

is said of the rest. Similarly, the *doors* are of pine, *pineae . . . claustra* 2.258–259⁶): nothing about the rest. The horse *as a whole* is of oak: 2.186, 230, 260.

One subtle and possibly confusing touch is provided by Sinon's reference to the horse as made of maple, 2.112. Some psychological subtlety (or over-subtlety) is intended here by Sinon, and it is not clear that we understand what his intention is. But in any case, Vergil hardly expects the reader to accept Sinon as a credible witness to anything—including the composition of the horse!

Even if this suggestion in regard to the horse is incorrect⁷), it is clear that one must seek a solution for the problem of the Trojan horse elsewhere than in supposed contradictions in Homer.

Livy's use of *quamquam* and the subjunctive

By DAVID J. LADOUCEUR, Cambridge (Mass.)

Grammars often attribute to Livy the use of the subjunctive after *quamquam* in the concession of a definite fact. Kühner-Stegmann, for example, cites four examples of this usage¹). In Woodcock, moreover, one finds that in classical usage *quamquam* is normally followed by the indicative or by a potential subjunctive. The subjunctive of fact after *quamquam*, however, Woodcock notes, is generally unclassical and occurs from Livy onwards²). Thus Cicero consistently uses *quamquam* with the indicative to concede a definite

⁶) I do not understand why McLeod regards Austin's equation of "abies" and "pineae" as "special pleading" (p. 145). Although the trees are distinct (cf. *Eclogues* 7.65–66), they are closely related (Pliny *N. H.* 16.38), have the same appearance (*ibid.* 41, "nec forma alia"), and are linked by other poets (Statius *Thebaid* 6.104, Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica* 3.165, Prudentius *Apotheosis* 520f.).

⁷) R. G. Austin, ed., *Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964) *ad* 16, regards the whole horse as being of fir. R. D. Williams, ed., *The Aeneid of Virgil* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1972–73), *ad* 2.16, believes that "robur" in Book Two "has the general sense of 'wood' rather than its special meaning 'oak'".

¹) R. Kühner, F. Holzweissig, C. Stegmann, A. Thierfelder, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (repr. Darmstadt, 1962), Vol. II, 442.5. The examples are as follows: 6.9.6, 36.34.6, 38.9.11, 38.57.8.

²) E. C. Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax* (Harvard University Press, 1959), 245.

fact, except in cases in which the concessive clause is subordinate in indirect discourse: "Concedo . . . *quamquam* et laetitiam voluptas animi et molestiam dolor afferat, eorum tamen utrumque ortum esse e corpore" (*Fin.* 1.17.55). Whenever the subjunctive occurs in direct discourse, the idea of potentiality is present: "*Quamquam* sensus abierit, tamen suis et propriis bonis laudis et gloria . . . mortui non carent" (*Tus.* 1.109). Tacitus, on the other hand, uses both the indicative and the subjunctive after *quamquam* to concede a definite fact: "illi . . . *quamquam* primo tumultu Claudium ducem legerant, non arma noscere, non ordines sequi" (*Hist.* 1.68.1). "Asinius quoque, *quamquam* prioribus temporibus natus sit, videtur mihi inter . . . Appios studuisse" (*Dial.* 21.7). "Drusus rediens Illyrico, *quamquam* patres censuissent . . . ut ovans iniret, prolato honore urbem intravit" (*Ann.* 3.11).

Since Livy falls chronologically between these two authors, it seemed worthwhile to examine the usage of *quamquam* with the subjunctive in his writings, how often it occurs in comparison to *quamquam* with the indicative, and under what circumstances. As a result of this examination the very existence of such a usage, unexplainable in traditional grammars as classical, came into question.

The results of a thorough investigation of *quamquam* in Livy may be summarized thus: *Quamquam* occurs in Livy 166 times, 130 times with the indicative, 28 times with the subjunctive, and 8 times with a noun, participle, or adjective³). Of the 28 cases with the subjunctive, at least 21 occur in indirect discourse. Thus, as in the example quoted above from Cicero, the subjunctive may be explained as a verb of a subordinate clause in indirect discourse. The 7 remaining cases are potential subjunctives. The data to substantiate this summary are given below.

