Esse videtur: Occurrences of Heroic Clausulae in Cicero's Orations

By

Elizabeth Dorothy Adams

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Classics and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Chairperson Anthony Corbeill

_____

Tara Welch

_____

Emma Scioli

Date Defended: April 22, 2013

The Thesis Committee for Elizabeth Dorothy Adams

certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Esse videtur: Occurrences of Heroic Clausulae in Cicero's Orations

_____

Chairperson Anthony Corbeill

Date approved: April 22, 2013

Abstract:

This thesis expands upon modern studies of Cicero's prose rhythm to provide an interpretation of his purpose in using the heroic clausula (the concluding rhythm of a sentence consisting of a dactyl followed by a spondee). Cicero's evaluation of heroic clausulae in his rhetorical treatises and his practice of using heroic clausulae in orations appear to be at odds with each other, making his use of this clausula a contentious point for scholars. After reviewing the basic principles of prose rhythm, I examine those that Cicero puts forth in his rhetorical treatises. I then examine previous arguments by modern scholars concerning Cicero's use of the heroic clausula. Through analyses of instances of this clausula in his orations, I conclude that Cicero frequently takes advantage of the negative perception of this rhythm in prose speech to augment his tone of invective.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1: Introduction to Latin Prose Rhythm	2
Section 2: Cicero's Considerations of Prose Rhythm	7
Section 3: Modern Investigations of Latin Prose Rhythm	10
Section 4: Shipley's Definition of Heroic Clausulae	18
Section 5: My Interpretation of *Orator* 217	24
Section 6: Introduction to my Investigation	27
Section 7: Cicero's Thoughts on Heroic Clausulae	29
Section 8: Examples of Heroic Clausulae in Cicero's Orations	35
Conclusion	45
Works Cited	46

Introduction

This paper takes its name from a suggested reading of Cicero's *Quinct*. 28. The reading of *esse videtur* creates a heroic clausula, which is the combination of dactyl plus spondee so familiar to readers of dactylic hexameter. *Esse videatur*, a proposed alternative, creates a first paean and spondee combination, familiar to readers as a particularly Ciceronian rhythmical combination. In my following analysis, rather than seek to atone for or explain away appearances of the less favored heroic clausula, as previous scholars have done, I find reasons for and intent behind its appearances.

I start off my investigation by providing an introduction to Latin prose rhythm, narrowing the focus to Cicero's discussions in particular. I look to modern studies of Latin prose rhythm to establish a method and direction for my investigation. I thereafter move to establish that heroic clausulae may be formed from and recognizable as more than just combinations of disyllables and trisyllables (the constructions made familiar by epic poetry). After analyzing Cicero's discussions of the heroic clausula, I analyze appearances of this clausula in his orations. Finally, I provide an explanation of what Cicero's intent when using this clausula seems to be.

Modern studies of Latin prose rhythm have consistently sought after technicality and precision – clear answers have been assumed to reside in numbers, percentages, and ratios. Only very recently has the field begun to look beyond the pragmatically oriented quantitative analyses, towards the subtleties and nuances of prose rhythm in practice. My study falls under the latter description. After a tip of my hat to the pre-established, preeminent quantitative analyses, I provide a qualitative assessment of Cicero's use of the heroic clausula. This clausula has historically been held in ill repute; my investigation seeks, if not to improve its standing, at least to explore the effects of this status. I argue that Cicero uses the heroic clausula with intent – he exploits the negative perception of the clausula by utilizing it in order to amplify an already present tone of invective.

Section 1: Introduction to Latin Prose Rhythm

The earliest discussion of prose rhythm occurs in Aristotle's *Ars Rhetorica*:

> τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως δεῖ μήτε ἔμμετρον εἶναι μήτε ἄρρυθμον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀπίθανον (πεπλάσθαι γὰρ δοκεῖ), καὶ ἅμα καὶ ἐξίστησι· προσέχειν γὰρ ποιεῖ τῷ ὁμοίῳ, πότε πάλιν ἥξει. …τὸ δὲ ἄρρυθμον ἀπέραντον, δεῖ δὲ πεπεράνθαι μέν, μὴ μέτρῳ δέ· ἀηδὲς γὰρ καὶ ἄγνωστον τὸ ἄπειρον. περαίνεται δὲ ἀριθμῷ πάντα· ὁ δὲ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς λέξεως ἀριθμὸς ῥυθμός ἐστιν, οὗ καὶ τὰ μέτρα τμήματα· διὸ ῥυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον, μέτρον δὲ μή· ποίημα γὰρ ἔσται. ῥυθμὸν δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται ἐὰν μέχρι του ᾖ.
>
> The form of a speech should be neither metrical nor unrhythmical. For the metrical is unconvincing (as it seems to have been fabricated), and at the same time it also diverts attention [of the listener], as it causes one to pay heed to when the similar thing will return. …The unrhythmical is unbounded, but it must be bounded, though not by meter, for the unlimited thing is unpleasant and unknowable. Everything is bounded by a number. The number for the form of a speech is rhythm, of which meters are sections. Wherefore it is necessary that speech has rhythm, but not meter, as that would be a poem. Nor should the rhythm be [overly] precise, but it should only exist up to a point.[1]

The governing principles of prose rhythm are thus laid out in this passage: within prose speech, a regular and predictable rhythm manifests itself as poetry and thereby distracts listeners. Portions of speech that are marked off by rhythms, however, may provide consistency and harmony within the prose, and bound the infinite possibilities of prose speech. Though Aristotle's distinction between the precise definitions of rhythm and meter is unclear here, the passage appears rather to primarily emphasize the importance of not excessively using rhythm (since this would create meter). For the sake of clarity throughout the remainder of this paper, rhythm may be considered simply as the combinations of longs and shorts that occur in prose; by contrast, meter exists as particular combinations of longs and shorts that are repeated in regular patterns.[2] The preceding definitions of the terms will suffice for the following investigation.

---

[1] *Ars Rhetorica* 1408b, using Ross' 1959 OCT. Following this section appears a discussion of the proper rhythms for prose, which will be discussed below. This and all following translations are my own.

[2] Oberhelman 2003: 3 discusses the Aristotelian use of these terms (μέτρον as the poetic arrangement of long and short syllables and ῥυθμός as the arrangement of syllables in prose) and Cicero's difficulty in translating them into

This avoidance of falling into poetic meters while using particular rhythms in order to enhance the aesthetic of a prose speech remains the guiding principle in Latin prose rhythm, which inherits most of its tendencies (and also its complications) from the pre-established Greek methods. The shortage of treatises on (or references to) prose rhythm between Aristotle's discussion and the first century BCE, however, makes it difficult to trace the development of the practice both temporally and linguistically. Further, as Oberhelman notes in his discussion of the development of Latin prose rhythm, there is no precise method for entirely understanding the nature of Greek prose rhythm, and this hinders our ability to understand the aspects that the Greek practice would lend especially to the development of early Latin prose rhythm.[3] There is also a paucity of Roman oratory before the mid-first century BCE, and therefore there is a dearth of examples of prose rhythm in practice as well as discussions of it until the time that Latin prose rhythm has developed. Though early Latin prose has its own unique rhythmical style, both the natural cadence of Latin tongue and the influence of precepts and practice of Greek prose rhythm develop it into a far more identifiable trait over centuries of silence.

An exception to this silence in rhetorical treatises is a brief reference to prose rhythm within a discussion of hyperbaton in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (approximately 90's BCE): …*transiectio, quae rem non reddit obscuram, multum proderit ad continuationes, de quibus ante dictum est; in quibus oportet verba sicuti ad poeticum quendam extruere numerum, ut perfecte et perpolitissime possint esse absolutae*.[4] ("…an instance of hyperbaton that does not render the matter incomprehensible will be quite useful for periods, which have been discussed above; in which [periods] the words should be arranged to have a certain poetic rhythm, so that the periods are able to be perfectly and most thoroughly completed.") The author here simply asserts that prose rhythm may be effectively produced

---

Latin terms. Wilkinson 1963: 138-9 discusses the "terminological ambiguity" of prose rhythm, especially as inherent in *numerus*.

[3] Oberhelman 2003: 236.

[4] 4.44, Caplan's 1954 Loeb.

by a rearrangement of words; when such rearrangement producing a noticeable rhythm is found at the end of periods (by which the *auctor* means a complete thought), the rhythms round off the thought.[5]

As may be implied from this passage, the basic tenets of prose rhythm do not differ between the earlier, Greek injunctions of Aristotle and the later, Latin injunctions of the *auctor*. Later Latin discussions of prose rhythm (in *Rhet. ad Her*., Cicero, and Quintilian, for example) are still primarily influenced by Aristotle's comments, and compel orators to use poetic rhythms, though not overly much, to create a clear breaking point between thoughts while aesthetically improving the delivery.

The use of prose rhythm is contingent upon the author and genre. There is, for example, what is considered a historical style of prose rhythm present in the works of Sallust and Livy that is distinct from the style utilized in oratory.[6] As Berry demonstrates in his 1996 article, "in oratory prose rhythm is mainly a matter of conforming to generic prescription rather than indulging in a personal taste peculiar to the author."[7] And yet his article goes on to effectively illustrate that, though the rhythm of multiple authors who share genres and time periods may be similar, an examination of their individual prose rhythm techniques may help to prove or disprove the authenticity of works.

The terminologies used in ancient discussions of prose rhythm remain vague and often conflated; much of the modern understanding of Latin prose rhythm comes from an understanding of the practices used by various authors and from treatises written after its development. Defining the terminology that will be used in the following investigation of Cicero's prose rhythm is necessary at this point. As in Latin poetry, prose rhythm is based on syllabic quantity, rather than stress, and the final syllable of a given

[5] *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.27: *continuatio est densa et continens frequentatio verborum cum absolutione sententiarum*. (A period is a concise and uninterrupted group of words coinciding with the completion of the sentence.)
[6] Aili 1979.
[7] Berry 1996: 60.

rhythmical phrase is considered to be anceps (that is, it may be either long or short).[8] Prose rhythm allows for resolution (two shorts may replace a long syllable) and contraction (one long may replace two shorts), and it also allows for the occasional substitution of one short syllable with one long.[9] The line between poetry and prose, when poetic rhythms are present within the prose, is a tenuous one, as is made clear by the constant reminders not to permit the prose to fall into poetry.

