EMBEDDED SPEECH AND THE EMBODIED SPEAKER IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY*

Abstract: This paper considers the presentation of speech performance in Roman historiography. It proposes the use of media theory to analyse the different medial elements of performed speech in Roman rhetorical culture. It identifies traces of performance in written speech and how similar traces are exploited in the historian's composition of speeches and narrative frames to speech. These traces are analysed as instances of 'intermediality' which help to present speech as a form of historical action. The implications of this for history as a written and a recited text are briefly reviewed.

Keywords: *actio*, intermediality, Livy, media, rhetoric, Sallust, Tacitus

His atrocioribusque, credo, aliis, quae praesens rerum indignitas haudquaquam relatu scriptoribus facilia subicit, memoratis …

Having recalled these things and others still worse, I believe, which the present sense of injustice suggested to him, but which are not at all easy for writers to represent … (Livy 1.59.11)

Livy's comment on the speech of Brutus the Liberator points to a component in speech performance which lies beyond narrative.[1] It has prompted me to think again about how we approach speeches in historiography and what we think they refer to. However 'fictional' the speech and however speculative Livy's conjecture about what Brutus must have said, the historian points to a reality lying behind his narrative of which he and his readers were fully aware: the nature and practice of rhetoric and the oral delivery of speech. In order to think about this further, in the following pages

---

[1] Wiseman (2009) sees this as a reference to a historical play performed in Livy's youth.

I review briefly the current interpretative methodologies for analysing speech in historiography (§ I), I explore the potential of media theory for thinking about the delivery of speech (§ II), and I turn to the concept of 'intermediality' to identify traces of speech delivery in historiography (§ III). Finally, I briefly consider how the balance between speech delivery and written narrative is maintained in the presentation of historical text and the recitation of history (§§ IV and V).

I. The State of Speech in Historiography

The practice in ancient historiography of including speeches (in indirect or direct discourse)[2] is so common that it practically constitutes an identifying feature of the genre.[3] Cicero's very brief account of historiography in *Orator* gives sufficient weight to the presence of narrative, description, and speech (*Orat.* 66):

> in qua [sc. historia] et narratur ornate et regio saepe aut pugna describitur; interponuntur etiam contiones et hortationes.

> in history there is elaborate narrative and frequent descriptions of countries and battles; also included are public speeches and speeches of encouragement.

This practice has generated extensive discussion among readers of modernity who are concerned with what they see as the degree of invention employed by the historiographers in their composition of these speeches.[4] Discussions of this sort have generally revolved around Thucydides' programmatic statement about how he will render speech (including but not exclusively formal speeches) given the difficulty of remembering the precise words. Debates have for the most part focussed on what exactly Thucydides means by 'saying the things most necessary in the circumstances' and how this can be reconciled with 'keeping as closely as possible to the general purport of what truly was said'.[5] In other words, what concerns many readers is the *content* of Thucydides' speeches: content in the sense of both the arguments and the words used in his

---

[2] On direct and indirect discourse see especially Laird (1999); de Bakker–de Jong (2022a) 3–14.

[3] As Marincola (2010) 259 observes, ancient protests at the inclusion of speeches in historiography are generally made on stylistic grounds.

[4] Woodman (1988); Laird (1999) 116–21; Marincola (2010).

[5] I have used the translation of Laird (1999) 144. For an overview of the issues, Pelling (2022) 22–9.

speeches, and by extension the speeches of other historical writers. And the stakes of this debate are, at the very least, what we can make of historiography's claim to represent the actions of the past if some of these actions are partially invented. The degree to which this engenders anxiety in a reader directly correlates to their belief in an objective past which can be accessed through discourse. The status of speeches in historiography becomes a test case for the veracity of ancient historiography.

More recently scholars have approached this question through formalist and especially narratological analysis, and have productively shifted the question from the content of the speech to the voice of the speaker.[6] Andrew Laird initiated this approach by putting pressure on the implicit distinction between indirect and direct discourse: he challenges the assumption that direct discourse *formally* signals greater authenticity and veracity.[7] Indeed, Laird advocates for speeches having an equivalent status to narrative in their capacity to render rather than exactly reproduce the past. As he says,

> Utterances and events have an equal existential status in the world of objective reality … Thus an utterance is as open as an 'event' is to manipulation by a historian.[8]

More recent narratological approaches to speeches in narrative have acknowledged the higher stakes of historiography. The narratological interest in focalisation and narrative voice reframes the debate by asking of the speeches not 'is this exactly what was said' but rather 'whose point of view is presented'? In their recent volume *Speeches in Ancient Greek Literature*, de Bakker and de Jong point to formal elements which enable the reader to perceive the 'deictic centre' of a speech—a term borrowed from linguistics to denote the way pronouns, verbal tense, and other features are mobilised to emanate from a first-person speaker.[9] In historiography, as in other narratives of the past where the 'here' of the speaker has become the 'there' of the narrator and reader, speeches allow the re-introduction of the 'here' perspective.[10] In this way the historian can present the past as it is shaped and rendered.[11] To illustrate what can be gained from a focus on deixis and focalisation, let us examine the opening sentences from Livy of Hannibal's speech to his men

---

[6] Pausch (2010a) introduces the issues.

[7] Laird (1999) 136–8; reliance on this formal distinction returns in de Bakker–de Jong (2022a) 5–6.

[8] Laird (1999) 150; cf. Pitcher (2022a) 272.

[9] de Bakker–de Jong (2022a) 7–10; for linguistics background, Edmunds (2008).

[10] Edmunds (2008) calls this 'deictic shift' while de Bakker–de Jong (2022a) refer to 'downshift'.

[11] Compare the comments of Wiater (2010) 77–8 on Polybius.

before the battle of Ticinus in 218 BC.[12] The speech commences after Hannibal has staged the spectacle of various Gallic captives eagerly participating in single combat to win their freedom (21.43.2–5):[13]

> Si, quem animum in alienae sortis exemplo paulo ante habuistis, eundem mox in aestimanda fortuna vestra habueritis, vicimus, milites; neque enim spectaculum modo illud sed quaedam veluti imago vestrae condicionis erat. ac nescio an maiora vincula maioresque necessitates vobis quam captivis vestris fortuna circumdederit: <u>dextra laevaque</u> duo maria claudunt nullam ne ad effugium quidem navem habentes; <u>circa</u> Padus amnis—maior Padus ac violentior Rhodano; <u>ab tergo</u> Alpes urgent, vix integris vobis ac vigentibus transitae. <u>hic</u> vicendum aut moriendum, milites, est, ubi primum hosti occurristis.

> If you will presently show the spirit that you just recently showed when spectating the fates of other men, then, soldiers, we are the victors; for that was no mere spectacle but a kind of projection of your own condition. I would think, perhaps, that your fortune has placed you in heavier chains and more pressing difficulties than your captives: <u>to your right and left</u> two seas shut you in, and you have no ship to help you escape; <u>around you</u> is the river Po—a Po greater and more fast-flowing than the Rhone; <u>behind you</u> the Alps loom over you, mountains which you barely got across when you were fit and full of strength. <u>Here</u> you must conquer or die, soldiers, here where you have first come up against the enemy.

This is a speech where visuality is consciously deployed, hence it is dense with deictic markers which situate the addressees in a precise geographical location: *dextra laevaque … circa … ab tergo … hic*. These location markers have a strong persuasive function, as they bottle Hannibal's soldiers up and point them at the oncoming Romans. What is also evident in this evocation of place is that the speaker positions the addressees in the time and place of their own experiences:[14] the Po which flows around them is compared with the Rhône which they remember navigating; the Alps which tower over them are the same mountains which nearly broke them in the crossing. Thus a strong sense is evoked of the presence of *these* soldiers in *this* particular experience of the north Italian landscape. At the same time, of course, these deictic markers

---

[12] My reading of this passage is greatly indebted to the essays of Pitcher ((2022a), (2022b), & (2022c)).

[13] Feldherr (1998) 97–9 on duels as spectacles to inspire emulation.

[14] In that respect, the trope works as a form of *enargeia* 'by activating images already stored in the listener's mind' (Webb (2009) 127).

resonate with the reader's recollection of the army's journey as it has been narrated by Livy in the preceding chapters. The climactic *hic* which situates the soldiers as addressees facing the necessity of their time and place is therefore provocatively overlaid with the reader's retrospective understanding of this point as the first of a sequence of successful engagements against the Roman army.[15] What the reader can also appreciate is that behind the apparently neutral placement of the soldiers in their current straits is the directive will of the speaker himself: Hannibal, whose drive and desire for vengeance has brought the soldiers to this pass—*hic*.

Deixis in this instance, then, conveys a strong sense of the presence of a speech event in a particular place and time without dissolving awareness of the narrative context from which it emerges. But we can also more firmly attribute these features to Livy as author by comparing this speech with Polybius' version.[16] Here too the staged combat between captives is consciously deployed as a trope to encourage the men, but Polybius' Hannibal never draws his audience's eyes away from that prefatory display. After a similar explanation of the exemplary function of the spectacle, Hannibal breaks into direct speech (Pol. 3.63.3):

εἰς παραπλήσιον γὰρ <u>αὐτοὺς</u> ἀγῶνα καὶ καιρὸν τὴν τύχην συγκεκλεικέναι καὶ παραπλήσια <u>τοῖς</u> νῦν ἆθλα προτεθεικέναι.

Fortune has constrained you into <u>the same kind</u> of struggle and critical moment that they have faced, and now sets before you a prize for combat equivalent <u>to theirs</u>.

The deictic markers here—αὐτούς, τοῖς—refer back to the captives, compelling the audience to reflect on what they have just seen and its similarities to their own situation.[17] The sense of place is implicit in the phrase 'Fortune has constrained you …',[18] but it is devoid of any markers which evoke the presence of speaker and audience in that place. Livy has taken the potential inherent in the verb συγκεκλεικέναι and has expanded it so as to convey the particular experience of being precisely *there* at precisely *that* time.

For readers who want to establish a firm connection with a specific speech event in the past, this kind of 'rhetorical embellishment' might seem like an

[15] Pausch (2010b) more extensively reviews evocations of the past in both Hannibal's and Scipio's speeches.

[16] For larger-scale differences between the two authors' treatment of the pre-battle speeches, Levene (2010) 272–3.

[17] Wiater (2010) 80–3 comments on the metanarrative effects of Hannibal's words.

[18] Levene (2010) 285–9 on Fortuna in speeches reflecting each historian's view of a battle's unpredictability.

obstacle to understanding. But another way of looking at this is to say that each author in his own way is attempting to make the speech present as an event or action in the past.[19] And a reason for this would be—to return to Laird's analysis—that speech is a significant medium of historical action. Not just what is said, but how it is said and how *persuasively* it is said, is a proper object of historical inquiry. Cicero, in his review of the history of oratory, makes the case for the centrality of speech to movements of history, and incidentally for the need to reconstruct imaginatively the presence and quality of speech in the past (*Brut.* 52–6):

> But let us turn to our own early orators, about whom it is difficult to know any more than can be <u>surmised</u> from the records (*de quibus difficile est plus intellegere quam quantum ex monumentis <u>suspicari</u> licet*). For who would believe that the originator of your noble line, L. Brutus, was not quick-witted? … who drove out an extremely powerful king, son of a most illustrious king, and regulated the state—freed as it was from permanent despotism—with annual magistrates, laws, and courts; who repudiated the authority of his own colleague so that he could cast off from the state the very memory of the royal name; which could certainly not have been achieved unless there had been persuasion through oratory (*quod certe effici non potuisset, nisi esset oratione persuasum*). In the same way we see … when the plebs had taken up position at the third milestone near the bank of Anio and had occupied that place called the Sacred Mount, the dictator M. Valerius settled their discord by speaking (*dicendo sedavisse discordias*) … Nor do I <u>think</u> that L. Valerius Potitus lacked ability in speaking (*ne … <u>arbitror</u> non aliquid potuisse dicendo*), who calmed the plebs when they were aroused against the patricians during the general ill-feeling against the decemvirs, by means of his laws and his public addresses (*contionibus suis*). We can <u>surmise</u> that Appius Claudius was skilled in speaking (*possumus Appium Claudium <u>suspicari</u> disertum*), since he brought the senate back to their senses after they were beginning to favour peace with Pyrrhus; we can surmise the same about C. Fabricius, since he was sent as a speaker (*missus orator*) to Pyrrhus to negotiate for the return of captives … We can <u>surmise</u> something even of M. Popilius' ability (*licet aliquid etiam … <u>suspicari</u>*), who when he was consul and was once performing the public sacrifice in his robe as flamen Carmentalis, hearing of a disturbance and dissent of the plebs against the patricians, he came into the public assembly just as he was, clad in his robe, and settled their dissent with his priestly authority and with his speech (*cum auctoritate tum oratione sedavit*). But I do not think that I have ever read

---

[19] Pausch (2010a) 5–8.

anything which told me that these men were considered to be orators
or that there was any reward for eloquence; I am led only by <u>conjecture</u>
to <u>surmise</u> this (*tantum modo <u>coniectura</u> ducor ad <u>suspicandum</u>*).

