THE LITERARY TECHNIQUES OF LIVY [1].

Over forty years ago, Konrad Witte published two articles on Livy's narrative-form which must furnish the basis of any appraisal of Livy, whether considered as historian or literary artist [2]. Using the narrative of Polybius, whom Livy followed closely in the Fourth and Fifth Decades when reporting Eastern affairs, Witte was able to illustrate in detail Livy's methods of transcription. He showed that the more dramatic sections of the *Ab Urbe Condita* were narrated in *'scenes'* ('Einzelerzählungen'), 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. Witte's researches in this field were not, however, exhaustive. First, there are some other types of scene for which Livy had particular methods of presentation: and secondly, there are certain interesting features in the narrative-genres discussed by Witte which are worthy of attention.

Sieges

In ancient warfare, sieges and blockades were common events. For the historian whose chief aim was to interest his audience and his readers, they posed a difficult problem, for unless there were some unusual method of attack, the description of stereotyped operations would clearly become monotonous. Livy attempted to solve this problem by focussing the attention on the persons under siege, a solution consonant with the increasingly humanitarian outlook of the Augustan Age. By adopting the stand-point of the besieged, he exploited his facility for *psychological observation*, especially in the description of the fall of a town. The attacking party is

usually mentioned briefly, followed by an extended account
of the defenders, and especially their state of mind. This pre-
dilection for psychological observation can be seen in Livy's
adaptation of Polybius's account of the fall of Abydus. Poly-
bius describes the conduct of the townsfolk, surveying the
scene from the outside through the eyes of Philip: Livy avoids
the narration of the grisly facts, and ponders instead the
motives of the besieged.

Pol. 16. 34. 9. Θεωρῶν δὲ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὴν ὁρμὴν τῶν
σφᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἀποσφαττόντων, κατα-
καόντων, ἀπαγχόντων, εἰς τὰ φρέατα ῥιπτούντων, κατακρημνιζόν-
των ἀπὸ τῶν τεγῶν, ἐκπλαγὴς ἦν . . . .

Livy 31. 18. 6. tanta enim *rabies* multitudinem invasit ut
repente, proditos rati qui pugnantes mortem occubuissent,
periuriumque alius alii exprobrantes et sacerdotibus maxime,
qui quos ad mortem devovissent eorum deditionem vivorum
hosti fecissent, *repente* omnes ad caedem coniugum liberorum-
que discurrerent, seque ipsi *per omnes vias leti* interficerent.

In this analysis of mental strain and the suddenness of
its effects, the word 'rabies' is important. In the previous
chapter, it is used to compare the plight of the Abydenes with
that of the Saguntines (31. 17. 5. ad Saguntinam *rabiem*
versi . . .); and in the account of the siege of Corinth, when
some Italian deserters repelled the Romans, we read: — 32.
23. 9. hos desperata salus, si Romani vicissent, ad *rabiem*
magis quam audaciam accendebat.

Another striking example of the psychological approach
can be seen in the account of the siege of Ambracia. The
Romans attempted to enter the city by digging a subterranean
passage, but the rising heap of earth betrayed the stratagem
to the townsmen, and they began to dig a trench. So much
Polybius tells us. But Livy imaginatively dramatises the sud-
denness of the moment of discovery, and stresses the mental
reaction of the besieged: —

Pol. 21. 28. 7. ὡς δὲ μέγας ὁ σωρὸς ἐγένετο τῆς ἐκφερο-
μένης γῆς καὶ σύνοπτος τοῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, οἱ προεστῶτες τῶν
πολιορκουμένων ὤρυττον τάφρον . . . .

Livy 38. 7. 7. cumulus *repente* terrae eminens index operis
oppidanis fuit, *pavidique ne iam subrutis muris facta in urbem
via esset*, fossam . . . ducere instituunt.

Almost all siege-descriptions show this same tendency to
concentrate the attention on the besieged, and especially on

their state of mind [3]). In many descriptions, Livy so far identifies himself with the besieged that he describes the Romans as 'the enemy' [4]).

The second tendency which characterises Livy's siege-descriptions is that of simplifying, if not ignoring, technical devices used. Here we are presented with an interesting facet of his make-up: he had no grasp of, or interest in, the specialised machines of war. In this there is a marked contrast between the avid curiosity of Polybius his source, who delighted in explanatory passages about such contraptions, and his own 'lay-man's' approach. In the siege of Ambracia, Polybius tells us, the townsfolk had discovered that the besiegers were building a tunnel, so they dug a trench parallel to the city-wall and lined it with thin sheets of brass (21. 28. 8. . . . ἔθηκαν παρὰ τὸν ἕνα τοῖχον τῆς τάφρου τὸν ἐγγὺς τῷ τείχει χαλκώματα συνεχῆ, λεπτότατα ταῖς κατασκευαῖς . . .), and then advanced along the trench with their ears close to the brass sheets, the reverberation of which indicated the position of the Roman miners. We find that Livy has said nothing of the brass plates, but has substituted a general explanation: —

38. 7. 8. . . . silentio facto pluribus locis aure admota sonitum fodientium captabant.

