



**UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)**

**Deictic Centres of Referential Expressions in Indirect Speech and Thought: Caesar's De Bello Gallico I.1-32**

Adema, S.M.

*Published in:*  
Latin linguistics in the early 21st century.

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Adema, S. M. (2015). Deictic Centres of Referential Expressions in Indirect Speech and Thought: Caesar's De Bello Gallico I.1-32. In G. Haverling (Ed.), Latin linguistics in the early 21st century. : Acts of the 16th international colloquium on Latin linguistics. (pp. 423-435)

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

# Deictic Centres of Referential Expressions in Indirect Speech and Thought: Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* I.1-32<sup>1</sup>

Suzanne Adema, VU University Amsterdam

## 0. Introduction

Beside direct speech and reports of speech acts, indirect speech is a main category of speech representation in narrative texts.<sup>2</sup> However, the category of indirect speech in, for instance, Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* (henceforth: *DBG*) is far from homogeneous, as some instances of indirect speech seem as succinct as reports of speech acts, subsidiary to the events of the story, while others are as elaborate and vivid as direct speeches, standing out as almost independent discourse units (Rasmussen 1963:63).<sup>3</sup>

A starting point for a new approach to the heterogeneous category of indirect speech might be the assumption that a narrator can vary in the degree in which he uses the two deictic centres available in indirect speech, his own and that of the represented speaker (Sznajder 2002, 2005, cf. also Vandelanotte 2009). This assumption is supported when we look at linguistic elements such as tense and adverbs, in which the narrator appears to have a choice to use his own deictic centre (past tenses, the use of *tum* or *id tempus*) or that of the represented speaker (present and perfect subjunctives, *nunc*). We could say that the more elements in an indirect speech are geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker, the more it resembles the vividness and autonomy of direct speech.

This article focuses on the deictic centres of referential expressions in indirect speech, and on how the narrator of *DBG* deploys them.<sup>4</sup> The narrator is the anchor point for person deixis in indirect speech (cf. Sznajder 2002:366), and this results in the use of the third person for all participants of a represented speech situation: the represented speaker, the represented addressee and the parties they talk about are all referred to by means of third person pronouns (terms taken from Vandelanotte 2009). The only exception seems to be a reference to the narrator and his narratees within an indirect speech. In those cases, we sometimes find a first person pronoun (*nos* or *noster*), instead of a third person pronoun (see section 1).

What I aim to show in this article is how the narrator of Caesar's *DBG* differentiates in the degree to which he uses his own deictic centre, especially within the large group of third person references (cf. Vandelanotte 2009:147).<sup>5</sup> He does this, for instance, by using the

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Nies Koopman, Maarten Prot, Josine Schrickx and David Stienaers for their comments on earlier versions of this article.

<sup>2</sup> The term report of a speech act is used for those instances in which a narrator mentions that a speech took place without quoting it.

<sup>3</sup> An example of indirect speech resembling the report of a speech act is the message in which Caesar is informed of the plans of the Helvetians to cross the Roman province (*DBG* 1.7, example 1). This message, embedded in a subordinate clause, is presented in the light of Caesar's reaction to it. In contrast, the lengthy explanation of the situation in Gaul by Diviciacus (*DBG* 1.31, example 9) seems an autonomous discourse unit, as it contains many elements geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker (e.g. *nunc*, several present and perfect tense subjunctives).

<sup>4</sup> The other linguistic elements, such as tense, adverbs, the occurrence of expressives, are taken into consideration in the research project within which this article was written. This research project on the forms and function of represented speech and thought in Latin war narrative is part of a larger, cooperative research project of the Classics departments of the VU University Amsterdam and the University of Amsterdam.

<sup>5</sup> The corpus selected for this article consists of all expressions referring to an entity that has a name (persons, peoples, cities, rivers) in the first 88 instances of indirect speech in Caesar's *DBG* (I.1-32). This amounts to 454 referential expressions. Zero-references due to referential identity between an argument in the main clause and one in the subordinate clause (30 instances, e.g. *civitati persuasit ut... exirent* in *DBG* 1.2, cf. Pinkster 1990:125) were left out of consideration, as well as direct reflexives (30 instances, 23 of which are cases of the possessive pronoun). All instances of the reflexive possessive pronoun referring to the subject of the subordinate clause were treated as directly reflexive, including references to the represented speaker (6 instances). References to the

pronoun *is* rather than the reflexive *se* to refer to the represented speaker (section 2), by using a name rather than a pronoun to refer to the represented addressee (section 3) or by using an evaluative expression indicating the opinion of the represented speaker about another party (section 4). These grammatical and lexical features are currently well-known ‘tools’ for deriving the deictic centre of referential expressions, and will therefore be discussed only briefly. The main focus of the article is presented in section 5, in which I will argue that we can use accessibility theory (Ariel 2001, Vandelanotte 2009, cf. Kroon 2010) to pronounce upon the deictic centre of referential expressions for which the other ‘tools’ cannot be used

