REVIEW–DISCUSSION

SOME RECENT WORK ON DIRECT AND INDIRECT DISCOURSE IN THE ANCIENT HISTORIANS

Dennis Pausch, ed., *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, Bd. 284. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010. Pp. 293. ISBN 978-3-11-022417-7. €99.95.

Mabel Lang, *Thucydidean Narrative and Discourse*. Edited by Jeffrey S. Rusten and Richard Hamilton. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press, 2011. Pp. xxiii + 219. ISBN 978-0-979-971341. US$65.00.

Note: The Tables of Contents of these volumes appear at the end of this review.

How should we be thinking about the dramatised direct speeches that are such a conspicuous feature of ancient historiography? In the thorough introduction to his excellent volume, *Stimmen der Geschichte*, Dennis Pausch offers three guidelines. First, speeches in historiographical works should be analysed in their narrative contexts, rather than treated as free-standing objects of analysis (3–4). Second, it is important to respect the individuality of the historians and the differences between them (4–5). Finally, it is useful to pay close attention to the effect the speeches produce on the reader. As Pausch argues (5–6), ancient historians frequently faced a daunting task, namely to interest the reader in an(other) analysis of events they already knew something about; in this situation, the presentation of information in the form of direct speeches has many rhetorical advantages. One important advantage is that speeches confront the reader with a single, limited point of view and with human ignorance of the future; these factors encourage (or entice) the reader to produce his or her own opinion, and thus to become involved in the historian's presentation.

All three points are surely indispensible bases for literary analysis of the direct speeches.[1] Their solidity contrasts sharply with Pausch's treatment of

---

[1] Some analysts of the historians remain unconvinced of the importance of literary analysis of historiography. Most famously, Lendon (2009) argues that literary analyses turn 'away from Rome's rocky reality onto the undemanding plain of textuality' (61), thus depicting rhetorical analysis as the choice of lazy scholars. However, Lendon shares Pausch's view (1) that the 'speeches included in the Roman historians [were] understood by ancient readers to be the author's free compositions' (42, n. 2); it is difficult to project

indirect discourse (7), which consists not of guidelines, but of resonant questions: when is the voice of an historical person represented in ancient historiography? Is it present in direct discourse only, or also in indirect discourse? Is there some sharp break between the two forms? Or is there crossing over of 'voice' from one to the other?

In the following remarks, I will discuss some of the papers in *Stimmen der Geschichte*,[2] a chapter from *Thucydidean Narrative and Discourse*, and a few other recent articles of note (listed in the bibliography), in the hopes of extending the conversation about direct and indirect discourse in the historians.[3] From the Pausch volume, I will first discuss Nicolas Wiater's essay on the speeches in Polybius and Dennis Pausch's essay on the speeches in Livy, approaching these together with Steven Usher's recent article on direct and indirect discourse in Polybius.[4] Together, the three essays form a productive and complementary argument.

In the second half of the paper I will consider Mabel Lang's essay on direct and indirect speeches in Thucydides in *Thucydidean Narrative and Discourse*. Carlo Scardino's essays of 2010 and 2012, the first of which is included in *Stimmen der Geschichte*, and Christoph Leidl's essay on responses to the speeches in historiography, also from *Stimmen der Geschichte*, will serve as counterpoints to Lang's argument. The essay will conclude with a brief discussion of John Marincola's closing contribution to that same volume, and suggest a modest 'fourth guideline' to add to the three guidelines of Pausch's introduction.

I

One of the most important contributions of Nicolas Wiater's paper on speeches and historical narrative in Polybius is his clearly explained hypothesis about the function of the direct speeches in Polybius' narrative. For Wiater, Polybius' direct speeches, which interrupt the narrative flow (78), are

---

what kind of analysis, other than literary analysis, would be appropriate for 'free compositions.' Cf. John Marincola's paper in *Stimmen der Geschichte*, which also addresses this issue (e.g., 262–3).

[2] Reviewed as a whole on BMCR: http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2011/2011-08-39.html.

