

Alfred Toth

The position of *inquit* in Petronius

According to Kühner-Stegmann, *inquit* and *inquam* appear “nur bei direkter Rede» (while *ait* appears both in indirect and in direct speech) and “ohne irgendwelche besondere Beschränkung in der Stellung» (1982, pp. 532 s.). Hofmann and Szantyr further remark: «Bei *inquit* wird das Subjekt regelmäßig nachgestellt» (1965, p. 402). «Äußerlich wirkt dieses *inquit* sehr oft fast wie ein Doppelpunkt oder Anführungszeichen» (ibid., p. 418). Devine and Stephens (2006, p. 516) show a little list of examples of different orders of *inquit*, but do not comment them. However, it is hard to assume, that in a sentence like, e. g.

Liv. 1, 39, 3

Viden tu puerum hunc, inquit

‘Do you see that boy, he said’

the following four additional orders have the same semantic/pragmatic value:

* *Inquit, viden tu puerum hunc*

? *Viden, inquit, tu puerum hunc*

? *Viden tu, inquit, puerum hunc*

? *Viden tu puerum, inquit, hunc.*

Primarily, as it seems, *inquit* in a sentence has a similar function like a room divider in a room – this is, “draw a distinction”: “That is to say, a distinction is drawn by arranging a boundary with separate sides so that a point on one side cannot reach the other side without crossing the boundary” (Spencer Brown 1969, p. 3).

However, in the present study, I shall try to show several semantic and and pragmatic functions of *inquit* aside from the purely syntactical function of the construction of a hyperbaton.

1. Left VP

(*Sat.* 35, 7)

Suadeo, inquit Trimalchio, cenemus

let us have dinner

(Sat. 66, 1)

Dicam, inquit, si potuero

I will tell you if I can, he said

(Sat. 72, 10)

Erras, inquit, si putas te exire hac posse, qua venisti

You are wrong if you suppose you can go out at the door you came in

2. Splitting of V-NP

(Sat. 18, 5)

Facio, inquit, indutias vobiscum

I will sign a peace with you

(Sat. 69, 2)

Adcognosco, inquit, Cappadocem

I perceive he is a Cappadocian

(Sat. 116, 9)

Adibitis, inquit, oppidum

You will go into a town

3. Splitting of left NP

(Sat. 9, 4)

Tuus, inquit, iste frater seu comes paulo ante in conductum accucurrit

That brother or friend of yours ran into our lodgings a little while ago

In the following example, the object pronoun “me” is also left-dislocated.

(Sat.61, 3)

Omne me, inquit, lucrum transeat

Jedes Geschäft soll mir schiefgehn (Ehlers)

An interesting case is the splitting of a coordinate NP:

(*Sat.* 71, 1)

Amici, inquit, et servi homines sunt

Liebe Freunde, auch Sklaven sind Menschen (Ehlers)

Left NP splitting occurs also in subordinate clauses:

(*Sat.* 101, 9)

(negavit hoc Eumolpus fieri posse,) quia magna, inquit, navigia portibus se curvatis insinuant

Eumolpus erklärte dies für unmöglich, weil große Fahrzeuge, so sagte er, nur in buchtartige Häfen einlaufen

4. Left dislocation

Cf. Bortolussi and Sznajder (2014). Some of the following cases may be left-dislocated due to topicalization, but not all of them (cf. *Sat.* 118, 1).

(*Sat.* 34, 5)

Aequum, inquit, Mars amat

Mars loves a fair field

(*Sat.* 48, 1)

Vinum, inquit, si non placet, mutabo

I will change the wine if you do not like it

(*Sat.* 118, 1)

Multos, inquit Eumolpus, o iuvenes, carmen deceptit

Yes, my young friends, said Eumolpus, poetry has led many astray

Additional explicit topic marking by a particle (cf. Toth 1994), we find in:

(*Sat.* 53, 13)

Nam et comoedos, inquit, emeram

Ich hatte mir ja, sagte er, auch Leute vom Singspiel gekauft (Ehlers)

(*Sat.* 45, 13)

Munus tamen, inquit, tibi dedi — et ego tibi plodo

I did give you a treat. Yes, and I clap my hands at you

5. Cleft Sentences

Cf. Hoffmann 2016.

