

## 2

### Two great orators

#### C. Gracchus (154-121 B.C.) and Cicero (106-43 B.C.)

##### C. Gracchus

From the speech *De legibus promulgatis* (122 B.C.)<sup>1</sup>

*Nuper Teanum Sidicinum consul venit. uxor eius dixit se in balneis virilibus lavari velle. quaestori Sidicino M. Mario datum est negotium, uti balneis exigerentur, qui lavabantur. uxor renuntiat viro parum cito sibi balneas traditas esse et parum lautas fuisse. idcirco palus destitutus est in foro, eoque adductus suae civitatis nobilissimus homo M. Marius. vestimenta detracta sunt, virgis caesus est. Caleni, ubi id audierunt, edixerunt, ne quis in balneis lavasse vellet, cum magistratus Romanus ibi esset. Ferentini ob eandem causam praetor noster quaestores abripi iussit: alter se de muro deiecit, alter prensus et virgis caesus est.*

Not long ago the consul came to Sidicinian Teanum.<sup>2</sup> His wife announced that she wanted to use the men's bath. The Sidicinian quaestor Marcus Marius was instructed to remove the public from the bath. The wife reports to her husband that the bath was not handed over to her fast enough and wasn't clean enough. A stake was therefore set up in the forum. The most distinguished man of his city, Marcus Marius, was taken there. His clothes were torn off and he was flogged. When the people of Cales heard about this, they issued an edict to the effect that, when a Roman official was there, no native could use the bath. In Ferentinum our praetor had the quaestors dragged off for the same reason; one threw himself from the wall, and the other was seized and flogged with rods.

##### Cicero against Verres<sup>3</sup>

*Ipse inflammatus scelere et furore in forum venit; ardebant oculi, toto ex ore crudelitas eminebat. expectabant omnes, quo tandem progressurus aut quidnam acturus esset, cum repente hominem proripi*

<sup>1</sup> Malcovati<sup>4</sup>, pp.191f., fr. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Teanum Sidicinum is situated in Campania under Mons Massicus, where Via Latina and Via Appia meet. Teanum, Cales and Ferentinum were municipia with Italic rights (H. Nissen *Italische Landeskunde* [Berlin 1902] II<sup>2</sup> pp.693, 694, 653).

<sup>3</sup> Cic. *Verr.* II 5,62,161 – 63,163; text of G. Peterson (Oxford 1907, 1917<sup>2</sup>). Cf. now also L. Piacente 'Cic. *Verr.* II 5,162' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Lingua e Letteratura Latina* (Univ. di Roma, Facoltà di Magistero) 1 (1979) pp.89-94. Piacente demonstrates that the repetition of the word *crux* (162) is due to conjecture. The present writer regards this conjecture as necessary, especially since *inquam* follows.

*atque in foro medio nudari ac deligari et virgas expediri iubet. clamabat ille miser se civem esse Romanum, municipem Consanum; meruisse cum L. Raecio, splendidissimo equite Romano, qui Panhormi negotiaretur, ex quo haec Verres scire posset. tum iste: se comperisse eum speculari causa in Siciliam a ducibus fugitivorum esse missum; cuius rei neque index neque vestigium aliquod neque suspicio cuiquam esset ulla; deinde iubet undique hominem vehementissime verberari. 162. caedebatur virgis in medio foro Messanae civis Romanus, iudices, cum interea nullus gemitus, nulla vox alia illius miseri inter dolorem strepitumque<sup>4</sup> plagarum audiebatur, nisi haec: 'civis Romanus sum!' hac se commemoratione civitatis omnia verbera depulsurum cruciatumque a corpore deiecturum arbitratur; is non modo hoc non perfecit, ut virgarum vim deprecaretur, sed cum imploraret saepius usurparetque nomen civitatis, crux, crux inquam, infelici et aerumnoso, qui numquam istam pestem viderat, comparabatur.*

63.163. *o nomen dulce libertatis! o ius eximium nostrae civitatis! o lex Porcia legesque Semproniae! o graviter desiderata et aliquando reddita plebi Romanae tribunicia potestas! hucine tandem omnia reciderunt, ut civis Romanus in provincia populi Romani, in oppido foederatorum, ab eo qui beneficio populi Romani fascis et securis haberet, deligatus in foro virgis caederetur? quid? cum ignes ardentisque laminae ceterique cruciatus admovebantur, si te illius acerba imploratio et vox miserabilis non inhiibat, ne civium quidem Romanorum, qui tum aderant, fletu et gemitu maximo commovebare? in crucem tu agere ausus es quemquam, qui se civem Romanum esse diceret?*

He came into the forum burning with rage and lusting for blood. His eyes blazed; cruelty was written all over his face. Everyone was eager to see which way he would finally turn and what he would do – when suddenly he had a man dragged forward, stripped in the middle of the forum, and tied up, and the rods prepared. The poor man shouted repeatedly that he was a Roman citizen from the municipium Cosa, and that he had served with L. Raecius, a highly respected Roman knight, who was in business at Panormus, and could give Verres confirmation of the fact. To this Verres replies that he has heard he was sent to Sicily as a spy by the leaders of the runaways – though there was no one to accuse him, nothing definite to go on, and not the slightest suspicion in anyone. Then he has the man beaten in the most violent way possible from all sides. 162. A Roman citizen was flogged with rods in the middle of the forum of Messina, men of the jury, while there was no groan, no other word of the poor man to be heard in the midst of the painful swish of the blows than this: 'I am a Roman citizen'. By this reference to his citizen rights he thought he could ward off every blow of the rods and shield himself

<sup>4</sup> *strepitumque* codd. nonn. Gellii (10,3,12); *crepitumque* codd. Cic.

from torture. But it was not enough that he failed to prevent violent scourging by entreaties; worse still, as he pleaded more and more and appealed to his citizen rights, the cross, the cross, I say, was got ready for the unhappy man in his affliction, who had never yet set eyes on that awful thing. 163. O sweet name of freedom! O wonderful privilege of being a Roman citizen! O Porcian law and Sempronian laws! O tribunician power, ardently desired and at last granted to the people of Rome! Has then all this lapsed so far into decay, that a Roman citizen in a province of the Roman people, in an allied city, can be bound and beaten with rods in the market-place by the man to whom the Roman people has entrusted the symbols of authority? Well! When he was tormented with fire, glowing metal and the other forms of torture – if his bitter entreaties and plaintive voice did not stop you then, were you not even moved by the pathetic tears and groans of the Roman citizens present? You dared to hand someone over to be crucified, who said he was a Roman citizen?

### 1. The problem

There has been agreement since antiquity that Gaius Gracchus was no less important as an orator than as a statesman;<sup>5</sup> however there has been no such agreement about the particular quality of his oratorical style. For Mommsen<sup>6</sup> the 'flaming words' of the speeches preserve 'the passionate earnestness, the noble bearing and the tragic fate of this lofty nature in a faithful mirror'. Central to his interpretation is the 'terrible passion of his heart', which made Gracchus 'the first orator that Rome ever had'.<sup>7</sup> The 'sober' parts of the speeches are also interpreted from the standpoint of passion: 'For all his mastery of oratory, he was himself often mastered by anger, so that the brilliant speaker's flow of words became clouded or halting'.<sup>8</sup> Such traits are 'the faithful reflection of his political actions and ordeals'.<sup>9</sup>

While a historian like Mommsen understands the speeches as direct evidence of personality, philologists on the other hand have established a more detached approach by looking at them in the context of literary history and determining how far they are conditioned by factors of this kind. Norden started from the principle that 'style in antiquity was not the man himself, but a

<sup>5</sup> The following go beyond Mommsen: E. Meyer 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen' *Kleine Schriften* I<sup>1</sup> (Halle 1910) pp.383-439, I<sup>2</sup> (Halle 1924) pp.363-398; R. v. Pöhlmann 'Zur Geschichte der Gracchenzeit' *SB München* (1907) pp.443ff.; F. Münzer *RE* 2 A 2 (1923) 1375ff. and 1409ff.; A. Heuss *Römische Geschichte* (Braunschweig 1960) pp.144-148 and 553f. (lit.).