### 1. The first person pronoun referring to the narrator and narratees

The narrator of *DBG* gives himself and his narratees an explicit appearance in some represented speeches by using a first person pronoun, as is illustrated in example 1.<sup>6</sup> The Helvetians plan to cross the Roman province (*DBG* 1.6), and Caesar is informed of these plans. The referential expression *provinciam nostram* is explicitly geared to the deictic centre of the narrator (cf. *Provincia Gallia*).

#### 1) Caesar, *DBG* I.7

Caesari cum id nuntiatum esset, eos per *provinciam nostram* iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci et quam maximis potest itineribus in Galliam ulteriorem contendit et ad Genavam pervenit.

The use of *nos* and *noster* in *DBG*, when indicating the use of the deictic centre of the narrator, has been much discussed (e.g. Görler 1976, Reijgwart 1993, Dangel 1995), but is rather infrequent in my corpus, although the Roman people and other Roman entities often feature in these speeches. While the corpus contains 48 references to Roman entities (Roman people, Roman army, Roman province, Roman republic, Rome), only three instances of *noster* occur.<sup>7</sup> The Roman people, as well as their army and province, are usually treated as a third party by the narrator (cf. Dangel 1995).

The small amount might indicate that meaning should be given to those cases in which the narrator does use *nos* or *noster*. In example 1, the plans of the Helvetians, narrated in the previous caput, are repeated in an indirect speech in which the narrator involves his narratees, while designating, again, the danger for the Roman province. Thereby, the narrator emphasizes that Caesar’s immediate reaction to this message was, indeed, the right thing to do. The use of his own deictic centre in this indirect speech, thus, seems to serve a larger communicative goal.

### 2. The use of *is* in references to the represented speaker

Although Latin has a specific pronoun to refer to the represented speaker, the reflexive *se*, a narrator may choose to use the pronoun *is*.<sup>8</sup> In the latter case, the referential expression is

---

represented speaker were treated as indirect reflexive pronouns when the represented speaker was not the subject of the subordinate clause (6 instances).

<sup>6</sup> *Nos* and *noster* are also used to refer to the narrator and his fellow Romans at the front, excluding the narratees (e.g. *nostra consilia* in *DBG* 1.17, Reijgwart 1993, cf. Görler 1976). Also in these cases, the referential expression is explicitly geared to the deictic centre of the narrator.

<sup>7</sup> These instances are *provincia nostra* in 1.7 (example 1), *exercitus nostri* in 1.11 (example 3) and *nostra consilia* in 1.17.

<sup>8</sup> As becomes clear from table 2, 53 instances of the indirect reflexive use of *se* occur (including the possessive pronoun). This number includes three indirect reflexives referring to a speaker who utters a speech or thought within another represented speech (dependent on *admirarentur* in 1.14, *iure iurando obstringere* in 1.31 and *intellegeret* 1.14); it also includes two indirect reflexives referring to the participant (Caesar) who is the addressee of the message (*suo* in 1.19 and *sibi* in 1.21). From the latter use of *se* and *suus* we may conclude that

geared to the deictic centre of the narrator (Kühner-Stegmann 1914: II.1 610). At first glance, five instances of this seem to occur in the corpus, but, in fact, only two of them are geared to the deictic centre of the narrator, one of which is *eorum* in example 2.<sup>9</sup> The Haeduans have come to Caesar to ask him for help, using the proximity of the Roman army to their land as an argument.

## 2) Caesar, *DBG* 1.13

Haedui, cum se suaque ab iis defendere non possent, legatos ad Caesarem mittunt rogatum auxilium: ita se omni tempore de populo Romano meritos esse ut paene in conspectu *exercitus nostri* agri vastari, liberi *eorum* in servitutem abduci, oppida expugnari non debuerint.