Cicero's primary point is that the art of rhetoric was not fully developed in
early Rome.[20] But as he argues for the existence of effective speech in the past,
he provides a methodology for its recovery. Three activities are linked by the
repeated terms of this passage: historical action (driving out kings, settling
discord, forging agreements); speech which motivates action (*oratione*/*dicendo* in
the instrumental ablative); and the supposition of the reader (*suspicari*/*coniectura*)
which makes the connection between the recorded historical action and lost
eloquence. Cicero as reader[21] is only one step away from the historian who not
only surmises but even supplies the missing speech. And the grounds on which
Cicero or the historian can justify such suppositions and supplementations is
their expertise in rhetoric.

II. The Media of Speech and Narrative

Thus far I have argued that more formalist approaches to speeches in
historiography have enabled us to recover why speeches are important for
historical understanding. But even from formalist or stylistic perspectives there
can be discerned a friction or change of texture between narrative or speech
which distinguishes the two discourses and enables Cicero, for instance, to
speak of speeches being 'included' (*interponuntur*) in the historical narrative.[22]
The approach to such inclusions that I want to explore for the rest of this paper
is by way of media theory; what happens when we consider speech not as a
different genre or as distinguished stylistically but as a different medium? Such
an approach, I believe, defamiliarises the subject in productive ways by

---

[20] Suetonius makes a similar about the study of grammar in early Rome (*Gramm. et Rhet.*
1), but his account highlights what is distinctive about Cicero's argument, which is that he
conjectures rhetorical excellence from the records of political action.

[21] As Kaster (2020) 64 n. 72 points out, Cicero's conjectures are likely drawn from early
annalistic history. Cf. Douglas (1966) 38–9 for the choice of historical exempla.

[22] Cf. the stylistic analysis of Dangel (1982). As Rhiannon Ash has pointed out to me, this
definition implies that speeches are 'detachable' from the historical narrative, an
implication borne out in the practice of excerpting speeches from historiography. The best
example we have from Rome is the surviving extracts from Sallust's *Histories* (but I am also
convinced by Ash's suggestion that Pliny's excerption of Livy (Plin. *Ep.* 6.20.5) could have
been focussed on speeches). As I will argue later in this paper, intermedial references to
speech performance are more widely disseminated in narrative, embedding the speech
more deeply and resisting its excerption. See, for example, my discussion of Sall. *Hist.*
2.43.1a, below, § III.

offering some tenets of media theory which provide new perspectives. First, there is the well-known soundbite of Marshall McLuhan: 'the medium is the message'.[23] Subsequent media scholars have reiterated that a medium cannot be assumed to be a neutral carrier of information or meaning.[24] The focus on the *content* of speeches in historiography has often proceeded on the assumption that it makes little difference whether the medium of that content is an oral performance or a written text. Instead, focussing on what is 'media-specific' about each mode of communication enables us to see what is distinctive about it. It also helps us to appreciate the ways in which one specific medium can be referenced or alluded to in another. For instance (and to adumbrate my later argument) the oral delivery of speech involves an encounter with a moving, sounding body which is one media-specific element of performed oratory. In an encounter with written text, on the other hand, the sound and movement of the body can only be alluded to or represented.[25] Meanwhile, the media-specific element of ink marks on a surface, which is distinctive to writing, can be represented or gestured towards as an object in speech performance.[26] In the following section, I will re-examine ancient oratory as an embodied performance in space and time which is subsequently transformed into a written text. The complex mediality of oratory, then, shapes and determines the meaning(s) it conveys.

The second insight afforded by media theory is the possibility of conceiving of media in both very precise and very capacious terms, encompassing material phenomena as well as broad socio-historical contexts. The precision of media theory is exemplified in the way various theorists have articulated various modes and aspects of media which enables an almost Lucretian focus on the self-effacing elements at the medial interface. Sybille Krämer in *Medium, Messenger, Transmission* invites us to consider the light waves on a colour spectrum which enable us to see a canary,[27] while Lars Elleström breaks down the 'material modality' of theatre into 'a combination of several interfaces: sound waves, surfaces that are both flat and not flat and that have both a changing and static character, and also the very specific corporeal interface of human bodies.'[28] The capacity of media theory, on the other hand, lies in its redefinition of social context not just as a field within which media operate but

---

[23] McLuhan (1964) 7.

[24] For example, Krämer (2015) 27–30.

[25] Cf. Rajewsky (2005) 55: 'an intermedial reference can only generate an *illusion* of another medium's specific practices.' Tischer (2019) draws on Rajewsky to analyse the orality of quotations in Roman prose.

[26] Butler (2002).

[27] Krämer (2015) 31.

[28] Ellström (2010) 17.

as a medium in its own right. Pantelis Michelakis, exploring how the metaphor 'medium as environment' informs conceptions of media, explains:

> What sustains the flight of Homer's winged/feathered words … is not just their 'wings/feathers'…, nor simply their path from a speaker to an addressee who 'speaks the same language'. Even in face-to-face inter-actions, such words simultaneously traverse the 'ether' not only of heroic *kleos* but also of epic performance, technical bardic memory, cultural memory, and imagination. Conversely, without Homer's winged words, such a complex environment would not simply be different; it would cease to exist.[29]

Together, the complexity of this medial environment and the detailed exposition of material interfaces outlined above enable theorists to identify multiple media operating in an individual work. The final insight we can draw from media theory is that there is no such thing as a 'pure' medium and that text, image, sculpture, and performance all manifest multi-medial qualities to a greater or lesser degree. Ancient oratory, like theatre, appears as distinctly multi-medial, in that we can refer to it as both a cultural practice and a textual work. Looking more closely at the different modes employed in oratory will help us to observe what aspects distinguish it from written narrative, and where there are points of convergence.

As I indicated above, we can think of oratory as embodied performance in space and time which is subsequently transformed into written text. The embodied performance involves the media of (i) sound, (ii) physical gesture, (iii) three-dimensional space, and (iv) the responsive presence of an audience.[30]

(i) The medium of sound in oratory is evaluated by volume, pitch and register, and the conformity of these to the meaning of the orator's words. As Shane Butler has observed, the qualitative vocabulary for vocal sound is defamiliarising and often synaesthetic:[31] terms like *acutus* and *gravis* (Cic. *Orat.* 56; Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.17) convey tangible as much as acoustic effects. Technical instructions on the production of vocal tone draw attention to the human body

---

[29] Michelakis (2020) 5. From this perspective it is possible to annul the distinction drawn by Johnson (2013) 120 between the medium of the bookroll and the complex social system within which it is read. Rather, conversations about books, readings silent or aloud from bookrolls, and conceptions of the literary all operate as interdependent medial environments. On media technologies, community, and (mis)communication, see Peters (1999).

[30] My discussion of these elements has benefitted from the analyses of *actio* by Cavarzere (2011), Hall (2014), and Balbo (2018).

[31] Butler (2015) 135–40.

which generates sonic vibration.[32] Quintilian articulates the bodily techniques 'necessary for achieving not only sweetness of voice but also that the nostrils, through which the overflow of the voice is carried away, are sweet-sounding' (*opus est … non oris modo suavitate, sed narium quoque, per quas quod superest vocis egeritur, dulcis sit, Inst.* 11.3.16). Meanwhile the emphasis on breath shows implicit awareness of the 'airwaves' along which the orator communicates. Instructions on care of the voice which extend to an entire regimen of diet, exercise, and sexual abstinence[33] reinforce the importance of the orator's body at the same time as they extend the performance of oratory into the performance of everyday life.[34] This is only one of the ways that oratory as a medium both transmits and is transmitted through the environmental media which constitute oratory as a high-status skill. We see this in the continuous application of decorum at different levels of the performance: the volume and pitch of voice must be appropriate to the words spoken, while the variations of pitch and the degree of rhythm is measured against adjacent modes of speech. Several authors position oratory closer to or further from song, depending on the style espoused by individual speakers. While Cicero identifies 'a sort of muffled singing in speech' (*etiam in dicendo quidam cantus obscurior, Orat.* 57),[35] authors from the younger Seneca onwards decry a lack of restraint in employing rhythm and pitch.[36] The terms *cantare* and *canticum* come to denote a media boundary between two kinds of performance—oratory and acting— a boundary restated by its associations with the performances of gender and social status.[37] This nexus of associations reinforces the tenet that oratory—as befits its generation in the body—should derive from 'natural' speech. Whether chant is adopted or avoided, the oratorical performance takes ordinary speech[38] to a heightened pitch of self-awareness: from *sermo* to *eloquentia*, conscious excellence in speaking.

(ii) Consideration of vocal sound has already shown the orators' acute awareness of their bodies as vehicles of *eloquentia*. Physical gesture, explicitly

---

[32] For the body of Crassus in Cicero *de Oratore*, Möller (2010).

[33] Gleason (1995).

[34] Cicero's account of how he modified his own body through constant exercise so as to develop a more authoritative (and less debilitating) vocal range: *Brut.* 313–16. Cf. Bishop (2019) 204–6.

[35] Also the elder Seneca recalls 'chanting Fuscus' expositions, each one of us employing a different pitch and rhythm': *has explicationes Fusci, quas nemo nostrum non alias alia inclinatione vocis velut sua quisque modulatione cantabat, Suas.* 2.10) Cf. Edward (1928) 108–9.

[36] Sen. *Ep.* 114.1; Plin. *Ep.* 2.14.13; Tac. *Dial.* 26.3.

[37] Gleason (1995) 111–21, Markus (2000) 141–4.

[38] Cic. *Orat.* 64 on the difference between philosophical *sermo* and oratorical *eloquentia*.

characterised as the *eloquentia corporis* (Cic. *de Orat.* 3.222), extends that aware-ness into the visual and kinetic.[39] These modes of performance are convention-ally summed up as *vox, vultus, gestus*,[40] and the detailed typologies of posture and movement presented by Quintilian provide an insight into the technologies of the body required for this part of oratory. Discussions of gesture and other non-verbal expressions emphasise their subordination to the ideas and arguments of the speech, the necessity for propriety, and the avoidance of mimesis as the domain of the actor or the pantomime dancer. This last injunction places gesture in a delicate position where it must correspond to the sense or meaning of the words without replicating either the words or the rhythm. As Cicero's Crassus elaborates (Cic. *de Orat.* 3.220),

> omnes autem hos motus subsequi debet gestus, non hic verba exprimens scenicus sed universam rem et sententiam non demonstratione sed significatione declarans.

