RHYTHM, STYLE, AND MEANING IN CICERO'S PROSE

I. ASSUMPTIONS

This article has a double purpose: to argue for some specific points on Cicero's rhythm, and to show how the significance of rhythm for literary understanding is larger than has perhaps been perceived. The piece is based on a reading of the whole of Cicero; but it will make only occasional reference to the letters. The question of rhythm in the letters is particularly involved, and it will be best handled elsewhere.[1]

The types of ending I shall speak of as 'rhythmic' are these (they are so arranged as to bring out their character as expansions of – ∪ –):

1	– ∪ – ×
2	– ∪ – ∪ ×
3	– ∪ – – ×
4	– ∪ – – ∪ ×
4a	– – – – ∪ ×

Any long syllable may be resolved, including the second of 4a. The list here is conventional, and limited. It in fact fits Cicero's theorizing reasonably well (cf. *Orat.* 162–236, esp. 212–26). He would not, though, have marked the beginning of all these clausulae at the same point or so definitely. In one respect we ourselves should not be too constricted. As is shown by his use of *atque* followed by a consonant (rare outside rhythmic closes), Cicero in practice sometimes seeks a greater length than the above. So particularly he can seek – ∪ – before 1, – ∪ – ×, and – ∪ before 2 – ∪ – ∪ ×, e.g. *Ver.* 5.100 'conuentum atque multitudinem', *Clu.* 194 'furorem atque crudelitatem', *Catil.* 4.14 'cura atque diligentia' (cf. 5, and also *Inv.* 1.70), *Orat.* 14 'latius atque copiosius'.[2]

The same crucial point confirms that 2 – ∪ – ∪ × should be regarded as a rhythmic ending, although it occurs less frequently than the others, and than the ending – – – ×. Cf. e.g. *Balb.* 18 'bonis atque fortibus', *De Orat.* 1.85 'uarietate rerum atque copia' (cf. e.g. *Brut.* 115), *Part.* 79 'uberior atque latior', *Leg.* 3.18 'se gerant atque gesserint' (cf. for the phrase *Rab. Post.* 41, and e.g. *Phil.* 5.37).[3] Indeed, Cicero will

---

[1] The article keeps virtually silent on Cicero's Greek or Latin predecessors or successors. (It may be mentioned in passing that the considerable literature on Seneca's rhythm contains much of interest to the student of Cicero.) The notes occasionally refer to Cicero's contemporaries. It should be noted that | will be used to mark what I consider rhythmic closes, sometimes in anticipation of the argument; but not every such close will invariably be indicated. In §5 below, ⊥ is used to mark the possibility of overlap between rhythmic units: ⊥ is used where the first close may occur, | where the second may.

[2] It should not be thought that two of our examples are special cases because the consonant is *c*. Cicero avoids *ac* before *c*, but his use of *atque* before it is essentially confined, as with other consonants, to rhythmic closes (otherwise he can use *et*). He may be variously differentiated from Nepos, who even writes 'simul ac conspexit' (*Pel.* 5.3), from Varro, who avoids *atque* before other consonants but writes 'atque commutatis' (*L.* 6.38, cf. Plancus and Cato, *Fam.* 10.24.5, 15.5.2), and from such later rhythmic writers as Quintilian, who is freer in using *atque* unrhythmically before *c* (M. Winterbottom, *CR* 42 [1992], 449).

[3] In the last two quotations *atque* even appears (despite *Orat.* 233!) where *ac* would have given rhythm 4. For statistics on rhythms, over different ranges of text, see esp. Th. Zielinski, *Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden* (*Philologus* Supp. 9.4 [1904], 589–844), and also E. Müller, *De numero Ciceroniano* (Diss. Kiel, 1887), 11–30, J. Wolff, *De clausulis Ciceronianis* (*Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* Supp. 26 [1901]), 593–9, Zielinski, *Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden* (*Philologus*

often use *atque* before a consonant to produce 2 where *ac* would have yielded the far more common 4a – – – – ∪×: e.g. *Ver.* 5.86 'propugnatorum atque remigum', *Flac.* 52 'in primis colit atque diligit', *Rep.* 6.18 'neruis imitati atque cantibus', *Off.* 1.9 facultates rerum atque copias'. There are few places where the preference is reversed: cf. *Ver.* 1.3 'minis atque potentia', *Tull.* 10, *Dom.* 145. Such places do confirm, though, that 4a itself must be seen as a rhythmic ending; cf. e.g. *Caecin.* 92 'per eius modi rationem atque uim', *Rep.* 6.28 'natura animi atque uis' (reproduced exactly in the citation at *Tusc.* 1.54). It is not very much less frequent than 4 – ∪ – – ∪×: in Zielinski's statistics for the end of 'periods' in speeches, 7.2% against 11.1% (that is, 64.9% of the figure for 4).[4] However, it is put as a lesser variant on 4 because Cicero so very often uses *atque* before a consonant to put 4 in place of 4a: I have noticed 113 examples, and there are doubtless many more.

The common – – – × is for our purposes best separated from the 'rhythmic' endings, which it does not resemble in shape. One would have various misgivings about including it. Cicero's dubiety in theory (*Orat.* 224) need not of course be fatal; but there are (necessarily) no instances of *atque* + consonant to cancel that dubiety in practice.[5] On the other hand, there are innumerable places where *atque* + consonant is used to replace the ending with a definitely 'rhythmic' one. The frequency of – – – × is essentially dictated by the nature of Latin, and especially Latin verbs, as is confirmed by the experience of anyone who begins to write rhythmic prose. There is also the practical difficulty that, if we take resolution of long syllables into account here too, no ending, if sufficient in length, could ever be classed as unrhythmic, with the exception of – ∪ – – – ∪× (resolutions included). – ∪ – – – ∪× itself (a formulation I prefer to ∪ – – – ∪×) is less favoured than the 'rhythmic' endings, as is shown not only by statistics, but by the absence of substantial confirmation from *atque* followed by consonant.

What of admitting other, especially shorter, rhythms to the class of 'rhythmic' endings? Clearly prose-rhythm is not a matter of rules in the same way as metre; but in practical terms it is best to err on the side of rigidity. A more generous (and less critical) approach like Fraenkel's in his *Leseproben* leads quickly to a confusion even of the real and fundamental distinction between rhythmic and unrhythmic prose: so a clearly unrhythmical letter by Caelius is classed by Fraenkel as the reverse.[6] Within the sphere of rhythmic prose itself, we produce only unclarity when everything can be proved too easily.

II. *ATQUE* FOLLOWED BY A CONSONANT

We begin our discussion from something we have already made use of, Cicero's handling of *atque* when a consonant follows. R. G. M. Nisbet has stressed, in an excellent article, the utility of this feature for the study of rhythm.[7] Its special value

---

Supp. 13.1 [1914]), esp. 3–10 and tables 1–2, H. D. Broadhead, *Latin Prose Rhythm* (Cambridge, 1922), Ch. 6, A. Primmer, *Cicero numerosus. Studien zum antiken Prosarhythmus* (SAWW no. 257, 1968), esp. 161–72, H. Aili, *The Prose Rhythm of Sallust and Livy* (Stockholm, 1979), Ch. 3.   [4] Zielinski, *D. constr. Rhythmus* (n. 3), 4.

[5] 'Necessarily', because the evidence strongly encourages the view that no consonant combinations lengthen a preceding final syllable. (Zielinski's discussion, *D. Clauselgesetz* (n. 3), 762f., is a surprising aberration.)