In the narration of the ensuing scuffle in the tunnel, Livy has made a ludicrous mistake in translation. The townsmen rushed into the tunnel with shields (θυρεούς), but Livy confusing this with θύρας, has written (38. 7. 10): — *foribus raptim obiectis* [5]). Polybius later described how the Ambraciots were to 'smoke out' the Romans by means of a corn-jar full of feathers ignited by charcoal. In this jar a hollow tube was to be placed, and fitted to the tube a blacksmith's bellows. As the feathers caught fire, the tube was to be removed. Livy has omitted some of these details. Perhaps they would have been too complex for the comprehension of his audience, but the omission also reflects the author's aversion from technicalities [6]).

---

3) See, for example, 32. 17-18 (the siege of Atrax), 36. 22-24 (Heraclea), 38. 28-29 (Same). 29. 6. 10-17 (Locri), 28. 22-23 (Astapa).
4) See 36. 22-24 (three times), 38. 29. 2., 38. 6. 7. (Ambracia), 2. 17. 3. (Pometia).
5) See Sage, the Loeb. edn. of Livy, Vol. XI P. 23.
6) Polybius narrated this part of the account in the form of a suggestion made by someone (i. e. in the didactic manner), and explained that the event accorded with the suggestion (γενομένων δὲ πάντων καθάπερ

If we examine Livy's narration of the siege of Syracuse (24. 33. 9.), and compare it with the account of Polybius, we again observe this difference of approach [7]). Polybius (8. 4.) has a long explanation of the construction of the σαμβύκαι, the harp-shaped ladders which were attached to quinqueremes and had a platform from which attackers could mount the city-wall. None of this appears in Livy's account [8]).

In brief, Livy's narration of sieges virtually excludes extended mention of attackers or of technical apparatus: he concentrates instead on the situation of the besieged, assessing the effects of the attack in terms of human emotions and sufferings, and thereby affecting his audience with that 'pity and fear' at which the rhetorical historians, no less than the tragedians, aimed.

Sea-Battles

It will be remembered that Witte drew attention to the many stock situations in Livy's battle-accounts, and under headings such as "The Outbreak of Battle", "The Commencement of Defeat", "The Outbreak of Flight", he convincingly showed that these accounts are in many cases identically constructed. These comments were confined to battles on land, but a similar technique is found in the narration of some sea-battles.

In the fourth Decade there are three main sea-engagements, that off Cissus (36. 43-45), that off Phaselis (37. 23-24), and that off Myonnesus (37. 29-30) [9]). Livy's accounts of these are constructed almost identically, and the terminology is often similar. There is accordingly an astonishing resemblance between these accounts which can hardly be accounted for entirely by any similarity of situation.

προείρηται . . . .). Livy has described the operation as it actually happened; thus his version is more lively and vivid.

7) It is doubtful whether Livy used Polybius (8. 3. seq.) directly. But the two accounts are similar in outline (whilst differing in one or two details) which suggests that a common source was used.

8) Though it is not strictly relevant to the discussion of sieges, we find another example of Livy's aversion from technical explanations in 37. 11.13., where he mentions some Rhodian fire-ships without describing details of their mechanism. Appian (Syr. 24.), who also follows Polybius (not always faithfully, it must be admitted), describes the details, which he must certainly have obtained from Polybius's account.

9) I omit detailed reference to the battle off Gytheum between Nabis and Philopoemen (35. 26.), since there was no real engagement.

In the descriptions of the *preparation for battle,* the fleet of Antiochus is invariably mentioned first, and the procedure is identical in each case. Livy starts with the left wing in each passage.

36. 44. 1. Polyxenidas, ut appropinquare hostes adlatum est, occasione pugnandi laetus sinistrum ipse cornu in altum extendit, dextrum cornu praefectos navium ad terram explicare iubet, et aequa fronte ad pugnam procedebat.

37. 23. 7. ab regiis sinistro cornu, quod ab alto obiectum erat, Hannibal, dextro Apollonius purpuratorum unus praeerat: et iam in frontem derectas habebant naves.

37. 29. 8. et regia classis, binis in ordinem navibus longo agmine veniens, et ipsa aciem adversam explicuit, laevo tantum evecta cornu, ut amplecti et circuire dextrum cornu Romanorum posset.

The reactions of the Rhodians or Romans are then described: —

36. 44. 2. quod ubi vidit, Romanus ...

37. 23. 9. Eudamus postquam hostium aciem ... vidit ...

37. 29. 9. quod ubi Eudamus ... vidit ...

In each case the Rhodian and Roman fleets convert their 'agmen' into an 'acies', and in two cases this rearrangement causes confusion: —

36. 44. 2. ... vela contrahit malosque inclinat et simul armamenta componens opperitur insequentes naves. iam ferme triginta in fronte erant, quibus ut aequaret laevum cornu dolonibus erectis altum petere intendit, iussis qui sequebantur adversus dextrum cornu prope terram proras derigere. Eumenes agmen cogebat: ceterum ut demendis armamentis *tumultuari primum coeptum est,* et ipse ... concitat naves.

37. 23. 9. ... et ipse in altum evehitur et deinceps quae sequebantur servantes ordinem in frontem derigere iubet. *ea res primo tumultum praebuit* ...

37. 29. 9. (Eudamus ... vidit) non posse aequare ordinem Romanos ... concitat naves ... aequatoque cornu praetoriae navi ... suam obiecit.

