

GRAMMATICAL AND STYLISTIC PARTICULARITIES IN LIVY'S WORK

Ana-Maria POPESCU POPA
Doctoral School of Humanities "Ovidius" Constanța
anamaria_popescu2006@yahoo.com

Abstract:

In this article we have conducted a number of grammatical and stylistic analyses on representative fragments from the monumental work of Livy. This analysis aims at discovering the particularities of construction in different types of texts, such as: *Praefatio* – the appeal to method, individual and collective portraits, discourses and battle scenes.

Key words: metonymy; alliteration; polyptoton; antithesis; parataxis; partitive genitive.

1. Praefatio or the appeal to method

Livy was of the opinion that historiography assumes purifying virtues, similar to those that Aristotle had assigned to tragedy. As Cicero, he rejected the opposition between poetry and historical art suggested by the Greek philosopher and adopted a poetic view of the events (T.L., *Praefatio*, 6). Quintilian would remark the sequence in the beginning of the text "*Facturusne operae pretium sim*", which he said formed a dactylic tetrameter (*Inst. Or.*, IX, 474), evocative of an epic poem, like Tacitus in his *Annals*. According to Livy, historiography seduces and comforts the readers' minds (T.L., *Praefatio*, 5), discovers patterns of behaviour and reprehensible conducts as well (T.L., *Praefatio*, 10):

„[9]Ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit; labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentes primo mores sequator animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est. [10] Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum

salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites.” (T.L., *Praefatio*, 9-10)¹ –

„But whatever opinions may be formed or criticisms passed upon these and similar traditions, I regard them as of small importance. The subjects to which I would ask each of my readers to devote his earnest attention are these - the life and morals of the community; the men and the qualities by which through domestic policy and foreign war dominion was won and extended. Then as the standard of morality gradually lowers, let him follow the decay of the national character, observing how at first it slowly sinks, then slips downward more and more rapidly, and finally begins to plunge into headlong ruin, until he reaches these days, in which we can bear neither our diseases nor their remedies. There is this exceptionally beneficial and fruitful advantage to be derived from the study of the past, that you see, set in the clear light of historical truth, examples of every possible type. From these you may select for yourself and your country what to imitate, and also what, as being mischievous in its inception and disastrous in its issues, you are to avoid.”²

The cause assumed by the historiographer is that of Rome, although at times he happens to temporarily adhere to other peoples’ views. The purpose of history is instructive, because it shows contemporaneity by what means, “*artibus*”, the greatness of Rome was created.

Pierre Grimal believes that the Padua-born historian takes into consideration doctrinarian aspects that have to do with *philosophia moralis*, adopting the stoical formula “*according to which the only Good is the moral Good, and refuses to subordinate anything to interest*”³. Livy desires history

¹ For the citation of the text in books I-XX, we have opted for the version Titi Livi, ed. 2005, *Ab urbe condita libri*, editionem primam curavit Guilemus Weissenborn, editio altera a eam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars. Libri I-XX, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, available at www.perseus.fr.

² The English translations in this study are taken from Livius, Titus (1905). *The History of Rome*. Translated by Canon Roberts. London: J. M. Dent & Sons. (available at <http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/txt/ah/Livy/>).

³ P. Grimal, 1994, p. 285.

to be a citizen's guide (*"magistra vitae"*). An essential aim of his work is that each reader should look into the life, the customs (*"mos maiorum"*), the men and means that contributed to the growth of the Roman power. This fragment emphasizes the strong feature of the moralist writer, who states that history offers examples of morality to those exploring it. The narrative is in the first person, by the pronominal form *"mihi"*, and takes the shape of a monologue addressed to the reader, validated by the second person deixes in the verb forms: *"te intueri"* and *"inde tibi tuaeque reipublicae"*, *Dativus commodi vel incommodi*, and the potential subjunctive verb form *"capias"* ("you may").

The address in the sequence *"tibi tuaeque rei publicae"* is direct, almost personal, according to Joseph B. Solodow:

„Livy employs the second-person singular pronoun and adjective: tibi tuaeque rei publicae. The address is direct, almost personal. Livy nowhere else addresses the reader this”⁴.

Although he seems to move toward the reader, the Paduan author distances himself from the Roman state. He speaks to the reader about *"tua res publica"*, not *"nostra"*, unlike Sallust, who includes himself in the narrative: *"civitatis nostrae"* (Sal., Jur., 4.5.). The grammatical first person has a limited use in Livy's writing, as A. D. Leeman remarks. The author never uses *"nostri"* to refer to the Roman troops⁵. The only time he uses this adjective is in the *Praefatio*, with a nuanced temporal reference: *"nostra ... aetas"* (5), *"vitia nostra"* (9).

The author's explicit exhortation is made by an enumeration of indirect interrogatives *"quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus"*. Livy's ideas present in his entire creation are explicitly stated: at the basis of any historical investigation lies *"vita"*, the political and collective existence, in all its aspects, but structured by *"mos maiorum"*, customs and traditions, by means of which communities meet, by moral laws and by *"viri"*, the illustrious men. According to the Paduan writer, in an accurately written history of Rome does the receiver discover models that are worthy of being followed as well as avoided, reprehensible models. One notes an antithetic structure at the ideatic level: model-antimodel, virtue-vice. Therefore, the

⁴ J. B. Solodow, 1979, p. 262.

⁵ A. D. Leeman, 1963, vol I, p. 296.

writer aims to praise the virtuous and blame the vicious, as P. G. Walsh remarks in his study:

„Livy's history is dominated by ethical preconceptions ... His idealisation of the past depicts such qualities in sharp outline.”⁶

T.I. Kuznetsova, a researcher of the Paduan's work, conducts a study of the stylistic features and states that the anthesis is “Livy's favourite device”⁷, characteristic mainly of the first decade. Morphologically, one notices the wealth of adverbs functioning as epithets: *acriter*, “fiercely, harshly”; *praecipue*, “exceptionally”; *salubre*, “beneficial, useful” and the present subjunctive contracted form *imitere* for *imiteris*.

At the end of the preface, the historiographer, just like the poets, invokes the gods and goddesses to help him set out on his journey with good fortune and carry out this monumental project. Thus, history becomes poetry, a spell that conquers the reader. Pierre Grimal remarks that Livy asks for this favour “on his own initiative”⁸, not to conform to tradition, which existed only among poets, but because he wants his work to begin with auspicious thoughts and words. Moreover, he says that the writer “remains faithful to the distinction, essential to Roman thinking, between religio and superstitio”⁹.

Livy breaks from the insipid, dusty tradition, laden with archaisms, and imposes a language that is partially tributary to Cicero, but naturally more modern, latently preparing the emergence of Tacitus' prose. Still, through dozens of moral examples provided, the historiographer is closer to his Latin predecessors¹⁰, although he strives, at least in the preface, to dissociate himself from the Sallustian pessimism, to which he often refers ironically.

2. The portraits

Livy's work presents a number of characters based on semilegendary historical figures, whom the historian turned into symbols of ancestral virtues in order to offer models to his contemporaries, in terms of love for one's homeland, goodwill, devotion etc.

⁶ P.G. Walsh, 1961, p. 66.

⁷ *Apud* E. Sved, T. Datso, 2018, p. 446.

⁸ P. Grimal, 1994, p. 286.

⁹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰ E. Cupaiolo, 1904, pp. 252-253.

The literary critic Jean Bayet remarks that exceptional protagonists, such as Horatius Cocles, Coriolanus, Virginia, appear in several episodes developed in dramatic form:

„with staging, with coup de théâtre, religious or moral conclusion, which may very well point to an early mythical elaboration previous to literary or pseudohistorical writing, as G. Dumézil’s research show.”¹¹

Roman historiography until Livy stands out through two great preferences for the construction of characters: outlining a collective character, the people, as a decisive force, in M. Porcius Cato’s *Origines* and depicting individual characters, personalities, in the historical monographs of Sallust and Caesar. Livy chooses to combine these two orientations. He is interested in the values of commanders and magistrates, but he also considers how the people and the soldiers think, feel and experience. Therefore, the author mentions the names of the leaders, when describing facts and qualities, with the constant view to subordinating individual interest to the general, collective ones of the people. The historian shows empathy when rendering episodes that deal with the tribulations, sufferings or revolts of the masses, even those of slaves. Referring to the level of the literary art of Livy’s work, N. I. Barbu highly praises the writer’s success, about which he states:

„Livy’s work reached heights of perfection through its simple and attractive narration, through the psychological analyses he conducts mainly by means of discourses, through the moral observations he makes here and there, through the brightness of the background and the details in which countless of deeds of this huge human drama, as the historian wishes to present it, happen.”¹²

The individual portraits depicted in Livy’s work surprise through the technique of the significant detail and the complex psychological analysis. Some physical traits are meant to nuance the inward, spiritual ones. Livy is a supporter of the dynamic portrait, which is structured progressively, by accumulating episodes, the characters’ statements or testimonies of those talking about them. The direct portrait appears less frequently in the work and

¹¹ J. Bayet, 1972, pp.41-42.

¹² N. I. Barbu, 1962, p. 163.

is almost never complete. The historiographer prefers to present the characters during their lives, but there are also obituary interventions: Cato the Elder (T.L., XXXIX, 50-52), Cicero (CXX).

Livy's work includes a number of portraits of heroes, whose deeds turned a fortress on the banks of the Tiber into a vast empire of the Antiquity, but the omnipresent character is the people, consumed by the miserable living conditions, yet with great devotion to the homeland, as H. Taine remarks:

*“Le plus beau de ces portraits est celui du peuple romain; chaque discours, chaque narration oratoire le précise et le complète”*¹³ – “The most beautiful of all these portraits is that of the Roman people; each discourse, each oratorical narration shapes and completes it.” (A/N)

In the historiographer's view, people's power and virtue underlie the durability of the greatness of the state. The Paduan writer illustrates the social and political realities in the history of Rome realistically and truthfully, despite the idealist conception regarding the course of historical events. The pages of his extensive work reveal the problems of the country, observed and reflected through realistic images: the miserable situation people are in and the exploitation of slaves by aristocrats, the fierce struggle between patricians and the vulgus, the social turmoil in Italic citadels.

Livy treats the human factor differently from a social point of view. He generally despises the crowd that he regards as servile, anarchical and reckless, but praises the force of the organized mass, of the Roman army, a key to success and power. That is why, the writer emphasizes the role of heroes, *“des hommes illustres”*¹⁴, of commanders, leading magistrates and consuls, who stand out through their ability to lead the army (Hannibal) or come to the fore through remarkable qualities (Mucius Scaevola). An exceptional situation (the episodes with Horatius Cocles, Mucius Scaevola, Cloelia) becomes a chance of destiny, because, in Livy's text, *Fortuna* reveals the special features of the individual, making him/her unique: *“unus vir”*, *“una virgo”*. However, Roman history is not dominated only by one Scipio, but by thousands of heroes, makers of history: Cincinnatus, Camillus, Papirius Cursor, Dedus, Fabius Maximus Cunctator, Scipio Africanus, Paulus Aemilius and many others. The historian outlines their bravery and tenacity,

¹³ H. Taine, p. 194.

¹⁴ *Idem*, p. 219.

generosity and honesty, discipline and courage, but mainly their patriotism. These “men” represented the very soul of Roman values. We should also mention some feminine figures that distinguish themselves through intelligence, courage and patriotism, such as Cloelia or Veturia. Although they are obviously fewer than men, their portraits strongly impress through expressiveness and profoundness.

Jacques-Emmanuel Bernard studied the typology of Livy’s characters and classified the almost 2,000 personages according to a three-fold criterion: “*types familiaux, sociaux, éthique.*”¹⁵ This distribution of characters reflects the historian’s moral philosophy, according to which each individual should play the role given by nature. In the French author’s view, the portraits serve to prove the thesis that Rome is superior to other nations. In the last part of his work, Jacques-Emmanuel Bernard analyses the relationship between the individual and the collective portraits, starting from the assumption that, if the individual cannot dissociate himself/herself from his/her people, heroes cannot be an exception and become exemplary prototypes for the masses. Certain portraits, such as those of Scipio or Camillus, point out the relationship between the individual and the collective dimension of the historical character, between personal heroism and attachment to the “*populus Romanus*”.