[6] *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros and Catos* (Rome, 1968), 169–71. None of Caelius' letters is rhythmical. For Cicero on the relation between oratorical rhythm and poetic metre cf., besides the *Orator*, *De Orat.* 1.70, 151, 3.175f., *Brut.* 32, *Part.* 72.

[7] 'Cola and clausulae in Cicero's speeches', in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens* [Festschr. Dover] (Oxford, 1990), 349–59.

is that it is largely confined to places where we find one of the rhythms 1–4a above followed by word-end. It thus enables us to confirm independently the presence of an intended rhythmic close, as opposed to the purely accidental occurrence of such a rhythm. In this respect it may be contrasted with the other main signal emphasized by Nisbet, hiatus. Basic principles demand that the final anceps in a rhythmic close must admit *brevis in longo* or hiatus. Whether a given confrontation of vowels is hiatus or elision can only be determined by our view on whether a rhythmic close is appropriate in that place. Hence it cannot also help to determine that view.[8]

Cicero's normal practice with *atque* + consonant is made abundantly clear when one inspects all the instances.[9] The letters reinforce the point; they also confirm that the feature is alien to Cicero's own language outside formal prose. He rarely follows *atque* with a consonant in letters that are not clearly rhythmic; there are adequate grounds for regarding the exceptional places as rhythmic too.[10] But although the essence is clear in Cicero's works, there is uncertainty about the exceptions, and this may have a bearing later. For myself, I would regard most apparent exceptions as textually suspect, save principally in idiomatic variants like *simul atque* and *aliter atque*; and certainly the MSS can be shown to present *atque* wrongly at times.[11] It might then be objected, when the feature is used later to confirm various patterns, that the instances alleged may be corrupt (or simply unrhythmical). This objection cannot be wholly discounted; but instances can confirm each other, and recurring types of phrase can support particular instances. The feature may certainly be used as a pointer and an argument, if not as irrefragable proof.

We shall now consider more closely what *atque* + consonant can tell us about rhythmic units: that is, about groups of words ending with a rhythmic close, and beginning after (not necessarily immediately after) a rhythmic close or significant punctuation or pause. We begin with a point that we shall linger on for its literary consequences. Cicero should not be thought of as resorting to *atque* + consonant *only* in order to obtain a rhythmic close.[12] When the device appears with particular frequency in a passage, or even a work, it is often plausible and desirable to see a positive interest in the dignity of an old usage. That in turn suggests that the device has its own stylistic value for Cicero.

There are notable accumulations of the device in prayers: three instances in *Ver.* 5.184–9 (also the peroration of the *Verrines*), two in *Mur.* 1 (also the opening of the speech), two in *Mil.* 85 (in the impassioned last third of the speech), and especially six in *Dom.* 144f. (also in the peroration). The last passage is the more noticeable for the

---

[8] Cicero's remarks on hiatus, *Orat.* 150–52, must be borne in mind when we postulate it; but the considerations in §5 below may complicate the matter.

[9] Wolff (n. 3) discusses a selection, 637–40.

[10] *Att.* 1.20.1 (?) and 2 (supported by e.g. *Fam.* 15.14.4, *Agr.* 2.15) occur in thoroughly rhythmic periods; *Att.* 5.13.1 'praefulci atque praemuni' (contrast 5.17.5) struck me so forcibly as grandiose in phrasing that it first made me see the significance of *atque* for this subject. Cicero's correspondents also avoid *atque* + consonant, save before *c* or in *simul atque* (nn. 2, 11). It occurs a fair number of times in Caesar and his continuators (*Gal.* 1.2.5, 34.3, 2.6.2, 3.8.2, 4.1.8, 2.2, 3.3, 25.3, etc.)

[11] So even in the fifth-century Turin palimpsest at *Scaur.* 50, where, the consonant apart, *atque* is used in an improbable position, and is obviously caused by the *atque* three words before. The unrhythmical *simul atque* at *Fin.* 4.34 (for example) is supported by the similar phrases at 1.30, 2.31, 3.16. For such uses of *atque* + consonant in authors who otherwise avoid it, cf. e.g. Var. *R.* 2.3.5 'aliter ... atque fit', *Ant. Div.* fr. 107 Cardauns (cit. Gellius) 'simul atque parti sunt', and note 'simul atque Dolabella' in Caelius, *Fam.* 8.6.1.

[12] 'Quam anxie Cicero clausulas quaesiverit', Wolff (n. 3) begins, 637.

very low frequency of *atque*+consonant in the work as a whole (in 1–143, the proportion of instances to Müller's pages is 7.5%).[13] It is plainly significant that the *Timaeus* has a higher percentage of *atque*+consonant per page (81.25%) than any other philosophical book. This is the more notable since most of the pairs in question have been produced in this form by Cicero, not Plato. The same is true of the translation from Pl. *R.* 9.571c3–572b1 in *Div.* 1.60f., where there are five instances.

Notable too are the striking increases in certain parts of some speeches. In *Mur.* 78f., when Cicero turns to the political situation, there are four instances; there have been seven in the speech before that, two of those, as we saw, in the opening prayer. Shortly after *Deiot.* begins its final part (35–43) there are three instances in two sections (36–7); there has been one in the rest of the speech. *Mil.* shows six in its passionate last part (72–105), none in the rest. Self-consciously exalted passages like *Tusc.* 5.70–75 tell the same tale.

The matter is probably significant even in some whole works and books. The highest percentages anywhere are for *Catil.* 4 (172.7%); *Catil.* 3 comes second or third (83%). Cicero must be seeking to enhance the momentousness of the situation, particularly in *Catil.* 4. *Arch.* has 78.3% or 87.0% (depending on 19 'saxa et [or *atque*] solitudines'); the instances are almost confined to the exalted two-thirds on poetry. Next after *Tim.* comes *N.D.* 2, Balbus' sublime exposition, with 74.1% (I subtract pages consisting largely of verse); the low figure for the refutation *N.D.* 3 (9.7%) forms a noteworthy contrast. Finally, we may mention *Man.* (72.0%): the high figure would support arguments on other grounds that the speech is much more elevated than Cicero's later description might suggest (*Orat.* 102).

All this would appear to indicate that Cicero can positively cultivate *atque* before a consonant, but will none the less normally confine it to rhythmic closes. There is no oddity here if we suppose that such closes have a certain gravity and weight, so that rhythm and language go well together. This point will be significant for our later argument. As to a liking for archaisms (or what Cicero views as such), one may note the passage in *Orat.* 160 on his frustrated passion for avoiding internal aspiration; a more significant example is his preference for *fieri, fierem*, etc., at least in closes.[14]

The other important feature of phrases with *atque*+consonant is that they present us with pairs of related words. These are essential to Cicero's writing in all periods.[15] They serve to give weight to particular concepts, and dignity to the style. A nice illustration is *Tim.* 46, where Cicero, feeling the occasion to be momentous, enriches it with his own pairs (and drops a less ponderous one in Plato). τοῦτο...