(*Sat.* 27, 4)

Hic est, inquit, apud quem cubitum ponitis

This is the man who will give you places at his table

(*Sat.* 100, 6)

Hoc erat, inquit, quod placuerat tibi, ut ...

Was this why you chose a quiet comer on deck ...

(Sat. 101, 6)

Hi sunt, inquit Giton, quos fugimus

But it is these two we are running away from, said Giton

6. Possession and possessor

The order of possession and possessor, split by *inquit*, can change.

(Sat. 37, 2)

Uxor, inquit, Trimalchionis, Fortunata appellatur

She is Trimalchio's wife Fortunata, he said

(Sat. 88, 2)

Pecuniae, inquit, cupiditas haec tropica instituit

Love of money began this revolution, he replied

Interestingly, in the following example, after insertion of *inquit*, the possessive pronoun of the possessor stays with the possession (but cf. 98, 8, *supra*):

(Sat. 67, 9)

Domini, inquit, mei beneficio nemo habet meliora

Thanks to my husband's kindness, nobody has finer ones

7. Vocative Phrase

In an overwhelming amount of examples, *inquit* appears in connection with a vocative phrase.

7.1. VOC - S

(Sat. 33, 1)

Amici, inquit, nondum mihi suave erat in triclinium venire, sed ...

It was not convenient for me to come to dinner yet, my friends, but ...

(*Sat.* 41, 7)

Dionyse, inquit, liber esto

Dionysus, rise and be free

(*Sat.* 137, 1)

Scelerate, inquit, etiam loqueris?

You villain, you dare to speak?

In the following example, the left part of the hyperbaton construction is repeated:

(*Sat.* 98, 8)

In tua, inquit, pater carissime, in tua sumus custodia

Dearest father, we are in your hands, yours entirely

7.2. S - VOC

(*Sat.* 47, 2)

Ignoscite mihi, inquit, amici

You will excuse me, gentlemen?

(*Sat.* 65, 5)

Contine te, inquit, homo stultissime

Control yourself, you silly fool

(*Sat.* 63, 1)

Salvo, inquit, tuo sermone, Trimalchio

Deine Geschichte in Ehren (Ehlers)

A surprising hyperbaton structure we find in:

(Sat. 67, 2)

Quomodo nosti, inquit, illam, Trimalchio, nisi argentum composuerit ...

Do you not know her better? said Trimalchio. Until she has collected the silver ..

7.3. VOC splitting

(Sat. 24, 2)

O, inquit, hominem acutum atque urbanitatis vernaculae fontem!

Welch ein heller Kopf und Vater des Großstadtwitzes!

(Sat. 106, 1)

O te, inquit, feminam simplicem

You silly woman

(Sat. 96, 6)

O poetarum, inquit, disertissime, tu eras?

What, most learned bard, was it you?

8. Imperative Phrase

Since there are so many examples of *inquit* in vocative phrases, its occurring in imperative phrases is not astonishing, However, in this case, the order is always IMP (X) – inquit.

(Sat. 16, 2)

Aperi, inquit, iam scies

Open the door, said a voice, and you will see

(*Sat.* 82, 3)

Age ergo, inquit ille, in exercitu vestro phaecasiati milites ambulant?

Well, do soldiers in your force walk about in white shoes?

(*Sat.* 107, 7)

Noli, inquit, causam confundere, sed impone singulis modum

Do not go confusing the issue

9. Addressing subjects

Cf. recently Molinelli (2014) and Mikulová (2015).

(*Sat.* 45, 1)

Oro te, inquit Echion centonarius, melius loquere

Oh, don't be so gloomy, said Echion, the old clothes dealer.

