The Classical Quarterly

Additional services for **The Classical Quarterly:**

Email alerts: Click here
Subscriptions: Click here
Commercial reprints: Click here
Terms of use : Click here

POLYBIUS ON SPEECHES IN TIMAEUS: SYNTAX AND STRUCTURE IN *HISTORIES* 12.25A

N. Wiater

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S000983881300058X

How to cite this article:
N. Wiater (2014). POLYBIUS ON SPEECHES IN TIMAEUS: SYNTAX AND
STRUCTURE IN *HISTORIES* 12.25A . The Classical Quarterly, 64, pp 121-135
doi:10.1017/S000983881300058X

Request Permissions : Click here

POLYBIUS ON SPEECHES IN TIMAEUS: SYNTAX AND STRUCTURE IN *HISTORIES* 12.25A*

The most famous – and most discussed – ancient statement on speeches in historiography is probably Thucydides 1.22.1, but Polybius' discussion of speeches in Timaeus in Book 12 of his *Histories* follows closely.[1] Although Polybius' criticism of Timaeus has been fruitfully studied from very different angles, the meaning and implications of many of his statements are still debated.[2]

This paper is part of an ongoing project that systematically (re-)examines the role of speeches in both the methodological and the narrative passages of Polybius' *Histories*. This project was prompted by a chapter on the speeches in the third book of Polybius'

[1] The standard treatment of speeches in Polybius is still P. Pédech, *La Méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris, 1964), 254–302; F. Walbank, *Speeches in Greek Historians*. The Third J.L. Myers Memorial Lecture (Oxford, 1965); for more recent treatments see S. Usher, 'Oratio recta and oratio obliqua in Polybius', *GRBS* 49 (2009), 487–514; J. Marincola, 'Speeches in classical historiography', in id. (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden, MA, Oxford and Victoria, 2007), 1.118–32, esp. 123–6; see further C. Wooten, 'The speeches in Polybius. An insight into the nature of Hellenistic oratory', *AJPh* 95 (1974), 235–51. On the polemical and methodological passages in Polybius, with special emphasis on book twelve and the polemic against Timaeus, see most recently C. Baron, 'The use and abuse of historians: Polybios Book 12 and our evidence for Timaios', *AncSoc* 39 (2009), 1–34, an interesting attempt to go beyond Polybius' polemical criticism and use it as a basis for a more balanced assessment of Timaeus' historical work; further, K. Sacks, *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1981); R. Nicolai, 'Polibio interprete di Tucidide', *Seminari romani di cultura greca* 2 (1999), 281–301; M. Vercruysse, 'A la recherche du mensonge et de la vérité. La fonction des passages méthodologiques chez Polybe', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser (edd.), *The Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.* Studia Hellenistica 30 (Leuven, 1990), 17–38; K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios*. Palingenesia 9 (Wiesbaden, 1975), 3–55, esp. 35–9 (on the speeches); J. Bocquet, 'Polybius on the critical evaluation of historians', *AncSoc* 13–14 (1982–3), 277–91; F.W. Walbank, 'Polemic in Polybius', *JRS* 52 (1962), 1–12; cf. also T. Wiedemann, 'Rhetoric in Polybius', in Verdin, Schepens and de Keyser (above), 289–300; on the speeches in Timaeus see L. Pearson, 'The speeches in Timaeus', *AJPh* 107 (1986), 320–68, and C. Baron's forthcoming study, *Timaios of Tauromenion and Hellenistic Historiography*. Scholarly interest in speeches in ancient historians has increased considerably in the last few years as is documented by such works as e.g. C. Scardino, *Gestaltung und Funktion der Reden bei Herodot und Thukydides*. BzA 250 (Berlin, 2007) and D. Pausch (ed.), *Stimmen der Geschichte. Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*. BzA 284 (Berlin, 2010).

[2] See the discussions of the relevant passages in the commentaries of F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1967) and P. Pédech, *Polybe. Histoires XII. Texte établi, traduit et commenté* (Paris, 1961); further S. Mohm, *Untersuchungen zu den historiographischen Anschauungen des Polybios* (Diss., Saarbrücken, 1977²), 51–67 (a detailed discussion of previous interpretations, especially Pédech's commentary); Sacks (n. 1), 79–95; Marincola (n. 1), 123–6.

work, published in a volume on speeches in ancient historiography in 2010.[3] Originally, the present paper was to become the second major step of this undertaking, a comprehensive discussion of Polybius' criticism of the speeches in Timaeus in Book 12, which represents the core of his theoretical discussion of speeches in historical narrative. This large-scale investigation came to an early halt at the programmatic passage 12.25a.4–5, which opens Polybius' criticism and is key to understanding his approach to speeches in historical narrative, but is also one of the most controversial statements of the entire *Histories*. Since none of the available interpretations of this passage seemed satisfactory (on the contrary, many, including Walbank's, turned out to be at odds with Greek grammar, as I will demonstrate below), it seemed necessary critically to re-examine the syntax, semantics and grammar of this crucial passage on its own and, if possible, to clarify its meaning, before any comprehensive review of Polybius' discussion of speeches in Book 12 could be carried out. What follows is therefore a philological analysis with a deliberately narrow focus on 12.25a.4–5; its purpose is to provide more reliable foundations for a comprehensive discussion, which will be undertaken in a separate study.

12.25a.4–5 is part of Polybius' general criticism of Timaeus for deliberately misrepresenting the historical events, a flaw, he notes, strikingly at odds with Timaeus' constant castigations of the alleged unreliability of other historical accounts. Polybius says he will now provide the ultimate evidence for Timaeus' deliberate falsification of the past (ταῦτα παρ' ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι κατατέταχε Τίμαιος, καὶ τοῦτο πεποίηκε κατὰ πρόθεσιν, 12.25a.4) which will convince even the most stubborn admirers of Timaeus' work.[4] This evidence, Polybius says, is the speeches in his work, and 12.25a.5 gives the reason (γάρ) for this statement (a translation of the passage is provided at the end of this article):

οὐ γὰρ τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι, πάντας ἐξαριθμεῖται τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους καὶ τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς πράγμασιν οὕτως ὡς ἂν εἴ τις ἐν διατριβῇ πρὸς ὑπόθεσιν ἐπιχειροίη <...> ὥσπερ ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως ποιούμενος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξήγησιν τῶν κατ' ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένων.

It is the beginning of the passage (οὐ γὰρ τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι) which has attracted most critical attention. In particular, scholars have found difficulty with the apparent tautology of οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν and οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν and tried to eliminate this problem by arguing that Polybius is distinguishing three different methods of rendering speeches in historiography, namely a *verbatim* reproduction, an accurate summary, and free invention by the historian.