---

[13] Of the speeches only *Q. Rosc., Font.,* and *Phil.* 1 have overall a lower percentage than 7.5, and they are as preserved much shorter works. The percentages given here and subsequently use Müller's (and Friedrich's) pages as those of a complete and accessible edition; the precise figures should not be trusted too implicitly. I include only the instances I think probably sound; but one will in any case be at the mercy sometimes of antiquated information. In the very first speech, the evidence for *atque* at *Quinct.* 48 looks far weaker now that we have M. D. Reeve's edition (*M. Tullius Cicero, Oratio pro P. Quinctio* [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992], 22, 51).

[14] See Zielinski, *D. Clauselgesetz* (n. 3), 773f.; Fraenkel (n. 6), 136, is led astray by his loose criteria. I have noted fifty-seven places where *fieri*, etc., gives a better rhythm; there are certainly more. I have found only fourteen where *fieri*, etc., gives a better rhythm (including *Corn.* 1 fr. 34 Crawford: 'fieri oportere', as in half the examples). The scansion is archaic even for Plautus and Terence, who use it mostly at line-end, e.g. *Bacch.* 299, *Poen.* 788, *Ph.* 593; see Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 11 Sk.

[15] Cf. J. C. Davies, 'Phrasal *abundantia* in Cicero's speeches', *CQ* 18 (1968), 142–9. Such pairs, some recurring, are common even in Caesar, and his continuators. In the latter cf. e.g. 'disciplinam seueritatemque' (*B. Alex.* 48.3, cf. 65.1), 'lenitatem et clementiam' (*B. Afr.* 86.2, cf. 92.4).

ἀπεργασαμένους ἄρχειν καὶ κατὰ δύναμιν ὅτι κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα τὸ θνητὸν διακυβερνᾶν ζῷον (42e1–3) becomes 'ut...id...perpolirent et absoluerent, | deinde ut huic animanti principes se ducesque praeberent | uitamque eius quam pulcherrime regerent et gubernarent |'.

Such pairs are often shown by *atque*+consonant to form in themselves the whole or the bulk of a rhythmic unit. The many recurring phrases and types of phrase indicate how the pairs are already entities in themselves. Often alliteration and other devices enhance their impact: one has only to think how 'furta atque flagitia' resounds through the *Verrines*.[16] It is important that these weighted elements are often the material for rhythmic units. Furthermore, when one considers carefully places where the pairs certainly end a rhythmic unit, and especially where they form most of one, one can usually see how they (or the whole unit) bear a distinct and significant emphasis, whether for argument, for emotion, or for clarity.

Sometimes, indeed, one can use places where a similar phrase is not part of a rhythmic close to show that the rhythmic version receives a heavier stress. In the opening of *Catil.* 3, we find 'urbem... | e flamma atque ferro | ac paene ex faucibus fati | ereptam...uidetis |'. The shape of the sentence, the dramatic context, the heightening movement in *paene*, and the alliteration for both 'e flamma atque ferro' and 'ex faucibus fati' show that the phrase is being given more force than in *Flac.* 97 'nos qui P. Lentuli ferrum et flammam de manibus extorsimus |' or *Prov.* 24 'iis qui haec omnia flamma ac ferro delere uoluerunt |'.[17] Without the context one might wonder how in *Vat.* 26 'hominem dies atque noctes | de laude et de re publica cogitantem |' the pair 'dies atque noctes' differed from the similar phrases, not rhythmically separated, at *Marc.* 22 'de te dies noctesque ut debeo cogitans', *Deiot.* 38, *Tusc.* 1.14, 5.70 'noctes et dies cogitanti'. In all cases the pair serves by its nature to heighten; but in *Vat.* 26 Cicero is bringing out the monstrosity of Vettius' claim about Laterensis, at the climax of his account of Vettius' allegations.[18] The inference from the context is confirmed by *Mur.* 78 'nihil dicam adrogantius |, tantum dicam totos dies atque noctes | de re publica cogitantem |' (note *totos*); probably by *Clu.* 190 'dies omnis atque [*atque* C: *ac* M][19] noctes | tota mente mater de pernicie fili cogitaret |' (note *omnis*, *tota*, and the monstrous paradox of 'mater...fili'); and certainly by *Agr.* 2.77 'uigilare dies atque noctes', where the word-order gives the phrase stress and the imagery revitalizes it (note in the rest of the sentence 'intentis oculis', 'intueri', 'coniuebo').

In *Pis.* 85 '...uiolati hospites, legati necati, | pacati atque socii | nefario bello lacessiti, | fana uexata |', Nisbet appears in his splendid commentary to regard 'pacati atque socii' as not intentionally rhythmic.[20] Yet the sentence in 84 'Denseletis, quae natio semper oboediens huic imperio..., nefarium bellum et crudele intulisti, eisque, cum fidelissimis sociis uti posses, hostibus uti acerrimis maluisti' confirms that Cicero is giving this item particular stress, and that 'pacati atque socii' is meant to stand in

---

[16] *Div. Caec.* 6 (here plainly an almost self-contained rhythmic unit), *Ver.* 7, *Ver.* 2.2, 3.151, 4.83; related phrases without alliteration 1.82, 3.111, 155, 4.30, 5.1.

[17] The phrase itself is naturally a well-worn one: note Cicero's remark at *Att.* 1.14.3, and cf. e.g. Sall. *Hist.* 1 fr. 77.10 (Philippus), *B. Alex.* 60.1.

[18] Comparison with the less emotive *Att.* 2.24.3 brings out how Cicero has given the sequence a rhetorical shape. 'Day and night' as a device to enhance is as old as Homer, cf. *Il.* 24.745, *al.*, and e.g. Epicur. *Men.* 135, Enn. *Ann.* 336 Sk, Lucr. 2.12, 3.62, *B. Afr.* 26.4; on its forms in Cicero cf. Madvig on *Fin.* 1.51, Landgraf on *S. Rosc.* 6.

[19] See S. Rizzo's apparatus (*M. Tulli Ciceronis pro Cluentio Habito oratio* [Milan, 1991]).

[20] R. G. M. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis in L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio* (Oxford, 1961), 154.

vigorous contrast to 'bello lacessiti', strengthened by 'nefario'. The difference from *Dom.* 23 (on Gabinius) 'quis..., | quis bellum ⟨cum⟩ pacatissimis gentibus, | quis..., quis...dedit? |' is evident enough.

Word-order confirms emphasis at *Tusc.* 3.72 'illa opinio mali, | quo uiso atque persuaso | aegritudo insequitur necessario |'. Here the placing of *necessario* shows the stress laid on the ablative absolute.[21] At *De Orat.* 2.133 the immediate surroundings indicate visibly the highlighting of a phrase for firmness of exposition: 'unum appellant in quo sine personis atque temporibus | de uniuerso genere quaeratur, | alterum quod personis certis et temporibus definiatur, | ignari omnis controuersias | ad uniuersi generis uim et naturam referri |' (cf. also especially 138f., 145).

From the phrases with *atque* + consonant it is evident that rhythmic closes can be associated with a definite emphasis, at least when the rhythmic units are short. We shall see that this is not an aspect of phrases with *atque* + consonant alone, but an aspect of rhythmic closes much wider in application.

III. RHYTHMIC CLOSE FOLLOWED BY RHYTHMIC VERB

We turn now to consider some extremely common phenomena, either little recognised or insufficiently established. These will further the argument on emphasis.

