QUINTILIAN ON PERFORMANCE: TRADITIONAL AND PERSONAL ELEMENTS IN *INSTITUTIO* 11.3

ELAINE FANTHAM

THIS CENTURY has been shamefully indifferent to Quintilian, to its own loss. The recent achievements of the specialists, such as Cousin's monumental Budé edition,[1] now almost complete, Winterbottom's scrupulous Oxford Text, or Kennedy's valuable study in the Twayne World Authors series, should have stimulated a rebirth of interest, and there is still time to hope they will do so; but many young students of Classics neglect or resent Quintilian as they resent much that is good in Latin literature, because they see him as a traditionalist and the embodiment of orthodoxy. He was traditional in his ideals and methods, but in a time like our own, when it takes courage to reassert tradition in the face of fashionable rebellion, of extremism and mannered self-indulgence in speech and writing.

Was he also derivative, unoriginal? Does his unquestioned respect for Ciceronian eloquence and theory mean that he made no substantial intellectual contribution? When my interest in ancient theatre and recitation led me to explore Quintilian's recommendations on the art of performance (a better and more comprehensive term than "delivery") I certainly found the Ciceronian precepts, but they accounted for less than half the analysis. On this topic Quintilian offers a great deal of practical advice, drawing on a wider range of material than either the Ciceronian discussions which determine his basic approach, or the cumulative tradition of Hellenistic and Roman rhetorical theory. Some of the most interesting elements in his presentation can only be the direct product of his own experience in the school and forum.

But we cannot measure Quintilian's independence without a reconnaissance of his practice in using and citing authorities in the *Institutio* as a whole. This will not only reflect his own knowledge but will be influenced by the needs of his readers. Who is he writing for? How much do they

[1]The following texts and works which are used repeatedly will be cited in abbreviated form: Jean Cousin, *Quintilien, Institution Oratoire* 6, Books 10–11, (Paris 1976) = Cousin 6; George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton 1967) = Kennedy, *APG*; *id.*, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton 1972) = Kennedy, *ARRW*; *id.*, *Quintilian* (New York 1969) = Kennedy, *Quintilian*; W. Kroll, *RE* Suppl. 7 (1940) *s.v.* "Rhetorik" 1039–1138 = Kroll, *Rhetorik*; A. J. Marshall, "Library Resources and Creative Writing at Rome," *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 252–264 = Marshall, "Libraries;" M. Winterbottom, *Problems in Quintilian* (London 1970, *BICS Suppl.* 30) = Winterbottom, *Problems*; M. Zicàri, *Quintiliano XI.3: La Trattazione del Porgere Oratorio* (Urbino 1968) = Zicàri. Quintilian is cited from Winterbottom's Oxford Classical Text of 1970.

PHOENIX, Vol. 36 (1982) 3.

know, and what access do they have to their own texts of oratory or rhetoric? I shall argue that the form of Quintilian's allusions to Cicero, whose work we can ourselves check, enables us to distinguish between the basic corpus of oratory which he could assume they studied with the *rhetor*[2] and the less known oratory and more sophisticated theory which was the core of his teaching, and for which they would depend on him.

First then his readership. As Kennedy notes, he speaks in Book 1 as a lecturer on teaching methods and in Book 2 is entirely concerned with the teacher, only addressing a casual warning to the pupils.[3] But he sees himself both as a professor of education providing a survey of theory (*doctrina*) and methodology (*exercitatio*) for instructors, and as communicating directly with students. So, in the third book, dealing with the definitions and classfication of rhetoric, he begins with the hope that he will not alienate young readers and refers sympathetically to Lucretius' image of honey smeared around the medicine cup.[4] Later in the same book he gives preference to a simpler classification of Issue, so as to be more serviceable to young students, but his language could imply mediation[5] through their teachers. When he opens Book 11 he is still aiming for the double readership, not only of professionals, but of those still learning the trade.[6] Obviously the man who addresses both teachers and pupils must assume different levels of knowledge and supply what is needed by the least sophisticated, while neither boring nor insulting his more experienced readers.

The modern scholar will cite authorities partly to justify his argument but also to provide access of reference to his readers: serious students are expected to follow up references, but if the author doubts whether they can or will do so, he will probably quote his source in full to avoid distortion at second-remove. When Quintilian sets out in Book 10 chapter 1 his recommended reading list of Greek and Roman writers in each genre of prose and verse, he expects that the young orator who has completed

[2]Quintilian recommends the study of written "classical" speeches in two contexts, both during the student's early years with the *rhetor*: he is to learn to recite them from memory aided by a *comoedus* or *diligens aliquis et peritus* (1.11.4), and the *rhetor* himself should preside over recitations of a *scripta ... oratio*, offering a critical interpretation (*praelectio*) similar to the *grammaticus*' interpretations of poetry (2.5.7–9). This may not, however, have been normal practice, cf. 2.5.1–3.

[3]Kennedy, *Quintilian* 36, citing 1.4.17: *sed mihi locum signare satis est; non enim doceo sed admoneo docturos;* cf. 2.9.1: *plura de officiis docentium locutus discipulos id unum interim moneo.*

[4]3.1.3: *In ceteris enim admiscere temptavimus aliquid nitoris non iactandi ingenii gratia ... sed ut hoc ipso adliceremus magis iuventutem ad cognitionem eorum quae necessaria studiis arbitrabamur.* Quintilian cites Lucr. 1.936–938 at 3.1.4.

[5]3.6.64: *in eo praesertim opere quod ad bonorum iuvenum aliquam utilitatem componimus* (cf. 2.12.22) and 3.8.70: *haec adulescentes sibi scripta sciant, ne aliter quam dicturi sunt exerceri velint et in desuescendis morentur.*

[6]11.15: *nos institutionem professi non solum scientibus ista sed etiam discentibus tradimus.*

his technical training will find available all the authors named, including those now lost to us like Eupolis and Cratinus in Greek Old Comedy and the Roman poets Aemilius Macer and Varro Atacinus.[7] Since up to 28 public libraries were founded between 39 B.C., when Pollio opened up his collection in the *Atrium Libertatis*, and the death of Hadrian,[8] we may conclude that Quintilian's students, even if they might have possessed only a few favourite authors, could easily consult the established "classical" texts. But it would probably be wrong to assume the same pattern of reading that we associate with serious students, or to believe that a teacher would consult a textbook of rhetoric as regularly as he would turn to history or poetry, the leisure reading of the educated Roman. Each new *Ars* would displace its predecessor, and the up to date rhetorician would take pride in discarding Valgius' translation of Apollodorus[9] for Celsus' manual as soon as it reached the bookmarket, while his students would probably be content with the excerpts and definitions dictated to them in class. In this way respect for a great theorist like Cicero would be perpetuated, with a restricted knowledge of his precepts on key issues, after students and even teachers had ceased to read his work in full.

The situation was quite different for the models of oratory, speeches by Demosthenes or Aeschines or Cicero himself. Students were trained to memorise large parts of these,[10] and it is likely that the speeches or excerpts once learnt would be drawn upon throughout their training to illustrate points of *inventio* or *elocutio*. The practice may have weakened, since Quintilian has to remind readers that young pupils should not only read Livy, Sallust, and Cicero but memorise them instead of their own raw compositions (2.5.18–20; 2.7.3).