Reviewing the arguments on which this assumption of such a tripartite structure of Polybius' thought is based, I will demonstrate that the interpretation of τὰ ῥηθέντα as meaning a reproduction of the actual speech, and of ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν as referring to an 'accurate résumé of the actual speech' (Walbank) encounters serious

---

[3] 'Speeches and historical narrative in Polybius's *Histories*', in D. Pausch (n. 1), 69–107.
[4] 25a.2–3: ἐπειδὰν γὰρ ἓν ἢ δεύτερον εὑρεθῇ ψεῦδος ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασι, καὶ τοῦτο γεγονὸς ᾖ κατὰ προαίρεσιν, δῆλον ὡς οὐδὲν ἂν ἔτι βέβαιον οὐδ' ἀσφαλὲς γένοιτο τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου συγγραφέως λεγομένων. ἵνα δὲ καὶ τοὺς φιλοτιμότερον διακειμένους μεταπείσωμεν, ῥητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ μελέτης τῆς κατὰ τὰς δημηγορίας καὶ τὰς παρακλήσεις, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς πρεσβευτικοὺς λόγους … The fragmentary state of Book 12 often makes it difficult to establish how the individual passages were originally connected, but the structure of the argument in 12.25a is not debated; on the structure of Book 12 in general see e.g. Sacks (n. 1), 66–79; Pédech (n. 2), ix–xxxv.

difficulties. On the one hand, these difficulties arise from fundamental issues of Greek semantics, which will be discussed in the first part of my argument; on the other, discussions have often focussed too narrowly on the beginning of the passage without giving due attention to its relation to the points Polybius makes in the remaining part of the sentence. However, as I will argue, this is essential to an adequate understanding of Polybius' criticism. Therefore, the findings of the first part of my argument will be complemented by the first in-depth analysis of the structure and semantics of *Histories* 12.25a.4–5 as a whole. Combined with a comprehensive analysis of Polybius' use of τὰ ῥηθέντα throughout his work, these considerations will provide a strong argument in favour of abandoning the idea that *Histories* 12.25a.4–5 represents a general statement on historical method and on different ways of rendering speeches in historical works.[5] Rather, as I will argue, Polybius is concerned here exclusively with the *direct* speeches in Timaeus' work and their lack of historical reliability.

The most influential interpretation of 12.25a.4–5 is, no doubt, the one proposed by Walbank in his *Historical Commentary*. Walbank translates the passage as 'what was said, nor the real sense of what was said', which he paraphrases as 'i.e. neither a transcript nor an accurate résumé of the actual speech'. At the same time, he rejects the alternative reading 'what was said, nor the form in which it was actually said', which was proposed by Welzhofer in 1880.[6] Similarly, Pédech takes τὰ ῥηθέντα γράφειν to refer to a reproduction of the historical speeches in direct speech, while explaining (like Walbank) ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν as referring to an accurate résumé in reported speech of what was said.[7]

An alternative explanation of τὰ ῥηθέντα is suggested by Mohm, who paraphrases it as 'a reproduction of the argument of the speech and its structure, the words being those of the historiographer' ('ein Nachzeichnen des Gedankengangs und des Argumentationsablaufs der Rede, wobei die sprachlichen Formulierungen auf den Geschichtsschreiber zurückgehen').[8] Finally, Nicolai objects to Pédech's interpretation. Referring to 12.25a.5 (quoted above), 25b.1, 25b.4 and 36.1.7,[9] he claims that Polybius

---

never distinguishes between a *verbatim* reproduction and a summary of a speech.[10] Instead, he suggests that ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν is merely an explication of τὰ ῥηθέντα and that Polybius employed this slightly tautological expression to emphasise even more effectively that Timaeus did not even intend to provide *verbatim* reproductions of speeches.[11]

All interpreters of this passage focus on one problem, namely the perceived tautology of οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα … οὐδ᾿ ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν, and all interpreters, except for Mohm and, probably, Welzhofer, unanimously take τὰ ῥηθέντα to mean 'the speeches as they were given', that is, as an expression synonymous with οἱ ῥηθέντες λόγοι.[12] If τὰ ῥηθέντα refers to the speeches as they were actually pronounced by the historical actors, then ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν becomes a problem because it seems superfluous.

Only Nicolai, as pointed out above, accepts the idea that this tautology might be deliberate and that ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν does not introduce a new point but is added to reinforce Polybius' previous statement, οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν. The other commentators cited above, by contrast, sought to solve the tautology by assigning a new meaning to ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν. They regarded the phrase as the middle element of an enumeration of three different methods of representing speeches in historical narratives:[13] first, Timaeus could have given the *verbatim* reproduction of the speeches, τὰ ῥηθέντα, which he did not do; alternatively, he could have given an

---

[10] As I will argue below, this is true for Polybius' use of τὰ ῥηθέντα but not for the similar expressions τοὺς κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένους … λόγους, τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους, and ⟨τὰ⟩ κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν ῥηθέντα in the passages he quotes to support his statement. In all of these passages it is evident from the context that Polybius is referring to the actual speeches as they were given by the historical actors. Nicolai fails to make this distinction and to take the context of the expressions into account.

[11] Nicolai (n. 1), 285. Usher (n. 1), 488, seems to understand the passage in a similar way, as is suggested by his translation 'He has not written what was said nor the actual words used', and subsequent comment: 'The first part of this charge would have been admitted by Thucydides, who, like Timaeus, did not hear what was actually said by speakers'; yet then he adds: 'But Polybius does not even allow Timaeus the credit of being a responsible reporter', which, by contrast, seems to indicate that he does, in fact, differentiate between 'what was said' (i.e. a reliable report of the speech) and 'the actual words used' (i.e. a *verbatim* reproduction of the speech). Unfortunately, Usher does not discuss the passage.

[12] This is apparent from Walbank's paraphrase of the expression as 'a transcript'; see Walbank (n. 2), 386. This also forces him to resort to the unconvincing explanation of πάντας τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους shortly afterwards as referring not to the speeches given by the historical actors, but to the speeches as presented by Timaeus (for a detailed refutation of this view see below). Pédech, on the other hand, directly translates τὰ ῥηθέντα as 'la lettre', i.e. a *verbatim* rendering; moreover, in his 'commentaire' he paraphrases τὰ ῥηθέντα γράφειν as 'reproduire purement et simplement les paroles prononcées … ce qui suppose une transcription fidèle, au style direct'; see Pédech (n. 2), 124. Nicolai's suggestion, that the slightly tautological expression merely highlights the fact that the speeches in Timaeus' work are not even meant to be transcripts of the actual speeches, shows that he, too, takes τὰ ῥηθέντα … ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν to be an alternative expression for 'the speeches that were given by the historical actors'. Finally, Welzhofer's (n. 6) position is not entirely clear. He translates τὰ ῥηθέντα as 'what was really said' ('das wirklich gesprochene'), while rendering ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾿ ἀλήθειαν as 'in the form/style in which it was actually said' ('in der form … wie es in wahrheit gesprochen worden'). Whereas his translation of τὰ ῥηθέντα leads us to believe that he takes the phrase to refer to the speeches given in general, the contrast with ὡς ἐρρήθη, 'the form', seems to suggest that he takes τὰ ῥηθέντα in a more specific sense as referring to the content of the speeches. The latter assumption is supported by his subsequent paraphrase of τὰ ῥηθέντα as 'the content' ('ihrem ganzen inhalt nach'). A similar interpretation of the phrase is suggested by Mohm (n. 2); cf. n. 7 above.