[3] The footnotes and in-text references contain remarks on several other papers from *Stimmen der Geschichte*. Choices about which articles to discuss in this essay should not be taken as judgements on those articles not discussed in detail, but rather reflect a desire to focus on questions pertaining to direct and indirect discourse. *Stimmen der Geschichte* is an exceptionally useful volume, and is excellent throughout. All translations from German are my own.

[4] Usher (2009).

moments of 'positioning,' during which an individual who is seeking actively to influence the course of events assesses the past and offers a course of action for the future, thus positioning himself in respect to historical characters and events as he understands them, and at the same time positioning himself in the reader's mind as agreeing with, or diverging from, the historian's presentation of those same characters and events (cf. pages 69–79). Wiater's analyses of selected speeches show both kinds of positioning very clearly, and help to substantiate his wider argument that Polybius contrasts speakers whose opinions agree with his historical account to those whose personal aims or situation cause them to represent matters in a different and problematic way (99–104).

It is interesting to ask whether Wiater's concept of 'positioning' works for speeches in indirect discourse. I quickly compared a small stock of familiar indirect speeches to Wiater's idea about 'positioning': in Thucydides, Pericles' speech in indirect discourse at 2.13 is definitely an example of positioning (summing up Athens' resources and recommending future action). We might also review the three successive speeches in indirect discourse Thucydides placed at 6.47–9 (Nicias, Alcibiades, and Lamachus); positioning is definitely again evident, as each general gives his assessment of the situation and offers a plan. In these examples the speakers position themselves in respect both to text-internal audiences (e.g. the Athenian assembly or the other generals), and also in respect to the historian's account of events.

It seems likely that Wiater has arrived at a sensible formulation, applicable to direct speeches in Polybius, but useful for thinking about direct speeches in other historians, and about indirect speeches, as well. At the same time, Usher's article of 2009 (undoubtedly published too late for Wiater to see it before he went to press) puts both the direct speeches and indirect discourse in Polybius in an entirely different light. Like Wiater, Usher spends much less time rehearsing what Polybius says speeches ought to do, and much more time analysing the speeches Polybius wrote. Also like Wiater, he introduces a remarkable principle: 'The main characteristic of the spoken word as Polybius reports it is his technique of beginning in indirect speech (*oratio obliqua*), and concluding with a passage of direct speech (*oratio recta*)'.[5]

Usher's first Polybian examples include speeches that Wiater also analyses, and some productive differences are visible here. It turns out, for instance, that the speech of Aemilius Paulus to the Roman army at 3.108–9, which Wiater (92–5) treats as one unbroken speech, as indeed it seems to be, begins in indirect discourse, switching to direct discourse at 3.109. Thus, the first part of 'positioning,' namely the rehearsal of the speaker's view of past

---

[5] Usher (2009) 490.

events, is recorded in indirect discourse, while Paulus' increasingly emphatic assessment of present advantages and exhortation to action are offered in direct discourse (Usher 490–1). This same crescendo from indirect to direct discourse is visible in Hannibal's corresponding speech at 3.111, although it has far different themes and character.[6]

Usher reviews a number of Polybian speeches and finds similar patterns; indeed, he argues that where indirect discourse and direct discourse appear together in Polybius, indirect discourse always appears first (512). He maintains that Polybius uses direct discourse, with or without introductory indirect discourse, for many reasons, mostly having to do with the opportunity for dramatic emphasis, dramatic characterisation, or the presentation of important themes and complex arguments. Where indirect discourse stands alone, it tends to be deployed for summaries, short quotations of a speaker's words, and on less dramatic occasions (512–3). Nevertheless: it is clear that the 'voice' of Aemilius Paulus or of Hannibal, for instance, emerged for both Wiater and Usher in both the indirect and direct parts of their speeches. Wiater noted no difference in rhetorical impact between the two modes, nor does Usher suggest that the sections of these speeches in indirect discourse less fully represent the character's speech than the sections in direct discourse.

