Giovanbattista Galdi

Some considerations on the apodotic uses of *atque* and *et* (2nd c. BC–2nd c. AD)

Abstract: This paper deals with the phenomenon often referred to as "para-hypotaxis," that is, with the cases in which an adverbial phrase is linked to the matrix clause by means of a copulative conjunction that "breaks" the hypotactic nexus, e.g., Gel. 2,29,8: *haec ubi ille dixit **et** discessit*. Specifically, we shall go over all the earlier occurrences of the construction, from Plautus to Apuleius, and, based on their discussion, we shall show that the few certain (or very probable) instances must be explained either by a special use of *atque* or by Greek influence. We shall hence deny the existence in Latin of "para-hypotaxis" as an autonomous syntactical category, at least in connection with (pre)classical and Early Imperial times.

Keywords: para-hypotaxis, anacoluthon, Graecism, colloquial Latin, apodotic conjunctions

Giovanbattista Galdi: Faculty of Letters and Philosophy, University of Ghent, Blandijnberg 2, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium. E-mail: giovanbattista.galdi@ugent.be

1 Introduction

This paper deals with the so-called apodotic uses of *atque* and *et*, that is, with those cases in which a proleptic adverbial phrase (subordinate – typically temporal – clause, conjunct participle, or ablative absolute) is linked to the matrix clause by means of a copulative conjunction that (often apparently) "breaks" the hypotactic nexus between the two predications,[1] e.g.,

(1) (Plaut. *Epid.* 217)
 quom ad portam uenio, <u>atque</u> ego illam illi uideo praestolarier
 'when I came to the door, <u>and</u> I saw her waiting there'

---

[1] The author would like to express his gratitude to Jim Adams, Gualtiero Calboli, Wolfgang de Melo, and Harm Pinkster for their very helpful comments and suggestions.

Instances of this phenomenon, often referred to as "para-hypotaxis," are reported from nearly every period of Latin literature, from Plautus onwards, but most of them go back to later times, particularly to Christian authors.[2] Our contribution is manifold, and can be summarized as follows: after presenting the two main theories advanced by scholars for apodotic *atque* and *et*, we shall go over all the occurrences of the construction, focusing on pre-Christian times, and, based on their discussion, we shall deny the existence of "para-hypotaxis" as an autonomous syntactical category, at least in connection with Classical and Early Imperial Latin. The final section is devoted to a short discussion of the Christian and late instances of the construction.

2 Previous accounts of apodotic *atque* and *et*

Although various explanations have been proposed for the origin of the construction in Latin,[3] two main theories can be distinguished. The first one, which one may call "polygenetic," is found in a short survey by Baehrens (1912: 426–431) and, more extensively, in Sorrento (1929, 1949: 25–91),[4] who collected a large number of occurrences found both in Latin (from Plautus up to late Latinity) and in Romance languages. Sorrento bases his analysis on the fact that all examples, regardless both of the introductory conjunction (*atque*/*et*) and of author or literary genre, must be put down to an encroachment of the "spontaneous" or "colloquial" parataxis on the more "literary" hypotaxis.[5] Accordingly, this usage can autonomously develop in different languages (specifically, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Romance) and may be found, in principle, after any subordinate clause (temporal,

---

2 See Wehr (2008: 180): "Die Konstruktion des apodosis-einleitenden *et* ist im Lateinischen selten nachweisbar. Die Mehrzahl der Beispiele entstammt offenbar dem christlichen Latein."

3 Two useful overviews are found in Dell'Era (1968: 38–43) and Wehr (1984: 154–159). See also Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 482). The phenomenon is also mentioned in a recent contribution by Rosén (2009: 343–346) who includes "para-hypotactic" *atque* and *et* in the category of the "superordinators," i.e., connectors such as *sed*, *uerum*, *ergo* used as apodotic elements "to various formally not corresponding conjunctions," and hence all "substitutable by zero" (2009: 343).

4 We will henceforth refer to Sorrento (1949), in which the author re-edited and partly enlarged his paper of 1929.

5 Cf. Sorrento (1949: 57): "Lo scrittore nell'atto che stende il suo pensiero, per esprimerlo con la maggior precisione, consequenzialità e, direi, logica concatenazione, lo rende complesso ed è mosso verso l'ipotassi, ma poi la paratassi prende quasi istintivamente il sopravvento su di lui." The association of hypotaxis with written language and parataxis with spoken language is made by Sorrento (1949: 55–57). On this point see Wehr (1984: 157–158) and De Caprio (2010: 298–301).

conditional, causal, concessive, etc.) and in many literary genres (e.g., comedy, epic, history, novel)[6]. Besides, as far as Latin is concerned, a direct link exists between the earlier and the late Antique instances of the phenomenon and the only reason for its spread in late and medieval times is that the contacts between popular and literary language became deeper.[7] This view was taken up and supported in later studies by Pighi (1929) and Dell'Era (1968)[8] and had a crucial impact on research because, since then, the hypothesis of anacoluthon, and thus of a polygenetic origin of the construction, has largely been accepted among scholars.[9] In order to show the extension of the construction over several centuries and in various stylistic registers, these scholars collected a large number of instances, constantly defending the reading *et* or *atque* in apodotic position also when the transmitted text is doubtful. Moreover, the discussion was mainly confined to the few lines or words in which the usage is supposed to occur, while little or no relevance was given to the more general context.

The second theory was suggested by Pasquali (1929): based on the observation that apodotic καί and δέ are rather common in Ancient Greek, he maintains that the corresponding uses of Latin *et* (and of its Romance followers) draw on a common Greek root.[10] Taking, however, this theory for granted, Pasquali does not explain it in detail (his study only consists of four pages) and, particularly, he devotes little or no attention to the Latin passages quoted by Sorrento, most of which are rejected without a convincing explanation. Besides, no clear-cut distinction is found between καί and δέ (the latter being admittedly much more spread) and there is no statistical evidence on the frequency and distribution of

---

6 For a recent overview of the critics to Sorrento's work, see De Caprio (2010: 295–304).

7 See Sorrento (1949: 56) and Pighi (1929: 554).

8 Dell'Era is the last philologist who dealt in detail with all earlier (that is, pre-Christian) instances of the phenomenon (Wehr only devotes a few lines to the discussion of the Plautine passages). He is also the only scholar who attempts to find a common denominator to all instances of the phenomenon in Latin. He claims that the contexts of occurrence, despite their obvious differences, share at least one of the following three features: surprise, rapidity, dismay ("sorpresa, rapidità o sgomento"). However, leaving aside the vagueness and heterogeneity of these categories, several examples reported by Dell'Era barely fit to them (see, for instance, [8]–[10] and [14] below).

9 This view is not confined to classical philologists. See for instance the recent contribution of Bertinetto and Ciucci (2012: 90–91): "P(ara)-H(ypotaxis) was fairly common in Late Latin, but the first examples date from much earlier times [. . .] This is noteworthy, for it discards the diachronic hypothesis based on the influence of Hebrew on Late Latin via Bible translations [. . .] As it happens, this syntactic structure is not only very old, but liable to arise in completely unrelated languages."

10 Before Pasquali's paper, the possibility of a Greek origin of the construction had been cautiously put forward by Brenous (1895: 435) and Baehrens (1912: 426).

apodotic conjunctions in Greek. Pasquali's hypothesis was adopted, several years later, by Wehr, who analyzed the occurrences of the phenomenon in Late Latin and Romance. Wehr makes the assumption that the earlier instances of apodotic *et*/*atque* (until the 2nd c. AD) are to be explained as an imitation of Greek literary models, while the Christian examples result from the Greek translation of the Old Testament (on this point, see Section 4). In our contribution we shall add evidence in support of this theory, claiming however that only a few of the earlier passages can be put down to Graecism.

3 Early instances of apodotic *atque* and *et*

In the following pages, we will go over all the Latin examples of the construction, up to the 2nd c. AD, and in some cases we will propose a different interpretation or reading of the text. Based on Löfstedt (1911: 203), Pasquali (1929: 117–118), Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 479), and others, a preliminary distinction will be drawn between *atque* and *et*.

3.1 Apodotic *atque*

The earliest instances of our phenomenon involve *atque*, which is mostly found in Plautus:[11]

(1)′ (Plaut. *Epid.* 217)
quom ad portam uenio, <u>atque</u> ego illam illi uideo praestolarier
'when I came to the door, <u>and</u> I saw her waiting there'

(2) (Plaut. *Poen.* 649–652)
nescimus nos quidem istum qui siet; / nisi dudum mane ut ad portum processimus, / <u>atque</u> istum e naui exeuntem oneraria uidemus
'we don't know who he is; but earlier this morning, as we came to the harbour, <u>and</u> we saw him coming out of a ship of burden'

---

11 These passages are also reported in ThLL II 1076, 6–11 ("*atque* apodosin ducit"). They are included in the more general group of instances in which the conjunction introduces unexpected events (ThLL II 1075, 81–82 "adseritur enuntiatum quo aliquid exprimitur quod praeter opinionem accidit; possis circumscribere *atque* 'et statim' ").