[13] Mohm (n. 2), 56, summarizing Walbank's (n. 2) and Pédech's (n. 2) interpretations of the passage, appropriately speaks of 'three degrees of authenticity' ('drei Stufen der Wahrheitstreue').

accurate résumé of what was said, ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν – a reading which is obviously influenced (and, in this case, led astray) by Thucydides' famous ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων (1.22.1);[14] finally, the third option – and the one which Timaeus chose – the historian could simply compose the speeches himself according to the rules of rhetorical compositions, προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι.[15]

As I will now demonstrate, the interpretation of ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν as 'a résumé of the actual speech' (Walbank) is ruled out by Greek language use. The main problem is that ὡς ἐρρήθη cannot refer to the *content* of a speech to the exclusion of its form or style; but this is what a 'résumé of a speech' must mean, summarizing only the arguments (possibly in the same order as they were proffered by the speaker) but not the exact words of the speaker, as explicitly stated by Pédech ('au style indirect').[16] But for ὡς ἐρρήθη to refer exclusively to the content of a speech, one would have to substitute ὡς with οἷα or ἅ.[17] Such a distinction is to be expected especially in a rhetorical context such as the present one: at least since Aristotle, authors of rhetorical handbooks clearly distinguished **what** was said from **how** it was said, the first referring to the content of the speech, the πράγματα, the second to its form, the λέξις. Aristotle makes a point of differentiating between **ἃ** δεῖ λέγειν and **ὡς** δεῖ εἰπεῖν (*Rhetorica* 3.1403b16) and, shortly afterwards, contrasts the 'convincing' (πιθανόν) that is based on the facts (πράγματα) with the 'convincing' that is based on the form or style of the speech (τῇ λέξει).[18]

A close look at the structure of Polybius' argument supports this interpretation: first, the poignant parallel of ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν and the following ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι renders it highly improbable that ὡς in ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν should be taken as limited to either the style or the content of the speeches: since ὡς in ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι clearly refers to both style *and* content of the speeches in Timaeus' narrative indiscriminately, the same must be assumed for ὡς in ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν, lest the parallel become meaningless.

Second, there is a clear parallelism between the beginning of 12.25a.4–5 and its end: the bipartite expression which concludes the passage, ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως ποιούμενος, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐξήγησιν τῶν κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένων, not only summarizes Polybius' main point, that the speeches in Timaeus are the historian's own composition and not an accurate representation of what was really said.[19] The two parts of this phrase also resume chiastically Polybius' opening statement, with ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ

---

[14] See Pédech's (n. 2) translation: 'ni même l'esprit', which would be an appropriate paraphrase of Thucydides' τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης, but is an impossible translation of ὡς ἐρρήθη; similarly, Walbank (n. 2), 386: 'the real sense of what was said'.

[15] Cf. Nicolai (n. 1), 286, who rightly points out that there is a substantial difference ('una differenza sostanziale') between Polybius' δεῖ and Thucydides' τὰ δέοντα: while Thucydides is referring to speeches composed with due regard to the circumstances and the character of the speaker, Polybius' point is that Timaeus is following the purely theoretical rules of rhetorical composition taught in the schools of declamation which have lost all contact with political reality and are a far cry from the verisimilitude which Thucydides sought to achieve.

[16] Pédech (n. 2), 124.

[17] Kühner–Gerth 2.2, §581.8, at 495, discuss a few cases in which ὡς seems to be used instead of the relative pronoun but conclude that in each of these cases the subordinate clause actually describes the way and method by which something was done or achieved ('die **Art** und **Weise** … **wie** sich das im Hauptsatz Ausgesagte verhalte', emphasis mine).

[18] *Rh*. 3.1403b.19–20; cf. *Eth. Nic.* 4.1128a.1: οἷα δεῖ λέγειν καὶ ὥς.

[19] I will return to this point below.

δυνάμεως ποιούμενος referring back to προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι and οὐκ ἐξήγησιν τῶν κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένων to οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν, οὐδ᾽ ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν. Since Polybius does not make any distinction between the form and the content of the speeches here, it seems safe to assume the same for τὰ ῥηθέντα and ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν at the beginning of the passage.

These considerations lead us to the first conclusion of this argument, that ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν cannot mean an 'accurate résumé' (in indirect speech) of a historical speech and, therefore, cannot refer to the content of a speech to the exclusion of its form: ὡς in ὡς ἐρρήθη and ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι can refer either to the style (λέξις) of a speech only (which does not make much sense in the present context),[20] or to both style *and* content of a speech together (the speech 'as it was uttered'), but never to the content of a speech alone.

Τὰ ῥηθέντα, by contrast, can denote a *verbatim* reproduction of an original speech, but it can equally be used to refer to the opposite notion, a mere summary of the content of a speech, regardless of the speaker's actual words.[21] This is how Mohm understood the term,[22] and this also explains why Welzhofer took ὡς ἐρρήθη to mean 'the form in which it was said' without further discussion.[23] Hence, τὰ ῥηθέντα can be used both in the sense of 'the exact speech that was given in style and content', and in the sense of 'the content/ main points of what was said'.

Therefore, and this is the second conclusion, if we wanted to uphold the assumption that Polybius is, in fact, distinguishing three different ways of rendering speeches in historical works – accurate reproduction, summary of the content and the historiographer's own compositions – it is ὡς ἐρρήθη, and not τὰ ῥηθέντα, as Walbank and Pédech claimed, which would have to be taken to designate the first alternative; τὰ ῥηθέντα, by contrast, which Walbank and Pédech had taken to refer to a *verbatim* reproduction

---

[20] For an interesting parallel expression which provides further support to this conclusion see Xen. *Ap.* 1. There the narrator explains that the authors of previous *Apologies* resemble each other in the 'loftiness' (transl. Todd) of Socrates' tone (μεγαληγορία) but that all of them failed in providing their speeches with a content (διανοίᾳ in the next quotation) sophisticated enough to match the 'loftiness' of the words, a failure he intends to correct (ὥστε **πρέπουσαν** φαίνεσθαι τὴν μεγαληγορίαν αὐτοῦ τῇ **διανοίᾳ**, ibid. 2, emphasis added). He remarks, however, that the fact that all the previous works concur in this 'loftiness' of Socrates' tone proved that 'it was really thus spoken by Socrates' (transl. mine). The phrasing of this statement, which, it is clear from the context, refers exclusively to the style of the previous works, is remarkably similar to Polybius's ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν· δῆλον ὅτι **τῷ ὄντι οὕτως ἐρρήθη** ὑπὸ Σωκράτους.

