



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Common Ground and the Presentation of Emotions: Fright and Horror in Livy's Historiography

van Gils, L.; Kroon, C.

DOI

[10.1163/9789004506053_035](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004506053_035)

Publication date

2022

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Emotions and Narrative in Ancient Literature and Beyond

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Gils, L., & Kroon, C. (2022). Common Ground and the Presentation of Emotions: Fright and Horror in Livy's Historiography. In M. de Bakker, B. van den Berg, & J. Klooster (Eds.), *Emotions and Narrative in Ancient Literature and Beyond: Studies on Honour of Irene de Jong* (pp. 523-539). (Mnemosyne. Supplements; Vol. 451). Brill.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004506053_035

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)

Common Ground and the Presentation of Emotions: Fright and Horror in Livy's Historiography

Lidewij van Gils and Caroline Kroon

In 2011 narratologists and linguists in Amsterdam joined forces in a long-term research project on textual strategies in ancient war narrative, which resulted in a publication in which the methodological fruit of the collaboration was applied to two famous ancient war narratives: Herodotus' account of the battle at Thermopylae and Livy's account of the battle at Cannae.*¹ In the present contribution we return to ancient war narrative and Livy's historiography, in order to expand on the topic of textual strategies by analysing and discussing the representation of emotions. We again take a mixed linguistic-narratological approach, in which cognitive-linguistic explanations play a prominent role.²

Previous scholarship has paid ample attention to the topic of 'emotions' in Livy, often in the context of a discussion of the author's adoption of a dramatizing, tragic-pathetic style of historiography, in which a variety of literary techniques are employed to convey the emotions of characters and to evoke emotions on the part of the audience. In various wordings and with reference to various individual episodes, the studies involved describe how Livy plays upon the emotions of his audience and ensures its involvement by means of, for instance, identification with (emotions of) characters in the story world.³ Recurring qualifications in Livian scholarship that are associated, in one way or another, with the historiographer's 'emotional' style include 'graphic description', 'tragic/dramatic colouring', 'vividness', '*enargeia*', and the like. Attention is

* The research for this article was funded by Anchoring Innovation. Anchoring Innovation is the Gravitation Grant research agenda of the Dutch National Research School in Classical Studies, OIKOS. It is financially supported by the Dutch ministry of Education, Culture and Science (NWO project number 024.003.012). For more information about the research programme and its results, see the website anchoringinnovation.nl.

1 See Van Gils, De Jong, and Kroon 2018.

2 See Van Gils and Kroon 2018.

3 See e.g. Catin 1944; Walsh 1961 (e.g. 162–163 on character emotions; 173–190 for reader emotions); Pauw 1991; Burck 1992; Conte 1994: 372–337; Feldherr 1998; Chaplin 2000; Tsitsiou-Chelidoni 2009; Levene 2010: 179–180; Pausch 2011, 2018; Buijs 2018.

drawn, moreover, to the fact that Livy's style varies according to subject matter: a plain simple style, for instance, for troop movements, and a more embellished or dramatized style for the sack of cities.

The graphic and emotional style attributed to Livy is usually illustrated with passages such as the following, in which emotions are focalized by a character. This example describes the fright and horror of Hannibal's soldiers while approaching the Alps:

Most of the men did, indeed, fear their enemy (*timebat hostem*), the memory of the last war being not yet erased (*memoria nondum oblitterata*); but they dreaded more (*magis metuebat*) the endless march over the Alps, something rumour made terrifying (*rem horrendam*), especially for those with no experience of it (*inexpertis*).

LIV. 21.29.7⁴

Pausch (2011: 149) discusses this passage as an illustration of Livy's use of embedded focalization in service of what he calls *Leserbindung* ('reader involvement'):⁵

'... when depicting the crossing of the Alps ... Livy marks the significance of this event by using embedded focalization from the perspective of the Carthaginians to give the reader a very involving and captivating picture of the event ...'⁶

Various linguistic elements indeed point here to embedded focalization: the use of the imperfect tense (*timebat*, *metuebat*), which in Latin and other languages is a typical feature of presentation from a story-internal perspective;⁷ the use of focalizing verbs of fear and of the focalizing expression *memoria*

4 All translations of Livy's Books 21 and 22 in this article are taken from Yardley 2019.

5 See also e.g. Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2009: 531–534), who in a general discussion on internally focalized narrative and mimetic effects in Livy discusses a passage in Book 21 that is very similar to the one quoted above (21.33.1–6), qualifying it as 'more vivid than a narrative where the narrator restrains himself in a short and/or critical description of the historical events without a detailed depiction of the recorded action or without a penetrating illumination of the psychological background of the historical figures'.