(3) (Plaut. *Bacch*. 277–280)

postquam aurum abstulimus, in nauem conscendimus, / domi cupientes. forte ut adsedi in stega, / dum circumspecto, <u>atque</u> ego lembum conspicor / longum, strigorem maleficum exornarier

'after we took the gold, we embarked on the ship, desirous for home. By chance, as I set on the deck, while I was looking around, <u>and</u> I see a long bark being equipped by this evil knave'

(4) (Plaut. *Merc*. 255–257)

ad portum hinc abii mane cum luci simul; / postquam id quod uolui transegi, <u>atque</u> ego conspicor / nauem ex Rhodo quast heri aduectus filius

'this morning, at daybreak, I went to the harbour. After I settled there what I wanted to, <u>and</u> I see the ship from Rhodes, in which my son arrived yesterday'

(5) (Plaut. *Most*. 1048–1050)

postquam ex opsidione in tutum eduxi maniplares meos, / capio consilium, ut senatum congerronum conuocem. / quoniam conuocaui, <u>atque</u> illi me ex senatu segregant

'after I had led my troops out to safety, I decide to convoke a senate meeting of my comrades. As I had convoked it, <u>and</u> they expel me from the senate'

In all passages *atque* occurs after a temporal clause.[12] Wehr (1984: 151–153) recognizes in these uses an emphasizing or focusing function, comparable to that which will characterize apodotic *et* in Late Latin (see Section 4 below), and this for four reasons: (a) four of five instances involve verbs of seeing (*uideo, conspicor*); (b) the main verb is always a historical present; (c) in all passages but (2) the subject pronoun is employed (*atque ego, atque illi*); (d) *atque* always introduces, apart maybe from (3), an unexpected event. It must be added that the use of the personal pronoun, which typically occurs in Latin to clarify or emphasize the reference to the subject, is even more striking in (1), (3), and (4), since here the subject is the same as that of the foregoing phrase. Besides, in four of five examples the *atque*-clause is "introduced" by the preceding context, which creates some sort of expectation. So, in (1) *atque* occurs at the end of a long report of the slave Epidicus. After calling the attention of his interlocutors, Apoecides and Periphanes (v. 205), he gradually shifts the focus of the narration from the soldiers departing from Thebes with their arms and prisoners (vv. 206ff.) to the courtesans attempting to trap them with their nets (vv. 213ff.), and finally to the girl whom he

---

12 Note that also in (5) *quoniam*, at odds with Dell'Era's claim (1968: 39 "già in Plauto abbiamo una protasi causale: Most. 1050"), has temporal force, according to a usage often attested in Early Latin. Cf. OLD 1567, nr. 1 and 2 and Baños (2011: 209).

saw by his house (v. 217 *atque ego illam . . . uideo*). This woman will play a central role in the following discussion (P: *quicum Epidice?* – E: *cum illa, quam . . .* – P: *uiden ueneficam*! – E: *sed uestita*, *aurata* 'P: with whom, Epidicus? – E: with that woman, whom . . . – P: just see the murderess! – E: but well dressed, covered with gold'), since she is the one whom Periphanes firmly wants to prevent from marrying his son. Similarly, in (3) Chrysalus is revealing to his master, Nicobulus, the deceits conceived by Archidemides in order not to pay back the money that he owes to him. Also here the speaker asks for the attention of the addressee (v. 273 *porro etiam ausculta pugnam, quam uoluit dare* 'besides, listen to the fight which he planned to put on') and after a brief introduction (vv. 278ff.) he "zooms" on the bark (*lembum conspicor*), which, as in (1), constitutes the main topic of the following lines: cf. v. 281 *perii hercle, lembus ille mihi laedit latus* 'I am dead, that bark breaks my flank', v. 286 *is lembus nostrae naui insidias dabat* 'that bark was laying an ambush for our ship'. Even clearer is the centrality of the *atque*-unity in (4). In a long monologue Demipho describes the dream that he had the previous night and explains that these visions foreshadowed what would happen to him later: he went to the harbor and, after transacting what he needed, he saw a ship and in it a girl whom he immediately fell in love with. The scene depicted in these few lines (vv. 256–257 *atque ego conspicor . . . nauem*, v. 260 *atque ego . . . aspicio . . . mulierem*) is of crucial importance for the entire comedy, whose main topic is the love of both Demipho and his son Charinus for this very woman. Finally, in (5) the closing aprosdoketon (*atque . . . segregant*) is rhetorically prepared by a three-step description based on two lexical reprises: (vv. 1047–1050) *eduxi omnem legionem . . . ; postquam . . . eduxi . . . capio consilium, ut . . . conuocem; quoniam conuocaui, atque illi me . . . segregant* 'I lead forth the whole troops . . . ; after . . . I had lead them forth . . . I take the decision to . . . convoke; as I had convoked (it), and they expel me'.

There is hence good reason to believe that in the above passages *atque* is used by Plautus as a focusing device to draw the attention of the public to a special textual segment. This emerges, as seen, by the regular presence – except for (2) – of common contextual features. The main question that arose in scholarship is whether these passages display a particular use of *atque*, as distinguished by *et* and *-que*, or they result from anacoluthic (or "para-hypotactic") constructions, that in principle may have occurred with any copulative conjunction (so Sorrento, Pighi, and Dell'Era).[13] The second hypothesis is undermined both by the contigu-

---

[13] A sort of compromise between the two positions is found in Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 479), who distinguish the instances of apodotic *atque* from those of *et* but, commenting on (3), observe: "Man wird dabei Kontamination zweier Ausdrucksweisen (*dum circumspecto . . . conspicor* und *circumspecto atque conspicor*) anzunehmen haben." See also Wehr (1984: 152).

ity of the two clauses linked by *atque*[14] (anacoluthon is hence very unlikely) and by the fact that in all cases only *atque* is found (the first certain examples of apodotic *et* go back to Vergil).[15] Some philologists, as seen above, assumed an adverbial or "additive" use of *atque* which existed in the Archaic period (or at least in Plautus' idiolect) and then disappeared over the centuries.[16] This view has support from both the etymology of the lemma (from *ad-que* 'in addition', 'thereto')[17] and its occasional uses in syntactic contexts in which *et* is never found (not in the Republican period at least; cf. *simul atque*).[18] Also, ancient authors had the feeling that *atque* could perform some other less known functions apart from the mere copulative one. Revealing is a passage of Gellius referring, among the others, to a temporal adverbial value of the word:[19]

(6) (Gell. X 29,1,4; it follows the text of Verg. *Georg.* I 199–203; see (7) below)
     atque . . . interdum alias quasdam potestates habet non satis notas, nisi in ueterum litterarum tractatione atque cura exercitis . . . pro alio quoque aduerbio dicitur, id est 'statim'
     'occasionally has *atque* different meanings, which are only known to those who are acquainted with reading and studying ancient texts [. . .] it is also found in place of another adverb, that is, *statim*'

---

14 There is a further aspect to consider. In Plautus *atque* is often found as a connector at the beginning of a new sentence. Cf. ThLL II 1076, 18ff. (this use is also found with *et* and *-que*; cf. for the Archaic period Elmer 1887: 313). In some cases the logical link to the previous text is very weak and the conjunction simply marks the change to a new (sub)thematic unit (see for instance Plaut. *Men.* 357 and *Merc.* 560, quoted below). The public was thus "prepared" in (1)–(5) to isolate syntactically the *atque*-sentence from the preceding text. Therefore (and also assuming a pause of the actor in the recitation), the risk of misunderstanding the text by including the *atque*-unity in the proleptic phrase (especially in [1] and [3] where the two clauses share the same tense) must have been exiguous.
15 The latter aspect, along with the absence of contextual evidence, strongly weakens Wehr's assumption (1984: 180) of a syntactical Graecism ("Es liegt nahe [. . .], auch in dem apodosis-einleitenden *atque* bei Plautus [. . .] einen Gräzismus zu vermuten").
16 Cf. the views of Löfstedt (1911: 203) and Pasquali (1929: 118). See also Wehr (1984: 153): "[Es] erscheint [. . .] legitim, *atque* in diesen Fällen [sc. in Plautus] die Funktion der besonderen Aufmerksamkeitslenkung [. . .] zuzuerkennen, die für Plautus neben der koordinierenden Funktion bestanden haben muß, sonst hätte er nicht diesen Gebrauch von ihr machen können." Wehr, however, does not see in these uses a specific (perhaps etymological) force of the particle, but simply traces them back to Greek influence (see above footnote 15).
17 Cf. Calboli (2003: 274).
18 See also the often quoted verse of Ennius *ann.* 537 *atque atque accedit muros Romana iuuentus* and its detailed discussion in Dunkel (1980).
19 Cf. also Non. 530,1–7.

Furthermore, the occurrence of *atque* in the Plautine passages is fostered by two usages of the lexeme that are very common in Archaic Latin:

A. *atque* (often followed by *etiam*) may display what Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 478) call "connective-climactic" ("anknüpfende-steigernde") force, that is, it introduces sentences, or sentence constituents that reinforce and intensify the preceding text, e.g., Plaut. *Pers.* 783 *qui illum Persam atque omnis Persas atque etiam omnis personas male di omnes perdant!* ('may all gods destroy that Persian <u>and</u> all Persians <u>and even</u> all people!'), *Bacch.* 1092 *perditus sum atque etiam eradicatus sum* ('I am ruined <u>and even</u> eradicated'). This usage is often found in dialogues, especially in answers that confirm and "raise" foregoing utterances, e.g., Plaut. *Pseud.* 739 *ecquid is homo habet aceti in pectore? :: atque acidissumi* ('does this man have any shrewdness in his breast? :: (yes) <u>and even</u> the sharpest'), *Cas.* 612 *erus sum :: quis erus? :: quoius tu seruo's :: egone? :: atque meus* ('I am the master :: what master? :: the one whose servant you are :: me, a slave? :: yes, <u>and</u> mine, in fact').

B. Chiefly in comedy, *atque* may occur before *eccum/eccam*, or, more seldom, *ipse/is* (in Plautus there are about 20 instances) in order to signal the arrival on the scene of somebody that typically has been mentioned in the immediately preceding context. This type of expression is by its very nature explicitly or implicitly related to verbs of visual perception (the same was observed for [1]–[4]), e.g., Plaut. *Men.* 357 *set ubi illest quem coquos ante aedis ait esse? atque eccum uideo* ('but where is the person that the cook said to be in front of the house? <u>and</u> there he his'), *Merc.* 560 *ut mihi aedis aliquas conducat uolo, ubi habitet istaec mulier. atque eccum it foras* ('I want him to rent a house for me, where this woman may live. <u>and</u> there he comes out').