The battle itself in each case has as its main feature clashes between individual ships or small groups, and the main engagement is described baldly. In two of the accounts the use of the Pluperfect is designed to plunge us into the middle of the battle without tiresome preliminaries: —

36. 44. 10. et *iam* classes quoque undique *concurrerant* et passim permixtis navibus pugnabatur.

37. 30. 1. *iam* totis simul classibus ab omni parte pugna *conserta erat.*

Above all, Livy, with his love of generalisation, is at pains to demonstrate that the courage of the Romans and the superior naval tradition of the Rhodians were decisive factors.

36. 45. 1. Polyxenidas enim ut *virtute militum* haud dubie se superari vidit... effuse fugere intendit.

37. 30. 2. robore navium et *virtute militum* Romani longe regios praestabant.

6. plurimum tamen, quae solet, *militum virtus* in bello valuit.

37. 24. 1. sed momento temporis *et navium virtus et usus rei maritimae* terrorem omnem Rhodiis dempsit.

37. 30. 2. (longe praestabant) Rhodiae naves *agilitate et arte gubernatorum et scientia remigum.*

Finally, we find that *the flights* of the fleets and of the commanders are described in similar phraseology: —

36. 45. 1. (Polyxenidas) ... *sublatis dolonibus* effuse fugere intendit.

37. 30. 7. (naves) ... *sublatis raptim dolonibus* ... capessunt fugam.

35. 26. 9. ipse Philopoemen in levi speculatoria nave fugit, nec ante *fugae finem* quam Patras ventum est *fecit.*

36. 45. 4. Polyxenidas non prius quam in portu Ephesi *fugae finem fecit* [10]).

Conferences

Apart from the narration of wars, the dramatic sections of Livy's history are chiefly concerned with meetings and discussions, whether between individuals or at councils and assemblies. In our consideration of the stylistic features of these descriptions, we must remember that Livy had written philo-

---

10) Other sea-engagements are reported in 21. 49—50, 22. 19—20, 25. 27., 26. 39., 28. 30., 30. 10., 44. 28., but many of these are assaults on land-fortresses or have other unusual features which prevent a clear-cut engagement. The others are so rare and so widely separated that a common technique of description could hardly be expected. The fact that the three engagements reported in the fourth Decade are close to each other has obviously (consciously or sub-consciously) made for a similar presentation.

sophical works before beginning the *Ab Urbe Condita* [11]). It is likely that the structure of 'conference-scenes' in his history has been affected by earlier dialogue-compositions.

Perhaps the most obvious structural device of dialogues composed after the Aristotelian model is that of *artistic division* between speeches or between sections of the argument. The method commonly used by Livy to achieve this effect can be called the 'silentium' device: he has invented a dramatic silence which has the effect of a curtain. (Similar usages in Cicero's dialogues suggest the source of this device[12]). Thus the Nicaea conference (32. 32-36) is divided into five sections. Night intervenes between the third and fourth, and the fourth and fifth. Between the second and third sections there is an interval whilst Philip (who was speaking from a boat) moved closer to the shore. To allow for a similar division between the first and second sections, Livy has invented a silence not recorded in Polybius: —

Pol. 18. 1. 10. ἐδόκει μὲν οὖν πᾶσι φορτικῶς κατάρχεσθαι τῆς ὁμιλίας. ὅμως δὲ λέγειν αὐτὸν ἐκέλευεν ὁ Τίτος ὑπὲρ ὧν πάρεστιν. ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος οὐκ ἔφη τὸν λόγον αὐτῷ καθήκειν ἀλλ᾽ ἐκείνῳ . . .

Livy 32. 33. 1. secundum haec silentium fuit, cum Romanus eum aequum censeret priorem dicere qui petisset colloquium, rex eius esse priorem orationem qui daret pacis leges, non qui acciperet. Whereas Polybius related how they bade each other speak first, Livy has converted this into a dramatic silence which effectively breaks up the continuous conference [13]).

Again, in the famous trial scene when Perseus indicts Demetrius before their father Philip, the king's speech is followed by a silence, and another is inserted between the speeches of the two brothers: —

40. 8. 20. haec furens ira cum dixisset, lacrimae omnibus obortae et diu maestum silentium tenuit.

---

11) v. Lucius Annaeus Seneca, Ep. 100. 9. nomina adhuc T. Livium, scripsit enim et dialogos quos non magis philosophiae adnumerare possis quam historiae, et ex professo philosophiam continentis libros . . .

12) v. Cicero De Oratore 3. 35. 143. haec quum Crassus dixisset, parumper et ipse conticuit et caeteris silentium fuit. v. also De Republica 2. 38. 64.

13) In this passage Livy omits reference to the vulgarity (φορτικῶς) of Philip's conduct because it is not consonant with his notion of the dignity of kingship.

40. 12. 2. deinde diu fuit silentium, cum perfusum fletu appareret omnibus loqui non posse [14]).