A full analysis of how Usher's structural observations about direct and indirect discourse in Polybius cohere with Wiater's concept of 'positioning' would be useful. Moreover, if we go back to Polybius' speeches, one other factor emerges as well, which is that Polybius sometimes introduced direct discourse not only with introductory sections of indirect discourse, but also with narratorial explanations or descriptions. Pausch's essay in *Stimmen der Geschichte* brings these introductory explanations more fully into the analysis. In his view, focalisation can be transferred from the narrator to a character without introducing any kind of quoted speech; indirect discourse is one level closer to surrendering focalisation to a character; and in direct discourse, the character's focalisation becomes dominant. '…so ergibt sich ein dreigliedriges Schema, in dem sich mit jeder Stufe—Schilderung durch den Erzähler, Referat in indirekter Rede, Verwendung von direkter Rede—die Intensität der vorgenommenen Perspektivierung steigert' (188).

Looking back at the two speeches from Polybius also described by Wiater and Usher, we see that Hannibal's speech falls quite nicely into this pattern: Polybius 3.111 displays character focalised description, which causes *oratio obliqua*, and then breaks into *oratio recta*. Aemilius' speech at 3.108–9 also accords to Pausch's threefold scheme, but in a different way: here we see the historian's summary of Aemilius' initial words (= 'free indirect dis-

---

[6] Usher (2009) 491–2; cf. Wiater 81.

course') flowing into indirect discourse, and then into direct discourse. Pausch's observation adds precision to the analysis of the relation between the immediate context of the speech and the speech itself, and complements Wiater's and Usher's useful paradigms for analysing the speeches. Moreover, it seems possible that Pausch is here suggesting a workable refinement of a twofold scheme broached by Andrew Laird in 1999.[7]

In an important study often quoted in this volume, Laird proposed that both direct and indirect discourse reflected maximum character focalisation and were both differentiated from what is called 'embedded focalisation' or 'free indirect discourse'.[8] The verbs of speaking that introduce indirect discourse separate them from the narrator's point of view: '…the very existence of a declarative verb is a clear signal that whatever message it governs is not the narrator's property'.[9] For Laird, Hannibal's speech would perhaps be an example of 'embedded focalisation' followed by indirect and direct discourse, both of which are the speech. Aemilius' speech displays 'free indirect discourse' followed by indirect and direct discourse, both of which are the speech. Laird seems to have had no doubt that the 'voice' of an historical character emerges in indirect discourse. As we have seen, Pausch's three part scheme is consistent with Laird's argument, but makes room for the fact that indirect discourse does not always possess the same level of rhetorical intensity as direct discourse.

Laird's argument has had a formative influence on attitudes about direct and indirect discourse: despite his protestations that 'the elevation of indirect discourse to a position of relative equivalence with direct discourse will appear controversial',[10] authors in Pausch's volume sometimes take that equivalence for granted.[11]

This is interesting, and perhaps our growing acceptance of this idea should be reviewed. The reason for my hesitation is the stylistic difference

---

[7] Laird (1999).

[8] Laird (1999) 140.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Laird (1990) 139.

[11] E.g. Chrysanthe Tsitsiou-Chelidioni, in her paper on Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*. As Pausch noted in his introduction, however, the differences between the historians (and, if I may be so bold as to make a further suggestion, within the historians) must be respected. Thus, if Tsitsiou-Chelidioni makes no distinction between direct and indirect speeches in Caesar's *BG*, the importance of the indirect speeches she analyses would lead us to that very attitude. By contrast, Rhiannon Ash seems to treat Dillius' Vocula's first speech in Tacitus' *Histories* (4.57.1–2), which is in indirect discourse, as preparatory to 'the climactic speech itself' (217) at 4.58, thus maintaining a distinction between direct and indirect discourse that seems appropriate for this passage.

between *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua*. This difference is difficult to pin down, particularly since ancient historians often create 'semantic equality' (cf., e.g., Pausch 204) between speakers of direct speeches; we all know essays in which analysts work hard to distinguish traces of the individual character of the speaker of a dramatised speech in Thucydides or Livy.[12] Yet surely this 'semantic equality' is even greater in indirect discourse, which is generally agreed to belong to a less vivid register of narrative, and to be more subject to the reporting narrator's formulations? Pausch's initial query about whether the 'voice' of an historical person emerges in indirect as well as direct discourse seems to suggest a concern for this same issue.

