

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XII

HELSINKI 1978 HELSINGFORS

I N D E X

Jaakko Frösén	Le transport du blé et le rôle des ἐπίπλοοι.....	5
Paavo Hohti	Einige Bemerkungen über die Aischines-Papyri.....	19
Iiro Kajanto	The Hereafter in Ancient Christian Epigraphy and Poetry.....	27
Saara Lilja	Descriptions of Human Appearance in Pliny's Letters.....	55
Ulla Nyberg	Über inschriftliche Abkürzungen der gotischen und humanistischen Schriftperioden.....	63
Martti Nyman	On the Alleged Variation <i>dēlēniō</i> ~ <i>dēlīniō</i>	81
Teivas Oksala	Warum wollte Vergil die Aeneis verbrennen?.....	89
Tuomo Pekkanen	Critical and Exegetical Notes on Tac. Germ.	101
Leena Pietilä-Castrén	Some Aspects of the Life of Lucius Mummius Achaicus.....	115
Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen	The Roman Senate and Criminal Jurisdiction during the Roman Republic.....	125
Juhani Sarsila	Some Notes on <i>virtus</i> in Sallust and Cicero.....	135
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica L - LVI.....	145
Holger Thesleff	Notes on the New Epicharmean 'Iatrology'.....	153
Toivo Viljamaa	Livy 1,47,1-7: A Note on the Historical Infinitive.....	159
Henrik Zilliacus	Euripides Medeia 214-221 und Ennius	167
De novis libris iudicia	173

L I V Y 1 , 4 7 , 1 - 7 : A N O T E
O N T H E H I S T O R I C A L I N F I N I T I V E

T o i v o V i l j a m a a

Three elements typical of Latin historical prose which frequently occur in Livy's narrative are: (1) the insertion of direct or (2) indirect speech, and (3) the use of historical infinitives (infinitives of narration). By these methods Livy enlivens and dramatizes those moments where the chronological sequence of narrated events and acts is interrupted. Direct and indirect speech in the general structure of Livy's narrative has been extensively studied by philologists and literary critics, sometimes in minute detail, and the results of these investigations are well-known; thus there is no need to repeat them in this context.¹ As for the historical infinitive, everybody knows that it is one of the most widely discussed problems of the Latin language; however, though it is a narrative construction par excellence, suprisingly few studies have been devoted to an examination of it in the framework of narrative technique.²

1 For reference see P.G. Walsh, *Livy*, Cambridge 1961; A.H. McDonald, *JRS* 47 (1957) 155-172; R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*, Oxford 1965; and the articles in E. Burck (ed.), *Wege zu Livius*, Darmstadt 1967.

2 In a recent study S. Contino (*L'infinito storico latino*, Bologna 1977) tries to revive the old theory of ellipse using transformational terminology. The results of his study would be more convincing (see the criticism by B. Löfstedt in *Language* 54 [1978] 237-239), if he had explained more clearly the narrative structures underlying the use of the historical infinitive.

Of the numerous studies that deal with the historical infinitive I shall only mention the three I have found most useful. Leo Spitzer (Word 10 [1954] 442-456) compares the use of the construction in different languages and in different text-types and warns us not to explain all instances of independent infinitives in terms of a single overall meaning. André Lambert (Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius, Zürich 1946) emphasizes that in Livy historical infinitives most frequently occur in connection with indirect discourse. This use of the construction can be explained by the fact that both devices serve for dramatic elaboration of picturesque scenes. In his study of narrative expression in the Latin historians Jean-Pierre Chausserie-Laprée (L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins, Paris 1969) makes important observations about the use of the historical infinitive especially in scenes introduced by dramatic particles like *iam*, *tum vero*, *enimvero*. Because his purpose is to list and classify the types of narrative expression by statistical methods, he does not, however, attempt to formulate any linguistic definitions and contents himself with the well-known psychological explanations of the construction, for example, "it is the primary function of the historical infinitive, in its original form, to express direct, impetuous, unpremeditated action flowing from a strong impulse, feeling, or disposition..." (J.J. Schlicher, Class. Phil. 9 [1914] 287). The linguistic explanation is, however, necessary for the simple reason that the narrator needs to rely on the reader's or hearer's knowledge of the language. Just as the narrator can use lexical items with their various nuances of meaning, so has he at his disposal the patterns of the syntactic system and it is the reader's or hearer's intuition of these patterns that makes the narration understandable.