Many of Livy's conference scenes (like those of other ancient historians, notably Thucydides and Tacitus) are constructed around antithetical speeches. He went to extraordinary lengths to balance these speeches, so far as was possible, both in length and order of topics. If we examine the accounts of the Lysimachia conference in Polybius (18. 50-52) and in Livy (33. 39-40), we see that Livy has effected major changes. Polybius reported a speech by Antiochus two and a half times as long as that of the Romans which preceded it: Livy effectively reduced the one and extended the other to make them more equal in length. An exordium and a peroration are inserted into the speech of the Romans; we also see some conventional rhetoric [15]). The speech of Antiochus has been rearranged so that the points raised by the Romans are answered in the same order. Most interesting of all, whereas Polybius reports additional speeches from the representatives of Smyrna and Lampsacus (which were interrupted by Antiochus on the grounds that the matter should be referred to the Rhodians [16]), Livy completely omits reference to these speeches: instead he focusses attention on the antithetical speeches of the Romans and of Antiochus, so that this scene is symbolic of the impending enmity between the two powers.

We find a similar balancing technique elsewhere. In the description of an assembly addressed by Eumenes and by the Rhodians, (Livy 37. 52-56; Polybius 21. 18-24) Livy reduced the speech of Eumenes and increased that of the Rhodians to equate them in length; further, he inserted into the speech of the Rhodians an answer to a point raised by Eumenes [17]), as well as more general topics. There is no doubt that here, as

14) The 'silentium' device can also be found in 3. 47. 6., 9. 4. 7., 30. 30. 2., 32. 20. 1., 34. 59. 1. E. Dutoit *Silences dans l'oeuvre de Tite Live* (Mél. de Phil., de Litt., et d'Hist. Anc. offerts à J. Marouzeau Paris 1948) draws attention to the prevalence of these silences but does not comment on their structural function.

15) e. g. 33. 39. 6., where the words of Pol. (18. 50. 6.) γελοῖον γὰρ εἶναι τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἆθλα τοῦ γεγονότος αὐτοῖς πολέμου πρὸς Φίλιππον Ἀντίοχον ἐπελθόντα παραλαμβάνειν become in Livy: id vero non ferendum esse, Romanos *per tot annos terra marique tanta pericula ac labores* exhausisse, Antiochum belli praemia habere.

16) i. e. by the regular Hellenistic method of arbitration.

17) 37. 54. 26-7. This referred to the cities which had sided with Antiochus. In Polybius the Rhodians make no reply to this point.

elsewhere [18]), he has tried to equate the two speeches in length and content.

Witte has drawn attention to another technique in these conference-scenes, by which Livy fuses a number of speeches to form one coherent, non-redundant statement. He illustrates this by an interesting passage in which Hannibal is represented as giving his views at a war-conference of Antiochus. Now Hannibal was not present at this conference, and Livy has added Hannibal's comments to those of the other speakers to include every element in the camp hostile to Rome [19]). In 38. 8. 3. the Aetolians are depicted as agitating for peace. Their own council-proceedings are first described: their envoys then make supplication to the Roman consul. When the consul replies, it is clear that he is answering not only the petition of the envoys but also the points made at the council at which he was not present [20]). Here Livy is more concerned to present a contrast between the Aetolian and the Roman viewpoints than to achieve complete consistency.

One other feature of conference-scenes can be considered here — Livy's refusal to insert personal comments as judgement of any situation leads him to attribute judgements made by Polybius to the historical personages involved [21]). An important example of this change is to be found in 37. 25. 4., where an observation of Polybius is converted by Livy into *a letter* sent by Antiochus to Prusias. Remarkably enough, this letter

---

18) e. g. 31. 29-32 (the Aetolian Council). Of the four speeches, the first two are equal in agregate length to the second two. The two main speeches are in Oratio Recta, the others in Oratio Obliqua. Thus an obvious balance is attained. In 37. 35. 2. seq. there is a long speech followed by a short one, then a short followed by a long. Livy has himself added to the first speech the topic of Lysimachia and certain commonplaces in order to make it comparable in length with the other long speech.

19) Livy 35. 17-19. v. Witte P. 377.

20) 38. 8. 3. omnium eo sententiae decurrerunt, ut *pax* si posset aequis, si minus tolerandis condicionibus *peteretur: Antiochi fiducia bellum susceptum: Antiocho* terra marique superato et prope extra orbem terrae *ultra iuga Tauri exacto,* quam spem esse ... ? (The envoys address the consul) orare consulem ut parceret urbi, misereretur gentis quondam sociae, nolle dicere iniuriis, miseriis certe coactae insanire ... ad ea consul respondit magis saepe quam vere umquam Aetolos *pacem petere. imitarentur Antiochum in petenda pace, quem in bellum traxissent;* non paucis urbibus eum ... sed omni Asia *cis Taurum montem* ... excessisse.

21) This *indirect* exposition is discussed in I. Bruns, *Die Persönlichkeit in der Geschichtsschreibung der Alten* (Berlin 1898). V. also Witte P. 274.

is a forthright condemnation of Roman imperialism, and is markedly similar to the letter recorded in Sallust and allegedly written by Mithridates to Arsaces [22]).

Pol. 21. 11. 1. (Ἀντίοχος)... διεπέμπετο συνεχῶς πρὸς Προυσίαν, παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν σφετέραν συμμαχίαν. ὁ δὲ Προυσίας κατὰ μὲν τοὺς ἀνώτερον χρόνους οὐκ ἀλλότριος ἦν τοῦ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον· πάνυ γὰρ ἐδεδίει τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, μὴ ποιῶνται τὴν εἰς Ἀσίαν διάβασιν ἐπὶ καταλύσει πάντων τῶν δυναστῶν.