Naturally, the accent in Latin prose rhythm continues to follow the Law of the Penultimate. The ictus – the syllable that is stressed in poetic feet – varies depending on the foot. For this investigation, centered upon the combination of a dactyl followed by a spondee (¯ ˘ ˘/¯ ¯), there is little controversy that the ictus appears on the first long of each foot. The use of accent and ictus in coincidence (the accent and ictus falling on the same syllable of a foot) or conflict (the accent falling on a syllable of a foot lacking ictus) has only been firmly established in hexameter starting with Vergilian works; the existence of ictus in prose, even when poetic meters appear, is more controversial, though coincidence occurs in the majority of clausulae.[10] Ictus, then, is primarily negligible in prose, as prose lacks a consistent or fixed meter. For the purposes of my investigation, however, the ictus must be taken into account, both because the particular clausula examined here is especially associated with portions of poetry where coincidence is paramount, and because coincidence is Shipley's basis for rejecting many instances of the clausula that I will be accepting as genuinely Ciceronian clausulae.

Prose rhythm appears throughout oratorical works. Rhythms occur in cola, which are sense units within sentences; therefore, they can help modern scholars reconstruct where sense breaks and pauses may have occurred in the delivery of an oration. Yet rhythms are typically most apparent at clausulae, by

---

[8] Cicero *Or.* 214, cf. Quintilian *Inst.*9.4.79. It seems best in this case, centered on Cicero's oratory, to accept his evaluation of the length of final syllables as he considers it in his treatises.

[9] These aspects of prose rhythm, however, will have little to do with my following investigation.

[10] Oberhelman 2003: 108 attributes the fact that "*many metrical clausulae fortuitously contain a coincidence of accent and ictus*" (emphasis his own) to the relatively regular accentuation of Latin words.

which I mean the ends of sentences; hence, in discussions of prose rhythm, the same term is often used for both the locations and the rhythms associated with them.[11] Cicero himself defines a clausula as the last two or three feet of a sentence.[12] Unfortunately, his reference to the ends of sentences as feet may give rise to an assumption of poetic meter throughout the text. As mentioned previously, the main difference between rhythm and meter is the repetitive and predictable nature of meter in poetry; Cicero's mention of "feet" is a convenient way to group combinations of syllabic lengths, rather than an implication that the prose is poetic. While this conflation of terms may confuse a discussion concerning prose, it is perhaps acceptable to use this poetic term in this investigation, which will focus on occurrences of a clausula closely connected with poetry, the heroic clausula (of the rhythm ¯ ˘ ˘ / ¯ ¯).

[11] Cicero in his two rhetorical treatises maintains that prose rhythm is most apparent at clausulae (*de Orat.* 3.192, *Orator* 199).

[12] *Orator* 216: *sed hos cum in clausulis pedes nomino, non loquor de uno pede extremo: adiungo, quod minimum sit, proximum superiorem, saepe etiam tertium* ("But when I refer to these feet in clausulae, I am not speaking about only the final foot: I add, at least, the one previous to it, and often a third").

Section 2: Cicero's Considerations of Prose Rhythm

In two treatises (*de Oratore* 3.173-198 and *Orator* 168-236), Cicero writes at length about the proper usage of prose rhythm. While these examinations are too lengthy to explicate in detail here, there are certain sentiments he expresses and rules he advises which have great bearing on the remainder of this investigation. In *Orator*, he attributes much of what he says to Greek practice; he tends to rely upon and cite Greek predecessors, and highlights where his own theory disagrees with theirs (e.g., *Orator* 215).[13] The remarks about prose rhythm in *de Oratore* and *Orator* often agree with each other, but occasionally offer differing advice (e. g., concerning which rhythms ought to be favored for clausulae). Quintilian (e. g. at *Inst.* 9.4.90) draws attention to discrepancies in the advice offered between the two texts; nevertheless, he throughout his work maintains the primacy of Cicero in both rhetorical theory and practice. Further, Cicero's texts are found in cases to offer suggestions that disagree with what has been found to be his own oratorical practice. Various interpretations of how these two texts relate to each other and to his practice have been offered; it seems best here to accept them as his basic theories on prose rhythm as a whole, though his personal practice developed slightly differently.

Near the outset of his lengthy discussion of prose rhythm in *de Oratore* (55 BCE), Cicero hearkens back to the Aristotelian discussion of prose rhythm, by having his interlocutor Crassus say *in quo illud est vel maximum, quod versus in oratione si efficitur coniunctione verborum, vitium est, et tamen eam coniunctionem sicuti versum numerose cadere et quadrare et perfici volumus* (in which [oratory] this is even greatest, that verse in a speech, if it is achieved by the collocation of words, is a fault; yet we desire that collocation, just as [we desire] a verse, to fall rhythmically, and to fit neatly, and to be completed).[14]

[13] Oberhelman 2003: 39 attributes Cicero's constant references to Greek style and predecessors to his desire to establish distance from the often denigrated Asiatic style of prose rhythm.
[14] 3.175.

As in Aristotle, there is an emphasis on the importance of prose rhythm in expressing and illustrating the completeness of a statement, as well as the importance of avoiding the dangerous descent into poetry.

Also in book 3 of his *de Oratore*, Crassus (and, therefore, Cicero) discusses at length the theory and practice of prose rhythm in oratory. Crassus states: *versus enim veteres illi in hac soluta oratione propemodum, hoc est, numeros quosdam nobis esse adhibendos putaverunt*, "the old [authors] thought that in prose, something close to verses must be used by us, that is, certain rhythms."[15] As he describes it, the purpose of prose rhythm is not only to draw attention to particular ideas, but also to make orations as aesthetically pleasing as possible. The audience, Cicero maintains throughout his works on rhetorical theory, would have been able to notice the distinct rhythms, and understand that they implied the end of a thought.[16]

The effect of prose rhythm on listeners is central to my following argument, and it is clear that orators were aware of its potential power. At *Orator* 214, Cicero, speaking of the oratorical abilities of Carbo the Younger, says that "such a shout of the assemblage arose at this ditrochee that it was remarkable."[17] The Latin word used for the assemblage is *contio*, so the assemblage did not consist only of the educated elite, but also the public – as tribune of the people, he was speaking before the people. As it elicits a reaction immediately upon its reception, rather than upon reflection, effective prose rhythm is an essential tool for winning over and persuading an audience. In the case of Carbo the Younger, for example, the audience's positive reaction immediately upon hearing a particular metrical pattern is an indication that the speaker is winning them over.

The magnitude and the instantaneity of the listeners' reaction to the rhythm illustrates that prose rhythm was widely perceived, and geared towards potential listeners. Cicero's attributing the

---

[15] 3.173.
[16] E.g. *de Oratore* 3.181, *Orator* 214.
[17] *Hoc dichoreo tantus clamor contionis excitatus est, ut admirabile esset.*

enthusiasm of the audience at least partially to the effect of the rhythm illustrates the intention of prose rhythm not only to improve a speech, but also to immediately amplify the effect of the speech on an audience. In an extensive series of metaphors, he refers to the charm inherent in necessary things (e.g. portions of architecture). He acknowledges that though it is necessary that pauses appear in prose speech, the pauses can be both adornments of its beauty and essential to its purpose.[18] Prose rhythm, then, is a structural element of a speech that performs a necessary task; when utilized with skill, however, the necessary task is made more effective and remarkable by doing so with a beauty that enhances its effectiveness.

Just as prose rhythm is essential to the structure of a speech, it is also essential to its meaning, and is considered to be an aspect of oratory that distinguishes a skilled speaker from a poor one. An untried speaker "pours out crudely as much as he is able and that which he says is bounded by his breath, not by art."[19] A skilled orator, by contrast, "binds his meaning to his words, such that he embraces it with a certain rhythm, both restrained and unbound."[20] The meaning of the sentence is thereby connected with – and even partially defined by – the rhythm of the language. The combination of the inextricable connection of rhythm and meaning, together with the conscious recognition of the rhythm by the audience, is essential to the argument of this paper.

[18] *De Oratore* 3.178-180.
[19] *De Oratore* 3.175: *incondite fundit quantum potest et id, quod dicit, spiritu, non arte determinat.*
[20] *De Oratore* 3.175: *sic inligat sententiam verbis, ut eam numero quodam complectatur et astricto et solute.*

Section 3: Modern Investigations of Latin Prose Rhythm

The formal investigation of Latin clausulae begins with Wüst's 1881 dissertation, which is his attempt to identify the relation of Cicero's practice of prose rhythm to the precepts set forth in his rhetorical treatises. He statistically analyzes the clausulae within eighteen of Cicero's speeches and calculates their relative percentages. These calculations help him to identify some of Cicero's favored and least favored clausulae (Wüst finds, for example, a preponderance of cretic and trochaic forms, but very few heroic clausulae).[21] However, this study was shortly overshadowed by the more comprehensive work of Zieliński, whose seminal study of Cicero's prose rhythm was published in 1904.

Zieliński's study purports to find rules for the construction and use of Cicero's clausulae. The essential theory guiding the rules found by Zieliński is that each clausula consists of a cretic basis (or its metrical equivalent), followed by a trochaic cadence of between two and five syllables.[22] The principles guiding clausulae, however, are of less import to my ensuing investigation than the process by which Zieliński fashioned them. In his pursuit of regular rules for clausulae, Zieliński dutifully scanned each clausula of Cicero's orations, and calculated the percentages of Cicero's use of each rhythm. The resulting percentages are based not on the absolute use of each clausula, but on its occurrences relative to the other clausulae. While the most common clausulae do not necessarily appear a majority of the time in texts, they do occur far more frequently than they would by chance. For example, a cretic followed by a spondee (or trochee) occurs with an absolute frequency of 7.4% in non-oratorical Latin prose, but 16.2% in the orations of Cicero.[23]

---

[21] Wüst 1881: 60-61 offers a table of relative percentages for 13 of the 18 speeches.

[22] 1904: 13; the three laws deemed most important by Clark in his 1905 review are the following (1905: 168): "The type of a clausula depends upon the relative frequency of the words necessary for its construction., (2) The ictus of the clausula harmonises with that of the word… (3) There is naturally a tendency to equipoise or balance between the long and short syllables."

[23] Wilkinson 1963: 141, using data from de Groot 1921.

