



# Cicero's Style

A SYNOPSIS

BY

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT



## CICERO'S STYLE

# MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H. S. VERSNEL

D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUADRAGESIMUM QUINTUM

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT

CICERO'S STYLE



# CICERO'S STYLE

A SYNOPSIS

FOLLOWED BY SELECTED ANALYTIC STUDIES

BY

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT



BRILL  
LEIDEN · BOSTON  
2003

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Albrecht, Michael von.

Cicero's Style: a synopsis / by Michael von Albrecht.

p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum ; 245)

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 90-04-12961-8

1. Cicero, Marcus Tullius—Literary style. 2. Speeches, addresses, etc., Latin—History and criticism. 3. Latin language—Style. 4. Rhetoric, Ancient. 5. Oratory, Ancient. I. Title. II. Series.

PA6357.A54 2003

875°.01—dc21

2003045375

ISSN 0169-8958

ISBN 90 04 12961 8

© Copyright 2003 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*Nec enim semper eodem modo. Quid enim simile habet epistula aut iudicio aut contioni?*

‘For I don’t always adopt the same style. What similarity is there between a letter and an oration in court or at a public meeting?’

Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 9. 21. 1

*Sine philosophia non posse effici quem quaerimus eloquentem.*

‘The eloquent man for whom we are searching cannot be shaped without philosophy.’

Cicero, *Orator* 4. 14

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgements .....	ix
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One: Differences of Genre .....	11
Orations .....	11
Philosophical Treatises .....	27
Rhetorical Treatises .....	45
Letters .....	52
Poetry .....	72
Official Documents (and Historiography) .....	75
An Interim Balance .....	75
Chapter Two: Nuances of Style Within Individual Works ....	79
Orations .....	79
Philosophical Treatises .....	85
Rhetorical Treatises .....	92
Letters .....	94
Poetry .....	95
Chapter Three: Chronological Development of Style .....	97
Orations .....	97
Philosophical Treatises .....	114
Rhetorical Treatises .....	116
Letters .....	118
Poetry .....	119
Conclusion .....	120
Excursus: Change of Sentence Length .....	122
Chapter Four: Consistency in Cicero's Style .....	127
Traditions: Greek and Roman .....	127
Cicero's Style in the Context of his Age: Cicero's and Caesar's Purism .....	134
Widening the Range of Expression .....	142
The Art of Artlessness: Consistency in Cicero's Style .....	144

Influence: Some Glimpses .....	146
Conclusion: Cicero and Literary Latin .....	157
Chapter Five: Style and Context in the Orations: Selected	
Analytic Studies .....	161
Preliminary Remarks .....	161
<i>Prooemium I: The De Marcello: Epideictic, Political, and</i> Discourse .....	163
<i>Prooemium II: The Pro Rege Deiotaro: Rhetorical Theory and</i> Oratorical Practice .....	174
<i>Narratio versus Prooemium: The Pro Milone: Levels of Style ....</i>	182
<i>Digressio versus Prooemium: The Pro Archia: The Relevance</i> of an Excursus .....	198
<i>Peroratio: The Verrine Orations: Cicero and the Gods of</i> Sicily .....	206
Conclusion .....	215
Epilogue: The <i>De Oratore</i> : Cicero and the Culture	
of Speech .....	219
Postscript .....	243
Bibliography .....	247
Index .....	275

## PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Hinc enim iam elocutionis rationem tractabimus, partem operis, ut inter omnes oratores convenit, difficillimam.*

‘For I shall now discuss style, a subject which, as all orators agree, presents the greatest difficulty.’  
Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8, *Prooemium*, 13

Cicero is our richest source of classical Latin prose. His orations, treatises, and letters run an astounding gamut of stylistic shades, which defy the common notions of ‘classical monotony’ and ‘dead language.’ A new reading of Cicero might be rewarding for all those interested in the mystery of good style and culture of speech.

The author has been fascinated by the subject of this book for forty years. None of its chapters, however, has been published in English. Of course, when reexamining some of his own preliminary studies, he realized that for an international readership all must be completely rewritten in order to reflect the author’s actual state of knowledge, and avoid, as far as possible, the pretentious obscurity of scholarly jargon. To make the text more accessible to younger students and the general reader, Latin and Greek quotations have been translated (Loeb translations have been gratefully used, though not always adopted literally).

First drafts of the present book were made when the author stayed in the United States and in the Netherlands as a visiting professor. This book would never have been written, therefore, without the friendship of Karl Galinsky (The University of Texas at Austin, Texas), Christian Habicht (The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey), Anton D. Leeman (The University of Amsterdam), and Gareth Schmeling (The University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida). At various stages of the work, individual chapters were corrected by Allan Kershaw, Rüdiger Niehl, and Francis R. Schwartz. The text of the book benefited from Claudia Nissle’s untiring vigilance and competence and from the critical remarks of some unnamed referees. Harm Pinkster was kind enough to draw the author’s attention to some interesting problems and publications. The author is deeply obliged to his admired friend and colleague John Velz (The University of Texas at Austin, Texas) for carefully revising the penultimate version.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## INTRODUCTION

*Ille se profecisse sciat, cui Cicero valde placebit.*

‘You should know that you have made real progress, once you come to like Cicero very much.’  
Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 10. 1. 112

There has been no comprehensive study of Cicero’s style for many years, and any attempt to fill this lacuna will be a venturesome enterprise. The present book is comprehensive in the sense that, though primarily concerned with the orations, it tries to cover all genres and a broad range of stylistic points; however, it is selective in the sense that, instead of attempting to list every linguistic and stylistic feature, it concentrates on what is strategically significant. Even great authorities, after extensive study, come to the conclusion that Cicero’s syntax is not yet sufficiently understood.<sup>1</sup> Certainly Cicero is amply treated in our grammar books,<sup>2</sup> but the authors do not always consider the function of a given phrase in its context. More than anything else the very fact that Cicero’s style has been idolized by some teachers into a dull model of deadening perfection was detrimental to a fresh approach. Classroom experience almost invariably led students to believe that Cicero’s style was limited to the type of well-rounded ‘periodic syntax’ propagated by old school manuals. Strangely enough, this misconception is still wide-spread, although specialists have done much to clear it away. As Shakespeare’s placement of this supposed Ciceronian style in Cassius’ mouth shows, the assumption that the ‘suspended’ syntax was somehow artificial, indeed sinister, goes back as far as the high Renaissance in England:

I will this night, / In several hands, in at his window throw, / As if they came from several citizens, / Writings all tending to the great opinion / That Rome holds of his name; wherein obscurely / Caesar’s ambition shall be glanced at.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lebreton 418. In the text and in the footnotes, books and articles are quoted in an abbreviated form. For complete titles, see bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> The stylistic sections of Hofmann/Szantyr are somewhat succinct, but contain valuable bibliographical information.

<sup>3</sup> Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* 1. 2.

Shakespeare obviously wished to suggest that Cassius' sinister temperament is reflected in his 'Ciceronian' suspended syntax. For this supposed evil and others like it we can look at an indictment of Cicero's 'faults' of style by J.-K. Huysmans:

In prose, his enthusiasm was not a whit greater for the redundant figures and nonsensical digressions of "Chick-pea" (= Cicero); the braggadocio of his apostrophes, the claptrap of his never-ending appeals to patriotism, the exaggerated emphasis of his harangues, the ponderousness of his style, well-fed and full-fleshed, but run to fat and devoid of bones and marrow, the intolerable litter of his sonorous adverbs opening every sentence, the monotonous structure of his portly periods tied awkwardly to each other by a thread of conjunctions, worst of all his wearisome habits of tautology, were anything but attractive to him.<sup>4</sup>

This staggering caricature portrays a frozen school tradition rather than the live author, master of a thousand shades of style. W. R. Johnson has done much to transcend the cliché of a turgid Cicero and to rediscover the principle of 'economy' in some of his orations. The present book is intended to further a 'revisionist' approach to his style.

During the last two centuries many scholars and teachers of Latin have steadily corrected inveterate errors concerning Cicero's Latin, but their works are often difficult to find, almost unknown. A major contribution, the importance of which has not yet been fully realized, was K. F. von Nägelsbach's masterly manual of Latin style. This as yet unsurpassed 19th century work opened new avenues in two directions: in the domain of linguistic method, the author pioneered a comparative (today one would say 'contrastive') approach to the means of expression of two mutually distinct languages, ancient and modern. Translating and re-translating texts, he systematically discovered the hidden treasures of style exploited by Latin authors

---

<sup>4</sup> Huysmans, J.-K., *À Rebours* (1884), ch. 3 (English translation [anonymous]: Paris: Groves and Michaux 1926): *En prose, la langue verbeuse, les métaphores redondantes, les digressions amphigouriques du Pois Chiche ne le ravissaient pas davantage; la jactance de ses apostrophes, le flux de ses rengaines patriotiques, l'emphase de ses harangues, la pesante masse de son style, charnu, nourri, mais tourné à la graisse et privé de moelles et d'os, les insupportables scories de ses longs adverbes ouvrant la phrase, les inaltérables formules de ses adipeuses périodes mal liées entre elles par le fil des conjonctions, enfin ses lassantes habitudes de tautologie, ne le séduisaient guère.* Actually, periodic sentence structure was derived from Isocratean rhetoric and from the practice of the Attic orators. It contributed much to realize the morpho-syntactic potential of the Latin language (Hoffmann, *Negatio* 122).

to make up for the 'poverty' of the Latin vocabulary as compared with ancient Greek (or modern languages). The size of the lexicon, therefore, is not the only criterion for the richness of a language and, for writers of Latin, style is not an adornment, but an integral part of the language. No one has yet fully drawn the consequences from Nägelsbach's approach to Latin for our understanding of Cicero. Another milestone in that process of revision was Einar Löfstedt's *Syntactica*; this masterpiece of 20th century linguistic scholarship in many cases justified apparently 'irregular' manuscript readings and defended Cicero against his editors.<sup>5</sup> Ever since, many scholars have contributed to our growing awareness that Cicero's style is more colourful and rich in nuances than had been dreamed of in our textbooks.<sup>6</sup> It is one of the aims of the present study to rediscover for modern readers a freshness and variety of stylistic colours quite unlike the bleakness of 'Ciceronian' and 'anti-Ciceronian' dogmas.

However, in many respects we are still lacking the basis for a comprehensive evaluation. Although there are excellent critical editions of and commentaries on individual works—relatively recent examples are D. Berry's commentary on the *Pro Sulla* and D. R. Shackleton Bailey's editions of Cicero's letters—, there is no complete modern edition of Cicero, and there is a need for modern commentaries on many of his works.<sup>7</sup> The style of the orations, the largest group of texts in the *Corpus Ciceronianum*, has been studied by L. Laurand, whose standard work, however, is more than seventy years old.<sup>8</sup> Later, L. P. Wilkinson's *Golden Latin Artistry*, a book not exclusively devoted to Cicero, has done much to attract modern readers to the beauty of prose rhythm and periodic structure. From more recent studies, though centred on single problems,

---

<sup>5</sup> See bibliography; Cicero is given much space also in: Meillet, *Esquisse* 205–217; Devoto, *Geschichte* 131–159 and, most recently, Santini, 'Lingue e generi,' with due attention paid to generic differences (often in agreement with Albrecht, 'Tullius').

<sup>6</sup> For a rhetorical inventory of many Ciceronian texts, see P. L. MacKendrick's books on the orations and the philosophical works. Studies devoted to individual key-words are especially fruitful, such as H. Frank's recent book on *ratio* in Cicero.

<sup>7</sup> We are slightly better provided with dictionaries and *indices*: see Merguet I; Merguet II; Abbott/Oldfather/Canter I; Abbott/Oldfather/Canter II, and Spaeth (to Cicero's poems, unfortunately using Baehrens' text). For proper names, Orelli/Baiter has been replaced by D. R. Shackleton Bailey's *Onomastica*. For Greek words, Orelli/Baiter, Part Three and, of course, D. R. Shackleton Bailey's editions of Cicero's letters and his articles containing addenda to Liddell-Scott-Jones.

<sup>8</sup> Laurand.

it appears that twentieth century philology was no longer satisfied with mere description and tried to penetrate the author's mind. An excellent example is W. Stroh, who proved that in Cicero's orations *dispositio* is a product of strategic planning (*inventio*) rather than of mere rhetorical theory. It is our intention to extend this approach to the domain of style and to show how Cicero's style in each case is conditioned by *inventio*.

For all the other writings of Cicero, we depend on a great number of scattered studies of individual phenomena. The fact that such studies have been devoted more frequently to Cicero's letters than to his treatises<sup>9</sup> is probably due to the growing interest in popular and colloquial language which arose in the 19th century<sup>10</sup> in many nations and finally even spread to the study of classical Latin. G. O. Hutchinson's *literary* appraisal of the letters, therefore, is a very recent and most welcome innovation. Much of previous research on Cicero's style done by French, Dutch, and German scholars is virtually inaccessible outside those countries;<sup>11</sup> the reader might welcome an account of this work—as well as of contemporary international research. Unfortunately, however, since antiquity syntax and style have frequently been neglected by both linguistic and literary scholarship; they are, as it were, a *terra incognita* to be discovered by both disciplines.

Such a survey might also suggest starting points for further studies.<sup>12</sup> In the author's view, progress will be attained mainly through coop-

---

<sup>9</sup> On the style of the *De Re Publica* helpful Zetzel 29–38; for imagery in the *De Oratore*, Fantham, *Comparative Studies*.

<sup>10</sup> For instance, Wölfflin, 'Vulgärlatein' 137–165, Hofmann, and Löfstedt.—Two studies by Parzinger (I and II) refer to all the works of Cicero. In his second publication Parzinger gives a helpful account of earlier research concerning the development of Cicero's style. His own contributions are noteworthy indeed, although he treats his subject rather mechanically and occasionally underestimates the influence of context and genre on style.

<sup>11</sup> This is especially true of the valuable contributions of 19th century high-school (*Gymnasium*) teachers published in so-called *Schulprogramme*. Here, a wealth of experience is found, based on teachers' and students' daily practice of translating Cicero's texts and studying his style. A relatively recent Dutch publication (an entire fascicle devoted to Cicero and his style) is especially relevant to our subject and rich in bibliographical information: *Lampas* 26,2 (1993) 89–181 (articles by A. D. Leeman, H. Pinkster., and others).

<sup>12</sup> During recent decades, the present author's interpretative approach to Latin texts and their style was accepted by authoritative scholars. Anton Scherer in his *Lateinische Syntax* recognized 'textual syntax' as an independent field of research, and the present author's approach to style was welcomed by Gualtiero Calboli in his

eration of linguists and literary critics—an example to follow might be A. D. Leeman's and H. Pinkster's commentary on the *De Oratore*. On the one hand, linguists in the last decades felicitously transcended the limits of etymology and morphology in favour of corpus-oriented studies, often on the basis of pragmatic or functional linguistics.<sup>13</sup> As a result, today we know more, for instance, about the use of verbal tenses, particles, negatives in many Latin authors. There is still much to be done in the field of Ciceronian syntax. A seminal contribution is, for instance, M. Bolkestein's inquiry into parenthesis in Cicero's letters. As for the artistic use of linguistic means, linguists gradually abandon old prejudices against literary texts and draw ever new conclusions from the fact that, in Latin, with its small, even sparse vocabulary, style is not an otiose adornment but part of the language. On the other hand, the present author fully shares H. Gotoff's<sup>14</sup> conviction that Cicero's style deserves to be studied in detail also by scholars interested in literature. In fact, literary critics increasingly find it rewarding to look, for once, beyond lyric poems and novels and study the artistic choice and arrangement of words, sentences, and passages in oratorical prose. J. Axer, J. J. Hughes, and A. R. Dyck<sup>15</sup> brought to bear the 'dramatic' and even 'theatrical' qualities of

---

supplement to Eduard Norden's *Kunstprosa* and by Wolfram Ax (see bibl.) in his critical account of research on Latin style. In a recent book on the history of the Latin language, Carlo Santini (see bibl.) followed the present author's distinction of generic styles in Cicero. Some of his observations on the *Letters to Atticus* were confirmed and developed further most recently by G. E. Dunkel, who illuminated the phenomenon of linguistic 'code-switching' in a bilingual society. For a criticism of the 'dualistic' approach of some classicists to 'classical' and 'vulgar' Latin s. now R. Müller, *Sprachbewußtsein* (with bibl.); Müller studies Cicero's approach to linguistic strata in Latin with the very interesting conclusion that Cicero's appraisal of the various levels of Latin is the most subtle and perceptive ever made (Müller, 330); for a discussion on a more abstract level (with bibl.), Fögen, 'Spracheinstellungen.' Clearly, stylistic ('diaphasic') differences are more important for Cicero than dialectal ('diatopic') and social ('diastratic') differences. (Some specialists might learn from Cicero how to use plain language and create technical terms that we might pronounce without blushing!)

<sup>13</sup> For a critical overview of studies on Cicero's style, Pinkster, 'Taal en stijl.'

<sup>14</sup> Gotoff, *Arch.*, 8–9 'When he stood before his audience, Cicero had at his disposal only words and the stylistic genius to construct from those words arguments that would shape men's opinions and move their hearts. The attempts to understand that stylistic genius seems a worthwhile literary enterprise' . . . 'Oratory is a literary art and a fit subject for literary criticism.'

<sup>15</sup> Axer, *Rosc.*, 9–58; Hughes, *Comedic Borrowing*; for tragedy: Dyck, 'Narrative Obscuration;' on attire: Dyck, 'Dressing to Kill.'

Cicero's orations, and J. R. Dugan<sup>16</sup> observed Cicero's 'self-fashioning' in the literary mode of the epideictic. A. R. Dyck, R. L. Gallagher, B. A. Krostenko, A. Leen, S. Treggiari, and others have inquired into the all-pervading (and unifying) role of crucial metaphors and symbols in Cicero's texts. As for the relationship between rhetorical theory and oratorical practice, after C. Loutsch's thoroughgoing analysis of Ciceronian *proemia*, S. M. Cerutti has worked out the 'accrative' character of Cicero's style. The present book is meant to encourage further dialogue between those interested in language and those interested in literature.

As a consequence of recent research, individual stylistic phenomena cannot be studied without taking into account each relevant text as a whole. Anyone who tries to do justice to stylistic phenomena in their context—from the immediate context of each passage to an oration's overall design—has to consider social and psychological factors, especially the ways in which the addressee's and the speaker's situations influence a given text. Cicero himself took account of these basic conditions by adopting the concept of decorum (*aptum*) into his conception of style. Cicero's language, therefore, is not merely his personal language, not even in his most private letters;<sup>17</sup> rather it reflects the points of contact between him and his audiences, real or imagined. It is one of the aims of this study to observe Cicero projecting this 'dialogue' with his readers into the artistic medium of his writings. In fact the fundamental importance of style to our understanding of Ciceronian texts is a corollary to the *literary* character of most of them.

Cicero was a reflective author. Therefore, his own remarks on style deserve the reader's full attention. It is true that there has been some scepticism among scholars about whether Cicero practices what he preaches.<sup>18</sup> Actually, the more creative and successful an author

---

<sup>16</sup> Dugan, 'Epideixis,' see bibl.

<sup>17</sup> A contrary view is held by Oksala, 103.

<sup>18</sup> Slightly exaggerated: Courbaud, Vol. 1, p. xv: 'Chose curieuse, son influence a été médiocre même sur lui-même, et le Ciceron des discours ne s'est pas assez souvenu du Ciceron théoricien de l'art oratoire.' Cicero's 'anti-Atticist' partiality in the *Brutus* and the *Orator* (Gotoff, *Arch.* 27) is a somewhat different problem: Wishing to prove his fidelity to 'Attic' standards, Cicero even ascribes his own prose rhythm to the influence of the classical Greek orators. The fact that he often refers to Isocrates has prevented some scholars from acknowledging his great debt to Demosthenes, but this last point is not Cicero's fault. For reservations concerning

is, the more often his theory lags behind his practice. We might even ask ourselves whether Cicero's theoretical 'prejudices' or our modern prejudices are closer to his stylistic practice. Moreover, the studies of L. Laurand and others show that such scepticism has sometimes been unwarranted, and that Cicero's statements are often to be taken seriously, particularly when based on practice and personal experience.<sup>19</sup> We should, of course, use Cicero's theoretical literary canons only as one of many possible approaches to a better understanding of his style, and nothing compels us to acquiesce in his judgements.

In the present book, style is understood to be an equivalent to *elocutio*,<sup>20</sup> that is to say the choice and literary use of linguistic means of expression. We will examine Cicero's style from two perspectives: Chapters 1–4 describe Cicero's stylistic exploitation of those linguistic means, whereas the interpretative studies contained in Chapter 5 illustrate the literary or rhetorical function of stylistic features in their contexts and show how the author's strategic aims and literary choices determine that usage in each case. The present study is descriptive, and theoretical discussion is confined to the requisite minimum. For our aims, it is sufficient to give the above 'operational' definition of style; but, as the study proceeds from smaller to larger units, it becomes indispensable to take into account the intellectual background of Cicero's choices and work out the dependence of style on thought, which is one of our major points.

There are a number of characteristic variables and constants in Cicero's style. Variables are studied in Chapters 1–3. Chapter 1 is devoted to changes of style according to the literary genre. Even

---

the theory of 'three styles,' see, for instance, Johnson and Gotoff, *Commentary, passim*; cf. below, Chapters 2 and 5.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *De Oratore*. 2. 18. 76 (mocking remarks about book-learning).

<sup>20</sup> Of course, the author is aware of the fact that discussions of style with respect to different genres, epochs, or personalities (even within the framework of different arts) are also helpful and necessary. Such distinctions are taken into account here, insofar as they affect Cicero's literary use of linguistic means of expression. For a recent contribution on style (correctness, clarity, ornament, and propriety), see: Rowe, G. E., 'Style', in Porter, S. E.: (ed.). There are linguistic limits to the freedom of stylistic choices. Actually there are no perfect synonyms. Some words refer to concrete objects, others have also abstract meanings. Some syntagms show an especially strong cohesion. Some words or constructions apply to persons, others to dead objects (see, for instance, Théoret). The first step is correctness (*Latinitas*); the second step is appropriateness (*aptum*). Only here, style becomes relevant.

generic differences may be explained to a certain extent by the nature or expectations of a given audience.

Chapter 2 treats changes of style within individual texts. (Interpretative analyses—Chapter 5—illustrate this matter in more detail).

Chapter 3 considers variables in terms of a ‘diachronic’ development of Cicero’s language and style. (It will become apparent, however, that a chronological explanation should be attempted only after an exhaustive generic and pragmatic analysis).<sup>21</sup>

Chapter 4 shows that there are constants—persistent elements of style—which stand the test in Cicero’s dialogue with traditions and audiences. Even some principles governing stylistic change can be reckoned among Cicero’s ‘constants’: an example is his increasing purism in the service of Latinity. Taken together, all these constant elements give an idea of Cicero’s personal style (a term that should be used with caution, however, given the continuity of generic traditions in antiquity),<sup>22</sup> they also explain why Cicero’s language was accepted to such a high degree by later generations. It is here, therefore, that some aspects of Cicero’s influence and the problems posed by Latin as a literary language are discussed.

Chapter 5 examines typical sections of Cicero’s orations—*prooemium*, *narratio*, *digressio*, *peroratio*. In them, style is conditioned by several factors: first, by *inventio*, the author’s strategy in the given oration; second, by specific precepts he adopts from rhetorical theory and, last and very important, by Cicero’s sense of decorum (*aptum*) and his ability to give a general human interest to the case under discussion. The texts in Chapter 5 have been chosen deliberately from orations with a strong ‘literary’ touch. If even here the style is conditioned by *inventio*, the same is true *a fortiori* for less ‘literary’ orations.

Chapters 1–4 illustrate the major points, as much as possible, through examples. Readers less experienced in Latin may start from the Epilogue and the selected analytic studies in Chapter 5; after this, in a slow and patient reading of the earlier chapters, they might gradually discover the hidden treasures of Cicero’s style.

---

<sup>21</sup> There is some danger in neglecting this principle, for instance, in Johnson; for a critical view of statistics and ‘chronological’ conclusions concerning ‘development’: Ax, *Probleme* 228–245.

<sup>22</sup> Cf., e.g., Norden, *Kunstprosa* 1, 12, who however goes too far in contesting the identity of style and man; cf. the end of Chapter 4 below; for a discussion of ‘style and personality,’ Ax, 246–253.

The Epilogue inquires into the intellectual roots of Cicero's stylistic choices. Cicero was a broadly educated orator, and he owed his entire career to his philosophical and rhetorical education, not to family or wealth. The culture of speech represented by Cicero is inseparable from his broad intellectual background. This is why for many generations in many countries a study of Cicero's style and of the rhetorical techniques behind it not only laid the foundations of political culture and humane and peaceful discussion, but also proved a path to independent thought and intellectual freedom.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CHAPTER ONE

### DIFFERENCES OF GENRE

*Prima virtus est vitio carere.*

‘The first of all virtues is the avoidance of faults.’  
Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8. 3. 41

*Cicéron écrit la langue de tout le monde;  
mais il l’écrit mieux que personne.*

‘Cicero writes the language of everybody, but better  
than anybody.’  
L. Laurand, *Cicéron* (1933) 154

### ORATIONS

#### *Orations Compared to Other Genres*

A first negative guideline for any orator who wants to influence his audience is to avoid all that could strike them as odd; and therefore he conforms his language and style to the common usage.

In his orations Cicero is eager to keep a middle course between the extremes of banality and sublimity. Even in the domain of phonetics and accidence he therefore eschews both colloquialisms (e.g. *pote* instead of *potest*) and flexional forms typical of poetry (such as genitives ending in *-ai*, infinitives ending in *-ier*). In a few isolated cases Cicero uses the archaic form *duint* (‘may they give’), but only in solemn and highly formal contexts (*In Catilinam* 1. 9. 22). In general, however, as far as the uncertainties of manuscript tradition allow at all for conclusions, archaic forms found in Cicero’s poetry and colloquial forms found in his letters are absent from his orations.<sup>1</sup> In choosing between the genitive endings *-um* and *-orum*, he follows not an abstract rule but the everyday language of his time (*Orator* 46. 155f.). His adherence to customary usage in spelling and pronunciation makes him also change his opinion on *pulcros*, *Cetegos*, *trumpos* and finally accept the fashionable Grecian sounds *-ch-*, *-th-*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Laurand 101–110 and our discussion of Cicero’s language in his letters and his poetry.

-*ph*- (*Orator* 48. 160). In the orations there are slight variations in accident and spelling. It was, for example, generally supposed that Cicero had spelled the genitive singular of nouns ending in *-ius* with a single *-i* all the time (a usage confirmed by republican inscriptions). The spelling *-ii*, however (which was recommended by Varro and spread from the Augustan period onward), is not uncommon in manuscripts and now and then seems to be supported by prose rhythm.<sup>2</sup> The slightly archaic form *abs* gradually disappears.<sup>3</sup> Cicero uses *istud*, but sometimes also *istuc*, especially before *quidem* (this is a problem of pronunciation<sup>4</sup> rather than of spelling). Some students will be pleased to know that even Cicero occasionally infringed the laws of our grammar books: Charisius, a 4th century grammarian who used good sources, read *poematorum* (for *poematum*) in the oration *Pro Gallio*.<sup>5</sup> In early orations we find the dative *unae* (for *uni*) *rei* (*Pro Tullio* 15. 36) and a genitive *nulli* (for *nullius*: *Pro Q. Roscio* 16. 48). For scholars, such 'errors' are precious traces of colloquial language.

The same rules apply to vocabulary.<sup>6</sup> In his orations, Cicero eschews poetic and colloquial expressions.<sup>7</sup> To give an example, he may say in a letter *quod in buccam venerit*<sup>8</sup> ('what came to the tip of his tongue') whereas in his orations the wording is more dignified: *neque hoc mihi nunc primum in mentem venit dicere*<sup>9</sup> ('and this has not come to my mind now for the first time' *Pro S. Roscio* 42. 122).

Archaic and poetic vocabulary is more frequent in Cicero's philosophical writings than in his orations. The same may be said of Greek words and colloquialisms, which are more common here even

<sup>2</sup> Laurand 109; the spelling *-ii* is more readily adopted in adjectives than in nouns; it is attested in poetry from Lucretius onward; Horace sticks to *-i*, whereas in Ovid *-ii* is frequent.

<sup>3</sup> Wölfflin, 'Vulgärlatein' 144; Hellmuth, *De sermonis* . . . 20; Neue/Wagener, Vol. 2, 3rd edn., 829–830; Parzinger II 57–60.

<sup>4</sup> Phonetic interaction between neighbouring words is frequently observed in live speech, but mostly neglected in spelling. In Sanskrit, euphonic combination of sounds—*sandhi*—is extended to the entire sentence and reflected in the spelling; ancient Greek papyri attest phenomena of *sandhi* familiar to us from modern Greek pronunciation.

<sup>5</sup> Orelli/Baiter 4, 946; = *Fig.* 4, p. 151 Crawford.

<sup>6</sup> Clearly visible in the lists made by Laurand 362–404; he does not mark, however, words which occur only in the orations; such a list would be helpful.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. below, p. 72.

<sup>8</sup> *Ad Atticum* 14. 7. 2; cf. 1. 12. 4; 7. 10.

<sup>9</sup> On the style of the letters, see pp. 52–71.

than in the dialogues found in his theoretical writings.<sup>10</sup> Technical terms used in the philosophical and rhetorical treatises are absent from the orations. Exceptions and borderline cases can always be explained from the context.<sup>11</sup> In order to be understood by all of his listeners, in his popular orations Cicero shuns Greek terms: most of the few Greek words attested in the orations had been adopted long ago by the linguistic community (many of them occur as early as Terence). Furthermore, Cicero avoids in his orations certain words used in his other writings (*grammaticus*, *hilarus*, *philosophari*, *philosophia*, *rhetor*). Foreign words give the style an exotic (*octaphoros*, *diadema*) or ironical touch (*idiota*, *philosophari*). Most of the words of Greek origin, however, refer to matters of daily life;<sup>12</sup> the use of such terms is conditioned by the subject matter, for instance in accusations and invectives.

But there are also positive choices specific to the orations. Since the orator, as a rule, abstains from anything that might shock his audience, it is not surprising that we cannot find any prominent phonetic or morphological features belonging exclusively to the orations. The vocabulary of the orations, however, is not only subject to restrictions; it also shows certain positive preferences as compared to the other writings. To give an example, of two possible synonyms (*interficere* 'to kill' and *occidere* 'to murder'), Cicero in his philosophical writings prefers the less colourful *interficere*, whereas in his orations and rhetorical writings he favours the more emotional *occidere*.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, some adjectives and adverbs disparaging an opponent occur in the orations but not in the philosophical writings: *nefandus* and *nefarie* ('sacrilegious, outrageous'), *scelestus* and *sceleste* ('criminal'), *spurcus* ('filthy').<sup>14</sup> Finally, the replacement of pale phrases with more vigorous and drastic ones, a tendency typical of colloquial speech, can also be

<sup>10</sup> On the philosophical writings, see pp. 27–44.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. pp. 45–49.

<sup>12</sup> Oksala 84.

<sup>13</sup> Löfstedt 2, 344. In Cicero's orations there are 160 instances of *occidere* and 121 of *interficere*. The ratio is similar in the rhetorical treatises. However, in his philosophical works there are 27 instances of *interficere* and only 10 of *occidere*. *Occidere* is preferred by rhetorical authors (Seneca the Elder, the author of the *Declamations* ascribed to Quintilian, also Velleius, Valerius Maximus, and Curtius), *interficere* by Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, and Tacitus (in his major works). In Livy the ratio is 156 (*interficere*): 159 (*occidere*).

<sup>14</sup> Laurand 78, but without explicitly referring to the emotional tone of the orations.

found in the high style of emotional speech: *Pro Caelio* 31. 75 *se eiecit atque extulit* 'broke loose and escaped'.<sup>15</sup>

In the domain of syntax and style, too, orators must beware of any kind of affected and unusual expression. Examples are violent hyperbatons or other drastic interferences in word order. Nevertheless in the service of emphasis Cicero exploits the full margin of transpositions acceptable in Latin prose, such as the inversion of *tam* in *Pro Caelio* 5. 12: *Neque ego umquam fuisse tale monstrum in terris ullum puto, tam ex contrariis diversisque et inter se pugnantibus naturae studiis cupiditatibusque conflatum* 'No, I do not believe that there has ever existed on earth so strange a portent, such a fusion of natural tastes and desires that were so contradictory, divergent, and at war among themselves'.<sup>16</sup> In other cases, Cicero employs transposition for the sake of variety: *nequaquam ex tam ampla neque tam ex nobili civitate* ('by no means from such a great and renowned city': *In Verrem* II. 4. 96).

Another feature objectionable in prose is poetic rhythm. In order to eschew dactylic sentence endings, Cicero in his prose even changes the metre of poetic quotations by inserting or rearranging words.<sup>17</sup> There is reason to assume that he rejected the heroic clausula (—∪—x) also in theory (cf. *Orator* 64. 217). According to Laurand,<sup>18</sup> heroic clausulae occur especially in Cicero's early orations and later in passages where simplicity is on display.<sup>19</sup> However, in later orations, short sentences and colons rather frequently show hexametric endings (*Philippicae* 8). This is especially true of questions; here punctuation apparently was not felt to be very strong.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, readers of Cicero should be prepared to find many cases of cretic scansion of dactylic words in the clausulae; in fact, many sentence endings, which look 'hexametric' to the eye, were virtually 'cretic,' because the penultimate word—dactylic by itself—was followed by a rhetor-

<sup>15</sup> Translation: Gardner. Löfstedt 2, 446, n. 2 with good reason defends this striking metaphor against critics who deemed it inappropriate for orations.

<sup>16</sup> Translation: Gardner; for this type of word order, cf. Löfstedt 2, 397–405; Hofmann/Szantyr 410. The reader should bear in mind that, in inflectional languages, such transpositions offer themselves quite naturally even to untrained speakers. Cicero, therefore, does not depart from common usage, but exploits its stylistic potential.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Zillinger, *Cicero* 107, n. 3; id., 'Klausel' 361–363.

<sup>18</sup> Laurand, 'Hexamètre' 75–94.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. also Laurand 179 with n. 8.

<sup>20</sup> Laurand 309, n. 4 referring to Wüst 68.

ical pause.<sup>21</sup> Finally, dactylic rhythm is not necessarily a 'primitive' feature; it may also give a lofty tone to the speech, as for instance with the Roman historians. This could be the case in Cicero's plea for the actor Roscius, in which other poetic elements occur as well.<sup>22</sup> We are in this case dealing with an ambivalent element of style, that can have either a colloquial or a poetic touch.<sup>23</sup>

As compared to his poetry, Cicero's orations exhibit less striking metaphors; even in the philosophical writings he uses them more freely.<sup>24</sup> In everyday speech the orator seems to have been very sensitive to pretentious metaphors (cf. *Ad Familiares* 16; 17).

Unlike the style of the philosophical writings, which sometimes rises to archaic solemnity, the diction of the orations is generally 'modern.' Consequently, in the orations, the position of the finite verb in the main clause is conventional (the verb stands mostly at the end of the sentence), whereas in the philosophical writings the (allegedly 'logical') position in the middle of the sentence occurs as often as the customary one.<sup>25</sup>

Cicero's syntax is more careful in his orations than it is in his letters: constructions like *super* taking the ablative or *gratulor cum* (instead of *quod*)<sup>26</sup> ('I congratulate . . . that') are not found in the orations (and in the treatises); moreover, *super* does not occur in the orations except for the phrase *satis superque*.<sup>27</sup> In some cases, however, the syntax of the orations comes rather close to colloquial language (e.g. *In Verrem* II 3. 225 *quinquies tanta . . . amplius* 'five times more').<sup>28</sup>

Among positive stylistic features, sentence construction<sup>29</sup> is more complex in his orations than in his letters. This is especially true for his private letters to Atticus, whereas the letters *Ad Familiares* actually

<sup>21</sup> Shipley 139–156.

<sup>22</sup> The unusual style of this plea is close to comedy and colloquial tone, in harmony with the person of Q. Roscius, an actor, s. Axer, *Rosc.*, *passim*.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Brignoli I.

<sup>24</sup> Metaphors are most prominent in orations that are close to the epideictic style, such as the *Pro Murena*, the *De Lege Manilia* (= *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*) the 10th *Philippic*, and the *De Marcello* (see, however, pp. 20–25). Morawski 1–5; cf. also Itzinger.

<sup>25</sup> Porten.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Laurand 110–115; even in Cicero's letters, *gratulor* with *cum* is only found within a quotation of Lucius Caesar's words (*Ad Atticum* 14, 17 A, 3 = *fam.* 9, 14, 3).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Merguet, q.v.

<sup>28</sup> According to the Vatican palimpsest (4th century); Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 288; cf. below, pp. 89–93; on the function of colloquial style in the *Pro Roscio comoedo*, s. Axer, *Rosc.* 14–20.

<sup>29</sup> For the details, cf. pp. 97–122.

are less familiar in tone than their title suggests and, therefore, much closer to the style of the orations.<sup>30</sup> The elaborate alternation of parataxis and hypotaxis found in the orations is also absent from Cicero's poetry. In the course of his life, his prose and his poetry developed in different directions: in his poems, participial constructions and connecting particles typical of prose become ever less prominent,<sup>31</sup> while in the orations the use of participles gains in frequency and freedom.

In his philosophical writings (cf. *Orator* 19. 62–64), Cicero is striving for an harmonious style suitable for scholarly contemplation, whereas the orations, in accordance with their persuasive function, are intended to have an instantaneous effect on their audience.<sup>32</sup> In the orations, therefore, emotional elements of style are more prominent. An example is the frequent use of anaphora and asyndeton, witness *In Catilinam* 2. 1: *abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit* 'he has gone, left us, got away, broken out.'<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, in his orations, Cicero exploits the emotional potential of word order by often placing the verb at the beginning of the sentence, especially in lively narrative. The less balanced character of the orations implies a less regular distribution of participles in their text. Furthermore, in the orations participles are more often used in predicate (in such cases their 'verbal' power serves to reflect a process), whereas in the philosophical writings they rather appear as attributes (conveying descriptions of circumstances in nominal form).<sup>34</sup> However, parallelism, despite its 'logic' and matter-of fact appearance, is slightly more favoured in the orations and letters than in the philosophical writings.<sup>35</sup> The reason is that parallelism has a strong psychological impact on listeners, as modern political orators know.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. pp. 52–71.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. pp. 119f.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Werner; for the orator's intention to influence his audience by means of suggestion, cf. Neumeister 186–192; Altavilla 345; with reference to Majorana 161: 'reflective' oratory mirrors the feelings of the audience, whereas an orator possessing 'syntone' eloquence starts from ideas he shares with his public, arouses the sleeping thoughts of his audience, and develops them organically; finally, an orator of the 'suggestive' type brings his listeners under his yoke and even diverts them from their original opinions.

<sup>33</sup> Translation: MacDonald; Havers 153.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Laughton, *Participle* 145–147.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Porten.

In order not to offend his audience, a good orator should conceal any superior education or learning he might have;<sup>36</sup> any infringement would be detrimental to his *auctoritas* and to the efficiency of his speech.<sup>37</sup> As one might have expected, Cicero follows this rule less strictly in his rhetorical and philosophical writings than in his orations. However, even in his dialogues he preserves the Roman dignity (*gravitas*) of his illustrious interlocutors (e.g. Cato maior, Scipio, Crassus)<sup>38</sup> by avoiding, for the sake of *urbanitas*, even the slightest hint of pedantry. Roman *auctoritas* did not allow for ample quotations, especially from Greek authors, except for very famous passages. In some cases, quotations serve purposes of humour or are used to answer the attacks of Cicero's opponents. In each case, Cicero adapts his quotations and his manner of quoting to the nature of his audience. Wit and irony, if no less poignant than in the letters, are certainly more disciplined in the orations; for Cicero always bears in mind his purpose and beware of saying anything that might shock his judges.<sup>39</sup>

### *Types of Orations*

#### *The Spoken and the Written Versions of the Orations*

Since the present study is centred on style as the literary use of linguistic means of expression and is therefore dealing with written texts exclusively, the vexed question of the relation between the written and the spoken versions of the orations need not be discussed at length here. The latter are of course inaccessible to us.<sup>40</sup> A related

<sup>36</sup> Jucker 87–91.

<sup>37</sup> *De Oratore* 2. 36. 153; cf. 2. 1. 4.

<sup>38</sup> *De Re Publica* 1. 22. 36 *ut unum e togatis*; *De Oratore* 1. 29. 132 *sicut unus pater familias*; cf. 1. 34. 159.

<sup>39</sup> Laurand 3, 253.

<sup>40</sup> The following studies should be mentioned here: Humbert starts from the practice of legal proceedings in Rome; for a thoroughgoing and very convincing criticism of Humbert, see Stroh, *Taxis*. For the problem of revision, cf. also Korte, ch. 5 'Geschriebene und gesprochene Rede,' pp. 74–78, discussing Norden, Zumpt, Meyer, Humbert, Pocock, and Opperskalski. In Heinze's view, the *Pro Caelio* is a rather exact record of the actually delivered oration (with the exception of §§ 39–50; cf. already Norden, *Werkstatt*; Heinze 193–258; cf. Cousin 91–98. In the *Pro Caelio*, there is no trace of carelessness, as far as rhythm is concerned, cf. Zielinski,

issue, however, will be our next subject: a comparative analysis of the published text of delivered orations and of orations written only for publication.<sup>41</sup>

*Orations Delivered and Published Versus Orations Never Delivered but Published. Epideictic Elements in Cicero's Orations*

Many of Cicero's orations were first delivered and then published, others were written for publication only. It is a fascinating task to compare the styles of these two groups of orations.

In the *Actio Secunda* against Verres, which was written for publication only, prose rhythm is treated carefully, whereas the *Actio Prima*, a delivered oration, is less balanced rhythmically. In Cicero's later years, however, the second Philippic (an undelivered pamphlet) has no privileged position as far as rhythm is concerned. Furthermore, in orations written for publication only, parentheses<sup>42</sup> and words of Greek origin are more frequent<sup>43</sup> than in other orations.<sup>44</sup> Finally, the undelivered orations (pamphlets) abound in elaborate *exempla*.<sup>45</sup> But even within this group there are differences: in the *De Signis* ('On statues') and the *De Suppliciis* ('On punishments inflicted on Roman citizens') rhetorical devices are generally more prominent than in the first three orations of the *Actio Secunda*. Such differences are caused by both the subject matter and the final position of these orations within the corpus of the *Verrinae*.

---

'Rhythmus.' For the relation between delivered and published orations, cf. also Laurand 1–23; Kirby 163ff. (with bibl.); Achard, *Pratique*, 30; Pinkster, 'Taal en stijl', 103f. (with bibl.); Blänsdorf, 'Cicero auf dem Forum'. As for 'literary' orations, Stroh, *Taxis* 54 is right: 'Wenn wir rhetorisch korrekt interpretieren wollen, haben wir . . . diese Fiktion als Realität zu nehmen.'

<sup>41</sup> The interesting problem of 'fictive orality' was addressed by Fuhrmann, 'Mündlichkeit.'

<sup>42</sup> Roschatt 189–244. The presence of Greek words in *Verrines II* can be explained by their subject matter (Sicily, sculpture). Frequency of parentheses, however, is not a mechanical consequence of a less familiar subject matter. In orations written for publication, parenthesis is a feature of stylistic refinement, rather than a mere expedient to give additional information.

<sup>43</sup> Oksala 74 and 77–78, with reference to *In Verrem II* and *Philippicae* 2.

<sup>44</sup> In the more elaborate orations (such as the *Pro Milone* or the *Pro Murena*), *conducatio*, for instance, is more frequent as well; Parzinger I 60–61.

<sup>45</sup> Schoenberger, *Beispiele* 45–46.

*Epideictic Elements in Cicero's Orations*

According to Cicero's theory (*Orator* 62. 209), elaborate *periods*<sup>46</sup>—such passages as have been called (ironically enough) 'Ciceronian style'—should be less frequent in judicial than in epideictic<sup>47</sup> orations (*Orator* 62. 209 and 66. 221). As a rule, in forensic style, art should be concealed. A lawyer should favour brief *colons*, since a lavish use of well-turned periods would endanger his credibility in court. However, elaborate periods are appropriate in eulogies and whenever splendid amplification is needed (*Orator* 62. 210). Consequently, even rhythm is determined by more or less unconscious expectations of the audience (*Partitiones Oratoriae* 21. 72–73) and clearly depends on the social and psychological background as well.

Although practically none of Cicero's orations is purely epideictic, epideictic elements appear in judicial and political orations and, of course, in orations written only for publication. In judicial orations, seemingly epideictic elements have a persuasive function; this is true, for instance, of the detailed excursus on the importance of literature in Cicero's plea for Archias.<sup>48</sup> The epideictic colouring of an oration has also some influence on the purity of diction and even on the technique of clausulae. In Cicero's second working period (the time of the *Verrinae*), purism<sup>49</sup> and prose rhythm<sup>50</sup> are especially prominent in the *Divinatio in Caecilium*, an oration in which Cicero intended to prove that he was the ideal advocate for the Sicilians' case. In his third working period (from the *Pro Fonteio* to the *Pro Cluentio*), the largely epideictic *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* has by far the most pleasing rhythm. The purity of Cicero's language in the same oration is fostered by the fact that it was delivered to the people and nowhere dealt with details of real life.<sup>51</sup> Not until the *Pro Archia*

<sup>46</sup> A period is 'a complete sentence consisting of several clauses, grammatically connected, and rhetorically constructed' (*OED*).

<sup>47</sup> Epideictic: 'adapted for display or show-off; chiefly of set orations' (*OED*).

<sup>48</sup> See below, Chapter 5, pp. 198–205.

<sup>49</sup> Oksala 45, however, explains the purism in this oration by its specifically juridic character.

<sup>50</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus,' recent studies (though more refined in method) often confirm Zielinski's observations. Especially important are Primmer and Habinek. Dangel points out connections between prose rhythm and word accent, and Aumont defines four new rules for clausulae (I have some doubts concerning his second rule).

<sup>51</sup> Oksala 53.

of the fifth period (from the *Pro Sulla* to the *Pro Flacco*) do we find an oration of the same rhythmical strictness.<sup>52</sup> In the time of his consulship (fourth period) the *Catilinarian Orations* stand out by their rhythm. Cicero polished them carefully, if only because they reflected the summit of his career as a politician. To give an example, by amply applying prosopopœia<sup>53</sup> and repeatedly introducing *Roma* as a speaker,<sup>54</sup> he defies the rules of 'plain' style and Atticism (*Orator* 25. 85). In his seventh working period (from the *Pro Sestio* to the *Pro Balbo*), the *In Vatinius* excels by its elaborate rhythm,<sup>55</sup> in this case Cicero developed a cross-examination into a showpiece of oratory. In his ninth working period (the time of the *Caesarian Orations*), the largely epideictic *De Marcello* is distinguished by its carefully worked-out rhythm and its exquisite vocabulary.<sup>56</sup> In his tenth working period (the time of the *Philippics*), the orations that come close to epideictic style are rather free of colloquialisms,<sup>57</sup> but do not differ from the others in terms of rhythm.<sup>58</sup> According to C. Morawski, in epideictic orations Cicero is bolder in his choice of metaphors, but perhaps the degree of pathos is even more important (*genus tenue, medium, grande*).<sup>59</sup>

### *Levels of Style*

Classical theory distinguished judicial, political ('deliberative'), and epideictic orations. In Cicero's practice, interesting crossings of genre can be observed: we have seen that epideictic elements are found in judicial orations, and we will see that political motives are of some importance to judicial orations, too. Another link between judicial and political orations rests in the fact that both were often directed to the same audiences. 'Since judicial orations are mostly . . . deliv-

<sup>52</sup> However, in the *Pro Archia*, the rhythmic clausulae at the sentence endings are much more elaborate than the colons within the sentences.

<sup>53</sup> A rhetorical figure 'by which an imaginary or absent person is represented as speaking or acting' (*OED*).

<sup>54</sup> *In Catilinam* 1. 7. 17–18; 1. 11. 27–29.

<sup>55</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus.'

<sup>56</sup> Absence of diminutives was observed by Parzinger II 45.

<sup>57</sup> Examples are the 9th *Philippic* with the obituary oration for Sulpicius, the 10th with the eulogy on Brutus 10. 3. 7–4. 9, and the eulogy on the fallen 14. 12. 31–13. 35; Laurand 339f.

<sup>58</sup> See, however, below, pp. 25f. on orations delivered before the people.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. below, pp. 21–25.

ered to the public in Rome, the people, of course, obtained much influence on decisions.<sup>60</sup>

However, in accordance with subject matter and purpose, certain features (such as elements of everyday language) become more prominent in judicial than in political orations.<sup>61</sup> As for style, the *conduplicatio*<sup>62</sup> of the type *te, te inquam* ('It is you, it is you that I mean') fits in well with the tone of forensic argument.<sup>63</sup> The judicial orations also stand out for the frequent occurrence of digressions (so-called excursuses), which subconsciously influence the feelings of the jury and therefore, in spite of their ostensible uselessness, are relevant to the process of persuasion.<sup>64</sup> Here Cicero follows his own teachings: 'It is often useful to make a digression in order to move your audience' *digredi . . . permovendorum animorum causa saepe utile est* (*De Oratore* 2. 77. 311). Yet, the very nature of excursuses sets limits to their use: one of the aims of digressions is to divert the listener (*delectare: Brutus* 93. 322); so subjects like praise and reproach, descriptions, and moral reflections are appropriate. Given its affinities to the epideictic genre and to 'middle style,' *digressio* is out of place in dry as well as in vehement speech.<sup>65</sup> Rhetorical irony is a further feature frequent in judicial orations, particularly in the *argumentatio*<sup>66</sup> (again with the exception of the *genus grande* on the one hand and sober orations like the *Pro Tullio* on the other). Given the multi-faceted character of Cicero's judicial orations, a discussion of their style is bound to ascertain tendencies rather than strict rules.<sup>67</sup>

Cicero himself assigns his orations to different levels of style according to their subject matter and aim (*Orator* 29. 102); Theophrastus may have influenced him on this point.<sup>68</sup> The orator quotes three

<sup>60</sup> Mack 16, n. 48; cf. *De Inventione* 1. 33. 56; 2. 45. 133f.; *Topica* 19. 73; *De Oratore* 2. 48. 198—50. 204.

<sup>61</sup> Laurand 3, 269.

<sup>62</sup> Repetition or ingemination, 'the action of reiterating a word' (*OED*).

<sup>63</sup> Parzinger I 60f.

<sup>64</sup> Canter, '*Digressio*' 351—361.

<sup>65</sup> Canter, '*Digressio*' 356—358.

<sup>66</sup> Canter, 'Irony' 457—464.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. the following section and pp. 79—85.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Laurand 232; similar views are held by Douglas, 'Theory' 18—26; critically Hendrickson, 'Style' 125—146; id., 'Origin' 249—290; Stroux, *De Theophrasti* . . . 5—9; further bibliography in Körte 80; for a harsh criticism of the 'three levels': Johnson *passim* and (better and more sophisticated) Gotoff, *Commentary*. For a moderate view, Habinek 147 ('a useful, albeit limited way of categorizing observable differences').

of his own orations as examples for three levels of style. Two of those are judicial orations. The *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, which is on high treason, is written in the grand style (*genus sublime*); the principal aim of this style is to move the audience (*movere*), and Demosthenes is its greatest model. An example of the middle style (*genus medium*) is Cicero's *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*, a political oration which largely develops his idea of a perfect general; the chief purpose of the middle style is to please the audience (*delectare*), and its main representative is Isocrates. Finally, the plain style (*genus tenue*) is exemplified by Cicero's *Pro Caecina*, a plea in a civil suit. The foremost aim of the plain style is to inform one's audience (*docere*), and its typical model is Lysias. This self-description of Cicero has been largely confirmed by several stylistic studies,<sup>69</sup> although, of course, actually there exist not only three but hundreds of levels of style. What matters, is that, in Cicero's view, there is a close interrelation between subject and style.

For civil cases the plain style is most appropriate. Striking rhythm and elaborate symmetry are avoided; instead, there is some display of a studied and agreeable negligence. Of course, pure Latin is a requirement, and aphorisms, witticisms, irony, and humour are not forbidden;<sup>70</sup> even metaphors may occur, but no neologisms. The *Pro Caecina* has shorter sentences than the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*.<sup>71</sup> In civil cases, which are decided by an individual judge, pathos is out of place. The speaker should only inform (*docere*), give proofs (*probare*), and define words properly. Since *perspicuitas* is the cardinal virtue of the plain style, plain and simple expressions abound here, such as various constructions with *facere* ('to do') some of them echoing colloquial style; the same effect is produced by phrases with *-modi*,

---

No doubt, the theory of 'three levels' implies abstraction and simplification (a fact well-known to ancient orators), but Johnson's antithesis between 'luxuriance' and 'economy' is even more simplistic, and it fails to recognize the difference between the sublime style (which fosters short sentences, like the plain style, though for a different reason) and the 'luxuriance' of long 'periods' which is appropriate to the middle style. Excellent: Winterbottom, 'Cicero and the Middle Style'. The theory of 'three styles' has the advantage of taking into account the three aims of the orator (*docere*, *delectare*, and *movere*) and, therefore, the principle of *aptum*. Consequently, even an element such as the length of sentences cannot be considered a merely stylistic choice; it depends on the *inventio* of the oration and the aims of the speaker.

<sup>69</sup> Laurand 3, 284–306; Gotzes; Hubbell 173–186.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. *Orator* 26. 87; 26. 89.

<sup>71</sup> Gotzes.

*-modo*, and *-modum*, an abundant use of pronouns (e.g. *hoc* together with an a.c.i. and similar constructions), repetitions of words and expressions like *hoc est* ('that is to say'). Characteristic features of this style, in which the subject matter is more important than the words, are insertions, short sentences, normal word order, parataxis, and direct speech; the frequency of antitheses is indicative of rational argument.

In rhythmical elegance the *Pro Caecina* (as Cicero's example of the 'plain style') is inferior to the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*, but not so much inferior as one might have expected.<sup>72</sup> The latter oration is not juridical, but political and largely epideictic in character; Cicero would use it later as a showpiece of what he calls the 'middle style.'<sup>73</sup> A look at the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* may help to characterize indirectly the plain style of the *Pro Caecina* and to establish some differences between plain and middle style. Since the foremost aim of middle style is to entertain one's listeners (*delectare*), Cicero in the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* sets a high value on rhetorical *ornatus* (such as *praeteritiones*).<sup>74</sup> Metaphors are used more freely than in the *Pro Caecina* (where they are mostly taken from military or gladiatorial life). In the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* trivial constructions with *facere* are less frequent, syntax is more elaborate, and well-rounded periods are found more often. Above all, careful sentence connection and a profusion of antitheses and hyperbata<sup>75</sup> create a feeling of poise and harmony, which is appropriate to the 'epideictic' nature of this oration and is avoided both in plain and in grand style.

Nevertheless, in Cicero's practice, plain and middle style overlap: a proof is the largely epideictic excursus in praise of civil law found in the *Pro Caecina*. However hard Cicero tried, he could never have become a plain and simple orator;<sup>76</sup> what is more: he did not want to become one. He even reproached the neo-Atticists for confining themselves to the plain style (cf. *Orator* 21. 72). It will be shown (in

---

<sup>72</sup> In the *Pro Roscio Comoedo*, which mimicks the style of comedy, the prose rhythm shows a studied negligence.

<sup>73</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus' (lists); Hubbell.

<sup>74</sup> *Praeteritio*: 'A figure by which summary mention is made of a thing, in professing to omit it' (*OED*), a stylistic device especially useful if you want to mention things you cannot prove.

<sup>75</sup> 'A figure of speech in which the customary order of words is inverted, especially for the sake of emphasis' (*OED*).

<sup>76</sup> Hubbell, 186.

Chapter 5) that in the *Pro Archia* a seemingly epideictic excursus is put into the service of Cicero's client.

Finally, there is a third level of style: In accordance with the national importance of the cause in question—a case of high treason—the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* is written in the grand style. In order to arouse strong emotions (*pathos*) in his listeners Cicero uses specific stylistic means such as old-fashioned formulaic speech, optative clauses introduced by *utinam*, questions, gradations, anaphorae,<sup>77</sup> and geminations. His imagery in this oration is slightly more poetic than in others. Given the seriousness of the case, the absence of irony here is no surprise.<sup>78</sup>

Cicero tells us that 'we treat private cases of slight importance with more subtlety, but capital cases or cases of honour in a more ornate style' (*Ad Familiares* 9. 21 *privatas causas, et eas tenues, agimus subtilius; capitis aut famae scilicet ornatius*). The greater elegance of orations in criminal cases compared with orations in civil ones becomes apparent even in the use of rhythmic clausulae: in fact, in Cicero's first working period (from the *Pro Quinctio* to the *Pro Tullio*), the *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*, a criminal defence, is rhythmically much more refined than the later orations *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* and *Pro Tullio*.<sup>79</sup> However, in this respect, the rhythmical perfection of the *Pro Quinctio* remains an anomaly, since this oration deals with a civil case and is the oldest extant of all his orations.<sup>80</sup> In Cicero's later orations there is no noticeable difference between orations in criminal or in civil cases, as far as rhythm is concerned.<sup>81</sup>

Although the borderlines among the three levels of style are fluid, Cicero's relative theory may serve as a first point of reference and

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Hofmann/Szantyr 695.

<sup>78</sup> Canter 'Irony,' see above, p. 21. Habinek (147) has shown that vocatives are most frequent in the elevated style (the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* has 1.5 vocatives per Oxford page; the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*, 0. 87; the *Pro Caecina*, 0.6). This is another proof of the small distance between the two last-mentioned orations.

<sup>79</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus' 67, see above, n. 73.

<sup>80</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus' 71 supposes that Cicero elaborated the *Pro Quinctio* later; but it is also possible that Cicero worked especially carefully at the beginning of his career: in fact, in this early oration, the formal symmetry of parallel sentences is not always justified by their content. Elegance of rhythm is in harmony not only with a beginner's care for technical detail in this case, but also with the emotional and lofty tone of that oration; in fact, the complete property of Cicero's client and even his good reputation were at stake.

<sup>81</sup> *Pro Fonteio*, *Pro Caecina*, *Pro Cluentio*; cf. the lists provided by Zielinski, 'Rhythmus.'

allow the reader to capture stylistic nuances.<sup>82</sup> Doubtless the stylistic level of an oration is conditioned by its subject matter and by its audience. The *Pro Caecina* was delivered to an individual judge, the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* and the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* to the people. This explains why Cicero in the first-mentioned oration preferred a rational approach, whereas in the other two he appealed to emotions, trying to win his audience through *ethos*<sup>83</sup> (in the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*) or raising pity through *pathos* (in the *Pro Rabirio*). Once again the orator's awareness of his audience determines his rhythmic choices.

*Political Orations: Orations Delivered Before the Senate or the People*

As a rule, everyday language is rarer in Cicero's political orations than in his pleas,<sup>84</sup> the presence or absence of this element clearly depends on the subject matter. Among the political orations, there are differences between those delivered before the Senate and those delivered before the people. Language, style, and content vary according to the educational level of the audience. Before the people, Cicero avoids Greek words even more carefully than he does before the Senate.<sup>85</sup> As a (somewhat paradoxical) consequence, in his popular orations his Latin is especially pure. It is less surprising that before the people, his mode of expression and his presentation of arguments is more emotional; stylistic principles like serial arrangement and accumulation (*coacervatio*) predominate.<sup>86</sup> Even rhythm serves to exert a subconscious influence on a large audience.<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, Cicero speaks to the people less openly than he does to the Senate (witness the different descriptions of the military situation in the 3rd and 4th *Philippics*). This is true not only for the presentation of the

---

<sup>82</sup> For interpenetration of the various levels of style in Cicero's maturity—'vehemens-style'—cf. Werner *passim*, see above, p. 16.

<sup>83</sup> *Ethos*: an orator's self-presentation as an unselfish person and the winning impression he makes on his audience. *Pathos*: an orator's appeal to strong emotions (anger or pity).

<sup>84</sup> Laurand 3, 269.

<sup>85</sup> Oksala 78 with reference to Cicero, *De Officiis* 2. 10. 35.

<sup>86</sup> For differences according to audience and genre, see Mack, above, p. 21.

<sup>87</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus' 69 recognizes the special position, as far as rhythm is concerned, of the 4th *Philippic*, but neglects the fact that this is a public oration.

facts,<sup>88</sup> but also for his use of words: since before his peers he gives free play to his penchant for satire,<sup>89</sup> diminutives and other colloquialisms are more frequent in the orations delivered before the Senate.<sup>90</sup> The same is true of irony, a sophisticated stylistic feature which would be wasted on an uneducated public. Tellingly, the only vulgar expression found in the 6th *Philippic* (a public oration) is an interruption coming from the audience (6. 5. 12) and taken up by Cicero.<sup>91</sup>

### *The Importance of Circumstances*

Many of the differences among the various groups of orations are caused by their subject matter or their specific audience. Generic rules are often derived from experiences which orators had with their audiences. Therefore, they ultimately reflect some of the (explicit or implicit) expectations of those audiences and the social and psychological conditions of the genesis of a given oration.

Another factor determining style is the function of the orator in the case in question. What conclusions should be drawn, for instance, from the fact that *narratio* is undeveloped or even non-existent in some of Cicero's later orations? Does the style of the *narratio* become more obscure in his later orations? Is this indicative of a development of Cicero's style? Here we should rather consider Cicero's role in the lawsuits under discussion: there is no *narratio* because Cicero was speaking after other advocates and therefore delivered only the epilogue, the *peroratio*.<sup>92</sup> Similarly, one could explain the small number of historical *exempla* in the *Pro Sulla* and *Pro Flacco* by the fact that Cicero was speaking next after Hortensius and did not want to repeat the same set examples.<sup>93</sup> In any given case, one should con-

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the more favourable representation of the Gracchi in orations delivered before the people: Murray 291–298; Robinson 71–76; cf. *De Lege Agraria* 2. 5. 10; 2. 12. 31; cf. also Schoenberger, *Beispiele* 18–20.

<sup>89</sup> On the attacks on Gabinius and Piso in the orations of thanks cf. Laurand 310.

<sup>90</sup> According to Parzinger II 45 diminutives are completely omitted in *Philippics* 4 and 6, in the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, the 3rd *Catilinarian*, the *De Marcello*, and the *Post Reditum ad Quirites*.

<sup>91</sup> Laurand 340.

<sup>92</sup> Preiswerk, *De inventione*.

<sup>93</sup> A different view is held by Schoenberger, *Beispiele* 46. D. Berry, *Commentary*, does not address this problem directly, on Cicero referring to Hortensius' previous plea, p. 17; on omission of *narratio* if detrimental to the client, p. 43.

sider the orator's real situation before mechanically applying rhetorical or generic categories.

## PHILOSOPHICAL TREATISES

### *Philosophical Treatises*<sup>94</sup> *Compared to Other Genres*

In phonetics and accidence the philosophical writings are quite regular. As for colloquialisms, the contracted form *dixti* occurs once (*De Finibus* 2. 3. 10) in a dialogue (as it does in a lively discussion in the *Pro Caecina* 29, 82). As far as archaisms are concerned, a perfect indicative ending in *-ere* is found only once; tellingly, this happens in a context which evokes Roman historiography, to the style of which this archaic form belongs (*De Legibus* 1. 2. 6). Similarly, in the *De Re Publica* 2. 34. 59 an infinitive ending in *-ier* appears in connection with legal terminology. A greater number of archaisms is found only in the *De Legibus* (where the subject matter fosters an archaizing tone): *bellum* ('war') is replaced with the older form *duellum* (3. 3. 9), known to us from Ennius; instead of *illos* and *illa* ('those,' 'this'), we have *ollos*, *olla* (2. 8. 19); nor does Cicero reject the old *endo* (for *in*). It is no surprise, then, to find syncopated forms of the perfect subjunctive and even the venerable *escunt* ('they are;' 3. 3. 9), which is also attested in Lucretius. As a rule, however, Cicero's approach to Latin is anything but archaizing; occasionally he even misunderstands old Latin forms.<sup>95</sup>

In the realm of phonetics, Cicero is satisfied to give his legal text only a slight archaic flavour: the most striking hallmark of old Latin, *-d* in ablative and imperative, is missing; *oe* instead of *u* is not used consistently.<sup>96</sup> The spelling *ei* for *i* and the use of *u* in the superlative and gerund had not yet become completely obsolete in Cicero's time. The spelling *-imus* came into fashion through Caesar and was supported mainly by Calvus, Messalla, and Brutus.<sup>97</sup> A sociological discrimination of *-umus* as 'rustic' would be clearly out of place for

<sup>94</sup> On the genre: Schenkeveld, 'Philosophical Prose', especially 216–223.

<sup>95</sup> He wrongly takes for a plural the archaic form *appellamino* (3. 3. 8), which should be a singular (third person); cf. also Jordan 225–250; cf. also Wilhelms 458–459.

<sup>96</sup> 3. 4. 10 *coeret* compared with 3. 3. 7 *curatores*; 2. 9. 22 *loedis* compared with 3. 7 *ludorumque*; cf. also *De Re Publica* 3. 9. 15 *poentre*.

<sup>97</sup> Marouzeau, 'Formation' 269; cf. also Marouzeau I 279–280.

Cicero's time, all the more as Augustus still gives preference to this form.

As for vocabulary, differences between Cicero's orations and his philosophical writings are partly conditioned by subject matter.<sup>98</sup> More than 5000 words form the basic vocabulary of both the orations and the treatises. In addition, each group has no more than 2000 words of its own. What is more, the 5000 words they have in common are at the same time the most frequently occurring ones.

It is partly due to chance that some words are found only in one of the two genres; for instance *consobrina* ('cousin,' *fem.*) is attested only in orations, *consobrinus* ('cousin,' *m.*) in treatises, too.<sup>99</sup> Other differences have their roots in chronology: *ilico* ('at once') is absent from the philosophical writings, but at that time Cicero had given up this word in his orations as well (the last occurrence is in the *Pro Murena* 10. 22). The same is true for *circa* ('around'), which disappears after the *De Lege Agraria* (1. 7. 22).

Further differences of vocabulary depend on the subject matter under discussion: as we might have expected, *hiberno*<sup>100</sup> and *hiemo* ('pass the winter')<sup>101</sup> are found only in orations dealing with campaigns, and it would be fruitless to look for these words in the philosophical writings. For the same reasons, agricultural terms<sup>102</sup> and some legal terms attested in Cicero's judicial orations (*spondeo* 'I guarantee;' *satisdatio* 'bail') are missing in his philosophical writings. Obviously, many names of animals turning up in the *De Natura Deorum* are not found in the orations. Of course, *res publica* is more frequent in the orations, *sapiens* in the philosophical writings. To be brief, the vocabulary of the philosophical writings is, despite their smaller bulk, not only larger than that of the orations but also more colourful and diversified.

On the other hand, there is less emotional language in the philosophical writings than in the orations. In his treatises, Cicero increasingly prefers the more factual word *dementia* ('insanity') to the more vigorous expression *amentia* ('madness'), which, in the serene style of

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Laurand 76–84.

<sup>99</sup> For more examples cf. Laurand 77.

<sup>100</sup> *De Lege Manilia* (= *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*) 13. 39.

<sup>101</sup> *Pro Fonteio* 7. 16; *In Verrem* II. 4. 47. 104.

<sup>102</sup> *Hordeum*, *horotinum*; *In Verrem* II. 3 = *De Re Frumentaria*.

the philosophical writings is used only with a certain reserve.<sup>103</sup> In his early orations *amens* ('mad') prevails, whereas in those of the fifties and forties, *amens* and *demens* ('insane') balance each other. In his philosophical writings *demens* is twice as frequent as *amens*.<sup>104</sup> For further differences of vocabulary caused by the more emotional nature of the orations (and, to some degree, of the rhetorical writings), see above, p. 13.

As for derivatives, they are generally more frequent in the philosophical writings.<sup>105</sup> Nouns ending in *-tor*, however, are not; but in the treatises, they are used with greater variety and refinement than in the orations. Of 38 *nomina agentis* ending in *-trix*, 5 occur only in the orations, whereas 28 appear only in the theoretical writings.<sup>106</sup> Verbal nouns ending in *-io* are three times as frequent, derivatives ending in *-us* and *-tas*<sup>107</sup> four times as frequent as in the orations. Abstract nouns<sup>108</sup> ending in *-ntia* are rather rare in the orations, whereas in the theoretical writings there are forty of them. Derivatives in *-mentum* occur more than twice as often in the treatises as in the orations; there is also an increase in number of nouns ending in *-or* (of the type *maeror*).<sup>109</sup>

Furthermore, forty-three newly coined verbal adjectives ending in *-bilis* appear in the theoretical writings. We also find twice as many adjectives ending in *-osus* as in the orations, and three times as many ending in *-alis*. Likewise, there are more words ending in *-eus* and more diminutive adjectives than in the orations (this is not true for diminutive nouns, however). Four adjectives qualified by *sub-* are found in the orations, 15 in the treatises (most of them in the rhetorical writings). There is no difference, however, in the number of adjectives with *per-*.

<sup>103</sup> For instance, *non multum differunt ab amentia, Tusculanae Disputationes* 4. 16. 36; cf. 3. 2. 4. ('are not far different from aberration of mind,' Translation: King).

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Parzinger II 42f., with slight inaccuracies.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 126–136.

<sup>106</sup> Bibl. in Hofmann/Szantyr 745.

<sup>107</sup> For *-tas* and *-tudo*, cf. Hofmann/Szantyr 743–744; neologisms e.g. *De Natura Deorum* 1. 35. 95; *Tusculanae Disputationes* 4. 11. 25.

<sup>108</sup> Use of abstract nouns was prepared for in old Latin drama, see Molsberger, who states a general preference for nominal expression in Latin drama (as compared to Greek drama); to a certain degree, Molsberger has been preceded by Goethe, cf. Albrecht, *History*, Vol. 1, 35, n. 1.

<sup>109</sup> *Substantiva privativa* (against which the Latin language was reluctant initially) are rather rare in Cicero: Hofmann/Szantyr 742.

Finally, inchoative verbs are almost five times more frequent in the theoretical writings than elsewhere; whereas intensive (frequentative) verbs occur only occasionally. Nine rather rare compound verbs with *-facere* and five with *-ficare* are found in the theoretical writings.<sup>110</sup>

### *Colloquial Language in Passages of Dialogue*

The fact that in the philosophical writings Cicero comes back to words and phrases typical of his juvenile style (*summe sanus* ['very healthy' for *valde sanus*], *usque eo* ['to the point of'], *verum etiam* ['but also'] for *sed etiam*),<sup>111</sup> may be due to the near-to-dialogue nature of the philosophical writings. Further colloquialisms, such as *belle* ('pretty,' 'very') or *festive* ('wittily'), are found even in the orations sometimes, although they are not characteristic of Cicero's juvenile style. Some adverbs and pronominal forms to be listed later as 'archaisms'<sup>112</sup> could be mentioned here as well. To give an example, in Cicero's time the archaic adverb *oppido* ('very,' e.g. *De Finibus* 3. 10. 33; cf. p. 53) was still alive in formulaic expressions used in colloquial language (*oppido pauci* 'very few,' *oppido ridiculus* 'very funny'). In the field of syntax, colloquial elements are even more frequent in Cicero's dialogues.<sup>113</sup>

### *Poetic and Archaic Elements in Elevated Style*

In his philosophical writings, Cicero is less afraid to use expressions which confer archaic solemnity on his style.<sup>114</sup> *Effari* ('to pronounce'), for instance, occurs only once in the orations (*De Domo Sua* 55. 141, in a religious context), but is found more frequently in the philosophical writings, though never without a valid motive: Cicero uses the word in legal (*De Legibus* 2. 8. 20 and 21) or oracular speech,<sup>115</sup>

<sup>110</sup> For compound words, cf. Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 137.

<sup>111</sup> Parzinger II 29.

<sup>112</sup> See next paragraph. For *dixi*, cf. above, p. 27.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. below, pp. 38–40.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. also Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 112–125, esp. 137–153; cf. also Bréguet 122–131; for archaism and neologism in ancient literary theory: Pennacini, *La funzione*.

<sup>115</sup> *De Divinatione* 1. 37. 81 and, in a figurative sense, in *De Re Publica* 5. 1. 1 with reference to Ennius.

in quotations from poets,<sup>116</sup> and finally in explaining the etymology of a Greek term.<sup>117</sup> The few passages where Cicero takes full responsibility for the use of this word are special cases. In *Academica* 2. 30. 97, immediately after a discussion of terminology, the verb has a rather emphatic ring and is put, as it were, in quotation marks. As for the *De Re Publica*, its style is especially lofty throughout. The same is true for words such as *fari* ('to speak',<sup>118</sup> *nuncupare* ('to call'),<sup>119</sup> *proles* ('offspring').<sup>120</sup>

Typical of the philosophical writings is the relative frequency of the negative *haud* linked with an adjective or adverb: this use of *haud* is found twice as often in the philosophical writings as it is in the rhetorical writings; in these, again, it is twice as frequent as in the letters; in the orations it appears even more rarely. Moreover, in the orations and letters, this construction is limited to a few set phrases. All this is proof of the closeness of the rhetorical writings to the orations.<sup>121</sup> In addition, *haud* appears in the orations almost exclusively in the Fifties. In the rhetorical and philosophical writings, it comes into fashion about the same time and even enjoys a certain popularity. Given the sporadic presence of *haud* at the beginning of Cicero's career, its relative frequency in the orations of the fifties may partly be an echo of Cicero's contemporaneous poetic attempts and of his stylistic ambitions in the *De Re Publica* and the *De Legibus*. Moreover, Cicero may have preferred *haud* in some philosophical

<sup>116</sup> *Tusculanae Disputationes* 2. 17. 39; *De Divinatione* 1. 20. 41.

<sup>117</sup> *Academica* 2. 29. 95; 2. 30. 95, cf. 97 (emphasizing a philosophical statement).

<sup>118</sup> Only once attested in the orations (in a set formula): *Pro Quinctio* 22. 71.

<sup>119</sup> In the orations, nowhere; in the theoretical writings, mostly in set phrases, in the *De Re Publica* in accordance with the lofty style of the context (6. 16), elsewhere as *variatio* for synonyms.

<sup>120</sup> In the orations, nowhere; in Cicero's poetical works, once (*Phaenomena* 134 Orelli; *Fig.* xx, p. 81 Ewbank, quoted in *De Natura Deorum* 2. 63. 159); in the *De Legibus* (3. 7), within the text of a law; in the *De Re Publica*, in an etymological explanation (2. 22. 40) and in the lofty context of the *Somnium* (*De Re Publica* 6. 21. 23). The archaic colour of the word is explicitly stated in the *De Oratore* (3. 153) without excluding a sparing use in appropriate contexts even in prose. For *tempestas* (as an equivalent for *tempus*), *suboles*, intensive and frequentative verbs as well as certain adverbs (*ferme*, *reapse*), cf. Laurand 91–98 and 84 n. 2; Delaruelle; cf. also Parzinger II 28ff.

<sup>121</sup> For *haud*: Parzinger II 35–37; *haud* is more emphatic than *non*: Hoffmann, *Negatio Contrarii*, 40; in prose, litotes often implies a low degree of the quality under discussion; in poetry, almost always a high degree (*ibid.*, 207). For chronological differences, cf. below, pp. 97–123.

discussions because it sounds more emphatic and ironical than *non*.<sup>122</sup> In fact, *haud* is absent from the later orations, whereas in his later philosophical writings Cicero maintains the style created for this genre. Another instance of interaction between philosophical writings and orations is the use of *quamvis* ('although'). This conjunction is not found in the orations from the *De Lege Agraria* to the *In Pisonem* (63–55 BC), whereas both earlier and later, it is frequent enough. Its reappearance in the orations in 54 BC echoes its occurrence in the *De Oratore* and the *De Re Publica*. It is also found in the treatises of the later period. There are other reminiscences of Cicero's 'juvenile' style in his philosophical dialogues; they probably reflect educated colloquial language.<sup>123</sup>

A. Traglia<sup>124</sup> discovers poetic elements in the language of the *De Natura Deorum* 2. 39. 98 (*globosus, perlucidus, liquor, fluitare, innare*). Of course, there are interactions between artistic prose and poetic language (see below pp. 40–42). A feature typical of both Cicero's *De Re Publica* and his poems is the figurative use of *circumiectus*,<sup>125</sup> a word which originally referred to clothing.—Seneca criticizes Cicero for using compound words such as *suaviloquens* or *breviloquentia*. According to A. Traglia<sup>126</sup> these words invented by Ennius had been assimilated into the common language of the educated class by Cicero's time.<sup>127</sup>

### *Subordinating Conjunctions*

There are certain limits to a purely chronological approach to Cicero's style as well as to a 'generic' approach. In this context the use of certain subordinating conjunctions is revealing. Wölfflin<sup>128</sup> observed that *propterea quod* becomes less frequent in the course of Cicero's development. However, this applies only to the orations (and perhaps to the rhetorical writings), where causal connections are increasingly denoted by a simple *quod*. On the contrary, in his philosophical

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Marouzeau III 83f.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. above, p. 30.

<sup>124</sup> Traglia, *Lingua*, 112.

<sup>125</sup> *De Re Publica* 2. 6. 11; Cic., *Poet.* 40. 2 Buescu. For the style of the *De Re Publica*, cf. pp. 85–92.

<sup>126</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 67 n. 1.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. Seneca apud Gellium 12. 2. 4–9; Cicero, *De Re Publica*. 5. 9. 11.

<sup>128</sup> Further bibliography in Parzinger II 28.

writings Cicero does not reject *propterea quod*, despite its relative heaviness. This difference is not merely owing to stylistic considerations. What matters more is the quasi-judicial precision of the expression and the specific stress it lays on causality, especially when placed before a long and complicated clause (e.g. *De Officiis* 1. 9. 28). The occurrence of *quamvis* (which is stronger than *quamquam*) in his treatises written after 55 may also be attributed to Cicero's striving for the utmost lucidity when treating theoretical subjects. The theoretical nature of the subject matter influences even the use of ordinary particles,<sup>129</sup> which in the philosophical writings take on additional and more specific shades of meaning.<sup>130</sup>

### *Adoption of Greek Words*

*Cicero . . . spoke Greek . . . it was Greek to me.*  
Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* 1. 2

Contrary to Shakespeare's opinion, Cicero would never have shown off his knowledge of Greek before a public unfamiliar with this language. Purely Greek words are not very frequent even in Cicero's treatises. Still, they occur fifty times as often as in his orations. Even words no longer considered foreign like *philosophia*, *rhetorica*, *dialectica*, *grammatica*, *geometria*, *musica* (cf. *De Finibus* 3. 2. 5) are avoided in the orations or used only ironically.<sup>131</sup> Cicero's reluctance to adopt Greek words—even those already accepted into the language—can easily be seen from his numerous Latin paraphrases of *philosophia*.<sup>132</sup> In his philosophical writings, a more generous use of *philosophia* and *philosophus* is imposed on the author by his subject matter. Sometimes, however, Cicero adopts loanwords even more readily than Lucretius does: examples are *atomus* and *physiologia* (besides, Lucretius could not use the latter word, because it does not fit into the hexameter).<sup>133</sup> The following words, which were to have wide dissemination later on, make their first appearance in his works: *dogma*, *empiricus*, *genealogus*,

<sup>129</sup> *Nam* introducing a further example: Poyser 8–10; see now: C. Kroon, *Discourse Particles in Latin*, § 7. 3.

<sup>130</sup> On changes in Cicero's approach to syntactic subordination during his career, see Johnson, *passim*, cf. here, Excursus to Chapter Three.

<sup>131</sup> Laurand 82.

<sup>132</sup> Stang, 'Philosophia' 82–93.

<sup>133</sup> Peters.

*ironia, sophisma, sophistes, theogonia, theologus*.<sup>134</sup> The fact that other philosophical terms are attested in Varro and Lucretius, too, suggests that Cicero's connection with the tradition of Latin scholarship is closer than one might have realized. Philosophical terms,<sup>135</sup> however, form only a minority among the Greek words used in the philosophical writings. Greek names of animals and plants are rather frequent, since Cicero likes to adduce examples from nature; other loanwords come from the domains of culture (religion, music, astronomy) and civilization (architecture, medicine, amenities of life).

Many Greek words are found in the *Academica*, where they are explained in detail. In his political writings and, at least partly, in his writings on moral philosophy, Cicero's vocabulary is less influenced by Greek than it is in his treatises on epistemology and philosophy of religion. In general, borrowings from Greek appear more often in his philosophical than in his rhetorical writings; they are less frequent in his letters than in his rhetorical treatises, and the least frequent in his orations.<sup>136</sup>

### *Latin Neologisms*

*coldtonguecoldhamcoldbeefpickled  
gherkinssaladfrenchrollscresssandwidges  
pottedmeatgingerbeerlemonadesodawater*  
K. Grahame, *The Wind in the Willows*,  
p. 13

Compound words filling several lines, perfectly acceptable in Sanskrit and in Greek (cf., for instance, Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 1168–1173, in all probability, Grahame's model), are unthinkable in Latin, a language utterly adverse to neologisms. Whenever in his philosophical writings Cicero takes the liberty of introducing new words or advocating their use, he likes to apologize for his neologisms by inserting an explanatory sentence or at least by adding *quasi* ('as it were') or *quidam* ('a certain'). If he never apologizes for a neologism in his orations, this is owing to the fact that there is none.<sup>137</sup>

<sup>134</sup> Weise/Gäbel 339–368.

<sup>135</sup> Many of them are explained in Latin in the text.

<sup>136</sup> On Cicero's borrowings from Greek, cf. Oksala 132–152 with references; Bignoli II.

<sup>137</sup> Laurand 81. On compound words in Latin, see Lindner.

Cicero translates Greek terms in several ways: by a single Latin word, which is often explained in its turn; by using analogous suffixes, or by shaping corresponding compounds; by adding the original expression; by means of periphrasis; finally, by more than one synonym and in some cases even by entire groups of Latin words.<sup>138</sup> The lasting influence of many terms coined by Cicero attests to the quality of the Latin equivalents he found, especially in the field of abstract nouns. Some of Cicero's new words would make philosophical history: *qualitas*,<sup>139</sup> *perceptio*,<sup>140</sup> *probabilitas*,<sup>141</sup> *evidentia*.<sup>142</sup> A word attested before Cicero but propagated by him is *intellegentia*.<sup>143</sup>

Participles play an important role in his translations of Stoic terms such as *causae efficientes* (*De Fato* 14. 33), *causae adiuvantes*, *causae antecedentes*, *causae antepositae* (*De Fato* 18. 41).<sup>144</sup> To denote freedom of will, however, *liberum arbitrium*<sup>145</sup> does not yet appear in Cicero. He says *motus voluntarii animorum sine ullo fato* and *necessitate motus animi liberati* (cf. *De Fato* 17. 39).

On the other hand, several Latinizations ventured by Cicero were not accepted by the linguistic community, e.g. *confatalis* (*De Fato* 13. 30). Cicero's striving for variety of expression in his translations of Greek terms is most clearly visible in the paraphrases used for *philosophia* and *philosophus*.<sup>146</sup> As a rule, Cicero rendered Epicurean terms less carefully than Stoic ones, partly because he was less interested in Epicureanism, partly because the Epicureans despised the formalities of dialectics.<sup>147</sup> Besides, we should consider in each case the stylistic level intended by the author: does he want, in the case under consideration, to give a mere interlinear version (a 'working translation') or does he pursue more ambitious stylistic aims?<sup>148</sup> Generally speaking, however, Cicero was very careful when translating terms of moral philosophy, especially as compared to Seneca, who

<sup>138</sup> Liscu.

<sup>139</sup> Especially in the *Academica*.

<sup>140</sup> Especially in the *Academica*.

<sup>141</sup> Especially in the *Academica*; the synonym *verisimilitudo*, *Academica* 2. 33. 107, however, was not accepted.

<sup>142</sup> Also in *Academica* 2; this word replaces *perspicuitas* later on.

<sup>143</sup> Hus 264–280.

<sup>144</sup> On participles, cf. also p. 16.

<sup>145</sup> Τὸ ἐκούσιον, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* 2, 997.

<sup>146</sup> See Stang 'Philosophia,' above p. 33.

<sup>147</sup> On this subject, cf. Stang 'Zur philosophischen Sprache' 93–102.

<sup>148</sup> On this, cf. Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen*, *passim* and below, p. 130.

attached greater importance to rhetorical adornment and forceful expression.<sup>149</sup> Cicero captures the precise meaning of Greek terms and semantic nuances of synonyms (cf. *beatus*—*felix*; *status*—*constitutio*). In the fourth Book of the *De Finibus* (even more than in the preceding books) he tries to render not only the meaning of Greek words but also their linguistic shape; later on he prefers those equivalents which have a natural ring and disguise their foreign origin (*finis bonorum*, *summum bonum*, *commodum*, *dilectus*). Some expressions, once discovered, are kept throughout his works (*appetitus*); in some cases, synonyms are used for the sake of stylistic variation (*honestum*—*pulchrum*); however, content is never sacrificed to rhetoric. Cicero usually translates Stoic terms as exactly as possible, as, for instance, in his Latin translation of *καθῆκον*, *officium*.<sup>150</sup>

Differences of style and vocabulary between orations and philosophical writings become visible when the same subject matter is discussed. Terms like ‘destiny’ or ‘bliss’ appear as abstract nouns in the philosophical writings, whereas in the orations the corresponding adjectives, which are much more common in Latin, are preferred: *beatitas* and *beatitudo* on the one hand, *beatus* on the other.<sup>151</sup> Further evidence of the same stylistic principles is Cicero’s predilection for current expressions like *perspicuum est* and *manifestum est* in his orations, whereas *evidens est* has a more technical ring and is therefore preferred in his philosophical writings.

### Conclusion

Stylistically, Cicero’s treatises, with their dialogue form, hold an intermediate position between his letters and his orations. Not that their level of style is generally lower than that of the orations, but that they cover a broader range of linguistic means. On the other hand, some passages of the treatises with their elevated style are stylistically between the orations and the poetic works. However, Cicero is moderate and discerning in his stylistic choices; differences of style are limited to very subtle nuances. Yet, poetic and colloquial influences cannot always be clearly distinguished from each other, since poetic

<sup>149</sup> Fischer.

<sup>150</sup> Kilb.

<sup>151</sup> Laurand 84.

diction and spoken language have many features in common, free use of colourful metaphors, for example. It would be wrong, therefore, to consider with Helmut Müller<sup>152</sup> the linguistic richness of the philosophical writings a mere consequence of the richness of the Greek examples. If the vocabulary of Cicero's late orations is not influenced by that of his philosophical writings, this does not allow us to conclude that the Greek models of his philosophical writings were the sole source of Cicero's development of his vocabulary. We should not forget that the conventions of the genre made it impossible to use a more colourful vocabulary in the orations. Hence, not every word which occurs for the first time in the philosophical writings necessarily comes from a Greek source. As far as terminology is concerned, the Greek influence is, of course, quite evident.

### *Syntactic and Stylistic Features*

#### *General: Plain and Sublime Style*

Cicero considered himself the founder of Latin philosophical prose. His few precursors in this field have sunk into oblivion, perhaps justly so. A passage like *Orator* 19. 62–64 might suggest the idea that the plain style is the most suitable for philosophical writing; but the same passage shows that Cicero feels attracted to the elaborate dialogue style of Plato, Aristotle, and Theophrastus. In his philosophical writings as well, Cicero tries to conform his style to the importance of the given subject. Consequently, he adopts sublimity of speech in the *Somnium Scipionis* and in his praise of philosophy in the prologue to the 5th book of the *Tusculans*. In doing so, he rivals Plato,<sup>153</sup> whom he admired not only as a philosopher, but also as an orator, cf. *De Oratore* 1. 11. 47 about Plato's *Gorgias*: *quo in libro in hoc maxime admirabar Platonem, quod mihi in oratoribus irridendis ipse esse orator summus videbatur* 'In this book, I especially admired Plato, for he, while making fun of orators, proved to be the greatest orator.'<sup>154</sup>

The style of the philosophical writings is, therefore, open in two directions. The framing dialogue, together with the relaxed atmosphere of theoretical discussion, may favour a closeness to everyday

<sup>152</sup> Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 126–153; for a new approach to the Romanization of the genre: Den Boeft.