I have referred to the similar function of direct or indirect speech and the historical infinitive. In the structure of Livy's narrative they have the common property of being included in descriptions of situations. They have their place in those scenes with

which Livy creates a pause in the regular sequence of narrated events: the narrator depicts a situation which begins at a given moment and portrays persons involved in the situation in a way that enables the reader to make his own observations about the characters and motives of the persons. This method may be called "indirect characterization" (see Walsh, *op.cit.* 82-83). Instead of stating directly what the characters and their actions are like, the narrator uses their words and describes their whereabouts, habits, and mental or physical reactions. This method of indirect characterization has generally been pointed out in studies dealing with the use of direct and indirect speech in narrative. Sometimes also students of the historical infinitive have been compelled to make similar observations, see, for example, Schlicher in *Class. Phil.* 9(1914) 288-289 and 290: "Hence it is not simply a rhetorical device, but an accurate description of what takes place, to portray the meeting of friends or relatives, as in I,15 (= *Claud.Quadr.* 39 P), by *comprehensare suos quisque, saviare, amplexare*..." "It is rather the way in which the act impresses the speaker, and specially, the form which this impression assumes in view of the person to whom he is communicating it."

To illustrate the syntactic consequences of indirect characterization, I take a simple example. Because the person involved in a narrated situation can be shown using words which express his mental or physical reactions, there may be in narrative texts sentences which are difficult to analyse syntactically. On the basis of the numerous instances in Livy where the verb *orare* occurs I compose the following three sentence-types, all possible in Latin:

- (a) *Tum ille: "Oro ut..."* (direct speech)
- (b) *Tum ille se orare ut...* (indirect speech)
- (c) *Tum ille orare ut...* (historical infinitive or indirect speech?)

The syntactic ambiguity of (c) follows from the fact that in Latin the narrator can insert the speeches, words or thoughts of individuals into the narrative without any introductory *verbum dicendi*.

This phenomenon is very common and it naturally makes for dramatic effect.

From the above observation it is easy to proceed to a linguistic explanation of the historical infinitive. By what means are we able to identify indirect discourse? The answer is: by observing the syntactic structure. The formal realization of indirect discourse follows the syntactic patterns in Latin, which indicate that it is syntactically subordinate. And in the grammatical description we can state that the indirect speech is a complement to a subordinator which belongs to the semantic class of *verba dicendi*, irrespective of whether the subordinator is realized in the actual utterance or not. If the introductory verb is missing, nobody, I think, would claim that there is an ellipse at the level of actual linguistic expression. But it may be necessary to explain this as an ellipse when the utterances are analysed at a more abstract level. For instance the accusative with an infinitive construction is indicative of syntactic subordination, and, in my opinion, the case is similar when the infinitive occurs with the subject-nominative: the construction indicates its syntactic relationship to a subordinator; compare, for example, the following "complete" sentences: [*ille orare*] *videbatur*; [*ille orare*] *coepit*.

I shall illustrate my view of the matter by analysing the structure of Livy's narrative in 1,47,1-7. The passage is part of the tragic story of the last days of Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome,³ and it begins the second act of the story. L. Tarquinius and Tullia, the king's daughter, have committed their first criminal act. Murdering their spouses, Tullia's sister and Tarquinius' brother, they have cleared the way for their own marriage and are now ready to attack the king himself. Livy, however, does not directly proceed to the events of the second act, but first concentrates on the new situation. By portraying the persons and their

3 For the form of the story and its development in Roman historical tradition see Ogilvie, *op.cit.* 184-187.

activities he is preparing for the account of actual events.

Situation:	<i>TUM VERO in dies infestior Tulli senectus,</i>
(A) Servius Tullius	<i>infestius COEPIT regnum esse;</i>
(B) Tullia	<i>IAM ENIM ab scelere ad aliud spectare mulier scelus. Nec nocte nec interdium virum con-</i> <i>quiescere pati, ne gratuita praeterita par-</i> <i>ricidia essent: non sibi defuisse...</i>
B ¹ (indirect speech)	
B ² (direct speech)	<i>"Si tu is es..."</i>
B ³ (Livy's comment)	<i>His aliisque increpando iuvenem instigat,..</i>
(C) Tarquinius	<i>HIS MULIEBRIBUS INSTINCTUS FURIIS Tarquinius</i> <i>circumire et prensare minorum maxime gentium</i> <i>patres; admonere paterni beneficii ac pro eo</i> <i>gratiam repetere; allicere donis iuvenes;</i> <i>cum de se ingentia pollicendo tum regis</i> <i>criminibus omnibus locis crescere.</i>
Event:	<i>POSTREMO...in forum inrupit...</i>

There are three persons participating in the situation. All have their own roles: the victim (A), the instigator (B), and the performer of the act (C). The division into roles forms the disposition of Livy's description.