> Gesture, however, must track all these emotions, not reproducing the words as an actor would, but revealing the whole subject matter and the sense, not by indication but by intimation.[41]

The injunction against mimesis is not purely to do with propriety or with the social difference between an actor and an orator.[42] Rather, it identifies gesture as an independent but not incoherent medial element within the whole multi-medial configuration of the speech performance. It is clear from the phrase *significatione declarans* that gesture communicates, and that it signifies meaning through conventionally agreed understanding of bodily movement.[43] By insisting that gesture does not reproduce words, Cicero and others place gesture alongside words as vehicles of meaning. Thus, even though elsewhere in rhetorical treatises we see language as the dominant medium of oratory, there is still a sense that the non-verbal media offer something which cannot be fully subsumed into language.

---

[39] Quintilian's introduction of gesture places it alongside pictures and dance as non-verbal media of communication. (*Inst.* 11.3.66–7) For gesture in Roman cultural life see Corbeill (2004) and in politics Aldrete (1999).

[40] For instance, [Cic.] *ad Her.* 3.19; Cic. *de Orat.* 3.216; Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.8; also, Plin. *Pan.* 67.

[41] Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.89: *gestus ad sensus magis quam ad verba accommodatus.*

[42] The distinction and its perpetual ambiguities are interrogated by Gunderson (2000) 111–48.

[43] Elleström (2010) 22–3 provides a useful framework in his formulation of the 'semiotic modality' of media, where he distinguishes between 'convention (symbolic signs), resemblance (iconic signs), and contiguity (indexical signs)'.

(iii) Voice and gesture together constitute the body as medium and set it moving through three-dimensional space. While space is one of the conditions for sound to act as a medium,[44] sound also works as 'a medium of spatial functionality':[45] the shape and architecture of the Forum disseminates the orator's performance, but the performance and experience of oratory also plays a significant role in constituting the Forum *as* Forum. The well-known anecdote about Porcius Latro, the finest declaimer of his day, who found himself unable to perform in the open space of the forum, is usually told to illustrate the degeneracy of declamation. But the reference to the speaker's need for 'ceiling and walls' and his request to transfer the court from the forum into a basilica attests to an established vocal practice which relies on the acoustics of a more confined space.[46] It points towards a closer connection between the orator's body and the space of speaking, which becomes an extension of the instrument producing sound. The space of speaking is also the stage for the orator's bodily performance, and that performative element can be extended to the orator's arrival at court, forum, or basilica. Tacitus has Marcus Aper include among the other pleasures of practising oratory the experience of arriving at the forum with one's entourage and rising to speak, suggesting that this is more regularly conceived of as part of the orator's performance (*Dial.* 6.4):[47]

> iam vero qui togatorum comitatus et egressus, quae in publico species, quae in iudiciis veneratio, quod illud gaudium consurgendi assistendique inter tacentes et in unum conversos, coire populum et circumfundi coram et accipere adfectum quemcumque orator induerit!

> Then indeed, with what a company of toga-clad men the orator steps out, what a showing he makes in public, with what deference he is received in the court, what supreme joy he feels in rising and taking up his position before a silent audience focussed entirely upon him, how pleasing it is that the people gather and circulate around him and take on whatever emotion the orator assumes!

---

[44] Nelis-Clément (2008); O'Gorman (2018).

[45] Holter–Muth–Schwesinger (2019) 45.

[46] … *nec ante potuisse confirmari <tectum> ac parietem desiderantem quam impetravit ut iudicium ex foro in basicilam transferretur.* Sen. *Contr.* 9 *pr.* 3; Quint. *Inst.* 10.5.17–18 imagines that the declaimer prefers the shade of the basilica; cf. Corbeill (2020) 129 on the greater range of vocal register permitted in the enclosed space.

[47] Tac. *Dial.* 6.4; cf. O'Gorman (2020) 116–18.

(iv) The audience itself becomes a necessary, not incidental, aspect of the oratorical performance. It is striking that Cicero, speaking of this, uses the analogy of the musician (*Brut.* 192):

> ut, si tibiae <u>inflatae</u> non referant sonum, abiciendas eas sibi tibicen putet, sic oratori populi aures tamquam tibiae sunt; eae si <u>inflatum</u> non recipiunt … agitandi finis faciendus est.

> If a wind instrument does not produce a sound when he <u>blows</u> into it, the instrumentalist realises that it will have to be thrown away. In the same way the ears of the people are like a wind instrument to the orator; if they do not receive the air <u>blown</u> into them … the orator must give up trying to persuade them.

Later Cicero uses the figure of the lyre player to make the same point, where striking the lyre strings is the equivalent of moving the hearers' emotions (*Brut.* 199):

> Ut enim ex nervorum sono in fidibus quam scienter et <u>pulsi</u> sint intellegi solet, sic ex animorum motu cernitur quid <u>tractandis</u> his perficiat orator.

> Just as it is possible to tell from the sound of the strings on a harp how skilfully they have been <u>struck,</u> so it can be discerned from the emotion of the audience's minds what the orator achieves in <u>manipulating</u> them.

What is significant about both these analogies is how the connection between orator and audience is conceived in terms of bodily contact—indeed with those very body parts already regulated and set in motion for the oratorical performance: breath and hands. This perhaps suggests that we could extrapolate the audience as another extension of the orator's body[48] in parallel with the extension of the orator's body into physical and social space explored earlier. Recent work on performance studies in theatre has elucidated how 'the specific mediality of performance consists of the bodily co-presence of actors and spectators'.[49] Whereas the concept of the audience as equivalent to a musician's instrument renders them passive, the perspective of performance studies emphasises the activity of the audience; even a silent audience submits to the rules of performance by their silence and their presence. In Tacitus' *Dialogus* quoted above we see the active co-presence of the audience in the terms of their description—*tacentes … in unum conversos, coire … circumfundi …*

---

[48] When I say 'extensions' I'm alluding to Marshall McLuhan's (1964) canonical definition of media as 'the extensions of man'.

[49] Fischer-Lichte (2008) 38: this is to distinguish live from recorded theatre performance.

accipere adfectum—each activity reciprocating and thereby accomplishing the orator's performance.

These four categories of media go some way towards disentangling the complex multi-mediality of speech performance. Its boundaries extend and merge into other media—acting, dance, architecture, and the 'life medium' of everyday communication—as well as into the 'environmental medium' of the Roman social collective. The final dimension to oratory can be found in the cultural expectation that an orator will, after or even instead of performing his speech, write it up and circulate it as a self-standing text[50]—a practice which the perspective of media may help to defamiliarise in our minds. It shows us that Roman oratory is not only multi-medial when it is delivered orally, but is also transmedial in that it is conceived as a discourse which is disseminated through different, independently existing media.[51] When a speech is transformed into a written text all the performance elements of oratory are (it seems) filtered out,[52] prioritising words as the vehicle of the speech's full content. Since voice and gesture are supposed to follow (but not replicate) meaning—which is explicitly conveyed by words—it might seem that the medium of writing preserves what is most important about a speech.[53] It is also what ensures the dissemination across time of what is otherwise a one-off event—a matter of some importance to Cicero in *Brutus*.[54] It also brings oratory closer to narrative and thereby facilitates its inclusion in historical narrative.

But what we also find in ancient rhetorical writing is a degree of anxiety about what is lost in this translation across media. This anxiety is expressed by writers who feel that the written speeches do not fully convey what was exceptional and persuasive about speakers in the past. In Cicero's *Brutus* the orator Galba is unable to translate into writing the force of intellect and emotion which he displayed so effectively in his delivery.[55] More than a century later Quintilian observes that Hortensius' written speeches do not seem to justify the praise Cicero bestows on his oratory (*Inst.* 11.3.8).

> … eius [*sc.* Hortensi] scripta tantum infra famam sunt … ut appearat
> placuisse aliquid eo dicente quod legentes non invenimus. et hercule
> cum valeant multum verba per se et vox propriam vim adiciat rebus et

---

[50] La Bua (2019) 33–47.

[51] Rajewsky (2005) 5.

[52] As we will see in below and in § III, traces of performance elements remain in both published oratory and the speeches of historiography.

[53] Quintilian finds it difficult to maintain his initial claim that spoken and written speeches should be exactly the same: *Inst.* 12.10.49–57.

[54] Butler (2015) 176–8.

[55] Cic. *Brut.* 91–4.

gestus motusque significet <u>aliquid</u>, profecto <u>perfectum quiddam</u> fieri cum omnia coierunt necesse est.

Hortensius' written speeches fall so far short of his reputation … that there clearly must have been <u>something</u> pleasing in the speeches when he delivered them that we do not find when we read them. Indeed, since words have considerable effect in themselves, and the voice adds <u>its own specific force</u> to the subject matter, and gesture and movement intimate <u>something</u>, then it must follow that when they all come together it must create <u>something perfect</u>.

There is a strong sense here of speech performance as multi-medial and of each component as media-specific, in the way that voice and gesture each add their particular dimension, the *aliquid* which is felt to be missing when reading the written speech.[56] The sense that the written speech lacks something corresponds structurally to Cicero's sense that the historical actors of early Rome must have been good orators. In both cases the reader perceives gaps in a written text which must be supplemented by the reader's supposition about an element which evades the medium of writing. Cicero supposes that early Romans were eloquent speakers because of the changes they effected in their world; Quintilian supposes that Hortensius' delivery was what secured his reputation as Rome's second finest orator.

   This kind of reaction to the written speech connects with other reading practices in antiquity which would tend to 'restore' some of the performance media of oratory. The evidence, for instance, that when reading aloud one was expected to render the correct pauses and emphases suggests that a reader—no less than a reciter—would be self-conscious about their breathing and perhaps even their vocal pitch.[57] Meanwhile, the Ciceronian speech would be learnt as an oral performance in school where breath marks and variation of tone would be memorised along with the words.[58] This practice is reflected in Quintilian's 'restoration' of vocal delivery to the opening of *Pro Milone*. Although he is dealing with the rewritten rather than the delivered speech, Quintilian maintains that each punctuation mark (*distinctio*) practically demands a change in facial expression. He goes on to supply 'performance notes', indicating the breath marks and variation of tone for the first section of the exordium. (*Inst.* 11.3.47–51) In a similar vein, Quintilian supplies the points

[56] Conversely, the written speech offers the orator an immortality which his performed speech can never achieve.

[57] See the discussion of Gell. *NA* 13.31 in Gavrilov (1997) and Johnson (2013) 109–11, who also reviews the textual markings inserted by readers to facilitate this. On recitation of epic, Markus (2000) and of tragedy, Bexley (2015).

[58] With thanks to Caroline Bishop for drawing this to my attention.

for slight changes of gesture in the opening sentence of *Pro Ligario*, though here he is remarking on the subtle error of gesturally marking the 'hidden stresses of language' (*Inst.* 11.3.108):

> … ut sit unus motus 'novum crimen,' alter 'C. Caesar', tertius 'et ante hanc diem', quartus 'non auditum', deinde 'propinquus meus' et 'ad te' et 'Q. Tubero' et 'detulit.'

> … so that there is one movement at 'novum crimen', another at 'C. Caesar', a third at 'et ante hanc diem', a fourth at 'non auditum', then 'propinquus meus', and 'ad te', and 'Q. Tubero', and 'detulit'.

In contrast to his detailed rendering of gesture earlier in the chapter, here Quintilian simply leaves the space for a gesture, simultaneously correcting his pupils' tendency to hold one pose for too long and their failure to recognise the number of beats in a sentence. The effect is to render the written speech permeable and to evoke the presence of one performance element without describing it. At the same time, it disrupts the written speech, interrupting it and carving it up into discrete phrases in a way that would, perhaps, be familiar to those who had learned the speech with breath marks and variations of tone. In order to show the missing medial elements of performed speech and the way that they conformed to the words of the written speech, then, there were established oral and written techniques which 'restored' those medial elements by opening up spaces within the speech-as-text. This is a phenomenon I will return to in a later section when considering the concept of intermedial representation through the 'fragmentation' of material in one or other medium.