Zieliński draws attention to three particular applications of his study. The first is the use of clausulae to enlighten modern scholars on issues of orthography and prosody.[24] The second application of the study is in the realm of textual criticism. He utilizes his categorizations of clausulae to create lists of suggested emendations for Cicero's texts, based upon the rhythms of clausulae yielded from particular combinations of words (i.e., a reading that offers a rhythm more often used by Cicero is to be preferred to a reading that offers a less common rhythm). Thirdly, Zieliński is able to apply his findings to questions of authenticity. Zieliński delineates five classes, based upon his relative percentages of clausulae, which are named according to their preponderance in Cicero's speeches: *verae*, *licitae*, *malae*, *selectae*, and *pessimae* (best, permitted, bad, culled, and worst). Zieliński created a formula from the percentage of each of these five classes throughout all of Cicero's orations, which he dubbed the "Echtheitskriterium" (criterion of authenticity).[25] He claimed that orations that fall into this general distribution of clausulae are very likely to have been written by Cicero; those that differ greatly are most likely not Cicero's works. This Echtheitskriterium assisted *de Domo Sua*, the authorship of which had previously been disputed, to become accepted as a text of Cicero's. Zieliński's work is still considered essential for the three previously mentioned pragmatic purposes.

Despite its groundbreaking nature, concerns have arisen concerning Zieliński's methods of analysis. One that would necessarily apply to any modern study of Latin prose rhythm is that he did not take into account the natural rhythms of Latin. Therefore, findings that appear significant based on his calculations could be at least partially due to the natural cadence of the Latin tongue. Yet it may be argued that there is no way to calculate the natural rhythms of the language. While it is tempting to guess at natural rhythm through ancient correspondence, Cicero, for example, often uses prose rhythm techniques within his letters; it is not inconceivable that other authors and those in other genres would

[24] E.g., consonantal duplication necessitated by rhythms within clausulae, such as *redductus* of *Phil*. 2.10.
[25] 1904: 219, *verae*: 60.3% + *licitae*: 26.5% + *malae*: 6.1% + *selectae*: 5.2% + *pessimae*: 1.4%.

also utilize their preferred rhythms and thus nullify the possibility of identifying natural rhythm. De Groot used translations from Greek into Latin made by authors in the nineteenth century to determine the "norm" of prose rhythm (likewise, Wilkinson analyzed nineteenth-century Latin orations of Sir Richard Jebb); however, these are also likely unconsciously influenced by the rhythms of Cicero and other commonly read authors.[26]

Even accepting that his findings are significant in relation to natural speech patterns, Zieliński faces many other critiques. His method of identifying clausulae, for example, is troublesome. He initially translated the Latin into Russian and subsequently read the Russian aloud, found the sense breaks in that translation, and assumed that those are parallel with the clausulae of the Latin. As noted by Berry, this practice yields the benefit that Zieliński's choice of sense breaks would have been influenced neither by the Latin rhythms nor by modern editions of the texts.[27] In the divisions of his clausulae, however, Zieliński occasionally moves into previous cola, or assumes a clausula in the middle of what appears to be a colon. Taking his criticism of Zieliński's methods a step further, Berry remarks that the five classes essentially are value judgments (ranging from *verae*/best/most often used to *pessimae*/worst/least often used).[28] Zieliński also takes into account clausulae he identifies from contested areas of texts, for example, those that have been emended or that vary in the manuscript tradition; the potentiality for alternative readings would deprive his research of some of its power.[29] It is also worth noting that different editors and scholars may consider certain combinations of consonants to yield different

[26] De Groot 1919, Wilkinson 1963: 140-141.
[27] Berry 1996: 49.
[28] Berry 1996: 53, noting that clausulae with similar relative frequencies are found in different classes, not necessarily in relation to their frequency (e.g. one clausula with 0.6% frequency Zieliński considers among the *licitae*, while one with 0.9% frequency he places among the *malae*). Resolved/substituted/contracted versions of certain clausulae are placed into different categories by Zieliński, though there is not necessarily evidence that they should be considered different clausulae.
[29] E.g. *Phil*. 13.27, to be discussed below.

lengths of vowels, and therefore different rhythms.[30] Finally, some works known to be by Cicero do not align very well with the Echtheitskriterium, either due to the fact that they were written early in his career, when his habits were being established, or because they are simply too short to yield meaningful results (e.g. *Q. Rosc*.). As many disputed works tend to be relatively short, the general applicability of the criterion is lessened.

Due to the prominence of Zieliński's analyses, any modern study of Cicero's prose rhythm is likely to be influenced by assumptions concerning which are the favored or least favored clausulae. Yet even with the problems of Zieliński's methods acknowledged, his method remains the most overarching and his results the most widely referenced by modern scholars of prose rhythm; while alternative methods of identifying or classifying clausulae have been put forth (e.g. by Bornecque, de Groot, et al.), his data are typically referred to. This will be the case as well in my following investigation.

The valuations inherent in Zieliński's divisions may induce editors towards potential assumptions of *malo numero* (bad rhythm) and towards emendations that are overly influenced by the categorizations. As has been noted, emendations that create more common or preferred clausulae are more likely to be accepted than emendations that provide less common clausulae. Below is an example of a clausula which is contested but, due at least partially to the prose rhythm, certain emendations appear to be more correct.

At *Quinct*. 28, Müller proposes *factum esse videtur* as an alternative to *factum videtur* (printed in Clark's OCT).[31] Müller's reading lacks any manuscript support; an alternative, *esse videatur*, also lacks support until the fifteenth century. Zieliński strongly disagrees with Müller's conjecture, as *ēssĕ vĭdētur* yields a

[30] Nisbet 1990: 359, for example, considers syllable length variable before the consonant cluster sc-.
[31] *Existima, C. Aquili, modo et ratione omnia Romae Naevium fecisse, si hoc, quod per litteras istius in Gallia gestum est, recte atque ordine factum vĭdētur*. "If that which was done on account of his instructions in Gaul seems done rightly and typically, then you think, Gaius Aquilius, that everything Naevius did at Rome was done with moderation and reason."

heroic clausula (dactyl plus spondee, ¯ ˘ ˘ / ¯ ˘), which is classified among what are considered to be the *pessimae* clausulae.[32] Though *esse videatur* creates a rhythm established as being favored by Cicero, Zieliński prefers to maintain the reading of the vulgate. The close of the sentence is not the close of this section of the speech, so there is no contextual reason for a particularly emphatic clausula, nor is the meaning of the sentence changed by the addition of an *esse*. I agree with Zieliński, insofar as I do not consider an emendation necessary here; the sentiment of the sentence does not appear to require any grammatical alterations. In cases such as this, when the text is contested, the advantages of an understanding of an author's prose rhythm are illustrated.

Colometry has offered useful approaches to understanding questions pertaining to the construction of and interactions between sense units and rhythms. Habinek's 1985 volume on colometry, a refinement of Fraenkel's earlier works on cola, looks to the creation and manipulation of linear aspects of sentences in order to further understand divisions of cola in sentences.[33] Habinek distinguishes between rhythmical and rhetorical cola, providing alternative methods to identify these aspects of the construction of speeches.[34] He uses the identification of cola to examine the prose rhythm internal to sentences, rather than only at clausulae.[35] Hutchinson in 1995 again confronts the issue of how to recognize and define cola accurately. He cites Nisbet's article on cola and clausulae in Cicero's speeches, which looks into hiatus, *atque* followed by a consonant, and unemphatic pronouns to identify a colon as a unit that "admits, or is capable of admitting, hiatus at the end."[36] Hutchinson also reinforces that

---

[32] 1904: 190: "H[andschri]ften schwanken zwischen *esse videatur*…und *factum videtur*… Letzteres dürfte das richtige sein." (Manuscripts fluctuate between *esse videatur*…and *factum videtur*…the latter is probably correct.) Cicero's opinions pertaining to this clausula are difficult to interpret (to be discussed below).

[33] Habinek 1985, response to Fraenkel's 1968 *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos,* as well as 1932: "Kolon und Satz," 1933: "Kolon und Satz II," 1965: *Noch einmal Kolon und Satz*.

[34] 1985: 11. Rhythmical cola he considers as "short, detachable, grammatical constituents of the Latin sentence," rhetorical cola as "units composed of one or more rhythmical cola, and having some rhetorical marking…"

[35] This upholds Cicero's injunction that rhythms should be more varied in internal cola than at clausulae.

[36] Nisbet 1990: quotation from 358. One might also identify a preceding colon by an appearance of hiatus following it.

atque followed by a consonant is most often used by Cicero with the purpose of creating rhythmic closes. More relevant to my later discussion of prose rhythm, he shows that a clausula may exist in the penultimate colon – that is, a clausula does not need to be the final element of a sentence, as it may be followed by a rhythmic close, and a final, single, word may itself be its own colon and rhythmic unit.

Modern scholarship has expanded the applications of prose rhythmical studies from identifying proclivities of individual authors to also encompassing the potential effects of prose rhythm, both on individual texts and on the audiences of these texts. For example, Berry in 1996 uses prose rhythm in order to help prove the authenticity of Cicero's *de Optimo Genere Oratorum* (46 BCE). After a discussion of the benefits and limitations of prose rhythm (and Zieliński's Echtheitskriterium in particular), he uses prose rhythm to support Cicero's authorship of the treatise. Berry discusses the above-mentioned problems with Zieliński's assessments of the clausulae, and proposes his own alternative (seemingly less biased) method of dividing clausulae. Through a comparison of Zieliński's identifications of clausulae in the *Panegyricus* of Pliny the Younger and the clausulae noted in five orations of Cicero, Berry illustrates that some speeches of Cicero's seem to resemble works of other authors rather more than the Echtheitskriterium, created from the Ciceronian average, would allow. Through its comparison of percentages of clausulae in rhetorical treatises (*Brutus* and *Orator*, contemporary with *de Opt. Gen.*), Berry's article effectively illustrates that prose rhythm is subject to generic prescriptions, but that authors nevertheless "may assert their individuality by the use of favourite or pet rhythms."[37] It also effectively shows that prose rhythm, while it may help to cast doubt on works, is yet not enough on its own to prove authorship. However, the variability of prose rhythm in terms of genre, author, and time period, may help to date texts (though, as has been mentioned, shorter texts provide less information concerning prose rhythm).

[37] Berry 1996: 60-61 (quotation from 60).