The referential expression *exercitus nostri*, too, is geared to the deictic centre of the narrator, and this has perhaps triggered the use of *eorum* in *liberi eorum*. The narrator seems to use these specific referential expressions to involve the readers and convince them that Caesar could not have rejected this request (Dangel 1995:106). Again, the use of the narrator's deictic centre for referential expressions serves a larger communicative goal.

As said, there are other instances in which a form of *is* might be seen as referring to the represented speaker, but in these cases the pronoun cannot be explained from the use of the deictic centre of the narrator (*eos* in *DBG* 1.6; *eos* in *DBG* 1.13; *eorum* in 1.31). This is the case when, as Kühner-Stegmann explain, the pronoun *is* occurs in speeches within a speech (*doppelte Abhängigkeit*, Kühner-Stegmann 1914: II.1 611), reflecting the deictic centre of the speaker quoted by the represented speaker (*eos* in 1.6). Dangel (1995) has pointed out that, when the represented speaker has the status of a spokesperson, he can speak about his people from an objective standpoint using the pronoun *is* instead of the reflexive. Dangel's point is corroborated by the fact that spokespersons also use the name of their people when one might expect *se* (e.g. *Helvetiis* and *eos* in 1.13, *Haeduos eorumque clientes* in 1.31).

Concluding the section on the represented speaker, we can say that the narrator of *DBG* seems as reluctant to use his own deictic centre when referring to the represented speaker as when he is referring to himself and his audience.

## 3. The use of proper names in references to the represented addressee

In my corpus, the represented addressee is mostly referred to by means of *is*, a zero reference or, in case of contrast, *ille* or *ipse*, reflecting the use of the second person in direct speech (Kühner-Stegmann 1914: II.1 548). The narrator sometimes deviates from this practice, however, and uses the name of the represented addressee, a type of referential expression that is unlikely to occur in direct speech.<sup>10</sup> An example is found at the end of the speech in which Diviciacus explains the current situation in Gaul to Caesar:

## 3) Caesar, *DBG* 1.31

Locutus est pro his Diviciacus Haeduis:

...

Ariovistum autem, ut semel Gallorum copias proelio vicerit, quod proelium factum sit ad Magetobrigam, superbe et crudeliter imperare, obsides nobilissimi cuiusque liberos poscere et

---

the represented addressee may take over the role of the represented speaker due to the choice for a certain verb or construction (e.g. *cognoscere*).

<sup>9</sup> The other case is *iis* referring to the Helvetians in the clause depending from *persuadent* in *DBG* 1.5. See Reinhardt (1899) and Kraner-Meusel (1913 ad *DBG* 1.5) for more examples in Caesar's *DBG* and *BC*.

<sup>10</sup> Note that the use of the name of the addressee may also be due to its occurrence in official messages presented by a spokesperson. As was explained above, spokespersons also use names to refer to the people they represent (cf. *Caesar* in Divico's message in 1.13).

in eos omnia exempla cruciatusque edere, si qua res non ad nutum aut ad voluntatem eius facta sit. Hominem esse barbarum, iracundum, temerarium: non posse eius imperia, diutius sustineri. Nisi quid in *Caesare* populoque Romano sit auxilii, omnibus Gallis idem esse faciendum quod Helvetii fecerint, ut domo emigrent, aliud domicilium, alias sedes, remotas a Germanis, petant fortunamque, quaecumque accadat, experiantur.

Diviciacus has explained who Ariovistus is and what he is doing in Gaul, and then turns to Caesar to ask him for help. As Caesar is the addressee, the pronoun *is* would have been a logical referential expression. A pronoun only, however, would have complicated the interpretation of the sentence. Not only has Caesar remained unmentioned in this speech, Ariovistus would also be a candidate for the referent of the pronoun *eo*, seeing that he was the discourse topic of the preceding clause.<sup>11</sup> To avoid confusion, the narrator has used the addressee's name, as he does in this speech and at six similar occasions.<sup>12</sup> In short, the represented addressee is usually referred to by means of the most 'neutral' referential expression possible in indirect speech, a form of *is* or a zero-reference (see table 2). When confusion for the narratee might occur, the narrator has the possibility to step in and use an unequivocal expression, as a service to his narratee.