III. Intermediality and the Historiographical Speech

Identifying what is 'media specific' about oratorical performance brings into focus the difficulties of rendering speech delivery in discursive prose. As the *auctor ad Herennium* observes, 'hardly anyone thinks it possible to write very clearly about vocal delivery, facial expression, or gesture, since these performance elements appeal to our senses.' (*omnes vix posse putarunt de voce et vultu et gestu dilucide scribi, cum eae res ad sensus nostros pertinerent*, [Cic.] *ad Her.* 3.19) This offers a way into thinking about the place of speeches in historiography as a media phenomenon and specifically an issue of intermediality. Although the term 'intermediality' is used slightly differently by different media theorists, it generally denotes something that happens between media.[59] In that sense,

---

[59] Rajewsky (2005); Hallet (2015); Dinter–Reitz-Joosse (2019b). My thanks to Martin Dinter for sharing his work with me.

we could call speech performance itself 'intermedial'; I have preferred to use the term 'multi-media' for speech performance and to reserve 'intermedial' for what happens when written narrative includes a written speech and (perhaps) evokes its delivery.[60]

Intermediality can be productive for thinking about historiographical speeches because it identifies the ways in which narrative conjures the sense of another medium. In this respect it differs from intertextuality, which generally requires the existence of a prior text whose presence is evoked. By contrast, intermediality can gesture towards, represent, or frame something whose prior existence or ontology is not so clearly established. In studies of the intermediality of inscriptions in ancient literary texts,[61] for example, various scholars have observed that a specific inscription does not have to exist 'out there' in the world beyond the text as a precondition for its intermedial presence in a literary work: this provides an immediate point of similarity with the status of speeches in historiography.

Recent work on intermediality in ancient texts has focussed almost exclusively on *ekphraseis* and quotations which give the impression that visual artworks or inscriptions are present in the text. Both of these phenomena draw attention to the evocation of visual and material media through narrative or description. By contrast, the shared medium of the written word between speech and narrative means that the markers of a media border are more subtle. Another strand of intermedial work which bears more directly on what we have seen about speech performance is the scholarship which focusses on multi-sensory dimensions of a literary text.[62] Since speech delivery, as the *auctor ad Herennium* observes, 'pertains to the senses', narrated speeches will employ intermedial markers which prompt sensory responses in the reader. This is facilitated by the way the ancient reader is attuned to 'restoring' performance elements, as outlined at the end of the last section.

The rhetorical treatises themselves point out some of the narrative strategies for evoking the sense of a delivered speech. Quintilian's observation that gesture stands in for adverbs and pronouns when pointing out places or people (*Inst.* 11.3.87) enables us to read gesture back into speech by focussing

---

[60] In Rajewsky's terms ((2005) 51–2), speech performance would be categorised as the subcategory of intermediality called 'media combination' and speech in historiography would be 'intermedial reference'; for Hallet (2015), they would be distinguished as 'overt' and 'covert' intermediality.

[61] These have been analysed by Martin Dinter for the Ovidian corpus, by Lydia Spielberg for Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus, and by Morgan Palmer for Livy and Augustus: Dinter (2019); Spielberg (2019); Palmer (2019).

[62] Stevens (2018), Ambühl (2019); Devereaux (2016) draws on cognitive theory to make important points about embodied understanding in historiography.

on the deictic elements which narratologists have already drawn attention to.[63]
Hannibal's speech, examined at the start of this paper, can be fruitfully
reinterpreted as dense with such gestural elements. As well as calling up the
landscape in which the army stands, that passage can be read to evoke an
embodied speaker pointing out where they stand. Later, Quintilian observes
that it is appropriate 'for a speaker to move his hand towards himself when he
speaks of himself or towards someone he intends to point out' (*ad se manum
referre cum de se ipso loquatur et in eum quem demonstret intendere, Inst.* 11.3.89). Again,
attention to personal and demonstrative pronouns in written speech will
enable the reader to supply the moving hand. The injunction against mimetic
gesture that we have already observed means that we seek the prompts to
restore performance elements not in the colourful language of the speech—
effugium, Padus, violentior Rhodano, Alpes urgent, vigentibus—but rather in the more
commonplace world of adverbs and pronouns: *dextra laevaque, circa, ab tergo,
vobis, hic*.[64]

Quintilian's list of speech acts communicated through hand gestures
provide a more vivid vocabulary which could also suggest a reconstruction of
vocal tone,[65] especially if set alongside detailed explications of tone such as in
Rhetorica ad Herennium 3.23–5 (*Inst.* 86–7):

> An non his [*sc.* manibus] poscimus polliceur, vocamus dimittimus,
> minamur supplicamus, abominamur timemus, interrogamus negamus,
> gaudium tristitiam dubitationem confessionem paenitentiam modum
> copiam numerum tempus ostendimus? non eadem concitant inhibent
> probant admirantur verecundantur?

> With these hands do we not request and promise, call and dismiss,
> threaten and beg, detest and fear, question and deny, show joy, sorrow,
> doubt, guilt, penitence, size, quantity, number, time? Do hands not
> impel, restrain, approve, admire, and blush?

This suggestion also draws attention to the framing of the speech in
historiography, which in narratological terms constitutes a boundary between
speech and narrative, but which is more complex in terms of intermediality.
As we can see from the vocabulary of speech-acts listed by Quintilian, the
narrative introduction or conclusion to a speech has the potential to evoke
elements of the delivery. This 'displacement' of some of oratory's performance

---

[63] This is the procedure of Boegehold (1999).

[64] Dutsch (2013) 410–18 explains Quintilian's gestural cues in relation to his theory of
language, and maps the cues onto his subsequent description of specific gestures.

[65] A similar observation of 'meta-rhetorical' cues in Pseudo-Quintilian is observed by
Stramaglia (2016) 40–2.

media into the narrative frame of the speech renders medial boundaries more porous.

To exemplify how such strategies can be deployed for reading performance in a historiographical speech, let us examine the opening of Cato's speech in support of the *lex Oppia*, as conceived by Livy (34.2.1–2):

> Si in sua quisque nostrum matre familiae, Quirites, ius et maiestatem viri retinere instituisset, minus cum universis feminis negotii haberemus: nunc domi victa libertas nostra impotentia muliebri hic quoque in foro obteritur et calcatur, et quia singulas sustinere non potuimus universas horremus.

> If each one of us, Citizens, had decided to retain the rights and dignity of a husband with respect to his own wife, we would have less to do with the ranks of women as a whole: but now that our freedom has been overthrown by the licence of women at home, here too in the forum it is ground down and trampled upon, and since we cannot rein them in individually, we are terrorised by them collectively.

The probable vocal tone for the opening would be the 'calm voice' recommended by the *auctor ad Herennium* (3.22): *utile est ad firmitudinem sedata vox in principio. Firmitudo* of will would match the steady opposition Cato shows to the women's demands in the narrative preceding the speech: they are *orantes* while he is *minime exorabilem.* (34.1.5, 7) *Firmitudo* of speech also cuts across the scene of noisy disagreement in the forum from both men and women. From a steady and calm opening vocal tone, however, Cato can be seen to build up a crescendo of outrage at the inversion of gender and social norms. The opposition between the domestic and civic spheres across which the crescendo gathers force culminates in his first discernible deictic gesture—*hic quoque in foro*. Accompanying the gesture, the vocal tone would change to match the final word of the opening sentence: *horremus.* This perhaps corresponds to the emotional range summed up by Quintilian's pairing of *abominamur timemus* as mediated by hand gesture. These terms, therefore, can be read as performance cues which convey, through writing, the sense of the speech as not purely a written medium.

The highly diverse audience before which Cato's speech is delivered provides the canvas for a range of deictic gestures with accompanying emotional or affective attitudes. As Cato establishes his argument, he specifies different groups and individuals towards whom he addresses himself (34.2.4–7):

> atque <u>ego</u> vix statuere apud animum meum possum utrum peior <u>ipsa res</u> an peiore exemplo agatur; quorum alterum <u>ad nos consules</u>

reliquosque magistratus, alterum <u>ad vos, Quirites</u>, magis pertinet. …
<u>Haec consternatio muliebris</u>, sive sua sponte sive <u>auctoribus vobis, M.</u>
<u>Fundani et L. Valeri</u>, facta est, haud dubie ad culpam magistratuum
pertinens, nescio <u>vobis, tribuni, an consulibus</u> magis sit deformis: <u>vobis</u>,
si <u>feminas</u> ad concitandas tribunicias seditiones iam adduxistis; <u>nobis</u> si
ut plebis quodam sic nunc <u>mulierum secessione</u> leges accipiendae sunt.

And <u>I</u> can hardly decide in my own mind whether <u>this situation</u> or the
example it sets is worse; the situation concerns <u>us consuls</u> and the other
magistrates, the example, conversely, concerns <u>you, Citizens</u>. … <u>This</u>
<u>female rebellion</u>, whether it arose spontaneously or was engineered <u>by</u>
<u>you, M. Fundanus and L. Valerius</u>, either way certainly the fault of the
magistrates, I do not know whether it disgraces <u>you tribunes</u> more or
<u>the consuls</u>: it disgraces <u>you</u>, if you led the <u>women</u> here to incite
tribunician sedition; it disgraces <u>us</u> if we must now accept laws enforced
by <u>female secession</u>, as we once accepted those enforced by plebeian
secession.

The division of the argument is mapped out onto the different components of
the audience—citizens, tribunes, magistrates, and consuls—and potentially
reinforced by gesture. At the same time as these groups are differentiated by
gesture and argument, they are united by gender and a shared sense of
responsibility for 'this situation … this female rebellion': the women are
marked out (and potentially gestured towards) as the problem which the
speech addresses. The sense of gesture evoked by pronouns here is also
coherent with the injunction that gesture should support the meaning of the
words. By firmly designating women as the object but not the audience of
speech—even though they are present in the forum—Cato's probable gestures
reinforce his argument that women should play no part in the passing of laws.
  That argument is extended, and a change of emotional register is
introduced, as Cato imagines how he would have addressed the women if it
were not for his sense of propriety (34.2.8):

<u>equidem</u> non sine rubore quodam paulo ante per medium agmen
mulierum in forum <u>perveni</u>. quod nisi <u>me</u> verecundia singularum magis
maiestatis et pudoris quam universarum tenuisset, ne compellatae <u>a</u>
<u>consule</u> viderentur, <u>dixissem</u> …

<u>As for me</u>, it was not without some embarrassment that <u>I arrived</u> in the
forum a while ago, making my way through a regiment of women.
Where (if <u>I</u> had not been held back by respect for some individual ladies
of greater dignity and chastity than the rest, so that they would not seem
to have been reproached by <u>a consul</u>) <u>I would have said </u>…

The terms evoking propriety here—*rubore, verecundia, maiestatis et pudoris*—would lend themselves to a dignified vocal tone, defined in *ad Herennium* as 'speech with a certain amount of impressiveness and with restraint of voice' (*oratio cum aliqua gravitate et vocis remissione*, 3.23) Although the restraint and respect is ostensibly due to (some) women, it has the effect of intensifying Cato's own self-presentation as consul. Hence the adverbs and pronouns denoting Cato here are less likely to be accompanied by gesture, but rather contribute to the performance of ethos which runs throughout this speech. This is most evident later in the speech when Cato turns to more general observations about the decline of morality in Rome (34.4.1):

> Saepe <u>me querentem</u> de feminarum, saepe de virorum nec de privat-orum modo sed etiam magistratuum sumptibus audistis …

> You have often heard <u>me lamenting</u> the expensive lifestyles of women, of men, and not merely of private citizens but even of magistrates …

While this turn in the argument situates the women's protest at the *lex Oppia* in a broader context of moral decline, Cato's performance of the argument as consistent with the speeches across his career also makes this one of many moves in the ongoing performance of ethos.

