Archaism and Innovation in Latin Poetic Syntax
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Summary. A number of syntactic patterns that are familiar features of classical Latin poetry show divergences from the norms of formal prose, and in many instances it has been claimed that an archaic pattern has been preserved or adopted and has become part of the distinctively poetic language. This chapter presents a selection of these patterns and examines some of the problems associated with their classification as archaisms, and the question of their poetic resonance. It may at times be hard to establish whether a pattern is genuinely archaic; some early Latin patterns recur not only in poetry but as features of everyday language; archaisms may have been perceived as such by the poets and used for deliberate effect, but within the tradition they may equally have become mere 'poeticisms'; archaic patterns may have come to be used in innovatory ways; they may have been retained, or even re-introduced, under the influence of Greek, in which case their antique associations may no longer have been felt; an archaic-looking pattern may have arisen simply from developments within the language of poetry. There is no simple opposition between archaism and innovation: rather the innovatory tendencies of Latin poetic language extend to the manipulation of archaisms for literary effect.

MATTHEW ARNOLD’S POETIC version of the Tristan legend naturally includes references to places connected with the story, amongst them King Mark’s seat in Cornwall; but unfamiliar British place names can be hazardous, and Arnold was unlucky enough to fall into the trap of supposing a natural pronunciation to be the correct one. The result was unfortunate:
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When the feast was loud and the laughter shrill
In the banquet-hall of Tyntagil

— unfortunate because the place-name is in fact to be stressed on the second syllable, and in a later edition Arnold amended his poem to restore the rhythm:

When the feast was gay and the laughter loud
In Tyntagel's palace proud

(Tristram and Iseult II 114–15).

Part of the solution in this instance was to introduce an inversion of the normal adjective–noun sequence, a feature at once archaic and poetic, and one can see here a clear example of its metrical convenience, and contribution to the rhyme-scheme. When the same phenomenon is found, say, in III 1 In King Marc's chapel, in Tyntagel old, one naturally suspects a similar history, and this is borne out in part, since the preceding edition had At Tyntagil, in King Marc's chapel old: here, however, the postposed adjective is already present, and indeed there are several other such instances in the poem. It is clear that for Arnold this inversion of the adjective–noun sequence was a standard poetic device, since it is found in other poems too;¹ it can only be a matter for speculation whether the occurrences in Tristram and Iseult might in part be accounted for by some subconscious notion that the syntagm was, as an archaism, particularly apt for the early medieval setting.

This English example may serve to introduce a discussion of archaic syntactic patterns in Latin poetry, which can be regarded in much the same light. Archaisms may have some attraction because of their metrical possibilities: the infinitive of purpose, for instance, may generate a convenient dactyl. It is, however, their resonance as archaisms, or at least as traditional poetic features, that will chiefly encourage their use. The distinction between deliberate selection of an archaic pattern because of its antiquity and its adoption simply in imitation of forerunners must be borne in mind,² but naturally there is always the possibility that a poet intends a combination of the two.

In this chapter, I shall review some familiar syntactic features of Latin poetic language to illustrate the variety of ways in which archaisms are used, but also to note the difficulty, in some instances, of determining

¹ A quick count gave the following figures: sixteen instances in Tristram and Iseult as against one in Sohrab and Rustum, a poem of similar length, but eight in Thyris, and four in The Scholar Gipsy, both considerably shorter poems; the crucial factor accounting for the difference seems to be not that Sohrab and Rustum is an epic poem, but that it is unrhymed.
² Cf. the remarks of Leumann (1959: 142ff.) on archaisms and Ennianisms, and the distinction between direct and indirect archaisms made in Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 768f.).
whether an archaism is truly in question, and to point, in others, to the fact that an archaic syntactic pattern may be used in a new way. The classification of archaisms is a more complex matter than it may at first appear.

How conscious Roman poets were that a syntactic pattern was archaic rather than simply part of an established poetic language is often difficult to determine, but the isolation of some examples of archaism must point to deliberate selection for effect: for instance,

\[ \text{urbem quam statuo vestra est} \quad (\text{Virg. Aen. 1.573}). \]

This is an instance of so-called \textit{attractio inversa}, which may be seen as a continuation of an inherited Indo-European pattern for restrictive relatives with the head incorporated into the relative clause.\(^3\) The pattern is well attested in early Latin: cf. Terence, \textit{Eun.} 653 \textit{eunuchum quem dedisti nobis, quas turbas dedit}; Cato, \textit{Or.} fr. 3.2 \textit{agrum quem vir habet tollitur}; id., \textit{de agr.} 51 \textit{ab arbo re abs terra pulli qui nascentur, eos in terram de primito}, and is even extended, though rarely, to appositive clauses, cf. Plautus, \textit{Am.} 1009 \textit{Naucratem quem convenire volui in navi non erat}. It is, however,