<sup>6</sup> *Römische Geschichte* pp.454f.

<sup>7</sup> *Ib.* p.104. The next sentence 'without it we should probably be able to include him among the foremost statesmen of all times' recalls Cic. *Brut.* 125f.

<sup>8</sup> *Ib.* p.104.

<sup>9</sup> *Ib.* p.104.

garment that he could change as he pleased'.<sup>10</sup> He demonstrated Gracchus' dependence on his Asianist teachers<sup>11</sup> and thus opened the way to an understanding in terms of literary history, although in so doing he went against his own maxim and still looked for the man in the style: 'The passionate temperament ... of this man of genius inevitably found in agitated Asianic eloquence a welcome means of giving fitting expression to his ideas'.<sup>12</sup>

Leo<sup>13</sup> however recognizes the opposition between Gracchus' temperament and the Asianic manner: this certainly had some effect, but could not make much difference to the orator. Leo is aware that the preserved fragments do not confirm the general conception of Gracchus' passionate gravity. Without repeating Mommsen's ingenious theory of anger rendering speechless, he sees here an accident of transmission.

Häpke<sup>14</sup> was the first to reject the cliché of the passionate and demagogic orator and to stress his factual style of argument.<sup>15</sup> This introduces an approach which it is worthwhile to pursue further.

What is the basis for the 'emotional' image of Gracchus? In Tacitus' view, which is taken over by most moderns, Gracchus' style is richer than Cato's.<sup>16</sup> Plutarch uses similar epithets and establishes at all points a contrast with the plainer and quieter diction of his brother Tiberius.<sup>17</sup> By its very consistency this contrast makes one suspect it of being artificial, like so much else in the 'comparative' parts of Plutarch.<sup>18</sup> Since his command of Latin was slight,<sup>19</sup> he had

<sup>10</sup> *Kunstprosa* p.12.

<sup>11</sup> *Ib.* pp.171-173; for a fuller discussion with regard to prose rhythm cf. Leo pp.508ff.

<sup>12</sup> In the following sentence there is a shift of emphasis. The discussion is no longer concerned with style, but with external aspects of delivery: 'We hear of his sensational *actio* ...' (Norden p.171).

<sup>13</sup> Leo p.308.

<sup>14</sup> N. Häpke *C. Semproni Gracchi oratoris Romani fragmenta* (Diss. Munich 1915).

<sup>15</sup> Welcome confirmation from a historical point of view is provided by Ernst Meyer *Römischer Staat und Staatsgedanke* (Darmstadt 1961<sup>2</sup>) p.303: 'Purely demagogic motions ... are not among them [sc. those of C. Gracchus]; on the other hand the nobility used purely demagogic means to overthrow the inconvenient tribune.'

<sup>16</sup> Tac. *dial.* 18 *Catonis seni comparatus C. Gracchus plenior et uberior; sic Graccho politior et ornatio Crassus; sic utroque distinctior et urbanior et altior Cicero*. There is a similar appraisal in Norden p.169 and Leeman p.56. Here Tacitus is influenced by Cic. *Brut.* 125: *Noli enim putare quemquam. Brute, pleniorum aut uberiorum ad dicendum fuisse.*

<sup>17</sup> Plutarch *Tib. Gracchus* 2.

<sup>18</sup> On Plutarch's limits as a historian cf. K. Ziegler *RE* 21 (1951) 910. Too much emphasis on moral questions can make Plutarch distort facts and alter their bearing. One example is his moralizing interpretation of the voice-trainer, who sets the pitch for Gracchus with his tuning pipe (cf. the instructive list of sources in N. Häpke [quoted above n.14] pp.36-38).

<sup>19</sup> Plut. *v. Demosth.* 2,2ff. On this cf. K. Ziegler *RE* 21 (1951) 926f.

only indirect knowledge of Gracchus' speeches.<sup>20</sup> Besides, the whole paragraph shows such a strong deductive tendency in proceeding from the opposed temperaments of the two brothers, that the particular comments on points of style can only be viewed with reservations as historical evidence.

The same is true of Tacitus, who did not study Gracchus' speeches, but gives a simplified version of a passage in Cicero. In the *Dialogus* the remark is part of a schematic survey of the technical progress of Roman oratory and it cannot in the last analysis claim to say anything individual about C. Gracchus.

Thus in spite of Plutarch and Tacitus it remains unclear how and to what extent Gracchus' strong emotion, which is undeniably present, has entered the style of his speeches. This question entails a historical problem. Have Plutarch and more recent scholars<sup>21</sup> perhaps drawn a distorted picture of Gracchus, in that, while they were quite right to point to the emotional aspect, in so doing they neglected other aspects of this many-sided personality?

The wide-spread view of C. Gracchus' stylistic *ubertas* stands in opposition to the opinion of Marouzeau, who cites him as a typical example of the poverty (*egestas*) of archaic Latin.<sup>22</sup> For him of course Gracchus is not a real person but a stage in a historical development. In the final analysis therefore both Plutarch and Marouzeau start with a general conception and reach their particular perceptions by deduction from it. Thus in accordance with their premisses each comes to the opposite result. Here the text is scarcely more than a 'prétexte'.

A more accurate picture can be obtained by paying attention to the different modes of expression and stylistic levels in Gracchus, as Leeman has shown.<sup>23</sup> In what follows we shall make the texts our starting-point and attempt (partly by comparison with Cicero) to

<sup>20</sup> On Plutarch's citations from Gracchus' speeches see N. Häpke pp.13-19. Cf. Pöhlmann p.445 (with lit.), who posits a historical work as intermediary.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also Val. Max. 8,10,1 (*flagrantissimo ingenio*); Tac. *dial.* 26 (*C. Gracchi impetum*); Apul. *apol.* 95 (*impetum*); Gell. 10,3 (*fortis ac vehemens*); Fronto p.132 van den Hout (*contionatur ... Gracchus turbulente; ... tumultuatur Gracchus*); Claud. Mam. *epist.* 2 p.206 Engelbrecht (*Gracchus ad acrimoniam ... capessendam usui*). There is also little attempt at discrimination in A. Heuss p.144: 'The passion that animated him was like a volcano.'

<sup>22</sup> J. Marouzeau *Eranos* 45 (1947) pp.22-24. He gives a more subtle analysis in *RPh* 45 (1921) pp.166-168: Gracchus is at home in 'two styles' (168). Quint. *inst.* 12,10,10 is lukewarm (while acknowledging the brevity). Cf. Sen. *epist.* 114,13. Plin. *epist.* 1,20 speaks of Gracchus' *orationes circumcisae*. Criticism is expressed by Gell. 10,3,15 and Sen. *epist.* 114,13.

