PART I

Introduction

CHAPTER I

Asyndetic and Syndetic Coordination:
Definitions and Types

I Coordination and Asyndeton

'Asyndeton' has been used by classicists in mixed ways. In this book I use
the term as it is used in modern linguistics, to refer to a form of coordin-
ation. Various other phenomena, though interesting in their own right and
often labelled 'asyndeta' by classical commentators and others, are left
aside, worthy as they may be of study. I start with 'coordination'.

Huddleston, Payne and Peterson (2002: 1275) define coordination as
follows:

> Coordination is a relation between two or more elements of syntactically
> equal status, the **coordinates**; they are usually linked by means of
> a **coordinator** such as *and* or *or*.

There is a similar definition at Huddleston (2002: 66), where a third
coordinator (*but*) is added. Examples are given of clause-coordination,
noun phrase-coordination and noun phrase prepositional phrase-
coordination. Quirk et al. (1972: 550–2) may be consulted too for defin-
itions along the same lines.

The definition of Haspelmath (2004b: 3–4) is much the same:

> A construction [A B] is considered coordinate if the two parts A and B have
> the same status (in some sense that needs to be specified further), whereas it
> is not coordinate if it is asymmetrical and one of the parts is clearly more
> salient or important, while the other part is in some sense subordinate. In
> practice, we typically suspect that a construction will be coordinate if it is
> systematically used to render English constructions with the coordinating
> particles *and*, *or* and *but*.

I follow here the view that the coordinators of Latin are copulative/
conjunctive, disjunctive and adversative (see e.g. Pinkster 1990: 11–12,
Torrego 2009: 444–6). Haspelmath, who accepts this distinction between
the three semantic types of coordination (2004b: 5), observes (2004b: 6)

3

that sometimes an additional type, 'causal coordination', is included. I do
not treat causal/explicative constructions here as forms of coordination.
Torrego (2009: 443) refers in this connection to coordinators on the one
hand, and 'discourse connectors' on the other, citing Pinkster (1990: 11–12)
for the criteria distinguishing them. See in particular Huddleston, Payne
and Peterson (2002: 1321–2), discussing the question whether in English *for*
is a coordinator. They state at the outset (1321) that *for* (along with several
other terms) lacks most of the properties that mark coordinators, and
conclude (1322), after an account of the properties of these terms: 'On
balance, we would favour putting them with the prepositions; in the
absence of positive coordinator properties the ability to link unlike
elements ... can hardly be reconciled with a coordinator analysis.'
'Prepositions' here (sc. 'with clausal complements') is used in a special
sense, equivalent to 'subordinating conjunctions' in traditional analysis
(see 1321 on this point). Quirk et al. (1972: 552) also argue that *for* is not
a pure coordinator. It follows that, if in the sentence *I am hungry, for I have
not eaten in three days*, the word *for* were omitted (*I am hungry. I have not
eaten in three days*), there would not be asyndeton but, in the traditional
terminology of classical scholarship, parataxis (see e.g. Woodcock 1959: 98;
also Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 96 on Old English, distinguishing parataxis
from coordination), with an element missing that is not strictly
a coordinator (*for* can of course be replaced by *because* in English). This
book is not about parataxis. I return to this topic below, 9.

Coordination is said to be 'syndetic' when it is overtly marked by
a coordinator, but 'asyndetic' when it is not (Huddleston, Payne and
Peterson 2002: 1276; see also e.g. Quirk et al. 1972: 550, Haspelmath
2004b: 4). The example given of asyndetic coordination, usually called
by classicists 'asyndeton', is: *He invited* [*all his colleagues, all his students*].
The following distinction is made (2002: 1275–6) between coordination
and subordination (see too Haspelmath 2004b: 33–7 on this issue):

> Coordination contrasts with subordination, where the elements are of
> unequal status. In subordination one element is head, the other(s) depend-
> ent, but precisely because coordinates are of equal status the functions of
> head and dependent are not applicable to coordination.

It would no doubt be possible to collect many definitions of coordin-
ation. I restrict myself to just one other, that of Dik (1968: 25):

> A coordination is a construction consisting of two or more members which
> are equivalent as to grammatical function, and bound together at the same
> level of structural hierarchy by means of a linking device.

Dik expands on various aspects of this definition in the following pages. I comment here just on 'equivalent as to grammatical function' and 'linking device'.