Very frequently a final word which by itself would constitute a rhythmic unit is directly preceded by what looks like a rhythmic close. It is legitimate, and normally desirable, to view both the final word and the preceding phrase as actually rhythmic.[22] Instances with *atque* + consonant provide support: *Ver.* 1.158 'cui ego nisi ui populi atque hominum clamore atque conuicio [cf. 5.28] | restitissem |'; *Phil.* 14.8 'nisi eum hic ipse Iuppiter | ab hoc templo atque moenibus [cf. *Sest.* 144 'templorum atque tectorum', etc.] | reppulisset |'; *De Orat.* 1.132 'neminem nec motu corporis | neque ipso [NB] habitu atque forma | aptiorem | nec voce pleniorem | ...'; *Tusc.* 1.72 'domesticis uitiis atque flagitiis | se inquinauissent |' (the unemphatic *se* makes little difference). Three of these examples tend to confirm that one can regard $- \cup - \times$ (1 in §1) as a rhythmic close on its own; it is especially common in this feature.

It could be asked whether there can be enough of a break in sense for us to have a rhythmic close before the last word. If one is guided by the use of *atque* + consonant, and by the abundance and coherence of examples, one may in general regard the weight or significance of a phrase as a quite sufficient ground for allowing a rhythmic close (though the concept of a phrase necessarily implies a break in sense too, on a certain level). In the present pattern the penultimate phrase is as a rule actually stressed or marked out. One might then turn to the final verb (or adjective), and ask whether a single word can be significant enough to form a rhythmic unit in itself. It is not claimed that significance is a necessary condition for a rhythmic unit; but here the final word is either stressed or marked out in sense like the phrase before, or else it has simply the important stylistic function of concluding a larger syntactical structure. Syntax too is a relevant criterion. What follows will offer support for these points, particularly that on emphasis. It may be said that one cannot legitimately use examples to indicate the connection of emphasis and rhythm, when weight is being

---

[21] A break after *mali* is desirable. The relative clause is not a defining one: 'uiso atque persuaso' elaborates 'opinio'. 'opinio mali' presents part of the standard Stoic definition: cf. 25, 74f.; cf. further Kidd on Posidon. fr. 165.6–8 EK, and note Varro's use of 'magni boni opinionem' at *L.* 6.50.

[22] Fraenkel (n. 6), 31, clearly recognizes that the final verb can constitute a 'colon'.

allowed as a criterion in those examples for a rhythmic close. Rather, we have taken our lead from a different point (*atque* + consonant); we are now illustrating how the appearance of rhythm in a specific pattern coincides so typically with emphasis or distinctness that one can reasonably allow the reality of the rhythmic closes, and with it the reality of the connection. Many of the examples could in any case be accepted as rhythmic on syntactical grounds alone. Later sections will help to build up the picture.

An interesting passage in regard to emphasis is *Orat.* 214. Here Cicero discusses the spectacular effect on its audience of a final $- \cup - \times$ in a *contio* by C. Papirius Carbo Arvina (*ORF*³ 87 F 4): 'patris dictum sapiens temeritas fili | comprobauit |'. Cicero too regards the final word as producing a rhythmic close on its own (cf. *Orat.* 224); hence this word creates the effect ('hoc dichoreo...clamor...excitatus est'). What precedes, however, is also important and emphatic, and would in Cicero be rhythmic; it is heightened by internal contrasts and chiasmus.[23] One thinks now of passages in Cicero himself: of the obvious emphasis on the penultimate phrase in *Fin.* 1.65 'nec vero hoc oratione solum, | sed multo magis uita et factis et moribus | comprobauit |'; or of the internal correspondences and weight in *Phil.* 14.28 'auctoritatem decreti nostri rebus gestis suis | comprobauit |' (cf., with a different sense of *comprobare*, 5.28 'quodque ille bellum priuato consilio susceperat, | id uos auctoritate publica | comprobastis |').

The degree of stress on the final element varies, especially if it is a verb; the emphasis on what precedes is constant. Both are stressed, for example, at *Div.* 2.96. Here Cicero is pointing out that those born with medical problems can be cured by nature or, particularly, by medicine (note 'arte atque medicina'): 'ut quorum linguae sic inhaererent ut loqui non possent, eae scalpello resectae | liberarentur |'. The effectively concrete *scalpello* heightens the stress on that phrase too: means and result are both important. The final emphasis diminishes a little with *Leg.* 3.34 'quam [i.e. 'legem tabellariam'] populus liber numquam desiderauit, | idem oppressus dominatu ac potentia principum | flagitauit |'. Here most weight falls on the participial clause, as the context and phrasing make clear; but the verb is strong.[24] It is less emphatic at *Brut.* 222, though all three separated units are important to the point: 'ut legem Semproniam frumentariam | populi frequentis suffragiis | abrogarit |'. The peak of the paradox stands in the penultimate phrase. Lastly, at *Marc.* 19 the first *cogitabis* removes the stress from the second: 'de nobis... | quotiens cogitabis, | totiens de maximis tuis beneficiis, | totiens de incredibili liberalitate, | totiens de singulari sapientia | cogitabis |'. *sapientia*, paired with *liberalitas* at *Lig.* 6, here gains a special emphasis and point: *sapienti* ends the preceding sentence, *sapientiam* all but ends the preceding paragraph, and a philosophical asseveration ensues. (Cf. *Deiot.* 37.) In any case the anaphora and the rhythmic series give weight to their final member.

Some further examples of the feature may be added. For a full appreciation of the emphasis one usually needs to read more of the context than can be given here. *Mur.* 79 'non enim deseruerunt [*sc.* 'exercitum Catilinae'] sed ab illo in speculis atque insidiis relicti | in capite atque in ceruicibus nostris | restiterunt |' (cf. *Agr.* 2.74 'quid igitur est causae | quin coloniam in Ianiculum possint deducere | et suum praesidium in capite atque [NB] ceruicibus nostris | collocare? |').[25] *Pis.* 66 'solet enim in

[23] Cf. Nep. *Timoth.* 2.3 'recens fili ueterem patris renouauit memoriam'.
[24] Note *efflagitauit* in *Corn.* 1 fr. 53 Crawford.
[25] For more examples of such phrases see J. Adamietz, *M. Tullius Cicero, Pro Murena. Mit einem Kommentar herausgegeben* (Darmstadt, 1989), 233. *atque ceruicibus nostris* shows an extended rhythm of the kind mentioned in §1 above.

disputationibus suis | oculorum et aurium delectationi | abdominis uoluptates | anteferre |'. *Mil.* 93 'tranquilla re publica mei ciues, | quoniam mihi cum illis non licet, | sine me ipsi sed propter me tamen, | perfruantur |'. *Phil.* 13.5 'quibus enim saeptis | tam immanis beluas | continebimus? |'. ('tam immanis beluas' is confirmed as a separate unit by 3.28: note the word-order. Cf. also 6.7, 13.22, and further 4.12, 7.27; in the last two places the image of the beast is drawn on as here.)[26]

Inv. 1.86 'quare illa a nobis alio tempore atque ad aliud institutum, | si facultas erit, | explicabuntur |' (cf. 2.10 'quoad facultas feret, | consequemur |'). *De Orat.* 1.26 'multum inter se usque ad extremum diei | collocuti sunt |'. *Brut.* 313 '... hoc eos quibus eram carus | commovebat | ...'. (The deviation from the expected 'quibus carus eram' [cf. e.g. *Fam.* 7.20.2] confirms a rhythmic intention. The phrase, like that at *Inv.* 1.86, is made distinct and significant rather than emphatic.)