#### 4. Evaluative expressions in references to other parties

The corpus contains 306 references to parties other than the represented speaker and the represented addressee ('third parties'). Eleven of these references are evaluative expressions, which makes them interesting for this research, since we can analyze whose evaluation of a referent is given in evaluative expressions, that of the narrator or that of the represented speaker.<sup>13</sup> Thus, we can pronounce upon the deictic centre used.

In this research, such an analysis shows that the corpus contains no explicit evaluations of the narrator. Only two cases occur in which we can conclude that the deictic centre of the speaker is used.<sup>14</sup> The clearest example of an evaluative expression geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker from within the corpus is found when Orgetorix, Casticus and Dumnorix (subject of *dant* and *spirant*) hope that they will master Gaul through the efforts of 'the three most powerful and most steadfast tribes':

##### 4) Caesar, *DBG* 1.3

Hac oratione adducti inter se fidem et ius iurandum dant et regno occupato *per tres potentissimos ac firmissimos populos* totius Galliae sese potiri posse sperant.

This positive evaluation of the tribes seems geared to the deictic centre of the represented speakers, although one might also argue that the narrator shares this evaluation. In any case, this evaluative expression is of importance to the narrator, as it emphasizes the threat to the Roman province and thus indicates the necessity of an intervention.

---

<sup>11</sup> Using the terminology that will be introduced in section 5, I would say that the referent Caesar is not accessible enough for the narratees to allow the use of *is*. From the perspective of Diviciacus, Caesar is of course highly accessible, as he is present in his immediate environment. See example 10.

<sup>12</sup> Excluding 'official messages' by spokespersons, the name of the represented addressee is used for the *legati Helvetii* (1.14), and for Caesar (1.17, 1.18, 1.20, 1.30 and twice in 1.31).

<sup>13</sup> The following evaluative expressions were found: *tres potentissimos ac firmissimos populos* (1.3); *homines inimico animo* (1.7); *homines bellicosos, populi Romani inimicos* (1.10); *hostes* (1.11; 1.17; 1.21; three times in 1.22); *perterritos Romanos* (1.23); *homines feri ac barbari* (1.31). A very clear example of an evaluative expression geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker is Vercingetorix' use of *hostes* when he refers to the Romans in his speech in *DBG* 7.14.

<sup>14</sup> These are *tres potentissimos ac firmissimos populos* (1.3, example 4) *perterritos Romanos* (1.23).

The narrator definitely shares the negative evaluations of Rome's enemies, and, therefore, it seems incorrect to say that the deictic centre of expressions such as *homines bellicosos, populi Romani inimicos* in the example below is only that of the represented speaker (Caesar, the subject of *intellegebat*).

5) Caesar, *DBG* 1.7

Id si fieret, intellegebat magno cum periculo provinciae futurum ut *homines bellicosos, populi Romani inimicos*, locis patentibus maximeque frumentariis finitimos haberet.

We cannot pronounce upon the deictic centre of this evaluative expression. It is, like most evaluative expressions in my corpus, unbiased with respect to the deictic centre (see table 2).

## 5. Accessibility theory and referential expressions in indirect speech

The previous sections discussed how we can derive the deictic centre of several, specific, groups of referential expressions, viz. references referring to the narrator and his narratees, references to the represented speaker or addressee and a small group of evaluative references to third parties. This section aims to show that an application of accessibility theory helps us to derive the deictic centre of the remaining group of referential expressions, or, at least, helps us to say that a reference is unbiased with respect to the deictic centre.

The main idea of accessibility theory is that the less accessible a referent is, the more information the referential expression will contain, and vice versa (Ariel 2001).<sup>15</sup> A brand new referent will be introduced into the story by means of, for instance, a presentative clause, whereas a mere verbal inflection suffices for a highly accessible referent.

Although fine-grained distinctions of levels of accessibility are possible, a threefold distinction turns out to be sufficient for the purposes of this article.<sup>16</sup> The largest group of referential expressions in the corpus consists of pronouns (e.g. *is, ille, hic, ipse*) and zero references, indicating that the referent is highly accessible. The second group is formed by referential expressions that indicate an intermediate level of accessibility: a known referent is (re-)introduced into the narrative (names or nouns, possibly accompanied by attributes). A small group of referential expressions indicates inaccessibility of the referent, as it introduces a brand new referent.<sup>17</sup>