Equivalence of grammatical function does not mean (e.g.) that two or more terms coordinated (whether with coordinator or asyndetically) must be of the same part of speech (see Dik 1968: 27–9, illustrating at 28 for example coordination of an adjective and prepositional phrase: *He was quite happy and at ease in his new surroundings*), though that is usually the case (see further on this issue e.g. Pinkster 1990: 9–10, Huddleston, Payne and Peterson 2002: 1326–9). In Latin it is tempting to interpret the asyndetic pair *ui pugnando* (e.g. Plaut. *Am.* 414 *legiones Teloboarum ui pugnando cepimus*, 'we have captured the legions of the Teloboians by force of arms'), in which *ui* is an ablative noun and *pugnando* an ablatival gerund, as hierarchically different (with *ui* a modifier of *pugnando*), but the pair also occurs with a coordinator (Plaut. *Mil.* 267 *ui pugnandoque hominem caperest certa res*, 'I am determined to capture the man by force and fighting'), and can be taken as coordinated (asyndetically), but composed of different parts of speech (note also *As.* 555 *copiae exercitusque eorum | ui pugnando, periuriis nostris fugae potiti*, with Leo 1960: 175, and see Adams 2005: 76 on *ui expugnando* in the *Bellum Africum* (36.4)). Or again, at Cic. *Fin.* 5.89 *in foro, domi*, a prepositional phrase and a locative are juxtaposed, but the syntactic distinction is natural because in classical Latin *domus* tends to be used without a preposition (thus *domi = in domo*). Note too Plaut. *As.* 562 *sciens lubenter peiieraris*, *Rud.* 186 *in usu, experiundo is datur acerbum* (on this last see XXIII.5.4). See also XXIV.5.1.2 on Ennius *Ann.* 192 (**9**) *prognariter . . . prudens*, with additional bibliography. For a pair that has overt coordination but linking different parts of speech see Catull. 31.4 *quam te libenter quamque laetus inuiso*. *Libenter* (adverb) and *laetus* (adjective) are coordinated by the anaphoric construction *quam . . . quamque*. Note too XXV.1.1.7 on Lucil. 1320 *clam inprouiso insidiisque*; also Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.18 *raro et pauca loquentis*, 2.6.27 *clare certumque locuto*. Such coordination is possible because predicative adjectives often behave as adverbs (see e.g. Woodcock 1959: 712). For further examples of this type see Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 172), citing also Sjögren (1900: 61).

One issue has however just been alluded to (on *ui pugnando*) that will come up constantly in this book: in a pair of terms (of the same or different parts of speech) that have usually been interpreted as coordinated asyndetically, one term may in reality be a modifier of the other (see

II.3.2), and in such cases the question arises whether the pair is genuinely an asyndeton.

Dik (1968: 31–2) discusses 'linking device' (see above for his definition of 'coordinatioin') briefly. He says:

> It seems that in all languages the linking device can either consist in the mere juxtaposition of the coordinated members (accompanied, in many cases, by a specific intonation pattern), or in the use of one or more coordinating particles.

Dik here uses 'juxtaposition' instead of 'asyndeton' as favoured by classicists (Torrego 2009 too prefers the former), and he also makes the (undoubtedly correct) point that in the case of coordination by juxtaposition/asyndeton there will usually be some intonational feature that marks out the terms as coordinated (see XX.1). He does not illustrate, but here is an example from a sentence of an English novel (P. D. James, *A Certain Justice*, Penguin, 1998):

> 229 And now, in his Chambers, there was this murder, <u>bloody, obscene</u>, with its overtones of madness and revenge, to demonstrate how fragile was that elegant, complicated bridge of order and reason.

If *bloody obscene* were pronounced without a pause *bloody* would have its slang sense and be an intensifier of *obscene*. If the two words are to be coordinated asyndetically (= *bloody and obscene*), there must be a pause between them. In this postponed position it is usually the second adjective that is the stronger one, and in such phrases it may be implied that the pause is for thought (see V.2), as the speaker seeks to come up with a term that will cap the first. In the pronunciation of the second pair above too (*elegant, complicated*) there would be a pause. Asyndeton (in speech) therefore does not consist of absence of coordination, but of coordination by means not of overt coordinating terms, but of features of pronunciation.

We know hardly anything of intonation in Greek and Latin, but it will be suggested later that there are indeed forms of asyndeton that must have been articulated with a distinctive tone, pause or the like (see V.1–2). See V.1 particularly on Arist. *Rh.* 1413b.29–30 = 3.12.4, where an example of ἀσύνδετα is ἦλθον, ἀπήντησα, ἐδεόμην. Aristotle's comments on the passage imply that there would have been a particular intonation, and similar comments are to be found in Quintilian. For an interesting remark see too Parker (2007: 136) on E. *Alc.* 400 ὑπάκουσον ἄκουσον: 'Where such a special effect occurs in correspondence, it must surely have been reflected in some way in the music.'

2   Asyndeton with Two Members, Conjunctive, Disjunctive and Adversative

Huddleston, Payne and Peterson (2002: 1275) use the term NP-coordination (noun phrase-coordination) of an example showing two single words (names) coordinated ([*Kim and Pat*] *speak excellent French*), but do not, at least at this point, use it of single words asyndetically coordinated. This latter type is common in Latin, and will form the main subject of this book. Classicists have traditionally called it 'asyndeton bimembre', though that is a term that can also be used of other varieties of asyndetic coordination, for example clausal or phrasal; by 'phrasal' I mean in this context that the asyndetic pair comprises not single words but longer units, phrases (see below, 6).