One of Rome’s prominent heroes is Mucius Scaevola, whose deeds remain exemplary. Through actual models, Livy aims to demonstrate the special virtues of the Romans in their earliest times and thus to make his contemporaries revive and cultivate old mores:

“[12] *Cum rex simul ira infensus periculoque conterritus circumdari ignes minitabundus iuberet, [13] nisi expromeret propere, quas insidiarum sibi minas per ambages iaceret, «en tibi» inquit, «ut sentias, quam vile corpus sit iis, qui magnam gloriam vident», dextramque accenso ad sacrificium foculo iniecit. Quam cum velut alienato ab sensu torreret animo, prope attonitus miraculo rex cum ab sede sua prosiluisset amoverique ab altaribus iuvenem isussisset, [14] «Tu vero abi», inquit, «in te magis quam in me hostilia ausus. Iuberem macte virtute esse, si pro me patria ista virtus staret; nunc iure belli liberum te, intactum inviolatumque hinc dimitto.»* (T.L., II, 12, 12-14) –

¹⁵ J.-E. Bernard, p. 162.

“The king, furious with anger, and at the same time terrified at the unknown danger, threatened that if he did not promptly explain the nature of the plot which he was darkly hinting at he should be roasted alive. ‘Look,’ Mucius cried, ‘and learn how lightly those regard their bodies who have some great glory in view.’ Then he plunged his right hand into a fire burning on the altar. Whilst he kept it roasting there as if he were devoid of all sensation, the king, astounded at his preternatural conduct, sprang from his seat and ordered the youth to be removed from the altar. ‘Go,’ he said, ‘you have been a worse enemy to yourself than to me. I would invoke blessings on your courage if it were displayed on behalf of my country; as it is, I send you away exempt from all rights of war, unhurt, and safe.’”

There is an emphasis on the dramatic moment in which Mucius Scaevola proves he is capable of any sacrifice to free Rome from a tyrannical rule. The historian structures the depiction of the episode on two levels describing Porsenna’s reactions: Porsenna’s rage at the sight of Gaius Mucius is rendered by means of the metonymy “*infensus ira*”; the second moment, which presents Porsenna surprised by the courage of the young Roman, is suggested by means of a formal and semantic redundancy: “*ab sede sua prosiluisse*”. One should note the multitude of alliterations: “*ira confensus*”, “*conteritus circumdari*”, “*alienato ab*”, “*intactum inviolatumque*”, then the polyptoton: “*iuberet*” – “*iussisset*” – “*iuberem*” and the climax: “*intactum inviolatumque*”.

The term “*minitabundus*” is to be noted, used in adverbial sense, as Livy often employs verbal adjectives ending in *-bundus*: “*ludibundus*”, “*contionabundus*”, “*vitabundus*”, “*tentabundus*”, “*deliberabundus*”, “*cunctabundus*”¹⁶ etc.

There is an interesting observation made by H. Taine, which is based on a comparison of the manners in which the character here in question is hypostatized by the Greek historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus and by the Roman historian Livy:

¹⁶ O. Riemann, 1879, argues that *-bundus* participles are rare in Latin prose writers. The list compiled by M. Kühnast, 1872, in: *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax*, pp. 338-9, with records of their presence in Livy’s work, includes a number of terms, unattested until then, which points out the Paduan historiographer’s predilection for these forms, p. 200.

“Denys fait de Mucius un Grec ingénieux, fertile en expédients comme Denys lui-même, qui effraye le bon Porsenna et se sauve par un stratagème à double effet. Dans Tite Live Mucius est un héros”¹⁷-

“Dionysius makes an inventive Greek out of Mucius Scaevola, ready to discover all kinds of expedients, like Dionysius himself, making an impression on the good Porsenna and saving himself through a strategy with double effect. In Livy, Mucius is a hero.” (A/N)

Sometimes, Livy’s discourse contains detailed descriptions of Rome’s enemies. A famous portrait is that of Hannibal, whose intentionality is an indirect glorification of the one who managed to defeat him:

“[2] *Missus Hannibal in Hispaniam primo statim adventu omnem exercitum in se convertit; Hamilcarem iuvenem redditum sibi veteres milites credere; eundem vigorem in voltu vimque in oculis, habitum oris lineamentaue intueri. Dein brevi effecit un pater in se minimum momentum ad favorem conciliandum esset.* [3] *Nunquam ingenium idem ad res diversissimas, parendum atque imperandum, habilis fuit.* [...] [5] *Plurimum audaciae ad pericula capessenda, plurimum consilii inter ipsa pericula erat. Nullo labore aut corpus fatigari aut animus vinci poterat.* [6] *Caloris ac frigoris patientia par; cibi potitionisque desiderio naturali, non voluptate modus finitus; vigiliarum somnique nec die nec nocte discriminata tempora;* [7] *id quod gerendis rebus superesset quieti datum; ea neque molli strato neque silentio accersita;* [8] *multi saepe militari sagulo opertum humi iacentem inter custodias stationesque militum conspexerunt. Vestitus nihil inter aequales excellens: arma atque equi conspiciebantur. Equitum peditumque idem longe primus erat; princeps in proelium ibat, ultimus conserto proelio excedebat.* [9] *Has tantas viri virtutes ingentia vitia aequabant, inhumana crudelitas, perfidia plus quam Punica, nihil veri, nihil santi, nullus deum metus, nullum ius iurandum, nulla religio.* [10] *Cum hac indole virtuum atque vitiorum triennio sub Hasdrubale imperatore meruit, nulla re quae agenda videndaque magno futuro duci esset praetermissa”.* (T.L., XXI, 4, 2-10) –

“No sooner had Hannibal landed in Spain than he became a favourite with the whole army. The veterans thought they saw Hamilcar

¹⁷ H. Taine, 1904, p. 195.

restored to them as he was in his youth; they saw the same determined expression the same piercing eyes, the same cast of features. He soon showed, however, that it was not his father's memory that helped him most to win the affections of the army. Never was there a character more capable of the two tasks so opposed to each other of commanding and obeying; you could not easily make out whether the army or its general were more attached to him. Whenever courage and resolution were needed Hasdrubal never cared to entrust the command to any one else; and there was no leader in whom the soldiers placed more confidence or under whom they showed more daring. He was fearless in exposing himself to danger and perfectly self-possessed in the presence of danger. No amount of exertion could cause him either bodily or mental fatigue; he was equally indifferent to heat and cold; his eating and drinking were measured by the needs of nature, not by appetite; his hours of sleep were not determined by day or night, whatever time was not taken up with active duties was given to sleep and rest, but that rest was not wooed on a soft couch or in silence, men often saw him lying on the ground amongst the sentinels and outposts, wrapped in his military cloak. His dress was in no way superior to that of his comrades; what did make him conspicuous were his arms and horses. He was by far the foremost both of the cavalry and the infantry, the first to enter the fight and the last to leave the field. But these great merits were matched by great vices - inhuman cruelty, a perfidy worse than Punic, an utter absence of truthfulness, reverence, fear of the gods, respect for oaths, sense of religion. Such was his character, a compound of virtues and vices. For three years he served under Hasdrubal, and during the whole time he never lost an opportunity of gaining by practice or observation the experience necessary for one who was to be a great leader of men.”

The discourse also exists in Polybius in a short form of some motifs, without emphasis or authority, but Livy invigorates it through the passion of Hannibal's sentences, as H. Taine comments: “*Tite Live met une âme dance ces phrases inertes, l' âme d'Annibal*”¹⁸.

¹⁸ *Idem*, p. 224.

The praise of such an enemy of Rome indirectly glorifies the Romans' courage to stand up to him for years and Scipio Africanus' ability to defeat him in the battle of Zama. The resemblance to his father, Hamilcar, the famous Carthaginian general, helped him win over the entire army, even the veteran and the most skilful soldiers, despite his young age. He amazed through the vigour of his face, "*vigorem in vultu*", through his sharp look, "*vim in oculis*", through his attitude and face features, anticipating, indirectly, the abilities of an artful leader from a young age.

Sometimes, the elan would take him right into the midst of perils, when the young commander would show great audacity in battle. A true soldier, he would never heed the heat or the cold nor would he allow himself to be led by the pleasures of the body, "*voluptas*", proving moderation as well. Hannibal surpassed his father and became infinitely cruel and insidious, even denying any faith.

Objectively, Livy seems to side with Rome's most fearsome enemy: "*nunquam ... habilius fuit*". In the first part of the episode, the historiographer compares the figures of the two Carthaginian generals, Hannibal and Hamilcar, and uses the alliteration "*vigorem in vultu vimque*" and the elements of 'variatio': "*habitum*", "*oris*", "*lineamentaue*". Physical and moral traits combine, being emphasized by means of the partitive genitive required by the superlative "*plurimum*": "*plurimum audaciae*", "*plurimum consilii*", of the climax: grimness – "*patientia*", moderation – "*desiderio naturali ... non voluptate*", vigilance – "*vigiliorum*", modesty shown by the anaphora of "*neque*" and the substantivized adjective "*aequalos*". Through the element of 'variatio': "*primus*", "*princeps*", Livy turns the man Hannibal into the general Hannibal, distinguished by his weapons and horses. The historians introduces us to the haze of this brave general's soul. The legendary commander, "*magno duci*", is presented by means of epithets: "*inhumana crudelitas*", the hyperbolized simile "*perfidia plusquam Punica*", repetitions: "*nihil veri, nihil santi*" and the polyptoton: "*nullus*", "*nulla*", "*nullum*". The binary structure of the entire fragment consists of a broad antithesis: *iuvenem-veteres, calor – frigoris*¹⁹, *die- nocte, primus – ultimus, virtutes – vitia*.

¹⁹ Gh. Bârlea, 2000, includes the pair "*calor*" >/ "*frigor*" (for "*frigus*") among the pairs of heterolexes, with the observation that the second terms underwent a phono-morphological change, p. 50. We should note, in Livy, the occurrence of the phonetically altered term "*frigoris*".

By recounting virtues, Livy offers the young generation living models to follow, because, by acknowledging the merits of the great general Hannibal, Scipio Africanus, the man who defeated him, is indirectly praised. The historian thus confirms the Romans' creed that virtue, even that of the enemy, deserves to be eulogized.

We should also highlight the use of objective genitives such as: “*caloris ac frigoris*” and partitive genitives: “*nihil veri, nihil santi*”. The phrase “*quod gerendis rebus suppereset*” is meant to indirectly render Hannibal's thinking.

Although Livy prefers the dynamic, progressively structured portrait, resulting from the accumulation of facts, actions and even dialogues or discourses of a character, he nevertheless paints a direct portrait of Hannibal, in which he tries to highlight both the moral and the physical side. Ideationally, Hannibal appears as an antihero who is all the more dangerous as he is endowed with real qualities, which implicitly increase the value of Roman leaders, capable of confronting and finally defeating him. The novelty of Livy's history lies in the literary coexistence between pragmatic and philosophic histories, based on fatal (stoical) resources, which adds a touch of miraculousness and fantastic. Furthermore, the fragment abounds in gerundival phrases that eternize and condense the portrait.