(*Sat.* 48, 10)

Rogo, inquit, Agamemnon mihi carissime

Bitte sehr, mein teuerster Agamemnon (Ehlers)

(*Sat.* 91, 8)

Quaeso, inquit, Encolpi, fidem memoriae tuae appello

Now, Encolpius, I ask you, I appeal to your honest memory

In the following example, *tibi dico* has about the same meaning as *quaeso* and *rogo*:

(*Sat.* 64, 2)

Tibi dico, inquit, Plocame, nihil narras?

Come you, Plocamus, have you got no story?

10. Wh-Questions

10.1. Wh-*inquit*

Another vaste source of examples for the occurrence of *itaque* are *wh*-questions. However, unlike one would expect, there are no clear cases of focus or topic marking, unless the hyperbaton by insertion of *inquit* shows up combined with other strategies.

(*Sat.* 104, 4)

Quis, inquit, prohibet navigium scrutari

Wer hindert uns, das Fahrzeug zu durchsuchen (Ehlers)

(*Sat.* 47, 10)

Quem, inquit, ex eis vultis in cenam statim fieri?

Now, which of them would you like turned into a dinner this minute?

(*Sat.* 107, 15)

Quid, inquit Lichas, attinuit supplices radere?

But why should they shave themselves to excite pity?

10.2. Wh-V-*inquit*

(*Sat.* 11, 3)

Quid agebas, inquit, frater sanctissime?

What are you at, my pure-minded brother?

(Sat. 98, 6)

Quid est, inquit, latro?

Now, you thief

(Sat. 24, 6)

Quare ergo, inquit, me non basiavit?

Warum hat er mich dann nicht geküßt? (Ehlers)

10.3. Wh-PRO-*inquit*

(Sat. 82, 3)

Quid tu, inquit, commilito, ex qua legione es aut cuius centuria?

Hullo, comrade, what regiment and company do you belong to?

(Sat. 74, 6)

Quid vos, inquit, adhuc non cenastis?

Why have you not had dinner yet?

The following example, however, may show a topic marking strategy:

(Sat. 136, 11)

Quid porro tu, inquit, me absente fecisti?

What did you do while I was away?

Cf.

also the other instance of *quid porro*: “*Quid porro ad rem pertinet, ...*”.

11. Accusativus cum infinitivo

Left of *inquit*, we find all parts of the A.c.I. construction: the verb which commands it, the infinitive (plus minus its object), and the object:

(Sat. 101, 7)

Fingite, inquit, nos antrum Cyclopi intrasse

I would have you imagine that we have entered the ogre's den, he said

(*Sat.* 78, 5)

Fingite me, inquit, mortuum esse

Imagine that I am dead

(*Sat.* 16, 3)

Me derisisse, inquit, vos putabatis?

Did you think you had deceived me? she said

(*Sat.* 39, 2)

Hoc vinum, inquit, vos oportet suave faciatis

Now you must make this wine go down pleasantly

12. Discourse particles

Cf. Toth 1994, Fedriani/Sansò 2017.

(*Sat.* 72, 2)

Ergo, inquit, cum sciamus nos morituros esse, quare non vivamus?

Well, well, if we know we must die, why should we not live?

(*Sat.* 101, 8)

Immo, inquit Giton, persuade gubernatori ut in aliquem portum navem deducat

No, said Giton, persuade the helmsman to run the boat into some harbor.

(*Sat.* 24, 4)

Ita, inquit Quartilla, et Ascylto embasicoetas detur

Also, sagte Quartilla, soll auch Askyltos seinen Betthüpfen haben. (Ehlers)

(*Sat.* 102, 10)

Ita vero, inquam ego

Soso, sagte ich (Ehlers)

(*Sat.* 69, 1)

Plane, inquit, non omnia artificia servi nequam narras

To be sure, you have forgotten some of the tricks of the vile slave.

(*Sat.* 72, 4)

Vero, vero, inquit Habinnas, de una die duas facere, nihil malo

Very true, very true, said Habinnas, making two days out of one is my chief delight

13. Topicalized personal pronouns

See, most recently, Janse/de Melo 2013.

Interestingly, only *ego*, *tu* and *vos* shine up. While the lack of *nos* may be by chance, the use of 3rd person subject pronouns is not attested in Petronius.