The relevance of accessibility theory for referential expressions in indirect speech lies in the fact that there are two deictic centres in indirect speech and, thus, two levels of accessibility (Ariel 2001:38, Vandelanotte 2009:74). A referent may be more easily accessible to the narrator and his narratee than to the represented speaker and vice versa. Furthermore, a referential expression in indirect speech may reflect either the accessibility level of the narrator or that of the represented speaker. When a pronoun is used, for instance, this means that the referent is highly accessible. The next step in the analysis should then be to see whether this particular referent is highly accessible to the narrator or to the speaker. In the first case, the pronoun reflects the deictic centre of the narrator, in the second that of the represented speaker. All in all, five scenarios are possible.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> This idea is used in many contributions on referent tracking in narrative texts, e.g. Givon (1983), Bolkestein (2000), Kroon (2009, 2010).

<sup>16</sup> See Kroon (2009, 2010) for a detailed discussion of several discourse functional positions of referent tracking.

<sup>17</sup> Expressions (from within the corpus) introducing a brand new referent: *esse nonnullos, quorum auctoritas apud plebem plurimum valeat, qui privatim plus possint quam ipsi magistratus* (1.17); *L. Cassium consulem* (1.7); *homini illic nobilissimo ac potentissimo* (1.18); *Ariovistus, rex germanorum* (1.31). In Kroon's (2009, 2010) terminology these introductions reflect the *priming stage*.

<sup>18</sup> The approach does not work in those cases in which the referential expression is due to factors other than the accessibility of the referent, such as contrast (Bolkestein 2000, Kroon 2009, 2010). These referential expressions (21 instances) are presented separately in table 2. An example is *Diviciaco fratri* in *DBG* 1.20.

In the first scenario, the referential expression reflects the fact that a referent is more easily accessible to the narrator than to the represented speaker. This indicates that the deictic centre of the narrator is used. In this scenario, found seven times in the corpus, the referent is presented by means of a pronoun or zero-reference, reflecting high accessibility in the narrative, while ignoring the fact that the referent is not highly accessible in the represented discourse situation.<sup>19</sup> In example 6 (= example 1) *eos* refers to the Helvetians, indicating that this referent is highly accessible.

#### 6) Caesar, DBG I.7

Caesari cum id nuntiatum esset, *eos* per provinciam nostram iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci et quam maximis potest itineribus in Galliam ulteriorem contendit et ad Genavam pervenit.

From the perspective of the narrator this referent is indeed highly accessible, as it was the discourse topic in the preceding caput. From the perspective of the represented speaker and his addressee, however, this referent is not highly, but intermediately accessible. That is, the referent is known to them, but it needs an introduction by means of a name of a noun: the message “*they*” are trying to march through the Roman province would not have been enough for Caesar to understand the situation.

This becomes clear when we look at the second scenario, which is similar to the first. The referent is, again, the discourse topic of the preceding narrative and, thus, highly accessible to the narrator, while it less accessible to the represented speaker. However, in this scenario, the referent is presented in accordance with the accessibility from the perspective of the speaker, for instance by means of a name, as in example 7.<sup>20</sup> Like the Helvetians in example 6, the Bellovaci are the discourse topic of the passage preceding example 7 (*his* refers to the Bellovaci) and, therefore, they are a highly accessible referent.

#### 7) Caesar, DBG 2.14

Pro his Diviciacus (nam post discessum Belgarum dimissis Haeduum copiis ad eum reverterat) facit verba: *Bellovacos* omni tempore in fide atque amicitia civitatis Haeduae fuisse; impulsos ab suis principibus, qui dicerent Haeduos a Caesare in servitatem redacto.

The referential expression *Bellovacos* at the start of Diviciacus’ speech is not in line with the high level of accessibility for the narrator. Rather, it reflects the accessibility from the perspective of the represented speaker and his addressee: at the start of his speech Diviciacus uses a name to introduce this known, but inactive referent into the discourse.

In short, the referential expression *Bellovacos* is geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker. Thus, the referential expression contributes to the idea that the indirect speech in example 7 is a discourse unit with more autonomy than that in example 6. We should assume a discourse boundary between *verba* and *Bellovacos*, and this discourse boundary reflects a change in perspective (cf. Bolkestein 2000, Kroon 2010).

