

## ANALYZING CICERO'S STYLE: A RESPONSE

My review article on Professor Gotoff's *Cicero's Elegant Style* seems to have caused him some distress. For that I am sorry. It was not intended. Gotoff is correct that I should have given him clear credit for the novelty of his attention to Cicero's asymmetries. For the omission I apologize. I thought that I had praised his achievement when I stated "That Cicero varies his balances with asymmetry is illustrated throughout the commentary" (p. 305) and "G. is at his best when he explains how Cicero has avoided strict symmetry" (p. 311), but I regret that, in the belief that the reader would immediately recognize Gotoff's divergence from *communis opinio*, I did not make clear the novelty and importance of his thesis.

For the rest, I do not believe it appropriate to write a detailed review of a review of a review. Suffice it to say that Gotoff has either misunderstood what I said or is mistaken in his response. Sometimes both have occurred, as when he notes that I am "unaware that the tmesis of *propterea quod* found" in the *Pro Plancio* "is unique in Cicero." Perhaps he meant "unique in Cicero's orations," although not even that is true. But my comment (pp. 303–4 and 305–6) was on the change in both meaning and structure if the order of *Pro Archia* 10. 23. 1 *vehementer errat propterea quod* were altered to *propterea errat vehementer quod*. The statistic that Cicero used such "tmesis" only once, even if it were true, is irrelevant to what I said, and misleading without consideration of the meaning which Cicero required with each order. The Ciceronian instances support what I said: compare, for example, *Philippics* 10. 15 *propterea laudantur quod*, *Pro Plancio* 61, *Academicae quaestiones* 2. 15, *De finibus* 3. 20, *De officiis* 3. 12 and 3. 20.

Of general interest to the reader may be the proper use of the term "hyperbaton." Gotoff extends the use considerably beyond the ancient meaning,<sup>1</sup> and, although an author may use terms as he will, when the usage obscures important differences the reviewer may express the hope that the use does not catch on. Gotoff had defined "hyperbaton" as "a reversal, transposition, or interruption of expected word groupings" (n. 91) and as "an intentional interference with a natural or expected collocation of words" (p. 70), but he employs the term often for mere deviation from English order. So in 4 *In Catilinam* 7. 14 "cum mea summa cura atque diligentia tum multo etiam maiore populi Romani ad summum imperium retinendum et ad communis fortunas conservandas voluntate," the words *multo etiam maiore* to *voluntate* form one "word grouping" and have not been interrupted by any word foreign to the group. *Multo etiam maiore* contrasts with

1. Gotoff referred (n. 91) to *Rhet. Her.* 4. 32. 44 and 4. 12. 18, but a broader view of the use can be gathered from other sources, including Quint. 8. 6. 62–67 and 9. 16, the *Grammatici Latini*, and especially by observing the circumstances to which ancient commentators applied the term; cf. *TLL*, s.v. Gotoff's use is in important respects broader than all, although he does not seem to recognize the use of parenthesis for hyperbaton or acknowledge its potential usefulness in constructing a period: so contrast Gotoff's statement on p. 235 of his book, "The use of parenthesis is destructive of periodicity," with Pliny's exemplification (*Epist.* 8. 7. 1) of how a parenthesis, used in what Pliny himself calls a hyperbaton, can create the tension and suspense required for an extended period; for Cicero's use of parenthesis to augment the period, cf. *Arch.* 3. 4. 1 and 8. 18. 1. Note that I do not quarrel with the definition of "hyperbaton" which Gotoff gave in n. 91, only with his application of the term.

*summa* (and is emphatic), *populi Romani* contrasts with *mea* (and is emphatic), and *ad summum* . . . *voluntate* expresses a single concept to balance and amplify *cura atque diligentia* and to help form a crescendo (every part of the second rhetorical colon is in crescendo). The quantity of modifiers placed between *maiore* and *voluntate* goes beyond normal and is stylistically noteworthy (and I do not “dismiss” this or any other means by which Cicero builds his periods), but so far as order is concerned the arrangement conforms to the good Latin practice of tucking for the sake of clarity other modifiers between the adjective and the noun modified (if the prepositional phrases had followed the noun, they would have been construed in common with *mea* . . . *diligentia*—inappropriate for *ad summum imperium retinendum*).

There are, then, areas of scholarly disagreement between us. But we also agree on much,<sup>2</sup> including the belief that stylistic analysis must start with the text. It was the aim of my review not to attack Gotoff’s method but to make clear some of the things which he left unsaid or unclear and to suggest ways in which his method needs supplementation, notably by attention to the relation between structure and meaning and to normal Latin word order and expression.<sup>3</sup> I urge all who are interested in the subject to read with care both Gotoff’s book and my review article, without the distortions that may enter in second-hand report.

CHARLES E. MURGIA  
*University of California,  
 Berkeley*

2. Gotoff is for instance wrong to suspect me of disagreeing with his assessment of Cicero’s attitude toward homoeoteleuton. My comment on Cicero’s avoidance of “too much of a jingle” in *Arch.* 3. 5. 1 referred to a specific set of circumstances within the *narratio* and is no more to be forced into a broad generalization concerning homoeoteleuton than are similar remarks by Gotoff: “Through word order and variation Cicero avoids the jingling effect of imperfect subjunctive endings” (p. 203).

3. Gotoff’s response indicates that these two issues continue to divide us. So Gotoff objects that “Cicero’s audience had never heard of Wackernagel’s law.” They of course had never heard of Wackernagel, but if the Romans’ “expectations of sentence movement” did not include conformation to the “law” (except where, by deviation, the speaker indicated special emphasis), Wackernagel would not have been able to formulate it. He did not come by it by reading Indo-European. Gotoff’s reference to “postpositive position where . . . unemphatic pronouns are often found” understates the regularity of some sort of postposition for unemphatic personal, demonstrative, and reflexive pronouns in Classical Latin. Recognition of the operation of Wackernagel’s law is but one small part of recognizing what is normal in Latin expression.