What this analysis shows is that the presentation of *actio* or speech delivery in historiographical speeches is far from explicit. Most of the performance cues are quite subtle and are likely not uniform or systematic: my reading of when to adduce gesture, in particular, varies depending on the tenor of the specific passage. The degree to which a narrated speech creates the sense of a performance medium—the degree to which it works intermedially—depends on more than just the performance cues that can be read from within the speech. Indeed, insofar as intermediality works by drawing attention to a 'border crossing', 'medial difference', or 'frame', we should look within the historiographical narrative itself for many of the features which designate the speech embedded in the narrative as a performance medium. Although these features can be usefully described as 'framing' the speech, they will also function to blur the boundaries between narrative and performance.

Framing elements can be organised into three general categories: (i) the *mis-en-scène* which describes the place of speaking, the preliminary perfor-mance, the expectations and response of the audience; (ii) elements of delivery 'displaced' from the speech and presented either before or after the words of the speech; (iii) the performance of ethos which can precede or follow the speech over a longer time period.[66]

---

[66] Not every narrative of speaking contains all or even any of these elements: Bartolomé (2016) 93.

   (i) The *mis-en-scène* presents in narrative form some of the performance elements reviewed above; the place of speaking, for example, constitutes part of the orator's 'sonic instrument', and the way in which he enters and positions himself in that place serves as a mute kinetic prelude to the performance of sound and movement which will ensue. In Livy, Camillus' arrival at the assembly to speak against the tribunes' proposal to abandon Rome works as a performance of authority and patrician unanimity: *in contionem universo senatu prosequente escendit atque ita verba fecit*, 5.50.8). The verb *escendit*, commonly used to represent climbing onto the rostra, tribunal, or some other raised platform,[67] denotes the familiar ceremony of arriving at the place of authority which literally guarantees speech.[68] In that sense also the word *contio* itself evokes the 'environmental medium' of the performance. Other aspects of preliminary performance include the narration of the speaker's dress and demeanour, as when Sallust describes the consul C. Cotta changing his dress to elicit pity (*Hist.* 2.43.1a Ramsey): *<post> paucos dies Cotta __mutata veste__ permaestus, quod pro cupita volu<n>tate †plevis avalia funera† hoc modo in contione populi disseru<it>*. The visual performance of sorrow precedes but also permeates his subsequent speech,[69] which is strongly focussed on the pathos of his self-presentation and culminates with his verbal and visual self-display in the mode of a sacrificial victim:[70] *adsum en C. Cotta consul!* (*Hist.* 3.43.10 Ramsey).

   Other narrative frames describing dress show speakers self-consciously selecting the garb that will communicate their attitude to circumstances as well as their performance persona. The Rhodians supplicating the senate after the defeat of Perseus carefully avoid mourning garb (which would be appropriate to supplication) in case it might signal their unhappiness at the king's downfall (Liv. 45.20.5); only when the senate refuses to receive their congratulations do they change their clothing and preface their formal speech with private lobbying: *extemplo __veste sordida sumpta__ domos principum cum precibus ac lacrimis circumibant, orantes …* (45.20.10). When their representative speaks in senate, he gestures towards their garb (*__in hoc squalore__ venimus in curiam Romanam Rhodii*, 45.22.2) in a way which summons up both the immediate performance of

---

[67] *In contionem* (Cic. *Red. Sen.* 12; *ad Att.* 4.2.3; Liv. 2.7.7); *in tribunal* (Liv. 2.28.6; 28.26.13; 30.15.11); *in rostra* (Liv. 30.17.3; 39.15.1). For a reverse movement entailing Scipio's claim to a higher authority: *ab rostris in Capitolium escendit* (Liv. 38.51.12).

[68] See especially the conflict between Papirius and Fabius over who occupies the *rostra* (Liv. 8.33.9–10); cf. Oakley (1998) 730–1.

[69] In the excerption of the speeches from *Histories* (Vat. Lat. 3864) this sentence is not included because it would be seen by the excerptor as not 'part of the speech'. But from the perspective of performance media, the sentence describes a visual element of Cotta's self-presentation and so would be considered 'part of the speech'.

[70] As Rosenblitt (2011) 404–5 observes, what differentiates Cotta's performance from a 'real' *devotio* is the absence of correctly scripted ritual gestures.

entering the space of formal speaking and the preceding speech performances in the houses of the leading senators. The speech ends with the movements and gestures of supplication which underline the tenor of the speech: *secundum talem orationem universis rursus prociderunt* + *ramosque oleae supplices iactantes* + *tandem excitati curia excesserunt* (45.25.1). The cultural familiarity of all these bodily actions—prostration, waving branches, tears, prayers, mourning clothes— only draws the audience further into the co-production of the performance, as when the supplicants are helped back into a standing position before exiting the stage.

As we have seen, the audience can be conceived of as an extension of the orator's body, as he 'moves' them to respond in a certain way. This effect can frame the historiographical speech in perceptible or imperceptible ways. The most imperceptible is when, as Christophe Leidl observes, the response to the speech is narrated as historical action.[71] This reinforces the significance of speech as a form of historical action in itself, as discussed at the start of this paper. It also points to the way that the intermediality of speech performance in narrative disseminates much further through the historical work. There are also moments where the narrative explicitly records the speaker's effect on the audience, as when Tiberius Gracchus delivers a speech inveighing against the attempted prosecution of Scipio Africanus (Liv. 38.53.1, 5):

> adiecit decreto indignationem: 'Sub pedibus vestris stabit, tribuni, domitor ille Africae Scipio? … Antiochum (recepit enim fratrem consortem huius gloriae L. Scipio) ultra iuga Tauri emovit, ut duobus Petiliis succumberet? …' movit et decretum et adiecta oratio non ceteros modo sed ipsos etiam accusatores.

> He appended a speech of indignation: 'Will the conqueror of Africa lie down to be trampled under your feet, tribunes? … did he drive Antiochus back beyond the hills of Taurus (for L. Scipio includes his brother as a partner in this glory) only to be brought down himself by the Petilii? …' His decree and appended speech moved not just the rest of the audience but even the prosecutors themselves.

The framing narrative presents a performance of *indignatio* which directs reading of the speech, with its barrage of rhetorical questions and a likely gesture towards L. Scipio, present as the pleader for his absent brother. The display of *indignatio*, and the sense that the proposed action violates the *dignitas* of Scipio and by extension the cultural system of honours as a whole, leads the audience to a change of heart. This effect is enhanced by audience expectation

---

[71] Leidl (2010) 239–41.

which Gracchus likely exploits when he first vetoes the decree of his fellow-tribunes and pauses to offer an alternative (38.52.9):

> is, cum vetuisset suum nomen decreto conlegarum adscribi tristi-oremque omnes sententiam expectarent, ita decrevit …

> This man, when he refused to have his name added to his colleagues' decree, and everyone was waiting for a harsher proposal from him, decreed the following …

The procedure of having one's name added at the head of the decree is perhaps exploited here to create a moment of suspense which throws into relief the generosity of Gracchus' unexpected support and offer of *auxilium* to Scipio. A narrative frame which deploys audience reaction to show an unsuccessful speech is evident in the case of Cato's resistance to the repeal of the *lex Oppia*, discussed earlier. Here the narrative representation of the audience shows a dense environment of physical presence and speech activity which threatens to overwhelm the oratorical performance (34.1.4–7):

> … ad suadendum dissuadendumque multi nobiles prodibant; Capitol-ium turba hominum faventium adversantiumque legi complebatur. matronae … omnes vias urbis aditusque in forum obsidebant, viros descendentes ad forum orantes … augebatur haec frequentia mulierum in dies … iam et consules praetoresque et alios magistratus adire et rogare audebant.

> Many prominent men were coming forward to speak for and against; a great crowd of supporters and opponents of the law was filling the Capitoline. The married women … continually blocked the streets of the city and the approaches to the forum, beseeching the men who were coming down to the forum … That throng of women kept increasing day by day … And now they even dared to approach and solicit the consuls, praetors, and other magistrates.

We have observed the forum as a medial environment which transmits the orator's speech through a complex of culturally ingrained actions, such as the performance of climbing up to the rostra before beginning to speak.[72] The same environment here is introduced with the reference to *nobiles* arriving with the intention to perform acts of persuasion, while the supporters and opposers of the bill constitute an audience ready to submit to the rules of performance

---

[72] Morstein-Marx (2004) 42–60 for the physical space and its ideological tensions.

by heckling or applauding each speaker. The introduction of the *matronae*, however, begins a process where the medial environment begins to function in a different way: now the men who approach the forum (going down into the valley, but not up onto the rostra) experience physical and vocal obstruction from the women. The effect of this is to obscure the usual transition from spontaneous 'unofficial' to formal speech. Cato's ascent to the rostra is not narrated; instead, his speech is introduced in a way that implies he is responding to the *ad hoc* addresses of the *matronae* (34.1.7):

> … et consules … adire et rogare audebant; ceterum minime exorabilem utique consulem M. Porcium Catonem habebant, qui pro lege quae abrogabatur ita disseruit …

> … and they even dared to approach and solicit the consuls; but they found one consul particularly to be not at all persuadable, M. Porcius Cato, who spoke as follows in support of the law that they tried to repeal …

The omission of the ceremonial approach to the rostra and the impression that Cato speaks in immediate response to the women is all the more striking given Cato's initial attempts in his speech to maintain only the men in the forum as his addressees. As a narrative frame it makes more sense of the moments later in Cato's speech where he succumbs to an imagined dialogue with the protesting women.[73] The only 'audience response' to the speech is the response of the tribune L. Valerius, and at the end of the debate the women's lobbying continues in a way that positions both formal speeches as mere interruptions.[74] Here the effect and effectiveness of formal speech is subordinated to the power of informal speech between different individuals and groups within the audience itself. Paradoxically, the intensity and energy of audience engagement in this debate derails their participation in and co-production of oratorical performance.

   (ii) Narrative descriptions of speech delivery can indicate the vocal tone or even the gestures which would accompany the words of the speech, but these representations of performance have to be separated from the speech and displaced into the narrative frame. They therefore either precede or follow the words of the speech, whereas in performance the two aspects would be simultaneous. We see this even with a very brief example, a fragment from Sallust's *Histories* where opposition to M. Lepidus is expressed: *tyrannumque et Cinnam* *maxuma voce* *adpellans* (1.56 Ramsey). The vocal register, designed to inspire indignation, matches the words which designate Lepidus a tyrant and

---

[73] Cato imagines addressing the women (34.2.9–10) and imagines their responses (34.3.9, 4.14).

[74] Vassiliades (2019) 122–3.

a second Cinna, while the participle *adpellans* denoting speech action is suitably forceful. The three elements—speech content, vocal register, vocal force—would be experienced simultaneously in performance, but here by necessity are experienced sequentially.

   It would be possible to think of this 'fragmentation' of narrated speech delivery as indicative of narrative's limited capacity to evoke performance, but it seems rather to provide flexible strategies for guiding the reader's perception of the embodied speaker. These are especially attractive in scenes of intense emotion and pathos. In Tacitus' account of the great climactic trial scenes near the end of *Annals* 16, he brings his rhetorical expertise to bear on the portrayal of voice and gesture, while carefully choreographing the order in which the reader experiences speakers' bodily presentations. The spontaneous, unstudied performance of two defendants—Barea Soranus and his daughter Servilia—provides a rich scene of gesture and tone. Servilia is charged with having consulted magicians to further her father's plots and to bring harm to the emperor (*Ann.* 16.31.1–32.1):

> … primum strata humi longoque fletu et silentio, post altaria et aram complexa, 'nullos' inquit 'impios deos, nullas devotiones, nec aliud infelicibus precibus invocavi, quam ut hunc optimum patrem tu, Caesar, vos, patres, servaretis incolumem. sic gemmas et vestes et dignitatis insignia dedi, quo modo si sanguinem et vitam poposcissent. viderint isti, antehac mihi ignoti, quo nomine sint, quas artes exerceant: hulla mihi principis mentio nisi inter numina fuit. nescit tamen miserrimus pater et, si crimen est, sola deliqui.' loquentis adhuc verba excipit Soranus proclamatque non illam in provinciam secum profectam, non Plauto per aetatem nosci potuisse, non criminibus mariti conexam: nimiae tantum pietatis ream separarent, atque ipse quamcumque sortem subiret. simul in amplexus occurrentis filiae ruebat, nisi interiecti lictores utrisque obstitissent.