<sup>23</sup> *Loc. cit.* pp.56-58.

reach an individual portrait of Gracchus the orator. This time the special character of our sample text calls for some methodological detours. If it has hitherto been thought more banal than it is, this is due largely to the fact that it has been considered in isolation. Consequently it will require some patience to make clear the intellectual landscape to which it belongs and to illustrate it from different angles by comparing other texts; in this way it can have its proper impact. The following sections deal in succession with attitude to language, narrative method, rationality and emotion.<sup>24</sup>

## 2. Attitude to language: Latinitas – mundities

### a) Choice of words

Certain words are repeated in our text without any evident rhetorical purpose: *in balneis, balneis, balneas, in balneis; lavari, lavabantur*. Another narrative of Gracchus presents a similar picture: we quote it here for comparison.<sup>25</sup>

*Quanta libido quantaque intemperantia sit hominum adolescentium, unum exemplum vobis ostendam. his annis paucis ex Asia missus est, qui per id tempus magistratum non ceperat, homo adulescens pro legato.<sup>26</sup> is in lectica ferebatur. ei obviam bubulcus de plebe Venusina advenit et per iocum, cum ignoraret, qui ferretur, rogavit, num mortuum ferrent. ubi id audivit, lecticam iussit deponi, struppis, quibus lectica deligata erat, usque adeo verberari iussit, dum animam efflavit.*

I want to show you by means of an example to what lengths the wantonness and intemperance of young people goes. A few years ago a young man who at that time had not yet held office was sent in place of an ambassador from Asia. He had them carry him in a litter. An ox-herd met him, a simple man from Venusia, and asked in jest (for he did not know who was being carried) if they were carrying a corpse. When the young man heard this, he had the litter put down and ordered the ox-herd to be beaten with the straps of the litter until he gave up the ghost.

In this text also we observe unrhetoical verbal repetitions of the same kind: *ferebatur, ferretur, ferrent; lectica, lecticam, lectica; iussit, iussit; per id tempus, per iocum*. Marouzeau stresses how much more artistic Cicero's handling of vocabulary is.<sup>27</sup> However one needs to be careful with phrases like 'colloquial carelessness', since even

<sup>24</sup> The Latin headings are based on Gell. 10,3,4: *brevitas sane et venustas et mundities orationis est*. <sup>25</sup> Fr. 49 Malcovati<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> On the constitutional background cf. T. Mommsen *Römisches Staatsrecht* (Leipzig 1887) II p.681,3 'This does not seem to refer to a delegate of the Senate, but of a Roman official present in Asia ... *pro legato* denotes the purpose of the journey'.

<sup>27</sup> *RPh* 45 (1921) p.167. Cf. the deliberate variation in Cicero: *in foro medio – in medio foro* (the latter more emphatic: 'En pleine place publique').

Quintilian<sup>28</sup> rejects as affectation the excessive search for synonyms merely for the sake of variety. Here we may be sure that Gracchus is keeping to the *proprietas verborum*.

### b) Sentence connection

In fragment 49 the demonstrative pronoun *is* connects the sentences: *is ferebatur ... ei obviam advenit ... ubi id audivit*. In fragment 48 (our main text) asyndeton is frequent: *quaestori ... uxor ... vestimenta ... alter*. Alongside this there is also connection by means of demonstratives: *eius ... idcirco ... ubi id audierunt ... ob eandem causam*. Participial constructions are significantly absent. But does that allow us to conclude: 'La construction dans Gracchus est uniforme et banale'?<sup>29</sup>

### c) Appreciation

The language of Gracchan narrative is pure, clear and precise. The origin of such *Latinitas*<sup>30</sup> can be traced back to the man's early biography. Gaius grew up – even more so than his brother – under the supervision of his mother Cornelia: according to Cicero's evidence (who was likewise a purist) she ensured that her sons grew up in the healthy ambience of an uncorrupted mother-tongue and she took personal charge of their upbringing and education<sup>31</sup> (we still possess a letter of this important woman).<sup>32</sup>

It is true that Gracchus' disciplined attitude to language and the effects of this on his style have put off later readers, who expected in certain contexts a richer and more elevated tone. Compared to Cicero's account with its artistic form and emotional colouring,<sup>33</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Quint. *inst.* 10,1,7, cf. 8,3,51.

<sup>29</sup> J. Marouzeau *RPh* 45 (1921) p.167.

<sup>30</sup> On *Latinitas* in general cf. J. Marouzeau *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire* (Paris 1949) pp.7-25 (*Latinitas – Urbanitas – Rusticitas*).

<sup>31</sup> Cicero *Brut.* 104: *Nam et Carbonis et Gracchi habemus orationes nondum satis splendidas verbis, sed acutas prudentiaeque plenissimas. fuit Gracchus diligentia Corneliae matris a puero doctus et Graecis litteris eruditus. nam semper habuit exquisitos e Graecia magistros, in eis iam adolescens Diophanem Mytilenaeum, Graeciae temporibus illis disertissimum. sed ei breve tempus ingenii augendi et declarandi fuit. Cic. Brut.* 210: on the importance of *usus domesticus* ... *Sed magni interest quos quisque audiat quotidie domi, quibuscum loquatur a puero, quemadmodum patres, paedagogi, matres etiam loquantur.* 211: *Legimus epistolas Corneliae matris Gracchorum: apparet filios non tam in gremio educatos quam in sermone matris.* On the importance of Cornelia cf. also Tac. *dial.* 28,9; Quint. *inst.* 1,1,6; Plut. *Tib. Gr.* 1,8; F. Münzer *REIV* 1592-1595.

<sup>32</sup> It is transmitted at the end of Nepos' life of Atticus. Nepos had evidently cited it in his work *De illustribus viris*. Cf. *HRR* II pp.38-40 Peter. Leo translated this letter in the appendix to his literary history (p.479).

<sup>33</sup> See below pp.41; 47ff.

Gracchus' report does indeed sound plain and commonplace: Gellius finds the diction 'comic',<sup>34</sup> i.e. close to everyday speech,<sup>35</sup> and dispensing with tragic ornamentation.<sup>36</sup> This need not of course entail any lack of *gravitas*, which in Cicero's view Gracchus did possess.<sup>37</sup> It is not therefore permissible to limit Cicero's idea of *gravitas* to the elevated style of the Verrines passage.

The term 'comic' is less helpful in defining the tone of Gracchan narrative than the aesthetic notion of *mundities*.<sup>38</sup> Belonging etymologically to the root \**meu-* ('wash'), it describes the aesthetic effect achieved through linguistic purity (*Latinitas*).

### 3. Narrative technique:<sup>39</sup> *Brevitas*

In the matter of linguistic purity we found no basic difference between Gracchus and Cicero. It is otherwise in regard to *brevitas*.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Gell. 10,3,4. He finds more *gravitas* in Cicero.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Don. Ter. *Hec.* 611 κωμικῶ χαρακτήρι et usu cotidiano.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Gloss. Plac. 5,56,11 *comoedia est quae res privatarum et humilium personarum comprehendit non tam alto ut tragoedia stilo, sed mediocri et dulci.*

<sup>37</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 125: *genere toto gravis* (about C. Gracchus). On the *genus grave* cf. Cic. *orat.* 96-99 (on this cf. W. Kroll), esp. 97 *huius eloquentiae est tractare animos... haec... inserit novas opiniones, evellit insitas.* Plutarch *Tib. Gr.* 2,3 also calls C. Gracchus γεγανωμένος (= μεγαλοπρεπής; cf. R. Jeuckens *Plutarch von Chaeronea und die Rhetorik* [Diss. Strassburg 1907] p.177; Häpke p.34).