Livy 37.25.4. Antiochus... ad Prusiam Bithyniae regem legatos miserat litterasque, quibus transitum in Asiam Romanorum increpabat: venire eos ad omnia regna tollenda, ut nullum usquam orbis terrarum nisi Romanum imperium esset. Philippum et Nabim expugnatos; se tertium peti: ut quisque proximus ab oppresso sit, per omnes velut continens incendium pervasurum; ab se gradum in Bithyniam fore, quando Eumenes in voluntariam servitutem concessisset.

Sallust Ep. et Or. 6... namque Romanis cum nationibus, populis, regibus cunctis una et ea vetus causa bellandi est, cupido profunda imperi et divitiarum. qua primo cum rege Macedonum Philippo bellum sumpsere... ac mox, fracto Philippo, Antiochus omni cis Taurum agro et decem milibus talentorum spoliatus est... Eumen⟨en⟩ cuius amicitiam gloriose ostentant, initio prodidere Antiocho, pacis mercedem; post, habitum custodiae agri captivi, sumptibus et contumeliis ex rege miserrumum servorum effecere...

There are a number of other examples of Livy's 'indirect exposition'. In 38. 10. 3. he converts the *thoughts* of Philip (in Pol. 21. 31. 3.) into complaints sent *per legatos per litteras.* In 33. 8. 1-2 Philip's *mental* reaction to the reports of his men (Pol. 18. 22. 8.) is converted into *an expression of his doubts.* In 33. 31. Livy has described a conference between Flamininus and the Roman commissioners. Polybius (18. 45.) stated that Flamininus urged the liberation of Greece, but the commissioners hesitated because they had no definite instructions, and they feared a possible invasion by Antiochus. In Livy's account, these doubts attributed to the commissioners have become their own words expressed at the conference: —

---

22) V. the Budé Edn. of Sallust P. 299. Bikerman, *La lettre de Mithridate dans les Histoires de Salluste* (Rev. Et. Gr. 1946 P. 131) states that the letter is not authentic.

Pol. 18. 45. 10. Ταύτην δὲ συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι τὴν ἀπορίαν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ διὰ τὸ περὶ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ προδιειλῆφθαι καὶ ῥητὰς ἔχειν τοὺς δέκα παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου τὰς ἐντολάς, περὶ δὲ Χαλκίδος καὶ Κορίνθου καὶ Δημητριάδος ἐπιτροπὴν αὐτοῖς δεδόσθαι διὰ τὸν Ἀντίοχον....

Livy 33. 31. nihil contra ea de libertate urbium alii dicebant; ceterum ipsis tutius esse manere paulisper sub tutela praesidii Romani quam pro Philippo Antiochum dominum accipere.

Dialogues

Livy's method of reporting dialogues is designed to convey a dramatic effect for the purpose of depicting the character of the personalities concerned. Usually the disputants are major figures: where less significant persons are involved, Livy has attempted to recount attitudes which reflect national characteristics, and in some cases the dialogue becomes symbolic of the antipathy between nations [23].

The favourite dialogue-form used by Livy has been demonstrated by Witte very effectively [24]. Both protagonists make short statements. A's first statement causes B no concern: it may even encourage a certain complacency, and B replies with assurance. A's second statement is the vital one — an unexpected comment or demand which causes the utmost fear or anger or confusion in B. This effect of περιπέτεια, as Witte calls it, often exists in Polybius, and Livy has merely embellished it to accentuate the contrast. For example, in 32. 10. Philip and Flamininus are depicted as exchanging views from opposite sides of the Aous. Though Polybius's account is lost, that of Diodorus, who followed Polybius closely in dialogues, has survived.

Diod. 28, 11. Φλαμίνιος μὲν ᾤετο δεῖν τὸν Φίλιππον ἐκχωρεῖν ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὅπως ἀφρούρητος ᾖ καὶ αὐτόνομος, ἀποδοῦναι δὲ καὶ τοῖς παρεσπονδημένοις τὰς βλάβας εὐδοκουμένως.

ὁ δὲ ἔφη δεῖν τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ καταλελειμμένα βεβαίως ἔχειν, ὅσα δὲ τυγχάνει προσηγμένος ἐκ τούτων ἐξάγειν τὰς φρουράς, περὶ δὲ τῆς βλάβης κρίνεσθαι.

---

23) In 36. 28. 1. Phaeneas is the personification of the Aetolian attitude. In 31. 18. the discussion at Abydus is symbolic of the antipathy between Rome and Macedon. (V. McDonald PCA 1938 Pp 25-6).

24) V. especially Pp 284, 288, 304, commenting on Livy 36. 28. Pol. 20. 10., Livy 39. 34. Pol. 22. 13., Livy 31. 18. Pol. 16. 34,

εἰπόντος δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα Φλαμινίου μὴ δεῖσθαι κρίσεως, δεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν τοὺς πεπονθότας πείθειν, καὶ διότι παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἐντολὰς ἔχει ταύτας, ὅπως μὴ μέρος τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν ἐλευθεροῦν,

ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Φίλιππος, καὶ τί τούτου βαρύτερον, φησί, προσέταξαν ἂν μοι πολέμῳ κρατήσαντες; καὶ ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἐχωρίσθη διωργισμένος.