Riggsby's 2010 examination of the *Second Catilinarian* broadens the scope of typical examinations of prose rhythm and colometry to also include semantics, by arguing that these technical aspects of the speech are in alignment with its content. For the *Second Catilinarian* in particular, he illustrates that "the form of the text is thus iconic of Cicero's shift in its content from emphasis on danger and chaos to peace and resolution."[38] That is, the speech moves from describing the state in a condition of disorder to one restored to political order by Cicero's discovery of the conspiracy. For example, Riggsby counts that the cola in the first two sections are comprised of 8.4 syllables on average, while cola are 10.1 syllables on average in the final two sections of the speech; he finds that the speech has developed from a choppier style of delivery into a smoother one.[39] He also finds that the clausulae in the final two sections more often consist of cretics and spondees (both in regular and resolved forms). This consistent repetition of endings he parallels with the focus on restored order that is apparent by this point in the oration.[40] Of more relevance to my own approach, Riggsby argues convincingly that the development of the content of the oration is reflected in its very construction, and an essential component of this construction is prose rhythm. Though he himself acknowledges that acceptance of his argument necessitates "an imaginative leap," the bonds between sentiment, expression, and interpretation are undeniably emphasized through Riggsby's analysis.[41] His tying together the content with the form of the speech is a parallel with the analysis I am about to make.

In light of the potential for the semantic effects of prose rhythm revealed by Riggsby's study, I propose a reexamination of Cicero's intentions concerning certain uses of the heroic clausula. This particular clausula consists of a dactyl followed by a spondee (or a trochee, as Cicero considers the length of the final syllable indifferent, as discussed above). The appellation "heroic" stems from the use of this

[38] 2010: 102.
[39] 2010: 101.
[40] While statistics are not given, Riggsby provides an illustrative table of clausulae in each section (103).
[41] Riggsby 2010: 104.

rhythm in epic poetry (*herous* as a substantive, however, often refers solely to a dactyl).[42] Cicero's opinion concerning this clausula is passionately debated (though by few), as his two rhetorical texts allow for differing interpretations and his practice does not appear to entirely align with these interpretations; his opinions will be discussed further below. I intend to argue that, though this clausula is perceived as one that Cicero avoids at some cost, he yet often uses it with the intention of underscoring his sentiments, especially when a sense of irony is present.

[42] *OLD*, *s.v. herous, -a, -um,* 2, "(applied to dactylic hexameter, the meter of heroic verse), 2b: (masc. as sb.) a hexameter, verse in this metre; also, a dactyl."

Section 4: Shipley's Definition of Heroic Clausulae

F. W. Shipley's 1911 article "The Heroic Clausula in Cicero and Quintilian" is one of the only discussions of any length concerning the heroic clausula (a dactyl followed by a spondee, of the rhythm ¯ ˘ ˘/¯ ¯) in Cicero's orations.[43] The article is an attempt to reconcile Cicero's statement at *Orator* 217, that the heroic clausula is acceptable in orations, and the statement of Quintilian at *Inst*. 9.4.102, which Shipley notes "explicitly condemns it."[44] However, Shipley remarks that in practice, Cicero utilizes the heroic clausula far less often than Quintilian.[45] Cicero uses it 0.6 % of the time in his orations, while the first three books of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* exhibit this clausula 1.9 % of the time. As has been mentioned, "in oratory prose rhythm is mainly a matter of conforming to generic prescription rather than indulging in a personal taste peculiar to the author."[46] Therefore, Quintilian's habits with respect to clausulae may be conforming to the art of writing rhetorical treatises, rather than oratory; Shipley may well be comparing two entirely different genres to arrive at his conclusion (though Quintilian's style is doubtlessly influenced by Cicero). Regardless of rhythmical conventions of genre, Shipley desires to reconcile these two authors' attitudes towards the clausula. According to Shipley, the discrepancy between their assessments and practice appears because the particular combination of longs and shorts created by a dactyl followed by a spondee (¯ ˘ ˘/¯ ¯) does not always create the heroic clausula – he defines the heroic clausula as also exhibiting coincidence (as is typical of the final two feet in most

[43] Laurand 1911 also discusses the heroic clausula. While Shipley seeks to explain occurrences of it, Laurand aims more at identifying Cicero's chronological tendencies.

[44] 1911:410. *Orat*. 217: *Ne iambus quidem, qui est e brevi et longa, aut par choreo qui habet tris brevis trochaeus, sed spatio par, non syllabis, aut etiam dactylus, qui est e longa et duabus brevibus, si est proximus a postremo, parum volubiliter pervenit ad extremum, si est extremus choreus aut spondeus; numquam enim interest uter sit eorum in pede extremo.* ("Not even an iamb – which consists of a short and a long; nor the trochee – equal to the choree, which has three shorts, but it is equal in the amount of time [it takes to say it], not in the number of syllables [of which it consists]; nor even a dactyl – which consists of a long and two shorts – if next to the final [foot], comes to the end insufficiently fluently, if the final [foot] is a choree or spondee; for it never matters which of those occurs in the final foot."); Quint. *Inst*. 9.4.102: *Ne dactylus quidem spondeo bene praeponitur, quia finem versus damnamus in fine orationis*. ("Not even a dactyl is placed well before a spondee, because we condemn the end of a verse at the end of a speech.") *Orat.* 217 will shortly be discussed at length.

[45] Shipley 1911: 410.

[46] Berry 1996: 60.

examples of contemporary dactylic hexameter poetry). For the purposes of this argument, I define "heroic clausula" as a dactyl-spondee combination (whether or not coincidence occurs in the feet, though I do find coincidence to emphasize the clausula); when referring to Shipley's assumed redefinition, I will specify.

Shipley approvingly notes Zieliński's statement that Cicero classified the heroic clausula among the good clausulae "aus Versehn" (by mistake).[47] He references other authors who have contested this section of the *Orator*. He also brings up Laurand's argument that Cicero most likely disapproved of the clausula.[48] Rather than emend the text of *Orator*, Shipley proposes that his redefinition of "heroic clausula" will align Cicero's statement and practice.

Shipley's initial argument that Cicero's theory and practice do align is based upon the typical line endings that appear in dactylic hexameter from the first century BCE onward, which are created from a combination of disyllable and trisyllable (¯ ˘ ˘/¯ ¯ or ¯ ˘/ ˘ ¯ ¯). He convincingly illustrates through a table of contemporary writers the discrepancy between heroic clausulae in prose and the usual construction of the final two feet in dactylic hexameter line endings. While the most common occurrences of the clausula in prose are pentasyllables or a combination created from monosyllables and tetrasyllables, the most common line endings in relatively contemporary dactylic hexameter poetry are combinations of disyllable and trisyllable.[49] Shipley notes that the final two feet of dactylic hexameter at this point in time tend to illustrate coincidence of accent and ictus. He claims that poetry would utilize tetrasyllabic or pentasyllabic words in the final two feet of lines if these were conducive to maintaining coincidence;

[47] Zieliński 1904: 167; Shipley 1911: 410-11.
[48] Laurand 1925: 167.
[49] The ratios are almost exactly reversed between the two genres: 70% of clausulae in Cicero's orations are pentasyllabic words or tetrasyllabic words followed by monosyllables; combinations of disyllabic and trisyllabic words make up at least 70% of contemporary dactylic hexameter line endings (data provided in Shipley 1911: 212).

he takes the lack of these constructions to mean that coincidence does not occur.[50] With this assumption, he attempts to support his argument that there is no coincidence in the heroic clausulae that occur more often in prose (i.e. the pentasyllabic words or the tetrasyllabic and monosyllabic combinations); finally, he decides that the types more commonly found in prose are not instances of the heroic clausula.

Concerning the clausulae that consist of a monosyllable followed by a tetrasyllabic word, Shipley argues that a secondary accent exists on the primary syllable of the second word. In this case, the secondary accent on the second foot of the clausula would nullify any possible coincidence of accent and ictus reminiscent of dactylic hexameter line endings. For example, a heroic clausula consisting of *nón vìdeátur*, due to the secondary accent on the second syllable (of the initial dactyl), would exhibit conflict, which is not permissible in the final feet of dactylic hexameter. Wilkinson, however, argues that a secondary accent on a polysyllable even in verse very likely had a minimal effect on the coincidence, and further notes that polysyllables in pentameter endings do not appear to give rise to any "fatal conflict" through any secondary accents.[51]

Shipley next claims that pentasyllables would not have accentuation that would yield coincidence – the initial and penultimate syllables. Rather, he argues that they would have accents on the preantepenultimate and penultimate.[52] He notes that compound verbs in Old French have the accent on the second syllable, and thus there would be a secondary accent there in Latin (that is, the accent would be where it existed in the uncompounded forms of the verb). Shipley claims that this accounts for the scarcity of uses of pentasyllables at the ends of lines in dactylic hexameter.

---

[50] Fraenkel 1968: 199 also considers it doubtful that Cicero would consider single pentasyllabic words to be heroic clausulae, due to their rarity at the end of hexameter lines.
[51] Wilkinson 1963: 230-2, quote from 230.
[52] 1911: 414.

Again, Wilkinson disagrees with the conclusions of Shipley. His remarks on pentasyllables in dactylic hexameter assume secondary accent on the initial syllable, and he points to Quintilian's evaluation of these (*Inst.* 9.4.64, discussed later).[53] While pentasyllables may be exceedingly rare in the final two feet of dactylic hexameter, it is notable that they occur with some regularity in, for example, elegiac couplets, occupying positions in the pentameter line that create a dactyl followed by a spondee (e.g., *Ars Amatoria*, 1.294: *sūstĭnŭīssĕ*).[54] It happens in pentameter lines that "the first ictus of the second hemistich will ordinarily coincide almost inevitably with a word-accent, either primary or secondary."[55] The occurrence of coincidence at this point in the pentameter line illustrates that there are secondary accents on the primary syllables of pentasyllabic words. Accepting coincidence in the initial portion of the second hemistich of the pentameter, Shipley's assessment of the accents appears thoroughly inaccurate.