\(^3\) On Indo-European relative clauses, see Lehmann (1984) and Hettrich (1988: 467ff.); on Latin developments Lehmann (1979). A distinction is sometimes made between a relative clause with embedded nucleus (i.e. what might traditionally be taken to be the antecedent is incorporated into the relative clause and takes its case from that) and \textit{attractio inversa}, where it is assumed that the antecedent is extracted from the main clause and fronted, with attraction to the case of the relative pronoun: so there would be a difference between the two sentences from Cato cited in the main text, with \textit{ab arbo re abs terra pulli qui nascentur, eos} . . . as an example of an embedded nucleus, and \textit{agrum quem vir habet, tollitur} as an example of \textit{attractio inversa}; I follow Hettrich (1988: 505 fn.53) in regarding the distinction as unnecessary in such instances — he would accept \textit{attractio inversa} where a demonstrative precedes the fronted nucleus, as in Plautus, \textit{Capt.} 110ff. . . . \textit{istos captivos duos heri quos emi} . . . \textit{is indito catenas}. There are numerous Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit parallels for a relative clause with an embedded nucleus, and it seems a secure reconstruction for Indo-European. It is then quite straightforward to suppose that an embedded nucleus might be fronted for emphasis, as seems clearly to be the case in the following Oscan example (Ve. 11): \textit{v. aadirans} \(v.\) (name in nom. sg.) \textit{eitiuvam} (‘money’, acc. sg.) \textit{paam} (rel. pronoun, acc. sg. fem.) \textit{vereilia pumpaianat} (‘to the Pompeian\textit{ vereia},’ dat. sg.) . . . \textit{deded} (‘gave’, 3sg.), \textit{eisak eitiuvad} (‘with that money’, abl. sg.) . . .; one may note here that the name of the donor has been placed first, and that ‘money’, in the accusative as the object of \textit{deded}, has also been positioned before the relative pronoun that agrees with it, and that ‘money’ is repeated in the main clause in what is there the appropriate case. This pattern, with the nucleus appearing both in the relative clause and the main clause, can be paralleled in Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit, and has been claimed as a feature of Indo-European ‘high’ style; cf. Watkins (1995: 541), who would derive the Virgilian sentence from a similar construction, with deletion of \textit{urbs} from the main clause, and fronting of accusative \textit{urbem} in the relative clause round the relative pronoun (ibid. fn.2).
apparently found nowhere else in classical poetry or prose, and it seems a safe conclusion that the stately archaism is deliberately selected to emphasize the solemn pronouncement. If the poetic tradition has played any part here, it can only be through some specific allusion to an earlier work that escapes us — and seems to have escaped ancient commentators too.

It has been claimed that another example of the deliberate use of an archaism for effect is to be recognized in Propertius’ statement of intent to strive for the grand manner:

sumite vires, Pierides: magni nunc erit oris opus (Prop. 2.10.11f.).

For the genitive rather than the usual ablative after opus est an early Latin parallel is provided by Lucilius 294 nummi opus atque assis; further instances from classical Latin are regularly cited, two from Livy (22.51.3 ad consilium pensandum temporis opus esse and 23.21.5 in stipendium quanti argenti opus fuit) and one from Quintilian (12.3.8 lectionis opus est). In some of these examples, including the line of Propertius, one might argue that the meaning is essentially ‘it is a matter of . . .’ rather than ‘there is a need for . . .’, and see this as evidence for the original nature of the construction, with a genitive that would later have been largely replaced by the ablative under the influence of usus est; this would accord the usage some antiquity, but would perhaps not suffice to show that its tone for Propertius was specifically archaic. Conversely, it has also been maintained that it is the ablative that is in fact original, a relic of the Indo-European instrumental, and the poorly attested genitive due to the analogy of egeo; there need then be no presumption of great antiquity, but this would not necessarily exclude the possibility that Propertius had adopted

4 See the excellent note of Austin (1971) ad loc., with further refs.
5 Servius remarks on this passage: hoc schema de antiquioribus sumptum possimus accipere; he cites parallels but no source for the Virgilian line. (I am grateful to Professor Roland Mayer for advice in connection with Servius' comments here and elsewhere.)
7 See Wackernagel (1926: 65); for an original genitive also Hofmann–Szantry (1965: 123). In the passage from Propertius, as Professor Jonathan Powell reminds me, it would be quite possible to give opus a more definite meaning as ‘the work [that I am about to compose]’: so various translators and commentators, cf. Rothstein (1966) ‘es wird eine Arbeit sein, die ein magnum os erfordert’, Paganelli (1961) ‘cette œuvre demande une voix puissante’, as against e.g. Goold (1990) ‘a loftier tone will now be needed’. A preference for this latter interpretation might be justified by appealing to the other attestations of opus + genitive, which, few though they are, seem to establish this as a Latin syntagm.
8 For an original ablative, Lindsay (1907: 33), Hofmann–Szantry (1965: 83), and more cautiously Ernout–Thomas (1953: 92).
as a perceived archaism a usage encountered in older texts.\(^9\) Whatever
may be the truth of the matter (and the paucity of attestations must be
an obstacle to any very confident assessment of the resonance of the
genitive construction), the example may serve to alert us to the possibility
that not all ‘archaisms’ are necessarily archaic.

Alternatively, a genuinely archaic pattern may be used in a way that
constitutes an innovation. A case in point, as Hélène Vairel-Carron has
convincingly shown,\(^10\) is the use of \(ne\) + present imperative for negative
commands. In early Latin this syntagm has an inhibitive meaning, effect-
ively ‘stop doing...’; some clear instances are: Plautus, \textit{Stich.} 20 \(ne\)
\textit{lacruma, soror}, said by a man comforting his disconsolate sister; id., \textit{Pers.}
227 \textit{ne me attrecta}, not so much ‘don’t touch me!’ as ‘get your hands off
me!’; id., \textit{Am.} 1109f. — \textit{et mihi!} — \textit{ne pace}, an expression of fear followed
by an admonition to be of good courage; Terence, \textit{And.} 868 \textit{ah ne saevi
tanto opere}, an attempt to calm someone down. There is a contrast with
other constructions (e.g. \(ne\) + subjunctive) that have a more general pro-
hibitive function, including reference forward in time. \(Ne\) + imperative is
adopted by Virgil (and after him becomes general poetic currency); it may
be used with the same inhibitive sense as in early Latin, so:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ne dubita, nam vera vides} & \quad (\text{Virg.,} \textit{Aen.} 3.316); \\
\text{ne saevi, magna sacerdos} & \quad (\text{Virg.,} \textit{Aen.} 6.544); \\
\end{align*}
\]
but it is clear that it can also function as a prohibitive with future refer-
ence, cf.
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{foliis tantum ne carmina manda} & \quad (\text{Virg.} \textit{Aen.} 6.74); \\
\text{tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito} & \quad (\text{Virg.} \textit{Aen.} 6.95); \\
\end{align*}
\]
and that the use of the pattern has been expanded, so that there is no
longer a contrast as in earlier times, and direct equation between the usage
of Virgil and Plautus is not possible. The antiquity of the expression is
remarked by Servius (on \textit{Aen.} 6.544) but not its innovatory applications.