6 Original text: '... bei der Darstellung der Alpenüberquerung ... trägt Livius der Bedeutung dieses Ereignisses Rechnung, indem er mit Hilfe der Fokalisierung aus der Perspektive der Karthager eine den Leser in besonderer Weise involvierende und damit in seinen Bann schlagende Schilderung des Geschehens gibt.'

7 For Latin, see e.g. Mellet 1988; Adema 2019.

nondum oblitterata; and the fact that the Romans are referred to from a Punic perspective as enemy (*hostem*), which is the strongest indication of character focalization here. It is less clear, however, what exactly is meant by *reader involvement* in these kinds of focalized passages and to what extent character focalization is a crucial factor in Livy for creating reader involvement.

Another question we might raise with regard to the topic of presenting emotions in historiography is whether emotionality can also play a role at other levels than that of characters: can and does an emotion like fright or horror also occur at the level of the narrator and narratee, and even at the level of the author and his audience?

In this article we will first address these two questions theoretically, disentangling the various levels which might be involved in the presentation of emotions and examining the concept of reader involvement. With this theoretical part, we hope to contribute to narratological-linguistic discussions on how to define key concepts in narrative discourse. In the next section, we study the instances of fright and horror in Livy's Books 21 and 22, and discuss, along the lines of our theoretical framework, Livy's presentation of these emotions and his attempt at reader involvement.

Theory

In order to answer the questions raised in the introduction in a systematic way, we make use of an analytical framework which distinguishes between three sets of text-internal roles involved in narrative genres: the (text-internal) author and his audience, a narrator and narratee, and characters or anonymous observers in the story world. Each of these text-internal roles may be thought of as evoking a distinct *cognitive space* in which emotions may play a role.⁸ In order to determine in a text which of the roles is concerned, we make use of the concept of *common ground*.

In ancient historiography, the text does not necessarily start as a narrative. Usually the text contains a non-narrative frame which encompasses a multitude of narrative episodes, brought together by a communicative role which in our view needs to be distinguished from the narrator's. The theoretical necessity, in historiographical as well as other narrative texts, for distinguishing between an *author* and a *narrator* (and the matching roles of audience and

⁸ See Van Gils and Kroon 2018 and 2019 for a more technical discussion of these cognitive spaces.

narratee, respectively), appears especially from the fact that these roles involve a different type of *common ground*, as we will explain.⁹

Formal narratology consistently distinguishes between the *text-external historical author* and the internal role of *narrator*.¹⁰ We take up these two concepts and, following the narratologists, will not investigate the text-external historical author. However, in our framework, we do distinguish another role, that of a *text-internal author*, who may rely on common ground with his intended audience for communicative purposes.¹¹ In formal narratology, the concept of *overt narrator* is used for many manifestations of what we prefer to call a text-internal author. In our view, a *narrator* (covert or overt) shares common ground, created by the narrative itself, with a *narratee*, as we will discuss below; an *author*, on the other hand, may assume common ground with his *audience* about times, places, knowledge, beliefs, wishes or situations outside the narrative itself. References to historical events, but also, for instance, intertextual remarks can be explained in terms of this type of common ground. When an author assumes the role of narrator, he can build up common ground with his narratee which is essentially different from the common ground of the author and his audience.

When we approach Livy's *History of Rome* as an act of communication, as we do as linguists, Livy provides the voice of the text-internal author and his contemporary audience provides an image for the text-internal audience.¹² The basic unit of research for a linguist is a communicative act, and every communicative act automatically creates the roles of *speaker* and *addressee*, which we will paraphrase for the purpose of this chapter on historiography with *text-internal author* and *audience*. The success of their communication is crucially based on the *common ground* between them and on whether the speaker / author succeeds in anchoring his message to this common ground. In the case

9 For the concept of common ground in cognitive linguistics, we refer to Clark and Brennan 1991.

10 E.g. Bal 1997; Genette 1972; De Jong 2014; De Jong *et al.* 2004. See also the Introduction to this volume.

11 Our text-internal author is not exactly defined as the 'implied author' dismissed by De Jong 2004: 3–4. In linguistic terms, we normally refer to this role as 'speaker', as one of the two basic roles in communication (together with addressee). However, in narratology the term 'speaker' is often used for characters, so in order to avoid confusion in this chapter we will use the term text-internal author. For a linguistic approach, see e.g. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008. For Latin, see Pinkster 2015, 2021.