Ac. Pri. 139 'tune[27] cum honestas in uoluptate contemnenda consistat, honestatem cum uoluptate | tamquam hominem cum belua | copulabis? |'. (The less densely rhythmic version at *Off.* 3.119 occurs in a less heightened context.) *Fin.* 4.2 'easdemne res, inquit, | a parum disserui non uerbis Stoicos a Peripateticis | sed uniuersa re | et tota sententia | dissidere? |' (cf. *Part.* 136 'in quibus omnis aequitas perturbetur si uerbis legum ac non sententiis | pareatur |'). *N.D.* 2.17 'ut ob eam ipsam causam, quod etiam quibusdam regionibus atque urbibus | contingere uidemus, | hebetiora ut sint hominum ingenia propter caeli pleniorem [*pinguiorem* Cobet] naturam, hoc idem generi humano euenerit, | quod in terra, hoc est in crassissima regione mundi, | collocati sunt |'. *Off.* 1.110 '... ut ... propriam nostram [*sc.* 'naturam'] sequamur, | ut etiam si sint alia grauia atque meliora, | tamen nos studia nostra | ⟨nostrae⟩ naturae regula | metiamur |' (cf. *Cato* 45).

IV. RHYTHMIC CLOSE FOLLOWED BY DISPONDAIC VERB

The device we have been discussing occurs also in a different form. In this, a rhythmic close is followed by an unrhythmic close, particularly by a verb of the shape ‒ ‒ ‒ ×. It may be objected that this should make us ignore our doubts in §1 and view ‒ ‒ ‒ × too as rhythmic, perhaps even as forming a rhythm with ‒ ⌣ ‒ before it. It does not greatly affect our wider argument if this final close too is seen as rhythmic. Our real interest is in the penultimate close, which here again is normally emphasized. However, the possibility of a rhythmic close followed by an unrhythmic is confirmed by phrases with *atque* + consonant. Cf. *Leg.* 2.38 'in animos teneros atque molles [cf. *Tusc.* 3.12, *Div.* 1.66; *atque* also in Nonius p. 549. 10 Lindsay] | influere'; *Ac. Pri.* 13 'horum nominibus tot uirorum atque tantorum [cf. *Sest.* 99, *Tusc.* 1.57, *al.*] | expositis'. In the following examples we see the rhythmic phrase followed by 5, 4, 3, 2, and even 1 long syllables: *Ver.* 7 'sed in oculis omnium | sua furta atque flagitia [cf. §2] | defixurus sim'; *Planc.* 35 'si quid est quod ... uideatur | ... homine ingenuo dignum atque docto, | non aspernor'; *Leg.* 3.49 'nos ... cogitare per nos atque dicere | debemus'; *Deiot.* 37 'quae omnes docti atque sapientes [cf. *Phil.* 12.27] | summa, quidam etiam bona sola esse dixerunt |'; *Man.* 36 'quantae atque quam multae [cf. *Fam.* 3.10.10] | sunt [cf. *Ver.* 5.50, *Har.* 23]'. In general, we find many examples of a rhythmic close followed by three, or two, long syllables: so *Caec.* 28 'decimo uero loco | testis exspectatus et ad extremum reseruatus | dixit'; *Fin.* 5.17 'quid autem sit quod ita moueat itaque a natura in primo ortu appetatur | non constat'. Such examples suggest that ‒ ‒ ‒ × does not have a unique status as being rhythmic. It is probably because of its weightiness

---

[26] Cf. *Sest.* 16; and note the scholiast's comment on *Aer. Al. Mil.* fr. 22 Crawford (cf. fr. 21), Schol. Bob. p. 174.8–10 Stangl.   [27] *tune* Reid: *tum* codd.; cf. 125, *Hort.* fr. 26 Grilli.

that it is even more common after a rhythmic close than $--\times$; that sequence in turn is more common than $-\times$.[28]

It would be more damaging to our outlook to view $---\times$ as not itself rhythmic but as part of a rhythm $-\smile----\times$.[29] Such a view, however, fails to respect the sense and shape of phrases: in such contexts the words before the $---\times$ are more naturally grouped to end a rhythmic phrase. It is also significant that where $---\times$ is preceded by what look like rhythms 1–4a (§1), word-end is far commoner before the $---\times$. This would be unexpected if the $---\times$ were only part of a single rhythm; it confirms that we should prefer to separate those syllables from what precedes.[30]

In this form of the device again the penultimate close can be seen from the context to bear emphasis; again the final verb may or may not do so.

Some instances of the form follow. The series begins with an example which illustrates the cohesion of this form with that in §3, where the verb is rhythmic. It turns next to a number of instances, themselves a selection, from part of a single book; the aim is to hint at the abundance of even the present form. Then come miscellaneous examples.

Ac. Pri. 15 'Peripateticos et Academicos, | nominibus differentes, | re congruentes, | a quibus Stoici ipsi | uerbis magis quam sententiis | dissenserunt' (cf. *Fin.* 4.2 and *Part.* 136, cited in §3). *Ver.* 3.77 'de qua muliere [i.e. Pipa] uersus plurimi supra tribunal | et supra praetoris caput | scribebantur'; 85 'quam tu totam [NB] insulam | cuidam tuorum sodalium | sicut aliquod munusculum | condonaras'; 95 (after ten lines on governors and the *equites* before 81 B.C.) 'tu sic ordinem senatorium | despexisti, sic...?'; 105 'non modo in publico | sed etiam de publico | conuiuari'; 132 'nihil eorum te audisse, nihil ad tuas auris | de infamia tua [note the chiasmus] | peruenisse'; 160 'inter impudicas mulieres | et intemperantis uiros | uersatus sit' (cf. *Phil.* 2.105 'ingenui pueri cum meritoriis, | scorta inter matres familias | uersabantur'); 166 'quibus enim testibus? | ...litteris eorum? | ...rem tam improbam, crimen tantae audaciae... | propter inopiam testium ac litterarum | praetermittam?'.

Clu. 142 'hanc [i.e. 'grauiorem opinionem'] causa perspecta atque omni ueritate cognita | deponatis' (cf. *N.D.* 2.73). *Part.* 75 'sed hic locus uirtutum atque uitiorum [cf. *Leg.* 1.38] | latissime patens | ex multis et uariis disputationibus | nunc in quandam angustam et breuem | concludetur'. *Brut.* 239 (on Pompey) 'maiorem dicendi gloriam habuisset | nisi eum maioris gloriae cupiditas | ad bellicas laudes | abstraxisset'.

Tusc. 5.75 'audeant dicere | beatam uitam in Phalaridis taurum | descensuram'. (The words 'in Phalaridis taurum' possess great force here at the climax of the passage; note *uel* in *Fin.* 5.85 and the word-order at *Tusc.* 2.17.) *Div.* 1.95f. 'semper aut Delphis oraclum...aut a Dodona petebant. | Lycurgus... | leges suas auctoritate Apollinis Delphici | confirmauit;... Lysander... eadem est prohibitus religione |'. *Off.* 2.26 (past treatment of empire, to be contrasted with later treatment) 'nostri autem magistratus imperatoresque ex hac una re maximam laudem | capere studebant, | si prouincias, si socios aequitate et fide | defendissent'.[31]

---

[28] Note the pungent effect of the disyllabic verbs for degrading activities at *Parad.* 37 'qui tergent, qui ungunt, qui uerrunt, qui spargunt'; verbs with four longs would not have the same force at all. Compare in English the *monosyllables* Spenser uses of the demeaning tasks inflicted by Radigund: 'To spin, to card, to sew, to wash, to wring' (*F.Q.* 5.4.31.6).