A more straightforward case of continuity might perhaps be sought in
the infinitive of purpose, current in early Latin after verbs of motion,\(^11\) e.g.
Plautus, \textit{Bacch.} 354 \textit{senex in Ephesus ibit aurum arcessere}; id., \textit{ibid.} 631
\textit{militis parasitus modo venerat aurum petere hinc}; id., \textit{Pseud.} 642 \textit{reddere
hoc, non perdere eru’ me misit}. In classical prose, a single instance is cited
from Varro (\textit{R.R.} 2.1.1), but there are frequent occurrences in poetry:

\(^9\) Note the suggestion of Tränkle (1960: 48) that the example in Livy 22.51.3 is ‘vielleicht aus
einem Annalisten’.
\(^10\) 1975: 183ff., esp. 312f.
\(^11\) See Bennett (1910: 418f.); Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 344f.).
nec dulces occurrent oscula nati / praeripere (Lucr. 3.895f.);
non . . . Libycos populare penates / venimus (Virg. Aen. 1.527f.);
processerat . . . / quaerere aquam (Prop. 1.20.23f.);
onne cum Proteus pecus egit altos / visere montes (Hor. Carm. 1.2.7f.).

By extension the infinitive of purpose comes to follow verbs that express not only motion but also impulsion:

quaerere terras agimur (Virg. Aen. 3.4);
ardor agit nova quaerere tecta (Virg. Aen. 7.393);
quiscumque virum perquirere silvis / egit amor (Val. Fl. 3.684f.).

This particular use of the infinitive is adopted by the historians: so in Livy, for instance, the infinitive occurs after impellere and subigere. Tacitus uses the infinitive after these, but also after an unusually wide range of other verbs and expressions (certare, accingi, agitare, hortari, cura est, etc.); this suggests, given his general avoidance of the everyday, an artificial literary extension of usage, in which connection it is probably significant that he seems not to use the infinitive after ordinary verbs of motion, the pattern so familiar from early Latin and the poetic language (and conceivably current in the spoken language — see below).

The infinitive of purpose is notably more successful than its competitor after verbs of motion, the supine in -tum (the old accusative form of a verbal noun), which occurs with some frequency in early Latin, e.g.:

ob portum obvagulatum ito (XII Tab.)
de nocte qui abiit piscatum ad mare (Pl. Rud. 898);
neque te derisum advenio . . . (Pl. Trin. 844);
nunc hinc parasitum in Cariam misi meum petitum argentum a meo sodali mutuom (Pl. Curc. 67f.);

but it turns out to be remarkably rare in classical poetry, though there are a few instances, e.g.:

vastatum finis iverat Assyrios (Catullus 66.12);
non ego . . . / . . . Grais servitum matribus ibo (Virg. Aen. 2.785f.);

---

12 See Riemann (1885: 281ff.).
13 For the usage of Tacitus, see Draeger (1882: 59f.).
14 See Kühn–Stegmann (1955: 723ff.); for early examples see Bennett (1910: 453ff.)
15 I am not convinced by the contention of Austin (1964) ad loc. that the supine is to be regarded as a feature of familiar language in early Latin and so here marks the ordinary everyday tone of the conversation between Creusa and Aeneas. It is true that one finds cubitum ire in general use (Cato, Cicero, Suetonius, etc., and cf. Horace, Serm. 1.5.48 lusum it Maecenas, dormitum ego Vergiliusque) and that there are some obviously popular expressions such as cacatum ire (CIL IV 5242; cf. also C. Titius, orat. 2 iudex testes poscit, ipsus it minuitum) but this simple pattern consisting just of ire + supine may best be regarded as a set idiomatic type; as an indication that freer use of the supine was a feature of colloquial...
vidimus flavum Tiberim . . . ire deiectum monumenta regis (Hor. Carm. 1.2.13ff.).

One may note in these examples the apparent restriction to use after forms of *ire*, although there is a further remarkably bold use of the supine by Virgil:

\[
\begin{align*}
si & \text{ fortuna permittitis uti,} \\
quaesitum Aenean et moenia Pallantea, . . . (Aen. 9. 240f.),
\end{align*}
\]
on which Wackernagel (1926: 278f.) justly observes that the poet has chosen the more *altertiimlich* expression in preference to a more usual *ut*-clause or *ad* + gerundive.

In preferring the infinitive to the supine to express purpose after verbs of motion, poetry may agree perhaps with everyday language: direct evidence to this effect is lacking for the classical period, and the argument would rest on an assumption that the infinitive of purpose that appears in late Latin (and survives everywhere in Romance, while the supine is hardly continued at all) continues the early Latin construction that was avoided in classical prose but persisted in the spoken language. This is beyond demonstration, and separate developments at various periods cannot be ruled out: the influence of Greek has been invoked\(^\text{17}\) — certainly a plausible suggestion for classical poetry, and quite probably a factor in late Latin developments. The question then arises as to whether it is appropriate after all to speak of the perpetuation of an archaism: some qualification is surely needed, if the old usage has had to be reinforced by external influence.\(^\text{18}\)

The use of the infinitive with the verb ‘give’ seems to show a similar blend of inheritance and Greek influence. There is a well-established early Latin imperatival expression *da bibere*:\(^\text{19}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
bibere & \text{ da usque plenis cantharis (Pl. Pers. 821);} \\
meridie & \text{ bibere dato (Cato, de agr. 89);} \\
\end{align*}
\]
but some of the uses of the infinitive with *do* in classical poetry, as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
argentii magnum & \text{ dat ferre talentum (Virg. Aen. 5.248),}
\end{align*}
\]

Latin, one might be tempted to cite Petronius 71.8 *ne in monumentum meum populus cacatum currat*, with a different verb of motion, but this is clearly just an elaboration of *cacatum ire* and offers no independent testimony. Certainly no colloquial tone is obviously detectable in *Aen. 4.117f. venatum Aeneas unaque miserrima Dido / in nemus ire parant*; and Tacitus shows no tendency to avoid the construction, cf. Draeger (1882: 88f.).

\(^{16}\) This is predominantly the case with Tacitus too, though note *miserant . . . oratum* (Ann. 14.25).