Wilkinson in his appendix to *Golden Latin Artistry* remarks upon pentasyllables in dactylic hexameter. He here assumes without discussion a secondary accent on the initial syllable.[56] He also notes Quintilian's assessment that people criticize Cicero for his use of pentasyllabic clausulae, because these are two feet contained in single words, which even in poems is *praemolle*, "very soft."[57] Quintilian then expands this to also include words of four syllables, and claims that words of too many syllables must be avoided at the end of clausulae.[58] Quintilian's reference to pentasyllabic examples from Cicero parallels Shipley's myopic view of the issue, whereby each recognizes the simple technical structure of the

---

[53] Wilkinson 1963: 232.
[54] Wilkinson 1963: 230-231. While in this position in pentameter, the second foot is a trochee (¯ ˘), rather than a spondee (¯ ¯), the length of the final syllable of the clausula is inconsequential, as noted previously.
[55] Siefert 1952: 66.
[56] Wilkinson 1963: 232.
[57] OLD, *s.v., praemolle*: "exceedingly soft or (of style) exceedingly flabby." Quintilian's use of *praemolle* and his condemnation of this practice point to the fact that the use of these polysyllabic words is noticeable, which will be considered in my later discussion of semantics.
[58] *Inst.* 9.4.66: *quare hoc quoque vitandum est, ne plurium syllabarum verbis utamur in fine* ("for which reason [containing two feet in one word] must be avoided, lest we use words of too many syllables at the end").

rhythms, as opposed to rectifying the rhythms with the semantics. Quintilian does discuss the use of pentasyllables in poetry and as heroic clausulae; though his remark overall is disapproving, it certainly illustrates that the phenomenon occurs, and helps disprove Shipley's argument.[59]

Due to his arguments concerning coincidence, Shipley strikes the heroic clausulae created with tetrasyllables and pentasyllables from Zieliński's list and provides examples of others in which coincidence occurs, and which are formed by combinations of disyllables and trisyllables. He proceeds to argue that, though they fit the meter of heroic clausulae and contain the coincidence of dactylic hexameter line endings, they are unacceptable as heroic clausulae.

The first five examples Shipley uses illustrate a final disyllable. He claims that one (*Phil*. 11) is corrupt, and so should not be considered an instance of the clausula, and that the other four necessitate a sense break within the clausula. The ensuing pause, he says, would render these clausulae ineffective. He then provides 11 examples of Ciceronian heroic clausulae with a final trisyllable. Here again, he argues that there are sense breaks between the final two words or that the penultimate word is more closely related to the previous sense unit. Again, by virtue of this, a pause would have to be inserted between the final two words; this caesura, he claims, would make these examples unrecognizable as heroic clausulae to the listeners.

Yet this appears to be untrue for more than a few of them. An example from *Phil*. 13, which will be discussed further below, will suffice: Shipley claims that a pause would exist between the final feet of *munera* and *rosit* in order to "bring out the force of the pun." Yet the pun must only exist by virtue of the close linkage of the words.

[59] *Inst.* 9.4.64.

As discussed above, Shipley's consideration of the accents in the endings noted by Zieliński ought not to be considered entirely accurate – in this case, he is still left with many more heroic clausulae than his final 16. Further, he appears to assume his conclusion through his practice of negating so many examples of the clausula in order to unite Cicero's statement with that of Quintilian. Concerning his examples of the clausula, for the most part, the disyllables and trisyllables appear to belong together as sense units, rather than with caesuras. Finally, he does not take semantics into account, as I will below, following a discussion of my interpretation of *Orator* 217.

Section 5: My Interpretation of *Orator* 217

Orator 217 follows a discussion on the proper use of prose rhythm and its effects on an audience. After describing rhythms suitable for particular instances in speeches, and the proper ways to utilize them, Cicero refers to the heroic clausula. This short passage has been interpreted in a variety of ways, typically in order to convey its meaning as implying that the heroic clausula is unacceptable, which would bring it into line with Zieliński's assessment of the clausula. I read the passage thus:

> *Ne iambus quidem, qui est e brevi et longa, aut par choreo qui habet tris brevis trochaeus, sed spatio par, non syllabis, aut etiam dactylus, qui est e longa et duabus brevibus, si est proximus a postremo, parum volubiliter pervenit ad extremum, si est extremus choreus aut spondeus; numquam enim interest uter sit eorum in pede extremo.*
>
> Not even an iamb – which consists of a short and a long; nor the trochee – equal to the choree, which has three shorts, but it is equal only in the amount of time [it takes to say it], not in the number of syllables [of which it consists]; nor even a dactyl – which consists of a long and two shorts – if is next to the final [foot], comes to the end insufficiently fluently, if the final [foot] is a choree or spondee; for it never matters which of those occurs in the final foot.

In sum, Cicero here claims that the final two feet consisting of a preceding iamb, trochee/choree, or dactyl, if followed by a choree or spondee, are acceptable rhythms with which to close sentences – a possible combination of these is, then, the heroic clausula. Some modern scholars tend to put emphasis on the *etiam* preceding *dactylus*, as it may imply a qualification of the preceding statement.[60] However, the *etiam* continues emphasizing the exceptional nature of these feet made apparent by the words which overtly connect the previously mentioned subjects (*ne…quidem*, *aut*). Further, it is sufficiently

[60] E. g., Shipley 1911: 415.

answered by the *si est proximus a postremo* – that is, *even* the dactyl is acceptable, *in the case that* it is next to the final foot. The *etiam*, in other words, signals the fact that though in many cases the heroic clausula carries a too poetical rhythm, in the case of the dactyl followed by a long syllable and an anceps, it happens to be an acceptable rhythm.[61] Cicero has previously noted that various rhythms must occasionally be used to move speeches quickly or slowly, so there cannot be a problem with rhythms that move quickly.[62]

As Shipley mentions, Zieliński writes that Cicero "by mistake" considers the heroic clausula among the good ones.[63] As mentioned above in his discussion of heroic clausulae, his remark on the *Orator* passage is simply that Cicero implies his avoidance of the heroic clausula through his use of the word *etiam*, as this "even" suggests a begrudging acceptance of the dactylic ending. Shipley claims that more is not expressed on the subject because "the convenient footnote had not yet been invented, and his sentence was already overloaded with parentheses."[64] He interprets the *etiam* as implying that the dactyl to be avoided would not necessarily be only created by the pattern of lengths ¯ ˘ ˘ / ¯ ˘, but would be the one recognized as the heroic clausula by virtue of this pattern also exhibiting coincidence of accent and ictus. After these comments, Shipley agrees that Cicero's practice is consistent with the *Orator* passage, due to his precise definition of the heroic clausula.[65]

[61] *De Orat*. 175 discusses the fault of speech falling into poetry.
[62] *Orat*. 212.
[63] Zieliński 1904:167; "that by mistake Cicero considers the clausula heroic (cadence of P3) among the good [clausulae]" (daß Cicero aus Versehn die clausula heroic (Cadenz von P3) zu den guten rechnet)
[64] 1911: 415.
[65] Shipley 1911, as discussed previously, claims that the heroic clausula is not formed where there is no coincidence of accent and ictus, and that the majority of Cicero's uses of it lacks this coincidence, especially the pentasyllabic endings of statements – therefore, there is no appearance of the clausula, and it is rarely utilized.

Laurand notes that "very probably [Cicero] disapproved of [the heroic clausula], for one should without doubt consider as a separate phrase the following words," before citing *dactylus…spondeus* of *Or*. 217.[66] In this case, the *spondeus* would no longer be governed by the *ne…quidem*, and Cicero would be stating that the dactyl arrives at the end of the sentence insufficiently fluently. Wilkinson notes that there is evidence of Cicero altering word order, choosing particular words, and "even straining syntax" in a marked avoidance of this particular clausula.[67] Yet perhaps a conscious choice to utilize this rhythm in an effective manner, with an intended result, also contributes to its rarity. Rather than find fault with Cicero or the manuscript tradition, I propose to reconcile Ciceronian text and practice. While I agree with Shipley in that Cicero is consistent with his statements in this passage, I believe he is not only approving of the use of the heroic clausula, but even defending the choice to utilize it in orations, as will become clear when looking into instances of the clausula in his orations.

[66] 1925: 179, "car on doit sans doute considérer comme un phrase distincte les mots suivants…" Laurand 1925: 67 follows Bornecque's suggestion of a lacuna here, which would make Cicero's statement concerning the heroic clausula negative, rather than positive.

[67] Wilkinson 1963: 158 claims that *Orator* 217 contrasts with Cicero's presumed tendency due to the fact that Cicero is remaining close to his Greek sources in discussing these tenets of prose rhythm. However, Cicero has already openly disagreed with Aristotle's assessment of the fourth paean (*Orat*. 214), implying that his discussion of prose rhythm is, at the least, somewhat influenced by his own practice.

Section 6: Introduction to My Investigation

My investigation to follow focuses on what intention may lie behind Cicero's utilization of the heroic clausula. As is evident from Shipley's attempt to discredit the clausula, the relative frequency with which Cicero uses heroic clausulae is troubling to modern scholars; the difficulty of reconciling his uses with the unclear discussions of the clausula in his treatises further complicates the issue. Bearing in mind that prose rhythm may be linked to semantics, I contend that some intent is present on occasions when this extraordinarily noticeable clausula appears.

In preparation for this study, I examined each one of the 107 heroic clausulae listed by Zieliński as existing in Cicero's speeches.[68] I examined the context surrounding each instance of the clausula, as well as its prominence in relation to the surrounding text. If the clausula is used to close a section, or finalize a line of thought, for example, attention is naturally drawn to it. I then consider what trends may be apparent in Cicero's use of the heroic clausula.

Given that I use Zieliński's list of clausulae, my definition for a heroic clausula necessarily is based on his.[69] Zieliński does not consider the heroic clausula (a dactyl followed by a spondee) to consist of enough syllables, and so takes into account preceding forms.[70] His preferred preceding forms consist of cretics, molossi, or trochaic rhythms, and resolved or substituted variations of these. Those instances of the heroic clausula that cannot be comfortably placed into these categories Zieliński still offers, but considers them to be "clausulae with an irregular basis."[71] I consider the heroic clausula, though only

[68] 1904: 163-166. A different list (consisting of 112 heroic clausulae) is provided by Laurand 1911: 76-84 (discussed below). 50 of Zieliński's clausulae are unaccounted for in Laurand; 49 of Laurand's do not appear in Zieliński's list. As Zieliński's work on clausulae is more often referred to by modern scholars, I follow his list.
[69] 1904: 163, he refers to the heroic clausula as something that has "long been known as infamous," (längst bekannte und verrufene).
[70] This is to fall in with his assumption that a clausula must be formed with a cretic or molossus as its basis.
[71] 1904: 166, "Clauseln mit unregelmässiger Basis." His negative perception of the heroic clausula is evident, as he considers creating another category of clausulae for heroic clausulae lacking his preferred preceding forms (n. 25),

consisting of five syllables, to be a remarkable enough rhythm on its own; the preceding rhythms, though they may signal the approach of a clausula, are likely not particularly consequential. The main discrepancy between our definitions of the clausula is between our consideration of the preceding rhythms, as I choose primarily to disregard them.