<sup>153</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio* 10. 1. 123.

<sup>154</sup> Leeman 198–216: 'The Styles of the Philosophical Writing in the Republic.'

language; on the other hand, important subjects require sublime and poetic elements of style. Generally speaking, the two tendencies have similar effects: a richer vocabulary and a freer syntax. Moreover, the rational content of philosophical discourse calls for constant improvement of language and style, both in quantity and quality.

*Colloquial Syntax: Points of Contact with Epistolary Style*<sup>155</sup>

Ellipses<sup>156</sup> are typical of colloquial language. Cicero uses elliptic expressions when quoting authors, e.g.: *Orator* 70. 233 *de Gracchi* ('from [a book of] Gracchus').<sup>157</sup> Other examples of ellipsis are *De Legibus* 1. 18. 49 *suapte* in the meaning of *suapte sponte* ('of one's own accord') and *Ad Atticum* 15. 4. 4 *dedita* (sc. *opera*) ('on purpose').<sup>158</sup> However, when letters and writings present an absolute use of *posse* as an intransitive verb pregnant with meaning ('to be possible'), one should not speak of 'ellipsis'.<sup>159</sup> As a rule, noun clauses and ellipses occur more often in the philosophical writings than in the orations.<sup>160</sup>

As for crossings and hybrid constructions: change of tense between conditional clause and main clause (*si est, erit*) is a feature of spoken language and is therefore found more often in letters and philosophical writings than in orations.<sup>161</sup> The *consecutio temporum*, too, is handled more freely in the philosophical writings (and in the letters, of course).<sup>162</sup> The reasons for this are of psychological nature: *Academica* 2. 27. 88 *tum cum videbantur, quo modo viderentur, id quaeritur* ('but our problem is how [the dreams] appeared at the moment when they were seen'). Had the sentence not been in the subjunctive, the imperfect indicative would have been used here, and this explains (by 'attraction') the appearance of the imperfect subjunctive instead of the expected perfect subjunctive. *Ad Atticum* 11. 16. 3 *idem a te nunc peto, quod superioribus litteris, ut . . . me moneres* ('I am asking you now

<sup>155</sup> Cf. also II A3 below.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. below, pp. 56f.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. *ex Apollodori*, *Ad Atticum* 12. 23. 2; *In Libonis*, *Ad Atticum* 13. 32. 3; Löfstedt 2, 215.

<sup>158</sup> Löfstedt 2, 251–253.

<sup>159</sup> Löfstedt 2, 270 e.g. *Ac.* 2. 26. 82 *quid potest sole maius?*

<sup>160</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 420.

<sup>161</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 549; the form *si erit—est* is, however, so common in the orations that it would be hazardous to draw general conclusions; Parzinger II 16f.

<sup>162</sup> Wiesthaler, esp. 96–98. Lebreton 273.

for the same thing [I asked] in my last letter, that you remind me . . .'). Here, the past meaning of the *quod*-clause justifies the choice of the imperfect subjunctive.<sup>163</sup> Such crossings of different constructions are rarely found in the orations (e.g. *In Vatinius* 2. 5., *In Pisonem* 12. 26). Anacoluthon occurs more often in the philosophical writings than in the orations.<sup>164</sup> Not surprisingly, the somewhat illogical reference of the relative pronoun and the verb of a relative clause to the predominant element of the main clause appears mainly in letters or treatises<sup>165</sup> as is the case with the crossing of *ut scribis, poema probatur* ('as you write, the poem meets with applause') with *scribis poema probari* to *ut scribis poema . . . probari*.<sup>166</sup> Here, we should also mention the absence of *quam* in sentences like *De Natura Deorum* 1. 38. 107 *nam quid est, quod minus probari possit, omnium in me incidere imagines* 'for what could be less approved of, [than] that the images of all of them should fall upon me.'<sup>167</sup> In the orations, a similar construction is attested only twice, characteristically enough, in impassioned orations such as *In Pisonem* 20. 47 and *Philippicae* 2. 4. 7. Attraction of cases as found in the following examples is also likely to come from colloquial speech: *Tusculanae Disputationes* 4. 12. 28 *haec . . . proclivitas ad suum quodque genus (vitii)* 'this inclination [of each individual] to his specific type of vice' instead of *suum cuiusque*; *De Oratore* 3. 57. 216 (*vox*) *est suo quoque in genere mediocris* instead of *quaeque* 'there is some middle level in each of these types of voices.'<sup>168</sup> An illogical attraction of number is sometimes supported by Cicero's striving for concinnity: *De Oratore* 1. 3. 11 *studiis doctrinisque* 'studies and [forms of] learning'.<sup>169</sup>

Another feature typical of spoken language is parataxis, the practice of coordinating words which are logically subordinated (for instance, 'try and do this' for 'try to do this'), cf. *De Oratore* 1. 41. 187 *experiar et dicam, si potero, planius* 'I will try and say it more plainly,

<sup>163</sup> Wackernagel 1, 254.

<sup>164</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 730.

<sup>165</sup> Löfstedt 2, 164–165.

<sup>166</sup> *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 2. 13. 2. Löfstedt 165–166; cf. *De Legibus*. 1. 21. 55; *De Re Publica* 1. 37. 58; cf. also Wackernagel 1, 59. Hofmann/Szantyr 731 with bibliography: 'Rektionsfähige Parenthesen.'

<sup>167</sup> Cf. *De Finibus* 5. 11. 31; *Orator* 67. 226; Löfstedt 2, 167–169.

<sup>168</sup> Wackernagel 1, 54.

<sup>169</sup> Wackernagel 1, 51; for the use of a genitive instead of an expected dative (in letters and treatises), cf. Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 214–215, cf. below, p. 58.

if I can.<sup>170</sup> When describing the intellectual development of a child (*De Finibus* 5. 15. 42), Cicero strikingly often uses parataxis with *-que* and *et*; this need not be a mechanical imitation of an alleged 'καί-style' of Greek philosophy,<sup>171</sup> but may be understood as an adaptation of the style to the 'naïve' subject.

A further colloquialism is 'Tmesis,' the splitting up of a compound word into its parts (thus restoring, in a way, the moment before the creation of that word, a procedure which brings back to the word its original freshness): *Ad Atticum* 1. 4. 3 *per mihi gratum est* ('this is most welcome to me indeed'); 1. 20. 7 *per mihi, per, inquam, gratum feceris, si...* ('you will do me a great, and I mean: great, favour, if...').<sup>172</sup> The same phenomenon is found in old French (*par est granz* 'he is very big'). On a slightly larger scale, an adverb may be separated from the adjective it determines; this is especially frequent with *tam*.<sup>173</sup> This phenomenon is based on a more general stylistic law: in languages with relatively free word order speakers tend to put the stressed words at the beginning and at the end of a phrase.

### *Archaic and Poetic Elements*

Quotations from poets appear more often in the philosophical writings than in the orations; this corresponds with Cicero's theory (*Tusculanae Disputationes* 2. 11. 26 *ne quo ornamento in hoc genere disputationis careret Latina oratio* 'so that Latin speech should not be devoid of any ornament in this genre of discourse'); he is also less scrupulous in using poetic quotations, provided that the dignity of the Roman participators in the dialogue is maintained.<sup>174</sup> Such flowers of speech make the discussion more vivid and give *auctoritas* to the ideas they express (for instance, in Book 5 of the *De Re Publica*, the Ennian verse *moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* 'The Roman republic

<sup>170</sup> Wackernagel 1, 63.

<sup>171</sup> Dutoit 453–460.

<sup>172</sup> Similarly 10. 1. 1; 15. 4. 2; *Ad Familiares* 3. 5. 3; *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 2. 8 (7). 2; *Pro Cluentio* 1. 2 (isolated instance in the orations); *De Oratore* 1. 47. 205 (in a rhythmic *clausula*); 1. 49. 214; 2. 67. 271 (dialogue style).

<sup>173</sup> *Ad Atticum* 3. 10. 2 *tam ex amplo statu, tam in bona causa*; *De Finibus* 4. 12. 30 *aeque vita iucunda* (not in the late orations). Similar hyperbata in letters and dialogues: Löfstedt 2, 397–404.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. above, p. 14.

lic rests in old customs and men').<sup>175</sup> A poetic feature found in a rather lofty context is the dactylic expression *noctesque diesque* 'day and night' (*De Finibus* 1. 16. 51);<sup>176</sup> of course, Cicero usually avoids repetition of *-que* in this expression which clearly belongs to the language of poetry<sup>177</sup> and had been used by Ennius (*Annales* 334 Vahlen = 335 Skutsch). By maintaining in this case the poetic rhythm (which he usually avoids), Cicero intimates that this is a quotation (and a very well-known one, a fact which excuses the poetic expression in the eyes of his Roman readers).

Metaphors excel in frequency and boldness in Cicero's philosophical writings, especially in the *Tusculanae Disputationes*. Functional metaphors found in his models are often developed into ornamental metaphors or replaced with new ones,<sup>178</sup> but here, as usual, he smooths the novelty of his expression by an introductory *quasi* or *ut ita dicam* ('as it were').<sup>179</sup> In some cases, poetic elements are fully integrated into the style of Cicero's own works.<sup>180</sup> While in later times, artistic prose would often influence the language of the poets, here, we find the opposite.<sup>181</sup>

The style of prayer is a further source of sublimity in Cicero's philosophical writings, witness his famous hymn to philosophy.<sup>182</sup> Similar effects are obtained by reminiscences of historical style as found at the beginning of the *De Legibus*, and later on, curial and legal style is prominent.<sup>183</sup> In the archaizing legal language of the *De Legibus*, Cicero uses *nec* together with *esse* and other verbal forms, e.g. *neque expiari* 'not to be atoned for' (*De Legibus* 2. 9. 22) as it is used in the *Twelve Tables*. As far as syntax is concerned, Cicero in his *De Legibus* alternates between polysyndeton with *-que* and asyndeton.<sup>184</sup>

<sup>175</sup> For Cicero's technique of quotation, cf. Jocelyn, *Tragedies, passim*; in general North 1–35.

<sup>176</sup> Cf. Ennius in Cic., *Cato* 1. 1 = *Annales* 334 Vahlen.

<sup>177</sup> *Noctes diesque*: *In Verrem* 1. 17. 52; II 5. 43. 112; *noctes et dies*: *De Oratore* 1. 61. 260; *Brutus* 90. 308; *Tusculanae Disputationes* 5. 25. 70; *et dies et noctes*: *Ad Atticum* 12. 46; *dies noctesque*: *Pro S. Roscio* 2. 6; 24. 67; 29. 81; *Pro Rege Deiotaro* 13. 38 and rather frequently in the orations. Another feature redolent of poetic language is *neque . . . non*, which, however, is mostly found outside the letters.

<sup>178</sup> Stroux, 'Gericht' 127.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. *De Oratore* 3. 41. 165. Hofmann/Szantyr 780.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. above, pp. 30–32, cf. also Traglia, *Fonti*.

<sup>181</sup> Bibliography on Cicero's archaisms in Hofmann/Szantyr 770–771.

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Hommel.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. above, pp. 27f.

<sup>184</sup> Jordan 250.

There are more archaisms rooted in old Latin official language: especially in the *De Re Publica*, daring syntactic constructions are acceptable which would be unthinkable in the orations, e.g. an archaic *genitivus finalis* like *De Re Publica* 1. 10. 16 *discendi . . . contendisse* ‘that he travelled . . . in order to learn’ (this is the reading of the palimpsest, whereas Nonius’ text *discendi causa . . . contendisse* is suspected to have been normalized by a scribe).<sup>185</sup> The stylistic level of free constructions like these depends on the context. The question whether such constructions are archaisms or colloquialisms is a false alternative; these two elements can coincide, particularly in the *De Re Publica*, where many expressions are reminiscent of the colloquial language of the second century BC: e.g. *fessus de via* (‘tired from the road’), *De Re Publica* 6. 10. 10. Here Cicero avoids the strikingly Ennian (and Plautine) *lassus*, but keeps the unobtrusively archaic *de*.<sup>186</sup>

One may, perhaps, also believe Cicero capable of venturing the following construction found in the manuscripts (*De Legibus* 2. 25. 63: *permansit hoc ius terra humandi; quam quom proxumi fecerant obductaque terra erat . . .* ‘the right to bury remained; after the family had completed [the burial], and earth had been heaped up. . .’). Here, according to Vahlen, the pronoun *quam* refers to an implied noun like *humationem*.<sup>187</sup> We have to go to Sallust to find a passage of similar boldness (*Catilina* 18. 2 *de qua* sc. *coniuratione* ‘about this [conspiracy]’). If such constructions are more than mere slips of the pen (this is E. Löfstedt’s explanation), they may be derived from the old Latin curial style. The basic patterns are constructions like *diem, quo die* (‘the day, on which . . .’). This type of construction can be loosened, e.g. when, instead of repeating a verb, Cicero uses an etymologically cognate noun.<sup>188</sup> The next step is the omission of the noun referring to the preceding verb.

### ‘Rational’ Style; Græcisms

While the style of the orations exerts an emotional impact on the listeners’ will, the diction of the philosophical writings is calm, bal-

<sup>185</sup> Cf. Pasoli 46–51.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Ronconi, ‘*Somnium*’ 394–405, esp. 396.

<sup>187</sup> Löfstedt 2, 146.

<sup>188</sup> *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, pars 2 fasc. 1 (2nd edn., 1918) p. 540 N° 756, line 8–9 *ubi venum datum erit, id profanum esto, venditio locatio aedilis esto*; cf. also Cicero, *Pro S. Roscio* 34. 96 *divinare—divinatione*.

anced, and meditative (*hoc . . . aequabile et temperatum orationis genus*, 'this poised and moderate genre of speech' *De Officiis* 1. 1. 3). Whereas in the orations, agglomerations of participles alternate with long passages without any participles, in the treatises, participles are distributed more regularly. As E. Laughton<sup>189</sup> demonstrated by comparing the *Philippics* with the *De Officiis* (and the *Orator*), the orations show a preference for a predicative use of participles, while attributive use prevails in the philosophical writings. In fact, in the treatises, the objective of the author when using participles is not to describe action but rather to denote abstract ideas and to define qualities. This chimes with the fact that the use of participles in 'adverbial' meaning is slightly more extensive and more artfully contrived in the treatises (and letters) than it is in the orations.<sup>190</sup>

The rational content of the philosophical writings favours the increase in frequency of certain constructions, e.g. the *ablativus comparationis*.<sup>191</sup> Sentence connectors which explicitly stress logical relations reappear here (to give an example, Cicero rediscovers in his philosophical writings the good old *propterea quod* which had played a part in his early orations and in the *De Inventione*).<sup>192</sup> Another feature betrays the same tendency: in the orations and letters, the *verbum finitum* preferably appears in the traditional final position, whereas its central position (which is more suited to 'logical' discourse) becomes equally frequent in the philosophical writings.<sup>193</sup>

Following his Greek models, Cicero rather often connects a nominal infinitive with a pronoun in his philosophical and rhetorical writings: *hoc non dolere, illud aemulari, sapere ipsum, totum hoc philosophari, beate vivere vestrum . . .* ('this indifference to pain,' 'that emulation,' 'knowledge itself,' 'this entire philosophical activity,' 'your idea of blissful life').<sup>194</sup> For all his efforts to adapt the Latin language to abstract philosophical thought, Cicero never neglects the natural basis of his native tongue. Nearly all lexical and syntactic Græcisms found in the philosophical writings and absent from the orations are

<sup>189</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 145.

<sup>190</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 23.

<sup>191</sup> Parzinger II 14f.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. also p. 32.

<sup>193</sup> Cf. above, p. 15.

<sup>194</sup> The contact between artistic and 'natural' language becomes apparent in the fact that similar expressions occur also in Plautus and in Cicero's letters; Wackernagel 1, 274.

attributed by Helmut Müller<sup>195</sup> to the overwhelming influence of the Greek models. However, one should also consider generic differences as well; in fact, many good Latin words and syntagmas were not acceptable in the orations for their archaic, poetic or colloquial ring, but were perfectly suitable in certain contexts offered by the treatises. Yet, some syntactical innovations traceable in the philosophical writings may be inspired by Greek parallels.<sup>196</sup> A possible example of Greek influence is *De Finibus* 2. 18. 59 *cuius mors tibi emolumentum futura sit* 'whose death may be of advantage to you.' Here, *emolumento* would have been expected, and the nominative form, which has a Grecian and sophisticated ring to it, is used only rarely by Cicero.<sup>197</sup> A comparative study of passages translated from works of Greek philosophers and the original texts might further our understanding of the syntax of the philosophical writings. Leaving out of consideration intrinsic differences between the two languages, e.g. the absence of articles in the Latin language, the different use of participles, and

Latin's general aversion to the coinage of new words, some typically Ciceronian features emerge: the syntax of his translations shows often an increase in logical stringency, and the rhythm of his sentences is more balanced than it was in Plato (sometimes, the use of two Latin words for one Greek term is not caused by semantic difficulties but by the orator's striving for balance of rhythm).<sup>198</sup> Cicero's translations attest to his sense of style, adapted as they are to their individual context.

Careful use of prose rhythm in Cicero's philosophical writings has been exemplified by several scholars;<sup>199</sup> Bornecque<sup>200</sup> has examined the *De Divinatione* (296–304), the *Cato Maior* (304–308), and *Laelius*

<sup>195</sup> See above, pp. 29f.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. e.g. Kroll, *Studien* 251, n. 11 on *Orator* 4; Laughton, *Participle* 38 on the construction *quaerenti mihi* . . . ; id. 54 on participles used in definitions; 43–44 on sentences, in which the participle, not the *verbum finitum*, is most important. Seminal: Coleman, R. 'Greek Influence on Latin Syntax' (see bibl.). He confirms Löfstedt's view that Greek syntax (despite its visible impact on certain literary texts and stylistic registers) had no lasting influence on Latin as a whole, but he most rightly stresses that in this interesting and complex field grammatical research, literary criticism, and sociolinguistics all have a contribution to make (p. 147). Coleman's study is a milestone; further steps are necessary to overcome old prejudices against literary texts as objects of linguistic research.

<sup>197</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 196.

<sup>198</sup> Cf. also below, pp. 128ff., 'Cicero as a Translator.'

<sup>199</sup> Ausserer; Blum; Aumont; on the basic aspects, see Habinek; cf. also Dangel.

<sup>200</sup> Bornecque, *Clausules*.

(309–313). *De Divinatione* and *Cato* are particularly sophisticated; their stylistic level is matched by the *Orator*.<sup>201</sup> As a rule, Cicero's prose rhythm is more sophisticated in his treatises than in the orations.<sup>202</sup>

### *Types of Philosophical Writings*

Some dialogues are situated in the past, others in Cicero's time. These differences, however, are not a solid basis for a classification of his philosophical works. More profitable is an approach according to the dates of composition: there are two chronologically separated groups: the *De Re Publica* and the *De Legibus* on the one hand, and the remaining philosophical writings on the other. In the earlier group philosophy is not yet separated from practice, whereas in the later writings philosophy is pursued for its own sake and even a systematic, complete treatment of philosophy is intended. The historical and legal content of the *De Re Publica* and the *De Legibus* calls for a style in which archaisms play a more important role than in Cicero's later writings, where, on the contrary, neologisms are more prominent. It cannot, however, be said that the manner of writing is generally less artistic in his later works.<sup>203</sup>

## RHETORICAL TREATISES

### *Rhetorical Treatises Compared to Other Genres*

Given the intimate relationship of Cicero's philosophical and rhetorical works, several aspects of the rhetorical works have been mentioned in the above discussion of his philosophical writings. The present chapter will dwell on some characteristics which nevertheless distinguish the *Rhetorica* from the *Philosophica* and from the orations.

There is very little to be said about phonetics and accident.<sup>204</sup> *Colloquialisms* in dialogues are a more fertile field, although much of what has been said about the philosophical works applies to the *Rhetorica* as well. To give an example, the adverb *oppido* appears in

<sup>201</sup> Primmer, *Cicero numerosus*, discusses some of Cicero's orations.

<sup>202</sup> Aumont, 428; for a criticism of Bornecque's methods, Aumont 159–161.

<sup>203</sup> Cf. above, pp. 40ff.; for further details, see Philippon 1104–1192.

<sup>204</sup> For the *De Inventione*, see below, pp. 116f.; for *pote* in the *Brutus*, see below, p. 52.

Caesar Strabo's treatise on humour (*De Oratore* 2. 64. 259), which is mostly written in a colloquial style.<sup>205</sup> In dialogue (and in letters) the rise of neologisms is favoured by parallelism and antithesis (*De Oratore* 1. 20. 93): *me sibi perfacilem in audiendo, te **perpugnacem** in disputando esse visum* 'explaining that he found in me a very ready listener, in yourself a most doughty antagonist'<sup>206</sup> (*perpugnacem* is a *hapax legomenon*).

As for Greek loanwords, the vocabulary of the rhetorical works is similar to that of the philosophical treatises. It is true that there is a great number of words spelled in Greek, but these are mainly technical terms. In his use of loanwords, however, Cicero is very sparing even in the *De Inventione*, an attitude which is especially conspicuous in comparison with the anonymous *Ad Herennium*,<sup>207</sup> which can be regarded as an analogue to the *De Inventione*. Cicero's purism, therefore, manifests itself as early as his first publication; moreover, most of the words he borrows from Greek refer to daily life, not to the terminology of rhetoric, and are found in the examples he quotes. The second Book of the *De Oratore*, the subject matter of which is related to the *De Inventione*, contains an equally small number of loanwords, whereas the third Book abounds in technical terms coming from Greek. Furthermore, the use of dialogue and of *exempla* encourages the author to borrow Greek words for colours, names of plants and expressions from everyday life. In the three books of the *De Oratore* there are only five words and one word-combination spelled in Greek and 129 Greek loan-words transcribed in Latin. Cicero is rather cautious in adopting foreign vocabulary.

The *Partitiones Oratoriae* are a conversation between father and son; here, Cicero avoids Greek words almost completely. The *Brutus* resembles the *De Oratore*, as far as style and loan-words are concerned, but contains more words spelled in Greek. The *Orator*, however, is closer to the *Philosophica*, because it uses many technical terms (particularly from the domain of metre). The small work *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* contains not Greek rhetorical terms but numerous other loan-words. In the *Topica* we find only a few borrowings, but many words spelled out in Greek, a fact, which according to Oksala might be due to

<sup>205</sup> For the colloquial character of *oppido*, cf. above, p. 30 and below, p. 52.

<sup>206</sup> Translation: Sutton.

<sup>207</sup> See Marx 116; cf. also Laurand 84–91; Oksala 112; on the *Ad Herennium* and the *De Inventione*, see now Adamik.

Cicero's unusual haste in writing down this work.<sup>208</sup> In the *Orator*, despite a relative increase in number of loan-words, there is an unexpectedly small stock of specifically rhetorical terms. Cicero generally strove to find *Latin* equivalents for the technical terms. In the field of poetics and metrics, however, he adopted many Greek expressions which are still used in English today.<sup>209</sup>

In his search for Latin equivalents for technical terms Cicero, as a principle, shunned neologisms in his rhetorical works. He generally avoided technical expressions as far as possible, no matter whether they were Greek or Latin. In his later rhetorical works he even tried to improve his Latin terminology by putting some accepted terms into better Latin; Latin technical terms appear especially in the brief textbooks *Partitiones Oratoriae* and *Topica*.<sup>210</sup> In his greater works, which raise higher literary claims, the diversity of Latin paraphrases is sometimes confusing.<sup>211</sup> The paraphrases vary; on the one hand Cicero strove for transparency, on the other he tried to avoid repetition. Later teachers of rhetoric (even Quintilian) were to prefer abstract terms and Greek expressions.

A comparison with the *Ad Herennium* is instructive.<sup>212</sup> The author of this work shunned paraphrase and generally used a single Latin translation for each Greek term. Cicero, however, took into account the Romans' aversion to abstract expressions. Already the *Ad Herennium* shows a tendency towards purism, and Cicero shows it even more: he eliminates abstract terms progressively. In the *De Oratore* Greek terms are translated by a single Latin word fifty times and paraphrased 41 times. In the *Orator* those numbers are 3 and 71.<sup>213</sup> Cicero's increasing purism manifests itself also in other fields: the orator rejects most of the words ending with *-io* which appear in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Although he himself created many words of this type, none of them can be found in the *Orator*.<sup>214</sup>

To be brief, there is more precision of terminology in those works which follow the Greek school tradition than in the others which have a more personal and literary touch. Elegance and abundance

<sup>208</sup> Oksala 123.

<sup>209</sup> On this passage, Oksala 110–131 with examples.

<sup>210</sup> Cf. Causeret 12–13.

<sup>211</sup> Causeret 13.

<sup>212</sup> Bornecque, 'Hérennius' 141–158.

<sup>213</sup> Bornecque, 'Hérennius.'

<sup>214</sup> Bornecque, 'Hérennius' 157.

are here preferred to schoolmasterly pedantry. This is shown, for instance, by the variety of expressions used in the *Orator* to describe the *genus tenue* (and the speaker who uses it): *callidior* (7. 23), *subtile* (21. 69), *summissus* (23. 76), *humilis* (ibid.), *suppressior* (25. 85), *Atticum* (23. 75).

Nevertheless, we should not believe that behind Cicero's search for ever new Latin terms there is no other motive than mere striving for variety. He rather tries hard to find more and more adequate and refined equivalents for Greek technical terms, which often seem to defy translation. It is the aim of the Roman author to convey facts rather than words, and by using ever new signifiers give the best possible expression of what he means to say. It is a well-known danger inherent in the use of strict terminology that words, instead of serving as keys to reality, are regarded as self-sufficient entities. Finally, in the students' minds, words might even substitute for reality and deflect from the facts. Perhaps the question 'How does Cicero translate the Greek terms?' is not quite the right one, for in most of his works it was not his aim to translate the technical terminology, but to convey judgements based on experience of facts. For him the terms were not an end in themselves, but were tools. The flexibility of Cicero's terminology helps the reader to keep this principle in mind.

An important factor of linguistic flexibility is the use of participles instead of nouns or adjectives. In one case we have the opportunity to watch how the Latinization of a grammatical term is carried out: Cicero dares to create the neutr. plur. *privantia* instead of *σπερητικὰ*. Gellius will use the adjective *privativus*.<sup>215</sup> Cicero's translation has verbal character because of its participial form; it was left to Gellius to pinpoint the technical term by making it an adjective.

### *Differences Between Orations and Rhetorical Treatises*

A difference between orations and rhetorical works becomes manifest in the divergent ways rhetorical themes are treated in both groups of works. When alluding to rhetorical rules in the orations, Cicero is even more careful than in his rhetorical works to avoid technical terms and choose verbal expressions.<sup>216</sup> For the rest the differences

<sup>215</sup> Wackernagel 2, 284.

<sup>216</sup> Laurand 84–91.

between orations and rhetorical works are the same which were shown above for the *philosophica*: in some cases dialogues in the treatises show some closeness to the colloquial style and, more generally, the style of the treatises is contemplative rather than stimulating.

### *Differences Between Rhetorical and Philosophical Treatises*

On average there are fewer loanwords in the rhetorical than in the philosophical works, but more than in the orations and letters.<sup>217</sup> As stated earlier, Cicero's preference for the emotional verb *occidere* (as compared to the neutral verb *interficere*) is more prominent in his orations than in his philosophical works. It is noteworthy that in this term the rhetorical works follow the usage of the orations, not of the philosophical works.<sup>218</sup>

### *Syntax and Style*

As for colloquial elements in dialogue, what has been said above (see pp. 38f.) about the philosophical works applies in principle to the rhetorical writings as well. For the colloquial repetition of a subject or object in connection with *is* see H. Lochmüller.<sup>219</sup> A freer treatment of syntax in dialogue is to be considered an artistic projection of the tone of oral discourse, as has been shown by C. Rhode.<sup>220</sup> Parentheses, too, are originally a hallmark of natural speech;<sup>221</sup> the fact that they are especially frequent in those of Cicero's rhetorical works which are elaborated with the greatest care, attests to Cicero's striving for an artistic form which emulates nature.<sup>222</sup> The use of the genitive instead of an expected dative is another colloquialism (known from Cicero's letters, see p. 58); it is found in his rhetorical (and philosophical) works several times as well.<sup>223</sup> For *amabo te*, see p. 63, for *pote*, p. 52 (both in quotations of oral remarks).

On the subject of syntactic Græcisms there is little to be added to what has been said in the context of Cicero's philosophical

<sup>217</sup> Oksala 153.

<sup>218</sup> Löfstedt 2, 344.

<sup>219</sup> Lochmüller 20–22.

<sup>220</sup> Rhode (*sic*).

<sup>221</sup> On parentheses in Cicero's letters, see below, p. 57.

<sup>222</sup> Roschatt 1883, see above, p. 26.

<sup>223</sup> Cf. Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 215.

works.<sup>224</sup> One of the comparatively few cases in the rhetorical writings is *Orator* 1. 4 *horum vel secundis vel etiam infra secundos* = τοῖς τούτων δευτέροις ἢ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ τοὺς δευτέρους ‘people second to these—or even worse than second.’<sup>225</sup>

### *Further Differences Between Rhetorical Writings and Orations*

Participles are distributed more regularly in Cicero’s rhetorical (and philosophical) works than in his orations; in accordance with the reflective content of the treatises, attributive use of participles prevails over predicative use.<sup>226</sup>

According to P. Parzinger<sup>227</sup> the litotes of adjectives, adverbs, and participles with privative prefixes *in-* and *dis-* (*de-*) appears mostly in the rhetorical works and—less frequently—in the letters. It is found even more rarely in the philosophical works, and least of all in the orations. This figure of speech is especially suitable for the *retorica* and letters because of its slightly ironic character and its touch of urbane understatement. In the orations, if at all, it is used to emphasize the statement.

In the *De Inventione* subordinate interrogative clauses with *-ne* are found much more often than in the orations of the same period;<sup>228</sup> this feature, however, is typical of the *De Inventione* only, not of the rhetorical writings altogether.

### *Differences of Syntax and Style Between Rhetorical and Philosophical Writings*

In the *Forties ut . . . ne* becomes less frequent in the orations and rhetorical works, while it appears more often in the letters and philosophical works.<sup>229</sup> A certain type of ablativus comparationis (*alius alio*) is much more common in the philosophical writings than in the *retorica* and the letters, and lacks altogether in the orations.<sup>230</sup> In general, however, the *ablativus comparationis* increases in number even

<sup>224</sup> Above, p. 44.

<sup>225</sup> See Kroll, W. *Studien* 251, n. 11.

<sup>226</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 145.

<sup>227</sup> Parzinger I 13–17. On litotes, Hoffmann, *Negatio Contrarii*, *passim*, on generic differences, 204 (prose and poetry).

<sup>228</sup> Parzinger II 17.

<sup>229</sup> Parzinger II 4.

<sup>230</sup> Wölflin, ‘Ablativus’ 465.

in the orations,<sup>231</sup> but most frequently it appears in the philosophical works. The word order *qua de, quo de* is one of the comparatively numerous special characteristics of the *De Inventione*; later it will return only in formulaic expressions.<sup>232</sup> In the *De Inventione*, Cicero also shows a special liking for *hoc est*, which will be replaced gradually with *id est* in all literary genres. In the philosophical works of the fifties *hoc est* is absent altogether, in his late period it will return in the *philosophica*, but only half as often as *id est*.<sup>233</sup> Therefore it cannot be considered a characteristic of the rhetorical works. It is telling, however, that Cicero in his youth preferred the slightly more emphatic expression *hoc est* and that in his later years he took it up again in his philosophical writings, where logical coherence was to be underlined, as he did in the case of *propterea quod*.

### *Types of Rhetorical Writings*

Following the degree of elaboration P. Parzinger<sup>234</sup> distinguishes two groups: one consisting of *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator*, the other of *Topica* and *Partitiones Oratoriae*. Practically, this classification coincides with a distinction based on the textbook character of *De Inventione*, *Partitiones Oratoriae*, *Topica*, and the higher literary level of *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator*.<sup>235</sup> But there are differences within the groups, too: in the *Orator*, for instance, W. Kroll<sup>236</sup> detected some traces of carelessness. Furthermore, it is possible to distinguish between works shaped as dialogues and works without dialogue; especially in the *De Oratore*, the dialogue form is handled with great care.<sup>237</sup>

The *De Oratore* is the most elaborate of Cicero's rhetorical writings, also in its prose rhythm.<sup>238</sup> The *Brutus* is less balanced rhythmically,<sup>239</sup> a fact which certainly cannot be explained by the 'atticist preferences' of the historical Brutus. The *Orator*, however, exhibits

<sup>231</sup> Parzinger II 14.

<sup>232</sup> Parzinger II 5f.

<sup>233</sup> Parzinger II 56.

<sup>234</sup> Parzinger I 5f.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. above, pp. 46f.

<sup>236</sup> Cf. Kroll, 'Tullius,' 1101.

<sup>237</sup> For the different types of dialogue in Cicero's work, see Zoll, esp. 64, with bibl.

<sup>238</sup> Bornecque, *Clausules* 278–284.

<sup>239</sup> Bornecque, *Clausules* 284–290.

an especially sophisticated rhythm—in perfect correspondence to its main theme.<sup>240</sup>

## LETTERS

### *Letters Compared to Other Genres*

*Sit tibi credibilis sermo consuetaque verba,  
blanda tamen, praesens ut videre loqui.*

‘Your language should inspire trust and your words be familiar, yet coaxing too, so that you seem to be speaking in her presence.’<sup>241</sup>

Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1. 467–468

To begin with phonetics and accident: the *Codex Mediceus* contains certain colloquial forms in the *Letters to Atticus*; F. Bücheler<sup>242</sup> was probably right in judging those forms the original ones: *divertium* for *divortium*; *loreolam* for *laureolam*; *rescripsi* for *rescripsisti*; *pote* instead of *potest*. Incidentally, the last-mentioned form also appears in another place in the *Brutus* (46. 172); there, it serves to characterize the language of an old Athenian woman of the people. Other colloquial forms found in the letters are: *mi* for *mihī*;<sup>243</sup> *-re* for *-ris* (for example, *rebare Ad Atticum* 14. 8. 1); cf. also *faxint* (several times in the letters).

Of course, colloquial vocabulary abounds in the Letters.<sup>244</sup> Diminutive forms are more frequent here than in all other genres.<sup>245</sup> In some letters, however, diminutive forms are rare, for example in those to Brutus. Of special interest are double-diminutives like *sub-turpi-cula* (*Ad Atticum* 4. 5. 1 ‘pretty ugly’) and a kind of diminutive, which

<sup>240</sup> Bornecque, *Clausules* 291–296.

<sup>241</sup> Translation: Mozley.

<sup>242</sup> Bücheler 509–510.

<sup>243</sup> Neue/Wagener 2, 3rd edn., 350–351.

<sup>244</sup> On colloquial language in the letters: Menna, *Aspetti* (to be read with critical attention). Excellent is the commentary by Tyrrell/Purser; see also Laurand 67–70 with a large bibliography. Occasionally, colloquial words are frequent also in orations, but only where required by content or situation, for example in the satire on Cato and the jurists (*Pro Murena* 6. 13 and 10. 23) or *In Pisonem* 6. 13: *foetidus* and *nidor* are found in Cicero only here; on *ganea* (*ganeum*) see Walde/Hofmann 582; for *caenum* cf. Lorenz 51; *furcifer* (*in Pisonem* 7. 14; more frequent in comedy) and *asine* (*Pis.* 30. 73), cf. Otto 40. In the *In Pisonem*, composita with *per-* and *sub-* abound (Laurand 283). Nevertheless, Werner (see above, p. 16) rightly classes this oration with the grand style, since judgements on style cannot be based exclusively on individual words; cf. also Opelt, *Schimpfwörter*.

<sup>245</sup> Parzinger II 45, cf. also Laurand 3, 264–270; further bibliography in Laurand 268, n. 2 and in Hofmann/Szantyr 774.

emphasizes a quality by means of diminution (e.g. *vetulus* 'too old').<sup>246</sup> Furthermore, in his letters, Cicero feels free to use interjections like *st!*,<sup>247</sup> *hui!*, *sodes* as well as pronominal forms with the deictic *-ce* as suffix (for example *hisce*). The same is true for apocopate forms like *scin*, *ain* and for words of a slightly archaic ring like *oppido* ('very').<sup>248</sup> *Absque*, however, does not appear in Cicero.<sup>249</sup> Moreover, many adjectives, verbs, and adverbs with *per-* and *sub-* and substantives with *-tor*, *-sor*, *-io* are typical of the letters. In addition, superlatives of participles and also comparatives and superlatives of adverbs are more frequent here than elsewhere. Finally, verbs like *cenitare*, *muginari*, *suppetiari*,<sup>250</sup> *tricari*, and nouns such as *combibo*, *salaco* are typical of the letters.

It is not always possible to tell which of the relevant words were created by Cicero, even if they are first attested in his works. We can be more confident in this regard concerning instantaneous and jocular creations such as *sullaturio*, *proscripturio*, *pseudocato*, *appietas*, *lentulitas*, *σηστιωδέστερον*, *facteon*.

Greek loanwords are more frequent in Cicero's letters than in his orations.<sup>251</sup> In the *Ad Familiares*, Greek borrowings are equally frequent in Cicero's own letters and in those of his friends.<sup>252</sup> The use of loanwords, therefore, does not reflect Cicero's individual preferences, but the general Hellenization of Roman culture in his age, especially in the fields of lifestyle, economy, and science.

More than 800 Greek words can be counted in Cicero's letters,<sup>253</sup> many of them are rare and exquisite, even *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*.<sup>254</sup> Greek

<sup>246</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 773–774.

<sup>247</sup> However, the manuscript tradition should be taken into account in the passages under consideration, see the word index by Abbott-Oldfather-Canter.

<sup>248</sup> *Ad Familiares* 14. 4. 4 in a trivial context excluding archaism; the use of *oppido* is limited to set phrases; compare *oppido pauci* with *paulum oppido* (*De Finibus* 3. 10. 33); see also *De Orat.* 2. 64. 259 *mimus vetus*, *oppido ridiculus* in the (rather colloquial) discussion of humour.

<sup>249</sup> In *Ad Atticum* 1. 19 it is a glosseme explaining *sine*: Hofmann/Szantyr 258.

<sup>250</sup> *Ad Atticum* 14. 18. 2 (conjecture!).

<sup>251</sup> See Laurand 72–75; Oksala 91–109; Dammann 18–21.

<sup>252</sup> Oksala 98.

<sup>253</sup> Steele 387–410; our knowledge of Cicero's use of Greek in his letters has been furthered by D. R. Shackleton Bailey's editions of Cicero's letters and by his articles containing supplements to Liddell-Scott-Jones. On Cicero's bilingualism, d N. Horsfall and—more cautious—B. Baldwin (with bibliography); on code-switching, Dunkel.

<sup>254</sup> Oksala 104.

vocabulary is much more common in the letters than in the orations, where such words are always excused and explained in Latin.

In principle Cicero was averse to macaronic confusion of tongues (*De Officiis* 1. 31. 111). In his letters, however, he felt free not to follow his own rules, which were made for formal prose, not for everyday conversation. Here, avoidance of Greek terms would have been the height of pedantry. Of course, Cicero was fully aware of the stylistic differences between letters and orations (*Ad Familiares* 9. 21. 1) and of the closeness of letters to the spoken language. Even within the corpus of letters there are considerable differences of style, depending on the degree of intimacy between the correspondents, the educational level of the addressee, Cicero's frame of mind at a given moment and, not to be neglected, the topic of the letter.

The use of Greek medical terms is due to the fact that the Latin language had only words for the most common ailments: *febricula*, *quartana*, *nauseola*. For the same reason, philosophical terms appear in Greek in the letters (*Ad Familiares* 9. 7. 2; 15. 16. 1). Some addressees seem to invite ample use of Greek vocabulary, so Atticus (proud as he is of his Greek erudition), Cicero's brother Quintus (a follower of Greek poets), Varro (the greatest scholar of his age), and intellectuals such as Trebatius, Papirius Paetus, and, of course, Caesar. As W. Dammann<sup>255</sup> rightly stressed, the effect of Greek words in Cicero's letters is far from being pompous, rather it is indicative of a certain *πίσις litterarum* ('patina of urbane literacy'), which is the hallmark of educated people (*Ad Atticum* 14. 7. 2).

On the other hand, the erudite character of foreign words should not be overrated. Most of them were well-known to Cicero's addressees and offered the shortest and most convenient way of communication. The sociological background of the use of Greek words is therefore more complex than one might expect. Actually, there is not only an esoteric, but also an exoteric side to foreign words. Even in modern languages, there are borrowings which sound more natural than their 'native' equivalents: an example is *preface* as compared to *foreword*. By using Greek expressions Cicero communicates with his educated addressee in an unemphatic tone. A complement to this function of linguistic borrowings is that of establishing distance. By their foreign nature, Greek words disrupt the linguistic context and

---

<sup>255</sup> Dammann 19.

invite the reader to take a distant and sometimes even an ironical look at things, an aspect of *urbanitas* not to be neglected in discussions of Greek vocabulary. It is this productive tension between two antagonistic functions—a detached view of the subject and a close conspiracy between speaker and addressee—that makes the use of foreign words especially suitable for the epistolary genre.

Greek words are conspicuous by their absence from letters of consolation, formal letters, and letters to persons of mediocre education. The same is true for letters of recommendation; wherever Cicero breaks this rule, he apologizes explicitly.<sup>256</sup> In such cases, the use of Greek would endanger the seriousness of the tone. Consequently, when Cicero himself is in need of consolation, his Greek (with its humorous and ironical undertones) disappears even from the *Letters to Atticus*.<sup>257</sup> To complete this survey, in some cases Greek serves as a secret language, in order to protect the message from the messenger.<sup>258</sup> It is worth noting that educated people in Shakespeare's time slipped into Latin in personal letters when the subject was delicate; this is to say that Renaissance England, where educated men were bilingual in Latin and English, was roughly analogous to First century BC Rome, where educated men were bilingual in Latin and Greek.

### *Influence of the Addressee on Cicero's Vocabulary*

When answering letters, Cicero often adhered to the structure of the letters he had received. What is more, he adopted words used by his correspondents and not attested elsewhere in Cicero. An example is *Ad Atticum* 1. 5. 5: *quod scribis . . . recolligi oportere* 'as you write, it is necessary to reestablish (his friendly attitude to you).'<sup>259</sup> Such cases are rather frequent:<sup>260</sup> in *Ad Atticum* 6. 9. 3 and 9. 10. 6 *neutiquam* 'by no means' is used by Cicero; in both cases the word

<sup>256</sup> *Ad Familiares* 13. 15. 3: 'I used a new kind of letter in order to show you that this is not an ordinary recommendation.' On Greek words in Latin see now Adams (fc.).

<sup>257</sup> Dammann 20.

<sup>258</sup> *Ad Atticum* 6. 4. 3; cf. 5. 2 (partly in Greek).

<sup>259</sup> Similarly, Cicero adopts the word *lacrimula* from his adversary (*Pro Plancio* 31. 76): Laurand, *Cicéron* 2, 2nd edn., 496–497; for the word *proelior* in Atticus and Cicero; see Laurand, *Cicéron est intéressant* 22.

<sup>260</sup> Very helpful: Hoppe.

belongs, as the context proves, to Atticus' usage. Similarly Cicero adopts a metaphorical expression of D. Brutus, who wrote to him *si frenum momorderis, peream* 'if you take the bit between your teeth, I'll stake my life'<sup>261</sup> (*Ad Familiares* 11. 23. 2). In Cicero's answer we find (*ibid.* 11. 24. 1): *sed, ut mones, frenum momordi* 'but, as you advise, I have taken the bit between my teeth.'<sup>262</sup>—Cf. also Cicero's quotation (*ibid.* 5. 2. 1) from Metellus' letter (*ibid.* 5. 1. 1).<sup>263</sup>

*Colloquial Syntax and Style: Ellipsis and the Minimizing of Linguistic Effort*

*A brave little face, with whiskers. A grave round face . . .  
Small neat ears and silky hair. It was the Water Rat.  
K. Grahame, The Wind in the Willows, p. 10*

'Ellipsis,' a category loaded with problems of both psychology and linguistic history, is used here only as a descriptive term, without necessarily implying 'omission.' In the *Letters to Atticus*, ellipses are frequent and bold. Here, Cicero dispenses with forms of *esse* and even of *verba dicendi*,<sup>264</sup> *verba faciendi*, and *eundi*.<sup>265</sup> Within the *Letters to Atticus* the frequency of ellipses changes according to situation and subject matter. Often they appear in letters conveying emotion, except for those from his exile.<sup>266</sup> Generally the frequency of ellipses in the *Letters to Atticus* is conditioned not only by Cicero's frame of mind at a given moment, but even more so by motives of social psychology: the greater the familiarity between correspondents, the smaller the risk of misunderstanding; among close friends there is no need of detailed explanations; a few hints are perfectly sufficient. For the same reason, the *Letters to Atticus* are especially difficult to understand for us. As Cicero in this case had in mind only one reader, he did not trouble to supply the information other readers might need. When writing to his friend Atticus, Cicero minimizes his linguistic effort by saying *aberam bidui* 'My distance from there

<sup>261</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>262</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>263</sup> According to Laughton, *Participle* 153, Cicero here adapts his use of participles to the style of his addressee.

<sup>264</sup> The quotation of a sudden exclamation is eye-catching: *Ad Atticum* 15. 11. 2 *hoc vero neminem audivi*—sc. *Dicentem*—cf. Quintilian, *Institutio* 6. 3. 73. Löfstedt 2, 264–265.

<sup>265</sup> *Ad Atticum* 16. 10. 1 *statueram enim recta Appia Romam*.

<sup>266</sup> Dammann 26–47. Menna, *Aspetti*, ch. I 3. Hofmann/Szantyr 419–425.

was two days'),<sup>267</sup> whereas less familiar acquaintances use fuller expressions.<sup>268</sup> Another instance is *Ad Atticum* 12. 45. 3 *tu vero pervolga Hirtium* 'Please publish Hirtius.' Of course he means Hirtius' book.<sup>269</sup> This is also the place to mention the extended use of the accusative in *Ad Familiares* 4. 13. 2 *ut ipsum, quod maneam in vita, peccare me existimem* 'That I think it is my fault that I am still alive.'<sup>270</sup>

### *Pleonasm and Appended Explanations*

In *Ad Familiares* 10. 25. 2 the Codex Mediceus reads: *dummodo ne quid haec ambitiosa festinatio aliquid imminuat eius gloriae* 'provided only that your hurry to get office detracts in no way from the glory.'<sup>271</sup> *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 3. 4. 3 *reus se*<sup>272</sup> *dixit, si in civitate licuisset sibi esse, mihi se satis facturum* 'the defendant declared, that if he were permitted to remain a citizen of the State, he would satisfy my claims to his gratitude.'<sup>273</sup> Repetition of *ut* after a subordinate clause is found in *Ad Atticum* 3. 5.<sup>274</sup> The use of *is* to come back to an object mentioned previously is colloquial, cf. *Ad Familiares* 13. 28. 3 *illud quod supra scripsi, id (tibi confirmo)*<sup>275</sup> 'what I wrote above (I take upon myself to guarantee).'<sup>276</sup> Another<sup>277</sup> type of pleonasm is represented by *coepi velle*,<sup>278</sup> an expression found more frequently in Caesar and Petronius. Originally it denoted the ingressive aspect of the aorist, later it became abundant.<sup>279</sup>

Other features typical of epistolary style are conditioned by the author's failure to break up the self-centred circle of his own thoughts,

<sup>267</sup> 5. 17. 1; cf. 5. 16. 4.

<sup>268</sup> Plancius in Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 10. 17. 1 *bidui spatio abest* or Lentulus, *ibid.* 12. 15. 7 *quadridui iter Laodicea afuisse*, Löfstedt 2, 247.

<sup>269</sup> Havers 166.

<sup>270</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 265; for this use of the accusative, cf. also *quid sim tibi auctor?* *Ad Familiares* 6. 8. 2 and *quid mi auctor es?* *Ad Atticum* 13. 40. 2.

<sup>271</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams; Löfstedt 2, 192–193 with a good explanation of *ne quid* 'in order that not possibly.'

<sup>272</sup> The first *se* is omitted in the Loeb-edition.

<sup>273</sup> Cf. also *Pro Plancio* 35. 86. Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>274</sup> Löfstedt 2, 227. For pleonasm in Cicero see also Löfstedt 2, 175–180.

<sup>275</sup> Occasionally also in the philosophical works: Hofmann/Szantyr 413.

<sup>276</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>277</sup> For *idque, atque id, et id* cf. Menna, *Aspetti* ch. I 2 *passim*.

<sup>278</sup> *Ad Familiares* 7. 5. 1; cf. *In Verrem* II 4. 28. 65.

<sup>279</sup> Löfstedt 2, 450–451; for abundant expressions in the letters see Sjögren, *Commentationes*, esp. 160–162.

a failure which makes it necessary to add further explanations in guise of afterthoughts (epexegetis).<sup>280</sup>

*Interfering Constructions and Phenomena of 'Perseverance'*

*We feed children whom we think are hungry.*  
*Times*

Many licences in syntax and style can be explained by interference, i.e. interaction of constructions or expressions of related meaning or function: an example is the (colloquial) attraction of cases in the relative pronoun found in *Ad Familiares* 5. 14. 1 *aliquid . . . eorum, quorum consuesti* 'one of the things to which you are used.'<sup>281</sup>

In the letters and orations we occasionally find the singular of the verb after *mille* (which is taken for a collective noun).<sup>282</sup> Once (*Ad Atticum* 9. 13. 2) *iubere* is probably followed by a dative according to the example of *imperare*.<sup>283</sup> In Cicero's letters and treatises occasionally a genitive takes the function of a dative: *Ad Familiares* 5. 15. 2 *quod vinculum quasi deest nostrae coniunctionis* 'This link is almost lacking in our relationship.' This use of the genitive seems to anticipate certain developments in later Latin, although, as the present author sees it, in the Ciceronian passage it is quite possible and even more natural to interpret *vinculum nostrae coniunctionis* as a regular genitive construction ('this link of our relationship is almost lacking').<sup>284</sup>

The use of *ex initio* for *ab initio* in *Ad Atticum* 1. 16. 3 is clearly influenced by the preceding expression *ex eventu*<sup>285</sup> and has to be explained as a case of 'perseverance.' Often the boundaries between subconscious perseverance and a deliberate striving for concinnity are fluid. Cicero plays on parallelism, for instance, in *Ad Atticum* 1. 16. 13: *qua re, ut opinor, φιλοσοφητέον . . . et istos consulatus non flocci faciteon* 'therefore I suppose one must take to letters, as you do, and not care a button for those consulships.'<sup>286</sup>

<sup>280</sup> See *Ad Atticum* 2. 18. 3 *a Caesare valde liberaliter inuitor in legationem illam, sibi ut sim legatus*; cf. Havers 49.

<sup>281</sup> Wackernagel 1, 56.

<sup>282</sup> *Ad Atticum* 4. 17. 7 = 16. 14; Wackernagel 1, 104; Gellius 1. 16.

<sup>283</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 200.

<sup>284</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 214–215.

<sup>285</sup> Havers 69.

<sup>286</sup> Havers 70. Translation: Shackleton Bailey.

The alternative phenomenon, the influence of a following on a preceding word, can be seen in *Ad Atticum* 4. 8a: *quid sit, quod se a me removit, si modo removit, ignoro* 'why he should have withdrawn himself from me, if he really did, I have no idea.'<sup>287</sup> Here the first *removit* must be explained as a side-effect of the indicative form of the second.<sup>288</sup>

### Word Order

*Over went the boat . . .*  
K. Grahame, *The Wind in the Willows*, p. 23

Some cases of *tnesis* and *hyperbaton*, fostered by the colloquial style of the letters, have been discussed above, p. 40. As a rule, the *verbum finitum* of the principal clause takes the final position in the sentence, but instances of central position are slightly more frequent in the letters than in the orations (the ratio between central and final position is about 1:2 in the orations, 2:3 in the letters, and 1:1 in the philosophical works). Although some instances of middle positions of verbs can be excused by later additions of places and dates, there remains in the letters a comparatively large number of cases which defy such an explanation and must be regarded as precursors of the so-called 'logical' word order of Romance languages. Initial position of the verb (which is bound to emphasize emotion or to highlight a topic) is slightly more frequent in the orations and the letters than it is in the philosophical works.<sup>289</sup>

### Emotional Expressions

Here we should mention expressions conveying vivid and graphic descriptions (*Ad Atticum* 7. 3. 11): *mihī certum est ab honestissima sententia digittum nusquam* 'I am determined not to stray an inch from the path of strict honour.'<sup>290</sup> Occasionally Cicero adopts metaphorical

<sup>287</sup> Translation: Shackleton Bailey.

<sup>288</sup> Havers 76; Sjögren, *Commentationes* 148; on phenomena of perseveration in word-order, see Porten (next note).

<sup>289</sup> See Porten, above, p. 16.

<sup>290</sup> 'Not a finger's breadth;' Havers 147. For *tam Ulixes* (*Ad Familiares* 1. 10 'such a widely travelled man') cf. Sjögren, 'Tulliana' 148-151; cf. equally Suetonius, *Titus* 7. 5. Translation: Shackleton Bailey.

expressions used by his addressees.<sup>291</sup> Another hallmark of emotional speech is an abundant use of the ethical dative.<sup>292</sup> For adverbs emphasizing emotions, see pp. 30; 87.

### *Formulaic Expressions*

Even the emotional tone of letters written in colloquial style can degenerate into mere observancy and adopt a formulaic character itself. A generous and careless use of common verbs like *esse*<sup>293</sup> and *facere* is redolent of everyday language.<sup>294</sup> The pompous expression *in maiorem modum* (instead of *valde*), which is often used in letters of recommendation,<sup>295</sup> has a bureaucratic touch. The formula *litteris nuntiisque* is part of epistolary style as well.<sup>296</sup> On the other hand, many syntactic and stylistic devices cannot be used in a colloquial style. In his letters Cicero applies the *ablativus comparationis* more sparingly than elsewhere;<sup>297</sup> the same is true for parataxis of words of the type *virum vir*.<sup>298</sup> Other features were mentioned in our discussion of the orations and philosophical works.

### *Syntactic Græcisms*

Syntactic Græcisms are more frequent in letters and theoretical texts than in orations; participles bearing the main stress in a sentence fall under this aspect:<sup>299</sup> *Tusculanae Disputationes*. 1. 14. 31 *ut ait Staius . . . quid spectans nisi etiam postera saecula ad se pertinere* ‘as Staius says . . . and what notion is in his mind except that even succeeding ages are his concern?’<sup>300</sup> equally *quid quaerens* ‘in search of what?’<sup>301</sup> (*De Finibus*

<sup>291</sup> Cf. p. 52; for puns, p. 65.

<sup>292</sup> Cf. Menna, *Aspetti*; Ch. 1, 5. Hofmann/Szantyr 93–94.

<sup>293</sup> Menna, *Aspetti*, Ch. 1.

<sup>294</sup> See Hofmann 165–172, Ch. 4: ‘Der triviale und sparsame Zug der Umgangssprache.’ Hofmann/Szantyr 755.

<sup>295</sup> Parzinger II 25.

<sup>296</sup> Parzinger II 25–26.

<sup>297</sup> See Neville.

<sup>298</sup> Parzinger I 41–44; cf. Hofmann/Szantyr 708a.

<sup>299</sup> Cf. Laughton, *Participle* 43–45; our knowledge of syntactic Græcisms has been furthered considerably by R. Coleman (see note 196); on bilingualism, see Dubuisson, ‘bilibinguisme’.

<sup>300</sup> Translation: King.

<sup>301</sup> Translation: Rackham.

5. 29. 87). This usage also appears in the letters.<sup>302</sup> A play on the idiosyncrasies of Greek grammar is the jocular genitive construction found in *Ad Atticum* 12. 29. 2: *Damasippi experiendum est* 'we must try of (sic) Damasippus.'<sup>303</sup> Of course, this locution is as impossible in Latin as in English. The joke is that it is not at all impossible in Greek and would probably be the very slip Damasippus would have made. On the other hand, Cicero himself in a home-made Greek exclamation uses *o* with accusative, a Latin construction not acceptable in Greek (*Ad Atticum* 6, 1, 18). Ironically, the meaning of the text is: 'O shameful ignorance!' In the present case, despite the use of a Greek word, the matrix of the text remains Latin.

According to W. Kroll,<sup>304</sup> Græcisms are found especially in Cicero's letters. If this is right, it is certainly not owing to deliberate competition with the linguistic potential of Greek (as was the case in his theoretical works). Rather, Cicero unintentionally imitates foreign constructions, which intrude into his mind.

### *Parataxis*<sup>305</sup> and *Parenthesis*

Private and formal letters differ in sentence construction.<sup>306</sup> Instructive examples are two letters treating the same subject: in *Ad Atticum* 5. 16. 4 Cicero uses short sentences, in *Ad Familiares* 3. 6. 3 well-rounded periods. This difference of style can be observed even in letters written successively, one of them to Antony (*Ad Atticum* 14. 13 b), the other to Atticus (ibid. 14. 14): the letter to Antony consists of greatly extended and rhythmically balanced periods, the letter to Atticus of short, unpretentious clauses. As is the case with ellipsis, the use of parataxis presupposes a certain degree of intimacy between the correspondents, a mutual knowledge of their intellectual pursuits as well

<sup>302</sup> *Ad Atticum* 8. 9. 2; *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 2. 13. 1 and *Ad Atticum* 16. 6. 2: *sed id satis superque . . . tecum me non esse, quid fugientem?*

<sup>303</sup> Löfstedt 2, 412 n. 2; for a different explanation, see Hofmann/Szantyr 83; the next example (from *Ad Atticum* 6. 1. 18) is perfectly explained by Dunkel (126ff.). On problems arising from contacts between languages, see Goebel.

<sup>304</sup> Kroll, *Studien* 251 n. 11.

<sup>305</sup> On paratactic construction of verbs in Cicero's and his friends' letters (*volo, velim, vellem, malim, malle, oro, rogo, peto, cave*, etc.), see Patzner 121–184 (with an alphabetical list of the relevant verbs). Menna (*Costruzione*) confines his study to some private letters.

<sup>306</sup> Dammann 25.

as of their linguistic usage. In a loose sequence of sentences the musical elements of speech (accent, speed, pauses) gain in importance; it is up to the reader to supply them in order to understand the text. The better he knows the writer of the letter, the easier this task will be for him.

Parenthesis—insertion of a more or less independent clause into another one—is an element of the spoken language. Consequently, parentheses are frequent in Cicero's letters. M. Bolkestein<sup>307</sup> devoted an exemplary study to two different types of parentheses: fully developed parenthetical clauses (which are placed, as a rule, before the semantic focus of the host clause), and brief parentheses of the types *credo* or: *ut arbitrator*, or: *ut ego/equidem sentio*, ('mental state verbs') etc., which do not form a homogeneous group. She even discusses problems of delivery (such as speed, pitch, and pauses) and the exact conditions and ways of insertion. Though she is not particularly interested in style, her valuable analyses and conclusions might serve as a point of departure for stylistic research. Actually Cicero does not limit himself to a quasi-natural use of these linguistic means (traditionally studied by scholars in his letters), but parentheses especially abound in Cicero's most elaborate orations and rhetorical writings.<sup>308</sup> As a stylist, Cicero artfully develops the latent potential inherent in a quasi-natural use of the Latin language. However, as has been shown by Hutchinson,<sup>309</sup> it might be time for a literary reading of the letters as well.

### *Formulaic Elements in the Letters*

Omitting *praenomina* is a sign of familiarity and affection in Roman epistolary style (*Ad Familiares* 7. 32. 1 *quod sine praenomine familiariter . . . ad me epistulam misisti* 'when you sent me a letter in a familiar style . . . without giving your *praenomen*;<sup>310</sup> occasionally Cicero uses this device to ease a tense situation. In formal letters he writes out the titles of the addressees and his own. A quite pompous letter of Metellus (*Ad*

<sup>307</sup> Bolkestein, M., see bibl.

<sup>308</sup> Cf. above, notes 42 and 222; see also note 166 and the relevant passages in the text.

<sup>309</sup> See bibl.

<sup>310</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams. On 'Conventions of Naming in Cicero': J. N. Adams (1978).

*Familiares* 5. 1) is answered by Cicero in an even more formal style, including even the name of the sender's father. The address of a letter to Pompey is quite formal, too (*Ad Familiares* 5. 7). At the head of his letters Cicero often omits the greeting formulas. They only appear in some letters to Pompey, to the Senate, and in the impersonal notes to his wife Terentia. Cicero often dispenses with greeting formulas at the end of his letters as well. *Cura ut valeas* is found in letters to his wife and to his secretary Tiro (who was ill at that time), but also in a letter to Caesar (*Ad Familiares* 7. 5. 1). Only occasionally the concluding formulas are more detailed and affectionate: *Mea Terentia, fidissima atque optima uxor, et mea carissima filiola et spes reliqua nostra, Cicero, valete* 'Terentia mine, the most faithful and best of wives, and my very dear little daughter and Cicero, our last remaining hope, good-bye'<sup>311</sup> (*Ad Familiares* 14. 4. 6); *cura, mi suavissime et carissime frater, ut valeas* 'my most charming and dearest of brothers, take care of your health'<sup>312</sup> (*Ad Quintum Fratrem* 3. 4. 6). Elsewhere Cicero says only *vale*. During the battle of Mutina he writes to Furnius and D. Brutus *vince et vale*.<sup>313</sup> Greetings to others sometimes appear in the letters to Atticus; in his letters to Tiro Cicero includes greetings from his family.

Many private letters are dated; dates are omitted regularly in letters of recommendation or consolation. While staying in Italy and writing to Atticus almost daily, Cicero occasionally omits the date, but not so during his exile. The dates of his letters written in Cilicia can be deduced from Cicero's detailed reports. Letters written en route mostly show the precise date.

*Amabo te*<sup>314</sup> or *si me amas, si me a te amari scis* ('please') are among the formulas of request. Other formulas are found in the letters to Atticus and Quintus. As for affirmations of affection, it should be kept in mind, however, that sometimes the more vivid they are, the less they are convincing, as is the case with Antony and Cicero.<sup>315</sup>

<sup>311</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>312</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>313</sup> *Ad Familiares* 10. 26. 3; 11. 25. 2.

<sup>314</sup> With one exception—*De Oratore*. 2. 69. 278—only in the letters: Parzinger II 26.

<sup>315</sup> *Ad Atticum* 14. 13 a.b., cf. 14. 13. 6.

*Proverbs and Quotations*

*At times, classical dicta, when quoted by a statesman from memory, seemed new-born.*

H. Gauger, *Die Kunst der politischen Rede in England* (1952), p. 55

Unlike the great orators of the English parliamentary tradition, Cicero in his orations usually abstains from quotations: he certainly would not undercut his own Roman *gravitas* or convict his listeners of ignorance. Even in his *Letters to Atticus*, quotations from poets<sup>316</sup> are rarer than in the philosophical treatises (especially the *Tusculanae Disputationes* and the *De Natura Deorum*); nevertheless Dammann<sup>317</sup> notes 73 Latin and 100 Greek quotations from poets in Cicero's letters. Cicero tends to quote ancient rather than new poetry (especially Homer, Euripides, Aratus, Ennius, and Terence) and tragedies rather than comedies. In his letters (which also abound in Greek<sup>318</sup> and Latin proverbs) quotations usually have a humorous effect. They are largely absent, therefore, from formal letters and letters written in a depressed mood. On the other hand, quotations often appear in private letters (to Atticus and Quintus) as well as in the famous letter of recommendation to Caesar in favour of Precilius (*Ad Familiares* 13. 15); a letter to Varro (*Ad Familiares* 9. 7) even contains two lines of Greek verse. Surprisingly, however, in Cicero's notes to his erudite secretary Tiro Greek quotations do not play an important role.

Cicero often varies the wording of his quotations, sometimes because he is quoting from memory, sometimes on purpose. Legal formulas are quoted in his letters to Atticus and to Trebatius, where Cicero occasionally makes fun of jurists. To the Romans, who dealt with the language of law every day, such remarks were an inexhaustible source of merriment.

*Wordplay, Humour, Irony*<sup>319</sup>

Cicero discusses humour in the *De Oratore* (2. 216–289). Witticisms were considered an integral part of epistolary style (*Ad Atticum* 5. 5).

<sup>316</sup> Dammann 53–66.

<sup>317</sup> Dammann 54.

<sup>318</sup> Dammann 47–53.

<sup>319</sup> On puns in Cicero's letters, see MacLaren 47–53.

1).<sup>320</sup> At any rate, they are more acceptable in private letters than in formal writing (*Philippicae* 2. 3. 7). Rather than an abstract law of literary theory, this is a fact of social psychology, a natural consequence of the principle of decorum (*aptum*) which was crucial for Cicero. Whereas in the orations humour and irony are tolerated only as instruments of persuasion,<sup>321</sup> Cicero acts with more licence in his letters, well-known as he was for his wit in conversation. In his opinion his quips had a personal touch and could not be mistaken for someone else's (*Ad Familiares* 7. 32. 1). He tells us that Caesar, who had just finished a collection of pointed remarks, was able to distinguish an authentic *bon mot* of Cicero from an imitation (*Ad Familiares* 9. 16. 4); Trebonius collected Cicero's witty remarks (cf. *Ad Familiares* 15. 21. 2–3). Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 6. 3. 5) ascribed another collection of this kind to 'Tiro or someone else.' That the other person was Cicero himself is suggested by Macrobius (*Saturnalia* 2. 1. 12). Some of Cicero's contemporaries did not like his jokes and considered them boring and chilly,<sup>322</sup> a view not shared by Quintilian, of course.

There are differences in this regard within the letters. Formal, political, and business letters as well as letters of recommendation do not show much humour and irony. Puns appear especially in private correspondence. Here, again, mechanisms of social psychology demand our attention: Cicero makes fun of enemies, but does not attack his addressee, even if he has been attacked himself (as was the case with Appius and Brutus). A. Haury<sup>323</sup> notes that Cicero's humour manifests itself mainly in letters to Epicurean friends (Atticus, also Trebatius and Paetus) and is almost absent from the correspondence with Stoics such as Cato, Brutus, and Varro, even Quintus. Yet, there is every reason to believe that these differences are not primarily due to philosophical views but to the character of each of these friends and of their relationship to Cicero.<sup>324</sup>

<sup>320</sup> Cf. Tyrrell and Purser about *Ad Familiares* 7. 10. 2.

<sup>321</sup> Laurand 234–255, cf. also Holst.

<sup>322</sup> *Institutio* 12. 10. 12; cf. 6. 3. 3.

<sup>323</sup> Haury 214–215; 221–222.

<sup>324</sup> On variations and metamorphoses of Cicero's humour in the letters cf. also Dammann 47–53. For types of quips, see pp. 52ff.

*Rhetoric in the Letters*

*The letter is too long by half a mile.*  
Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost* 5. 2

'Rhetorical figures' appear in all types of letters, although they may not always be used intentionally.<sup>325</sup> Whenever Cicero writes in great excitement, he falls into a rhetorical style even in his *Letters to Atticus*. It would be in vain to try to differentiate between natural emotion and rhetoric from case to case. We have to acknowledge that an educated man like Cicero could express emotions quite spontaneously in forms showing his rhetorical education.

Nevertheless, the prevalent use of a rhetorical figure in elaborate letters may be indicative of their artificial character and of a high degree of artistic awareness. An example is the scarcity of anaphora in the *Letters to Atticus* (Books 12–16), to his wife, and in letters of recommendation and the greater frequency of anaphora in letters of higher literary claims, such as those to Pompey, Crassus, Appius, and Curio; the letters of consolation; the letter to Quintus on the administration of provinces (and even the 7th and 8th Books of the *Letters to Atticus*). Anaphora is especially impressive in a letter to Appius Claudius (*Ad Familiares* 3. 10. 10). Similar observations can be made concerning the use of questions and interjections, although the latter play an important role in the *Letters to Atticus*, too.<sup>326</sup> Hendiadys is rarer in the *Letters to Atticus* than elsewhere; as a rule, this figure is not used very often in private letters. On the other hand, emotional and emphatic repetition of words is especially common in Cicero's letters to Atticus and Quintus,<sup>327</sup> a fact which tells against a rhetorical interpretation in such cases.

Prose rhythm in the letters has been discussed by H. Bornecque and others.<sup>328</sup> Not surprisingly, prose rhythm is prominent in letters destined for publication; however, it is found also in some private letters, even to Atticus. According to H. Bornecque, differences in rhythm may be a matter of whether Cicero dictated a letter or wrote it down himself: the act of dictating induces the speaker to use rhythmic clausulae instinctively. On the other hand, one might assume

<sup>325</sup> Dammann 21–25.

<sup>326</sup> On climax and chiasmus, Dammann 22–23.

<sup>327</sup> Dammann 24.

<sup>328</sup> Bornecque, *Clausules* 565–570. Here he corrects single points of his earlier treatise (*Bornecque, Prose*).

with equal right that an author is more controlled when writing himself. Interpretations should be based on the texts themselves rather than on mere speculation. There are many variations. A connoisseur like F. Skutsch<sup>329</sup> speaks of 'a nearly complete rhythmical elaboration' of the letters.<sup>330</sup> Surprisingly (and much too sweepingly), Aumont judges the letters to Atticus and Quintus *à peu près amétriques*, but he is right in observing a more sophisticated rhythm in the letters *Ad Familiares*.<sup>331</sup>

### *Historical Exempla*

Historical *exempla* abound in the letters, even in those of Cicero's correspondents. Roman examples are matched—and even surpassed in number—by foreign ones. The *exempla* are narrated without adornment, some of them are only alluded to. Often Themistocles is named. 'His fate is very similar to Cicero's, and it is tempting to compare oneself with a greater man.'<sup>332</sup> Did Cicero want to show off his erudition by using historical examples?<sup>333</sup> Actually, he used only examples which were familiar to him and his addressees, so we gain an insight into the way of thinking of the educated class in the 1st century BC.

### *Types of Letters*

*Vous ne lirez guère d'ouvrage qui soit plus utile pour vous  
former l'esprit et le jugement; mais surtout je vous conseille de ne jamais  
traiter injurieusement un homme aussi digne d'être respecté de tous  
les siècles que Cicéron (on the Letters to Atticus).*

'You will hardly read a book more useful to shape your mind and judgement; above all I advise you never to treat slightly a man so worthy of being respected by all ages as Cicero is.'

Racine, *Letter to his son*, October 4, 1692

The style of letters, as a rule, mimics the tone of everyday conversation (*Ad Familiares* 9. 21. 1): *verumtamen quid tibi ego in epistulis videor?*

<sup>329</sup> Skutsch 431.

<sup>330</sup> For clausulae in the letters, see also Laurand 192 n. 1.

<sup>331</sup> Aumont 428.

<sup>332</sup> Schoenberger, *Quellen* 48.

<sup>333</sup> Schoenberger, *Quellen* 32.

*nonne plebeio sermone agere tecum? Nec enim semper eodem modo. quid enim simile habet epistula aut iudicio aut contioni? . . . epistulas vero quotidianis verbis texere solemus* ‘but be that as it may, how do I strike you in my letters? Don’t I seem to talk to you in the language of common folk? For I don’t always adopt the same style. What similarity is there between a letter, and an oration in court or at a public meeting? . . . but my letters I generally compose in the language of every-day life.’<sup>334</sup> It would be an over-simple generalization, however, to say that they are written in ‘the’ colloquial language, as if there were only one type of colloquial language. Differences of style are numerous, depending on content, situation, addressee, and on the degree of familiarity between author and addressee. Cicero himself distinguishes the following genres of letters: *Epistularum genera multa esse non ignoras, sed unum illud certissimum, cuius causa inventa res ipsa est, ut certiores faceremus absentes, si quid esset, quod eos scire aut nostra aut ipsorum interesset . . . reliqua sunt epistularum genera duo, quae me magno opere delectant, unum familiare et iocosum, alterum severum et grave* ‘that there are many kinds of letters you are well aware; there is one kind, however, about which there can be no mistake,—for indeed letter-writing was invented just in order that we might inform those at a distance if there were anything which it was important for them or for ourselves that they should know . . . There remain two kinds of letters which have a great charm for me, the one intimate and humorous, the other austere and serious.’<sup>335</sup> Further distinctions made by Cicero will be discussed in the following paragraphs. At any rate such occasional statements of Cicero should not be regarded as abstract literary theories, but as expressions of his sense of appropriateness.<sup>336</sup>

*Private Letters: The Function of the Addressee, of Content and Situation*

Cicero distinguishes between private and formal letters (cf. *Pro Flacco* 16. 37). With regard to content and style, the letters to Atticus are the most private ones. The letters to his brother Quintus, to his wife

<sup>334</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>335</sup> *Ad Familiares* 2. 4. 1; cf. 4. 13. 1. Translation: Glynn Williams.

<sup>336</sup> Fraenkel, ‘Trebatius’ 69; for Cicero’s *genera epistularum* also Büchner, ‘Briefe’ 1210; Koskenniemi 97–102; cf. also Thraede.

and daughter (*Ad Familiares* 14), and to his freedman Tiro (*Ad Familiares* 16) are comparable, though slightly more aloof from the vivid atmosphere of conversation; a further step is marked by the letters to M. Marius (*Ad Familiares* 7. 1–4), Trebatius (*Ad Familiares* 7. 6–22), Papirius Paetus (*Ad Familiares* 9. 15–26), and Varro (*Ad Familiares* 9. 1–8), who shared his interest in literature and law. Next come the letters to Lepta (*Ad Familiares* 6. 18; 19), Servius Sulpicius (*Ad Familiares* 4. 1–4; 4. 6; 13. 17–28a), M. Fadius Gallus (*Ad Familiares* 7. 23–27), Curius (*Ad Familiares* 7. 28; 30; 31), and Q. Cornificius (*Ad Familiares* 12. 17–30). The letters to his son-in-law Dolabella (*Ad Familiares* 9. 10–14) belong to this category as well,<sup>337</sup> although in this case the friendship is a superficial one. Many private letters are not carefully structured, they proceed by leaps and bounds and contain postscripts and enclosures (*Ad Quintum Fratrem* 3. 1. 17; 19; 23).

Even within the *Letters to Atticus* there are considerable differences in style.<sup>338</sup> The impact of content on style manifests itself, for instance, in the disappearance of colloquial elements even from private letters marked by grief and sorrow, as was the case during his exile in Greece,<sup>339</sup> during Cicero's stay in Brundisium (*Ad Atticum* 11), and after the death of his daughter Tullia (cf. the 12th Book of the *Letters to Atticus* and the letter to Servius Sulpicius, *Ad Familiares* 4. 6). The closer a letter is to colloquial Latin, the fewer the participles,<sup>340</sup> they are, however, prominent in narrative passages.

### Formal Letters

Formal letters,<sup>341</sup> which inform the Senate about Cicero's activities, show a different style; the same is true of his correspondence with functionaries in his province or in that of his colleague Bibulus. To

<sup>337</sup> Dammann 7.

<sup>338</sup> According to Laughton, *Participle* 149 *Ad Atticum* 16. 1–7—especially 3, 5, and 7—are 'more literary' than the other letters of the 15th and 16th book, a fact which influences the frequency of participles in these letters. These seven letters were written between July and the mid of August 44. Cicero has decided to travel to Greece; he is less uncertain and depressed, and his epistolary style gains in fluency. From the 8th letter on unsteadiness and anxiety grow. The style becomes less coherent again.

<sup>339</sup> *Ad Atticum* 3; *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 1. 3–4; *Ad Familiares* 14. 1–4.

<sup>340</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 150.

<sup>341</sup> Dammann 8.

the same category belong letters addressed to the Senate such as *Ad Familiares* 15. 1–2, to Sallustius (*Ad Familiares* 2. 17), to C. Coelius Caldus (*Ad Familiares* 2. 19), to L. Mescinius Rufus (*Ad Familiares* 5. 20), and to C. Cassius (*Ad Familiares* 14. 14). Other letters to Cassius, however, have a more private nature (*Ad Familiares* 15. 15–18). The first half of a letter to Cato<sup>342</sup> may also be mentioned here for the closeness of its style to the letters to the Senate of the same period. The language of these formal letters is simple, sober, and factual; only Cicero's own activities are reported in a more rhetorical style.<sup>343</sup>

To the same group belong many letters, which were not written in an official capacity, but addressed to persons Cicero only met in his official life, especially letters written before entering upon office or after the end of his tenure: to C. Antonius Hybrida (*Ad Familiares* 5. 5), Q. Metellus Celer (*Ad Familiares* 5. 2), and to Appius Claudius (*Ad Familiares* 3. 2–8).

Political letters, explaining Cicero's patriotic attitude and trying to win over men of influence, for instance Pompey (*Ad Familiares* 5. 7) and Crassus (*Ad Familiares* 5. 8), are written in a formal style as well. The same can be said of letters pleading his own cause: Cicero writes from Dyrrhachium to the consul Q. Metellus (*Ad Familiares* 5. 4) and from his province to Cato, asking him to advocate his triumph (*Ad Familiares* 15. 4. 11f.); he also requested the magistrates and designed magistrates to prevent the prolongation of his *imperium*.<sup>344</sup>

To many of Cicero's letters there is both a political and a private side. This applies to the letters written after the beginning and after the end of the civil war to many supporters of Caesar who had tried to win him over to their side.<sup>345</sup> After Caesar's death he often wrote to the generals in Gaul,<sup>346</sup> in order to bring them over to the side of Caesar's murderers.<sup>347</sup> The style of these letters is careful, deliberate and rhetorical. Elaborate letters can be expected to contain many participles. However, participles are not found in 'rhetorical' passages; they rather appear in brief reports on military activities.<sup>348</sup>

<sup>342</sup> *Ad Familiares* 15. 4. 1–10.

<sup>343</sup> *Ad Familiares* 15. 1; 15. 4. 10.

<sup>344</sup> *Ad Familiares* 2. 7. 4; 8. 3; 10. 4; 15. 7–13.

<sup>345</sup> Dammann 9.

<sup>346</sup> To Furnius: *Ad Familiares* 10. 25–26; to Lepidus: *Ad Familiares* 10. 27.

<sup>347</sup> To Plancus, *Ad Familiares* 10. 1–3; 5; 6; 10; 12–14; 16; 19; 20; 22.

<sup>348</sup> Cf. Laughton, *Participle* 147–156.

Private communications should not get into foreign hands, as Cicero emphasizes several times; consequently, some letters were destroyed.<sup>349</sup> On the other hand, political letters showing Cicero in a patriotic light were destined to be brought to the public (*Ad Atticum* 8. 9. 1; 16. 5. 5). The latter passage shows that Cicero planned to publish his letters—or rather a selection of them—to some extent in a revised form. But this does not apply to most of the letters to Atticus.

### *Letters to Political Friends*

Letters to political friends are directed to M. Brutus,<sup>350</sup> to Cassius (*Ad Familiares* 12. 1–10) and to Trebonius (*Ad Familiares* 10. 28). The style of these letters is powerful and rich in colours; some letters to Cassius<sup>351</sup> and to M. Brutus are private in character. Certain letters addressed to supporters of Caesar and Pompey belong to this category, too, for instance those to P. Cornelius Lentulus (*Ad Familiares* 1. 1–9), C. Curio (*Ad Familiares* 2. 1–7), Caelius (*Ad Familiares* 2. 8–16), which have a personal touch.

### *Letters of Consolation and Recommendation*

Letters of consolation are addressed to some of Pompey's supporters living in exile after Caesar's victory; almost all of the letters of recommendation are written to Roman magistrates. Both of these types of letters, especially the consolations, have a formal character. Some of the letters of recommendation, however, are surprisingly charming, such as those addressed to Caesar in favour of Trebatius and Precilius (*Ad Familiares* 7. 5; 13. 15) and to Trebatius in favour of Silius (*Ad Familiares* 7. 21). This shows again that the degree of familiarity determines the style.

<sup>349</sup> Dammann 10.

<sup>350</sup> Two books *Ad Brutum*; furthermore *Ad Familiares* 11. 5–8; 12; 14–18; 21; 22; 24; 25.

<sup>351</sup> Cf. for instance *Ad Familiares* 15. 15–18.

POETRY<sup>352</sup>

In Cicero's verse we find forms never used by him in prose, such as genitives ending in *-ai*,<sup>353</sup> infinitives, in *-ier*,<sup>354</sup> the form *potesse*,<sup>355</sup> the singular *cervix*,<sup>356</sup> the archaic<sup>357</sup> active verb *adulo*, *-as*;<sup>358</sup> the use of *navita* for *nauta*.<sup>359</sup> Such archaic forms were part of the poetic style; they would not have been acceptable in prose.<sup>360</sup> Moreover, in Cicero's verse Greek names keep their Greek endings and quantities in contradistinction to the usage in archaic Latin.<sup>361</sup> The only exception is *cratera*, nom. sing. (*Aratea* 219).

To turn to the domain of vocabulary:<sup>362</sup> Cicero's use of adjectives is rich and varied in all of his works; in his poem on astronomy, there is, in addition, a great abundance of epithets referring to light and splendour. Some compound adjectives<sup>363</sup> appear in Cicero's poetic works for the first time, although we cannot be sure that he invented them. Examples are *praeuius*,<sup>364</sup> *tristificus*,<sup>365</sup> and several formations with *-fer* and *-ger*.<sup>366</sup> In using such words Cicero follows the Ennian tradition (Catullus and his circle were more cautious in this regard).

The same is true for nouns derived from verbs or adjectives (for instance, *advolutus*, *circumiectus*, *orsus*, *tortus*, *diritus*),<sup>367</sup> frequentative verbs

<sup>352</sup> See p. 119.

<sup>353</sup> For example *Prognostica* 216 = *Fr.* 4. 1 = *De Divinatione* 1. 9. 15; cf. Neue/Wagener, Vol. 1, 3rd edn., 16–17, 21. Leo, *Forschungen* 328. Müller, *De Re Metrica* 471–472.

<sup>354</sup> For example, *Phaenomena* 475 = 231; Neue/Wagener, Vol. 1, 3rd edn., 230; cf. 225.

<sup>355</sup> *Phaenomena* 347 = 106; cf. Neue/Wagener, Vol. 1, 3rd edn., 611.

<sup>356</sup> *Phaenomena* 60. 290 = 56; 631 = 385; 723 = 473; 728 = 479, *Prognostica* 224; *Marius Fr.* 2 (*De Divinatione* 1. 47. 106). Laurand 1, 106 corrects Neue/Wagener, Vol. 1, 3rd edn., 672, who says that Cicero does not know the singular *cervix*.

<sup>357</sup> Cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* I 877. 49.

<sup>358</sup> *Tusculanae Disputationes* 2. 10. 24 translated from Aeschylus, *Prometheus*.

<sup>359</sup> *Tusculanae Disputationes* 2. 10. 23 translated from Aeschylus, *Prometheus*.

<sup>360</sup> Laurand 1, 106.

<sup>361</sup> *Hyadas*, acc.pl. (*Aratea* 178 = *nat. deor.* 2. 43. 111); *Helice*, nom. sing. (*Aratea* 38 = *De Natura Deorum* 2. 41. 104); *Deltoton*, acc. sing. (*Aratea* 239 = 5); *Persea*, acc. sing. (*Aratea* 20); *Arctoe*, nom. pl. (*Aratea* 441); *Nereides* (*Aratea* 446); *Celaeno*, nom. sing. (*Aratea* 35); *Academia* (*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum. Fr.* 11. 73).

<sup>362</sup> See Traglia, *Lingua* 111–158.

<sup>363</sup> On compound words in Cicero, recently, Lindner, 166–169; 265–270 (discussion of Cicero's practice and relative theory; complete lists of words and instances, and modern bibliography).

<sup>364</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 120.

<sup>365</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 120–121.

<sup>366</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 754.

<sup>367</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 129–135.

ending in *-ito* (as used by Cicero mainly in letters and in poetry), inchoatives in *-sco*, and a desiderative such as *petessere*.<sup>368</sup> The use of verbs with prefixes as synonyms for simple verbs is typical of poetry as well, for example *collucere*, *relocere*,<sup>369</sup> in such cases further additions may underline the original force of a prefix.<sup>370</sup> On the other hand, *simplicia* may replace the more usual *composita* as well: *suescere*, *stinguere*, *clinare*, *mergere*.<sup>371</sup>

Astronomical terms are used sparingly: the signs of the zodiac go by their Latin names (*Capricornus* is attested in Cicero for the first time), but Cicero's creation *orbis signifer* for *zodiacus* (*Aratea* 317–318) did not survive. When adopting Greek words, he uses justifying or explanatory phrases. *Cometes*, however, clearly needs excuses only in prose.<sup>372</sup>

As a rule, Cicero as a poet proves a purist in his treatment of terminology; archaisms are rarer than in Ennius, whereas diminutives and other colloquialisms are less frequent than in Catullus.<sup>373</sup> Metre is handled with the greatest care. Only one hiatus is found in Cicero's verses;<sup>374</sup> this is much fewer than in Catullus or Virgil. After Ovid Cicero has the smallest number of elisions. In his poems Cicero prepares for the Augustan preference for placing words of two or three syllables at the end of the hexameter. Many sophisticated types of word order typical of the Augustan age were worked out by Cicero as well. The same is true of the coincidence of *ictus* and accent in the second part of the hexameter. There is only one spondaic hexameter<sup>375</sup> in Cicero, although this type of verse is often used by Aratus; in this respect Cicero deliberately differs from the neoterics, whose *spondeiazontes* he ridicules.<sup>376</sup>

<sup>368</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 136–137.

<sup>369</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 137–138.

<sup>370</sup> *Aratea* 12 *praelabitur ante*.

<sup>371</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 139.

<sup>372</sup> Cf. *De Natura Deorum* 2. 5. 14 and on the other hand *De Consulatu Suo* 2. (= *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* Fr. 11) 15.

<sup>373</sup> In Cicero's poetry only one diminutive is found, which moreover is not typical: *curriculum*, *Aratea* 264.

<sup>374</sup> Cf. also *Marmorale* 72–73.

<sup>375</sup> Spondaic hexameter: an hexameter having a spondee in the fifth foot.

<sup>376</sup> Cf. Peck 60–74. For the greater monotonousness of Cicero's verse as compared with Lucretius: Merrill 293–306. For a weak defence, see Traglia (*Lingua* 159–233).—On caesurae see also Guendel; on verse structure, Leuthold 33–42 and Traglia *ibid*.

Instances of poetic license in syntax are not numerous in Cicero. For example, *bis sex* ('twelve') replaces *bis sena* (*Aratea* 319); *exiguo . . . tempore* (*Aratea* 185) means 'for a short time.' In line 100 *simul* replaces *et*. In line 76–77 we find an indirect interrogative clause with *ut* and indicative. The construction *certant reddere*<sup>377</sup> 'they strive for rendering' is typical of poetry as well. Poetic forms are plurals like *otia*<sup>378</sup> ('leisure') and *rores* ('dew').<sup>379</sup> *Cervicibus* ('neck') (*Aratea* 358) however is regular, the singular would be poetic.—*Ut* in a spatial sense (*ubi*, ὅς, ἦ) appears only once.<sup>380</sup> For *-que . . . -que*, see p. 135. In his use of the *ablativus qualitatis* Cicero is close to Lucretius and Ennius; Catullus does not use it so often.<sup>381</sup>

Enjambement and hyperbaton are more frequent in Cicero than in old Latin; it is, therefore, in his own poetry that the impact of prose artistry on poetic style begins to manifest itself.<sup>382</sup> So he becomes a pioneer of the sophisticated word-architecture typical of the hexameter of the Augustan age. His sparing use of alliteration—as compared to Ennius—had an influence on the style of later poets also.<sup>383</sup> On the level of metaphors, there is interaction between the astronomical lore of the *Aratea* and the imagery of the *De Re Publica*. Cicero's enhancement of the creative power of the orator's word in the *De Oratore* and his Latinization of Greek cosmology in the *De Natura Deorum* are matched by his discovery of the physical universe for the language of Latin poetry in the *Aratea*.<sup>384</sup>

<sup>377</sup> *Aratea*, Fr. 36 (3) 4 Bu. = *Prognostica* 3. 4 Baehrens.