(*Sat.* 42, 1)

Ego, inquit, non cotidie labor

Ich bade nicht alle Tage (Ehlers)

(*Sat.* 114, 5)

Tu, inquit, Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus

Help us in our peril, Encolpius

(*Sat.* 26, 9)

vos, inquit, nescitis hodie apud quem fiat?

Do you not know at whose house it is to- day?

14. Conditional clauses

Cf. Haiman 1978.

(*Sat.* 64, 13)

Si quis, inquit, noluerit accipere, caput illi perfunde

If anyone refuses to take it, pour it over his head

(*Sat.* 100, 4)

Si quis deus manibus meis, inquit, Gitona imponeret ...

Ah, if the gods would deliver Giton into my hands ...

(*Sat.* 9, 5)

Si Lucretia es, inquit, Tarquinium invenisti

If you are a Lucretia, you have found your Tarquin

15. Negative focus

Cf., most recently, Gianollo 2017.

(*Sat.* 64, 8)

Nemo, inquit, in domo mea me plus amat

No one in the house loves me better (than Scylax)

(Sat. 80, 1)

Non frueris, inquit, hac praeda super quam solus incumbis

You shall not enjoy this treasure that you brood over all alone

(Sat. 126, 9)

Nolo, inquit, tibi tam valde placeas

Ich will nicht, daß du dir so sehr viel zugutehältst (Ehlers)

As we know already from the standard works on Latin grammar, *inquit* can never appear in initial position of a clause. In all the examples that we have shown so far, it appears in middle position. However, in the work of Petronius, there also two instances where *inquit* appears at the end of the clause.

(Sat. 36, 5)

Non minus et Trimalchio eiusmodi methodio laetus: "Carpe!", inquit

Trimalchio was delighted with the trick he had played us, and said: Now, Carver

(Sat. 87, 7)

Itaque excitavit me sopitum et: "Numquid vis?" inquit

Also weckte er mich aus meiner Benommenheit und sagte: Möchtest du?
(Ehlers)

References

Bortolussi, Bernard and Lyliane Sznajder, Topicalization versus Left-Dislocation in Biblical Latin. In: Journal of Latin Linguistics 13/2, 2014, pp. 163-195

Fedriani, Chiara and Andrea Sansò (eds.), Pragmatic Markers: Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Amsterdam 2017, pp. 1-33

Gianollo, Chiara, Focus-sensitive negation in Latin. In: Catalan Journal of Linguistics 16, 2017, pp. 51-77

Haiman, John, Conditionals are topics. In: Language 54/3, 1978, pp. 564-589

- Hoffmann, Roland, Latin cleft constructions, synchronically, diachronically, and typologically reconsidered. In: *Pallas* 102, 2016, pp. 201-320
- Hofmann, Johann Baptist/Szantyr, Anton, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München 1965
- Janse, Mark/de Melo, Wolfgang, La position des pronoms personnels enclitiques chez Pétrone. In: *Latomus* 72/2, 2013, pp. 447-467
- Kühner, Raphael/Stegmann, Carl, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 2 Bde. Darmstadt 1982
- Mikulová, Jana, Verbs introducing direct speech in late Latin texts. In: *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 20/2, 2015, pp. 123-143
- Molinelli, Piera, From verbs to interactional discourse markers: the pragmaticalization of Latin rogo, queso. In: *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13/2, 2014, pp. 163-194
- Petronius, with an English translation by Michael Heseltine. New York 1925
- Petronius, *Satyrica*. Lateinisch-Deutsch von Konrad Müller und Wilhelm Ehlers. 3. Aufl. München 1983
- Spencer Brown, George, *Laws of form*. London 1969
- Toth, Alfred, Thema, Topik und Koda im Lateinischen. In: *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 4, 1994, pp. 177-210
- Wehr, Barbara, *Diskurs-Strategien im Romanischen*. Tübingen 1984

Address of the author:

Prof. Dr. Alfred Toth, 8225 East Speedway, Apt. 1013, Tucson, AZ 85710 (USA)