Though a dispondee could technically create a heroic clausula (the two shorts of the dactyl may contract into a single long), this does not yield a rhythm that is recognizable as a dactylic rhythm. The rhythm is far more recognizable to listeners as akin to the end of dactylic hexameter poetry when created from a dactyl and spondee, rather than simply a dispondee. In concordance with Zieliński's list, then, I do not consider a dispondaic rhythm to create a true heroic clausula. I further restrict my examination to instances in which the ictus of the dactyl coincides with the initial syllable of the word or words that constitute the heroic clausula (e.g. *múnera rosit*). As has been illustrated, a rhythmic clausula may be followed by other words.[72] While this may have an effect on the number of heroic clausulae present throughout his orations (and will be discussed further below), I choose still to follow Zieliński's list. Accepting that coincidence of accent and ictus is present in prose speech, I prefer my examples of the clausula to exhibit coincidence. The coincidence augments the poetic aspect of the rhythm, since Latin hexameters at this time period are increasingly tending to exhibit coincidence in the final two feet. The coincidence, I contend, is drawing attention to what is said, as well as how it is said.

---

which would detract from the number of instances of this clausula, and therefore relative percentages of appearances.

[72] Hutchinson 1995.

Section 7: Cicero's Thoughts on Heroic Clausulae

It is necessary before the inception of my investigation to take into account how Cicero may have regarded the use of the heroic clausula in orations. He rarely refers to the heroic clausula, but more often to the use of the dactyl in prose rhythm. His discussions of the dactyl consistently indicate his perception of dactylic rhythms as too poetic for oratory. Of import to my investigation is that, as has been previously discussed, one problem with excessively poetic rhythms in prose is that they become noticeable and distasteful to the audience. As Aristotle said, the audience after noticing a rhythm may expect a speech to continue in a poetic meter; after hearing a proliferation of dactyls, one might reasonably expect the closing rhythm of a hexameter line.

Again, the earliest discussion of the hexameter meter in prose occurs in Aristotle's *Ars Rhetorica*, immediately following his brief injunctions concerning how to properly use prose rhythm (discussed above). As Cicero recognizes the authority of Aristotle in his oratorical treatises, it seems appropriate to turn first to the recommendations of the earlier source. Aristotle's assessment of the rhythms appropriate for prose speech may claim that "of the rhythms, the heroic is lacking solemnity, but not lacking in spoken harmony" (τῶν δὲ ῥυθμῶν ὁ μὲν ἡρῷος σεμνῆς ἀλλ' οὐ λεκτικῆς ἁρμονίας δεόμενος).[73] However, the proper reading of the text is contested. Ross' OCT offers the reading just quoted, but Sandys reads σεμνὸς καὶ λεκτικῆς, in which case the heroic rhythm may be "solemn and lacking in spoken harmony." All the extant codices record this passage as σεμνὸς καὶ λεκτικὸς καὶ ἁρμονίας δεόμενος ([the heroic is] solemn and appropriate for speech and lacking in harmony"); Sandys rightly notes that a claim that the dactylic hexameter meter lacks harmony is "absurd in itself, and contradictory to the evidence of our own ears, and all ancient authority;"[74] nor is this rhythm appropriate for speech. The difficulty in interpreting this passage is evidenced by the plethora of

[73] *Ars Rhet*. 1408b.
[74] 1966: 86.

alternative readings offered by editors of the text, which is itself indicative of the troubles that plague modern scholars of prose rhythm.

Cicero in his *Orator*, while not necessarily ameliorating the textual difficulties confronted by modern editors of Aristotle, yet offers his own interpretation of this passage, sufficient for our current needs. He pits the technique of Ephorus, an orator who excessively uses the dactyl, against that condoned by Aristotle, who Cicero claims "judges the heroic rhythm to be grander than prose speech requires."[75] Regardless of whether this clarifies what Aristotle had originally written, Cicero considers the dactylic rhythm to provide a rhythm too solemn or dignified for everyday conversation. The qualities of the dactyl that render it undesirable for prose speech, however, certainly do not nullify the possibility that a poetic rhythm may be used for a specifically chosen or employed clausula in an oratorical context. I argue that Cicero may appreciate the heroic clausula simply for the fact that it draws attention to itself by virtue of its assumed inappropriateness for typical speech; the unsuitability of the clausula that treatises remark upon makes this rhythm particularly powerful when used by an orator who wants to surprise his audience with the unexpected.[76]

In *de Oratore*, Cicero writes that heroic rhythms (dactyls only, still, rather than dactyl followed by spondee) are acceptable in cola that occupy earlier or more central positions in periods – that is, they ought not to appear at clausulae, where the rhythms are more noticeable.[77] Shortly thereafter, he also

[75] *Orat*. 192, *iudicat heroum numerum grandiorem quam desideret soluta oratio*. At *De or*. 3.182, however, Cicero says that Aristotle "first encourages us towards the dactyl" (*primum ad heroum nos…invitat*). Mankin 2011 (*ad loc.*) takes this as a misreading of *Ars rhet.* 1408b, offering the suggestions that Cicero "confused his authorities" or had a text of Aristotle akin to the surviving manuscripts.

[76] As has been noted, Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.64 describes the appearance of pentasyllables as dactylic hexameter line endings as *praemolle,* excessively soft – this notable aspect of them surely makes the appearance of pentasyllables as heroic clausulae more noticeable to listeners.

[77] *De or*. 3. 182.

asserts that the dactyl and paean will occur naturally in speech, and that a speaker ought not to be too concerned when they appear – the author may ameliorate this by using a variety of different rhythms.[78]

In a later discussion of dactylic rhythms, at *Orator* 191, Cicero writes that *sunt enim qui iambicum putent, quod sit orationis simillimus, qua de causa fieri ut is potissimum propter similitudinem veritatis adhibeatur in fabulis, quod ille dactylicus numerus hexametrorum magniloquentiae sit accommodatior*. ("There are those who think the iambic [is the rhythm most suitable for prose], because it is most like speech (for which reason it happens that the iamb, particularly due to its likeness to reality, is used in plays), since that dactylic rhythm of hexameters is more suitable for exalted speech.") He clearly remarks that the dactyl itself is evocative of hexameters, and therefore it must also recall the rhythm of the ending of hexameter lines.[79] Dactylic rhythms, then, as well as heroic clausulae, may be too grand for oratory due to their suggestion of epic meter and material. As dactylic rhythms evoke heroic clausulae, the clausulae may well be subject to the same restrictions as the dactylic rhythms.

To move beyond purely dactylic rhythms, there is a potential reference to the heroic clausula, when Cicero writes (*de Or*. 3.193) the following: *duo enim aut tres fere sunt extremi servandi et notandi pedes, si modo non breviora et praecisa erunt superiora, quos aut chorios aut heroos aut alternos esse oportebit aut in paeane illo posteriore, quem Aristoteles probat, aut ei pari cretico*. ("There should be two or three final feet preserved and noted for the end, provided that the earlier parts are not shorter and abrupt, which [final feet] should be chorees or dactyls or these in alteration, either with that final paean which Aristotle approved of, or its equal the cretic.") Understanding *alternos* as "in alteration," this passage may be understood to condone the use of a heroic clausula, since a potential combination of the final

[78] *De or*. 3.191.
[79] At *Or*. 197, Cicero writes that the dactyl is suitable to both low and loftier speech. Presumably, he is speaking of individual occurrences of the rhythm, rather than repetitive uses of it.

two feet of a sentence recommended by Cicero consists of a dactyl followed by a choree – the heroic clausula.

Likely due to this possibility, interpretations of this passage are troubled. Leeman and Pinkster suggest understanding *alternos* as "their alternates," that is, the spondee or cretic, alternates of a trochee and dactyl (understanding that if a dactyl or choree is in the final foot, the final syllable could be either long or short).[80] However, they note that no parallel for this interpretation of *alternos* is found in the *ThLL*. Oberhelman understands the passage to condone an ending consisting of a trochee or dactyl; alternatively, a paean or cretic followed by a trochee or dactyl is acceptable.[81] The suggestions concerning this passage tend to be conjectures that will make Cicero's statement conform to what he says in *Orator*, as well as his practice. It seems indicative of the trouble with modern prose rhythmical studies that they all exhibit a degree of undue influence pitting them against the heroic clausula, most often based on the findings of Zieliński that the heroic clausula provides a statistically unexpected rhythm.

Above has been discussed Cicero's remarks at *Or*. 217, at which point I believe that he condones the use of the heroic clausula. Wüst notes that the heroic clausula typically is found after interrogations because the Latin language lacks strong punctuation; the clausula is used, then, as a substitute punctuation that signifies the end of a phrase.[82] Shipley's assessment of the heroic clausula, as well as the problems inherent in his assessment, has been illustrated above. The other main post-Zieliński article on Cicero's heroic clausulae was published in the same year, written by Laurand.[83] He writes that

[80] A dactyl or choree in the final foot would render the cretic or spondee possible, due to the anceps final syllable.
[81] 2003: 38; he does not explain why he interprets the text as such.
[82] Wüst 1881: 68.
[83] Half a century after Laurand and Shipley, Fraenkel 1968 provides a short section on the heroic clausula in the appendix to his *Leseproben.* He acknowledges others' belief that Cicero would avoid or very rarely use the heroic clausula, and unequivocally states "that is completely not the case" (Das ist durchaus nicht der Fall). To support his argument, he points to a number of appearances of the heroic clausula in Cicero's orations. He does not, however,

hexameter endings are indeed rare, and many exist due to bad conjectures, but he warns modern scholars against excessively emending away heroic clausulae. Laurand's argument rests on the fact that Cicero's early works exhibit far more uses of the heroic clausula than those later in his career; he takes this to mean that the later paucity of occurrences of the clausula is an indicator of Cicero's developing and refining his style.[84] Laurand offers instances of the heroic clausula (as mentioned above, a list of 112, as opposed to Zieliński's 107), making special note of those he believes to be problematic and the ones that Cicero attributes to a speaker other than himself (to be discussed later). His assessment of the clausula does align with Shipley, as he writes that the lack of caesura in most instances of it, as well as the preponderance of instances that consist of tetra- and pentasyllabic words, might detract from recognition of the form as a heroic clausula.[85]

In his discussion, Laurand touches briefly upon the subject of my investigation. Not only does he note that the heroic clausula is most often used in earlier, less refined speeches, but he also writes that passages "where the style is simple, informal, ironic" have a tendency to exhibit more instances of this clausula. I believe that this observation may be taken a step further. I argue that not only does this clausula appear in such passages, but these very appearances are intentional, and that the heroic clausula is used to emphasize these aspects of the sections. Just following the quote above, Laurand writes that the heroic clausula in Cicero's later period "never appears in the brilliant morsels where the works of his youth did not always exclude them."[86] The fact that he writes that the heroic clausula *never*

---

come to any conclusion concerning the clausula other than that Cicero is concerned with the rhythm, but not particularly distressed by appearances of it. "Cicero himself, the great master of rhythm, was certainly occupied with the meter, but not disturbed by it" (Cicero selbst, der grosse Meister der Rythmik, ist gewiss des Versmasses inne geworden, aber es wird ihn nicht gestört haben), 1968: 198-200.