<sup>38</sup> For the meaning cf. Lat. *lautus*. Since the concept is surprisingly not treated by P. Monteil *Beau et laid en latin* (Paris 1964), some examples may be cited: Cic. *or.* 79: *removebitur omnis insignis ornatus... elegantia modo et munditia remanebit, sermo purus erit et Latinus*; Quint. 8,3,87: *quaedam velut e tenui diligentia circa proprietatem significationemque munditiae*; Gell. 1,23,1 (on Cato) *cum multa... venustate atque luce atque munditia verborum*; 10,24,2 (Augustus) *munditiarum... patris sui in sermonibus sectator.*

<sup>39</sup> For a general treatment of the subject in Cicero see also now R.C. McClintock *Cicero's Narrative Technique in the Judicial Speeches* (Diss. Chapel Hill 1975; Microfilm: *Dissertation Abstracts* 36 [1975] 3672A); D. Berger *Cicero als Erzähler, forensische und literarische Strategien in den Gerichtsreden* Europ. Hochschulschriften 15,12 (Frankfurt/Bern/Las Vegas 1978); M. Fuhrmann 'Narrative Techniken in Ciceros zweiter Rede gegen Verres' *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 26 (1980, Heft 3) pp.5-17; J. Blänsdorf 'Erzählende, argumentierende und diskursive Prosa' *Würzburger Jahrbücher* N.F. 4 (1978) pp.107ff.

<sup>40</sup> On brevity as a characteristic of the Latin language cf. Plut. *Cato maior* 12,7 (on Cato) θαυμάσαι δὲ φησι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὸ τάχος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν δξύτητα τῆς φράσεως· ἃ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐξέφερε βραχέως, τὸν ἐρμηνεῖα μακρῶς καὶ διὰ πολλῶν ἀπαγγέλλειν· τὸ δ' ὄλον οἶεσθαι τὰ ῥήματα τοῖς μὲν Ἑλλήσιν ἀπὸ χειλέων, τοῖς δὲ Ῥωμαίοις ἀπὸ καρδίας φέρεσθαι. Plut. *Caesar* 50,3 καὶ τῆς μάχης ταύτης τὴν δξύτητα καὶ τὸ τάχος ἀναγγέλλων εἰς Ῥώμην, πρὸς τινα τῶν φίλων Ἀμάντιον, ἔγραψε τρεῖς λέξεις. "Ἐλθον, εἶδον, ἐνίκησα." Ῥωμαῖστί δὲ αἱ λέξεις εἰς ὁμοῖον ἀπολήγουσαι σχῆμα ῥήματος, οὐκ ἀπίθανον τὴν βραχυλογία ἐχουσιν. In this trait (as in much else) Roman and Stoic meet. The latter regarded συντομία as one of the chief stylistic virtues (see Leeman p.39 with n.81; reference to *SVF* [ed. H. von Arnim, Leipzig 1903] III p.214,16). For a similar view cf. Quint. 4,54,68; Cic. *inv.* 1,32; Rut. Lup. 2,8. Plin. *epist.* 1,20,1-4 is critical of *brevitas* (including that of Gracchus).

Analysis of the Cicero text will show indirectly how concisely Gracchus writes.

In fr. 48 Gracchus strings the facts together asyndetically. Variety is provided by the change of tense in the wife's reaction: *uxor renuntiat*. Here the historic present forms a deliberate contrast to the surrounding perfects.<sup>41</sup> Use of *idcirco* as a sentence link introduces the erection of the stake and puts strong emphasis on the triviality of the motive. In an otherwise asyndetic style an adverb like this acquires structural significance. The whole narrative is dominated by balancing pairs. This is accentuated by the fact that sentences begin in the same way: sentence 1 and 3 start with *uxor*; cf. later the proper nouns *Caleni - Ferentini* and in the last sentence *alter - alter*. The alliteration has a similar function: *vestimenta - virgis*. The overall structure falls into three parts: background (2 × 2 sentences); main event (2 × 2 short sentences); consequences (2 longer sentences). The absence of any sort of emotional comment is noteworthy.

At the beginning of the Cicero passage asyndetic connection of sentences predominates, as in Gracchus. A new element is the representation of psychology in terms of physiognomy: *toto ex ore crudelitas eminebat*. A translation such as 'cruelty stood written on his brow' would be far too colourless. Psychology is mirrored by emotional adjectives and participles (*inflammatus scelere et furore; illius miseri; o nomen dulce; o ius eximium; o graviter desiderata... tribunicia potestas; acerba imploratio et vox miserabilis; fletu gemituque maximo*) and also by psychological abstracts (*scelere et furore; crudelitas*). Whereas Gracchus is content to use only 'proper' terms, as befits the style of the report, Cicero employs more expressive verbs:<sup>42</sup>

Gracchus	Cicero
<i>adductus... Marius</i>	<i>proripi</i>
<i>vestimenta detracta sunt</i>	<i>nudari</i>

Let us pass now to the overall structure. Whereas Gracchus simply reports, Cicero is able to make his hearers visualize what happens by breaking it up into smaller units that follow each other step by step.<sup>43</sup> Here one of the most important devices is the imperfect<sup>44</sup> and the

<sup>41</sup> This is meant to be emphatic, and perhaps also to characterize what happens as the outcome of the preceding events.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. J. Marouzeau *RPh* 45 (1921) p.167.

<sup>43</sup> In Cicero the arrangement of tenses in the narrative operates on several planes, producing an impression of perspective. In Gracchus there is just one plane.

<sup>44</sup> Gellius had already noted the function of the imperfect correctly (10,3,12).

periphrastic future subjunctive: *expectabant omnes, quo tandem progressurus aut quidnam acturus esset*. Through these verbal forms an expectant tension is created, which is suddenly relaxed in the following *cum repente*.

In Gracchus the action is over very soon after it has begun. Cicero on the other hand achieves an effective slowing down, for example through the preparation of the rods. Whereas Gracchus deprives himself of the chance of powerful visualization by using the dry perfect *caesus est*, Cicero employs the imperfect *caedebatur* in expressive initial position.<sup>45</sup> By means of *diutina repraesentatio*, as Gellius calls it, Cicero is able to build up a scene: general silence, crash of the whip strokes ... and against this background from the mouth of the tortured man the words ring out: 'I am a Roman citizen'. In this way Cicero lets what is outrageous about the event become dramatically audible in the action itself, whereas Gracchus is content with the simple statement that the most distinguished man of his city is involved.

The evocative imperfect appears once again in the preparation of the cross, accompanied by an expressive repetition:<sup>46</sup> *crux, crux, inquam, ... comparabatur*. Generally speaking, verbal repetitions in the Cicero text have an intensificatory effect, as for example the thematically recurrent *civis Romanus/civitas* and *populus Romanus*, as well as the polysyndeton with *neque* and the anaphoric *o*.

Accordingly Cicero does not merely have emotion present subconsciously, but lets it appear in the actual text (this is clear from the use of emotional adjectives and psychological abstracts and from the whole of the lengthy *commiseratio* appended to the account).<sup>47</sup> He makes the hearer visualize the events dramatically (there are various means to this end: choice of expressive verbs, emphatic initial position, creation of a background full of tension or anticipation by using the imperfect, which in Gracchus is completely absent at this point, and finally the skilful use of retardation in breaking up a single overall event into individual phases, which as they follow each other give rise to a dramatic progression).<sup>48</sup>

<sup>45</sup> J. Marouzeau *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine* vol. II (Paris 1938) p. 71. Also in Cicero: *ardebant oculi ...; expectabant omnes ...*

<sup>46</sup> In the repetition of the word *crux* Piacente (quoted above p. 33 n. 3) sees the work of a humanist; but surely the ensuing *inquam* presupposes a repetition of *crux*.