12 We will not discuss the difference between the *historical author* and *implied author*, because for our investigation this distinction is not relevant, but see Leech and Short 1981: 259 for a discussion of these concepts.

of Livy's *History of Rome*, this common ground can be broadly described as the general knowledge and experiences of the educated Roman men of the first century CE.¹³ Apart from such culturally determined knowledge and experiences, basic emotions like fear, joy and hatred can be seen as part of a universal kind of common ground, basically shared with all human or humanlike beings.

At the start of a new narrative episode, the author prototypically makes use of common ground with the audience in order to anchor the story itself to the ongoing discourse. In the terms of the influential sociolinguist Labov, we refer to such a transitional phase to a new story as *abstract*, and to the similarly transitional phase at the end as *coda* of a story.¹⁴ With the following coda of the episode about the Battle of Lake Trasimene, we illustrate how the common ground of the historian and his contemporary audience may be reflected in the discourse.

Such was (*haec est*, lit. this is) the famous (*nobilis*) battle of Trasimene; few disasters suffered by the people of Rome have been as memorable (*memorata*). ... Statistics for the fallen on both sides are many times greater in other authors (*trahitur ab aliis*); beyond avoiding idle exaggeration, to which historians are all too prone, I (*ego*) have also accepted Fabius as my main source, since he was contemporary with this war.

LIV. 22.7.1–4

In this passage, a number of elements clearly presuppose common ground with the contemporary audience. First, the words *nobilis* ('famous') and *memorata* ('memorable') explicitly refer to the fame of the Battle of Lake Trasimene, which forms part of the collective Roman memory. In addition, the present tense forms *est* and *trahitur* are not narrative instances of 'present for past', but anchor the states of affairs referred to by the verbs to the common ground of the author and audience. Finally, the passage contains a number of referential expressions (*haec*, *ego*, and the proper noun *Fabius*) which have the discourse situation of author and audience as their deictic centre, and which, for their correct interpretation, invite the audience to extract information from the common ground. It is to be noted here that the proper noun *Fabius* does not refer to a Fabius who is a character in the narrative of the Battle of Lake Trasimene (in which case an appeal would have been made to the common ground

13 For a description of Livy's contemporary reader, see e.g. Pausch 2011.

14 A typical narrative episode in the Labovian model consists of the following phases: abstract, orientation, complication, peak, resolution, and coda. See Labov 1972; Fleischman 1990.

of the *narratee* instead of the audience; see below), but to a historiographer known to Livy's contemporary audience. As illustrated by the example above, at the level of author and audience we typically find reflection on authority (discussion of sources) and relevance of the story (references to the memorability of the battle). Such reflections are anchored in the shared knowledge and experiences of upper-class Roman citizens in the first century CE. One of the issues we will address in the next section is whether we also find the expression of emotions at this particular level.

Having introduced the level of author and audience as having their own, particular common ground, we may now turn to the level of narrator and narratee, and the type of common ground involved in the interaction between these two roles. As mentioned above, it is important to terminologically distinguish between a broader concept 'narrative' as it is used in a rather offhand way for complete works of historiography, and 'narrative proper' which should be restricted to (parts of) discourse in which a spatiotemporal world is created as separate from the discourse situation of author and audience, and which is characterized by the fact that a certain narrative tension is evoked and resolved. Once such a narrative proper has started, the common ground of author and audience temporarily makes place for shared knowledge about the story world. The author has now assumed the role of narrator, casting the audience as a narratee who agrees to follow the narrator as a guide in the story world. Their common ground as narrator and narratee is usually quickly filled with all kinds of necessary information (time, place, protagonists, circumstances, etcetera) in a section that in Labovian terminology is called *orientation*, and will dynamically be expanded by the narrative sections that follow.

That the common ground of narrator-narratee is not the same as that of author-audience may be demonstrated by instances of deictic reference which are uninterpretable in the world of author and audience, but fully understandable from the perspective of a narrator and narratee. A clear example, brought to us by Irene de Jong, is the use of the demonstrative *cette* in the opening sentence of André Malraux's novel *La voie royale*:¹⁵

Cette fois, l'obsession de Claude entrait en lutte: il regardait opiniâtrement le visage de cet homme ...

ANDRÉ MALRAUX, *La voie royale*

15 De Jong, April 2018 (oral presentation at the 8th Anchoring Innovation Expert Meeting, Arnhem).

The use of the demonstrative *cette* at the very start of the novel can only be explained as pointing to something in the cognitive space of a narratee who, apparently for already quite some time, has been taken along by a narrator in a narrative, and can draw on the quite specific common ground that has been created by the narrative prior to the point at which the novel starts. The audience (the reader of the novel) cannot draw on this common ground for interpreting the demonstrative *cette*, which explains the slight confusion we experience as readers when reading the opening lines of *La voie royale*. The novelist seems to deliberately forbid the reader access to the common ground of narrator and narratee in a literary game that is based on the distinction between narratee and audience, two roles that theoretically need to be clearly distinguished.