II

Mabel Lang, one feels, would have approved of this line of questioning. Her recent, and highly original, paper on direct and indirect speeches in Thucydides argues for a fundamental difference between direct and indirect discourse in this historian. For Lang, the direct speeches are the speeches referred to in the famous *Redensatz* at 1.22.1; as Thucydides explains, they are interpretive (153) and carefully selected (156). The indirect speeches, by contrast, belong to the *erga* of the *History*. '[1.22.1]…applies only to the long direct speeches and not to the more or less brief indirectly reported speeches, which often simply effect action or affect it in some way and so are defined along with the actions themselves as described in 1.22.2' (157). The very evidence that, for Laird, showed that the indirect speeches were equivalent to the direct speeches, namely the persistent appearance of the explicit verbs of speaking that introduce indirect discourse, appears in Lang as a reason for placing direct and indirect speeches in different categories. Lang argues that in each case the introductory verb designates a *deed* of speaking, which often also encounters a practical response (157). Since the short indirect speeches are far more numerous than the long direct speeches (32 direct speeches, but 138 indirect speeches in Books 2–5.25 and 6–7 of Thucydides), Lang argues that indirect speeches have a distinct function in the narrative: … 'generally speaking, indirect discourse is important both in moving the narrative forward by motivating action, and in explaining inaction by clarifying situations' (158).

To review: Wiater describes Polybius' speeches as performing 'positioning,' and it does not seem like Usher expresses any quarrel in principle with this description. Usher points out, however, that Polybius' rhetorical strate-

---

[12] A discussion of this issue ('the convention that speakers use the dialect and style of the narrator himself'), with literature, can be found in Marincola (2007) 129.

gies in formulating the speeches included an habitual shift from indirect to direct discourse. Noting that this is not the only common shift in rhetorical register, Pausch sees the shift from character focalisation to indirect discourse to direct discourse as a progress through three levels of intensity, in terms of the dominance of the character's point of view in the narrative; by contrast, Laird saw only two levels: some kind of 'free indirect discourse,' and character text, regardless of whether that character text is structured with direct or indirect discourse.

Lang differs from all of these scholars with her suggestion that the direct speeches are speeches, but the indirect speeches belong to the *erga*, the deeds, of Thucydides' *History*. For the other scholars discussed above, indirect speeches are speeches, like the direct speeches, and the question is how they work: are they to be taken for granted as equivalent character text, and if so, how can their functions and rhetorical authority be distinguished from those of the direct speeches? Lang ignores narratology entirely, and proceeds mainly through comparing the responses to direct and indirect speeches: looking at the direct speeches, it is evident to Lang that many have little effect on the narrative; by contrast, the indirect speeches frequently provoke active reactions or responses. The argument is set forth not only as an explanation, but also in an exhaustive chart of the speeches and their responses (189–96), which the editor of this essay, Jeffrey Rusten, organised from Lang's notes.

To take up only a small section of Lang's larger argument, a chunk of her paper considered direct-indirect speech pairs. This seems interesting, since if it could be shown that such speech pairs existed, and particularly if it could be demonstrated that Thucydides intentionally deployed indirect discourse in contrast to direct discourse, we could posit that he intended to fulfil different rhetorical purposes with each mode.

Lang sets out to show (158–60) that she has found six direct–indirect pairings: Archidamus' direct *Feldherrnrede* at 2.11, paired with Pericles' indirect speech at 2.13; Teutiaplus' direct speech at 3.30, paired with the Ionians' indirect speech at 3.31; Demosthenes' direct exhortation to his troops at 4.10, paired with Brasidas' indirectly recorded exhortations at 4.11; and the Spartans' speech at 4.17–20, paired with the Athenian responses at 4.21.3 and 4.22.2. Finally, she finds two other such pairs for Brasidas: a direct exhortation to his troops at 4.126, followed by commands in indirect discourse at 4.128.1, and a direct explanation, at 5.9, of a plan for attack, followed by a command in indirect discourse at 5.10.5.

Despite some evident strengths, this list seems less convincing than it needs to be. The strongest example is the Archidamus–Pericles speech pair at 2.11–3, which is discussed below. However, the Ionians' indirect speech at 3.31, also discussed below, is one of two indirect speeches that closely follow

Teutiaplus' direct speech at 3.30, moreover these indirect speeches respond to each other as well as the direct speech.