Another hero worth mentioning is Horatius Cocles, who proved his courage during an Etruscan attack. “*Fatum*” in Roman mythology is the embodiment of destiny, and the accomplishment is realized by “*virtus*”, which brings a “*praemium*”:

“[2] *pons sublicius iter paene hostibus dedit, ni unus vir fuisset, Horatius Cocles. Id munimentum illo die fortuna urbis Romanae habuit.* (T.L., II, 10, 2) [...] [10] *[Etrusci] iam impetu conabantur detrudere virum, cum simul fragor rupti pontis, simul clamor a Romanorum alacritate perfecti operis sublatus, pavor subito impetum sustinuit.* [11] *Tum Cocles «Tiberine pater» inquit, «te sancte precor, haec arma et hunc militem propitio flumine accipias». Ita sicut erat armatus in Tiberim desiluit multisque superincidentibus telis incolumnis ad suos tranavit.*” (T.L., II, 10, 10-11)

“The enemy would have forced their way over the Sublician bridge had it not been for one man, Horatius Cocles. The good fortune of Rome provided him as her bulwark on that memorable day. [...] He

advanced to the head of the bridge. Amongst the fugitives, whose backs alone were visible to the enemy, he was conspicuous as he fronted them armed for fight at close quarters. The enemy were astounded at his preternatural courage [...] Then Cocles said, ‘Tiberinus, holy father, I pray thee to receive into thy propitious stream these arms and this thy warrior.’ So, fully armed, he leaped into the Tiber, and though many missiles fell over him he swam across in safety to his friends.”

Horatius Cocles succeeded in stopping, for a short while, the assault of the Etruscans, who had attacked with a significant force. When there was only a part of the bridge left unbroken, the Roman soldiers had shouted at him to withdraw, but Cocles, having forced his two companions to leave, cast a menacing glance at the Etruscan chiefs and reproached them: “Slaves of tyrant kings! Have you forgotten your own liberty and now you have come to take that of others?”. The fragment highlights the idea that destiny can be overcome only by those with a firm will. We note that in Livy’s view, destiny, *fatum*, is above all, including the gods, and subdues everything. We implicitly infer that *fatum* meant for Rome a mission which her ancestors had already accomplished and which the contemporaries have a duty to carry forward. The real virtues which place the Roman above the ordinary mortal are patience, bravery, moderation, resolution, generosity, honesty, incorruptibility, love of country taken to sacrifice. The event mentioned turns into a chance of destiny for Horatius Cocles, as semantically suggested by the occurrence of the adverb *forte*, “fortuitous”. For Cocles, *fortuna* seems to be the haphazard which brings out his special qualities and makes him unique, “*unus vir*”. In another episode, a young woman, Cloelia, is singularized and presented as a model, “*una virgo*”. We should note the opposition between the individual character and the collective one, of the attacking enemies, through predominantly nominal structures, noun + qualifying adjective, with the stylistic function of epithet, often placed before the determiners: “*unus vir*”, “*insignis*”, “*audacie miraculo*”, “*incolumnis*” (for the hero) / “*cedentium pugne*”, “*pavore subito*” (for the enemies).

Not only male figures are role models, but also female ones, as previously mentioned. We shall further resume the analysis of several heroine portraits, which give an account of Livy’s style. Among the 10 young women

who had been chosen to be part of the tribute to Porsenna, Cloelia and Valeria, daughter of Publicola, stood out:

“[6] *ergo ita honorata virtute feminae quoque ad publica decora excitatae et Cloelia virgo, una ex obsidibus, cum castra Etruscorum forte haud procul ripa Tiberis locata essent, frustrata custodes, dux agminis virginum inter tela hostium Tiberim tranavit sospitesque omnes Romam ad propinquos restituit. Quod ubi regi nuntiatum est, primo incensus ira, oratores Romam misit ad Cloeliam obsidem deprecendam: alias haud magni facere.*”(T.L., II, 13, 6) [...]. [9] *utrimque constiti fides: et Romani pignus pacis ex foedere restituerunt, et apud regem Etruscum non tuto solum, sed honorata etiam virtus fuit.*” (T.L., II, 13, 9) –

“The Etruscan camp was situated not far from the river, and the maiden Cloelia, one of the hostages, escaped, unobserved, through the guards and at the head of her sister hostages swam across the river amidst a shower of javelins and restored them all safe to their relatives. When the news of this incident reached him, the king was at first exceedingly angry and sent to demand the surrender of Cloelia; the others he did not care about. [...] After peace was thus re-established, the Romans rewarded the unprecedented courage shown by a woman by an unprecedented honour, namely an equestrian statue.”

The Romans knew how to properly honour the deeds of the heroes they glorified and to whom they showed gratitude, “*praemium*”. Cloelia shows traits worthy to be known by descendants. She is courageous and does not consider only her personal saving, but also that of all maidens, whom she leads to their native land swimming. The use of “*procul*” with the ablative without “*a*” or “*ab*” is to be noticed. After the restoration of peace, Cloelia had an equestrian statue erected in her honour, which was something completely new for a woman.

Livy grants a privileged status to traditional meta-values, which Augustus was trying to restore: *pietas*, “piety”, by respecting the majesty of gods and the place accepted in the world for any citizen of the City, and *fides*, some people’s loyalty to others and to fate. Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus is such a human model, an example of the city of Rome, who imposes an axiological system that ensures Rome’s greatness:

“[7] *spes unica imperii populi Romani*, [8] *L. Quinctius trans Tiberim, contra eum ipsum locum ubi nunc navalia sunt quattuor iugerum colebat agrum, quae prata Quinctia vocantur*. [9] *ibi ac legatis – seu fossam fodiens, palae innixus, seu cum araret, operi certe, id quod constat, agresti ingentus – salute data in redditaque rogatus ut, quod bene verteret ipsi reique publicae, togatus mandata senatus audiret, admiratus raogitansque „satin salve?” Togam propere e tugurio proferre uxorem Raciliam iubet*. [10] *qua simul absterso pulvere ac sudore velatus processit, dictatorem eum legati gratulantes consalutant, in urbem vocant; qui terror sit in exercitu exponunt*”. (T. L., III, 26, 7-10) –

“The one hope of Rome, L. Quinctius, used to cultivate a four-acre field on the other side of the Tiber, just opposite the place where the dockyard and arsenal are now situated; it bears the name of the ‘Quinctian Meadows.’ There he was found by the deputation from the senate either digging out a ditch or ploughing, at all events, as is generally agreed, intent on his husbandry. After mutual salutations he was requested to put on his toga that he might hear the mandate of the senate, and they expressed the hope that it might turn out well for him and for the State. He asked them, in surprise, if all was well, and bade his wife, Racilia, bring him his toga quickly from the cottage. Wiping off the dust and perspiration, he put it on and came forward, on which the deputation saluted him as Dictator and congratulated him, invited him to the City and explained the state of apprehension in which the army were.”

Livy’s discourse here implies the concept of “*libertas*” emerging from the historian’s opinion that magistrates should abide by the laws and way of living of their ancestors. In the midst of the attacks and violations of territories by Sabines and Aequi, L. Quinctius Cincinnatus was elected dictator (458 A.D.). It is said that the news of his being granted this high dignity found him ploughing. The three predicates “*consalutant*”, “*vocant*”, “*exponent*” coordinated and located in final positions in sentences emphasize the short speech of the messengers who have no time to waste. Morphologically, we should note the use of the partitive genitive *iugerum*, required by the numeral “*quattuor*”, and of the subjective genitive “*senatus*”, as well as the forms “*pale*”, singular dative imposed by the compound verb “*innixus*”, and “*ipsi*

quae rei publicae” - dativus commodi vel incommodi. In terms of the sentence syntax, the subordinate “*uxorem Raciliam profere*” – infinitive clause – and “*pulvere ac sudore*”, a compound subject of the absolute participle clause, are of great discursive impact.

Although most portraits contain references to the image of some characters during their lives, there are a few pages tinged with a hint of obituary. Let us further analyse the portrait of Cicero at door’s death:

“Primo in Tusculum fugerat; inde transversis itineribus in Formianum [...] proficiscitur. Unde aliquotiens in altum provectum cum modo venti adversi retulissent, modo ipse iactationis navis, caeco volvente fluctu, pati non posset, taedium tandem eum fugae et vitae cepit; regressusque ad superiorem villam, quae paulo plus mille passibus a mari abest: «Moriar, inquit, in patria saepe servata!» [...] Vixit tres et sexaginta annos, ut, si vis adfuisset, ne immatura quidem mors videri possit. Ingenium et operibus et premiis operum felix. [...] Si quis tamen virtutibus vitia pensaverit, vir magnus ac memorabilis fuit.” (T.L., CXX) –

“He had first taken refuge at Tusculum; taking the side road, he set off for Formianum to embark on a ship from Gaeta. Several times he was pushed back on the high seas, strong winds bringing him back and him not bearing the shaking of the ship while the troubled wave was twisting it, so in the end he got tired of running away and of living; and upon return to the villa located 100 paces away, he said: ‘Let me die in the country I have often saved!’ He lived until the age of 63 and, had he not taken down by violence, his death could not have come so soon. He was a fortunate genius as regards his works and rewards for his works; should someone however weigh his mistakes and merits, it would turn out that Cicero was a great man worth remembering.”

The text presents the end of the great orator and his moments of agony brought about by his flight from Rome and estrangement from his homeland. Referring to the narration of the last century of the republic, Jean Bayet appreciates Livy’s ability to dominate his extensive readings, his impartiality, closeness of events and topicality of his concerns, which allowed him to recreate an accurate atmosphere. All this prompted him to state that the

account of Cicero's death is a text of "great historical value"²⁰. At the death of the great orator, nature is presented by means of hostile elements suggested by the epithets "venti adversi", "itineribus transversis", "fluctu caeco". The reactions of the environment to the character's inner turmoil anticipate the naturalistic current. The conditional "si vis adfuisset" is an ironic allusion to Mark Antony, who had ordered Cicero's death in 43 A.D., because of the fourteen *Philippics* composed by the orator against the emperor. That is why Cicero had fled Rome and gone into a self-imposed exile. Cicero's two villas outside Rome indirectly point to the orator's wealth. The fragment presents his travels to Tusculum and then to Formianum, his sensitivity at sea, the notation of his age and state of mind before death. The characterization of Cicero appears at the end of the text as a result of a thorough analysis of flaws and virtues, suggested by the alliteration "virtutibus vitia". The epithets "felix", "magnus", "memorabilis" and the polyptoton "operibus operum" render in words the true glory of this great orator, rhetor, philosopher and politician of the 1st century A.D. The agitation caused by the flight, the strong winds, the waves of the insurgent sea, rendered through the hyperbaton "caeco...fluctu", is perfectly consistent with the character's emotional turmoil. The orator struggles with contradictory feelings, is undecided on whether to run or return to his dear country. The alliteration "taedium tandem" emphasizes the weariness seizing his soul at the thought of not seeing his house and the country he served at the very cost of his life. The text impresses by the manner in which it highlights the patriotism of the character, who decided to come back home at any cost: "Moriar in patria saepe servata!"

3. The pictures, between grammar and stylistics

Ab urbe condita is a work which combines the particularity of historical facts and the general meaning resulting from artistic generalization. In Livy's creation, the basic unit in the art of drawing up the ensemble seems to be the pictures and what we call episodes²¹, which the author connects through the concatenation technique. The historian consciously aims to achieve a unitary composition.

²⁰ J. Bayet, 1972, p. 374.

²¹ By **episodes** one refers to narrative units formed around a secondary event in the structure of facts rendered through complex epic developments: description, narration, dialogue.

Narration is Livy's favourite manner of presentation, having a double role in his creation: epic and dramatic. His storytelling talent is proven by involving the reader in the action, by increasing the reader's curiosity and by unfolding the story so that the facts could not be anticipated but occur as a surprise.