The roles of narrator and narratee are, of course, artificial, but nonetheless may be more or less constructed as full persons who can see, hear, think or feel emotions.¹⁶ Often narrators focalize (in the form of *observing*) emotions of characters in the story world. In theory, however, narrators may also *experience* emotions *themselves*.¹⁷ The narratee, for his part, may be encouraged to share the narrator's focalization of emotions: he may, for instance, be invited to virtually 'view' or even 'feel' a particular scene while the narrator is describing it. Moreover, during the narration the narratee may be stimulated to experience such typically narratee-related emotions as curiosity, tension and surprise.¹⁸

The third level at which emotions may be represented is that of the characters in the story world. In narratological terms, we may speak of focalizing characters. As we saw at the level of narrators, a variety of focalization types may play a role and for emotions it is relevant to distinguish at least between a character who is represented as *feeling* particular emotions, and a character who is represented as *observing* emotions of another character. The observing character may be an anonymous story-internal perspective or a group or a main character in the story. Emotions felt by characters may strongly resonate with the audience, which may be explained by the fact that emotions may count as *universal common ground*. We take it that reader involvement relies, among other things, on the audience's unconscious recognition of this type of common ground.

16 For the purpose of this contribution, we roughly distinguish between *observing* emotions and *feeling* them.

17 A famous instance of this in Virgil's *Aeneid* (2.204) is *horresco referens*, which refers to the horror of the narrator himself in narrating the story.

18 See Hogan 2011 and the Introduction to this volume.

Not all members of an audience will, of course, be equally affected by emotions in a story world, due to, for instance, differences in personal experiences.¹⁹ When a member of the audience is maximally involved (emotionally or otherwise), we might use the term *immersion*.²⁰ Particular narrative strategies and linguistic devices may stimulate a state of immersion, as is also observed by Allan (2020:17): ‘Readers can feel themselves being immersed in the story world in various degrees. The more a text enables the reader to construct an experiential simulation of the described situation (e.g. by means of words or other linguistic cues), the more intense the feeling of immersion will be.’ In the same publication, we find character focalization among the five categories of features Allan distinguishes as enhancing the chances of reader immersion. Other categories are verisimilitude of the represented scene (graphic details, slow pace, activating cognitive frames of cultural knowledge), transparency (covert narrator, (in)direct discourse), interest, and emotional involvement. A last category is the so-called principle of Minimal Departure (internally consistent story world, possibly subject to the same rules as ‘real life’). A fully immersed member of the audience can be assumed to have lost awareness of the discourse situation he is in, and to have even forgotten that a narrator is structuring and verbalizing the story.²¹

In the following section we will have a look at examples of the emotions of fright and horror in Livy, especially Books 21 and 22, and see, on the basis of the theoretical discussion above, whether and how the levels of author-audience, narrator-narratee, and characters are involved. Moreover, with regard to the examples of fright and horror at the level of characters, we will come back to the issue of (the various degrees of) reader involvement and to Livy’s alleged dramatizing style.

Fright and Horror in Livy’s *History of Rome*

Books 21 and 22 of Livy’s *History of Rome* form the start of the narrative of Rome’s war against Hannibal, which occupies the entire third decade of this work (Books 21–30). In these first two Books, Hannibal confidently crosses the Alps and explores the Italian territory and his adversaries. The Romans, for their

19 For differences between reader experiences, see Fernandez-Quintanilla 2020.

20 See for recent publications on immersion in ancient languages Grethlein and Rengakos 2009; Allan *et al.* 2017; Grethlein and Huitink 2017; Allan 2020, and Allan in this volume.

21 For experimental psychological research on gradual immersion into a story world, see Bjørner *et al.* 2016.

part, are warned (and frightened) by extremely negative prodigies and have to deal with populist politics during the elections which give power to leaders who lack patience, reflection, or strategic insight. The Roman army suffers several major defeats (among which the notorious one at Cannae), which are narrated in the form of different episodes in which the perspectives of Hannibal and the Romans are usually found in alternation.²²