As for Lang's third example, Brasidas' mid-battle exhortations in indirect discourse to the captains and pilots of Spartan and allied ships at Pylos at 4.11. 4 appeal to separate groups (i.e. here we also find not one speech, but two).[13] The theme of his exhortations, namely to spare no effort to land, certainly responds to Demosthenes' argument at 4.10 that the Athenians' main task is to stand fast and prevent the Spartans from landing. But are Brasidas' exhortations set in indirect discourse because of their relation to Demosthenes' theme? Or is it not rather the case, as Lang herself might otherwise argue, that they are placed in indirect discourse so as not to impede the dramatic flow of the battle narrative, in which Brasidas himself will shortly faint from his wounds (4.12.1)?

In reference to the fourth example, Lang has forgotten that the Athenians answer the Spartan speech of 4.17–20 at 4.21.3, but Cleon himself answers at 4.22.2, so that this is an example of two short indirect statements by two different speakers answering a direct speech, not an example of a speech pair. As for Brasidas in Thrace (the fifth example), his commands in indirect discourse at 4.128.1 follow his speech at 4.126, but by chapter 128 the action has taken over, so that the indirect statements are entirely embedded in the immediate circumstances of the battle story. For me, this is another example in which indirect discourse is employed so as not to hinder the swiftness of a highly dramatic narrative; and are there speech pairs in which both speeches are spoken by the same speaker? Finally, the sixth example, in which Lang argues that Brasidas' commands at 5.10.5 answer his speech at 5.9, another example in which a speaker is supposed to answer himself, is further complicated by the fact that the beginning of Brasidas' short speech at 5.10.5 is in indirect discourse, but the final sentence in direct discourse.

The attempt to compel direct and indirect speeches into purposefully opposed pairs has not worked very well, then, for this reviewer. However, we do have the cases of Archidamus' speech at 2.11, answered by Pericles' indirect speech at 2.13, and it is also useful briefly to review the speeches at 3.30–2, particularly as a number of Lang's examples show a pattern of several indirect responses to a direct speech. To discuss these first: At 3.30 Teutiaplus of Elis advises the Spartan commander Alcidas, in direct discourse, to attack Mytilene immediately, before the victorious Athenians settle in. Thucydides records that Alcidas was not persuaded (3.31.1). Then the Ionians advise Alcidas, in indirect discourse, to foment a revolt against Athens among the Ionians (3.31.1). Thucydides again records that Alcidas was

---

[13] Here Lang may have been misled by a rare dubious comma after ἐκέλευε (the second verb of speaking in this passage) in the OCT.

not persuaded, and explains Alcidas' view that the Spartans, having come too late to do anything about Mytilene, should return home as soon as possible (3.31.2).

In the next sentence, Thucydides describes how the Spartans now put to sea, but stop at an obscure port to put to death their prisoners of war (1.32.1). Alcidas then hears a highly ironic speech in indirect discourse, since the Samians tell him that this is no way to free the Greeks, and warn him about the consequences of his behaviour (3.32.2). This speech receives a positive response: Thucydides explicitly confirms that Alcidas modifies his behaviour as a result of the Samians' remarks (3.32.3).

Both the direct and the indirect speeches in this short passage are highly rhetorical. In direct discourse, Teutiaplus outlines the one possible chance still to act, and gives a vivid (and plausible) assessment of the disorder in a newly captured city; Alcidas' negative response to this speech arises from his fear of Athens' navy (cf. 3.33.1). The Ionians, whose speech is rendered indirectly, are much less realistic, if not actually disingenuous, in their description of the possibilities of raising a general rebellion against Athens. Both speeches receive the same immediate negative response; i.e. they have the same impact (or non-impact) on events.