A discourse boundary due to a change in perspective might also be the reason for the otherwise unexplainable combination of noun and name in example 8, *flumen Ararim*, referring to a highly accessible referent on both levels. The referent is the river Saône (*flumen*

---

<sup>19</sup> This first scenario occurs at seven instances in the corpus, *ipse* in 1.4; *eos* in 1.7; *id flumen* in 1.12; *illum* in 1.13; *eum* in 1.19; *iis* in 1.26 and *iis* in 1.28.

<sup>20</sup> This example was found outside the corpus. It is used for the sake of clarity, as the two examples from within the corpus (*Diviciacum* in *Diviciacum ad se vocari*, 1.19 and *flumen Ararim* in 1.12, example 8) are rather complex.

*Arar*), which has been elaborately introduced in the narrative, and has been mentioned by means of *id flumen* in the indirect speech.

8) Caesar, DBG 1.12.1

Ubi per exploratores Caesar certior factus est tres iam partes copiarum Helvetios *id flumen* traduxisse, quartam vero partem citra *flumen Ararim* reliquam esse, de tertia vigilia cum legionibus tribus e castris profectus ad eam partem pervenit quae nondum flumen transierat.

Contrary to expectation, the reference *flumen Ararim* is used in the second part of the indirect speech. My explanation would be that this indicates a change in perspective: the first part of this message is predominantly geared to the deictic centre of the narrator, whereas the second part is geared more to the deictic centre of the speaker. This is suggested, too, by the use of *vero*, which expresses the excitement of the messengers and emphasizes the urgency of the situation: Caesar can still prevent that this fourth part of the Helvetians crosses the river. The analysis of referential expressions shows that the narrator presents this message in two parts, an informative part and an urgent part, requiring immediate action. It is indeed this latter part of the message to which Caesar acts in the main clause.

The third and fourth scenario are both concerned with referents that are more easily accessible to the represented speaker. The use of *Harudes* in example 9 illustrates the third scenario.<sup>21</sup>

9) Caesar, DBG 1.31.10

Locutus est pro his Diviciacus Haeduus:

...

Sed peius victoribus Sequanis quam Haeduis victis accidisse, propterea quod Ariovistus, rex Germanorum, in eorum finibus consedisset tertiamque partem agri Sequani, qui esset optimus totius Galliae, occupavisset et nunc de altera parte tertia Sequanos decedere iuberet, propterea quod paucis mensibus ante *Harudum* milia hominum XXIII ad eum venissent, quibus locus ac sedes pararentur.

The *Harudes* have not yet been mentioned in the story and, strictly speaking, the narrator should have used an introductory clause explaining to his narratees that this is a people from the north of Germany. The narrator, however, does not so, but presents the referent in accordance to the accessibility level of the represented speaker, Diviciacus. He can introduce the *Harudes* into the discourse by means of a name only, as they are known to him and his addressee, Caesar. This and eight similar referential expressions are geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker.

In the fourth scenario, too, the referent is more easily accessible to the represented speaker, and the referential expression itself is geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker. The difference with the third scenario is that the referential expression is followed by an explanatory clause which interrupts the indirect speech or thought, as is the case in example 10. Caesar is receiving information about Dumnorix, who was responsible for the failure of a cavalry engagement.

10) Caesar, DBG 1.18.10

Reperiebat etiam in quaerendo Caesar, quod proelium equestre adversum paucis ante diebus esset factum, initium eius fugae factum a *Dumnorige atque eius equitibus* (nam equitatu,

---

<sup>21</sup> By 'more easily accessible' I mean that a referent can be intermediately accessible to the represented speaker (*unum pagum* in 1.13; *flumen* in 1.13; *propinquis hostibus* in 1.16; *Biturigibus* in 1.18; *Harudum* in 1.31; *Magetobrigam* in 1.31) or highly accessible (*eorum* in 1.18; *eius* in 1.19), while it is inaccessible or intermediately accessible to the narrator.



quem auxilio Caesari Haedui miserant, Dumnorix praeerat): eorum fuga reliquum esse equitatum perterritum

The referent ‘Dumnorix and his horsemen’ is more easily accessible to Caesar, the represented speaker or ‘thinker’, than for the addressees of the narrator, who do not know (yet) that Dumnorix and his horsemen were present at this occasion. Therefore, the expression *Dumnorige atque eius equitibus* indicates the deictic centre of the represented speaker. The narrator repairs this inequality in accessibility, by interrupting the represented speech with an explanatory clause (*nam*) containing indicative verb forms.<sup>22</sup>