<sup>378</sup> *De Consulatu Suo* 2 = *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, Fr. 11.

<sup>379</sup> *Aratea*, Fr. 37 (4) 7 Bu. = *Prognostica*, Fr. 6. 4 Baehrens.

<sup>380</sup> *Aratea* 2–3; Löfstedt 2, 415.

<sup>381</sup> Grashoff 58–62.

<sup>382</sup> Cicero even reflected on the relationship of oratory and poetry: Pennacini, 'Posizione . . .'

<sup>383</sup> On alliteration, see also Guendel, p. 87; the often blamed sound play *fortunatam natam* (*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* 17), however, gives proof of archaizing taste (Traglia, *Lingua* 159–233, esp. 229). On Cicero and the tradition of the language of Latin poetry see below, p. 133. For Cicero's literary achievement as a poet see Büchner, K., 'Fragmente,' 1236–1267.

<sup>384</sup> Gee, 'Cicero's astronomy.'

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS (AND HISTORIOGRAPHY)<sup>385</sup>

We know too little of Cicero as an author of official documents. As for the content of annual edicts written by governors in the provinces, there are some remarks in Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*, especially 6. 1. 15.<sup>386</sup> Examples of decisions of the Senate formulated by Cicero are found in the *Philippics* (5. 19. 53; 8. 11. 33; 9. 7. 15–17). Here traditional legal formulas are important: *consules alter ambove si iis videatur* ('the consuls, either of them or both if they wish'). Another sign of bureaucratic style is the fact that clausulae are not as regular as elsewhere.<sup>387</sup>

In a document traced out by Cicero we find an intriguing departure from the *consecutio temporum*: here the present tense—*cense*—is followed by preterite *consecutio*. This may be explained by the fact that Cicero already had the definitive version of his text in mind and therefore presupposed *censuerunt* as main verb.<sup>388</sup> For Cicero's legal style see above, pp. 27f.

## AN INTERIM BALANCE

In Chapter 1 we have seen how, as a stylist, Cicero excelled in many genres. To make things clearer, we could arrange the different genres on a sort of dial according to their closeness to everyday spoken language. Starting from private letters ('6 o'clock,' as it were), we could proceed with the hour hand clockwise (left side, upward) to more formal letters, then to the dialogues in the treatises, to formal orations, philosophical and historical texts, to the lofty style of peroration, and, finally, to poetry ('12 o'clock'). In the field of poetry, we might gradually descend (again moving with the hour hand clockwise) from epic (the poetic counterpart to historiography in Rome), through tragedy to comedy and satire ('6 o'clock'). Here, finally, we

---

<sup>385</sup> See p. 92; moreover Leeman 168–197, esp. 168–179. For influence of the style of historiography on Book 2 of the *De Re Publica*, see p. 92 and on *De Legibus* 1. 6 above, p. 27; cf. also p. 148. on Livy; on Cicero's projected historical works, Rambaud, on his ideas on historical style, most recently, Nicolai; on history in Cicero, MacKendrick (*Phil.*), 21–25.

<sup>386</sup> Marshall 185–191.

<sup>387</sup> Cf. Havet 5.

<sup>388</sup> Wiesthaler 96–97.

have come full circle. However, points of contact between poetry and everyday spoken language are not limited to 'low' genres. Generally in poetry (on the right side of the dial) there is preference for strong metaphors, short sentences, little care for logic and sentence connection, frequent use of emotional stylistic features (such as exclamation and apostrophe). The same is true for the lowest and the loftiest forms of prose (left side of the dial).<sup>389</sup> Only in the middle of the 'left' side of our dial (around '9 o'clock' in our dial), in formal rhetorical prose, 'logic' elements prevail: no unusual metaphors, longer sentences, careful sentence connection. This is true for certain parts of the orations and the theoretical treatises, but neither for letters nor for plain passages in the orations (located close to '6.00') nor even for the grand style of *peroratio* (located close to '12.00'). Our imaginary dial with its sweeping hour hand forms a pie graph which shows quite clearly that the use of 'periodic style' is far from universal and actually limited to a narrow segment of prose.

Such differences of genre and style are not an arbitrary invention of writers or critics but largely depend on the audience as viewed by the author. Actually, the choice and the number of signs will vary considerably according to whether he has to persuade a friend in a private letter or the Roman people in a public oration. Since Cicero and, say, Atticus have many experiences in common, the style of their letters will often be allusive. This feature makes private letters obscure to the general reader. On the other hand, orations delivered to the Roman people have to be understood by the largest possible audience and, therefore, will exhibit the highest degree of clarity and explicitness (that is why, in former days, they were especially recommended to young writers of Latin as models of style).

The following chapters will consider further factors determining stylistic differentiation. The place and function of integral parts within the whole of an oration (or treatise, etc.) may cause considerable shifts of style from one section of the text to another (Chapter II); moreover, chronological changes (Chapter III) as well as constant elements in Cicero's career as a stylist deserve our attention (Chapter

---

<sup>389</sup> Some literary critics have rightly discovered parallels between certain Ciceronian orations and comedy (Ayer, Hughes) and, on the other hand, tragedy (Dyck, 'Narrative obfuscation'). This is a promising field of stylistic research. An example might be a study of interrogative sentences. Are they redolent of drama or of cross-examination?

IV). Finally, select interpretative examples will show how the elements studied separately hitherto interact in Cicero's practice and how a multitude of factors—such as the audience, the degree of 'literary' elaboration, literary theory, and, above all, the aim of persuasion—cooperate to create an individual style in each given case (Chapter V).

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CHAPTER TWO

### NUANCES OF STYLE WITHIN INDIVIDUAL WORKS

*Sit igitur cura elocutionis quam maxima, dum sciamus tamen  
nihil verborum causa esse faciendum, cum verba ipsa  
rerum gratia sint reperta.*

While, then, style calls for the utmost attention, we must always bear in mind that nothing should be done for the sake of words only, since words were invented merely to give expression to things.<sup>1</sup>

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8, *Prooemium* 32

Stylistic nuances should be viewed in their context—there is no better way to an understanding of style than interpreting texts.<sup>2</sup> Since this cannot be done exhaustively in a brief chapter, two complementary approaches are adopted: the rhetorical treatises and letters, which have received less attention hitherto, are represented here by selected texts; for the orations and the philosophical works the reader will find a general overview here (and a discussion of individual texts selected from the standard divisions of orations in Chapter 5).

### ORATIONS<sup>3</sup>

Each section of an oration needs a somewhat different stylistic treatment, in accordance with its specific function.

The introduction (*prooemium*, *exordium*)<sup>4</sup> should attract the listeners, prepare them for what will follow,<sup>5</sup> and have them sympathize with

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation: Butler.

<sup>2</sup> For analytic studies, see Chapter 5.

<sup>3</sup> For relevant theory, cf. *De Oratore* 2. 320–322; *Orator* 124; for Cicero's usage, Laurand 307–331.

<sup>4</sup> *Orator* 15. 50; 36. 124; *De Oratore* 2. 78. 317.

<sup>5</sup> In his *prooemia* Cicero introduces the (or: some) main motifs of his defence, for instance in the *Pro Caelio* the theme of the *meretrix*, who is at the bottom of the accusation (Heinze 193–258, esp. 203–204) or in the *Pro Archia* the leading idea of

the speaker's 'selfless and noble' character ('ethical proof,' *ethos*). Consequently, the style of *prooemia* should be moderate and enjoyable ('middle style'), avoiding the extremes of both dryness and grandiloquence; however, the speaker may create a favourable atmosphere by using well-poised and well-rounded periods and deploying even some unobtrusive elegance of diction.

In his *prooemia* Cicero uses purer Latin<sup>6</sup> and less colourful vocabulary than in his *narrationes*. Sentence construction and clausulae are handled with more care. The number of historical *exempla* is limited.<sup>7</sup> Irony is rare,<sup>8</sup> gentle and friendly emotions prevail. Here, strong emotional appeal (*pathos*) appears only in some exceptional cases,<sup>9</sup> among them the *exordium* of the *Pro Murena*. As in the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* 5 (and perhaps in his first oration *Pro Cornelio*) Cicero starts with a solemn invocation of the gods. However, even in the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, an oration Cicero considered an example of the grand style, the *prooemium* (at least in the first sentences) is more serene than the other sections of the oration. Different stylistic devices conspire here to make the listener attentive, benevolent and ready to learn: in this regard the *exordium* of the *De Lege Agraria*—an oration, by which Cicero induced the people to reject the proposal for a popular agrarian law—is a masterpiece of carefulness, consideration, circumspection and stylistic-musical tuning of emotions. Further examples of Ciceronian prefaces will be discussed in Chapter 5.

The second section of a classical oration, called *narratio* (*Orator* 36. 124), should be believable, above all; therefore its style should be simple, almost colloquial. Here the speaker should avoid ostentatious rhetoric and, of course, the artifices of historiographical style. Syntax and rhythm may be treated with a certain (studied) negligence. The plain and simple character of *narratio* allows only for a small number of historical examples<sup>10</sup> and of reported orations.<sup>11</sup> Even in the

---

the value of poetry, an important argument of his defence. In accordance with *De Oratore* 2. 78. 318 Cicero here lays the foundations for his main arguments; he creates 'expectations' and, by doing so, imperceptible prejudices in favour of his case. For the stylistic means used to achieve this, see below, Chapter 5.

<sup>6</sup> Oksala 77.

<sup>7</sup> Schoenberger, *Beispiele* 50–57.

<sup>8</sup> Canter, 'Irony' 457–464.

<sup>9</sup> *In Verrem* II 3: this oration was not delivered; cf. also Lussy.

<sup>10</sup> Schoenberger, *Beispiele*.

<sup>11</sup> Wiesthaler 18.

highly emotional *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* the style of the *narratio* is relatively simple (7. 20). We will see in Chapter 5 that in the *Pro Milone* Cicero mimicked simplicity so perfectly that some critics deemed this *narratio* not brilliant enough. Quintilian, however, justly remarked that it is precisely the seeming clumsiness of this narrative that makes it more believable (*Pro Milone* 9. 24–10. 29); it was not by mere chance, therefore, that Cicero alluded here to the slowness of women when preparing themselves for an evening out (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 4. 2. 57–58). Nor should editors in a *narratio* ‘correct’ the allegedly ‘colloquial’ use of an indicative after *quamvis* (*Pro Rabirio Postumo* 2. 4), which is well-attested in our manuscripts. Much more rhetorical are the numerous narrative passages found in the *Actio Secunda in Verrem*, too numerous to be all moulded in the same style.<sup>12</sup> But the *Actio Secunda*, which was written for publication only, is the exception which proves the rule, and E. Paratore is certainly not right in trying to label Cicero’s narratives altogether ‘Asiatic.’<sup>13</sup>

The next section of a classical oration is *argumentatio*. According to *Orator* 36. 124–125 it has no prescribed style; everything depends on the subject. The predominant use of plain style, however, is conditioned by two factors: the argumentative content and the fact that *argumentatio* is often intertwined with *narratio*. A feature such as *oratio obliqua*, for instance, would be out of tune in a *prooemium*,<sup>14</sup> but perfectly appropriate in an *argumentatio*.<sup>15</sup>

Interaction of different levels of style (cf. above, pp. 23ff.) as exemplified by the orations *Pro Caecina*, *De Lege Manilia*, and the *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, can be observed in the *argumentatio*, which often occupies most of the space in the oration.<sup>16</sup> Thus the *argumentatio* is simple in style where legal matters are concerned, more brilliant in passages which are meant to impress the audience, and more vehement where life and death or the commonweal are at stake. In the *argumentatio* irony<sup>17</sup> and word-play both have their places;<sup>18</sup> the same is to be said of historical examples<sup>19</sup> and reported

<sup>12</sup> Much more embroidered is e.g. *In Verrem* II; 4. 33. 72–36. 79; 4. 48. 106–49. 110; and much more elevated is the punishment of Gavius (5. 61. 160–62. 162).

<sup>13</sup> Paratore, *L’oratoria*.

<sup>14</sup> Only *Pro S. Roscio* 2. 6 and *Divinatio in Caecilium*, repeatedly from 2, 4 onwards.

<sup>15</sup> Wiesthaler 17.

<sup>16</sup> Right: Laurand 326.

<sup>17</sup> Canter, ‘Irony’ 457–464.

<sup>18</sup> Holst, *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> Schoenberger, *Beispiele*.

speech,<sup>20</sup> all the more as Cicero enjoys writing fictive dialogue. Different levels of style are often put next to each other in a single *argumentatio*.

After this, in an excursus (*digressio*), which is meant to divert the audience, the orator may again rise to the level of ‘middle style.’ Digressions may appear (in agreement with Cicero’s theory) at various moments in the oration, most frequently in the *argumentatio*. In practice, for example, in the *Pro S. Roscio Amerino* such an excursus is found at the end of the *narratio*.<sup>21</sup> Digressions may have the character of an *amplificatio* and view the given case in a larger context; thus in the *Pro Caecina* (26. 73–27. 77) there is a general excursus on the benefits of *ius civile*. The style here is more brilliant, and the rhythm is more pleasing than in other sections of the oration. An especially instructive example of a ‘useful’ excursus—Cicero’s *Pro Archia*—will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Finally, *peroratio*: in Roman orations more often than in Greek ones, the last section (called *peroratio*) (*Partitiones Oratoriae* 52–60) has the aim of producing a strong emotion in the listeners’ minds in order to induce them to take a certain decision. Therefore the style of the finale may be pathetic and exploit all the resources of the *genus grande*.

At the beginning of a *peroratio* the style may change abruptly.<sup>22</sup> Vocabulary and style are even more solemn than in the *exordium*, but, given the emotional tone of the finale, the phrasing is less regular than in the *prooemium*, and the sentences become shorter, more lively and energetic. Figures of speech are used more boldly.<sup>23</sup> Historical examples<sup>24</sup> and reported speech are more important here than in the *prooemium*: they may serve to arouse pity (a feature called ἔλεεινόν) and provoke the ultimate decision.<sup>25</sup> Not surprisingly, irony<sup>26</sup> is rare in the *peroratio*: actually, the strongest appeal to emotions (*miserericordia*, above all)<sup>27</sup> is expected to come at the end of the oration.

<sup>20</sup> Wiesthaler 18.

<sup>21</sup> Solmsen, ‘Aristotelian Tradition;’ Lussky; ‘*Digressio*’ 351–361.

<sup>22</sup> *Pro Caelio* 70 after the witty remarks on Clodius and Clodia.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Landgraf, *Rede* 1st. edn. 386–391, 2nd edn. 263–267.

<sup>24</sup> Schoenberger, *Beispiele*.

<sup>25</sup> For instance, *Pro Milone* 34. 93–36. 99; *Pro Quinctio*. 30. 93; *Pro Rege Deiotaro* 15. 42; Wiesthaler 17.

<sup>26</sup> Canter, ‘Irony.’

<sup>27</sup> Lussky, 351–361.

There are, however, several significant exceptions to this rule: in the *Pro Caecina*, which is mainly concerned with subtle points of civil law, a profusion of pathos would be inappropriate. The same applies to the *Divinatio in Caecilium*, though for other reasons. Here, Cicero recommends himself as accuser and an appeal to emotions would be out of place. In the *Pro Archia*, it is Cicero's intention to play down the absence of evidential documents by a solemn praise of poetry.<sup>28</sup> A pathetic conclusion would have destroyed the effect of this excursus and revealed the weakness of his case. So he prefers to leave the judges with the impression that the small matter of Archias' citizenship should be handled generously in view of the great importance of poetry to the Roman state. In the *Verrines*—except for the last one, the ending of which will be analyzed in Chapter 5—the conclusions are not very emotional either: in the *Actio Prima*, the strictest objectivity was imperative, since the Senators were very reluctant to admit such accusations against their peers. In the *Actio Secunda*, which was written for publication only, it was wise to reserve the strongest emotional appeal to the conclusion of the last oration, for reasons of both rhetorical and artistic economy.<sup>29</sup> In the *Pro Balbo*, Cicero speaks after no lesser authorities than Crassus and Pompey and is therefore allowed to show serene confidence. Finally, when pleading in front of Caesar (in the *Pro Ligario* and the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*), he has to persuade only an individual judge; he therefore passes over the usual *commiseratio* and finishes his pleas in a deliberately simple and noble key (*Pro Rege Deiotaro* 14. 40).

All this shows the potential range of stylistic variation even within individual orations. In fact, none of Cicero's orations is limited to a single style, and he may apply any of the three levels of style as defined in the *Orator* (102)—and actually much more than three of them—in almost any of his orations at least in some place. Even the *Pro Caecina*, which figures in the *Orator* as a typical example of plain style, contains an excursus in praise of the *ius civile*, which is written in the middle style.

Together with differences in style,<sup>30</sup> another fundamental line of approach deserves attention, namely the persisting effort to act on

<sup>28</sup> See below, Chapter 5, pp. 198–205.

<sup>29</sup> Even there, Cicero avoids exaggerated *pathos*, cf. below, Chapter 5, pp. 214f.

<sup>30</sup> As analyzed by Laurand in his third volume, for instance.

the listener by way of emotion, a feature exemplified by Werner<sup>31</sup> in the *In Pisonem* and found in about 50 per cent of Cicero's pleas,<sup>32</sup> mostly referring to criminal cases (*Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, *Pro Cluentio Habito*, *Pro Murena*, *Pro Sulla*, *Pro Caelio*, *Pro Balbo*, *Pro Plancio*, *Pro Rabirio Postumo*). As a result, many of these orations draw near to the 'grand style' (*genus grande*).<sup>33</sup> Such continuous use of emotional appeal, which is attested as early as the great orator Antonius, can be considered typical of Roman oratory. It is a facet of the general and thorough-going 'partiality' of the forensic oration,<sup>34</sup> a unifying link making each section of the oration an integral part of the process of persuasion. However, even in orations continually conveying the ardour of personal feeling and conviction, explicit appeal to emotion is limited to the most appropriate moments. On the other hand, *pathos* is largely absent from orations discussing problems of civil law (*Pro Quinctio*, *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo*, *Pro Tullio*, *Pro Caecina*); nor does the *Divinatio in Caecilium* by its nature admit of *pathos*.

The attribution of stylistic characteristics to individual sections of an oration is not subject to a mechanical code of rhetorical rules, all the more since the structure of the orations is often conditioned by other factors. In his *Oratio cum Senatui Gratias Egit*, Cicero, after having dealt with his enemies, turns to his friends. At this moment, invectives, foreign words,<sup>35</sup> and metaphors quit the field to make room for the noble and majestic flow of 'middle style'.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, in the *In Pisonem*, which is full of invective, Cicero's Latin becomes much purer whenever he comes to speak of Pompey or himself. In the *Pro Murena*, the pathetic appeal to the commonweal (37. 78–80) contrasts with the immediately preceding satire on Cato and the Stoics (35. 73–36. 77).<sup>37</sup> An especially charming variation of tones and stylistic levels is found in the *Pro Flacco*.<sup>38</sup> In the first *Philippic* the narrative of Cicero's return contains more participles than the report of his departure; since participles serve to give full information without encumbering the discourse, they tend to appear in rapid

<sup>31</sup> Werner, *passim*.

<sup>32</sup> Lussky, *ibid*.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. also Solmsen, 'Aristotelian Tradition.'

<sup>34</sup> Neumeister, 163–185.

<sup>35</sup> *Oratio Post Reditum in Senatu habita* 6. 14–15.

<sup>36</sup> 8. 19; 8. 20; 21–9. 23.

<sup>37</sup> Laurand 315.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Laurand's analysis 316–318.

narrative. Whenever rhetorical adornment is required, the number of participles decreases.<sup>39</sup> Even within each single passage, stylistic nuances help to establish the right balance in matters of syntax and meaning; in fact, each single sentence is shaped to serve the purpose of persuasion.<sup>40</sup>

### PHILOSOPHICAL TREATISES

The ‘homogeneous and well-tempered’ style (*aequabile et temperatum genus*) of philosophical writing seems to exclude shifts of tone comparable to those found in the orations. Yet, there are more stylistic differences than one might have supposed. Even in the relatively plain discourse of the *De officiis*—the sober diction of which chimes with its Stoic content—there is a surprising abundance of shades: exclamations, epigrams, quoted remarks by imaginary objectors, passages resembling dialogue, an invective directed at the dead Caesar, vivid narrative passages, and miniature portraits.<sup>41</sup>

#### *The Style of the Prooemia*

The closeness of *prooemia* to the ‘middle style’ (cf. above, pp. 79f.) is in harmony with their content and function. For the use of prefaces in his dialogues, Cicero could cite Aristotle as an authority (*Ad Atticum* 4. 16. 2). Cicero’s prefaces often hint at the political background; ‘their considerations about man and man’s fate sound like the choruses of an old tragedy, and lend deeper resonance to his . . . dialogues.’<sup>42</sup> The *prooemium* to the third Book of the *De Re Publica*, for instance, studies the relationship between philosophy and politics in Greece and Rome in view of ‘a fusion of Roman political life and education with Greek philosophy.’<sup>43</sup> Cicero’s use of a style combining

<sup>39</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 142.

<sup>40</sup> Neumeister 163–185.

<sup>41</sup> Dyck, *Commentary* on the *De Officiis*, pp. 49–50; on the range of styles in the *De Re Publica*, from the colloquial to the elevated, Zetzel, 29–33. On the genre, Schenkeveld, ‘Philosophical Prose’, esp. 216–223.

<sup>42</sup> Hirzel 489.

<sup>43</sup> Pöschl 156; for a new appraisal of the preface to *De Re Publica*, Book I, see Blössner.

personal warmth with unobtrusive dignity is therefore justified by the content of his prefaces.<sup>44</sup>

In the *prooemia* of his philosophical writings, Cicero often speaks on behalf of himself. It is characteristic of the personal tone of the book-prefaces that, in the *De Officiis*, *equidem* appears in the introduction to the first Book.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, the references to the author as a living person imply the use of basically non-archaic vocabulary. If at all, archaisms appear only when required by the subject matter. In the *De Re Publica* (5. 1. 1), for one, after a quotation of Ennius, which sounds like an oracle to him, he uses the solemn word *effari* ('to pronounce'). Less obtrusive is a verb like *opitulari* ('to help') found in another *prooemium* of the same work (1. 6. 10). Finally, the adverb *reapse* ('in reality': 1. 2. 2; cf. 2. 39. 66), which looked archaic to later generations, was still in use at Cicero's time, as the letters demonstrate (e.g. *Ad Familiares* 9. 15. 1). The archaisms of the introductory parts are therefore unostentatious and hardly surpass what is commonly found in orations.

In Cicero's philosophical works the finite verb is often placed in the middle rather than at the end of a sentence. However, in the first 15 pages of the *De Natura Deorum* the regular final position prevails. Some readers might believe that Cicero here, for his review of philosophical theories, adopts an 'historical' style (including the traditional final position of the verb). Be this as it may, it is no surprise that, in contradistinction to specifically philosophical sections, in a preface and in an introductory dialogue word-order and sentence structure should follow the common Latin usage, as they actually do.

### *The Style of the Dialogues*

'No special study has been made of the style of the dialogues.'  
J. E. G. Zetzel, 29

Cicero had a taste for the old Latin colloquial language, which was still being used in his day by elderly ladies of family.<sup>46</sup> Thus he con-

<sup>44</sup> On the content of the *prooemium* and the significance of the dialogue-action: Ruch, *Préambule*.

<sup>45</sup> 1. 1. 4; 1. 12. 37. Jordan 319–320. In *De Officiis* 1, 37 *equidem* is used to distinguish Cicero's own words from Cato's.

<sup>46</sup> He acutely observes the greater linguistic conservatism of women, cf. *De Oratore* 3. 12. 45.

juries up the conversational tone of the nobility of the Scipionic period, when shaping his dialogues in the *De Re Publica*, although he shrinks away from obtrusive naturalism.<sup>47</sup> If several gerundives ending in *-undus* appear on Scipio's lips,<sup>48</sup> this is certainly one of those slightly archaic linguistic features.<sup>49</sup> Likewise, an infinitive form like *nectier* evokes Scipio's manner of speech (2. 34. 59).<sup>50</sup> No less typical of the older colloquial language is the use of *propter* ('near') for *prope* (1. 11. 17, but cf. also *Brutus* 24) and of *nimis* (1. 37. 58) for *valde* ('very').

For the intimate conversational tone of Cicero's dialogues the appearance of *equidem* ('I, for my part') is characteristic.<sup>51</sup> Not surprisingly, this word is also very common in his private letters to Atticus, where Cicero speaks frankly. On the other hand, in the *De Officiis*, a treatise devoid of dialogue, *equidem* appears rarely, tellingly enough in the preface to the first Book and where Cicero opposes his own view to that of a quoted author.<sup>52</sup> Where it is to be found in the orations, Jordan<sup>53</sup> calls it 'a parliamentary flower of speech' (in Sallust and Caesar it only appears in orations).

The use of dialogue by Cicero is a corollary to the high esteem in which oral discourse was held in Roman society. This attitude affects even his style, in particular his way of quoting sources: in principle, live witnesses are preferred to books. To avoid quoting literary sources, often an entire chain of intermediary persons is mobilized.<sup>54</sup> This complicated method, which was perfectly justified in old Cato's generation (Greek erudition being detrimental to a Senator's *auctoritas*), is applied by Cicero, however, even to dialogues laid in his own time; therefore, not all of his statements concerning personal acquaintance of Romans with Greek philosophers<sup>55</sup> should be taken at face value. On the other hand, Roman education was based much more on personal dialogue than is the case today. As for the social background of the urbane colloquial tone of Cicero's dialogues

<sup>47</sup> On the points of contact in vocabulary and style between philosophical writings and letters, cf. pp. 30 and 38ff.

<sup>48</sup> *De Re Publica* 2. 14. 27; 24. 44; 39. 65.

<sup>49</sup> Cf., however, pp. 31f.

<sup>50</sup> *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta* 9. 20, p. 241 Malcovati; cf. Bréguet 127.

<sup>51</sup> Jordan 318–320.

<sup>52</sup> 1. 1. 4; 1. 12. 37.

<sup>53</sup> 327.

<sup>54</sup> For instance, Cicero, *Cato* 12. 39; 13. 43.

<sup>55</sup> Hendrickson, 'Sources' 184–199.

one should keep in mind that Plato, though an aristocrat, indeed, would faithfully reflect the democratic conditions of Athens, whereas Cicero's 'Romans were much more concerned about good manners. The busy masters of the world despised the 'merrygreeks,' prone to talk whenever an opportunity presented itself. Romans stooped to do so only on very special occasions and in select company, . . . mostly of the same political party and social class, sometimes even of the same family . . . Hence, the style of conversation changed: personal attacks and insults—as found in Greek dialogues—have disappeared; instead, to our taste there are too many mutual compliments.<sup>56</sup> Touches of humour and irony, therefore, appear more rarely in Cicero's philosophical writings than in Plato's dialogues, a surprising feature in an author otherwise so witty.<sup>57</sup> In harmony with the calm *ethos* of his philosophical style, Cicero does not exceed the bounds of good-natured humour here.

Elements of oratorical and forensic style are manifest in Cicero's philosophical dialogues as well. Cicero praises in Plato's dialogues the fact that the reader gets involved with the characters; the same quality is found in his own dialogues.<sup>58</sup> Sometimes the course of the dialogue calls for the use of rhetorical devices. To give an example, after a brilliant and ingenious oration of Lucullus, Cicero is in a difficult position (*Academica* 1. 20. 64). In accordance with rhetorical practice, he therefore first affects the greatest modesty and then busies himself with skillfully uncovering contradictions in Lucullus' (Antiochos') oration.<sup>59</sup> Cicero plays the role of the 'resourceful advocate' in the drama of the philosophical dialogue.<sup>60</sup> The shaping of philosophical debates as dramatic dialogues is prepared for by the Academic tradition. In the *Hortensius* a struggle with controversial statements arises (Hortensius, as an opponent to philosophy, unfolds an entire catalogue of errors made by the different schools of philosophy). At the

---

<sup>56</sup> Hirzel 491–492. For the literary, historical, and social background of the dialogue form in Cicero cf. Hirzel, Vol. 1, 457–552, esp. 495: 'Countless oral dialogues awakened in him his old love for the literary form of dialogue;' on the technique and the settings of Ciceronian dialogues, see Becker; Ruch, and, most recently, Auvray-Assayas (with reference to Plato and modern bibl.).

<sup>57</sup> Haury 216.

<sup>58</sup> Süß 419–436, esp. 427.

<sup>59</sup> This belongs to the practice of rhetoric, cf. the story of Crassus in *De Oratore* 2. 54. 220–222, *Pro Cluentio* 51. 140–142.

<sup>60</sup> Süß 431.

end Cicero has gained his 'case.' It would be a fascinating task to underpin this by means of stylistic observations, all the more so since in the *Lucullus*, in powerful and sustained imagery, the philosophical discussion is described in the terms of a serious lawsuit and a political debate.<sup>61</sup>

### *The Function of Landscape and Scenery*

Landscape is no less important in Cicero's dialogues than it is in Plato's, and there are subtle thematic links between descriptive passages and dialogues.<sup>62</sup> The vocabulary used to describe nature partly overlaps with that of poetry. When dealing with difficult philosophical themes Cicero, trying to sugar the pill, handles the setting with special care:<sup>63</sup> In fact, the epistemological subject matter of the *libri Academici* was unusually difficult and thorny for a Roman audience. All the more, Cicero took pains to exploit all the artistic resources of dialogue in order to grant his readers some respite from that embroiled and tormented style of discussion (*tortuosum genus disputandi*). Now and then, the philosophical discussion is interspersed with glimpses of landscape and seascape visible from the place of action, Hortensius' villa at Bauli. Similar effects are produced by Roman examples, references to Roman poetry, serious and joking allusions to Roman public life and magistrates in general and to the lives and deeds of the interlocutors in particular. The high level of elegance maintained here is closer to the *Hortensius* than to the later, more extensive treatises (*De Natura Deorum*, *De Finibus*, *Tusculanae Disputationes*). An artistic highlight is the finale, which is thematically connected with the description of the departure from the villa at the seaside (§ 147). Each of the four participants in the dialogue gets a hearing once more. Catulus has to act as an umpire. For the time being, he makes a merely personal choice between the two sceptical attitudes developed in Cicero's lecture: the attitudes of Arcesilaus and of Carneades.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Cf. also 1. 20. 64 *in causis maioribus*; 65 *cum de re publica disceptatur*.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Süß 425 on the landscape of the Gulf of Naples in connection with the argument in *Lucullus*.

<sup>63</sup> Stroux, 'Schlußwort' 109–111, esp. 109.

<sup>64</sup> Regarding Hortensius and his staging, which is reminiscent of Plato's *Gorgias*:

*Concentrations of Certain Types of Words*

Whereas the style of the philosophical writings, in general, aims at balance and fluency,<sup>65</sup> the vocabulary varies considerably according to the subject matter. This applies, for instance, to certain philosophical terms in *Academica* 1 and 2, and to the use of abstract nouns in Cicero's masterly discussion of the movement of atoms in the first Book of the *De Finibus* (1. 6. 17–20). The *De Natura Deorum* abounds in terms referring to animals, most of them not found elsewhere in Cicero.<sup>66</sup>

Of course, such 'nests' or concentrations of unusual words in certain passages are a challenge to champions of *Quellenforschung*; first, however, one should try to explain the vocabulary within the given context (a principle not always observed in scholarly practice). Cicero calculates the listener's reaction to occasional accumulations of unfamiliar words and he also considers the overall effect of such passages within the treatise as a whole.

*Prose Rhythm*

G. O. Hutchinson has shown that in the philosophical writings prominence and density of rhythmic closes is reserved to passages where the author is seeking a particularly powerful eloquence.<sup>67</sup>

*The Function of Poetic Quotations*

Quotations from poets are longer and more numerous in the philosophical writings than in the orations. A famous poetic passage may come up in urbane conversation and create an atmosphere of cheerful communication. Furthermore, quotations may add *auctoritas* to an idea and set the theme, as does Ennius' memorable line on Roman customs and men quoted at the beginning of Book 5 of the *De Re*

---

Gigon 222–245. On scenery in general also Ruch, *Préambule*. On the poetic vocabulary of the description of nature cf. above, p. 32.

<sup>65</sup> Above, pp. 28f.

<sup>66</sup> Archaic vocabulary appears in the *De Re Publica*, particularly in Books 2 and 6 (p. 27); poetic words occur at a point in the *De natura Deorum*, cf. p. 32. On colloquial elements in the *De Oratore*, see pp. 39f.

<sup>67</sup> Hutchinson, 'Rhythm.'

*Publica: Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* ‘the Roman state rests on old customs and on men.’ The same applies to the quotation from Cato at the beginning of the second Book of the *De Re Publica*.<sup>68</sup> Longer passages cited from poetic works add brilliance to Cicero’s discussion. Poetic style is especially appropriate to lofty subjects; a prose writer who knows his limits (and those of pedestrian style) will be wise enough to resort to quotation in such cases.

### *Quotations from Plato*

In the *De Re Publica*, there are two major quotations translated from Plato, both holding key positions in Cicero’s text: one toward the end of Book 1, the other at the end of Book 6.<sup>69</sup> The passage from Plato, *Republic* 562 is adjusted stylistically to the Ciceronian context.<sup>70</sup> In terms of form, Cicero condenses and rearranges his model; the use of graphic imagery and hendiadys strikes a more ambitious note in comparison to Plato. By its style, the quotation is adjusted to the elevated tone of its context; by the great name of its author, it bestows on Cicero’s finale an even more solemn character. The fact that he is quoting and translating allows for the use of more colourful language than Cicero would have used when speaking on his own behalf. Placed as it is at the end of Book 6, the quotation from Plato has the character of a revelation, it is a sublime and harmonious final chord. No less select is the style of Cicero’s translation from Plato’s *Timaeus*;<sup>71</sup> it is a match to that of the quotation in the *De Re Publica*. One can assume, therefore, that Cicero’s translation from Plato’s *Timaeus* was meant to be quoted at a crucial moment in his planned dialogue.

Unlike the quotations from Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle, which at the same time serve as an artistic ornament, the translations from Epicurus and Stoic authors are merely instrumental.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Cf. above, pp. 40f.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 40–49.

<sup>70</sup> Cicero, *De Re Publica* 1. 43. 66–67.

<sup>71</sup> Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 96–125.

<sup>72</sup> Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* 75–88; on Cicero as a translator, see also below, pp. 129ff.

*Archaic Colour*

A consistent use of archaisms, as found in historiography, was not practicable for Cicero given the subject of his writings, the nature of his talent and his stylistic preferences. A slight archaic tinge was acceptable, if at all, in the *De Re Publica* and *De Legibus*,<sup>73</sup> concerned as they are with traditional political and legal institutions. As E. Bréguet<sup>74</sup> has shown, the style of the *De Re Publica*, for all its classical moderation, has some epic grandeur.

The æsthetic effect of the archaisms is explained by Cicero in his *De Oratore* (3. 38. 153).<sup>75</sup> Many such words began to acquire an old-fashioned flavour in Cicero's time (*De Oratore* 3. 43. 170: *vetustum verbum . . . , quod tamen consuetudo ferre possit* 'the word [may be] archaic but at the same time acceptable to habitual usage'.<sup>76</sup>

As for the distribution of the archaisms over the *De Re Publica*, they are about twice as frequent in the 2nd Book as in Book 1. This might be owing to the 'historical' colouring of Book 2. The 6th Book, being a 'revelation,' has a solemn ring. Except for some archaisms, which conjure up Ennius as a 'cosmic' poet, the Latin of the *Somnium Scipionis* is remarkably pure.<sup>77</sup>

## RHETORICAL TREATISES

A study of stylistic differences in the *De Oratore* is especially rewarding.<sup>78</sup> In the *prooemium* of the 3rd Book Cicero explains (3. 4. 16) that he tried to characterize Antonius' and Crassus' personal styles by the orations he attributed to them.<sup>79</sup>

Even the subject matter to be treated by each of them is chosen to fit the persons. Antonius—being a man of practice—discusses *inven-*

<sup>73</sup> On archaisms in the *De Legibus*, Pascucci, 'L'arcaismo . . .'

<sup>74</sup> Bréguet.

<sup>75</sup> For Cicero's views on archaisms, cf. Tondini 225–228.

<sup>76</sup> Translation: Rackham; According to Bréguet 129, archaisms and alliterations tend to appear in the same places.

<sup>77</sup> *Sphaera* is avoided here; cf., however, *De Natura Deorum* 2. 34. 88; on the style of the *Somnium* cf. Ronconi, *Somnium* 395–405. Ronconi, however, appears to exaggerate the exceptional character of the *Somnium*.

<sup>78</sup> Martinelli; on imagery in the *De Oratore*, Fantham, *Comparative Studies*, 137–175.

<sup>79</sup> On the characteristics of both orators cf. also *Brutus* 37. 139–140; 43. 158; 44. 162; 59. 214–215; *Orator* 66. 222–223; *De Oratore* 3. 4. 16; 8. 32–9. 33 and 49. 190.

*tio*, *dispositio*, and *memoria*; Crassus—an artist of style—*elocutio*. The same is true for the distribution of the parts in the quarrel between philosophy and rhetoric. Accordingly, in the beginning Antonius is pleased with the role of the improviser genius (*De Oratore* 1. 48. 207). His absent-mindedness is characteristic: he forgets to discuss, of all things, *dispositio* and has to be reminded of it by Catulus (2. 42. 179f.). Antonius' style is familiar, often jocular, whereas Crassus' is serious and, above all, based on long and profound preparation (*De Oratore* 3. 5. 17). Only on one occasion does Antonius fall into a declamatory style: while praising eloquence (2. 8. 33–9. 36). Here the change of genre (the transition to the *genus laudativum*) gets the better of the individual style—although the very character of Antonius' eloquence makes us expect passionate tones as well.<sup>80</sup> According to Cicero's *Brutus* (43. 158) Crassus' vocabulary was more select than that of Antonius,<sup>81</sup> and Crassus' style more brilliant. In the *De Oratore* this impression is confirmed by Crassus' lavish use of historical and philosophical amplifications and quotations from poets. Crassus does not build up long, well-rounded periods; he prefers an 'Asiatic' style consisting of short *colons* (*Brutus* 44. 162). Although Cicero does not try to reproduce the style of both orators pedantically, there are intriguing differences found especially in those passages which are written in a lively style and do not deal with prim rhetorical theory in the narrow sense of the word. Tellingly, prose rhythm is sometimes treated less carefully by Antonius.<sup>82</sup> On closer inspection, Crassus uses more symmetrical constructions and *isocola*, as well as rhetorical questions, synonyms, redundancy, *diptota*, and *polyptota*. In practice, therefore, Cicero lends his own style to Crassus, and gives to Antonius a slightly less elaborate manner of expression. In the organization of periods the use of bipartite and tripartite structures is less prominent with Antonius, of whose style parentheses are typical. Martinelli justly states that Cicero is concerned with self-representation no less than with a portrayal of those two orators. Antonius and Crassus reflect two sides of Cicero, which are, in Martinelli's view,<sup>83</sup> embodied in the *Pro Milone* and the *In Pisonem*. In any case, the attention Cicero gives to the individual features of each orator is an original touch

<sup>80</sup> *De Oratore* 3. 9. 32; 2. 28. 124; 3. 4. 16.

<sup>81</sup> *De Oratore* 3. 9. 33; cf. *Brutus* 37. 139–140.

<sup>82</sup> Martinelli 15.

<sup>83</sup> Martinelli 83.

of the *De Oratore* and indicative of the great care Cicero invested in this masterpiece.

Other stylistic differences are conditioned by the subject matter. Vividness of style could be attained more easily in the first Book, which deals with general problems, than in the later, more technical sections. In these, technical terms abound at certain points,<sup>84</sup> whereas the treatise on humour in the 2nd Book of the *De Oratore*<sup>85</sup> indulges in colloquialisms.

All these features should be incorporated into a general view of Cicero's prose artistry in the *De Oratore*. An appropriate study of the style of *De Oratore* ought to pursue the stylistic changes conditioned by person and subject matter into all the ramifications of the dialogue<sup>86</sup> and measure them by the principle of *aptum*.

#### LETTERS

Differences of style appear within letters whenever quotations are involved. Within a stylistically homogeneous letter to Brutus the expression *sectam sequi* appears when the decision of the Senate against Antony is mentioned. Cicero took over this formulation, as H. Haffter showed, from the Senate's opinion itself.<sup>87</sup> Mention of official matters is stylistically perceptible, e.g. in those letters which are of partly private and partly formal character.

Further stylistic clashes occur in letters which fall into a *narratio* and a *peroratio*. Thus a letter addressed to Cato (*Ad Familiares* 15. 4), in its first half (1–10), reports the successful completion of the war in the province and is written in a relatively plain style, whereas the second half of the letter is rhetorically coloured: here, Cicero strives to obtain a *supplicatio* and a triumph. Basically this letter is a small oration (there is even a short, but well-shaped preface). Mock-heroic elements (and other stylistic nuances) have been discovered by G. O. Hutchinson in *Ad Atticum* 1. 16, a study opening new avenues

<sup>84</sup> Also in the *Orator*, cf. p. 46. On the problem of source-analytical conclusions cf. p. 90.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. p. 46.

<sup>86</sup> On the art of dialogue in the *De Oratore*, cf. Zoll.

<sup>87</sup> Haffter, *Dichtersprache* 13–14.

for a literary appraisal of Cicero's letters.<sup>88</sup> Finally, Miriam T. Griffin has sharpened our awareness of philosophical badinage in Cicero's letters, which 'tease us into imagining the delightful philosophical discussions they mention and presuppose.'<sup>89</sup>

## POETRY

See below, p. 119.

---

<sup>88</sup> Hutchinson, 'Briefe,' fundamental: Hutchinson, *Correspondence*.

<sup>89</sup> In Powell, (ed.), 325–346, esp. 346.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CHAPTER THREE

### CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF STYLE

#### ORATIONS

E. Norden, referring to U. v. Wilamowitz, warns us against hasty conclusions about chronology based on differences of style.<sup>1</sup> This warning was justified in view of the purely statistical approach prevalent at that time. On the other hand, T. Zielinski,<sup>2</sup> in a no less biased way, subordinates genre to chronology. Considering Norden's warning, it seems to be safer to exhaust all the other possibilities before resorting to chronological explanation.<sup>3</sup> Even so, a whole series of phenomena remains for which chronology furnishes the most plausible rationale.

In order to understand what follows one should keep in mind the different periods of Cicero's development. Parzinger makes the following division: I until 66 BC, II until 60 (or 59), III until 50, IV until 43. The *cæsuras* presupposed here are quite manifest in Cicero's work. E. Laughton's<sup>4</sup> approach is similar, except that he combines P. Parzinger's first two periods into a single one.

T. Zielinski (1920) divides the orations into ten groups: I from *Pro Quinctio* to *Pro Tullio*; II the *Verrines*; III from *Pro Fonteio* to *Pro Cluentio*; IV from *De Lege Agraria* to *Pro Murena*; V from *Pro Sulla* to *Pro Flacco*; VI from *Post Reditum cum Senatui Gratias Egit* to *De Haruspicum Responsis*; VII from *Pro Sestio* to *Pro Balbo*; VIII from *In Pisonem* to *Pro Milone*; IX from *Pro Marcello* to *Pro Rege Deiotaro*; X the *Philippics*. On the whole, this division is plausible; the disadvantage that some periods (the 8th, for example) are longer than others is made up for by the fact that Zielinski lists each single oration separately.

---

<sup>1</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa*, Vol. 1, 'Nachträge' p. 4 (to Norden's p. 12); for a critical discussion of statistical methods and of chronological conclusions drawn from statistics: Ax 228-245.

<sup>2</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus.'

<sup>3</sup> This has not always been done, for instance, by Parzinger; among the brilliant exceptions are Laughton and Laurand.

<sup>4</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 32.

Whoever tries to assign common linguistic and stylistic features to certain periods should not forget that generic influences often interfere with chronological ones. Nevertheless, it is possible to trace some lines of development in Cicero's work. It is an established fact, for instance, that Cicero's early orations have in common some stylistic features which tend to disappear in his later works. Nor is there any doubt that certain elements of style are typical of his mature orations. On the other hand, the 'Atticism' of Cicero's 'Caesarian' orations has been overstated. The same is true of some attempts to separate the vocabulary of the *Philippics* from that of the other orations.<sup>5</sup>

### *Language and Style of Cicero's Early Orations*

Stylistically, the early orations form a well-defined group.<sup>6</sup> A few striking features of phonetics and morphology come to notice. In the early oration *Pro Tullio* (15. 36), we find *unae rei* ('for a single case'), which should be *uni rei* in classical Latin. However, this usage is not limited to Cicero's early period, since *aliae* appears twice in the *De Divinatione* (2. 13. 30). On the other hand, the genitive form *nulli consilii* ('of no reflection whatever') seems to be confined to the early period (*Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* 16. 48, this is an oration striving for closeness to colloquial speech; moreover, in this passage, the use of the ending *-i* is conditioned by preceding similar forms). Contracted verb-forms (such as *amarunt*) are clearly more frequent in Cicero's early orations and in the *De Inventione* than in his later works, but the use of such forms largely depends on considerations of rhythm as well.<sup>7</sup> In the *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino* (45. 131), Gellius (9. 14. 19) read the genitive form *pernicii* ('of destruction'), whereas our manuscripts have *pernicię*; in the same oration (50. 145), the genitive form *metuis* (scilicet *causa*), 'because of fear,' is transmitted, but the text is uncertain in this reading.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> On Cicero's 'late style,' see the 'Excursus' at the end of this chapter.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Löfstedt 2, 302, n. 3. The following works are still valuable (despite some exaggerations in detail): Nikl; Ernst; see esp. Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione*; Landgraf, *Rede* 5-7; Hellmuth, *De sermonis* . . . deals with the orations from 81-69 BC; Thielmann 347-463.

<sup>7</sup> Parzinger II 47-49.

<sup>8</sup> For phonetics and accidentence in the early orations cf. also Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 35-36.

We can be more confident in matters of vocabulary. Cicero uses adverbs like *perperam*, *ocius*, *porro* only or prevalently in his early orations. Another feature reminiscent of old Latin is the use of verbal compounds as synonyms for their simple forms (which Cicero would prefer later),<sup>9</sup> or, vice versa, of an unprefixated verb for the classical compound.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, we find synonyms, of which one is abandoned later,<sup>11</sup> and even a Plautine word like *cedo* ('hand it over!').<sup>12</sup> The use of *bene* and some other synonyms for 'very'<sup>13</sup> is redolent of old Latin (and colloquial) style, as is *numquidnam* ('if anyone').<sup>14</sup>

The young Cicero, in the way of colloquial<sup>15</sup> Latin, used the reflexive pronoun *se* rather freely, even in subordinate clauses not related internally to the main subject.<sup>16</sup> Preterite forms after *dum* 'while' (instead of the classical present tense) appear in Cicero's works until 63 BC.<sup>17</sup> Other features of colloquial Latin are: the use of *facere* as an auxiliary verb in paraphrases;<sup>18</sup> the construction of *esse* with *sic*;<sup>19</sup> the use of *nullus* for *non*;<sup>20</sup> and also a phrase like *id erit signi* 'this will be indicative of' (*Pro S. Roscio Amerino* 30. 83). The expressions *ad villam* and *apud villam*<sup>21</sup> for *in villa*<sup>22</sup> are old Latin as well. *Mihi ausculta* 'listen to me' (*Pro S. Roscio Amerino* 36. 104) is colloquial, as are phrases like *vetus est* 'it is an old saying' (for: *vetus verbum est*) and *non necesse habeo dicere*<sup>23</sup> 'I need not say.' *Amicissima* as a predicative to *brevitas* (*Pro Quintio* 9. 34) has a somewhat pretentious ring ('brevity, which is especially dear to me'); later on, Cicero would use *amicus* only when referring to persons.

Certain words—some of them redolent of legal or bureaucratic usage—are prominent in the earlier orations, but would gradually

<sup>9</sup> Thielmann 354–361.

<sup>10</sup> For instance, *mitto* plus infinitive in the sense of *omitto*: Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 40–41.

<sup>11</sup> Thielmann 380–393.

<sup>12</sup> Laurand 280. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* III 733, 44.

<sup>13</sup> Later Cicero stays with *valde*; cf. also Parzinger II 32–33.

<sup>14</sup> *Pro S. Roscio* 37. 107; cf. *Ad Familiares* 11. 27; *De Oratore* 2. 3. 13.

<sup>15</sup> Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 37.

<sup>16</sup> *Pro S. Roscio* 2, 6; cf. *De Inventione* 2. 2. 7.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Merguet s.v. *dum*.

<sup>18</sup> Hellmuth, *De sermonis* . . . 40–42.

<sup>19</sup> Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 38.

<sup>20</sup> Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 39.

<sup>21</sup> *Pro S. Roscio* 15. 44; *Pro Tullio* 20 and *In Verrem* II 4. 22. 48.

<sup>22</sup> *In Pisonem* 36. 89; *Pro Milone* 19. 51; *Philippicae* 1. 3. 8; 2. 17. 42; 2. 41. 104.

<sup>23</sup> Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 41.

give way to briefer and more elegant expressions. This is true of coordinating conjunctions such as: *eo quod, quemadmodum, idcirco, verumtamen, verum* (*verum* later appears only in an established formula such as *non solum—verum* or, occasionally, is used to avoid tedious repetition of *sed*). The same applies to double expressions of concessive or causal relation such as *tametsi—tamen* or *propterea quod*.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, bureaucratic repetition of the noun in a relative clause (*diam, quo die* ‘the day on which’) is more frequent in the earlier orations than in the later ones.<sup>25</sup> Such overexplicitness is reminiscent of old Latin texts, which were more directly influenced by oral speech and therefore insisted on clarity rather than brevity.

The simplest form of connecting two sentences is the repetition of a word which is important to both of them; this usage, which is very popular in old Latin,<sup>26</sup> is especially appropriate to the style of the *narratio*, which even in Cicero’s later orations is unpretentious and close to everyday language.<sup>27</sup>

In a construction like *auctore et consuasore Naevio* ‘on the initiative and advice of Naevius’ (*Pro Quinctio* 5. 18) the use of nouns is still close to old Latin usage; later Cicero prefers to express himself by means of participles.<sup>28</sup>

Alliterations<sup>29</sup> and, above all, duplications (e.g. *oro atque obsecro* ‘I beseech and implore,’ *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* 7. 20) abound in the early orations; the expression *commendare et concredere* (‘to recommend and entrust’), for example, is found only there.<sup>30</sup> Other duplications

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Wölfflin, ‘Vulgärlatein’ 137–165, esp. 142; Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 42.

<sup>25</sup> Of the 50 instances only 36 are from the orations and the *De Inventione*; only 21 of these are from the first period of Cicero’s life; in the forties this form of expression appears only once in the orations; Parzinger II 7–10.

<sup>26</sup> For instance, Cato, *De Agri Cultura*. 43. 1, but cf. also Cicero, *Pro Quinctio* 5. 22: *Itaque ex eo tempore res esse in vadimonium coepit. Cum vadimonia saepe dilata essent et cum aliquantum temporis in ea re esset consumptum neque quidquam profectum esset, venit ad vadimonium Naevius* ‘And so from that time the matter had to be settled in the courts. After several appointments had been made and adjourned, involving considerable loss of time without any result, Naevius appeared in court’ (translation: Freese). It is not by chance that this example is from a *narratio* (plain style!).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. above, Chapter Two and below, Chapter Five; see also Gotzes 23, for ‘abundant’ use of demonstrative pronouns placed after relative clauses (in the style of old Latin legal language), cf. also *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* I 197, § 3; I 205 II, line 20; Cato, *De Agri Cultura* 148. 1; Cicero, *De Re Publica* 6. 26; cf. Hofmann/Szantyr 187.

<sup>28</sup> *Philippicae* 14. 6. 16 *populo Romano idem sentiente* ‘and the Roman people agreed.’

<sup>29</sup> Laurand 123; cf. also Hofmann/Szantyr 701.

<sup>30</sup> *Pro Quinctio* 20. 62; *Pro S. Roscio* 113; cf. also *inopia et solitudo, Pro Quinctio* 1. 5;

appear in Cicero's later orations, too, but in a less stereotyped manner.<sup>31</sup> Isocolon is used in his early orations somewhat schematically as well.<sup>32</sup>

In his early orations Cicero does not yet disdain certain types of facile ornament: there are trite phrases such as *quivis potest intellegere* 'anybody can understand'<sup>33</sup> or *quem honoris causa nomino* 'whom I mention honoris causa' (later Cicero would mock at this flaccid flower of speech on the lips of Antony, *Philippicae* 2. 12. 30f.). The same is true of some types of elementary irony: here belongs the commonplace practice of sardonically calling a bad person *vir optimus* 'the best of men' (*Pro Quinctio* 4. 19) or, to quote Antony from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* 3.2, 'an honourable man;' later, Cicero's irony would become more subtle.

To be brief, Cicero's early orations exhibit some colloquial, poetic,<sup>34</sup> and legal<sup>35</sup> elements, which are sometimes difficult to differentiate, but quite clearly attest to some 'old Latin' features still alive in this period of Cicero's activity. His alleged 'Asianism' will be discussed next.

### *The Problem of a Change in Cicero's Style after his Journey to Greece and Asia*

In his *Brutus* (91. 316), Cicero tells us that during his journey to Greece (79–77 BC) he turned away from 'youthful exuberance' (*iuvenilis redundantia*, cf. also *Orator* 30. 108). However, the *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo*, which was given after that journey,<sup>36</sup> shows no trace of stylistic restraint; actually, it is the 'most Asiatic' of his orations. Since Cicero is defending an actor, he adopts stylistic features from Plautine comedy. Perhaps we should consider this oration an artistic caprice of Cicero; moreover he might have tried to conquer his rival Hortensius on his own field. Indeed, he had gained new confidence in his rhetorical skills through his studies with Molon and was in all probability

---

*Pro S. Roscio* 7. 20; *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 1. 1. 25; Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 45.

<sup>31</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa* 1, 225–231.

<sup>32</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa* 227, n. 1 on the *Pro Quinctio*; Parzinger I 68–75 examines more closely Cicero's use of *isocolon* in his orations.

<sup>33</sup> Parzinger II 24–25.

<sup>34</sup> Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 14–34.

<sup>35</sup> Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 21–22.

<sup>36</sup> The date of this oration is uncertain (66 or 76); its unusual style is conditioned by the person of Roscius and defies chronological explanation; cf. Axer, *Rosc.*

pleased to have completed his apprenticeship. With reference to Molon's efforts to restrain him, Cicero tellingly adds: *si modo id consequi potuit* 'if he was able to do so at all' (*Brutus* 91. 316). This clause, often overlooked, hints at some hidden recalcitrance of Cicero's nature. It was on delivery rather than style that Molon's teachings had an immediate effect: a less fatiguing technique made it possible for Cicero to follow his vocation without impairing his health.<sup>37</sup> On the other hand, one cannot deny that in the long run the self-control acquired from Molon had an influence on Cicero's style as well.<sup>38</sup> It is a probable guess, therefore,<sup>39</sup> that Cicero after his return first beat Hortensius at his own game and only then put into practice the stylistic teachings of Molon.<sup>40</sup> Leeman<sup>41</sup> rightly suggests that the *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* might show the influence of Cicero's teachers from Asia Minor. But why should the mature periodic style found in the *Verrines* not be a late consequence of Molon's teachings? For the mere fact that Cicero had 'matured' in Sicily<sup>42</sup> is not sufficient reason to produce a periodic style. The truth is probably more complex.<sup>43</sup> In his *Verrines*, which represent the second phase of his oratory, Cicero found his way to a style both more disciplined and more powerful. He reduced the exuberance of 'old Latin' expressions and also abandoned the 'Asiatic' (or 'Plautine') experiment of the *Pro Q.*

<sup>37</sup> Klingner 547–570.

<sup>38</sup> Haffter is justly more cautious than Klingner: Haffter, *Reise* 48–49: 'The Greek journey, however, which had been undertaken for a very practical purpose, but, as was to be expected with Cicero, would become fruitful later in many respects, had an important effect on the development of Cicero's prose-style as well' (49). Cf. also Davies, 'Molon' 303–314.

<sup>39</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa*, Vol. 1, 'Nachträge' p. 16.

<sup>40</sup> Here, Norden (*ibid.*) agrees with Hübner. Accordingly, Cicero in this oration preferred the *genus sententiosum et argutum* (*Brutus* 95. 325), whereas in the *Pro Quintio* and the *Pro S. Roscio Amerino* he had used the other 'Asiatic' *genus* (*verbis volucre atque incitatum*). For the characteristics of the 'Asiatic' style cf. also Dion. Hal., *De Orat. Ant.* 1. 2 and Quintilian, *Institutio* 12. 10. 12–26. In view of the manifold cultural opportunities offered in Rome and of the style of orators like Crassus it would be absurd to assume that Cicero had no knowledge of the 'Asiatic' style before going to Asia.

<sup>41</sup> Leeman 91–111.

<sup>42</sup> Leeman 107.

<sup>43</sup> Considering the scarcity of biographical evidence it is too venturesome to counter Cicero's explicit testimony with one's own suppositions. For example, one should not regard all his early orations as completely 'Asiatic;' actually, already in the *Pro S. Roscio* there is a variety of styles. Cf. also Nisbet, 'Speeches' 47–79, esp. 52–53.

*Roscio Comoedo*. However, this change of style does not imply a breach of continuity.<sup>44</sup> On the other hand, it would be wrong to regard all of Cicero's oratory as 'Asiatic.'<sup>45</sup> H. Haffter makes the point that old Latin duplications are used more sparingly in the *Verrines* than in the earlier orations.<sup>46</sup>

### *The Orations of the Fifties*

The orations delivered after the exile have a common theme: the dispute with Clodius. In syntax, they exhibit an astounding abundance of resources. As far as style is concerned, there is interaction between orations, poetic works, and the great rhetorical and philosophical treatises of the same period.

As for vocabulary, the negative *haud* ('not') is attested for the most part in the middle and late periods of Cicero's style.<sup>47</sup> In the orations, 13 of 17 examples date from the fifties;<sup>48</sup> in the rhetorical writings, 12 of 17 passages are found in the *De Oratore* (there is one instance more, if the *Partitiones Oratoriae* belong to the same period); significantly, *haud* is absent from Cicero's early treatise *De Inventione*. It often appears in the letters and the philosophical writings of the middle period.<sup>49</sup> In the orations it is preferably combined with the verb *scio* ('I know'), occasionally also with *dubito* 'I doubt' (*Pro Milone* 68 *dubitans*). Perhaps the frequency of *haud* at this time is indirectly linked with Cicero's interest in early Latin poetry; tellingly, in this period quotations from poets become more frequent in his orations; an example containing *haud* (with *dubitare*) is attested in the *Pro Sestio* (120). The stock phrase *haud scio an* ('perhaps') is limited to the Fifties; the only exceptions date from neighbouring periods.<sup>50</sup> Of the four<sup>51</sup> passages in exception is found in the *Pro Quinctio* (13).<sup>52</sup> Unlike his

<sup>44</sup> The correct explanation is found in Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* 13.

<sup>45</sup> Paratore, *L'oratoria*.

<sup>46</sup> Haffter, *Dichtersprache* 77–78.

<sup>47</sup> Parzinger II 35–37.

<sup>48</sup> If one includes the *Pro Flacco* (59 BC).

<sup>49</sup> In the *De Legibus*, according to Parzinger only in 7, according to Merguet (s.v. *haud* and *an*) in 8 passages.

<sup>50</sup> 70 BC (the *Verrines*) and 46 BC (the *De Marcello*).

<sup>51</sup> *Pro Sestio* 120, being a quotation, does not count here.

<sup>52</sup> *Haud mediocriter*: the passage is slightly ironical; the connotation of damage, which is explicit in Plautus, *Merator* 237, is implied by Cicero here; cf. also Cicero, *De Oratore* 2. 303 *mediocriterne . . . nocent*. The closeness to the language of comedy

practice in his orations, in his later philosophical works *haud* is used in the same ways as it was in the middle period.

The phrase *ut—ne* ('lest')<sup>53</sup> has an archaic ring; it serves to intensify a message and to convey solemnity to it. *Ut ne* occurs most frequently in the orations. It is most prominent in Cicero's early period, and again in the fifties, where it is found in orations, letters, philosophical and rhetorical writings. In Cicero's last period *ut ne* becomes rarer in the orations and the rhetorical writings (to a lesser degree also in the letters); but it is maintained in the *Philosophica*, as is the case with *haud*.

Cicero's syntax is rich and expressive in the Fifties; there are connections with the treatises written at the same time. According to Laughton, it is in the *Pro Sestio* that Cicero uses participles most frequently and with the greatest versatility.<sup>54</sup> Certain types of indirect interrogative sentences, too, are most numerous in the orations of that period.<sup>55</sup> That was the moment when Cicero, fully aware of his mastery, made a point of tackling specific technical tasks, which allowed him to expand his expressive potential in the field of syntax.

In the well-rounded periods written by Cicero in the Fifties E. Paratore<sup>56</sup> discovers greater perfection and concentration than in his earlier works. In the orations of that epoch a type of antithesis, in which a word is prepared asyndetically by its negated opposite (e.g. *non semel, sed bis* 'not once, but twice') is a particular favourite.<sup>57</sup> The same phenomenon appears in the *De Oratore* at the same time.

A statement of P. Parzinger's,<sup>58</sup> however, needs modification. In his view, lavish use of a certain type of litotes<sup>59</sup> is typical of Cicero's style in the fifties. A closer look at the relevant passages shows, however, that the frequency of this figure of speech in the fifties is not typical of all the works written at that time, but only of the *De*

---

may be intentional here (cf. also the use of *hercule*), but Cicero does not refer to a definite passage.

<sup>53</sup> Parzinger II 1–4.

<sup>54</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 23; a very typical example is *Pro Sestio* 55. 118.

<sup>55</sup> To a great extent this is owing to the *Interrogatio in Vatinius*, which is composed with particular care; cf. Zielinski's tables (Zielinski, 'Rhythmus').

<sup>56</sup> Paratore, *L'oratoria*; for a critical view of Cicero's mature period, see Johnson, *passim*.

<sup>57</sup> Parzinger I 12.

<sup>58</sup> Parzinger I 16.

<sup>59</sup> Litotes: a figure of speech, in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of the contrary (*OED*).

*Oratore*. In Cicero's last working period the same figure of speech is attested most abundantly in the *Brutus*; in his first period, in the *De Inventione*. Therefore, what we have here is not a characteristic of the Fifties, but of the rhetorical writings.

Furthermore, Cicero's poetic productivity in the Fifties might have influenced his use of alliteration in his prose writings, and, in fact, in the orations delivered between 56 and 52 quotations from poets are more prominent than in other orations. This is especially true of the *In Pisonem* and the *Pro Sestio*, where Cicero explicitly apologizes for that feature (*Pro Sestio* 55. 119); perhaps at that time his style was influenced by preparatory readings for his *De Oratore*.<sup>60</sup> The unique position of the orations made in the Fifties is also shown in other minor features. In the same years, abundant use of recent historical examples and genealogical references<sup>61</sup> might reflect Cicero's reading the *Annalis liber* of his friend Atticus.<sup>62</sup>

In those years of violent conflicts and discussions the dividing line between legal and political orations is often blurred. In both types there is an increase in number of sarcastic expressions caused by Cicero's exile and of lofty passages inspired by the memory of his consulship. The pleas made after his return, which are more aggressive in style than the *Verrines*, pave the way for the *Philippics* in many respects. At that time, Cicero deliberately cultivated a new urbanity, to soften the violence of the political debate. Irony and emotional appeal seem to be toned down by humour and gentle feelings (*ethos*).<sup>63</sup> Even less than in any other period are individual orations limited to a single stylistic level ('high,' 'middle,' or 'plain'). The 'vehemens-style,' detected by E. Werner<sup>64</sup> in the *In Pisonem*, perfectly fits the combative situation of those years.

#### *An Exceptional Position for the Caesarian Orations?*

Did Cicero, in order to please the dictator, adopt a neo-Attic style in the three orations he delivered before Caesar? This somewhat

<sup>60</sup> Zillinger, *Cicero* 68; North 1–33.

<sup>61</sup> Schoenberger, *Quellen* 47–49.

<sup>62</sup> On the prose-rhythm of *Oratio Post Reditum in Senatu habita*, *Post Reditum ad Quirites*, *Pro Sestio*, and *Pro Caelio*, cf. Primmer, *Cicero numerosus*.

<sup>63</sup> Haury 144–174.

<sup>64</sup> Werner 8.

paradoxical idea of the great Wilamowitz<sup>65</sup> was elaborated diligently by K. Guttman in a dissertation.<sup>66</sup> However, as was shown by J. Skrbinišek,<sup>67</sup> neither did Cicero limit himself to using ‘plain style’ here nor was Caesar a follower of the neo-Attic style in his own orations. It is true that, especially in some passages of the *Pro Deiotaro*, Cicero’s style is not pompous, because there was only a single judge to be persuaded.<sup>68</sup> The *De Marcello*, on the other hand, is a largely epideictic oration delivered before the Senate and, accordingly, exhibits an especially ornate style. As a rule, stylistic differences in Cicero’s work are conditioned by his varying audiences and by rhetorical aims rather than by schools of rhetoric.

#### *Old Latin and Colloquial Elements Reduced to Functional Use*

These are some ‘old Latin’<sup>69</sup> words found in Cicero’s early orations, followed by the synonyms preferred in his later works:<sup>70</sup> *abs te* (*a te*); *verum* (*sed*), *quemadmodum* (*ut*); *propterea quod* (*quod*); *tametsi—tamen* (*quamquam—tamen*); *propter* (= *prope*); *ad* (= *in*); *necessitudo* (*necessitas*); *tempestas* (= *tempus*); *pessumdare* (*perdere*); *missum facere* (*omittere*) and similar constructions of *facere*; *fugitare* (*fugere*); *apisci* (*adipisci*); *certatio* (*certamen*); *adsentio* (*adsentior*); *amentia* (*dementia*); *hoc est* (*id est*); *atque adeo* (*vel dicam, sive etiam*); *cum primis* (*imprimis*); *seu potius* and *ac potius* (*vel potius* and *aut potius*); *idcirco, quocirca, quapropter* (*igitur, ergo*); *pertimesco* (*extimesco*); *seu* (*sive*); *humaniter* (*humane*); *ilico* (*statim*); *circa* (*circum*); on the other hand, *quocirca* is found only in the middle and late period.

There is a gradual decrease in number of adjectives and adverbs with *per-* in Cicero’s orations:<sup>71</sup> Tellingly, 170 passages are from legal orations, 25 from orations delivered before the Senate, ten from orations delivered before the people. However, since legal orations are more numerous in Cicero’s early period than later, the statistics

<sup>65</sup> Wilamowitz, ‘Thukydideslegende’ 332; defended by Johnson; see now Gotoff, *Commentary*.

<sup>66</sup> Guttman, *passim*.

<sup>67</sup> Skrbinišek, *passim*.

<sup>68</sup> Laurand 346.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. here Parzinger *passim*, esp. II 26–49.

<sup>70</sup> Some of them appear in Cicero’s early or middle period along with the old Latin synonyms. For *amentia/dementia* the generic explanation (above, p. 30) is clearly preferable.

<sup>71</sup> Parzinger II 46.

reflect not exclusively a diachronic development of style, but also a generic difference. Even so, the relative decrease in number of such compounds cannot be disputed (all the more since it is also observed in the letters); only the decrease is in reality less marked than the statistics seem to suggest.<sup>72</sup>

Other observations of Parzinger's are blurred by the fact that he does not interpret his statistics, which is a step backward as compared to Laurand. For instance, his observations concerning the use of diminutives in Cicero's orations<sup>73</sup> are, it can be said, chronologically irrelevant, since the use of such expressions largely depends on the subject matter. The greatest number (51) of diminutives is found in the *Verrines*, whereas there are only five of them in orations delivered before the people, 39 in orations delivered before the Senate (twelve of these in the *In Pisonem*), and 156 in legal orations. Under these circumstances, Parzinger's table, showing the chronology of this usage, is of questionable value. The decrease in the orations of the 'fourth' period (that is to say after 50 BC) corresponds to the decrease in the number of orations delivered before the courts in this period.

On the whole, Cicero's attitude to diminutives, far from being merely conditioned by time,<sup>74</sup> develops from a somewhat less deliberate use in the early orations to a more conscious and more refined use, as found for instance in the *Pro Flacco* and the *Pro Caelio*.<sup>75</sup>

In the domain of style, explanatory *conduplicatio* is replaced in Cicero's later period by *et quidem* and similar expressions,<sup>76</sup> in conformity with his increasing infatuation with *quidem*.<sup>77</sup> The replacement of other relatively heavy constructions with more elegant ones has been discussed earlier.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Refined: Laurand 271–277, who takes account of the peculiar nature of each word; older: Lochmüller 6–11.

<sup>73</sup> Parzinger II 45.

<sup>74</sup> Parzinger II 45.

<sup>75</sup> Laurand 3, 270.

<sup>76</sup> Parzinger I 67–68.

<sup>77</sup> Grossmann.

<sup>78</sup> See above, p. 85.

*Functional Use of Colloquial Elements in the Later Orations*

More and more it appears that a purely chronological interpretation of statistics is not completely satisfactory, and that the context and the literary genre require due attention. It is true that, generally, Cicero's purism increases, but there are generic differences: some archaisms, for instance, continue to play a major part in the philosophical writings.<sup>79</sup> In many cases, it is only from the orations that colloquial features disappear.<sup>80</sup> Even here, however, they are not completely lacking. Only, Cicero employs them more deliberately and for special purposes, above all, to give his speech a natural ring.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, even in his later working periods, passages redolent of invective or satire abound in colloquial (and Greek) elements.<sup>82</sup>

*Refinement of Syntax and Style*

Particles are justly considered 'the most mobile elements of the language.'<sup>83</sup> Some of them establish connections with the preceding sentence (this is the normal case); others prepare the way for what is to come. The latter is a more sophisticated type of connection, which becomes more frequent in Cicero's later years. Now, *quidem* ('it is true that') is a signal qualifying the importance of what follows immediately in favour of arguments to be mentioned later. It is therefore a hallmark of a refinement of style which is typical of Cicero's later period.<sup>84</sup>

In the course of Cicero's life the use of predicative present participles increases considerably.<sup>85</sup> In his later period, 'adverbial' usage of the participle is developed into interesting new types, among which the quasi-causal use excels by its subtlety.<sup>86</sup> On the other hand, there

<sup>79</sup> *Reapse, sepse, suapte, suopte, summe sanus, usque eo, verum, saepenumero, belle, festive, rebar*: Parzinger II 28–29.

<sup>80</sup> For instance, *abs te* and *ac potius* persist in the letters somewhat longer than in the orations, cf. Parzinger II 58–60 and 34.

<sup>81</sup> Laurand 264.

<sup>82</sup> Laurand 277–283 on *Pro Milone* 22. 60; *Pro Murena* 10. 23–13. 28; *Pro Sestio* 51. 110; *In Pisonem* 6. 13.

<sup>83</sup> Jordan 275.

<sup>84</sup> On the subject of anticipatory incompleteness in syntax cf. Mendell 141–190.

<sup>85</sup> For Cicero's increasing mastery in the use of participles cf. Laughton, *Participle, passim*, esp. 136–139.

<sup>86</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 45.

is some decline in the use of the *ablativus absolutus*<sup>87</sup> in the treatises, not, however, in the orations and letters. Stylistically, the *ablativus absolutus* is less flexible than the *participium coniunctum* (especially when connected with the subject of the sentence, a construction favoured by Cicero in his last period). The same preference for the more flexible construction appears in the relative (though not absolute) increase in number of gerundives and the slight decrease of gerunds in Cicero.<sup>88</sup>

The same applies to isocolon, a stylistic feature used, perhaps, too much by Cicero in his youth.<sup>89</sup> But already in the *Verrines* symmetry is put into the service of a more rigorous intellectual approach. On this path, the *Pro Milone* is a milestone.<sup>90</sup> No longer is there a contrast between symmetry of form and poverty of content.

Interrogative sentences occur more often in the later writings than in the earlier ones, another fact indicative of the ever increasing liveliness of Cicero's sentence construction,<sup>91</sup> although some types of interrogative sentences are rarer in the last period of his life. Generic differences also play their part: subordinate interrogative clauses are found most frequently in the rhetorical writings and least of all in the orations, whereas the letters and the philosophical writings hold a middle position in this regard.

Similarly, the so-called 'Law of Behaghel'—to be precise, not a law, but the stylistic principle of placing the longer element after the shorter one—is followed more schematically in the early orations than in the later ones, as Lindholm has shown on the example of *optimus et nobilissimus*.<sup>92</sup> To such increase in sophistication and decrease in scrupulous symmetry there corresponds also the growing importance of parentheses.<sup>93</sup> In the orations of the first period there are few of them, in those of the middle period they appear with some regularity. They are especially frequent in the great orations of that period (*Pro Cluentio*, *De Domo Sua*, *Pro Sestio*). The largest number of parentheses is found in the orations of Cicero's last years. The same

<sup>87</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 104.

<sup>88</sup> Snellman.

<sup>89</sup> For instance, *Pro Quinctio* 31. 95; cf. Norden, *Kunstprosa* 226–231.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. also Parzinger I 68–75.

<sup>91</sup> Parzinger II 17–21; Gutsche.

<sup>92</sup> Lindholm 127ff.; Hofmann/Szantyr 725.

<sup>93</sup> Roschatt 189–244.

is true of the rhetorical and philosophical writings. Another typical example of stylistic sophistication is Cicero's growing preference for a feature like *quamvis felix sit, sicut est*: 'happy as he may be (and he really is).'<sup>94</sup> Here, a state of affairs is first regarded as hypothetical, then confirmed as real. Such abrupt changes of viewpoint can produce strong ironical effects. The quoted example has a precedent in Demosthenes,<sup>95</sup> a proof of the relevance of Demosthenes to an aging Cicero even in matters of style.

Further evidence of an ever maturing mastery of style is Cicero's increasing predilection for certain paratactic types of word-order and certain forms of *adnominatio* and *geminatio*.<sup>96</sup> The figure of *occultatio* (a convenient means of introducing material which could not withstand closer examination, and of putting forward a statement without having to prove it) appears more often in the later orations; this is not only owing to the fact that the *In Pisonem* and the *Philippicae* belong to the later orations, but also to Cicero's growing skill.<sup>97</sup> Similarly, in the orations play on words becomes rarer,<sup>98</sup> irony and wit become subtler.<sup>99</sup> Finally, Cicero over time contrives to shape each single sentence into a process of persuasion.<sup>100</sup> Generally, he follows more and more in detail the principles of appropriateness (*aptum*) and convenience (*utile*).

### *Refinement of Rhythm*

In Cicero's orations, prose rhythm took a clear development. Here Laurand, for all his merits in this field of investigation, has not done justice to Zielinski's work; in point of fact, Zielinski's second study is more reliable than his first one, since the author now considers the endings of each single sentence and colon.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>94</sup> Parzinger II 23–24.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Albrecht, *Parenthese* 190; cf. *ibid.* 22.

<sup>96</sup> Parzinger I 75.

<sup>97</sup> Usher 175–192.

<sup>98</sup> For its popularity in *Pro S. Roscio*, see Holst 90–95.

<sup>99</sup> Laurand 254; Haury 110–218.

<sup>100</sup> For instance, *Pro Milone* 4; Neumeister 164–168.

<sup>101</sup> On the significance of Zielinski's investigations see, for instance, Hubbell. Not even Primmer, *Cicero numerosus*, has fully replaced Zielinski. Aumont opened new avenues for research on prose rhythm.

An important result of Zielinski's earlier publication<sup>102</sup> was the change in the proportion of what he calls 'clausula 2' (- ∪ - / - ∪ -) to what he calls 'clausula 2' (**bold**) (- - - / - ∪ -), i. e. of the 'lighter' type *cessit audaciae* to the 'heavier' type *credatis postulo*. In Cicero's early orations there is a slight preponderance of the heavy basic form, whereas from the year of Cicero's consulate the proportion changes in favour of the light form.<sup>103</sup> Thus there is increasing refinement even in the field of rhythm. In his second study Zielinski<sup>104</sup> confirms that Cicero gradually came to prefer the more pleasing *clausulae*. Not that he pushed the less elegant types from the ending to the middle of the sentence, rather that he favoured the more elegant varieties everywhere. This development took place relatively quickly during his formative years. For *clausulae* of periods, the culminating point is already reached in his 'democratic' orations (Zielinski's period III); for sentence endings this happens not before the consular orations (his period IV) and for the cola, not before the post-consular orations (his period V). With slight deviations Cicero maintains this high level up to the end of his life.<sup>105</sup>

The use of patch-words in order to achieve a *clausula* is manifest in some relatively early orations cf. e.g. *In Verrem* II; 5. 58. 149 *spoliati dicerentur* instead of *essent*; *Pro S. Roscio Amerino* 53. 153 *perventuram putetis* instead of *perventura sit* (in the same paragraph also the notorious *esse videatur*); *De Lege Manilia* 10. 27 *dicendum esse videatur* instead of *dicendum sit*. On the other hand, one can later observe that a mature Cicero tries to avoid facile ornament, by placing, for instance, an empty formula like *esse videatur* not at the end, but in the middle of the sentence (*Pro Rabirio Postumo* 1).<sup>106</sup> An inconspicuous technical means to achieve a more pleasing rhythm is an ever increasing use of *-que* and *atque* in *clausula*.<sup>107</sup> All this is indicative of Cicero's growing ability to conceal his art.

<sup>102</sup> Zielinski, 'Clauselgesetz' 591-844.

<sup>103</sup> In 63 BC is 2: 2 = 1, 24; to the exile 1, 62; after the exile 1, 88; to the *Pro Balbo* again 1, 46; to the *Pro Milone* 1, 46 as well; in the Caesarian period 2, 3; in the *Philippicae* 3, 2.

<sup>104</sup> Zielinski, 'Rhythmus.'

<sup>105</sup> Cf. pp. 23ff.; on the details of Cicero's progressive neglect of 'clausula V 2' see Zielinski, 'Rhythmus' 70-73.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Parzinger II 52-53; Laurand 186-192.

<sup>107</sup> Laurand 186; Wolff 633-640. On the heroic *clausula* cf. above, p. 14.

*Cicero's 'Late Style'*

It is Cicero's early style that we know best, but the language and style of his later orations have been studied as well. Hauschild's<sup>108</sup> attempt at identifying a 'special character' of the vocabulary of the *Philippicae* has been refuted by Laurand<sup>109</sup> in the main; nonetheless, there remain several features typical of Cicero's late style: in the vocabulary there are a few more or less subconscious elements, such as the striking frequency of *quidem, sed* (instead of *verum*) and *etsi* ('however').<sup>110</sup> The same applies to *cerno* ('I realize'), which also becomes more and more frequent in the orations and to some degree outshines more common synonyms like *animadverto*.<sup>111</sup> In this case, a more colourful word, which also plays a role in old Latin, is on the increase in the style of Cicero's late years. Although such instances would become more and more numerous in Silver Latin, it would be an overstatement, should we deduce from such phenomena a general return of Cicero to old Latin colourfulness. On the contrary, an aging Cicero often prefers less striking expressions:<sup>112</sup> the calm precision of *id est* (for the slightly more emphatic *hoc est* which he used earlier) fits Cicero's urbane style in his mature orations. A parallel case is the replacement of forceful expressions such as *atque adeo* (= *vel potius, 'or rather'*) with more subjective and therefore less offensive expressions such as *vel dicam; vel si mavis; sive etiam; vel etiam (si vis); vel ut verius dicam* ('or should I say;' 'or, if you prefer,' 'or also;' 'or also, if you like;' or, to use a better word').<sup>113</sup>

The *ablativus comparationis* differs from the equivalent construction with *quam* in brevity and precision. In his later works, Cicero applies this type of ablative more and more, a development found in the philosophical writings and, to some extent, even in the orations,<sup>114</sup> although here *quam* is used in general. The appearance of ellipses with *nihil* and *quid* in orations of his last two working periods is a

<sup>108</sup> Hauschild 235–305; Hauschild has found a defender in Johnson, who knows his name through Lafaye (as their unanimous misspelling of Hauschild's name proves).

<sup>109</sup> Laurand 332–342; for an appraisal of Cicero's late style, see Johnson, *passim* (cf. below, Excursus to this Chapter, pp. 122f.).

<sup>110</sup> See p. 108.

<sup>111</sup> Parzinger II 37–38.

<sup>112</sup> Parzinger II 53–57.

<sup>113</sup> Parzinger II 34–35.

<sup>114</sup> Parzinger II 14–15.

further mark of the achievement in conciseness in the late phase of Cicero's style.<sup>115</sup> Power and precision are increasingly obtained through geminations such as *iam iam*,<sup>116</sup> adnominations of the type *facit et fecit*,<sup>117</sup> and certain types of 'juxtaposition of words'.<sup>118</sup>

Other observations suggest a fuller control of rhetorical exuberance in Cicero's old age: an example is *anaphora*, which after having been used by Cicero more abundantly than by any other Roman author, seems to appear less frequently in the works of his old age.<sup>119</sup>

During (Laughton's) first two periods of Cicero's work (I = before the exile, II = before the civil war) participles in 'concomitant use' appear frequently in the nominative and in the oblique cases, whereas, in the third period (47–43 BC) the nominative (which had been predominant before Cicero's time) becomes more frequent again: after times of experiment Cicero in all literary genres returns to a more familiar mode of expression.<sup>120</sup>

The same is to be observed in the domain of word-order: if placed after its noun, the possessive can be separated from it. Cicero increasingly uses this artificial type of word order up through the *Caesarian Orations*, where a culmination is reached; in the *Philippicae* he reverts to his earlier style.<sup>121</sup> Such striving for a more natural word-order may be due to the special character of the last-mentioned orations. Certain types of hyperbaton (*aeque vita iucunda* 'a life equally pleasant') diminish in the later orations as well.<sup>122</sup> Even rhythm is slightly different in the *Philippicae*; although the clauses are the same as in the other orations, the sentence construction is more choppy, less periodical than in the other works. The combative context is matched by a more lively rhythm. In some places Laurand finds a rough energy, to which we are not accustomed in Cicero,<sup>123</sup> a fact, however,

<sup>115</sup> Parzinger II 13–14; 'economy' in Cicero's late orations is especially stressed by Johnson.

<sup>116</sup> Parzinger I 62–65.

<sup>117</sup> Parzinger I 26–37.

<sup>118</sup> *Ad senem senex de senectute*, *Lael.* 1. 5; Parzinger I 37–57.

<sup>119</sup> Donnermann 498.

<sup>120</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 33.

<sup>121</sup> Menk.

<sup>122</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 410; Löfstedt 2, 397.

<sup>123</sup> *Nos ad civem mittimus, ne imperatorem populi Romani, ne exercitum, ne coloniam circumsedeat, ne oppugnet, ne agros depopuletur, ne sit hostis?* (*Philippicae* 5. 10. 27) 'Are we sending to a fellow-citizen to bid him cease from besieging, from attacking a general, an army, a colony of the Roman people, from wasting its territory, from being

not exclusively due to chronological factors, but also to the situation and theme of the *Philippicae*.<sup>124</sup> The close relationship of the *Philippicae*, especially of the second, to Demosthenian *veritas* and *severitas*, harmonizes with the high esteem of Demosthenes expressed in the *Orator*.<sup>125</sup> Generally, comments on Demosthenes accumulate in Cicero's later period.<sup>126</sup>

To be brief, the following features seem to be typical of Cicero's practice in his late orations:<sup>127</sup> a general increase in purism, suppression of showy ornament, strength and transparency instead of abundance.<sup>128</sup>

### PHILOSOPHICAL TREATISES

Cicero wrote philosophical treatises in two distinct periods of his life; in the earlier, philosophy is still closely connected with political and rhetorical practice; in the later, it is an end in itself. Differences conditioned by subject matter and artistic genre make it difficult to draw conclusions as to a 'development of style.' The language of the philosophical treatises was to some extent subject to changes similar to those in the language of the other works. Even in the philosophical writings, technical terms are relatively less frequent than Greek borrowings referring to culture and everyday life. However, Cicero's terminology<sup>129</sup> is less puristic in the domain of philosophy than in that of rhetoric. Yet, Cicero in his treatises does not borrow as freely from Greek vocabulary as he does in his letters. Although he replaced Greek terms with more suitable Latin substitutes, as his career advanced, the gradual infiltration of Greek civilization in Rome made

---

our enemy?'; *negat hoc D. Brutus imperator, consul designatus, natus rei publicae civis, negat Gallia, negat cuncta Italia, negat senatus, negatis vos* (*Philippicae* 4. 4. 9) 'This consulship Decimus Brutus, commander, consul elect, a citizen born to serve the State, denies; Gaul denies it; all Italy denies it; the Senate denies it; you deny it' (Translations: Ker).

<sup>124</sup> Laurand 341.

<sup>125</sup> *Orator* 7. 23; 8. 26ff.; 31. 111.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Orelli/Baier.

<sup>127</sup> Laurand 2, 304.

<sup>128</sup> Büchner, *Cicero* 523, including the socio-psychological elements, speaks of: 'the later style, fully concentrated on the subject, aiming at conciseness . . . , as Cicero now deemed it appropriate in a public oration.'

<sup>129</sup> Oksala 132-152.

it increasingly necessary to adopt Greek words. The linguistic development within the rhetorical and the philosophical writings thus reflects antagonism between the progressive Hellenization of Roman life on the one hand and Cicero's growing control of the Latin language in his search of purity on the other.

In the field of style, too, the development in the philosophical writings is to some degree analogous to that found in the other works; an example is the use of antithesis, which is more frequent in the *De Re Publica*<sup>130</sup> than in the later philosophical writings. The same applies to figures of the type *non natura, sed studio* ('not by nature, but by study').<sup>131</sup> In the last period a certain type of *adnominatio*<sup>132</sup> examined by Parzinger increases in number in the philosophical writings and even more so in Cicero's other works. Parallel phenomena are: a more frequent use of 'parataxis of words',<sup>133</sup> of the *ablativus comparationis*<sup>134</sup> and of interrogative sentences.<sup>135</sup> The increase of *cerno* ('I realize'), which can be found in other works, too, is especially manifest in the later philosophical writings.<sup>136</sup>

In other cases the development within the *Philosophica* differs from the general development: the statistics of *ut ne* show an increase in usage in the philosophical writings, and a decrease in the other works of the last period.<sup>137</sup> Parzinger explains this phenomenon by the numerous echoes of old laws in the *De Legibus* (a work which, however, does not belong to the last period). Rather Cicero uses *ut ne* in his philosophical writings to make logical relationships more explicit; a parallel case is the reappearance of *propterea quod* in the later philosophical writings, not in the orations. The same explanation applies to the phrase *hoc est* which, while decreasing in usage in all the other genres, appears in the philosophical writings only in the last period. Additional reasons are variation (to avoid repetition of *id est*) and elegance (as seen in the use of *haud* in the philosophical writings of the last period, while it is lacking in the orations).

---

<sup>130</sup> Parzinger I 10–13.

<sup>131</sup> Parzinger I 18–25.

<sup>132</sup> Parzinger I 26–37.

<sup>133</sup> Parzinger I 37–57.

<sup>134</sup> Parzinger II 14–15.

<sup>135</sup> Parzinger II 17–21.

<sup>136</sup> Parzinger II 37–38.

<sup>137</sup> Parzinger II 4.

Nor should external influences on style be neglected: after the death of his daughter, Cicero temporarily changed from philosophical dialogue to soliloquy and wrote a consolation for himself. Moreover, one should not forget that not all his works were written with the same care, although generalizations should be avoided here: actually, not all the writings of the last period are worked out less meticulously than those of the middle period.<sup>138</sup> On the whole, as far as the philosophical writings are concerned, a chronological approach seems to be less rewarding than studies of stylistic differences within single works (see Chapter Two).