The third speech, the second speech in indirect discourse, chastises Alcidas' cruelty to innocent victims of the war (cf. the narrator focalised explanations of 3.32.3), and receives a positive response in word and deed. This speech therefore corresponds more closely to Lang's conception of indirect speeches in Thucydides. However, it also shows close rhetorical connections to the surrounding narrative: Where we have just perceived that Alcidas cannot consider helping the Ionians revolt from Athens, the Samians' bitter joke, that he instead 'frees' his Ionian prisoners by executing them, binds the indirect speech of the Samians to that of the Ionians. 3.30–2 seems to comprise a short network of speeches. Teutiaplus' longer direct speech is vivid and realistic. The economical indirect speeches are highly rhetorical, the Ionian speech being an entirely too hopeful ploy, the Samian speech daring and ironic. The three speeches are closely bound together by the narrator's depictions of Alcidas' successive responses.

My interpretation of these speeches differs from Lang's, but might be consistent with Christoph Leidl's argument in *Stimmen der Geschichte*. Leidl analyses responses to the speeches in ancient histories. He posits that the historians recorded responses and reactions to the speeches both in order to bind them to the narrative context (237) and also to engage the reader in assessing the speech together with the character of the response it provokes (cf. esp. 248). Unlike Lang, and perhaps closer to the brief analysis offered above, he seems to draw no fundamental difference between direct and in-

direct speeches in regard to the responses they might receive (cf. esp. 237, n.5).

To move on to our final example. Archidamus' speech at 2.11 and Pericles' speech at 2.13 are both longish speeches, one in direct and the other in indirect discourse. Both are delivered by famous leaders, and both address the moment of final preparation for the war between Athens and Sparta. In the long run, both find persistent response: these speeches exercise a long term effect on the narrative, as both leaders' characters and policies are put to the test. This seems like a speech pair. Why is one in direct and the other in indirect discourse?

Archidamus' speech to his army does fall into the category of the *Feldherrnrede*, which is usually a direct speech. More puzzling is Pericles' speech at 2.13: of Pericles' four speeches, why is this one in indirect discourse? Lang is certainly right that the speech contains practical information. For Scardino, this is not unimportant, and he points out that the speech at 2.13 repeats much information from the speech at 1.140–4: he finds that speeches in indirect discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides frequently repeat material from direct speeches.[14] Other reasons why Pericles' speech at 2.13 is in indirect discourse are also possible, however, and formal considerations might be important. For instance, since Thucydides interrupts this speech three times with comments, it is possible that the speech is in indirect discourse partly in order to enable these interruptions.[15] As will be argued below, the versatility of indirect discourse for a variety of treatments and contexts seems to be one of its great advantages.

Pericles' speech in 2.13 seems to be a fairly unusual case of a lengthy free-standing speech in indirect discourse answering a speech in direct discourse. However, Scardino shows that somewhat lengthier speeches in *oratio obliqua* are more common in Thucydides than in Herodotus.[16] His survey of indirect discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides brings in a large number of examples; ultimately he argues that the speeches in indirect discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides distinguish themselves from the direct speeches through a more restricted thematic range, but not through less intense rhetorical elaboration. By contrast to Lang, he argues that the indirect speeches are fully functional speeches according to the aims Thucydides outlined in the *Redensatz* at 1.22.[17] Seen in this light, Thucydides' choice to represent

---

[14] Scardino (2012) 76–8, cf. 92.

[15] Cf. Foster (2010) 162–73.

[16] Scardino (2012) 93.

[17] Scardino (2012) 94.

Pericles' speech at 2.13 in indirect discourse is unusual, but not fundamentally foreign to his usual practices.

III

The principle that speeches in indirect discourse are fully functional speeches does not entail that direct and indirect discourse serve the same ends in the narrative. However, sometimes their uses may indeed be the same; both direct and indirect speeches serve a variety of functions in narrative context, some of which are very similar to each other. In terms of narrative functions, moreover, the indirect speeches seem to be more versatile than the conspicuous direct speeches.

This might be an important point. The indirect speeches in ancient historical narratives may be long, and set in conspicuous positions, like the opening speeches of Julius Caesar's *BG*, or very short and undistinguished, or anything in between. They can serve many functions, both as independent speeches, as coordinate and subordinate speeches bound into dialogues and speech networks, or as introductions or responses to direct speeches.[18] The pattern in which indirect discourse introduces direct discourse, and which Usher noticed had become so regular in Polybius, is, among a variety of other arrangements, also common in Herodotus and Thucydides.[19] On the other hand, Christoph Leidl notes that speeches in indirect discourse, like speeches in direct discourse, are often used to frame responses to direct speeches (Leidl 253). Indirect discourse, in other words, can be plugged in nearly anywhere the historian needs it.