Two factors hampered consultation of ancient texts: the physical form of the book-roll, which deterred the reader from unwinding beyond the preface or early sections of a work, and the lack of a numerical reference system for sections of the work. Thus Quintilian could only indicate a passage by citing an opening phrase, but even this would not be easily picked out of an unparagraphed text with little or no word division. It is far more likely that the grammatically incomplete tags prodded the reader to complete the context from memory. In fact both prose and verse, especially Virgil and Cicero, are regularly identified by tags, but there is great variation in the frequency of such quotations from one work to

[7]Eupolis and Cratinus, 10.1.66; Aemilius Macer and Varro Atacinus are recommended in 10.1.87 for content rather than diction.

[8]See Marshall, "Libraries" 261.

[9]For Valgius Rufus' version of Apollodorus' *Techne* (perhaps only a summary), see 3.1.18.

[10]See note 2, above, and Cicero *De Orat.* 1.154 *oratione aliqua lecta ad eum finem quem memoria possem comprehendere*, and *Brutus* 127, 174, cited by S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (London 1977) 81 and 219.

another, and illustrations tend to cluster around favourite passages within the single speech.

This pattern is easily demonstrated from one of the best-known speeches, which Cicero never delivered, but published immediately after his court victory—the fifth speech of the second *actio* against Verres. This contains some gloriously memorable passages, for instance Cicero's account of Verres' seasonal tour of duty as governor with his summer tent pitched on the Lido at Syracuse, or the later vignette of a convivial governor leaning on his *amica* and gaping open-mouthed as the pirate captains sailed into the city's inner harbour; there are also two famous horror-stories, the imprisonment and execution of the Sicilian sea-captains, and the public flogging of the citizen Gavius, watched by a Verres inflamed with fury as his victim appealed: *civis Romanus sum.*[11]

When Quintilian wants to illustrate narrative techniques in book 4 he refers to a minor anecdote of this speech by the tag *in Verrem de L. Domitio* and a brief summary (4.2.17–18) which would make it unnecessary for his readers to remember the story, but the narrative of Verres' gubernatorial progress is simply evoked by the title *iter Verris* (4.2.19). In neither case is it necessary to specify which of the seven speeches of the Verrine series is meant. Later in the same chapter the abuse of the Sicilian sea-captains is simply labelled *M. Tullius circa nauarchos*; there is no need to name the speech, although it has not been quoted for over four pages, because the excerpt was famous. The four words of the brutal lictor, *ut adeas tantum dabis* are quoted again, and quite bare, as an example of characterisation through speech in 11.1.40. Quintilian quotes from this sequence of four sections (*Verr.* 2.5.116–119) in ten widely scattered places, a frequency only approached by the seven separate citations of the three sections describing the flogging of Gavius (2.5.163–165). In the chapter on performance he alludes to two passages from this speech to illustrate the violation of decorum that would result if an orator were to mimic the vulgar actions he reported. I quote in full:

non enim aut in illa periodo stetit soleatus praetor populi Romani *inclinatio incumbentis in mulierculam Verris effingenda est; aut in illa* caedebatur in medio foro Messanae *motus laterum qualis esse solet ad verbera torquendus aut vox qualis dolore exprimitur eruenda* (11.3.90)

The excerpts are widely separated in the original speech, but the first is immediately recognisable with only the name of Verres as a reminder, while the second is identified by a tag, like the first line of a hymn or a Shakespearian soliloquy; grammatically incomplete, but enough to evoke the whole excerpt in the educated reader's memory.

Consider how casually reference is given to the sea-captain affair; in Book 6, Quintilian is talking about Cicero's multiple *miseratio* at the end of this speech giving tears of pity *et Philodamo et nauarchis et cruci civis*

[11] *Verr.* 2.5.26–31; 86 f., 116–119 and 163–165.

Romani et aliis plurimis (6.1.53).[12] The figure of climax is illustrated in 8.4.27 by two lines about the murderous jailer; as in the preceding quotation from the *Pro Ligario*,[13] Quintilian gives no speech title, but leaves his readers to recognise it as we would the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." Other sentences from this passage are quoted without reference to illustrate figures of speech: concession at 9.2.51, aposiopesis (9.2.57), change of tense and inversion of emphatic words in two separate snatches from the next chapter (9.3.11 and 43). Both of these are perhaps more obvious for containing proper names. Throughout the chapters on figures and tropes where citation is constant, excerpts from favourite speeches like *Pro Milone* and *Pro Ligario* are given without identification and two sentences from the passage *de nauarchis* are dismembered to illustrate complete and incomplete or suspended rhythms (9.4.71 and 108). Quintilian's public may not have known the fifth Verrine by heart, but there were clearly sections which any student could pick up from a phrase and continue for several flowing paragraphs. How early did this practice of memorisation begin? When Cicero referred in *Orator* to the *Verrines* simply as *accusationis septem libri* (103) and treated them as parallel to the well known speeches of Demosthenes, they were probably already models for study.

The change of regime had brought, however imperceptibly, a change in the scope of oratory. Quintilian's teaching places the greatest possible stress on Cicero's forensic speeches—the *genus iudiciale*. This had always been the dominant *genus* in the teaching of rhetoricians, rather than deliberative political oratory or ceremonial epideictic, as is shown by the scale of treatment given to judicial oratory by the *Auctor ad Herennium* and in *De Inventione*. But deliberative oratory now had no real chance of making an effect. The Emperor knew what was good for Rome and the discreet orator either recommended a foregone conclusion or kept quiet. Hence Quintilian subordinates Cicero's *contiones* and senatorial speeches to the court pleading; they are, he admits (3.8.65), no less eloquent but they are less studied. In an absolute if benevolent autocracy the plea for political pardon of the *Pro Ligario* offered a better model than the *Pro Lege Manilia* (quoted only once in the *Institutio*) or the *De Provinciis Consularibus* (quoted not at all). The *Catilinarians* and *Philippics* survived despite the disappearance of their political *raison d'être* but *Catilinarians* 2, 3, and 4 are quoted only once each, and among the *Philippics* there is the same imbalance; *Philippic* 2 is quoted 15 times, whereas all the others total nine references; of the fifteen instances 11 are drawn from the same section, that which describes Antony vomiting in his curule chair (*Phil.* 2.63–64). Obviously Quintilian, like a good pedagogue, drew his examples from passages that his students already knew off by heart.

[12]The condemnation of Philodamus (from *Verr.* 1.75–76) is cited as briefly at 11.3.172.

[13]Another favourite speech, cited 52 times, 5 times in 11.3 alone.

In contrast quotations from the *Rhetorica* of Cicero are more limited in context. Thus in the historical *résumé* of previous theory from 2.15 to the end of Book 3, Quintilian works with *De Inventione*, *Partitiones Oratoriae*, and *Topica;* he refers four times to *De Inventione* 1: to 1.8 at 3.5.14; to 1.10 at 3.6.50; to 1.14 at 3.6.58; to 1.19 at 3.11.9 and 12; twice he gives direct quotations, but *De Inv.* 1.19 is quoted inaccurately. He names *Topica* at 3.5.15, then quotes from it *his verbis* at 3.5.18 (*Top.* 80), 3.6.13 (*Top.* 93) and 3.11.18 (*Top.* 95). I list these references in full, because they occur in sequence; indeed there is a further unacknowledged quotation from *Topica* 94 in 3.8.28, between the citations of *Top.* 93 and 95. It would be reasonable to infer from this that Quintilian made and worked from running notes; undoubtedly the inconvenience of consultation would lead a professional both to compose his own summaries and to memorise as much as possible from concentrated works like *Partitiones*. Just as Brutus composed epitomes of early historians for his own use, and Varro excerpted precepts of stockbreeding from Mago's multivolumed work on farming for his cowherd to review,[14] so Quintilian will have excerpted and abridged. But citation of theory is restricted. Outside Book 3 of the *Institutio*, *De Inventione* is cited only in the chapters of Book 5 on proofs, examples, and epicheiremes (5.10, 11, and 14) where he combines excerpts from the technical works with citations from several lost speeches of Cicero.[15] Either he consulted Cicero intensively before composing these sections, or he had systematically compiled a commonplace book.