[21] See e.g. Thuc. 2.27.2: ὁ μὲν Ἀρχίδαμος τοσαῦτα εἶπεν· οἱ δὲ Πλαταιῶν πρέσβεις ἀκούσαντες ταῦτα ἐσῆλθον ἐς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τῷ πλήθει τὰ ῥηθέντα κοινώσαντες ἀπεκρίναντο … Obviously, the messengers do not repeat Archidamus' whole speech to their people but give them a summary of the content, τὰ ῥηθέντα; similarly, ibid. 5.60.1: ὁ Ἆγις δεξάμενος τοὺς λόγους αὐτός, καὶ οὐ μετὰ τῶν πλεόνων οὐδὲ αὐτὸς βουλευσάμενος ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ κοινώσας τῶν ἐν τέλει ξυστρατευομένων, σπένδεται τέσσαρας μῆνας, ἐν οἷς ἔδει ἐπιτελέσαι αὐτοὺς τὰ ῥηθέντα, i.e. 'the things he had ordered them to do in his speech'; in Isoc. 3.12.3 (Ἡγοῦμαι δ᾽ οὕτως ἂν μάλιστα παρακαλέσαι καὶ προτρέψαι πρὸς τὸ μνημονεύειν ὑμᾶς τὰ ῥηθέντα καὶ πειθαρχεῖν αὐτοῖς), τὰ ῥηθέντα is followed by a summary of the main points Isocrates might make; Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.13 (προσιόντων δ᾽ εὐθὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἡριππίδας. Τὰ μὲν ἄλλα, ὦ Ἀγησίλαε, τὰ ῥηθέντα τί ἄν τις μακρολογοίη; τέλος δὲ λέγει Σπιθριδάτης πᾶν ποιεῖν ἂν ἡδέως ὅ τι σοι δοκοίη), with τὰ ῥηθέντα meaning 'the several other points he made'; Pl. *Phlb.* 39b1 (ἀποδέχομαι τὰ ῥηθέντα οὕτως, 'I understand what was said, i.e. the arguments proffered in the speech, as follows').

[22] Mohm (n. 2), 56 (see above).

[23] To him, this interpretation was so obvious that he even stated that 'the meaning of this passage is so clear that a misunderstanding is impossible' ('die stelle ist so klar, dasz kein misverständnis möglich ist', 541).

of a speech, would then have to be taken to denote an (accurate) summary or résumé of the content of a speech alone. On this basis, Polybius' sentence would translate thus:

For Timaeus does not record what was said [τὰ ῥηθέντα, that is, give a summary of the content of a speech], nor does he record a speech the way it was actually given [ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν, that is, provide a *verbatim* reproduction of the original speech], but presenting us with speeches as they should have been uttered, he recounts all the speeches that were given and the circumstances of the events just as if someone was setting about to compose a rhetorical exercise on a given topic <...> and, in so doing, is showing off his own rhetorical abilities but does not provide an account of what was actually said.

At first sight this might seem a satisfactory explanation, but a closer look reveals some difficulties with this, too, which are worth exploring further. First, the use of οὐδέ is problematic. If the above interpretation were correct, Polybius' arrangement of the three methods of rendering speeches in a historical narrative would be somewhat odd. We expect a climax, starting with the best possible and, from the point of view of historical accuracy, most desirable option, a *verbatim* reproduction of the speeches, then proceeding to the less desirable but still acceptable option of an accurate summary of the content, and culminating in the absolutely unacceptable method adopted by Timaeus, free composition of speeches by the historian. As it stands, however, the order of the alleged first and second elements of the list is reversed.

We would then have to assume that οὐδέ implies a sense of climax along the lines of 'Timaeus does not provide a summary of the actual speeches, *let alone* a *verbatim* reproduction ...'. The difficulty with this assumption is that οὐδέ does not have this meaning. To be sure, it can be used 'with a sense of climax, "nor even"',[24] as in the example cited by Denniston, Plato, *Respublica* 347d1–2: οὐκ ἔχοντες ἑαυτῶν βελτίοσιν ἐπιτρέψαι οὐδὲ ὁμοίοις. The difference between this and our passage is that in *Respublica* 347d1–2 οὐδέ introduces an element of inferior degree to the element introduced by οὐ: 'they cannot socialize with people who are better than themselves nor even with those who are their equals'. This makes sense because οὐδέ, connecting two negative terms with a climax, would naturally be expected to introduce a term that is even 'more negative' than, or inferior to, the first one, as in βελτίοσιν and ὁμοίοις: the climax is a negative one. Οὐδέ in Polybius 12.25.a.4, by contrast, requires a 'positive climax' because the *verbatim* reproduction of the original speech (ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν) would be even more authentic, and hence desirable, than a (faithful) summary (τὰ ῥηθέντα). The sense required for οὐδέ is therefore 'let alone', rather than 'nor even',[25] for which Denniston, not surprisingly, does not cite any passages, because in Greek such a 'positive' climax after a negative expression is regularly introduced with μὴ ὅτι.[26]

We are thus left with the alternative either to accept that Polybius might have phrased his statement differently than we would expect (which is certainly an option) or to look for a different explanation. If we opt for the second option (which I do), the above considerations make it seem doubtful that we are dealing with three different elements of an

---

[24] *GP*, s.v. 2, at 193.

[25] The passages cited by Denniston under II.2, at 196, do not apply because here οὐδέ modifies one word only, rather than being part of an enumeration of negative elements as in Polybius.

[26] See Kühner–Gerth 2.2, §525.4, at 260. The examples listed there include Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.35 (διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα οὐδὲ πλεῖν, μὴ ὅτι ἀναιρεῖσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας δυνατὸν ἦν); Pl. *Phdr.* 240d7–e1 (καὶ λόγῳ ἐστὶν ἀκούειν οὐκ εὐπρεπές, μὴ ὅτι δὴ ἔργῳ ... μεταχειρίζεσθαι).

enumeration. This suggests that we should explore different possible meanings of the passage.

This interpretation receives further support from a close examination of the specific uses Polybius makes of τὰ ῥηθέντα when referring to speeches of historical actors; to my knowledge, such a systematic study has never been undertaken. A *TLG* search for τὰ ῥηθέντα in the *Histories* shows that Polybius applies the term to refer to (1) a summary mention of a speech without any further specifications regarding content and form, as in 4.26.8[27] and 28.16.9;[28] (2) speeches rendered in indirect speech, as in 3.29.1,[29] 11.9.8,[30] 15.24.3,[31] 18.8.8,[32] 23.18.1;[33] and (3) speeches rendered in direct speech, as in 5.37.12.[34] This indeterminacy of the term shows that Polybius uses τὰ ῥηθέντα to refer to speeches neutrally and in a general sense as a historical event ('the things said'/ 'the speech') without any inherent specification as to whether a speech is actually represented in a historical work at all and, if it is, in what way the historiographer processed the event. Particularly significant here is 21.22.1, where Polybius uses τὰ ῥηθέντα to refer to a speech of Eumenes which he had reported previously partly in indirect (21.19.1–5) and partly in direct speech (21.19.6–21.11). Whether the historiographer rendered 'the things said' in direct or indirect speech, mentioned them only in passing as a statement of fact, namely that a historical actor gave a speech, or provided a mere summary of the contents, becomes clear only through the context in which the expression is used.

In other words, τὰ ῥηθέντα is not a (quasi-)technical term describing any specific way of representing speeches in historiography, and there is no reason to suppose that 12.25a.4 is the only passage in which Polybius expected his readers to understand it as such. If τὰ ῥηθέντα does not designate any specific way of rendering speeches but requires specification from the context, it cannot stand alone representing the first element of an enumeration which, in turn, leads to the conclusion that the idea of a tripartite structure of Polybius' argument should be abandoned.