<sup>47</sup> On this cf. Gell. 10,3,14: *haec M. Tullius atrociter, graviter, apte copioseque miseratus est*.

<sup>48</sup> Gell. 10,3,7/8 stresses the *sub oculos subiectio* and describes the effect on the reader of this text of Cicero in the following terms: *Animum hercle meum, cum illa M. Ciceronis lego, imago quaedam et sonus verberum et vocum et eiulationum circumplectitur*.

There is a great temptation (and it is one to which the majority of interpretations have in fact succumbed) to play Cicero off against Gracchus, whether as an absolute stylistic norm or as representing a more mature level historically. These views are basically just as one-sided as was the wilful attempt of many archaizers to set Gracchus above Cicero.<sup>49</sup> We can see for example how dangerous the idea is that Gracchus did 'not yet' have this or that device at his disposal, if we look at the following text of Cato, which displays a rich range of emotion and is nonetheless earlier than Gracchus:<sup>50</sup>

*Dixit a decemviris parum bene sibi cibaria curata esse. Iussit vestimenta detrahi atque flagro caedi. decemviro Brutiani<sup>51</sup> verberare, videre multi mortales. quis hanc contumeliam, quis hoc imperium, quis hanc servitatem ferre potest? nemo hoc rex ausus est facere: eane fieri bonis, bono genere gnatis, boni consultis? ubi societas? ubi fides maiorum? insignitas iniurias, plagas, verbera, vibices, eos dolores atque carnificinas per dedecus atque maximam contumeliam, inspectantibus popularibus suis atque multis mortalibus, te facere ausum esse? set quantum luctum, quantum gemitum, quid lacrimarum, quantum fletum factum audivi! servi iniurias nimis aegre ferunt: quid illos, bono genere gnatos, magna virtute praeditos, opinamini animi habuisse atque habituros, dum vivent?*<sup>52</sup>

He said he had not been properly supplied with provisions by the decemviri. He ordered them to be stripped of their clothing and whipped. Decemviri flogged by beades! Many people saw it. Who can endure this outrage, this misuse of authority, this servitude? No king dared do this. Can this happen to respectable, right-thinking people of good family? What has become of the alliance? What of the pledge given by our ancestors? You dared to inflict glaring injustices, blows, beatings, weals, pain and torment in shame and utmost indignity before the eyes of their countrymen and many people! But how great was the sorrow, how great the lamentation, what abundance of tears, how mighty the sobbing, as I heard! Even slaves feel enormous resentment about unjust treatment. How do you think those people must have felt, who were of good family and had done great services, and how will they still feel, as long as they live?<sup>53</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Gellius is perceptive enough to dissociate himself explicitly from such eccentric views (10,3,15). Cf. also Sen. *epist.* 114,13: *multi ex alieno saeculo petunt verba, duodecim tabulas locuntur. Gracchus illis et Crassus et Curio nimis culti et recentes sunt*. Cf. W. Soltau *NJbb* 9 (1906) p. 26 n. 1.

<sup>50</sup> Cato fr. IX J. = fr. 58 Malcovati<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> The Bruttians performed these tasks as a punishment for their support of Hannibal in the Second Punic War.

<sup>52</sup> On the rhythmical structure of the passage cf. A. W. de Groot *La prose métrique des anciens* (Paris 1926) pp. 44f. ('périodes arrondies, membres symétriques et souvent isochrones, mais pas de métrique').

<sup>53</sup> Translation partly after O. Ribbeck, in *Neues Schweizer Museum* 1 (1861) p. 12.

By comparison with Gracchus the word order in Cato is freer. He is also aware, as Cicero was later, of the expressive initial position of the verb:<sup>54</sup> *videre multi mortales*.<sup>55</sup> The text shows that the Censor does not strive for brevity at any price, but that he too loves *ubertas*. There is an anticipation of Ciceronian *miseratio* with anaphora, emotional substantives and adjectives; but Cato's sentences are short-winded in comparison, and the technique of dramatic climax is absent.<sup>56</sup>

Comparison with Cicero and Cato thus enables us to make two negative statements about Gracchus:

- 1) He does not really narrate in a visual and dramatic way; he does not build up an effective climax like Cicero.
- 2) He does not employ *miseratio* here, although Cato is already familiar with it.

We have therefore to speak in terms of deliberate intent at least as regards the second point.<sup>57</sup> This means we can discard the view that there is no more to Gracchus than primitiveness. Accordingly we are justified in adopting a positive approach to the question of Gracchus' artistic principles in the narrative before us.

#### 4. Rationality: Acutum

The structure of the Gracchan narrative is, as we have established, strictly rational. Balancing pairs predominate, accentuated several times by parallelism. The transparency of the structure, combined with the hard language of facts, gives the tone a cutting, unmasking quality. In rationality such as this lies the charismatic element that distinguishes Gracchus as an 'intellectual'.

*Brevitas* is closely related to *acutum*<sup>58</sup> (ὀξύτης), which is based on the notion of a short, sharp thrust-weapon. In terms of content, ideas are compressed into a very small space;<sup>59</sup> in moral terms, the

<sup>54</sup> On this in general cf. J. Marouzeau *L'ordre des mots ...* passim, esp. pp. 49ff.

<sup>55</sup> The remarks of Fankhänel (above p. 11 n. 42) p. 230 about consular reports as the model for such positioning are not convincing; on the other hand the structural function of such a change of position is clear.

<sup>56</sup> C. Gracchus is considerably more restrained than Cato e.g. in the accumulation of synonyms; so here too he shows a refined taste. Cf. the cases of *ubertas* demonstrated by Häpke, loc. cit. p. 40, almost all of which are elegantly unobtrusive: *sapientia atque virtute; commoda et rem publicam; bonam existimationem atque honorem; pretium et praemium; eodem loco atque ordine; sumptus atque pecunias*.

<sup>57</sup> There is some support for this view in the fact that *miseratio* is ascribed mainly to *Tiberius* Gracchus in our tradition (cf. Plut. *Tib. Gr.* 2), whereas Gaius' style was felt to be more virile.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. e.g. Quint. 6, 3, 45: *acutior est illa atque velocior in urbanitate brevitatis*.

<sup>59</sup> The proem to Eustathius' commentary on the *Odyssey* explains ὀξύτης as

expression denotes an earnest and dignified attitude (*gravitas*); and as to form, it often approaches the maxim or occurs with some other kind of point.<sup>60</sup> Accordingly it is no accident that antithesis is the figure of speech which appears most often in the fragments.<sup>61</sup> Here are some examples. *Pessimi Tiberium fratrem meum optimum interfecerunt*.<sup>62</sup> what an apt reversal of the title *vir optimus*,<sup>63</sup> claimed as hereditary for the murderer Nasica, alongside the slogans *boni* and *mali cives!* Gracchus plays with the closely related contrast of *boni* and *improbi*<sup>64</sup> in the following fragment: *abesse non potest, quin eiusdem hominis sit probos improbare, qui improbos probet*.<sup>65</sup> We owe the quotation to Cicero, who does however suggest an improvement: *qui improbos probet probos improbare*.<sup>66</sup> This gives rise to an even sharper point and above all to a clausula. In the Ciceronian version the word order is more involved and rather more artificial than is to be expected in Gracchus.<sup>67</sup>

Hellenistic training is evident in the following sentence: *quae vos cupide per hosce annos adpetistis atque voluistis, ea si temere repudiastis, abesse non potest quin aut olim cupide adpetisse aut nunc cupide repudiastis dicamini*.<sup>68</sup> The period is carefully handled. The first half contains 32 syllables, the second 31; we observe in it two sections each beginning with *aut* and each of 10 syllables.<sup>69</sup> Norden<sup>70</sup> refers to Gorgias and Isocrates in relation to this period. However for once he is less critical than an ancient authority,<sup>71</sup> who discovers a

νοημάτων βαθύτης ἐν ἐπιπολαζούσῃ ἀπλότητι. (Ed. Rom. 1379 = ed. G. Stallbaum, Leipzig 1825, T. I p. 2). Cf. also J.C. Ernesti *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae* (Leipzig 1795, repr. Hildesheim 1962) s.v. ὀξύτης.