To sum up: The effect of indirect discourse is a certain distance to the speaker, whose speech becomes the object of the narrator's report. Lang's fundamental observation that indirect discourse can more easily be integrated into the deeds and actions of a history seems quite valid: versatility has emerged as a key characteristic of indirect discourse, which fits into historical accounts wherever needed without causing the action to pause. By contrast, the usually longer direct speeches splice scenes and require a fundamental shift in grammar; we have so far paid no attention to the convenience of indirect discourse, which allows the historian to report a speech in a narrator focalised story without changing the basic grammatical structure of a prose account. This practical advantage already makes indirect discourse attractive for tightly composed action narratives.

---

[18] On the versatility of indirect discourse, cf. also Scardino (2012) 70.

[19] Cf. Scardino (2010) 41; id. (2012) 78–9.

To pass on to the final essay to be mentioned here, it is of note that the chronologically organised *Stimmen der Geschichte* volume provides ample evidence of the important influence of the historians upon one another. John Marincola's paper on historical *exempla* in the speeches in ancient historiography therefore appropriately closes the volume. Marincola distinguishes clearly between allusion and intertext ('whereas allusion thinks primarily in terms of individuals—an author intentionally calling to mind another author—intertextuality sees such relationships between texts as functions of discourse, readers, and texts in general …', 261–2). He makes a persuasive argument for careful attention to a type of allusion, namely the historical *exempla* found in the speeches of ancient historians, and which are yet another device for engaging the ancient audience in the historian's analysis.[20] Particularly valuable are his analyses of speech networks in which historical exempla are contested among the speakers and in which exempla come to represent ideas with which not only the speakers, but also the text-internal audience of the speeches, and the reader, may test their conceptions of history.

In *Stimmen der Geschichte* the speeches themselves (cf. Pausch 5–6), the responses to the speeches (e.g. Leidl 248), and as we just saw, the historical exempla in the speeches are each explained as devices for engaging the reader in the historians' argument, so that the volume as a whole sketches a detailed picture of the historians' enormous effort to draw readers into their accounts. It seems clear, moreover, that not only general readers, but also those most careful readers, namely subsequent historians, were deeply affected by this effort. I therefore modestly suggest adding a fourth guideline to Pausch's three opening suggestions (which were to analyse speeches in narrative context, take care for the differences between the historians, and keep the reader's responses in mind). If the speech and narrative context under analysis are formed partly by association with a previous narrative, this will surely be important for understanding the reader's range of responses, not to mention the character of the particular historical narrative. When analysing historiography and its speeches, whether direct or indirect, we might therefore also remind ourselves to remain alert for the historians' responses to other historians.

Ashland University   EDITH FOSTER
                                                         efoster@ashland.edu

---

[20] '… the meaning of *exempla* was not fixed; they were interactive and dynamic, and the audience (both contemporary and later) was expected to evaluate their appropriateness and utility' (287).

STIMMEN DER GESCHICHTE
Table of Contents

THUCYDIDEAN NARRATIVE AND DISCOURSE
Table of Contents, listing only chapters published in 2011 for the first time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Foster, E. (2010) *Thucydides, Pericles, and Periclean Imperialism* (Cambridge).

Laird, A. (1999) *Powers of Expression, Expression of Powers: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford).

Lendon, J. E. (2009) 'Historians without History: Against Roman Historiography', in A. Feldherr, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge) 41–62.

Marincola, J. (2007), 'Speeches in Classical Historiography', in id., ed. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) 118–32.

Scardino, C. (2012) 'Indirect Discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides', in E. Foster and D. Lateiner, edd. *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford), 67–96.

Usher, S. (2009), '*Oratio Recta* and *Oratio Obliqua* in Polybius', *GRBS* 49: 487–514.