### RHETORICAL TREATISES

We have rhetorical writings from three different periods: The *De Inventione* dates from Cicero's early years; the *De Oratore*<sup>139</sup> was written between 55–51 BC; finally, from 46 BC onward, the *Brutus* and other works followed.

In the chronological development of Cicero's style there are parallels between the rhetorical writings and the orations. Stylistically, the *De Inventione* is in several respects similar to the orations written at the same time.<sup>140</sup> Certain words and phrases are characteristic of the *De Inventione*; examples are *nuperrime* ('quite recently,' a hapax legomenon in Cicero)<sup>141</sup> and *tum—tum* ('now—now'), which in his later works becomes rarer.<sup>142</sup> Typical of the *De Inventione* is also the anastrophe *qua de, quo de (agitur etc.)*.<sup>143</sup> In the prose rhythm of the *De Inventione* a marked preference for the ('Asiatic') dichoree (the double trochee: — ∪ — ∪) is found; later, Cicero would warn his readers against an excessive use of this rhythm.<sup>144</sup>

E. Ströbel<sup>145</sup> lists some features which the *De Inventione* shares with the early orations: on the one hand, there are traces of negligence:

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Stroux about the *Academica* above, p. 89.

<sup>139</sup> On the probable date of the *Partitiones Oratoriae*, see Schanz/Hosius 1, 463.

<sup>140</sup> Refer particularly to Thielmann; Ströbel.

<sup>141</sup> Influence of his teacher; cf. the occurrence of this word in the *Ad Herennium*.  
<sup>142</sup> Parzinger II 33–34.

<sup>143</sup> Cf. Parzinger II 5–6.

<sup>144</sup> *Orator* 63. 213–214; De Groot, *Prosarhythmus* 1, table p. 107; De Groot, *Prose* 3–4.

<sup>145</sup> Ströbel 9–10.

the author repeats certain words without rhetorical effect and even with different meaning, nor does he avoid monotony in the domain of sentence connection (striking *quare* and *quodsi*). On the other hand, there is variation: *brevi* / *breviter*; *in praesenti* / *in praesentia*; *necessarie* / *-o*; *false* / *-o*; *quicum* / *quocum*; change of singular and plural, verbal compounds and their simple forms, active and passive, present and future tense (*si erit . . . est*), indicative and subjunctive, *ille* and *is*. Rhetorical devices, such as *litotes*,<sup>146</sup> are used lavishly. The profusion of words borders on pleonasm, and, for the sake of concinnity, the same idea is repeated in different words.

Conversely, in Cicero's later rhetorical writings the number of parentheses increases, partly in order to achieve clarity, partly to avoid the stiffness of strictly symmetrical arrangement.<sup>147</sup>

A common feature of the *De Oratore* (and also the *De Re Publica*) and the orations of the same period<sup>148</sup> is the use of a certain type of antithesis, in which an idea is preceded—and emphasized—by the negation of its opposite, for instance: *non opinari, sed scire* 'not to guess, but to know.' The tense political atmosphere after his exile might have encouraged Cicero to use this pointed type of expression.

The later rhetorical writings chime with the later orations in the repetitive use of *quidem*.<sup>149</sup> A comparative approach to the *De Inventione* and the *Orator*<sup>150</sup> throws into relief some differences between the early and the late period: in proportion to the length of the texts, *sed* is five times as frequent in the later works; often, it is no more than a connecting particle.<sup>151</sup>

Differences between the *De Oratore* and the *Orator* are more difficult to grasp. But there is definitely a shift of focus, comparable to the change in Cicero's orations from the 'grand' style of the middle epoch to the harsh 'matter-of-fact' style of the *Philippics*. The *genus grande* is pivotal in the *De Oratore*, whereas in the *Orator* the ideal

<sup>146</sup> Ströbel 8–9.

<sup>147</sup> Roschatt 207.

<sup>148</sup> Parzinger I 13.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. pp. 107f.

<sup>150</sup> Laurand 2, 308–309.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. the following transitions: *Inu.*: *nunc de narratione . . . dicendum videtur* 1. 19. 28; *nunc deinceps ratiocinationis vim et naturam consideremus* 1. 33. 57; *nunc ab coniecturali constitutione proficiscemur* 2. 4. 14; *Orator*: *sed iam forma ipsa restat* 39. 134; *sed sententiarum ornamenta maiora sunt* 39. 136; *sed haec nisi collocata* 41. 140. *Nunc* indicates the transition to a new action of the author, *sed* the transition to a new subject.

orator is described as a man able to express himself perfectly in the three styles.<sup>152</sup> It was the quarrel with the young defenders of Attic style that caused this change.<sup>153</sup> Furthermore, in the *Orator*, Cicero gives more prominence to *convenientia* ('congruency') as a criterion for the use of the three kinds of style. Numerous parallels between the *Orator* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Demosthenis vi dicendi*) may be owing to a common source.<sup>154</sup> In any case, if renderings of technical terms are much more precise in the *Orator* than in the *De Oratore*, this is not only due to the special character of these two works, but part of a general development within the treatises.<sup>155</sup>

### LETTERS

The letters which have survived date from a shorter period of time than the orations. The oldest letter we have was written in 68 BC. It is precisely in the letters that Cicero's style is especially rich and varied, which makes it difficult to trace a continuous line of development.

Relatively homogenous are the letters to Atticus. A comparison of an earlier with a later group shows on the one hand a decrease in the use of *abs te*, *propterea quod*, *quemadmodum*, *nobismetipsis*, *tametsi*, *verum* and on the other hand an increase of *quidem*, *equidem*, *sed*, and *etsi* ('however,' as in the later orations).<sup>156</sup> Ellipses are used with more freedom,<sup>157</sup> the tone becomes even more spontaneous (the early letter 5. 2 sounds rather ceremonious; the author, of course, is dealing with a quite delicate affair).<sup>158</sup> Consequently, the ardent *geminatio: etiam atque etiam*, which is typical of the genre, is spreading steadily within the letters.<sup>159</sup>

In the letters, Cicero's vocabulary develops along similar lines as in his other works. The use of adjectives and adverbs with *per-*

<sup>152</sup> Cf. also the allusion in *De Oratore*. 3. 55. 212.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Barwick.

<sup>154</sup> Probably Caecilius of Calacte, see Nassal; on the development of Cicero's theory of style cf. also Douglas, 'Theory' 18-26.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. here Linderbauer; Parzinger II 49-51; Laurand 75-91; more detailed Oksala 110-123.

<sup>156</sup> Group I: *Att.* 1. 1-11; group II: 16. 7-15.

<sup>157</sup> Heidemann.

<sup>158</sup> Laurand, *Cicéron* 2, 2nd edn. 304-307 and Laurand, 'L'évolution' 62-72.

<sup>159</sup> Parzinger I 64.

increases considerably and decreases again in the course of his life.<sup>160</sup> It is interesting that these compounds become slightly rarer over time even in the letters, though not to the same extent as in the orations. Along with chronology, genre should be taken into account: in letters of recommendation (as found in the 8th Book of the *Ad Familiares*), such compounds are understandably quite frequent, whereas the *Letters to Brutus*, which follow higher stylistic standards, provide only one example. Another parallel development to the orations is to be observed in the use of *adnominatio* (of the type *esse et fuisse*).<sup>161</sup> Finally, in his letters, Cicero shows from the middle to his last period a growing preference for the nominative use of the *participium coniunctum*,<sup>162</sup> a development observed in all of his writings.

The style of Cicero's letters is very much subject to external influences and transitory moods. Here are two examples: there are no Greek words in the letters to Atticus from Cicero's exile and after the death of his daughter (Books 3 and 12).<sup>163</sup> Moreover, during Cicero's exile, his letters are written rather negligently, whereas after Tullia's death they take on a solemn ring.

### POETRY

The development of Cicero's poetic language can be compared with the development of his prose language, since it shows a similar tendency. Even in his poetic works archaisms are not numerous, and nearly all of them are found in the first period of his poetic production, in his translation of the *Phaenomena*. A typical example is the elision of final *-s* (on the revival of the final *-s* in upper-class pronunciation in Cicero's lifetime: *Orator* 48. 161): as far as archaisms in language are concerned, Cicero follows the authority of Ennius.<sup>164</sup> However, in matters of style and composition, Cicero is a pioneer and an innovator even in poetry,<sup>165</sup> though anything but a follower of Catullus' 'modern' style. When comparing Cicero's early poem,

<sup>160</sup> Parzinger II 46.

<sup>161</sup> Parzinger I 26–37.

<sup>162</sup> Laughton 32–33.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Marouzeau, *Traité* 161–162.

<sup>164</sup> Details in Traglia, *Lingua* 95–110.

<sup>165</sup> Traglia, *Lingua*, *passim*.

the *Phaenomena*, with the poems written in the Fifties,<sup>166</sup> Traglia observed an increase in stylistic richness, freedom, and maturity.

In other respects, the evolution of Cicero's poetic style takes the opposite direction to the development of his prose style. The use of the present participle, for example, is constantly expanding in his prose,<sup>167</sup> whereas it considerably declines in his poetry.<sup>168</sup> This difference may be owing to the traditions of the language of Latin poetry. Quite unlike archaic prose writers, early Latin poets, especially Ennius, showed a preference for present participles. This is even true of Cicero's *Phaenomena*, which in many respects pays tribute to Ennius. In the course of Cicero's poetic career, then, the use of present participles (in predicative constructions) declines, a tendency bound to continue in Augustan poetry.

### CONCLUSION

The development of Cicero's style is subject both to external influences and to personal preferences. To begin with external influences, the style of Cicero's Letters becomes more negligent during his exile, whereas after his daughter's death solemnity gains ground. In his philosophical writings the death of Tullia causes a shift from dialogue to soliloquy (Cicero addresses a *consolatio* to himself).

Especially in the Fifties Cicero cultivated several literary genres simultaneously. The result was a fruitful interaction among poems, orations, and philosophical writings on the level of style.

The style of Cicero's letters is often influenced by his correspondents. Cicero adopts from them some expressions which he does not use elsewhere. Similarly, in the *De Inventione*, his vocabulary reflects that of his teacher. Further research might clarify to what degree the style of Cicero is subject to external influences; for example, his rivalry with Hortensius in his early years is an established fact. As for his philosophical writings, their dependence on Greek sources has sometimes been exaggerated; it cannot be doubted, however,

---

<sup>166</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* (38) assigns the *Prognostica* to the mature period, among other works.

<sup>167</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 45.

<sup>168</sup> Traglia, *Lingua* 70–73.

that the richness and flexibility of Greek syntax induced Cicero to competition.<sup>169</sup>

Moreover, Cicero (if somewhat hesitantly) accepted recent words which had become fashionable in his own time. An example is *declamantans*, which is followed by an excusing parenthesis: *sic enim nunc loquuntur* 'because that is the way people talk now' (*Brutus* 310).<sup>170</sup>

In the development of Cicero's vocabulary we observe a slow but continuous increase in usage of Greek words referring to practical life and civilization. This phenomenon is all the more significant since it is constantly counteracted by Cicero's purism. It must be considered, therefore, a reflection of the spreading of Hellenistic lifestyle in Rome.<sup>171</sup>

Finally, there is interaction between Cicero and some general tendencies discernible in the development of the literary language of his age. A gradual decrease in the use of bureaucratic expressions such as *diem, quo die* is attested not only in Cicero but also in Caesar.<sup>172</sup> Although in many cases Cicero took an active part in the development of literary Latin, a gradual liberation from the stiffness of early Latin may be considered a general trend of his age.<sup>173</sup>

On the other hand, some of the factors which, consciously or not, condition the development of Cicero's style are rooted in his personality: consider his purism which increasingly controls his use of colloquialisms, confining them to determined functions. Another motive is Cicero's zest for learning, which leads him to improve upon his style. The range of his use of participles is gradually extended, his periods are constructed with ever greater skill, his sentence structure comes to avoid excessive symmetry, and the rhythm of his clausulae gains in sophistication. These features are indicative of the evolution of a keen sense of style, of an unflinching ability to find the

<sup>169</sup> For syntactic Græcisms, see below, p. 131.

<sup>170</sup> Laurand, 'Lecture' 54-64.

<sup>171</sup> Oksala 82. His view is confirmed by the fact that the increase remains significant, even if we neglect the last two *Verrines* and the *In Pisonem* (where lavish use of Greek words is required by the subject-matter).

<sup>172</sup> The expression is found eleven times in the first book of the *Galic War*, in the other six books only eleven times altogether, and four times in the *Civil War*: Frese 23.

<sup>173</sup> Further important external influences (such as subject-matter, genre, and the theory of style) are neglected here, since they cannot be used for chronological purposes.

proper word and to hide craftsmanship. All this in the course of his career became second nature with him and led to a new, quasi-natural way of speaking. This includes the birth of a slightly less ambitious style in his old age. Parallel developments can be observed in Livy and Tacitus.

Moreover, during determined periods we find preferences for certain relatively inconspicuous words and expressions, the frequency or rareness of which is not always subject to rational explanation.<sup>174</sup>

We may conclude, therefore, that in the development of Cicero's style, personal factors exert a continuous influence, especially when based on conscious apprenticeship (which is a feature typical of Cicero), whereas external influences are mostly limited to certain periods of time and exposed to unexpected shifts.<sup>175</sup>

*Excursus: Change of Sentence Length*<sup>176</sup>

Johnson subdivides Cicero's activity into four periods: I (81–66 BC: from the *Pro Quinctio* to the *Pro Caecina*); II (66–59 BC: from the *De Imperio Pompei* to the *Pro Archia*); III (57–52 BC: from the *Post Reditum* to the *Pro Milone*); IV (46–43 BC: *Caesarian Orations* and *Philippics*). In his choice of passages (the first thirty sentences in thirty-two of Cicero's orations) the average numbers of words per sentence are: I: 23.8; II: 25.5; III: 26.5; IV: 18.4. This amounts to a slight increase in sentence length from the first to the third period and a decrease in the last period. Interestingly enough, in the last period the *De Marcello*, doubtless owing to its epideictic character, excels by sentence length (23.2 words per sentence); in the second period, the partly epideictic *Pro Archia* shows an even higher rate (28.2), but it is equalled (and even slightly exceeded) by the *Third Catilinarian*, a largely epideictic piece of self-praise (28.8), and the *Pro Cluentio* (28.4), the especially artful character of which has been elucidated by Stroh.<sup>177</sup> In the first period, the *Actio Prima* against Verres exhibits the longest

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Ströbel 6–8.

<sup>175</sup> To give an example, during the first period of Cicero's philosophical activity (54–51 BC) the style of his orations is influenced by his philosophical writings, whereas in the last period of his life this is not the case.

<sup>176</sup> See Johnson, *passim* (with tables).

<sup>177</sup> Stroh, *Taxis*, 194–227, especially 218.

sentences (30.5), followed by the *Pro Quinctio* (27.6). Both these orations were of crucial importance for Cicero's career; therefore, he elaborated them with the greatest care. Surprisingly enough, in the introductions of orations never delivered and only written for publication (such as the *Actio Secunda* against Verres and the *Second Philippic*) the length of sentences is below average. Unfortunately Johnson does not give the numbers for the last two orations of the *Actio Secunda* of the *Verrines*. In order to obtain a more comprehensive impression of Cicero's attitude to sentence length, it would be useful to look beyond the prefaces (which are most likely to contain long sentences) and establish similar statistics for the other sections of Cicero's orations, especially *narratio* and *peroratio* (where, if for diverging reasons, shorter sentences are to be expected). Johnson's interesting observations concerning shifts of preference for indicative or subjunctive subordination cannot be discussed here in detail; some of his psychological explanations might be questioned. Subjunctive subordination is more frequent in periods I and III (when Cicero was struggling for his *auctoritas*) than in periods II and IV, where the 'statement predominates over its embellishments' (p. 38). Ultimately, Johnson himself is aware of the fact that sentence length, 'though it can help to delimit what is possible or likely in an author's style and can focus our attention on what we need to look for, . . . cannot define a style' (p. 40).

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CONSISTENCY IN CICERO'S STYLE

*Nam neque illud ipsum, quod est optimum, desperandum est et in praestantibus rebus magna sunt ea quae sunt optimis proxima.*

'For one should not despair of achieving what is best, and in matters of excellence it is a great thing to get as close as possible to what is best.'  
Cicero, *Orator* 2. 6

It is time to turn to the constant elements which give Cicero's style its character.<sup>1</sup> For all the importance of his educational background and the stage of development of literary Latin in his lifetime, his stylistic choices in theory and practice steadily and faithfully reflect his own cultural intentions.

#### *Traditions: Greek and Roman*

##### *Theory: Philosophy and Rhetoric*

In his *Orator* (3. 12) Cicero declares: 'I confess that I have become an orator (if I am one and whatever kind of orator I may be) not in the workshops of the teachers of rhetoric but in the open air of the Academy' (*et fateor me oratorem, si modo sim aut etiam quicumque sim, non ex rhetorum officinis, sed ex Academiae spatiis exstitisse*). Along with the traditions of Platonism,<sup>2</sup> Cicero took a great interest in Peripatetic philosophy.<sup>3</sup> Further influences came from Stoic dialectics and ethics<sup>4</sup> and, to a much lesser degree, from Stoic rhetoric. Hermagoras, one of the most influential teachers of rhetoric, was not a Stoic; however, in Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae*, which are derived for the most

---

<sup>1</sup> On consistency and variation in Cicero's oratorical style, cf. Panayiotou.

<sup>2</sup> Sattler 164–169.

<sup>3</sup> Solmsen, 'Aristotelian Tradition' 35–50; 169–190; id., 'Aristotle' 390–404.

<sup>4</sup> Thiele; s. however Laurand, *De Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis* 51–57.

part from Academic and Peripatetic sources, the doctrine of *brevitas* bears the stamp of Stoicism.<sup>5</sup> The specific qualities of Cicero appear against the background of the traditions of rhetoric and philosophy, as was shown by A. Michel in a comprehensive book<sup>6</sup> and by Laurand, whose old dissertation is still useful. The latter author's common sense is refreshing indeed; consider, for instance, his remarks on the exaggerations of *Quellenforschung*: *nihil est tam mirum neque tam a monumentis et historia alienum quod non possit etiam a doctis viris affirmari*.<sup>7</sup> ('There is nothing so strange or so blatantly at variance with historical evidence that it could not be affirmed even by learned people').

On the whole, Cicero's *De Oratore* and *Orator* differ from textbooks current in his time and preferably refer to Plato, Aristotle, and Theophrastus. Cicero agrees with Plato and Isocrates in his belief that talent is the most important prerequisite for a fruitful study of rhetoric, and that technical training, though necessary, is not sufficient. Together with Plato (in his *Phaedrus*), Isocrates, and Aristotle, he is convinced that oratory must be based on philosophy. He agrees with Plato, Aristotle, and Theophrastus in demanding from the orator a profound knowledge of psychology and emotions. He has learnt from Isocrates, Aristotle, and Theophrastus that the orator should also deal with general problems (*communes quaestiones*) and even use rhythmic composition (not poetic metre, of course).

Although Cicero loved to quote the 'Ancients,' in practice he mostly relied on the traditions of contemporary schools of rhetoric. The great number of allusions to the Island of Rhodes in the *De Inventione* suggests that one of his sources in this work was Rhodian; perhaps it is identical with Hermagoras. In fact, Cicero agrees with this author in his doctrine of *status* and in his classification of *causae*.<sup>8</sup> However, in the second Book of the *De Oratore*, Cicero differs considerably from Hermagoras. On the other hand, the use of *digressio*, which to Hermagoras had been an integral part of any oration, is rejected in the *De Inventione*, although Cicero would recommend it in his later works. As for Cicero's doctrine of *clausulae*, it is difficult

<sup>5</sup> Stroux, *De Theophrasti* . . . , 68, cf. Diog. Laert. 7. 59.

<sup>6</sup> Michel.

<sup>7</sup> Laurand, *De Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis* 77; cf. furthermore, Kroll, 'Rhetorik' 1039–1138; Riposati, *Problemi* 657–787; Kennedy, with further bibl.

<sup>8</sup> *Genus honestum, admirabile, humile, anceps*.

to decide whether he inherited it from the Asians or from the Rhodians (if a specifically 'Rhodian' doctrine existed at all).

Cicero despised the rhetorical teachings of the Stoics (as Hermagoras did). You should read them, he said, if you want to become speechless (*De Finibus* 4. 3. 7). He adopted, however, Stoic dialectics, especially in his *Topica*. Above all, the Stoic doctrine of decorum (πρέπον) was of primary importance to Cicero's approach to style, though in this regard he did not need to rely on rhetorical textbooks.

No matter how we interpret the relationship between the *De Inventione* and the analogous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, the *De Inventione* is based, among other material, on a Latin precursor (perhaps a teacher's oral instruction). In the *Orator*, the remarks on the sound of Latin words and on analogy are drawn from Latin sources.<sup>9</sup>

By 100 BC, the Romans had accepted the ornate and pompous style of 'Asiatic' oratory.<sup>10</sup> In reaction to this, the neo-Atticists fostered a plain and simple style, which, however, was not free from dryness. Thanks to the variety of his style, Cicero belongs to neither group and defies classification. In his view the perfect orator must avoid both extremes and, what is more, avoid monotony, a fault they have in common. In his early years, Cicero rivals Hortensius, who fostered the 'Asiatic' style. In agreement with the Asians, Cicero shows preference for the double trochee (or dichoree —υ—υ) as a *clausula* (*Orator* 63. 212).<sup>11</sup> The rhetorical writings of his old age increasingly reflect his critical dialogue with the Atticists. It would be rash, however, to label him as a representative of 'Asiatic' oratory.<sup>12</sup> Actually, he is an eclectic who relies on his sense of appropriateness rather than on doctrines. It is not very helpful to call his *ubertas* ('linguistic resourcefulness') and his prose rhythm 'Asiatic' and his concise *narrationes* 'Attic.' Nor should we make of Cicero an 'Atticist' altogether.<sup>13</sup> Trying to combine the severe taste of the 'Atticists' with the brilliancy and fullness of the 'Asiatics,' Cicero is the best of Atticists and the best of Asians; once mastery has been attained, differences of method lose some of their importance.<sup>14</sup> Even those who maintain

<sup>9</sup> Kroll, 'Cicero' 1101; on the *Ad Herennium* and the *De Inventione*, see now Adamik.

<sup>10</sup> On the problem of 'Atticism' and 'Asianism,' see Dihle, 'Beginn.'

<sup>11</sup> Laurand 3, 344; Norden, *Kunstprosa* 145.

<sup>12</sup> Paratore, 'Osservazioni.'

<sup>13</sup> Castorina.

<sup>14</sup> Laurand 3, 343–349; Leeman 136–167.

that the influence of *rhetores Latini* and ‘Asiatic’ orators on Cicero was stronger than he makes us believe must admit that Cicero in the course of his life found a more moderate style.<sup>15</sup>

As for poetic theory, Cicero did not share the artistic principles of Catullus. This helps us to understand his poetry and even some aspects of his prose. Unlike Catullus, Cicero draws a borderline between poetry and scholarship. Cicero’s purism radically differs from Neoteric tendencies and is closer to the style of Lucretius.<sup>16</sup> However, it would be an exaggeration to talk of direct hostility to the Neoterics.<sup>17</sup>

### *Stylistic Practice: Greek Influence*

The importance of Greek poets for Cicero cannot be discussed in detail here.<sup>18</sup> Cicero’s poetic translations give us a perfect idea of his response to Greek poetry. A. Traina has shown in detail how Cicero replaces the *ethos* of his Greek models with Roman *pathos*.<sup>19</sup>

In his early years Cicero tried to imitate Plato’s and Xenophon’s dialogues, originally for the sake of exercise. Later, Plato was an important model for his philosophical dialogues,<sup>20</sup> even in the domain of style. The quiet, balanced and fluid diction of Cicero’s dialogues results from his emulation of Plato rather than from mere theoretical reflection. The same is probably true of the stylistic influence of Heraclides Ponticus and certainly of Aristotle, whose *Protrepticus* was the model of Cicero’s *Hortensius*. The remains of Cicero’s dialogue give us an idea of the elaborate elegance of its lost original.<sup>21</sup> Cicero’s enthusiastic praise of Aristotle’s style might surprise modern readers, given the matter-of-fact diction of the transmitted treatises; actually, Cicero knew the (since lost) books Aristotle had written for a larger public. With regard to form, Aristotle had set a precedent for the use of prefaces in Cicero’s dialogues (Cicero, *Ad Atticum* 4. 16. 2).

<sup>15</sup> Leeman 95–97 and 110–111.

<sup>16</sup> Ronconi, ‘*Somnium*.’

<sup>17</sup> For a balanced view: Traglia, *Lingua* 48–60; Gagliardi 269–287; cf. also Martin 185–193.

<sup>18</sup> North 1–33; Lange.

<sup>19</sup> Traina 141–159 with bibl.; s. also Trencsényi-Waldapfel 161–174.

<sup>20</sup> Pöschl 108–186; for the range and importance of Cicero’s imitation of Plato see also Zoll.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Cicero’s praise of Aristotle’s style (*De Oratore* 1. 11.49; *Brutus* 31. 121).

The influence of Roman society on Cicero's dialogues is considerable. He shows an exclusive preference for aristocratic characters. Furthermore, he rejects vulgar and familiar expressions and strives to preserve the dignity of his class. He indulges in psychology and individual character portrayal and takes into account the reality of political life. All this gives Cicero's dialogues a Roman stamp and a personal touch (although certain modern attempts to range Cicero higher than Plato give proof of some un-Roman self-deception).

*Cicero as Translator<sup>22</sup> and Follower of Greek Philosophers and Orators*

Cicero's achievement as a translator has found both high praise and severe condemnation. According to some scholars he paved the way for abstract thought in Latin; according to others he just replaced the clear and precise style of his Greek models with the emotional diction typical of bad translators and underdeveloped languages.<sup>23</sup> For an equitable assessment we should first consider the difficulties which Cicero had to face. First, the subject matter and the terminology were new to the Roman reader. Second, there is no structural or semantic one-to-one correspondence between any two languages, not even between Greek and Latin, which are much less closely related to each other than one might suppose. For instance, there is no article in Latin, nor is there an equivalent for the verbal adjectives (ending in *-τός*); and Latin is less flexible in its use of prepositions and participles. Finally, neologisms are hardly accepted in Latin. In a language using a small number of words, the skilful way in which they are placed in sentences and conjoined with other words gains in importance (*callida iunctura* ('shrewd conjoining?')) Often, therefore, Cicero must compensate for a limited Latin vocabulary through style; style, then, becomes an integral part of the language. The seriousness of the problems<sup>24</sup> he faced as a translator gives us

---

<sup>22</sup> Dubuisson, 'Traduction'; Fögen, 'Sprachbewußtsein'; Lambardi; Müller-Goldingen; Pascucci, 'Parafrasi e traduzione'; Powell, 'Cicero's Translations . . .'; Puelma, 'Cicero als Plato-Übersetzer'; Puelma, 'Rezeption'; Striker, 'Greek philosophy'; Schofield (Stoic vocabulary); Richter; Seele (an up-to-date overview); Störig. For Latin translations of Greek compounds, recently, Panagl; on Latin words created into the image of Greek words (*calques*), Szemerényi; on nominal composition, Nadjo; on participles, Laughton and Hintzen; for the Romanization of the literary genre: Den Boeft.

<sup>23</sup> Poncelet, 'Précision' 134–156; also, Poncelet, *Cicéron*.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. above, pp. 34ff.; 47f.

a high opinion of his achievement (and is another proof of the crucial importance of style to our understanding of Latin language and literature).

H. Müller<sup>25</sup> distinguishes (free) ‘artistic’ translations from (literal) working translations. This allows us to observe that Cicero is perfectly able to translate literally (if he wants to do so) and that the emotional impact of his artistic translations is conditioned by the context into which they were embedded by Cicero. Therefore, one may disagree with Poncelet,<sup>26</sup> who thinks that Chalcidius (probably 5th century) translates Plato more adequately than Cicero does. If Chalcidius’ terminology is more precise than Plato’s (a feature praised by Poncelet), this implies a narrowing of meaning, and hence, falsification. Cicero’s sense of the liveliness of Plato’s dialogues was strong enough to prevent him from falling into Chalcidius’ error. In some cases, Cicero even gives a more consistent arrangement to Plato’s thoughts; this is clear evidence against the alleged intellectual deficiencies of the Latin language and of our author.<sup>27</sup>

To come to Greek Orators,<sup>28</sup> it has been generally held that Cicero’s style was strongly influenced by Isocrates, the ‘Rhodian school’ (if such a ‘school’ did exist) possibly acting as an intermediary. Actually, Demosthenes was more important for him, and the absurd theory<sup>29</sup> that Cicero knew his orations only through quotations has been belied by modern research.<sup>30</sup> It may be true that Cicero was slightly less influenced by Demosthenes’ style than by his fusion of oratory and politics, but even so Demosthenes’ speeches *On the Crown*, *On the Embassy*, and his *Philippics* left their traces in Cicero’s works.<sup>31</sup> Unlike Isocrates, Cicero shows a preference for the use of tricolon (each consisting of members of increasing length), a rhythm which gives his orations a resolute and rapid pace. Likewise, anaphora and gemination are more frequent than in Isocrates. All these features are Demosthenian.<sup>32</sup> Cicero combines the  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  of

<sup>25</sup> Quoted above, p. 35.

<sup>26</sup> Poncelet, ‘Style philosophique’ 145–167.

<sup>27</sup> On the cases when Cicero is ‘clearer’ than his model: cf. Engelbrecht 216–226, esp. 219; in general, cf. also Jones 22–34.

<sup>28</sup> Laughton, ‘Cicero’ 27–49; Weische, *Nachahmung*; Stroh, *Taxis*; Rahn 265–282.

<sup>29</sup> Preiswerk, ‘Gemeinplätze’ 27–38.

<sup>30</sup> Stroh, *Taxis* and Weische, *Nachahmung*.

<sup>31</sup> Stroh, ‘Redezyklen’ and id., ‘De Ciceronis Demosthenisque . . .’ Wooten.

<sup>32</sup> Laughton (see above, n. 28) quotes Demosthenes’ oration *On the Crown*.

Isocrates' style with the emotional πάθος of Demosthenes into a Roman synthesis.

Earlier, scholars would explain Cicero's use of syntax and style largely by Greek influence.<sup>33</sup> By the 20th century they became more cautious.<sup>34</sup> As none of us is a native speaker of Latin, it is difficult for us to determine if a given construction could be considered an organic development of the linguistic and stylistic potential of Latin or if it was definitely felt to be 'Greek.' The great Latin writers rarely crossed this borderline. However, in some cases it is possible to observe how Cicero consciously exploited the 'verbal' qualities of Latin nouns or made use of the latent power of Latin participles to create a richer and more colourful syntax and style. Rather than 'Græcism' we might call this a healthy way of competing with the Greeks. Certain expressions, however, which are unparalleled in Latin, can only be understood in the light of their Greek equivalents.<sup>35</sup> Even unintentional Græcisms are not excluded,<sup>36</sup> especially in letters—which in a bilingual civilization is certainly no surprise.

*Roman Practice: Cicero as a Disciple of Great Roman Orators*

Cicero's *Brutus*, an homage to the great orators of the Republic, shows the importance of the living example of Roman political speakers as patterns of excellence for the younger generations. In the *De Oratore*, two famous orators, Antonius and Crassus (above p. 93), are the exponents of two conflicting views of rhetoric and of two aspects of Cicero's personality; other prototypes (and masks) used by our author are Cato in the *De Senectute* and Scipio in the *De Re Publica*.

Patterns of excellence induce imitation. The principle of instruction in action, of teaching and learning by example rather than precept, is widespread in 'early' societies; Polybius (in his Sixth Book) rightly stressed the importance of *exempla* to Roman civilization. This is especially true of oratory, an art which in Rome had had

<sup>33</sup> Brenous.

<sup>34</sup> For example, Löfstedt 2, 406–457; on Græcisms, see Coleman's excellent article.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Kroll's commentary on *Orator* 1. 4; on constructions including participles: Laughton, *Participle* 38. 43–45. 53–54. 112.

<sup>36</sup> Kertelheim 5.

pre-literary roots.<sup>37</sup> A feature typical of Roman oratory was (as could be observed in Antonius, for instance: *De Oratore* 2. 197–203) the persistence of the appeal to the emotions throughout the entire oration, a principle applied by Cicero in most of his pleas. In all probability Hellenistic teachers of rhetoric had limited the use of emotional appeal to introductions and perorations. For Cicero's different practice, Roman traditions of political speech were crucial.<sup>38</sup>

The style of Cicero's early orations is reminiscent of old Roman orators who showed a preference for alliteration and accumulations of synonyms (as attested by the fragments of Cato, for example). But there was also another style, plain, simple and stripped of ornament, as represented by Gaius Gracchus.<sup>39</sup> The two conflicting stylistic modes discussed in Cicero's age<sup>40</sup>—'Atticism' and 'Asianism'—supplied a vocabulary which helped to understand these two tendencies inherent in Roman oratory. It is therefore merely a question of terminology whether the style of Cicero's early orations should be called 'old Latin' or 'Asiatic.' If some scholars regard Cicero's orations as 'typical' examples of 'traditional oratory',<sup>41</sup> they should consider that their quality is anything but average.<sup>42</sup>

### *Cicero and the Tradition of Roman Legal and Official Language*

Cicero's *De Legibus* is one of the richest sources for the influence of Roman legal language on his style. Jordan and others have shown that in his imitations of legal style Cicero followed æsthetic rather than linguistic criteria. When quoting laws in his orations, he loves to intersperse the texts with personal remarks<sup>43</sup> which help to avoid a stylistic breach in his discourse.<sup>44</sup> Editors should of course abstain from 'improving' by conjecture formulaic constructions found in Cicero's texts which in fact are derived from Roman legal or official language; an example is the use of a *genitivus forensis* with *promittere*

<sup>37</sup> Leo, *Geschichte* 1, 21–46.

<sup>38</sup> Solmsen, 'Aristotle' 390–409, esp. 394. On the importance of Roman (along with Greek) traditions Solmsen, 'Orations' 542–556.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Albrecht, *Masters* 33–53.

<sup>40</sup> If they existed.

<sup>41</sup> Oksala 40.

<sup>42</sup> Laurand, *Cicéron* 3rd edn. 154.

<sup>43</sup> *Pro S. Roscio* 43. 126; *Pro Cluentio* 54. 148.

<sup>44</sup> On Cicero's use of quotations, Wiethaler 20–22.

in *Topica* 4. 22.<sup>45</sup> In all probability the same construction, though not in a legal context, is used by Cicero in *De Re Publica* 1. 10. 16 as an archaism: *discendi* 'in order to learn,' where editors, of course, insert *causâ*.<sup>46</sup>

The style of the *acta senatus* exerted a strong influence on the genesis of a Roman literary language. Such records are known to us from Cicero's letters<sup>47</sup> and from inscriptions. In his orations, there is evidence of his mastery of this genre in his own proposals for resolutions of the senate (*senatus consulta*).<sup>48</sup> A study of Cicero's attitude to the language of Roman administration is a desideratum.

### *Cicero and the Tradition of Poetic Latin*

In Cicero's time, Ennius' influence on the language of Latin poetry was paramount. Cicero shares Ennius' preference for compound adjectives (which occasionally appear even in his prose)<sup>49</sup> and for a predicative use of present participles (especially in the *Aratea*). Archaisms, however, are not particularly numerous in Cicero; the same applies to alliteration. Elision of final *-s* is found only in his early poetry. Furthermore, Cicero avoids hiatus and elision of vowels in his poems, and his word order gains in freedom and smoothness (as it does in his prose). A similar tendency appears even in his use of enjambement. All this establishes Cicero's importance as a precursor of the classical poets of the Augustan age.<sup>50</sup>

### *Cicero's Use of Colloquial Speech*

Scholars are accustomed to consider the *Letters to Atticus* a document of the colloquial language of the educated class in Rome.<sup>51</sup> This is only part of the truth. P. Oksala rightly observed that the *Letters to Atticus* do not reflect the conversational language of the entire educated

<sup>45</sup> *Sed qui in pariete communi demoliendo damni infecti promiserit, non debet praestare quod fomix vitii fecerit*. . . he who has issued a guarantee to make up for possible damage . . . Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 166f.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. also p. 42.

<sup>47</sup> For a trace of this official style in Cicero's letters, see p. 188.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. above, p. 75.

<sup>49</sup> See above, p. 32.

<sup>50</sup> On his attitude toward the Neoterics, see above, p. 73.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Büchner, 'Briefe' 1232-1234.

class at Rome, but the language of a small circle, ‘perhaps of Cicero only.’<sup>52</sup> Clearly, the last quotation implies an overstatement: since any language is communication, the addressee takes an integral part in its creation, and thus we would have to assume a minimum of two persons to close the circle (*Cicero and Atticus*). However, Oksala is certainly right in insisting on the smallness of the circle in question.<sup>53</sup>

*Cicero’s Style in the Context of his Age: Cicero’s and Caesar’s Purism*<sup>54</sup>

Given the fragmentary transmission of old Latin prose, we are often not in a position to estimate the originality of Cicero’s linguistic usage. In any case, the increase in use of certain stylistic features during his lifetime must be considered a consequence of his stylistic theory and literary practice. To begin with his vocabulary: Like Caesar, Cicero tried to eliminate certain synonyms; an example is his preference for either the simple or the compound form of a given verb.<sup>55</sup> In prose, the use of *causâ* as a preposition with the genitive is older than that of *gratiâ*. In Cicero’s orations, there are eighteen instances of *causâ*; but only one of *gratiâ*; in Caesar, *gratiâ* is attested only once (*De Bello Civili* 2. 7). Sallust shows an increasing preference for *gratiâ* (on the whole, there are 15 instances of *gratiâ* as opposed to 13 of *causâ*, but in the *Iugurtha*, the ratio is 12 to 5), and among Silver Latin authors, Quintilian cherished *gratiâ*. *Gratiâ* seems to have a more solemn ring: in ancient Roman tragedy, the ratio between *gratiâ* and *causâ* is 5 to 3, whereas in comedy, it is 50 to 142.<sup>56</sup> Cicero’s use of these prepositions is indicative of his central

<sup>52</sup> Oksala 103.

<sup>53</sup> For the details see above, pp. 52–71.

<sup>54</sup> On Cicero’s purism see now, Müller, R., *Sprachbewußtsein*, esp. 322–334. On Caesar’s and Cicero’s use of *imperare*, Évrard.

<sup>55</sup> On this, Norden, *Kunstprosa* 189–191; for Cicero’s linguistic and stylistic theory, see Tondini 211–233.

<sup>56</sup> Jocelyn, *Tragedies* 277, on *Fig.* 132; Wölfflin, ‘Kausalpartikel’ 161–176; Reissinger; cf. also Rankin 378f. More complex is the use of *propter* and *ob* (Kühner/Stegmann §§ 98f.). Caesar clearly prefers *propter* and tends to limit *ob* to set expressions (with *rem/res* or *causam/-as*). Cicero, though adhering to the same principle, exploits the potential of *ob* on a larger scale than Caesar does. Cicero uses traditional gerundive constructions like *ob ius dicendum* and even introduces new short and elegant expressions (*ob hoc/id/ea*). *Ob* had been a standard word in the inscriptions of the republican age. For its slightly archaic ring it would be lavishly employed by Sallust (in the *Bellum Iugurthinum* and in the *Historiae*), Tacitus, Velleius, Mela.

position as a classical author between Old and Silver Latin. He makes a deliberate selection of his linguistic material. Another example of this tendency is his preference of the adjective *Hispaniensis* as opposed to *Hispanicus*.<sup>57</sup> The latter form is neither particularly expressive nor very popular among Latin writers. More interesting is the almost exclusive presence of *infimus* ('lowest') in Cicero, whereas its colloquial synonym *imus* appears only once in a set formula (tellingly, in the *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo*, an oration deliberately mimicking comedy 7. 20). In Cicero's correspondence, the only instance of *imus* is found in a letter written by Brutus (in: *Ad Brutum* 1. 6. 4). Caesar displays the same tendency. The poets, however, prefer *imus*, as do prose authors influenced by colloquial language (such as Vitruvius and Petronius). Finally, Tacitus and Suetonius use both forms and establish semantic differentiations: while *imus* applies to spatial relationships, *infimus* takes on metaphorical meanings.<sup>58</sup> Against this background, we come to appreciate Cicero's purism: for him, whatever the meaning or the literary genre, *infimus* is the only acceptable form.

As far as Cicero's use of Greek words is concerned, P. Oksala observes an interesting antagonism: on the one hand, Cicero's purism steadily resists the Greek influence; on the other, Roman life is increasingly exposed to Hellenization, so that despite Cicero's reluctance, in the course of his lifetime there is some increase in Greek vocabulary in his works.

Cicero's concern with purity of diction appears also in his treatment of Latin syntax. While he expects an orator to use correct grammar and syntax (*De Oratore* 3. 11. 40; 3. 13. 49), he allows poets more freedom in this respect: *invidere* ('to envy') is known to be a verb governing the dative, but Accius can feel free to construct it with an accusative (*Tusculanae Disputationes* 3. 29). Certain constructions adopted by other Latin authors are never found in Cicero. To give some examples, Cicero avoids imperatives after *ne* (though one is found after *nec* in a letter to Atticus, 12. 22. 3), as well as infinitives after verbs of motion. The use of *-que . . . -que* is limited to his poetry (*Phaenomena* 20, attested in *De Natura Deorum*. 2. 41. 104). The only exception proves the rule: in *De Finibus* 1. 16. 51, Cicero is clearly

<sup>57</sup> Parzinger II, 43f.

<sup>58</sup> Löfstedt 2, 347–350.

quoting another author.<sup>59</sup> Further constructions shunned by Cicero are the combination of *-que* and *et* and the use of the infinitive after *valeo* (which is cherished, among others, by Lucretius). Cicero's purism in the selection of his vocabulary was noted by authors like Tacitus (*Dialogus* 22) and Gellius (*Noctes Atticae* 10. 21. 1). A high degree of deliberateness in his stylistic choices is also attested in his own works: he corresponds with Atticus on a problem of grammar (*Ad Atticum* 7. 3. 10); he rebukes his son<sup>60</sup> and his secretary Tiro<sup>61</sup> for their careless phrasing. No wonder, then, that Pompey consults him as an expert concerning a problem of grammar<sup>62</sup> and Caesar and Varro dedicate entire works on grammar to him.<sup>63</sup>

E. Norden referred to a problem arising from Cicero's purism:<sup>64</sup> 'At the height of its stylistic perfection, literary Latin had an extremely poor vocabulary.' It is precisely the striving of the authors for *elegantia* and *urbanitas* that caused the elimination of certain words, some of which would reappear in late Latin. Yet the impression described by Norden is, to some degree, owing to an optical illusion. Actually, the seeming richness and colourfulness of popular language and its 'emotional' character is undercut by omnipresence of stereotypes and set formulas.<sup>65</sup> 'Classical prose had at its disposal innumerable words, expressions, and stylistic devices which were necessarily lacking in popular language as far as it is known to us. The creation of this prose style, which largely was the work of Cicero, remains actually one of the greatest exploits in Western civilization.'<sup>66</sup> Cicero laid the foundations for the language of abstract thought in Latin.<sup>67</sup>

### *The Latin of Cicero's Correspondents*

Even in his letters, Cicero pays more heed to correctness of syntax than his friends do.<sup>68</sup> His linguistic awareness comes to the fore if

<sup>59</sup> Friedländer 2.

<sup>60</sup> Quoted by Servius, *Aeneid* 8.168; cf. Quintilian, *Institutio* 1. 7. 34.

<sup>61</sup> *Ad Familiares* 16. 17. 1.

<sup>62</sup> Gellius 10. 1. 7.

<sup>63</sup> Laurand 25–30.

<sup>64</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa* 1, 189.

<sup>65</sup> Löfstedt 2, 319; Meillet, review 165.

<sup>66</sup> Löfstedt 2, 317.

<sup>67</sup> Meillet, *Esquisse* 208.

<sup>68</sup> See Schmalz, 'Briefsammlungen' 87–141; id., *Latinität*; id., *Sprachgebrauch*; Tyrrell/Purser I<sup>3</sup> 90–93; III CI–CIX. Antoine 58–70; Burg; Becher; Hellmuth,

we compare him to Pompey, who does not care much for grammatical congruity: *ut cohortes . . . ad me missum facias* 'let the cohorts be sent to me.'<sup>69</sup> A parallel (if not exactly comparable) case is *In Verrem* II 5. 65. 167 *hanc sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum* 'they feel confident that this one fact will be their defence.'<sup>70</sup> Cicero's use of the singular *fit* to denote the 'sum' of several numbers is much less harsh, since *fit* is the technical term used in such arithmetical operations. Even less objectionable is the use of a neuter plural with reference to a single idea or sentence.<sup>71</sup> In *Philippicae* 2. 24. 58 we observed the use of a nominative in an apposition, a negligence very frequent in modern languages, too: *sequebatur raeda cum lenonibus, comites nequissimi* 'there followed a travelling-coach of pimps, a most iniquitous retinue.'<sup>72</sup> This slight lack of grammatical coherence (*anacoluthon*) is in harmony with the vehement style of the *Philippics*.<sup>73</sup> In the present case, the plural is justified by the fact that *raeda cum lenonibus* is to be understood as a plural subject: 'a wagonload of pimps.'

A further stylistic irregularity, retrospective use of *neque* without another *neque*, is found in the letters of Cicero's friends, not in his own<sup>74</sup> (Caelius in: Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 8. 13. 2): *qui exercitum neque provincias traderet* 'one who was inclined to surrender neither his army nor his provinces.'<sup>75</sup> Cicero's mastery of free word order can be studied in the following case. Luckily, we can compare a passage from

---

*Sprache*; Bergmüller; Gebhard; Köhler; Rhodius, *De syntaxi*; id., *De L. Munati*. . . . For the use of clausulae in Cicero and his contemporaries see Bornecque, *Prose*; id., *Clausules*, 565–570. For a fuller bibliography, look up the names of the correspondents in: Hofmann-Szantyr, *Literaturverzeichnis* II.

<sup>69</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., p. 3, footnote. In the spoken language such verbal expressions began to loose their flexibility and defy declension.

<sup>70</sup> Translation: Greenwood, *Futuram* is the reading of the authoritative manuscripts and preferred by most editors; *futurum* is attested in and vigorously defended by Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 1, 7 (*in libro spectatae fidei Tironiana cura atque disciplina facto*; *futurum* is understood to be an 'infinitive' which defies declension, a usage frequent in older Latin; for example, Gracchus said: *credo ego inimicos meos hoc dicturum*); Löfstedt 2, 11.

<sup>71</sup> *Philippicae* 5. 6. 17 *illa . . . quod*; cf. Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 10–11.

<sup>72</sup> Translation: Ker.

<sup>73</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 82.

<sup>74</sup> Löfstedt 1, 2nd edn., 346–347; similarly, Vitruvius' closeness to everyday spoken language is evinced in his lavish use of *constructio ad sensum*. A boldness (or carelessness) unparalleled in Caesar and Cicero is *aquae calidae multitudo, e quibus . . .* (8. 3. 10; Löfstedt 2, 138).

<sup>75</sup> Translation: Glynn Williams, who (against the authority of the Mediceus) inserts another *neque* before *exercitum* and reads *tadere vellet* (with Ernesti).

an original oration of Antony with Cicero's free adaptation:<sup>76</sup> Antony's wording is found in Cicero, *Philippicae* 2. 12. 30: *Brutus, quem ego honoris causa nomino, cruentum pugionem tenens Ciceronem exclamavit* 'Brutus, whom I name with respect, grasping his bloody dagger, shouted: Cicero!'<sup>77</sup> Cicero's improved version runs as follows (ibid. 2. 12. 28): *Caesare interfecto statim cruentum alte extollens Brutus pugionem Ciceronem nominatim exclamavit* 'when Caesar had been slain . . . Brutus, at once lifting high his bloody dagger, shouted for Cicero by name.'<sup>78</sup> The reader will notice the omission of the trite formula *quem ego honoris causa nomino*, the addition of a bold hyperbaton *cruentum . . . pugionem*, the replacement of the colourless participle *tenens* with a much more vivid expression (*alte extollens*), and the increased length of the last segment (*Ciceronem nominatim exclamavit*), which greatly contributes to the general harmony between the parts of the sentence. As a result, the most important words appear in the most conspicuous places, i.e. at the beginning and at the end of each colon.

#### *Cicero and Caesar*

The so-called *attractio modi* is typical of Cicero's style. No other Latin author uses it more frequently. In subordinate clauses, which should have the verb in the indicative mood, Cicero often prefers the subjunctive, if the sentence depends on a subjunctive verb. This preference is not necessarily indicative of a deliberate adaptation to everyday spoken language; rather, it is a corollary to Cicero's 'striving for stylistic equilibrium, for a harmonious contexture of sentences, supported by his aversion to pedantry.'<sup>79</sup> Cicero's attitude toward style is therefore more puristic than that of, say, Pompey or Caelius, but he is less afraid of 'illogical' constructions than Caesar is, provided that they lend liveliness and unity to his diction. Generally speaking, Cicero, instead of following rigid rules, trusts his feeling for Latin idiom and strives for variety. An example is his use of *egere* and *indigere* ('to need'). Caesar constructs both verbs with the ablative, whereas Cicero uses the ablative with *egere*, but mostly prefers the genitive with *indigere*.<sup>80</sup> In the case of the latter verb, Latin usage

<sup>76</sup> Fraenkel, *Iktus* 164.

<sup>77</sup> Translation: Ker.

<sup>78</sup> Translation: Ker.

<sup>79</sup> Löfstedt 2, 121.

<sup>80</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 83.

offered him an option. Whenever Cicero chooses the ablative, he has strong stylistic reasons for doing so: in *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* 15. 44 there is another genitive nearby, so the orator selects the ablative for the sake of clarity. The same is true of *De Legibus* 2. 12. 30: *consilio et auctoritate optimatum semper populum indigere* 'that the people always needs the advice and the authority of the *optimates*.' In *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1. 36. 88, the ablative is favoured by parallelism: *ne vivus quidem bono caret, si eo non indiget* 'even living persons—not only dead ones—do not *lack* what they do not miss.'

Anastrophe of the type *quo de* (for *de quo* 'about which') are more frequent in old Latin than in Cicero and Caesar; in this respect, once again, Caesar is more consistent than Cicero. In his early work *De Inventione*,<sup>81</sup> the frequency of such anastrophe may be owing to the influence of old Latin usage (or of colloquial speech, as vestiges in Romance languages show); even later he does not reject anastrophe, especially when it helps to avoid indecent combinations of sounds.<sup>82</sup> Accumulation of synonyms is another feature typical of early Latin. It is telling that Caesar discards this tendency much more radically than Cicero, who, on the contrary, likes to display his rich vocabulary.<sup>83</sup>

Caesar does not share Cicero's love for the *dativus graecus* or *dativus auctoris* (*In Catilinam* 2. 12. 26 *mihī . . . consultum atque provisum est* 'has been planned and provided for by me'), which in fact he uses only twice.<sup>84</sup> He employs *nonne* only once (*De Bello Civili* 2. 32. 8) and avoids it completely in indirect interrogative clauses.<sup>85</sup> Caesar says *confidere alicui* ('to trust someone'), but *aliqua re*, whereas Cicero often uses the dative for lifeless objects as well.<sup>86</sup> 'Gnomic' perfects are found in Cicero, not in Caesar.<sup>87</sup> The same is true for the use of the periphrastic forms in *-urus fuerim* in subordinate clauses containing unreal propositions,<sup>88</sup> a construction known also to Cicero's contemporary Brutus.<sup>89</sup> The only 'second supina' accepted by Caesar

<sup>81</sup> Parzinger II 5–6; cf. also Wackernagel, Vol. 2, 199.

<sup>82</sup> Cicero, *Orator* 44. 154; *Ad Familiares* 9. 22. 2.

<sup>83</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 788.

<sup>84</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 96–97. Tillmann 79ff.; on this and what follows next: Weise 155–165.

<sup>85</sup> Hofmann/Szantyr 462.

<sup>86</sup> Kühner/Stegmann, Vol. 1, 399–400; Weise 156.

<sup>87</sup> Weise 156 (problematic).

<sup>88</sup> Cicero, *Pro Milone* 12. 33; *Philippicae* 9. 1; Hofmann/Szantyr 665.

<sup>89</sup> Cicero, *Ad Brutum* 1. 11. 1; Kühner/Stegmann, Vol. 2, 409.

are *natu*, *factu*, and *aspectu*, whereas Cicero uses twenty-four different forms of this type. On the other hand, Caesar favours gerundives and the ablative absolute.<sup>90</sup>

In some respects Caesar is closer to everyday spoken Latin. To give an example, he often mixes up *se* and *eum*, a negligence found in Cicero only in some of his earliest works.<sup>91</sup> Other colloquialisms are: the singular use of *multus* with nouns like *dies* or *nox*<sup>92</sup> and the transposition of a noun from a secondary clause into the main clause, e.g. *nosti virum, quam tectus* ('you know the man, how secretive he is'). Cicero uses this construction in a letter (*Ad Atticum* 14. 21. 2), Caesar in a published work (*De Bello Gallico* 1. 39. 6).<sup>93</sup>

In Caesar, 'pleonasms' are influenced by the parlance of Roman administration. This can be observed in the formulaic repetition of nouns in relative clauses (*diem, quo die* 'the day on which') and in expressions like *postridie eius diei* ('the next day'), *propterea quod* ('because'), and *permittere, ut liceat* ('to allow'). Another tautology is the use of *rursus* ('again') together with *re*.<sup>94</sup>

Caesar prefers asyndeton, Cicero polysyndeton. On the level of literary style, the narrative character of Caesar's writings encourages a more lavish use of the historical present and the historical infinitive. On the other hand, the rhetorical character of Cicero's writings allows the author to combine abstract nouns with transitive verbs as active subjects to the point of almost personifying qualities like: *audacia*, *constantia*, *fortitudo*, *improbilas*, *invidia*, *valetudo*. Moreover, Cicero indulges in plural forms of abstract nouns.<sup>95</sup> In his striving for vividness he is less afraid of parenthesis and anacoluthon than Caesar is. Against O. Weise,<sup>96</sup> who tried to derive these differences of style directly from differences of character, one would insist on generic laws as an additional factor. The style of *commentarius* requires a bureaucratic sobriety which in orations or philosophical treatises would be out of place. The fragments of Caesar's orations show that

<sup>90</sup> Weise 156 with bibliography.

<sup>91</sup> Lebreton 122–149.

<sup>92</sup> Further examples in Weise 157.

<sup>93</sup> *Qui se ex his minus timidus existimari volebant, non se hostem vereri, sed angustias itineris et magnitudinem silvarum, quae inter eos atque Ariovistum intercederent, aut rem frumentariam, ut satis commode supportari posset, timere dicebant.*

<sup>94</sup> Weise 158–160 with further examples.

<sup>95</sup> Weise 160; Lebreton 32–74; 421–427.

<sup>96</sup> Weise 162–165.

in this genre his style was anything but unadorned. On the other hand, the objectivity of Caesar's *commentarii* is treacherous. Cicero's rhetoric is self-evident; Caesar's rhetoric is less obvious, but perhaps even more dangerous.

To a man of action like Caesar, for all his stylistic mastery, words are not an end in themselves but only a means to influence people. His closeness to colloquial and administrative language is in harmony with the style of *commentarius* and also with a practical and matter-of-fact approach to reality which relies on visual rather than auditory impressions. Even in the field of language and style, the mind of this great strategist and organizer eliminated useless elements and fostered uniformity by means of clear rules (*De Analogia*).

Cicero's language is more varied than Caesar's. Instead of following exclusively the rules of analogy,<sup>97</sup> he conforms to the established usage. His linguistic and stylistic choices are not made once and for all but according to circumstances. His sensitive and versatile nature leads him to accept even illogical constructions, provided that they satisfy his keen sense of beauty. He has a fine ear for music and is exacting in regard to prose rhythm and the balance of sentences, although he avoids the stiffness of excessive symmetry. In discarding both colloquialisms and bureaucratic language, however, Cicero is more consistent than Caesar. His fondness for the use of abstract nouns as acting subjects is indicative of an ambitious style; moreover, it is one of the 'emotional' features typical of the great orator.

---

<sup>97</sup> Cicero (*Orator* 155–162) relied on the good linguistic usage of his age rather than on analogistic theories. It is not surprising that he was followed by Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.6) since orators have to avoid anything that might sound unusual or pedantic in order not to deflect their audience from what they are saying. Even Caesar (*De Analogia*, *Fig.* 16 Klotz = *GRF* 14. 152 Funaioli), despite his analogistic principles, ridiculed Varro's preference for *lact* as the 'correct' nominative of *lactis*. On 'analogists' and 'anomalists' (Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, Books 9 [on anomaly] and 10 [on analogy]): Ax, 'Sprache' (with critical discussion of a complex bibliography); recent scholarship has abandoned the strict dichotomy between 'technical' (Alexandrian) and 'philosophical' (Stoic) grammar; s. now Grebe, esp. 199–200; Dihle, 'Analogie,' rightly stressed that there was no irreconcilable conflict, since either side accepted the alternative principle as well.

*Widening the Range of Expression*

It is in Cicero's letters that we find most new words. They often have a humorous or ironical touch: *sullaturit* ('he wants to become a Sulla'), *proscripturit* ('he thirsts for proscriptions'), *pseudocato* ('a sham Cato'), *appietas* and *lentulitas* ('the quality of belonging to the illustrious families of Appii or Lentuli'). In some cases, Cicero does not even shrink from mixing Greek and Latin within the same word: *σηστιωδέστερον* ('rather redolent of Sestius') and *facteon* ('must be done'). Along with numerous diminutives and adjectives with *per-* and *sub-*, which were current in colloquial speech, there are also oddities like *putidiusculus* ('a bit too obtrusive'), *subturpiculus* ('pretty ugly').

However, some other words which first appear in Cicero, cannot have been created by him, but must have existed either in current or in technical language, *adversaria* ('account-books'), *agrarius* ('concerning public property'), *architectura* ('architecture'), *authepsa*<sup>98</sup> ('cooking machine').<sup>99</sup> In his efforts to Latinize Greek technical terms, Cicero, as a rule, proceeded with much caution and avoided expressions that might have sounded strange to a Roman audience. Even so, some of his neologisms (e.g. *veriloquium* for ἐτυμολογία) gained no acceptance. For all his merits in the field of terminology,<sup>100</sup> Cicero, as a creator of a cultivated Latin prose style, was less interested in the invention of new words than in the appropriate use of the extant vocabulary. Consequently, if scholars study Cicero as a 'creator of words,'<sup>101</sup> they run the risk of distracting our attention from the following points: Cicero was not eager to create new words at any costs, nor can we always decide whether words first attested in his writings were created by him. The problem is rather: what types of word-formation were alive in Cicero's day? One should, therefore, not be satisfied with collecting vocables first attested in Cicero but consider individual suffixes and the frequencies of their appearance in the formation of new words. This is especially true for *nomina*

<sup>98</sup> Cicero, *Pro S. Roscio*. 46. 133: this item was so expensive, that passers-by who heard the auctioneer call out the offered prices, thought that some landed property was being sold.

<sup>99</sup> Laurand 68–70.

<sup>100</sup> See above, pp. 33f. and 46f.

<sup>101</sup> Kretschmer 227–249; Löfstedt 2, 320 with note 2.

*agentis* in *-or* and *-ix*, and, to a lesser degree, for nouns derived from verbs in *-itas* and *-io*.<sup>102</sup> The fact that these types of word-formation were still fully alive in Cicero's time was correctly observed by modern teachers of Latin style who, for the same reason, allowed students a slightly broader use of these suffixes, even if the repetitive words were attested only after Cicero.<sup>103</sup> Our orator shuns violent neologisms of the Ennian type and limits his linguistic creativity to employing suffixes still productive in his epoch; this very fact protected Cicero's language from going out of fashion and contributed very much to its longevity. Similarly, when Latinizing Stoic terms Cicero often prefers the liveliness of participles to the dryness of abstract nouns. (Later generations of authors would unfailingly discover the charms of abstraction—often to the detriment of their poor readers.)

For centuries, scholars have insisted on the restrictive aspects of Cicero's usage, probably for pedagogical reasons. Now it is high time to emphasize his positive contributions to the deployment of the syntactic and stylistic potential of Latin. To give an example, in the course of his life's work, his use of participles gradually gains in freedom and sophistication. While before him predicative participles had appeared almost exclusively in the nominative or accusative, he extended this usage to all cases;<sup>104</sup> suffice it to remind the reader of what after Cicero would become the standard opening of classroom compositions: 'While I pondered (*cogitanti mihi*) . . . the thought came to me.'<sup>105</sup>

Creative use of the participle is found as early as the *De Inventione*, whereas it is lacking in the non-Ciceronian parallel text *Ad Herennium*. In this area Cicero made a considerable contribution to the development of Latin style. The same may be said of predicative participles in other respects also.<sup>106</sup> Moreover, Cicero enriched Latin prose style with a concise and elegant construction by extending the

<sup>102</sup> For *-itas*, see Marouzeau II 146–162, esp. 146; on *-io* 149 (on the 'verbal' character of these nouns).

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Krebs 1, 34–35; cf. also above, p. 29 on 'productive' suffixes found in the philosophical writings.

<sup>104</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 4.

<sup>105</sup> 'While I was thinking . . .' Laughton, *Participle* 37–38.

<sup>106</sup> Laughton, *Participle* 118–124. Even the predicative use of the future participle (which would become popular not before the Silver Age) is occasionally prepared for in Cicero, as it is in Caius Gracchus and Brutus (Laughton, *Participle* 124).

use of the *dativus auctoris*<sup>107</sup> from pronouns to nouns.<sup>108</sup> Prose authors like the *Auctor ad Herennium* and Caesar were more reserved in this respect than poets (and, later, Tacitus).

As a general tendency, Cicero in his prose style frees himself more and more from stereotypes. In the course of his life his sentence construction becomes more sophisticated and the number of parentheses increases. Word order gains in expressive power.<sup>109</sup> The development of Cicero's style is based on the 'negative' principle of selectivity and the 'positive' principle of intensification through increasing functionalism. According to Eduard Fraenkel, 'the language of the great Augustan poetry as well as the language of Cicero's artistic prose in its structural laws is nowhere qualitatively different from the colloquial language of the educated Roman; stylistic refinement means nothing other than selection and enhancement of elements already developed in everyday speech (after the writer has reached a certain intellectual level, of course).'<sup>110</sup>

### *The Art of Artlessness: Consistency in Cicero's Style*

There is a productive tension between Cicero's selective approach to his linguistic material and his deliberate development of the syntactic and stylistic potential of Latin. His economy of stylistic means helps him to adapt his expressions ever more to his audience, to his subject matter, and to the given case. As a consequence, his diction looks more and more 'natural.' According to Zielinski,<sup>111</sup> fixed word order is an archaic principle, aloof from psychology, whereas the

<sup>107</sup> Landgraf, *Dativus*; Parzinger II 16.

<sup>108</sup> An example is *De Oratore* 3. 14. 54 *vero enim oratori, quae sunt in hominum vita, quandoquidem in ea versatur orator atque ea est ei subiecta materies, omnia quaesita, audita, lecta, disputata, tractata, agitata esse debent* 'For the genuine orator must have investigated and heard and read and discussed and handled and debated the whole of the contents of the life of mankind, inasmuch as that is the field of the orator's activity, the subject matter of his study.' Translation: Rackham.

<sup>109</sup> On the development of Cicero's prose rhythm, cf. Laurand 183 (comparing Cicero to Sallust, Caesar, and Livy); Norden, *Kunstprosa* 939-940; De Groot, *Handbook* 224-226; Primmer, *Cicero numerosus*, passim; see now Aumont, who, despite interesting observations concerning the position of clausulae within their contexts, does not fully replace his predecessors.

<sup>110</sup> Fraenkel, 'Kolon' 197-213, esp. 198.

<sup>111</sup> Zielinski, 'Wundt' 533-567, 635-666, esp. 640.

free word order of classical languages is 'psychological' and 'natural.' There is some truth to his statement that a 'natural' style (as understood by Zielinski) is in many ways a discovery of classical antiquity; certainly Cicero helped his compatriots to find in each case the expression which was most appropriate to both the nature of the case and the nature of the Latin language.

Consequently, Cicero's purism is a complex phenomenon. On the one hand, it is conditioned by the psychology of language and social factors (the less educated his listeners, the purer Cicero's Latin); on the other hand, it is based on a personal preference. Moreover, the subject matter is important: politics and law are more likely to be discussed in pure Latin than culture or everyday life. To be sure, Cicero's purism pervades his works, but the degree of its realization depends on the subject matter and on the audience. Cicero's development of a 'natural' style is not a natural process determined by external conditions, but a product of personal creativity.

To sum up, constants in Cicero's style are not limited to individual phenomena typical of all of his writings; they also encompass certain principles which operate throughout his work. There is some consistency of generic laws (for instance, the slightly more poetic vocabulary of the Fifties is maintained in the later philosophical works, but dropped in the later orations and letters). However, the laws of literary genres, in their turn, are conditioned by the given subject matter and the expectations of the audience. They can be reduced, therefore, to the principle of decorum (*aptum*), a principle clearly recognized by Cicero. Finally, Cicero's purism, an important constant in his work, interacts with the influences of his public and the exigencies of the given case. The basic constant in Cicero's literary activity, however, is his unconditional striving for perfection as expounded in the first paragraphs of his *Orator* (quoted on p. 125). All the constants in Cicero's style ultimately depend on his ideal of the *orator perfectus*.

*Influence: Some Glimpses*

‘Tradition’ does not mean ‘preserving ashes,’  
but ‘keeping the flame alive.’  
Jean Jaurès (1859–1914)

A description of Cicero’s style would be incomplete without referring (at least briefly) to some aspects of his influence. The language of an individual cannot be considered separately from its acceptance by the linguistic community. This principle, which is based on the communicative nature of language, is sometimes strangely neglected even by scholars. To give an example, W. Wundt in his influential *Völkerpsychologie*<sup>112</sup> limited his psychological research to an analysis of the *origin* of linguistic phenomena and neglected another process, which is no less important: their acceptance and survival within a linguistic community. Actually, Wundt’s work, despite its title, is not centred on peoples but on individuals. In a little-known but important critical article, Zielinski<sup>113</sup> insisted on the perspective of social selection and thus added a new dimension to our research on Cicero’s style.

‘Cicero writes the language of everybody, but he does so better than anybody.’<sup>114</sup> The broad influence of Cicero’s orations was made possible by his adapting his style to the linguistic horizon of a large audience and by the convincing artistic shape he gave to his orations. As will be shown in Chapter 5, a further factor guaranteeing Cicero’s longevity was his rhetorical art of *amplificatio*: he was able to confer on the subject matter of his orations a general human interest. For later generations his work would be the codification of what was considered to be good Latin in his day. His importance as a ‘classic’ may be described like this: whoever imitated Cato the Elder, was ‘archaizing,’ whereas whoever imitated Cicero was trying

---

<sup>112</sup> Wundt; on Cicero’s influence, Zielinski (*Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*) is the standard authority. For a very useful supplement: MacKendrick (*Phil.*) 258–293 and (on Cicero in America) 294–315. On Daniel Webster as a new Cicero in the vein of the *De Oratore*, *ibid.* 302ff. Further bibliography on Cicero’s influence in: Cavallo (and other eds.), vol. 5, 300f.; for Ciceronianism, Sabbadini; Classen, ‘Cicerostudien’ 198–245; Scaglione (see index s. v. Cicero), but he is wrong in attributing periodic sentence structure to the high style (p. 404); periodicity actually tends to correspond to the middle style.

<sup>113</sup> Zielinski, ‘Wundt.’

<sup>114</sup> Laurand, *Cicéron* 154.

to write good Latin. Cicero's language was not subject to ageing, and again and again, it has deployed its regenerative force.

It is true that, initially, Cicero's authority was not uncontested, and a canonization (in the manner of the Renaissance) was out of the question. But even his opponents could not ignore the high standards of linguistic purity and stylistic beauty he had established. Scholarship is still far from being able to give a full account of the influence of Cicero's language and style. One of the reasons for this is that our grammars (quite understandably) are more interested in the (relatively few) discrepancies from Cicero's usage found in other authors than in the (numerous) parallels.

*Cicero and the Orators of the Following Generation*

In the course of his life, Cicero had come to take an intermediate position between Atticism and Asianism.<sup>115</sup> His stylistic attitude which avoided the mannerisms of both extremes could claim to be 'classical.' Still in his lifetime, Atticism had lost any practical significance (although Messalla and Augustus himself held 'Attic' views), whereas the Asiatic genre would have a great future. The most lively witness to the impact of that new manner in the Augustan age is Seneca the Elder, who conjures up those orators and their orations from his prodigious memory. Clearly, Latin prose style could not be perfected further in the direction taken by Cicero. A new splitting up of the long periods into cola (a development prepared already in Cicero's late orations) and a new enrichment of the vocabulary from poetic sources seemed to be imperative. The very genesis of this new manner shows indirectly the towering importance of Cicero's prose style: anyone eager to rise above mere imitation had to call into question the borderlines between poetry and prose. This experiment was all the more intriguing as, through Cicero's activity, the Roman audience had developed a keen sense of those borderlines.

---

<sup>115</sup> On this debate: Dihle, 'Analogie.'

*History*

Among historians, Sallust was quite un-Ciceronian in his imitation of Thucydides and Cato the Elder,<sup>116</sup> whereas Livy followed Herodotus and Isocrates. We have seen that Isocrates was a model for Cicero, too, in some respects. Consequently, Livy's style became ever more Ciceronian the closer the events he described were to his own age. Livy, in fact, held Cicero in high esteem and rejected Sallust's style. It is subject to debate whether Livy followed Cicero deliberately<sup>117</sup> or simply adhered to the Latin usage of the Augustan age.<sup>118</sup> In all probability, the facts are more complex: of course, Livy basically followed the standards of literary Latin generally accepted in his age, but one should keep in mind that those standards had grown out of the Latin of the previous generation,<sup>119</sup> the language used and refined by Cicero. Being a son of his age, Livy in several minor points deflects from Ciceronian usage; nevertheless, his work meets the standards established by Cicero for an historical style not overburdened with archaisms.<sup>120</sup> Gries justly states that Livy, rather than choosing between 'Ciceronian' and 'poetic' usage, followed the linguistic standards of his own age. In this regard, Livy's general attitude is the same as Cicero's, who had developed his literary Latin from the good usage of his age. Both in his theory of historiography and in his practice as an historian, therefore, Livy adheres to the spirit, if not always to the letter, of Cicero's precepts and practice.

*Cicero and the Style of Augustan Poetry*

Cicero's influence on the language and the style of Augustan poetry is difficult to assess. In matters of vocabulary, it is hard to tell Ciceronian from Ennian elements;<sup>121</sup> no doubt, some 'Ennianisms'

<sup>116</sup> On Sallust's literary principles, cf. Leeman, A. D., *Orationis Ratio*, 179–190.

<sup>117</sup> Walsh; new evidence on Cicero's influence on Livy, even concerning prose rhythm, in Sträterhoff.

<sup>118</sup> Gries.

<sup>119</sup> On differences between Livy's and Cicero's usage, Walsh, 245–270. In prose rhythm, Livy seems to avoid clausulae cherished by Cicero and to prefer clausulae avoided by the great orator, see Dangel (who, in this respect, confirms Zielinski's view).

<sup>120</sup> On Livy's theory and practice as a writer, Walsh, *passim*, esp. 36; Leeman, *Orationis Ratio*, 190–197.

<sup>121</sup> Traglia 61–110.

may have been handed down to the Augustans through Cicero as an intermediary. As a creator of poetic words Cicero was less important than as a creator of a poetic style. In fact, he prepared for the artistic treatment of the hexameter and even the types of well-balanced word order found in Augustan poetry.<sup>122</sup> Moreover, in his translations of passages from Greek poets, Cicero took into consideration the nature of the Latin word-accent and thus made a contribution of his own to the development of Latin verse structure.<sup>123</sup>

The influence of Cicero's prose on Augustan poetry was even more important. The Augustans created a 'contemporary' poetic language (containing relatively few archaic elements), a language based on the Latin of their own epoch. So they could not ignore Cicero, the creator of classical Latin. Twice it happened, as F. Leo observed, that great poetry developed on the basis of a previous acme of prose in Rome: first, in the age of Ennius and Plautus and again 'when Cicero's oratory paved the way for Augustan poetry.'<sup>124</sup>

Cicero had set the standard for good contemporary Latin. In the domain of word order, his influence had a liberating effect;<sup>125</sup> in the domain of diction, his example furthered, for instance, an increase of the use of hyperbaton<sup>126</sup> and a decrease of those accumulations of 'synonyms'—which in old Latin had served to define the intended meaning more precisely. Consequently, Cicero's critique Huysmans (quoted in the general introduction of this book) was doubly wrong: first by confounding this legitimate stylistic device with tautology, second by ignoring the decrease of this type of expression precisely through Cicero's activity.

By transferring the stylistic devices of prose to poetry Cicero himself had shown the way to the Augustans. By shaping a multifaceted literary language able to express all shades of meaning, he had made possible the rise of Augustan poetry. With regard to generic styles, the religious mood of the *Third Catilinarian* influenced Horace, and the 'monarchic' topics found in the *De Marcello* and in some passages of the *De Re Publica* were developed further by the Augustans.

---

<sup>122</sup> Traglia 225; on Cicero's influence as a poet Traglia *ibid.* 235–272 and Büchner, 'Fragmente,' 1236–1267.

<sup>123</sup> Fraenkel, *Iktus* 316–319.

<sup>124</sup> Leo, *Geschichte* 33.

<sup>125</sup> Fraenkel, E., 'Vergil und Cicero,' 217–227; *id.*, *Iktus* 335f.

<sup>126</sup> Norden, *Aeneis* 6, pp. 391–395; Haffter, *Dichtersprache* 79.

A comparative approach to Ovid and Cicero might be rewarding. An example is Ovid's use of a rhetorical parenthesis in order to portray Ulysses.<sup>127</sup> 'Against H. Fränkel's attempt to minimize the rhetorical element in Ovid, one should first try to determine what the Romans meant by the term and then ask where the rhetorical influence came from. Along with Ovid's classroom experience, it might be relevant, too, that the creator of classical literary Latin had been an orator.'<sup>128</sup>

Quite understandably, scholars have been studying differences<sup>129</sup> rather than parallels between Ciceronian and Augustan Latin. Some differences are owing to the poets' (cautious) use of archaisms; more important, however, is the fact that each of them simply relies on the living language of his age.<sup>130</sup>

### *Seneca the Philosopher*

Cicero's contributions to the vocabulary of philosophy are considerable; an example is the notion of *qualitas*. Critics who maintain that Cicero replaced precision with emphasis<sup>131</sup> should consider both the difficulties he had to face and his literary intentions in each case. His influence on Seneca can be traced in the case of the term *indifferens*, which in all probability had been coined by Cicero (*De Finibus* 3. 53) and was picked up by Seneca (*Epistulae* 82. 10, twice; *Dialogi* 7 [= *De Vita Beata*]. 22. 4). On the other hand, the noun *indifferentia* was not used by Cicero and is equally avoided by Seneca and later authors as a philosophical term.<sup>132</sup>

Quintilian, who defended a moderate Ciceronianism,<sup>133</sup> was Seneca's opponent in matters of style. This obscures the fact that even Seneca was greatly indebted to Cicero. In the domain of prose rhythm—an essential constituent of prose style in antiquity—Seneca acknowledges

<sup>127</sup> Albrecht, *Parenthese* 189–215, esp. 190.

<sup>128</sup> Kraus, W., 'Forschungsbericht: Ovid,' *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 11 (1958) 40.

<sup>129</sup> Kroll, *Studien* 247–279 ('Die Dichtersprache'); Maurach, G., *Lateinische Dichtersprache* (Darmstadt, 1995) is rather reticent on Cicero.

<sup>130</sup> Löfstedt 2, 347; an example is Augustan *imus* (for Cicero's *infimus*).

<sup>131</sup> Poncelet, *Style philosophique*, passim.

<sup>132</sup> Stang, 'Zur philosophischen Sprache' 95f.

<sup>133</sup> *Ille se profecisse sciat, cui Cicero valde placebit* (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 10. 1. 112). Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* 327, considers Quintilian an eclectic rather than an exponent of classicism.

Cicero's authority as a model (*Epistulae* 100. 7): *Lege Ciceronem: compositio eius una est, pedem servat, curvat lenta et sine infamia mollis. At contra Pollionis Asinii salebrosa et exiliens et ubi minime exspectes, relictura. Denique omnia apud Ciceronem desinunt, apud Pollionem cadunt exceptis paucissimis, quae ad certum modum et ad unum exemplar adstricta sunt* 'Read Cicero: his style has unity; it moves with a modulated pace, and is gentle without being degenerate. The style of Asinius Pollio, on the other hand, is 'bumpy', jerky, leaving off when you least expect it. And finally, Cicero always stops gradually; while Pollio 'drops,' except in the very few cases where he cleaves to a definite rhythm and a single pattern.'<sup>134</sup> However, there are considerable differences: whereas Cicero in his philosophical writings was striving for a well-balanced and contemplative style, Seneca tried to influence his reader's decisions by means of short and pointed cola; nevertheless, by constantly using this feature, his style admits of less variation than Cicero's does. Moreover, in Seneca's age, Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* began to have an effect upon the written language.<sup>135</sup>

#### *Ciceronianism in the First Century AD*

In the first century AD, Asconius Pedianus wrote excellent commentaries on works of Cicero. Such scholarly work met the needs of the classroom, where Cicero's orations were studied thoroughly. Seneca and Petronius agree with Quintilian (who is the exponent of a consolidated school tradition) in their criticism of the excesses of rhetorical declamation. In the Tacitean *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Messalla, a defender of a classical style of oratory, propagates a return to Cicero's principles as an antidote against the decline of eloquence. Messalla is less pessimistic than Petronius' Agamemnon, whereas Quintilian, being a teacher, ranks instruction higher and philosophy somewhat lower than Messalla does. Nothing is more typical of Cicero's significance than the fact that even a modernist like Aper referred to Cicero as an exemplary case (Tacitus, *Dialogus* 22): *Ad Ciceronem venio, cui eadem pugna cum aequalibus suis fuit, quae mihi vobiscum est* 'I come now to Cicero, who had the same battle to fight with his contemporaries that I have with you.'<sup>136</sup> The style of the

<sup>134</sup> Translation: Gummere.

<sup>135</sup> Oksala 105.

<sup>136</sup> Translation: Peterson.

*Dialogus* (so different from that of Tacitus' historical writings) would not have been possible without Cicero; the same is true of Pliny's *Letters* and *Panegyric*. Some divergences are rightly stressed by Leeman:<sup>137</sup> as an orator, Pliny adhered to Cicero's ideal of 'fullness' (*ubertas*), but to achieve this, he used typically 'modern' devices which would not have satisfied Quintilian.<sup>138</sup> Unlike Quintilian, who considered the forensic orator the embodiment of oratory, Pliny cultivated the epideictic genre as art for art's sake; in his theory of historiography, unlike Cicero, he showed a preference for the Sallustian and Tacitean mode, to which even Quintilian felt attracted.<sup>139</sup>

### *Archaists*

The stylistic ideal of the archaists was at first glance diametrically opposed to Cicero's. Symptomatic of a great change was the new meaning given to the term *elegans*. In Caesar's and Cicero's day, this term denoted the proper expression, the right word in the right place; in Fronto's time, it came to mean the rare and exquisite word. Though fully recognizing Cicero's importance, Fronto did not find enough archaic words in his works and turned to earlier models.<sup>140</sup> At that time, it was fashionable to give one's style some antique colour (*colorem vetusculum appingere*),<sup>141</sup> but we should not overlook that, basically, an author like Fronto was not fond of archaism for archaism's sake but was in search of the proper Latin word;<sup>142</sup> this is confirmed by the fact that Fronto carefully studied Cicero's letters. He warmly recommended Cicero's *De Imperio Pompei* as a model to his illustrious student (Fronto p. 210 Van Den Hout) and even warned him against using obsolete words inconsiderately (ibid. 58). In his deliberate choice of words (*delectus verborum*)<sup>143</sup> and of levels of style, he strictly followed the principle of *aptum* (ibid. 207–211). Consequently, as a learned and moderate Atticist, Fronto was anything but tread-

<sup>137</sup> Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* 323.

<sup>138</sup> Leeman, ibid. 327.

<sup>139</sup> Leeman, ibid. 337.

<sup>140</sup> Klotz, A., 'Klassizismus und Archaismus,' *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie* 15 (1908), 401–417, especially 416.

<sup>141</sup> Fronto, p. 150 Van den Hout.

<sup>142</sup> *Verba propria* (p. 159); cf., for instance, his list of synonyms for "washing" as applied in various contexts (p. 58 Van Den Hout).

<sup>143</sup> Cf. 57–58; 136.1; 144.22; 146.15–147.9; 150–151 Van Den Hout.

ing opposite to Cicero's world. Nor is Gellius an enemy of the great orator; he defends him against Seneca's attacks (*Noctes Atticae* 12.2) and quotes Favorinus recommending to a student (*ibid.* 1.10.4) 'old moral principles, but contemporary speech' (*vive igitur moribus praeteritis, loquere verbis praesentibus*) together with Caesar's well-known warning against words unheard-of.<sup>144</sup>

The work of Chalcidius allows us to measure the progress in philosophical language achieved from Cicero to the 4th century AD.

### *Christian Authors*

Among Christian writers, it is only with Minucius Felix (whose dialogue *Octavius* is reminiscent of Cicero's philosophical writings) and Lactantius (sometimes called the 'Christian Cicero') that Ciceronian influence begins to prevail. Their attempts should not be dismissed as '*de gauches retours aux emphases cicéroniennes*' ('awkward relapses into Cicero's emphatic tones'),<sup>145</sup> they fulfilled an important mission in their age, conveying Christianity to the educated class in an urbane Latin (free from evangelical rusticities) and developing a Christian anthropology which was more attractive to Roman readers than theological hair-splitting. In Cicero's time, his style had helped to make Greek education an integral part of Roman culture; now, in the age of Constantine, it contributed to assimilating Christianity into the Roman identity. Cicero's style was an obvious choice, not because it was Cicero's, but because it was considered the essence of good Latin. As a further step, Ambrose in his *De officiis Ministrorum* would Christianize Cicero's *De Officiis*; but it was left to Jerome to deserve fully the title of 'Christian Cicero'<sup>146</sup>—to the point of dreaming that in the Last Judgement the Lord would rebuke him: 'Thou art a Ciceronian, not a Christian' (*Epistulae* 22. 30). Later in his life, Jerome would reconcile this antithesis. The rhetoric of his attacks against Jovinian was inspired by Cicero.<sup>147</sup> As a translator, Jerome adhered

<sup>144</sup> *Tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum* (Caesar, *De Analogia*, quoted by Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 1. 10. 4 = *Frg.* 16 Klotz = *Grammatic. Roman. Fragmenta* 14. 152 Funaioli.

<sup>145</sup> Huysmans, J. K., in his famous *A Rebours* (Paris, 1884), chapter III (p. 51).

<sup>146</sup> Ironically given to Ambrose by the same Huysmans (*ibid.* 53): 'P'ennuyeux Cicéron chrétien.'

<sup>147</sup> Steinmann, J., *Hieronymus* (1958, German edn. Cologne, 1961), 218.

to the principle of literal translation only for biblical texts, and even here he tried to reconcile fidelity with beauty.<sup>148</sup>

Ambrose's and Jerome's efforts to convey to Christian ministers a broad educational background<sup>149</sup> were crowned by Augustine in his *De Doctrina Christiana*. Ciceronian rhetoric<sup>150</sup> was turned into Christian hermeneutics: the art of speech became an art of reading. Augustine was well aware of the fact that in Cicero style and content could not be separated from each other ('everyone admires his tongue, but ignores his wisdom').<sup>151</sup> He never forgot that it was through Cicero that he was first converted to a contemplative life.<sup>152</sup> It is no less true, however, that he had difficulty in accepting the message of the Bible (p. 144) because of its un-Ciceronian style.<sup>153</sup> The diction of his earlier works reveals his closeness to Cicero.<sup>154</sup> In his *Confessions*, his attitude to word-play is more Ciceronian<sup>155</sup> than in his sermons with their broader acceptance of popular and Plautine elements.<sup>156</sup> A feature typical of Augustine is play on homonyms of distant etymological origin such as (*Sermon* 295. 3): *flevit amare, qui noverat amare* 'he who had come to know love, wept bitter tears.' Such puns had been disapproved of by Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 9. 3. 69) and avoided by Cyprian, a fact ascribed to Ciceronian influence by C. Mohrmann.<sup>157</sup> Although one should not exaggerate the severity of Cicero's taste in this regard, there is a significant difference between Cicero's pronounced purism in his orations delivered before the people and the contrary attitude of the Christian preacher. But there are parallels in another respect: in Cicero's time, *nomina agentis* end-

<sup>148</sup> Steinmann, *ibid.* 235–236; cf. 96–98; on the un-Ciceronian character of his exegesis of Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*, *ibid.* 173; on Cicero's and Jerome's theory of translation, Serra Zanetti; further articles on Cicero's influence *ibid.*

<sup>149</sup> Thanks to figures like Jerome and Benedict, education and learnedness would remain a hallmark of Western monks and ministers.

<sup>150</sup> On Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* and Cicero, Prestel; Pollmann.

<sup>151</sup> Augustine, *Confessions* 3. 4. 7.

<sup>152</sup> On the philosophical importance of Cicero for Augustine: M. Testard's classical book and recent article; in addition: Tescari.

<sup>153</sup> *Visa est mihi indigna, quam Tullianae dignitati compararem* 'to me it looked unworthy to be compared to the stateliness of the Ciceronian eloquence,' Augustine, *Confessions* 3. 5. 9, translation by Watts, W. (1631, London and New York, 1919).

<sup>154</sup> Mohrmann 1, 248.

<sup>155</sup> Mohrmann 1, 317. For Augustine's rhetorical theory and his practice in the sermons, see Avilés.

<sup>156</sup> Mohrmann 1, 344.

<sup>157</sup> Mohrmann 1, 294–295.

ing in *-tor* were an important instrument of political invective or propaganda; they continued to play this role in imperial propaganda and even in Christian homilies.<sup>158</sup>

### *Prose Rhythm*

Except for historians, who followed their own rules, the majority of the Latin writers (even Suetonius and Florus) used the Ciceronian rhythmic *clausulae*. The same is true for Church Fathers such as Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Leo the Great.<sup>159</sup> Since the sense of quantities decayed, the main types of quantitative *clausulae* were replaced with corresponding *clausulae* exhibiting an analogous rhythmic sequence in terms of word accent. During a period of transition, especially careful writers tried to meet the requirements of both accent and quantity. The relevant doctrine of *cursus* would be observed by ambitious ecclesiastical writers right into the early modern age,<sup>160</sup> whereas many humanists of the Renaissance were less eager to imitate Cicero's prose rhythm,<sup>161</sup> although they had a keen sense of the balanced structure of Ciceronian prose.<sup>162</sup> Nevertheless, the existence of prose rhythm continued to be known in theory. It was only in the 19th century that it fell into oblivion.

### *Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Modern Age*

In the Middle Ages, rhetoric was taught as one of the liberal arts: together with grammar and dialectics, it was part of the *trivium*, though considered inferior to dialectics. In the Carolingian period Cicero again became the model of polished style (Lupus of Ferrières); his influence increased in the 11th century and reached its peak in the 12th century with John of Salisbury and Otto von Freising. In the same epoch, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and the *De Inventione* served as a basis for a revival of a type of rhetoric which, for all its care

<sup>158</sup> Weische, *Studien* 105–111.

<sup>159</sup> For an overview from Cicero to Augustine, Primmer, 'Mündlichkeit.'