Fright and horror are the dominant emotions in many episodes, experienced by various characters.²³ For instance, in the episode of the battle at Lake Trasimene (Book 22.1–7) Hannibal is afraid of the Gauls, the senators and consul Servilius are frightened by a high number of exceptionally negative prodigies, the Roman troops headed by consul Flaminius are in a panic after their consul has been killed, and the people in Rome are terrified when the news of the defeat of the Roman army arrives.²⁴ The only one who is never afraid, and even ridicules fear, is consul Flaminius (*impavidus consul*). In general, we can say that in this Trasimene episode the reader gets an *exemplum* that fear may be justified and that fearlessness (*temeritas*) is far more dangerous than caution. As such the episode clearly contributes to one of the major themes that run through the first two Books of Livy's third decade, namely the contrast between the good Roman commanders who are fearful and rely on reason and prudence, and the bad ones who are characterized by rashness and their reliance on fortune.²⁵

Theoretically, there is no obstacle for the *author* to refer to his own emotions as an author. In Book 22, the author sometimes expresses apprehension (*uix ausus sim*) at this level:

22 An excellent general study of Livy's account of the Hannibalic War in his third decade (including the treatment of such topics as narrative structure and focalization) is Levene 2010.

23 Fright and horror are not discussed elsewhere in this volume, but compare the gruesome descriptions of corporeal punishment in 2Maccabees discussed by Van Henten, who points at its emotional impact upon the narratee. Fear is discussed in this volume by Coray and Krieter, and Van Emde Boas (in Homer's *Iliad*), and by Rutherford (in Herodotus' *Histories*), whereas Finkelberg points at the feelings of sorrow that may accompany the collapse of a philosophical argument.

24 The presence of nouns denoting fright and horror (*timor*, *pavor*, *metus*, *terror*, etc.) and cognate verbs and adjectives (*timeo*, *vereor*, *horribilis*, *pavens*, etc.) in Book 22 is slightly superior to their presence in Livy's work as a whole (5.7 every thousand words in Book 22 and 5.2 in Livy as a whole).

25 See e.g. Oakley 2018: 166.

The armies also were augmented. But how large were the additions of infantry and cavalry I should hardly venture to declare with any certainty (*uix quicquam satis certum adfirmare ausus sim*)—so greatly do historians differ in regard to the numbers and kinds of troops.

LIV. 22.36.1

Needless to say, this idiomatic use of an expression of fear does not express the type of emotion we are investigating here. Apart from such politeness related expressions of fear, there are no expressions of fear, fright, horror and the like in Books 21 and 22 at the level of author and audience. In view of the fact that we are dealing here with the genre of historiography, this outcome is, of course, not unexpected. Elsewhere in Livy, we did find a rare example of a felt emotion focalized by the *audience*. As the emotion involved concerns neither fright and horror, nor the related emotion of fear, we will not discuss this example here.²⁶

But what about emotionality at the level of the Livian narrator and narratee? The Livian narrator often *observes* emotions of characters in the story world. In the following example, the fright (and fearlessness) experienced by the Romans within the story world is presented from the narrator's perspective. The narrator refers to the terrifying situation, common ground at this point in the narrative, which leads to the narratee's expectation that the characters will be terrified. The narrator, however, thwarts this expectation, at least as far as the Roman consul is concerned.

Despite the chaos all round (*perculsis omnibus*), the consul showed considerable composure in such a precarious situation (*satis ut in re trepida impavidus*). The ranks were in disarray as his men all turned toward the confused shouts, but he formed them up (*instruit*) and ... he encouraged them (*adhortatur*) and commanded them (*iubet*) to stand and fight. The way out of there (*inde*) was not by prayers and petitioning the gods, he said, but by force and valor.

LIV. 22.5.1–2

The passage starts with a topic-switch (*consul*) within the battle-episode. At this point in the narrative, the narratee does not need further disambiguation as to which consul is meant: that Flaminius is meant is part of the common ground of narrator and narratee. Hannibal has laid an ambush between the

²⁶ Liv. 42.49.2–6.

hills and the lake for the Roman troops under the command of Flaminius and the Romans have just discovered they are completely surrounded by Punic enemies. The narrator describes the consul as ‘rather unalarmed (*impavidus*) in such a dreadful situation’, a description which evokes the common ground between narrator and narratee that the situation should have called for a more apprehensive reaction by the consul. The historic present tenses *instruit*, *adhortatur*, and *iubet* mark the actions of Flaminius as business as usual, being in line with what the narratee could at this point expect: on earlier occasions, the consul has had no fear and now again he incautiously behaves as if there were no chaos all around.²⁷ There are no indications that the perceived elements within the story world (chaos all around, confused shouts) are linked to a character’s focalization: the narrator’s perspective is manifest through the evoked narrator-narratee common ground until the commander is presented as a speaking character.²⁸

At times, the narratee may be invited to share the narrator’s perspective, as appears, for instance, from the occurrence of the so-called imaginary second person singular, like *cerneres* and *uideres* (‘you could see’).²⁹

After that, one might have seen (*cerneres*) the different expressions on their faces as they left their informants, depending on whether the news each received was good or bad, and could also have seen (*uideres*) people gathering round them as they went home, offering congratulations or consolation.