At the pragmatic level, the aspect that binds A and B with (1)–(5) is the special relevance of the *atque*-clause in connection to the preceding (and often also to the following) text. This effect is reached either by means of a semantically climactic structure (A), that confers special salience to the *atque*-unity, or (B) through the appearance on the scene or in the narration of a new (mainly animated) element, (1)–(4), which, although "introduced" or foreshadowed in the preceding context, typically creates a surprise effect.

After Plautus, only two more certain instances of apodotic *atque* are found:

(7) (Verg. *georg.* I 199–203)
    sic omnia fatis / in peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri, / non aliter quam qui aduerso uix flumine lembum / remigiis subigit, si bracchia forte remisit, / atque illum in praeceps prono rapit alueus amni

'so, by the law of fate, incline all things to the bad and, losing their power, they slip backwards. Just like the one who scarcely propels his boat with the oars against the stream of the river: if he happens to slack his arms, <u>and</u> the river drags him away headlong downstream'

(8) (Gell. XVII 20,4)

haec uerba ubi lecta sunt, <u>atque</u> ibi Taurus mihi 'heus' inquit 'tu, rhetorisce'

'as these words were pronounced, <u>and</u> Taurus said to me "hey, you little rhetorician"'

The interpretation of (7) is controversial.[20] Some scholars considered *atque . . . rapit* as part of the foregoing sentence *si . . . remisit*. On this view, we would have a highly unusual change of tense within a conditional clause (*si . . . remisit, atque . . . rapit*) which is not attested elsewhere in Virgil. Alternatively, one may link the final verse (*atque . . . amni*) to *subigit* in v. 202, assuming the resumption of *qui* by a demonstrative pronoun (*atque illum = atque quem*). This usage though is rare in Classical Latin[21] and would not anyway account for the conditional clause *si . . . remisit* which should logically be postponed to *atque* ('no differently than the one who [. . .] barely forces his boat against the stream <u>and</u>, <u>if by chance he slackens his arms</u>, the river sweeps him away').[22] Besides, as seen in the discussion of (6), already Gellius felt that *atque* in (7) possesses a less known adverbial-temporal function (= *statim*). We are hence most likely in presence of an apodotic use of the conjunction, which, interestingly enough, shares some of the characteristics highlighted in (1)–(5). For the *atque*-clause contains a historical present (*rapit*) and describes a scene that, even if not unexpected, is of highly dramatic nature. Moreover, it is "prepared" by a short thematic unity (which it closes) concerning the continuous risk for nature's products to degenerate if neglected by human hand (vv. 197–199). Noteworthy is also the subject inversion (*non aliter quam <u>qui</u> . . . atque illum <u>alueus</u>*) that contributes to isolate the final verse, conferring it particular emphasis.[23] It is likely that Virgil was well aware of the special uses of *atque* found in Plautus (and perhaps in other now lost works of the early period) and deliberately imitated them both at the syntactic and pragmatic level, setting a special focus on the *atque*-unity. Example (8) is normally explained as

---

20 An overview of the syntactical explanations of the passage is found in Mynors (1990: 45).

21 Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 565–566) mention only one instance in Virgil (*Aen.* VII 61–63).

22 For details, see Dell'Era (1968: 51–53).

23 See also Schindler (2000: 201): "Durch den abrupten Subjekt-wechsel von *qui* . . . / *remigiis subigit* (201f.) zu *rapit alveus* (203) wird [. . .] deutlich, wie sehr der Fluss die Oberhand gewinnt, zumal der Ruderer in demselben Vers nur noch als Objekt (*illum*) ohne die Möglichkeit zu eigener Aktivität erscheint."

an archaism by Gellius, who certainly knew, along with Virgil's verse (see [6]), the Plautine passages. This is possible, but the pragmatic force emerging in the previous two authors is entirely absent in (8), where *atque* simply marks the beginning of a new speech held by the same person (*haec uerba ubi lecta sunt, atque . . . inquit*). Alternatively, this use may hence be interpreted as a Graecism. As seen above (see Section 2), apodotic καὶ is attested several times in Ancient Greek: according to Denniston, there are as many as 25 certain instances of the phenomenon from Homer to Plato, along with 11 further possible cases which though may also be put down to other factors.[24] This usage is chiefly found in poetry: Homer (nine times), lyric poetry (five times), and tragedy (two very probable instances). Seven further cases (all in the form κᾆτα, κἄπειτα) occur in comedy but, interestingly enough, at least three of them display a raising of the stylistic register (Arist. Eq. 392, Lys. 560, Nu. 624). All or most of these uses were certainly known to Roman authors and due to the several occurrences in ancient epic and lyric, they may have been felt as syntactic archaisms characteristic of higher literary style. This aspect is of crucial importance for the interpretation of (8). The whole scene is set in a Greek environment. Gellius recalls a lecture by the philosopher Taurus that he attended as a young student in Athens. After reading an excerpt from Plato's *Symposium* (Gellius quotes by heart the original Greek text), Taurus addresses a short speech to Gellius, which we read in its Latin translation, apart from a few Greek words (*rhetorisce,* ἐνθύμημα, ὁδοῦ πάρεργον). The paragraph ends up with the Latin version, *excercendi gratia,* of Plato's passage. We can assume that in this context, in which nearly everything is Greek (the place, the language, the main character, and the references within his speeches), Gellius adopted, perhaps as a sign of praise,[25] a syntactic feature that was probably considered characteristic of higher literary registers. This impression gains support by the fact that, unlike (1)–(5) and (7), *atque* is accompanied by a temporal adverb (*ibi*) that resumes the correlative subordinator (*ubi . . . atque ibi*). This very well fits to the Greek usage: in by far most of the instances collected by Cooper III (2002: 3017), apodotic καί is immediately followed by a temporal adverb such as

---

24 See Denniston (1959: 308–309).
25 Note that at the beginning of the paragraph the author overtly praises the rhythmic and syntactic properties of Plato's passage: *uerba illa Pausaniae inter conuiuas amorem . . . laudantis, ea uerba ita prorsum amauimus, ut meminisse etiam studuerimus* ('I admired so much those words of Pausania who praises love among the banqueters, that I applied myself to memorize them'). Referring to the entire passage, Beall (1997: 219) observes: "The atmosphere of the chapter is one of courteous rivalry, not only between Gellius and Plato, but also between rhetoric and philosophy and between Latin and Greek. Emulation of this kind, in Gellius' view, is the spice of liberal studies."

τότε, δή, ἔπειτα, etc.,[26] e.g., Hdt. I 55,2 (hexameter oracle) ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν ἡμίονος βασιλεὺς Μήδοισι γένηται, / καὶ τότε, Λυδὲ ποδαβρέ, πολυψήφιδα παρ᾽ Ἕρμον / φεύγειν 'but when a mule shall become monarch of the Medes, and then, you tender-footed Lydian, flee away to the pebbly Hermus'.

In addition to the seven examples above – (1)–(5), (7), (8) – Dell'Era (1968: 56–59, 61) reports three instances of apodotic *atque* from Early Imperial times, which though, upon closer examination, appear to result from an erroneous interpretation of the syntactic context:[27]

(9) (Petron. 59,2)
tu, Hermeros, parce adulescentulo. sanguen illi feruet, tu melior esto. semper in hac re qui uincitur, uincit. et tu cum esses capo, cocococo, atque cor non habebas
'you Hermeros, bear with the young fellow. His blood boils, so be better than him. The loser is always the winner in this type of matters. You too, when you were a young cockerel, cock-a-doodle-doo, and you had no grain of sense'

(10) (Papin. *dig*. XXXIV 1,10,2)
alimentis . . . filiae relictis ab herede filio pro modo legatae dotis, quam solam pater exheredatae filiae nubenti dari uoluit, atque pro incrementis aetatis eam exhibendam esse respondi, non pro uiribus hereditatis
'I gave the response that, if maintenance has been left to the daughter, [. . .] the bequest has to be paid by the son, who is the heir, in correspondence with the dowry that the father decided to leave to the disinherited daughter at the time of her marriage, and according to her increase in age, not according to the value of his estate'

(11) (Stat. *Theb*. II 26–31)
illos ut caeco recubans in limine sensit / Cerberus, atque omnes capitum sub-rexit hiatus, / saeuus et intranti populo, iam nigra tumebat / colla minax, iam sparsa solo turbauerat ossa / ni deus . . . domuisset lumina somno
'as Cerberus, who was lying on the dark threshold, perceived them, and raised all the mouths of his heads, fierce even to the people who entered, he was already swelling his threatening black necks, he had already scattered the bones littering the ground, had not the god soothed his eyes with torpor'

---

26 See Cooper III (2002: 3017): "Apodotic καί stands in some places in Epic and Lyric without a supporting adverb, but τότε, δή or ἔτι or a combination of these more usually support the καί. In comedy εἶτα or ἔπειτα support the καί and the protasis is participial."

27 Number (10) is also quoted by Sorrento (1949: 47) and Pighi (1929: 554). For the explanation of (9), see also Dell'Era (1970: 165–166).