> … at first, prostrate on the ground, she was silent for a long time except for her weeping, then embracing the altar she spoke: 'I have called on no impious gods, no human sacrifices, asked for nothing with baneful prayers; I have only prayed that you, Caesar, you, conscript fathers, would preserve this man, the best of fathers. I gave up my jewels and garments and other signs of rank, just as I would have given my life's blood if asked. They would have seen this, those men previously unknown to me by name or by the arts they practise: I made no mention of the emperor except as one of the gods. And my poor father had no knowledge of his: if it is a crime, I alone am guilty.' Soranus intercepted her words while she was speaking and shouted that she had not come with him to the province, she was too young to have known Plautus, she

was not implicated in her husband's crimes, guilty only of excessive pietas, she should be tried separately, and he would accept whatever fate offered. At the same time, he rushed into the embrace of his daughter as she came to meet him. The lictors forced them apart.

Again the performance elements in the narrative frame are suitable to the content of each speech. Servilia embraces the altar while she speaks—an appropriate gesture to signal that she speaks the truth and comes to the senate in suppliant mode, but also a gesture which follows her words as she attests her piety to the *numen Caesaris*. We can also extrapolate from the narrative of her long and silent weeping the quality of her vocal delivery.[75] Meanwhile Soranus' vocal delivery is pre-described for us as shouting—*proclamat*—which is perhaps supplemented by the asyndeton of clauses in his speech.[76] His movement of rushing to embrace his daughter follows the words where he speaks of her piety, while also providing a counter-movement to his plea that they be tried separately. But what is also striking is how Tacitus conveys the sense of simultaneous or overlapping sounds and movements in an ordered narrative. Servilia's embrace of the altar follows the meaning of her words but also precedes them in narrative; at the end of Soranus' interjection the narrative tells us how he is moving while still speaking: *simul in amplexus ruebant*. Finally, we have the overlap of speeches: Soranus starts shouting while Servilia is still speaking, and the narrative registers that overlap while keeping each speech separate and entire.

The integrity of the speech which requires displacement of delivery into the framing narrative can be usefully compared with Quintilian's alternative strategy for integrating performance notes into speech. As we have seen, Quintilian interweaves phrases from Cicero with directions for breath and gesture in a way which supplements the written speech but also fragments it. Each procedure in a different way makes visible the intermediality of speech performance rendered in description or narrative: while Quintilian's interpolations make the speech more performable, the historian's use of narrative frames makes the speech more readable.

(iii) At various points in the delivery of a speech there are intersections with the socio-cultural norms which shape the Roman male's actions and interactions with others. We have seen how the self-conscious excellence of formal speaking partakes of, but is anxiously kept separate from the arts of theatrical performance. We have also seen how a figure such as Cato constructs and maintains a persona in life which he can deploy in oratory, as when he invites his audience to recall his many strictures against luxury.

---

[75] For a comparable presentation of tearful speech, see the self-defence of Demetrius at Liv. 40.121–3.

[76] Balbo (2020) 143 on *clamare* as indicating loss of control.

Consistency and appropriateness are the ideals: the elite male conducts himself in speech as he should in life. Conversely, he partakes of socio-political life through the medium of speech. I have argued elsewhere that this 'feedback loop' between speech acts and socio-political life amplifies our understanding of the rhetorical term *ethos*: the character projected to the audience as the most appropriate for speaker, speech, and their reception.[77]

Ethos is already operative not only in the speeches of historiography but also in the narrative frames, where it plays a significant role in audience expectation and audience response to a speech. The example of Tiberius Gracchus examined above shows how ethos shapes and is shaped by speech performance. As we have already observed, Gracchus confounds the assumptions of his hearers by proposing a decree in support of Scipio when they had expected a harsher sentence. Their assumptions are shaped by their prior knowledge of Gracchus and his attitudes (38.52.9):[78]

> tribunus plebis eo tempore Ti. Sempronius Gracchus erat, cui inimicitiae cum P. Scipione intercedebant. Is, cum … tristiorem … omnes sententiam exspectarent …

> One plebeian tribune at this time was Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, who maintained an enmity with P. Scipio. This man, when … everyone was waiting for a harsher proposal from him …

Here Gracchus might be said not only to live his persona but to deploy it tactically: as argued above, the surprise generated by his uncharacteristic proposal amplifies its effect. The speech of *indignatio* which follows is thus underscored by the implicit argument that all personal animosities should be put to one side when giving Scipio due credit and honour for his services to the country. This not only shows up the pettiness of the prosecutors but showcases Gracchus' capacity to put the glory of Rome above his own feelings. Hence, the performance contributes to the ongoing construction of Gracchus' ethos and the enhancement of his authority as a public speaker (38.53.6):

> ibi gratiae ingentes ab universo ordine, praecipue ab consularibus senioribusque, Ti. Graccho actae sunt quod rem publicam privatis simultatibus potiorem habuisset.

---

[77] O'Gorman (2020) 112–16.

[78] A comparison with Aulus Gellius' version of the same story, where prior knowledge of the enmity between the two men is not focalised through the audience, highlights Livy's evocation of ethos in this episode. (Gell. *NA* 6.19.6)

Then great gratitude was shown to Tiberius Gracchus by the whole order and especially by the consuls and senior senators, because he had considered the commonwealth to be more important than his personal quarrels.

The performance of ethos in and around speech highlights the blurred boundaries of oratory as a medium—the way it continually intersects with the 'life medium' of a Roman senator. Hence the dispersal of ethos through the historiographical narrative does not create the same sort of displacement of performance elements that we have observed in the case of speech delivery. Rather, it echoes the duration of ethos across the speaker's life and can be conjectured for narrative moments which are placed much earlier or later in the historical work. The appearance of a speaker in the historical narrative can reactivate the reader's memory of earlier character sketches just as his intervention in public would reactivate the audience's recollection of his deeds and character. Gracchus' speech and persona in Book 38 of Livy's history, for example, recalls his first appearance as the young adjutant chosen by the Scipios to pay a surprise visit to Philip at Pella (37.7.11):[79]

Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, longe tum acerrimus iuvenum, ad id delectus … incredibili celeritate ab Amphissa. … die tertio Pellam pervenit.

Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, at that time by far the most energetic of the young men, chosen for this task … with extraordinary speed left Amphissa … and on the third day arrived at Pella.

Livy's choice of *acerrimus* to characterise Gracchus makes perfect sense in a context where courage and energy is needed,[80] but it also plants in advance the possibility that Gracchus' personal qualities will make him a fierce opponent in political in-fighting at Rome.[81] It reinforces the *indignatio* with which he speaks in defence of Scipio but also supports the audience's assumption that he intended to deliver a harsher sentence against him.[82] This very brief character sketch, therefore, is entirely appropriate to its context while enabling the historian to adumbrate the tactical deployment of ethos in an episode of speech performance.

---

[79] Briscoe (2008) 178; Gracchus' incredible journey was in 190 BC, three years before the prosecution of Scipio.

[80] There are many examples throughout Livy, but for an example in the same decade, see 39.31.7.

[81] Once more very common: an example from the same decade, 39.39.9.

[82] Again, very common: from the same decade, 39.43.2.

Appositional phrases of description are very much the domain of narrative as well as of speech; what I am suggesting here is their capacity to evoke the performance of the orator's persona which would have been conveyed through the media of everyday life as well as of formal speaking. Descriptive moments which occur earlier in the narrative and are implicitly or explicitly 'reactivated' in the delivery of a speech replicate the activation of the audience's memory as they receive the orator's performance. We can, therefore, also think about the focalisation of these descriptions and its potential to overlap the perspective of the narrator (working through the medium of writing) and the contemporary speaker and audience (communicating through and responding to the medium of performance).

The example of Sallust's Cotta, examined above, offers a brief example of such overlap. The year 75 BC is introduced by Sallust with a character sketch of the consuls (*Hist.* 2.38 Ramsey):

> Dein L. Octavius et C. Co<t>ta consulatum ingress<i>, quorum Octavius langu<i>de et incuriose fuit, C<ot>ta promptius, sed ambiti … e tum ingenio largit. … cupiens gratia<m> sing<ul>orum …

> Then L. Octavius and C. Cotta entered the consulship. Of the two, Octavius' behaviour was ineffectual and careless while Cotta's was more active, but because of ambition and his nature he was inclined to bribery … desirous of the favour of individual men …

Beginning a new episode in the narrative with the names of consuls evokes the medium of writing and the genres of historical record. This signals that the character sketches which immediately follow are focalised through the narrator and encompass the future as well as the past careers of these men. Later in the book, Sallust presents Cotta's speech to the people in the aftermath of food riots which have put both consuls at risk. As we have already seen, the account of the speech is prefaced with Cotta's change into the *tunica sordida*; this description of visual display echoes the character sketch from earlier in the narrative (*Hist.* 2.43.1a Ramsey):

> <post> paucos dies Cotta mutata veste permaestus, quod pro cupita volu<n>tate †plevis avalia funera† hoc modo in contione populi disseru<it>.

> A few days later Cotta, having changed his dress in deep sorrow, because instead of the goodwill he desired †the plebs were at odds with him†, in the assembly of the people he gave a speech of this sort.

Initially this seems like another instance of the narrator's focalisation, except that the reference to Cotta's sorrow suggests that the *quod* clause is focalised through the consul. The media perspective enables us to open this out, as what the sentence describes is not just Cotta's attitude to the situation but his conscious visual display of that attitude. As argued above, the change of dress is a prelude to the performed sound and movement of the speech; what the dress communicates will be elaborated by the speech. The description thus overlaps the perspectives of narrator and speaker, and mediates between the written and the performed. Finally, in the speech itself Cotta refers to his reputation for courting goodwill in order to present himself as a man who cares more about the state than he does even about his own life (*Hist.* 2.43.4 Ramsey):

> … avidissumus privatae gratiae maxumas inimicitias pro re publica suscepi …

> … deeply desirous of the favour of individuals, I have nonetheless willingly won the most bitter enemies for myself for the sake of the commonwealth …

This is far from being an ironic echo of the historian's judgement;[83] Cotta is mobilising what he knows people think about him and shaping it to his theme. In this way he presents a persona which is plausible because it acknowledges and responds to the audience's prior perceptions. Here he puts an existing 'tag' about his character in a new context, with powerful oppositions between *privatae–pro re publica* and *gratiae–inimicitias* so as to invite reconsideration of previous judgements. The differently focalised echoes across all three of these character descriptions—*cupiens/cupita/avidissimus; gratiam/voluntate/gratiae*—is evocative of a social commonplace: 'what everybody says about Cotta'. From Cotta's performative work with his ethos, we are able to discern how that ethos worked[84] as the interface between the consul and the people of Rome.

Not all character sketches call to be redeemed as embedded and intermedial references to ethos, however. Just as the performance element of many speeches in historiography are muted so as to prioritise the sense of a written source, so the description of character is at times reserved for the judgement of the historian. At the end of the debate on the punishment of the Catilinarian conspirators, for example, Sallust carefully distinguishes between the immediate response of the senate to what they have heard, and his own response to what he has heard and read over time (*Cat.* 53):

---

[83] McGushin (1992) 214.