\(^{18}\) On the question of the revival of obsolent Latin syntactic patterns under the influence of Greek, see Coleman (1975).

\(^{19}\) See Bennett (1910: 418f).
seem to have as much to do with Greek models (δῶκε δ’ ἀγεῖν) as early Latin, and particularly so in examples such as:

*dederatque comam diffundere ventis* (Virg. *Aen.* 1.319);
*praebuit ipsa rapi* (Ovid *Her.* 5.132);
*tristitiam et metus / tradam protervis in mare Creticum / portare ventis* (Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.1ff.).

Further ‘Greek’ usages can be seen in connection with the granting of prayers by the gods:

*tu das epulis accumbere divum* (Virg. *Aen.* 1.79);
*da flamam evadere classi* (Virg. *Aen.* 5.689);
*da . . . Latio considere Teucros* (Virg. *Aen.* 6.66f.);
*nova da mihi cernere litora ponti / telluremque novam* (Lucan 1.693ff).

Here one thinks naturally of Greek δ.osgi super infinitive in prayers, and the extension to addressing humans in a polite formula:

*da iungere dextram* (Virg. *Aen.* 6.697);
*date tangere vultus* (Val. Fl. 4.634);
*da iungere dona, da Scythicas sociare domos* (Val. Fl. 5.515ff);

or to impersonal uses of *do*:

*sed non ante datur telluris opaca subire / . . . quam . . .* (Virg. *Aen.* 6.140ff);
*nullaque datur considere terra* (Val. Fl. 4.511);
*verum inter medias dabitur si currere cautes* (Val. Fl. 4.587);

follows naturally enough. Greek influence here is hardly to be denied, and indeed it was noted by the ancients: Servius on *Aen.* 1.319 states: *graeca autem figura est*, and even adds that this usage is the source of *da bibere*. This last conclusion is unnecessary, but one may well have doubts about simply reversing the derivation and allowing that development of the early Latin figure was responsible for all occurrences of *do* + infinitive in poetic language.

The antiquity of *da bibere* may be accepted, but there has been some division of opinion as to whether the infinitive is to be taken as equivalent to an object noun, and so parallel to *da aquam*, or (more plausibly) as related to the infinitive of purpose, and perhaps, if one accepts a parallel with Cato, *de agr. 5.3 satui semen dare*, providing evidence for the origin

---

21 Cf. Norden (1903) on *Aen.* 6.66f.
22 Despite Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 345); cf. p. 174 above.
of the Latin -re infinitive in a dative case-form. An argument for the infinitive of purpose is seen in the existence of an alternative construction with a ‘final’ subjunctive:

\[ \text{tum vos date bibat tibicini (Pl. Stich. 757);} \]
\[ \text{dato bubus bibant omnibus (Cato de agr. 73);} \]

which is not confined to the verb bibere, cf.

\[ \text{vin aquam? — si frustulenta est, da, opsecro hercle, absorbeam (Pl. Curc. 313).} \]

This type of construction, with a dependent subjunctive but no subordinating conjunction, is found after several verbs in early Latin, in competition with ut clauses, and can be readily explained as arising from original parataxis: This is well attested in the case of imperative forms of sino:

\[ \text{postea amurca spargito bene sinitoque combibat (Cato de agr. 91);} \]
\[ \text{noli sis tu ilic aduorsari, sine amet, sine quod lubet id faciat . . . (Pl. Cas. 204ff.);} \]
\[ \text{sinite abeam, si possum, uiua a uobis (Pl. Mil. 1084).} \]

The plain subjunctive after the imperative of sino recurs in classical poetry (and Livy), cf.

\[ \text{sinite instaurata revisam / proelia (Virg. Aen. 2.669);} \]
\[ \text{sine pascet durus aretque (Hor. Ep. 1.16.70);} \]
\[ \text{dem sinite amplexus (Val. Fl. 4.635).} \]

With some verbs instances are rarer, as, for instance, with decet:

\[ \text{decet animo aequo nunc stent (Pl. Poen. 21f.).} \]

23 Cf. Blümel (1979: 89 with 80 fn.9), and earlier Ernout–Thomas (1953: 260). See also Kühner–Stegmann (1955: I 681); Bennett (1910: 418f.).

24 Cf. Kühner–Stegmann (1955: II 227ff.); the truly paratactic stage, with two separate clauses (as opposed to subordination with no subordinating conjunction), may lie a long way back, cf. Bennett (1910: 245). It seems clear that use of the subjunctive alone, without ut, was quite normal in colloquial Latin following rogo (standardly at Vindolanda), volo and opto (see Adams (1995a: 117f.)); it may be no accident that the examples seem to show first-person forms of these verbs, so that they can be seen as simply reinforcing a jussive subjunctive or subjunctive expressing a wish, and this will also fit the occurrence of the pattern with the imperatives of sino, facio, dico, etc. — even scribe dentur mi in a Vindolanda letter (343.16f.) is merely a variant of this. More striking is the unusual example in the same letter of the plain subjunctive following a third-person verb, desiderabat coria ei adsignarem (343.31f.), on which see Bowman et al. (1990).

25 Bennett (1910: 234f.) notes only two instances of non-imperatival forms of sino with a substantive clause in early Latin: Ter. Hec. 590f. neque sinam ut qui nobis, mater, male dictum velit, mea pertinacia esse dicat factum (the only instance in early Latin of sino with a following ut-clause, readily accounted for by the complex structure of the sentence, with the subject of dicat given by a relative clause); Plautus Miles 54 sivi viverent.
This is probably the only good Plautine example, and the usage is not continued later, but it is almost certainly old given the Umbrian parallel construction seen in facia ticit ‘faciat decet’ (Tab. Ig. II 17). By the same token then, Umbrian deitu etaians ‘dicito eant’ (Tab. Ig. VIb 64), where the subjunctive represents a transformation of the imperative of direct speech as seen in deitu etato ioutinur ‘dicito -“itote, Iguvini”’ (ibid. 63), provides support for the antiquity of dico + subjunctive in Latin, e.g. Plautus, Stich. 624 dixi equidem in carcerem ires. This continues later, but in everyday language as well as poetry, though not in formal prose:

\[
\begin{align*}
dices igitur vel amico tuo Suettio \ldots vel Labeoni nostro paulum proferant auctionem & (Cic. Att. 13.12.4); 
dic corpus properet fluviali spargere lympha \ldots & (Virg. Aen. 4.635); 
\end{align*}
\]

Given this distribution, the status of the construction must be uncertain: old, it certainly is, but surely too familiar in the spoken language to be perceived as archaic.