This suggests that οὐ τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν means that Timaeus 'has not written down what was said' in as general and as neutral a sense as possible: Polybius begins his argument with a statement of the general problem, namely that there is a discrepancy between the historical event, in this case the documented speeches given by the historical actors, τὰ ῥηθέντα, and the way in which this event is represented in Timaeus'

---

[27] Προσελθόντος δὲ καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν ἐν Αἰγίῳ καὶ διαλεχθέντος διὰ πλειόνων, τὰ ῥηθέντα μετ᾽ εὐνοίας ἀπεδέξαντο.

[28] Τὰ μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τούτων ῥηθέντα πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον καὶ τὰς δοθείσας αὐτοῖς ἀποκρίσεις ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου καὶ διότι πάντων τῶν φιλανθρώπων τυχόντες ἐπανῆλθον, ἐν τοῖς Ἰταλικοῖς εἴπομεν, referring to *Histories* 28.2.1–6, where the speeches are only summarily mentioned (ἐξ ὧν πλεονάκις ἐν τοῖς ἐκείνων πράγμασιν ἀντιρρήσεως γινομένης, καὶ διελκομένων τῶν διαβουλίων, ἐλάμβανον ἀφορμὰς οἱ βουλόμενοι λογοποιεῖν κατὰ τῆς πόλεως. οὐ μὴν ἥ γε σύγκλητος τότε προσεποιήθη τούτων οὐδέν …, 28.2.4–5).

[29] Τὰ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων λεγόμενα, with a slight variation in vocabulary.

[30] Πάντες δ᾽ οἱ παρόντες οὕτως ἀπεδέξαντο τὰ ῥηθέντα καὶ τὸν νοῦν τῆς παρακλήσεως ἐθαύμασαν (about a speech of Philopoemen); the same speech is referred to at 11.10.1 as εἷς λόγος εὐκαίρως ῥηθείς and at 11.10.7 in πάντες ἐπανῆγον ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις, τά τε ῥηθέντα καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα διαφερόντως ἀποδεδεγμένοι.

[31] Συγχωρεῖν τὸν βασιλέα Θασίους ἀφρουρήτους, ἀφορολογήτους, ἀνεπισταθμεύτους, νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις. ἐπισημηναμένων δὲ μετὰ κραυγῆς πάντων τὰ ῥηθέντα παρήγαγον τὸν Φίλιππον εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

[32] Τίνα μὲν οὖν ἦν τὰ τότε ῥηθέντα παρ᾽ ἑκατέρου, δυσχερὲς εἰπεῖν.

[33] Τοιαῦτα μὲν ἦν τὰ ῥηθέντα παρ᾽ ἑκατέρων.

[34] Εἶπε κατὰ τοῦ Κλεομένους τὸν ἄρτι ῥηθέντα λόγον.

account (γέγραφεν). The concrete form in which Timaeus (mis-)represents these facts is not yet an issue; it is in the following part of the sentence, starting with οὐδέ, that it becomes apparent through ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ’ ἀλήθειαν (an expression, as argued above, referring to both style *and* content), that Polybius is here referring to the *direct* speeches in Timaeus (and these only): all *direct* speeches in Timaeus are compositions of the historian rather than as-faithful-as-possible reproductions of the original speeches. Again, examination of the overall structure of the passage provides additional support for these conclusions: as pointed out above, there is a noticeable parallelism between ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως ποιούμενος and προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι on the one hand, and οὐκ ἐξήγησιν τῶν κατ’ ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένων and οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν, οὐδ’ ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ’ ἀλήθειαν on the other. Summing up his main points, Polybius’ statement at the end of his argument also distinguishes between *two* different ways of rendering *direct* speeches only: they are either an accurate reproduction of the original speeches, which is what serious historiographers should aspire to, or compositions of the historiographer, which is the method adopted by Timaeus and severely criticized by Polybius.

Hence Nicolai was right in surmising τὰ ῥηθέντα and ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ’ ἀλήθειαν referred to the same notion, and as such could be seen as tautological, but that there was some sort of difference between them. We are now able to explain that this difference consists in the fact that Polybius specifies the implication of the general expression οὐ τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν by adding the explicatory οὐδ’ ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ’ ἀλήθειαν.

Such a specific use of οὐδέ after a more general element introduced by οὐ, which is sometimes, as in the present case, followed by ἀλλά, and sometimes not, occurs also elsewhere throughout the *Histories*; it can be seen as yet another instance of Polybius’ tendency to combine expressions which seem to be almost synonymous in order to create as precise an expression as possible.[35] The following examples demonstrate that, as at 12.25a, the terms thus linked are usually not strictly speaking synonymous and the resulting phrase tautological, but that the second term generally specifies or adds some additional nuance to the (often more general) first term; often, the second term also describes the result or consequence of the first. In all those cases in which this construction is followed by ἀλλά the stylistic effect is a particular emphasis on the element which ἀλλά introduces. As such, the expression is a climactic one, but the emphasis does not increase steadily from the first to the last element; rather, the explication of the first two elements prepares the introduction of and lays stress on the third one.

Examples of this usage include 1.65.3 (Καρχηδονίους δὲ [*sc.* ἐξεδέξατο] κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν **οὐ μικρὸς οὐδ’ εὐκαταφρόνητος** ὁ πρὸς τοὺς ξένους καὶ τοὺς Νομάδας καὶ τοὺς ἅμα τούτοις ἀποστάντας Λίβυας [*sc.* πόλεμος]);[36] 3.57.4–5 (ἡμεῖς … τοῦτο τὸ μέρος … παρελείπομεν … πρῶτον μὲν **οὐ βουλόμενοι παρ’ ἕκαστα διασπᾶν** τὴν διήγησιν **οὐδ’ ἀποπλανᾶν** ἀπὸ τῆς πραγματικῆς ὑποθέσεως τοὺς φιληκοούντας, δεύτερον δὲ κρίνοντες **οὐ διερριμμένην οὐδ’ ἐν παρέργῳ** ποιήσασθαι τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν μνήμην, **ἀλλὰ** κατ’ ἰδίαν καὶ τόπον καὶ καιρὸν ἀπονείμαντες τῷ μέρει τούτῳ …; the reader being led astray [ἀποπλανᾶν] would, in fact, be the effect of ‘breaking up’ [διασπᾶν] the narrative, just as a ‘scattered’

---

[36] Cf. 2.6.6–7 (οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σκερδιλαΐδαν πεζῇ πάλιν ἀνεχώρησαν … **οὐ μικρὰν οὐδὲ τὴν τυχοῦσαν** κατάπληξιν καὶ φόβον ἐνεργασάμενοι τοῖς τὰς παραλίας οἰκοῦσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων).