LIV. 22.7.12

In this instance, the narratee is invited to view the reactions of the Roman women at the gates of the city. Gilmartin (1975: 109) comments on this example ‘Anxiety and pathos may also be involved, as when Livy draws our eyes to the faces of people at Rome after news of the defeat at Lake Trasimene’.

But do we also find manifestations of fright and horror *felt* (rather than *observed*) by the narrator or narratee? In Livy 21 and 22 we did not come across instances of a terrified or otherwise emotionally involved narrator or narratee,

27 For this use of the present tense, see Van Gils and Kroon 2019.

28 In the indirect discourse traces of the narrator’s perspective continue to be present (*inde*). The double deictic nature of indirect discourse is well-known. For a recent study see Dancygier 2012, who refers to the phenomenon as ‘blending’.

29 For this construction in Latin historiography see Gilmartin 1975, who observes that Livy uses it twelve times in the third decade, of which four instances can be found in Book 22 (Gilmartin 1975: 107).

but this is not to say that it would have been impossible, as appears from the following passage from Florus' *Epitome of Roman History*, a work which is based chiefly on Livy:³⁰

The soldiers, under the leadership of Papirius, calling for vengeance, rushed furiously along (horrible to relate, *horribile dictu*) with their swords drawn.

FLO. *Epit.* 1.11.11³¹

The parenthetically inserted supine construction *horribile dictu* ('horrible to relate') reflects the horror felt by the narrator in the act of narrating.

Books 20 and 21 do not contain any instances of an appeal to the emotions of the narratee, but we have found a potential example in Livy's Book 41. In this passage the historian describes a triumphal procession in honour of the military successes of a consul, and the exact financial rewards given to a number of participating veterans:

To the allies a half less was given than to the citizens. And so they followed the car in silence, so that you could perceive (*sentires*) that they were angry.

LIV. 41.13.8³²

The imaginary second person singular is again an invitation to the narratee to focalize a scene in the story world, but the type of focalization might be different here: whereas *cerneres* invites the narratee to view, *sentires* seems to be an invitation to at least recognize an emotion.

The observed absence of fear *felt* by the narrator or narratee in Books 21 and 22 of Livy's *History of Rome* is just as interesting as its presence would have been: in order to describe a literary work, it is useful to take into account the complete literary toolbox and also to take note of tools which are not used by the author. To understand what fear felt by narrator and narratee may look like, we have included and discussed the passages in Florus and Livy 41.

What remains to be discussed is whether and how in Livy 21 and 22 fright and horror are observed and felt at the level of *characters*. Character focalization

30 Elsewhere, Livy does use expressions that point to emotions felt by the narrator, and which are comparable to the expression *horribile dictu* in the Florus example. See e.g. Liv. 7.26.4–5 (*dictu mirabile*, 'marvellous to relate').

31 Translation by Forster 1929.

32 Translation by Sage 1938.

has been related, as we have mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, to the graphic quality and vivid style of Livy's work, potentially leading to reader involvement. The example there (about Hannibal's soldiers who are afraid to cross the Alps) exhibits some, but not all features that are assumed to enhance 'reader involvement'. In terms of Allan 2020 (see above), we recognize the presence of verisimilitude, character focalization, and the principle of Minimal Departure, but full reader immersion seems to be hampered by the fact that the focalizer is in this case not an individual but an anonymous group.³³ Furthermore, the feeling of fright and horror itself is only minimally described: the anonymous consciousness at the level of the story world seems to *observe* rather than to *feel* the emotionality of the scene. And finally, the focalization of the narrator continues to be present in expressions like *inexpertis* ('for the inexperienced'), thus blocking a high degree of involvement of the audience with the character. This example, which shows the typical way of presenting fright and horror in Livy's Books 21 and 22, may illustrate what commentators have called his 'dramatic quality', but for an interpretation in terms of *enargeia* and immersion there does not seem to be enough textual evidence here: in most of the instances, the immersive qualities are limited to the presence of an observing character and to graphic details.

There are some instances in which horrific details of a scene in the story world are presented from a story-internal viewpoint, using character focalization to express how characters on the scene *experience* their situation. For instance, the chaotic situation on the battlefield at Lake Trasimene is viewed from a character point of view. In this passage, we hear how, in spite of Flaminius' efforts to organize a proper fight, the soldiers struggle to even understand where they are:

Furthermore, in such dense fog, ears were more useful than eyes. It was to sounds that they would turn their faces and eyes—to groaning from wounds being dealt, blows falling on bodies and armour, and mingled cries of confusion and panic.