[29] Cf. Zielinski (n. 3), *D. Clauselgesetz*, 729–33, *D. constr. Rhythmus*, 9 f.

[30] Zielinski's own remarks on hiatus and *brevis in longo*, *D. Clauselgesetz*, 732f., provide further ammunition against him. On word-end, cf. Aili (n. 3), 56; one should not count places like *Caec.* 28 above.

[31] The bare ablative emphasizes the means of defence, cf. e.g. *Red. Sen.* 31, *Cael.* 11.

V. OVERLAPPING OF RHYTHMIC UNITS; OR RHYTHMIC CLOSE FOLLOWED BY UNRHYTHMIC VERB

Very commonly what looks like a rhythmic close is followed by a close which in itself is unrhythmic, but would form part of a rhythmic close if taken with what precedes it. *De Orat.* 1.163 may be used to illustrate the possible interpretations: 'me enim et hunc Sulpicium impedit pudor | ab homine omnium grauissimo, | qui genus huius modi disputationis | semper contempserit, | haec, quae isti forsitan puerorum elementa uideantur, exquirere'. One could: (i) deny a close after *uideantur*, and end with *-antur exquirere*; (ii) allow a close after *uideantur* and make *exquirere* unrhythmic; (iii) allow a close after *uideantur* and, abandoning our criteria in §1, make *exquirere* a short but supposedly rhythmic close; (iv) allow a rhythmic close after both *uideantur* and *exquirere*, so that *uideantur* at first provides a close to its phrase, but is then swallowed up into the close of the larger syntactic entity.[32]

(i) cannot be sustained in all instances where a penultimate and rhythmic close looks plausible. That is shown by a considerable number of places where *atque* + consonant is involved, as: *Dom.* 57 'ut me ab omnibus ad meam pristinam dignitatem | expectatum atque reuocatum [cf. 144, *Sest.* 140] ⊥ queratur |'; *Pis.* 3 'cum hac me nunc peste atque labe [cf. *Ver.* 3] ⊥ confero? |'; *Orat.* 187 'quibus implicata atque permixta ⊥ oratio | quoniam tum stabilis est, tum uolubilis | ...'; *Rep.* 2.3 'si nostram rem publicam uobis | et nascentem...et iam firmam atque robustam ⊥ ostendero |'; *Ac. Pri.* 91 'nam haec quidem iudicare | ad ceteras res, | quae sunt in philosophia multae atque magnae [cf. *Man.* 23], ⊥ non est satis |'; *Lael.* 93 'qui ad alterius non modo sensum ac uoluntatem | sed etiam uultum atque nutum ⊥ conuertitur |'.

It is difficult to refute (iii), apart from the whole uninviting outlook which it presupposes. One way is to use instances where the final close is too short to be thought rhythmic even by Fraenkel: e.g. *Inv.* 1.70 'quod ipse magna cura atque diligentia [cf. §1] ⊥ scripsit |' (where *atque* guarantees the first close); *Tusc.* 3.35 'nam reuocatio illa, | quam adfert cum a contuendis nos malis auocat, ⊥ nulla est |'; *Top.* 59, where the attempted definition '[*sc.* 'hereditas est pecunia'] quae morte alicuius ad quempiam peruenit |' is shortly expanded to 'hereditas est pecunia quae morte alicuius ad quempiam peruenit ⊥ iure |'; *Off.* 1.60 'uacandum autem omni est animi perturbatione, | cum cupiditate et metu, | tum etiam aegritudine et uoluptate, | ut tranquillitas animi et securitas [cf. 72 '| et tranquillitas animi atque securitas |] ⊥ adsit |'.

It might be thought that *Orat.* 223 makes in favour of (iii): 'sed quae incisim aut membratim efferuntur, ea uel aptissime cadere debent, ut est apud me [*Scaur.* 45 *m*]: domus tibi deerat? at habebas. pecunia superabat? at egebas. haec incise dicta sunt quattuor.'[33] Yet Cicero's own account of rhythm in the *Orator* makes it improbable that ⌣⌣–× in itself would seem to him 'aptissime cadere'. More likely he feels the rhythm both in *-us tibi deerat, -a superabat*, and also in *-at? at habebas, -abat? at egebas.*[34] The passage thus makes against (iii) and also against (ii).

---

[32] This last line of approach is espoused by Zielinski, *D. constr. Rhythmus* (n. 3), 25f.

[33] Cf. Fraenkel (n. 6), 99f.

[34] Fraenkel himself well illustrates short questions and answers combining into a single rhythmic unit (41, 213). Split resolution does not matter in Cicero. One cannot use Cicero's discussion of rhythm in the *Orator* to show that in cases of apparent overlap the final unit would have seemed a desirable rhythmic close in Cicero's own terms. Even if we regarded those terms as authoritative for us (which would be difficult), most of the examples below would not suit. Those from *Phil.* 13.16 and *N.D.* 3.94 would be exceptions (as would e.g. *Ver.* 4.23 '⊥ Phaselis fuit |', *Dom.* 76 '⊥ honestauit |').

A further point against (ii) is that passages where *atque* + consonant is followed by a simply unrhythmic close are very markedly rarer than those which allow overlap: this is not likely to be coincidence. One may also mention passages where unusual word-order suggests a concern for the final rhythm: so *Phil.* 5.3 'non iam leuitatis est, | sed, ut quod sentio dicam, ⊥ dementiae' (e.g. *Pis.* 32 'id dicam quod sentio' gives the normal order of clauses in the phrase).

It does not greatly matter for the larger argument whether (ii) or (iv) is accepted, that is, whether the final unit (most often a verb) is seen as unrhythmic or as part of an overlapping rhythmic close; (iv) may seem too audacious, and I do not insist on it. If we accept it, the first close may be followed by hiatus, as in two of the examples above with *atque* + consonant. This must then be ignored, and elision must take place, when the first close is engulfed by the second. One must likewise then ignore the original role of a short syllable as *brevis in longo*. It would follow that the rhythmic closes can sometimes be in part a matter for the mind rather than the ear: the mind would be aware of the rhythmic shape. Such an approach may sound rather Kantian; but it could be urged that concentration on the speeches, and possibly misguided beliefs about ancient reading, have focused attention too much on performance.[35] In any case, short and vigorous units should not obscure from one's view the importance for the style of large syntactic structures.

Whether we follow (ii) or (iv), the penultimate close tends again to be emphatic (or markedly distinct). This happens especially when the rhythmic unit in question is short. Sometimes, the penultimate close marks rather the end of a substantial part of the sentence. Very commonly the two considerations of architecture and emphasis combine; but in some cases (such as *Brut.* 197 below), it is plainly the big syntactic entity that matters.

Some further examples of the feature: *Ver.* 20 'qui reus pridie se condemnatum putabat, | is, posteaquam defensor eius | consul est factus, ⊥ absoluitur? |'. *Flac.* 6 'praeturae iuris dictio, | res uaria et multiplex | ad suspiciones et simultates, ⊥ non attingitur |'. (The preceding 'ea res siletur', 'uox...missa nulla est', 'muta est...accusatio' urge us to make 'non attingitur' part of a proper rhythmic close.) *Marc.* 6 'quae quidem ego nisi ita magna esse fatear | ut ea uix cuiusquam mens aut cogitatio capere possit, ⊥ amens sim |'. *Phil.* 13.16 'unus furiosus gladiator cum taeterrimorum latronum manu | contra patriam, contra deos penatis, | contra aras et focos, | contra quattuor consules ⊥ gerit bellum |'. (The surprising 'contra quattuor consules' not only ends the series but is its most significant phrase, as appears from what precedes the quotation.)