Quintilian's use of *Orator* and *De Oratore* is much greater. It increases in the books on *elocutio*, where he repeatedly quotes in parallel the corresponding sections of both works on the figures and rhythm. In fact the longest continuous quotations in the *Institutio* are the parallel lists of figures from *De Oratore* 3.201–208 and *Orator* 134–139 which occupy 9.1.26–36 and 37–45. Here Quintilian is not only affirming Cicero's authority but combatting the contemporary tendency to concentrate on figures of thought and on the ellipses, ironies, and ambiguities of a highly artificial post-classical rhetoric. Cicero is enlisted to fight his battles, and vindicate his conservative policy of denying recognition to new figures.

However, when Quintilian endorses Cicero's teaching from these works in the chapter on performance (11.3) he has no motive beyond his own respect for his predecessor's values. Though he is much more specific and practical than his model, he begins and ends his discussion with gestures of acknowledgement to Cicero, and it is Cicero who dictates the framework of his treatment.

[14]See Cic. *Att.* 12.56 *Epitome Bruti Fanniana* and D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* 5 (Cambridge 1966) Appendix 2. For Varro see *R.R.* 2.5.18: *sunt complura, quae exscripta de Magonis libris armentarium meum crebro ut aliquid legat curo.*

[15]There is a run of quotations from *pro Oppio*, *pro Vareno*, and *pro Cornelio* in 5.10–5.13.

This chapter, occupying 37 often difficult pages in the Oxford text, is almost a book in itself, and although there are articles discussing individual sections, I know of only one commentary, that of Zicàri, representing his 1968 seminar at the University of Urbino, ironically broken off by student disturbances before he could introduce them to the topics of *cultus* and *decorum*. (Castiglione would have turned in his tomb.)

In view of the length and variety of the discussion I shall begin with a summary of its contents: initially I shall not attempt to comment on the origin of specific sections. There is a substantial introduction (1–13) which, as often in Quintilian, attempts to reconcile the student to the need for training, and which outlines the main division between voice and movement, designed to appease ears and eyes respectively (14). From 15–64, Quintilian is concerned only with the voice. A preliminary analysis distinguishes natural quality (*natura*, 14–16) from its versatility in use, based on pitch, tone, and pace (17–18) and introduces a discussion of developing and preserving the voice (19–29), keeping the throat in condition by exercise, medication, sexual abstinence, and diet; he adds a caution against pampering the voice as a stage artist might do, since the orator will have to speak in the open air and dominate a crowd. There follows an aesthetic discussion of enunciation and timing, illustrating from the *Aeneid* (36–38) and from Ciceronian oratory (39, 47–50) the correct pacing of the phrases in the period. Given a beautiful voice, the speaker can cultivate a stylish delivery by blending the virtues of *aequalitas* (evenness in enunciation) and *varietas* (variety of expression) (43–44). As a counterpart to the physical recommendations of 19–29 Quintilian offers a horrendous list of errors of voice-production, from forcing the tone (51, compare perhaps 1.11, 6–8 on the "plummy" voice) to gulping (53), wheezing and whistling (55–56), spitting and snuffling (56)—all errors of undertraining—to the affectation of sing-song delivery (57–59). Contemporary orators are worse than the Asiatic intoners of Cicero's day; they sound like a drunken revel or nightclub artists; they might as well hire lyreplayers, flutes, and oriental *cymbala* to accompany them.

Finally (61–64) Quintilian uses the concept of propriety (the main topic of 11.1) to relate vocal tone to emotional level; sincerity needs art to control it, while artistry lacks conviction: for each effect there is a change of tone denoted partly by psychological epithets, partly by terms conveying tone (*aspera et densa et respiratione crebra . . . contracta . . . fortis . . . teres*), partly conveying pitch (*gravis . . . flexa . . . inter acutum et gravem media*).

The even longer section on *gestus* (66–136) goes far beyond the brief notice given to it by Cicero, considering each part of the body, the head (68–71), eyes and brows (72–79), nostrils (80), lips (81), neck (82), arms (83–85), hands (85–87), and, later, fingers (92–106). Before describing the individual finger gestures and their significance Quintilian gives special attention to the different standards of gesture appropriate to court and

stage (88–92), rejecting mimicry and a too close matching of gesticulation to the individual phrase. After the physical account of finger gestures he illustrates the proper relationship between gesture and phrasing and the degree of movement appropriate to different parts of the speech in 107–116 (corresponding to 36–39 and 47–51 in the section on voice). Next he considers body movement (*totius corporis motus*, 122) and stance (*in pedibus observatur status et incessus*, 124), and brings his recommendations up to date to allow for the new enclosed courtroom and one-man hearing (134). A list of faults (117–136) includes splaying the feet (125), swaying from side to side (128), posturing (128), and pacing up and down (130); at 131 Quintilian introduces a foreshadowing of his next theme—men who haul up the folds of their toga to thigh level with their right hand and walk and talk while gesticulating with their left hand, "although it is bad form even to bind the right hand while extending the left." But at 131 Quintilian is moving on to the offences of arrogance: whispering and joking aside to friends, reading a speech or using a prompter (*palam moneri excidentis*), crossing the court (135), and the final insult—eating and drinking in midspeech—which shows equal contempt for the profession and the audience.

There are two further topics: a discussion of the care and grooming of the toga (137–149), and an extended review of propriety in action. First the *toga*. Like most upper class clothing it seems to have been developed for its power of constriction; to quote Veblen "if in addition to showing that the wearer can afford to consume freely and uneconomically it can also be shown that he or she is not under the necessity of earning a livelihood, the evidence of social worth is enhanced in a very considerable degree. Our dress therefore . . . should make plain to all observers that the wearer is not engaged in any kind of productive labour."[16] Emmeline and Lawrence Richardson have shown that the early Republican *toga exigua* was relatively practical, leaving as it did the right arm completely free;[17] but even in the Republic methods were evolved of draping the toga so as to restrict the actions of the wearer (*ad cohibendum bracchium toga*) and in the Empire the fuller toga first attested in Horace's *Epodes* was

[16] *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (repr. New York, Mentor 1953) 120.

[17] See Emmeline and Lawrence Richardson (Jr.), "*Ad cohibendum bracchium toga*," *YCS* 19 (1966) 255–268, which uses 11.1.137 f. as evidence. The size, texture, and drape of the *toga* were all taken as indications of a man's personality, so that Suetonius praises Augustus for wearing *togae neque restrictae neque fusae* (*Aug.* 73). These variations can be illustrated from Horace whose upstart wears a *bis trium ulnarum toga* (*Epod.* 4.8; double the usual 15 feet by 10 feet according to the Richardsons). Horace himself admits his bad grooming: *si toga dissidet impar, rides* (*Ep.* 1.1.96); looks back nostalgically on the fine togas of his youth: *quem tenues decuere togae*, (*Ep.* 1.14.32); makes fun of men who affect old-fashioned Stoic virtue: *exiguae . . . togae textore Catonis* (*Ep.* 1.19.13); and measures the restraint due to a subordinate: *arta decet comitem toga* (*Ep.* 1.18.30). The *toga laxa* (Tib. 1.6.40; 2.3.78) was taken as a sign of wantonness, as was loose clothing in general.

customarily draped in such a way that a man could do little more with his left hand than carry a scroll or light object. The exact prescription for the length of the toga and its draped (but not pinned) *sinus* worn over the left shoulder clearly imposed more restraint on the speaker than in the time of the *veteres* (143) who had let it hang to the ankle, and any attempt to get the thing out of the way had to be played down (140 *cuius extremam oram reiecisse non dedecet*). The man who wore it too tightly draped risked throttling by what we might call the Laocoon effect (140, 141), whereas a looser drape could disintegrate in mid-speech to shame the wearer.