A similar problem arises over the use of the subjunctive after forms of facio: this is frequent in early Latin after the imperative, and this usage recurs in Cicero’s letters and in everyday language as well as in classical poetry, with fac functioning almost as a sort of imperative particle:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{opera omnia mature conficias face} & \text{(Cato de agr. 5.7);} 
& \text{fac fidele sis fidelis} & \text{(Pl. Capt. 439);} 
& \text{in medium turbae fac memor agmen eas} & \text{(Ovid Am. 1.4.56);} 
& \text{fac (denarios) mi mittas} & \text{(Tab.Vind.: II 343.26).} 
\end{align*}
\]

In early Latin the plain subjunctive is found after other forms of facio also, but in only a few of the instances are these second- or third-person forms, e.g:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{nunc haec res me facit festinem} & \text{(Titinius 98 (Davault));} 
& \text{labeam bifariam faciat habeant} & \text{(Cato de agr. 20.2);} 
\end{align*}
\]

26 There are uncertainties over the text of Most. 72f. The example from the Poenulus comes in a passage that is full of jussive subjunctives, but that need not detract from its evidential value.

27 Bennett (1910: 212f.) notes only 3 instances of dico + subjunctive in early Latin, as against 21 with an ut-clause.

28 See Bülow-Jacobsen et al. (1994: 34), text no.4; this is an ostrakon of the second century AD from the Red Sea region. (I am grateful to Professor J. N. Adams for drawing my attention to this example.) It will be noted that the subjunctive follows an imperative form, which may be parallel to the tendency to preserve the subjunctive after fac, see below.

29 For figures, see Bennett (1910: 224f.).

30 Cf. Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 530f.); see also TLL VI i.105.1ff. for one or two examples even from more formal prose.
paupertas fecit ridiculus forem (Pl. Stich. 177);

and the normal pattern here, persisting into the classical period, would seem to be a clause introduced by ut.31 The plain subjunctive, however, predominates in early Latin after a first-person form, as, for instance, the archaic future faxo:32

ervom tibi aliquis cras faxo ad villam adferat (Pl. Most. 65);
go faxo dicat me in diebus pauculis / crudum virum esse (Pl. Truc. 644f.).

The form faxo is rare in classical and later Latin, but the usage with a following subjunctive makes the occasional appearance in verse,33 e.g.:

haud sibi cum Danais rem faxo et pube Pelasga / esse ferant (v.l. putent) (Virg. Aen. 9.154f.).

Morphologically and syntactically this might well be accounted archaic, but it might be more appropriate to think in terms of archaic elements surviving in a set idiom that was part of the living language, as the occurrence in Petronius 95.3 faxo sciatis might suggest,34 without necessarily having archaic connotations for speakers. One may, however, suspect that the adoption of faxo + subjunctive by later poets is more self-conscious:

iam foedera faxo / Haemonii petat ipse viri metuatque morari (Val. Fl. 7.177f.);
te tamen hac... formidine faxo / iam tua silva ferat (Val. Fl. 4.191f.);

the Virgilian echoes (ego foedera faxo / firma manu (Aen. 12.316f.)) and the relentless alliteration combine to suggest that here we have to do not so much with archaism as a resounding epicism.

A progression to mere imitation can be observed also in connection with another rare construction, the use of the impersonal gerundive with a direct object.35 It occurs only once in Plautus:

hercle opinor mi advenienti hac noctu agitandumst vigilias (Pl. Trin. 869),

with isolated instances in other early writers, e.g.

---

31 See the examples given by Bennett (1910: 227).
32 After faxo, according to Bennett (1910: 225ff.), a plain subjunctive occurs eighteen times, as against solitary faxo ut scias (Plautus, Asin. 897).
33 Cf. also Ovid, Met. 3.271, 12.594; Seneca, Med. 905 has (unusually) 2nd sg. subj. faxis.
34 Similarly Apuleius Met. 1.25 faxo scias; etc.
35 The examples are collected by Risch (1984: 186ff.). For Blümel (1979: 85ff.) this is 'die historisch älteste Konstruktionsweise' for the gerund(ive), but more convincing is the argument of Hettrich (1990: 14ff.) that it is an innovation.
optandum uxorem, quae non vereatur viri (Afranius com. 99R).

It occurs a number of times in Varro, who is much given to employing archaisms, it is found ten times in Lucretius, e.g.

aeternas quoniam poenas in morte timendumst (Lucr. 1.111),

and it is once used by Cicero, with what seems to be deliberately archaising effect, to establish the character of the speaker:

... viam ... quam nobis quoque ingrediundum sit (Cic. Cato 6).36

An archaic tone is therefore probably to be recognized in the single Virgilian instance:

... alia arma Latinis quaerenda, aut pacem Troiano ab rege petendum (Aen. 11.229f.),

which is manifestly the inspiration for the later use of the construction in Silius Italicus:

nunc pacem orandum, nunc improba...
arma reponenda et bellum exitiale cavendum
auctor ego (11.559ff.).37

Several of the features so far mentioned have in common that they make for a denser texture to the sentence, without explicit markers of subordination. Some such factor no doubt encouraged also the tendency to prefer simple case-forms to prepositional phrases, which is such a notable feature of Latin poetic language — including, for instance, a preference for a plain ablative in place of in + ablative. This is noted as an archaism by Servius on Aen. 11.686 silvis te, Tyrrhene, feras agitare putasti?, where he remarks, no doubt correctly, that silvis is pro ‘in silvis’

36 See Powell (1988: 114) ad loc. Professor Powell has also noted (private communication) that in Cato 42, two of the manuscripts read notandum putavi libidinem, where again the archaism would suit the speaker, and adoption of this reading might be seriously considered — the generally preferred notandum might well be an instance of the regularization that has perhaps removed a number of instances of the less familiar gerund (cf. the next note).