The presentation is varied and readers are fascinated both by the narratives with smooth action and by those in which they are faced with surprising, dynamic situations and scenes, with characters that act in an unexpected fashion or manifest themselves at the discursive level in memorable dialogic passages. That is why Livy's historical account, generally epic through its dramatism, turns into a scenic representation. One should note the power to imagine vast pictures, scenes and human profiles, to impose that cathartic function, which Aristotle recommends to the authors of tragedies, on history: therefore, historical truth, in the modern sense, no longer counts, for the epic breath elevates history to the level of fabulous or even myth. Each narrative core is a foundation on which stands a huge edifice made up of hundreds of mosaic pieces, of various colours. The diversity of situations is impressive, but the event flow is the same: in accordance with his own mainly stoical view of destiny. Livy believes that *fatum* governed the growth of Rome precisely because the gods were convinced of the sacred, hence great, mission of the Roman people. However, to become the chosen people, they had to prove their virtues, their qualities. Therefore, they were subjected to gruelling challenges. The intervention of this *fatum* also occurred during the war against the Etruscan invaders and later against the Gallic or Punic conquerors. In fact, Rome's adversaries would stimulate the tenacity and virtues of future masters of the world, qualities which existed not only among the most important Romans but also among the common people.

Jean Bayet rejects the title "*original scholar*"²² and criticizes him for not having the ability to give the early centuries of Rome "*a plausible colour*"²³; for not intuiting "*the religious value of the legends he recounted*"²⁴ or the various interests of clashing populations, nor the importance of the economic matters he "*would briefly touch upon.*"²⁵

²² J. Bayet, 1972, p. 374.

²³ *Idem*, p. 375.

²⁴ *Ibidem*.

²⁵ *Ibidem*.

The historian vibrantly glorifies mainly the period of archaic Rome. The legend of Romulus is a microcosm of Livy's history and renders the idea of Rome's gradual growth through the progressive genesis of its institutions:

“[1] *Priori Remo augurium venisse fertur, sex vultures; iamque nuntiato augurio cum duplex numerus Romulo se ostendisset, utrumque regem sua multitudo consalutaverat: tempore illi praecepto, at hi numero avium regnum trahebant. Inde cum altercatione congressi certamine irarum ad caedem vertuntur; ibi in turba ictus Remus cecidit.*[2] *Volgatior fama est ludibrio fratris Rerum novos transiluisse muros; inde ab irato Romulo, cum verbis quoque increpitans adiecisset, „Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea”, interfectum.* [3] *Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus; condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata*”. (T.L., I, 7, 1-3) –

“Remus is said to have been the first to receive an omen: six vultures appeared to him. The augury had just been announced to Romulus when double the number appeared to him. Each was saluted as king by his own party. The one side based their claim on the priority of the appearance, the other on the number of the birds. Then followed an angry altercation; heated passions led to bloodshed; in the tumult Remus was killed. The more common report is that Remus contemptuously jumped over the newly raised walls and was forthwith killed by the enraged Romulus, who exclaimed, ‘So shall it be henceforth with every one who leaps over my walls.’ Romulus thus became sole ruler, and the city was called after him, its founder.”

The first books refer to time immemorial, so that the boundary between real and fabulous effaces and the historical fact is approached by stagings that respect artistic virtualities. The topic of each legend is a narrative core. The entwining of history and legend, also found in Vergil, is suggested by the impersonal structure *fama est*, ‘rumour is, myth has it’. The epithet *vulgatior*, ‘better known’, highlights the Romans’ belief in myths and worship of tradition. In his text, Livy claims that the legend of the founding of Rome due to a fratricide is much better known. Romulus becomes the prototype of the Roman founder, capable of anything for his country, even of killing his own brother. In terms of the manner in which the Paduan

historiographer integrates the legend, Livia Buzoianu²⁶ says that in the relationship between Romulus and the laws, Livy emphasizes the value of the latter: “the founding of Rome by Romulus is the heroic version of a bloody deed, resulting in a fratricide”²⁷.

The city was to be founded upon sacred moral principles, *fides* and *pietas*, and those who did not obey them had to perish, “*interfectum esse*”. It is to be noticed that Livy often employs abstract nouns in the plural in order to express states of mind: *irarum*, “fits of rage”.

The text stresses the idea of sacrifice needed to create the foundation of Rome as an eternal city. The polyptoton “*conditoris condita*” reveals the theme of the text: the praise of the image of the founder of this city, Romulus Quirinus, capable of any action in the name of his country. The signs favourable to founding acquire symbolic connotations: number 12 becomes sacred for the fulfilment of Romulus’ destiny: “*Priori Remo augurium venisse fertur, sex vultures; iamque nuntiato augurio cum duplex numerus Romulo se ostendisset*”. Number 12 symbolizes the supreme power of Rome, as opposed to 6, which points to the unfulfillment, end and death of Remus. The association of numbers with the Roman power symbol, “*vultures*”, is the responsibility of priests who interpreted the acceptance of gods and the will of destiny, which is emphasized by the polyptoton “*augurium*”/“*augurio*”. The dramatism of the text is underlined by Remus’ death, highlighted by means of the climax, by the terms: “*altercatione*”, “*certamine*”, “*irarum*”, key words arranged in a chronological succession.

Livy’s history, entailed by the theme of predestination, abides by the Ciceronian principle “*historia - magistra vitae*”, providing examples of virtue and promoting ancient rites. Romulus had observed the ritual dedicated to foundation, that of delimiting with a plough the sacred precinct of the city, inviolable, “*pomoerium*”, expressed in the text through the hyperbaton “*novos muros*”.

We should note that, like Sallust, Livy uses the historical infinitive as a tool to generate a vivid and rapid narration. The historian commonly uses the historical infinitive with the subject in the nominative to present a number

²⁶ In *Poetica verba*, 2000, Livia Buzoianu tries to demonstrate the ability of the poet Publius Ovidius Naso to mythologize the individual in *Metamorphoses*. According to the author, the events in *Metamorphoses* are few and have different values: some are legendary, some are authentic, focused on four personalities: Aeneas, Romulus, Caesar and Augustus, p. 91.

²⁷ L. Buzoianu, p. 94.

of actions occurring frequently: “*subsistere*”, “*dividere*”, “*facere*”, “*celebrare* (*ita genti itaque educati*)” (T.L., I, 4). The researcher O. Riemann signals the frequency of compound intransitive verbal constructions with prepositions and points out the use of such terms as “*afflare*”, “*invadere*”, “*incurrere*”, “*circumvectari*”, “*excedere*”, “*supervadere*” with the accusative.²⁸

The fragment known by the exclamation “*Vae victis!*”, uttered by Brennus, has remained famous through the description of the pain felt by the Romans. It presents the general fury mixed with the bitter taste of defeat:

„[6] *cum famem unam natura vinci non sineret, [...] [7] diem de die prospectans ecquod auxilium ab dictatore appareret, postremo spe quoque iam non solum cibo deficiente et cum stationes procederent prope obruentibus infirmum corpus armis, vel dedi, vel redimi se cuacumque pactione possint iussit, iactantibus non obscure Gallis haud magna mercede se adduci posse ut ubsidionem relinquunt. [8] [...] inde inter Q. Sulpicium, tribunum militum, et Brennum, regulum Gallorum, colloquio transacta res est et mille pondo auri pretium populi gentibus mox imperaturi factum. [9] Rei foedissimae per se adiecta indignitas est: pondera ab Gallis allata iniqua et, tribuno recusante, additus ab insolente Gallo ponderi gladius, auditaque intoleranda Romanis vox: «Vae victis!»”. (T.L., V, 48, 6-9) –*

“But soon the famine could neither be concealed nor endured any longer. [...] (The army of the Capitol) were day by day eagerly watching for signs of any help from the Dictator. At last not only food but hope failed them. Whenever the sentinels went on duty, their feeble frames almost crushed by the weight of their armour, the army insisted that they should either surrender or purchase their ransom on the best terms they could. [...] A conference took place between Q. Sulpicius, the consular tribune, and Brennus, the Gaulish chieftain, and an agreement was arrived at by which 1000 lbs. of gold was fixed as the ransom of a people destined ere long to rule the world. This humiliation was great enough as it was, but it was aggravated by the despicable meanness of the Gauls, who produced unjust weights, and when the tribune protested, the insolent Gaul threw his sword into the scale, with an exclamation intolerable to Roman ears, ‘Woe to the vanquished!’”

²⁸ O. Riemann, p. 201.

Compromise and mental failure are relevant through short, concrete, clarifying statements: “*vel dedi vel redimi*”, which, through sonority, convey the message of the lack of a somewhat honourable option: capitulation or tribute. The two alternatives are expressed by verbs in the infinitive, dependent on “*iussit*”, which accentuates the dramatic note.

The narrative sequences follow one another gradually, ascending; the unfolding of the events is presented step by step, the starting point being the Romans’ long wait in the hope of a victory tactic. The sequence containing the alliteration and the polyptoton “*diem de die prospectans*” presents the dramatic accumulation of expectation in which Camillus’ soldiers are. The accusative “*diem*” accompanied by the ablative of separation with prosecutive character in the temporal sphere, “*de die*”, has an adverbial nuance and suggests the gradual passage of time, unfavourable to Romans. With a redundancy effect, Livy also uses the verb compounded with the prefix “*pro-*” (“*procederent*”), which indicates the progression of the states of mind.

Livy insists on the idea of injustice done to Romans using a “*variatio*”: “*rei foedissime*”, “*indignitas*”, “*pondera iniqua*”, “*intoleranda romanis vox*”, “*vae victis*”. The exclamation is conferred by the musicality of the alliteration “*vox*”, “*vae victis*” and by the message itself. In the quoted passage, one notes that almost all predicates are expressed by verbs in the passive voice and designate completed actions, as if their destiny had been stigmatized and their hearts “sealed with shame” (“*indignitas*”). Using the passive voice, Livy insists on the process of slow reification the Romans are subjected to. The subjects of these verbs denote objects or notions: “*res*”, “*gladius*”, “*pondera*”, “*vox*”, “*indignitas*”. The Romans bear the consequences of their own mistakes and mainly that of not having defended Rome and of having reached a limit situation. Because “*culpa Camillus*” had been committed, Rome was invaded by the Gauls and could have perished if it had not been for the exceptional leader of the country.

The Gauls’ long siege at the beginning of the 4th century A.D. is an occasion to praise the ancestors’ virtues, “*mores maiorum*”. The siege takes place during the dictatorship of Furius Camillus, to whom Brennus, the chief of Gauls, had ironically replied “*Vae victis!*”. After the Gauls had burnt the city, Camillus restored it and increased its greatness, gaining the title of *alter conditor Romae*, “the other founder of Rome”. The episode depicts a part of this long siege of the Gauls that had starved the Roman refugees on the

Capitolium hill, which is highlighted by the epithet “*summa*” related to the acute lack of supplies. The hero praised in this fragment is M. Manlius. The text reflects the historian’s desire to raise a hymn of glory to Rome and its heroes, whose deeds and virtues led to the creation of the greatest empire in the ancient world:

“[1] [...] *arx Romae Capitoliumque in ingenti periculo fuit. [...] [3] (Galli) tanto silentio in summum evasere ut non custodes solum fallerent, sed ne canes quidem, sollicitum animal ad nocturnos strepitus, excitarent. Ansres non fefellerent, quibus sacris Iunonis, in summa cibia tibi tamen abstinebatur, Quae res saluti fuit; namque clangore eorum alarumque crepitu excitus M. Manlius, qui triennio ante consul fuerat, vir bello egregius, armis arreptis simul ad arma ceteros ciens, vadit et, dum ceteri trepidant, Gallum, qui iam in summo consisterat, umbone ictum deturbat*”. (T.L., V, 47, 1, 3) –
“[...] the Citadel and Capitol of Rome were in imminent danger. [...] (The Gauls) finally reached the summit. So silent had their movements been that not only were they unnoticed by the sentinels, but they did not even wake the dogs, an animal peculiarly sensitive to nocturnal sounds. But they did not escape the notice of the geese, which were sacred to Juno and had been left untouched in spite of the extremely scanty supply of food. This proved the safety of the garrison, for their clamour and the noise of their wings aroused M. Manlius, the distinguished soldier, who had been consul three years before. He snatched up his weapons and ran to call the rest to arms, and while the rest hung back he struck with the boss of his shield a Gaul who had got a foothold on the summit and knocked him down. He fell on those behind and upset them.”