[84] Or failed to work: there is little agreement about whether Cotta's speech is effective or not. For an overview of the issues, see Rosenblitt (2011).

postquam Cato adsedit, consulares omnes itemque senatus magna pars sententiam eius laudant, virtutem animi ad caelum ferunt, alii alios increpantes timidos vocant. Cato clarus atque magnus habetur; senati decretum fit sicuti ille censuerat. sed mihi multa legenti multa audienti quae populus Romanus … praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit adtend-ere quae res maxume tanta negotia sustinuisset. Sciebam … cognov-eram … ac mihi multa agitanti constabat … sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, divorsis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar: quos quoniam res obtulerat, silentio praeterire non fuit consilium, quin utriusque naturam et mores, quantum ingenio possum, aperirem.

Once Cato sat down, all the senators of consular rank and most of the senate commended his proposal, they praised to the heights his excellence of spirit, they carped at each other with accusations of cowardice. Cato was regarded as a shining example of a great man; the degree of the senate was passed just as he had recommended. As for me, as I read and heard about the outstanding achievements of the Roman people … I wanted to consider what circumstance especially enabled such great labours. … I knew … I had learned … And as I thought harder about it, it became evident to me … But in my own memory there were two men of considerable excellence but very different characters, and they were M. Cato and C. Caesar; and since my subject has brought them to notice, I do not plan to pass them over in silence, but to reveal the nature and character of these men with the ability at my disposal.

The audience response is characterised by intensified formal and informal speech and by two features we have already seen: the role of the speech in solidifying and extending the speaker's ethos—the younger Cato's evaluation as *clarus atque magnus*—and the translation of audience response into historical action—the passing of a senate decree on the terms of Cato's proposal. A sharp disjunction is marked between these immediate responses to the speech and the historian's judgement, first by the emphatic introduction of the first person—*sed mihi*—and secondly by the expanded range of material which communicates information to the historian and prompts his thought.[85] We see the historian 'reading and hearing' the history of the Roman people;[86] he

---

[85] A comparable example can be found in Tac. *Ann.* 4.20.2: *hunc ego Lepidum temporibus illis gravem et sapientem virum fuisse comperior.* See O'Gorman (2020) 130–1.

[86] Hearing history likely happens, as Peter Wiseman (2015) suggests, through the medium of recitations as well as historical theatre, but it is important to emphasise that Sallust here and elsewhere presents his work as mediated through script as much as sound.

acquires information—*sciebam, cognoveram*—and turns it over in his mind so as to arrive at an interpretation. This process of research provides him with a theory of Rome's rise to power and moral decline, against which backdrop he will then place the two most eminent men of his generation. The judgement arrived at by the historian is not very different from that of the senate in terms of evaluation—both assign *virtus* to Cato—but it is very different in terms of media. The historian's response does not participate in the multi-media environment of performed oratory but is partitioned off into an adjacent environment where perceptions and communications are organised into a different (though perhaps no less multi-sensory) configuration.

IV. The Written Speech

The evocation of speech performance in historiography enhances the work in a number of ways, but, as the last example suggests, the narrative cannot be entirely made up of intermedial references. It is important for the historian to emphasise at times the specific qualities of historiography which will include media as well as genre and commitment to truth. We only have to think of Thucydides' differentiation of his work from a 'declamation to be listened to at one specific time' (1.22.4) to see the role of performance media as a foil to express what is distinctive about historical writing. In that respect, it is interesting to look at what historiography gains from its references to oratory not in the performance stage of its 'life cycle' but in the written stage. The sense that the historian is consulting written speeches creates a 'citation effect', evoking the processes and activities of historical research.[87] The Roman historians generally avoid reproducing in their texts the speeches or other works which have been published elsewhere.[88] But lurking behind this is the well-known practice of the first historian to write in Latin, the elder Cato, whose inclusion of his own speeches *in toto* in his *Origines* is self-consciously designed as a mode of self-promotion analogous to other media in Roman culture.[89]

Recent scholarship has drawn connections between Cato's published speeches and his historical writing as suffused with the author's embodied presence. Enrica Sciarrino focusses on Cato's bodily authority, distilled

[87] Haimson Lushkov, esp. (2010), has persuasively argued for a more dynamic approach to citation in historiography.

[88] Brock (1995); Spielberg (2015). Briscoe (2012) 669 reminds us that the speech of the Rhodian ambassador rendered by Livy at 45.20–4 (discussed above, § III) had been published (Pol. 30.4.10–14).

[89] Sciarrino (2011); Elliott (2020).

through his ritualised status as censor and 'transcribed' into prose.[90] Meanwhile, Jackie Elliott argues that Cato's inclusion of two (or more) of his speeches in *Origines* furthers his self-presentation as a figure who emerges out of the past and is tangibly, uncannily present for the future.[91] Elliott enjoins particular attention to the ethos projected by Cato, and the elements she highlights from the surviving fragments of his speeches—especially the density of first- and second-person pronouns and verbs—correspond to what we have observed as 'performance notes' in written oratory. The legacy that Cato passes on to later historians, therefore, is more than just the incorporation of one written text within another but relies on those texts' capacity to communicate spoken, written, and embodied authority. It is worth examining for a moment how Livy responds to this legacy both in the way he represents Cato as a speaker and, significantly, how he negotiates the existence of Cato as published written text.

As we have already seen, the speech which Livy gives to Cato in the Oppian debate of 195 BC offers a plethora of opportunities for self-presentation through gesture, the appeal to ethos, and imagined exchanges between the senator and the *matronae*. The intermediality of the speech also works as way of referencing the historical Cato's speaking style:[92] an equivalent density of first- and second-persons can be seen in the opening to the Livian Cato's speech as in the introduction to the historical Cato's speech in defence of the Rhodians in 167 BC.

> Scio … quo mihi nunc magnae curae … quod nostras secundas res confutet … quo maiore opere dico suadeoque … in potestatem nostram redeamus. (Gell. *NA* 6.3.14)

> Si in sua quisque nostrum … negotii haberemus: nunc domi victa libertas nostra … sustinere non potuimus … horremus … equidem … ducebam … sinas. atque ego vix statuere apud animum meum possum … (Liv. 34.2.1)

In other words, Livy does not simply evoke the medium of performance but also evokes the distinctive performance style of Cato. Yet when it comes to

---

[90] Sciarrino (2011).

[91] Elliott (forthcoming); I am grateful to Jackie Elliott for sharing with me her work before publication.

[92] Briscoe (1981) 39–42 on the evocation but not imitation of Cato's style in this speech. Briscoe notes the predominance of first-person forms but sees this as 'more a general reflection of Cato's character than an imitation of a particularly striking element in his speeches' (41). As indicated above, I consider character/ethos as an element of speech performance.

Cato's defence of the Rhodians in Livy's historical narrative, the historian declares his unwillingness to render a speech already published in two generic contexts (Liv. 45.25.2–3):

> plurimum causam eorum [*sc*. Rhodiorum] adiuvit M. Porcius Cato, qui asper ingenio tum lenem mitemque senatorem egit. non inseram simulacrum viri copiosi, quae dixerit referendo; ipsius oratio scripta exstat, Originum quinto libro inclusa.

> M. Porcius Cato provided the greatest support to the case of the Rhodians; harsh by nature, at that time he acted as a mild and gentle senator. I will not insert a representation of that eloquent man by reproducing what he said: his written speech survives, included in the fifth book of his *Origins*.

The initial impression given by this passage is that Livy conceives of his practice as equivalent to Cato's; he would insert Cato's speech into the *Ab Urbe Condita* at this point had Cato not already included it in the *Origines*. The emphasis on the *oratio scripta* being included emphasises the common mediality of speech and writing and therefore, perhaps, the two writers' shared identity as historians. But we can also see the comment as organised around a set of oppositions, the most obvious being between performed speech and written speech: *quae dixerit* versus *oratio scripta*. This begins to suggest that the speech Livy could insert (but will not) would not necessarily be the same as the one Cato had included. The different verbs for inclusion are also suggestive. Cato's written speech is included in his history: *inclusa* suggests defined edges between narrative and speech—what we would now call a 'cut and paste'. But Livy's inclusion would be an insertion: *inseram* connotes either grafting or mixing, which implies greater integration or embedding of speech and narrative.

The most striking opposition in the comment, however, is that between the *simulacrum viri copiosi* which Livy could (but will not) present and the *oratio scripta* whose existence is the reason for Livy's reticence. It suggests that Livy characterises his version of a speech in terms of embodied performance but denies the same characterisation to Cato's version. This could be read as another dimension of the competition which is played out between authors and their strong predecessors—and Cato as both speaker and historian looms over Livy. It also reintroduces a false dichotomy between the eloquent man and the written text which Livy pointedly resolved earlier in the narrative, in his eulogy of Cato during his campaign for the censorship in 184 BC (39.40.7):

… nec is tantum, cuius lingua vivo eo viguerit, monumentum eloquentiae nullum exstet: vivit immo vigetque eloquentia eius sacrata scriptis omnis generis.

… nor was he merely a speaker whose tongue was lively while he lived, but who left no lasting record of his eloquence: he lives indeed and flourishes through his eloquence which is enshrined in writing of all kinds.

The repetition of the alliterative pair *vivo/vivit–viguerit/viget* suggests a seamless transition across media to secure immortality. Livy's later claim, then, to be able to render 'the man himself' oscillates between being equivalent to and something different from the speech as text. Livy's deferral to the prior existence of Cato's published work makes 'eloquent man' equivalent to 'written speech'. But there remains always the possibility of insisting on the difference between the two phrases. The representative power of Livy's narrative, immanent in the term *simulacrum viri copiosi*, suggests his capacity to summon up the performative elements of the man which his written speech only holds in potential. The *simulacrum viri copiosi* corresponds to the 'something missing' which Quintilian detects in the gap between Hortensius' published speeches and what Cicero says about Hortensius. The medium through which Livy's negotiates with the Catonian corpus, then, is definitively historiographical writing, but even the definitively written medium invokes the ghost of performed eloquence.

V. Conclusion: The Performed Narrative

<ne> nunc quidem haec sine indignatione legi audirive posse certum habeo; inde existimari potest qui habitus animorum audientibus ea patribus fuerit.

I am quite certain that even now these words cannot be read or heard[93] without a sense of indignation; and on that basis it can be surmised what the feelings were among the senators who listened to the speech. (Liv. 44.14.13)

How might the intermediality of speech in historical narrative have been experienced? Throughout this paper I have focussed on words and phrases that could evoke the sense of a performance medium which relies on sound and movement in three-dimensional space. I have argued that such words and

---

[93] For this formulation, see Wiseman (2015) 99, to which we can add this passage and Cic. *Marcell.* 28.

phrases would be recognisable as cues for the reader to reconstruct a sense of performance, and that this recognition would stem from rhetorical training. Hence, I would claim that, although there is no ancient term for our concept of 'media',[94] there is a high degree of 'media awareness' among rhetorically informed readers and writers. In particular, the sense of what is gained and what is lost in the transition from a performed to a written speech appears especially acute among writers who consciously reflect on the past and its traces in the present. What I have not considered is the possibility that speeches in historiography re-entered the sphere of performance through recitation.[95] This is certainly what Livy suggests in his comment inviting readers to reconstruct the original audience's reaction to the *superbia* of the Rhodians in 169 BC. The repetition *audiri … audientibus* provides one medium through which the reader achieves identification with the audience (another medium of identification is the shared cultural investment in the dignity of the Roman senate).

We know about the recitation of historiography from Pliny[96] as well as from an anecdote in Suetonius about Claudius' disastrous attempt to give a public reading of his historical works.[97] What we mean by recitation has also been substantially revised by contemporary scholarship on reading culture.[98] While Matthew Roller has highlighted the co-performance of the reciter and his critical audience,[99] Erica Bexley points to the way that recitation also emerges from the intersection of rhetoric and theatre.[100] We cannot recover the degree to which a recitation of historiography was 'performative' in the sense that it required the reciter to change vocal register or to introduce gesture (though this seems likely). What we can bear in mind is that the shared mediality of speech and historical narrative would have been experienced by the Roman reader sometimes through writing, and sometimes through an embodied speaker.