Quintilian extends the concept of propriety in *actio* by considering it from four viewpoints: the occasion (*quis, apud quos, et quibus praesentibus sit acturus*, 150) the three functions of proving, conciliating, and swaying the emotions (154–160), the variation appropriate to different parts of the speech (161–174, foreshadowed in 152–153), and the specific shaping of phrases on rising or falling pitch. This leads him to the universal (and Ciceronian) maxim *caput esse decere quod facias* (177), glorifying the style or grace which is shown to depend on understanding one's own talents (*norit se quisque*, 180) and on restraint (*regnare maxime modum*). Quintilian closes with praise for Cicero's advice in *Orator* and the ideal of *viri boni et gravis auctoritas*, recalling the social standards of *De officiis* as much as the rhetorical works.[18]

Up to this point I have left aside the specifically Ciceronian elements in Quintilian's account; they are many, starting from the basic division into *vox* and *gestus* observed in *De Oratore* 3.212 and *Orator* 54; the division into *bonitas* and *tractatio* is also his,[19] as is the equilibrium of the two virtues of evenness and variety.[20] In the last section of the discussion of the voice Quintilian twice quotes from the Ciceronian treatment in *Orator* 57,[21] but he seems to be using *De Oratore* 3.217–219 as his model for the variations of vocal tone to reflect changing emotions.[22]

[18]*Caput esse artis decere* is quoted from the actor Roscius by Cicero *De Orat.* 1.132, in a context which also suggested Quintilian's advice of knowing one's capacities: *quae quibus a natura minora data sunt tamen illud adsequi possunt ut iis quae habent modice et scienter utantur et ut ne dedecent.* Compare *Off.* 1.114 *suum quisque igitur noscat ingenium, acremque se et bonorum et vitiorum suorum iudicem praebeat, ne scaenici plus quam nos videantur habere prudentiae.* For the speaker's need to convey *auctoritas*, note *Off.* 1.124 where the magistrate is to remember that *se gerere personam civitatis debereque eius dignitatem et decus sustinere.*

[19]*Orator* 59: *vocis bonitas quidem optanda est; non est enim in nobis, sed tractatio atque usus in nobis* = *De Orat.* 3.224: *vox quae primum est optanda nobis deinde quaecunque erit, ea tuenda.*

[20]For the stress on *varietas*, compare *Orator* 57: *tam suavis varietas*; *De Orat.* 3.225: *quid est vicissitudine et varietate et commutatione aptius?*

[21]Here the inaccurate paraphrase of *hic e Phrygia et Caria rhetorum epilogus* as *illos e Lycia et Caria rhetoras paene cantare in epilogis* betrays citation from memory.

[22]Cic. *De Orat.* 3.217 indicates the tones for anger, pity, or lamentation, fear, violence,

Although Cicero himself offered only summary discussions of *actio*, Quintilian extends his influence over the present discussion by transferring principles from other Ciceronian contexts; thus he introduces *actio* by Cicero's persuasive definitions of *quasi sermo* and *eloquentia quaedam corporis*[23] and adopts explicitly his division into *vox et motus* (*Orator* 55), but he amplifies this by introducing as the goal another Ciceronian ideal, the power to speak so as to inflame the audience: *ut quisque audit, movetur* (2). Both the image of firing the listener—*felices tamen si nostrum illum ignem iudex conceperit* (3)—and the *a fortiori* argument from the fictitious emotions of actors to the greater persuasive power of the orator dealing with actuality recall Cicero's discussion of *movere* (in the emotional sense) from *De Oratore* 2.189–194.[24] Another Ciceronian feature imposes a shape on the essentially recalcitrant and miscellaneous material of 30–64. For when Quintilian demands that the voice should be *emendata, dilucida, ornata, et apta* (30) "correct, clear, stylish, and appropriate," he is taking over from Cicero the four Theophrastean virtues of *elocutio* listed at *De Orat.* 3.55 and *Orator* 79. But while it is simple to illustrate correctness and clarity of utterance, and style is covered by the recommendation of evenness and variety, a whole range of useful tips about voice-production must be smuggled in under this rubric before Quintilian finally turns to propriety of vocal tone. As Kroll remarks,[25] this innovation does not quite come off, but Quintilian is rather more successful when he adopts the fourfold interpretation of *decorum* in the coda of his chapter, from 150 to 184. The Oxford text clearly indicates Quintilian's direct borrowings from Cicero's two discussions, and it would be tedious to demonstrate piecemeal how he has reutilised every scrap of advice.

It is more remarkable that Quintilian differs so greatly from Cicero in his treatment of *gestus*. He does indeed echo Cicero's distaste for theatrical mimicry, matching gesture to the word or phrase (89 *ad sensus magis quam ad verba accommodatus*, cf. 1.113 and 18–19, quoting *De Orat.* 3.220), but he enumerates a whole range of expressive finger poses, and yet can quote verbatim shortly afterwards (122) Cicero's explicit rejection of finger movements in *Orator* 59: *nullae argutiae digitorum, non ad numerum*

---

pleasure, and resentment or distress. Quintilian matches these: *laetis in rebus = voluptas* (219), *in certamine = vis* (219), *in ira = iracundia* (217); from *in invidia facienda* we have material without direct parallel, then *in metu = aliud metus* (218), and *miseratione flexa et flebilis ex consulto quasi obscurior* picks up *miseratio et maeror flexibile, plenum interruptum* (217). *Orator* 56 compresses these into one sentence.

[23] *Quasi sermo corporis, De Orat.* 3.222; *quasi corporis quaedam eloquentia, Orator* 55.

[24] For the fire imagery in this context see *De Orat.* 2.190–191: *ut nulla materies tam facilis ad exardescendum est quae nisi admoto igni ignem concipere possit, sic nulla mens . . . possit incendi nisi inflammatus ad eum et ardens accesserit.* For theatrical comparison, cf. 2.191; 3.214.

[25] W. Kroll, "Quintilianstudien," *RhM* 73 (1920) 269–272.

articulus cadens trunco magis toto se ipse moderans et virili laterum flexione. A passage in Aulus Gellius[26] shows us that Cicero was probably reacting against the mannered Asianism of his predecessor Hortensius, criticised by Cicero's own generation; tastes had no doubt changed to favour a *poeticus decor*[27] in gesture as in diction, but a modern reader may regret that Quintilian should favour this artificial aspect of eloquence. (For convenience I have set out in a footnote some of the clearest echoes from the shorter account of *Orator* 54–59 which Quintilian seems to have found more helpful than the discursive conversational survey attributed to Crassus at *De Oratore* 3.213–227.[28])

Most surprising is the use to which Quintilian has put Cicero's *Brutus*, the history of Roman oratory composed of individual portraits, often of forgotten men. Teaching method recommended following up a maxim by *exempla*, and Quintilian chooses five men to illustrate the power of good delivery; they are mentioned in roughly chronological order, beginning with Gaius Gracchus and quoting his most famous speech in a shorter and probably less accurate form than that which Cicero gives in the section of *De Oratore* on *actio*.[29] This speech had won special praise from Cicero who declared, without personal recollection, that it had been delivered with such powers of eyes, voice, and gesture that even Gracchus' enemies wept. Quintilian's other instances are Antonius and Crassus, praised in *Brutus* 141 for their effective performance, and Hortensius,[30] who owed his entire success to delivery and lost his reputation when old age impaired his physical technique. These three figures dominate the

[26]Gellius 1.5.2 *manusque eius inter agendum forent argutae admodum et gestuosae, multaque in eum quasi in histrionem in ipsis causis atque iudiciis dicta sunt.* See also note 30 below.