[διερριμμένην] mention of such things would result in them appearing 'subordinate' [ἐν παρέργῳ] in different narrative contexts);[37] 10.7.2 (**οὐ κατεπέπληκτο** τοὺς Καρχηδονίους **οὐδ' ἥττητο τῇ ψυχῇ**);[38] 15.13.3–4 (τοῖς δὲ μισθοφόροις τῶν Καρχηδονίων **οὐ συνεγγιζόντων οὐδὲ παραβοηθούντων, ἀλλ'** ἀποδειλιώντων ταῖς ψυχαῖς, πέρας ἐνέκλιναν οἱ βάρβαροι);[39] 27.9.5 (ποτὲ δὲ καὶ χλευάζειν ἐγχειροῦσι τὸν ἕτερον, **οὐ μισοῦντες οὐδὲ καταγινώσκοντες, ἀλλὰ** παραδόξως τε συμπαθεῖς γινόμενοι …); 11.4.2 (**οὐ** γὰρ νῦν **πρῶτον οὐδὲ δεύτερον** ποιούμεθα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης λόγους, **ἀλλ'** ἐξ ὅτου τὸν πόλεμον ἐνεστήσασθε).

Comparison with these passages shows that the same syntactic structure and stylistic effect underlie Polybius' **οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα** γέγραφεν **οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ** προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι …[40] Accordingly, not too much emphasis should be placed on the explicatory οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν. As mentioned above, this element is more than just a tautological apposition because it specifies Polybius' general criticism, that 'Timaeus has not recorded the things said', by explicating the consequences of this methodological failure: the style and content of the direct speeches in Timaeus' work are inauthentic. But in order to appreciate the stylistic effect of the phrasing it is necessary to regard the first and the second elements as being closely interrelated: grammatically, both are objects dependent on γέγραφεν[41] which are combined as a pair by οὐδέ.[42] This prepares the introduction of Polybius' actual point: Timaeus' historical work is condemnable not simply because the speeches are inauthentic. Timaeus deliberately falsified history by substituting for the true speeches his own rhetorical showpieces, designed solely to exhibit his rhetorical ability; in so doing, he made it impossible for the reader to achieve any clear and reliable understanding of what happened and why, which Polybius regards as the essence of any respectable historical writing.[43]

So far, this discussion has demonstrated the difficulties inherent in two generally accepted and interrelated assumptions about Polybius' criticism of speeches in Timaeus, namely (1) that the passage constitutes a general statement on historical method regarding different ways of representing speeches in historical works, and (2) that Polybius distinguishes three different ways of rendering speeches in historiography, ordered as a climax descending from the most desirable to the least acceptable.

By contrast, the in-depth discussion of the semantics and syntactic structure of the passage has revealed two things. Firstly, unlike Thucydides 1.22.1, *Histories*

---

[37] Similarly, 3.85.9 (τῆς ὁμολογουμένης ἥττης **οὐ μετρίως οὐδὲ κατὰ σχῆμα** τὴν περιπέτειαν ἔφερον).

[38] Cf. 11.15.2 (**οὐ πτοηθεὶς ἔφευγεν οὐδ' ἀθυμήσας ἀπέστη** <...>, **ἀλλ'** ὑποστείλας αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸ τῆς φάλαγγος κέρας).

[39] Cf. 31.12.5 (τὴν δὲ σύγκλητον **οὐ** τολμήσειν ἔτι **βοηθεῖν οὐδὲ συνεπισχύειν** τοῖς περὶ τὸν Λυσίαν …).

[40] In order to clarify the structure I have removed the comma after γέγραφεν which obfuscates the effect of the phrasing by making οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν seem like a rather gratuitous apposition.

[41] On indirect questions belonging to the category of 'substantive clauses' as objects in a sentence, see Kühner–Gerth 2.2, §547.7, at 349.

[42] It is therefore the copulative force of οὐδέ which prevails (cf. Kühner–Gerth 2.2, §535.4b, at 293). I attempt to bring out the close interrelation of οὐ τὰ ῥηθέντα and οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν and the connective function of οὐδέ in the translation below by rendering the phrase as 'not … and', rather than as 'not … and not'.

[43] Cf. Meister (n. 1), 36.

12.25a.4–5 is not a general theoretical statement on different methods of rendering speeches in historiography,[44] the most reproachable of which is illustrated in the case of Timaeus, and we should not read Polybius' argument in the light of the statement of his predecessor. On the contrary, 12.25a.4–5 is concerned *only* with the *direct speeches* in Timaeus' work specifically. Polybius is not giving a lesson in historiographical method in general but is criticizing one particular aspect of Timaeus' work, which in his opinion best illustrates the unreliability of the work as a whole. And the direct speeches are particularly suitable for that purpose because every reader can compare the original speech (as far as it was accessible, but that does not concern us here) with what Timaeus has written. And Timaeus' procedure is so very problematic because, if accurately reproduced, direct speeches can offer the readers an immediate and authentic access to the past and the minds of the historical actors themselves. In stark contrast, the speeches in Timaeus' work grant the readers access to Timaeus' mind only and thus provide no valuable insight into the reasons and factors that determined the course of the past. This explains why Polybius thought that the (direct) speeches in Timaeus were particularly suitable to prove the general unreliability of his work as a whole (12.25a.1–4).

Secondly, instead of a tripartite structure we are, in fact, dealing with a bipartite structure which also occurs elsewhere in the *Histories*. This overall structure is designed to lay stress on the second element (introduced by ἀλλά) by creating a strong contrast with the first one. This contrast owes its effectiveness to an emphasis on the first element which is created by its subdivision into two closely interrelated, yet not simply tautological, components by means of οὐ … οὐδέ.

The following is a translation that makes no attempt to smooth over Polybius' somewhat cumbersome diction, but instead adheres as faithfully as possible to the original grammar and syntax (the impersonal aorist passive verbs are particularly difficult to render): 'Not the things that were spoken has he recorded and how it was really spoken, but presenting us with how it should have been spoken …'.

As mentioned above, scholarly interest in 12.25a.4–5 has focussed almost exclusively on the first part of the sentence, while the rest of Polybius' statement has been neglected. This has obfuscated the fact that Polybius' remarks about the (lack of) reliability of Timaeus' speeches is, in fact, not an independent point made for its own sake. They are part of a more general criticism of characteristics of Timaeus' narrative that are centred on, but not limited to, the way in which Timaeus handles direct speeches. In the remainder of this article I will demonstrate how Polybius' criticism of the direct speeches in Timaeus relates to the remaining part of the sentence and Polybius' statements made there.

Concentrating on defining how οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν relates to what precedes it, scholars have disregarded the fact that Polybius is, in fact, making two points about the way in which Timaeus handles speeches in his work, each point being represented by one of the two main verbs, namely γέγραφεν in οὐ … τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν and ἐξαριθμεῖται in πάντας ἐξαριθμεῖται τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους καὶ τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς πράγμασιν. These two main points are connected by οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι. In what follows, particular attention will be paid to the function of this juncture.

---

[44] Cf. Baron (n. 1), 8: 'it is misleading to refer to the book as a digression on historical method, or to state that its purpose is to lay out a theory of historiography, since this obscures its highly polemical nature'.

Before doing so, however, we need to consider one preliminary issue concerning the meaning of πάντας … τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους that was raised by Walbank. In his comment on the phrase, Walbank explains it as: '"all these speeches", that is, all the speeches according to the historian's version, not the real speeches, which P. insists were *not* recorded … P. does not express the distinction very clearly'.[45] I will argue now that this explanation is unconvincing for several reasons and that we should take ῥηθέντας to refer to the actual, historical speeches and not, as Walbank suggests, to the speeches as invented by Timaeus.