ELLEN O'GORMAN

University of Bristol   e.c.ogorman@bristol.ac.uk

---

[94] Guillory (2010).

[95] Pelling (2022) 8–14.

[96] Recitations of history are customary, although the work is more about truth than display: Plin. *Ep.* 7.17.3; see also 9.27. Pliny also refers to recitations of biography (4.7.2) and *exitus* literature (8.12.4–5).

[97] Suet. *Claud.* 41.1: Claudius succumbs to a fit of the giggles.

[98] Dupont (1997); Johnson (2010).

[99] Roller (2018).

[100] Bexley (2015).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldrete, Gregory (1999) *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Baltimore and London).

de Bakker, Mathieu and Irene de Jong (2022a) 'Introduction: Narratological Theory on Speech', in de Bakker–de Jong (2022b) 1–30.

——, edd. (2022b) *Speech in Ancient Greek Literature* (*Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* vol. 5; Leiden).

Balbo, Andrea (2018) 'Traces of *Actio* in Fragmentary Roman Orators', in Christa Gray, Andrea Balbo, Richard M. A. Marshall, and Catherine E. W. Steel, edd., *Reading Republican Oratory: Reconstructions, Contexts, Receptions* (Oxford) 227–46.

—— (2020) 'Between Real and Fictional Eloquence: Some Observations on the *actio* of Porcius Latro and Albucius Silus', in Dinter–Guérin–Martinho (2020) 134–47.

Bartolomé, Jesús (2016) 'La *actio* en las arengas de Livio: puesta en escena, representación y espectáculo', in Isabel Moreno and Roberto Nicolai, edd., *La representación de la* actio *en la historiografía griega y latina* (Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca 21; Rome) 91–101.

Bexley, Erica (2015) 'What is Dramatic Recitation?' *Mnemosyne* 68: 774–93.

Bishop, Caroline (2019) *Cicero, Greek Learning, and the Making of a Roman Classic* (Oxford).

Boegehold, Alan L. (1999) *When a Gesture was Expected: A Selection of Examples from Archaic and Classical Greek Literature* (Princeton).

Briscoe, John (1981) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 34–37* (Oxford).

—— (2008) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 38–40* (Oxford).

—— (2012) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 41–45* (Oxford).

Brock, Roger (1995) 'Versions, "Inversions" and Evasions: Classical Historiography and the "Published" Speech', *PLLS* 8: 209–24.

Butler, Shane (2002) *The Hand of Cicero* (London and New York).

—— (2015) *The Ancient Phonograph* (New York).

Cavarzere, Alberto (2011) *Gli arcani dell'oratore: alcuni appunti sull'actio dei romani* (Rome and Padua).

Corbeill, Anthony (2004) *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome* (Princeton).

—— (2020) 'Physical Excess as a Marker of Genre in the Elder Seneca', in Dinter–Guérin–Martinho (2020) 134–47.

Dangel, Jacquelin (1982) *La phrase oratoire chez Tite-Live* (Paris).

Devereaux, Jennifer (2016) 'Embodied Historiography: Models for Reasoning in Tacitus' *Annals*', in William Short, ed., *Embodiment in Latin Semantics* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia) 237–68.

Dinter, Martin (2019) 'Intermediality in the *Metamorphoses*', in Dinter–Reitz-Josse (2019b) 96–118.

Dinter, Martin and Bettina Reitz-Joosse (2019a) 'Introduction' in Dinter–Reitz-Joosse (2019b) 1–10.

——, edd. (2019b) *Intermediality and Roman Literature* (*Trends in Classics* 11.1: Berlin).

Dinter, Martin, Charles Guérin, and Marcos Martinho, edd. (2020) *Reading Roman Declamation: The Elder Seneca* (Oxford).

Douglas, Alan Edward, ed. (1966) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus* (Oxford).

Dupont, Florence (1997) '*Recitatio* and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse', in Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, edd., *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge) 44–59.

Dutsch, Dorota (2013) 'Towards a Roman Theory of Theatrical Gesture', in George W. M. Harrison and Vayos Liapis, edd., *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre* (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 353; Leiden) 409–31.

Edmunds, Lowell (2008) 'Deixis in Ancient Greek and Latin Literature: Historical Introduction and State of the Question', *Philologia Antiqua* 1: 67–98.

Edward, William A. (1928) *The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge).

Elleström, Lars (2010) 'The Modalities of Media: a Model for Understanding Medial Relations' in id., ed., *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality* (London and New York) 11–48.

Elliott, Jackie (2020) 'Reading Ennius' *Annals* and Cato's *Origins* at Rome', in Cynthia Damon and Joseph Farrell, edd., *Ennius: Poetry and History* (Cambridge) 107–24.

—— (forthcoming) 'Cato's *Origines* and Earlier Traditions of Self-representation and Self-commemoration at Rome', *AJPh*.

Feldherr, Andrew (1998) *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

Fischer-Lichte, Erika (2008) *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics* (London and New York).

Gavrilov, Alexander K. (1997) 'Techniques of Reading in Classical Antiquity,' *CQ* 47: 56–73.

Gleason, Maud (1995) *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton).

Guillory, John (2010) 'Genesis of the Media Concept', *Critical Inquiry* 36: 321–62.

Gunderson, Erik (2000) *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor).

Haimson Lushkov, Ayelet (2010) 'Intertextuality and Source-Criticism in the Scipionic Trials', in Wolfgang Polleichtner, ed., *Livy and Intertextuality* (Bochum) 90–133.

Hall, Jon (2014) 'Cicero's *Brutus* and the Criticism of Oratorical Performance', *CJ* 110: 43–59.

Hallet, Wolfgang (2015) 'A Methodology of Intermediality in Literary Studies', in Gabrielle Rippl, ed., *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature–Image–Sound–Music* (Berlin) 605–18.

Holter, Erika, Susanne Muth, and Sebastian Schwesinger (2019) 'Sounding Out Public Space in Late Republican Rome', in Shane Butler and Sarah Nooter, edd., *Sound and the Ancient Senses* (London and New York) 44–60.

Johnson, William A. (2010) *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities* (New York and Oxford).

—— (2013) 'Bookrolls as Media', in N. Katherine Hayles and Jessica Pressman, edd., *Comparative Textual Media: Transforming the Humanities in the Postprint Era* (Minneapolis) 101–124.

Kaster, Robert (2020) *Cicero: Brutus and Orator* (New York and Oxford).

Krämer, Sybille (2015) *Medium, Messenger, Transmission: An Approach to Media Philosophy* (Amsterdam).

La Bua, Giuseppe (2019) *Cicero and Roman Education: the Reception of the Speeches and Ancient Scholarship* (Cambridge).

Laird, Andrew (1999) *Powers of Expression/Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin literature* (Oxford).

Leidl, Christophe (2010) 'Die (Ohn)macht der Rede: Publikumsreaktion in der Geschichtsschreibung', in Pausch (2010) 235–58.

Levene, David S. (2010) *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).

McGushin, Patrick (1992) *Sallust: The Histories, Volume I: Books i–ii* (Oxford).

McLuhan, Marshall (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York).

Marincola, John (2010) 'The Rhetoric of History: Allusion, Intertextuality, and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches', in Pausch (2010) 259–90.

Markus, Donka D. (2000) 'Performing the Book: The Recital of Epic in First-Century C.E. Rome,' *ClAnt* 19: 138–79.

Michelakis, Pantelis (2020) 'Introduction: Classical Antiquity, Media Histories, Media Theories' in id., ed., *Classics and Media Theory* (Oxford) 1–28.

Möller, Melanie (2010) 'Der Schwanengesang des Crassus: Modi sprachlicher Repräsentation in Ciceros *De oratore* (3,1–6)', in Therese Fuhrer and Damien Nelis, edd., *Acting with Words: Communication, Rhetorical Performance, and Performative Acts in Latin Literature* (Heidelberg) 31–46.

Morstein-Marx, Robert (2004) *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge).

Nelis-Clément, Jocelyne (2008) 'Le cirque romain et son paysage sonore', in ead. and Jean-Michel Roddaz, edd., *Le cirque romain et son image* (Bordeaux) 431–57.

Oakley, Steven P. (1998) *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X, vol II: Books VII–VIII* (Oxford).

O'Gorman, Ellen (2018) 'The Noise, and the People: Popular *Clamor* and Political Discourse in Roman Historiography,', in Stephen Harrison and Sebastian Matzner, edd., *Complex Inferiorities: The Poetics of the Weaker Voice in Latin Literature* (Oxford) 128–48.

—— (2020) *Tacitus' History of Politically Effective Speech: Truth to Power* (London and New York).

Palmer, Morgan E. (2019) 'Inscriptional Intermediality in Livy', in Dinter–Reitz-Joosse (2019) 74–95.

Pausch, Dennis (2010a) 'Einleitung' in id. (2010c) 1–13.

—— (2010b) 'Der Feldherr als Redner und der Appell an den Leser: Wiederholung und Antizipation in den Reden bei Livius', in id. (2010c) 183–209.

——, ed. (2010c) *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie* (Berlin).

Pelling, Christopher, ed. (2022) *Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War: Book VI* (Cambridge).

Peters, John Durham (1999) *Speaking into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication* (Chicago).

Pitcher, Luke (2022a) 'Polybius', in de Bakker–de Jong (2022b) 266–89.

—— (2022b) 'Appian', in de Bakker–de Jong (2022b) 290–308.

—— (2022c) 'Cassius Dio', in de Bakker–de Jong (2022b) 309–28.

Rajewsky, Irina O. (2005) 'Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality', *Intermediality: History and Theory of the Arts, Literature, and Technologies* 6: 43–64.

Roller, Matthew (2018) 'Amicable and Hostile Exchange in the Culture of Recitation', in Alice König and Christopher Whitton, edd., *Roman Literature under Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian: Literary Interactions, AD 96–138* (Cambridge) 183–207.

Rosenblitt, J. Alison (2011) 'The *devotio* of Sallust's Cotta,' *AJPh* 132: 397–427

Sciarrino, Enrica (2011) *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose: from Poetic Translation to Elite Transcription* (Columbus, Oh.).

Spielberg, Lydia (2015) *The Rhetoric of Documentary Quotation in Roman Historiography* (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania).

—— (2019) 'Monumental Absences in Ancient Historiography', in Dinter–Reitz-Joosse (2019) 51–73.

Stevens, Benjamin Eldon (2018) 'Sensory Media: Representation, Communication, and Perception in Ancient Literature', in Jerry Toner, ed., *A Cultural History of the Senses in Antiquity* (London and New York) 224–44.

Stramaglia, Antonio (2016) 'The Hidden Teacher: "Metarhetoric" in Ps.-Quintilian's *Major Declamations*,' in Dinter–Guérin–Martinho (2016) 25–48.

Tischer, Ute (2019) 'Quotations in Roman Prose as Intermedial Phenomena', in Dinter–Reitz-Joosse (2019) 34–50.

Vassiliades, Georgios (2019) 'The *Lex Oppia* in Livy 34.1–7: Failed Persuasion and Decline', in Sophia Papaioannou, Andreas Serafim, and Kyriakos Demetriou, edd., *The Ancient Art of Persuasion across Genres and Topics* (Leiden) 118–137.

Webb, Ruth (2009) *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Farnham and Burlington, Vt.).

Wiater, Nicolas (2010) 'Speeches and Historical Narrative in Polybius' *Histories*', in Pausch (2010c) 67–107.

Wiseman, Timothy Peter (2009) 'A Puzzle in Livy,' *G&R* 56: 203–10.

—— (2015) *The Roman Audience* (Oxford).

Woodman, Anthony John (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London, Sydney, and Portland).