LIV. 22.5.3–4

The text cited here contains several linguistic elements that appeal to common ground that the reader shares with the characters of the story, and as such may enhance the chances to involve the reader: the imperfect tense, percept-

33 Tsitsiou-Chelidoni 2009: 535 points to the fact that character focalization in Livy often concerns anonymous groups, which makes it difficult to identify with a character.

ible details (*caligine, gemitus, clamores*), the mentioning of senses (*aurium, oculorum, ora oculosque*) and emotions (*paventium*). However, the characters on the scene (the soldiers) are anonymous and presented as a group, which might preclude a high degree of identification on the part of the audience, who supposedly will identify and empathize more readily with fully fledged characters.³⁴

Conclusion

Previous scholarship has given due attention to Livy's dramatizing, tragic-pathetic way of writing history, implying, among other things, that character perspective and the representation of character emotions may strongly enhance reader involvement. In our contribution we have addressed two questions that are evoked by these discussions. First, in order to have a fuller picture of the narrative choices made by Livy and other authors, we have raised the question of whether emotions can theoretically also be found in cognitive spaces other than that related to characters in the story world. Second, we addressed the issue of whether and to what extent character perspective and character emotions in Livy may indeed be taken as an important means to achieve reader involvement.

In order to answer these questions in a systematic way, we have distinguished three levels of 'communicative roles' in historiography which essentially differ from one another as to the common ground involved at each level: (i) the (text-internal) author and his audience, (ii) the narrator and narratee, and (iii) the characters and anonymous observers in the narrated world. At all levels, a distinction can be made between observing emotions and feeling emotions.

We have applied these theoretical levels to the analysis of manifestations of fright and horror in Livy's Books 21 and 22. At the level of author and audience, Livy uses expressions of fright and horror, or of fear in a larger sense, only idiomatically to formulate his apprehension as a speaker to provide the addressee with exact historical data. Expressions of fright and horror, or of fear at large, as focalized by the addressee were not found in Books 21 and 22, although theoretically they are not impossible.

34 Compare Rood's contribution to this volume on collective emotions and experiences in Thucydides' narrative of the naval battle in Syracuse harbour.

As expected, expressions of fright and horror most commonly occur at the level of narrator and narratee. Often, the narrator focalizes (in the sense of *observes*) the character's fear or frightful events. This is clear from the presence of many linguistic elements which are anchored in the common ground of narrator and narratee. It is not impossible to find the narratee being invited to focalize (again in the sense of observing) fear, but this use seems to be limited to imaginary second person constructions, like *cerneres* or *videres*. We have sporadically found in Livy instances of a narrator or narratee who focalizes emotions in the sense of *feeling* them himself (cf. formulas like '*mirabile dictu*' and instances of the imaginary second person singular *sentires*, respectively), but not in Books 21 and 22.

Finally, at the level of characters, we have discussed examples of character focalization, again both in the sense of *observing* and in the sense of *feeling* emotions. In this discussion we have pointed out that the relation between character focalization and reader involvement is complex. By making use of five categories of 'immersive features' (Allan 2020), we have investigated to what extent Livy's reader could feel involvement in passages which represent character emotions. It turns out that some of these 'immersive features' indeed do occur in these passages and might endorse qualifications of Livy's style such as 'graphic' or 'dramatic', but that they do not seem to induce the audience into a state of full 'reader immersion'.

Bibliography

- Adema, S.M., *Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid. Narrative Style and Structure* (Leiden 2019).
- Allan, R.J., 'Narrative Immersion: Some Linguistic and Narratological Aspects', in J. Grethlein, L. Huitink, A.C.F. Tagliabue (eds.), *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece. Under the Spell of Stories* (Oxford 2020) 15–35.
- Allan, R.J., Jong, I.J.F. de, Jonge, C.C. de, 'From *Enargeia* to Immersion: The Ancient Roots of a Modern Concept', *Style* (2017) 34–51.
- Bal, M., *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto [1985] 2nd edn. 1997).
- Bjørner, T., Magnusson, A., Nielsen, R.P., 'How to Describe and Measure Obstacles of Narrative Immersion in a Film? The Wheel of Immersion as a Framework', *Nordicom Review* (2016) 101–117.
- Buijs, M., 'ET RATIO ET RES: Characterization of Roman Conduct through Speech' in L.W. van Gils, I.J.F. de Jong, C.H.M. Kroon (eds.), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative. Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden / Boston 2018) 273–292.
- Burck, E., *Das Geschichtswerk des Titus Livius* (Heidelberg 1992).