The sequence starts with the emphatic location of the city of Rome, the “central character” of Livy’s entire history, and of its highest hill, “*arx Romae Capitolinumque*”. The eternal city is predestined to govern the entire world. The adjectival epithet “*ingenti*”, used to render the idea of imminent danger, reveals precisely the power of Rome to save itself in any situation and its ancestors’ great virtue to always emerge victorious.

Manlius becomes the symbol of bravery, of courage, of virtue, suggested by the nominal phrase “*vir bello egregius*”, which indirectly

describes Rome by reference to its great past. The key words which emphasize the greatness of Rome in battle are “*bello*” and “*armis*”.

The text is structured on two levels: of Rome and of its enemy, the Gauls, or that of the divine, suggested by the sacrality of the geese, and of the human, of the terrestrial, suggested by the Roman and Gaul combatants. In the description made by the Paduan author, one should note the richness of epithets intensifying the danger that threatens Rome: “*ingenti*”, “*tanto*”, “*summum*”. The elements of the climax suggest *silentio*, “silence”, *nocturnus*, “night”, *inopia cibi*, “hunger”, and amplify the dramatic tension of the text. The binary structure of the fragment is also rendered by the two antagonistic levels: the static level, of silence and night, and the dynamic, alert one, marked by the presence of the geese “*anseris*” and of the armies “*armis*”. Livy masterfully combines auditive and visual images and contrasts Manlius’ courage and the cowardice of the Gauls, who attack at night, sneaking to the top of the cliff. The dynamism of the narrative is achieved through the agglomeration of participles. The text is almost devoid of ornaments and the account is balanced. Verbal forms are handled with virtuosity, carefully chosen and amaze through the shortness of vocables or their discreet archaic scent (“*evasere*”, “*fefellere*” – contracted forms of the perfect indicative, instead of “*evaserunt*”, “*fefellerunt*”). Manlius has all the qualities of an exemplary leader: he is *vigilans*, ‘careful, attentive’, *fortis* – “courageous, energetic”, *audax* – ‘audacious’, *impavidus*, ‘fearless’, *firmus* – ‘strong, firm’, *rapidus*, ‘stormy’, *promptus*, ‘resolute’ and *capax imperii*, ‘capable of ruling’. *Caeperei*, ‘the others’, manifest themselves as a mass, a community that acts within the boundaries of the ordinary: in difficult situations, common people get scared or lose heart. Still, this small community besieged for seven months in the citadel has an exemplary conduct, because, though constrained by great shortcomings, it respects the sacrality of the place.

4. The discourses

The first Latin historian who introduced discourse into a historical account was M. Porcius Cato in *Origines*. His successors later used it as a literary means by which various ideas could be expressed. The discourses in *Ab urbe condita* are an example of how the raw material provided by history may be artistically processed. In the 35 preserved books of Livy’s history

there are 400 discourses, but according to specialists²⁹, his entire work must have comprised about 2,000.

The component parts of discourses preserve the classical, Demosthenic or Ciceronian pattern. All secondary ideas are grouped around the main idea. The *exordium*, *narratio* and *peroration* form a unit and express the content of ideas with engaging passion, from beginning to end.

While the Ciceronian *amplification* divagates from the central idea through excessive developments and digressions, Livy's writing is clear, with all secondary ideas grouped around the main one. In Livy, the oratorical gradation is ascending, both in longer and in shorter discourses.

Gheorghe Bârlea remarks that the timid beginnings of oratory in Rome may have been the "*discourses recomposed by the authors of histories about the legendary beginnings of Rome, which would frequently point out the great exploits in Livy or Virgil, as once had done in the Greek Homer, Herodotus or Thucydides*"³⁰ and calls them "*post factum compositions which served as models for orators and rhetors in the historical age*"³¹.

Experts on Livy's creation have noted that the historian alternates the direct and indirect styles with grace and in a balanced manner, often within the same speech. The direct style is used when dramatic tension is enhanced, when great passions are triggered. Discourses contain suggestions regarding the characters' psychology, as Quintilian would consider, as early as the Antiquity, that they were adapted to the characters and realities evoked (Quint., *Inst. Or.*, X, 1, 101). Most discourses are monologues, but sometimes they are constructed on the dialogical model, as in a real controversy.

Quintilian would appreciate Livy's "*lactea ubertas*" (*Inst. Or.*, IX), a rich language, as he accepted archaic and poetic expressions, used adverbs as adjectives, adjectives as adverbs, verbal adjectives ending in the suffix *-bundus*, developed similes, which one does not find in M. T. Cicero. The use of the direct style gives authenticity to the text, stirring powerful emotions in the reader's soul, whereas oratorical gradation creates the dynamism of the situation, emphasized by the mode of presentation: the monologue (Veturia's discourse). Although the discourses are fictitious, they are of great oratorical

²⁹ J. Bayet, 1972, p. 385.

³⁰ Gh. Bârlea, 2004, p. 109.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

value. Their tones are diverse and impress through variation: C. Camuleius (TL, IV, II) stands out through vehemence and violent revolt, Vibius Virius – through the gloomy pathos (TL, XLIX, XXVIII), Cato – through gravity, Paulus Aemilius – through dignified sadness.

The writer sometimes opts for the introduction of several dramatic elements, such as those in the episode of Coriolanus, II, XL:

“[1] *Tum matronae ad Veturiam, matrem Coriolani, Volumniamque uxorem frequentes coerunt. Id publicum consilium an muliebris timor fuerint, parum convenit.*[...] [5] *Coriolanus, prope ut amens consternatus, ab sede sua cum ferret matri obviam complexum, mulier in iram ex precibus versa: „Sine, priusquam complexum accipio, sciam, inquit, ad hostem ad filium venerim, captiva materne in castris tuis sim.* [6] *In hoc me longa vita et infelix senecta traxit, ut exsulem te, deinde hostem viderem? Potuisti populari hanc terram, quae te genuit atque aluit?*[7] *Non tibi, quamvis infesto animo et minaci perveneras, ingredienti fines ira cecidit? Non, cum in conspectu Roma fuit, succurrit: intra illa moenia domus ac Penates mei sunt,* [8] *mater, coniux liberique? Ergo, ego nisi peperissem, Roma non oppugnaretur! Nisi filium haberem, libera in libera patria mortua essem! Sed ego nihil iam pati nec tibi turpius nec mihi miserus possum nec, ut sim miserrima, diu futura sum” –*

“Then the matrons went in a body to Veturia, the mother of Coriolanus, and Volumnia his wife. [...] Coriolanus, almost like one demented, sprung from his seat to embrace his mother. She, changing her tone from entreaty to anger, said, ‘Before I admit your embrace suffer me to know whether it is to an enemy or a son that I have come, whether it is as your prisoner or as your mother that I am in your camp. Has a long life and an unhappy old age brought me to this, that I have to see you an exile and from that an enemy? Had you the heart to ravage this land, which has borne and nourished you? However hostile and menacing the spirit in which you came, did not your anger subside as you entered its borders? Did you not say to yourself when your eye rested on Rome, ‘Within those walls are my home, my household gods, my mother, my wife, my children?’ Must it then be that, had I remained childless, no attack would have been made on Rome; had I never had a son, I should have ended my days a free woman in a free

country? But there is nothing which I can suffer now that will not bring more disgrace to you than wretchedness to me; whatever unhappiness awaits me it will not be for long.”

Gnaeus Marcius Coriolanus was a brave man who distinguished himself through courage in the battles against king Tarquinus Superbus. In 493 B.C. he stood out in the battles for the conquest of the Volscian town of Corioli, from which he received the cognomen Coriolanus. He was accused of treason before the assembly of the people and sentenced to exile. The accusation was based on the flagrant violation of the “*lex sacrata*”, a law which sanctioned the tribunitial inviolability, because he had demanded that the institution of the tribune should be abolished. In retaliation, he would ally with the Volsci and the Aequi and attack Rome. The episode recounted presents the arrival of his mother, Veturia, accompanied by her daughter-in-law, Volumnia, and her two grandchildren, to the enemy camp and the speech in which she asks Coriolanus to withdraw his army. Plutarch reports that the initiative of the matron delegation belonged to Valeria, sister of Valerius Publicola³². “*Costernatus*” is the term which proves Livy’s craft in probing the soul of both mother and son. Veturia’s change of attitude is signalled by the author in the sequence “*in iram ex precibus versa*”. Although she has come to beg him, upon seeing him, Veturia becomes angry. The asyndetic complement clause “*sciam*”, located after the verb “*sine*”, similar to poetic texts, gives Veturia’s words an extremely grave tone. The subjunctive mood in the adverbial clause of concession “*quamvis ...perveneras*” emphasizes the authenticity of the fact related by the grieving mother. Oratorical gradation is ascending through the words of the unhappy mother who mercilessly denounces her son as traitor to his country. The reproaches to her son are twofold: betrayal of the country and betrayal of the family. The mother’s grief increases and deepens, from the pain of the exile, “*uxulem*”, to the suffering of knowing him the enemy of the country, “*hostem*”. At an advanced age, the woman deeply feels the sorrow caused by her son’s deeds, “*longa vita et infelix senecta*”. Despite her longevity, Veturia laments her fate and blames Coriolanus for her profound unhappiness, marked by the adjectival epithet placed in front of the determiner: “*infelix*”. One notes a crescendo of the situation seen through the eyes of the dishonoured mother. She condemns her

³² Plutarch, ed. 1966, cap. 33, p. 98.

son for the acts of aggression against his country, using adjectives with a strong semantic impact, which point to Coriolanus' actions: *infesto*, "hostile", *minaci*, "threatening", *turpius*, "shameful", or her inner experiences: *miserus*, "unhappy, miserable". The mother-son relationship is hypostasized at the discursive level through the first- and second-person pronominal forms "*mihi*", "*tibi*", in the *dativus commodi vel incommode*. The relative participial clause "*tibi ingredienti fines*" substitutes a temporal clause in the fragment. The country is referred to by an enumeration of nouns detailing the general-particular relation, which highlights the dramatism of the narration and the strong revolt felt by a mother who seems to deny a son that has not learnt the real values of a Roman from her: *domus*, "home", *Penates*, "gods of the house", *mater*, "mother", *coniux*, "wife", *liberi*, "children". In the mother's eyes, the son has committed a true *hybris* by violating the laws of the city and attacking it, "*moenia*". A true Roman should respect and love his homeland, should not attack it, should protect his family, show consideration to customs and be a model for his successors. *Peroratio* is discursively validated through the use of the coordinating conclusive conjunction "*ergo*", placed before a sentence under the sign of hypothetical framework, marked by two conditional subordinate clauses "*Ergo, ego nisi peperissem, Roma non oppugnaretur! Nisi filium haberem, libera in libera patria mortua essem!*". The annulment of the act of giving birth to Coriolanus is achieved through verbs in the negative form: "*nisi peperissem*", "*nisi filium haberem*", while the consequence of his disappearance is rendered through a repetitio: "*libera in libera patria*".