Inv. 1.107 'deinde primum locus est misericordiae, | per quem quibus in bonis fuerint | et nunc quibus in malis sint ⊥ ostenditur |'. *Brut.* 197 'ut contra Crassus ab adulescente delicato | qui in litore ambulans | scalmum repperisset | ob eamque rem aedificare navem | concupiuisset ⊥ exorsus est | ...' (In 'aedificare navem concupiuisset' a very full close is produced, with the rhythmic verb *concupiuisset* preceded by an emphatic rhythmic close [note the word-order].)

Leg. 3.43 'inuito eo qui cum cum populo ageret seditionem non posse fieri, | quippe cui liceat concilium, simul atque intercessum turbarique coeptum sit, ⊥ dimittere |'. *Fin.* 2.57 'quem quidem [i.e. 'dolorem'] uos, | cum improbis poenam proponitis, | impetibilem facitis, | cum sapientem semper boni plus habere uultis, ⊥ tolerabilem |'. *N.D.* 3.94 'quae deseri a me, | dum quidem spirare potero, ⊥ nefas iudico |'. *Tim.* 12 '... ⟨eius⟩ cum deus similem mundum efficere uellet, | animal unum aspectabile, | in

---

[35] Cf. on performance e.g. Nisbet (n. 7), 357.

quo omnia animalia continerentur, ⊥ effecit |'. (The Greek, like the context, shows the importance of *unum, omnia*, and the relative clause: 30d3–4 ζῷον ἓν ὁρατόν, πάνθ' ὅσα αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν συγγενῆ ζῷα ἐντὸς ἔχον ἑαυτοῦ, συνέστησε.)

VI. DENSITY OF RHYTHMIC CLOSES

We have now seen these penultimate units regularly acquiring emphasis (or the like); in two of the three patterns these units do not normally accompany major closes in the sentence. The units are most often obviously short (a term it would be futile to quantify). Even more become so if one remembers that one need not begin the unit from the rhythmic close before, or from the last clear pause. The association of short units (at least) with emphasis or distinctness may be seen again in a different phenomenon. When we find three, four, or more short units next to each other, we can generally see that the individual phrases are each being stressed, for the argument or for intensity, or are being rendered distinct, for clear and pointed exposition. The range of purposes can be seen especially effectively in the philosophical works; on these the discussion will eventually concentrate. Many other examples have been given incidentally in the preceding sections.

The notion of this phenomenon implies that the frequency of rhythmic closes is not uniform in Cicero. That diversity is constantly confirmed by reading; the passages in question stand out as one comes on them (in my experience). It may be objected that the assignment of emphasis, or distinctness, is arbitrary, and the appearance of rhythmic closes accidental. This objection can be answered by a careful consideration of the context in individual cases, and also by patterning within the passage. Other arguments too can be brought to bear.

Atque + consonant, since it rarely occurs more than once in a sentence, can in itself provide little confirmation; but cf. e.g. *N.D.* 1.4 'sunt autem alii philosophi, | et hi quidem magni atque nobiles, | qui deorum mente atque ratione | omnem mundum administrari censeant |'. *atque* can, however, be helped by other features in particular passages; these passages can then provide strong examples. So at *Leg.* 2.10 'quam ob rem lex uera atque princeps, | apta ad iubendum et ad uetandum, | ratio est recta summi Iouis |', if we allow the first close, as *atque* compels us to, we must also allow the second (the second not including a possible close after *iubendum* too). At *De Orat.* 3.122 'nostra est, inquam, omnis ista prudentiae doctrinaeque possessio, | in quam homines quasi caducam atque uacuam | abundantes otio | nobis occupatis | inuolauerunt |', the break after *otio* is stronger than, and thus supported by, the break after *uacuam*, which *atque* confirms; 'abundantes otio' defines 'homines'. The contrast of 'abundantes otio' with 'occupatis', the syntactical independence of the ablative absolute, the argument in §3, and the whole ingenuity of metaphor make a close with *occupatis* acceptable and desirable too. *atque* is a little less decisive at *Ver.* 5.65 '| cum eius cruciatu atque supplicio [cf. *Phil.* 12.21] | pascere oculos | animumque exsaturare uellent |'. But the word-order, the stress on seeing in the context, and *Phil.* 11.8 'atque in eius corpore lacerando atque uexando, | cum animum satiare non posset, | oculos pauerit suos |' confirm that 'pascere oculos' deserves separate emphasis.[36]

Even without much or any help from *atque*, parallels can strongly support the existence of the feature. So at *Red. Sen.* 34 'neque ego illa [i.e. 're publica'] exterminata | mihi remanendum putaui, | et illa, simul atque reuocata est, | me secum

---

[36] Tac. *Hist.* 3.39.1 (cf. Suet. *Vit.* 14.2) makes apparent the strength of the phrase in this context.

pariter reportauit |', the closes, and the obvious emphasis on the pronouns, are confirmed by the parallel passage at *Red. Pop.* 14 'itaque neque re publica exterminata | mihi locum in hac urbe esse duxi, | nec si illa restitueretur, | dubitaui quin me secum ipsa reduceret |'. At *Dom.* 93 'si... | ego respondere soleo | meis consiliis periculis laboribus | patriam esse seruatam |', the close after *laboribus*, suggested by the position of *meis*, is supported by *Catil.* 3.1 'deorum immortalium summo erga uos amore, | laboribus consiliis periculis meis | e flamma atque ferro...' (see §2) and by *Mur.* 3 (where the whole sentence must be read; *sustentata* is a dispondaic close, cf. *Sest.* 7).

Before we proceed to the philosophical works, an example or two from the works on rhetoric. We may quote, first, the climactic *Brut.* 143, where Cicero arrives at the supreme orator of the past: 'huic alii parem esse dicebant, | alii anteponebant | Lucium Crassum |'; and, second, the charmingly self-conscious *De Orat.* 3.176, where he displays the art he has just spoken of: 'nam cum uinxit forma et modis [note the word-order], | relaxat et liberat | immutatione ordinis, | ut uerba neque adligata sint [cf. 'et astricto et soluto' just before] | quasi certa aliqua lege uersus | neque ita soluta ut uagentur |'.