<sup>160</sup> Laurand 353–361; Crusius/Rubenbauer 132–137 (with bibl.); Dangel has shown that Cicero respected the word accent to some degree, thus preparing for the later practice.

<sup>161</sup> Laurand 184.

<sup>162</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa* 806; Linck, G. H., *De oratione concinna* (Altorf 1709) 32–34.

for *elocutio*, however, indulged in un-Ciceronian mannerisms to the point of obscurity.

With the Renaissance and its return to a creative imitation of the classics a great change took place. Dialectics retreated before rhetoric. In England, rhetoric was not confined to the classrooms or to a small circle of scholars, but immediately influenced the life of the nation. Rhetoric was practiced not only in lecture halls and in Parliament, but even in gentlemen's clubs. Under the spell of the classics, there arose a new sense of the beauty of words, a new delight in the euphony of speech. Teachers of rhetoric were not alien to public life. An example is Sir Thomas Wilson, a statesman who was the author of the most influential handbook of rhetoric in England. English culture was especially enriched by the fact that politicians absorbed Cicero's and Demosthenes' culture of speech and integrated it into their own active political experience.

It would be outside the scope of the present essay to study Cicero's influence on Latin and vernacular style from the Renaissance to our day.<sup>163</sup> When Salutati was called 'Cicero's monkey' (*Ciceronis simia*) by his biographer, this was meant to be a honorific title, not an insult. In classrooms, thanks to Italians like Barizza and Guarino,<sup>164</sup> Cicero took a place of honour. Luther<sup>165</sup> preferred him to Aristotle; Melancthon<sup>166</sup> and Ioannes Sturm gave Cicero a leading role in the curriculum of protestant schools,<sup>167</sup> and the Jesuits,<sup>168</sup> in their

---

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Zielinski, *Cicero*, 134–203; Sabbadini, *Storia*; Paratore, E., 'Cicerone attraverso i secoli' (very succinct). A fresh approach to 17th and 18th century Latin style (especially: Ruhnken) is found in Nikitinski, *De eloquentia latina*, who, however, underrates the innovative force of Nägelsbach's approach to Latin style.

<sup>164</sup> Zielinski, T., *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, 181f.; Lorenzo Valla shocked his contemporaries by preferring Quintilian to Cicero, but through his *Elegantiae* laid a solid foundation for later Ciceronianism.

<sup>165</sup> Cf. Albrecht, *History*, 556f.

<sup>166</sup> *Proponas tibi aliquod Ciceronis scriptum, illud saepe legas, ut ita eius formam et rationem loquendi in animum tibi imprimas, atque in scribendo tuum styllum ad eum dirigas. Utere iis verbis et tali compositione* (Philippus Melancthon, *Praelectio de III Lib. De Oratore*, quoted by a 16th century reader on the title page of my copy of Sturm's edition, see the following note); on Cicero's influence on both protestant and catholic schools, Zielinski, *Cicero* 354–355.

<sup>167</sup> In his *Praefatio*, Ioannes Sturm rightly maintains that Erasmus did not deny Cicero's excellence but wished to free scholars from slavery and encourage them to independent thought (ed. of Cicero's orations, Vol. 1 Argentorati 1540, fol. \*iij verso): *Neque enim Erasmus negavit Ciceronem ceteris anteponi debere, sed servitutem a docturum ingenijs depellere conatus est, et iudicium prudentiamque requisivit.*

<sup>168</sup> See now: Feigenbutz/Reichensberger, *Barockrhetorik und Jesuitenpädagogik*, an *editio princeps*, based on a ms. discovered by the present author.

turn, had their students learn his texts by heart. From the Renaissance onward, there were numerous cross-references between Latin and vernacular style. The lively discussions between the followers of Cicero and those of Seneca or Tacitus (such as Justus Lipsius, who non the less recommended daily readings of Cicero) greatly enriched even the stylistic awareness of vernacular writers and furthered the emancipation of modern languages.<sup>169</sup> A document of that epoch still worth reading is Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* (1528). The author attacks Italian imitators of Cicero and justly maintains that each writer should develop a style of his own and follow Cicero's sense of appropriateness (*aptum*) rather than ape his expressions; far from being an enemy of Cicero, he even finds pertinent words of praise for him, especially in his *Colloquia*. Moreover, the problem of 'Ciceronianism,' often ridiculed as a hobby-horse of some crazy humanists, at closer inspection turns out to have influenced explicitly or implicitly all reflections on rhetoric in Europe since the Renaissance: an intriguing parallel case to late antiquity, when Augustine—in an extremely fruitful 'discussion' with Cicero—put on a new basis rhetoric—the art of conveying the truth—and hermeneutics—the art of understanding what you read.

### *Conclusion: Cicero and Literary Latin*

Many elements of Cicero's language and style (and among them, many innovations) were accepted by the linguistic community. Only a few words and constructions were rejected, among them some poetic words, which were ridiculed as early as the first century,<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> Cf. the masterly survey by Magnien, 'D'Érasme à Montaigne,' (with modern bibl.); on Cicero's style as studied throughout the ages see also Nägelsbach, 1–23 (with older bibl.) and Heesakkers (for the epoch from Petrarch to Lipsius, with many quotations and a rich bibliography). Ironically, the most recent editors of Menge's manual (which in its penultimate edition had also included precious material from Livy and from some other important authors) returned to a superstitious idolatry of Caesar and Cicero (p. xxiv), to the point of allowing their poor students to use, for instance, only those forms of *amare* which happen to be explicitly attested in Cicero, a servile attitude which in my judgement is utterly un-Ciceronian and will produce parrots rather than stylists and further pedantry rather than literary judgement. A new edition of Nägelsbach's masterly manual of Latin style is a desideratum indeed.

<sup>170</sup> See above, p. 32.

and an unfortunate Latinization like *veriloquium* for *etymologia*. In the domain of style one might mention here the Greekish use of a participle in an interrogative clause: *supplex te ad pedes abiciebas quid petens* (lit. 'you flung yourself to his feet—asking for what?').<sup>171</sup>

Classical Latin as shaped by Cicero differs considerably from Old and Late Latin. However, these differences are often conditioned by style (e.g. literary genre or social level) rather than by chronology. In fact, for all their chronological distance, the latter two forms of Latin have some features in common.<sup>172</sup> Examples are words attested both in Romance languages and in Plautus' comedies (which, however stylized, mirror some elements of spoken Latin) like *fabulari* ('to speak'; Spanish *hablar*) or *quaerere* used as a synonym for *velle* (Spanish *querer*).<sup>173</sup> In many cases, originally, there is a stylistic rather than a semantic difference between synonyms. In the following series, the 'everyday' word appears before its literary equivalent: *portare/ferre*; *grandis/magnus*; *et/atque*; *imus/infimus*. As a consequence, the 'literary' words more often assume metaphorical meanings, a fact from which some authors derive a rule.

Cicero's role within the development of literary Latin is determined by the circumstance that in the first century BC the acme of prose chronologically preceded the golden age of poetry.<sup>174</sup> Just as Cicero paved the way for Augustan poetry, in early Rome the pioneers of poetry could rely on an established tradition of oratory and legal prose. As a purist, he fulfilled a selective function by excluding useless doublets. On the other hand, he enriched the Latin vocabulary, especially in the domain of philosophy. Above all, he bestowed on the style of Latin prose a subtlety and richness in nuances never attained before him. Cicero's great personal achievement was made possible by favourable conditions: for centuries, republican political structures had fostered the development of oratorical skills and traditions, based on a keen sense of 'good Latin' as developed in the leading groups of the Roman society. In this respect, Cicero could

<sup>171</sup> *Philippicae* 2, 86; Laughton, *Participle* 44.

<sup>172</sup> For the modern discussion of linguistic strata (historical, geographical, social . . .) in Latin, see, most recently, Müller, R.

<sup>173</sup> Löfstedt 2, 320–322.

<sup>174</sup> In addition, there might have been in republican Latin a general tendency towards some ideal type of written language: Marouzeau, 'Notes complémentaires' 89–94, esp. 93.

start his activity as a stylist on a very high level. In his hands, the basic principles of clarity and functionalism were transformed into beauty and harmony.<sup>175</sup> For a just appraisal of Cicero's stylistic achievement we must take into account the relationship to his contemporaries. We might consider, then, Cicero's language as the sum of the linguistic points of contact between him and his various audiences. Language and style form a borderline between an individual and his surroundings and, therefore, may even be used to define his personality. In this regard, with all due respect to Norden,<sup>176</sup> the style and the man are inseparable even in antiquity. In any case, the fact that Cicero strove to find for each situation the most appropriate expression made his language most suitable for being accepted by the linguistic community as its own language.

This phenomenon, which sheds light on the psychology of groups, could be observed repeatedly in the course of the history of Latin literature; certain authors chose his language and style as their model (an attitude which, interestingly, never was regarded as 'archaizing'). Others tried, on the basis of their own contemporary usage, to write a Latin style free from unnecessary archaisms and neologisms and thus followed the spirit rather than the letter of Cicero's precepts and examples.

---

<sup>175</sup> Cf. Zielinski, *ibid.* 665.

<sup>176</sup> Norden, *Kunstprosa* 12: 'Der Stil war im Altertum nicht der Mensch selbst, sondern ein Gewand, das er nach Belieben wechseln konnte.'

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CHAPTER FIVE

### STYLE AND CONTEXT IN THE ORATIONS

Ἄλλὰ τόδε γε οἶμαι σε φάναι ἄν, δεῖν πάντα λόγον  
ὥσπερ ζῶον συνεστάναι σῶμα τι ἔχοντα αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ,  
ὥστε μήτε ἀκέφαλον εἶναι μήτε ἄπουν, ἀλλὰ μέσα  
τε ἔχειν καὶ ἄκρα, πρέποντα ἀλλήλοις καὶ τῷ ὅλῳ  
γεγραμμένα.

'But I do think you will agree to this, that every discourse must be organized, like a living being, with a body of its own, as it were, so as not to be headless or footless, but to have a middle and members, composed in fitting relation to each other and to the whole.'

Plato, *Phaedrus* 264 c<sup>1</sup>

#### *Preliminary Remarks*

Chapters 1–4 surveyed the ways Cicero proved himself a master stylist in the various literary genres he worked in. The next step is to document, by select interpretative examples from the orations, the ways in which the elements studied separately hitherto interact in Cicero's practice and the ways in which a multitude of factors—such as the audience, the degree of literary elaboration, the influence of literary theory, and, above all, the aim of persuasion—cooperate to create an individual style in each given case.

The choice of texts to be discussed here is conditioned by considerations of form, content, and social context. As for form, the chosen passages represent the standard divisions of a classical oration: *prooemium*, *narratio*, *digressio*, *peroratio*. In order to capture the generic differences between these divisions and Cicero's individual stylistic achievement in each case it will be necessary to discuss the position of the chosen passages within the relevant oration as a whole (as hinted at in the motto of this chapter). Furthermore Cicero's stylistic practice will

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation: Fowler.

be compared to his theory and measured against the guiding principle of decorum (*aptum*), the towering importance of which to style has not always been fully recognized by commentators on Cicero.<sup>2</sup> Hence style might turn out to be determined by invention rather than by arbitrary stylistic choices. Another all-pervasive thread is Cicero's use of stylistic means to give an individual case general significance (*amplificatio*). This will lead over to the subject of the Epilogue to this book: Cicero's contribution to a 'culture of speech.'

In fact, all the selected texts exhibit a high degree of literary sophistication, and they have been selected for this reason. The *Pro Milone* is the second version—written for publication—of a plea that in its oral form was unsuccessful. No matter whether Cicero's bad performance in this case was caused by shortcomings of the delivered version or by poor delivery only—a husky and tremulous voice betraying the speaker's nervousness—the published version—combining a high degree of elaborateness with studied negligence—shows Cicero at his best. The *Actio Secunda* of the *Verrines* was written for publication only. It is a test-case of Cicero's art of *amplificatio*.—Quite different keys are struck in Cicero's Caesarian orations. While the *De Marcello* was given in the Senate and has a more 'epideictic' ring, the *Pro Deiotaro* was delivered before a single judge—Caesar himself. This situation conditions the style of the oration. Caesar would not have appreciated the 'full orchestra' style of the *Verrines*, and Cicero found a new diction appropriate to the changed situation—a style comparable, so to speak, to 'chamber music.' The means of persuasion chosen here are no less rhetorical, but more subtle. The 'subliminal' or 'indirect' type of introduction called *insinuatio* enters here.

As for the social context of our texts, the examples allow to distinguish pleas before a single judge (such as the *Pro Deiotaro*) from orations directed to a large public (given in the forum—and rewritten later—like the *Pro Milone*, or even written for publication only—such as the *Actio Secunda* of the *Verrines*).

On the level of content, the texts under discussion here deal with serious problems that might interest a modern reader: the *De Marcello* is shown not to be mere praise of Caesar's 'clemency' (as many have thought) but a courageous attempt to win over an 'almighty' dictator to prove his great 'wisdom' (*sapientia*) by voluntarily submitting to the *auctoritas* of the Senate and the traditions of the Republic.

<sup>2</sup> Neglected by Gotoff (*Commentary*), for instance.

More radically the *Pro Rege Deiotaro* reflects the change from the Republic to the Principate; it is a complement to the preceding oration in that it shows what a plea for clemency before an almighty single judge looks like. The *Verrines* denounce greed as a crime against divine order and human society, a message that has lost nothing of its topical interest. The *Pro Archia* takes up the importance of poetry and letters to society. The *Pro Milone* reveals an intellectual's discomfort in front of a massive military presence inimical to freedom of speech. Each of these orations raises burning issues and illustrates the ways to handle them in an appropriate style.

Finally, the examples will allow the reader of this book to establish some hierarchy among the different factors conditioning style and also to consider what might be the leading principles behind Cicero's stylistic choices.

The first example illustrates *prooemium*, the first division of an oration. Special attention is given here to the change and fusion of different types of discourse: epideictic, forensic, and political.

Prooemium (I): *The De Marcello*<sup>3</sup>  
*Epideictic, Forensic, and Political Discourse*

Hitherto, scholars have not felt particularly attracted to the *De Marcello*. Even so, there is no unanimity among the few concerning the character and the style of this oration. And where unanimity has been achieved—as on the title and the main purpose of the speech—it is

---

<sup>3</sup> For an earlier version of this study, Albrecht, M. von, 'Ciceros Rede für Marcellus. Epideiktische und nicht-epideiktische Elemente,' in P. Neukam (ed.), *Die Antike in literarischen Zeugnissen* (Munich, 1988), 7–16; for a stylistic commentary: Gotoff, *Caesarian Speeches*, 3–91 (on the dynamics of sentence structure); on the rhetorical devices used in this oration, MacKendrick (*Speeches*), 406–421 (e.g., high frequency of *tu*, referring to Caesar, of metaphors and of personifications); for 'laudatory' elements in Cicero's orations, Achard, *Pratique*, 359–425; for a recent assessment of the political and rhetorical importance of the Caesarian orations, see C. Ramos; for a general discussion of the *De Marcello* and a full and critical bibliography see Kerkhecker (2002). He rightly rejects an extreme reading 'against the stroke' (Cicero challenging the senators to murder Caesar: Dyer 1990); instead he insists on Cicero's opening a new page and creating a new (and seminal) language of 'personal loyalty' at an historical moment (between the Republic and the Principate) in a literary form. Kerkhecker does not emphasize, however, the crucial importance of *sapientia* to the *De Marcello* (see Rochlitz and the present chapter). On Cicero's attitude to Caesar, Achard, *Pratique*, 159–175. On Cicero's believability in the *De Marcello*, most recently, Winterbottom; on Cicero, rhetoric, and empire: Steel.

treacherous. A fuller understanding of the character and the style of the oration might emerge from a study of epideictic (laudatory), forensic (legal), and deliberative (political) oratory in the *De Marcello*. Moreover, two excursuses will discuss the title and the main purpose of the oration.

Scholars are used to quoting parallel texts mainly from Cicero's *Letters*<sup>4</sup> and the *De Re Publica*. Problems of form will be discussed here in the light of the *Orator* (dating from roughly the same period of Cicero's life). Moreover, Caesar's *Bellum Civile* might illustrate some aspects of the content of the oration.

### I *Epideictic Elements*

Epideictic elements are features typical of orations delivered on festive occasions. Among those of Cicero's orations which contain a relatively large number of epideictic elements,<sup>5</sup> the *De Marcello* takes a place of honour.

Cicero's theories concerning epideictic oratory and the so-called middle style give us some hints as to which elements of his oration the author would have regarded as epideictic.<sup>6</sup> The most important passages on this subject are found in the *Orator*.<sup>7</sup>

First of all, according to the *Orator* (37), the epideictic genre admits of greater freedom (*liberiore licentia*) in prose rhythm. This does not

---

<sup>4</sup> Even Kerkhecker, despite some (inevitable?) compliments to 'Literaturwissenschaft' and 'language,' basically uses the well-known material from the letters in an historical and philological vein, a procedure, which, of course, is unobjectionable.

<sup>5</sup> Especially, the *De Imperio Pompei* (= *De Lege Manilia*) and the *Pro Archia*. Moreover, the epideictic character of Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* is stressed by Ronnick. On the affinity of epideictic oratory with the middle style, Winterbottom, 'Cicero and the Middle Style.'

<sup>6</sup> The doctrine of *status* cannot be applied to the epideictic genre without qualifications. The *status qualitatis* is said to be the most important *status* of the *genus laudativum* (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 3. 7. 28). In such cases, the problem at stake is: *an honestum sit*. In the *De Marcello*, Cicero makes the point that Caesar's great military exploits are not yet matched by comparable merits as a citizen. Even this element (typical of the *inventio* of laudatory speeches) serves another purpose (namely, a deliberative one). In addition, the orator uses elements of the *status finitionis* to make his ideas plausible. The life and the deeds of a person are partly described by *facta*, partly measured by the standard of *lex*. The epideictic redefinition of vices in terms of neighbouring virtues (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 3. 7. 25) was a trick accepted by Quintilian only when employed in the service of public welfare. This *color* is used by Cicero (*De Marcello* 21): 'Since Caesar's enemies are either dead or have been pardoned, there are only friends in the Senate.' Thus, the orator turns 'menace' into 'protection.'

<sup>7</sup> Cicero, *Orator* 21, cf. 25–26; 37–42; 63–65; 91–96.

mean, however, lack of care. On the contrary, the context shows that Cicero's idea of 'freedom' is different: the artist need not conceal his art, he may use freely all stylistic resources and apply them more frequently than elsewhere (*de industriaque non ex insidiis sed aperte elaboratur: Orator* 38). In fact, in the 19 lines of the *peroratio* (*De Marcello* 33f.) we find no fewer than 21 rhythmic *clausulae*.<sup>8</sup>

A further hallmark of the epideictic style emphasized in the *Orator* is a rich vocabulary (*copia verborum, Orator* 37). In the *De Marcello* this applies especially to the semantic fields of moral qualities like 'wisdom' and 'clemency.' We will come back to the abundance of nominal and verbal expressions deployed in this domain.

The next point is euphony. According to Cicero, the epideictic genre is full of sonorous words (*verbis sonans, Orator* 42). To give an example, in the introduction of the *De Marcello* the sequence *omnes* (-is), *omnium*, *omnibus* appears twice. This feature (called polyptoton) is part of the 'loveliness' (*dulce, Orator* 42) which is typical of the 'middle style.' However, Cicero uses it in order to achieve a political aim: in its context, the double polyptoton sounds almost like a spell conjuring up the presence of the community as a whole. Thus Cicero tries to neutralize Caesar's demonic ego, by integrating him into the *res publica*.

Another element typical of epideictic speech is frequent use of *sententiae* (cf. Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 5). In fact, Cicero, in the present oration, expresses his ideas in a pointed manner. The most striking example is a compliment to Caesar (implying at the same time a lesson in magnanimity): 'You seem to have vanquished Victory herself' (*ut ipsam victoriam vicisse videaris, De Marcello* 12). This aphorism is conspicuous to the point of needing a careful introduction and almost an excuse; its artificial character is evident.<sup>9</sup> All this is typical of the epideictic genre. Nevertheless even this word-play is not idle talk; it reveals the central idea of the oration.

As for sentence structure, according to Cicero an epideictic discourse must consist of well-rounded periods (*in orbe inclusa currat oratio, Orator* 207). In the *De Marcello* Cicero bestows attentive effort on sentence construction. In fact, the very first sentence of the oration consists of a chiasmic and a parallel sequence. First we have

<sup>8</sup> Dcretic (10), cretic + trochee (8), cretic + ditrochee (3). This is a great number, even if one neglects Zielinski's version of line 8 in Clark's edition (*unius solum salute, sed ut de omnium sentio*) and of line 14 (*praestare debeo*: the reading of the Harleianus 2682, 11th century), but *debeo* makes a *clausula* as well.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also the word-play on *mens* and *amens* (*De Marcello* 6).

*silenti*  
     *finem*  
         *hodiernus dies*  
             *attulit*  
                 *idemque*  
             *initium*  
     *dicendi.*

Then two parallel groups follow:

*tantam enim . . . mansuetudinem*  
     *tam inusitatam clementiam*  
*tantum . . . modum*  
     *tam . . . incredibilem sapientiam*

Both of these structures are not only indicative of æsthetic sophistication, they also serve the aims of persuasion. In our first example, the turning-point in Cicero's behaviour is reflected in a sentence carefully constructed around an axis of symmetry. In the second example, Caesar's clemency is placed into a broader context (*mansuetudo, clementia, modus, sapientia*); this suggests that praise of Caesar's *clementia* is neither the only subject nor the ultimate goal of the oration but only a means to an end;<sup>10</sup> we will come back to this point.

The next topic is antithesis; its frequent use in epideictic orations is recommended in the *Orator* (38) as well (*ut crebro conferantur pugnantia*). Antithesis often appears in chiasmic or parallel arrangement:

1. *silenti finem . . . attulit, . . . idemque initium dicendi* (chiasmus)
2. *in eadem causa fuisset, non in eadem esset fortuna* (chiasmus combined with parallelism)
3. *quanta in dato beneficio sit laus, cum in accepto sit tanta gloria* (same form as 2)

These antitheses convey crucial themes: the first of them shows that Cicero (who is the voice of the Republic, as it were) ventures to speak in public after a long silence. The two other examples illuminate the relations between Cicero and Marcellus and between Caesar and Marcellus.

Furthermore, long digressions are typical of epideictic oratory (*Orator* 65). This applies to the *De Marcello*. However, the digression in this

<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the middle and the end of the sentence are emphasized by the same type of *clausula* (cretic + trochee).

oration contains an important political message. Consequently, there is some contrast between structure and content. What at first sight seems to be a eulogy with a political excursus, turns out to be a political oration in guise of a eulogy.

Cicero is especially impressive in his use of *gradatio* and *amplificatio*. These techniques are essential to laudatory orations, although their use is not limited to them. In the *De Marcello*, Cicero begins with an 'epideictic' use of these techniques (although he will not limit himself to this use of amplification): Caesar's victories are great, but what he has done today is even greater (this is the structural principle behind paragraphs 4–13). In the central section of the oration Cicero is even bolder: 'What you have done is great, but not yet great enough, given your own greatness and that of our country' (22–30). The same figure of thought comes back towards the end: 'We express our deep gratitude, and the gratitude we feel is even deeper' (33). Cicero puts amplification into the service of his goals of persuasion, as can be clearly seen from the following statement: 'Posterity is still waiting for something to praise in you' (*nunc etiam quae laudet expectat* 28). A strange statement indeed in a so-called eulogy!

Finally, in epideictic orations moral considerations prevail over utilitarian considerations, *honestum* gets the better of *utile*. Accordingly, Cicero dwells on *clementia* and *sapientia* rather than on Caesar's safety, a problem addressed only in a highly moral context (the senators as Caesar's 'bodyguards'). However, *honestum* is not excluded from political orations either; any politician will try to buttress his utilitarian decisions by moral arguments. The importance of moral principles for the *De Marcello*, therefore, is no proof of its epideictic character.

To sum up the first section, epideictic elements help Cicero to tie up his oration and lend some inner unity to it. However, such elements are not used for their own sake: Cicero reserves them for those positions within the oration where they are appropriate and where they convey important messages.<sup>11</sup> Epideictic categories prove, therefore, an important element of the stylistic variety within the oration, though insufficient for an adequate understanding of it as a whole.

---

<sup>11</sup> We shall see that the most important of these messages is Caesar's recognition not only of *clementia*, but even more of *sapientia* (which implies his acceptance of republican standards).

## II *Forensic Elements*

Under the pretext of thanking Caesar for having pardoned Marcellus, Cicero defends forensically all of the former partisans of Pompey against several heavy charges. In this context he takes up some catchwords of Caesarian propaganda, not without criticizing and redefining them. In this respect, a comparative look at the *Bellum Civile* might be helpful.

The first term in question is *dignitas*. Caesar had overtly defended his own *dignitas*,<sup>12</sup> even against the established order of the Republic. Cicero, on the contrary, exhorts him to reinstate the *ornamenta dignitatis* of the Republic and to discover the great *dignitas* implied in *magnitudo animi* and *consilii*, a moral attitude saving the lives of former enemies and restoring them to their moral status (*dignitas*):<sup>13</sup> *tantus est enim splendor in laude vera, tanta in magnitudine animi et consilii dignitas, ut haec a virtute donata, cetera a fortuna commodata esse videantur* 'For so bright is the lustre of true glory, so high the merit that lies in magnanimity and prudence, that while these seem to be a gift of virtue's bestowal, all else is but a loan of fortune' (*De Marcello* 19).<sup>14</sup> By asking Caesar to reestablish the *dignitas* of the Republic and of the Pompeians, he succeeds in turning the tables so that the burden of proof lies upon Caesar; this procedure, current in judicial oratory, is called *retorsio criminis*.

Even more intriguing is Cicero's reinterpretation of *sapientia*. Far from approving of Caesar's Epicurean wisdom ('I have lived enough'), Cicero champions a different kind of *sapientia* which is closely linked with the Republic and envisages a Caesar conquering himself and recognizing the Senate and the Republic. Cicero tries to teach the dictator a hard lesson.

Less daring, but equally close to the judicial genre is the general line of defence. Cicero maintains that the Pompeians (a group of

<sup>12</sup> Caesar, *Bellum Civile* 1. 9. 2 *sibi semper primam fuisse dignitatem*; cf. also 1. 4. 4: Pompey wished that nobody should equal him in *dignitas*. In 1. 7. 7 Caesar orders his soldiers to defend his *existimatio* (prestige) and *dignitas*. In 1. 8. 3 Pompey had already instrumentalized Caesar's *dignitas* in order to win him over for the Republic: *Caesarem pro sua dignitate debere et studium et iracundiam suam rei publicae dimittere*. On *dignitas* in Cicero, Piscitelli.

<sup>13</sup> Caesar enhanced the *dignitas* of Marcellus and of his ancestors (10), and restored that of the Pompeians (13).

<sup>14</sup> Translation: Watts. When describing Cicero's honourable attempts to incorporate the powerful men of his time into the traditional Republic, Achard (*Pratique* 183) uses the telling term *apprivoiser* ('to domesticate').

which he is the spokesman in a way) when offending Caesar did not act on purpose, but accidentally. What they committed was *error*, not *scelus*.<sup>15</sup> He goes on to say that he defended Pompey only as a friend, although he knew that his cause was a desperate one, whereas others were inspired by blind belief in the phantom of the Republic or by fear of Caesar (of whose *clementia* they were clearly ignorant). Here again, Caesarian propaganda (as found in the *Bellum Civile*) is criticized repeatedly. Cicero, while siding with Pompey, was free from *cupiditas* (an objection against the Pompeians raised in *Bellum Civile* 1. 4. 2; cf. 13). Nor was, in his view, the majority of the Pompeians motivated by cruelty (a vice imputed to them by Caesar repeatedly).<sup>16</sup> As for their ignorance, however, Cicero, of course, fully agrees with Caesar.

Other strategies of defence typical of judicial oratory are employed by Cicero as well. He identifies himself with the cause of Marcellus. If this were a judicial oration (as is the case with the *Pro Archia*, which will be considered later), this would mean that Cicero makes use of his own authority as a senator and as a former consul to help his friend. There are traces of this method in the initial part of the *De Marcello*: Cicero regrets that Marcellus, who had shared his political views, had not been as lucky as himself. Similarly, in the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*, Cicero maintains that Deiotarus had not done anything but what Cicero himself and many other distinguished followers of Pompey had done (*quem nos omnes secuti sumus*, *Pro Rege Deiotaro* 12).

Not satisfied with these analogies, Cicero exploits the reverse pattern, too. What might have looked like a plea for Marcellus, turns out to be a defence of the Pompeians and of the Republic. Cicero here employs the technique of *thesis*, a procedure explained in the *Orator* (126 *quicquid est enim illud in quo quasi certamen est controversiae, quod Graece κρινόμενον dicitur, id ita dici placet, ut traducatur ad quaestionem perpetuam atque ut de universo genere dicatur* 'For whatever that part

<sup>15</sup> In defending himself against Augustus, Ovid (*Tristia*, Book Two) would adopt the same method.

<sup>16</sup> *Bellum Civile* 1. 2. 8, etc. Caesar's *lenissima postulata, otium* (ibid. 1. 5. 5). *Crudelitas* of the Pompeians (ibid. 1. 2. 8). The Pompeians are described by Caesar not as friends of the Republic, but as Caesar's enemies (*mimici Caesaris*, ibid. 1. 2. 8; 1. 3. 4; 1. 4. 4; 1. 7. 7). Their motives are base (hatred, greed, thirst for power, envy 1. 7. 1), they act unjustly (for instance, in the case of the two legions, 1. 4. 5; cf. *iniqua condicio* 1. 16), and they are eager to begin the war (1. 4). Behind their hasty actions there is no design (1. 5. 1). Their reactions are excessive (*senatus consultum ultimum*). They destroy temples and disregard Roman traditions (1. 6).

may be called that deals with the central point of the controversy, which the Greeks call κρινόμενον or the issue, ought to be treated in such a way as to transfer the subject to the realm of universals and bring about a discussion of a general principle.<sup>17</sup> Thus, Cicero manages to bestow on his oration an interest beyond the given occasion. Many years earlier, he had turned his plea for the citizenship of Archias into a general defence of education and its importance for Roman society. Similarly, Caesar's pardoning Marcellus gives him occasion to make a general plea for the partisans of Pompey and the Republic. An individual act of clemency is invested with symbolical value by Cicero. The orator draws a political programme for the Republic and intimates that this programme was implied in the pardoning of Marcellus.

Actually, Cicero speaks of Marcellus (*de Marcello*), who does not need an advocate any more, and by doing so defends the Pompeians, the Senate, and the Republic. To achieve this end indirectly, he uses the methods and themes of judicial oratory, though for political aims.

### III *Excursus: The Title of the Oration*

In the current editions, the oration under consideration is called *Pro Marcello*; but should we not prefer the title *De Marcello*? First of all, *Pro Marcello* is not appropriate. Since the oration was given *after* Marcellus had been pardoned, it is, strictly speaking, not a plea for Marcellus. In A. C. Clark's Oxford edition, there is no hint at divergent manuscript readings of the title, which therefore seems to be attested unanimously. But when looking up other editions we find that not all manuscripts bear the title *Pro Marcello*; in the Fuldensis, there is no title at all. And there is more: quotations of our oration in ancient authors bring us back to the end of the fourth century. Arusianus Messius and Servius call our oration definitely *De Marcello*, a title which makes much more sense than the one used in the printed editions.<sup>18</sup> Some 19th century scholars—among them, Nägelsbach—had been aware of the problem.<sup>19</sup> A heading beginning with

<sup>17</sup> Translation: Hubbell.

<sup>18</sup> According to I. C. Orelli, I. G. Baiter, and C. Halm (*M. Tulli Ciceronis opera quae supersunt omnia* 2. 2 Turici 1856 *ad. loc.*), *Pro Marcello* is attested in G (Gemblacensis), *Pro Marco Marcello* in E (Erfurtensis), T (Tegenseensis), and M (Mediceus); F (Fuldensis) has no title. *De M. Marcello* is found in Arusianus Messius p. 264 ed. Lindem. and in Servius, *ad Verg., Aen.* 1. 548 (Thilo/Hagen).

<sup>19</sup> Nägelsbach, *Stilistik*, consistently quotes this oration as *De Marcello*.

*de* is excellent Latin; in Greek titles of orations, *περί* is very common, and in Cicero we find *de* in *De Lege Manilia*, an oration no less rich in epideictic elements than the *De Marcello*.

#### IV *A Political Oration*

In a sense, the *De Marcello* is a political oration; in fact, Cicero tries to give Caesar political advice. This is not an easy task, and Cicero is rather daring in his statements.

To begin with, he inverts the given political situation. Regardless of the actual military dictatorship, Cicero praises civil power and deems *toga* much superior to *arma*, as he had done years ago under Pompey,<sup>20</sup> and with no better success. Once again, the orator wants to be a Mentor to a great general, a new Laelius to the Scipio of his age. To attain this goal, he interprets Caesar's actions—especially his pardoning certain partisans of Pompey—as implying Caesar's subordination of his personal interest to the laws and interests of the Republic.

In order to give more weight to this political advice, he chooses a rather dangerous path: for all his admiration of Caesar's military exploits, he in effect minimizes them by saying that they are not exclusively owing to Caesar's genius but also to chance and to the valour of his soldiers. By doing so, he qualifies, of course, Caesar's self-portrait as found in the *Bellum Civile*, where stress is laid on the general's *consilium*. Cicero goes on saying that a man's victory over himself is more indicative of his moral perfection than any military triumph. Finally, and this is perhaps even more important, he reveals the bitter truth that Caesar has not even laid the foundations for a Roman Republic (let alone achieved the building of that Republic): 'Maybe you have lived enough for yourself, but certainly not for your country.' For all the praise he showers upon the dictator, he tries to convey a serious message to him.

The *De Marcello* is a political oration; it reveals that Cicero's point of view has not changed since the *De Imperio Cn. Pompei (De Lege Manilia)*. He is neither an abject flatterer nor simply an epideictic orator asserting the obvious (as Mommsen<sup>21</sup> thought). Even in his most 'epideictic' orations Cicero is a political orator, adhering to his guiding principles: the priority of civil over military power and of

<sup>20</sup> In the *De Officiis* (1. 77) he quotes his own line: *Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi*.

<sup>21</sup> *Römische Geschichte*, 3, 619.

civic spirit over an individual's unlimited despotism. The fact that Cicero modifies some of the keywords of Caesarian propaganda is further evidence of the political nature of the *De Marcello*.

In handbooks of rhetoric we read that political ('deliberative') orations can border on the epideictic whenever their addressees have already decided how to act and the orator only encourages them to go on.<sup>22</sup> In doing so, Cicero follows an old tradition going back to Homer's Agamemnon who uses the same method to exhort his fellow kings. Hence Cicero, far from disguising a eulogy as a political speech, rather delivers a political oration in guise of a eulogy.

### V *The Intention of the Oration*

More important than the semantic field of 'clemency' is the context into which this theme is inserted. The mere fact that *clementia* is not found in an isolated position, but often in connection with *modus*, *sapientia*, *consilium* (virtues not directed towards the past, but towards the future) reveals a crucial aspect of this oration, an aspect not sufficiently taken into account hitherto. *Pace* former opinions, *clementia* is not the pivotal theme of the *De Marcello*.<sup>23</sup> Cicero builds up a climax reaching from *mansuetudo* and *clementia* to *modus* and *sapientia*. The text of the oration confirms this impression.<sup>24</sup> *Clementia* is framed and crowned by *modus*, *sapientia*, *consilium*, *salus rei publicae*, *communis omnium salus*. In fact, it could not be Cicero's intention to throw into relief a king's virtue such as *clementia*. He was much more interested in *sapientia* and in Caesar's victory over himself, a victory that seemed

<sup>22</sup> Lausberg, *Handbook*, §§ 56; 63.

<sup>23</sup> See now the thesis of my student Rochlitz.

<sup>24</sup> *Mansuetudo*, *clementia*, *modus*, *sapientia* (1), *conservare*, *restituere* (2), *datum beneficium* (3), *sapientia*, *consilium* (7), *animum vincere*, *iracundiam cohibere*, *victoriam temperare*, *extollere iacentem*, *amplificare eius pristinam dignitatem* (8), *aliquid clementer*, *mansuete*, *iuste*, *moderate factum*, *in iracundia praesertim* (9), *id esse salvum velis* (i.e. the remains of the Republic), *dignitatem suam reddidisti* (10), *iustitia et lenitas animi* (11), *te ipsum vicisti*, *ipsam victoriam vicisse* (12), *conservare* (13), *conservandos* (15), *liberalitas* (16), *victoria terminata*, *non ira victoriae* (17), *clementia et sapientia* (18), *Caesar sapiens* (the Pompeians) *in re publica tecum simul esse voluisti*, *beneficia*, *liberalitas*, *sapientia*, *magnitudo animi et consilii* (19), *conservare* (20). *Clementia* is a new type of *dignitas*. The combination of both terms in Cicero's oration implies a re-interpretation of two Caesar's favourite catchwords. *Caesar minime timendus*; *salutem reddidisti*; *conservasti*; *miser cordia* (21), *tua salute contineri suam* (22), *vulnera sananda*, *mederi* (24), *salus rei publicae*, *sapiens* (25), *ut rem publicam constituas* (27), *urbs stabilita tuis consiliis*, *bellum civile salute patriae restinxeris* (29), *odium bonitate leniret* (31), *dissensio extincta aequitate victoris*, *te salvo salvi* (32), *Marcello rei publicae reddito*, *de communi omnium salute* (33), *conservare*, *ornare*, *merita* (34).

to show that the dictator finally respected the Senate and the Republic. Once the towering importance of *sapientia* has been recognized, the organic unity of the oration appears; *sapientia* is the otherwise missing link between eulogy and political oratory in this oration.

#### VI *Special Style of the Caesarian Orations?*

Do the Caesarian orations have a style of their own? Numerous parallels between the *De Marcello* and a much earlier oration such as the *De Lege Manilia*—conditioned by the subject matter and the audience—do not argue in favour of such a view. It is true that Guttman<sup>25</sup> tried to prove the existence of a specific style of the *Orationes Caesarianae*, and he was bold enough to identify this style with ‘Atticism’ and with Caesar’s own style. His very efforts, however, reveal that the *De Marcello* has a special position even within that group, a result which is at variance with his own thesis. Actually, the change of style from the *De Marcello* to the *Pro Rege Deiotaro* is occasioned by a change of audiences: there, Caesar and the Senate; here, Caesar alone. In fact, there was no public to listen to the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*. The change of style somehow reflects the change from the Republic to the Principate.

Briefly, there are parallels between orations given at different times and there are considerable divergences between almost contemporaneous orations. Both phenomena are explained by specific circumstances, the form chosen and the aim pursued in each case. Before making general statements on the Caesarian orations, one should consider the addressees (in the present case, Caesar and, more important, the Senate), the alleged subject matter and the real aim of the oration. Hence it appears that Cicero in a sophisticated way follows the principle of decorum (*aptum*) as established in his *Orator*. The very fact that this treatise is directed against the Atticists might have warned scholars against searching for traces of ‘Atticism’ in the orations of that epoch. Finally, it has been shown above that the theories expounded in the *Orator*—a treatise written against narrow Atticism—are the best commentary on Cicero’s practice in the *De Marcello*.

In the *De Marcello*, distinct oratorical intentions or attitudes coexist. The same is true of the corresponding styles—epideictic, forensic, political. Their calculated alternation, superposition, and coalescence

<sup>25</sup> Guttman.

into a polyphonic whole reveals both the usefulness and the limits of generic categories. The application of such categories is not an aim in itself, and none of them suffices to explain a given text. However, if taken together, such categories are instrumental to the establishment of stylistic nuances, which, in their turn, reflect author's intentions. Style, therefore, ultimately rests on *inventio*.

Prooemium (II): *The Pro Rege Deiotaro*  
*Rhetorical Theory and the Practice of Oratory*<sup>26</sup>

Some critics would readily affirm that, among the numerous evils that weigh so heavily upon Roman literature, rhetoric is the worst, a sickness condemning that literature to immobility from its birth to its death. Fortunately, this condemnation of eloquence is in itself no more than a burst of eloquence, and brilliant rather than illuminating. Actually, in the classical period, writers were much less subject to the tyranny of the principle of absolute originality than the modern age is, and often it is the very strictness of traditions and rules that allows the reader to grasp more perfectly the individual contribution of each author. In fact, the huge potential of creative and emancipatory forces hidden in the art of oratory should be well-known to many of us, though often ignored or belittled, as if it were limited to the mechanical application of a set of rules. Without taking rhetorical theory into account, it would in fact be difficult to assess the wealth of imagination and talent deployed in Cicero's rhetorical practice.

As far as the relationship between Cicero's rhetorical theory and his practice is concerned, scholars are far from unanimous. On the one hand, we have Edmond Courbaud's statement: 'Strangely enough, his influence has been slight even on himself and the Cicero of the discourses has not remembered well enough Cicero the theorist of rhetoric.'<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, it has been demonstrated by L. Laurand<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Originally in French in *Les Etudes Classiques* 52 (1984), 19–24; for a stylistic commentary, see Gotoff, *Caesarian Speeches*, 197–272; on the stylistic devices used in this oration: MacKendrick (*Speeches*) 439–458; on the exordium, Cerutti 131–150.

<sup>27</sup> 'Chose curieuse, son influence a été médiocre même sur lui-même et le Cicéron des discours ne s'est pas assez souvenu du Cicéron théoricien de l'art oratoire' (Courbaud, E., edition of Book 1 of the *De Oratore*, p. xv.

<sup>28</sup> In his thesis *De Ciceronis studiis rhetoricis* and in his masterpiece, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*.

that it is possible to describe the style of Cicero's orations in the light of the *De Oratore* and the *Orator*. However, the domains of *inventio* and *dispositio* were not fully covered by Laurand. Here C. Neumeister<sup>29</sup> and W. Stroh<sup>30</sup> have opened new avenues and done justice to the advocate's tactical reflections (without neglecting rhetorical theory, of course).

After these and other<sup>31</sup> studies, both general and specific, the next step to be taken might be to study the dependence of style on *inventio* (which is one of the purposes of the present book) and it may be the right moment to try an approach from an historical point of view, that is to say, on a diachronic scale. Needless to say, the subject deserves to be studied at length. However, the present study is focused only on a problem which has received less attention hitherto: the influence of the *De Inventione* on Cicero's practice in his orations. This lacuna in Ciceronian studies might be owing to the fact that Cicero in his mature years disclaimed his juvenile work on rhetoric. In order to get a precise idea of the practical impact of the theoretical teachings found in the *De Inventione* we have chosen to study their application in an oration from Cicero's mature years, the plea for King Deiotarus. In a 'late' oration, one would not expect to find echoes of a beginner's theoretical work. If such influences can be traced even here, the same might apply much the more to earlier orations. Furthermore, we will have to inquire into the character of that early treatise and into the reasons for its being rejected by Cicero in his mature years.

## I *A Modest Preamble*

Cicero starts his plea for King Deiotarus with a personal confession: whenever he begins an important oration, he is, if we believe him, much more nervous than one would expect him to be, given his age and his experience. Moreover, in the present case he feels even less comfortable in view of the unusual conditions he must face. Is it not strange, even unheard-of that a king should be subject to a capital trial? What is more, Cicero is compelled to defend a *friend of the*

<sup>29</sup> *Grundsätze der forensischen Rhetorik, gezeigt an Gerichtsreden Ciceros* (München, 1964).

<sup>30</sup> *Taxis und Taktik*.

<sup>31</sup> See Loutsch and especially Cerutti 131–150 (Cerutti rightly compares this oration to the *Pro S. Roscio Amerino* and the *Pro Milone*, orations in which Cicero had to cope with especially awkward situations).

*Roman people*, upon whom he had often showered words of praise before the Senate. And what about the accusers? There is a grandson, irreverent enough to sue his own grandfather (in whom, alas! there is not much filial piety either), and there is a suborned slave, his accomplice and his perfect match in meanness of spirit. But Cicero's greatest preoccupation is the fact that the judge is identical with the victim of the crime under consideration. (His only comfort is his knowledge of Caesar's unusual moral qualities; Cicero insinuates that for the noble Caesar his own verdict over Deiotarus is much less important than the world's verdict on Caesar.) Finally there is the inconvenient fact that the public has been excluded from the audience of the lawsuit, a circumstance which considerably impairs the efficacy of an advocate's plea.

It is only after this discreet and modest preamble (which will be studied here) that Cicero turns—in a slightly less oblique way—to the crucial problem: the angry feelings of the judge with regard to the accused. The orator is cautious enough not to mention those feelings directly but to intimate that the accusers pinned all their hopes on Caesar's anger: now, he suggests, it is up to Caesar to prove that he is above any suspicion of partiality. Only then does Cicero mention Caesar's famous *clementia*—together with *fides* and *constantia*.

## II *The De Inventione: Calculated Frankness and Insinuation*

The next step is to compare this *exordium* with Cicero's rhetorical theory. As early as *De Inventione* 1. 20 in the definition of *exordium* a seminal principle appears: the intention to prepare the listener psychologically for the oration as a whole. In the given case, therefore, Caesar has to be made benevolent (*benevolus*), attentive (*attentus*) and ready to learn (*docilis*). The special stress laid on benevolence in the present oration is in harmony with the specific teachings of the *De Inventione* with regard to cases implying prejudice on the part of the judge (*genus admirabile*): *In admirabili genere causae, si non omnino infesti auditores erunt, principio benevolentiam comparare licebit. Sin erunt vehementer abalienati, confugere necesse erit ad insinuationem. Nam ab iratis si perspicue pax et benevolentia petitur, non modo ea non invenitur, sed augetur atque inflammatur odium* 'in the difficult case, if the auditors are not completely hostile, it will be permissible to try to win their good-will by an introduction; if they are violently opposed it will be necessary to have recourse to insinuation. For if amity and good-will are sought

from auditors who are in a rage, not only is the desired result not obtained, but their hatred is increased and fanned into a flame<sup>32</sup> (*De Inventione* 1. 21).

In his *Pro Rege Deiotaro*, Cicero conforms to these precepts by beginning with a *captatio benevolentiae*, but he surpasses the limits of school rhetoric by combining the calculated frankness of a frontal attack with the indirect method of insinuation. At first sight the reader is struck by Cicero's frankness when mentioning the identity of the judge with the victim of the crime. The insinuation he adds regards Caesar's wish to appear as a merciful and mild-hearted ruler—though Cicero, for the moment, is cautious enough to avoid the grandiloquent terms of *clementia* and *miser cordia*. He is satisfied with attributing to his judge a keen awareness of his own dignity, an unusual degree of self-respect, and the wish to see this flattering idea confirmed by public opinion. It is in this way that Cicero indirectly makes up for the Roman public's absence, so detrimental to the force of his eloquence, and reestablishes the public venue he missed so sorely in the present lawsuit.

The *De Inventione* dissuades the orator from asking an angry person straightforwardly for peace and benevolence. Accordingly, Cicero avoids addressing the theme of Caesar's anger on his own or on his client's behalf. Instead, with great deftness, he ascribes to his adversaries the intention to rely on Caesar's anger. So he assigns to them the odious role of attributing to Caesar an unpleasant emotion and even calculating on his partiality in favour of their false accusation. It was a stroke of genius to use his opponents, as it were, as lightning rods—a stratagem reminiscent of Ovid's advice in his *Art of Love* (2. 335f.), a work frequently parodying rhetoric: If your lady is sick, do not administer bitter medicine to her, but let your rival do that. Only after having taken all these precautions does Cicero venture an appeal to the judge to eliminate any suspicion of partiality by practising his well-known virtues of *clementia*, *fides*, and *constantia*. To buttress this appeal to Caesar's magnanimity, Cicero recalls old links of hospitality between Caesar and Deiotarus and earlier proofs of Caesar's treating the King with moderation.

Therefore, the *exordium* of the *Pro Deiotaro* ingeniously exploits two specific techniques recommended in the *De Inventione* (1. 20f.) for dealing with biased judges—*principium (captatio benevolentiae)* and *insinuatio*.

<sup>32</sup> Translation: Hubbell.

Moreover, in paragraphs 7 to 14, *insinuat*io is combined with the recapitulation of the antecedents of the accused. Here, a retrospective examination of the facts is bound to confirm the moderate character of Caesar's behaviour with regard to Deiotarus. At the same time, the orator tries to prove that his client's errors could be understood and even pardoned. If we believe Cicero, Deiotarus was not spurred by personal hatred of Caesar, but merely subject to an *error communis* (10) when siding with Pompey, 'what we all did' (*quem nos omnes secuti sumus*). Thus, Cicero dares to turn to good account even his own anti-Caesarian past. And there is more: he insists on Pompey's memorable greatness. In order not to hurt Caesar by his frankness, he is eager to add that, of course, Caesar has surpassed even Pompey in greatness.

A closer look at the rules concerning *insinuat*io is appropriate (*De Inventione* 1. 23–25). This technique is recommended whenever the addressee has resentments against the speaker or his cause. Cicero's use of his adversaries as 'lightning rods' might be based on the following rule (*De Inventione* 1. 24): *Si causae turpitudine contrahet offensionem, aut pro eo homine, in quo offenditur, alium hominem, qui diligitur, interponi oportet . . .* 'if the scandalous nature of the case occasions offence, it is necessary to substitute for the person at whom offence is taken another who is favoured . . .' Did Caesar not sympathize with the accusers in our case? Then follows the advice to distract the listener's attention from the things he hates and draw it to things he loves. Cicero does so by referring to Caesar's fame, his magnanimity, and his yearning for public recognition.

No less relevant to the *Pro Deiotaro* are further precepts of the *De Inventione* concerning *exordium*, which apply in detail to the structure of the *exordium* under consideration. Now, according to Cicero's early teachings, the appeal to *benevolentia* may start *a nostra, ab adversariorum, ab iudicum persona* ('from our own person, from those of our opponents, or from those of the judges') or, finally, from the cause itself (*ab ipsa causa*) and, in fact, we find a mature Cicero following carefully the order he once established or learnt in his youth. There is no better commentary on the first six paragraphs of the *Pro Rege Deiotaro* than the quoted passage from the *De Inventione*.

### III *Style: Limits of the De Inventione*

After this striking example of the unimpaired validity of Cicero's early work for his practical oratory, it is fitting to single out some

aspects of the *exordium* under consideration that cannot be explained satisfactorily by the *De Inventione*. Actually the general rules for *exordia* apply to the *Pro Deiotaro* only in part. For a young Cicero, the *exordium* had to be full of *sententiae*, *gravitas*, and *dignitas*. On the other hand, both the fireworks of witticism and the allurements of symmetrical sentence structure looked dangerous to him, since the artificial character of these devices is too conspicuous and might impair the plausibility of the speech and the believability of the speaker. In this respect, the *Pro Rege Deiotaro* is forgetful of the lessons of the *De Inventione*: the *exordium* of this oration abounds in parallel and symmetrical constructions, and witty antitheses give a brilliant polish to the ideas they express. For a pertinent analysis of style, therefore, Cicero's other rhetorical treatises should be consulted. In the *Orator* (124), Cicero is much more cautious: *Principia verecunda, nondum elatis incensa verbis, sed acuta sententiis vel ad offensionem adversarii vel ad commendationem sui* 'the beginning will be modest; not yet warmed by elevated language, but distinguished by ideas designed either to rebuff the opponent or to recommend the speaker himself.' There is no trace left of a stigmatization of parallel sentence structure. To this one should add (*Orator* 50): *Vestibula nimirum honesta aditusque ad causam faciet illustres* 'the orator will certainly make fair "porches" and gorgeous approaches to his oration.' A psychological explanation is given in the *De Oratore* (2. 317): *Nec est dubium, quin exordium dicendi vehemens et pugnax non saepe esse debeat: sed si in ipso illo gladiatorio vitae certamine, quo ferro decernitur, tamen ante congressum multa fiunt, quae non ad vulnus sed ad speciem videantur, quanto hoc magis est in oratione spectandum, in qua non vis potius quam delectatio postulatur . . . sic omnia, quae fiunt quaeque aguntur acerrime, lenioribus principiis ipsa natura praetexuit* 'nor is there any doubt that the opening passage of a speech ought not as a rule to be of a forcible, fighting character; but if in an actual fight to the death between gladiators, where the decision is made by the steel, nevertheless before closing a number of strokes are made that seem not to be intended to inflict a wound but to be done for the sake of appearance, how much more proper is it for this to be taken into consideration in making a speech, where what is asked for is not so much force as entertainment! . . . so true is it that all processes and actions of extreme rapidity have been provided by Nature herself with more gentle commencements.'<sup>33</sup> In the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*—as in

<sup>33</sup> Translation: Sutton; Rackham.

other cases—this moderate pace is achieved by the larger scope of the harmonious and graceful periods which open the oration. Therefore, the *exordia* belong to the ‘middle’ style, the *genus temperatum*.

The principle of placing a ‘prelude’ before the oration proper, like a skirmish preceding a battle, is manifest even in the oration considered here, given that the dangerous topic of Caesar’s anger is not raised straightforwardly (cf. *De Oratore* 2. 213 *nam neque assiliendum statim est ad illud genus orationis* ‘for you must not bound all of a sudden into that (emotional) style’). Instead, Cicero skilfully outflanks that anger by resorting to the high moral standards of his judge. He thus neutralizes the most difficult point of his case—as he loves to do—by inserting it into a larger context of moral and political ideas.

Finally, it is in the *De Oratore* as well that Cicero insists on establishing firm links between the *exordium* and the body of the oration in terms of an organic unity. Introductions should be specific to the cause (*causarum propria*), the ideas developed here should spring from the very core of the cause (*ex ipsis visceribus causae*) and expound its basic aspects. The ties between the preface and the whole of the oration are quite manifest in the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*. Even the enumeration of the reasons for Cicero’s stage fright is an ideal introduction to the case under consideration: Cicero names the leading figures, portrays their characters and their relationships, and gives us an idea of the judge and of the case. Moreover, the listener grasps the importance of the case and the general line of Cicero’s defence.

Consequently, in the *exordium* of his *Pro Rege Deiotaro*, Cicero applies the categories developed in the *De Inventione* with mastership, but, in addition, tries to meet more profound standards of unity (as expounded in the *De Oratore*).

#### IV *Some Conclusions*

Several conclusions emerge from this study of the *exordium* of the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*. For the invention and the disposition of his arguments, Cicero largely draws on his juvenile work, the *De Inventione*, which (though disclaimed by him in public) fully maintains its practical importance for the author. On the other hand, there is much progress in the field of oratorical technique, not foreseen in the *De Inventione*: the coexistence and interference of several functions within one and the same passage, the interpenetration of *insinuatio* and *principium* with the beginning of the *narratio*. Above all, one becomes aware of

the insufficiency of the precepts of the *De Inventione* in the field of style, whereas the *De Oratore* and the *Orator* help to explain some subtler stylistic features of Cicero's rhetorical art.

There is a striking discrepancy between the great impact of the *De Inventione* on *inventio* and *dispositio* and its negligible relevance to style (*elocutio*) and to the general coherence between the *exordium* and the whole of the oration. In my opinion, this very contrast might shed some light both on the real importance of this early work for Cicero and on the reasons why he disclaimed it. The *De Inventione* was a working instrument rather than an accomplished work of art. Would any painter of his age have exposed his palette to the eyes of his public? In Cicero's later treatises, stylistic reflection is developed further, they are closer to Cicero's art and reflect, in a way, the mutual enrichment of theory and practice. However, in the *De Oratore* and in the *Orator* we no longer find such detailed sequences of precepts applicable to everyday practice as in the *De Inventione*. Might it be that Cicero's later treatises discuss their subject on such a high level that their practical applicability is impaired? In fact, despite the well-known defects of that early work, and despite the existence of much better treatises by the same author, there is no other book which reveals more about Cicero and the secrets of his workmanship. This may be an explanation of Cicero's eagerness later in his career to suppress the *De Inventione*; it gave away too much. Here we find the undeniable roots of the great orator and teacher of oratory. In the course of centuries an overwhelming majority of readers has preferred the *De Inventione* to Cicero's more mature works—against the will of the author. It seems to be high time to overcome the unfortunate simplifications of a long tradition in the schools and appreciate the subtler nuances of Cicero's style in the light of his mature practice and theory.

The present analysis of a Ciceronian prooemium has shown that, on the one hand, an approach in terms of school rhetoric can contribute to understand many aspects of Cicero's style, but that the subtler nuances of his diction can be appreciated only in the light of his mature theory and—even more fully—of his mature practice. The next division of a classical oration to be considered here is *narratio*. In the following example, the sophistication of an artfully contrived preface (and of a highly emotional epilogue) forms an intriguing contrast with the (studied) artlessness of *narratio*.

Narratio *Versus* Prooemium: *The Pro Milone Levels of Style*

*Quam nihil festinato, nihil praeparato fecisse videtur Milo!  
Quod non solum rebus ipsis vir eloquentissimus, quibus  
moras et lentum perfectionis ordinem ducit, sed verbis etiam  
vulgaribus et cotidianis et arte occulta consecutus est.*

‘What an absence of haste and premeditation this gives to Milo’s proceedings! And the great orator secures this effect not merely by producing facts which indicate the slow and tardy nature of Milo’s departure, but by the use of careful concealment of his art.’<sup>34</sup>

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 4. 2. 58

I *The Invention of a Preface*

At the very beginning of his famous *Pro Milone*<sup>35</sup> Cicero speaks of his own shyness. Although he tries to persuade himself that the unusual presence of military forces at the trial is meant to guarantee his safety, in accordance with Pompey’s well-known wisdom and sense of justice, the orator feels strongly that the soldiers deprive him of a responsive audience. Lacking this important stimulus, he will not be able to develop the whole compass of his art. All these are arguments meant to win the sympathy of his judges; moreover, our text reveals that Cicero is fully aware of the audience’s essential contribution to the success of an oration: *non illa praesidia . . . non afferunt tamen oratori aliquid, ut in foro et in iudicio, quamquam praesidiis salutaribus*

<sup>34</sup> Translation: Butler.

<sup>35</sup> The *Pro Milone* was revised after a disastrous performance at the actual trial; see, for example, Stone, 88–111, although Pinkster (‘Taal en stijl,’ 104) is right in excluding *substantial* changes. The *Pro Milone* was chosen here precisely because of its bookish character and the correspondingly high degree of verbalization of elements which, self-evident as they were, did not need to be mentioned in an actual trial (on Cicero and his audiences, Achard, *Pratique* 25–30). On the openings of Cicero’s orations, see the recent books of Loutsch and Cerutti (103–129, rightly stressing Cicero’s ‘persona of humility’ in this *deprecatio*, comparable to the *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*); for Cicero’s attitude to *potentissimi*, Achard, *Pratique* 143–183; on the political background and its impact on Cicero’s judgements: Comerci; for a rhetorical commentary, Donnelly; on style, especially Cicero’s use of *ego, nos, tu, vos*, MacKendrick (Speeches) 357–405; 518–524; for recent analyses of the argumentation in this oration, Braet (with bibl.) and Fedeli; for an excellent modern survey (with special regard to the *Pro Milone*, Pinkster, ‘Taal en stijl.’ For the relationship between the oral and the published form of orations, see above, p. 25 with note 40.

*et necessariis saepti sumus, tamen non timere quidem sine aliquo timore possimus* ‘and the train-bands . . . cannot but have their effect upon the pleader, so that here in a court of law and before a jury, though surrounded by troops who are at once a safeguard and a necessity, still even my immunity from fear cannot but have a touch of fear in it’ (1. 2).<sup>36</sup> Cicero tries to make the best of the situation: he will have a silent audience at least. And, what is more, he boldly maintains that the excluded listeners, i.e. the Roman people, not only support Milo’s cause, but also feel it to be crucial to the nation’s destiny. By appealing to his imagined public, Cicero cleverly makes up for the absence of a real public and tries to exert some moral pressure on the jury. Almost invisibly he has made the transition from the topos of modesty to the central topic of the *exordium*: the great importance of the case at stake. From the following paragraph it appears, however, that there was in fact a strong opposition against Milo and Cicero even among the people. Cicero tries to isolate and stigmatize this group as a faction of Clodius’ drones who tyrannically try to impose their own judgement on the jury. The orator is clever enough to play on the jury’s self-esteem while endeavouring to dissociate the jury from the Clodian party, and the Clodian party from public opinion. Alleging that the jurors were frightened by the Clodians, Cicero conveys to them the idea that a judgement in favour of himself and Milo would be proof of the jury’s courage and independence. Is it not a master stroke of our ‘fearful’ orator first to impute some kind of fear to the jurors and then to comfort them magnanimously?

In the paragraph that follows Cicero identifies himself with Milo’s cause. Indiscriminately he speaks of *boni* and *fortes viri* or *cives* (4), thus imparting some of Milo’s *fortitudo* to himself and a good deal of his own *bonitas* to Milo. His oratorical skill becomes evident if we tentatively assume a different distribution of the adjectives. Had Cicero qualified Milo as *bonus* and himself as *fortis*, the effect would have been disastrously risible. While praising himself and Milo he does not forget to flatter the jury (truly noble and distinguished persons at the right place, are they not?). And now it is up to them to decide whether good, courageous and industrious men, who had suffered so many hardships while defending good citizens against bad ones, are to be honoured or cruelly punished.

---

<sup>36</sup> Translation: Watts.

In the last part of his *exordium*, Cicero cuts a good figure as a fair and businesslike orator. He will not misuse all the good Milo has done for the Republic as an excuse for his killing Clodius. Instead, he will first prove that Milo was attacked by Clodius and then merely maintain Milo's right of self-defence.<sup>37</sup>

In terms of rhetoric, this introduction seems to satisfy all the criteria for this part of an oration: the orator acquaints us with the persons, with the case, and with the avenues of defence he will choose. In addition, he introduces himself as a good citizen, an unselfish friend, a noble character. At the same time, he skilfully tries to separate the jurors from his opponents in the case and to convey to them the idea that, by acquitting Milo, they assert their independence as judges. Finally he shows that not only Milo's life is at stake but the very life of the Republic itself.

The next step is to compare Cicero's practice to his theory, first in the field of invention, then in the field of style; for even when discussing style it is impossible to neglect invention. In fact, only if we understand Cicero's aims can we pass a judgement on his style.

## II *Cicero's Contemporaneous Theory*

In the second Book (2. 315–325) of his *De Oratore* (which was written in 55, only a few years before the *Pro Milone*) Cicero gives us a mature account of the essential qualities of an *exordium*. Having explained the strategies of invention to be applied in the body of the oration, Antonius (who is the speaker in that part of the book) reveals that he does not compose an *exordium* before the rest of the oration is devised. Hence, the first thing to be delivered is the last to be invented. In fact, this order of composition is a consequence of the function of the *exordium* as a key to the whole oration. Indeed, an orator who writes the introduction before the oration cannot but produce something meagre, pointless, or trivial: *exile aut nugatorium aut vulgare atque commune*, *De Oratore* 2. 315). Before considering the stylistic demands made for an *exordium*, suffice it to say that in this part of the oration, the language and style should be handled with the utmost care and with constant attention to the invention of the entire oration. In the field of invention, the golden rule for an *exordium*

---

<sup>37</sup> When defining the *status* he adopts in his orations, Cicero avoids the technical terminology of rhetoric.

is to be specific to the cause (*causarum propria*, *De Oratore*, *ibid.*). It must acquaint the reader with the case (*prima quasi cognitio*, *De Oratore*, *ibid.*) and, at the same time, gain his favour and awaken his interest. It serves to 'warm up' the orator and his audience and therefore has to be styled in a soft and elegant way. The reader remembers Cicero's statement (above, p. 147) 'that all processes and actions of extreme rapidity have been provided by Nature herself with more gentle commencements' (*De Oratore* 2. 317).<sup>38</sup> This introductory and preliminary character of the *exordium* (which is some sort of 'prelude') implies a prevalence of æsthetic values (*venustas, non vis potius quam delectatio* 'not so much force as entertainment' (*De Oratore*, *ibid.*). Evidently, at the beginning of a speech the orator has to spare his forces and not exhaust his ammunition.

Hence, the invention and the style of the *exordium* must grow out of the very core of the cause (*ex ipsis visceribus causae*, *De Oratore* 2. 318). In his preceding chapters the author had shown that a great deal of the planning of an oration consists of choosing a clear line of defence (*status*) and then expanding the strong points and dropping or hiding the weak ones. An introduction written after the oration will cautiously prepare the general strategy and pave the way for the main argument (*communitio*, *De Oratore* 2. 320; ὁδοποιήσις, Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 14. 1). If the orator has chosen a roundabout way and intends to blind the jury by an impressive digression, he will indirectly prepare his listeners in the introduction and distract their attention from the weak points of his case.

Generally speaking, the introduction should give an idea of the problem as a whole (*rei totius quae agetur significatio*, *De Oratore* 2. 320), provide an approach to it (*aditum ad causam et communitio*, *ibid.*) or adorn and enhance its significance (*quoddam ornamentum et dignitatem*, *ibid.*). The extent and scope of an introduction will depend on the importance of the case (*pro portione rerum*, *ibid.*) and the size of the audience. If an introduction is needed (and usually it is), the orator will start from the accused, from his opponent, from the cause, or from the jury (*ibid.* 321–322). He will make his audience feel that the accused is a good man (*bonum virum*, *ibid.* 321), noble and unselfish (*liberalem*), unlucky (*calamitosum*), and deserving of their compassion (*miser cordia dignum*).

<sup>38</sup> Translation: Sutton.

In the *Pro Milone*, Cicero starts from Milo's courage (*fortissimo viro* 1. 1). In the later part of his introduction he stresses Milo's dedication to the cause of the Senate (4), his energy (5), and his unselfish struggle for the survival of the Republic (6). But he adds some enlivening personal touches: first of all, he makes Milo's cause his own and, by doing so, lets him share his personal merits and authority. Second, except for an incidental remark on his and Milo's sufferings, he nobly refuses to exploit the traditional topos of pity for Milo,<sup>39</sup> and, instead, dwells on the inconveniences of his own situation as a speaker without a proper audience. Third, by choosing Milo's courage (and not, say, his cleverness) as a crucial theme, he prepares his line of defence from the very beginning: a *brave* man is more readily believed to have acted spontaneously in self-defence than to have cunningly plotted a murder. This is an especially convincing way of relating the introduction to the very heart of the case. The influence of this strategy on style is clear enough: the orator has to choose, for instance, the right adjectives.

The same is true of abstract nouns such as *furor*. In fact, the next source of invention mentioned in the *De Oratore* is the distasteful character of the opponent (*ex adversario iisdem ex locis fere contraria; De Oratore* 2. 321). In the *Pro Milone* Publius Clodius, who without any doubt was no less energetic a person than Milo, evidently could not be styled by Cicero as a *vir fortis*. Nor does Cicero call him a *vir audax*, not even a *vir* at all, but *furor*. He is not a man, but a mental disease, which took possession of an entire group (*eorum quos Publii Clodii furor rapinis et incendiis et omnibus exitiis publicis pavit, Pro Milone* 2. 3 'those whom P. Clodius' madness nourished by means of robbery, arson, and all kinds of murderous attacks on our state'). It is somewhat inconsistent on Cicero's part to represent Clodius on the one hand as an obsessed madman, and, on the other, as a person coldly and deliberately planning to murder Milo. But in a general way orators do not care too much for consistency since they try to leave no stone unturned. Being a good psychologist, Cicero does not draw the attention of his jury to Clodius as a person (which could have the undesirable effect of arousing pity for Clodius), but as an ulcer on Roman society; this is a stylistic device which, indirectly, makes Milo look more like a good surgeon than a murderer.<sup>40</sup> From Clodius'

<sup>39</sup> Dyck. 'Narrative Obfuscation' (240), shows that Cicero portrays Milo almost as a Stoic sage and himself as his emotional and timid advocate.

<sup>40</sup> Tellingly, Brutus rewrote the *Pro Milone* by changing the avenue of defence

people, Cicero and Milo suffered many injuries (*diu vexati*, *ibid.* 2. 4), and now things have come to a point where good citizens (such as Milo and his attorney), instead of being honoured, have to expect cruel punishments. Yet, Cicero, as he tells us, does not ask for pity; he just claims the ultimate human right of self-defence for his client.

Further sources of invention listed in the *De Oratore* arise from qualities inherent in the given cause: *ex re, si crudelis, si nefanda, si praeter opinionem, si immerito, si misera, si ingrata, si indigna, si nova, si quae restitui sanarique non possit* 'from the matter charged, in case it is cruel or outrageous or improbable or undeserved or pitiable or showing ingratitude or unworthy or unprecedented or not admitting of compensation or remedy' (*De Oratore* 2. 322). By his portrayal of Milo and himself, Cicero has done his best to represent a possible condemnation of Milo as a cruel thing (*crudelissimorum suppliciorum, Pro Milone* 2. 5), and one in blatant opposition to the highest rewards (*amplissimorum praemiorum, ibid.*) they could have justly expected. Especially, Cicero stresses the unexpectedness of the case (*praeter opinionem, παράδοξον*). Milo's cause originally looked rather hopeless, even irremediable, and the orator deploys quite a number of artifices to give it a more honourable touch. He even allows his audience to divine a 'secret': Did not Milo's deed serve the interest of the Republic? Without explicitly stating this he makes it clear that to him Milo's cause is not only a paradoxical but even a most honourable one. However, he knows that his opponents are strong; therefore, in his introduction, he does not strain his argument but confines himself to a plea for fairness, presented in a deliberately moderate and contemplative style.

Finally, there is the appeal to the audience. Of course, a jury has to be made benevolent, attentive, and ready to learn (*De Oratore* 2. 322–223). In the plea for Milo, the problem was to make the judges benevolent. The reader will remember that Cicero strove to do this by artificially splitting the Clodian group off from public opinion and, on the other hand, opposing the Clodians to all of the honest citizens (among whom, of course, the jurors take pride of place). It goes without saying that, apart from direct flattery, the presentation of Milo and of Cicero himself in a favourable light is another means

---

(*status*); to him, Milo had committed the crime and, yes, it was murder (not self-defence), but it was a meritorious, even glorious deed. Brutus replaced, more nobly than wisely, the 'status of definition' with the 'status of quality.' For Cicero's technique of '*isolement des improbi*', see Achard, *Pratique* 110–142.

of winning the jury's sympathy. As for the topos of 'making the audience attentive,' in the *De Oratore* Cicero justly remarks that in the beginning of a plea any jury is supposed to be attentive. The orator's task, therefore, is rather to give their minds the good direction, to have them look at things the way the orator would like them to, and to prepare their hearts unobtrusively for the great attacks of passion to come. The same is true of docility. A good orator will not lay open all of his strategy in the *exordium* but try to make his audience ready to learn only certain things and forget others. Cicero's chapter on the *exordium* ends with the repeated demand for organic unity and cohesion of the preface and the body of the oration (*De Oratore* 2. 323ff.).

In the introduction to his *Pro Milone*, Cicero seems to be rather honest and outspoken about his line of defence. If, initially, he renounces the traditional *commiseratio* for the sake of a more businesslike approach, this is part of the good orator's self-presentation in the *exordium*. Like Shakespeare's Antony he merely tries to make people believe that he is 'no orator as Brutus is' but 'a plain blunt man that love my friend' (*Julius Caesar* 3, 2). This will not prevent Cicero from giving vent to his eloquence in the peroration, in which no form of emotion is lacking. Nor does he disclose immediately all of his tactics of defence: in fact, in the narration he will maintain that Clodius was not killed by Milo but by Milo's slaves. Also, the moral theme of justified political murder is only alluded to in the introduction; it will be utilized more fully later on, though not as a corner-stone of the argument.

In the domain of invention, therefore, the hallmark of the whole *exordium* is moderation. Does the same principle apply to style?

### III *The Style of a Preface*

A discussion of Cicero's rhetorical invention was a prerequisite to an appraisal of his qualities as a stylist in the *Pro Milone*. In the field of elocution, Cicero's theory provides a tripartite pattern. According to Cicero's *Orator*, the ideal orator must excel not only in one but in three styles: plain, middle, and grand.<sup>41</sup> In his choice of style, he

---

<sup>41</sup> Clearly, the three levels are no more than a means to find one's way through an infinite variety of stylistic shades; on the relative usefulness of this ternary system as compared to a binary one, cf. p. 28 with note.

is not completely free, since elocution has to be in accord with the audience and the subject matter. Moreover, there are differences of style even within a single oration. Should we not expect a good and suitable introduction to differ in style from a good narration and, again, from a good peroration?

It might be helpful to compare Cicero's introduction to the *Pro Milone* with some paragraphs of his *Orator* (91–96). There Cicero talks of what he calls the middle style, which ranges between plain and grand. It is 'more substantial' (*robustius*) than the plain style and more moderate (*summissius*) than the grand style. In it there is very little force (*nervorum*), but very much sweetness and charm (*suavitatis*). In this style all kinds of adornments are suitable. It is flowing in a soft and placid way (*sedate placideque*); metaphors and metonymies embellish it like stars. Allegory can be made to result from continuous use of metaphors.<sup>42</sup> The middle style is appropriate to serene philosophical contemplation and even to sophistic oratory. Indeed, it deploys all the stylistic features conveying beauty, richness, colourfulness, elegance, and charm; excluded, however, are strong emotion and pathetic expression.

Now to take up the style of the introduction to the *Pro Milone*, first of all, we find all kinds of parallel and chiasmic structures often combined with artful repetitions of words, all of which converge to create a specific atmosphere of beauty and harmony.<sup>43</sup> Second, we have rather long sentences (the first sentence takes six lines; in paragraph 2. 4, the second sentence consists of eight lines). This kind of

<sup>42</sup> Cf. The definition in Quintilian, *Institutio* 9. 2. 46; see also 8. 6. 44.

<sup>43</sup> The numbers in parenthesis refer to the paragraphs of the oration.

(1) Artful repetitions of words: *novi iudicii nova forma*.

(2) Anaphora: *non*.

(2) Word play and paradox: *ne non timere quidem sine aliquo timore possimus*.

(2) Antithesis of *amorum* and *oratori*.

(2) Antithesis: *sententiis iudicum, telis militum*.

(2) Juxtaposition of *sapientiae, temeritatem*.

(3) Antithesis: *periculum—praesidium*.

(3) Antithesis: *quieto—magno*.

(3) *auxilium—silentium*.

(4) Meaningful repetition: *bonis, bene bonos*.

(4) Antithesis: *verbis—re et sententiis*.

(4) Antithesis: *semper . . . dedidi . . . semper miseri*.

(5) Anaphora: *quid*.

(5) Parallel structure: *salutem extinguendam—gloriam infringendam*.

(6) Parallel structure: *nec deprecaturi—nec postulaturi*.

(6) *cetera amisimus, hoc . . . relinquatur*.

movement imparts a relatively quiet character to the text—in complete accord with Cicero's theory. Third, the sentences are carefully connected.<sup>44</sup> There are no exclamations or questions. The syntax seems to be more rational than emotional. Fourth, in 58 lines there are 39 clausulae of the most common types,<sup>45</sup> which is a proportion of two thirds. This is the musical background to the general harmony already observed. Fifth, there are no less than twenty adjectives<sup>46</sup> in 58 lines. Most of them depict Milo and Cicero as persons deserving sympathy and pity, and their opponents, as the contrary. This is further evidence of the convergence of rhetorical invention and elocution (or: style).

Though Cicero will not expound the theory of *genus medium* until the *Orator*, in fact the whole stylistic character of the introduction of the *Pro Milone* chimes with his later theory of the middle style. In his discussion of *exordium* in the *De Oratore* (2. 315–325) Cicero—briefly but strongly—insists on careful styling: an introduction should be 'carefully framed and pointed and epigrammatic and suitably expressed' (*accurata et acuta et instructa sententiis, apta verbis, De Oratore* 2. 315).<sup>47</sup> Clear-cut thoughts must be put into suitable words. 'Suitable' (*apta*) means appropriate to the character of the introduction. It follows that, generally speaking, the choice of style is not arbitrary, but largely depends on invention and ultimately cannot be separated from it. This important stylistic rule is to be found in the *De Oratore*, which seemingly dwells more on invention than on style, but, in fact, attacks the problem of style at its very root.

---

<sup>44</sup> 1152, 6 *enim*; 1152, 11 *quae*; 1152, 14 *sed*; 1153, 4 *quam ob rem*; 7 *vero*; 12 (antithesis); 17 *quam ob rem*; 18 *nam*; 26 *enim*; 27 (anaphora); 30 (asyndeton); 32 *vero*; 1154, 3 *quamquam*; 6 (explicative asyndeton); 10 *sed*.

<sup>45</sup> Type 1. *clausulas esse* 14

Type 1a. *esse videatur* 4

Type 2. *clausulas fecimus* 12

Type 3. *clausulas feceramus* 6

Type 4. *feceramus* 3

<sup>46</sup> *Fortissimo, salutaribus, opposita, sapientissimi et iustissimi, quieto . . . magno, reliqua, adversum infestumque, hesterna, maximos, bonis et fortibus, amplissimorum, delectis, dediti, miseri, perditissimus, laboriosus magis sollicitum magis exercitum, amplissimorum, crudelissimorum, pro bonis contra improbos, clariores. We omitted omnis, cunctus, talis.*

<sup>47</sup> Translation: Rackham. The rhythm of the Latin (dicretic and ditrochee) shows how far stylistic care was meant to be extended.

IV *The Invention of a Narratio*

The character of the narration in the same plea is completely different. Paragraph 28 gives a rather circumstantial description of what Milo did. The style is intended to be casual and unadorned, with a touch of humorous clumsiness: *Milo autem cum in senatu fuisset eo die, quoad senatus est dimissus* (note the colloquial repetition *senatu—senatus*, the most primitive form of connecting statements), *domum venit, calceos et vestimenta mutavit* (this simple juxtaposition of finite verbs suggests a straightforwardness bordering on illiteracy), *paulisper, dum se uxor, ut fit, comparat, commoratus est*. ‘Milo, on the other hand, after having been in the Senate that day until its dismissal, went home, changed his shoes and his raiment, waited for a short time while his wife made such preparations as ladies must make. . . .’<sup>48</sup> The slow pace of the narration is enhanced by the humorous parenthesis *ut fit* (‘as it happens, as usual’), which is meant to evoke similar experiences in the minds of the jurors. Any judge who had ever waited for a lady slowly making her toilet would readily give credit to Milo’s alibi. Hence, the simplicity and candour of Cicero’s narration in the *Pro Milone* is fraught with indirect implications. The excessive plainness of style adds to the credibility of the report.<sup>49</sup>

In the same passage, there are disconnected sentences (e.g. 10. 28 *obviam fit* and 10. 29 *fit obviam*) and an ellipsis (10. 28 *quod numquam fere*). Towards the end of the narration we find another parenthesis, which at the most delicate point of the argument stresses the speaker’s sincerity: ‘And I shall only describe the event as it took place, without any idea of shifting the charge from my client’ (*dicam enim aperte non derivandi criminis causa, sed ut factum est*, 10. 29).<sup>50</sup>

One may add, however, that even in this classic example of Ciceronian plain style, art is not completely lacking. In fact, in 17 lines there are 15 clausulae.<sup>51</sup> As for rhythm, strangely enough there is

<sup>48</sup> Translation: Watts.

<sup>49</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio* 4. 2. 57–61.

<sup>50</sup> Translation: Watts; on Cicero’s rhetorical intention here: Dyck, A.R., ‘Narrative Obfuscation’ . . .

<sup>51</sup> Type 1. *clausulas esse* 8

Type 1a. *esse videatur* 3

Type 2. *clausulas fecimus* 1

Type 3. *clausulas feceramus*—

Type 4. *feceramus* 3

no difference of elaborateness between the artful *exordium* and the apparently negligent *narratio*. A glance at the adjectives in paragraphs 28 and 29 of the *narratio* will increase the reader's doubts concerning the artlessness of the narration in the *Miloniana*. There are no less than 10 adjectives<sup>52</sup> in 17 lines. The percentage is roughly the same as in the *exordium* (i.e. two thirds). This is additional evidence of the elaborate character of the narration in the *Pro Milone*. The adjectives are skilfully used to underline the contrast between Clodius who travelled fast and light (*expeditus*) and Milo, who was hampered by a slow and heavy crowd carrying all sorts of household utensils. This contrast helps to make believable Cicero's point that Milo was not the attacker but the attacked. On the level of nouns, the ironical description of Milo as *insidiator* works along the same lines.

#### V Narratio: *Theory and Practice*

How then does Cicero's narration in the *Pro Milone* correspond to the theories advanced in *De Oratore* 2. 326–330? Cicero starts from the hackneyed statement that a narration has to be brief. He warns us, however, not to be too short, since excessive brevity risks obscurity. One would expect him to say that obscurity is the opposite of clarity which ought to be the main quality of a good narration. Instead, Cicero tells us that a narration, above all, has to be charming. Does he mix up the businesslike *genus tenue* with the florid *genus medium*? Not at all; but he knows that the charm of a narration adds to its credibility and thus directly contributes to the main aim of the orator which is persuasion. It is only after this important reservation that he turns to the well-known theory of transparency, the use of plain and simple words, the respect for chronological order, and the creation of an uninterrupted chain of events. Moreover Cicero makes us aware of the fact that sometimes a narration is unnecessary and sometimes even detrimental. A skilful orator will not enlarge upon facts that might endanger his client.

In the *Pro Milone*, much of the charm of the narration is produced by elements which, strictly speaking, are unnecessary, such as the circumstantial description of Milo waiting (*ut fit* 'as one does'), while his wife was dressing . . . The passage from the *De Oratore* is the best commentary on the narration in the *Pro Milone*.

<sup>52</sup> *Expeditus, paenulatus, magno, impedito, muliebri, delicato, superiore, adversi, fideli, praesenti.*

Clearer (though less enlightening) than the passage from the *De Oratore* is a short definition of the narration in the *Partitiones Oratoriae*. Here, Cicero does what a teacher is supposed to do: he explicitly states that the main qualities of the narration are clarity and plausibility and that charm is but an addition: *quoniam narratio est rerum explicatio et quaedam quasi sedes et fundamentum constituendae fidei, ea sunt in ea servanda maxime quae etiam in reliquis fere dicendi partibus; quae partim sunt necessaria, partim assumpta ad ornandum; nam ut dilucide probabiliterque narremus necessarium est, sed assumimus etiam suavitatem* 'Well, the statement is an explanation of the facts and as it were a base and foundation for the establishment of belief. Consequently special attention must be given in this part to the rules that must also be observed in almost all the rest of the divisions of a speech; rules that are partly indispensable and partly adopted for the purpose of embellishment. Clarity and persuasiveness in the statement of the case are essential, but we also add charm' (*Partitiones Oratoriae* 9. 31).<sup>53</sup> As for the prevalence of clarity over brevity cf. also *Topica* 26. 97: *narrationes ut ad suos fines spectent, id est ut planae sint, ut breves, ut evidentes, ut credibiles, ut moderatae* 'the narratives must receive similar treatment in order that they may look to their goal, which is to be plain, brief, clear, credible, restrained and dignified.'<sup>54</sup>

The differences between practical manuals and the *De Oratore* show that, in his greatest rhetorical treatise, Cicero was not content to repeat what everybody knew; instead, he enriched and enlivened his rhetorical theory with personal experience. This makes the *De Oratore* less suitable as a textbook of rhetoric but much more interesting reading. The only texts that surpass even the *De Oratore* and are more varied and more sophisticated than any theory are Cicero's orations themselves.

In the *Orator* (75–90), Cicero describes the stylistic qualities of the *genus tenue*. An orator using plain style is called 'down-to-earth' and 'humble' (*summissus et humilis*); copying everyday spoken language (*consuetudinem imitans*), he seems to talk like everybody, and everybody thinks that he can equal him, though, in reality, nothing is more difficult to do. First of all, Cicero frees the plain orator from the bonds of prose rhythm (nonetheless in practice, as we have seen, he applies it in the narration of the *Pro Milone*). Equally, in the *genus tenue* hiatus

<sup>53</sup> Translation: Rackham.

<sup>54</sup> Translation: Hubbell.

does not need to be avoided. On the other hand, even in this simple style there must be no actual negligence. A *studied* negligence, however, will add to the fascination. Figuratively speaking, there will be no pearls or precious stones, only cleanness and elegance (in the field of style, *elegantia* means the use of the right word in the right place).

Cicero mentions the following features of plain style: pure and correct Latin (*sermo purus et Latinus*), clarity and explicitness of speech (*dilucide planeque dicetur*), and care for appropriateness (*quid deceat*). Although plain style is not adverse to ‘the charm and richness of figurative ornament’ (*ornatum illud suave et affluens*) and even to ‘frequent maxims, and sharp ones’ (*acutae crebraeque sententiae*, *Orator* 24. 79),<sup>55</sup> generally speaking, in this genre the orator will make very moderate use of the resources of rhetoric (*verecundus usus*). To start with the choice of words, propriety will be the prevailing rule. There will be few neologisms and archaisms, no bold metaphors, although the plain orator may use current metaphors. Of course, his sense of propriety will prevent him from exploiting poetic metaphors. Likewise, he will make sparing use of rhetorical schemes such as parallelism (*concininitas*). The plain style has to be free of conspicuous rhetorical embellishment, but it admits wit and humour (though, again, without exaggeration).

It is true that the narration of the *Pro Milone* roughly corresponds to Cicero’s idea of plain style, but the marked prose rhythm (as well as the abundance of adjectives) belies his theory. Maybe this is owing to the fact that the *Pro Milone* is a written oration, and one which was written with special care to make up for the orator’s actual discomfiture. Neither will rhythm be lacking in the narrations of the other orations; complete carelessness would have been quite unnatural to the best of orators.<sup>56</sup>

## VI *A Brief Look at a Peroratio*

A brief look at the *peroratio* (103–105) may suffice to throw into relief the plain style of *narratio* by comparing it to a third, contrasting, type of style. Cicero had depicted Milo as a hero despising the raising of pity. If he nevertheless appeals to emotion, he does so (if we believe him) against his client’s will. The *peroratio* abounds in exclamations and questions. Twice we encounter the solemn interjection *o*; fur-

<sup>55</sup> Translation: Hubbell.

<sup>56</sup> Cicero does not discuss the divergent *narratio* presented by his opponent. He beware of drawing the listeners’ attention to weak points of his cause, see Dyck, 227.

thermore, the orator addresses the gods and his country.<sup>57</sup> Direct quotations catch the listener's ear. Sentences are short and loosely connected. The style is extremely lively and emotional.<sup>58</sup>

Adjectives are rather rare here (34 in 128 lines). They are only applied to exalt Milo's strong character, his immortal merits, the happiness he wished to give his fellow-citizens, the unhappiness of his attorney who is unable to help him, and the sorrow of Rome which will lose him. Most of the peroration, however, is so brisk in style that adjectives would seem too cumbersome. Cicero alleges that he is unable to speak because of tears—a ploy that Antony will use in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* (3. 2). The long series of exclamations, apostrophes, and the like is by itself highly emotional, passion seems to speak for itself and needs no further explanation.

Actually, in this *peroratio*<sup>59</sup> Cicero deploys all the resources of rhetoric. This is completely in harmony with his theory concerning the grand style (*Orator* 28. 97: *amplus, copiosus, gravis ornatu* 'magnificent, opulent, stately, and ornate'), which aims at moving the audience (*tractare animos, permovere*). The speaker is 'grand, impetuous, and fiery' *gravis, acer, ardens*.<sup>60</sup> This form of oratory is not only the most efficient one, but also the one most dangerous to the orator, because if he has not duly prepared his audience, they will laugh at him and think he has gone mad. It is necessary, therefore, to combine and mix the different styles of oratory (as recommended by Cicero in his *Orator*).

<sup>57</sup> In our next example (from *In Verrem II* 5) Cicero resorts to the same device.