Livy 32. 10. 3. summa postulatorum consulis erat: praesidia ex civitatibus rex deduceret: iis quorum agros urbesque populatus esset, redderet res quae comparerent; ceterorum aequo arbitrio aestimatio fieret.

Philippus aliam aliarum civitatium condicionem esse respondit. quas ipse cepisset, eas liberaturum; quae sibi traditae a maioribus essent, earum hereditaria ac iusta possessione non excessurum. si quas quererentur belli clades eae civitates cum quibus bellatum foret, arbitrio quo vellent, populorum cum quibus pax utrisque fuisset, se usurum.

consul nihil ad id quidem arbitro aut iudice opus esse dicere. cui enim non apparere ab eo qui prior arma intulisset iniuriam ortam? nec Philippum ab ullis bello lacessitum priorem vim omnibus fecisse. *inde cum ageretur quae civitates liberandae essent, Thessalos primos omnium nominavit consul.*

ad id vero adeo accensus indignatione est rex ut exclamaret, 'quid victo gravius imperares, T. Quincti?' atque ita se ex colloquio proripuit.

Livy here appears to have added one significant sentence not contained in Polybius — the reference to the Thessalians as the first people to be freed: this makes more specific the words of the consul μὴ μέρος τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν αὐτήν ....., and makes more explicable the angry reaction of Philip. Notice how the anger is more forcefully expressed; ἐχωρίσθη is rendered ' se... proripuit', φησί as 'exclamaret', and the question of Philip, a generalisation in Diodorus, is in Livy directly put to Flamininus.

There are of course many conversations recorded by Livy which do not contain matter lending itself to the περιπέτεια technique. In these other dialogues Livy has concentrated on producing a lively and stimulating effect, free from wordy connections and explanations, as for example in 32. 32. 13. (compare with Pol. 18. 1. 6.) and 38. 14. 7. (Pol. 21. 34. 6.). He is so addicted to the dialogue form that sometimes he creates dialogues where none existed in the source. Witte has

shown how Livy coalesced the conversation of two different days into a single dialogue [25]). Elsewhere he has added some purely common-place conversation to create a dialogue. In Polybius's account of a conversation between Cn. Cornelius and Philip there is merely one remark made on each side; Livy converts this into his normal structure with two remarks on each side.

Pol. 18. 48. 4. ... καὶ συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ πρεσβευτὰς πέμπειν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ὑπὲρ συμμαχίας, ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ τοῖς καιροῖς ἐφεδρεύων ἀποκαραδοκεῖν τὴν Ἀντιόχου παρουσίαν. τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως συγκαταθεμένου τοῖς ὑποδεικνυμένοις . . . .

Livy 33. 35. 3. ... percunctatus si consilium non utile solum sed etiam salutare admittere auribus posset, cum rex gratias quoque se acturum diceret, si quid quod in rem suam esset expromeret ... The conversation then proceeds as in Polybius.

In 33. 8. 1. seq. (the description of a meeting between Philip and some of his troops at the battle of Cynoscephalae) Livy has created a dialogue from the words of the soldiers and some comments of Polybius (18. 22. 8.) which Livy has transferred, with a little elaboration, to the mouth of Philip [26]).

Livy's use of *Oratio Recta* and *Oratio Obliqua* in dialogue-scenes gives a clue to the much controverted problem of their use generally in the *Ab Urbe Condita*. In the passage just quoted (33. 8. 1.) Livy has converted the comments of the soldiers from *Oratio Recta* in Polybius to *Oratio Obliqua*. This has the effect of lessening the prominence of the soldiers in the dialogue, and thus the attention is focussed on Philip, confronted with the necessity to take a vital decision. Usually Livy has followed Polybius in the use of *Oratio Recta:* both authors use it to convey a more emphatic effect, and to concentrate attention on the speaker. Occasionally statements made by Polybius in *Oratio Obliqua* have been converted into *Oratio Recta:* Bornecque, quoting Kohl, says that it is the ideas of Livy, or those which he approves, which are related in Direct Speech [27]). In some passages it appears to be *the opinion which prevails* which is so expressed [28]). Such precise

---

25) See Livy 39. 34. 3. and Polybius 22. 13. 8. (the Maronea incident).

26) This passage is discussed by A. Lambert *Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius* (Privately Printed 1946) Pp 58-9.

27) *Tite Live* P. 158.

28) e. g. 31. 25., 32. 10., 32. 34., and the speech of Menippus in 35. 32. 7. seq.

formulations however are dangerous, and it is safer merely to observe that Livy puts into *Oratio Recta* the statements to which he especially wishes to draw attention.

Speeches

The research which has been made into the approach of Livy to speeches has not always sufficiently availed itself of the opportunity to compare such speeches with those still to be found in Livy's sources [29]). Such a comparison shows considerable changes in Livy's account, occasionally for moral or patriotic considerations, but almost always with stylistic motives. In other words, Livy imitates Thucydides in adhering to the spirit of what was said whilst encasing it in his own literary framework [30]). Such changes have the effect above all of more vivid characterisation of the speaker concerned [31]).