<sup>60</sup> B.R. Voss *Der pointierte Stil des Tacitus* (Münster 1963) examines neither the ancient concepts nor the modern one ('punch line'). On the concept of 'epigrammatic point' see H. Lausberg *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik II* (Munich 1960) p. 933.

<sup>61</sup> The correct interpretation in Häpke pp. 38f., with examples. Häpke misunderstands Leo p. 309, 1 'parallelism and antithesis are less prominent, but very studied, in the sentences at Gell. 11, 10, 4'.

<sup>62</sup> Fr. 17 Malcovati<sup>4</sup>. The fragment comes from a recommendation of the motion of the tribune Carbo, which was intended to allow re-election to the tribunate (131 B.C.).

<sup>63</sup> F. Münzer *RE* 2 A 4 (1923) 1380.

<sup>64</sup> *improbus = rerum novarum cupidus* cf. *ThLL* 7 (1934-1964) 690.30; 36; 40; 42; 68ff.

<sup>65</sup> Fr. 24 Malcovati<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>66</sup> It is not clear to the present writer what is to be gained from labelling this stylistic figure *commutatio* (Leeman p. 57).

<sup>67</sup> There are also sharp epigrammatic points to fragments 28, 43, 58 and 60, Malcovati<sup>4</sup>. <sup>68</sup> Fr. 32 Malcovati<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>69</sup> Norden *Kunstprosa* I p. 172. In the proem to the speech *De legibus promulgatis* Gracchus observes the Asianic rhythms, especially the double trochee (Leo p. 309, 2). Cf. also Häpke p. 59. 'Metric' and 'non-metric' passages in C. Gracchus are distinguished by A.W. de Groot pp. 46f. <sup>70</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>71</sup> Titus Castricius ap. Gell. 11, 13.

tautology here: the point does indeed suffer from having the decisive adverbs already appear in the first half of the sentence. A translation makes the weakness visible: 'If you now blindly scorn what throughout these years you have eagerly desired and wanted, then it will inevitably be said of you that you either desired it once in blind greed or now blindly scorned it'. In translation the sentence loses its rigorous structure and with it its effect. For the sake of the overall design Gracchus has here accepted a tautology. However the following intensification is in every respect a success: *pueritia tua adulescentiae inhonestamentum fuit, adulescentia senectuti dedecoramentum, senectus rei publicae flagitium*.<sup>72</sup> This sentence became one of the standard examples of a good climax, and to this circumstance we owe its preservation.<sup>73</sup>

From the narrative whose purpose is to unmask, it is only one step to the pitiless candour and logic of fragment 44. Its sequence of thought is as follows: Everyone wants something from you; none of us works for nothing; neither do I: I want honour from you; whoever speaks against the law under discussion, does not want honour from you, but money from Nicomedes; whoever speaks for the law, does not want honour from you either, but money from Mithridates; whoever is silent, is the worst: he let himself be bribed by both.

We have attempted to understand *acutum* in Gracchus' style, with respect to both form and content, as a symptom of his marked rationality. We also established *en passant* that the same trait is reflected in the application of Greek rhetorical technique.<sup>74</sup> However for Gracchus there is nothing strange in either. On the one hand the striving for pointed formulations is the refinement of a genuinely Italic tendency; on the other the rhythmic structure of the sentence gives scope not just to Greek theory, but to the 'architectonic' trend of the Latin language. The purity of the linguistic substrate is matched by the lucidity of Gracchan diction, which gives to *acutum* a character different from what it has in Cato.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Fr. 43 Malcovati<sup>4</sup> from the speech against L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi of 123 B.C.

<sup>73</sup> Isidore *orig.* 2,21,4.

<sup>74</sup> Leeman sees such traits in Cato; scepticism is expressed by M. Fuhrmann *Gnomon* 38 (1966) p.360.

<sup>75</sup> Cicero's attitude is not to be thought of as less rational; it is merely that alongside elevation and irony there is also humour, and besides analytic rationality there is also the specifically artistic kind. See the end of the chapter.

## 5. Style and emotion

### a) Word order

In contrast to Cato and Cicero it is only on rare occasions that Gracchus' word order makes use of inversion.<sup>76</sup> The verbs stand mostly at the ends of the sentences, in line with normal practice and without particular emphasis. If however one looks at the other parts of the sentence, a different picture emerges.<sup>77</sup> In fragment 48 the proper name *Marcus Marius* is twice given an important place; the same thing happens with the place names *Teanum Sidicinum* and *Ferentini*. Gracchus felt that proper names need to be specially stressed (which is what Goethe recommended to actors)<sup>78</sup> and so he moved the names to the beginning or end of the sentence. Initial and final positions are not particularly noticeable during silent reading; only oral delivery reveals their full power.<sup>79</sup> In the sentence *eoque adductus suae civitatis nobilissimus homo M. Marius* the emphasis is due to the unusual final position of the subject and to the attribute *nobilissimus*,<sup>80</sup> especially as Gracchus is otherwise sparing in his use of adjectives.<sup>81</sup>

In fragment 49 the decisive element in the sentence is each time stressed by its position at the end: firstly the subject, which is introduced to the audience with a certain undertone of irony as *homo adulescens pro legato*; secondly the jest of the drover: *num mortuum ferrent*; and finally the shocking conclusion of the scene: *dum animam efflavit*. On this view even the seemingly colourless *idcirco* at the beginning of the sentence acquires importance ('for this reason and no other, for this ridiculous reason'). In contrast therefore to Marouzeau, who thinks inversion is absent in Gracchus, we have to conclude that skilful exploitation of initial and final position in the sentence imparts liveliness and grace to our text.

<sup>76</sup> J. Marouzeau *L'ordre des mots...* II p.71.

<sup>77</sup> Marouzeau failed to notice this.

<sup>78</sup> Goethe *Regeln für Schauspieler* (1803) §13 (WA 40, 143) 'in general a stronger emphasis than usual must be placed on proper names in pronunciation, because such a name has to be especially noticeable to the listener'. Also important is §27 (WA 40, 150f.) (proper names should be pronounced more clearly and with a special tone of voice, to arouse the hearer's imagination).

<sup>79</sup> The importance of final position is recognized by Quint. 9,4,29. Cf. ib. 67 (though in connection with sentence rhythm): *initia clausulaeque plurimum momenti habent, quotiens incipit sensus aut desinit*. The end is even more noticeable than the beginning (cf. 9,4,63).

<sup>80</sup> On the almost invariable forward position of such adjectives in early prose see A. Reckzey *Über grammatische und rhetorische Stellung des Adjektivums bei den Annalisten, Cato und Sallust* (Programm Berlin 1888) p.29.

<sup>81</sup> When he uses them, he does so all the more effectively: fr. 17 *pessimi - optimum*; 27 *postremissimum nequissimumque*.