Passage (9) reports the words of Trimalchio, who is trying to settle an intense dispute between Hermeros and Giton. He addresses Hermeros asking him to spare his young and hot-blooded fellow and reminding him that he too (that is, Hermeros) used to act as a rooster in his youth. Since *atque* occurs after an adverbial phrase (*cum . . . esses*), a few scholars corrected it in *aeque*, while the great majority supposed the ellipsis of a verb (*faciebas, sonabas*, etc.) after *cocococo*.[28] Dell'Era sees in the latter a mere interjection ('cock-a-doodle-doo') followed by "para-hypotaxis": "E pure tu, quand'eri un galletto (chicchirichì), e mica ragionavi."[29] The only argument he advances is the stylistic contrast resulting from the use of a lexical hyperurbanism (*atque* admittedly belongs to higher literary registers[30] and is almost absent from the freedmen's speech[31]) within a syntactic vulgarism (the anacoluthic structure). One can object, however, that the choice of *atque* seems due in the first instance to the rhythmic repetition of [k] (*cum esses capo, cocococo, atque cor*), which also accounts for the use of *cor* in the less common meaning 'mind', 'judgment'.[32] Besides, even accepting Dell'Era's argument, the ellipsis of a verb after *cocococo* followed by the stylistically marked *atque* would produce an analogous contrast. Finally, in Petronius' novel there are several undisputable cases of ellipsis,[33] particularly in the mouth of the uneducated,[34] whereas no certain instances of "para-hypotaxis" are found (see also below). There is hence no need to refuse the traditional interpretation of the passage. In (10), taken from the *responsa* of Papinianus, the syntax has clearly been misunderstood. Sorrento, Pighi, and Dell'Era, based on ThLL II 1076, 13–16, consider the long section *pro modo legatae dotis, quam solam pater . . . dari uoluit* as belonging to the ablative absolute *alimentis . . . relictis*, followed by the "para-hypotactic" *atque . . . respondi*.[35] But none of them observed that the finite verb

---

28 See for instance Biville (1996: 860): "Toi aussi, quand tu n'étais qu'un coquelet, <tu faisais> cocorico et tu ne te comportais pas plus intelligemment."

29 Dell'Era (1968: 57) and (1970: 166). This view is shared by Rochette (2007: 171).

30 See ThLL II 1150, 10–11: "*atque* particula videtur altioris potius generis dicendi propria esse quam sermonis vulgaris." Likewise, Calboli (2003: 275) observes that *atque* is rather frequent in the *Orationes* and the *Origines* of Cato, whereas in the stylistic lower *De agri cultura, et* is strongly overwhelming. Also on inscriptions the use of *atque* is rare. Cf. Elmer (1887: 294).

31 According to Dell'Era (1970: 161 and n. 3), *et* occurs 230 times in the speeches of uneducated characters, while there are only two instances of *atque,* apart from (9), both in the variant *ac*. In one case, however, the lemma is used within a comparison: 42,7 *aeque est enim ac si in puteum conicias* 'for it is just the same as if you should throw in a cistern'.

32 On this point, see Biville (1996: 861).

33 For details, see Petersmann (1977: 293).

34 Dell'Era (1968: 57) himself remarks: "Certo un'ellissi non può meravigliare sulla bocca degli incolti."

35 Cf. Sorrento (1949: 47), Pighi (1929: 554), and Dell'Era (1968: 61).

respondi introduces the whole text following the ablative absolute, from *ab herede filio* up to *pro uiribus hereditatis*: 'If maintenance is left to a daughter, I <u>answered that</u> the bequest should be provided from the son heir in accordance both with the dowry [. . .] and with her increase in age, not with the value of the estate'. The segment *atque pro incrementis aetatis* is thus regularly coordinated to *pro modo legatae dotis*, both being opposed to the following *pro uiribus hereditatis*.[36] More problematic is (11). Dell'Era (1968: 58) assumes again anacoluthon, based on the fact that the two actions *sensit* and *subrexit* are linked by a temporal-logical nexus, whereby the latter is necessarily a consequence of the former: "Cerbero sdraiato sulla soglia oscura dapprima *sensit illos*, e solo <u>in conseguenza di questo</u> (cioè dopo: *ut*) *subrexit hiatus capitum*, e poi con più larga ripresa dopo l'inciso *iam tumebat colla* [. . .], *iam turbauerat ossa, ni deus horrentem domuisset.*"[37] This view, though interesting – one may think of a reminiscence of Virgil (see [7] above) – is scarcely compelling because both predicates *sensit* and *subrexit*, whose temporal and logical succession is insured by the word order, may belong to the *ut*-clause, followed by the main predication *tumebat*:[38] 'After Cerberus saw them and reared the mouth of his heads [. . .], he was already swelling his [. . .] necks, he had already scattered the bones [. . .], had not the god etc.'. Accepting this interpretation, there would be a stylistically explainable contrast between the momentaneous perfects *sensit*, *subrexit* and the durative *tumebat*.

Summing up, only seven certain instances of apodotic *atque* are found in pre-Christian Latin, of which five are in Plautus and one each in Virgil and Gellius. The Plautine passages, (1)–(5), are very likely to arise from an original additive/ adverbial function of the conjunction, which disappeared in later Latin. Besides, in almost all cases the *atque*-clause bears a special focus (in [4] it introduces the main topic of the whole comedy) and is "prepared" by the foregoing text. Analogous properties characterize the Virgilian example (7) in which we can thus suppose an intentional imitation of Plautus' style. Gellius was certainly familiar with all these instances (in [6] he even quotes Virgil's verse), but the only use he makes of apodotic *atque* (8) has pragmatically nothing in common with them, and

---

36 The reference of *eam* (*exhibendam eam*) is inferable from the preceding syntagma *pro modo legatae dotis*. See also the translation of Vignali (1838: 11): "Lasciati alla figlia gli alimenti [. . .] io risposi, che la dote la quale soltanto il padre volle che si desse alla figlia diseredata nel maritarsi, dal figlio erede le si doveva dare <u>a misura della dote legata, e secondo il crescere dell'età</u>, non secondo le forze dell'eredità."

37 Dell'Era (1968: 58). On the same ground, some editors emended *atque* in various ways (*aeque*, *ecce*, etc.). For details see Dell'Era (1968: 59). More recently, Eden (1998: 322) suggested the reading *utque*.

38 On this point, see also Anderson (1941–1945: 10–11): "Attempts to make a principal clause of *atque . . . hiatus* (27) by emendation or otherwise are futile."

should rather be seen as a syntactic Graecism explicable from the context of occurrence.

3.2 Apodotic *et*

This usage is rare until the 2nd/3rd century AD, and some of the alleged instances are problematic. Sorrento (1949: 46–47) mentions eleven passages, but three of them were already rejected by Pasquali (1929: 118), for they occur after perfect participle and must be put down to the ellipsis of *est*.[39] Dell'Era's list (1968: 46–61) is shorter (nine cases), but it also includes the following doubtful instances (I give the text as quoted by Dell'Era):[40]

(12) (Curt. IV 15,22)
    turbata erat utraque acies. Alexander et a fronte et a tergo hostem habebat.
    qui auerso ei instabant, <u>et</u> ab Agrianis equitibus premebantur
    'both armies had been thrown into disorder. Alexander had the enemy both in front and behind him. Those who attacked him from behind <u>and</u> were pressed by the Agrian horsemen'

(13) (Petron. 47,6)
    credite mihi, anathymiasis si in cerebrum it, <u>et</u> in toto corpore fluctum facit
    'believe me, if the internal vapours rise to the brain, <u>and</u> they cause a flux over the entire body'

(14) (Quint. VI 3,60)
    cum (Vatinius) *reus agente in eum Caluo frontem candido sudario tergeret idque ipsum accusator in inuidiam uocaret: 'quamuis reus sum', inquit, '<u>et</u> panem candidum edo'*
    'while (Vatinius), who was prosecuted by Calvus, wiped his front with a white handkerchief and the accuser tried to use this as an argument against him, (Vatinius) said: 'Although I lie under an accusation, <u>and</u> I eat white bread''

---

39 E.g., Verg. *Aen.* VI 547 *tantum effatus et in uerbo uestigia torsit* 'he said so and while speaking he turned on his heel'; cf. also *Aen.* X 256, 877.
40 Dell'Era (1968: 46–51, 54–56, 58–61).

(15) (Apul. *met*. VII 26,4)

> *interim dum puerum illum parentes sui plangoribus fletibusque querebantur,*
> *et adueniens ecce rusticus nequaquam promissum suum frustratus destinatam*
> *sectionem meam flagitat*
>
> 'while the parents were mourning the boy with tears and lamentations, <u>and</u>
> there it turns up the farmer, who did not forget his promise, and proposes to
> operate on me'

In (12) *et* is found after a relative clause (*qui . . . instabant*) and can hardly be
linked to *ab Agrianis* (thus, 'also by the Agrians') because, as noted by Dell'Era,
"dal contesto non risulta minimamente che altre forze esercitassero pressione
sulla colonna in questione."[41] Most editors expunge it, while Hedicke adds *ipsi*
after it.[42] This example, along with (13) and (14), is particularly relevant for Sor-
rento's and Dell'Era's point, because it would prove that the "para-hypotaxis,"
although prevailing after temporal phrases, may in principle occur after any sub-
ordinate type. This view though is invalidated by a glance at the wider context.
The passage deals with the assault of Alexander on the right wing of the Persian
army. During this action, the king's army was attacked on the rear by the left wing
of the Persians which, in turn, was pressed on the back by the Agrians. Therefore,
Alexander's army and the left Persian wing stood in the same situation, both
assaulting and being charged upon the rear. This is described by the author in the
paragraphs 20 to 22 and summed up in (12). Accordingly, we first read *Alexander*
et a fronte et a tergo hostem habebat, in which the two *et* perfectly depict the
scene, and then, *qui auerso ei instabant, et ab Agrianis equitibus premebantur*,
meaning that the left wing of the Persians was at the same time attacking Alexan-
der and attacked by the Agrian horsemen. *Et* is hence used as an adverb (*etiam*)
linking the two predicates *instabant* and *premebantur*: 'Those who pressed upon
his rear were also (that is, concurrently) pressed by the Agrian horsemen'. There
is thus no need to assume a pleonastic or apodotic use of the conjunction. Alter-
natively, one might assume that *qui* is a connective relative referred to *hostem* and
the plurals *instabant, premebantur* are due to a *constructio ad sensum*.[43] Also in
(13) *et* may be explained in two ways. The only manuscript transmitting the pas-
sage (H) reads *anathimia is si in cerebrum it, et*. Most editors print *anathymiasis*
omitting *si*, while a few of them (as Ernout) prefer *anathymiasis si in cerebrum it,*
et. This solution is adopted by Dell'Era on the grounds that both *si* and *et* occur in