To begin with, the aorist participle ῥηθέντας makes sense only if Polybius is referring here to speeches that were actually *uttered* in the past, and it is in this sense that Polybius uses combinations of passive participles of verbs of speaking, with or without κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀληθῶς, or similar adverbial expressions, both throughout his work and in our passage itself. Nicolai, in fact, quotes three such instances, erroneously referring to them as evidence that Polybius did not distinguish between knowledge of the original speeches and the way these are rendered in the historical account.[46] Yet in 12.25b.1, τῆς ἱστορίας ἰδίωμα τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτοὺς τοὺς κατ' ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένους, οἷοί ποτ' ἂν ὦσι, γνῶναι λόγους, the added οἷοί ποτ' ἂν ὦσι makes it unmistakeable that Polybius is here referring to the original speeches as given by the historical actors, and the contrast of τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους and ψευδῆ δ' ἀντὶ τούτων ἐπιχειρήματα καὶ διεξοδικοὺς … λόγους in 12.25b.4, as well as that of <τὰ> κατ' ἀλήθειαν ῥηθέντα <καθ'> ὅσον οἷόν τε πολυπραγμονήσαντας διασαφεῖν and οὔτε (*sc.* πρέπει) τοῖς ἱστοριογράφοις ἐμμελετᾶν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν οὐδ' ἐναποδείκνυσθαι τὴν αὑτῶν δύναμιν in 36.1.7, have the same effect. To this list we can add the final part of our passage, which was discussed above, where again the contrast with ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως makes it clear that τῶν κατ' ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένων refers to the original speeches as they were actually uttered by the historical actors, and not to the speeches as they were composed by the historiographer. For the representation of speeches in historical works, by contrast, Polybius uses γράφειν, as at the beginning of our passage, where both terms are combined in οὐ [...] τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν.

Secondly, the verb ἐξαριθμεῖται itself precludes that Polybius is referring with ῥηθέντας to the speeches composed by Timaeus. Ἐξαριθμέω means to 'recount', that is, give a full enumeration of a given set of objects without any exceptions, and in this sense it often (as in the present passage) connotes a tiresome, unnecessary process.[47] By definition, the process of 're-counting' requires a pre-existing number of items which someone chooses to enumerate completely instead of selecting only the most significant elements. These considerations lead us to the conclusion that πάντας ἐξαριθμεῖται τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους refers to the speeches that were actually uttered by the historical actors.[48]

---

[45] Walbank (n. 2), 385–6.

[46] Nicolai (n. 1), 285; cf. my remarks above.

[47] Cf. Isoc. 4. 66: **Ἅπαντας** μὲν οὖν **ἐξαριθμῶν** τοὺς κινδύνους **λίαν ἂν μακρολογοίην**· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν μεγίστων τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὅνπερ ὀλίγῳ πρότερον πειράσομαι καὶ περὶ τούτων διελθεῖν; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.72.2: **κατέτριψαν ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν** ἐκείνην τὰς ἀλλήλων ἀρετὰς **ἐξαριθμούμενοι** καὶ **λιπαροῦντες** μὴ λαβεῖν αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀρχήν (these examples cited in LSJ, p. 587, s.v. III); in Polybius cf. τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι in 2.56.10, which will be discussed below.

[48] Both Pédech and Nicolai take πάντας ἐξαριθμεῖται τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους as referring to the original historical speeches; cf. Pédech's (n. 2) translation of the phrase: 'tous les discours

In order to understand the function of this expression, it is important to note that we are already in the second part of Polybius' argument in which he is concerned with yet another flaw of Timaeus' historical work. In the first part of the sentence, οὐ γὰρ τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραφεν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι, Polybius criticizes the general lack of authenticity of the direct speeches in Timaeus' work. Now he moves on to his second point of criticism, namely the *number* of speeches included by Timaeus: Timaeus' fault is not only to have composed the speeches in his work himself. He also did not distinguish between relevant and irrelevant speeches that were given in a certain historical situation but included each and every speech of any historical actor because this provided him with even more opportunities to substitute his own compositions for original speeches and thus to show off his rhetorical skills.[49]

This is in keeping with Polybius' criticism of the negative influence of rhetorical education on the reliability of historiography elsewhere in the *Histories*: rhetorical declamation induces authors such as Timaeus to show off their rhetorical skills by composing declamatory show pieces – instead of including the original speeches, even though they might have been of mediocre quality – as well as showing off their historical knowledge by adding as many circumstantial details as possible, relevant or not. By contrast, Polybius repeatedly stresses that it is a core competence of the true historiographer to identify, and report, only those speeches that had a decisive impact on the course of events, for example, at 12.25i.5 (τὸ μὲν ματαίως καὶ ἀκαίρως [καὶ] πρὸς πάντα πάντας διεξιέναι τοὺς ἐνόντας λόγους contrasted with τοὺς ἁρμόζοντας καὶ καιρίους ἀεὶ λαμβάνειν), 36.1.7 (the historian's duty is <τὰ> κατ' ἀλήθειαν ῥηθέντα <καθ'> ὅσον οἷόν τε πολυπραγμονήσαντας διασαφεῖν, καὶ τούτων τὰ καιριώτατα καὶ πραγματικώτατα) and 2.56.10.[50]

In the latter passage Polybius objects to historiographers who make use of these rhetorical practices (τοὺς ἐνδεχομένους λόγους ζητεῖν καὶ τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι) in order to evoke pity and horror, effects normally associated with tragedy (καθάπερ οἱ τραγῳδιογράφοι), instead of doing what they are supposed to do, namely 'to report what was actually done and said, even if it happens to be

prononcés'. The anonymous reviewer raises the question whether ἐξαριθμεῖται might simply mean that Timaeus 'enumerated' all the speeches without giving his own version of each of them. This is possible but, in my view, unlikely since Polybius specifies ἐξαριθμεῖται by adding 'in the same way as someone might embark on a rhetorical exercise <…> giving a demonstration, as it were, of his own skills, but not an account of the things that were really spoken'. This specification makes sense only if Timaeus actually included his own version of each of the speeches given in a particular situation.

[49] I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for raising the question of how this passage relates to Polybius' statement at 25b.4, that Timaeus 'destroys the very essence of historiography by passing over in silence [παρασιωπῶν] both the speeches that were given [τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους] and the reason [sc. why they were successful or failed] and producing [λέγων] historically inaccurate [ψευδῆ] rhetorical exercises [ἐπιχειρήματα] and long-winded discourses [διεξοδικοὺς λόγους] instead'. There is no contradiction between the passages; rather, both statements express the same idea, but with a different emphasis. In both cases οἱ ῥηθέντες λόγοι refers to the speeches that were actually pronounced by historical actors. Like 25b, 25a mentions that Timaeus has replaced these speeches with his own, but the emphasis here is on the fact that he includes all of them (πάντας ἐξαριθμεῖται τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους) (in his own versions) indiscriminately; the main focus is on Timaeus' failure to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant speeches. 25b, by contrast, is concerned exclusively with the fact that Timaeus replaced the original speeches (τοὺς ῥηθέντας λόγους) with his own rhetorical creations, thus making the originals inaccessible to the reader (παρασιωπῶν) and, in so doing, preventing an adequate understanding of the course of events.