Livy's method of indicating that his rendering only approximates to the original is the insertion of a vague phrase at the commencement of a speech. Thus in 37. 45., where he reproduces a speech of Scipio Africanus, he writes: *in hunc modum* locutus fertur. The speech bears little resemblance in form to the original in Polybius, which is merely a catalogue of peace-terms expressed prosaically in *Oratio Obliqua*. Livy's version, in *Oratio Recta*, is more rhetorically expressed, and Scipio's preeminence as the *doyen* of Roman generals is brought out by the increased emphasis on Hannibal. One sentence with its bold use of anaphora, congeries, and antithesis is sufficient to show the difference from the original: —

Pol. 21. 17. 2. διὸ καὶ νῦν αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπόκρισιν δοθήσεσθαι παρὰ Ῥωμαίων, ἣν καὶ πρότερον ἔλαβον, ὅτε πρὸ τῆς μάχης παρεγενήθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσ⟨ποντον⟩.
Livy 37.45.13. postquam traiecimus Hellespontum, priusquam castra regia, priusquam aciem videremus, cum communis Mars et incertus belli eventus esset, de pace vobis agentibus quae

---

29) v. Canter *Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches* AJPh 1917; R. Ullmann *Etude sur le style des discours de Tite Live* (Oslo 1929) and *La technique des discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite* (Oslo 1927); A. Lambert op. cit., O. Kohl *Über Zweck und Bedeutung der livianischen Reden* (Jahresber. der Realschule und des Gymn. zu Barmen 1872); Bornecque op. cit. Pp 155-174.

30) v. Thuc. 1. 22. This attitude is condemned implicitly by Polybius's attack on Timaeus in 12. 25. 5.

31) v. S. K. Johnson 'Oratory and Characterisation in the later books of Livy' PCA 1929 36-7.

pares paribus ferebamus condiciones, easdem nunc victores victis ferimus [32])

Livy's speeches are regularly constructed with an exordium and a peroration, sometimes composed by himself, sometimes elaborated from a topic found in his source. Thus in 33. 12. 5., as Witte has shown [33]), the most effective argument in a speech of Flamininus is converted into an exordium. In 32. 34. a speech of Philip in Polybius 18. 5. is rearranged so that the point on which Philip was most indignant is brought forward from the end to form a more effective introduction. In 33. 39.-40. there is an exchange of speeches between the Romans and Antiochus. In the speech of the Romans, Livy has inserted as introductory topic a general expression of senatorial displeasure, and the possibility of a future invasion of Italy as the peroration. Antiochus's speech commences with an expression of indignation at the Roman inquisition. None of these topics appears in Polybius [34]).

Frequently Livy has changed the order of topics to give the speech greater cohesion and rhetorical force. In 18. 4-5 Polybius reported a section of Philip's speech at the Nicaea council. The first topic was Lysimachia, previously annexed by Philip: then Cius, which he had attacked: then the law permitting the Aetolians to support as individuals either of two external powers in conflict: and finally the Aetolian demand for the evacuation of Greece by the Macedonians. Livy's rearrangement in 32. 34. has brought the final topic to the beginning, the Aetolian law next, and finally Cius and Lysimachia. The speech is skilfully planned to give the smoothest continuity by ingenious inter-connection of topics [35]).

Speeches before battle are as we should expect a specialised genre. In this type of speech the elaboration made by

---

32) Another illustration of the amplification of a speech with the aim of characterisation can be seen in the speech of Hannibal in 36. 7. A comparison with Appian (Syr. 14) suggests that Livy's prefatory remark (regem atque eos qui aderant *tali oratione* advertit) conceals considerable changes. Rearrangement of topics, insertion of exordium and peroration, introduction of the topic of Pyrrhus, omission of the fact that the Lacedaemonians refused to ally themselves with Antiochus, all help in building up a picture of the gigantic threat facing Rome, with Hannibal indirectly depicted as the implacable enemy, a courageous and consummate leader of the anti-Roman forces.   33) Pp. 296-9.

34) 18. 50. 5. seq. Another example can be seen in 37. 52. (Pol. 21. 18).

35) There are many examples of such transposition of topics: see, for example, Livy 33. 31. (Pol. 18. 45) and 37. 36. (Pol. 21. 15.)

Livy lies chiefly in *exemplaria* — apposite references to previous battles or hardships overcome. In 33. 8., for example, Livy has summarised a speech of Flamininus from Polybius 18. 23. 3-7. The Roman general reminded the soldiers of their victory in Epirus, when the Macedonians were routed, in spite of their holding τὰς ἀπηλπισμένας . . . δυσχωρίας. Livy has amplified the δυσχωρίαι: — 33. 8. 4. simul admonens cum isdem Macedonibus pugnaturos, quos ad Epiri fauces, montibus fluminibusque saeptos, victa naturali difficultate locorum expulissent . . .

Such praise for one's own troops and emphasis on the weaknesses of the enemy naturally form the basic topics of such speeches [36]).

So much for the matter of Livian speeches. As regards the *form,* Livy imposes on all speeches his own literary polish, whatever the source. His version of a speech by Africanus in 38. 51. 7. can be compared with the original speech recorded by Aulus Gellius (4. 11. 4.). Here Livy has been careful to retain the matter of the original but he has embellished it by copious use of rhetorical figures — congeries, isocolon, apostrophe, antithesis [37]). Abundant research has however been made into the form of Livy's speeches, and no more need be said here.

Battle-Accounts

Witte's demonstration of Livy's stock techniques in the narration of battles, perhaps the most important section of all, does not include a number of features which are noteworthy.