---

41 Dell'Era (1968: 54).
42 Hedicke (1908: 99).
43 This idea has been suggested to me by Wolfgang de Melo.

the manuscript and "eliminare l'uno o l'altro appare arbitrario."[44] It is possible, though, that the scribe of H (or of an earlier testimony), confused by the isolated use of a bizarre Greek word (that remains almost unparalleled in the entire Latinity[45]), reanalyzed its ending in *is si*. This solution is supported by the fact that H exhibits several deviations in the transmission of Greek words, e.g., 48,8 *apothan in helo* for *apothanein thelo*, 49,8 *tethilis* for *ti theleis*, 30,5 *bylinchis* for *bilychnis*, etc. The second solution is to take *et* in the common meaning *etiam* and link it to the following *in toto corpore*. Referring to this solution, Dell'Era (1968: 56) remarks: "Sembra un po' strano dire che 'la flatulenza, se arriva al cervello, provoca effervescenza <u>anche</u> in tutto il corpo', con la bizzarria di supporre inverificabili umori nel cervello." But the words of Trimalchio cannot be taken *ad litteram* anyway, as he asserts that the internal vapors (*anathymiasis*), if rising to the brain, may cause a flux over the whole body (*in toto corpore*), whereas the physical reaction should strictly be confined to the abdominal area. We can hence assume that Trimalchio – who is inviting in a rather dramatic tone his guests to feel free to relieve themselves – deliberately overstates the symptoms and the consequences of the disease by extending it to the entire body, from head to toe. In (14), all testimonies read *et parentem candidum*. The editors print *et panem item* or *et panem tamen*. Dell'Era (1968: 58) pleads for *et panem* (which he needs for the "parahypotaxis") but does not explain the corruption *panem → parentem*. Although the text cannot be restored with certainty, the reading *et panem item* is supported by the context. In the previous sentence we read that Vatinius, while prosecuted by Calvus, wiped his forehead with a white handkerchief. This caused the reaction of Calvus, because the accused ought to wear dark clothes.[46] Vatinius' reply can only be understood in connection to the foregoing *candido sudario*: 'Although I lie under an accusation (and I hence ought to wear mourning), also the bread that I eat is white', meaning, 'if I may eat white bread, than I am also allowed to use a white cloth'.[47] There is hence no syntactic rupture but quite the contrary, the *et*-clause being closely connected to the preceding text. Finally, for the explanation of (15) one has to compare another very close passage of Apuleius' romance:

---

44 Dell'Era (1968: 56).

45 According to ThLL II 21, 8–9 there is only one further occurrence in Theodorus Priscus (ca. 400 AD).

46 Cf. Russell (2001: 93).

47 Cf. Russell (2001: 93): "The point of the example is that the defendant's use of a white handkerchief [...] is defended by pointing out that there is nothing wrong with his eating white bread."

(16) (Apul. *met*. V 28)

interim, dum Psyche quaestioni Cupidinis intenta populos circumibat, <u>at</u> ille . . . in ipso thalamo matris iacens ingemebat

'in the meantime, while Psyche travelled around the world searching for Cupid, <u>but</u> he was lying and mourning in the very chamber of his mother'

This excerpt shares three relevant syntactic features with (15) which are not found elsewhere in Apuleius: (a) the construction *dum* + imperfect indicative (the conjunction is normally followed by the subjunctive);[48] (b) the pattern *interim dum* (*interim* occurs otherwise alone); (c) the apparent use of an apodotic conjunction after subordinate clause, namely *et* (15) and *at* (16). These peculiarities, especially (a) and (c), can readily be explained by assuming that in both passages *dum* is not employed as a subordinator, but is linked with the foregoing *interim* and has an adverbial force analogous to *interdum* ('meanwhile', 'in the meantime').[49] On this view *et* and *at* are not apodotic but coordinate two syntactically equivalent sentences.[50] These are the remaining instances:

(17) (Verg. *Aen*. IX 47–52)

Turnus, ut ante uolans tardum praecesserat agmen / uiginti lectis equitum comitatus <u>et</u> urbi / improuisus adest, maculis quem Thracius albis / portat equus cristaque tegit galea aurea rubra, / 'ecquis erit mecum, iuuenes, qui primus in hostem? / en,' ait

'as Turnus had flew before his slow troops, accompanied by twenty chosen horsemen, <u>and</u>, all unforeseen, he reached the town; a Thracian horse was carrying him, a golden helmet with crimson crest was protecting him: "Who first will be with me to fight against the enemy?", he said'

---

48 See Callebat (1968: 344–346).

49 This seems to be the solution adopted by Helm (1931) who in both cases edits *interimdum*. Cf. also Callebat (1968: 345): "Apulée a [. . .] deux exemples de *dum* ainsi suivi d'un imparfait mais deux exemples où *dum* apparaît en corrélation avec *et* ou *at* et n'a donc pas une nette valeur subordonnante."

50 Another, less likely possibility would be to see in *et ecce* in (15) a simple equivalent of *ecce*. In fact, Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 482) observe that "formelhafte Verbindungen wie *et ecce*, *et ideo* ganz zu *ecce*, *ideo* abgeschliffen waren." The two scholars do not give further details on the phenomenon, but from other studies it appears that apodotic (*et*) *ecce* first spreads in Christian Latin. Cf. the examples collected in Wehr (1984: 173–179) (see also Section 4 below). This explanation must hence be ruled out.

(18) (Verg. *Aen*. IX 402–403)

ocius adducto torquens hastile lacerto / suspiciens altam lunam <u>et</u> sic uoce precatur

'speedily swinging his spear with lifted arm, looking at the moon on high, <u>and</u> with these words he prays'

(19) (Gell. II 29,8)

haec ubi ille dixit <u>et</u> discessit

'as he said this, <u>and</u> he left'

(20) (Varr. *rust*. II 7,9)

equus matrem salire cum adduci non posset, cum eum capite obuoluto auriga adduxisset et coegisset matrem inire, cum descendenti dempsisset ab oculis, <u>et</u> ille impetum fecit in eum ac mordicus interfecit

'since the horse could not be persuaded to leap over his mother, after the driver brought him with covered head and forced him to pair with the mother, when he removed (the cloth) from the eyes of the horse, who was coming down, <u>and</u> it attacked him and bit him to death'

(21) (Petron. 38,8)

sed quomodo dicunt – ego nihil scio, sed audiui – quom Incuboni pilleum rapuisset, <u>et</u> thesaurum inuenit

'but, as they say – I know nothing, I just heard it – when he stole the mantle to the spirit, <u>and</u> he found a treasure'

(22) (*Acta arv*. a. 81 (CIL VI, 2060) I 15–16)

cum in aedem Caesarei consedissent, <u>et</u> ex sacrificio gustarunt[51]

'as they sat down at Caesar's sanctuary, <u>and</u> they ate the food of the sacrifice'

In (17) some editors emended *comitatus et* (v. 48) in *comitantibus* or *ut* (v. 47) in *at*, but the text is unanimously transmitted and is also quoted as such by Macrobius (*sat*. I 2,7). Pasquali (1929: 118) and others believed that the *ut*-sentence extends from *Turnus* to *rubra* (v. 50) and the main clause begins with *ecquis erit … ait* (vv. 51–52).[52] But then again, as for (7) above, we would have a very odd change of tense within the same subordinate clause: *ut … praecesserat … et … adest.*[53] In

---

51 This example is reported by Wehr (1984: 188). No mention is found in the studies of Dell'Era (1968), Sorrento (1949), and Pighi (1929).

52 Ribbeck's suggestion of a nominal use of the participle (*ut ante uolans = ut qui ante uolat*) is implausible also because there are no parallels in Virgil. Cf. Ribbeck (1862: 117–118).

53 Also the hypothesis put forward by Conington and Nettleship (1875: 157) of linking *comitatus* with *improuisus* (*comitatus et … improuisus*) is highly questionable because the two words

(18) most editors either replaced *torquens* with *torquet* (so Mynors) or emended the following verse in various ways (e.g., *suspicit en! altam lunam*; *suspicit altam lunam sic*).[54] However, the manuscripts exhibit no variants and the two verses are quoted as above respectively by Nonius (246,28) and Priscianus (*gramm.* III 104,27–28).[55] A possible syntactic solution could be the ellipsis of *est* after *torquens* (or *suspiciens*), but this type of periphrasis is not attested in Virgil.[56] On the whole, given the reliability of the transmitted text (which is also confirmed by indirect sources), it is preferable to keep *et* both in (17) and (18). This use results from a rare construction. Dell'Era (along with Sorrento and Pighi) pleads for the "para-hypotaxis," which would be chosen here because of its expressive properties.[57] In fact, in both cases the context is highly dramatic: (17) refers to the first assault of Turnus against the Trojan camp and the scene is "prepared" by an extended section of text (vv. 25–46) describing Turnus's army speedily advancing over the fields and the following reaction by the Trojans; (18) introduces Nysus' invocation to Diana, which preludes his desperate attack against the Latins: here, too, we have a brief introduction (vv. 394–401), in which Nysus sees his friend Euryalus being dragged away by the enemies and wonders what to do (vv. 399ff.). The hypothesis of an anacoluthon isolating a special textual segment within a pivotal narrative sequence is hence plausible in both passages. However, due to the high stylistic nature of both passages, one can barely share Sorrento's view of a choice of the "para-hypotaxis" intended as accidental "lapse" from the hypotaxis into the more colloquial parataxis. Also Dell'Era's assumption (1968: 62) of a use of the construction as a "scelta stilistica di maggiore espressività" is highly questionable since it bases on the assumption that the "para-hypotaxis" constitutes a well-established stylistic device, a sort of rhetorical means which the reader was able to recognize as such and to associate with particularly dramatic contexts. But, as seen above, there are no certain instances of the phenomenon (not with *et*, at least) in the whole Archaic and Classical period. There is, instead, reason to believe that the construction of (17) and (18) is modelled on apodotic καί. For the whole ninth book of the Aeneid is strongly influenced by Homer. Specifically, the

---

belong to different grammatical categories (I could find no parallels in Virgil for the coordination of a participle with an adjective) and are separated by *urbi*, which certainly goes with *adest*. For references, see Dell'Era (1968: 48).