[27]The phrase is that of Marcus Aper at Tacitus *Dialogus* 20.5.

[28]*Orator* 55 *quasi corporis quaedam eloquentia* 11.3.1
56 Demosthenes on *actio* (*De Orat.* 3.213) 11.3.6
57 *varietas* 11.3.44
57 *cantus obscurior*, Asiatic *epilogi* 11.3.58, 60
59 *excursio moderata eaque rara* 11.3.126 *procursio opportuna brevis moderata*
rarum incessum neque ita longum 11.3.126 quotes
nullae argutiae . . . flexione 11.3.122 quotes
bracchi proiectione 11.3.84
60 *indices* [*animi*] *oculi*; cf. *De Orat.* 3.211 11.3.75 *in ipso vultu plurimum valent oculi per quos maxime animus emanat, lacrimas iis natura mentis indices dedit.*
animi est enim omnis actio et imago animi voltus indices oculi

[29]Gracchus is quoted at 115 below "*quo me miser conferam? in Capitolium? ad fratris sanguinem? an domum?*;" cf. *De Orat.* 3.214 "*quo me miser conferam? quo vertam? in Capitoliumne? at fratris sanguine redundat. an domum? matremne ut miseram lamentantem videam et abiectam?*"

[30]See *Brutus* 303 for Hortensius' *actio* and 320 for its decline.

Brutus, but there is no echo of Cicero's phrasing, and it might seem likely that Quintilian was drawing on a more general memory. But confirmation that *Brutus* is being used comes from the last *exemplum*, the censor Cn. Lentulus, whose sole distinction is to have been cited at *Brutus* 234 because his performance conveyed an inflated impression of his talents.[31] His very insignificance shows that Quintilian has deliberately read through *Brutus* to gather material. We may add two subsequent allusions, one to the rustic accent of L. Cotta,[32] who aimed to sound old-fashioned, and another to the sweet enunciation, *suavis appellatio litterarum*, of Q. Catulus.[33] Indeed Quintilian goes to *Brutus* not only for Cicero's youthful reminiscences of men he had heard in action, but even to echo Cicero's report of the melodious delivery of Cornelius Cethegus, consul in 204 B.C., and to borrow a phrase of Ennius from Cicero's transmission; this borrowing is confirmed when he continues in the same passage to recall Cicero's words in *Brutus* condemning rabble-orators who bark instead of pleading.[34]

In fact *Brutus* is quoted by Quintilian less than any other of Cicero's *Rhetorica*, but of the nineteen quotations scattered through the *Institutio*, thirteen are gathered in this chapter. For defects he borrows repeatedly from *Brutus*, citing Calidius for two separate failings (*Brutus* 278, quoted at 123 and 155) and Titius for his dance-like frivolity (*Brutus* 224, quoted 128) following up at 129 with two hilarious stories about the elder Curio. This man used to saw and throw his arms about as he spoke, so that one wit asked "who was the fellow trying to talk from a dinghy?" while another turned to Curio's heavily medicated and bandaged colleague, saying "*numquam, Octavi, collegae tuae gratiam referes: qui nisi se suo more iactavisset, hodie te istic muscae comedissent*" (*Brutus* 216–217, quoted with only the slight change of transferring a phrase from direct into indirect speech.) Why did Quintilian not draw his examples from his own experience? He speaks elsewhere of great orators of his youth: for instance he respected the merits of his teacher Domitius Afer, but although he speaks with deep feeling in 12.11.3 about Domitius' decline as a performer when he failed to retire in time, he does not use his old teacher to illustrate either the defects or special successes of *actio*. Domitius does feature in this chapter, but only for his acid witticism against the wretched Manlius Sura—who would in fact have been a perfect example for Quintilian's

[31] *Cn. . . . Lentulus multo maiorem opinionem dicendi actione faciebat quam quanta in eo facultas erat* (234).

[32] Cotta is so described both at *De Oratore* 3.42 and *Brutus* 259.

[33] Is this the younger or the elder Catulus? Compare the wording of 11.3.35 with *Brutus* 133: *de sono vocis et suavitate appellandarum litterarum*, and 259: *suavitas vocis et lenis appellatio litterarum.*

[34] Compare 11.3.31 *Quod Ennius probat cum dicit 'suaviloquenti ore' Cethegum fuisse, non quod Cicero in iis reprehendit quos ait latrare, non agere* with *Brutus* 58 *latrant enim iam quidam oratores non loquuntur.*

fools' gallery; with 127, compare the fuller account in 6.3.54: *Afer enim venuste Manlium Suram multum in agendo discursantem, salientem, manus iactantem, togam deicientem et reponentem, non agere dixit, sed satagere.* Again Quintilian enormously admired Trachalus: he tells us in his critical list of recommended authors (10.1.199) that Trachalus was superb, and even greater when you heard him—*auditus tamen maior.* For he had incomparable *felicitas* of voice, and his delivery would have done credit to the stage, besides which he had the utmost grace (*decor*). Why then does Quintilian pass over Trachalus, when his real subject is performance? Apart from the wisecrack of Afer and another from the late Augustan Cassius Severus (133), there is neither a description or quotation of any orator from the four generations since Cicero's death in the whole long chapter.

Yet this is an extraordinarily rich discussion, and I would like to counteract my stress on Quintilian's Ciceronianism by illustrating some of the many elements other than Ciceronian theory which have gone into the composition of this account.

The first incontrovertibly new element, independent of Ciceronian theory, is paradoxically the mass of citations from Ciceronian practice. Thus Quintilian demonstrates the art of pausing to register punctuation from the classic description of Antony vomiting in the second *Philippic* (2.62–63, cited at 39). The need to change expressions with the emotional content of each phrase is illustrated from the famous opening of the perhaps undelivered version of the *Pro Milone* (47–50) and the proper division of a sentence into sub-units for the purpose of gesticulation is shown in the opening of the *Pro Ligario* (108–110). Towards the end, a series of emotional colourings is suggested for well-known purple passages and moments of exclamation from eight speeches—a three-word tag identifies *pro Cluentio* 14, and Antony's nausea is cited for the second time. But alongside Cicero, Quintilian uses speeches from Virgil, half-lines from the *Aeneid*, unidentified, and grouped out of order: e.g., in 176, a half-line from *Aeneid* 1, another from the third Eclogue, yet another from *Aeneid* 1, and two half-lines from Book 2; we also have an excerpt from Horace, to caution against the unattractive gesture of wrinkling the nostrils in disgust.[35] Virgil is a model of eloquence, Horace more often an *arbiter elegantiae.*

A second category is more ambiguous, comprising references to Greek oratory, predominantly Demosthenes and his rival Aeschines; there are no references to classical Greek rhetoricians in this chapter. Demosthenes opens the chapter as the twin pillar alongside Cicero; Quintilian rests the supremacy of *actio* in the good orator on their double authority and retells two anecdotes that occur together in *De Oratore* 3.213; one of these, in which Demosthenes gave to *actio* (*hypocrisis*) first, second, and third prize, is also told in both *Brutus* and *Orator.* But Quintilian adds a detail