There are so many different types of asyndeton that to collect all the phenomena in a Latin corpus that might loosely be called 'asyndetic' would be a vast, even impossible, task and hardly worth the effort. In some texts there may even be asyndeta of one sort or another in just about every sentence or two, and there is no point in setting out to classify the completely banal. That is why I have decided to concentrate particularly (but not exclusively) on one distinctive and stylistically interesting type, a type with a literary dimension, in that its use and motivations vary across literary genres. It is also of great antiquity, in that it is found in other early Indo-European languages, including other varieties of Italic (on Umbrian see XXII.4), and also in some ancient formulae (e.g. *patres conscripti*) in Latin that must go back to the period before written literature (see XXII.5 on some old formulae). It is a type too that continues in modern languages, not least English, and indeed in certain patterns that are very similar to some of those in Latin (see VI, Appendix). A question that will also come up is whether in some literary genres our type of asyndeton may sometimes have been influenced by the practice of Greek writers in the same genres. I note in passing that, according to Torrego (2009: 452), coordination by juxtaposition (i.e. asyndeton) (in Latin) 'is an almost marginal device from the first texts'. It is added that '[t]wo types of juxtaposed sets can be found in Latin: residual and formularized expressions, and instances where they are used as a marked form of coordination with stylistic intention'. These assertions are misleading on several fronts. First, when a coordinated group has three or more members, juxtaposition is the normal form of coordination (see below, 4, and also XVIII.2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). Second, there are writers and genres in which asyndetic pairs are very common, and in some laws, for example, such pairs outnumber coordinated pairs (see XXII.2.1).

Third, the types of asyndetic pairs vary considerably, from the mundane and everyday (e.g. pairs of imperatives addressed to a subordinate), to the contrived, such as compound coinages in early Latin. The numerous types will be defined in later chapters. The above remark does little justice to the diversity even of asyndeton bimembre in classical Latin.

Also unsatisfactory is Leo's summary (1960: 164) of the distribution of asyndeton bimembre: 'asyndeton autem bimembre notum est italicis linguis familiare esse, graecae non item; unde evenit ut Cicero Caesar Sallustius et sequentes omnes culti sermonis antistites raro eo uterentur . . ., cum tricolon a Graecis excultum semper floreret'. It is indeed rare in Caesar, but common in certain of Cicero's works (particularly the philosophica), and in the historians Sallust and Tacitus. On the comparative rarity of asyndeton bimembre in Greek see e.g. Wölfflin (1900: 27–8), Denniston (1952: 105), Dover (1968: 129) on *Nub.* 241. Nor should it be implied that there is a close connection between Latin and Greek in the use of asyndeton. This is a topic that will come up from time to time.

I refer above to asyndeton bimembre consisting of two words as a 'type', but it is many types, which will be identified later, in a preliminary way in this Introduction (see below, this section, and sections 5–10), and then in detail when phenomena are classified in separate chapters, and when specific texts are discussed. It may seem straightforward to identify pairs of juxtaposed words to which a coordinator could be added without changing the meaning, but there are often difficulties of interpretation (see e.g. II.2.3)

An asyndeton with two members in Latin could usually be rewritten with the addition of the Latin equivalent of one of the coordinators referred to earlier, *and*, *or*, *but*, and as a preliminary classification I illustrate these three semantic features of asyndetic pairs.

First, at Sall. *Cat.* 51.9 (**15**) *caedem incendia fieri*, 'slaughter and arson are carried out', *caedem* and *incendia* could be linked by *et*, *-que* or *atque*, as these are two manifestations of the savagery of war. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 1.3 *caede atque incendiis*, *Cat.* 1.6 *caedis atque incendiorum*, *Dom.* 21 *caedis et incendiorum*, *Har. resp.* 6 *caede incendiisque*, 58, same phrase. The variability of the coordinator in this one phrase when it is syndetically coordinated (a variability typical of established pairs) incidentally makes it clear that neat distinctions between the semantics of the different Latin coordinators are unlikely to bear close inspection. Torrego, for example, states (2009: 459) of *atque* that the 'capacity of presenting a member in an emphatic (or oriented) way is the differentiating property of this coordinator'. Tac. *Ann.*