In (A) Livy expresses the situation of the king very briefly, using two structurally parallel phrases which draw attention to two important factors in his position: he is an old man (*Tulli senectus*) and he is a king (*regnum*). Because of these factors his life is threatened. The external factor which makes the situation even more menacing for him is the change brought about by the previous act of the criminal couple (*tum vero*).

In (B) Livy describes Tullia's behaviour and concentrates upon the motives which made her persuade her new husband to kill her own father. Because the character of Tullia is the most important in the story, this part of the description is most extensive. Tullia's motives and her character are presented in three different ways: in indirect speech, in direct speech, and in the narrator's comment.

Finally, in (C) Livy focuses attention on Tarquinius' activities. By employing expressions commonly used in connection with electioneering (see Ogilvie, op.cit. 190) he gives the reader the impression of Tarquinius' acting like a candidate, in devious ways but for a definite purpose.

The whole scene is clearly separated from the rest of the story. It begins with *tum vero* and is interrupted by the adverb *postremo*, with which Livy begins his account of the events themselves (note the perfect form of the predicate). It is the use of adverbs that gives the impression of unity to the scene. The description is divided into parts according to the roles in the situation, but Livy connects the parts in a way which strengthens the impression of unity. *Tum vero* opens the scene. In the chronological sequence of the story it marks the moment to which all the states and activities of the narrated situation are related. *Iam enim* (B) connects the portrayal of Tullia's behaviour to the preceding *infestior* and *infestius*. The description of Tarquinius activities is connected to the preceding part by the phrase *his muliebribus instinctus furiis*.

A most remarkable contribution to the unity of the description is made by the fact that all the predicates indicating the state, behaviour, or activity of the persons are infinitives: *infestior... infestius esse* (A); *sperare, pati* (B); *circumire, prensare, admonere, gratiam repetere, allicere, crescere* (C). The verbs are those that can normally occur in Latin narrative as historical infinitives.⁴ However, according to traditional Latin grammar only those in (B) and (C) are classified as historical infinitives, whereas the infinitive phrases in (A) are classified as object complements of the predicate *coepit*. But this classification is inconsistent with

⁴ Compare Liv. 2,6,1; 2,22,6; 3,11,9-10; 3,12,5-6; 3,14,5; 3,17,10; 3,69,3-5; 7,12,12-14; 9,7,9-12; 22,22,21; 27,20,9-10; 40,56,7; and the lists in Schlicher, op.cit. 282-292, and W. Dressler, Studien zur verbalen Pluralität, Wien 1968, 130-140. With *coepit*, e.g. Liv. 3,47,2, cf. Caes. civ. 2,28,2.

the reader's impression of the unity of the scene. In my opinion, all the infinitives have the same place in a description of the syntactic structure, because they denote simultaneous states and activities and are all related to the moment which opens the situation (*tum vero coepit*). It is for this reason that here, and often also in passages where no form of *coepi* occurs in the context, the historical infinitives are conceived to be complements of an aspectual verb, like *coepi*.

The above analysis of infinitive constructions implies a revision of the usual concept of the syntax of auxiliary verbs like *coepi*. Many problems connected with the syntactic behaviour of *coepi* may be solved if it is considered to be, not a transitive which takes infinitives as object complement, but an intransitive aspectual verb which takes entire propositions as complement. This is, in my opinion, also consistent with the notion "aspect", if it is defined semantically as the narrator's concept of action or being.⁵

Note that I am not proposing that all instances where independent infinitives occur in Latin narratives should be explained in the same way, and I am certainly not claiming that there is an ellipse of *coepi* at the level of actual expression (see, the discussion above about indirect discourse where there is no overt introductory verb). In many cases, however, a form of *coepi* may be added without causing any substantial change in meaning. The reason is that historical infinitives occur in narrative episodes where the narrator portrays situations as reactions to or continuations of preceding events. It is the form of the construction (infinitive with subject-nominative) and the way it is inserted in the narrative that indicate the syntactically subordinate status of the historical infinitive.

⁵ I discuss the problems of the syntax of *coepi* in an article entitled "Coepi, a problem in Latin syntax" (in *Four Linguistic Studies in Classical Languages*, Publ. of the Dept. of General Linguistics, Univ. of Helsinki, 5 [1978]).