54 An overview of the state of the question is found in Dell'Era (1968: 49).

55 Particularly, Priscianus commenting on the anomalous use of *et*, assumes its postposition *quarto loco* (hence *et suspiciens*). But according to ThLL V/2 897, 78ff. this phenomenon never occurs in Virgil. Even *tertio loco* the postposition is practically non-existent (there is only one instance in *Aen.* XII 381). On this point see Dell'Era (1968: 50–51).

56 See Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 388).

57 Cf. Dell'Era (1968: 53).

last six books of the work are unanimously considered Virgil's Iliad. Since though book 6 and 7 are largely inspired by non-Iliadic models, book 9 is "the first of the substantially Iliadic four last books of the *Aeneid*; its action is the central Iliadic action of the siege, as Turnus launches a full-scale assault on the Trojan fortifications."[58] Each main episode of the book can be traced back to a precise Homeric (mainly Iliadic) model[59] and it is hence no surprise to detect here twice a syntactic feature which finds in Homer its largest extension, both after subordinate and participial phrase. The assumption of Graecism may tentatively be suggested also for (19), the authorship of which has long been questioned. The passage is taken from the fable of the lark who put her nest in a cornfield that was about to be reaped. Most scholars assumed that the whole passage draws on a satire by Ennius. In particular, Vahlen based on lexical and metrical evidence claimed that Gellius here was not only inspired by his model, but also copied entire fragments from it.[60] However, the archaisms that he invokes (e.g., *pulli tremibundi, trepiduli, die crastini*) can also be put down to Gellius' well-known predilection for old-fashioned style and some of the trochaic sequences which he refers to are not cogent.[61] Besides, there is no compelling reason to assert that Gellius' main source here is Ennius, because the whole story is presented as the translation of an Aesop's fable (*haec eius* [Aesopi] *fabula de auiculae nidulo*) and only at the end reference is made to two verses from Ennius' satires (*hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris . . . composuit*).[62] Accordingly, the lexical and prosodic features of the text must be ascribed in the first instance to Gellius. As for the syntax of (19), there are at least two plausible explanations. First, due to the Aesopian origin of the fable, Gellius adopted a syntactic Graecism, which, as seen above, was very likely associated with higher literary registers and was thus particularly suitable to the distinctive old-fashioned style of the entire passage. Besides, Gellius probably knew and imitated, in a different context, apodotic καί (see the discussion of [8]). Second, *et* has to be taken in its adverbial meaning (= *etiam*) and links the two predicates *dixit – discessit*, emphasizing the rapidity of their succession: 'The moment that he said these words (as he stopped talking), he also went away'.[63] In (20) the text is uncertain. The passage is transmitted as such by three testimonies that are copies of the now lost *Marcianus*. However, the *editio princeps*, printed in

---

58 Hardie (1995: 2).

59 For references, see Hardie (1995: 9–10).

60 Cf. Vahlen (1903: CCXII).

61 See Courtney (1993: 15).

62 This point is made by Luzzatto (1984: 82).

63 This hypothesis is already found in Frobenius (1910: 87), who though attributes the entire passage to Ennius. He speaks of "kumulative Bedeutung" of *et* ("da ging er 'auch schon' davon").

1471, displays no *et* and Poliziano, who compared this edition with the *Marcianus*, noting, where necessary, the divergences, did not remark anything in this specific passage. Therefore, all modern editions expunge *et*,[64] but the evidence is not altogether decisive. If we retain the conjunction, we may either put it down to anacoluthon – this phenomenon is often found in Varro[65] – or link it to the following *ac*: *et ille in eum impetum fecit – ac mordicus interfecit* ('he both assaulted him and bit him to death').[66] Also in (21) the text has been questioned by some editors, for *et* may readily result from dittography (*rapuisset et*).[67] However, since it figures in the only testimony of the passage (H), it is safer to maintain it.[68] This use can be explained in various ways.[69] As suggested for (19), the conjunction may have adverbial force (*etiam*) and connect the two predicates *rapuisset – inuenit*, emphasizing the speed of the action ('when/as soon as he stole the cap, he also found a treasury'). Pasquali (1929: 118) proposed instead a syntactic Graecism,[70] given both the origin of the speaker (Hermeros) and the fact that his language is markedly influenced by Greek.[71] It is though disputed whether apodotic καί was common in colloquial Greek of 1st century AD. For after the Classical period, in which the construction is characteristic of higher registers (see the discussion of [8] above), apodotic καί is restricted to Ptolemaic papyri where it only occurs

---

64 See also ThLL V/2 896, 55.

65 Several examples are collected by Laughton (1960: 20–22). He observes that Varro "shows little sign of being conscious of his anacolutha" (1960: 20).

66 The copulative correlation *et – ac* is rare in Latin, but there are a few certain examples in Varro, e.g., *rust*. I 15,1. Cf. Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 516) and Saint-Denis (1947: 162). The weak point of this solution is the word order, because in (20) one would logically expect *ille* to precede *et* (*ille et . . . fecit, ac . . . interfecit*).

67 So for instance in ThLL V/2 896, 56.

68 Cf. Calboli (2009: 166): "I accept *et* in Petronius's text, because the only reason to exclude it is a grammatical argument, which is not an adequate reason."

69 Dell'Era (1968: 55) suggests a break of the hypotactic structure ("spezzatura impulsiva") which must be interpreted as a conscious vulgarism by Petronius ("sarà questo uno dei tanti volgarismi coscienti con cui Petronio ha voluto connotare la lingua dei convitati"). Against this interpretation stands the immediate proximity of proleptic and main clause (*quom . . . rapuisset, et thesaurum inuenit*).

70 See also Calboli (2009: 166): "In my opinion, a Greek basis cannot be excluded."

71 See Boyce (1991: 92): "In the speech of Hermeros [. . .] we are still left with a large number of others [sc. Greek words] which have perfectly good Latin equivalents, and which seem to indicate a special attempt by Petronius to represent the heavy Greek influence on the speech of Hermeros." Cf. Adams (2003: 21): "At least one of the freedmen in Petronius (Hermeros) speaks a form of Latin which must have been meant to suggest a Greek or bilingual background." See also Adams (2013: 19, 854).

between participial phrase and finite verb.[72] Several further instances (both after subordinate clause and after participle) are found in the New Testament, but they are almost systematically accompanied by ἰδού and, more importantly, they appear to draw, to a great extent, on Jewish *waw*.[73] Therefore, we do not have enough evidence for assuming a continuous use of apodotic καί in colloquial and/or literary Greek, from Homer up to Christian times[74] and, in the absence of further data, Petronius' example must be explained differently. Finally, in (22), as also supposed for (19) and (21), *et* may link the predicates *consedissent* and *gustarunt*, stressing the temporal proximity of the two actions: 'the moment they sat down they also ate from the sacrifice'. There is however a second point, which might be more relevant here. The language of the *Acta Arvalium* dating from Domitian onwards is characterized by a highly formulaic character.[75] In particular, the tag *ex sacrificio* is regularly found, apart from (22), within the expression *consederunt et ex sacrificio epulati sunt*, which occurs 11 times in the protocols dating from 81 AD[76] onwards (little can be said about the earlier ones, since they all survive in fragmentary state). For the construction in (22) we may thus assume a purely mechanical lapse: the drafter attempted to replace the standard phrase *consederunt . . . sunt* with the semantically equivalent *cum consedissent, ex sacrificio gustarunt*, but inadvertently left unchanged the conjunction *et* before *ex sacrificio*. Due to the presence of other inaccuracies on the stone,[77] this hypothesis seems preferable.

Summing up, the alleged occurrences of apodotic *et* in Late Republican and Early Imperial times are rather sporadic and nearly each of them can be ascribed to different syntactic factors. The only certain cases of anacoluthon occur in Vergil (and perhaps Gellius) and are explainable as syntactic Graecisms.

---

72 See Mayser (1926: 343).

73 Some cases of apodotic καὶ are still found in Modern Demotic Greek, but they do not entirely correspond to the Latin passages. Cf. the example quoted by Pighi (1929: 555): εἶναι τόσο κουτὸς καὶ δὲν τὸ καταλαβαίνει 'he is so stupid and [= that] he doesn't understand it'.

74 Cf. also Wehr (1984: 179, n. 284): "Es fehlt [. . .] weitgehend an Belegen, die die Kontinuität des Gebrauchs von apodosis-einleitendem καί von Homer bis zum Neuen Testament erweisen."

75 See Henzen (1874: XI): "Universe [. . .] formulae imperante Domitiano receptae paucis sive inmutatis sive additis videntur in usu mansisse usque ad aetatem Elagabali."