[84] 1911: 85. Laurand shows that Cicero's oratorical oeuvre, divided chronologically into nearly equal thirds, shows 41 occurrences of the clausula in the first third, and 71 in both the latter parts together.

[85] 1911: 86, also citing Wüst 1881: 89-90. He is tentative to go so far as Shipley does in the assumption that these are not heroic clausulae.

[86] 1911: 86, "simple, abandonné, ironique, jamais dans les morceaux brillants d'où les oeuvres de jeunesse ne les excluaient pas toujours."

appears in Cicero's later grand oratorical flourishes implies at the least that Cicero does take this clausula into account, and supports that it is at least occasionally purposefully utilized. The distaste for noticeably poetic rhythms in oratory provides a further argument for the occasional intentional appearances of them.

Essential to my argument is, as has been established above, that the heroic clausula is a noticeable rhythm, both to speakers and to audiences (one of the reasons for which it is often assumed to be condemned). By drawing attention to its appearance, the heroic clausula thereby also draws attention to the semantics of the passage. This is, perhaps, especially useful and noticeable in places where the heroic clausula may emphasize a mock heroic or sarcastic element of a passage.

All of this discussion illustrates the problems confronted in modern investigations of prose rhythm. The difficulty in accurately translating and defining the terminologies inherent to prose rhythm, as well as the existence of textual discrepancies in the places where these discussions occur, and the desire of editors to reconcile the text of the treatises with their interpretations as well as with Cicero's practice, give rise to many difficulties in modern prose rhythmical studies. It seems that the best way to more fully understand Cicero's proclivities is to center the investigation on his oratorical practice, as I am about to do. I believe that the heroic clausula suggests a grandiloquence that I argue is ironically undercut by the seemingly inappropriate combination of this particular clausula with the often sarcastic tone of Cicero's speech at that particular point.

Section 8: Examples of Heroic Clausulae in Cicero's Orations

Appearances of heroic clausulae are occasionally unavoidable, due to the nature of the Latin tongue (the "normal" percentage of its appearances in unrhythmical prose is 8.3%).[87] For example, it often happens that pentasyllabic words create self-contained heroic clausulae.[88] As has been established above, however, many of these appearances in Cicero's orations may not be accounted for solely by chance. In the examination to follow, it shall become apparent that the placement of and emphasis on heroic clausulae helps to heighten particular aspects of the semantics of passages in which they appear. The clausulae appear to be especially emphatic at points at which Cicero is also emphasizing an ironic, sarcastic, or essentially inappropriate aspect of a person at whom or case at which his invective is aimed; often, it occurs when implicating the speech or thought of an opponent. The clausula deemed inappropriate for prose may be used effectively in that very genre to heighten the inappropriate nature of its content.

By my count (accepting that an accent appears on *non*), at least 60 heroic clausulae (of Zieliński's list) exhibit coincidence on the initial syllables of the dactyl and spondee, and the majority of these exhibit a strong tone of mockery.[89] As Laurand has noted, a number of the instances of the heroic clausula are in directly quoted speech.[90] The clausula also appears in indirect quotations, or assumptions of what might be said (e.g. *Dom*. 105, below). As this clausula occurs throughout Cicero's oratorical works, it

[87] Figure from de Groot 1921: 106.
[88] E. g. *Dom.* 105: *implicuisses,* an example to be discussed below. Heroic clausulae which are created from syncopates or alternative forms are, of course, often contested by modern scholars (in the case of *Dom*. 105, for example, Zieliński suggests *implicavisses* to avoid the heroic clausula).
[89] Although I use Zieliński's list, his definition of the clausula I find too narrow, constricted by his restrictions of the basis. Shipley's is also too narrow, constricted by restrictions of accent. My definition considers a heroic clausula to consist of the final five syllables creating a dactyl plus spondee/trochee.
[90] Laurand 1911: 77-78 gives a list of six; three of these are titles or terms of laws or edicts, one is a letter from Antonius, and two are from the *pro Caelio* (discussed further below).

seems best to examine a few examples from various points in his chronology, and thereafter to examine some overlooked by Zieliński.

The first occurrence I will examine occurs in the earliest extant speech of Cicero, at *Quinct*. 79 (81 BCE). Though it is unnecessary to examine the structure of the entire speech, some contextualization may illustrate that this is a pivotal point in Cicero's case. An edict that granted Gaius Naevius *bonorum possessio* over the property of Publius Quinctius, his business partner, was pronounced on February 20 or 21 at Rome. Quinctius was expelled from his property in Gaul by Naevius' minions on February 23 or 24. Though this was after the edict had been granted, the expulsion of Quinctius doubtlessly took place sooner than news of that edict could have reached Gaul. At this point in the speech, Cicero has been berating his opponents to admit that this temporal discrepancy exists; by emphasizing the impossibility of Naevius's story, Cicero calls into question the legality of the actions of Naevius.

Cicero has been drawing the responses out of his opponents and simultaneously drawing attention to their responses by speaking with many brief questions interspersed with imperatives. The first extensive sentence that appears is a description of the speed of the alleged journey from Rome to Gaul; this description closes with a heroic clausula (with coincidence) on *cōnfĭcĭūntur*: *biduo post aut, ut statim de iure aliquis cucurrerit, non toto triduo DCC milia passuum cōnfĭcĭūntur*. ("Two days later, or, if someone immediately started running from the court, in not even three days, 700 miles was traversed.") This ends a section, and immediately following it in the oration come interjections concerning the unbelievably fast nature of the presumed journey; surrounding the statement with both preceding short statements and succeeding interjections draws attention to it, and the heroic clausula highlights the impossibility of the circumstances Cicero is describing. [91] Since the impossible speed of this travel is crucial to Cicero's argument, this sentence is placed in a yet more emphatic light. Not only

[91] *O rem incredibilem! o cupiditatem inconsideratam! o nuntium volucrem!* ("O incredible thing! O hasty avarice! O winged messenger!")

has Cicero been highlighting the impossibility of the argument, he has been doing so by consistently asking his opponents to speak and subsequently quoting them; as the heroic clausula appears when he is explaining his opponents' alleged story, he is also putting the clausula ill-suited for prose into their mouths, implicating their rhetorical abilities as well as their alleged story.[92] The audience finds that "the events of February 83 BC are presented in the *narratio* as a dastardly plot by Naevius to ruin his partner by depriving him of all his property," and I argue that the heroic clausula further calls into question their story.[93]

I have selected from a more central period of Cicero's oratorical works an instance at *Dom*. 105 (57 BCE). Cicero is in the process of berating Clodius for his intrusion into the rites of Bona Dea. Amidst a list of rhetorical questions, he asks, *quae autem te tanta mentis imbecillitas tenuit ut non putares deos satis posse placari nisi etiam muliebribus religionibus te implicuisses?*[94] (What weakness of mind had control of you such that you thought it not possible for the gods to be placated enough unless you had entangled yourself also in female rites?) *Te implicuisses* (accepting elision, though the heroic clausula would still appear if hiatus were taken into account) encompasses both the subject and verb of its colon and the heroic clausula.

Clodius himself is both the subject and the object of the colon. His masculinity is thereby impugned, for though he should be in control of his masculinity, he actively subverts it, and he does so by choice rather than under duress. The clausula heightens the invective nature of the attack by virtue of its appearance here. The clausula does not entirely close off a section of the speech, but it finalizes the attack on

[92] Implied (or overt) use of the heroic clausula when describing or quoting the prose of Cicero's opponents appears to implicate their rhetorical abilities; such use of the clausula also appears, for example, in *Phil*. 13, where he is insulting Antonius' use of prose.
[93] Lintott 2008: 51.
[94] Though all manuscripts support this reading, Zieliński 1904: 206 suggests *implicavisses*, altering it to a cretic and spondee, one of Cicero's more common clausulae (Maslowski's 1981 Teubner offers the suggestion but does not print it).

Clodius' masculinity, since the use of *etiam* emphasizes that he did not only violate sacred rites, but even those that are sacred to women. The concept of Clodius "entwining" himself with things sacred to women underscores the attack on his masculinity.[95] The use of *putares* makes the rest of the discussion not only an implied quotation of Clodius' line of reasoning, but a virtual replication of what Clodius was thinking, by transforming all that follows into implied indirect discourse. Just as in the case of *Quinct*. 79 above, Cicero is implicating Clodius' understanding of propriety not only concerning sacred rites, but also concerning rhetoric.

Just following this, Cicero alters his tactic of assault from insulting Clodius' masculinity to accusing him of letting down his ancestry via this religious indiscretion, as there appears a reference to Clodius' predecessor Appius Claudius Caecus.[96] The reference to an ancestor famous politically and oratorically underscores the emphasis on violation that this clausula contains, as a rhythm that surely does not belong in prose emphasizes the inappropriate nature of the politically and socially powerful male in the garb of women, at a ritual for women. The inappropriate combination of the heroic rhythm with the subject matter highlights the anti-masculine nature of Clodius' actions; the violation of religious and gender norms is paralleled with the violation of rhetorical norms apparent in the speech.

As has been mentioned previously, prose rhythm is used to justify or suggest emendations of texts. A more comprehensive understanding of the use and intentions of prose rhythm may also help to support readings of manuscripts; as will be seen below, the use of the heroic clausula may illustrate that certain manuscript readings should be accepted rather than emended.

---

[95] Geffcken 1973: 83, in a discussion of Cicero's constant attacks against Clodius' womanly garb, illustrates that "By dressing up, Clodius – as Cicero depicts him – entered this world of play, of differentness, and secrecy."

[96] According to Livy 9.29, Appius Claudius Caecus is punished with blindness due to his own religious infraction (of handing over the Potitii family's rites of Hercules to slaves); this tradition surely comes to mind when confronting his later relative's transgression. Emphasizing this connection is the fact that the rites of Hercules are connected with those of Bona Dea.

In the second *Philippic* (44 BCE), Cicero ends a discussion of Antonius' base behaviors with an instance of the heroic clausula (*Phil*. 2. 63). I begin with a brief discussion of the manuscript trouble that occurs at this point in the text.