4.26.2 *regemque et socium atque amicum appellaret* is quoted with the translation 'and he called him king and ally, even friend'. This translation has the effect of associating *regem* and *socium*, and of dissociating *amicum* from *socium*, as if *amicum* were particularly emphatic. But *socius* + *amicus* was an established pair (see on Sall. *Hist.* 4.60.17 Ramsey (**47**); also XVIII.4), used asyndetically (Sallust **47**) or coordinated by *-que* as well as *atque*, and with variable word order (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 16.4 *amicis sociisque* but Livy 38.11.2 *socios amicosque*). We will also see that in legal language *societas* and *amicitia* were associated, asyndetically (see on Sallust **47**). Moreover *socius* and *amicus* combined belong to a wider semantic type, of pairs to do with personal or inter-state relationships (see on Sallust **47**, with cross references). The phrase structure of *regemque et socium atque amicum* above was not correctly analysed (it is [*regemque*] *et* [*socium atque amicum*], and that is a constant problem in comments on both syndetic and asyndetic coordination.

Second, at Sall. *Cat.* 14.3 (**5**) *omnes undique parricidae sacrilegi conuicti iudiciis*, 'everyone everywhere convicted of parricide or sacrilege by the courts', *aut* could be added but *et* would give the wrong meaning. The asyndeton *parricidae sacrilegi* would traditionally be described as 'disjunctive'.

Third, 'adversative asyndeton', that is of the type in which *sed* could be inserted, is not so easy to illustrate from pairs of individual words or pairs of phrases, though the term is used constantly by commentators and others to express a relationship between two clauses. I will discuss clausal adversative asyndeton below (8). Here however are some phrasal adversative examples:

Cic. *Att.* 3.15.7 *fidem eandem, curam maiorem adhibuisses*, 'you would have brought to bear the same loyalty but greater solicitude'.
Cic. *Fam.* 9.26.4 *non multi cibi hospitem accipies, multi ioci*, 'you will receive a guest of not much appetite for food but of much appetite for jokes'.
Livy 3.71.6 *non iuuenem, uicesima iam stipendia merentem*, 'not a youth, but one already performing his twentieth year of military service'.
Tac. *Ann.* 5.3.2 *sed non arma, non rerum nouarum studium, amores iuuenum et impudicitiam nepoti obiectabat*, 'yet the princeps cast against his grandson imput-ations of neither armed force nor enthusiasm for revolution but of love affairs with young men and immorality' (Woodman 2004; on the adversative asyndeton see Woodman 2017: 62).

The second example above does show an adversative relationship between the two phrases *non multi cibi*, *multi ioci*, but they are not juxtaposed. For other instances of adversative phrasal asyndeton, see Cic. *Off.* 3.119 (below, 8) and Cic. *Quinct.* 54 (below, 7).

Adversative asyndeton comprising just two words is hard to identify, because possible pairs are usually open to another interpretation. Here is a possibility, but it is not straightforward:

Tac. *Ann.* 2.48.1 (**118**) *bona Aemiliae Musae, locupletis intestatae . . . tradidit*, 'the goods of the wealthy but intestate Aemilia Musa . . . he handed to . . .'.
   The translation, by Woodman (2004), treats *locupletis intestatae* as an adversative asyndeton, but one could take *intestatae* as substantival, 'a wealthy intestate woman', or alternatively if both terms are adjectival the (asyndetic) coordination may be copulative ('wealthy and intestate').

   The following pair is also problematic:

Caelius ap. Cic. *Fam.* 8.1.4 *sed inter paucos, quos tu nosti, palam secreto narrantur*, 'but among a few – you know who – they are related openly but in secret' (a small group say these things openly among themselves, but not outside the closed circle (?)).
   See Cicero **213** on possible interpretations of this passage.

   I have restricted myself in this section to the most basic semantic classification of asyndeta bimembria, in line with the usual classification of syndetic coordinations (see e.g. Torrego 2009: 445–6 for the three types illustrated from Latin both with and without coordinators).
   In later sections I will go beyond the two-word asyndeton bimembre that is my primary subject, to illustrate some of the other types of asyndeton attested in Latin that will come up. I begin though with a brief account of classifications by the ancients themselves.

3 Ancient Classifications of Asyndeton

Asyndeton is not infrequently discussed in ancient rhetorical works, Greek and also Latin. Lausberg (1998: 315–16), §§709-11 collects numerous passages, and distinguishes (citing ancient sources) between nominal and verbal asyndeton, and within the first category between single words and groups of words (i.e. nominal phrases), and within the second category between single words and groups of words, including clauses lined up one after another. Boccotti (1975) also has a useful collection of ancient evidence, and his discussion deals particularly with the supposed aims and effects of the phenomena, as argued by the sources. See further Calboli (1993: 370–2, 1997a: 800).
   The type comprising sequences of single words, usually three or more, comes up quite often, particularly groups of verbs. We saw Arist. *Rh.* 1413b.29–30 ἦλθον, ἀπήντησα, ἐδεόμην above, 1. In the same passage Aristotle cites another example, also consisting of three verbs (ἦλθον,