[50] This aspect of Polybius' use of speeches has been examined in detail by Usher (n. 1).

entirely mediocre' (τῶν δὲ πραχθέντων καὶ ῥηθέντων κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν αὐτῶν μνημονεύειν πάμπαν, <κ>ἂν πάνυ μέτρια τυγχάνωσιν ὄντα). Comparison of Polybius' objections to the practice of these 'tragic' historiographers in this passage with his criticism of Timaeus at 12.25a.5 is helpful further to elucidate the latter passage. The methods of Timaeus and the 'tragic' historiographers have in common that both deflect from the actual events and apply rhetorical methods of amplification instead: they invent speeches and include as much circumstantial description as possible.

Yet two important differences need to be stressed: first, both Timaeus and the 'tragic' historiographers composed the speeches in their works themselves. But Timaeus included all speeches that were given in a specific situation indiscriminately, that is, all the speeches in Timaeus were actually given at some point, it is only their style and content that are inauthentic, and many of them are irrelevant. The 'tragic' historiographers, by contrast, also include speeches that were never actually given, but could have been given in a certain situation (τοὺς ἐνδεχομένους λόγους),[51] that is, not only content and style of their speeches are inauthentic but also the occurrence of the speeches itself. Second, the 'tragic' historiographers apply the rhetorical techniques for the specific aim of inducing a particular emotional response in their recipients, while Timaeus applied them simply to show off his rhetorical education (ὥσπερ ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως ποιούμενος, 12.25a.5).

Returning to 12.25a.5, we can now identify two interrelated elements that constitute Polybius's criticism of Timaeus. Firstly, the direct speeches in Timaeus are inauthentic: Timaeus wants to show off his rhetorical abilities and therefore composes the speeches himself. And secondly, owing to the same flaw, Timaeus replaces each and every historical speech indiscriminately with one of his own, which he supplements with an unnecessary wealth of details about their circumstances. But many of these speeches along with the circumstances in which they occurred are historically irrelevant and should therefore never have been included. In contrast to the 'tragic historians', however, Timaeus does not seem to have invented speeches which have never been given at all. Whether this is accurate or not, we have no means to determine; at any rate, Polybius does not criticize Timaeus for inventing speeches that were never given.[52]

In the two ὡς-sentences Polybius has created a sophisticated transition between these two points. From the point of view of grammar, each of these ὡς-sentences belongs to one of the main verbs that form the core of Polybius' statement: as the above discussion has shown, (οὐδ᾽) ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν and (οὐ) τὰ ῥηθέντα both represent direct objects dependent on γέγραφεν, while ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι depends on προθέμενος which, in turn, is governed by ἐξαριθμεῖται.

By way of contents and phrasing, by contrast, this seemingly clear-cut attribution is deliberately undercut; several stylistic properties invite the reader to perceive them as forming a pair despite the fact that they depend on different finite verbs and, therefore,

[51] Thus, correctly, Nicolai (n. 1), 287 ('la ricerca di tutti i discorsi possibili'). Nicolai is mistaken, however, when claiming that this, along with the enumeration of the circumstances of an event, is characteristic of the tragic genre ('appartengono alla prassi del genere tragico'). Rather, Timaeus and the 'tragic' historiographers apply the same rhetorical techniques; what distinguishes them, as I argue above, is the *effect* they want to achieve with them.
[52] Most recently, C. Baron (n. 1) has demonstrated how selective and distorted an image of Timaeus' work Polybius presents. He convincingly suggests that this is deliberate because Polybius wished to 'supplant Timaios as *the* Greek historian of Rome' (5); ibid. 8–9, 26, 33–4; see already Walbank (n. 1 [1962]), 9–10.

grammatically belong to different parts of the sentence: both are introduced with ὡς, contain a passive aorist form of λέγειν, and consist of the same number of words (if we include προθέμενος); moreover, the chiasmus of κατ' ἀλήθειαν and δεῖ poignantly highlights the key notions of historical accuracy as opposed to composition by the rules of declamation. Finally, the adversative ἀλλά, which connects the two parts of the sentence, does not connect the two main verbs directly but sets up an opposition between the objects of the first main verb, οὐ τὰ ῥηθέντα and οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, and the object of the participle, the second indirect question, ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι; all this contributes to the two indirect questions acquiring the weight of almost a third point besides the main verbs, the principal carriers of meaning of the two parts of the sentence.

The result is a third centre of meaning between the two verbs, which has more weight than a mere apposition but does not constitute a fully independent, additional, point of its own. Rather, it bridges the main points by simultaneously explicating the first one and facilitating the transition to the second. Apart from the aforementioned stylistic features, the participle plays a crucial role in this process: after the first part of the sentence, the reader might have expected the main point of the passage to be the opposition between recording speeches as they were actually given and composing speeches according to the rules of school rhetoric. Instead of ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι depending on a participle, we would have expected the indirect question to depend on a finite verb in order to complete the opposition: 'not the things that were spoken has Timaeus recorded and how it was really spoken, but he presents us with how it should have been spoken …'

Instead, by making ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι depend on a participle, Polybius lays more emphasis on it than on the preceding οὐδ' ὡς ἐρρήθη κατ' ἀλήθειαν, which, being the explication of οὐ τὰ ῥηθέντα, has no verbal form of its own to support it; at the same time, however, ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι is not on the same syntactic level as οὐ τὰ ῥηθέντα, which directly depends on the first finite verb (γέγραφεν) and together with it constitutes the first main and independent point. Rather, it is subordinate to, and so prepares the reader for, the introduction of Polybius' second main point, which is represented by the second finite verb (ἐξαριθμεῖται). Consequently, there is a certain tension between grammar and style in Polybius' sentence: the style mitigates the grammatical association of each of the two elements of the middle part of the sentence with Polybius' first and second main point, respectively. Polybius thus prevents the two finite verbs from being the only carriers of meaning and the sentence from falling into two clearly distinguished parts. Instead, this construction allows him to tie the two main verbs closely together by way of an elaboration of his first point which, at the same time, introduces his second point by illustrating it (προθέμενος ὡς δεῖ ῥηθῆναι), thus forcefully expressing the close interrelation of what he regards as Timaeus' key faults: the lack of authenticity of the direct speeches combined with his inability (refusal?) to limit the direct speeches in his work to the historically relevant ones only.

I bring this article to a conclusion by proposing a full translation of *Histories* 12.25a.4–5 which takes into account the results of the preceding discussion:

For not the things that were spoken has Timaeus recorded and how it was really spoken, but presenting us with how it should have been spoken, he recounts all the speeches that were uttered and the circumstances of the events in the same way as someone might embark on a rhetorical exercise <…> giving a demonstration, as it were, of his own skills, but not an account of the things that were really spoken.

University of St Andrews   N. WIATER
nw23@st-andrews.ac.uk