In this scenario, occurring at seven instances in the corpus, the referential expressions within the indirect speech are geared to the deictic centre of the represented speaker, whereas the referential expressions in the introductory or explanatory clauses are (clearly) geared to the deictic centre of the narrator.<sup>23</sup>

The scenarios above show the relevance of accessibility theory for an analysis of the deictic centre of referential expressions in indirect speech. However, the most common scenario turns out to be the one in which a deictic centre cannot be assigned, as the referent is equally accessible in both situations. The referent can, for instance, be brand new for both the narrator and his addressee, as well as for the represented speaker and his addressee. An example is found in example 9 above, in which *Ariovistus, rex Germanorum* introduces this referent into Diviciacus’ speech about the situation in Gaul, but also into the narrative as a whole. More often the referent is intermediately accessible (a noun or a name, 141 cases) or highly accessible (a pronoun or zero reference, 103 cases) on both levels. Apparently, the narrator makes sure that he has introduced referents into his story before he lets characters talk about them.

The five scenarios seem to reflect at least two different levels of independence of the represented speech in the narrative. The first scenario (example 6) contributes to the suggestion that a represented speech is summarized by the narrator and encapsulated into the narrative, whereas the other scenarios leave room for the idea that the speech is a more or less autonomous discourse unit, as at least the referential expressions are, or might be (in the fifth scenario), geared to the deictic centre of the speaker. In the second scenario (example 7), this suggestion is especially strong. An overview of the occurrence of the scenarios and deictic centres can be found in table 1.

**Table 1: Overview of deictic centres and scenarios**

	Deictic centre					
	Narrator		Speaker			Unbiased
	1 <sup>st</sup> scen.	4 <sup>th</sup> scen.	2 <sup>nd</sup> scen.	3 <sup>rd</sup> scen.	4 <sup>th</sup> scen.	5 <sup>th</sup> scen.
Introducing expression		(7)				6
Noun or name			2	6	6	141
Pronoun or zero	7			2	1	103

## 6. Outcomes and conclusions

Although the narrator is the anchor point for person deixis in indirect speech, and all participants are referred to in the third person, I hope to have shown that we can nevertheless

<sup>22</sup> Note that instances as example 3, in which the represented addressee is indicated by means of a name, have a similar scenario (see note 11).

<sup>23</sup> The instances in the corpus of this combination of a speaker-geared reference and a narrator-geared reference are the following: *angustos fines* in 1.02; *pontem* in 1.07; *Santonum fines* in 1.10; *equitibus* in 1.18; *iis* in 1.24; *Germani* in 1.28; *Boios* in 1.28. Strictly speaking, the references in the indicative clauses are not part of my corpus, as such clauses interrupt the speech.

differentiate between referential expressions geared to the deictic centre of the narrator and referential expressions geared to the deictic centre of the speaker. Or, we can, at least, conclude that the expression is unbiased with respect to a deictic centre.

In this article, I have applied several, currently well-known ‘tools’ for deriving the deictic centre of referential expressions to a corpus of speeches in Caesar’s *DBG*. In addition, I have used accessibility theory, which turns out to be an effective, if somewhat complicated, tool to assign a deictic centre to referential expressions.

Table 2 sums up the outcomes presented in this article, and shows that the narrator of *DBG* prefers referential expressions that are neutral with respect to the deictic centre over referential expressions that are explicitly geared to his own deictic centre or to that of the speaker. The use of neutral referential expressions leaves room for the idea that the speech is an independent unit resembling direct speech. The suggestion that the indirect speech resembles direct speech is even stronger when the narrator explicitly uses the deictic centre of the speaking character.

In conclusion, it can be observed that in several examples in this article (example 1, 2, 4 and 8) the choice for a specific deictic centre can be connected to a larger communicative goal or strategy of the narrator.