37 The readings in both these passages require discussion. In Aen. 11.230, petendum is a correction in one of the ancient capital manuscripts, and was read by Servius and other ancient grammarians (see the apparatus criticus in Geymonat (1973)); it has been generally accepted in preference to the petendam of the tradition, no doubt rightly, given that the standard gerundive construction is the more likely interloper. In the Punica passage, orandum rests only on the reading of the lost Cologne manuscript reported by Modius, though the Virgilian parallel is persuasive support (see the apparatus criticus in Delz (1987)), and this is a particularly striking illustration of the danger posed to unfamiliar syntactic patterns by widespread regularization in the manuscripts. Other interesting archaic features may in this way have been totally obliterated.
et est archaismos. There is an ablative *campis* with a slightly different sense, 'across the fields', in the well-known half-line *Aen. 4.404 it nigrum campis agmen*, borrowed from Ennius: here one may well suppose that the listener or reader is expected to recognize the loan and to appreciate the humorous adaptation to a description of ants of a verse originally relating to elephants, so that any connotations of archaism will be a secondary matter. Such instances would, however, add to the variety of functions of the case-forms, and the deceptively similar *it tectis Argoa manus* of Valerius Flaccus (3.3), where the Argonauts are in fact leaving the palace and the ablative has the value 'from', suggests that poets enjoyed playing with the ambiguities of the simple ablative form.

It is worth considering in more detail two ways of using a case-form to express direction. From Indo-European, Latin will have inherited an accusative of direction (which accounts, *inter alia*, for the use of the supine in -rum after verbs of motion); this is continued in the use of the simple accusative with names of towns, but in early Latin a freer use is found, in that names of countries can also appear with a simple accusative and no preposition (in competition with *in* or *ad* + acc.)

\[
\text{partim errant, nequinont Graeciam redire (Liv. Andr. Od. 14); parasitum misi nudiusquartus Cariam (Pl. Curc. 206).}^{38}
\]

This is picked up by the later poets, who use the simple accusative for countries, e.g.

\[
\text{ibitis Italiam (Virg. Aen. 3.254),}
\]

or equivalent expressions:

\[
\text{Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit / litora (Virg. Aen. 1.2f); quo regnum Italiae Libycas averteret oras (Virg. Aen. 4.106);}
\]

and more generally for expressions of place:

\[
\text{ea . . . loca cum venere volantes (Lucr. 6.742); devenere locos ubi . . . (Virg. Aen. 1.365);^{39} speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem / devenient (Virg. Aen. 4.124f.).}
\]

This extension to common nouns (other than *domum*) is essentially a

---

38 It is now generally accepted that there is no reason to suppose that Plautus believed Caria to be the name of a town. Lindsay (1907: 25 fn. k) argues that Plautus simply does not follow the strict rules of classical Latin, but Wackernagel (1928: 223ff.) points out that the rules apply in Old Latin to Italian placenames but that there is fluctuation in the use of prepositions with towns as well as countries with non-native names, suggesting that usage was simply less well established for these.

39 Servius ad loc. remarks: 'ad' minus est, without further comment.
feature of poetry, and once again it is a question of innovatory use of an archaic pattern.

More complex is the dative of direction, where Greek influence has often been recognized and as often disclaimed. In early Latin we find a construction that seems to be native, and where indeed a dative of goal is barely distinguishable from an indirect object (particularly if there is any suggestion of personification of 'death' or 'sleep'):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Quiris let} & \text{0 datus} & (\text{Festus 245M}); \\
\text{quattuor viros sopori se dedisse autum} & \text{at} (\text{Pl. Am. 306}); \\
\text{ib} & \text{0 ad medicum atque ibi me toxico morti dabo} & (\text{Pl. Merc. 472}); \\
\text{ob sutelas tuas te morti misero} & (\text{Pl. Capt. 692}).
\end{align*}
\]

A natural extension of this usage can be seen in classical poetry:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{multos Danaum demittimus Orco} & (\text{Virg. Aen. 2.398}); \\
\text{corpora non leto missa trecenta forent} & (\text{Ovid Fast. 2.664}); \\
\text{si quis casus puerum egerit Orco} & (\text{Hor. Serm. 2.5.49});
\end{align*}
\]

yet at the same time echoes have been perceived of Homeric Αίδη προώσης. Another fairly straightforward use of the dative might be seen in the notion of stretching out one's hands in imploration to the gods:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{quas (manus) pro vobis diis immortalibus tendere consuevit} & (\text{Cic. Font. 48}),
\end{align*}
\]

by extension to the all-powerful Romans:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{quae paulo ante Romanis de muro manus tendebant} & (\text{Caes. B.G. 7.48.3}),
\end{align*}
\]

and to heaven in general:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Anchises ... / ... caelo palmas cum voce tetendit} & (\text{Virg. Aen. 2.688f.}).
\end{align*}
\]

In the last case there is the possibility of a shift in interpretation from person to place, which results in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{it clamor caelo} & (\text{Virg. Aen. 5.451}),
\end{align*}
\]

where the sense is rather 'sky', and so to other terms, yielding the poetic dative of direction, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pelago Danaum ... dona / praecipitare iubent} & (\text{Virg. Aen. 2.36f.}).
\end{align*}
\]

There may even be an example of the usage with a proper name in:

\[\text{40} \text{Greek influence is admitted by Kühner–Stegmann (1955: II 320), Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 100f.); but Leumann (1959: 146) firmly denies that this is a Graecism.}\]
tum Cilicum liquere solum Cyproque citatas / immisere rates (Lucan 8.456ff.).