## b) Delivery

When Gellius criticizes the absence of emotional appeals, he may not be paying enough attention to the fine nuances in word order, which do make a difference even within the limits of this simple language. He thinks that emotion, hate and irony are not given sufficient expression here.<sup>82</sup> Yet could the orator not put them into the tone of his delivery? Historical evidence confirms what is already suggested by the word order. Gracchus was a master of delivery and actually had recourse to powerful non-literary devices to give his words emphasis. Plutarch depicts his lively performance in contrast to his brother's steady manner.<sup>83</sup> Cicero puts C. Gracchus in the same class as Demosthenes with regard to delivery.<sup>84</sup> In Gaius' case it is permissible to speak of an art of 'register', for we should bear in mind a fact which strikes us as unusual nowadays in an orator: he always had a man beside him who set the tone with a tuning-pipe, whenever his master spoke too deeply or with too much violence.<sup>85</sup>

According to Cicero's evidence, one of the most elevated passages in Gracchus clearly owed its effect on the audience more to skilful delivery than to the mere words of the text:<sup>86</sup> *quo me miser conferam? quo vertam? in Capitoliumne? at fratris sanguine madet. an domum? matremne ut miseram lamentantem videam et abiectam?*<sup>88</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Gell. 10,3,4: *In tam atroci re ac tam misera atque maesta iniuriae publicae contestatione ecquid est, quod aut ampliter insigniterque aut lacrimose atque miseranter aut multa copiosaque invidia gravique et penetrabili querimonia dixerit? brevitatis sane et venustas et mundities orationis est, qualis haberi ferme in comoediarum festivitatis solet ...*; ib. 13 on Cicero: *complotationem deinde tam acerbae rei et odium in Verrem detestationemque apud civis Romanos inpenso atque acriter atque inflammanter facit.*

<sup>83</sup> Plut. Tib. et C. Gracchus 2.

<sup>84</sup> Cic. de orat. 3,214.

<sup>85</sup> Cic. de orat. 3,224. 227. This is the source of Quint. inst. 1,10,27; Val. Max. 8,10,1; Gell. 1,11,10ff. The story is reinterpreted in moral terms and misunderstood by Plutarch Tib. Gr. 2,4; mor. 456 A; Cass. Dio fr. 85,2. Of fundamental importance is R. Büttner Porcius Licinus (Leipzig 1893) pp.80ff. Cf. also Norden *Kunstprosa* I p.57, with the important reference to L. Cresollius *Vacationes autumnales, sive de perfecta oratoris actione et pronuntiatione libri III* (Paris 1620) p.499.

<sup>86</sup> Fr. 61 Malcovati<sup>4</sup>; Cic. de orat. 3,214.

<sup>87</sup> The transmission is uncertain at this point: *sanguine madet* M: *sanguinem* (-ne P<sup>2</sup>) *redundat* L. Quint. inst. 11,3,115 abbreviates to: *ad fratris sanguinem*. This is the source of C. Julius Victor (p.443 Halm). *redundat* is the word to be expected in such a context in Cicero. *madet* is no doubt right. The word is not typically poetic (e.g. Cato agr. 85). The present passage is strangely cited in *ThLL* 8 (1936-1966) 33,29 s.v. *madere* as a piece of Cicero (!) without reference to Gracchus (W. Richter).

<sup>88</sup> The moving words are assigned to a speech made by C. Gracchus in the last days of his life (121 B.C.). (Thus Malcovati ad loc., though without pinning herself down to the last day, like Häpke [p.90].) This strikes the present writer as plausible, but not absolutely certain. May not *madet* even indicate that the murder of Tiberius is not all

It has long been recognized that there are parallels to this passage in earlier and later literature.<sup>89</sup> The links with Euripides are closer than with Ennius. Like Euripides, Gracchus puts the objection immediately after each question and so obtains an arrangement that is lively and varied, but also very clear. Norden has dismissed the idea of direct dependence on Demosthenes<sup>90</sup> (for it is unlikely that Gracchus would have developed such tremendous grandeur from Demosthenes' trivialization<sup>91</sup>). The best explanation therefore is that Gracchus is drawing on the tradition of the Greek schools. The striking similarity with Euripides can in the present writer's opinion be explained most simply by the fact that on mnemonic grounds Greek rhetors liked to exemplify their teachings with quotations from the poets.

If we ask ourselves why the passage in Gracchus moves us, what comes to mind first are significantly not stylistic considerations, but on the one hand the oppressive situation in which the words were spoken, and on the other the masterly delivery attested by Cicero, which held even the opposition in its spell.<sup>92</sup>

The special quality of the style becomes clear on comparison with later parallels, from which we select only Cicero *Pro Murena* 41,88f.:<sup>93</sup>

*Si, quod Iuppiter omen avertat, hunc vestris sententiis afflixeritis, quo se miser vertet? domumne? ut eam imaginem clarissimi viri, parentis sui, quam paucis ante diebus laureatam in sua gratulatione conspexit, eandem deformatam ignominia lugentemque videat? an ad matrem, quae misera modo consulem osculata filium suum nunc cruciatur et sollicita est, ne eundem paulo post spoliatum omni dignitate conspiciat? sed quid*

that far back in the past? This argument could perhaps be used to support the view of K.W. Piderit (on *de or.* 3,214) that the speech was made shortly after Tiberius' death. One would then of course have to rebut Häpke's counter-arguments (p.88).

<sup>89</sup> Eurip. *Med.* 502-505 νῦν ποῖ τράπωμαι; πότῃρα πρὸς πατρός δόμους; / οὐς σοὶ προδοῦσα καὶ πάτραν ἀφικόμην; / ἢ πρὸς ταλαίνας Πελοπίδας; καλῶς γ' ἂν οὖν / δέξαιτό μ' οἴκοις ὧν πατέρα κατέκτανον. Enn. *trag.* 231 R.: *quo nunc me vertam? quod iter incipiam ingredi? Domum paternamne? an ad Peliae filias?* Demosth. *or.* 28 (= κατὰ Ἀφόβου β') 18 ποῖ δ' ἂν τραποίμεθα ... εἰς τὰ ὑποκείμενα τοῖς δανείσασιν; ἀλλὰ τῶν ὑποθεμένων ἐστίν. ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ περιόντ' αὐτῶν; ἀλλὰ τούτου γίγνεται ... On this cf. Norden *Kunstprosa* I Nachträge pp.13f. (to p.171); ib. examples and bibliography. Malcovati ad loc. has missed these important addenda. Here Norden provides more abundant material than the article of M. Bonnet *REA* 8 (1906) pp.40-46, cited by Malcovati.

<sup>90</sup> Leeman pp.56f. seems to assume direct influence from Demosthenes in spite of Norden.

<sup>91</sup> Norden ib.

<sup>92</sup> Cic. *de or.* 3,214: *Quae sic ab illo esse acta constabat oculis, voce, gestu, inimici ut lacrimas tenere non possent.*

<sup>93</sup> Text of A.C. Clark (Oxford 1905).