<sup>58</sup> The first adjective in the peroration *fortissimo* echoes Milo's first introduction in the exordium. *Stabilem ac non mutatam* stresses related features of his character. Following adjectives (*timidos, supplices* and *fortes atque animosos*) underline Cicero's bold idea that those who are not asking for pity are more worthy of it. With the repetition of *fortissimus* he comes full circle.—A following group of adjectives is related to the citizens and to Rome as Milo fervently wishes them to be: *incolumes, beati, praeclara, carissima, tranquilla, bona* (by contrast: *mala*).—To raise the jury's pity, he now harps on the futility of Milo's hopes (*fallaces, inanes*). He helped the knights who were *boni*, but *debiles*, though he himself was not helped by the *boni*.—*Ingratis, timidis, infimam, tutior, singularibus* (Milo's merits). *Vera* (a statement of Milo's), *fortes et sapientes viros praestabilius* (to save one's country), *beatos* (those who are duly honoured), *nec miseros, amplissimum* (glory), *mortui* (who live through fame) *divina (virtus), reliqua (querela), supplicem* (Cicero), *incredibili* (Milo's composure), *dignior, fortissimi, miserum infelicem* (Cicero, who cannot save Milo), *acerbiorem, ? immortales (gods), fortem, beatam* (the country where Milo will live), *ingratam, miseram* (Rome, if Milo is exiled), *optimum, sapientissimum, fortissimum* (judges). Milo's importance is enhanced by reminiscences from philosophy and tragedy (see Dyck).

<sup>59</sup> We limit ourselves to some brief remarks here and will come back to *peroratio* below, pp. 206–215.

<sup>60</sup> Translation: Hubbell.

VII *Some Conclusions*

Looking back at our three passages, we realize that the narration can be reasonably attributed to the plain style, the peroration to the grand style, and the *exordium* to the middle style.

Another result is the fact that long sentences are typical neither of Latin in general nor of Cicero, but mainly of the middle style. The same is true of careful sentence connection and subordination, which are often thought to be general features of the Latin language and of Ciceronian style, but in point of fact are only one of the registers in his repertory.

Furthermore, Cicero's theory proves to be of some help to the analysis of his practice. So Courbaud's scepticism concerning the influence of Cicero's rhetorical theory on his practice appears to be exaggerated.<sup>61</sup> It is true that in the *Orator*, as Harold Gotoff has shown,<sup>62</sup> Cicero is biased, since he is defending himself against extreme Atticists; and it is equally true that, as has been shown here, even in his attempts at writing 'plainly and simply,' he cannot help betraying his sophistication which is second nature to him. Despite its shortcomings, however, Cicero's own theory (or, his adaptation of traditional theory) has the advantage of being closer to the subject and to Cicero's mind than any later theory. Some aspects of the interaction between theory and practice can be studied by comparing the practically oriented treatises (*De Inventione*,<sup>63</sup> *Partitiones Oratoriae*) to the mature teaching of the *De Oratore* and by taking into account Cicero's philosophical background.

Cicero knows that the first rule of good style is appropriateness: in a strong appeal to emotions, long sentences would be as unbelievable as they are in a plain *narratio*. In order to introduce the ora-

---

<sup>61</sup> Courbaud, E., ed. of Cicero, *De Oratore*, Book I, p. xv. Even more sharply, Gotoff, *Arch.*, p. 33: 'No ancient critic has been more fully responsible for the misunderstanding of Ciceronian prose style than Cicero himself.' I agree with Gotoff's excellent remarks on Cicero's practice being closer to Demosthenes than to Isocrates, but there are also 'theoretical' statements showing the crucial importance of Demosthenes to Cicero, cf. Stroh, W., 'Die Nachahmung des Demosthenes . . .,' 1-31. Gotoff has contributed much to our understanding of the *Orator* and its biased approach to the problem of style.

<sup>62</sup> See the preceding footnote.

<sup>63</sup> It is true that there are some philosophical passages in the *De Inventione*, but its thrust is eminently toward praxis.

tor as a calm, amiable, and considerate person, some long sentences, however, might have a winning and beneficial effect on the listener.

It is through Cicero that we know best what classical Latin is like and it is through a close reading of his orations that we become aware that classical Latin is completely unlike the common notion of a dead language. Above all, it is through Cicero that we can understand that the secret of good style ultimately does not rest on rules but on flexibility and appropriateness.

Thus, the doctrine of three styles is only part of the truth; doubtless, it helps the reader to develop a feeling for different levels of style and for what, at a given moment in a given context, might be appropriate or not. It does not reveal, however, the whole of Cicero's secret. What makes Cicero a master stylist is the fact that he did not dwell only on the elaboration of the parts, but was able to conceive an oration as a whole, as an entire process of persuasion, as an organic unit. Doing so, he was not enslaved by single recipes and tricks of rhetorical routine but governed by overall principles. In the domain of invention his main principle was persuasion, in the field of elocution or style, it was appropriateness, in the field of æsthetics it was unity.

This ample scope was due to a very rare mixture in Cicero's talent, a mixture of theoretical reflexion and practical eloquence. So on the one hand he was able to grasp Plato's great vision of a speech as an organic unity and understand Aristotle's approach to rhetoric as the art of persuasion, while on the other hand, as an orator, he was able to put his insights into practice. For Latin, a language not particularly rich in vocabulary, he unearthed previously unrecognized treasures of rich and colourful expression. But rather than inventing words unheard-of he activated the latent potential of Latin grammar and fully exploited all the resources of style. If classical Latin survived for so many centuries and could impose its high standards of form and style on subsequent generations and cultures, this was due, in good part, to the man who shaped it: Cicero, the master stylist.

Digressio *Versus* Prooemium:  
*The Pro Archia The Relevance of an 'Excursus'*<sup>64</sup>

*Les digressions amphigouriques du Pois Chiche*

‘The nonsensical digressions of Mr. Chick-pea’  
 J.-K. Huysmans, *À Rebours*, Chapter 3

Cicero's plea for Archias contains an extensive excursus on the importance of poetry and education. Many scholars have taken exception to the unusual length of this digression and tried to explain it in various ways.<sup>65</sup> A solution which has found broad acceptance is the following: when performing his oration, Cicero dwelt longer on the factual side of the problem and shortened the ‘unnecessary’ excursus found in the written version. This explanation, which looks plausible at first sight, does not seem to have been challenged hitherto.<sup>66</sup> The present inquiry will start from a preliminary problem (I): What does the introduction of the oration tell us about the relation between factual and non-factual argument? This part of the study will enable a judgement whether the oration in its present form was planned as an organic unit. In the second place (II) the initial question will be addressed: the relevance of the excursus (*argumentatio extra causam*) and of its style to the aim of the oration.

## I The *Prooemium*

What line of argument did Cicero follow when contriving the present introduction? He started from the persons: his client, himself, and their mutual relationship. This allows a fresh and natural approach to his actual situation: formerly, Archias had contributed to Cicero's education as an orator, now Cicero wants to thank him by putting his oratory at the service of his teacher. This appealing exchange of roles does not fail to shed a favourable light on Cicero's Roman sense of *pietas*, a moral quality (*ethos*) likely to win the hearts of the

---

<sup>64</sup> For an earlier version of this chapter, see Albrecht, ‘Prooemium;’ text: Kasten; commentaries: Reid; Vretska. On Cicero's motives for defending Archias: Ries, 8; Reinach, 19f.; on the political background, Taylor, 62–70; on the theoretical background of the *Pro Archia*, Zink; on Cicero's style in this oration, Gotoff, *Arch.* (basic); on the structure of the oration as compared to the *Pro Milone*, see Craig 136f. On Cicero's use of excursus, see Eisenberger and, most recently, Davies.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. below, p. 203.

<sup>66</sup> Not even by Humbert.

jury. Then he goes on to specify this basic idea. Archias has a special claim to benefit from the full range of Cicero's abilities: natural talent (*ingenium*), practical exercise (*exercitatio*), and theoretical knowledge (*artium studia et disciplina*).<sup>67</sup> This passage, under a thin veil of coy modesty, throws into relief Cicero's competence as an orator. What is more: Cicero makes the cause of Archias his personal cause by bringing to bear his full authority (*auctoritas*) as a consul. The same is true for later passages in this oration: whenever he dwells at length on his personal merits this is, rather than an outburst of vanity, an expression of his readiness to put the full range of his influence at the disposal of his client.

The next sentence bridges the gap between poetry and oratory by subsuming them under the term of *humanitas*.<sup>68</sup> This important Ciceronian keyword (which has no exact Greek parallel) prepares the reader for the general issues which will be treated in the second part of Cicero's oration (12–30), the lengthy excursus usually considered an *argumentatio extra causam*. The passage which immediately follows has the same function. In fact, Cicero, after having sketched his relationship to his client (as far as it could be exploited to win the benevolence of the judges), goes on to excuse the special style of oratory he would use on the present occasion: his speech, he says, deviates from the usual practice of judicial oratory. In fact, it borders on the epideictic genre.<sup>69</sup>

At first sight, this passage gives an excuse for the unusual type of oratory adopted by Cicero here; on closer inspection, however, we discover that the second part of his introduction is meant to exert a psychological influence on the judges. First, Archias' high level of education is thrown into relief (any other type of oratory would be

<sup>67</sup> At the beginning of the *De Inventione* (1. 2) Cicero similarly mentions *ars, studium, exercitatio*, and *facultas ab natura profecta*. However, the *Author ad Herennium* (1. 1) names only *ars* and *exercitatio*. Cf. also *De Oratore* 1. 113; 2. 147; Isocrates 15. 187–192; Neumeister, *Grundsätze der forensischen Rhetorik* 58; 69 (with bibl.); basic Laurand, *De M. Tulli Ciceronis studiis rhetoricis*.

<sup>68</sup> Articles on Roman values in *Römische Wertbegriffe*, ed. By Oppermann; especially Haffter, H. and Schmid, W. (with bibl.).

<sup>69</sup> Although Cicero here follows on the whole the *dispositio* of judicial speeches, scholars have found typically epideictic elements in this oration (and even parallels to the Thucydidean funeral speech of Pericles): Murphy, 99–111: προσίμιον (1–(1–2), γένος (3), ἀνατροφή (3), ἐπιτηδεύματα (5), πράξεις (3), σύγκρισις (18), miraculous events (19), ἐπίλογος (31). On Cicero's style in general, see Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, 288: 'das Beste geben noch immer die alten treuen Bücher, vorab Nägelsbach . . ., sodann die Kommentare . . .—freilich sind es die Bäume, nicht der Wald.'

unworthy of him); second, the same is true for the praetor, the judges, and the listeners (by adopting a style beyond their everyday experience,<sup>70</sup> Cicero flatters their pride as intellectuals).<sup>71</sup> All this helps him to win the benevolence of his audience and to turn this benevolence to his client's account. Further factors speaking in favour of his client are the latter's devotion to *otium*,<sup>72</sup> silence, and scholarship, and his natural aloofness from the bench and the bar. By Cicero's time, Romans, for all their contempt for the *Graeculi*, were proud of their Greek educations. In what follows, Cicero would use his own *auctoritas* to enhance *otium* and cultural activities (12–14), and finally invest the creativity of poets with divine honours and political importance. In his *prooemium*, Cicero is satisfied to hint at this subject, which he will develop later. For the moment, he limits himself to a minimal statement: Archias has no court experience, he is a harmless and loveable person. Actually, even this moderate statement is bold enough. First of all, the fact of being a *Graeculus* is anything but a recommendation in the eyes of a Roman audience. Cicero is clever enough to turn this handicap to his client's advantage from the beginning by following one of the most demanding principles of rhetoric: the art of transforming weak points into strong points. In the *Pro Archia*, Cicero brilliantly succeeds in doing so by championing the recognition of Greek culture in Rome. The relevant passage in the oration, however, is not an otiose addition but a necessary link in the process of persuasion. The orator has carefully anchored this motif in his *prooemium* and organically developed it in the course of his oration, thus bestowing on his text an overarching unity of theme.

By indirectly preparing the second part of his oration (the *argumentatio extra causam*), he is skilful enough not to confront the judges immediately with the true problem he has to face (actually, he is compelled to argue his case *ex persona*, since the factual proofs are

---

<sup>70</sup> Zielinski (see preceding note) 288–289 quotes Vargha, J., *Die Verteidigung in Strafsachen* (Vienna, 1879) 47: 'daß der Kern der Unwiderstehlichkeit jener klassischen Redner nicht etwa in geschwätziger Überredungskunst, sondern vielmehr darin lag, daß sie die Richter auf die Kulturhöhe ihrer Zeit emporhoben und ihnen großartige Gesichtspunkte zur Beurteilung menschlicher Individualitäten und Verhältnisse erschlossen.'

<sup>71</sup> *Ab auditorum persona benivolentia colligitur, si res eorum fortiter, sapienter, mansuete, magnifice iudicatas proferemus; et si, quae de iis existimatio, quae iudicii expectatio sit, aperiemus* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1. 5. 8).

<sup>72</sup> On *otium*, see André; Bernert; Burck; Fuhrmann, 'Cum dignitate otium;' Jucker; on the function of *otium* in the *Pro Archia*, Rutz; Taylor.

insufficient) but to divert their attention to the *genus dicendi*,<sup>73</sup> to the stylistic genre adopted in the oration, a choice justified by the person of his client and his highly educated audience.

Only after having prepared his listeners for what will follow does Cicero briefly mention the problem at stake: is Archias a Roman citizen? Later in his speech, our orator will treat this subject with the same brevity (he has good reason for doing so). And it is by now that he throws the case into a fresh perspective, which will dominate the second part of his oration: Not only is Archias justly a Roman citizen, and nobody can deprive him of this right, but he is also such an excellent man that, if he were not a Roman citizen, he should be made one.

At the end of the *exordium*, therefore, Cicero has given a clear outline of his speech. This *prooemium* fulfills the tasks of a rhetorical introduction with playful elegance: Cicero wins the benevolence of the judges, raises their attention and makes them ready to learn. In fact, they come to know the main characters, the juridical problem at stake, and the disposition of the oration.

Far from pedantically treating one point after another, Cicero skilfully connects them: the presentation of the characters includes the winning of sympathy (*ethos*). The announcement of the theme is not limited to a blunt statement that Archias is right but is inserted into a loftier context (*humanitas* and *otium*) as early as the introduction of the oration. Even the mention of Cicero's own *auctoritas* prepares the audience for Cicero's later way of arguing his cause. Moreover, Cicero, by calling his client not *Archias*, but *Aulus Licinius*, anticipates a favourable decision of his cause from the outset.

The *prooemium* of the *Pro Archia*, therefore, fulfills the rhetorical requirements for an *exordium*, not in a mechanical, but in a sophisticated way. There is interpenetration of motifs;<sup>75</sup> elements alluded to are no less important than those addressed explicitly. Moreover, the introduction contains the crucial features of the oration that will follow—not only its plan, but also its leading themes and overarching principles.

---

<sup>73</sup> Ries refers the *novum dicendi genus* to content. Ultimately, this proves to be true, but it is not implied in the expression, which is used to turn his listeners' attention from the content to the form of the speech. Moreover, announcing something 'new' is part of the technique of *prooemium* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1. 4. 7).

<sup>74</sup> On Cicero's lending artistic unity to his orations by means of leading motifs (*Leitmotive*), see, for instance, Büchner, *Literaturgeschichte*, 187; one of these motifs is the 'house,' see, most recently, Treggiari and Leen ('The *Domus* Motif').

<sup>75</sup> Cicero knew that he owed his political career to his education, not to his birth.

What is perhaps most important is the way Cicero justifies his use of a special type of oratory appropriate to the case under discussion. The orator gives up the ancient Roman hypocrisy which compelled speakers to conceal their Greek culture; he boldly sides with education and successfully appeals to the culture of his audience. Cicero thus leads his listeners towards higher goals, far beyond the small problem of Archias' citizenship, which, viewed in a larger context, becomes of secondary importance and is resolved almost automatically.

The method of discovering a human aspect in a lawsuit and viewing a given cause, as it were, from a higher level, may astonish a modern reader.<sup>76</sup> Whether we like it or not, in Cicero's time juries and listeners were educated enough to appreciate both the dangers and the positive potential of that kind of oratory. And the fact that his orations were studied in later times and have survived throughout the centuries is precisely owing to Cicero's gift for inserting an individual case into a larger framework of general human interest.<sup>77</sup>

It appears from our analysis of the *exordium* that Cicero especially dwells on personal aspects (e.g. his own *auctoritas*)<sup>78</sup> and on general issues which are far beyond the legal problem at stake. This is true for the *exordium*, for Cicero's sketch of the *dispositio*, and for the body of the oration. The preponderance of the so-called *argumentatio extra causam* within the oration is carefully prepared for in the introduction. The next paragraph will try to determine whether Cicero in his actual plea followed the same line of argument.

## II Argumentatio Extra Causam: *the Usefulness of an Excursus*

The last-mentioned question cannot be separated from the question whether a general discussion of intellectual culture was necessary in the given case or not. The plan is to start from *dispositio* and then discuss a basic problem of *inventio*.

<sup>76</sup> 'Certainly, no English Court would listen to a great deal that Caesar says' Reid, 17, n. 6.

<sup>77</sup> Mommsen made a reproach even out of this fact: 'Er publicirte seine Plaidoyers regelmäßig auch dann, wenn sie nicht oder nur entfernt mit der Politik zusammenhängen. Dies ist nicht Fortschritt, sondern Unnatur und Verfall.' (Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. 3, 619). How could Mommsen (a defender of classical education) not see that Cicero wanted to give his people some examples of rhetorical culture?

<sup>78</sup> On the stylized 'Cicero' in this oration, see. now Dugan; a similar technique will be found **below** (pp. 211 ff.) in his negative image of Verres.

As mentioned, the *dispositio* of the *Pro Archia* has been subject to criticism, especially the lengthiness of the *excursus*. The most radical solution to this problem was to contest the authenticity of the oration;<sup>79</sup> however, none of the arguments adduced proved to be valid, and Zielinski<sup>80</sup> has shown that the rhythmical structure of the *Pro Archia* perfectly fits into the development of our orator's style. A further explanation was based on a 'genetic' theory saying that Cicero in his oral plea dwelt at more length on the factual side of the case;<sup>81</sup> however, the internal evidence of Cicero's text belies this theory, as can be shown. Even less satisfactory is the following explanation: Cicero was allowed to stray away from his subject, since the court was presided over by his brother, who would not have interrupted the orator.<sup>82</sup>

A more acceptable explanation might be based on Cicero's text and on the links between his factual *argumentatio* and his *excursus*. As was shown, there are close thematic connections between the *exordium* and the rest of the oration. The next step is to ask whether Cicero was compelled to establish these connections by the nature of the case. Two answers are possible:

1st: The case was an easy one, and Cicero took the occasion to place himself in the limelight and deliver a eulogy of education. Then the *argumentatio extra causam* was only a pretext. This has been, with slight modifications, the *opinio communis* of most of Cicero's commentators.<sup>83</sup> Behind this approach there was a good pedagogical intention: interpreters wished Cicero to defend a good cause and therefore willingly submitted to the self-assurance he shows in this case.

2nd: Cicero only pretended that the case of Archias was easy, and the brevity of his factual *argumentatio* is explained by the scarcity of evidence in his favour; therefore, an additional *argumentatio extra causam* was indispensable.<sup>84</sup> This leads us into the domain of *inventio*.

<sup>79</sup> Schanz / Hosius, 2, 426.

<sup>80</sup> Zielinski, 'Clauselgesetz' 591–844; id., 'Der constructive Rhythmus' 1–295. The *Pro Archia* shows slightly more elegant *clausulae* at the endings of sentences than the neighbouring orations (*Pro Sulla* and *Pro Flacco*), whereas the endings of cola are less elegant. The additional polish found in conspicuous places is in accord with the 'epideictic' character of this speech.

<sup>81</sup> Halm, 100; regrettably accepted by Schanz / Hosius, 2, 426.

<sup>82</sup> Rutz, 47, n. 3.

<sup>83</sup> This view was expounded most thoroughly by Sternkopf, 337–373.

<sup>84</sup> This is the view of Drumann / Groebe, 218 and Reinach, 19.

Herewith a brief examination of the factual arguments in favour of Archias' Roman citizenship: The inhabitants of Heraclea had granted citizenship to him. Together with them, he later received Roman citizenship on grounds of the *Lex Plautia Papiria*. The weak link in this chain was the fact that the archives of Heraclea had burnt so that there was no written evidence. Instead, Archias adduced a series of witnesses, all of whom, however, could be considered biased (among them, his own patron, Lucullus).

No better was the documentary basis of his Roman citizenship: A good friend of Archias had inserted his name into the register of citizens, and the name of Archias did not appear in the census lists. It is true that Archias' absence from the census lists could be explained by his absence from Rome—and Cicero enlarges upon this relatively strong point of his cause—, but the basic problem remained: as there were no documents proving Archias' Heracleian citizenship, his Roman citizenship was questionable on principle. Doubtless, Archias' case (no matter whether it was just or not) was a weak one.

How did Cicero proceed when contriving his plea? Clearly, he would have emphasized the problematic aspects of his cause if he had dwelt at length on the factual *argumentatio*. Therefore, Halm's<sup>85</sup> supposition that Cicero in his oral delivery spent more time on *confirmatio* and *refutatio* is highly improbable.<sup>86</sup> Rather, Cicero was compelled to cover up the scarcity of evidence by diverting the attention of his listeners to a subject which was, strictly speaking, outside the cause: poetry and education. Distraction,<sup>87</sup> though, was not his only aim; in addition he shrewdly introduced the principle of *aequitas* to compete with *ius* and to avoid the dangers of *summum ius summa iniuria*.<sup>88</sup>

It follows that the unusual proportions of the oration are conditioned by the basic principles of forensic rhetoric. In accordance with these, weak points are treated briefly,<sup>89</sup> whereas the theme of education (a field where Cicero feels fully at ease) is discussed at length.

<sup>85</sup> Quoted above, n. 77.

<sup>86</sup> It is true that, despite the weakness of the case, Cicero had some personal advantages by the authority of Lucullus and, to a lesser degree, of Quintus and his own.

<sup>87</sup> He further instrumentalized *ethos* (sympathy) and even *pathos* (enthusiasm for education and literature).

<sup>88</sup> Stroux, *Summum ius*; Büchner, *Humanitas Romana*, 80–105; Pringsheim, 131–246.

<sup>89</sup> Neumeister, *Grundsätze* 32–34; unconvincing Rutz, 47, 3, who considers the structure of the speech *regelwidrig*. Rather, Cicero follows a principle of rhetoric, which is above the individual precepts; even so, he adhered to the rules of rhetoric, see Murphy, 99–111; cf. Drumann / Groebe, Vol. 4, 217f.

One could object here that despite the weakness of Archias' case a Roman court could not have doubted the testimony of Lucullus and of the Senate of Heraclea.<sup>90</sup> Even so, Cicero was obliged to argue his case in such a way as to facilitate a verdict in favour of Archias and to justify it by objective arguments.

Therefore, the excursus with the so-called *argumentatio extra causam* was necessary anyway, and there is no reason to suppose that in Cicero's actual plea the proportions between factual and general argument would have been different from those in the published text. Moreover, we might challenge the opinion<sup>91</sup> that the *Pro Archia* is less suitable for a discussion of rhetorical problems. Quite to the contrary, the disproportion between factual and non-factual argument in the present oration is an especially telling example of the power and, therefore, the dangers of rhetoric.

The 'charming' and largely 'epideictic' style of the excursus<sup>92</sup>—which is fully in harmony with what Cicero would later call 'middle style'—should not prevent critical readers from recognizing that this digression—for all its highly literary content and style—is conditioned by the specific nature of the case and by the avenues of defence chosen by Cicero. *Inventio* is behind the choice of even this avowedly unusual style.

Contrary to Huysmans' view (quoted in the Introduction to this book), even a highly ornate digression like the one in the *Pro Archia*, therefore, is in no way 'nonsensical' (*amphigourique*), but it serves Cicero's forensic purpose. At the same time, it is an excellent example of Cicero's ability to lend a general human interest to a given case. Someone might object that no modern court would listen to such a praise of education and literature, but this argument might even speak in favour of the Roman society in Cicero's day.

Last follows an example of the style of *peroratio*, the most emotional division of a classical oration. In the present case, *peroratio* concludes not only a single oration, but an entire group of them. The passage was deliberately chosen from a 'written' oration. If even in such a literary example style depends on invention, this is true *a fortiori* for less contrived pleas.

<sup>90</sup> Mommsen, 619, outdoes Cicero's rhetoric by his own rhetoric: 'Wo er zu handeln schien, waren die Fragen, auf die es ankam, regelmäßig eben abgethan . . . Gegen Scheinangriffe war er gewaltig, und Mauern von Pappe hat er viele mit Geprassel ingerannt.'

<sup>91</sup> Rutz 47, n. 3.

<sup>92</sup> Convincingly worked out by Gotoff (*Arch.*) in detail.

Peroratio: *The Verrine Orations*  
*Cicero and the Gods of Sicily* (In Verrem II. 5. 184–189)<sup>93</sup>

*Nephew, what means this passionate discourse,  
 This peroration with such circumstance?*  
 Shakespeare, *Second Part of Henry VI*, 1. 1.

### I *The Importance of Literary Considerations*

When he introduces gods worshipped in Sicily into his *Verrine Orations*,<sup>94</sup> Cicero is not guided by antiquarian interests, but by rhetorical and literary considerations. In fact, literary criteria should not be undervalued, all the more since the *Actio Secunda* of the *Verrines* was written for publication only. Of the three functions of oratory (*docere, delectare, and movere*),<sup>95</sup> it is the two last mentioned which offer the largest scope for literary development. The function of entertaining the reader (*delectare*) is perfectly illustrated by the memorable passage on Ceres and Proserpina at Henna (II. 4. 106–107), whereas the function of arousing emotions (*movere*) is covered, for instance, by the final passage of the last oration (II. 5. 184–189) with its numerous invocations of gods, a passage which shall be considered here in some detail. Nevertheless, *delectatio* is not excluded even here, a fact deserving special attention in a discussion of Cicero's style.

In addition, a study of the literary and rhetorical aspects of the text might even shed some light on the value of the *Verrine Orations* as historical sources, a problem linked with the philological question whether the ending of the *Verrines*, as we read it, is placed in the position originally intended by the author.

### II *Deliberate Omissions*

First of all: mention or invocation of gods is especially appropriate in the *peroratio*, the final division of an oration, which is expected to include passionate speech. The next consideration is which gods mentioned in the Corpus of the *Verrines* are invoked in our text and in

<sup>93</sup> For an earlier version of this chapter, Albrecht, 'Götter.'

<sup>94</sup> In what follows, 'Sicilian gods' means gods that are worshipped in Sicily.

<sup>95</sup> For a distinction of stylistic levels in various divisions of Cicero's orations, Nisbet, 'Speeches,' see also **above pp. 69–73**.

what order. To begin with a negative statement, in the present chapter the names of several gods are missing. Perhaps not too surprisingly, merely local *numina* such as the river-god Chrysas are passed over in silence, within a series otherwise echoing the *De signis* (II. 4. 96). Quite understandably also, typically Roman deities such as Janus, Quirinus, and Vesta, are absent: in fact, Verres could not have found any statues of these gods in Sicily. But what are we to make of the fact that neither deities such as Venus Erycina and Bacchus (both closely related to Sicily) nor Mars, second only to Jupiter in the official cult of Rome, are mentioned?

A first consideration might be that Cicero, as a philosopher, was not particularly fond of Venus and Bacchus, nor, as a confirmed civilian, of Mars (*Ad Familiares* 7. 23. 2). But another explanation will take us further: Verres had not seriously offended these divinities. To be more precise, Verres (ironically apostrophized as *homo Venerius* by Cicero [II. 5. 142]) most eagerly defended the rights of Venus Erycina, as can be seen even in Cicero's biased account (*Divinatio in Caecilium* 55), although, of course, he was not entirely selfless in this service (cf. II. 1. 27). And there is further evidence for his closeness to Venus: he used the servants of Venus as his private myrmidons (e.g. II. 3. 50) and he dedicated a silver Cupid to Venus (II. 5. 142). Consequently, not even his worst enemy could have made it plausible that Verres should have offended his own tutelary goddess.

In his *peroratio*, therefore, Cicero omits Venus, and wherever else he has to mention her, he does so either with Catonian *severitas*<sup>96</sup> or with a mundane smile on his lips. He could dismiss Bacchus even more casually, since the service of Venus and Liber is anything but saintly (cf. II. 5. 27). When he remarks that Verres (quite unlike the great Marcellus) had taken his vows not to Honos and Virtus, but to Venus and Cupid (II. 4. 123), he can count on the smiling assent of his audience. Nor could his theft of a Cupid by Praxiteles offend the religious feelings of the Roman public (II. 4. 4). Consequently, there is no invocation of Amor, which would have been quite out of place anyway at the end of an oration on the maltreatment of Roman citizens.

The absence of Mars is a more difficult question. It would come almost as a surprise, had Verres not stolen a statue of Ares as well.

---

<sup>96</sup> A reproach is implied in II. 5. 132 (the loss of the ships).

But Cicero's reticence concerning this god<sup>97</sup> is consistent to the point of raising suspicion. As we know from Cicero, Verres was considered a good general by his advocates, and, if mentioning Mars, an accuser ought to have discussed this fact, which puzzled him anyhow: *Timeo ne Verres propter hanc eximiam virtutem in re militari omnia quae fecit, impune fecerit*, 'I fear that Verres in view of these unusual military qualities will get off scot-free for all that he did' (II. 5. 2). Clearly it was easier to pass over Verres' 'martial' merits in silence than to disclaim them.

Yet there is possibly still another reason for the absence of Mars from the text under consideration. The ending of the oration had been placed initially in another position, namely *before* Cicero's appraisal of Verres' military talent (before II. 5. 1, therefore). It will be seen that the final passage under consideration here does not take into account the information contained in II. 5 in other respects either.

We can conclude then that Cicero is biased in his choice of gods from the very beginning. His criteria are the relationship between Verres and Sicily and the suitability of the material for the aims of the accusation.

### III *Romanization of Names and amplificatio*

As for the connection of style and *inventio*, a look at the arrangement of the names of gods might be rewarding. A list of parallel passages from the preceding books is revealing:

Juppiter	II. 4. 61–71
	II. 4. 130
Juno	II. 1. 50
	II. 4. 103
Minerva	II. 1. 45
	II. 4. 122 (cf. 118 and 123)
	II. 4. 97
	II. 4. 71
Latona, Apollo, Diana	II. 1. 45; 54
	II. 4. 72–83; 122
	II. 4. 71, cf. II. 1. 48 <sup>98</sup>

<sup>97</sup> The mentions of Mars in the *Verrine Orations* are limited to a set phrase (II. 3. 9) and to a sardonic sneer at Venus (II. 5. 132).

<sup>98</sup> Cf. also II. 5. 127.

Mercury	II. 4. 84–92
Hercules	II. 4. 94–95
Mater Idaea	II. 4. 97
Castor, Pollux	II. 1. 129–133
Ceres, Libera	II. 4. 98–102; 106–115

Doubtless the general matrix of this series of gods is found in the *De Signis* (II. 4). Even the arrangement of most of the names quoted (from Latona to Ceres and Libera) agrees with this model and needs no further explanation. The close analogies of form and content raise the question whether the chapter under consideration should not be placed more appropriately at the end of the *De Signis*. In that oration (II. 4. 71), a recapitulation of non-Sicilian names preceded a closer description of Verres' misdeeds in Sicily; here, both non-Sicilian and Sicilian gods are assembled. This corresponds exactly to the reader's knowledge at the end of II. 4, where such a recapitulation is missing.

Cicero considers the role of Sicilian gods on several levels, of which Sicily is only the first one. In our text, the most important Sicilian cults—that of Zeus in Syracuse and of Demeter in Henna<sup>99</sup>—are placed at the beginning and at the end: they form the cornerstones. These are the gods of Rome's Sicilian allies. Cicero, therefore, acts as an advocate of *socii*, and Verres violates the principle of *fides*.

In the arrangement of the names of gods, there are some deviations from the order followed in the *De Signis*: in our epilogue, the Capitoline Triad (Juppiter—Juno—Minerva) is given the first place. This is due to the fact that Cicero's approach to the gods of Sicily in our text is conditioned by the relevance of these gods to Rome: compared to the specifically Sicilian perspective, this marks a second level of interpretation.

Consequently, the famous Zeus of Syracuse turns out to be Juppiter Capitolinus (a somewhat surprising identification, given the problematic relationship between Rome and Syracuse). Verres would therefore be considered an enemy of the gods of the Roman state and a perfect candidate for the charge of felony, whereas Cicero figures as the defender of Rome and her gods. Even this aspect has been prepared for in the *De Signis*. There, Juppiter Capitolinus, defrauded by Verres of a precious candelabrum, had played an

<sup>99</sup> Sicily is *insula Cereris* (II. 5. 99).

important role. Moreover, as early as the *Divinatio in Caecilium* (26) Cicero had introduced himself as the advocate of Rome.

Likewise, Cicero establishes links between Rome and Ceres of Henna and the Mater Magna of the Enguini. In the finale of II. 5 Proserpina is addressed as Libera, which is her ritual name in the Roman cult; similarly, in II. 4. 106 she is introduced as Libera, and Proserpina is used only as a variant. Cicero dwells on the Roman character of the cult of Ceres, in order to raise his public's indignation at the sacrilegious behaviour of Verres (187): *non ut ab illis huc allata, sed ut ceteris hinc tradita esse videatur* 'so that she does not seem to have been brought here by those people but to have been handed over to the others from here' (cf. also II. 4. 114). Other divinities are Romanized by the mention of Scipio's authority; he left their cults untouched and even sanctioned them by sacral acts. This turns the temples of the Sicilian gods into Roman historical monuments and Verres, who pillages them, into an enemy of Rome. A further Roman aspect stressed by Cicero is Sicily's function as a granary of Rome (187; cf. II. 3. 47): Verres has deprived the Roman people of bread! Clearly in the epilogue under consideration, the material of II. 4 is complemented from previous *Verrine Orations*; but the last one (the *De Supplicis*), to which our chapter is supposed to belong, is conspicuously absent. Another element of Romanization is a reminiscence from the 1st Book of the *Actio Secunda*: the fraudulent restoration of the temple of Castor<sup>100</sup> in Rome. This feature creates a typically Roman background to Verres' crimes against Ceres and Proserpina (Sicilian goddesses, whose Roman features are stressed by Cicero).<sup>101</sup> Hence, even the additions from II. 1 help to Romanize the Sicilian gods by projecting them on a larger scale.

However, Cicero does not stop here and proceeds to a further level of interpretation. By insulting the Sicilian gods, Verres commits a crime against humanity. The reasoning behind this is simple: Sicily's tutelary goddesses, Ceres and Libera, are the inventors of agriculture and, therefore, of civilization. Not only the Sicilians but all nations (*gentes ac nationes*) worship particularly Ceres of Henna, as Cicero had told us in the *De Signis* (II. 4. 108); she is *princeps omnium sacrorum, quae apud omnes gentes nationesque fiunt* 'the chief authority

<sup>100</sup> On the symbolical function of this building, Römisch, 117–135.

<sup>101</sup> Le Bonniec, 381–383.

behind all sacred rites in any people or nation' (II. 4. 109). Whoever offends these goddesses, as Verres does, unmasks himself as an enemy of the human race and human behaviour. This is impressive; however, in an oration on violence against persons (*De Suppliciiis*) another way of reasoning would have been more natural.

Sicilian gods, therefore, are evoked on three levels of interpretation and successively related to Sicily, Rome, and mankind. Cicero's rhetorical art appears from his effective arrangement of the individual elements in key positions within his text. As a result, an effect of *amplificatio* (ἀϋξησης) is achieved. The gravity of Verres' crimes is considerably enhanced. In this context, arrangement (*dispositio*) and style (*elocutio*), especially the use of metaphors, both subtle and powerful means of insinuation, prove to be determined by *inventio*.

#### IV *Metamorphoses Through Style: Verres' 'Fall' and Cicero's 'Ascension'*

Viewed against a gradually broadening background, the Sicilian gods serve as a framework for a negative appraisal of Verres, who gradually becomes a demoniac figure, a villain of cosmic dimensions. Consequently, *inventio* based on *amplificatio* elicits a moralizing style and its specific vocabulary: quite consistently, the chapter ends in a catalogue of vices: *scelus* (against gods), *audacia* (against Rome), *perfidia* (against the allies), *libido* and *avaritia*, *crudelitas* (this is the only word which fits into the specific context of the *De Suppliciiis*, but *Verr.* II. 1. 122 is reason enough to use it). The description of Verres as an enemy of humanity and of Cicero as its champion is justified by the *De Signis* (II. 4. 71), where the gods reclaim their property from Verres. Cicero's prayer (in II. 5 extr.) is a perfect counterpart to that passage.

Even so, the subject 'Cicero and the Sicilian Gods' is not yet exhausted. In Cicero's day, Sicily worshipped false divinities, even the person of Verres, honouring him with golden statues and styling him Σωτήρ (II. 2. 63). He established the *Ludi Verrini, ut ei sacra facerent quotannis, cuius opera omnium annorum sacra deosque patrios amiserant* 'so that they should annually accomplish sacred rites for him, through whose activity they had lost their sacred objects from years immemorial and their native gods' (II. 4. 151).

Cicero's indignant comment—in a style both passionate and pointed—runs as follows: *etenim minime conveniebat ei deorum honores haberi, qui simulacra deorum abstulisset* 'it was utterly inappropriate that a man

should be granted divine honours who had stolen the statues of the gods' (ibid.). This problem is pinpointed most clearly at the end of II. 4. The final chapter of II. 5 is the appropriate answer.

But there is more. While Verres in the course of Cicero's oration degenerates from a god of Sicily into an enemy of gods and mortals (cf. II. 4. 112), a criminal who deprived the Sicilians of their gods, Cicero makes an alternative career for himself: from an odious accuser (cf. the beginning of the *Divinatio in Caecilium* and the ending of II. 5)—there were no public prosecutors in ancient Rome—he gradually becomes the advocate of Rome's allies (cf. the beginning of the *Divinatio*), of Rome herself, of mankind, and of the gods. But he does not stop even here. His very wish to be a defender rather than an accuser hearkens back to the beginning of the *Divinatio*, which reveals a surprising possibility of enlarging the Sicilian Olympus: Cicero declares that he agreed to defend the cause of the Sicilians because the Sicilians maintained that the life of the entire province was at stake: *sed ut vitam salutemque totius provinciae defenderem* 'but that I should defend the life and welfare of the entire province' (*Divinatio in Caecilium* 1. 1). It is well known that in the view of the ancients the function of life-savers was considered divine and that the title of Σωτήρ was given to mortals who were worshipped as heroes and gods. As a contrast to Verres' unjustified claim to divine honours (II. 2. 63; II. 4 extr.), Cicero stresses his own *pietas* and *fides* in his final prayer in II. 5. Cicero as a person (*me duce atque auctore* 'under my guidance and authority') is mentioned at the end of II. 3 as well, and in II. 5. 129 a Sicilian addresses him as *salus mea* 'my salvation.' As early as the beginning of the *Divinatio* Cicero intimates that the Sicilians set all their hopes on him. When they ask him to save their lives (*Divinatio in Caecilium* 1, 3), he has them assess their situation as follows: *sese iam ne deos quidem in suis urbibus, ad quos confugerent, habere, quod eorum simulacra . . . Verres . . . sustulisset* 'that in their towns they did not even have gods with whom to take refuge, because Verres had taken away their statues.'<sup>102</sup> By fulfilling the function of 'life-saver' Cicero plays the role of a god for the Sicilians. However, far from claiming divine honours, he is satisfied with being the advocate of the gods, as he had advocated the cause of Sicily, Rome, and

<sup>102</sup> Cf. *Divinatio in Caecilium* 1. 14 *deum denique nullum Siculis reliquit* 'finally, he left no god (i.e. no statue) to the Sicilians.'

mankind.<sup>103</sup> We should, however, give him credit for abstaining from styling himself a god. This winning touch of modesty, which distinguishes him favourably from some of his contemporaries (among them, Verres), should be added to the traditional portrait of Cicero, which focuses on his personal vanity. Cicero's point was not self-apotheosis but the assumption of the role of life-saver by human beings. His way of thinking is not theological but humanitarian.

## V Elocutio in the Service of Persuasion

It is time to survey the rhetorical means used by Cicero in the text under consideration with special regard to style (*elocutio*).

The traditional invocation of gods had become obsolete in Cicero's day and he himself ridicules one of his adversaries for using this device (*Divinatio in Caecilium* 43). Therefore, the invocation must serve a definite literary and rhetorical purpose in our case; otherwise Cicero would have left it out.<sup>104</sup> Interestingly enough, there is such a purpose behind our text, though not in the context of the last, but the penultimate *Verrine*.

The invocation helps to enhance *pathos* in accordance with the sublime stylistic level and the emotional tone typical of *peroratio*. It is accompanied by other elements of religious discourse such as vocatives, anaphoric use of *tu* in different cases and of relative clauses (*cuius*, . . . *cui* . . . *quam*, . . . *quam*, etc.), double expressions in the manner of early Latin (*imploro et obtestor* 'I beseech and implore' 188), evocation of the speaker's merits and the culprit's misdeeds by means of anaphoric use of *si* (188 and 189).

The detailed list of the names of gods (11) allows of a comprehensive recapitulation of the places where they are worshipped in Sicily and the crimes perpetrated there by Verres (*collectio*, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις). Here, Cicero rhetorically exploits the close connection between those gods and Sicily: first, the use of toponyms conjures up the presence of the island in the listeners' minds; second, by identifying the gods with their statues and calling their temples their

<sup>103</sup> In II. 5. 35, Cicero insists on his keen sense of duty. Among his future tasks as an *aedilis* he mentions the organization of plays for the gods whose names he mentions. There is no allusion to this office in the *peroratio* considered here.

<sup>104</sup> Invocations of gods are relatively rare in Cicero (see Römisch). Demosthenes uses this device in his *De Corona*, an oration Cicero studied thoroughly.

homes, the orator bestows graphic vividness on his speech (*evidentia*, ἐνάργεια). This tendency is especially clear in the passage referring to Henna, which is another parallel to the *De Signis* (188 *incolitis* and *praesidetis*; cf. II. 4. 107 *ut haec insula ab ea non solum diligi, sed etiam incoli custodiri que videatur* 'so that it looks as if this island is not only loved but also inhabited and guarded by her'; II. 4. 108 *ad ipsam Cererem proficisci* 'start one's way to Ceres herself'; cfr. II. 4. 111 *habitare apud sese Cererem Hennenses arbitrantur* 'the inhabitants of Henna are convinced that Ceres lives in their very town').

When speaking of the gods of Sicily, Cicero takes pains to use especially reverential language (*religiosissimus, sanctissimus*, etc.). Indirectly, this also contributes to enhance his own noble character (*ethos*).

A device both powerful and inconspicuous is insinuation, which is achieved by a purposeful arrangement of the material; a stylistic corollary to this is the interpretation of Sicilian divinities in terms of the Roman state religion.

Perhaps the most important rhetorical technique adopted by Cicero in this oration is one that he constantly disclaims<sup>105</sup> but constantly employs: *amplificatio*.

## VI *A Literary Oration*

Some of the rhetorical and stylistic observations in the present context may be relevant even to an assessment of Cicero as an historical source. To give an example, his insistence on the 'Roman' character of certain cults should not be taken at face value; similarly, in order to persuade his listeners, he emphasizes his respect for the gods of Sicily by means of style.

However one should not overstress the deeply emotional character of this finale. Tellingly, Cicero does not pull out all the stops fitting the subject of the *De Suppliciis*. From his orchestration of this passage the funereal timbre of the brass instruments is conspicuously absent: there is a host of offended gods, but where are the *Poenae atque Furiae* of the citizens of Rome (II. 1. 7) and of Sicily, so impressively conjured up in II. 5. 113? Even in this cardinal point, the epilogue under consideration does not go beyond the information found in the *De Signis*. The absence of any reference to Book 5, especially

<sup>105</sup> For instance, II. 4. 2.

of the Furies, competent for the revenge of crimes against citizens, would be understandable if the final chapter of Book 5 were initially part of the *De Signis*, where the prayer is perfectly appropriate as a continuation of the last sentence (saying that Verres had eliminated all the gods from Sicily) and gives a recapitulation of the book.

Nevertheless, it is possible that Cicero himself transposed the prayer to the end of the entire corpus. The invocation of the gods made this especially successful passage suitable to form the conclusion of the entire corpus. A further excuse for placing the prayer at the end of Book 5 is the fact that the influence of the gods of Sicily on Rome and on the world reaches its culmination in the chapter under consideration to the point of potentially including even the problem of *crudelitas* and *humanitas*. It remains true, however, that after such an oration as the *De Supplicis*, the present finale leaves the reader with an almost too friendly and serene impression. In a judicial oration, this would impair the persuasive effect; in a published book, the orator takes leave from his readers in a moderate and graceful note which ultimately reflects a shift from *pathos* to *ethos*.

Consequently, Cicero's practice in the epilogue under consideration shows that he never applies rhetorical rules mechanically. First, invention conditions the choice of stylistic means. Second, Cicero gives general relevance to a special case (*amplificatio*). Third, the very character of *peroratio* fosters the deployment of specific stylistic devices. Fourth: The use of these devices can be modified by literary considerations, especially in orations not destined for delivery.

## CONCLUSION

The present choice of examples—deliberately limited to the orations—witnesses to Cicero's wide range of styles even within the limits of one genre.

It becomes clear that the texts under consideration exemplify the styles appropriate to the different divisions of a classical oration. The discussion of the *Pro Rege Deiotaro* is centred on the *prooemium* (which sheds some light on Cicero's use of his own theories). In the *Pro Milone* the 'ornate' style of the *prooemium* calls for direct confrontation with the 'plain,' deliberately 'negligent' *narratio*. In the service of credibility, the highest form of art consists in the concealment of art, which seems to have become second nature. It turns out that the stylistic

difference is caused by the overall design (*inventio*) of the oration. The relevance even of *digressio* (excursus) to the cause under discussion can be studied in the *Pro Archia*. Here the excursus serves to hide the weakness of documentary evidence in favour of Archias. Therefore, even an 'ornamental,' 'quasi-epideictic' passage has a persuasive function within the context of the oration. In order to serve this aim, the style of the excursus must be, of course, especially appealing to the listener. Again, *inventio* is crucial, even for the choice of stylistic means. Last comes *peroratio*. Here, in order to move the listener, pathos and the grand style are required. However, Cicero, for literary reasons, may slightly mitigate the *pathos*, as he does in the given case.

Since the present book is on style as the literary use of linguistic means, examples written in a literary style have been deliberately chosen. The finale of *Verrines II* is especially complex. On the one hand, the mention and invocation of the immortal gods is a procedure typical of *peroratio*. On the other hand, in this finale Cicero does not insist any longer on the subject of the last oration, the terrible *supplicia* inflicted on Roman citizens, but comes back to Verres' requisitions of statues. Although the latter actions are, strictly speaking, sacrilegious, the atmosphere of this peroration is less gloomy than that of the rest of *Verrines II* 5. Cicero knows what his readers expect from him. In this last peroration, *literary* criteria take preeminence over pragmatic ones.

As for Cicero's adherence to his own rhetorical theories, at least two intriguing points emerge: In his relatively late oration *Pro Rege Deiotaro* it can be observed that Cicero's early theory determines his practice even after the *De Oratore*. (It follows that in all probability Cicero disclaimed the *De Inventione* not because he disagreed with its teachings, but because it gave away too many professional secrets.) On the other hand, his later theory of 'middle style' is prepared for much earlier by his stylistic practice in the *prooemia*.

On a more general scale the examples document the interaction of different factors in Cicero's practice as a stylist. Especially, two points should be made:

First, in many discussions of style the importance of appropriateness (*aptum*) is neglected. A discourse must be appropriate to the speaker, to the listener, to the subject matter, to the given situation (in space and time). The leading role of this principle—which is of higher rank than most of the special precepts of rhetoric—

deserves to be stressed. *Aptum* is not a merely æsthetic criterion, it has factual, social and psychological components.

Last and most important: *inventio*. In the examples studied here, even the details of *elocutio* are conditioned by the overall design of the oration, that is to say, by *inventio*. Hence what Wilfried Stroh proved for the *dispositio* of Cicero's orations holds equally true for *elocutio*: style is not an independent æsthetic domain, but ultimately conditioned by *inventio*. To state this case, it was necessary to choose examples of 'literary' elaborateness. If even here style is subdued to *inventio*, this applies *a fortiori* to more 'pragmatic' orations.

The following Epilogue will consider the principles behind Cicero's practice in his orations and, more generally, the importance of a 'culture of speech' in the light of the *De Oratore*.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> For examples from Cicero's philosophical writings and letters, see Chapter 2; and Laurand's comparative analysis of early and late letters (*Cicéron*, 304–307). For an interpretative analysis of a philosophical text, see my *Masters of Roman Prose*, pp. 102–111 of Neil Adkins' excellent English translation.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## EPILOGUE

### THE *DE ORATORE*: CICERO AND THE CULTURE OF SPEECH

Ah! boy, Cornelia never with more care  
Read to her sons than she hath read to thee  
Sweet poetry and Tully's orator.  
Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus* 4. 1

The sweetness of the lips increaseth learning.  
Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*  
(1605) 6. 3 (from *Proverbs* 16. 21)

Cicero's ideal of rhetorical education is a very broad subject. To study this question, one can focus on the central notion of the *orator*,<sup>1</sup> or place Cicero's views within the context of Greek thought,<sup>2</sup> or even, enlarging the scope, examine the relationship between philosophy and rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> Another starting point is offered by a study of the *De Oratore*, looking closely at its educational aims and the culture of speech it stands for.

Cicero's ideal of rhetorical education will be illustrated: first by comparing the *De Oratore* and the *De Re Publica*; then by discussing Cicero's view of Socrates in the *De Oratore*; and, finally, by dealing with the importance of rhetorical education for the present time.

---

<sup>1</sup> On the *De Oratore*, Leeman/Pinkster (commentary); MacKendrick (*Phil.*) 36–44; 325 (bibl.); Schulte, *Orator*; Leeman, 'De integratie.' Most recently, Narducci, *Eloquenza*; Narducci, (ed.), *Cicerone: Prospettiva 2000* and Cambiano in Narducci (ed.) *Interpretare Cicerone: Wisse. On vir bonus dicendi peritus*, Petersmann. On the influence of Cicero's ideal, Quadlbauer, 'Optimus orator.'

<sup>2</sup> Barwick, *Bildungsideal*.

<sup>3</sup> Michel, A., *Rhétorique et philosophie chez Cicéron* (Paris, 1960); id., 'La théorie de la rhétorique chez Cicéron: éloquence et philosophie,' in *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron* (= *Entretiens Fondation Hardt*, 28, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1981), 109–139 (with discussion 140–147).

I. *Cicero's Ideal of Rhetorical Education*<sup>4</sup>

The following concepts (nos. 1–4) mark the political and intellectual background, the requirements Cicero expects an orator to meet:

1. *Princeps*: Cicero considered the orator identical with the politician and the sage. This element of his thought is expressed in the close resemblance of both form and outlook of two of his main works: the *De Oratore* and the *De Re Publica*. Cicero's dialogue *De Oratore* is an important, though unfortunately much neglected, counterpart to the *De Re Publica*. The concepts of the ideal orator and of the ideal politician explain and complement each other. Both the *De Oratore* and the *De Re Publica* stand out as masterpieces in Cicero's œuvre, marked by their sublime literary form as well as by the exceptional practical knowledge of the author: Cicero's philosophical talent may be subject to discussion, but his competence as an orator and a Senator remains beyond doubt.

Both works date from the same period in Cicero's life, the time of his so-called *otium* after his return from exile. There are also close resemblances between the ideas expressed in both works, and these parallels can contribute much to our understanding of the *De Re Publica*.<sup>5</sup>

To Cicero, the orator is simultaneously a politician and a sage (philosopher). Cicero's ideal orator is primarily concerned with the active management of life and of public affairs; this is a quintessentially Roman conception, but it also points back to Pre-Socratic—or rather Pre-Sophistic—thought, inasmuch as the philosopher and the orator are considered one and the same person. Virtues cannot be possessed in an abstract sense, they can only be realized through corresponding actions: *virtus in usu sui tota posita est* 'virtue consists entirely in its application' (*De Re Publica* 1. 2).<sup>6</sup> Rather than theoretical

<sup>4</sup> To render these 12 concepts somewhat more graphic, they are each headed by a Latin or Greek lemma.

<sup>5</sup> Since the *De Oratore* is less known than the *De Re Publica*, it might be helpful to quote some parallels: a) the central figures (Scipio and Crassus, respectively) are in some way compared to Socrates (see below, II), and both to a large extent direct the dialogue; moreover, both works are set shortly before the death of the main speaker (as is for instance Plato's *Phaedo*). b) A comparison of the education and qualities of the statesman in the *De Re Publica* and of the orator in the *De Oratore* should be extremely rewarding. c) The proems of the *De Re Publica* and the *De Oratore* and the relationship of *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa* would provide another theme for examination.

<sup>6</sup> Roman and Jewish thought share this view: one may compare the *Epistle of St. James*, which, in accordance with Jewish tendencies, denounces faith without pious works as invalid.

knowledge, Romans appreciate a life that exemplifies philosophical insight. The study of science and philosophy is thought to be a preparation for an active life.<sup>7</sup>

Here we see a fundamental difference between Cicero and many philosophers of both his own and later times: as he says in the preface to his *De Re Publica*, he wishes to be of use to as many people as possible. He is not satisfied, as so many philosophers are, to convert a few, but he takes the law-giver as his model. Men like the Seven Sages—Solon, for instance—have not endeavoured to educate only a few individuals, but rather entire communities.<sup>8</sup> Thus, it becomes necessary for Roman thought to go back beyond Socrates to the time of the Pre-Socratics, when science and wisdom, philosophy, oratory, and politics had not been divided into discrete disciplines (cf. *De Oratore* 3. 130). Cicero, therefore, for his educational ideas, has to rely on the traditions of archaic Greece. This recourse to early stages of Greek thought seems to have been a general feature of Roman self-definition: Virgil worked his way through Hellenism to Homer, Lucretius reached beyond Epicurus to Empedocles, Cicero proceeded beyond Plato and Demosthenes to the early law-givers. This old concept of a philosophy encompassing rhetorical skill and political activity was re-established at a relatively late date by Isocrates, who thus became, almost necessarily, a chief authority for Cicero.

The best way of teaching and learning is through living examples: therefore, the two younger listeners in our dialogue, Gaius Cotta and Publius Sulpicius (whose function has been rightly stressed by Leeman<sup>9</sup> in his commentary to this work), are vital for our understanding the *De Oratore*.<sup>10</sup> It is to their honour that they are granted

<sup>7</sup> However, Cicero is not as averse to contemplation as it might seem, cf. Pffigersdorffer.

<sup>8</sup> *Ergo ille civis qui id cogit omnis imperio legumque poena, quod vix paucis oratione persuadere philosophi possunt, etiam iis, qui illa disputant, ipsis praefendus est doctoribus* 'Therefore the citizen who compels all men, by the authority of magistrates and the penalties imposed by law, to follow rules of whose validity philosophers find it hard to convince even a few by their admonitions, must be considered superior even to the teachers who enunciate these principles' (*De Re Publica* 1. 3).

<sup>9</sup> Leeman, A. D., Pinkster, H. (eds.), *De Oratore*, Vol. 1, 23f.

<sup>10</sup> (Sulpicius): *Ego enim, qui ab ineunte aetate incensus essem studio utriusque vestrum* (scil. Crassi et Antonii), *Crassi vero etiam amore, cum ab eo nusquam discederem, verbum ex eo numquam elicere potui de via ac ratione dicendi . . . ; quo in genere tu, Antoni, (vere loquar) numquam mihi percontanti aut quaerenti aliquid defuisti . . . Date nobis hanc veniam, ut ea, quae sentitis de omni genere dicendi, subtiliter persequamini . . . et longe Academiae illi ac Lyceo tuum hoc suburbanum gymnasium antepoanam* 'The fact is that I, who from my earliest manhood was aglow with enthusiasm for you both, and a positive devotion to Crassus—seeing that on no occasion did I leave his side—could never get a word out of him

the privilege of listening to the talk of their seniors and of profiting from their experience. This way of learning, on the whole, remained typical of Roman orators even after Greek texts for rhetorical instruction had become widely available. By adding to the gathering these *adulescentes* (who in reality were no longer so young anymore at the fictive date of the dialogue), Cicero reveals his educational intentions and offers sympathetic figures with whom his readers might identify; this deference to Roman custom is crucial to the purpose of the work, since he himself had pointed out that he was not merely echoing the teachings of Greek schools of rhetoric (as he had done in his *De Inventione*, which he himself condemned in his mature age). Rather, he wanted to present a civil, urbane discussion among respected orators, in accordance with Roman *dignitas* and the *auctoritas* of characters like Crassus and Antonius.<sup>11</sup>

2. *Senatus populusque*: The activities of an orator, to the Roman mind, are linked to the institution of the Roman Republic. The orator feels responsible not only for individual citizens, but for the entire *civitas*; his zeal is not esoterically confined to a circle of his own creed, but exoterically directed to the public. These circumstances condition his style.<sup>12</sup> As far as possible he avoids technical expressions, since, to

---

respecting the nature and theory of eloquence [. . .], whereas on this subject you, Antonius,—and what I shall say is true—have never failed me at all in my probings or interrogatories [. . .]. Grant us the favour of recounting with exactness of detail, your respective opinions upon every branch of oratory, [. . .] and I shall rank these semi-rural training-quarters of yours far above the illustrious Academy and the Lyceum' (*De Oratore* 1. 97).

*Gerendus est tibi mos adulescentibus, Crasse, qui non Graeci alicuius quotidianam loquacitatem sine usu neque ex scholis cantilenam requirunt, sed ex homine omnium sapientissimo atque eloquentissimo . . . sententiam sciscitantur* 'It is for you, Crassus, to comply with the wishes of young men, who do not want the everyday chatter of some unpractised Greek, or old sing-songs out of the schools, but they are anxious to learn the opinion of the wisest and most eloquent man in the world [. . .].' (1. 105). For Cicero's preference for Roman *dignitas* over Greek school rhetoric and for *auctoritas* of Roman orators, as for instance of Crassus, see *De Oratore* 1. 23.

<sup>11</sup> Cicero stresses the obligations of the orator to the Roman Republic; Augustine will direct attention to the obligation to truth. Rhetoric thus is transformed into hermeneutics, i.e. a theory of interpretation (in the *De Doctrina Christiana*, the Scripture and Christ, seen as embodiments of truth, lend a new strength and earnestness to the demands that Plato imposed on rhetoric, though at the price of dogmatic rigidity).

<sup>12</sup> *Pauciores oratores quam poetae boni reperientur. Quod hoc etiam mirabilis debet videri, quia ceterarum artium studia fere reconditis atque abditis e fontibus hauriuntur, dicendi autem omnis ratio in medio posita communi quodam in usu atque in hominum ore et sermone versatur, ut in ceteris id maxime excellat, quod longissime sit ab imperitorum intellegentia sensuque disiunctum, in dicendo autem vitium vel maximum sit a vulgari genere orationis atque a consuetu-*

him, all superfluous specialization falls under the heading of *obscuritas*. He endeavours to talk about politics and rhetoric without the typical jargon of the Greek scholars. The *De Oratore* is the first—and almost the only—rhetorical textbook of literary beauty. This is a new and very Roman achievement. The teaching of rhetoric had become less and less appealing ever since the time of the Sophists. Cicero gave back to this discipline its original æsthetic value<sup>13</sup> by adopting a style dictated by literary finesse and respect for his readers. There were two reasons why Cicero strove to renew the union of philosophy and rhetoric. The first reason was archaic and Roman: the individual's responsibility towards *res publica* lent a seriousness of purpose to the *De Oratore*. The issue at stake was not merely education, but the chance of leading a meaningful life and achieving happiness, within a certain institutional frame.<sup>14</sup> The other reason was 'modern' and Greek:

3. Λόγος (*lógos*): Cicero owed his political success only to his education, not to noble birth or personal wealth. Therefore, the 'Greek' road to rhetorical and philosophical learning, to him, was also the only path to becoming a true Roman; it provided him the chance of personal satisfaction by allowing him to take part in the life of the Republic as a person of his time and of his people. This is why the orator, the politician, and the learned man (φιλόσοφος, *philosophus*) are one and the same. It is not enough to be able to win a case on a tactical level—this would be entirely a matter of routine—, but

---

*dine communis sensus abhorre* '[. . .] fewer good orators will be found even than good poets. And this should seem even more marvellous because the subjects of the other arts are derived as a rule from hidden and remote sources, while the whole art of oratory lies open to the view, and is concerned in some measure with the common practice, custom, and speech of mankind, so that, whereas in all other arts that is most excellent which is farthest removed from the understanding and mental capacity of the untrained, in oratory the most grievous fault is to depart from the language of everyday life, and the usage approved by the sense of the community.' (1. 11f.).

<sup>13</sup> In patristic thought, and so also with Augustine, the Church takes the place of the Roman Republic. Terminology as well as models of thought are adopted: *populus* for the Christians, *gentes* for the pagans, while Roman patriotism and Stoic eagerness for self-sacrifice are converted into accepted models of behaviour for martyrs.

<sup>14</sup> Cicero claims that the Romans originally possessed already everything the Greeks had achieved, and possessed it to a higher degree and with greater earnestness. Still, he says, one should appropriate Greek knowledge for practical application. The Christians later treated the ancient heritage in a similar way: compare, for instance, the transformation of the *De Oratore* from a rhetorical into a hermeneutic handbook in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*.

the crucial skill is the ability to develop general ‘strategies.’ This skill, however, can be enhanced only through a liberal education and wide learning, not through any form of mere specialized training.

Cicero sees the task of the orator in relation with the general human *logos* (cf. Isocrates).<sup>15</sup> Crassus—rather one-sidedly, to be sure—

---

<sup>15</sup> *Neque vero mihi quidquam, inquit, praestabilius videtur quam posse dicendo tenere hominum coetus, mentes allicere, voluntates impellere, quo velit, unde autem velit, deducere. Haec una res in omni libero populo maximeque in pacatis tranquillisque civitatibus praecipue semper floruit semperque dominata est. Quid enim tam admirabile quam ex infinita multitudine hominum existere unum, qui id, quod omnibus natura sit datum, vel solus vel cum paucis facere possit? aut tam iucundum cognitu atque auditu quam sapientibus sententiis gravibusque verbis ornata oratio et polita? aut tam potens tamque magnificum quam populi motus, iudicum religiones, senatus gravitatem unius oratione converti? Quid tam porro regum, tam liberale, tam munificum quam opem ferre supplicibus, excitare afflictos, dare salutem, liberare periculis, retinere homines in civitate? Quid autem tam necessarium quam tenere semper arma, quibus vel tectus ipse esse possis vel provocare improbos vel te ulcisci lacessitus? Age vero, ne semper forum, subsellia, Rostra curiamque meditare, quid esse potest in otio aut iucundius aut magis proprium humanitatis quam sermo facetus ac nulla in re rudis? Hoc enim uno praestamus vel maxime feris, quod colloquimur inter nos et quod exprimere dicendo sensa possumus. Quamobrem quis hoc non iure miretur summeque in eo elaborandum esse arbitretur, ut, quo uno homines maxime bestiis praesent, in hoc hominibus ipsis antecellat? Ut vero iam ad illa summa veniamus, quae vis alia potuit aut dispersos homines unum in locum congregare aut a fera agrestique vita ad hunc humanum cultum civilemque deducere aut iam constitutis civitatibus leges, iudicia, iura describere? Ac ne plura, quae sunt paene innumerabilia, consector, comprehendam brevi: sic enim statuo, perfecti oratoris moderatione et sapientia non solum ipsius dignitatem sed et privatorum plurimorum et universae rei publicae salutem maxime contineri.* ‘Moreover,’ he continued, there is to my mind no more excellent thing than the power, by means of oratory, to grasp the attention of assemblies of men, win their good will, direct their inclinations wherever the speaker wishes, or divert them from whatever he wishes. In every free nation, and most of all in communities which have attained the enjoyment of peace and tranquillity, this one art has always flourished above the rest and ever reigned supreme. For what is so marvellous as that, out of the innumerable company of mankind, a single being should arise, who either alone or with a few others can make effective a faculty bestowed by nature upon every man? Or what so pleasing to the understanding and the ear as a speech adorned and polished with wise reflections and dignified language? Or what achievement so mighty and glorious as that the impulses of the crowd, the consciences of the judges, the austerity of the Senate, should suffer transformation through the eloquence of one man? What function again is so kingly, so worthy of the free, so generous, as to bring help to the suppliant, to raise up those that are cast down, to bestow security, to set men free from peril, to maintain men in their civil rights? What too is so indispensable as to have always in your grasp weapons wherewith you can defend yourself, or challenge the wicked man, or when provoked take your revenge? Nay more (not to have you forever contemplating public affairs, the bench, the platform, and the Senatehouse), what in hours of ease can be a pleasanter thing or one more characteristic of culture, than discourse that is graceful and nowhere uninstructed? For the one point in which we have our very greatest advantage over the brute creation is that we hold converse one with another, and can reproduce our thought in words. Who therefore would not rightly admire this faculty, and deem it his duty to exert himself to the utmost in this field, that by so doing he may surpass men themselves in that particular respect wherein chiefly men are superior to animals? To come, however,

points out the positive sides and the importance of speech and of the orator's task (1. 30–34): The orator is able to guide the emotions and the will of his audience. It is Aristotle who, in his *Art of Rhetoric*, had first discussed this topic at large, paying special attention to the emotional means of persuasion (*ethos* and *pathos*). A similar doctrine of *ethos* is also found in Isocrates,<sup>16</sup> probably under the influence of Aristotle.

Of special importance is Cicero's remark that the orator enjoys high esteem among all free nations (*in omni libero populo*); this is one reason for the place of rhetoric in the school curriculum. The crucial word in this respect is *arma* (1. 32). In a civilized society, speech is the only acceptable means of pressing an issue and of defending oneself. Whoever has mastered the art of oratory will see through the tricks of demagoguery of politicians and is thus immune to their manipulations. He also learns how to marshal his thoughts efficiently and to convince others through reasonable discourse.

Since *λόγος* is what distinguishes man from animals, rhetorical education also means cultivation of what is specifically human. State and society depend entirely on the culture of speech (cf. also Isocrates). We are reminded here of a thought expressed in Cicero's preface to his *De Oratore*: Although speech as a gift of nature seems equally available to everyone, yet there are surprisingly few very effective orators. In fact, the orator, compared to other specialists or even to poets, is at a disadvantage, because he cannot afford to create his own language. Since his aim is to persuade all, he has to speak like them, but better than anyone else (*De Oratore* 1. 12, cf. n. 15). Thus, it is the orator's duty to hide his depths under a smooth surface. Abstruseness (*obscuritas*) being the greatest fault in a speech, the orator can never—as poets or philosophers do—try to impress his audience

---

at length to the highest achievements of eloquence, what other power could have been strong enough either to gather scattered humanity into one place, or to lead it out of its brutish existence in the wilderness up to our present condition of civilization as men and as citizens, or, after the establishment of social communities, to give shape to laws, tribunals, and civic rights? And not to pursue any further instances—wellnigh countless as they are—I will conclude the whole matter in a few words, for my assertion is this: that the wise control of the complete orator is that which chiefly upholds not only his own dignity, but the safety of countless individuals and of the entire State.' (1. 30–34).

<sup>16</sup> Modesty must prevent the orator from pointing out his own virtue, but he can hint at it as a prerequisite (*ethos*). A just and pious, that is, a good man can sell his arguments more convincingly. He therefore has to strive for the true *pleonexia* (πλεονεξία, 'greediness,' 'gain'): not for more money, but for more virtue.

with an unintelligible oracular style. Cicero thus favours a culture of communication, as it is his conviction that man develops his very nature through speech.<sup>17</sup>

4. ἰδέα (*idéa*): Cicero endeavours to develop a concept of the orator according to Platonic ideals (he does so in the *De Oratore*, and even more in the *Orator*).<sup>18</sup> He idealizes Crassus, to be sure, but only because he wishes to demonstrate through him his sublime concept of the perfect orator.<sup>19</sup>

The next four points (5–8) list Cicero's special requirements for the ideal orator:

5. *Rem tene, verba sequentur*: For Cicero's Crassus, a thorough understanding of the case is more important than rhetorical technique, and knowledge takes precedence over persuasion (3. 125).<sup>20</sup> This is

<sup>17</sup> According to Augustine, Christ is the incarnation of *Lógos* (*John's Gospel* 1. 1) and of truth itself.

<sup>18</sup> *Attamen quoniam de oratore nobis disputandum est, de summo oratore dicere necesse est. Vis enim et natura rei, nisi perfecta ante oculos ponitur, qualis et quanta sit, intellegi non potest* 'Nevertheless, as our debate is to be about the orator, I am bound to speak of the supreme orator; for it is impossible to understand the character and magnitude of a thing's essential nature unless a perfect specimen of it is set before your eyes' (*De Oratore* 3. 85; cf. also 1. 95). More at length *Orator* 7–19, esp. 7: *Atque ego in fingendo summo oratore talem informabo, qualis fortasse nemo fuit . . .* 'In delineating the perfect orator I shall be portraying such a one as perhaps has never existed . . .' 10: *has rerum formas appellat idéας . . . Plato*. 'These patterns of things are called *idéας* or ideas by Plato.' 19: *Investigemus hunc igitur, Brute, si possumus, quem numquam vidit Antonius, aut qui omnino nullus unquam fuit. quem si imitari atque exprimere non possumus, quod idem ille vix deo concessum esse dicebat, at qualis esse debeat, poterimus fortasse dicere*. 'Let us search then, Brutus, if we can, for this man whom Antonius has never seen, or who has never existed at all. If we cannot present an exact copy—he said this was scarcely within the power of a god—yet we may be able to say what he ought to be like.'

<sup>19</sup> For Augustine, for example in his *De magistro*, Christ is the true teacher.

<sup>20</sup> *Rerum enim copia verborum copiam gignit; et, si est honestas in rebus ipsis, de quibus dicitur, existit ex re naturalis quidam splendor in verbis. Sit modo is, qui dicet aut scribet, institutus liberaliter educatione doctrinaque puerili et flagret studio et a natura adiuvetur et in universorum generum infinitis disceptationibus exercitatus oratissimos scriptores oratoresque ad cognoscendum imitandumque delegerit, ne ille haud sane, quemadmodum verba struat et illuminet, a magistris istis requiret. Ita facile in rerum abundantia ad orationis ornamenta sine duce, natura ipsa, si modo est exercitata, labetur.* 126 *Hic Catulus, Dii immortales, inquit, quantam rerum varietatem, quantam copiam, Crasse, complexus es quantisque ex angustiis oratorem educere ausus es et in maiorum suorum regno collocare! Namque illos veteres doctores auctoresque dicendi nullum genus disputationis a se alienum putasse accepimus semperque esse in omni orationis ratione versatos* 'For a full supply of facts begets a full supply of words, and if the subjects discussed are themselves of an elevated character this produces a spontaneous brilliance in the language. Only let the intending speaker or writer, thanks to the

an Aristotelian approach, but also a typically Roman one (the quoted words are Cato's).<sup>21</sup>

6. *Enkúklios paideía* (ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία): The *proemium* of the *De Oratore*, comparable in importance to that of the *De Re Publica*, is followed by the body of the text, which is presented as an account of a talk among Roman aristocrats. Lucius Crassus during the *Ludi Romani* retires to his Tusculanum, where he is joined by his father-in-law Quintus Mucius Scaevola and the orator Antonius. Antonius and Crassus are the most important orators of their age and the main speakers of the dialogue. Cicero has Crassus expound the necessity of an all-round education for the orator.<sup>22</sup> Scaevola, a famous expert in Roman law, also plays an important part in the First Book. Crassus expects from the orator encyclopedic learning. Of course, he does not demand detailed bookish precision, but only an acquaintance with the principles of each discipline. The most relevant subjects are literature, Roman law, and history.<sup>23</sup> (Cicero himself had composed

---

training given by a liberal education in boyhood, possess a glowing enthusiasm as well as the assistance of good natural endowments, and, having had practice in the abstract discussions of general principles, have selected the most accomplished writers and orators for study and imitation: then certainly such a one will not have to come to your professors to be shown how to put words together and how to invest them with brilliance of style; so easily nature of herself, if only she has received training, given a plentiful supply of matter, will find her way without any guidance to the adornments of oratory". Here Catulus broke in: "By the immortal gods," he said, "what an enormous variety of important considerations you have covered, Crassus, and out of what narrow limitations you have been bold enough to rescue the orator and elevate him to the throne of his ancestors! For in the good old days, as we are told, the professors and masters of rhetoric considered no kind of discourse to lie outside their province, and continually occupied themselves with every system of oratory" (*De Oratore* 3. 125–126).

<sup>21</sup> Augustine takes the obligation to truth very seriously.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Kühnert.

<sup>23</sup> A proof of the historical knowledge of Augustine: He points to Roman patriotism as an example for Christians in their relation to the Church. Here is Cicero's text (*De Oratore* 1. 17–20): *Est enim et scientia comprehendenda rerum plurimarum, sine qua verborum volubilitas inanis atque invidenda est, et ipsa oratio conformanda non solum electione, sed etiam constructione verborum, et omnes animorum motus, quos omnis vis ratioque dicendi in eorum, qui audiunt, mentibus aut sedandis aut excitandis expromenda est; accedat eodem oportet lepos . . . ; 18 tenenda praeterea est omnis antiquitas exemplorumque vis, neque legum ac iuris civilis scientia negligenda est. Nam quid ego de actione ipsa dicam? . . . quid dicam de thesauro rerum omnium, memoria? 20 Ac mea quidem sententia nemo poterit esse omni laude cumulatus orator, nisi erit omnium rerum magnarum atque artium scientiam consecutus: etenim ex rerum cognitione efflorescat et redundet oportet oratio* "To begin with, a knowledge of very many matters must be grasped, without which oratory is but an empty and ridiculous swirl of verbiage: and the distinctive style has to be formed, not only by the choice of words, but also by the arrangement of the same; and all the mental emotions,

a lost work: *De iure civili in artem redigendo* and toyed with the idea of writing history.)<sup>24</sup>

7. *Philosophia*:<sup>25</sup> Where philosophy is concerned, only one of its branches, physics, seems to be negligible. (St. Augustine goes even further, calling it *curiositas*). But the orator cannot do without ethics and psychology. The emotional means of persuasion (*ethos* and *pathos*), in particular, are treated in some detail in the Aristotelian manner. Logic is important as the rational means of persuasion (induction and deduction), as the teaching of the *topiká* (τοπικά) is for the finding of general ideas.<sup>26</sup>

---

with which nature has endowed the human race, are to be intimately understood, because it is in calming or kindling the feelings of the audience that the full power and science of oratory are to be brought into play. To this there should be added a certain humour [. . .]. Further, the complete history of the past and a store of precedents must be retained in the memory, nor may knowledge of statute law and our national law in general be omitted. And why should I go on to describe the speaker's delivery? [. . .] What need to speak of that universal treasure-house the memory? [. . .] And indeed in my opinion, no man can be an orator complete in all points of merit, who has not attained a knowledge of all important subjects and arts. For it is from knowledge that oratory must derive its beauty and fullness.'

<sup>24</sup> Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire*.

<sup>25</sup> *Oratorem nisi qui sapiens esset, esse neminem* 'That no one can be an orator without being wise' (1. 83). *Nam neque sine forensibus nervis satis vehemens et gravis nec sine varietate doctrinae* (here the *in utramque partem dicere* is mentioned: Aristotle, Arcesilaus, Carneades) *satis politus et sapiens esse orator potest* 'For an orator cannot have sufficient cogency and weight if he lacks the vigour that public speaking demands, and cannot be adequately polished and profound if he lacks width of culture' (3. 80). *Dummodo illa res tanta sit, ut omnibus philosophorum libris, quos nemo oratorum istorum attigit, comprehensa esse videatur* 'provided it be granted that the subject is so extensive that it might be supposed to fill all the volumes of the philosophers, books which none of those gentlemen have ever had in their hands' (3. 81). *Nunc intellego illa te semper etiam potiora duxisse, quae ad sapientiam spectarent, atque ex his hanc dicendi copiam fluxisse* 'Now I understand that you have always valued more highly those things that look toward wisdom, and that this varied eloquence is derived from these things' (3. 82). *Me oratorem non ex rhetorum officinis, sed ex Academiae spatii existitisse* '(and I confess) that whatever ability I possess as an orator comes, not from the workshops of the rhetoricians, but from the spacious grounds of the Academy' (*Orator* 12). *Solesque non numquam hac de re a me in disputationibus nostris dissentire, quod ego eruditissimorum hominum artibus eloquentiam contineri statuum, tu* (scil. *Quinte frater*) *autem illam ab elegantia doctrinae segregandam putes et in quodam ingeni atque exercitationis genere ponendam* 'and generally you disagree with me in our occasional discussions of this subject because I hold that eloquence is dependent upon the trained skill of highly educated men, while you consider that it must be separated from the refinements of learning and made to depend on a sort of natural talent and on practice' (*De Oratore* 1. 5): Cicero and his brother thus correspond to Crassus and Antonius.

<sup>26</sup> Augustine stresses even more than Cicero the genuinely philosophical element.

8. *Vir bonus*: The orator's *ethos* is crucial (*videatur vir bonus*; cf. also 1. 204 *viros bonos*).<sup>27</sup> Because in this context the question is one of practical politics, the argumentation is not idealistic. It is indeed decisive for a politician not only to be good (in the sight of the gods), but to appear so to the people.<sup>28</sup>

The last four points (9–12) present the rhetorical and stylistic qualities that are furthered by Cicero's philosophical learning:

9. *Ironia, urbanitas*:<sup>29</sup> Socratic irony is treated in the context of the *ridiculum*, a constituent element of human culture. Cicero himself is a master of humour and irony;<sup>30</sup> here, he hides behind the mask of Julius Caesar Strabo.

10. *Amplificatio*:<sup>31</sup> His philosophical training enables Cicero to place each individual case in a larger context and thus to point out its

---

<sup>27</sup> *Mihi vero, inquit Mucius, satis superque abs te videtur istorum studiis, si modo sunt studiosi, esse factum. Nam, ut Socratem illum solitum aiunt dicere perfectum sibi opus esse, si qui satis esset concitatus cohortatione sua ad studium cognoscendae percipiendaeque virtutis; quibus enim id persuasum esset, ut nihil mallent esse se quam bonos viros, is reliquam facilem esse doctrinam: sic ego intelligo, si in haec, quae patefecit oratione sua Crassus, intrare volueritis, facillime vos ad ea, quae cupitis, perventuros ab hoc aditu ianuamque patefacta* "To me indeed," observed Mucius, "you seem to have done enough and to spare for the enthusiasms of your friends, if only they are real enthusiasts. For, just as great Socrates is said to have been fond of describing his work as accomplished, once some man had been so far stimulated by his encouragement as to pursue the knowledge and apprehension of excellence (since further instruction came easily to such as had been persuaded to set the attainment of virtue above all else), so I see that, if you two will consent to enter upon these courses revealed by Crassus in what he says, you will most readily reach the end of your desires by this Way and through this Door which he has opened" (1. 204). Cf. below, on *amplificatio*.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Augustine's apt remark: a good man makes a more convincing orator.

<sup>29</sup> *In hoc genere Fannius in annalibus suis Africanum hunc Aemilianum dicit fuisse et eum Graeco verbo appellat εἰρωνεία, sed uti ferunt, qui melius haec norunt, Socratem opinor in hac ironia dissimulantiaque longe lepore et humanitate omnibus praestitisse. Genus est perelegans et cum gravitate salsum cumque oratoris dictionibus, tum urbanis sermonibus accommodatum. 271 Et hercule omnia haec, quae a me de facetiis disputantur, non maiora forensium actionum quam omnium sermonum condimenta sunt* 'Fannius in his *Chronicles* records that Africanus (the one named Aemilianus) was outstanding in this kind of thing, and describes him by the Greek word "dissembler", but, upon the evidence of those who know these subjects better than I do, my opinion is that Socrates far surpassed all others for accomplished wit in this strain of irony or assumed simplicity. This is a choice variety of humour and blended with austerity, and suited to public speaking as well as to the conversation of gentlemen. And I vow that all this discourse of mine concerning types of pleasantry is as excellent sauce for general talk as for legal actions' (2. 270).

<sup>30</sup> See Haury.

<sup>31</sup> See *De Oratore* 1. 17–20 (quoted above, n. 25); also: *Vero enim oratori, quae sunt*

general significance. This ability marks Cicero's merit as an author of orations and allows his works to remain valuable reading for later generations;<sup>32</sup> he learned this manner of writing (the *thesis*, for instance) from philosophical and rhetorical disciplines.

11. *Aptum*: Cicero's particular merit as a stylist in prose is his ability to differentiate levels of speech and style according to subject, recipient, and situation.<sup>33</sup> This differentiation is based on the doctrine of *aptum* ('decorum,' appropriateness), as it was developed in the Middle Stoa, and also in rhetoric. Reflective approach to speech and style makes form itself an expression of meaning in Cicero.

12. *In utramque partem disserere*:<sup>34</sup> Cicero's extraordinarily successful performance as an orator was due to his philosophical education, more precisely, to the Sceptic teachings of the Academy. Here he learned to study the strategic position of the opposing party as closely as his own. (This technique would be incorporated in Renaissance education and survives in modern academic 'debate' as a discipline).

Cicero himself applies this device in his dialogue: Crassus' important first speech meets with resistance: Scaevola defends the opposite view. He considers that it is not the orator, but prudent men who are the greatest asset to the state. He accuses Crassus, in his demand for providing the student of rhetoric with a liberal educa-

---

*in hominum vita, quandoquidem in ea versatur orator atque ea ei est subiecta materia, omnia quaesita, audita, lecta, disputata, tractata, agitata esse debent. 55. Est enim eloquentia una quaedam de summis virtutibus . . .; sicut haec vis, quae scientiam complexa rerum sensa mentis et consilia sic verbis explicat, ut eos, qui audiant, quocumque incubuerit, possit impellere; quae quo maior est vis, hoc est magis probitate iungenda summaque prudentia; quarum virtutum expertibus si dicendi copiam tradiderimus, non eos quidem oratores effecerimus, sed furentibus quaedam arma dederimus* 'For the genuine orator must have investigated and heard and read and discussed and handled and debated the whole of the contents of the life of mankind, inasmuch as that is the field of the orator's activity, the subject matter of his study. For eloquence is one of the supreme virtues [. . .]; as is the case with this faculty, which, after compassing a knowledge of facts, gives verbal expression to the thoughts and purposes of the mind in such a manner as to have the power of driving the hearers forward in any direction in which it had applied its weight; and the stronger the faculty is, the more necessary it is for it to be combined with integrity and supreme wisdom, and if we bestow fluency of speech on persons devoid of those virtues, we shall not have made orators of them but shall have put weapons into the hands of madmen' (3. 55).

<sup>32</sup> Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*.

<sup>33</sup> See Part One of this book.

<sup>34</sup> See n. 26. For the influence of this technique on English drama: Altman, who, however, is surprisingly reticent on Cicero.

tion, of unduly attributing to the orator skills acquired from other branches of knowledge (41). Here the name of Socrates comes into play (42):<sup>35</sup> 'Throngs of philosophers, starting with their original source and headmaster, Socrates, would jump at you and prove to you that you know nothing; the Academy would force you to change all your statements to their opposites.' Two things are remarkable here. One is the technique of *in utramque partem disserere*: Cicero has learned from the philosopher Philo of Larissa, an Academic Sceptic, to view each case from opposite sides (an invaluable practice for a forensic orator, who is thus forced to seize in advance the arguments of his opponents).<sup>36</sup> One result of this training is the present rebuttal by

---

<sup>35</sup> *Quod vero in extrema oratione quasi tuo iure sumpsisti, oratorem in omnis sermonis disputatione copiosissime versari posse, id, nisi hic in tuo regno essemus, non tulissem multisque praeissem, qui aut interdicto tecum contenderent aut te ex iure manum consortum vocarent, quod in alienas possessiones tam temere irruisses. 42 Agerent enim tecum lege primum Pythagorici omnes atque Democriti ceterique sua in iure physici vindicarent, ornati homines in dicendo et graves, quibuscum tibi iusto sacramento contendere non liceret. Urgerent praeterea philosophorum greges iam ab illo fonte et capite Socrate nihil te de bonis rebus in vita, nihil de malis, nihil de animi permotionibus, nihil de hominum moribus, nihil de ratione vitae didicisse, nihil omnino quaesisse, nihil scire convincerent; et, cum universi in te impetum fecissent, tum singulae familiae litem tibi intenderent. 43 Instaret Academia, quae, quidquid dixisses, id te ipsum negare cogeret. Stoici vero nostri disputationum suarum atque interrogationum laqueis te irretitum tenerent. Peripatetici autem etiam haec ipsa, quae propria oratorum putas esse adiumenta atque ornamenta dicendi, a se peti vincerent oportere; ac non solum meliora sed etiam multo plura Aristotelem Theophrastumque de istis rebus quam omnes dicendi magistros scripsisse ostenderent* 'But as for the claim you made at the close of your speech, and made as though in your own right—that whatever the topic under discussion, the orator could deal with it in complete fullness—this, had we not been here in your own domain, I would not have borne with, and I should be at the head of a multitude who would either fight you by injunction, or summon you to make joint seizure by rule of court, for so wantonly making forcible entry upon other people's possessions. For, to begin with, all the disciples of Pythagoras and Democritus would bring statutory process against you, and the rest of the physicists would assert their claims in court, elegant and impressive speakers with whom you could not strive and save your stake. Besides this, schools of philosophers, back to great Socrates their fountain-head, would beset you: they would demonstrate that you have learned nothing concerning the good in life, or of the evil, nothing as to the emotions of the mind or human conduct, nothing of the true theory of living, that you have made no research at all and are wholly without understanding respecting these things; and after this general assault upon you each sect would launch its particular action against you in detail. The Academy would be at your heels, compelling you to deny in terms your own allegation, whatever it might have been. Then our own friends the Stoics would hold you entangled in the toils of their wranglings and questionings. The Peripatetics again would prove that it is to them that men should resort for even those very aids and trappings of eloquence which you deem to be the special aids of orators, and would show you that on these subjects of yours Aristotle and Theophrastus wrote not only better but also much more than all the teachers of rhetoric put together' (1. 41–43).

<sup>36</sup> This doctrine would become important again in the Renaissance and ultimately in Shakespeare, see Altman.

Scaevola. Even more important is another aspect: Scaevola here draws on the distinction between philosophy and rhetoric, the very distinction that Cicero's Crassus wants to overcome in the dialogue under consideration. Therefore, the title of *orator* has a much greater import for Cicero than for Scaevola. Socrates, here, is mentioned as the chief representative of the philosophers who will turn against Crassus. This announces an important line of thought in the Third Book of the *De Oratore*. Socrates and Plato have disjoined philosophy from rhetoric, both subjects have been handed over to specialists, each of whom has no understanding of the other branch (and does not even strive for such an understanding).

A frequent objection to the Ciceronian model is that he allegedly degrades philosophy to an auxiliary discipline by putting it into the service of oratory. This is, however, only partly true, and especially of the rhetorical writings: In the *De Oratore*, the perspective is determined by the context. In Cicero's later works (roughly from the time of the *Hortensius*, the reading of which converted St. Augustine to a *vita contemplativa*), we find a different assessment. Already in the *De Re Publica*, however, there are occasional hints of a more favourable attitude toward contemplation.<sup>37</sup> In the *De Officiis*, Cicero will go as far as to make *honestum* the only criterion for what constitutes the *utile*. After all, Cicero's orator is not a sophist, ready to abandon every principle to win an argument, but a public man, who, in the frame of the Roman Republic, wants to put into practice what he holds to be the common weal.

## II. *The Figure of Socrates in the De Oratore*

*And gladly would he learn and gladly teach*  
Geoffrey Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*

As the original source of all philosophers who separate 'heart' and 'tongue,' *cor* and *lingua* (3. 61), Socrates appears in the dialogue in a rather negative light. He and Plato are responsible for the definitive rift between philosophy and rhetoric. In particular, the separation of truth from beauty has had grave consequences (3. 60)<sup>38</sup> also for the

<sup>37</sup> See Pfligersdorffer.