These could be seen as purely analogical Latin developments, or one might accept that there was reinforcement from Greek. A further factor may well have been the increasing degree of competition in many contexts between the dative and ad + accusative (compare, for instance, with morti dabo, etc. cited above, Plautus Capt. 1019 ego hunc ob furtem ad carnificem dabo, or the variation between Capt. 360 quae ad patrem vis nutiari and 400 numquid aliud vis patri nutiari?): this could provide a basis for artificial extension of the use of the dative. At all events, in the poetic dative of direction, something new has arisen that involves more than simply the maintenance of an archaism.

These instances of case-syntax seem to reflect, as was previously noted, a preference for avoiding prepositions: this can no doubt be associated with reaction to the general tendency of Latin, which — as the Romance languages abundantly show — was towards increasing use of prepositional phrases rather than simple cases. But is avoidance of the new to be counted as a penchant for archaism?

Prepositions are also involved in my final examples, which concern word order. It seems that in classical Latin, indeed from Plautus on, an attributive genitive normally followed the governing noun, though it might precede it to mark antithesis or for other stylistic reasons. These patterns are maintained when there is a preposition governing the head, so that in the classical period one would normally find, say, per finis Sequanorum but marked in Allobrogum finis and residual set phrases like de senatus consulto; the preposition will normally come first. An inspection of

41 Professor J. N. Adams has drawn my attention to the fact that in imperial Latin the ablative in -o came largely to replace the locative in -i in place names of the second declension (e.g. Londinio for Londini), and that just as directional forms in -ae of the first declension (e.g. Alexandrie (= -ae) 'to Alexandria') are most plausibly to be taken as locatives rather than datives of direction, so directional forms in -o (2nd decl.) are more likely to be locative ablative (see Adams (1995a: 108ff.)). This might allow an alternative explanation of Lucan's Cypro, but one that is probably not to be projected back onto the Virgilian examples of the dative of direction.

42 See Lofstedt (1942: 187ff.); more briefly Ernout-Thomas (1953: 69ff.).

43 Strictly speaking, variations in word order that are not grammatically significant would be classified as stylistic rather than syntactic features, but there is some advantage in linking them in the present context, when the same issues of apparent innovation within poetic language are in question.

44 See Adams (1976: 73ff.). The validity of his contention that in an earlier period the genitive normally preceded the governing noun (cf. senatus consultum, Marci filius, etc.), except in special cases (paterfamilias, tribunus militum, names of temples such as aedes Bellonae, etc.), cannot be discussed here, though I am inclined to accept it.
examples in the *Aeneid* and in Lucan, to see what orders occur and with what frequency, yields the results tabulated below. The first set of figures (with percentages adjusted to the nearest half per cent) includes instances where adjectives are present that do not disrupt the basic pattern, and instances of discontinuity, discussed later. The abbreviations used are: P[reposition], S[ubstantive], [A]tributive, G[enitive], A[jective in agreement with the Substantive = As, or with the Genitive = Ag]. The basic patterns are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th><em>Aeneid</em></th>
<th><em>Lucan</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G—P—S</td>
<td>(reginae ad limina)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P—G—S</td>
<td>(in Eurotae ripis)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P—S—G</td>
<td>(ad sidera caeli)</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One must also allow for some patterns where the positioning of an adjective can create a semblance of ambiguity (e.g. in *nigri cum lacte veneni* the order of the main constituents is P—S—G, but the case of the preceding adjective can give an initial impression of a pattern G—P—S); the figures for these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th><em>Aeneid</em></th>
<th><em>Lucan</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G—P—Ag—S</td>
<td>(rupis ab Illyricae scopulis)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P—As—G—S</td>
<td>(ex alto delubri culmine)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag—P—S—G</td>
<td>(nigri cum lacte veneni)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P—Ag—S—G</td>
<td>(in duri certamina Martis)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and it can be seen that these make up a hefty part of the instances. (The rare pattern, S—P—G and its variants, discussed below, accounts for the remainder percentages.)

The G—P—S pattern is strikingly frequent in Virgil in comparison with the usual marked variant P—G—S, while even the 'standard' P—S—G has only a medium frequency. The G—P—S pattern is very rare in prose: in Book I of Caesar's *De bello Gallico*, for instance, amongst numerous instances of the other two patterns (*in finis Vocontiorum, in Santonum finis*), G—P—S is found only once in *quorum per finis* (28.1), where the usual fronting of the relative pronoun is responsible for the different order. Nor does the pattern seem to be a regular feature of early Latin — there is no example in the *Captivi* of Plautus, nor in the

45 The choice of Lucan for comparison is motivated simply by a desire to see how closely the Virgilian pattern was followed by a later epic poet. It would be interesting to have a more comprehensive set of figures, especially those for other Augustan poets.

46 Note the other prose examples given by Marouzeau (1949: 60).
Rudens (despite frequent occurrences in this play of in fanum Veneris and in Veneris fanum, and similarly with other prepositions, there is not a single instance of Veneris in fanum or the like); it is, however, found in Ennius, cf. Ann. 260V. (Skutsch 222) sulpureas posuit spiramina Naris ad undas; Satur. 41V. (from the Hedyphagetica) Nestoris ad patriam hic capitur magnusque bonusque, where it already occupies the two positions within the hexameter that are its preferred sites in classical poetry.

Given this distribution, it hardly looks as though the G—P—S pattern can be reckoned as an archaism. It is interesting to note that in Umbrian, which retains a number of postpositions as bound forms, the normal order is S—P + G, cf. vuku-kum kureties ‘ad lucum Coredii’ (Tab. Ig. Ib4), etc.,\(^{47}\) with the genitive preceding S—P only when it is a pronominal form, e.g. erer nomne-per ‘pro eius nomine’ (Tab. Ig. VIa34).\(^{48}\) This seems to afford a parallel to Latin prose usage, and surely suggests that a more general use of G—P—S is a poetic innovation, perhaps associated with the development of hexameter verse and imitation of Greek (cf. Homeric patterns of the type ὁδὶς πρὶς ποὶοις (II. 2.456)), although adaptation of the Latin pattern As—P—S (magnis de rebus) with replacement of the adjective by an attributive genitive might have played a part. A further phenomenon may point to one of the reasons for its usefulness: if we take the simple cases of three-word groups, and look at the frequency of discontinuities, we find (with number of occurrences):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{G—P—S:} & \quad \text{G } <> \text{ P—S} \\
\text{Aen. 39:} & \quad 18; \text{ Lucan 17:} \quad 8.
\end{align*}
\]

In as many as one third of the examples, the genitive is actually separated from the rest of the prepositional phrase: there are instances already in Lucretius (e.g. 5.707 quantum solis secedit ab orbi). This provides a way of breaking up the phrase, comparable to the separation of adjective and noun, without disrupting the association of the preposition and the noun it governs.