76 On this point, see also Henzen (1874: XXI–XXII): "In actis [. . .] a. 81 legimus haec: inde cum in aedem Caesarei consedissent, et ex sacrificio gustarunt: inde ad summotum in aede sacrificio facto immolauit deae Diae agnam opimam, quo sacrificio peracto in Caesareo epulati sunt. Quae verba fere respondent iis, quae in omnibus actis posterioribus in tetrastylo Arvales fecisse dicuntur."

77 See the forms *collegius* (ll. 27, 34, 39), *safricium* for *sacrificium* (l. 24), *querceribus* for *carceribus* (l. 19), *ob . . . causa* (ll. 39f).

4 Apodotic copulative conjunctions in Christian and Late Latin

Nearly all certain instances of *et* after proleptic adverbial phrase are found in Late Latin. In her detailed discussion of the feature, Wehr refers to circa 40 cases in Christian texts[78] and Eklund mentions not less than 90 instances from the whole Latinity, almost all of which come from late sources.[79] As expected – given the unpopularity of *atque* in imperial times – the phenomenon is basically restricted to *et*. According to Wehr, *-que* only appears three times (e.g., *Act. Andr. et Matth.* 93,11 *ille respondens, dixitque ad eos* ('while giving his response, <u>and</u> he said to them')[80] and the few examples of *atque* quoted by Dell'Era are all dubious.[81] Wehr

---

78 Cf. Wehr (1984: 151–177). See also Wehr (2008: 179–187).

79 See Eklund (1970: 180).

80 Wehr (1984: 172).

81 See Dell'Era (1968: 42–43). These are the passages: (1) (Avell. 2a,2, late 4th cent.) *quia per Faustum atque Marcellinum . . . interpellata clementia nostra, ueriti sumus ne, si per nos nihil fuisset responsum petentibus, nos uideremur annuere his, qui diuinae legi . . . aliquid addidissent, atque ideo . . . moderamur ut eqs.* ('since, as our mercy was appealed by Faustus and Marcellinus, we feared that, if we would give no answer to their questions, we would appear to support those who added something to the divine law, <u>and</u> therefore we rule that etc.'). Anacoluthon cannot be excluded here due to the very long distance between subordinate and main clause. Besides, the presence of an ablative absolute (*interpellata clementia nostra*) and two further adverbial phrases (*ne . . . uideremur annuere his, qui . . . addidissent*) within the causal clause might have contributed to a syntactic rupture. Alternatively, one might think of the ellipsis of *est* after *interpellata* (thus 'since our mercy was appealed by Faustus and Marcellinus'), a phenomenon attested throughout Latinity; cf. Hofmann and Szantyr (1972: 422); (2) (Avell. 97,34, late 5th cent.) *auctor ergo bonus . . . inferioris creaturae suae miseratus offensam – quod spiritalis substantia, quae et sui et alterius processerat ipsa deceptrix, atque in sua nequitia perseuerans omnino consequi digna non fuerat – terrenae conditionis . . . naturam . . . suscepit* ('the good Creator having mercy on the offense of his inferior creature – which the spiritual substance, that had betrayed both itself and others, <u>and</u> by persisting in its wickedness, was totally unworthy to receive – assumed the nature of the earthly condition'). The awkward construction possibly arises from an encroachment of the two relative clauses (*quod spiritalis substantia . . . digna non fuerat and quae . . . processerat ipsa deceptrix*), fostered by the use of the same tense; (3) (Peregr. Aeth. 9,6, 4th cent.) *quia ad plenum discere uolebam loca, quae ambulauerunt filii Israhel . . . , ac sic necesse fuit* ('as I wanted to learn thoroughly the places where the children of Israel walked through, <u>and</u> so it was necessary etc.'); (4) (Peregr. Aeth. 18,3) *quoniam necesse erat eum nauibus transire . . . , ac sic immorata sum ibi* ('since it was necessary to cross (the river) in ships, <u>and</u> so I waited there'). Both in (3) and (4) *ac sic* has to be considered a fixed pattern corresponding to simple *sic*: it occurs over 40 times in Egeria's text, mostly followed by *ergo*; cf. Väänänen (1987: 115); (5) (Eucher. pass. Acaun. 6,12, 5th cent.) *cum . . . causam cognouisset, ac detestatus conuiuas detestatusque conuiuium refugiebat* ('as he learned the reason, <u>and</u> he despised the table mates and, after despising the meal, he flew away'; this passage is also reported in ThLL II 1076, 16–17). The text is probably to be emended,

(1984: 157) rightly observes that the frequency of apodotic *et* in late sources and the very short distance between the adverbial and the matrix clause (which are often juxtaposed) undermine the hypothesis supported by Löfstedt, Sorrento, and others, of an anacoluthon caused by a contamination between hypotaxis and parataxis. One should assume that in each case the writer lost, so to speak, the syntactic control over the sentence, slipping into the more "colloquial" parataxis. Wehr thus assumes that in by far most of the Christian examples *et* is intentionally inserted by the writer as a focus-marker to draw the attention to a special text segment ("Funktion der besonderen Aufmerksamkeitslenkung").[82] In particular, the conjunction is typically found after a temporal clause to introduce three types of utterances:[83] (a) miracle or unexpected event, e.g., *Itin. Anton. Plac.* rec. A 34 *quae dum nupta fuisset, et in ipsa nocte nuptus sui mortuus est sponsus eius*[84] ('after she married, <u>and</u> in the very night of her marriage her bridegroom passed away'), (b) appearance of a new protagonist, e.g., *Act. Andr. et Matth.* 41,7 *cum . . . ambularetur intendens mediis fluctibus, et uidit perambulantem per medium fluctibus maris paruam nauiculam* ('while he was walking along staring at the middle of the waves, <u>and</u> he saw a tiny little boat sailing through the middle of the waves of the sea'), and (c) *verba dicendi* followed by direct speech, e.g., Fr. *Enoch* 8 *quum . . . uidit Enoc filium suum Mathusalem uenientem ad se, et ait*[85] ('when Enoch saw his son Methuselah coming to him, <u>and</u> he said'). Wehr argues that one of the elements that contributed to this special use of *et* is its frequent occurrence next to *ecce* after subordinate clause or participial phrase, e.g., *Itin. Anton. Plac.* rec. A 37 *inde mouentes ut ascenderemus Sinna, et ecce multitudo monachorum obuiauerunt nobis* ('while we were moving from there to ascend the Sinai, <u>and</u> a multitude of monks came to greet us'). This phenomenon originates, in turn, in the *Vetus Latina* as a calque of Greek καὶ ἰδού, which is often found in the Septuagint and probably draws on Jewish *waw*.[86] Starting from these instances, *ecce* "infected" the semantics of *et,* which then began to occur alone with the same function.[87] Due to the great popularity of Christian texts and, particularly, of

---

since *ac* is transmitted by one only manuscript (Par. lat. 11748) that belongs to the less reliable group of the *codices interpolati*; see for details Krusch (1896: 23).

82 Cf. Wehr (2008: 183). This function is comparable to that of *atque* in Archaic Latin. See the discussion of (1)–(5) above.

83 On this point, see Wehr (1984: 162–168; 2008: 183–184).

84 *et* is transmitted by both manuscripts of the oldest family, but Geyer (1898: 181) expunges it.
85 *et* is found in the only codex of the fragment, but is expunged both by James (1893: 148) and Charles (1913: 278).

86 On the possible connection between apodotic *et* and Hebrew, see also Calboli (1994: 172).

87 Wehr (2008: 187): "Es kann [...] als Hypothese angenommen werden, daß aufgrund des Nebeneinanders von *et ecce* in der Apodosis die deiktische Partikel *ecce* die Semantik von *et*

Bible translations in late and medieval literature, apodotic *et* and *et ecce* passed into Romance, where the corresponding lexemes (*e, ed ecco, e vec vos*, etc.) are frequently attested with the same function up to the end of the Middle Ages. Wehr's line of argumentation appears compelling, also because she explains why the construction is basically confined to Christian sources. Although apodotic *et* may result, in single cases, from anacoluthic constructions,[88] its special frequency in Christian literature and in pragmatically analogous contexts hints at an intentional choice of the author. These passages must thus be distinguished from the sporadic (and mainly uncertain) occurrences of apodotic *et* in Classical and Early Imperial times.

5 Conclusions

Summing up, the following main results arose from the above analysis.

First, in by far most of the straightforward (or very likely) instances of an apodotic copulative conjunction (*et/atque*) the hypothesis advanced by Sorrento of a spontaneous or colloquial slip from the hypotaxis into the "more popular" parataxis must be rejected because of both the contiguity of the two clauses and the fact that all passages are found in literary sources.[89] Besides, at odds with Dell'Era's claim, nearly all examples occur after a temporal clause: the only exception is (18), in which though the participles *torquens* and *suspiciens* display temporal function.

Second, one has to distinguish between the apodotic uses of *atque* and those of *et*: the former occurs five times in Plautus and is nearly absent in later authors, while the latter first figures in Virgil and will enjoy a fairly wide distribution in Christian sources.

Third, only seven of the fifteen instances of apodotic *atque* provided by Dell'Era can be retained and they are chiefly restricted to Plautus.[90] There is no

---

beeinflußt hat." A further contributing factor suggested by Wehr (1984: 175) is the influence of Greek καὶ which is occasionally employed in the New Testament in apodotic position. She later rejected this hypothesis (2008: 184, n. 27), due to the fact that in the *Vetus Latina* there are only three instances of apodotic *et* drawing on Greek καί (Lc. 2,21; 2,27–28; 13,25).

88 This explanation applies particularly to the cases in which subordinate and main clause are separated by several words.