*ego*<sup>94</sup> *matrem aut domum appello, quem nova poena legis et domo et parente et omnium suorum consuetudine conspectuque privat? ibit igitur in exsilium miser? quo? ad Orientisne partis, in quibus annos multos legatus fuit, exercitus duxit, res maximas gessit? at habet magnum dolorem, unde cum honore decesseris, eodem cum ignominia reverti. an se in contrariam partem terrarum abdet, ut Gallia Transalpina, quem nuper summo cum imperio libentissime viderit, eundem lugentem, maerentem, exsulem videat? in ea porro provincia quo animo C. Murenam, fratrem suum, aspiciet?*

If you – Jupiter forbid it! – crush this man [Murena] with your judgment, where then will the poor wretch turn? To his home, where he will have to see how the image of his illustrious father is now shamefully dishonoured and grieving, which but a few days ago, when people congratulated him, he saw crowned with laurel? Or to his mother, the poor woman, who lately kissed her son as consul and is now tormented by the thought of seeing him shortly stripped of all dignity? But why do I mention his mother and his house, when the law's new penalty robs him of house and mother and the sight and society of all his family? So will the poor man go into exile? Where? To the Orient, where he was many years legate, led armies and achieved great things? But it is very painful to return with shame to a place one has departed from with honour. Or will he hide himself at the other end of the world, so that Transalpine Gaul, which was recently so pleased to have him there as commander-in-chief, should now see him again as one sorrowing, grief-stricken and homeless? Besides, what will be his feelings when in this province he looks his brother C. Murena in the face?

As to detail, one should note how Cicero works out the contrast between past and present on four occasions (with the image of his father, his mother, the Orient and the Occident). What determines the overall structure is that the first dilemma is immediately followed by a second, which surpasses the previous one. The *miseratio* is not limited to the father's house and the mother, but on another level also embraces the entire globe (Orient and Occident). We saw a similar technique in the account of the mistreatment of the Roman citizen, that we looked at earlier. In both passages a climax and a powerful impression of variety are produced by the method of resolution into individual elements and by an arrangement that allows what is more important to develop out of what is less so.<sup>95</sup>

Diametrically opposed to this is the passage from Ennius; it imparts brilliance to its subject, not by breaking it up, but by a tight

<sup>94</sup> *Ego* codd.; *eius* Clark.

<sup>95</sup> It is another matter whether the emphasis has increased with the expansion (Leeman p.57 concedes an increase in *ubertas*, but not in *vis*).

juxtaposition of opposites. Gracchus' balanced and yet brief formulation stands midway between the condensed manner of Ennius with its epigrammatic suggestiveness and Cicero's unfolding climax. If one ignores the non-literary elements (the situation and the manner of delivery), then here too the stylistic effect depends chiefly on the economical use of resources: pure Latinity, clear antitheses, expansiveness only insofar as it is needed for understanding, and colourfulness only as required for the effect on the audience. Even in this passage, which is among the most emotional in Gracchus, a marked rationality<sup>96</sup> is evident in the clarity of the arrangement and the economy<sup>97</sup> of the means.

## 6. Conclusion

Norden has shown that for Roman orators, as for the poets, it was first and foremost the Hellenistic style, and not that of classical Greece, which was the standard.<sup>98</sup> What Gracchus learnt from Diophanes of Mytilene<sup>99</sup> or Menelaus of Marathus<sup>100</sup> was in its delicacy and polish more likely to appeal to the Italic sense of form than to furnish Roman *gravitas* and Gracchan passion<sup>101</sup> with an appropriate linguistic receptacle.<sup>102</sup> In the carefully fashioned sentences Gracchus' temperament could only appear under the surface. It had to find an additional outlet in an intense *actio* involving stance and gesture, and this was what struck the audience most about Gracchus the orator.<sup>103</sup> It is surely clear to any attentive reader of the fragments that in the brief and markedly simple formulations there is a build-up of emotion. This gives rise to a peculiar sort of nervous, ironic tension, such as was observable particularly in the word order of narratives that appear quite plain and factual. The man with the

<sup>96</sup> Following Norden, E. Meyer (quoted p.35 n.5) pp.368f. saw here 'wild passion and Asianic rhetoric'. Leo too was heavily influenced by Norden's view; however he implicitly admits that the fragments are only rarely characterized by an elevated manner (*Geschichte der römischen Literatur* p.309). To begin with, Meyer had discussed the fragments objectively; however he changed his mind under Norden's influence (cf. p.368).

<sup>97</sup> One should note for example the economical use of anaphora. Gracchus also admits deliberate verbal repetitions elsewhere, e.g. with greater frequency in fr. 44.

<sup>98</sup> Norden *Kunstprosa* I p.169.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 104.

<sup>100</sup> According to Cic. *Brut.* 100 this Phoenician helped Gracchus compose his speeches.

<sup>101</sup> See p.37 n.21.

<sup>102</sup> A somewhat different view in Norden p.171.

<sup>103</sup> Cic. *de or.* 3,213f. Quint. *inst.* 11,3,8ff. 115ff. Iul. Vict. p.443,2 Halm. Plut. *Tib. et C. Gr.* 2,2. Cass. Dio fr. 85,2.

tuning-pipe will have been there to prevent the voice being overstrained, for it was all too easy for Gracchus' repressed dynamism to vent itself in vocal over-exertion. In this self-imposed rational control we find an outward reflection of the combination of strong emotion and keen intellect that constitutes the charm of what remains of Gracchus' speeches. We have to recognize in conclusion that in his case the tension between violent feeling and disciplined style is not due to incompetence or to the inadequacy of the Latin of the day, but that it is part of the man's nature.

From this point of view it is necessary to subject both the *topos* of the 'passionate' Gracchus and the views on the *ubertas* or *egestas* of his style to a more balanced and subtle examination. Can we really set Gracchus against Cicero and vice versa? Is it a case of primitive strength versus decadence or artistry versus crudity?

All these antitheses are misguided. As Leeman<sup>104</sup> saw, Gracchus' style is varied. What we have been able to demonstrate beyond this pointed rather to the spirit and manner in which the means are employed than to a one-sided selection.

This is even more true of Cicero. The artistic *narratio* from *de suppliciis* cannot be regarded as the only type of Ciceronian narrative. Here the elevated tone is justified because a particularly serious case is involved. The artistic elaboration may also have something to do with the character of a speech intended only for reading. Otherwise Cicero too is aware that plainness can increase the credibility of a *narratio*. Even so artistic a speech as the one for Milo tells the events with marked simplicity.<sup>105</sup>

Similar traits are also visible in these men's attitude to language. With Gracchus, who according to Münzer<sup>106</sup> never ceased 'being the great lord', a natural feeling for style, as refined by education,<sup>107</sup> is part of his character as a grand seigneur; with Cicero it has become second nature through study and self-discipline.

Cicero's superior artistic perfection is explicable in terms not only of the stricter requirements of a changed world, but also of his stronger literary bent. Yet may not the conversion of powerful feeling into literary form also bespeak a nature that, while perhaps less forceful, is more interested in compromise? What we have here is not

<sup>104</sup> Cited above p.37

<sup>105</sup> Quint. *inst.* 4,2,57f. *callidissima simplicitatis imitatio*.

<sup>106</sup> *RE* 2 A 2 (1923) 1397. Cf. also L. Homo *Nouvelle histoire romaine* (Paris 1941) p.185.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 2.

glowing passion under the surface of an icy rationality, but emotion elevated to literary form and an artistic intellectuality that consciously pervades the realm of sentiment.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>108</sup> The ability to speak simply on lofty subjects, which we have again come to value since the 18th and 19th centuries, belonged not only to Gracchus, but also to Cicero; cf. the chapter on *rep.* below. Cicero has an infallible sense of what is appropriate in each situation (*aptum*).

**ARCA**

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

**23**

**MASTERS OF  
ROMAN PROSE  
FROM CATO TO APULEIUS**

**Interpretative Studies**

**MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT**

Translated by **NEIL ADKIN**

1989

General Editors: **Francis Cairns, Robin Seager, Frederick Williams**

Assistant Editors: **Neil Adkin, Sandra Cairns**

ISSN 0309-5541

**X** FRANCIS CAIRNS