**Table 2: Deictic centres of referential expressions in indirect speech and thought**

Participant	Referential expression	Deictic centre			Total
		Narrator	Repr. Speaker	Unbiased	
Narrator & narratees	noster/ nos	3	N.A.	N.A.	3
Represented Speaker	(indirect) reflexive or possessive reflexive pronoun	N.A.	N.A.	53	53
	Zero	N.A.	N.A.	32	32
	Ipse	N.A.	N.A.	9	9
	Relative pronoun	N.A.	N.A.	1	1
	Is	2	N.A.	N.A.	2
Represented addressee	Zero	N.A.	N.A.	22	22
	Is	N.A.	N.A.	14	14
	Ipse/il/le/relativum	N.A.	N.A.	5	5
	Name	7	N.A.	N.A.	7
Third party	Evaluative expression	0	2	9	11
	Introducing expression	0	0	6	6
	Noun or name	0	14	141	155
	Pronoun or zero	7	3	103	113
	Contrastive expression	N.A.	N.A.	21	21
		19	19	416	454

## Bibliography

- ARIEL, MIRA. 2001. ‘Accessibility Theory. An overview’. In: T. Sanders, J. Schilperoord and W. Spooren (eds), *Text Representation. Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 29-87.
- BOLKESTEIN, MACHTELT. 1992. ‘Anaforische Subjecten en Tekststructuur in het Latijn’. *Gramma/TTT* 1, 111-124.

- BOLKESTEIN, MACHTELT. 1996. 'Reported Speech in Latin'. In: T. Janssen and W. van der Wurff (eds), *Reported Speech. Forms and functions of the verb*. Amsterdam, 121-140.
- BOLKESTEIN, MACHTELT. 2000. 'Discourse organization and anaphora in Latin'. In: S. C. Herring (ed), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 107-137.
- BOLKESTEIN, MACHTELT AND MICHEL VAN DE GRIFT (1994). 'Referent tracking in Latin discourse'. In: J. Herman (ed), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: 283-302.
- DANGEL, JACQUELINE. 1994. 'Syntaxe et stylistique du discours indirect chez Tacite: une parole rhétorique'. In: J. Herman (ed), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 211-226.
- DANGEL, JACQUELINE. 1995. 'Stratégies de parole dans le discours indirect de César'. In: D. Longrée (ed), *De Usu, Études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency*. Louvain-la-Neuve, 95-113.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1983. 'Introduction'. In: Givón, T. (ed), *Topic Continuity in Discourse. A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia 5-41.
- GÖRLER, WOLDEMAR. 1976. 'Die Veränderung des Erzählerstandpunktes in Caesars Bellum Gallicum'. *Poetica* 8, 95-119.
- KRANER, FRIEDRICH, WILHELM DITTENBERGER ET AL. (1913 [1961]). *C. Iulii Caesaris. Commentarii De Bello Gallico*. Berlin.
- KROON, C. H. M. (2001). *Communiceren in een dode taal. Of: Hoe Caesar geschiedenis schreef. Inaugural Speech VU University Amsterdam*. Amsterdam.
- KROON, CAROLINE. 2009. 'Text structure and referential choice in Latin narrative. The anaphoric use of the Latin demonstrative *ille*'. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 23, 115-113.
- KROON, CAROLINE. 2010. 'Anaphoric Reference and referential choice in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*'. In: P. Anreiter & M. Kienpointner (eds), *Latin Linguistics Today. Proceedings of 15<sup>th</sup> International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Innsbruck April 2008*. Innsbruck, 579-593
- KÜHNER, RAPHAEL & CARL STEGMANN. 1914<sup>2</sup>. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, II. Satzlehre*, 1-2. Hannover.
- RASMUSSEN, DETLEF. 1963. *Caesars Commentarii: Stil und Stilwandel am Beispiel der direkten Rede*. Göttingen.
- REINHARDT, PETER. 1899. *Die oratio obliqua bei Caesar*. Aschersleben
- REIJGWART, ILSE. 1993. 'Zur Erzählung in Caesars Commentari. Der 'unbekannte' Erzähler des Bellum Gallicum'. *Philologus* 137, 18-37.
- SZNAJDER, LYLIANE. 2002. 'Interférences et conflits dans les formes du discours rapporté'. In: A. M. Bolkestein, C. H. M. Kroon, H. Pinkster, R. Risselada and J. C. Gieben (eds), *Theory and description in Latin Linguistics, selected papers from the XIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 361-377.
- SZNAJDER, LYLIANE. 2005. 'Stratégies de prises en charge énonciatives dans le discours indirect'. In: G. Calboli (ed), *Latina Lingua! Proceedings of the twelfth international colloquium on Latin linguistics (Bologna, 9-14 June 2003)*. Roma, 749-761.
- VANDELANOTTE, LIEVEN. 2009. *Speech and Thought Representation in English. A Cognitive-Functional Approach*. Berlin/ New York.