There is first what we may call the 'switch-technique'. Perhaps the most notable difference to the ordinary reader between the accounts of Livy and Polybius is that Polybius writes much more episodically. He devotes his attention to a particular topic in a particular locality, and having disposed of it, he commences a fresh narration about the new topic. Livy avoids this episodic effect by skilful linking-up of scenes,

36) e. g. 21. 40-41, 23. 45. 2., 26. 41., 3. 62. 2., etc.
37) v. Marouzeau Rev. Phil. 1921 Pp. 165-6. This speech of Africanus is not recorded in Polybius, and it is fortunate that Aulus Gellius has preserved it, since it disposes of the over-zealous contention that Livy has invented the speech to glorify his hero (v. Carcopino, quoted by Bornecque, op. cit. P. 122).

so that his narration assumes a more cohesive aspect. This
'switch-technique' is obviously of particular value in the descrip-
tion of wide-spread warfare. The method of transition consists
in relating the journey of a person or persons from the locality
being described to the locality where the next operations to be
narrated are enacted. For example, in 31. 24. there is a descrip-
tion of Philip's speedy offensive from Chalcis to Athens, a
plan which would have succeeded, says Livy,
ni speculator .. contemplatus regium agmen ex specula qua-
dam praegressus nocte media Athenas pervenisset. *idem ibi
somnus, eademque negligentia* erat quae Chalcidem dies ante
paucos prodiderat, Excitati nuntio trepido ...
Thus the transition is accomplished without wearying the rea-
der, and it is made all the smoother by the comparison between
the unpreparedness of the two cities [38]).

In 32. 23. a similar treatment is observed. Livy passes
from the narration of the Sicyon Council to that of the siege
of Corinth. To avoid the bald change of topic, he mentions
the decision of the Council to send troops to Corinth, and
accompanies them, so to speak, to that city, describing the
scene as it met the eyes of the Achaean contingent. Again, in
36. 6. Livy describes the journey of Antiochus to Boeotia be-
fore commenting on Boeotian affairs; Polybius (20. 7.) passes
directly to the new topic [39]).

Another technique occasionally used in battle-accounts can
be labelled the 'deus ex machina'. A comparison of the ac-
counts of the battle of Thermopylae in Livy (36. 15-19) and
Appian (Syr. 17-20) shows how Livy has made more dra-
matic use of the forces of Cato. Appian tells us that the Ro-
man commander Glabrio sent Cato and Flaccus with chosen
forces, and immediately proceeds to relate their success and
failure respectively before embarking on an account of the
operations of the main Roman force in the Pass. Livy has at
the outset (17. 1.) mentioned merely the despatch of these
forces. In chapter 18 the main battle is described: the prelimin-
ary success of the king's forces, the later advance of the Ro-
mans, and the final stale-mate. Then, when the Romans ap-
peared far from success (18. 8. et aut incepto inrito recessis-

---

38) An almost identical example is found in 31. 33. 5-6.
39) It is obvious that this technique can be used more widely than
in battle-accounts. Cf. 36. 21. 6. also.

sent aut plures cecidissent...) Livy suddenly introduces the
victorious Cato in the rear of Antiochus [40]).

Another instructive feature of these accounts is the empha-
sis laid by Livy on the part which fear plays in the destiny
of a battle. This 'fear-complex' has a clear correspondence
with Livy's sympathy with the besieged party in siege-des-
criptions, and with the defeated force in battle-accounts. It
is part of his psychological approach. For example, in 33. 7. 8.
he writes: (Philippus) ... aliquamdiu inops consilii trepidavit;
deinde... committendam rerum summam ratus... Athenagoram
mittit. There is no record of this fear in Polybius 18. 21. In
31. 34. 5. we read of Philip's panic after a skirmish with the
Romans: ipsum quoque regem terror cepit nondum iusto proe-
lio cum Romanis congressum. The account of Diodorus shows
that Philip, on the contrary, was reassuring his troops with the
utmost indifference to danger [41]). There are many other
examples of Livy's emphasis on the fears of participants in
battle [42]).

University College, Dublin   P. G. Walsh

---

40) Another example of this 'deus ex machina' technique can be
found in the description of a battle in Epirus in 32. 12. Livy has super-
imposed his usual 'stages' on the battle: — et dum aviditate certaminis
provecti extra munitiones pugnant, haud paulo superior est Romanus
miles... postquam multis vulneratis interfectisque recepere se regii in
loca aut munimento aut natura tuta, verterat periculum in Romanos...
neque impunita temeritate inde recepissent sese, ni clamor primum ab
tergo auditus, dein pugna etiam coepta amentes repentino terrore regios
fecisset. (Notice that this sentence is constructed as in the passage in 36. 18. 8.
with a conditional clause.) The account of Plutarch (Flamininus 4. 6.) sug-
gests that Livy has exaggerated the danger to the main force, and the
suddenness of the appearance of the task force in the rear: — οἱ μὲν ἀλα-
λάξαντες ἐπέβαινον ἐρρωμένως καὶ συνέστελλον εἰς τὰ τραχύτατα τοὺς πολε-
μίους, οἱ δὲ ὄπισθεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων ἀντηλάλαξαν.
    41) Diodorus 28. 8.
    42) e. g. 31. 27. 10., 32. 5. 2., 33. 15. 6., 35. 27. 16., 36. 16. 6.