Ab Urbe condita includes an evolutive presentation of the Roman power, under the aegis of three great founders: Romulus, Camillus and Augustus. As Augustus, Camillus had opposed leaving Rome and moving the capital of the Roman state. Therefore, the praise of Camillus is an indirect exaltation of Augustus:

"[3] [...] *quae tristia, milites, haec, quae insolita cunctatio est? Hostem an me an vos ignoratis? Hostis est quid aliud quam perpetua materia virtutis gloriaeque vestrae? Vos contra me duce, [4] ut Falerios Veiosque captos et in capta patria Gallorum legiones Caessas taceam, modo trigeminae victoriae triplicem triumphum ex his ipsis Volscis et Aequis et ex Etruria egistis.*[5] *An me, quod non*

dictator vobis sed tribunus signum dedi, non agnoscitis ducem? Neque ego maxima imperia in vos desidero, et vos in me nihil praeter me ipsum intueri decet; neque enim dictatura mihi umquam animos fecit, ut ne exsilium quidem ademit. [6] Idem igitur omnes sumus, et ud eadem omnia in hoc bellum afferimus quae in priora attulimus, eundem euentum belli expectemus. Simul concurreritis, quod quisque didicit ac consuevit faciet: vos vincentis, illi fugient".(T.L., VI, 7, 3-6) –

“What is this gloom, soldiers, this extraordinary hesitation? Are you strangers to the enemy, or to me, or to yourselves? As for the enemy - what is he but the means through which you always prove your courage and win renown? And as for you - not to mention the capture of Falerii and Veii and the slaughter of the Gaulish legions inside your captured City - have you not, under my leadership, enjoyed a triple triumph for a threefold victory over these very Volscians, as well as over the Aequi and over Etruria? Or is it that you do not recognise me as your general because I have given the battle signal not as Dictator but as a consular tribune? I feel no craving for the highest authority over you, nor ought you to see in me anything beyond what I am in myself; the Dictatorship has never increased my spirits and energy, nor did my exile diminish them. We are all of us, then, the same that we have ever been, and since we are bringing just the same qualities into this war that we have displayed in all former wars, let us look forward to the same result. As soon as you meet your foe, every one will do what he has been trained and accustomed to do; you will conquer, they will fly.”

Camillus' speech abides by the classical discourse canons and reflects Livy's ability to skilfully combine history and rhetoric, narrative and eloquence. Written in a Ciceronian fashion, the passage presents Furius Camillus, an Etruscan in origin, a leader of Rome for three decades, between 394 and 363 B.C. Due to his brilliant victories against the Gauls during their invasion in Italy and the rapid restoration of the city of Rome after its burning by the Gauls, the Roman posterity glorified him, granting him the title of “*alter conditor Romae*”. His military successes brought him the position of dictator five times and that of military tribune with consular powers seven times.

His discourse includes grave, incisive tones, worthy of a leader of ancient Rome, but also motivating arguments of a brave commander of soldiers, whom he knows how to encourage. The speech is written in a style typical of traditional rhetoric. One notices the frequency of interrogations, exclamations and pronominal structures: Camillus refers sometimes to him personally, sometimes to the soldiers, keeping a bridge of direct communication, guaranteed by the undoubted presence of the conative function. The short digressions on previous successes aim at a factual and justifying exemplification: Camillus proves to be not only a brilliant military commander, but also a true psychologist, when he seems to rely on the joy and elan of the army, recalling its past victories. P. G. Walsh calls these sequences “*speeches before battle*”³³, *exemplaria*, which were references to previous battles, to the successes of his own troops, by resorting to the illustration of the enemy’s weaknesses³⁴. The sentence at the end of the fragment is particularly eloquent in this regard, in that he tells his soldiers that they are used to winning and trained to conquer, which gives them balance and a feeling of security. The phrase “*lidem igitur omnes sumus*” is meant to emphasize the tradition of fighters eager to overcome. In the arsenal of artistic techniques, one can find, alongside of rhetorical elements specific to discourse, the polyptoton: “*hostem*” – “*hostis*”, “*dictator*” – “*dictatura*”, “*bellum*” – “*belli*”, “*afferimus*” – “*attulimus*”; variation: “*trigeminae*” – “*triplicem*”, “*didicit*” – “*consuevit*”; alliterations: “*vos vincetis*”, “*triplicem triumphum*”, “*eundem eventum*”.

Hannibal’s discourse includes the remarkable deeds, “*egregia*”, of the two commanders and highlights the greatness of the two empires: Carthaginian and Roman. Faced with the enemy that has definitively crushed him, he says:

“Paulisper alter alius conspectu, admiratione mutua prope attoniti, conticuere; tum Hannibal prior: «Si hoc ita fatum erat et qui primus bellum intuli populo Romano, quique totiens prope in manibus victoriam habui, is ultro ad pacem petendam venirem, laetor te mihi sorte potissimum datum at quo peterem. tibi quoque multa egregia non in ultimis laudum hoc fuerit Hannibalem cui tot de Romanis ducibus

³³ P. G. Walsh, 1954, p. 112-113.

³⁴ e.g. III, 62, 2; XXI, 40-41; XXIII, 45, 2; XXVI, 41;

victoriam di dedissent tibi cessisse, teque huic bello vestris prius quam nostris cladibus insigni finem imposuisse. [...] quod ego fui ad Trasummenum, ad Cannas, id tu hodie es. vixdum militari aetate imperio accepto omnia audacissime incipientem nusquam fefellit fortuna. Patris et patrum persecutus mortem ex calamitate vestrae domus decus insigne virtutis pietatisque eximiae cepisti: amissas Hispanias recuperasti quattuor inde Punicis exercitibus pulsus; consul creatus, cum ceteris at tutandam Italiam parum animi esset, transgressus in Africam duobus hic exercitibus caesis, binis eadem hora captis simul incesisque castris, Siphace potentissimo rege capto, tot urbibus regnis eius, tot nostri imperii ereptis, me sextum decimum iam anum haerentem in possessione Italiae detraxisti. Potest victoriam malle quam pace animus. Novi spiritus magnos magis quam utiles; et mihi talis aliquando fortuna adfulsit». – (T.L., XXX, 30)

“For a few moments they gazed upon one another in silent admiration. Hannibal was the first to speak. ‘If,’ he said, ‘Destiny has so willed it that I, who was the first to make war on Rome and who have so often had the final victory almost within my grasp, should now be the first to come to ask for peace, I congratulate myself that Fate has appointed you, above all others, as the one from whom I am to ask it. Amongst your many brilliant distinctions this will not be your smallest title to fame, that Hannibal, to whom the gods have given the victory over so many Roman generals, has yielded to you, that it has fallen to your lot to put an end to a war which has been more memorable for your defeats than for ours. [...] What I was at Thrasymenus and at Cannae, that you are today. You were hardly old enough to bear arms when you were placed in high command, and in all your enterprises, even the most daring, Fortune has never played you false. You avenged the deaths of your father and your uncle, and that disaster to your house became the occasion of your winning a glorious reputation for courage and filial piety. [...] Then you were elected consul, and whilst your predecessors had hardly spirit enough to protect Italy, you crossed over to Africa, and after destroying two armies and capturing and burning two camps within an hour, taking the powerful monarch Syphax prisoner, and robbing his dominions and ours of numerous

cities you have at last dragged me away from Italy after I had kept my hold upon it for sixteen years. It is quite possible that in your present mood you should prefer victory to an equitable peace; I, too, know the ambition which aims at what is great rather than at what is expedient; on me, too, a fortune such as yours once shone’.”

We should retain the structure “*datum est*”, an impersonal passive verb, which signals the intervention of “*fatum*” and “*fortuna*” in the two commanders’ lives. In this regard, we believe that the observation of Professor Petre Gheorghe Bârlea on the unity of the opposites of the terms “*fortuna*” and “*fama*” is relevant: that they are particular cases of enantiosem³⁵, which includes the idea of *favourable/unfavourable*, attested in Livy’s work. Hannibal seems to chronologically reconstruct the episodes of confrontations between the two sides. The opposition between the present, with its bitter taste of defeat, and the past, filled with the joy of victories against the Romans, as those of Trasimene and Cannae, is morphologically validated by the option for the succession of verbal forms along the past “*fui*”-present “*es*” axis, strengthened by the time adverbial “*hodie*”. The alternation of first- and second-person pronominal forms, in the singular and the plural: “*ego*” – “*tu*”, “*nostris*” – “*vestris*”, validates the antithesis between the two commanders and their armies. We should note the verbal forms “*recuperasti*” and “*conticuere*”, syncopated variants of the perfect indicative, active diathesis of “*recuperavisti*” and “*conticuerunt*”.

5. The rhetoric of battle scenes

Livy proves a special narrative talent when he gracefully organizes his material in large episodes and glowing pictures. Unlike Sallust, who condenses the discourse through key moments and words, Livy strives to paint the magnificent spectacle of history in detail. As in novels, Livy’s work has a narrator as an entity that is predominantly independent from the author. The interventions of the auctorial voice are rare, because the narrator tends to distance himself from the events recounted. Just like a competent psychologist, the Paduan writer recreates the scenes and analyses, from within the plot, the people’s motivations, concerns and reactions to events or situations.

³⁵ P. Gh. Bârlea, 2000, also includes the terms: “*sors*”, “*adventura*”, “*fama*”, “*infestus*”, “*obviare*”, “*hostis*”, “*tollere*” in the same series of concepts related to “fate”, p. 15.

P. G. Walsh discusses the importance of the studies of Konrad Witte, according to whom Livy used rigorous methods in order to describe battles, dialogue scenes and other narrative genres. He defined a subdivision of Livy's text, the scenes – "Einzel Erzählungen" as sections with a more dramatic content, with succinct introductions, detailed descriptions and conclusions:

*"He showed that the more dramatic sections of the Ab Urbe condita were narrated in scenes (Einzel Erzählungen), each with an abbreviated introduction and conclusion but with an elaborated central description. Further, he demonstrated how Livy, following a procedure well-established amongst historians, had stock methods of describing battle-accounts, dialogue-scenes, and other specialised narrative-genres."*³⁶

Hipolite Haine speaks about the pride of the Romans, both in their private and public life, nurtured by the series of victories and the habit of dominating, which resulted in a particular kind of courage:

*"Les Romains ne combattent pas par élan de bravoure et d'imagination, comme les Athéniens, par besoin d'action et de mouvement, comme les barbares, mais par maximes d'orgueil et par obstination. Leurs défaites sont admirables."*³⁷

"The Romans do not fight out of bravery or imagination, like the Athenians, or out of the need for action or movement, such as the barbarians, but out of an immeasurable vanity and stubbornness."(A/N)

These are to be found in the account of the battle of Trasimene. Hannibal leaves his winter camps, crosses the Apennines, Etruria and heads south, towards Rome. The consul C. Flaminius rushes in and attacks him by surprise. Hannibal is informed about the Romans' intentions and strategically chooses the battlefield, in a narrow place, near Lake Trasimene, and morning as the moment of the battle, as the thick fog would have favoured such an endeavour. When the Romans enter the gorge, Hannibal is the one who attacks them by surprise:

"Consul, percussis omnibus, ipse satis, ut in re trepida, impavidus, turbatus ordines, vertente se quoque ad dissonos clamores, intruit, ut

³⁶ P. G. Walsh, 1954, p. 97.

³⁷ H. Haine, 1904, pp. 200-201.

tempus locusque patitur et, quocumque adire audiriue potest, adhortatur ac stare ac pubnare iubet: «nec enim inde votis aut imploratione deum, sed vi ac virtute evadendum esse; per medias acies ferro viam fieri et, quo timoris minus sit, eo minus ferme periculi esse». Ceterum prae strepitu ac tumultu nec consilium nec imperium accipi poterat, ... tantumque aberat ut sua signa atque ordines et locum noscerent, ut vix ad arma capienda aptandaque pugnae competeret animus, opprimerenturque quidam, onerati magis iis quam tecti.»(T.L., XXII, 5, 1-3)

“In the universal panic, the consul displayed all the coolness that could be expected under the circumstances. The ranks were broken by each man turning towards the discordant shouts; he re-formed them as well as time and place allowed, and wherever he could be seen or heard, he encouraged his men and bade them stand and fight. ‘It is not by prayers or entreaties to the gods that you must make your way out,’ he said, ‘but by your strength and your courage. It is the sword that cuts a path through the middle of the enemy, and where there is less fear there is generally less danger.’ But such was the uproar and confusion that neither counsel nor command could be heard, and so far was the soldier from recognising his standard or his company or his place in the rank, that he had hardly sufficient presence of mind to get hold of his weapons and make them available for use, and some who found them a burden rather than a protection were overtaken by the enemy.”