89 In the case of (22), the only non-literary instance, a different syntactic interpretation has been suggested.

90 The remaining eight cases have been rejected or challenged for various reasons. See (9)–(11) and footnote 81.

certainty about the origin of this use, but it may tentatively be put down to an original additive/adverbial function of the conjunction, which was in use in Early Latin and faded away in later centuries. Moreover, in six of the seven examples (five of which in Plautus) *atque* exhibits a focusing function: it draws the attention of the public/reader to a textual segment that bears special relevance within the narration and is introduced or "prepared" by the foregoing text.

Fourth, the only certain instances of apodotic *et* – (17), (18) – were found in Vergil. They both occur in the ninth book of the Aeneid and are probably to be seen as a Graecism. For apodotic καί emerges several times in Classical Greek and because of its repeated occurrences in Epic and Lyric may have been associated with stylistically higher registers. All the other alleged instances of the construction are open to different syntactic readings. Particularly, a number of them can be traced back to the adverbial function of *et* (= *etiam*), by which it links two subsequent actions fulfilled by the same agent, stressing the immediacy of their succession (e.g., *quom Incuboni pilleum rapuisset, et thesaurum inuenit*).[91] The only occurrence in a non-literary source (22) may result from a mechanical error of the drafter who accidentally copied, after a temporal clause, the formulaic pattern *et ex sacrificio*.

In conclusion, the earliest certain (or very likely) instances of apodotic copulative conjunctions, up to the 2nd century AD, are restricted to literature and occur in very heterogeneous sources and contexts (Plautus, Vergil, Gellius). Besides, a basic distinction must be drawn between the uses of *atque*, probably reflecting an original additive force of the word, and those of *et*, which seem to draw on the correspondent Greek construction. Most of the instances referred to in scholarship can be explained without the assumption of a syntactic break. These points strongly undermine the hypothesis put forward by Sorrento, Pighi, and Dell'Era both of an anacoluthic (or "para-hypotactic") origin of the phenomenon and of its continuous use from the Archaic period up to the birth of the Romance languages. The spread of the construction in Christian Latin (both after participial phrase and subordinate clauses) is hence to be distinguished from its very rare occurrences in earlier sources and, as suggested by Wehr, is likely to result from a later influence of Greek Biblical writings.

---

91 This solution applies particularly to (19), (21), and maybe (22). The interpretation *et* = *etiam* has also been proposed for (13) and (14) where the conjunction may be referred to nominal phrases (*in toto corpore, panem*).

References

Adams, James Noel. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, James Noel. 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, William Blair. 1941–1945. Notes on Statius, Thebais II. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 178. 10–12.

Baehrens, Wilhelm Adolf. 1912. *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*. Philologus, Supplementband XII (2. Heft). Leipzig: Dietrich.

Baños, José Miguel. 2011. Causal clauses. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*, vol. 4, 195–234. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Beall, Stephen Michael. 1997. Translation in Aulus Gellius. *Classical Quarterly* (n.s.) 47(1). 215–226.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Luca Ciucci. 2012. Parataxis, hypotaxis and para-hypotaxis in the Zamucoan languages. *Linguistic Discovery* 10(1). 89–111.

Biville, Frédérique. 1996. *Et tu cum esses capo, cocococo* (Pétr. 59,2). Métaphores et onomatopées animalières dans Sat. 57–59. *Latomus* 55. 855–862.

Boyce, Bret. 1991. *The language of the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis*. Leiden, New York, København & Köln: Brill.

Brenous, Joseph. 1895. *Étude sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe Latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Calboli, Gualtiero. 1994. Subordination and coordination: Constructions in between. In József Herman (ed.), *Linguistic studies on Latin. Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23–27 March 1991),* 167–177. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Calboli, Gualtiero. 2003. *Marci Porci Catonis Oratio pro Rhodiensibus. Catone, l'Oriente Greco e gli Imprenditori Romani*, 2nd edn. Bologna: Pátron.

Calboli, Gualtiero. 2009. Latin syntax and Greek. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*, vol. 1, 65–193. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Callebat, Louis. 1968. *Sermo cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée*. Caen: Faculté des Lettres de l'Université.

Charles, Robert Henry (ed.). 1913. *The apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. 2: Pseudepigrapha*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Conington, John & Henry Nettleship (eds.). 1875. *P. Vergili Maronis opera*, vol. 3. London: Whittaker.

Cooper III, Guy L. 2002. *Greek syntax* (*after K. W. Krüger*), vol. 4. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Courtney, Edward. 1993. *The fragmentary Latin poets*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

De Caprio, Chiara. 2010. Paraipotassi e *sì* di ripresa. Bilancio degli studi e percorsi di ricerca (1929–2010). *Lingua e Stile* 45(2). 285–328.

Dell'Era, Antonio. 1968. Appunti sulla paraipotassi latina. In *Omaggio a Eduard Fraenkel per i suoi ottant'anni. Contributi di allievi dei suoi seminari di Pisa, Bari e Roma,* 35–69. Roma: Leberit.

Dell'Era, Antonio. 1970. *Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Denniston, John Dewar. 1959. *The Greek particles,* 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dunkel, George. 1980. Ennian *atque atque; prope. Glotta* 58. 97–103.

Eden, P. T. 1998. Problems of text and interpretation in Statius, Thebaid I–VI. *Classical Quarterly* (n.s.) 48(1). 320–324.

Eklund, Sten. 1970. *The periphrastic, completive and finite use of the present participle in Latin (with special regard to translations of Christian texts in Greek up to 600 A.D)*. Uppsala: Almqvist-Wiksell.

Elmer, Herbert Charles. 1887. *Que, et, atque* in the inscriptions of the Republic, in Terence, and in Cato. *The American Journal of Philology* 8(3). 292–328.

Frobenius, Rudolf. 1910. *Die Syntax des Ennius*. Nördlingen: Kommissionsverlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung.

Geyer, Paul (ed.). 1898. *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi IIII–VIII. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 39. Prague, Wien & Leipzig: Tempsky & Freytag.

Hardie, Philip (ed.). 1995. *Virgil: Aeneid, book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hedicke, Edmund (ed.). 1908. *Q. Curti Rufi historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Helm, Rudolf (ed.). 1931. *Apulei Platonici Medaurensis Metamorphoseon libri XI*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Henzen, Wilhelm (ed.). 1874. *Acta fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*. Berlin: Reimer.

Hofmann, Johann Baptist & Anton Szantyr. 1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.

James, Montague Rhodes (ed.). 1893. *Text and studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic literature. Vol. 2, no. 3: Apocrypha Anecdota*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krusch, Bruno (ed.). 1896. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum III*. Hannover: Hahn.

Laughton, Eric. 1960. Observations on the style of Varro. *Classical Quarterly* (n.s.) 10(1). 1–28.

Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*. Uppsala: Arbeten utgifna med Understöd af Vilhelm Ekmans Universitetsfond.

Luzzatto, Maria Jagoda. 1984. Note su Aviano e sulle raccolte esopiche greco-latine. *Prometheus* 10. 75–94.

Mayser, Edwin. 1926. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolomäerzeit*, vol. 2(1). Berlin & Leipzig: Teubner.

Mynors, Roger Aubrey Baskerville (ed.). 1990. *Virgil Georgics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pasquali, Giorgio. 1929. Le origini greche della para-ipotassi romanza. *Atene e Roma* (n.s.) 19. 116–119.

Petersmann, Hubert. 1977. *Petrons Urbane Prosa. Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax)*. Wien: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Pighi, Giovanni Battista. 1929. Recensione di L. Sorrento, *Il fenomeno di para-ipotassi nelle lingue neolatine* e G. Pasquali, *Le origini greche della para-ipotassi romanza. Aevum* 3. 547–560.

Ribbeck, Otto (ed.). 1862. *P. Vergilii Maronis opera*, vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner.

Rochette, Bruno. 2007. Éléments asyntaxiques dans la Cena Trimalchionis (26,7–78,8). Remarques sur la structure de la phrase de Pétrone. In Colette Bodelot (ed.), *Éléments asyntaxiques ou hors-structure dans l'énoncé latin. Actes du colloque international de Clermont-Ferrand (Clermont-Ferrand, 16–17 septembre 2005)*. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.

Rosén, Hannah. 2009. Coherence, sentence modification, and sentence-part modification – The contribution of particles. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*, vol. 1, 317–441. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Russell, Donald Andrew (ed.). 2001. *Quintilian. The orator's education. Books 6–8*. Cambridge & London: Loeb.

Saint-Denis, Eugene. 1947. Syntaxe du latin parle dans les *Res rusticae* de Varron. *Revue de Philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 21. 141–162.

Schindler, Claudia. 2000. *Untersuchungen zu den Gleichnissen im römischen Lehrgedicht: Lucrez, Vergil*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Sorrento, Luigi. 1929. Il fenomeno di para-ipotassi nelle lingue neolatine. Due note. *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 62. 449–463, 481–496. (This paper has been re-edited and partly enlarged in Sorrento 1949: 25–91.)

Sorrento, Luigi. 1949. *Sintassi romanza. Ricerche e prospettive*. Varese & Milano: Cisalpino.

Väänänen, Veikko. 1987. *Le journal-épître d'Egerie (Itinerarium Egeriae). Étude linguistique*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Vahlen, Johannes (ed.). 1903. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*, 2nd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.

Vignali, Giovanni. 1838. *Corpo del diritto. Digesto*, vol. 5. Napoli: Achille Morelli.

Wehr, Barbara. 1984. *Diskurs-Strategien im Romanischen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Wehr, Barbara. 2008. Spätlatein aus der Sicht der Romanistik: zu apodosis-einleitendem *et*. In Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire latin tardif VIII, Actes du VIIIᵉ colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Oxford, 6–9 septembre 2006), 179–190*. Hildesheim, Zürich & New York: Olms-Weidmann.