[35]From *Epist.* 1.5.23: *ne sordida mappa/corruget nares.*

not found in Cicero or indeed in Plutarch's life; only the pseudo-Plutarchian *Lives of the Ten Orators* reports, in connection with this story about *hypocrisis*, that Demosthenes studied with Andronicus; and this life used more than one source, for later it reports his work with another actor, Neoptolemus, while Plutarch himself speaks of his studying with Satyrus.[36] Yet neither Greek authority has the second anecdote, told by Cicero of Aeschines in exile; asked by the Rhodians why Demosthenes had defeated his own fine speech, he said "ah, but you should have heard him yourselves." Clearly Quintilian has at least one other source besides Cicero. Anecdotes about Demosthenes began to be gathered even in his lifetime by Demetrius of Phalerum, to whom Plutarch credits three other details (*Demosth.* 11) also found in our chapter. A favourite theme was his training methods, and his need to overcome his scant breath and lispings r's. Quintilian reports three of his practice techniques: that he climbed steep hills reciting as many lines as possible without pause, that he spoke with pebbles in his mouth (54), and that he used to declaim in front of a mirror, although it only gave him a reverse image (68); these come ultimately from Demetrius. But he also reports that Demosthenes cured his tendency to move his shoulders excessively by speaking on a narrow platform with a spear suspended overhead; only the pseudo-Plutarchian *Life* has this tale, in a version which replaces the spear with a dagger or spit. We cannot tell how it came to Quintilian. The Greek sources also have a strange tale that Demosthenes used to practise in a subterranean chamber, shaving half his head to keep himself from going out in public. This is absent from Cicero but seems to underlie Quintilian's report at 10.3.25.[37] In contrast the details of his actual performance that survive in Quintilian seem to come through Cicero: thus his low submissive opening to *De Corona* is described in *Orator* 26, and the mutual reproaches of Demosthenes and Aeschines for their use of pathetic inflexions of the voice are reported in Cicero's central discussion of *actio* at *Orator* 57: *cum alter alteri obiecit vocis flexiones* is reproduced at 11.3.168 as *illae inclinationes vocis quas invicem Demosthenes atque Aeschines exprobrabant.*[38]

[36]On Demosthenes' training methods see V. D'Agostino, *RCS* 4 (1956) 145–150. Note that Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 53 refers not only to the original account of Demetrius of Phaleron, but to "all the others who have written his biography." I have presented in diagram a comparative content analysis of Quintilian's reports against Cicero, Plutarch's *Life*, and pseudo-Plutarch, *Vita decem oratorum* (see Appendix).

[37]Quintilian omits reference to shaving the scalp and to the underground chamber, probably because he does not want to recommend extreme measures.

[38]As Sandys notes on *Orator* 58 this allusion could draw directly on the famous speeches themselves, cf. Dem. *De Cor.* 259, 280, and 291; Aesch. *In Ctes.* 209–210. Cicero had planned to translate both speeches into Latin, and shows a close knowledge of *De Corona* again at *Orator* 26 and 27, where he translates from *De Cor.* 232 what may be the only allusion to Demosthenes' hand gestures in ancient literature: *negat in eo positas esse*

Another "Greek" element is the Homeric allusion at 158, that Ulysses composed himself for speech by standing briefly with his eyes lowered and holding his sceptre still. This derives from a rhetorical *topos* that can be traced as early as Plato's *Phaedrus* (261b) representing Homer's Greek leaders as models of eloquence. The tradition, based on two passages, one portraying Nestor's soothing counsel at *Il.* 1.247–249, the other describing the joint embassy of Menelaus and Ulysses in *Il.* 3.215–224, was later adapted to associate each leader with one of the three levels of style. Ulysses, as the representative of the grand style, became the model orator for Cicero (*Brutus* 40) and Quintilian, who quotes this passage (omitting the detail of 11.3.158) at 12.10.64: *sed summam aggressus in Ulixi facundiam magnitudinem illi iunxit.*[39]

But there may be an overlap with the third category of non-Ciceronian material, since both the Demosthenic training anecdotes and the Homeric exempla may have enlivened the technical treatises of Greek and Roman writers on voice production and gesture, or *cheironomia.*[40] Cicero was well aware of variations in vocal quality and problems of voice-production, since he had himself undergone a complete retraining when threatened by tuberculosis in his twenties.[41] Indeed he enumerates different types and timbres of voice not only in the section of *De Oratore* devoted to *actio*, but in the earlier discussion of natural talent and *decere*, which we noted as being used by Quintilian for his summing-up of this whole chapter. Like Quintilian, for instance, he warns against speaking after a heavy meal,[42] but he would have thought it ungentlemanly to go into technical details of exercise, or speak too explicitly about the medical conditions affecting the nose and throat. Such details were the business of the *phonaskoi*[43]

---

fortunas Graeciae, hocin an illo verbo usus sit, huc an illuc manum porrexerit. See also Zicàri 84–86.

[39]See G. Kennedy "The Ancient Dispute over Rhetoric in Homer," *AJP* 78 (1959) 23–35, and R. G. Austin's commentary on 12.10.64.

[40]On *Cheironomia* see Robert P. Sonkowski, "An Aspect of Delivery in Ancient Rhetorical Theory," *TAPA* 90 (1959) 256–274 and C. Sittl, *Die Gebärde der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 1890) ch. 11, "Schauspieler und Redner," with an annotated appendix on this chapter (11.3.65 f.). The Latin for *cheironomein* is *manus iactare* (6.3.54, 11.3.179; cf. Prop. 4.8.42, Ovid *Fasti* 3.536, and Juvenal 3.106).

[41]Cicero *Brutus* 314: *ut consuetudinem dicendi mutarem, ea causa mihi in Asiam proficiscendi fuit.*

[42]Warning against exercise after eating, 11.3.26, cf. Cic. *De Orat.* 1.115 and Aristotle *Problems* 11, 22 where however *phonaskein* (see n. 43 below) is specifically referred to stage actors and chorus.

[43]For *phonaskoi* see Johanna Schmidt, *RE* 20A (1941) 522–526, on which I base this note. The concept of *phonaskia*, like the verb, is known from the fourth century, when Demosthenes despite his own intense vocal training speaks of Aeschines' *phonaskia* as part of his attacks on the ex-actor at *De Cor.* 280 and *De falsa Leg.* 255, 336.But although such training is attested both for Demosthenes' time in Athens and at Rome from the time of Gaius Gracchus, Cicero speaks of it as appropriate only for *tragoedi* (see *De Orat.*

who were no doubt usually Greek, like their designation. There is a rash of Greek terms in this section; the punctuation pauses, *hypodiastole* and *hypostigma* (36–37), the synonyms for the fault of *monoeidea* or *monotonia* (44–45), and the paraphrase at 51 of *kokkusmos, cui Graeci nomen a gallorum immaturo cantu dederunt,* for the vocal scoops of the pubescent male, and the affliction of *brasmos,*[44] or bronchial wheeze, in 55.