The fragment captures Hannibal’s mastery on the battlefield. A good commander, he conceives an ingenious strategy in order to catch the Roman camp off guard in a very elaborate morning attack. The structure “*omnibus percussis*” is an absolute participial with a causal nuance. The objective genitive “*imploratione deum*” highlights the consul’s distrust of the gods’ power in the face of the hurricane hitting them at the time of the Punic attack. The multiple direct object “*adire quae audire*” underlines, at the phonetic level, the confusion and chaos which seize the Roman army, completely caught unawares and incapable of regrouping amid the uproar. The two causal-inductive clauses are followed by an appositive explanatory sequence,

whereas the quotation marks introduce indirect speech related to the verb “*iubet*”. We notice the prevalence of verbs, which gives dynamism to the entire battle picture; in terms of the lexical-semantic area, military concepts are chosen, such as battle lines, weapons. Furthermore, the syntactic elements help objectify the tension of the battle, for the sentences are combined paratactically or by means of the abovementioned absolute participial structures which render the infernal rhythm of operations on the battlefield.

Amid the attack unleashed by the enemy, the connection between the commander and the Roman soldiers is broken, resulting in a real disorder. The Romans are surrounded by enemies and their only hope of being saved rests in their own deeds in battle:

“Et erat in tanta caligine maior usus aurium quam oculorum. Ad gemitus vulneratorum ictusque corporum aut armorum et mixtos terrentium paventiumque clamores circumferebant ora oculosque. Alii fugientes pugnantium globo illati haerebant; alios redeuntes in pugnam avertebat fugientium agmen. Deinde, ubi in omnes partes nequiquam impetus capti, et ab lateribus montes ac lacus, ab fronte et ac tergo hostium acies claudebat, apparuitque nullam, nisi in dextra ferroque, salutis spem esse, tum sibi quisque dux adhortatorque factus ad rem gerendam.” (T.L., XXII, 5, 4-7)

“In such a thick fog ears were of more use than eyes; the men turned their gaze in every direction as they heard the groans of the wounded and the blows on shield or breastplate, and the mingled shouts of triumph and cries of panic. Some who tried to fly ran into a dense body of combatants and could get no further; others who were returning to the fray were swept away by a rush of fugitives. At last, when ineffective charges had been made in every direction and they found themselves completely hemmed in, by the lake and the hills on either side, and by the enemy in front and rear, it became clear to every man that his only hope of safety lay in his own right hand and his sword. Then each began to depend upon himself for guidance and encouragement.”

As regards the atmosphere on the battlefield, P. G. Walsh claims that fear played the decisive role in many battles³⁸:

*“This 'fear complex' has a clear correspondence with Livy's sympathy with the besieged party in siege-descriptions and with the defeated force in battle accounts.”*³⁹

The participles employed give dynamism to the fight and emphasize the result of the completed actions. The imperfect indicative forms illustrate a time of the narrative and the prolongation of terror amid the cries. The text abounds in temporals expressed by participial relatives: present participle and perfect participle.

The Romans are surrounded and decimated and the remaining ones gather their forces, determined to fight until the last breath. In the end, their catastrophic defeat is inevitable. A consul and many combatants are killed and those left outside the gorge are pushed into the lake by Hannibal's cavalry. The dramatism of the fight is captured in an apocalyptic vision:

“et nova de integro exorta pugna est, non illa ordinata per princeps hastatosque ac triarios, nec ut pro signis antesignani, post signa alia pugnaret acies, nec ut in sua legione miles aut cohorte aut manipulo esset: fors conglobabat et animus suus cuique ante aut post pugnandi ordiem dabat; tantusque fuit ardor animorum, adeo intentus pugnae animus, ut eum motum terae, qui multarum urbium Italiae magnas partes prostravit avertitque cursu rapidos amnes, mare fluminibus invexit, montes lapsu ingenti proruit, nemo pugnantium senserit. Tres ferme horas pugnatum est et ubique atrociter; circa consulem tamen acrior infestiorque pugna est.” (T.L., XXII, 5, 7-8)

“[...] and the fighting began afresh, not the orderly battle with its three divisions of principes, hastati, and triarii, where the fighting line is in front of the standards and the rest of the army behind, and where each soldier is in his own legion and cohort and maniple. Chance massed them together, each man took his place in front or rear as his courage prompted him, and such was the ardour of the combatants, so intent were they on the battle, that not a single man on the field was aware of the earthquake which levelled large portions of many towns in Italy,

³⁸ e.g. XXXI, 27, 10; XXXII, 5, 2; XXXIII, 15, 5; XXXV, 27, 16; XXXVI, 16, 6.

³⁹ P. G. Walsh, 1954, p. 114.

altered the course of swift streams, brought the sea up into the rivers, and occasioned enormous landslips amongst the mountains. For almost three hours the fighting went on; everywhere a desperate struggle was kept up, but it raged with greater fierceness round the consul.”

Livy uses the dative of direction instead of the accusative of direction, thus making, through the modernity of morphosyntactic selection, the transition to the imperial age. It is to be noted that the historiographer uses the parataxis even in the case of subordination relations, which would have required subordinating connectors.

We note that in these fragments Livy manipulates the documentary factual material according to Rome’s interests and practises a true art of historical distortion. The account of the battle of Zama, which decided the Romans’ victory in the second Punic War, is relevant in this respect. Casualties on both sides are obviously disproportionate and lacking in veracity: 20,000 dead and 20,000 Punic prisoners, as against the only 1,500 Romans killed in battle. The author tries to point out the military skills of Scipio⁴⁰ and his soldiers during the fight, as well as the confusion which takes hold of Hannibal’s army, despite the military genius of the commander. The very acknowledgment of the military abilities of the famous Carthaginian commander emphasizes, by contrast, the importance of the Roman victory and increases it. The French scholar Michel Rambaud draws attention to the historical distortion phenomenon in Latin historiographic prose identified in Caesar’s work and also points to Livy’s narrative about the first defeats of the Romans in the Punic Wars: the battles of Tressin, Trebbia and Trasimene⁴¹.

The fragment renders the discourse that both great commanders who confronted in the battle of Zama, Hannibal and Scipio Africanus, are supposed to have delivered to their soldiers. Having left for Italy, Hannibal meets Scipio in an attempt to make peace, but he fails. Upon return to their

⁴⁰ M.-A. Levi, 1997, claims that Scipio is a pioneer through the manner in which he was appointed consul instead of his father and his uncle, by open ballot, with many changes of mind and doubts. The traditional barriers of “*ordo magistratum*” are thus removed. Moreover, he is considerate as regards the Hellenistic culture, which is proven by his direct relationship with Jupiter.

⁴¹ M. Rambaud, 1966, p. 35.

camps, each of the two encourages the soldiers and insists on the advantages that triumph might bring.

Hannibal's speech, in an indirect style, abounds in infinitives in the future tense, which suggests the possibility of fulfilling what the commanders said, for the battle of the next day was to take place between two very strong armies, with equal chances of victory.

The consequences of victory are emphasized by antitheses: "*in unum diem*" / "*in perpetuum*", "*Roma*" / "*Carthago*", "*Africam aut Italiam*" / "*orbem terrarum*".

"In castra ut est ventum, pronuntiant ambo: «arma expedirent milites animosque ad suprenum certamen, non in unum diem, sed in perpetuum, si felicitas adesset victores. Roma ad Carthago iura gentibus daret ante crastinam noctem scituros; neque enim Africam aut Italiam, sed orbem terrarum victoriae praemium fore.»(T.L., XXX, 32)

"On their return to their camps, the commanders-in-chief each issued an order of the day to their troops. 'They were to get their arms ready and brace up their courage for a final and decisive struggle; if success attended them they would be victors not for a day only but for all time; they would know before the next day closed whether Rome or Carthage was to give laws to the nations. For not Africa and Italy only - the whole world will be the prize of victory.'"

We note that the linking elements (conjunctions, relative pronouns, relative adverbs) do not come first. In main clauses with a direct imperative, the verbs pass in the indirect style in the subordinate clause in the subjunctive mood: "*expedirent*". The form "*fore*" is contracted from "*fututum esse*", the active indicative future of the verb "*esse*".

When he comes back to the camp, Hannibal reorganizes the infantry: mercenary Carthaginians in the front line, Africans, Carthaginian citizens and a Macedonian corps, in the second line, and the veterans in the third. At the head he puts 80 elephants and the cavalry on the flanks. In his turn, Scipio organizes his troops so that the elephants should not cause problems. Deviated to the flanks, the elephants disorient the Carthaginian cavalry on the run. After a bloody confrontation, the infantry of both sides is forced to regroup in the second line. A new attack of the Romans results in a real massacre of the Carthaginian army:

“Igitur primo impetu extemplo movere loco hostium aciem Romani. Ala deinde et umbone pulsantes, in summos gradu illato, aliquantum spatii, velut nullo resistente, incessere, urgentibus et novissimis primos, ut semel motam aciem sensere, quod ipsum vim magnam ad pellendum hostem addebat. Apud hostes, auxiliares cedentes secunda acies, Afri et Carthaginienses, adeo non sustinebant, ut contra etiam, ne resistentes pertinaciter primos caedendo ad se perveniret hostis, pedem referrent. Igitur auxiliares terga dant repente, et in suos versi partim refugere in secundam aciem, partim non recipientes caedere, ut et paulo ante non adiuti et tunc exclusi; et prope duo iam permixta proelia erant, cum Carthaginienses simul cum hostibus, simul cum suis cogerentur manus conserere.” (T. L., XXX, 34, 3-7) –

“As a consequence, the Romans made the enemy give ground in their very first charge, then pushing them back with their shields and elbows and moving forward on to the ground from which they had dislodged them, they made a considerable advance as though meeting with no resistance. When those in the rear became aware of the forward movement they too pressed on those in front thereby considerably increasing the weight of the thrust. This retirement on the part of the enemy's auxiliaries was not checked by the Africans and Carthaginians who formed the second line. In fact, so far were they from supporting them that they too fell back, fearing lest the enemy, after overcoming the obstinate resistance of the first line, should reach them. On this the auxiliaries suddenly broke and turned tail; some took refuge within the second line, others, not allowed to do so, began to cut down those who refused to admit them after refusing to support them. There were now two battles going on, the Carthaginians had to fight with the enemy, and at the same time with their own troops.”

There is a complete lack of nominal epithets in the fragment. Dynamic images come to the fore. Changes of plans, close-remote, occur in an almost cinematic technique of sequential unfolding of the attack. The verbs “*movere*”, “*incessere*”, “*sensere*” are syncopated forms of the perfect

indicative verbs “moverunt”, “incesserunt”, “senserunt”. Livy opts for verbs in the present infinitive, the historical infinitive: “refugere”, “caepere”, which give the impression of action unfolding in front of the readers’ eyes. The subordinate “*ne resistentes primos*” is a participial relative with hypothetically desiderative value (“in case...”) and the structure “*quod ipsum*” introduces a clause with appositional value. We note the syntactic parallelisms “*et...et*”, “*simul...simul*”, which capture the total confusion on the battlefield. The relative participle with causal value “*non recipientes*” has as referential terms: “*Afri et Carthaginenses*”, the second line of battle.

During the fight, Hannibal withdraws the first two lines to the flanks and leaves the centre free. Then Scipio sends the remaining soldiers of the first line to the centre and outflanks with the other two. The prompt intervention of the cavalry led by Laelius and Masinissa decides the fate of the battle and the Romans take revenge on the victors of Cannae:

“Ita novum de integro proelium ortum est; quippe ad veros hostes perventum erat, et armorum genere et usu militiae et fama rerum gestarum et magnitudine vel spei vel periculi pares: sed et numero superior Romanus erat et animo, quod iam equites, iam elephantos fuderat, iam, prima acie pulsa, in secundam pugnabat. In tempore Laelius ac Massinissa, pulsos per aliquantum spatii secuti equites, revertentes in aversam hostium aciem incurrere. Is demum equitum impetus percussit hostem: multi circumventi in acie caesi, multi per patentem circa campum fuga sparsi, tenente omnia equitatu, passim interierunt. Carthaginensium sociorumque caesa eo die supra milia viginti, par ferme numerus captus cum signis militaribus centum triginta duobus, ephantis undecim; victores ad mille et quingenti cecidere.”(T. L. , XXX, 34, 12-13; 35, 1-3) –

“Thus the battle began entirely afresh, as the Romans had at last got to their real enemies, who were a match for them in their arms, their experience and their military reputation, and who had as much to hope for and to fear as themselves. The Romans, however, had the superiority in numbers and in confidence, since their cavalry had already routed the elephants and they were fighting with the enemy's second line after defeating his first. Laelius and Masinissa, who had followed up the defeated cavalry a considerable distance, now

returned from the pursuit at the right moment and attacked the enemy in the rear. This at last decided the action. The enemy were routed, many were surrounded and killed in action, those who dispersed in flight over the open country were killed by the cavalry who were in possession of every part. Above 20,000 of the Carthaginians and their allies perished on that day and almost as many were made prisoners. 132 standards were secured and 11 elephants. The victors lost 1500 men.”