This cannot be said of another pattern of discontinuity, P—G <> S, of which there are instances from Lucretius on; in the earlier examples, the

\(^{47}\) There are a number of good examples in the description of the city boundaries of Iguvium given in Tab. Ig. VIa12–14, e.g. presoliuuf-e nurpier, tettom-e miletinor, randem-e rufser, all showing a noun in the accusative governed by postposition -e 'to' and a following genitive; unfortunately the meaning of most of the words is obscure.

\(^{48}\) Adams (1976: 3) cites erer nomne-per as showing that in Umbrian a genitive normally preceded its head, but the immediate juxtaposition of erer (masc.) nomne-per and erar (fern.) nomne-per, referring back to the Fisian mountain and the city of Iguvium respectively, suggests that the pronouns are fronted for contrast.
inserted element seems most commonly to be a single word, some form of the verb:

- in equi conscendere costas (Lucr. 5.1297);
- in luminis erigit oras (Lucr. 5.1455);
- sub luminis edidit oras (Virg. Aen. 7.660);
- ad Hesperiae venturos litora (Virg. Aen. 3.186).

This persists later, as in:

- et prior in Nili pervenit litora Caesar (Lucan 8.641),

but now further elements, e.g. the object of the verb, may also intervene, as in

- in Magni viventem ponite castris (Lucan 6.233),

or instead of a verb, another noun:

- conlapsaque flebat iniquae in Veneris Medea sinus (Val. Fl. 7.251f).

This pattern sets up a considerable tension by leaving the preposition before the genitive, which it cannot possibly govern. In another pattern that produces this result without discontinuity, S—P—G, one might be tempted to see a simple inversion of S and P, so:

- cava per calamorum (Lucr. 5.1382);
- corpus in Aeacidae (Virg. Aen. 6.58);
- litus harenosum ad Libyae (Virg. Aen. 4.257);
- Hyperboreae plaustrum glaciale sub Ursae (Lucan 5.23).

It seems likely, however, that this pattern (if it is not simply modelled on Greek 'anastrophe' of prepositions) is based on the type S—P—As (rebus in arduis), where the preposition is inserted between the noun and the adjective that agrees with it, a poetic variant of the more frequent type As—P—S (magnis de rebus).49 The curious thing about this S—P—G pattern is that it reproduces the one that seems to be normal in Umbrian, where postpositions are involved (see above on vuku-kum kureties, etc.). Since it is widely believed that Latin also originally had postpositions, and still shows traces of them in forms such as mecum, etc., it looks as though, paradoxically, Latin has created as a poetic feature a sequence that might be supposed to be very archaic indeed. This is quite a new hazard to be reckoned with in the quest for archaisms.

There is the possibility of discontinuity with this pattern too, S <> P—G, and the result is something startlingly new, and thereby no doubt

49 See Marouzeau (1949: 57ff.) and p. 159 above.
poetically arresting, with the preposition stranded before a genitive, far from the noun it governs:

metasque dati pervenit ad aevi  (Virg. Aen. 10.472),

the only instance I have noted in the Aeneid, but echoed by Lucan:

Cambyses longi populos pervenit ad aevi  (Lucan 10.280),

in a nice instance of variation. There are further examples from several poets:\n
magi speciem glomeravit in orbis  (Ovid Met. 1.35);
dum vada tendis ad Hebri   (Ovid Her. 2.15);
patriae sedes remeamus in urbis  (Lucan 1.690);
ipsius aspectu pereant in velleris (Val. Fl. 7.551).

This can no doubt be seen as part of the general trend towards the adoption by poets of word orders that result in the wilful separation of elements that naturally go together; this seems quite foreign to archaic Latin, and nowhere else, perhaps, can the innovatory tendencies of Latin poetic syntax be quite so clearly seen.

In this paper, I have naturally not attempted to cover all possible syntactic features that might be classified as archaic (let alone those that involve some form of innovation), but rather to give some idea of the problems inherent in any such classification: the need to know whether something is truly archaic, or perceived as such; whether its use is to be explained by that fact, or whether it was just felt to be a 'poeticism'; whether the poetic use is the same as the archaic use, or shows adaptation and development; whether changes, or indeed retentions, can be accounted for purely within Latin, or whether Greek influence is to be recognized (I have ignored here Graecisms pure and simple, like the accusative of respect); or whether we may at times have been duped into thinking that something is an archaism whereas it has in fact arisen through a process of change that has come full circle.

It may be remarked, in cautionary conclusion, that Latin poetic language, with its fondness for parataxis and unmarked subordination arising from it, and its use of plain case-forms rather than prepositional phrases, shows a remarkable similarity to the syntactic patterns reconstructed for the Indo-European parent language; but this should not be taken to imply continuity. Very little of what might be reconstructed as Indo-European

\[90\] For a useful collection of examples from Ovid onwards, see Eich (1925).
poetics seems to have survived the development, from the third century BC, of an essentially innovative literary language at Rome under the heavy influence of Greek, and there is no reason to suppose that poets had access to a remoter poetic past, except in so far as features of it were preserved in religious or legal usages, and the connotations of these were not necessarily archaic rather than technical. The interplay between archaism and innovation surveyed above is concerned with a relatively small span of time, and with the reaction within the poetic tradition both to the usages of the early Latin authors and to trends in the development of the language as a whole. The 'Indo-European look' of certain characteristics of Latin poetic syntax illustrates only that apparent archaism may in fact result from rampant innovation.
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