- Catin, L., *En lisant Tite-Live* (Paris 1944).
- Chaplin, J.D., *Livy's Exemplary History* (Oxford 2000).
- Clark, H.H., Brennan, S.A., 'Grounding in Communication', in L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine, S.D. Teasley (eds.), *Perspective on Socially Shared Cognition* (Washington 1991) 127–149.
- Conte, G.B., *Latin Literature. A History* (Baltimore 1994).
- Dancygier, B., *The Language of Stories* (Cambridge 2012).
- Feldherr, A., *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley 1998).
- Fernandez-Quintanilla, C., 'Textual and Reader Factors in Narrative Empathy: An Empirical Reader Response Study Using Focus Groups', *Language and Literature* (2020) 124–146.
- Fleischman, S., *Tense and Narrativity. From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (Austin 1990).
- Forster, E.S. (ed. and transl.), *Florus. Epitome of Roman History* (Cambridge, MA 1929).
- Genette, G. *Figures 3* (Paris 1972).
- Gilmartin, K., 'A Rhetorical Figure in Latin Historical Style: The Imaginary Second Person Singular', *TAPhA* 105 (1975) 99–121.
- Gils, L.W. van, Kroon, C.H.M., 'Discourse-Linguistic Strategies in Livy's Account of the Battle at Cannae', in L.W. van Gils, I.J.F. de Jong, C.H.M. Kroon (eds.), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative. Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden / Boston 2018) 191–233.
- Gils, L.W. van, Jong, I.J.F. de, and Kroon, C.H.M. (eds.), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative. Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden / Boston 2018).
- Gils, L.W. van, Kroon, C.H.M., 'Engaging the Audience. An Intersubjectivity Approach to the Historic Present Tense in Latin' in L.W. van Gils, C.H.M. Kroon, R. Risselada (eds.), *Lemmata Linguistica. Clause and Discourse* (Berlin / Boston 2019) 351–373.
- Grethlein, J., Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin 2009).
- Grethlein, J., Huitink, L., 'Homer's Vividness: An Enactive Approach', *JHS* 137 (2017) 67–91.
- Hengeveld, K., Mackenzie, L., *Functional Discourse Grammar. A Typologically-Based Theory on Language Structure* (Oxford 2008).
- Hogan, P.C., *Affective Narratology. The Emotional Structure of Stories* (Lincoln, NE 2011).
- Jong, I.J.F. de, 'Introduction. Narratological Theory on Narrators, Narratees and Narratives', in I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden / Boston 2004) 1–10.
- Jong, I.J.F. de, *Narratology and Classics. A Practical Guide* (Oxford 2014).
- Jong, I.J.F. de, 'Anchoring Devices at the Opening of Narrative Texts', Oral Presentation at the 8th Anchoring Innovation Expert Meeting, Arnhem, April 2018.

- Jong, I.J.F. de, Nünlist, R., Bowie, A.M. (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden / Boston 2004).
- Labov, W., *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (Philadelphia 1972).
- Leech, G., Short, M., *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (London 1981).
- Levene, D.S., *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford 2010).
- Mellet, S., *L'imparfait de l'indicatif en latin classique. Temps, aspect, modalité* (Paris / Leuven 1988).
- Oakley, S., 'Livy on Cannae: a literary overview', in L.W. van Gils, I.J.F. de Jong, C.H.M. Kroon (eds.), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative. Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden / Boston 2018) 157–190.
- Pausch, D., *Livius und der Leser. Narrative Strukturen in Ab Urbe Condita* (Munich 2011).
- Pausch, D., 'Who Knows What Will Happen Next? Livy's "fraus Punica" from a Literary Point of View', in L.W. van Gils, I.J.F. de Jong, C.H.M. Kroon (eds.), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative. Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden / Boston 2018) 234–252.
- Pauw, D.A., 'The Dramatic Elements in Livy's History', *AClass* (1991).
- Pinkster, H., *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, Vol. 1 (Oxford 2015).
- Pinkster, H., *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, Vol. 2 (Oxford 2021).
- Sage, E.T., *History of Rome. Volume XII. Books 40–42*. (Cambridge, MA 1938).
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed. and transl.), *Cicero's letters to Atticus. Volume III* (Cambridge 1968).
- Tsitsiou-Chelidoni, C., 'History beyond Literature: Interpreting the "Internally Focalized" Narrative in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*' in J. Grethlein, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin / New York 2009) 527–554.
- Walsh, P.G., *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge 1961).
- Yardley, J.C. (ed. and transl.), *Livy. History of Rome. Books 21–22* (Cambridge, MA / London 2019).