In the philosophical works, we occasionally meet a passage where the density is notably sustained. Here the author is usually seeking a particularly powerful eloquence. *Tusc.* 5.73–5 forms a striking instance (we have already mentioned the abundance of *atque* +consonant in 70–75). Corroboration is offered by various exalted passages in the *Paradoxa*. So 18 'te miseriae', etc., or 33 'refrenet primum libidines, | spernat uoluptates, | iracundiam teneat, | coerceat auaritiam, | ceteras animi labes repellat, | tum incipiat aliis imperare | cum ipse improbissimis dominis, | dedecori ac turpitudini, | parere desierit | [cf. *Lael.* 82 'cupiditatibus iis quibus ceteri seruiunt | imperabunt |]'. At *Tim.* 26 the weight given to groups of words by the closes enhances the solemnity of the passage: 'seseque ipse uersans | diuinum sempiternae sapientisque uitae | induxit exordium |'. The Greek original is αὐτὴ ἐν αὑτῆι στρεφομένη θείαν ἀρχὴν ἤρξατο ἀπαύστου καὶ ἔμφρονος βίου πρὸς τὸν σύμπαντα χρόνον (36e3–5). It confirms the points of division and emphasis (and even encourages us to see a close after *sempiternae* too); it also shows how Cicero has reshaped the passage to create dignity through his own devices.[37] At *Off.* 3.100 the simple phrases, especially in the first half of the sentence, acquire an intensity and significance which make the narrative sublime: 'cuius [i.e. Regulus] cum ualuisset auctoritas, | captiui retenti sunt, | ipse Karthaginem rediit, | neque eum caritas patriae retinuit | nec suorum |'. Elevation and argument obviously interact at *Div.* 2.22 'an Cn. Pompeium censes tribus suis consulatibus, | tribus triumphis, | maximarum rerum gloria | laetaturum fuisse | si sciret...?'; elevation and emphasis do so at *Tusc.* 4.51 (on P. Scipio Nasica) 'tum cum consulem languentem reliquit | atque ipse priuatus | ut si consul esset | qui rem publicam saluam esse uellent | se sequi iussit |'.[38]

Vigour of argument and sharpness of exposition are the main consideration in other passages. Naturally, the argument is seldom without some resonance of emotion, and exposition is seldom without some pressure of argument. So in *Leg.*

---

[37] The Greek internal accusative gives a weight to θείαν which Cicero achieves through the separation of *diuinum* (a certain conjecture). *sempiternae* takes on the sense of both ἀπαύστου and πρὸς τὸν σύμπαντα χρόνον (R. Giomini in his edition [Leipzig, 1975] wrongly, I think, denies that the latter phrase is rendered by Cicero). The word is much grander than ἀπαύστου, and also coheres effectively with *diuinum*.

[38] The last part adapts a formula: cf. Serv. *A.* 7.614, 8.1, Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*[3] (Leipzig, 1887), i.696 n. 1. But note the unrhythmic adaptation at Vell. 2.3.1, and the less dense one at *Vir. Ill.* 64.7. Note too the dense paraphrase at *Rab. Perd.* 20.

1.40 the parenthesis at first seems to offer the argument some relatively dry and subordinated support; but with its last member it has gained colour and energy, and leads us into the grandiose passage that ensues. 'itaque poenas luunt non tam iudiciis—quae quondam nusquam erant, | hodie multifariam nulla sunt, | ubi sunt tamen persaepe falsa sunt— | sed eos agitant insectanturque furiae | non ardentibus taedis | sicut in fabulis | sed angore conscientiae | fraudisque cruciatu |'.[39] *Tusc.* 2.35 'laboris est functio quaedam | uel animi uel corporis | grauioris operis et muneris; | dolor autem motus asper in corpore | alienus a sensibus |' might look like bare definition. The context makes clear the argumentative (and patriotic!) significance of the distinction, which Greek cannot match.[40]

   Some other examples, argumentative and expository. *Fin.* 1.33 'itaque earum rerum hic tenetur a sapiente delectus, | ut aut reiciendis uoluptatibus | maiores alias consequatur | aut perferendis doloribus | asperiores repellat |'. (The less usual order in 'reiciendis uoluptatibus' and 'perferendis doloribus' aims at emphasis; it is not needed for rhythm.) *Fin.* 3.11 'dicuntur ista, Cato, magnifice, inquam; sed uidesne uerborum gloriam | tibi cum Pyrrhone et cum Aristone, | qui omnia exaequant, | esse communem? |'. (The names are not only stressed for exposition but slightly barbed: cf. 2.35, 4.47, 5.23, and esp. 4.60; *Off.* 1.6.) *N.D.* 3.28 'illa uero cohaeret et permanet | naturae uiribus, | non deorum |'. *Div.* 1.117 'esse deos, et eorum prouidentia | mundum administrari | eosdemque consulere rebus humanis, | nec solum uniuersis, | uerum etiam singulis |'. (A new unit starts with *et*. For the close after the emphatic 'eorum prouidentia' cf. *Fin.* 4.12, *N.D.* 1.4 above [both confirmed by *atque* + consonant], 2.73, 74 [where the context especially supports a close with 'prouidentia deorum'], 75, 77, 80 [note the pair; cf. *Catil.* 3.21]. For the close after 'uniuersis' cf. *Off.* 2.65 'haec tum in uniuersam rem publicam, | tum in singulos ciues | conferuntur |'.)

   To illustrate how such moments are felt as distinctive in their contexts, I give the whole section in which the last example is set. The part already quoted stands in relief as the crucial point, and also as the most impressive in content.

quo modo autem aut uates aut somniantes | ea uideant quae nusquam etiam tunc sint magna quaestio est. | sed explorata si sint ea quae ante quaeri debeant, sint haec quae quaerimus faciliora. | continet enim totam hanc quaestionem | ea ratio quae est de natura deorum, | quae a te secundo libro est explicata dilucide. | quam si obtinemus, | stabit illud quod hunc locum continet de quo agimus, esse deos, et eorum prouidentia | mundum administrari, | eosdemque consulere rebus humanis, | nec solum uniuersis, | uerum etiam singulis. | haec si tenemus, | quae mihi quidem non uidentur posse conuelli, | profecto hominibus a dis futura significari necesse est. |

   The whole discussion has indicated some particular ways in which the rhythm is relevant to literary interpretation. More broadly, it is now (I hope) evident that short rhythmic units are regularly emphasized or marked out, at least in certain positions; and that this emphasis or distinctness is variously exploited. It follows that the analysis of rhythm is important to full awareness of a passage's meaning and force. Such analysis can often direct one to real points of emphasis one had not noticed

[39] Bake's *sed* for the MSS' *ut* seems better than Ziegler's *at*: cf. *Brut.* 58, *Fin.* 1.1. The oratorical versions of the theme are naturally more intense, *Rosc.* 66, *Pis.* 46 (cf. also *Parad.* 18); those passages tend to confirm the close after 'ardentibus taedis' (note the change in order). 'cruciatu' may be pointed; cf. Calp. *Decl.* 49 'habet...poenam suam: cruciatur conscientia, pudore torquetur...'.

[40] In the preceding sentence 'sunt finitima omnino, sed tamen differt aliquid', rhythm adds an argument in favour of *differunt*; I venture to think it preferable on other grounds, despite Madvig on *Fin.* 3.15, and the editions of Müller, Pohlenz, Douglas, and others.

before. It follows also that Cicero's writing is more pointed and more strenuous than is sometimes supposed. Even in the philosophy his style, however 'aequabile et temperatum' (*Off.* 1.3), is not in the least bland or undifferentiated. Whatever his critics may have claimed about his actual rhythms, in sense, point, and force his writing, and his use of rhythm, do not lack sinew.[41]

Exeter College, Oxford   G. O. HUTCHINSON

[41] Cf. Calvus and Brutus, *Ep.* fr. ix a 2 SB (see A. Gudeman, *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus*[2] [Leipzig, 1914], 316–19), *Orat.* 229, Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.12. I am grateful to the referee of *CQ* for suggestions, and especially to Professor M. Winterbottom for much bracing discussion.