In writing on gesture Cicero's distaste for technicalities and his own literary emphasis had limited his comment to a general affirmation of the importance of physical deportment, placing more stress on the expression of the eyes and set of the head than the rest of the body; his own main tenet was propriety and the consequent restraint of the orator's gestures in comparison with those of the stage. But tastes change; *iam recepta est actio paulo agitatior* (11.3.184), and so Quintilian finds it worthwhile to spend fifteen sections on the symbolic or emotion-related finger-groupings in combination with different poses or movements of the arms, raising them and letting them fall, bringing them up towards the face or thrusting them away in repudiation, or sweeping them to either side. The severe limitations on the use of the left arm (cf. 93, 113, and 114 *manus sinistra nunquam sola gestum facit*) are probably based more on the constrictions of the *toga,*[45] whose *sinus* must not be allowed to break loose before the more moving part of the oration (142, 145), than on any archetypal

---

1.251 quoted below) and the professional title *phonaskos* is not attested in Greek or Latin before the first century A.D.; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 84 (which could be taken as evidence for the use of the professional title in Augustus' time), *Nero* 25, and Tac. *Ann.* 14.15. Thus Quintilian is actually the earliest extant author in either language to use the noun *phonaskos.* Schmidt traces the requirements of diet and exercise for vocal training from Plato *Leg.* 2.665e to the medical writers, although the first known textbook of *phonaskia* is reported in the second century A.D. by Diogenes Laertius (2.819) as the work of an undated Theodorus. These *phonaskoi* should be distinguished from the *comoedus* of whom Quintilian writes at 1.11.12 as well as from the *doctores scaenici* of 11.3.71 below, who were presumably concerned with acting as such. For the exercises of the *phonaskos,* compare Cicero's description in *De Orat.* 1.251: *me auctore nemo dicendi studiosus Graecorum more tragoedorum voci serviet qui et annos complures sedentes declamitant et cotidie antequam pronuntient vocem cubantes sensim excitant, eandemque cum egerunt sedentes ab acutissimo sono usque ad gravissimum sonum recipiunt et quasi quodam modo conligunt,* with *Inst.* 2.8.15: *non satis est dicere presse tantum aut subtiliter aut aspere, non magis quam phonasco acutis tantum aut mediis aut gravibus sonis aut horum etiam particulis excellere. Nam sicut cithara ita oratio perfecta non est nisi ab imo ad summum omnibus intenta nervis consentiat.* Cicero's description sounds like a standard exercise still used to develop the vocal range and ensure continuity from the head into the chest register. (I have not been able to consult A. Krumbacher, *Die Stimmbildung der Redner im Altertum* [Schöningen 1921].)

[44]The MSS here read *bramon,* except for Valla's text where *branchon* is probably his own conjecture. *Brasmos* from *brassein* ("to seethe") is Butler's emendation, adopted by most modern editors.

[45]See Cousin 6, p. 369 for a survey of ancient and modern literature on the etiquette of the *toga.*

taboos such as control the use of the left hand in Islamic society. There is further evidence of changing taste in Quintilian's comments on the more flamboyant gestures: although he endorses the detailed hand gestures, and accepts the practice traditionally attributed to the demagogue Cleon[46] of smiting the thigh in vehement oratory, he cannot approve of smiting the brow to convey indignation; the gesture is seen as artificial,[47] and indeed even clasping hands and beating the breast is regarded as theatrical. He may be drawing throughout on any of the three Roman writers *de gestu* whom he later acknowledges, Plotius and Nigidius, Cicero's contemporaries,[48] or Pliny the Elder, quoted twice, once for a cheap accusation that Cicero wore his *toga* long to conceal varicose veins (143), and once for his recommendations (148) to be cautious in wiping the brow with one's handkerchief so as to avoid disarranging one's hair. Quintilian also notes in Laenas the use of an odd term, *inotiosam* (183),[49] taken over from the *Veteres*, who in turn had translated it from the Greek. This, then, is a tradition which had been Roman for several generations, and Quintilian need not himself have consulted any Greek sources.

However, the tradition of gesture certainly went back to Greek theory, and it seems likely that the practice of the courts was an offshoot of the older concern with gesture in the theatre. Quintilian seems to have been an observant spectator, and he is the only literary source for some of the theatrical practices mentioned in this chapter. Gesture and delivery were usually taught by *comoedi*, just as the Demosthenic tradition assigns three different actors as his teachers. In the first book, however, Quintilian discusses the role of the *répétiteur* in training because this was the recognised practice, not as his own recommendation. In fact when the young student advances from reciting comic speeches to classical court oratory Quintilian substitutes for the *comoedus* as a coach *diligens aliquis ac peritus* (1.11.14), reflecting Roman preference for the gentlemanly layman. Like Cicero he deprecated the flamboyance of stage gesture, with its twin excesses of mimicry and unmanly gracefulness. Cicero's friendship

[46] 11.3.123. Compare Plut. *Nicias* on Cleon's introduction of this and other unrestrained gestures into the oratory of the *ecclesia*. Zicàri cites Ovid *Met.* 11.81 and Sen. *De Ira* 1.16 for other instances of this gesture of anger.

[47] 11.3.123: *quamquam, si licet, de fronte dissentio; nam etiam complodere manus scaenicum est, et pectus caedere.*

[48] Plotius, if this is Plotius Gallus, is really a generation before Cicero, since he introduced the teaching of Latin rhetoric at Rome before the censorship of Crassus and Ahenobarbus in 92 B.C. (see Suet. *Rhet.* 26). It would seem that this emphasis on delivery and gesture answered the new need to appeal to the less educated public, since we find it associated with both Gaius Gracchus and the party of C. Marius.

[49] *Inotiosam* has little manuscript authority, being attested only in the late Parisinus lat. 7723, but it offers the right sense of "busy," "fussy," perhaps rendering Greek *ascholos*, since *negotiosus* already had a different connotation. The paradosis gives the unintelligible *mocosam*, which Winterbottom obelises. Laenas was a contemporary of Celsus, perhaps a generation before Quintilian, cf. 3.1.21.

with the famous Roscius[50] had interested him in the affinities between the requirements of stage and forum (both, of course, open-air and large-scale in Cicero's day). Nevertheless it is Quintilian who shows a greater familiarity with stage-production, offering details of theatrical practice for which we sometimes have no other evidence. Besides the running thread of allusion, we might note in 73–75 Quintilian's argument for the importance of expression, recalling the tradition that playwrights composed a stage role and actors prepared it by gazing at its mask,[51] whose fixed expression would associate great roles with a single dominant mood—for example, the savagery of Medea or the brutal confidence of Hercules. He also compares the different mannerisms of comic types, and the custom of designing the leading-father's mask with one severe frowning eyebrow and one benign relaxed brow, so that the appropriate side of the mask might be presented to the audience in each scene.[52] In warning the orator against vulgarly imitative gestures, he first quotes examples from oratory, where the speaker is required to describe ugly or shameful postures without imitating them, then (91) a vocal equivalent, when the comic actor playing a young man in a Menander play adopts a quavering tone to quote an old man's words.[53] When Quintilian contrasts in passing the different pace of the comic actor Roscius and the tragic hero Aesopus, the allusion must be second-hand, since both men were long dead; but he has a more detailed personal appraisal of two contemporary comic

[50]Roscius and Cicero had been friends at least since 76 B.C., when Cicero delivered *Pro Roscio comoedo*, acting for him against a professional partner, Fannius. Cicero quotes Roscius' views in *De Orat.* 1.129–133 and 254 and comments on his excellence in gesture at 1.124 and 251: *quis neget opus esse oratori in hoc oratorio motu statuque Roscii gestum et venustatem*? But Quintilian refers to Roscius only in 11.3. (111, cf. the indirect allusion of 177), and in Tacitus *Dialogus* 20.3 the modernist Aper rejects his gesture as unacceptable on the contemporary stage.

[51]Apart from this passage the practice is known to us only from visual representations. See T. B. L. Webster, "The Poet and the Mask," in *Classical Drama and its Influence: Essays Presented to H. D. F. Kitto* (London 1965) 5–13. There are many reliefs of Menander (or a comic poet) contemplating the masks of the three leading roles in a comedy (illustrated in A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*[2] [Oxford 1968] figs. 88 and 109). For the tragic actor contemplating his mask, compare the Gnathia vase and the painting from Herculaneum illustrated in Pickard-Cambridge figs. 54a and 55.