In the writer’s view, the Carthaginians appear as the eternal enemies of Romans and especially as the victors of Cannae. There is an element of poetic syntax, singular for the plural: “Romanus”, the enemy of all. The game of verb tenses and moods places the action on a certain background. Sentences acquire edgy turns by juxtaposition and also by ample developments, in which rapid actions happen, by the abundance of the various types of participial constructions: relative and absolute.

Following the defeat, the Carthaginians are forced to conclude peace in humiliating conditions. This meant losing the political independence of Carthage, in addition to the usual burdensome tribute:

“Ita dimissi ab Roma Carthaginenses cum in Africam venisset ad Scipionem, quibus ante dictum est legibus pacem fecerunt. Naves longas, elephantos, perfugas, fugitivos, captivorum quattuor milia tradiderunt, inter quos Q. Terentius Cilleo senator fuit. Naves provectas in altum incendi iussit; quingentas fuisse omnis generis, quae remis agerentur, quidam tradunt: „quarum conspectum repente incendium tam lugubre fuisse Poenis quam si ipsa Carthago arderet”. De perfugis gravius quam de fugitivis consultum; nominis Latini qui erant securi percussi, Romani in crucem sublati.”(T.L., XXX, 43, 10-13) –

“The Carthaginian envoys were at length dismissed and returned to Scipio. They concluded peace with him on the terms mentioned above, and delivered up their warships, their elephants, the deserters and refugees and 4000 prisoners including Q. Terentius Calleo, a senator. Scipio ordered the ships to be taken out to sea and burnt. Some authorities state that there were 500 vessels, comprising every class propelled by oars. The sight of all those vessels suddenly bursting into flames caused as much grief to the people as if Carthage itself were burning. The deserters were dealt with

much more severely than the fugitives; those belonging to the Latin contingents were beheaded, the Romans were crucified.”

The term “*agerentur*” refers both to Carthaginians and Romans and syntactically expresses, in a direct manner, the states of mind of the two sides: the winner’s right to impose, humiliating, and that of the defeated to obey, humiliated. The suggestion of the Carthaginians’ state of mind is enhanced by the hyperbolic construction in indirect style – “*quarum.....aderet*”. The comparative subordinate “*quam si arderet ipsa Cathago*” includes an edifying suggestion of the psychological state of the vanquished, who become aware of the devastating consequences of the defeat.

6. Conclusions on Livy’s language and style

The purpose of Livy’s work involves multiple nuances: a patriotic nuance, because it aims to glorify Rome, mainly the New Rome, rebuilt by Augustus, and to raise, according to Hypolite Taine, “*an arch of triumph for the king people*”; a personal one, because it aims to find solace in the decadence of the republic by evoking the fascinating spectacle of past events; and last but not least, a moral-educative nuance, because it intends to draw life lessons from the narrated events and instruct the contemporaries through examples of ancient virtues. The writer creates under the impulse of dissatisfaction with the degenerate mores and aims at redressing the city life through a number of examples to follow or to avoid. Livy’s creation has, therefore, an obvious instructive purpose, as it appears in the *Prefatio*, in which he states that his intention is to create a civic guide. The role of history is to show the contemporary world by what means Rome’s greatness was created, how the predecessors acted, who the worthy men of the past were and what the civic duty to the country was.

In a modern vision, his history has a low scientific value: compiled in a faulty manner, inspired by the most ardent patriotism, it leaves much to be desired in terms of accuracy and impartiality, but if cautiously consulted, it remains a precious source of information about the epoch evoked.

Livy’s work does not aim at knowing the truth by applying a rigorous method of research into the causes of the events, because he applies his Roman ancestors’ view, according to which history remains a moral in action and a work of eloquence: “*opus hoc unum maxime oratorium*” (Cicero, *De legibus*, I, 2).

Literarily, Livy's work has a unanimously recognized artistic value; the fluent and charming narrative sometimes mounts to the pathos of tragedy or the solemnity of the epopee. The discourses which are present throughout Livy's work, alongside of those of Cicero, are the most beautiful moments of Roman eloquence.

Livy grants destiny, *fatum*, the decisive role in history. "*Fati necessitas*" is fulfilled through human action and, in this respect, the moral factor is very important. The historian's admiration is for those who acted in the direction given by "*fatum*", in order to fulfil their destiny.

The style, less pure than that of the great prose writers of the previous age, remains classic and betrays Cicero's dominant influence. As regards sentence syntax, the writer's style stands out through the ample rhetorical periods, much more varied than those of Cicero, as Jean Bayet remarks:

"Overall, Livy's style is based on periods. But these highly academic periods are more consistent and less symmetrical than in Cicero; hence, sometimes a certain stumbling, but also a great variety of suggestions and a lot of stylistic richness, even under the appearance of monotony."⁴²

The Paduan writer's period is less symmetrical, but its structure accepts both short, incisive, energetic sentences and the majestic unfolding in long sentences. In the construction of his periods, Livy has the merit of skilfully connecting the main clause to an entire series of subordinate clauses, in participial form, and of decisively contributing to the formation of the historical style.

The techniques of Livy's style are the use of relations by parataxis, as a means of expression, the play of temporal oppositions, "*cum inversum*", and the presentation particles "*iam tum vero*", borrowed from the epic poets. The transfrastic "*tum vero*" highlights the affective reactions, of indignation, anxiety, enthusiasm or military ardour. The sentences, the syntactic periods respectively, subsume a number of adverbials. Thus, through amplitude, clarity and abundance, Livy announces Tacitus' style.

Lexically, one encounters words used in the singular with a collective meaning instead of the plural: "*miles*" instead of "*milites*", "*Romanus*"

⁴² J. Bayet, 1972, p. 376.

instead of “Romani”. Morphologically, we have noticed the more frequent use of the partitive genitive, of relationship “*minutus spei*” ‘decreased in hope’, and of the dative after compound verbs of motion. One notes the preference for the dative instead of “ad + Accusative” and the use of the Ablative without preposition “*ab*”, “*de*”, “*ex*”. Furthermore, there is in Livy’s text a preference for the old synthetic forms and for the use of the indicative and subjunctive imperfect, tenses with a durative aspect, due to their descriptive property. The idea of repetition is rendered by means of the subjunctive, not indicative, imperfect and past perfect. He does not say “whenever you came”, but “whenever you might have come”.

It should be remarked that in the analysed fragments, the structures which are particularly interesting for analysis according to the ScaPoLine grid are those containing a direct discourse, an indirect discourse and a free indirect discourse, as well as a few grammatical classes: adjective, adverb, subordinating conjunctions and verbs in the subjunctive mood in conditional clauses.

Bibliography

- BARBU, Nicolae I., 1972, *Istoria literaturii latine*, București: Editura de stat didactică și pedagogică.
- BAYET, Jean, 1972, *Literatura latină*. Traducere în românește de Gabriela Creția, București: Editura Univers.
- BÂRLEA, Gheorghe, 1999³, *Contraria latina. Contraria romanica*, București: All.
- BÂRLEA, Gheorghe, 2000, *Miezul cuvintelor. Studii de lingvistică generală și lingvistică latină*, Târgoviște: Editura Bibliotheca.
- BÂRLEA, Gheorghe, 2004, *Peithous demiourgos. Știința și arta convingerii în Antichitatea greco-latină*, Târgoviște: Editura Bibliotheca.
- BERNARD, Jacques-Emmanuel, 2000, *Le portrait chez Tite Live. Essai sur une écriture de l'histoire romaine*, Bruxelles: Latomus.
- BUZOIANU, Livia, 2002, *Poetica Verba*, Constanța: Ovidius University Press.
- CIZEK, Eugen, 1994, *Istoria literaturii latine*. Vol.I. București: Societatea „Adevărul” S.A.
- CUPAIOLO, Fabio, 1904, *Storia della letteratura latina*, Napoli: Loffredo editore.
- GAFFIOT, François, 2000, *Dictionnaire latin – français*. Nouvelle Edition, Paris: Hachette.

- GUȚU, Gheorghe, 1983, *Dicționar latin-român*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- GRIMAL, Pierre, 1994, *Literatura latină*. Traducere de Mariana și Liviu Franga. Note suplimentare și cuvânt înainte de Liviu Franga. Medalion biografic *Pierre Grimal* de Eugen Cizek, București: Editura Teora.
- LEEMAN, A. D., 1963, *Orationis Ratio. The stylistic theories and practice of the Roman orators, historians and philosophers*, vol. I-II, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- LEVI, Mario-Attilio, 1997, “Indizi di Scipione Africano et di una età din cambiamento”, in: *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne*, 23/1, pp. 145-153.
- LIVI, Titi, ed. 1898, *Ab urbe condita libri*, editionem primam curavit Guilemus Weissenborn, editio altera auam curavit Mauritius Mueller Pars. Libri I-XX, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- LIVI, Titi, ed. 1880, *Ab urbe condita libri XXI-XXII*, für den Schuldegebrauch erklärt von Eduard Wölfflin, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- LIVI, Titi, 1902, *Ab urbe condita libri XXIII, XXIV, XXV*, texte latin publié par O. Riemann et E. Benoist, Paris: Hachette.
- LIVI, Titi, ed. 1902, *Ab urbe condita libri XXVI-XXX*. Texte latin publié avec une notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Tite-Live, des notes critiques et explicatives, des remarques sur la langue, un index des noms propres historiques et géographiques, un commentaire historique, des cartes et des plans par O. Riemann et T. Homolle, Paris: Hachette.
- LIVIUS, Titus, 1959, *Ab urbe condita (de la fundarea Romei)*. Traducere de Villan Janina, Florica Demetrescu, Paul H. Popescu. Studiu introductiv de Toma Vasilescu. Note de Paul H. Popescu, București: Editura Științifică.
- MAROUZEAU, Jules, 1922, *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*, Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- MAROUZEAU, Jules, 1935, *Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- NICHITA, Mihai, 1962, *Proză istorică latină*, București: Editura pentru Literatură Universală.
- NICHITA, Mihai, (coord.), 1981, *Istoria literaturii latine*, vol. II, partea I – *Perioada principatului*, București.

- PACHET, Pierre, 1999, *Un à un. De l'individualisme en littérature (Michaux, Naipaul, Rushdie)*, 1993, Paris: Le Seuil.
- PICHON, René, 1928¹, *Histoire de la littérature latine*, Paris: Hachette.
- PLUTARH, ed. 1966, *Viețile paralele*, vol. III, București: Ediura Științifică.
- RAMBAUD, Michel, 1966, *La deformation historique chez Caesar*, Paris: Le Belles Letres.
- RIEMANN, Othon, 1879, *Études sur la langue et la Grammaire de Tite-Live*, Paris: Ernest Thorin.
- SOLODOW, Joseph B. 1979, „Livy and the story of Horatius”, in: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109, pp. 251-268.
- WALSH, Patrick Gerard, 1954, „The literary techniques of Livy”, in: *RhM* 97, pp.97-114.
- WALSH, Patrick Gerard, 1961, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge: University Press.