Indirect Discourse

Livy	Expressions Introducing Indirect Discourse
2.32.1	rati
4.24.8	ferunt
6.12.5	simile veri est
10.11.13	venerunt questum . . . orare . . . se

³) D. W. Packard, *A Concordance to Livy*, Vol. IV, Q-Z, (Harvard University Press, 1968) was essential in gathering this data. The concordance is based upon the Conway-Walters text through Book 35 and Weissenborn-Müller for the remainder. Though the argument here is not directly affected, the tendency of the former to correct, in the tradition of Madvig, should be noted. Ogilvie's new Oxford text often reverts to Weissenborn-Müller.

22.37.3	nuntiarunt
23.29.7	persuaserant
25.28.6	negarunt
26.48.5	collaudavit
27.4.3	optimum visum est
28.9.4	convenit
29.4.9	questus
29.21.10	gratias agere
29.30.1	ratus
32.6.3	consilium habuit
34.12.5	respondet
35.48.8	(occurs in indirect discourse, but no single word introduces indirect discourse)
36.22.3	(occurs in indirect discourse, but no single word introduces indirect discourse)
36.34.6	manu abnuit
38.58.12	argui
42.23.4	querebantur
43.6.3	exposuerunt

Potential Subjunctives

6.9.6	“Quamquam expertum exercitum adsuetumque imperio qui in Volscis erat mallet, nihil recusavit.” (Although he might have preferred . . .)
7.13.6	“Quamquam de gloria vix dicere ausim . . .” (And yet I may scarcely dare speak about glory . . .)
28.41.2	“Quamquam, si aut bellum nullum in Italia, aut is hostis esset . . . qui te in Italia retineret . . . simul cum bello materiam gloriae tuae esse ereptum videri posset.” (And yet, if either there were no war in Italy, or the enemy were such that . . . whoever would detain you in Italy would be able to appear as . . .)
35.48.4	“His equestribus copiis quamquam vel totius Europae exercitus in unum coacti obrui possent, adiciebat multiplices copias . . .” (Although by these cavalry forces the armies even of all Europe . . . might be able to be destroyed, he continued to add forces . . .)
36.17.13	“Illud proponere animo vestro debetis, non vos pro Graeciae libertate tantum demicare quamquam is quoque egregius titulus esset . . .” (Before your minds you should hold this, that you are not fighting simply for the freedom of Greece, although that would be a noble motive . . .) The subjunctive may also be explained as in subordination after the indirect clause <i>vos . . . demicare</i> .
45.17.7	“Ceterum quamquam tales viri mitterentur quorum de consilio sperare posset imperatores nihil indignum . . . decreturos esse, tamen in senatu quoque agitata sunt . . .” (But although there would be sent men such that . . . yet there was discussion in the senate . . .)
45.23.5	“Quamquam Perseus vere obiceret . . .” (And yet Perseus might truly reproach . . .)

Of the four examples cited by Kühner-Stegmann two have already been dealt with, 6.9.6 and 36.34.6. Admittedly in the first example and perhaps in other examples above, the idea of potentiality, while present, is certainly attenuated. In no clear case, however, does Livy, like Tacitus, indiscriminately use the subjunctive to concede a definite fact. As for the two remaining examples cited, 38.9.11 and 38.57.8, the text is at question. In both cases the latest revision of Weissenborn-Müller reads against Kühner-Stegmann:

38.9.11 “haec quamquam spe ipsorum aliquanto leviora erant, petentibus Aetolis, ut ad concilium referrent, permissum est” (erant *M. B. et rell. codd. essent*).

One might prefer to follow the usually reliable authority of *Codex Bambergensis* here and retain *essent*. Even in that case, however, the concession may be one made by the Aetolians and not by Livy. The subjunctive would, therefore, be quite classical. A literal translation would run thus: “permission was granted to the Aetolians asking that, although (as they said) the terms were much lighter than they anticipated, they might submit them to their council.”

38.57.8 “haec de tanto viro quam et opinionibus et monumentis litterarum variarent proponenda erant” (*codd. Vett. edd: quamquam et*).

Since *B* breaks off with *inci* (38.46.4), its authority cannot be invoked here. While a reading such as *quamquam* could easily arise from dittography, *quam* would be more difficult. In either case, however, a conditional sense for the verb is possible: “. . . however much they might differ . . .”

In Livy, therefore, there is no clear use of the subjunctive after *quamquam* to concede a definite fact. When the subjunctive is used, either the concessive clause is subordinated in indirect discourse or some notion of potentiality is present.