[52]The only literary evidence for this mask besides Quintilian 11.3.74 is at Pollux 4.144, who describes the leading old man (*cuius praecipuae partes sunt*) as having the right eyebrow raised. See Pickard-Cambridge 223 no. 3 (and perhaps 224 no. 7) and figs. 108 and 110, in which the angry old man is identified as this type by Webster.

[53]At first sight it is strange that Quintilian illustrates this feature from Menander rather than from one of the classic Terentian adaptations, such as Chaerea's mockery of his father's old friend at *Eun.* 335–342. But it is clear from Quintilian's own comments at 10.1.71 that Menander was used by rhetors as training for declamation, for he particularly recommends the plays as practice in *ethopoeia*. So also Statius *Silvae* 2.114 describes an educated young slave declaiming Menander. For full discussion of the role of Menander in education with *grammaticus* and *rhetor* see S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley 1977) 215–218 and 224.

actors, Demetrius and Stratocles:[54] both were successful, but Demetrius played ladies and gentlemen, whether young ingenues or father-roles, and was a superb exponent of mannered or feminine gesture, whereas Stratocles specialised in slaves, pimps, and parasites, and the more lively roles which made an asset of his bustling gait, his excessive laughter, and his trick of shrugging his shoulders (178). He notes that if either man had adopted the other's mannerisms, it would have been a blunder, but in men with real style, even their faults can be attractive. The analogy between actor and pleader was traditional but Quintilian's illustration seems to be personal and freshly coined.

How much of this chapter can we attribute neither to Cicero nor to other sources, but to Quintilian's own teaching practice or observation in court? Decorum led Cicero to ignore much that Quintilian is ready to discuss, but even so, I suppose his many practical comments on health and diet, and the vividly observed blunders which he reports both in the section on voice (51 ff.) and that on gesture (117 ff.) are noted at first hand. His world is full of men who pant like beasts of burden, or spatter their audience with spittle (56), who teeter from side to side as they speak, or wave their arms around wildly, knocking those nearby, who indecorously wipe their nose with the back of their hands, or stick out their stomachs. We may feel more sympathy for the poor fellow who cannot control his toga: if it is not falling unevenly (139) it may pull across the right shoulder, destroying the breadth and dignity of the draped torso; as for the *sinus*, it may betray him by sagging below the hem of his tunic (140), by slipping from the left shoulder (144), or riding across the throat. If he wraps his left arm in his toga it will look frantic, but let him beware of throwing it back over the right shoulder; this is an effeminate and debauched gesture. The costume has its own fighting role (*velut proeliantem* 146) and poses should look keen and ready for action. But more indulgence is shown as the speech approaches its climax; now even sweat and exhaustion and the disintegration of the *toga* are not out of place, but proof of commitment (147).

Obviously these warnings are not for a future Cicero, but for the routine performer. We may forget just how mediocre pupils could be, but almost every scion of the governing class aimed to become an orator. Suppose that all the sons of modern politicians were expected to train as Shakespearian actors: professional drama teachers would have to give advice that seems to us elementary. As a last sample, consider the list of faults with which Quintilian rounds off his section on deportment:

[54]Juvenal too groups Demetrius and Stratocles as examples of versatile "character" actors (3.99–100), but makes no distinction between them, although, according to Quintilian, Demetrius played more respectable roles. It is likely that Juvenal has simply taken over the names without personal experience of them, and without appreciating their difference of style.

These are bad mannerisms: staring at the ceiling, rubbing the face and making rude grimaces, puffing out the cheeks with self-satisfaction or knitting the brows into a frown to make oneself look grimmer, teasing the hair back from the forehead against its natural lie to create a frightening effect: again, as Greek speakers often do, to practise one's speech with incessant movements of fingers and lips, to scrape the throat audibly, to thrust one foot too far forward, or clutch part of the toga with the left hand, to stand splayed or bolt upright, throwing the head back or letting it drop, or hunching the shoulders like wrestlers about to engage. (160)

Easy and obvious? Then let the reader practise Quintilian's eight-point prescription for a calm dignified pose as he stands waiting to address a crowd of strangers. He should stand up straight, with the legs even and slightly apart (the left foot may be advanced slightly), keep his knees straight, shoulders relaxed, look serious (but not gloomy, staring, or slack), hold his arms a little away from his sides, with the left hand as prescribed above (114) and the right extended a little in front of the *sinus*, in an unobtrusive gesture: he is now ready to begin (159).

I have suggested five ingredients in Quintilian's chapter which have not been drawn from Cicero but are the contributions of his own reading or experience; illustrations taken from Ciceronian or Augustan texts of verse and oratory, reports of techniques used by the Greek orators, technical lore from Greek or Roman trainers of voice or movement, theatrical practice, and finally direct observation. One thing is missing, which we must regret; there are no details of Cicero's own gestures or stance, perhaps because the generation that could observe him in action did not survive the civil wars to record its memories. But Cicero remains the *auctor* throughout; his *praecepta*, his criteria, and even the examples that he quoted have provided the structure and much of the documentation in this chapter. He also provides the summing-up. Quintilian had begun the chapter with the Ciceronian image of *actio* as the speech or eloquence of the body (11.3.1); so too at the end he returns to Cicero, *idem qui* [*optime*] *omnia praeceperat* (184), alluding to his advocacy of restraint in *Orator* 57 and appreciation of Antonius' techniques at *Brutus* 141–142. Here too Cicero had repeated the *bon mot* of Demosthenes with which Quintilian launched our chapter (11.3.6): *actio*, as we remember, takes first, second, and third prize in the stakes of eloquence, ahead of every other aspect of oratory. Even readers too idle or modern-minded to consult Cicero's texts would have received from Quintilian both the substance of Cicero's teaching about delivery and enough clearly acknowledged quotations to recognise the source of this teaching. But they would also have acquired a vast amount of useful down-to-earth advice, and for the majority of students these practical hints and cautions might have been even more valuable.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DEMOSTHENICA

Quintilian 11.3	Cicero *Orator*, etc.	Pseudo-Plutarch	Plutarch: *Demosthenes*
6 a) Demosthenes gives first three places to *actio*.	*Orator* 56, *Brutus* 142, *De Or.* 3.213	845b First three places	—
b) trained by Andronicus of Rhodes	—	Andronicus	—
c) Aeschines' anecdote	*De Orat.* 3.213	—	—
54 Climbing hill and long sequence of verse	*De Orat.* 1.261	—	11. Demetrius of Phalerum cited for hill
Pebbles in mouth	*De Orat.* 1.261	—	Pebbles
68 Mirror; reverse image	—	844d Mirror	Mirror device
97 Low-key opening of *De Corona*	*Orator* 26 *in illa pro Ctesiphonte oratio . . . summissius a primo*	—	—
130 Hanging spear, narrow platform	—	844d Spit, or *xiphidion* suspended	—
168 Dem. and Aesch. mutually reproach each other for inflexions	*Orator* 58, cf. 27	—	—
Compare also 10.3.25 Study in enclosed place without view for practice without distraction	—	844d Care for *philologein*; shaved half head to confine himself indoors	7. Practice in subterranean study; shaved half head
10.3.30 Declaimed on shore to accustom himself to din of hostile crowd	*Fin.* 5.5. Shore at Phalerum	Shore at Phalerum; same motive	—
(Andronicus, 11.6)	—	Neoptolemus as trainer	7. Satyrus as trainer
—	—	Narrow bed	—