<sup>38</sup> *Quorum princeps Socrates [fuit] is, qui omnium eruditorum testimonio totiusque iudicio Graeciae cum prudentia et acumine et venustate et subtilitate, tum vero eloquentia, varietate, copia,*

use of speech. The λόγος (*lógos*), which according to Isocrates still constituted a unity, dissolves into philosophy and rhetoric. However, it must be noted here that Plato's Socrates did not cause, but only diagnosed this separation in the *Gorgias*, and that Plato himself, as Cicero acknowledges, had later on in the *Phaedrus* called for an art of rhetoric as a serious discipline.

Cicero also appreciates Socrates as a teacher in the best and fullest sense of the word, as a guide to self-understanding and fulfilment in life. Romans regarded political activity as a duty, and it is for this reason that the great teachers in Cicero's works, Scipio (in the *De Re Publica*) and Crassus (in the *De Oratore*), are strongly connected with Socrates. In the opening paragraph, the names of Crassus and Socrates are juxtaposed.<sup>39</sup> This is not an accident: like Socrates in Plato's

---

*quam se cumque in partem dedisset, omnium fuit facile princeps, iis, qui haec, quae nunc nos quaerimus, tractarent, agerent, docerent, cum nomine appellarentur uno, quod omnis rerum optimarum cognitio atque in eis exercitatio philosophia nominaretur, hoc commune nomen eripuit sapienterque sentiendi et ornate dicendi scientiam re cohaerentes disputationibus suis separavit* 'The chief of these was Socrates, the person who on the evidence of all men of learning and the verdict of the whole of Greece, owing not only to his wisdom and penetration and charm and subtlety but also to his eloquence and variety and fertility easily came out top, whatever side in a debate he took up; and whereas the persons engaged in handling and pursuing and teaching the subjects that we are now investigating were designated by a single title, the whole study and practice of the liberal sciences being entitled philosophy, Socrates robbed them of this general designation, and in his discussions separated the science of wise thinking from that of elegant speaking, though in reality they are closely linked together' (3. 60).

<sup>39</sup> . . . ut, cum lauti accubuissent, tolleretur omnis illa superioris tristitia sermonis eaque esset in homine iucunditas et tantus in iocando lepos, ut dies inter eos curiae fuiss videretur, convivium Tusculani. 28 Postero autem die, cum illi maiores natu satis quiescent, in ambulationem ventum esse dicebat: tum Scaevolam, duobus spatiis tribusve factis, dixisse: Cur non imitamur, Crasse, Socratem illum, qui est in Phaedro Platonis? Nam me haec tua platanus admonuit, quae non minus ad opacandum hunc locum patulis est diffusa ramis quam illa, cuius umbram secutus est Socrates, quae mihi videtur non tam ipsa aquila, quae describitur, quam Platonis oratione crevisse, et quod ille durissimis pedibus fecit, ut se abiceret in herba atque ita illa, quae philosophi divinitus ferunt esse dicta, loqueretur. id meis pedibus certe concedi est aequius. 29 Tum Crassum: Immo vero commodius etiam; pulvinosque poposcisse et omnes in iis sedibus, quae erant sub platano, consedissee dicebat. . . . that, as soon as they had bathed and settled down to table, the melancholy turn taken by the earlier discussion was wholly banished, and such was the man's pleasantness and so great the charm of his humour that it seemed as though a day in the Senate-house was closing with supper at Tusculum. Then Cotta went on to say how on the morrow, when those older men had rested sufficiently and everyone had come into the garden-walk, Scaevola, after taking two or three turns, observed: "Crassus, why do we not imitate Socrates as he appears in the *Phaedrus* of Plato? For your plane-tree has suggested this comparison to my mind, casting as it does, with its spreading branches, as deep a shade over this spot, as that one cast whose shelter Socrates sought—which to me seems to owe its eminence less to 'the little rivulet' described by Plato than to the language of his dialogue—and what Socrates did, whose feet were thoroughly hardened, when

dialogues, Crassus appears as a teacher in Cicero's work. A Roman audience would not see any exaggeration in this comparison; for any young Roman, rhetorical education was a prerequisite for a political career, and thus for finding personal fulfilment in service to the *res publica*.

Socrates is able to motivate others to become *boni viri* (1. 204).<sup>40</sup> Similarly, Crassus' speech about the great importance of oratory is framed by encouraging remarks to the *adulescentes* (33 and 34). Later on in the First Book, Mucius Scaevola recalls with approval Socrates' great method of teaching (1. 204):<sup>41</sup> Socrates is reported to have said that his goal was achieved when he had inspired someone with a zeal for acquiring insight and virtue. Here, Socrates is presented as the great master of intellectual and moral upbringing. The Romans had a special understanding of this side of him, and Cicero has an even deeper appreciation for the dialogical form of Plato's works than many Greeks, who were more inclined to systematizing.

Furthermore, Socrates' demand that an orator must possess a thorough knowledge of the facts of his case is also at the base of Cicero's conception of the speaker:<sup>42</sup> 3. 125: *rerum copia verborum copiam gignit*

---

he threw himself down on the grass and so began the talk which philosophers say was divine,—such ease surely may more reasonably be conceded to my own feet.' 'Nay,' answered Crassus, 'but we will make things more comfortable still,' whereupon, according to Cotta, he called for cushions, and they all sat down together on the benches that were under the plane-tree" (1. 27).

<sup>40</sup> See n. 28.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Neque vero Asclepiades, is quo nos medico amicoque usi sumus, cum eloquentia vincebat ceteros medicos, in eo ipso, quod ornate dicebat, medicinae facultate utebatur, non eloquentiae. 63 Atque illud est probabilius, neque tamen verum, quod Socrates dicere solebat, omnes in eo, quod scirent, satis esse eloquentes; illud verius, neque quemquam in eo disertum esse posse, quod nesciat, neque, si optime sciat ignarusque sit faciundae ac poliendae orationis, diserte id ipsum, de quo sciat, posse dicere. 64 Quamobrem, si quis universam et propriam oratoris vim definire complectique vult, is orator erit mea sententia hoc tam gravi dignus nomine, qui, quaecumque res incidit, quae sit dictione explicanda, prudenter et compositae et ornatae et memoriter dicet cum quadam actionis etiam dignitate. 65 Sin cuiquam nimis infinitum videtur, quod ita proposui, quaecumque de re, licet hinc quantum cuique videbitur, circumcidat atque amputet, tamen illud tenebo, si, quae ceteris in artibus aut studiis sita sunt, orator ignoret tantumque ea teneat quae sint in disceptationibus atque in usu forensi, tamen his de rebus ipsis si sit ei dicendum, cum cognoverit ab iis, qui tenent, quae sint in quaque re, multo oratorem melius quam ipsos illos, quorum eae sint artes, esse dicturum.* 'Asclepiades also, he with whom we have been familiar both as physician and as friend, at the time when he was surpassing the rest of his profession in eloquence, was exhibiting, in such graceful speaking, the skill of an orator, not that of a physician. In fact that favourite assertion of Socrates—that every man was eloquent enough upon a subject that he knew—has in it some plausibility but no truth: it is nearer the truth to say that neither can anyone be eloquent upon a subject that is unknown to him, nor, if he knows it perfectly and

(‘From rich knowledge of things a rich vocabulary springs’). For Cicero, Cato’s traditional Roman views converge with Plato’s demands as expressed in the *Phaedrus* and with Aristotle’s scholarly approach to rhetoric and to style.

Finally, the eristic and elenctic method of Socrates—his art of eliciting the truth by means of controversial disputation and cross-examining—is of the greatest importance for the *De Oratore*. Scaevola jokingly remarks that Socrates and his disciples would force Crassus to recant everything he had said. This shows Cicero’s indebtedness to Academic Scepticism, which itself took Socrates as its model and origin, and which practiced the art of *in utramque partem disserere* (1. 41).<sup>43</sup> It is in this sense that Socrates is a central figure for Cicero’s undogmatic method of reaching the truth. In a time of general scepticism, this method is the only way of finding the truth, and a means for the orator to remain a philosopher (1. 41).

Furthermore the figure of Socrates serves as a mask for the speaker who directs the dialogue: Crassus, a new Socrates and occasionally an anti-Socrates, is presented, like Scipio in the *De Re Publica*, shortly before his death. This serious background lends special emphasis and meaning to Cicero’s work, just as in some of the later Platonic dialogues, for instance in the *Phaedo*, the impending death of the master enhances the importance of his words. Crassus in Cicero represents the ideal orator and teacher, but he is also the author’s surrogate in the dialogue (as Socrates is for Plato). The frequent echoes of the *Phaedrus* which we find in the *De Oratore* have a programmatic significance, for that is the dialogue in which Plato no longer categorically objects to rhetoric, but rather demands a proper philosophical foundation for it.

---

yet does not know how to shape and polish his style, can he speak fluently even upon that which he does know. Accordingly, should anyone wish to define in a comprehensive manner the complete and special meaning of the word, he will be an orator, in my opinion worthy of so dignified a title, who, whatever the topic that crops up to be unfolded in discourse, will speak thereon with knowledge, method, charm and retentive memory, combining with these qualifications a certain distinction of bearing. If however someone considers my expression ‘whatever the topic’ to be altogether too extensive, he may clip and prune to his individual taste, but to this much I shall hold fast—though the orator be ignorant of what is to be found in all the other arts and branches of study, and know only what is dealt with in debate and the practice of public speaking; none the less, if he should have to discourse even on these other subjects, then after learning the technicalities of each from those who know the same, the orator will speak about them far better than even the men who are masters of these arts’ (1. 63).

<sup>43</sup> See n. 36.

In the *prooemium* of the Third Book, Cicero sets a monument for the deceased Crassus by comparing him with Socrates, and himself with Plato (3. 15).<sup>44</sup> Plato in his writings had suggested that the real Socrates was even greater than Plato's literary portrait of him. Cicero wishes to achieve the same effect for Crassus in the minds of his readers. The Roman *vel discendi studium vel docendi* 'eagerness to teach or to learn' (*De Re Publica* 2. 1) relies on great *exempla*. P. Hadot<sup>45</sup> has shown that Socrates serves as a mask for thinkers such as Nietzsche and Kierkegaard. Cicero applies this device on two levels: Crassus serves as his mask; in turn, Socrates stands behind both Crassus and Cicero.

As far as style is concerned, irony is a fundamental part of the mask: The urbanity and grace in Crassus' behaviour are likewise reminis-

---

<sup>44</sup> . . . sermonemque L. Crassi reliquum ac paene postremum memoriae prodamus, atque ei, etsi nequaquam parem illius ingenio, at pro nostro tamen studio meritam gratiam debitamque referamus. 15. Neque enim quisquam nostrum, cum libros Platonis mirabiliter scriptos legit, in quibus omnibus fere Socrates exprimitur, non, quamquam illa scripta sunt divinitus, tamen maius quiddam de illo, de quo scripta sunt, suspicatur. Quod item nos postulamus, non a te quidem, qui nobis omnia summa tribuis, sed a ceteris, qui haec in manus sument, maius ut quiddam de L. Crasso, quam quantum a nobis exprimeretur, suspicentur. Nos enim, qui ipsi sermoni non interfuissemus et quibus C. Cotta tantummodo locos ac sententias huius disputationis tradidisset, quo in genere orationis utrumque oratorem cognoveramus, id ipsum sumus in eorum sermone adumbrare conati. Quodsi quis erit, qui ductus opinione vulgi aut Antonium ieiuniorum aut Crassum pleniorum fuisse putet, quam quomodo a nobis uterque inductus est, is erit ex iis, qui aut illos non audierint aut iudicare non possint. Nam fuit uterque, ut exposui antea, cum studio atque ingenio et doctrina praestans omnibus, tum in suo genere perfectus, ut neque Antonio deesset hic ornatu orationis neque in Crasso redundaret.' . . . and let me place on record the remaining and almost the final discourse of Lucius Crassus, and repay him the gratitude due to his deserts, which if it by no means comes up to his genius yet is the best that my devotion can achieve. In point of fact, when reading the admirable volumes (scrolls) of Plato, almost all of them containing a picture of Socrates, there is not one of us who, although they are works of genius, yet does not imagine something on a larger scale in regard to the personality that is their subject; and I make a similar claim not indeed upon yourself, who pay me the highest possible consideration, but upon everybody else who takes the work into his hands, that he shall form a mental picture of Lucius Crassus on a larger scale than the sketch that I shall draw. For I was not myself present at the conversation, and have only received a report from Gaius Cotta of the general lines of argument and opinions expressed in this debate; and it is just this that I have attempted to indicate in the discourses of the two orators, merely the class of oratory in which each of them was actually known to me; and if there is anybody who is led by the popular belief to think that Antonius must have employed a plainer style or Crassus a more abundant one than each is represented by me as using, the critic will belong to the class of people who either never heard these orators or else lack the capacity to judge them. For in point of fact each of them, as I have before explained, not only exceeded everybody else in devotion to oratory, in natural talent, and also in learning, but also was an absolute master in his own class, so the oratorical embellishments in question were neither wanting in the case of Antonius nor superabundant in that of Crassus' (3. 15).

<sup>45</sup> Hadot, *Arts libéraux*.

cent of Socrates. Julius Caesar Strabo, in the comprehensive lecture on humour in the art of speech-making that he presents in the Second Book, refers expressly to Socratic irony (2. 170).<sup>46</sup> There, the words *humanitas* and *lepos*, which were already used in 1. 27, appear again. In the dialogue under discussion, Cicero effaces himself and places the limelight upon Crassus, just as Plato does with Socrates.

Right at the beginning of the dialogue (see n. 39), Crassus, the main figure, is presented at his most urbane and humane (27). After the group has settled itself down for the meal, Crassus leaves behind the worrisome problems of everyday business. The important keywords appear in § 27: *humanitas*, *iucunditas*, and *lepos* (in contrast to *tristitia*). The next day, Scaevola, when seeing a plane-tree in the Tusculanum, remembers Plato's *Phaedrus* and urges Crassus to imitate Socrates by lying down on the grass and giving a divine speech. Crassus seizes upon the tone of Socratic playfulness by offering his guests more in the way of comfort than was provided in Plato, and has cushions brought out. In ancient literature, the landscape and the setting take on a deep significance.<sup>47</sup>

The scene serves the creating of the mood in several respects. From the literary point of view, Cicero hints here that he, as the author of a dialogue with artistic ambitions, wishes to compete with Plato. Mommsen<sup>48</sup> ironically comments that Cicero 'with his orations outranked Demosthenes, and with his philosophical dialogues Plato' (and that he 'only lacked the time to overcome Thucydides as well'). One should keep in mind, however, that, in his time, Cicero was the only orator who could seriously compete with Demosthenes, and that even today, Cicero ranks with Plato among the very few authors who have written about philosophical topics in an appealing and enjoyable literary form. To write an artistically shaped work on as technical a topic as rhetoric was entirely a novelty; in this regard, Cicero's achievement as a writer has had neither predecessors nor successors.

Cicero's reference to Plato's *Phaedrus* is especially meaningful for the simple reason that a main topic of that dialogue is oratory. Whereas in the *Gorgias*, Plato had denounced rhetoric as a pseudo-science, in the *Phaedrus*, he demands a philosophical, i.e. scientific foundation, for

<sup>46</sup> See n. 30.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Ruch, *Préambule*.

<sup>48</sup> *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. 3, 6th edn. (Berlin, 1875), 620.

the art of oratory. It was Plato's student Aristotle who answered this demand with his *Art of Rhetoric* (*Ῥητορική Τέχνη*). Like this standard work of Aristotle, Cicero's dialogue, too, comprises three books (cf. *Ad Familiares* 1. 9. 23, although the expression *Aristotelio more* there seems to refer to the dialogue form rather than to the number of books).

### III. *The Significance of Rhetorical Education and Culture of Speech*

Which aspects of Cicero's ideal of the orator can still be relevant for us today? Whereas in classical Greek education gymnastics and music dominated, the goal of Roman education was to produce the orator. In the same way that the study of philosophy was viewed by Cicero, a study of the classical languages in general and of rhetoric and style in particular can be considered a basic mental training for many different disciplines. As literacy is the basis of the professions, an education with a solid basis in grammar and rhetoric in the present can have the following uses:

First, it teaches how to learn, and how to take the first step deliberately before the second. Grammatical training, which is the only possible basis for any teaching of rhetoric, helps to discern what is known from what is unknown. This is not only an ideal preparation for all higher learning; as a further step, a solid rhetorical and stylistic training is a way for shy children to achieve some self-confidence and to learn how to articulate their demands in forms that will achieve their intent. The *grammaticus* dealt with poetry, the *rhetor* with prose texts. It was a very sensible method to enlarge first the vocabulary with the *grammaticus* and then, with the *rhetor*, develop stylistic imagination. The ancient curriculum began with Homer: Only the best text was good enough for school children. Strabo called Homer's works 'a first philosophy' (*prôte tis philosophía*, πρώτη τις φιλοσοφία). Rhetorical education is æsthetical education.<sup>49</sup>

It is only at the second level, when the young Roman moved on to the *rhetor*, that his poetic exuberance was restrained for the less

---

<sup>49</sup> On beauty as an introduction to truth, cf. Schiller's *Briefe zur ästhetischen Erziehung des Menschen* and his poem 'Die Künstler' ('Only through the morning gate of beauty / did you find the land of truth; / what here we felt as beauty, / will come our way as truth one day'). Art is specific to humanity: 'In diligence the bee defeats you, / In dexterity the worm can be your teacher, / Your knowledge you share with privileged spirits, / But art, o man, you have alone' (ibid.).

conspicuous refinement of prose, as taught by Cicero and Quintilian.<sup>50</sup> In ancient education, prose represents the higher level of learning. The poets are free to create bold metaphors, to alter the word order arbitrarily, or to leave the connection of thought unexpressed. The orator is not allowed any of this, otherwise he becomes unintelligible or even ridiculous. Prose is the more difficult art, since it has to hide its own artificiality. Philosophers can revel in the creation of technical terms—suffice it to mention the numerous terms for the various arts in the Platonic differentiations (διαίρέσεις), or the linguistic cavils attributed to Socrates by Aristophanes (*Clouds* 640–678): ‘sparrowess,’ ‘kneading-troughness’ (such artificial feminine forms are becoming fashionable again in some modern languages, though for different reasons). The orator, on the other hand, has to follow an iron rule: if he wants to persuade his audience, he cannot afford to distract their attention from the cause by any quirks (in pronunciation, vocabulary, etc.). This inherent necessity to remain inconspicuous is the best possible school of style and good taste. Speech is communication. Thus, in both form and vocabulary, ‘originality’ is an almost mortal danger for the orator. Good prose is at least as rare as good poetry and an especially difficult art, since the licences granted to the poet are denied to the orator. The way ancient education was structured reflects these facts.

Of course, even a prose writer who wants to render his presentation graphic and colourful, will try to achieve a certain verve through unobtrusive use of metaphors, allegories, or comparisons. However, if he wants to persuade his audience, he will always respect the limits of what is generally accepted. In fact, Cicero’s Latin is at its purest in his orations to the people, because here he needs to reach as many listeners as possible.<sup>51</sup>

In their various forms,<sup>52</sup> essays composed with rhetorical diligence are one of the most creative and socially valuable exercises, and they

<sup>50</sup> Cf. above, n. 13.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> The most common form is that of *χρεία*, the composition of which is briefly described in the hexameter *quis, quid, cur, contra, simile et paradigmata, testes*. A speech composed according to the principles of the art serves three aims: *delectare* is important especially at the beginning (in the *prooemium*), to win the sympathies of the listeners; for this, the middle style characterized by longer phrases and *ethos* is appropriate. At a later point, a digression can serve similar purposes. *Docere* is the purpose of the main section of the speech (*narratio* and *argumentatio*), and here the plain style is called for. At the end of the speech, *flectere* is what is needed; here, *pathos* can be

are also practiced with pleasure by the students. Through rhetorical exercises the student is forced to lend not only rational, but also emotional and aesthetic qualities to his discourse. The struggle for the right word is a basic school of social behaviour, an exercise in which aesthetics and ethics, beauty and truth are inseparably intertwined. The search for the right word is even more difficult in the composition of prose. The concept of *aptum* is both an aesthetic and a social norm. Translation into the mother tongue is invaluable for the enhancement of one's own ability of expression.

The *disputatio in utramque partem* as taught by Cicero is of the greatest pedagogical use. This exercise can also transform one of the deficiencies of oratory into a virtue: it is not a secret that a limit of rhetorical education is its imperfect attachment to truth. A speaker who wants to achieve something is necessarily partial and will present a tendentious selection of the facts; and even these facts he will arrange and interpret so as to obtain the greatest effect, giving second place to truthful representation. The *disputatio in utramque partem* is an antidote to this deficiency in rhetorical education. As a Sceptic, Cicero does not search for truth, but is satisfied with formulating two opposing probabilities. His attitude is undogmatic; Seneca later shows greater zeal for persuading, even converting his audience. It is only in late antiquity that rhetoric can entirely be allied to truth again, for instance when St. Augustine in his *De Doctrina Christiana* transforms oratory into a comprehensive system of hermeneutics thus changing what had been the art of persuasion into an art of understanding texts. If we take the *disputatio in utramque partem* seriously as a pedagogical instrument, the students will not feel ideologically pressured, but will be enabled to search for the truth by themselves through thesis and antithesis.

Moreover, rhetoric offers the only means for winning an argument without the need to give up human dignity by resorting to violence.

What is perhaps even more important: by scrutinizing Cicero's style and the secrets of rhetorical invention behind it, modern students will be enabled to see through the demagogical strategies of others. One might even surmise that the gradual abolition of active rhetorical

---

applied, and the general stylistic level ought to be the *genus grande*; cf. Cic. *De Oratore* as quoted by St. Augustine in his *De Doctrina Christiana* 4. 34 (biblical examples for the three levels of style in Augustine, *ibid.* 4. 39). For modern introductions to Latin prose composition, see Minkova and Tunberg.

exercises and of Latin prose composition in the classrooms since the end of the 19th Century greatly contributed to making future generations vulnerable to the shameless rhetoric of demagogues, ideologues, and salesmen. Often, enmity to classical studies was governed by the idea that uncritical citizens could be manipulated more easily.

Finally, by applying rhetorical methods of persuasion to himself, a speaker gains a powerful means of self-education, and can, through reasoned thinking and speaking, strengthen his own will.

To put it briefly: in all free countries, rhetoric is a prime means of education, an art of developing what is specific to humans. Culture of speech is the basis of communication and discussion. Speech is the only instrument allowing man to prevail peacefully in what he recognizes to be right and just. To the individual, rhetoric shows how to avoid being manipulated by others, how to build up an inner world, and how to gain intellectual freedom. The enemies of freedom know well why they are enemies of Latin: grammar and rhetoric are taught in Latin class. For this reason, the learning of Latin should not be a privilege, but a human right.

#### IV. *Conclusion*

In this framework a study of Cicero's style offers several advantages: in a language like Latin the study of grammar cannot be separated from the study of meaningful texts. Nor can the study of Cicero's style be disjoined from the content of the texts and from the rhetorical intentions behind the texts. The theories advanced by Cicero help us to pinpoint his specific intentions, although his practice is—as happens with all great writers—even better than his theories. The above<sup>53</sup> interpretations of selected passages from his orations, chosen from the constituent parts—*prooemium*, *narratio*, *digressio*, *peroratio*—, illustrate the basic fact that ultimately *elocutio* (style) cannot be understood without taking into account *inventio* and *dispositio* and that, what is more, the overarching principle of *aptum* determines Cicero's stylistic choices even in detail.

A literary approach to Cicero's style is fostered by the fact that Cicero published his orations, and that some of them were written only for publication, or (as was the case with the *Pro Milone*) completely

---

<sup>53</sup> Chapter 5.

rewritten for that purpose. In many cases, what we read is not a reflection of 'nature,' but of art, which, however, has become 'second nature' to Cicero. It is both intriguing and instructive to follow him on his path towards an ever more appropriate style. Generations of students have learned from his orations how to give a clear stylistic shape to their thoughts and how to express themselves in such a way as to be understood by the general reader. Our analyses have shown, among other things, that the popularity of Cicero's orations as an object of stylistic studies was a corollary to the very nature of his style rather than a fancy of some narrow-minded humanists. Among Cicero's orations, those given to the people use a language and a style that can be understood by the largest possible public. Here, students have found a stylistic approach they could safely imitate: a plain and accessible vocabulary (free from learned accessories), a powerful imagery (devoid of poetic extravagance), and, above all, a use of *amplificatio* bestowing on the individual case a general human interest. Cicero was the last great orator of the Roman Republic, and he remained its very voice for a posterity governed by emperors. Some generations believed they could separate his language from his thought: as Augustine put it (without sharing their view), they admired 'his tongue, not his mind.'<sup>54</sup> One of the aims of the present study has been to show that Cicero's style is intimately linked with and cannot be dissociated from his thought. Cicero owed his political career to his education. His oratory was one of the most important factors that fostered that career. The present study may have shown in some detail to what degree the style of Cicero's orations was conditioned by his broad educational background and by his efforts to re-establish the Pre-Socratic unity of politics, oratory, and philosophy.

---

<sup>54</sup> *Perveneram in librum cuiusdam Ciceronis, cuius linguam fere omnes mirantur, pectus non ita* 'I had come to read a book by a certain Cicero; all the world admires his tongue, not his mind' (Augustine, *Conf.* 3. 4. 7). On the same page we read: *Non ergo ad acuendam linguam referebam illum librum neque mihi locutionem, sed quod loquebatur persuaserat* 'therefore, I did not use that book to perfect my style but it had convinced me of its content, not only of its style.'

## POSTSCRIPT

May I be allowed to speak in the name of  
luminosity and transparency.

Ἄς μοῦ ἐπιτραπεῖ, παρακαλῶ, νὰ μιλήσω στὸ  
ὄνομα τῆς φωτεινότητος καὶ τῆς διαφάνειας.  
Odysseas Elytis, *Ἐν λευκῶι* 1992, p. 316.

Whoever has had the patience to read through these pages—many of them full of thorny technical matters—might have found out the pattern in the carpet by himself. Yet, before taking leave of his reader the author ought to explain what made him think that a subject like Cicero’s style should be studied in such detail in our day.

As the modern Greek poet Odysseas Elytis observed, our age is suffering from the lack of a common language.<sup>1</sup> In a world, in which even users of the same language often do not understand each other and feel ‘separated by a common language,’ a dialogue with Cicero—a representative of what had been the common language of Western civilization for two millennia—might be instructive under several aspects:

First: appropriateness. A serious study of Cicero’s style may show how to adapt verbal expression to the subject matter, the situation, and the listeners in each given case. In the present time we observe two opposed tendencies in this respect. On the one hand, there is excessive adaptation to what some TV managers and certain politicians and salesmen deem to be the intellectual level of their audiences. On the other hand, some erudite teachers and writers, in the footsteps of the *rhetorum praeceptor* justly ridiculed by Lucian, obscure simple matters by using complicated vocabulary instead of illustrating complex matters in plain words. Both groups, though in different ways, insult their audiences. The result is detrimental to both language and intellectual honesty. Both groups might learn from Cicero

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘We suffer from the lack of a common language. And the consequences of this lack are felt even in the political and social reality of our common homeland, Europe.’ Πάσχουμε ἀπὸ τὴν ἔλλειψη μιᾶς κοινῆς γλώσσας. Καὶ ὁ ἀντίκτυπος ἀπ’ αὐτὴ τὴν ἔλλειψη σημειώνεται ἀκόμη καὶ στὴν πολιτικὴ καὶ κοινωνικὴ πραγματικότητα τῆς κοινῆς μας πατρίδας, τῆς Εὐρώπης. Odysseas Elytis, *Ἐν λευκῶι* 1992, pp. 330f.

how to meet their listener on his own level and, as a further step, draw his attention to broader issues.

Second: clarity. In all disciplines, our modern languages are becoming ever more difficult and obscure. All over the world, legal speech, for instance, has lost the transparency of Roman Law. What is more, each individual modern language is about to forfeit its particular gift: some writers of French, a language justly praised for its proverbial clarity, yield to the logophobia of certain would-be-philosophers; while some writers of German misuse the unique terminological precision of their mother tongue to create a spectral world of cloudy ‘knowledge;’ and even English in the hands of certain mystagogues tends to lose much of its admirable brevity and matter-of-factness. Often, the specialists’ jargon seems to be made to conceal new findings rather than to convey them to other human beings. It is true that in some disciplines—like mathematics or natural sciences—such esoteric non-communication might be inevitable, in humanities, political, and social sciences it is badly out of place.

The underlying problem of transparency might encourage serious reflection on style and rhetoric in general and a dialogue with Cicero in particular. In fact, one of Cicero’s merits is that he handled technical arguments—such as philosophy or rhetoric—in a style accessible to the general reader. In philosophy, he shares this glory with very few others (Plato, Seneca, Boethius); in technical writing on rhetoric, with almost nobody (except, perhaps, for Quintilian). In oratory, the noble principle of ‘the art that conceals art’ allows him to compete with nature by speaking like everybody, but better than anybody.

In the Introduction, style was defined as *elocutio*, the choice and use of linguistic means to literary ends. In Latin, which has a small vocabulary and is reluctant to accept new words, *callida iunctura*, i.e. shrewd conjoining and interaction of terms, plays an eminent role. Style, therefore, was not an otiose adornment, but an integral part of the language itself.

In the present book a fresh approach to style was tried. For Cicero—it has been argued—style is not an end in itself but a product of *inventio*. The style, then, is inseparable from the message. Later writers of Latin would follow Cicero, not because he was Cicero, but for the quality of his style: the perfect congruity of the linguistic expression with the occasion, the subject matter, the listeners, and the speaker.

As for rhetoric, romantic critics have brought it into disrepute by making it a synonym for bad literature. They considered it the ‘insin-

cere' and 'unnatural' antipodes of poetry (which for them was the essence of sincerity and nature herself). No wonder then, that under the spell of romanticism, the art of persuasion was banished from classrooms—together with *chria*, the practical exercise of rhetoric, the writing of Latin compositions (thought to be ridiculous survivals of a vanished day). The consequences are well known: generations no longer trained in rhetoric could not penetrate the fallacies of unscrupulous demagogues and fell prey to terrible wars and dictatorships. Coming generations will need an even more vigorous preparation for fuller freedom and—in addition—special training which will enable them to unmask the deceptive rhetoric of salesmen of all sorts.

Rhetoric, therefore, turns out to be a serious requirement for democratic societies, the legitimate means to defend a good cause and, what is more, the only sort of weapon worthy of human beings.

Finally, why study Cicero? There is no better training for young citizens than the study of a great orator's theory and practice of invention, disposition, and elocution (or style, which has been shown in this book to be a product of invention as well). Furthermore the 'periodic' style usually termed 'Ciceronian' has turned out to be only one side of a multi-faceted phenomenon. As a stylist, Cicero is a much more complex figure than has been dreamed of in most of our textbooks. Master of a thousand styles, he uses none of them for its own sake, but puts them all into the service of what he has to say. Moreover, the principles of the art of persuasion as expounded in the *De Oratore* go far beyond the tricks of a shrewd lawyer; they question the traditional separation of rhetoric from philosophy and pave the way for Augustine's reopening the debate on rhetoric and truth.

In addition, the orations considered here in some detail—even, and especially, those with a strong 'literary' touch—reflect important issues and show in what kinds of style such issues can be discussed. There is Cicero's courageous attempt to bring back the almighty dictator Caesar into the community of the old *res publica* by appealing to his *sapientia* and encouraging him to subordinate his personal interests to those of his country (in *De Marcello*, often wrongly regarded as a piece of mere flattery). Furthermore, there is the finale of the *Verrines*: an analysis of greed with its detrimental consequences for divine order and human society (a text that takes on a sinister ring in our day). Next, the *Pro Archia* addresses the importance of poetry and letters to society. In a world increasingly dominated by narrow-minded specialists and in dire need of managers able to 'think big,'

Cicero's insistence on a style governed by general culture is a message worthy of being considered anew. Finally, the *Pro Milone* articulates an intellectual's discomfort in the face of an overwhelming military presence, a presence which menaces the liberty of speech. The stylistic means, in each case, have been chosen by Cicero to convey his message according to the needs of each of his varying audiences with the utmost clarity and appropriateness. So, in a sense, he has armed us with the intellectual and verbal skills for coping with some problems of topical interest.

To sum up: Cicero's is a voice deserving to be heard anew. Rhetoric is not a monstrous pseudo-science, but a precious tool of emancipation. And Cicero's style is not a dull classical relic, but a memorable example of 'live' language, even more alive—thanks to the stylist's well-concealed art—than the worn-out patterns of everyday speech. For coming generations, a thoroughgoing study of Cicero's style might prove a helpful stepping stone for crossing the muddy river of political gibberish and commercial propaganda, which are the dead languages of our day.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals are abbreviated according to the system of J. Marouzeau, *L'année philologique*. This list contains books and articles on Cicero used in the present book. For editions and commentaries, see, for instance, my *History of Roman Literature* and Cavallo (and others), (eds.), *Lo spazio* (quoted below).

- Abbott / Oldfather / Canter I = Abbott, K. M., Oldfather, W. A., Canter, H. V., *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistolarum* (Urbana, 1938).
- Abbott / Oldfather / Canter II = Abbott, K. M., Oldfather, W. A., Canter, H. V., *Index verborum in Ciceronis Rhetorica, necnon incerti auctoris libros ad Herennium* (Urbana, 1964).
- Achard, G., 'L'emploi de *boni viri, boni civis* et de leurs formes superlatives dans l'action politique de Cicéron,' *LEC* 41 (1973), 207–221.
- , *Pratique rhétorique et idéologie politique dans les discours 'optimates' de Cicéron* (Leiden, 1981).
- , (ed.), *Cicéron. De l'invention. Texte établi et traduit* (Paris, 1994).
- Achard, G. and Ledentu, M. (eds.), *Orateur, auditeurs, lecteurs. À propos de l'éloquence romaine à la fin de la république et au début du principat* (Lyon, 2000).
- Adamik, T., 'Cicero's Theory of Three Kinds of Style,' *ACD* 31 (1995), 3–10.
- , 'Basic Problems of the *Ad Herennium*: Author, Date, its Relation to the *De Inventione*,' *AAniHung* 38 (1998) 267–285.
- Adams, J. N., 'The Substantival Present Participle in Latin,' *Glotta* 51 (1973), 117–136.
- , 'Conventions of Naming in Cicero,' *CQ* 28 (1978), 145–166.
- Alberte González, A., *Cicéron ante la retórica: La 'auctoritas' platónica en los criterios retóricos de Cicéron* (Valladolid, 1987).
- Albrecht, J., *Literarische Übersetzung. Geschichte-Theorie-Kulturelle Wirkung* (Darmstadt, 1998).
- Albrecht, 'Götter' = Albrecht, M. von, 'Cicero und die Götter Siziliens,' in *Ciceroniana*, n.s. 4 (Roma, 1980 = Atti del IV Colloquium Tullianum, Palermo, 28 settembre–2 ottobre 1979), 53–62.
- Albrecht, *History* = Albrecht, M. von, *A History of Roman Literature*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1997).
- Albrecht, *Masters* = Albrecht, M. von, *Masters of Roman Prose* (Leeds, 1989).
- Albrecht, *Parenthese* = Albrecht, M. von, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (Hildesheim 1963), 2nd edn. (1994 = *Spudasmata*, 7).
- Albrecht, 'Prooemium' = Albrecht, M. von, 'Das Prooemium von Ciceros *Rede pro Archia poeta* . . .,' *Gymnasium*, 76 (1969), 419–429.
- Albrecht, 'Tullius' = Albrecht, M. von, 'Marcus Tullius Cicero. Sprache und Stil,' *RE Supplement* 13 (1973), 1237–1347.
- Albrecht / Vester = Albrecht, M. von, Vester, H., *Ciceros Rede pro Archia: Deutung und unterrichtliche Behandlung* (Heidelberg: Kerle, 1970 = *Heidelberger Texte, Didaktische Reihe*, 2).
- Altavilla, E., *Forensische Psychologie*, 2 (Graz, 1959); 2nd edn. (1968).
- Altman, J. B., *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley, 1978).
- Andersen, O., *Im Garten der Rhetorik. Die Kunst der Rede in der Antike* (Darmstadt, 2001).
- André, J. M., *L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne* (Paris, 1966).
- Antoine, F., *Lettres de Caelius à Cicéron. Texte latin publié avec commentaire et introduction* (Paris, 1894), 58–70.
- Aumont, J., *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine. De Cicéron à Pline le Jeune et de César à Florus* (Paris, 1996).

- Ausserer, A., *De clausulis Minucianis et de Ciceronianis quae quidem inveniuntur in libello de senectute* (= *Commentationes Aenipontanae* 1, Innsbruck 1906).
- Auvray-Assayas, C., 'Réécrire Platon? Les enjeux du dialogue chez Cicéron,' in: Cossutta, F. and Nancy, M. (eds.), *La forme du dialogue chez Platon. Évolution et réceptions* (Grenoble, 2001) 237–253.
- Avilés, M., 'La teoría de la retórica agustiniana y la práctica de sus sermones,' *Augustinus*, 28 (1983), 391–417.
- Ax, *Probleme* = Ax, W., *Probleme des Sprachstils als Gegenstand der lateinischen Philologie* (Hildesheim, 1976 = *Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 1).
- Ax, 'Sprache' = Ax, W., 'Sprache als Gegenstand der alexandrinischen und pergamenischen Philologie' in Schwitter, P. (ed.), *Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike* (Tübingen, 1991), 275–301.
- Axer, J., (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis oratio pro S. Roscio Comoedo*. (Lipsiae, 1976).
- Axer, *Rosc.* = Axer, J., *The Style and the Composition of Cicero's Speech Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo: Origin and Function* (Warszawa, 1980; rev. by Rutz, W., *Gnomon*, 55 (1983), 454–455).
- Axer, 'Mil.' = Axer, J., 'Gladiator's Death: Some Aspects of Rhetorical Technique in Cicero's Speech *Pro Milone*,' *Eos*, 77 (1989), 31–43.
- Bailey, see Shackleton.
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D., *Romans and Aliens* (London, 1979).
- Baldwin, B., 'Greek in Cicero's Letters,' *AClass* 35 (1992), 1–17.
- Ballaira, G., 'Il giudizio di Quintiliano sullo stile di Seneca (*Inst.* 10, 1, 129),' *GB* 9 (1980), 173–180.
- Baratin, 'Remarques' = Baratin, M., 'Remarques sur la place et le rôle du concept de latinité dans les grammaires latines antiques,' *Ktema*, 13 (1988), 187–193.
- Baratin, *Syntaxe* = Baratin, M., *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome* (Paris, 1989).
- Barwick, *Bildungsideal* = Barwick, K., *Das rednerische Bildungsideal Ciceros* (Berlin, 1963 = *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, 54, 3).
- Becker, E., *Technik und Szenerie des ciceronischen Dialogs* (diss., Münster, 1938).
- Becher, F., *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Caelius* (Progr. Nordhausen, 1888).
- Berger, D., *Cicero als Erzähler. Forensische und literarische Strategien in den Gerichtsreden* (diss.; Konstanz, 1975; Frankfurt 1978).
- Bergmüller, L., *Über die Latinität der Briefe des L. Munatius Plancus* (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1897).
- Bernert, E., 'Otium,' *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 4 (1949–50), 89–99.
- Berry, D. H., *Cicero, Pro Sulla Oratio, Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Biville, F., *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1909).
- Blänsdorf, 'Typologie,' = Blänsdorf, J., 'Erzählende, argumentierende und diskursive Prosa: Versuch einer angewandten Typologie,' *WJA*, n.s. 4 (1978), 107–119.
- Blänsdorf, J., 'Archaismus,' *Der Neue Pauly* 1 (1996), 981–982.
- , 'Cicero auf dem Forum und im Senat. Zur Mündlichkeit der Reden Ciceros,' *ScriptOralia Romana* (Tübingen, 2001) 205–228.
- Blass, F., *Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa: Paulus-Hebräerbrief-Pausanias-Cicero-Seneca-Curtius-Apuleius* (Leipzig, 1905).
- Bloomer, W. M., *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome* (Philadelphia, 1997).
- Blössner, N., *Cicero gegen die Philosophie. Eine Analyse von De Re Publica* 1, 1–3 (Göttingen, 2001).
- Blum, I., *De compositione numerosa dialogi Ciceronis de amicitia* (= *Commentationes Aenipontanae* 8, 1913).
- Bolkestein, A. M., 'Between brackets. Some properties of parenthetical clauses in Latin. An Investigation of the Language of Cicero's *Letters*,' in: Risselada, R. (ed.), *Latin in Use. Amsterdam Studies in the Pragmatics of Latin* (Amsterdam, 1998) 1–17.
- Bornecque, *Prose* = Bornecque, H., *La prose métrique dans la correspondance de Cicéron* (diss.; Paris, 1898).

- Bornecque, *Clausules* = Bornecque, H., *Les clausules métriques latines* (Lille, 1907).
- Bornecque, 'Hérennius' = Bornecque, H., 'La façon de désigner les figures de rhétorique dans la rhétorique à Hérennius et dans les ouvrages de rhétorique de Cicéron,' *RPh* 60, 3e série 8 (1934), 141–158.
- Braet, A., 'Een analyse van de argumentatie in *Pro Milone*,' *Lampas* 26 (1993) 119–130.
- Bréguet, E., 'Les archaïsmes dans le *De re publica* de Cicéron,' in *Hommages à J. Bayet, éd. par M. Renard et R. Schilling* = *Coll. Latomus* 70 (1964), 122–131.
- Brenous, J., *Études sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine* (thèse; Paris, 1895).
- Brignoli I = Brignoli, F. M., *Studi I: Il ritmo eroico nella prosa ciceroniana* (Napoli, 1957 = *Biblioteca del GIF*, 5).
- Brignoli II = Brignoli, F. M., *Studi ciceroniani II: Le parole greche nelle opere di Cicerone* (Napoli: Armanni, 1957 = *Biblioteca del GIF*, 5).
- Brush, P. C., *Cicero's Poetry* (diss. on microfilm; Yale Univ., New Haven, 1971), summary: *DA* 32 (1971), 2659A–2660A.
- Bücheler, F., 'Zur Kritik der Ciceronischen Briefe,' *RhM* 11 (1857), 509–535.
- Büchner, 'Briefe' = Büchner, K., 'M. Tullius Cicero: Briefe,' in *RE* 7 A1 (Stuttgart, 1939), 1192–1235.
- Büchner, *Cicero* = Büchner, K., *Cicero* (Heidelberg, 1964).
- Büchner, 'Fragmente' = Büchner, K., 'M. Tullius Cicero. Fragmente,' *RE* 7 A (Stuttgart, 1939), 1236–1267.
- Büchner, K., *Humanitas Romana* (Heidelberg, 1957).
- Büchner, *Literaturgeschichte* = Büchner, K., *Römische Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1957, 2nd edn., 1962).
- Burck, E., 'Vom Sinn des *otium* im alten Rom' (1963), repr. in Oppermann, H., (ed.) *Römische Wertbegriffe*, 503–515.
- Burg, F., *De M. Caelii Rufi genere dicendi* (Leipzig, 1888).
- Butler, S., *The Hand of Cicero* (London 2001) [not yet accessible to me].
- Cabrillana Leal, C., 'Posiciones relativas en la ordenación de constituyentes. 1, Estudio de la posición de sujeto, objeto y verbo en latín,' *Habis*, 24 (1993), 249–266.
- Calboli, G., 'La formazione oratoria di Cicerone,' *Vichiana*, 2 (1965), 3–30.
- , 'La retorica preciceroniana e la politica a Roma,' in *Éloquence et Rhétorique chez Cicéron. Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions* (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1982 = *Entretiens Fondation Hardt*, 28), 41–108.
- , 'I modelli dell'arcaismo: M. Porcio Catone,' *AION* 8 (1986), 37–69.
- , 'Asiani (Oratori),' in Della Corte, F. (ed.), *Dizionario degli Scrittori Greci e Latini*, 1 (Milano, 1987), 215–232.
- , 'The Asiatic Style of Antony: Some Considerations,' in Czaplá, B., Lehmann, T., Liell, S. (eds.), *Vir bonus dicendi peritus: Festschrift für Alfons Weische zum 65. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden, 1997), 13–26.
- , 'Genera dicendi,' *Der Neue Pauly* 4 (1998), 911–913.
- Cambiano, G., 'Cicerone e la necessità della filosofia,' in: Narducci, E., (ed.), *Interpretare Cicerone* (Firenze, 2002), 66–83.
- Canter, 'Digressio' = Canter, H. V., 'Digressio in the Orations of Cicero,' *AJPh* 52 (1931), 351–361.
- Canter, 'Irony' = Canter, H. V., 'Irony in the Orations of Cicero,' *AJPh* 57 (1936), 457–464.
- Casaceli, F., 'Osservazioni sul linguaggio tecnico-retorico di Cicerone. A proposito di *gravis*,' *Helikon* 11–12 (1971–1972), 461–465.
- Castorina, E., *L'atticismo nell'evoluzione del pensiero di Cicerone* (Catania, 1952).
- Causeret, C., *Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron* (Paris, 1886).
- Cavallo, G., Fedeli, P., Giardina, A., (eds.) *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, Vol. 5: *Cronologia e bibliografia della letteratura latina* (Roma, 1991).
- Cavarzere, A., 'La corrispondenza di Celio e la precettistica di Cicerone,' *Quaderni di retorica e poetica*, 1 (1985), 25–32.

- Cavazza, F., *Studio su Varrone etimologo e grammatico: la lingua latina come modello di struttura linguistica* (Firenze, 1981 = *Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Magistero*, n.s. 7).
- Ceccarelli, L., 'L'allitterazione a vocale interposta variabile nell'opera poetica di Cicerone,' *RCCM* 26 (1984), 23-44.
- Cerutti, S. M., *Cicero's Accretive Style. Rhetorical Strategies in the Exordia of the Judicial Speeches* (Lanham, 1996).
- Chausserie-Laprée, J. P., 'Structures phoniques dominantes dans les *Aratea* de Cicéron,' *Mélanges Selim Hassan I: ASAE* 52 (1977), 133-146.
- Christes, J., 'Realitätsnähe und formale Systematik in der Lehre vom *exordium* der Rede,' *Hermes*, 106 (1978), 556-578.
- Cipriani, G., *Struttura retorica di dieci orazioni ciceroniane* (Catania, 1975).
- Cizek, E., 'La poétique cicéronienne de l'histoire,' *BAGB* (1988), 16-25.
- Clark, M. E., Ruebel, J. S., 'Philosophy and Rhetoric in Cicero's *Pro Milone*,' *RhM* 128 (1985), 57-72.
- Classen, C. J., 'Cicerostudien in der Romania im 15. und 16. Jh.,' in Radke, G., (ed.); *Cicero. Ein Mensch seiner Zeit* (Berlin 1968), 198-245.
- , *Recht, Rhetorik, Politik. Untersuchungen zu Ciceros rhetorischer Strategie* (Darmstadt, 1985; Italian translation, Bologna, 1998).
- , 'Cicero orator perfectus: ein *vir bonus dicendi peritus*?,' in Prete, S. (ed.), *Commentario: Studi di filologia in ricordo di R. Ribuli* (Sassoferrato, 1986), 43-55.
- Clausen, W., 'Cicero and the New Poetry,' *HSPH* 90 (1986), 159-170.
- Codoñer, C., 'Eloquencia y orator,' *ECLás* 26 (1984), 297-302.
- , 'Procedimientos de formación léxica en "languages" especiales,' *Voces* 2 (1991), 51-61.
- , 'Terminología especializada: la crítica literaria,' *Voces* 1 (1990), 99-119.
- Coleman, R., 'Vulgar Latin and the Diversity of Christian Latin,' in Herman, J. (ed.), *Latin vulgaire—Latin tardif. Actes du 1<sup>er</sup> Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2-5 septembre 1985)*, (Tübingen, 1987), 37-52.
- (ed.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics. Selected Papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Cambridge, April 1987* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1991).
- , 'Greek Influence on Latin Syntax,' *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1975 (publ. Oxford, 1977) 101-156.
- Comerci, G., 'Cicerone e la crisi della Repubblica: diffamazione, bande armate, crisi del diritto nella Roma del I secolo,' *Messana*, n.s. 15 (1993) 45-75.
- Coseriu, E., *Die Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart; I: Von der Antike bis Leibniz* (Tübingen, 1969).
- Cotton, H. M., 'Mirificum genus commendationis. Cicero and the Latin Letter of Recommendation,' *AJPh* 106 (1985), 328-334.
- Courbaud, E. (ed.), *Cicéron, De l'orateur. Texte établi et traduit par Edmond Courbaud*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1922; 5th edn. 1962).
- Cousin, J., 'Rhétorique dans le *Pro Caelio*,' in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Roma, 1961), 91-98.
- Craig, C. P., *The Role of Rational Argumentation in Selected Judicial Speeches of Cicero* (diss.; Chapel Hill, NC, 1979).
- , 'The Structural Pedigree of Cicero's Speeches *Pro Archia*, *Pro Milone* and *Pro Quinctio*,' *CPh* 80 (1985), 136-137.
- , *Form as Argument in Cicero's Speeches* (Atlanta, 1993).
- Crawford, J. W. (ed.), *M. Tullius Cicero: The Fragmentary Speeches: An Edition with Commentary*, 2nd edn. (Atlanta, 1994).
- Crusius / Rubenbauer = Crusius, F., Rubenbauer, H., *Römische Metrik*, 2nd edn. (München, 1955).
- Dammann, W., *Cicero quomodo in epistulis sermonem hominibus, quos appellat, et rebus, quas tangit, accommodaverit* (diss.; Greifswald, 1910).
- Dangel, J., 'Le mot, support de lecture des clausules cicéroniennes et liviennes,' *REL* 62 (1984) 386-415.

- (ed.), *Grammaire et rhétorique: notion de Romanité. Actes du colloque organisé à Strasbourg les 28, 29 et 30 nov. 1990* (Strasbourg, 1994), 179–196.
- , 'Le sermo cotidianus dans les textes latins,' in Bammesberger, A. and Heberlein, F. (eds.), *Akten des 8. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik, Eichstätt, 1995* (Heidelberg, 1996), 503–517.
- Davies, 'Molon' = Davies, J. C., 'Molon's Influence on Cicero,' *CQ*, n.s. 18 (1968), 303–314.
- Davies, 'Plain Style' = Davies, J. C., 'Some Observations on the Early Development of Cicero's Plain Style,' *Latomus* 39 (1970), 729–736.
- Davies, 'Reditus' = Davies, J. C., 'Reditus ad rem. Observations on Cicero's Use of Digressio,' *RhM* 131 (1988), 305–315.
- Debru, A., 'In respiratione (*Nat. Deor.* 2, 136). L'expression de la respiration en latin,' in: A. Debru, M. Palmieri, B. Jacquiod (eds.), *Docente natura. Mélanges de médecine ancienne et médiévale offerts à G. Sabbah* (Saint-Étienne, 2001) 43–67.
- De Groot, *Handbook* = De Groot, A. W., *A Handbook of Antique Prose Rhythm*, Vol. 1 (Groningen: Wolters, 1919).
- , *Prosarhythmus* = De Groot, A. W., *Der antike Prosarhythmus*, 1 (Groningen: Bouma, 1921).
- De Groot, *Prose* = De Groot, A. W., *La prose métrique des anciens*, 6th edn. (Paris, 1926).
- Delarue, F., 'L'asianisme à Rome,' *REL* 60 (1982), 166–185.
- Delaruelle, L., *Études sur le choix des mots dans les discours de Cicéron* (Toulouse, 1911).
- Della Corte, F., 'Avanguardia e retroguardia poetica in Cicerone,' *Ciceroniana*, 5 (1984), 21–38.
- Den Boeft, J., 'Philoisiam latinis litteris illustrare. Cicero's romanising van een genre,' *Lampas* 33 (2000) 46–62.
- Desbordes, 'Argumentation' = Desbordes, F., 'L'argumentation dans la rhétorique antique,' in *L'argumentation dans la rhétorique antique: une introduction* (Paris, 1990 = *LALIES*, 8), 81–110.
- Desbordes, F., 'Latinitas: constitution et évolution d'un modèle de l'identité linguistique,' in Said, S. (ed.), *Hellenismos. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 25–27 octobre 1989* (New York, 1991), 33–47.
- Devoto, G., *Storia della lingua di Roma*, 1st edn. (Bologna, 1940), 2nd edn. (Bologna, 1944).
- Devoto, *Geschichte* = Devoto, G., *Geschichte der Sprache Roms*, translated by Opelt, I. (Heidelberg, 1968).
- Díaz y Díaz, M. C., 'Latinitas. Sobre la evolución de su concepto,' *Emerita*, 19 (1951), 35–50.
- Dihle, 'Analogie' = Dihle, A., 'Analogie und Attizismus,' *Hermes*, 85 (1957), 170–205.
- , 'Beginn' = Dihle, A., 'Der Beginn des Attizismus,' *A&A* 23 (1977), 162–177.
- Dik, S. C., *Functional Grammar* (Amsterdam, 1978).
- , *The Theory of Functional Grammar* (Doordrecht, 1989).
- Döpp, S., 'Weisheit und Beredsamkeit. Gedanken zu ihrer Relation bei Cicero, Quintilian und Augustinus,' in Neukam, P. (ed.), *Information aus der Vergangenheit* (München, 1982), 37–63.
- Donnelly, F. P., *Cicero's Milo. A Rhetorical Commentary* (New York, 1935).
- Donnermann, H., *De anaphorae apud Romanos origine et usurpatione* (diss.; Marburg, 1918), 60.
- Douglas, 'Theory' = Douglas, A. E., 'A Ciceronian Contribution to Rhetorical Theory,' *Eranos*, 55 (1957), 18–26.
- , 'Background' = Douglas, A. E., 'The Intellectual Background of Cicero's *Rhetorica*,' *ANRW* 1, 3 (1973), 95–138.
- , 'Form' = Douglas, A. E., 'Form and Content in the *Tusculan Disputations*,' in Powell, J. G. F. (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (Oxford and New York 1995), 197–218.
- Drumann, W., Groebe, P., *Geschichte Roms*, Vol. 4, 2nd edn. (Leipzig, 1908).
- Dubuisson, M., 'Cicéron et le bilinguisme gréco-latin,' *ACD* 31 (1995), 43–48.

- Dubuisson, M., 'Non quaerere externa, domesticis esse contentos: Cicéron et le problème de la traduction du grec en latin,' *Ktèma*, 14 (1989), 201–204.
- Dugan, J. R., *Pleasure and Utility in the Poetic Theories of Philodemus and Cicero* (New Haven, 1996).
- , 'How to Make (and Break) a Cicero: "Epideixis", textuality, and self-fashioning in the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*,' *Class Ant* 20 (2001) 35–77.
- Dumont, J. C., 'Cicéron et le théâtre,' *Association Guillaume Budé. Actes du IX Congrès, Rome 13–18 avril 1973* (Paris, 1975), 424–430.
- Dunkel, G. E., 'Remarks on code-switching in Cicero's Letters to Atticus,' *MH* 57 (2000) 122–129.
- Dutoit, E., 'Un exemple de style "koî" dans le *De finibus*,' in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Roma, 1961), 453–460.
- Dyck, A. R., *A Commentary on Cicero's De Officiis* (Ann Arbor, 1996).
- , 'Narrative Obfuscation, Philosophical Topoi, and Tragic Patterning in Cicero's *Pro Milone*,' *HSCPh* 98 (1998), 219–241.
- , 'Cicero the Dramaturge: Verisimilitude and Consistency of Characterization in Some of his Dialogues,' in Schmeling, G. and Mikalson, Jan W. (eds.), *Qui miscuit utile dulci: Essays for Paul Lachlan Mac Kendrick* (Wauconda, Illinois 1998), 151–164.
- , 'Dressing to Kill: Attire as a Proof and Means of Characterization in Cicero's Speeches,' *Arethusa* 34 (2001) 119–130.
- Dyer, R. R., 'Rhetoric and Intention in Cicero's *Pro Marcello*,' *JRS* 80 (1990), 17–30.
- Eberick, C., 'Latin as a SDOV language: the Evidence from Cicero, in Calboli, G. (ed.), *Papers on Grammar*, Vol. 3 (Bologna, 1990), 1–17.
- Eisenberger, H., 'Die Funktion des zweiten Hauptteils von Ciceros Rede für den Dichter Archias,' *WS* 13 (1979) 88–98.
- Engelbrecht, A., 'Zu Ciceros Übersetzungen aus dem Platonischen Timaeus,' *WS* 34 (1912), 216–226.
- Ernst (first name not mentioned in the book), *De genere dicendi et compositione rhetorica in prioribus Ciceronis orationibus* (Progr. Neu-Ruppin, 1885).
- Ernstberger, R., *Studien zur Selbstdarstellung Ciceros in seinen Briefen* (Heidelberg, 1956).
- Évrard, É., 'L'environnement syntaxique du verbe "imperare" chez César et chez Cicéron,' in Longrée, D. (ed.), *De usu: Études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency* (Leuven, 1995), 115–129.
- Ewbank, W. W. (ed.), *The Poems of Cicero. Edited with Introduction and Notes* (London, 1933).
- Fallu, E., 'Les rations du proconsul Cicéron. Un exemple de style administratif et d'interprétation historique dans la correspondance de Cicéron,' in Temporini, H. (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung, I: Von den Anfängen Roms bis zum Ausgang der Republik*, 3 (Berlin, 1972), 209–238.
- Fantham, E., 'Ciceronian *conciliare* and Aristotelian *ethos*,' *Phoenix*, 27 (1973), 262–275.
- , 'Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero *De Oratore* 2, 87–97 and Some Related Problems of Ciceronian Theory,' *CPh* 73 (1978), 1–16.
- , 'On the Use of *genus*-Terminology in Cicero's Rhetorical Works,' *Hermes*, 107 (1979), 441–459.
- , '*Varietas* and *Satietas*: *De Oratore* 3. 96–103 and the Limits of *ornatus*,' *Rhetorica*, 6 (1988), 275–290.
- Fedeli, P., 'Estrategias retóricas en el *Pro Milone* de Cicerón,' *Auster* 4 (1999) 95–109.
- T. Feigenbutz, A. Reichensberger, *Barockrhetorik und Jesuitenpädagogik. Niccolò Vulcano: Sagata Pallas sive pugnatrice eloquentia. Edition mit Einleitung. Übersetzung und Kommentar*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1997).
- Ferrarino, P., 'Cicerone poeta e critico. La sua prima produzione poetica,' in id., *Scritti scelti* (Firenze, 1986 = *Opuscoli accad.*, 15), 46–50.

- Ferrero, A. M., 'La simplicitas in Cicerone,' *AAT* 112 (1978), 225–252.
- Fischer, R., *De usu vocabulorum apud Ciceronem et Senecam Graecae philosophiae interpretes* (diss.; Freiburg, 1914).
- Fjodorov, N. A., 'La genèse de la composante esthétique dans la sémantique du groupe lexical *decus-decorum-decere-dignitas* (d'après les textes de Cicéron),' *VМУфил* 1 (1981), 49–61 [in Russian].
- Flobert, P., 'Lingua Latina et Lingua Romana: purisme, administration et invasions barbares,' *Ktema* 13 (1988) 205–212, repr. in Dangel, J. (ed.), *Grammaire et rhétorique: notion de Romanité* (Strasbourg: Université des Sciences humaines, 1994) 69–76.
- Fögen, *egestas* = Fögen, T., *Patrii sermonis egestas. Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache. Ein Beitrag zum Sprachbewußtsein in der römischen Antike* (München, 2000).
- Fögen, 'Spracheinstellungen' = Fögen, T., 'Spracheinstellungen und Sprachnormbewußtsein bei Cicero,' *Glotta*, 75 (1999), 1–33.
- , 'Sprachbewußtsein' = Fögen, T., 'Sprachbewußtsein in der römischen Antike: Ciceros Stellungnahme zum Problem der *patrii sermonis egestas*' in Deininger, S., Fögen, T., Scharloth, J., Zwickl, S. (eds.), *Einstellungsforschung in der Soziolinguistik und Nachbardisziplinen: Studies in Language Attitudes* (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 2000), 13–39.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W., 'Cicero's Knowledge of the Rhetorical Treatises of Aristotle and Theophrastus,' in Fortenbaugh, W. and Steinmetz, P. (eds.), *Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos* (New Brunswick, 1989), 39–60.
- Fraenkel, *Iktus* = Fraenkel, E., *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928).
- , 'Kolon' = Fraenkel, E., 'Kolon und Satz,' I, *NGG* 13 (1932), 197–213.
- , 'Trebatius' = Fraenkel, E., 'Some Notes on Cicero's Letters to Trebatius,' *JRS* 47 (1957), 66–70.
- , 'Vergil und Cicero' = Fraenkel, E., 'Vergil und Cicero,' *Atti e memorie della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova*, n.s., Vol. 19–20 (1926–27; Modena, 1928), 217–227.
- Frank, *H. Ratio bei Cicero* (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1992 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie*, 75).
- Frese, R., *Beiträge zur Beurteilung der Sprache Caesars* (Progr. München, 1900).
- Friedländer, F., *De nonnullis locis Ciceronianis* (Progr. Königsberg, 1860).
- Fuhrmann, M., 'Cum dignitate otium,' *Gymnasium*, 67 (1960), 481–500.
- , 'Narrative Techniken in Ciceros Zweiter Rede gegen Verres,' *AU* 23 (1980), 5–17.
- Fuhrmann, 'Mündlichkeit' = Fuhrmann, M., 'Mündlichkeit und fiktive Mündlichkeit in den von Cicero veröffentlichten Reden,' in Vogt-Spira, G. (ed.), *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1990), 53–62.
- Gagliardi, D., 'Cicerone e il neoterismo,' *RFIC* 96 (1968), 269–287.
- , *Cultura e critica letteraria a Roma nel I secolo d.C.* (Palermo, 1978).
- Gaillard, J., 'La notion cicéronienne d'istoria ornata,' *Caesarodunum*, 15bis (1980), 37–45.
- Gallagher, R. L., 'Metaphor in Cicero's *De Re Publica*,' *CQ* 51 (2001) 509–519.
- Garbarino, G., 'Verba poetica in prosa nella teoria retorica da Cicerone a Quintiliano,' in *MAT* 5a, ser. II (1978), 141–237.
- García Hernández, B. (ed.), *Estudios de Lingüística Latina. Actas del IX Coloquio Internacional de Lingüística Latina. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 14–18 de abril de 1997*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1998).
- Gauger, H., *Die Kunst der politischen Rede in England* (Tübingen, 1952).
- Gebhard, E., *De D. Iunii Bruti genere dicendi* (diss.; Jena, 1891).
- Gee, E., 'Cicero's Astronomy,' *CQ* 51 (2001) 520–536.
- Geffken, K. A., 'Comedy in the *Pro Caelio*, with an Appendix on the *In Clodium et Curionem*,' *Mnemosyne*, suppl. 30 (1973), 867–868.
- Gennaro, S., 'Animadversiones quaedam de Ciceronis arte rhetorica,' *Orpheus*, 10 (1989), 121–126.
- Georgieva, N., 'Les propositions causales dans la langue latine classique,' *AUS* 73 (1978), 151–185.
- Gigon, O., 'Die Szenerie des ciceronischen *Hortensius*,' *Philologus*, 106 (1962), 222–245.

- Giodice-Sabbatelli, V., 'Constituere, dato semantico e valore giuridico,' *Labeo* 27 (1981), 338–357.
- Glucker, John, 'As Has Been Rightly Said . . . by Me,' *LCM* 13 (1988), 6–9.
- Glušcenko, L. M., 'La substantivation des adjectifs désignant des personnes (d'après le livre I de la République de Cicéron),' *InFil* 49 = *PKFil* 15 (1978), 9–14.
- , 'Les particularités morphologiques et syntaxiques des adjectifs substantivés en latin (d'après les traités philosophiques de M. T. Cicéron),' *InFil* 60 (1980 = *PKFil* 17), 10–17 [in Russian, summary in German].
- , 'Particularités syntaxiques des adjectifs substantives dans les traités de Cicéron *De la république* et *Des lois*,' *InFil* 65 (1982 = *PKFil* 18), 41–46 [in Russian, summary in German].
- , 'L'intensité de la substantivation des adjectifs chez Cicéron,' *InFil* 80 = *PKF* 21 (1985), 23–29.
- , *Les adjectifs substantivés chez Cicéron en tant que système fonctionnel (étudiés d'après les traités De re publica, De legibus, De finibus bonorum et malorum)* [en russe] (résumé de thèse; Moskva Univ., 1987).
- Gnomon: Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft.* München.
- Goebel, H. (and others), (eds.), *Kontaktlinguistik* (Berlin, 1996).
- Görler, W., 'Ein sprachlicher Zufall und seine Folgen: "Wahrscheinliches" bei Karnaades und bei Cicero,' in Müller, C. W., Sier, K., Werner, J. (eds.), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griech.-röm. Antike* (Stuttgart, 1992), 159–171.
- González, A. A., 'Cicéron y Quintiliano ante la retórica: Distintas actitudes adoptadas,' *Helmantica*, 34 (1983), 249–266.
- Gotoff, H. C., *Arch.* = Gotoff, H. C., *Cicero's Elegant Style: An Analysis of the Pro Archia* (Urbana, 1979).
- , 'The Concept of Periodicity in the *Ad Herennium*,' *HSCPh* 77 (1973), 217–225.
- , 'Thrasymachus of Calchedon and Ciceronian Style,' *CPh* 75 (1980), 297–311.
- , 'Cicero's Style for Relating Memorable Sayings,' *ICS* 6 (1981), 294–316.
- , 'Analyzing Cicero's Style from the Text of Cicero: A Reply,' *ClPh* 77 (1982), 336–339.
- Gotoff, *Caesarian Speeches* = Gotoff, H. C., *Cicero's Caesarian Speeches: a Stylistic Commentary* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1993).
- Gotzes, P., *De Ciceronis tribus generibus dicendi in orationibus Pro A. Caecina, De Imperio Cn. Pompei, Pro C. Rabirio Perduellionis Reo adhibitis* (diss.; Rostock, 1914).
- Gould, J. B., *Ciceros literarische Leistung* (Darmstadt, 1973 = *Wege der Forschung*, 240).
- Grashoff, J. H., *Beobachtungen zur Stiltechnik der Dichter Cicero, Catull und Tibull* (unpr. diss.; extract in *Jahrbuch der Phil.Fak. Göttingen*, 1922), 58–62.
- Govaerts, S., 'Morphologie, syntaxe, lexicologie,' *RELO* 4 (1978), 37–76.
- Grebe, S., 'Kriterien für die *Latinitas* bei Varro und Quintilian' in Haltenhoff, A. and Mutschler, F.-H. (eds.), *Hortus Litterarum Antiquarum: Festschrift H. A. Gärtner* (Heidelberg, 2000), 191–210.
- Green-Pedersen, N. J., 'Reflections on Cicero's *Topica*,' *MT* 32–33 (1978), 43–54.
- Gries, K., *Constancy in Livy's Latinity* (New York, 1947).
- Griffaton, A. C., 'Amplification oratoire et analyse littéraire,' in *La puissance de la parole: De l'éloquence antique aux technologies nouvelles. Actes du colloque organisé par la MAFPEN et l'ARELAD, mars 1987* (Dijon, 1987), 51–64.
- Griffin, M. T., 'Philosophical Badinage in Cicero's *Letters to his Friends*,' in Powell, J. G. F. (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 325–346.
- Grilli, A., 'In due passi delle Tuscolane di Cicerone (I, 87–88 e III, 8–11),' in *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à P. Boyancé: Coll. de l'École franc. de Rome* 22 (Roma, 1974), 345–356.
- , 'Cicerone tra retorica e filosofia,' in: Narducci, E. (ed.), *Interpretare Cicerone* (Firenze 2002) 53–65.
- Grossmann, G., *De particula quidem* (diss.; Königsberg, 1880).

- Grube, G. M. A., 'Educational, Rhetorical and Literary Theory in Cicero,' *Phoenix*, 16 (1962), 234–257.
- Guendel, M., *De Ciceronis poetae arte capita tria* (diss.; Leipzig, 1907).
- Gutsche, O., *De interrogationibus obliquis apud Ciceronem* (diss.; Halle, 1885).
- Guttman, K., *De earum quae vocantur Caesarianae orationum Tullianarum genera dicendi* (diss.; Greifswald, 1883).
- Habinek, T., *The Colometry of Latin Prose* (Berkeley, 1985).
- Hadot, *Arts libéraux* = Hadot, I., *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris, 1984).
- Haffter, *Dichtersprache* = Haffter, H., *Untersuchungen zur alllateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1934 = *Problemata*, 10).
- , *Reise* = Haffter, H., *Ciceros griechische Reise und die Entwicklung seines Redestils*, abstract in: *Acta Philologica Aenipontana*, 1 (1962), 48–49.
- Hahn, H., 'Zur Struktur des ciceronischen Redepröoemiums,' *AU* 11, 4 (1968), 5–24.
- Hall, J. C. R., 'Persuasive Design in Cicero's *De Oratore*,' *Phoenix*, 48 (1994), 210–225.
- , *Style and Design in Cicero's De oratore* (diss., microfilm; Austin, Tex., 1992), cf. *DA* LIII 1992–1993, 2801 A.
- Halm, K., *Ciceros Reden gegen . . . Catilina, für . . . Sulla und für . . . Archias* (Berlin, 10th edn., 1878).
- Haltenhoff, A., *Kritik der akademischen Skepsis. Ein Kommentar zu Cicero, Lucullus 1–62* (Frankfurt, 1998).
- Hariman, R., 'Political Style in Cicero's Letters to Atticus,' *Rhetorica*, 7 (1989), 145–158.
- Hartung, H. J., *Ciceros Methode bei der Übersetzung griechischer Termini* (diss.; Hamburg, 1970).
- Hauray = Hauray, A., *L'ironie et l'humour chez Cicéron* (Leiden: Brill, 1955).
- Hauschild = Hauschild, O., *De sermonis proprietatibus, quae in Philippicis Ciceronis orationibus inveniuntur* (diss.; Halenses, 1885), 235–305.
- Haverling, G., 'On the Use of *absque* in Cicero and Quintilian,' *Eranos*, 87 (1989), 133–138.
- Havers = Havers, W., *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1931).
- Havet = Havet, L., *Ad Ciceronianum de Sophocle testimonium* (special print from: *Liber gratulatorius in honorem Herwerdeni*), (Utrecht, 1902).
- Heberlein, F., 'Lateinische Grammatik und lateinische Linguistik. Zur Neuausgabe von Menges *Repetitorium*,' *Gymnasium* 108 (2001) 149–155.
- Heesakkers, C. L., 'Driemaal Cicero. De Neolatijnse Cicero-cultus van Petrarca tot Lipsius,' *Lampas* 26 (1993), 131–158 (with bibl. and list of sources).
- Heidemann = Heidemann, A., *De Ciceronis in epistulis verborum ellipsis usu* (diss.; Berlin 1893).
- Heilig, E., *Untersuchungen zur Valenz und Distribution lat. und dt. Verben an Hand von Ciceros philosoph. Schriften und den literaturtheoretischen Schriften von Thomas Mann: Ein Beitrag zur kontrastiven Grammatik des Lateinischen und Deutschen* (diss.; Tübingen, 1978).
- Heinze = Heinze, R., 'Ciceros Rede *pro Caelio*,' *Hermes*, 60 (1925), 193–258.
- Helander, H., 'Nouns that Express Negation: An Analysis of Some Expressions in Cicero's *De finibus*,' *Eranos*, 77 (1979), 121–126.
- Heldmann, K., 'Dekadenz und literarischer Fortschritt bei Quintilian und bei Tacitus,' *Poetica*, 12 (1980), 1–23.
- Hellmuth, *De sermonis . . .* = Hellmuth, H., *De sermonis proprietatibus quae in prioribus Ciceronis orationibus inveniuntur* (diss.; Erlangen, 1877).
- , *Sprache* = Hellmuth, H., *Über die Sprache der Epistolographen Ser. Sulpicius Galba und L. Cornelius Balbus* (Progr. Würzburg, 1888).
- Hendrickson, 'Style' = Hendrickson, G. L., 'The Peripatetic Mean of Style and the Three Stylistic Characters,' *AJPh* 25 (1904), 125–146.
- , 'Origin' = Hendrickson, G. L., 'The Origin and Meaning of the Ancient Characters of Style,' *AJPh* 26 (1905), 249–290.

- Hendrickson, 'Sources' = Hendrickson, G. L., 'Literary Sources in Cicero's *Brutus* and the Technique of Citation in Dialogue,' *AJPh* 27 (1906), 184–199.
- Hentschke, H. G., 'Zur historischen und literarischen Bedeutung von Ciceros Schrift *De legibus*,' *Philologus* 115 (1971), 118–130.
- Hilton, J., 'Temporal Connectors in the Narrative Discourse of Cicero,' in Lavenay, M. and Longrée, D. (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de linguistique latine, Louvain-la-Neuve/Borlée, 31 mars–4 avril 1989* (Louvain, 1989), 173–184.
- Hintzen, B., *Das Partizip Präsens in Ciceros Reden unter Einbeziehung des Partizips Perfekt der Deponentien* (diss.; Münster, 1993).
- Hirzel = Hirzel, R., *Der Dialog* (Leipzig, 1895; repr. Hildesheim, 1963).
- Hoffmann, M. E., *Negatio Contrarii. A Study of Latin Litotes* (Assen, 1987).
- Hofmann = Hofmann, J. B., *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, 1st edn. (Heidelberg, 1926); 3rd edn. (1951), 4th edn. (1978).
- Hofmann / Szantyr = Hofmann, J. B., Szantyr, A., *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, rev. edn. (München, 1972); 2nd repr. 1997 = *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 2).
- Holst, H., *Die Wortspiele in Ciceros Reden* (Oslo, 1925 = *SO*, fasc. suppl. 1).
- Holtus, G. and Radtke, E. (eds.), *Sprachlicher Substandard* (Tübingen, 1986 = *Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft*, 36).
- Hommel, H., *Cicero's Gebetshymnus an die Philosophie, Tusc. V 5* (= *SHAW* 1968, No. 3).
- Hoppe, F., *Zu den Fragmenten und der Sprache Ciceros* (Progr. Gumbinnen, 1875).
- Horsfall, N., 'Doctus Sermones Utriusque Linguae,' *EMC / CV* 23 (1979) 79–95.
- Hubbell, H. M., 'Cicero on Styles of Oratory,' *YCIS* 19 (1966), 173–186.
- Huby, P., 'Cicero's Topics and its Peripatetic Sources,' in Fortenbaugh, W. and Steinmetz, P. (eds.), *Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos* (New Brunswick, 1989), 61–76.
- Hübner, T., *De Ciceronis oratione pro Q. Roscio comoedo quaestiones rhetoricae* (diss.; Königsberg, 1906).
- Hughes, J. J., *Comedic Borrowing in Selected Orations of Cicero* (diss. on microfilm; Iowa, 1987), summary in: *DA* 48 (1988), 1759 A–1760 A.
- Humbert, J., *Les plaidoyers écrits et les plaidoiries réelles de Cicéron* (Paris, 1925; repr. Hildesheim, 1972).
- Hus, A., 'Intellegentia et intellegens chez Cicéron,' in *Hommages à Jean Bayet, éd. par M. Renard et R. Schilling = Latomus*, 70 (1964), 264–280.
- Hutchinson, 'Briefe' = Hutchinson, G. O., 'Cicero's Briefe als Literatur (*Ad Att.* 1, 16),' *Hermes*, 121 (1993), 441–451.
- , *Correspondence* = Hutchinson, G. O., *Cicero's Correspondence. A Literary Study* (Oxford, 1998).
- , 'Rhythm' = Hutchinson, G. O., 'Rhythm, Style, and Meaning in Cicero's Prose,' *CQ* 45 (1995), 485–499.
- Imholtz, A. A., 'Gladiatorial Metaphors in Cicero's *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*,' *CW* 65 (1972), 228–230.
- Innes, D., 'Cicero on Tropes,' *Rhetorica*, 6 (1988), 307–326.
- Iordache, R., 'El uso del adverbio quatenus en las obras de Cicerón. Un aspecto de la aportación de Cicerón al desarrollo del latín literario,' *Helmantica*, 37 (1986), 321–335.
- Itzinger, F., *Index der in Ciceros Rede für Milo enthaltenen Metaphern und Angabe des Wandels der Wortbedeutung*, 2 vols. (Progr. Budweis, 1888–1889).
- Jaeger, W., *Briefanalysen: Zum Zusammenhang von Realitätserfahrung und Sprache in Briefen Ciceros* (Frankfurt, 1986 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie*, 26).
- Janson, T., *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm, 1964).
- , *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin* (Stockholm, 1979).
- Jocelyn, *Tragedies* = Jocelyn, H. D., *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge, 1967).
- , 'Poetry' = Jocelyn, H. D., 'Greek Poetry in Cicero's Prose Writings,' *YCIS* 23 (1973), 61–111.
- Johnson, W. R., *Luxuriance and Economy. Cicero and the Alien Style* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971 = *University of California Classical Studies*, 6).

- Jones, D. M., 'Cicero as a Translator,' *BICS* 6 (1959), 22–34.
- Jordan, H., *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1879).
- Jucker, H., *Vom Verhältnis der Römer zur bildenden Kunst der Griechen* (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1950).
- Kaimio, J., *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979 = *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, 64).
- Kasten, H., (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes Pro Sulla, Pro Archia poeta* (Leipzig, 1966).
- Kaster, R. A., 'Becoming "Cicero",' in *Style and Tradition. Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998), 248–263.
- Kennedy, G. A., *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 BC–AD 300* (Princeton, 1972).
- Kerkhecker, A., 'Privato officio, non publico. Literaturwissenschaftliche Überlegungen zu Ciceros *Pro Marcello*,' in: J. P. Schwindt (ed.), *Klassische Philologie inter disciplinas* (Heidelberg, 2002) 93–149.
- Kertelheim, J., *Über Græcismen in Ciceros Reden* (Progr. Bergedorf bei Hamburg, Jena, 1894).
- Kilb, G., *Ethische Grundbegriffe der alten Stoa und ihre Übertragung durch Cicero* (diss.; Freiburg i.B., 1939).
- Kinzig, W., 'Die Kategorie des Neuen in alter Literatur: Anmerkungen zur literar-ästhetischen Verwendung des Neuheitsbegriffes in der lateinischen Antike,' *Arcadia*, 25 (1990), 113–126.
- Kirby, J. T., *The Rhetoric of Cicero's Pro Cluentio* (Amsterdam, 1990).
- Kircher, C., 'Un micro-système lexical du Latin: urbanus et ses satellites,' in Granarolo, J. and Braun, R. (eds.), *Hommages Pierre Fargues* (Paris, 1974 = *Annales de la Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Nice*, 21), 185–191.
- Klaus, E., 'Affectation catonischer Simplizität? (zu Cic. *Verr.* 2, 4, 4f.),' *Gymnasium*, 99 (1992), 146–156.
- Klingner, F., 'Ciceros Rede für den Schauspieler Roscius, eine Episode in der Entwicklung seiner Kunstprosa,' *SBAW* 4 (1953), repr. in Klingner, F., *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1964), 547–570.
- Klinz, A., 'Sprache und Politik bei Cicero und den römischen Historikern,' *AU* 29 (1986), 59–64.
- Klotz, A., 'Klassizismus und Archaismus,' *ALL* 15 (1908), 401–417.
- Köhler, A., *Über die Sprache der Briefe des P. Cornelius Spinther* (Progr. Nürnberg, 1890).
- Konstan, D., 'Rhetoric and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Cicero's Catilinarian Orations,' in Poulakos, T. (ed.), *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric: Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition* (Boulder, 1993), 11–30.
- Kornacka, K., 'Stylizacja dramatyczna form podowczych w tekście czterech mów Cyncerona przeciw ko Katylinie,' *RoczHum* 42 (1994), 21–32.
- , 'Patos i jigo realizacja stylistyczna w mowie Cyncerona *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*,' *RoczHum* 43 (1995), 41–70.
- Körte, A., 'Χαρακτήρ,' *Hermes*, 64 (1929), 69–86.
- Korte, C., *Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Rede für Sestius* (diss.; Münster, 1939).
- Koskenniemi, H., 'Cicero über die Briefarten,' *Arctos*, n.s. 1 (1954), 97–102.
- Krebs, J. P., *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 vols., 7th edn., revised by Schmalz, J. H. (Basel: Schwabe, 1905; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984).
- Kretschmer, P., 'Die Wortschöpfer,' in *Germanistische Forschungen: Festschrift anlässlich des 60semestrigen Stiftungsfestes des Wiener Akademischen Germanistenvereins* (Wien: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1925), 227–249.
- Kroener, H.-O., 'Rhetorik in mündlicher Unterweisung bei Cicero und Plinius,' in Vogt-Spira, G., *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1990), 63–79.
- Kroll, *Studien* = Kroll, W., *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924; repr. New York: Garland, 1978).

- , 'Tullius' = Kroll, W., 'M. Tullius Cicero: Rhetorische Schriften,' in *RE* 7 A 1 (Stuttgart, 1939), 1091–1103.
- , 'Entwicklung' = Kroll, W., 'Die Entwicklung der lateinischen Schriftsprache,' *Glotta* 22 (1934), 1–27.
- , 'Rhetorik' = Kroll, W., 'Rhetorik,' in *RE*, suppl. 7 (Stuttgart, 1940), 1039–1138.
- Kroon, C., *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at* (Amsterdam 1995).
- , 'Discourse particles, Tense, and the Structure of Latin Narrative Texts,' in: Risselada, R. (ed.), *Latin in Use. Amsterdam Studies in the Pragmatics of Latin* (Amsterdam 1998) 37–61.
- Krostenko, B. A., *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance* (Chicago, 2001).
- , 'Beyond (dis)belief: rhetorical form and religious symbol in Cicero's *De Divinatione*,' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 130 (2000) 353–391.
- Kühner / Stegmann = Kühner, R., Stegmann, C., *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre erster Teil*, 3rd edn. (Hannover, 1955).
- Kühnert, F., *Allgemeinbildung und Fachbildung in der Antike* (Berlin, 1961).
- Krostenko, B. A., 'Pleasure, Truth, and Beauty in the Language of Cicero and Catullus, a Cognitive Approach' (diss.; Cambridge, 1993).
- Klèma: Klèma. Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome antiques*. Strasbourg.
- Kubiak, D. P., 'Aratean Influence in the *De consulatu suo* of Cicero,' *Philologus*, 138 (1994), 52–66.
- , 'Cicero and the Poetry of Nature,' *SIFC* 8 (1990), 198–214.
- Kuklica, P., 'Ciceros ästhetische Ansichten,' *GLO* 11–12 (1979–80), 17–20.
- Kytzler, B. (ed.), *Ciceros literarische Leistung* (Darmstadt, 1973).
- Lambardi, N., *Il Timaues ciceroniano. Arte e tecnica del vertere* (Firenze, 1982 = *QFL*, 2).
- Landgraf, *De Ciceronis elocutione* = Landgraf, G., *De Ciceronis elocutione in orationibus pro Quinctio et pro Sex. Roscio Amerino conspicua* (diss.; Würzburg, 1878).
- , *Dativus* = Landgraf, G., *Der Dativus auctoris* (Progr. München, 1899).
- , *Rede* = Landgraf, G., *Ciceros Rede für Sex. Roscius aus Ameria*, hsg. u. erkl., 2nd edn. (Erlangen: Deichert, 1914).
- Lange, E., *Quid cum de ingenio et litteris tum de poetis Graecorum Cicero senserit* (diss.; Halle, 1880).
- Laughton, 'Cicero' = Laughton, E., 'Cicero and the Greek Orators,' *AJPh* 82 (1961), 27–49.
- , *Participle* = Laughton, E., *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford, 1964).
- Laurand = Laurand, L., *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron avec une esquisse de l'histoire du 'cursus'*, 3 vols., 1st edn. (1907); 4th edn. (Paris, 1936–1938; repr. Amsterdam, 1965).
- Laurand, *De Ciceronis studiis rhetoricis* = Laurand, L., *De M. Tulli Ciceronis studiis rhetoricis* (diss; Paris, 1907).
- , 'Hexamètre' = Laurand, L., 'Les fins d'hexamètre dans les discours de Cicéron,' *RPh* 35 (1911), 75–94.
- , 'Lecture' = Laurand, L., 'Pour la lecture de Cicéron,' *REL* 3 (1925), 54–64.
- , *Cicéron* = Laurand, L., *Cicéron*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1933).
- , 'L'évolution' = Laurand, L., 'Sur l'évolution de la langue et du style de Cicéron,' *RPh* 7 (1933), 62–72.
- , *Cicéron est intéressant* = Laurand, L., *Cicéron est intéressant*, 3rd edn. (Paris, 1937).
- Lausberg, H., *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study. Foreword by G. A. Kennedy* (Leiden, 1998).
- Laurens, P., 'Cicéron, maître de la *brevitas*,' *Caesardunum* 19bis (1984), 29–41.
- Lebek, W. D., *Verba prisca: die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung* (Göttingen, 1970 = *Hypomnemata*, 25).
- Le Bonniec, H., *Le culte de Cérés à Rome* (Paris, 1958), 381–383.
- Lebreton, J., *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Thèse, Paris, 1901).

- Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* = Leeman, A. D., *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1963; repr. 1986).
- Leeman, A. D., 'The Technique of Persuasion in Cicero's *Pro Murena*,' in *Éloquence et Rhétorique chez Cicéron. Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions* (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1982 = *Entretiens Fondation Hardt*, 28), 193–236.
- , 'Ironie in Ciceros *De Oratore*,' in id., *Form und Sinn. Studien zur römischen Literatur* (Frankfurt, 1985), 39–47.
- Leeman, A. D. and Braet, A. C., *Klassieke Retorica* (Groningen, 1987).
- Leeman, A. D., Pinkster, H. (eds.), *M. Tullius Cicero: De Oratore Libri III*, 5 Vols. (with various co-editors), Vol. 1 (Heidelberg, 1981).
- Leen, A., 'Cicero and the Rhetoric of Art,' *American Journal of Philology* 112 (1991), 229–245.
- , 'Clodia Oppugnatrix: The Domus Motif in Cicero's *Pro Caelio*,' *CJ* 96 (2000–2001) 141–162.
- Leff, M. (ed.), *Cicero on Tatnic: Papers from Rutgers University Conference on De Oratore held in Tatnic, Maine, October 1987* (Berkeley, CA, 1988 = *Rhetorica*, 6).
- Leo, *Forschungen* = Leo, F., *Plautinische Forschungen*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1912; repr. Dublin and Zürich: Weidmann, 1973).
- , *Geschichte* = Leo, F., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1913; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967).
- Leonhard, J., 'Cicero als Redner und Schriftsteller,' *Der Neue Pauly* 2 (1997), 1196–1202.
- Lévy, C., 'Cicéron créateur du vocabulaire latin de la connaissance: essai de synthèse,' *La langue latine, langue de la philosophie. Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de L'Université de Rome 'La Sapienza'* (Rome, 17.–19. Mai 1990 (Paris and Rome, 1992), 91–106.
- , *Cicero academicus. Recherches sur les Académiques et la philosophie cicéronienne* (Roma, 1992).
- Leuthold, W., *Die Übersetzung der Phaenomena durch Cicero und Germanicus* (diss.; Zürich, 1942).
- Linck, G. H., *De oratione concinna* (Altdorf, 1709), 32–34.
- Lindner, T., *Lateinische Komposita. Morphologische, historische und lexikalische Studien* (Innsbruck, 2002).
- Lintott, A. W., 'Cicero and Milo,' *JRS* 64 (1974) 62–78.
- Liscu, M. O., *L'expression des idées philosophiques chez Cicéron* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1937).
- Linderbauer, P. B., *De verborum mutuatorum et peregrinorum apud Ciceronem usu compensatione I and II* (Progr. Metten, 1892 and 1893).
- Lindholm, E., *Stilistische Studien* (Lund, 1931).
- Lochmüller, H., *Quaestiones grammaticae in Ciceronis libros oratorios* (diss.; München, 1901).
- Löfstedt, E., *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, 2 vols. (Lund: Gleerup, 1928–1933).
- López, G., *Consuetudo elegans Latini sermonis (Cic. or. 153). Appunti per una ricostruzione del concetto ciceroniano del linguaggio* (1982 = *QJLL*, 4), 49–55.
- Lorenz, A., *Plautus, Pseudolus erklärt* (Berlin, 1876, repr. 1981).
- Lorenzo, J., 'Estudio de algunas parejas de sinónimos en Cicéron,' *SPhS* 1 (1977), 157–176.
- Loutsch, C., 'Ironie et liberté de parole. Remarques sur l'exorde ad principem du *Pro Ligario* de Cicéron,' *REL* 62 (1984 [1986]), 98–110.
- , *L'exorde dans les discours de Cicéron* (Bruxelles, 1994).
- Lozano Escribano, A. J., *Campo semántico de la causación en Cicéron y Lucrecio* (Murcia, 1980).
- Ludwig, W. (ed.), *Éloquence et Rhétorique chez Cicéron. Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions* (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1982 = *Entretiens Fondation Hardt*, 28).
- Lusky, E. A., *The Appeal to the Emotions in the Judicial Speeches of Cicero as Compared*

- with the *Theories Set Forth on the Subject in the De Oratore* (diss.; University of Minnesota, 1928).
- MacCall, J. F., *The Syntax of Cicero's Greek in his Letters* (diss. Albany, NY, 1980).
- Mack, D., *Senatsreden und Volksreden bei Cicero* (Würzburg, 1937 = *Kieler Arbeiten*, II); cf. also Mack, D., 'Der Stil der ciceronischen Senatsreden und Volksreden,' in Kytzler, B., *Ciceros literarische Leistung* (Darmstadt, 1973), 210–224.
- Kytzler, B., 'Beobachtungen zu den Matius-Briefen,' *Philologus* 104 (1960) 48–62.
- McClintock, R. C., *Cicero's Narrative Technique in the Judicial Speeches* (diss. on microfilm; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1975), summary: *DA* 36 (1975), 3672A.
- MacKendrick, P. L., *The Philosophical Books of Cicero* (1989; Ppb. London, 1995)
- , *The Speeches of Cicero: Context, Law, Rhetoric* (London, 1995).
- MacLaren, M., 'Wordplays Involving *Bovillae* in Cicero's Letters,' *AJPh* 87 (1966), 192–202.
- Magnien, M., 'D'Erasmus à Montaigne, une querelle pour le Siècle: autour de l'imitation de Cicéron,' in *Shakespeare: rhetoriques du texte et du spectacle. Actes du Congrès 1991 sous la direction de M. T. Jones-Davies* (Paris, 1992), 53–78 (with bibl.).
- Majorana, A., *L'arte di parlare in pubblico* (Milano, 1909).
- Malaspina, E., 'L'introduzione di materia nel vocabolario retorico e filosofico a Roma,' *AAT* 125 (1991), 41–64.
- Malcovati, E., 'Sulle opere retoriche di Cicerone,' *Athenaeum*, 49 (1971), 398–400.
- Manzo, A., 'La formazione retorica di Cicerone,' in Reggi, G. (ed.), *Cicerone oratore: rendiconti del corso di aggiornamento per docenti di latino e greco del Canton Ticino, Lugano 22–23 settembre 1987* (Lugano, 1990) 79–86.
- Marache, R., *La critique littéraire de la langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère* (Rennes, 1952).
- Mariner Bigorra, S., 'Cicerón, orador: una autocrítica y una revisión,' *Eclás* 18 (1974), 103–124.
- Marmorale, E. V., 'Dell'iato in un verso di Cicerone,' *GIF* 3 (1950), 72–73.
- Marouzeau I = Marouzeau, J., 'Notes sur la fixation du latin classique,' *MSL* 17 (1911), 266–280.
- Marouzeau II = Marouzeau, J., 'Notes sur la fixation du latin classic, II: le vocabulaire,' *MSL* 18 (1913), 146–162.
- Marouzeau III = Marouzeau, J., 'Notes sur la fixation du latin littéraire': III. Utilisation des doublets,' *MSL* 20 (1918), 83–84.
- Marouzeau, 'Notes complémentaires' = Marouzeau, J., 'Notes complémentaires sur l'emploi du participe présent latin,' *RPh* 35 (1911), 89–94.
- , 'Formation' = Marouzeau, J., 'Notes sur la formation du latin classique: V. Une antinomie: "archaïque et vulgaire",' *MSL* 22 (1920), 263–272.
- , *Traité* = Marouzeau, J., *Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin* (Paris, 1935), 5th edn. (Paris, 1970).
- Marshall, A. J., 'The Structure of Cicero's *Edict*,' *AJPh* 85 (1964), 185–191.
- Martin = Martin, J., 'Cicero und die zeitgenössischen Dichter,' in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Roma, 1961), 185–193.
- Martín Rodríguez, A. M., 'El proceso intersubjetivo de *dare litteras*,' *CFC* 1 (1991), 99–116.
- Martinelli, N., *La rappresentazione dello stile di Crasso e di Antonio nel De Oratore* (Roma, 1963).
- Marx, F., *Incerti auctoris De ratione dicendi ad C. Heremium Libri IV* (Leipzig, 1894; repr. Hildesheim, 1966).
- Matsuo, H., 'Forma eloquentiae and genera dicendi. The Concept of the Ideal Style in Cicero's *Orator*,' *ICS* 25 (1977), 91–101.
- Matthews, V. G., 'Some Puns on Roman *cognomina*,' *G&R* 20 (1973), 20–24.
- Maurach, G., *Lateinische Stilübungen. Ein Lehrbuch zum Selbstunterricht* (Darmstadt, 1997).
- May, J. M., 'The *ethica digressio* and Cicero's *Pro Milone*. A Progression of Intensity from *logos* to *ethos* to *pathos*,' *CJ* 74 (1979), 240–246.

- , 'The Rhetoric of Advocacy and Patron-client Identification: Variations on a Theme,' *AJPh* 102 (1981), 308–315.
- , *Trials of Character: the Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1988).
- , 'The Monologic Dialogic as a Method of Literary Criticism: Cicero, *Brutus* 285–289 and Horace, *Epistle* 2. 1. 34–39,' *Athenaeum* 68 (1990), 177–180.
- Meador, P. H., 'Rhetoric and Humanism in Cicero,' *Ph&Rh* 3 (1970), 1–12.
- Meillet, review = Meillet, A., Review of: Hofmann, J. B., *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg, 1926 = *Indogermanische Bibliothek* I, 17), in *Litteris*, 3 (1926), 165.
- , *Esquisse* = Meillet, A., *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine* (Paris, 1928).
- Mendell, C. W., *Latin Sentence Connection* (New Haven, London, Oxford, 1917), 141–190.
- Meiser, G., *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt, 1998).
- Menge, H., *Repetitorium der lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*, 12th ed. by Thierfelder, A. (Leverkusen, 1955, not fully replaced by the following title).
- , *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*, completely new edn. by Burkard, T., Schauer, M., and Maier, F. (Darmstadt, 2000).
- Menk, E. A., *The Position of the Possessive Pronoun in Cicero's Orations* (diss.; University of Iowa, 1925).
- Menna, Aspetti = Menna, P., *Aspetti sintattici e lessicali di carattere intimo e familiare nelle lettere Ciceroniane* (Nola, 1955).
- , *Costruzione* = Menna, P., *La costruzione paratattica ed ipotattica nelle lettere Ciceroniane* (Nola, 1959).
- Merguet I = Merguet, H., *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen*, 4 vols. (Jena, 1877–1884).
- Merguet II = Merguet, H., *Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften Cicero's, mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen*, 3 vols. (Jena, 1887–1894).
- Merrill, N. W., *Cicero and Early Roman Inveective* (diss. Cincinnati, 1982).
- Merrill = Merrill, W. A., 'The Metrical Technique of Lucretius and Cicero,' *UCPA* 7 (1919–1924), 293–306.
- Michel = Michel, A., *Rhétorique et philosophie chez Cicéron* (Paris, 1960).
- Michel, A., 'L'originalité de l'idéal oratoire de Cicéron,' *LEC* 39 (1971), 311–328.
- , 'Rhétorique et philosophie dans les traités de Cicéron,' in Temporini, H. (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung, I: Von den Anfängen Roms bis zum Ausgang der Republik*, 3 (Berlin, 1972), 139–208.
- , 'Cicéron, Pompée et la guerre civile. Rhétorique et philosophie dans la Correspondance,' *AAntHung* 25 (1977), 393–403.
- , 'La théorie de la rhétorique chez Cicéron; éloquence et philosophie,' in *Éloquence et Rhétorique chez Cicéron. Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions* (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1982 = *Entretiens Fondation Hardt*, 28), 109–148.
- , 'La tradition de la philosophie hellénistique dans le vocabulaire esthétique et moral à Rome: De Cicéron à Tacite,' in *Actes du VIIe Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Association d'Études classiques, I–II, publiés par. J. Harmatta* (Budapest, 1984), 415–424.
- , 'Cicéron et la langue philosophique: problèmes d'éthique et d'esthétique,' in *La langue latine, langue de la philosophie. Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de L'Université de Rome 'La Sapienza' (Rome, 17.–19. Mai 1990* (Paris and Rome, 1992), 77–89.
- , 'Grammaire et rhétorique chez Cicéron,' in Dangel, J. (ed.), *Grammaire et rhétorique: notion de Romanité. Actes du colloque organisé à Strasbourg les 28, 29 et 30 nov. 1990* (Strasbourg, 1994), 113–119. (Earlier in *Ktéma* 14 (1989), 189–195.)
- , 'Sagesse et spiritualité dans la parole et dans la musique: de Cicéron à saint Augustin,' in Albrecht, M. von and Schubert, W. (eds.), *Musik und Dichtung: Neue Forschungsbeiträge, Viktor Pöschl zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Frankfurt: Lang 1990), 133–144.
- Michel, G. (and others), *Einführung in die Methodik der Stiluntersuchungen*, 2nd edn. (Berlin, 1972).

- Milic, L., *Style and Stylistics: An Analytical Bibliography* (New York, 1967).
- Minkova, M., *An Introduction to Latin Prose Composition* (London, 2001). A second volume by the same author and Tunberg, T. has been announced.
- Mohrmann, C., *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, 3 vols., 2nd edn. (Roma, 1961–1965).
- Mollfulleda, S., 'Un aspecto poco estudiado de las ideas gramaticales de Cicerón: la fonología,' *Faventia*, 9 (1987), 59–65.
- Molsberger, H. J., *Abstrakter Ausdruck im Altlatein: Form und dramatische Funktion abstrakt-begrifflichen Sprechens in der altlateinischen Bühnensprache* (Frankfurt, 1989).
- Mommsen, T., *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. 3, 8th ed. (Berlin, 1889).
- Monteleone, C., 'Struttura e dialettica del De optimo genere oratorum,' *AFLB* 16 (1973), 431–459.
- Morawski, C., 'De metaphoris Tullianis observationes,' *Eos*, 16 (1910), 1–5.
- Moreschini, C., 'Osservazioni sul lessico filosofico di Cicerone,' *ASNP* 9 (1979), 99–178.
- Morris, E. P., 'A Science of Style,' *TAPhA* 46 (1915), 103–118.
- Motto, A. L., Clark, J. R., 'Ingenium facile et copiosum: Point and counterpoint in Senecan Style,' *CB* 52 (1975), 1–4.
- Müller, *Prosaübersetzungen* = Müller, Helmut, *Ciceros Prosaübersetzungen* (diss.; Marburg, 1964 = *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der ciceronischen Sprache*).
- , *De re metrica* = Müller, Lucian, *De re metrica*, 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1894; repr. Hildesheim, 1967).
- Müller, R., *Sprachbewußtsein* = Müller, R., *Sprachbewußtsein und Sprachvariation im Lateinischen*, Heidelberg 2001.
- Müller-Goldingen, C., 'Cicero als Übersetzer Platons,' in Müller, C. W., Sier, K., Werner, J. (eds.), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Stuttgart, 1992), 173–187.
- Müller-Wetzel, M., *Der lateinische Konjunktiv. Seine Einheit als deiktische Kategorie. Eine Erklärung der modalen Systeme der klassischen Zeit* (Hildesheim, 2001).
- Murgia, C. E., 'Analyzing Cicero's Style,' *CPh* 76 (1981) 301–313 and 77 (1982) 340 f. (cf. Gotoff, H., *ibid.* 336–339).
- Murphy, P. R., 'Cicero's *Pro Archia* and the Periclean *Epitaphios*,' *TAPhA* 89 (1958), 99–111.
- Murray, R. J., 'Cicero and the Gracchi,' *TAPhA* 97 (1966), 291–298.
- Murgia, C. E., 'Analyzing Cicero's Style,' *CPh* 76 (1981), 301–313.
- , 'Analyzing Cicero's Style: A Response,' *CPh* 77 (1982), 340–341.
- Nadjo, L., 'Réflexions sur quelques apports de la linguistique moderne à l'étude de la composition nominale en latin,' in: B. Bureau, C. Nicolas, (eds.), in: *Moussyllanea* (Festschrift Moussy), (Louvain and Paris, 1998) 69–76.
- Nägelsbach, K. F. von, *Lateinische Stilistik*, 9th edn. (Nürnberg, 1905; repr. Darmstadt, 1967).
- Nagnajewicz, M., 'The Technique of identifying Greek Terms and Their Latin Equivalents in Cicero's Scientific Writings,' *Société des Lettres & Sciences de l'Université catholique de Lublin. Annales de Lettres & Sciences humaines*, 19 (1971), 5–44.
- Narducci, E., 'Gli slogans della pace in Cicerone,' in Uglione, R. (ed.) *Atti del convegno nazionale di studi su La pace nel mondo antico (Torino, 9–10–11 aprile 1990)* (Torino, 1991), 165–190.
- Narducci, *Eloquenza*: Narducci, E., *Cicerone e l'eloquenza romana. Retorica e progetto culturale* (Roma, 1997).
- Narducci, E., (ed.), *Cicerone: Prospettiva 2000: Atti del 'I symposium Ciceronianum Arpinas,' Arpino, 5 maggio 2000* (Firenze, 2001).
- (ed.), *Interpretare Cicerone. Percorsi della critica contemporanea. Atti del 'II Symposium Ciceronianum Arpinas,' Arpino, 18 maggio 2001* (Firenze, 2002).
- Nassal, F., *Ästhetisch-rhetorische Beziehungen zwischen Dionysos von Halikarnaß und Cicero* (diss.; Tübingen, 1910).
- Neue / Wagener = Neue, F., / Wagener, C., *Lateinische Formenlehre*, 3. vols., 3rd edn. (Berlin, 1902).

- Neumann, G., *Sprachnormung im Klassischen Latein*, in *Sprachnorm, Sprachpflege, Sprachkritik* (Düsseldorf, 1968 = *Sprache der Gegenwart, Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache, 2: Jahrbuch*, 1966; 1967), 88–97.
- Neumeister, C., *Grundsätze der forensischen Rhetorik, gezeigt an Gerichtsreden Cicerons* (München, 1964).
- Neville, K. P. R., *The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Latin* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1901).
- Nicolai, R., 'Opus oratorium maxime. Cicerone tra storia e oratoria,' in: Narducci, E. (ed.), *Cicerone: Prospettiva 2000* (Firenze, 2001) 105–125.
- Nicolas, C., 'À propos du lexique philosophique de Cicéron,' in Droit, R.-P. (ed.), *Les grecs, les romains et nous. L'antiquité est-elle moderne?* (Paris, 1991), 300–306.
- Nielsen, K. H., *An Ideal Critic: Ciceronian Rhetoric and Contemporary Criticism* (Bern and Frankfurt, 1995).
- Nikitinski, O., *De eloquentia latina saec. XVII et XVIII dialogus = Sergius sive de eloquentia grammaticorum libri duo = La prosa d'arte latina dei secoli XVII e XVIII* (Neapoli, 2000).
- Nikl, A., *De iuvenili redundantia in oratione pro S. Rosc.* (Kempten, 1836).
- Nisbet, *Comm.* = Nisbet, R. G. M., (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis in L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio. Edited with Text, Introduction, and Commentary* (Oxford, 1961):
- , 'Speeches' = Nisbet, R. G. M., 'The Speeches,' in Dorey, T. A. (ed.), *Cicero* (collected essays), (London, 1965), 47–79.
- , 'Cola' = Nisbet, R., 'Cola and Clausulae in Cicero's Speeches,' in Craik, E. M. (ed.), *Owls to Athens?: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford, 1990), 349–359.
- Nóbrrega, V. L., 'Le droit et la stylistique dans *Pro Tullio*,' *Romanitas*, 14–20 (1981), 363–372.
- Norden, *Aeneis 6* = Norden, E., *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch 6*, 3rd edn. (Berlin, 1927; repr. Darmstadt, 1957).
- , *Werkstatt* = Norden, E., *Aus Cicerons Werkstatt* (Berlin, 1913 = *SPAW* 1913).
- , *Kunstprosa* = Norden, E., *Die antike Kunstprosa*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1898; 3rd edn. Berlin, 1915; repr. Darmstadt, 1958).
- North, H., 'The Use of Poetry in the Training of the Ancient Orator,' *Traditio*, 8 (1952), 1–33.
- Novara, A., 'La dignité de l'enseignement et le dialogue d'après Cicéron, *Orat.* 144: Essai sur les raisons du choix de la forme dialoguée, dans les grands traités rhétoriques cicéroniens,' *ALMA* 10 (1983), 35–52.
- Novielli, C., *La retorica del consenso. Commento alla tredicesima Filippica di M. Tullio Cicerone* (Bari, 2001).
- Oksala, P., *Die griechischen Lehnwörter in den Prosaschriften Cicerons* (Helsinki, 1953 = *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae ser. B, Vol. 80*, 1).
- Oldsjö, F., *Tense and Aspect in Caesar's Narrative* (Uppsala, 2001).
- Oliščuk, R. L., 'L'influence des facteurs sémantico-grammaticaux sur l'adjectivation des participes présents (d'après les *Lettres* de Cicéron et de Pline le Jeune),' *InFil* 74 = *PKF* 20 (1984), 27–34 [in Russian, with an abstract in German].
- , 'Le rôle du préfixe négatif *in-* dans l'adjectivisation des participes latins (d'après les *Lettres* de M. T. Cicéron),' *InFil* 80 = *PKF* 21 (1985), 60–65 [in Russian, with an abstract in German].
- Opelt, *Schimpfwörter* = Opelt, I., *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen: Eine Typologie* (Heidelberg, 1965).
- , 'Sprachbewußtsein' = Opelt, I., 'Vom Sprachbewußtsein der Römer,' *Jahrbuch der Universität Düsseldorf* (1968/69), 43–54.
- Oppermann, H., (ed.), *Römische Wertbegriffe* (Darmstadt, 1967).
- Orelli / Baiter = Orelli, J. C., Baiter, J. G., *Onomasticon Tullianum*, 3 vols. (Zürich, 1836–1838).
- Otto, A., *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890; repr. Hildesheim, 1964).

- Panagl, O., 'Die Wiedergabe griechischer Komposita in der lateinischen Übersetzungsliteratur.'
- Panagl, O. and Krisch, T., (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg 1986* (Innsbruck, 1992).
- In: Etter, A., (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si* (= Festschrift Risch), (Berlin 1986) 574–582.
- Panayiotou, G., *Consistency and Variation in Cicero's Oratorical Style* (diss. Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1984).
- Paobella, M. R., 'Alcune osservazioni semantico-lessicali su *fortuna* in Cicerone,' *BStudLat* 19 (1989), 33–48.
- Paratore, E., 'Cicerone attraverso i secoli' in *Marco Tullio Cicerone nel bimillenario della morte*: Istituto di Studi Romani. Centro di Studi Ciceroniani (Firenze, 1961) 235–253.
- Paratore, *L'oratoria* = Paratore, E., *L'oratoria ciceroniana della maturità*, Università di Roma, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia (Roma, 1959).
- , 'Osservazioni' = Paratore, E., 'Osservazioni sullo stile dell'orazione ciceroniana *In Pisonem*,' in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani, Roma, aprile 1959* (Roma, 1961), Vol. 2: 9–53.
- Parzinger I = Parzinger, P., *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Entwicklung des Ciceronischen Stils*, 1st part. *Programm des Königlichen Humanistischen Gymnasiums Dillingen für das Schuljahr 1910/11* (Landshut, 1911).
- Parzinger II = Parzinger, P., (same title, 2nd part), *Programm des Königlichen Humanistischen Gymnasiums Dillingen für das Studienjahr 1911/12* (Landshut, 1912).
- Pascucci, G., 'L'arcaismo nel *De legibus* di Cicerone,' in *Studia Florentina A. Ronconi oblata* (Roma, 1970), 311–324.
- , 'Parafraasi e traduzione da autori greci nel *De legibus* di Cicerone,' in *Litterature comparate. Problemi e metodo. Studi in onore di E. Paratore* (Bologna, 1981), 413–427.
- Pasoli, E., 'Cicerone rep. I 16,' *RFIC* 91 (1963), 46–51.
- Patzner, F., *De parataxis usu in Ciceronis epistulis praecipuo* (Wien und Leipzig, 1910 = *Dissertationes Philogogae Vindobonenses*, 9, 2).
- Peck, T., 'Cicero's Hexameters,' *TAPhA* 28 (1897), 60–74.
- Pennacini, A., *La funzione dell'arcaismo e del neologismo nelle teorie della prosa da Cornificio a Frontone* (Torino, 1974).
- , 'Posizione di Cicerone nella questione della applicabilità della retorica alla poesia,' in Goldin, D. (ed.), *Retorica e poetica. Atti del III Convegno Italo-tedesco Bressanone 1975* (Padova, 1979), 65–75.
- Peters, F., *T. Lucretius et M. Cicero quomodo vocabula Graeca Epicuri disciplinae propria Latine verterint* (diss.; Münster, 1926, abridged version).
- Petersmann, H., 'Bild und Gegenbild des *vir bonus dicendi peritus* in der römischen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis in die frühe Kaiserzeit,' in Czapla, B., Lehmann, T., Liell, S. (eds.), *Vir bonus dicendi peritus: Festschrift für Alfons Weische zum 65. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden, 1997), 321–329.
- Petrone, G., 'La parola e l'interdetto. Note alla *Pro rege Deitaro* e alle orazioni cesariane,' *Pan* 6 (1978), 85–104.
- Pfligersdorffer, G., *Politik und Muße: Zum Proömium und Einleitungsgespräch von Ciceros De Re Publica* (München, 1969).
- Philippson, [R.], 'M. Tullius Cicero: Die philosophischen Schriften,' in *RE* 7 A (Stuttgart, 1939), 1104–1192.
- Pierrettori, G., 'La forma della raccomodazione nell'epistolario ciceroniano,' *Invigilata lucernis* 22 (2000) 139–178.
- Pinkster, H., 'Opmerking over het gebruik van subjekt-pronomina, in het bijzonder in Cicero *De oratore II*,' *Lampas*, 19 (1986), 309–322.
- , 'Lateinische Stilistik. Eine Übersicht,' in: *Sprache und Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 55 (1985) 67–77.
- , *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (London, 1990 [originally in Dutch: Amsterdam 1984; German ed., Tübingen, 1988]).

- , 'Taal en stijl van Cicero: een inleiding in recente literatuur,' *Lampas* 26, 2 (1993) 101–118.
- Piscitelli, C. T., 'Dignitas in Cicerone. Tra semantica e semiologia,' *BStudLat* 9 (1979), 253–267.
- Pollmann, K., *Doctrina Christiana. Untersuchungen zu den Anfängen der christlichen Hermeneutik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Augustinus, De Doctrina Christiana* (Habilitationsschrift, Fribourg, 1996).
- Poncelet, 'Précision' = Poncelet, R., 'Précision et intensité dans la prose latine,' *REL* 26 (1948), 134–156.
- , 'Style philosophique' = Poncelet, R., 'Deux aspects du style philosophique latin: Cicéron et Chalcidius, traducteurs du *Phèdre* 245 C,' *REL* 28 (1950), 145–167.
- , *Cicéron* = Poncelet, R., *Cicéron traducteur de Platon: l'expression de la pensée complexe en latin classique* (Paris, 1957).
- Porten, B. J., *Die Stellungsgesetze des verbum finitum bei Cicero und ihre psychologischen Grundlagen* (diss.; Köln, 1922, 'im Auszug gedruckt').
- Porter, S. E., (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC–AD 400* (Leiden 1997).
- Posch, S., 'Zur Symmetrie und Ausgewogenheit bei Cicero,' in Muth, R. and Pfohl, G. (eds.) *Seria Philologica Aenipontana*, 3 (Innsbruck, 1979), 307–317.
- Pöschl = Pöschl, V., *Römischer Staat und griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero* (Berlin, 1936; repr. Darmstadt, 1990).
- Powell, J. G. F. (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (Oxford, 1995).
- , 'Cicero's Translations from Greek,' in id. (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (Oxford, 1995), 273–300.
- Poyser, G. H., 'A Usage of *Nam*,' *CR* 66, n.s. 2 (1952), 8–10.
- Preiswerk, *De inventione* = Preiswerk, R., *De inventione orationum Ciceronianarum* (diss.; Basel, 1905).
- , 'Gemeinplätze' = Preiswerk, R., 'Griechische Gemeinplätze in Ciceros Reden,' in *Iuvenes dum sumus: Aufsätze zur klass. Altertumswissenschaft der 49. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner* (Basel, 1907), 27–38.
- Prestel, P., *Die Rezeption der ciceronischen Rhetorik durch Augustinus in De Doctrina Christiana* (Frankfurt, 1992 = *Studien zur klassischen Philologie*, 69).
- Price Wallach, B., 'Rhetoric and Paradox: Cicero, *Paradoxa Stoicorum* IV,' *Hermes*, 118 (1990) 171–183.
- Primmer, *Cicero numerosus* = Primmer, A., *Cicero numerosus* (Wien, 1968 = *SAWW* 257).
- , 'Mündlichkeit' = Primmer, A., 'Gebändigte Mündlichkeit: zum Prosarhythmus von Cicero bis Augustinus,' in Vogt-Spira, G. (ed.), *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1990) 19–50.
- Pringsheim, F., *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Vol. 1 (Heidelberg, 1961).
- Puelma, M., 'Cicero als Plato-Übersetzer,' *MH* 37 (1980), 137–178.
- , 'Die Rezeption der Fachsprache griechischer Philosophie im Lateinischen,' *FZPhTh* 33 (1986), 45–69.
- Quadlbauer, F., *Die antike Theorie der genera dicendi im lateinischen Mittelalter* (Wien, 1962 = *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 241).
- , 'Optimus orator, perfecte eloquens. Zu Ciceros formalem Rednerideal und seiner Nachwirkung,' *Rhetorica* 2 (1984), 103–119.
- Quémener, J., *Cicéron, Pro Milone. Texte présenté, annoté et commenté* (Paris, Montréal, 1972).
- Radke, G., (ed.); *Cicero. Ein Mensch seiner Zeit. Acht Vorträge* (Berlin 1968).
- Rahn, H., 'Demosthenes und Cicero zur Frage der geistigen Einheit der Antike,' in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani, Roma, aprile 1959*, Vol. I (Roma, 1961), 265–282.
- Rambaud, M., *Cicéron et l'histoire* (Paris, 1953).
- , 'César et la rhétorique. A propos de Cicéron,' in *La rhétorique à Rome. Colloque des 10–11 décembre 1977, Paris* (Paris, 1979), 19–39.

- Ramos, C. E., *Politics and Rhetoric. Studies in Cicero's Caesarian Speeches* (Austin, Tex., 1994).
- Rankin, H. D., 'Word-Play on Prepositional *gratia* in Cicero, *Pro Roscio Amerino*, 16, 45,' *Hermes*, 89 (1961), 378–379.
- Reed, J. T. 'The Epistle', in Porter, S. E., (ed.), 171–193.
- Reid, J. S., *Cicero, Pro Archia. A Commentary* (Cambridge, 24th edn., 1951).
- Reinach, T., *De Archia poeta* (Paris, 1890), 19–20.
- Reischmann, H. J., 'Rhetorische Techniken in der Diffamierungskunst, dargestellt an Ciceros Invektive *In Pisonem*,' *AU* 29 (1986), 57–64.
- Reissinger, K., *Über Bedeutung und Verwendung der Präpositionen ob und propter im älteren Latein* (diss.; Erlangen, Landau, 1897).
- Reyes Coria, B., *La retórica en la partición oratoria de Cicerón* (México, 1987).
- Rhode, C., *De anacoluthis maxime grammaticis in Ciceronis de oratore libris* (Vratislaviae 1833).
- Rhodus, *De syntaxi* = Rhodius, A., *De syntaxi Planciana* (Progr. Bautzen, 1894).
- , *De L. Munati* = Rhodius, A., *De L. Munati Planci sermone* (Progr. Bautzen, 1896).
- Richardson, W. F., 'The Latin Prefix *sesqui-*,' *Prudentia*, 17 (1985), 37–41.
- Richter, F. and Eberhard, A., (eds.), *Cicero, Rede für den Dichter Archias. Für den Schul- und Privatgebrauch erklärt*, 5th edn. By E. Nohl (Leipzig, 1926).
- Richter, H. E., *Übersetzer und Übersetzungen in der römischen Literatur* (diss.; Erlangen, 1938).
- Ries, W., (ed.), *Cicero, Pro Archia* (Heidelberg, 1965).
- Riggsby, A. M., 'Appropriation and Reversal as a Basis for Oratorical Proof,' *CPh* 90 (1995), 245–256.
- Riposati, *Problemi* = Riposati, B., *Problemi di retorica antica: Introduzione alla filologia classica* (Milano, 1950), 657–787.
- , 'Tecnica' = Riposati, B., 'La tecnica dialogica nel *De oratore* di Cicerone,' *Vichiana*, 11 (1982), 254–263.
- Rissanen, V.-M., 'Some Aspects of Cicero's Conception and Use of Analogy,' in Vaakera, J. and Vainio, R. (eds.), *Utriusque linguae peritus: Studia in honorem Tovio Viljamaa* (Turku, 1997), 120–125.
- Robinson, A., 'Cicero's Use of the Gracchi in Two Speeches Before the People,' *A&R* 39 (1994) 71–76.
- Rochette, B., 'Les auteurs latins et les langues étrangères. La période républicaine,' *Latomus* 52 (1993), 541–549.
- , 'Du grec au latin et du latin au grec. Les problèmes de la traduction dans l'antiquité gréco-latine,' *Latomus*, 54 (1995), 245–261.
- Rochette, B., 'Grecs et Latins face aux langues étrangères. Une contribution à l'étude de la diversité linguistique dans l'antiquité classique,' *RBPh*, 73 (1995), 5–16.
- Rochlitz, S., *Das Bild Caesars in Ciceros Oraciones Caesarianae. Untersuchungen zur clementia und sapientia Caesaris* (Frankfurt, 1993 = *Studien zur klassischen Philologie*, 78)
- Römisch, E., 'Umwelt und Atmosphäre: Gedanken zur Lektüre von Ciceros Reden,' in Radke, G., (ed.), 117–135.
- Ronconi, 'Somnium' = Ronconi, A., 'Osservazioni sulla lingua del *Somnium Scipionis*,' in *Studi in Onore di Gino Funaioli* (Roma, 1955), 395–405.
- , 'Arcaismo' = Ronconi, A., 'Cicerone e l'arcaismo del II sec. d. C.,' in id., *Da Omero a Dante. Scritti di varia filologia* (Urbino, 1981), 273–291.
- Ronnick, M. V., *Cicero's Paradoxa Stoicorum: A Commentary, an Interpretation and a Study of Its Influence* (Frankfurt, 1991).
- Roschatt, A., 'Über den Gebrauch der Parenthese in Ciceros Reden und rhetorischen Schriften,' in *Acta Seminarii Erlangensis*, 3 (Erlangen, 1883), 189–244.
- Rose, H. J., 'The Greek of Cicero,' *JHS* 41 (1921), 91–116.
- Rosén, H., *Latine loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin* (München, 1999).
- Rousselot, P., 'Les conditions du langage politique: le point de vue de Cicerón,' *BAGB* 3 (1996), 232–260.
- Rowe, G. E., 'Style,' in Porter, S. E., (ed.), 121–157.

- Rowland, R. J., 'Cicero and the Greek World,' *TAPA* 103 (1972), 451–461.
- Ruch, *Préambule* = Ruch, M., *Le préambule dans les œuvres philosophiques de Cicéron* (Paris, 1958 = *Publ. de la Fac. des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg*, 136).
- , 'Nationalisme' = Ruch, M., 'Nationalisme culturel et culture internationale dans la pensée de Cicéron,' *REL* 36 (1958), 187–204.
- Rutz, W., 'Ciceros Rede *Pro Archia Poeta* im Lateinunterricht,' *Der Altsprachliche Unterricht* 7 (1964), 47–57.
- Sabbadini, R., *Storia del ciceronianismo nell'età della rinascenza* (Torino, 1886).
- Safarewicz, G., 'De antiquiore sermone a M. Tullio Cicerone in libris de legibus adhibito,' *Meander*, 35 (1980), 533–539 [in Polish, with abstract in Latin].
- Salvatore, M., 'Il *foedus* e la nascita della lingua,' *Sileno*, 16 (1990), 5–39.
- Santini, 'Lingue e generi' = Santini, C., 'Lingue e generi letterari dalle origini agli Antonini,' in Poccetti, P., Poli, D., Santini, C., *Una storia della lingua latina. Formazione, usi, comunicazione* (Roma, 1999), 316–338.
- Sattler, M., 'Some Platonic Influences in Rhetorical Works of Cicero,' *QJS* 35 (1949), 164–169.
- Scaglione, A., *The Ancient Theory of Composition. From its Origins to the Present. A Historical Survey* (Chapel Hill, 1972).
- Scaillet, A., 'Cicéron, *Pro Milone*. La théorie oratoire appliquée à l'exorde et a la narration,' *LEC* 59 (1991) 345–347.
- Scarcia, R., 'Qualis apud Graecos atticismus,' in Benedini, E. (ed.), *La repubblica romana: da Mario e Silla a Cesare e Cicero: Atti del convegno (Mantova, Teatro Accademico, 5–9. Oktober 1988)* (Mantova, 1990), 135–157.
- Schanz / Hosius = Schanz, M., Hosius, C., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 4 parts, (München, 1927; repr. 1959).
- Schenkeveld, D. M., '*Judicia vulgi*: Cicero, *De Oratore* 3. 195ff. and *Brutus* 183ff.,' *Rhetorica*, 6 (1988), 291–306.
- , 'Philosophical Prose', in Porter, S. E. (ed.), 195–264.
- Scherer, A., *Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1975 = *Indogermanische Bibliothek: 1. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher*).
- Schindel, U., *Die Rezeption der hellenistischen Theorie der rhetorischen Figuren bei den Römern* (Göttingen, 2001).
- Schmalz, 'Briefsammlungen' = Schmalz, J. H., 'Über den Sprachgebrauch der nicht-ciceronischen Briefe in den ciceronischen Briefsammlungen,' *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen*, 35, n.s. 15 (1881), 87–141.
- , *Latinität* = Schmalz, J. H., *Über die Latinität des P. Vatinius* (Progr. Mannheim, 1881).
- , *Sprachgebrauch* = Schmalz, J. H., *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Asinius Pollio*, 2nd edn. (München: Beck, 1890).
- Schmid, W., 'Das Werden der lateinischen Philosophensprache,' *WHB* 5 (1962), 11–17.
- Schmidt, P. L., 'Cicero und die republikanische Kunstprosa,' in Fuhrmann, M. (ed.), *Römische Literatur*, 3 (Frankfurt a.M., 1974), 147–179.
- Schoenberger, *Beispiele* = Schoenberger, H., *Beispiele aus der Geschichte: Ein rhetorisches Kunstmittel in Ciceros Reden* (diss.; Erlangen, 1910 = Progr. Augsburg, 1910/11).
- , *Quellen* = Schoenberger, H., *Über die Quellen und Verwendung der geschichtlichen Beispiele in Ciceros Briefen* (Progr. Ingolstadt, 1914).
- Schofield, M., 'Cicero, Zeno of Citium, and the Vocabulary of Philosophy,' in: Canto-Sperber, M. and Pellegrin, P. (eds.), *Le style et la pensée* (Festschrift Brunschwig, J.), (Paris, 2002) 412–428.
- Schrijvers, P. H., 'Invention, imagination et théorie des émotions chez Cicéron et Quintilien,' in Den Boeft, J. and Kessels, A. H. M. (eds.), *Actus. Studies in Honour of H. L. W. Nelson* (Utrecht, 1982), 395–408.
- Schulte, H. K., *Orator. Untersuchungen über das ciceronianische Bildungsideal* (Frankfurt a.M., 1935).

- Schweinfurth-Walla, S., *Studien zu den rhetorischen Überzeugungsmitteln bei Cicero und Aristoteles* (Tübingen, 1986 = *Mannheimer Beiträge zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft*, 9).
- Seager, R., 'Cicero and the Word *popularis*,' *CQ* 22 (1972), 328–338.
- Seele, A., *Römische Übersetzer: Note-Freiheiten-Absichten. Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Darmstadt, 1995).
- Serbat, G., 'Les sens du parfait actif d'après Cicéron,' *REL* 54 (1976), 308–352.
- , *Linguistique latine et linguistique générale* (Louvain-La Neuve, 1988).
- Serra Zanetti, P., 'Sul criterio e il valore della traduzione per Cicerone e S. Gerolamo,' in *Atti del I Congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Rome, 1961), 355–405.
- Settle, J. N., 'The Trial of Milo and the Other *Pro Milone*,' *TAPhA* 94 (1963) 268–280.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., (ed.), *Cicero, The Philippics. Edited by D. R. S. B.* (Chapel Hill, 1986).
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches* (Stuttgart, 1988).
- , *Onomasticon to Cicero's Letters* (Stuttgart, 1995).
- , *Onomasticon to Cicero's Treatises* (Stuttgart, 1996).
- , see also the Loeb editions listed at the end of this volume.
- Shipley, 'Treatment' = Shipley, F. W., 'The Treatment of Dactylic Words in the Rhythmic Prose of Cicero with Special Reference to the Sense Pauses,' *TAPhA* 41 (1910), 139–156.
- Sideri-Tolia, A., 'The Compound Adjectives in Naevius, Ennius, Plautus, Terentius and Cicero,' *Parouzia*, 6 (1988) 205–221.
- Sihler, A. L., *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford, 1995).
- Sinkovich, K. A., 'Mythological comparisons in Cicero,' *RSC* 24 (1976), 187–189.
- Sjögren, *Commentationes* = Sjögren, H., *Commentationes Tullianae de Ciceronis Epistulis ad Brutum ad Quintum fratrem ad Atticum quaestiones*, Arbeten utgifna med understöd af Wilhelm Ekmans Universitetsfond, 8 (Uppsala, 1910).
- , 'Tulliana' = Sjögren, H., *Eranos*, 19 (1919/29), 118–162.
- Skrbinšek, J., *Stilisierung der Reden Ciceros für Ligarius und den König Deiotarus* (Progr. Villach, 1908).
- Skutsch, F., *Die lateinische Sprache*, in: *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1912).
- Snellman, W. J., *De gerundiis orationum Ciceronis* (diss.; Helsingfors, 1894).
- Solmsen, 'Aristotle' = Solmsen, F., 'Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings,' *CPh* 33 (1938), 390–404.
- , 'Speeches' = Solmsen, F., 'Cicero's First Speeches. A Rhetorical Analysis,' *TAPhA* 69 (1938), 542–556.
- , 'Aristotelian Tradition' = Solmsen, F., 'The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric,' *AJPh* 62 (1941), 35–50; 169–190.
- Soubiran, G. (???), 'Le sénaire tragique de Cicéron,' *Ciceroniana*, 5 (1984), 69–80.
- Spaeth (jr.), J. W., *Index verborum Ciceronis poeticorum fragmentorum* (Urbana, 1955).
- Spitzer, L., *Stilstudien*, 2 vols., 2nd edn. (München, 1961).
- Stang, 'Philosophia' = Stang, N., 'Philosophia, philosophus bei Cicero,' *SO* 11 (1932), 82–93.
- , 'Zur philosophischen Sprache' = Stang, N., 'Zur philosophischen Sprache Ciceros,' *SO* 13 (1934), 93–102.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp, E., 'Ciceronische *convivia*: der rastlose Republikaner und der zügellose Zecher,' *Hermes* 129 (2001) 362–376.
- Steel, C. E. W., *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire* (Oxford, 2001). [not yet accessible to me]
- Steele, R. B., 'The Greek in Cicero's Epistles,' *AJPh* 21 (1900), 387–410.
- Sternkopf, W., 'Die Oekonomie in der Rede Ciceros für den Dichter Archias,' *Hermes* 42 (1907) 337–373
- Stone, A. M., 'Pro Milone: Cicero's Second Thoughts,' *Antichthon*, 14 (1980), 88–111.
- Störig, H. J. (ed.), *Das Problem des Übersetzens* (Darmstadt, 1963).
- Sträterhoff, B., *Kolometrie und Prosarhythmus bei Cicero und Livius: De imperio Cn. Pompei*

- und Livius 1, 1–26, 8 kolometrisch ediert, kommentiert und statistisch analysiert, 2 vols. (Oelde, 1995).
- Striker, G., 'Cicero and Greek philosophy,' *HSCPh* 97 (1995) 53–61.
- Ströbel, E., *Tulliana: Sprachliche und textkritische Bemerkungen zu Ciceros Jugendwerk de inv.* (München, 1908).
- Stroh, 'De Ciceronis Demosthenisque . . .' = Stroh, W., 'De Ciceronis Demosthenisque Eloquentia Ovid Germani Critici iudicaverint quaeritur,' *Ciceroniana* 6 (1988), 59–76.
- , 'Nachahmung,' = Stroh, W., 'Die Nachahmung des Demosthenes in Ciceros *Philippiken*,' *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 28 (Vandœuvres-Genève 1981, publ. 1982), 1–31.
- , 'Redezyklen' = Stroh, W., 'Ciceros demosthenische Redezyklen,' *MH* 40 (1983), 35–50.
- , *Taxis* = Stroh, W., *Taxis und Taktik: Die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden* (Stuttgart, 1975).
- , 'Wirkung' = Stroh, W., 'Worauf beruht die Wirkung ciceronischer Reden?,' in Jäger, G. (ed.), *Rede und Rhetorik im Lateinunterricht: zur Lektüre von Ciceros Reden* (Bamberg, 1992), 5–37.
- Stroux, *De Theophrasti . . .* = Stroux, J., *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi* (Leipzig, 1912)
- , 'Gericht' = Stroux, J., 'Das Gericht über die Lebensziele (Cicero *de fin.* II 36ff),' *Philologus*, 89 (1934), 126–132.
- , 'Schlußwort' = Stroux, J., 'Das Schlußwort zu Ciceros *Lucullus*,' *Philologus*, 92, n.s. 46 (1937), 109–111.
- , *Summum ius* = Stroux, J., *Summum ius summa iniuria* (Berlin, 1926).
- Süss, W., 'Die dramatische Kunst in den philosophischen Dialogen Ciceros,' *Hermes*, 80 (1952), 419–436.
- Swiggers, P., Wouters, A. (eds.), *Ancient Grammar: Content and Context* (Leuven and Paris, 1996).
- Szemerényi, O., 'Quellen des lateinischen Wortschatzes mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bedeutungslehnwörter,' in: Panagl / Krisch (eds.) 1992, 311–326.
- Taylor, J. H., 'Political Motives in Cicero's Defense of Archias,' *AJPh* 73 (1952), 62–70.
- Tescari, O., 'Se effettivamente S. Agostino abbia disistimato Cicerone,' in *Atti del I Congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Rome, 1961), 197–205.
- Testard, M., *Saint Augustin et Cicéron* (Paris, 1958).
- , 'Observations sur la pensée de Cicéron, orateur et philosophe: consonances avec la tradition judéo-chrétienne: 3, L'*Hortensius*,' *REL* 79 (2001) 54–69.
- Teyssier, M. L., 'Le langage des arts et l'expression philosophique chez Cicéron,' *REL* 57 (1979), 187–203.
- Théoret, M., *Les discours de Cicéron. La concurrence d tour casuel et du tour prépositionnel* (Montréal, 1982).
- Thiele, G., *Hermagoras: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik* (Strassburg, 1893).
- Thielmann, P., *De sermonis proprietatibus quae leguntur apud Cornificium et in primis Ciceronis libris* (diss.; Straßburg, 1879 = *Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses* 2), 347–463.
- Thraede, K., *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Briestopik* (München, 1970).
- Tillmann, H., 'De dativo verbis passivis linguae Latinae subiecto, qui vocatur Graecus,' *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis*, 2 (1881), 70–139.
- Tondini, A., 'Problemi linguistici in Cicerone,' in *M. Tullio Cicerone nel bimillenario della sua morte* (Firenze, 1961), 225–228.
- Toohy, P., 'How good was Latin? Some Opinions from the Late Republic and Early Empire,' *Arethusa*, 14 (1981), 251–269.
- Traglia, *Fonti* = Traglia, A., *Sulle fonti e sulla lingua del Somnium Scipionis* (Roma, 1947).
- , *Lingua* = Traglia, A., *La lingua di Cicerone poeta* (Bari, 1950).
- Traina, A., 'Commento alle tradizioni poetiche di Cicerone,' in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Roma, 1961), 141–159 with bibl.
- Treggiari, S. M., 'The Upper-Class House as Symbol and Focus of Emotion in Cicero,' *JRA* 12 (1999) 33–56.

- Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I., *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi ciceroniani*, 2 (Roma, 1961), 161–174.
- Tuomi, R., *Studien zur Textform der Briefe Ciceros* (Turun, 1975 = *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis* Series B OSA- Tom. 138).
- , *Zu Sprache und Text in den Briefen des Cicero: Besprechung einiger Stellen der Briefe Ciceros mit dem Bestreben nach neuen Aspekten im Rahmen eines knappen Materials* (Turun, 1983 = *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis B*, 159).
- Tyrell, R. and Purser, C., (eds.), *The Correspondence of Cicero* (Dublin, 1904).
- Ueding, G. (ed.), *Rhetorik zwischen den Wissenschaften: Geschichte, System, Praxis als Probleme des "Historischen Wörterbuchs der Rhetorik"* (Tübingen, 1991).
- Ullmann, S., *Language and Style* (Oxford, 1964).
- Unterharmann, J., 'Gli autori classici e il latino arcaico,' *AION* 8 (1986), 13–35.
- Usher, S., 'Occultatio in Cicero's Speeches,' *AJPh* 86 (1965), 175–192.
- Valenti Pagini, R., 'La retorica di Cicero nella moderna problematica culturale,' *BStudLat* 7 (1977), 327–342.
- , 'Tra logica e retorica: il concetto e la tecnica dell'affirmatio,' *BStudLat* 20 (1990), 331–343.
- Van Wageningen, J., (ed.), *Cicero, Oratio pro Caelio. Recensuit atque interpretatus est J. V. W.* (Groningen, 1908).
- Van Zyl, D. H., 'Cicero's Eclecticism and Originality,' *Akroterion*, 35 (1990), 118–122.
- Vereecke, E., 'Le rythme binaire et ternaire dans l'argumentation: Cicéron, Pro Milone 1–31,' *LEC* 59 (1991), 171–178.
- Volpe, M., 'The Persuasive Force of Humor. Cicero's Defense of Caelius,' *QJS* 63 (1977), 37–43.
- Vretska, H., 'Rhetorische Vernichtung des Gegners: Cicero, in *Catilina* 1, 1,' *Anregung*, 37 (1991), 243–248.
- Vretska, H. and K., (eds.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro Archia Poeta Oratio. Ediderunt, transtulerunt, adnotationibus criticis atque exegeticis instruxerunt* (Darmstadt, 1979).
- Wackernagel, J., *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, 2 vols. (Basel, 1920).
- Walde / Hofmann = Walde, A., Hofmann, J. B., *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1, 3rd rev. edn. (Heidelberg, 1938 = *Indogermanische Bibliothek*, 1, 2).
- Walker, J., *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (Oxford, 2000).
- Walsh, P. G., *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961).
- Watson, W. L., 'The Surname as a Brickbat in Cicero's Speeches,' *CJ* 66 (1970), 55–58.
- Watt, W. S., 'Enim Tullianum,' *CQ* 30 (1980), 120–123.
- Weische, *Emphase* = Weische, A., 'Emphase durch *copia dicendi*,' in: Moussy, C. de (ed.), *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones. Actes du Xe colloque... Paris 1999* (Louvain 2001) 1009–1017.
- , *Studien* = Weische, A., *Studien zur politischen Sprache der römischen Republik* (Münster, 1966).
- , *Nachahmung* = Weische, A., *Ciceros Nachahmung der attischen Redner* (Heidelberg, 1972).
- Weise / Gäbel = Weise, O., Gäbel, G., 'Die Latinisierung griechischer Wörter. Die Lehn- und Fremdwörter Varros,' *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*, 8 (1893), 339–368.
- Wenskus, O., 'Gespräche' unter Freunden. Rhetorik als Briefthema bei Cicero und Plinius,' in: Döpp, S. (ed.), *Antike Rhetorik und ihre Rezeption. Symposium zu Ehren von Classen, C. J.* (Stuttgart 1999) 29–40.
- Werner, E., *Stilistische Untersuchungen zur Pisoniana* (diss.; Leipzig, 1933).
- Wiele, B., 'Der Aspektwandel des Barbarenbegriffs bei den Römern als Ausdruck wachsender Wertschätzung des *patrius sermo*,' in: Scheel, H. (ed.), *Altertumswissenschaft mit Zukunft. Dem Wirken Werner Hartkes gewidmet* (Berlin, 1973), 106–115.
- , *Lateinische Sprache und römische Nationalität. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Sprachbewußtseins bei den Römern* (diss.; Berlin, 1979).
- Wiesthaler, F., *Die oratio obliqua als künstlerisches Stilmittel in den Reden Ciceros* (diss.; Innsbruck: Wagner, 1956 = *CAen* 12).

- Wilamowitz, 'Thukydideslegende' = Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 'Die Thukydideslegende,' *Hermes* 12 (1877), 326–367.
- , 'Asianismus' = Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 'Asianismus und Attizismus,' *Hermes* 35 (1900), 1–52; also in: id., *Kleine Schriften III* (Berlin, 1969), 223–273.
- Wilhelms, J. W., *Is the Language of the Ideal Laws in Cicero's De Legibus Truly Archaic?* Summary in *CJ* 38 (1943), 458–459.
- Wilkinson, L. P., *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge: UP, 1963).
- Winterbottom, M., 'Cicero and the Middle Style,' in Diggle, J., Hall, J. B., Jocelyn, H. D. (eds.), *Studies in Latin Literature and its Tradition in Honour of C. O. Brink* (Cambridge, 1989), 125–131.
- , 'Believing the *Pro Marcello*,' in: Miller, J. F., Damon, C., Myers, K. S., (eds.), *Vertis in Usun. Studies in Honor of E. Courtney* (München 2002) 24–38.
- Wisse, J., 'De oratore uit de mottenballen. De ideale redenaar tussen retorica en filosofie,' *Lampas* 34 (2001) 286–299.
- Wolff, J., *De clausulis Ciceronianis* (Leipzig, 1901), 633–640.
- Wölfflin, 'Vulgärlatein' = Wölfflin, E., 'Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein,' *Philologus*, 34 (1876), 137–165.
- , 'Kausalpartikel' = Wölfflin, E., 'Zu den lateinischen Kausalpartikeln,' *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie*, 1 (1884), 161–176
- , 'Ablativus' = Wölfflin, E., 'Der ablativus comparationis,' *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie*, 6 (1889) 465.
- Wooten, C. W., *Cicero's Philippics and Their Demosthenic Model. The Rhetoric of Crisis* (Chapel Hill, 1983).
- Wüst, G., *De clausula rhetorica quae praecepit Cicero quatenus in orationibus secutus sit* (diss.; Straßburg, 1881).
- Wundt, W., *Völkerpsychologie*, 3rd edn. (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1905–1923; repr. Aalen, 1975).
- Zakrzewska-Gebka, E., 'The Function of Diminutives in Judicial Speeches of Cicero,' *Eos* 69 (1981), 57–68 [in Polish, sum. in Engl.].
- Zetzel, J. E. G., (ed.), *Cicero, De Re Publica. Selections* (Cambridge, 1995), 29–38 ('Style').
- Zielinski, 'Wundt' = Zielinski, T., 'W. Wundt i filozofiya yazyka,' *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, 13 (1902), 533–567, 635–666.
- , 'Clauselgesetz' = Zielinski, T., 'Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden: Grundzüge einer oratorischen Rhythmik,' *Philologus*, Supplement 9 (1904), 591–844.
- , 'Rhythmus' = Zielinski, T., 'Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden: Der oratorischen Rhythmik zweiter Teil,' *Philologus*, Supplement 13 (1920), 1–295, with appended lists.
- , *Cicero* = Zielinski, T., *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, 4th edn. (Leipzig, 1929; repr. Darmstadt, 1967).
- Zillinger, *Cicero* = Zillinger, W., *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter* (diss.; Würzburg, 1911).
- , 'Klausel' = Zillinger, W., 'Der Einfluß des Zitats auf die Klausel bei Cicero,' *Blätter für das Gymnasialschulwesen*, 50 (1914), 361–363.
- Zink, N., *Orator perfectus. Ciceros Reden Pro Archia und Pro Ligario und die rhetorische Theorie* (Frankfurt, 1975).
- Zoll, G., *Cicero Platonis aemulus: Untersuchung über die Form von Ciceros Dialogen, besonders von De Oratore* (Zürich, 1962).

*Translations Quoted in this Book*

As a rule, translations of passages from Cicero and other classical authors are quoted (or adapted) from the Loeb Classical Library.

## CICERO

*Orations*

- The Speeches: Pro Quinctio, etc.: With an English Translation* by J. H. Freese (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1930; repr. 1967).
- The Speeches: The Verrine Orations: With an English Translation* by L. H. G. Greenwood, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1967).
- The Speeches: Pro Caelio, De Provinciis consularibus, Pro Balbo. With an English Translation* by R. Gardner (London and Cambridge, Mass.: Loeb, 1965).
- The Speeches: In Catilinam I–IV, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco. With an English Translation* by C. MacDonald (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1976).
- The Speeches: Pro Milone, Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro Rege Deiotaro: With an English Translation* by N. H. Watts (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1931, repr. 1964).
- Philippics: With an English Translation* by Walter C. A. Ker (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1963).

*Rhetorical Writings*

- De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica: With an English Translation* by H. M. Hubbell (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1949, repr. 1960).
- De Oratore: With an English Translation* by E. W. Sutton. *Completed, With an Introduction*, by H. Rackham, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1942; repr. 1967).
- Brutus, with an English Translation* by G. L. Hendrickson. *Orator, with an English Translation* by H. M. Hubbell (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1939, rev. edn. 1962).
- De Partitione Oratoria: With an English Translation* by H. Rackham (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1942; repr. 1960).

*Philosophical Writings*

- De Re Publica and De Legibus: With an English Translation* by C. W. Keyes (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1959).
- Tusculan Disputations: With an English Translation* by J. E. King (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1971).
- De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum: With an English Translation* by H. Rackham (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1983).

*Letters*

- The Letters to His Friends: With an English Translation* by W. Glynn Williams, 3 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1965).
- Letters to Friends. Edited and Translated* by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 3 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 2001).
- The Letters to his Brother Quintus, The Letters to Brutus, Handbook of Electioneering, Letter to Octavian:* Translated by W. Glynn Williams *et al.* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1972).
- Letters to Quintus and Brutus. Letter Fragments. Letter to Octavian. Invectives. Handbook of Electioneering. Edited and Translated* by D. R. Shackleton Bailey (London and Cambridge, Mass. 2002).

*Letters to Atticus. Edited and Translated by* D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 4 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

## OVID

*The Art of Love, and Other Poems: With an English Translation by* J. H. Mozley (London and New York, 1929).

## SENECA

*Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales. With an English Translation by* R. M. Gummere, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1971).

## QUINTILIAN

*The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian with an English Translation by* H. E. Butler, 4 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1921; repr. 1953).

## TACITUS

*Tacitus in Five Volumes: Vol. 1: Agricola. Translated by* M. Hutton, *Revised by* R. M. Ogilvie; *Germania. Translated by* M. Hutton, *Revised by* E. H. Warmington; *Dialogus. Translated by* Sir W. Peterson, *Rev. by* M. Winterbottom (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1970).

## PLATO

*Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 1: Translated by* N. Fowler (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1914, repr. 1982).

*This page intentionally left blank*

## INDEX

- Ablativus comparationis* 43; 50f.; 60; 112;  
115
- Abs* 12; 118
- Abstract nouns: 35; 47; 90; 136;  
see also: Translation; Vocabulary
- Accius 135
- Accusative, extended use 57
- Acta Senatus* 133
- Ad Herennium* 47; 127; 144; 155
- Adjectives 183; 186 190; 192; 194; 195, n.  
– (*-bilis, -osus, -alis, -eus*) 29  
– compound 32; 72; 133  
– (*per-* and *sub-*) 29, cf. 52f.; 106f.;  
118; 142  
– ‘poetic’ 32  
– preferred to abstract nouns 36  
– verbal (in Greek) 129
- Adnominatio* 110; 115
- Adverbs 13; 30; 50; 53; 60; 86f.; 99; 118
- Alliteration 100
- Adversaria* 142
- Amabo te* and similar formulas 63
- Ambrose 153
- Amicissima brevitatis* 99
- Amplificatio* 82; 146; 162; 167; 202;  
205; 208; 214; 229f.
- Anacoluthon* 137
- Anaphora 66; 113; 130
- Antithesis 115; 166; 189, n.
- Antonius, see: Orators, Roman
- Appetitus* 36
- Appietas* 142
- Aptum* 6; 8; 65; 110; 145; 152; 157;  
162; 190; 216f.; 230
- Archaisms 119  
– in orations 12f.  
– in legal texts 27; 92  
– in philosophical treatises 27; 30f.;  
40–42; 92  
– in spelling 27
- Archaisms 152
- Aristotle 37; 91; 126; 128, 156; 225;  
235; 238
- Asconius Pedianus 151
- Asianism (and Atticism) 101ff.; 118;  
127f.; 132; 147
- Astronomy, terminology 73
- Asyndeton – polysyndeton* 41
- Atomus* 33
- Atticus  
– *Annalis Liber* as a source for Cicero  
105  
– letters influencing Cicero’s  
vocabulary 55
- Auctoritas* 17; 40
- Augustine 155; 157; 222, n.; 223, n.;  
226, n.; 227, n.; 228; 240; 242, n.
- Authepsa* 142
- Barzizza 156
- Beatitas, beatitudo* 35
- Behaghel’s ‘law’ 109
- Belle* 30; 108, n.
- Bene* (‘very’) 99
- Bilingualism 5, n. 12; 54f.; see:  
Syntax, Greek; Vocabulary, Greek
- Caesar 144; 153  
– *De Analogia* 141  
– *De Bello Civili* 164; 168; 171  
– see Cicero and Caesar’s style  
– *clementia* and *sapientia* 162; 168; 172
- Catullus 119; 128
- Cato the Elder 227
- Causae adiuvantes, antecedentes, antepositae, efficientes* 35
- Cedo!* (interjection) 99
- Cenitare* 53
- Cerno* 112
- Chalcidius 130; 153
- Chiasmus 166
- Chronology versus genre 97f.
- Cicero, see also: Style  
– and Caesar’s style 121; 134–141  
– culture of speech 9; 156; 162;  
204; 219–242  
– and historiography 75  
– influence 146–156  
– journey to Greece and Asia 101f.  
– ‘late style’ 112ff.  
– lending general importance to a  
given cause 205; see: *amplificatio*  
– letters 3f.; 52–71; 118f.; 152  
– addressee’s influence 55f.; 120

- compared to other genres 55
- compared to those of his correspondents 136ff.
- of consolation 71
- formal 9ff.
- literary reading of 4; 62
- to political friends 71
- private 68ff.
- written for publication 71
- of recommendation 71
- to 'Stoics' or 'Epicureans' 65
- stylistic differences within individual letters 94f.
- types of letters 67f.
- *Ad Atticum* 38; 40; 55f.; 66; 70f.; 118; 128; 133; 136; 151
- *Ad Brutum* 62f.; 119; 135
- *Ad Familiares* v; 15; 24; 40, n.; 54; 57; 62f.; 68; 70f.; 119; 137; 207; 238
- *Ad Quintum Fratrem* 40, n.; 57; 62
- and literary Latin 157-160
- official documents 75
- orations 11-26
- orations: *Pro Archia* 19; 79, n.; 122; 162; 198-204; 245
  - *Pro Balbo* 20; 83
  - *Pro Caecina* 22-25; 81ff.; 122
  - *Pro Caelio* 14; 79, n.; 107
  - 'Caesarian' orations 20; 98; 105f.; 113; 122; 173f.
  - *In Catilinam* 11; 16; 122; 149
  - *Pro Cluentio* 19; 109; 122
  - *De Domo Sua* 30; 109
  - *Pro Flacco* 20; 26; 107
  - *Pro Fonteio* 19
  - *Pro Gallio* 12
  - *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* (= *De Lege Manilia*) 19; 22f.; 25; 81; 111; 122; 152; 171
  - *De Lege Agraria* 28; 32; 80
  - *Pro Ligario* 83
  - *De Marcello* 20; 106; 122; 149; 162; 163-172; 245
  - *Pro Milone* 81; 103; 109; 122; 162; 175 n.; 182-197; 246
  - *Pro Murena* 28
  - *Philippicae* 14; 18; 20; 25f.; 39; 43; 98; 101; 110; 113f.; 122f.; 137f.
  - *In Pisonem* 32; 39; 105; 107; 110
  - *Pro Quinctio* 24; 31, n.; 99ff.; 103; 122f.
  - *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* 22; 24f.; 80f.
  - *Pro Rabirio Postumo* 81; 111
  - *Post Reditu in Senatu* and *P.R. apud Quirites* 105, n.; 122
  - *Pro Rege Deiotaro* 83; 106; 162; 169; 174-181; 215
  - *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* 12; 24; 98; 100-103; 135; 139
  - *Pro S. Roscio Amerino* 12; 98f.; 111; 175 n.
  - *Pro Sestio* 20; 104f.; 109
  - *Pro Sulla* 3; 20; 26
  - *Pro Tullio* 12; 24; 98
  - *In Vatinius* 20; 39
  - *In Verrem* 14f.; 18; 19; 83; 102; 105; 107; 109; 111; 122f.; 137; 162; 206-214; 245
  - see also: orations, types of
  - philosophical treatises 27-44; 114-116
    - dialogues 86f.; 128; 234
    - and epistolary style 38ff.
    - *prooemia* 85f.; 128
    - types of 45
    - *Academica* 31; 35, n.; 38; 88f
    - *Cato Maior* 44f.; 131
    - *Consolatio* 116; 120
    - *De Divinatione* 31, n.; 44f.; 98
    - *De Fato* 35
    - *De Fimibus* 27; 30; 33; 36; 40f.; 44; 89; 127; 135; 150
    - *Hortensius* 128
    - *Laelius* 44
    - *De Legibus* 27; 31; 38; 41f.; 45; 115; 132; 139
    - *De Natura Deorum* 28; 31, n.; 39; 64; 89; 135
    - *De Officiis* 33; 43; 54; 153; 232
    - *De Re Publica* 27; 31f.; 37; 40; 42; 45; 115; 131; 133; 149; 164; 217ff.; 232; 236f.
    - *Tusculanae Disputationes* 29, n.; 31, n.; 37; 39ff.; 64; 89; 135; 139
  - poems 72-75; 119f.; 133
  - rhetorical treatises 45-51; 92-94; 116-118
    - types of 51
    - compared to orations 48
    - to philosophical treatises 49ff.
    - variation of style 92-94
    - *Brutus* 45, n.; 46; 52; 102; 116; 131
    - *De Inventione* 46; 50; 105; 116f.; 120; 126f.; 155; 175-181; 196; 222
    - *De Optimo Genere* 46; 164
    - *De Oratore* 5; 32; 37; 39; 46f.; 93f.

- 103ff.; 116ff.; 126; 131; 135; 175;  
180f.; 184–188; 192; 196; 219–242  
– *Orator* v; 11; 14; 16; 19f.; 23; 37f.;  
43; 47; 51; 80; 101; 114; 117ff.;  
125ff.; 145; 167; 169; 175; 181;  
188f.; 193–196; 226  
– *Partitioes Oratoriae* 19; 47; 125;  
193; 196  
– *Topica* 47; 127; 133  
– shortcomings 158  
– speaking after other advocates 26  
– theory and practice 6–8; 174–181  
– see: translator  
– working periods  
  – general 97  
  – orations 97f. cf. also 19f.
- Ciceronianism 157  
*Circa* 28  
*Coepi velle* 57  
Colloquialisms 30; 45; 48f.; 52f.; 56;  
68; 86f.; 98f.; 108; 121; 140  
*Combibo* 53  
Comedy 5; 52, n.; 101; 158  
Compound words 32; 34  
Concealment of art 144ff.  
  – of erudition 17  
*Conduplicatio* 21; 107  
*Confatalis* 35  
Conjunctions, coordinating 41  
  – subordinating 32f.  
*Consobrinus, -a* 28  
*Consecutio temporum* 38  
*Convenientia* 118  
Crassus, see: Orators, Roman  
*Credo* 62  
Cyprian 154
- Dative 60; 139; 144  
*Declamitans* 121  
Decorum, see *aptum*  
*Dedita (opera)* 38  
*Delectare* 21f.  
*Delectus verborum* 152  
*Deprecatio* 182, n.  
Demosthenes 110; 114; 130; 156;  
196, n.; 221; 237  
Dialogue 235; see also Cicero,  
  Philosophical Treatises  
*Diem, quo die* 42; 100  
*Digressio*, see: Oration, standard divisions  
Diminutives 107  
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 118  
*Disserere in utramque partem* 230  
*Divertium* 5
- Docere* 22  
Drama, see comedy
- Education, see: Cicero, culture of speech  
*Effari* 30; 86  
*Elegans* 152  
Elision of final *-s* 119  
Ellipsis 38; 56f.  
Emotional appeal 84; see *pathos*  
Enjambment 74; 133  
Ennius 90; 119f.; 133; 148f.  
*Eo quod* 100  
Epexegetis 57f.  
*Equidem* 86f.; 118  
Erasmus 157  
*Escunt* 27  
*Esse videatur* 111  
*Ethos* 25 n.; 201; 229  
*Etiam atque etiam* 118  
*Etsi* 118  
*Experiar et dicam* 39  
*Evidens est* 36  
*Evidentia* 35  
Excursus, see: Oration, standard divisions  
*Exemplum* 18; 131  
  – see: historical *exempla*  
*Exordium*, see: Orations, standard  
  divisions, *Prooemium*
- Facere* 22; 99  
*Facteum* 53  
*Fari* 31  
*Festive* 30  
*Finis bonorum* 36  
Fronto 152
- Gellius 153  
*Geminatio* 110; 113; 130  
General culture, see: Cicero, culture of  
  speech  
*Genetivus forensis* 132  
Genres  
  – and audience 26  
  – differences of 11–78  
  – interaction between 120  
Gracchus, C. 132  
*Gradatio* 167  
*Grammatica* 33  
*Grammaticus* 13  
*Gravitas* 17  
Guarino 156
- Haud* 31f.; 103f.; 115  
Heraclides Ponticus 128

- Hermagoras 125ff.  
 Heroic clausula 14  
 Hexameter 73  
 Historical exempla 26; 80ff.  
 Homer 238  
*Honestum* 167  
 Horace 149  
 Hortensius, rivalry with 120; 127  
*Hui!* 53  
 Humour, see *urbanitas*  
 Hybrid constructions 38  
 Hyperbaton 74; 113; 149  
   – for the sake of emphasis 14  
   – for variation 14
- Idcirco* 100  
*Ilico* 28  
*Indifferens* 150  
 Infinitives used as nouns 43  
*Insinuatō* 180  
*Intellegentia* 35  
 Interrogative sentences 15  
*Inventio*, see: Orator, tasks  
*Ironia* 33  
 Irony 24; 26; 64f.; 80ff.; 101; 110;  
   229  
 Isocolon 109  
 Isocrates 22; 126; 130; 148; 224; 233
- Jerome 153  
 Jesuits 156  
 John of Salisbury 155
- Lactantius 153  
 Landscape, scenery 89; 237  
 Language  
   – dead 242  
   – Latin 129  
   – ‘early’ and ‘late’ 158  
   – literary, and Cicero 157  
   – see: syntax; vocabulary, and  
   individual words  
 Law, Roman 227f.  
 Legal language 100f.; see: style,  
   bureaucratic; see: Cicero, *De Legibus*  
 Letters, see: Cicero, Letters  
*Liberum arbitrium* 35  
 Linguistic choices 11f.  
   – see: archaisms, neologisms, syntax,  
   vocabulary  
 Lipsius, Justus 157  
 Litotes 104; 117  
 Livy 148  
 Logic 228
- Logos* 223ff.; 233  
 Lucretius 128; 136  
 Lupus of Ferrières 155  
 Luther 156
- Melanchthon 156  
 Metaphors 6; 15; 20; 22f.; 37; 41;  
   56; 59f.; 74; 76; 84; 135; 158; 163,  
   *n.*; 189; 194; 211f.; 239  
*Mi (mihi)* 52  
 Minucius Felix 153  
*Misericordia* 82  
 Molon 101f.  
*Movere, permovere* 21
- Narratio* see: Oration, standard divisions  
   – theory 192ff.  
*Nefandus, nefarie* 13  
 Negligence, studied 194  
 Neologisms 34ff.; 45; 142  
*Neutiquam* 55  
*Nimis* 87  
*Non semel, sed bis* 104f.; cf. 115  
 Nouns 29; 90; 142f.; 192  
*Nullus* (‘not’) 99  
*Numquidnam* 99  
*Nuncupare* 31  
*Nuperrime* 116
- Obscuritas* 225  
*Occultatio* 110  
*Officium* 36  
 Omissions, deliberate 206  
*Opitulari* 86  
*Oppido* 30; 45f.; 53  
 Oral discourse in Rome 87  
 Orations, see Cicero, Orations  
   – Oral versus written 17f.  
   – types of  
     – civil 23–25  
     – civil versus criminal 24  
     – epideictic 18ff.; 164–167; 205  
     – judicial (forensic) 20–25; 168ff.  
     – political (deliberative) 171f.  
     – before the Senate/the People 25ff.  
     – before a single judge 25  
   – standard divisions 8; 79; 161  
     – *prooemium (exordium)* 79f.; 163–190;  
       198ff.  
     – *narratio* 26; 80f.; 94; 100; 127;  
       182; 191–194  
     – *argumentatio* 21; 81f.  
     – *digressio* (excursus) 82; 126; 198–205  
     – *peroratio* 26; 82; 94; 194f.

- compared to rhetorical treatises 48
- importance of literary criteria 214ff.
- Orator, tasks 92f.; see also: *docere*,  
*delectare*, *movere*
  - *inventio* 4; 92f.; 184; 203; 216
  - importance to style 216
  - *dispositio* 4; 93
  - *elocutio*, see: style
    - depending on *inventio* 4; 184; 203
  - *memoria* 93
- Orators, Roman 131; Antonius and  
Crassus 93; 227; 235f.
- Otto von Freising 155
- Ovid 150
- Parallelism 16; 58; 166; 189, n.; see  
also Style: ‘perseverance’; generating  
*hapax legomena* 46
- Paraphrase of terms 47f.
- Parenthesis 5; 39, n.; 49; 62; 109;  
117; 191
- Participles 16; 35; 43; 50; 70; 84f.;  
104; 108f.; 113; 120f.; 143
- Pathos* 24; 84; 128; 131
- Per-* and *sub-* 52f.; 106 see: adjectives
- Perceptio* 35
- Periodic sentence structure, see: Style
- Peroratio*, see: Oration, standard divisions
- Peripatetic philosophy 125
- Perpugnacem* 46
- Perspicuitas* 22
- Petronius 151
- Philo of Larissa 231
- Philosophari* 13; *hoc philosophari* 43
- Philosophia* 33; 35; 228
- Philosophical terms 33f.
- Philosophical writings, see: Cicero,  
Philosophical writings
- Philosophy and rhetoric 125ff.; 219–242
- Physiologia* 33
- Phonetic interaction between  
neighbouring words 12, n. 4
- Plato and Platonism 37; 91; 125f.;  
128ff.; 161; 197; 220, n.; 221; 226;  
232–238
- Plautus, see: comedy
- Pleonasm 57; 140
- Pliny the Younger 152
- Poematorum* 12
- Poetry 72ff.
- Poetic language 30–32; style 40ff.  
– sometimes close to colloquial 36f.
- Polybius 131
- Pote* 52
- Praenomen* omitted or written out 62f.
- Privative prefixes (*in-* or *dis-*) 50
- Probare* 22
- Probabilitas* 35
- Proles* 31
- Pronouns, personal 182, n.
- Pronunciation, change of 11f.
- Prooemium*, see: Oration, standard  
divisions
- Propter* (*prope*) 87
- Propterea quod* 32; 43; 100; 115; 118; 140
- Proscripturum* 142
- Prose rhythm 14; 51f.; 66f.; 110f.;  
116; 126f.; 148, n.; 150; 155; 164;  
190ff.; 194
  - differences in the orations 19f.
  - in the treatises 44f.; 90
- Proverbs 64f.
- Puns 65; see: *urbanitas*
- Putidiusculus* 142
- Qualitas* 35; 150
- Quamvis* 32f.; 110
- Quapropter* 106
- Quasi, quidam, ut ita dicam* 35; 41
- Quemadmodum* 106
- Quidem* 107f.; 112; 117f.
- Quintilian ix; 1; 11; 65; 79; 81; 134;  
150ff.; 154; 164 n.; 182; 239
- Quocirca* 106
- Quo de, qua de* 51; 139
- Quotations 17; 40f.; 64f.; 90f.; 105
- Racine 67
- Reapse* 86; 108, n.
- Rebare* 52; cf. 108, n.
- Recolligi* 55
- Rhetores Latini* 128
- Rhetoric
  - importance 219–246
  - in letters 66; 94
  - and philosophy 125ff.
  - see: Cicero, rhetorical treatises
  - see: Cicero, culture of speech
  - see: Orations; Orator
- Rhetorica* 33
- Rhetorical Writings, see: Cicero,  
Rhetorical Writings
- Saepenumero* 108, n.
- Salaco* 53
- Salutati 156
- Sallust 42; 134
- Satire 26; 52, n.

- Satis superque* 15  
*Satisfatio* 28  
*Scelestus, sceleste* 13  
*Sed* 112; 117f.  
 Seneca the Elder 147  
 Seneca the Philosopher 150f.  
 Sentence  
   – connection, loose 195  
   – length 122f.  
   – length and Middle Style 196  
   – periodic structure 194  
*Sepe* 108, n.  
 Shakespeare 1; 33; 66; 101; 188; 206; 219  
 Socrates 231–237  
*Spondeo* 28  
*Spurcus* 13  
*St!* 53  
 Stoics 125; 127  
 Sturm 156  
 Style (Cicero's), overview 75ff.  
   – 'bureaucratic' 60; 121  
   – and Caesar's style 134–141  
   – chronological development 97–126  
   – chronology versus genre 97  
   – and comedy 5, n. 12  
   – concentrations ('nests') of unfamiliar words 90  
   – consistency 127–145  
   – 'contemplative' 49  
   – and context in the orations 161–218  
   – 'dramatic' qualities 5  
   – emotional 16; 59  
   – formulaic 60; 62ff.; 132  
   – generic differences 11–78  
   – and *inventio* 190; 216  
   – legal 132  
   – levels of style 20–25; 75ff.; 196  
     – interacting 105  
     – grand 24f.; 84; 195  
     – middle 23f.; 85; 180; 189; 196; 205  
     – plain 22f.; 48; 83; 191; 193f.  
   – 'matter of fact' style 117  
   – metamorphosis through style 211  
   – nuances in individual works 79–96  
   – periodic sentence structure 1f.; 19; 104; 196  
     – in the philosophical writings 36f.  
     – see: Style, middle; Orations, epideictic; Orations, *prooemium*  
   – purism 108; 114; 121; 134–141; 145  
   – 'rational' 42ff.  
   – 'self-centred' 57f.  
     – in the service of persuasion 213f.  
     – variables and constants 7  
     – varying according to moods 118  
     – 'vehemens-style' 84; 105  
*Suapte (sponte)* 38; 108, n.  
*Sullaturit* 142  
*Substantiva privativa* 29, n.  
*Subturpicula* 52  
*Sullaturio* 53  
*Summe sanus* 30; 108, n.  
 Symmetry  
   – avoidance of excessive 28; 109; 121  
 Synonyms  
   – accumulations of (e.g. 'duplications') 14; 16; 100f.; 139; 149  
   – *apisci* – *adipisci* 106  
   – *atque adeo* – *vel dicam* 112  
   – *beatus* – *felix* 36  
   – *bellum* – *duellum* 27  
   – *causa* – *gratia* 134  
   – *cerno* – *animadverto* 112  
   – *circa* – *circum* 106  
   – *dementia* – *amentia* 28  
   – *egere* – *indigere* 138  
   – *fessus* – *lassus* 42  
   – *fugitare* – *fugere* 106  
   – *grandis* – *magnus* 158  
   – *Hispaniensis* – *Hispanicus* 135  
   – *hoc est* – *id est* 51; 112; 115  
   – *honestum* – *pulchrum* 36  
   – *humaniter* – *humane* 106  
   – *illos* – *ollos* 27  
   – *infimus* – *imus* 135  
   – *hoc est* – *id est* 51  
   – *interficere* and *occidere* 13  
   – *missum facere* – *omittere* 106  
   – *necessitudo* – *necessitas* 106  
   – *portare* – *ferre* 158  
   – *propter* – *ob* 135 n.  
   – *status* – *constitutio* 36  
   – *tametsi* – *quamquam* 106  
   – variation 117  
 Syntax 15; 49  
   – awkward, replaced with more elegant 99f.; 107–110  
   – colloquial 38ff.  
   – complex 15  
   – Greek syntax, competition with 44; 49f.; 60f.; 120f.; 131  
   – Interfering constructions 58  
   – parataxis 39f.; 61f.  
     – and hypotaxis 16  
   – see: parenthesis

- 'perseverance', phenomena of 58
- in poetry 16; 74
- Tacitus 151f.
- Tam ex* 14
- Tametsi* 100; 118
- Tautology 149
- Technical terms, avoidance of 48
  - philosophical, see: Translation
  - rhetorical 118
- Theophrastus 37; 126
- Tmesis 40
- Translation, Translator (Cicero as) 34ff.; 44; 47f.; 119; 128ff.; 150; 152; 154
- Tricolon* 130
  
- Ubertas* 127
- Urbanitas* 17; 64f.; 229
- Usque eo* 108, n.
- Ut arbitror; ut ego (equidem) sentio* 62
- Ut . . . ne* 50; 104; 115
  
- Vale* and similar formulas 63
- Variation of tones
  - within orations 79–85
  - philosophical treatises 85–92
  - rhetorical treatises 92ff.
  - letters 94f.
- Verbs
  - with *-facere* or *-ficare* 30
  - inchoative 30
  - juxtaposed 191
  - frequentative 30; 72
  - omitted 56
- Veriloquium* 142
- Verum* 30; 100; 118
- Verumtamen* 100
- Vocabulary
  - Addressees' influence 55
  - see: adjectives
  - see: archaisms
  - basic (5000 words) 28
  - colloquial 30
  - see: compound words
  - in early orations 106f.
  - emotional 13
  - Greek 13; 33f.; 46; 54f.; 108
    - increase of 121
  - see: neologisms
  - see: nouns
  - poetic 72f.
  - special (orations) 28
  - special (treatises) 28ff.
  - see: verbs
- Wilson, Thomas 156
- Word order 14f.; 43; 59; 86; 113; 137f. 149
  - see: hyperbaton
- Wit, see *urbanitas*
- Xenophon 91; 128

# SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL,  
D.M. SCHENKEVELD, P. H. SCHRIJVERS AND S.R. SLINGS

135. SMALL, D.B. (ed.). *Methods in the Mediterranean*. Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09581 0
136. DOMINIK, W.J. *The Mythic Voice of Statius*. Power and Politics in the *Thebaid*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09972 7
137. SLINGS, S.R. *Plato's Apology of Socrates*. A Literary and Philosophical Study with a Running Commentary. Edited and Completed from the Papers of the Late E. De Strycker, s.j. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10103 9
138. FRANK, M. *Seneca's Phoenissae*. Introduction and Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09776 7
139. MALKIN, I. & Z.W. RUBINSOHN (eds.). *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World*. Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09917 4
140. SEGAL, A. *Theatres in Roman Palestine and Provincia Arabia*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10145 4
141. CAMPBELL, M. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica III 1-471*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10158 6
142. DeFOREST, M.M. *Apollonius' Argonautica: A Callimachean Epic*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10017 2
143. WATSON, P.A. *Ancient Stepmothers*. Myth, Misogyny and Reality. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10176 4
144. SULLIVAN, S.D. *Psychological and Ethical Ideas*. What Early Greeks Say. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10185 3
145. CARGILL, J. *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 09991 3
146. PANAYOTAKIS, C. *Theatrum Arbitri*. Theatrical Elements in the *Satyrice* of Petronius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10229 9
147. GARRISON, E.P. *Groaning Tears*. Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy. 1995. 90 04 10241 8
148. OLSON, S.D. *Blood and Iron*. Stories and Storytelling in Homer's *Odyssey*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10251 5
149. VINOGRADOV, J.G. & S.D. KRYZICKIJ (eds.). *Olbia*. Eine altgriechische Stadt im Nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09677 9
150. MAURER, K. *Interpolation in Thucydides*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10300 7
151. HORSFALL, N. (ed.) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. 1995 ISBN 90 04 09559 4
152. KNIGHT, V.H. *The Renewal of Epic*. Responses to Homer in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10386 4
153. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *The Gorgon's Severed Head*. Studies of *Alcestis*, *Electra*, and *Phoenissae*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10382 1
154. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, F. (ed.). *Lygdamus*. Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. Translated by J.J. Zoltowski. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10210 8
155. MATTHEWS, V.J. *Antimachus of Colophon*. Text and Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10468 2
156. TREISTER, M.Y. *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10473 9
157. WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.). *Voice into Text*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10431 3
158. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica, Book V*. A Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10506 9

159. SCHMELING, G. (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 09630 2
160. SICKING, C.M.J. & P. STORK. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10460 7
161. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Altera*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10624 3
162. GERA, D. *Warrior Women*. The Anonymous Tractatus *De Mulieribus*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10665 0
163. MORRIS, I. & B. POWELL (eds.). *A New Companion to Homer*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 09989 1
164. ORLIN, E.M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10708 8
165. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *A History of Roman Literature*. From Livius Andronicus to Boethius with Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature. 2 Vols. Revised by G. Schmeling and by the Author. Vol. 1: Translated with the Assistance of F. and K. Newman, Vol. 2: Translated with the Assistance of R.R. Caston and F.R. Schwartz. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10709 6 (Vol. 1), ISBN 90 04 10711 8 (Vol. 2), ISBN 90 04 10712 6 (Set)
166. DIJK, J.G.M. VAN. Ἀἴοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10747 9
167. MAEHLER, H. (Hrsg.). *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*. Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10671 5
168. DILTS, M. & G.A. KENNEDY (eds.). *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire*. Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10728 2
169. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Quaestiones Propertianae*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10793 2
170. HEINZE, T. (Hrsg.). *P. Ovidius Naso. Der XII. Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason*. Einleitung, Text und Kommentar. Mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie *Medea*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10800 9
171. BAKKER, E.J. (ed.). *Grammar as Interpretation*. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10730 4
172. GRAINGER, J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10799 1
173. GERBER, D.E. (ed.). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 09944 1
174. SANDY, G. *The Greek World of Apuleius*. Apuleius and the Second Sophistic. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10821 1
175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralyisin Cave*. Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule*. Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia*. A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories*. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's Academici Libri*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals*. Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power*. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The Poetics of Aristotle and the Tractatus Coislinianus*. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions*. Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. P.H. SCHRIJVERS. *Lucrece et les Sciences de la Vie*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca. Hercules Furens*. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6

188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality*. The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic*. An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. HOUT, M.P.J. VAN DEN. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. KRAUS, C. SHUTTLEWORTH. (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography*. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. LOMAS, K. & T. CORNELL. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy*. ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *History of Greek Colonization and Settlement Overseas*. 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. WOOD, S.E. *Imperial Women*. A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN & P. STORK. *Linguistics into Interpretation*. Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. PFEIJFFER, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*. A Commentary on *Nemean V*, *Nemean III*, & *Pythian VIII*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil, Aeneid 7*. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. IRBY-MASSIE, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. GRAINGER, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. GRAINGER, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. SOLOMON, J. *Ptolemy Harmonics*. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11591 9
204. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica, Book VI*. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. MADER, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography*. Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. NAUTA, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons*. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. JAMES, A. & K. LEE. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna*, Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. DERDERIAN, K. *Leaving Words to Remember*. Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. SHORROCK, R. *The Challenge of Epic*. Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4
211. SCHEIDEL, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. KEULEN, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca Troades*. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. MORTON, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. GRAHAM, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. GROSSARDT, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros*. Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3

216. ZAFIROPOULOS, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The Augustana Collection*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. RENGAKOS, A. & T.D. Papanghelis (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. WATSON, J. *Speaking Volumes*. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MACLEOD, L. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles' Elektra*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. MCKINLEY, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine*. "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. REESON, J. *Ovid Heroides 11, 13 and 14*. A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4
222. FRIED, M.N. & S. UNGURU. *Apollonius of Perga's Conica: Text, Context, Subtext*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11977 9
223. LIVINGSTONE, N. *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12143 9
224. LEVENE, D.S. & D.P. NELIS (eds.). *Clio and the Poets*. Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11782 2
225. WOOTEN, C.W. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12213 3
226. GALÁN VIOQUE, G. *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12338 5
227. LEFÈVRE, E. *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' Tragödien*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12322 9
228. SCHEIDEL, W. *Death on the Nile*. Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12323 7
229. SPANOUDAKIS, K. *Philittas of Cos*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12428 4
230. WORTHINGTON, I. & J.M. FOLEY (eds.). *Epea and Grammata*. Oral and written Communication in Ancient Greece. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12455 1
231. McKECHNIE, P. (ed.). *Thinking Like a Lawyer*. Essays on Legal History and General History for John Crook on his Eightieth Birthday. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12474 8
232. GIBSON, R.K. & C. SHUTTLEWORTH KRAUS (eds.). *The Classical Commentary*. Histories, Practices, Theory. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12153 6
233. JONGMAN, W. & M. KLEIJWEGT (eds.). *After the Past*. Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H.W. Pleket. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12816 6
234. GORMAN, V.B. & E.W. ROBINSON (eds.). *Oikistes*. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12579 5
235. HARDER, A., R. REGTUIT, P. STORK, G. WAKKER (eds.). *Noch einmal zu.... Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12794 1
236. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable*. Volume Three: Inventory and Documentation of the Graeco-Latin Fable. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11891 8
237. SCHADE, G. *Stesichoros*. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12832 8
238. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUITER (eds.) *Andreia*. Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11995 7
239. GRAINGER, J.D. *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12840 9
240. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Tertia*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12977 4
241. PANAYOTAKIS, S., M. ZIMMERMAN, W. KEULEN (eds.). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12999 5
242. ZACHARIA, K. *Converging Truths*. Euripides' *Ion* and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13000 4
243. ALMEIDA, J.A. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13002 0
244. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil, Aeneid 11*. A Commentary. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12934 0
245. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Cicero's Style*. A Synopsis. Followed by Selected Analytic Studies 2003. ISBN 90 04 12961 8