Of two main manuscript traditions, V is the older and, for the most part, more reliable. D (the reconstructed ancestor of selected manuscripts dating from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries) fills in some gaps in V and contains some corrections, some of which also occur in V, written by later hands. At this point in the manuscript, V reads *splendidiora* (a self-contained heroic clausula), while D reads *splendida* (this creates a double cretic, considered a more desirable clausula). Modern editors seem to be torn concerning which tradition to follow.

As attested in most discussions of the manuscripts, V "was written by an ignorant scribe who faithfully copied whatever he found in the text that he was transcribing, even if it made no sense," or, presumably, if it exhibited undesirable rhythms.[97] D has a number of passages which have clausulae deemed superior; Shackleton Bailey provides a list of 13 instances where "D is vindicated against V by superior rhythm." He goes on to write that "since the good clausulae in D cannot reasonably be set down to coincidence or deliberate improvement, they are to be accepted and regarded as a warning to editors against too heavy a commitment to the superiority of V."[98] Fedeli's Teubner prints *splendidiora*, but cites D's *splendida*, and he points to other editors with the remark that *splendidiora respuunt nonnulli propter clausulam* ("More than a few [editors] reject *splendidiora* due to the clausula").[99] Clark's 1910: 1952 OCT prints *splendida*, citing the "bad rhythm" (*malo numero*) of *splendidiora*. Laurand reads *splendidiora* and enters it into his list of heroic clausulae, though he does note the

[97] Ramsey 2003: 23.
[98] Shackleton Bailey 1986: xiii.
[99] Fedeli's apt use of *respuunt* (spit out) further adds to the conflation of oral emission of verbal and physical vomit.

manuscript variation.[100] Ramsey in his 2003 edition of the text prefers *splendida*. As is evidenced by these various scholars' decisions, the arguments concerning the legitimacy of the heroic clausula are compelling on both sides: V is older, while D has corrections (textual corrections as well as those that render more favorable clausulae). V's scribe was, presumably, honest in his ignorance; D's shows improvements and conjectures. V is more comprehensive, while D fills in the gaps of V. The semantics, perhaps, may help to illustrate which reading is more likely correct.

Previous to this, in the same speech, Cicero writes *ad maiora veniamus*; the parallel construction of this transition appears to support the use of the comparative *splendidiora*.[101] At this point in the oration, Cicero is ending his detailed description of Antonius' public vomiting; it seems reasonable to assume that he would have specifically wanted to adorn his oration at this point to strongly emphasize the invective. The discussion of the vomiting is followed by the phrase *veniamus ad splēndĭdĭōra*, "let us move to his more illustrious deeds."[102] A sense break immediately occurs here as Cicero goes on to discuss Antonius' more despicable behaviors, so a clausula at this point is likely to be intentional; Lacey argues that the pattern of a dactyl followed by a trochee is likely to be "looking forward to the next phrase," and further finds that "the closing sentence is laughing in sense and rhythm."[103] Antonius' vomiting took place at a *contio*, where he was about to deliver an oration; presumably, the description of his vomiting is also an illustration of his poor oratorical abilities – notably, Cicero also describes Antonius' oratorical style as "vomiting" in the fifth *Philippic*.[104] This blurring of the line between the literal and metaphorical use of the vomiting surely brings to mind his poor oratorical style, reflected in the heroic clausula of *splendidiora*. Cicero in the thirteenth *Philippic* quotes a heroic clausula

[100] 1911: 77.
[101] 2.31.
[102] 2.63.
[103] Lacey 1986: 32; *ad loc.*
[104] *Phil*. 5.20: *evomuit*.

(*cōnsŭlārĭōrum*) that occurs in a letter of Antonius.[105] Throughout this particular speech, Cicero has been attacking not only the content of Antonius' letter, but also the style of his prose, which reflects Cicero's awareness of the importance of connections between content and construction.

A tone of sarcasm is certainly present here, as Cicero implies that what he has previously been discussing may already be described as illustrious (*splendida*); he also does the opposite of what he has suggested, and continues with great disdain and emotion his discussion of Antonius' actions concerning the auction of Gnaeus Pompeius' goods. The coincidence present in this heroic clausula heightens the mock heroic aspect of the passage. All these aspects of the clausula point to Cicero's intentional use of the heroic clausula, and the reading of manuscript V.

Another notable heroic clausula (the customary poetic combination of trisyllable and disyllable, exhibiting coincidence) possibly occurs at *Phil*. 13.27; *est etiam ibi Decius ab illis, ut opinor, Muribus Deciis, itaque Caesaris mūnĕră rōsit* ("Even Decius is there, from, as I think, that Mures Decii family, and so he gnawed on the gifts of Caesar"). Though only one 13th century manuscript exhibits *munera rosit*, the remaining manuscripts have the nonsensical *numerose sit.* Fedeli's Teubner prints *munera rosit*, while Clark prints *munera arrosit* "for the sake of the clausula" (*clausulae gratia*); this emendation results in a cretic and spondee. In his attempt to discredit Cicero's use of the heroic clausula, Shipley notes some evidence of corruption due to the rarity with which *–que* is added to adverbs, though *itaque* appears in the same sentence as the questionable clausula.[106] Shackleton Bailey emends the passage to *munera erosit*, altering the clausula (accepting elision) to a cretic followed by a trochee.[107] Nisbet claims that Clark's *arrosit* is the correct reading, as this would create a more desirable clausula.[108] Again, the

[105] *Phil*. 13.44.
[106] 1911: 416.
[107] Shackleton Bailey 1986: 340.
[108] Nisbet 1990: 359. *Arrosit* is upheld by Cicero's use at *Sest*. 33; Merguet: 1884, however, cites *Phil*. 13.27 and *Balb*. 57 as instances of *rodo* and only Sest. 33 for *adrodo*. More convincingly, Cicero in the same year as this

difficulties of this passage may be ameliorated by looking into the effects of the potential heroic clausula; I maintain that the heroic clausula occurs intentionally, as it emphasizes the humor of this statement.

Here, Cicero is making a pun by saying that Decius, a descendant of Decius Mus (mouse), nibbled at the gifts of Caesar. *Rodere*, or a compound of it, is surely appropriate at this point in order to create a pun. Cicero's use of *ut opinor* earlier in the sentence is a certain indication that he is being sarcastic at this point in the oration. The fact that Cicero is making a joke must be clear from this signal to the audience. The audience surely would also have been aware of the appearance of the clausula, and this would have drawn attention to the joke as well as to Cicero's facetiousness. The construction of this clausula from a trisyllable and disyllable, a typical construction of a hexameter line ending, seems to imply that this appearance is intentional, as it must have been especially noticeable to the audience. The overall context of this oration is based around the prose of Antonius, as Cicero has just started to insult a letter written by Antonius.[109] This clausula appears as Cicero is just about to turn back to the letter; it may well be a conscious reflection of a less than respectable prose style.[110] Due to its humorous aspect, its evident poetic construction, and its presence in a manuscript, *munera rosit* must be the correct reading.

Two instances of the heroic clausula appear very close to one another at *pro Caelio* 63; *'in balneis dēlĭtŭērunt.' Testis egregios! 'dein temere prōsĭlŭērunt.' homines temperantis!'* ("They hid in the baths." Outstanding testifiers! "Then they rashly jumped out." Cool-headed men!). These instances are overlooked by Zieliński (though not by Laurand), perhaps due to their appearance in quotations or in the middle of the dialogue Cicero is speaking. Though the rhythms appear in the middle of a section, we have seen above that clausulae may be followed by other words; their location should not detract from

---

Philippic also uses *rodo* at *de Div*. 2.59 when discussing mice eating through shields, though a compound appears just before.

[109] *Phil*. 13.22.

[110] As mentioned previously, another heroic clausula appears at *Phil*. 13.44, within the letter of Antonius.

the force of their appearance at this point in the speech.[111] Moreover, the clausulae are immediately followed by exclamations; as the force of the exclamations requires a pause beforehand, the clausulae preceding them are emphasized. Quintilian's description of pentasyllabic clausulae as *praemolle*, even if disapproving, illustrates that these clausulae are noticeable to listeners.[112] I believe that Cicero intentionally utilizes the heroic clausulae here to heighten the force of his humor as well as his invective against his opponents.

The humor throughout this passage is made glaringly apparent by the appearances of the puns that immediately follow the appearance of each clausula. Sarcasm exists in Cicero's description of outstanding witnesses (as the men hiding would presumably not have witnessed anything); their *testis* are standing out as well, as the men are hiding naked in the baths. The other pun in *temperantis* mocks the lack of self-control these men have, made further unbelievable as their temperatures would be affected by being in the baths. The proximity of the rhyming verbs *delituerunt* and *prosiluerunt* further supports the resonation of mockery within the passage. In Geffcken's extensive treatment of humor in this speech, she argues that the description of the encounter in the baths brings the speech to the level of mime, therefore degrading Clodia.[113] Geffcken notes that though a detailed description could harm Cicero's case, he approaches it through a confusing discussion of it that is yet amusing to the jury. He "uses several devices to achieve this farcical treatment. First of all, he blows up the episode into a mock-epic encounter, with hyperbole and flamboyant exaggeration."[114] The humorous use of heroic clausulae certainly underlies the mock-heroic description of the bath encounter; as the clausulae occur within quotations of Cicero's opponents, they are subtly accused of foolishly considering the encounter to be adventurous. Moreover, as the content of the speech implies that they are unreliable witnesses,

[111] Hutchinson 1995.
[112] *Inst.* 9.4.64.
[113] Geffcken 1973:24.
[114] Geffcken 1973:25.

the use of the heroic clausulae simultaneously insults their method of speaking – and by extension, their virility and trustworthiness.[115] This use echoes that in *Phil*. 13, as he is insulting the prose of his opponent. The humor throughout this passage is made glaringly apparent by the appearances of the puns *testis* (since the men are hiding naked in the baths, their *testis* are certainly outstanding) and *temperantis* (since their temperatures are affected by the baths, they cannot physically be cool-headed). The humor is further supported by the proximity of the rhyming verbs *delituerunt* and *prosiluerunt*. The heroic clausulae here undoubtedly augment the humor of the situation that Cicero describes and simultaneously implicate his opponents as disreputable.

[115] See Richlin 1997 for the reflection of masculinity in oratorical delivery.

Conclusion

I have shown above that one may reconcile Cicero's recommendation of the heroic clausula at *Orat*. 217 with its ill repute, which is reflected in the relative paucity of its appearances in his orations. I find that the rarity of his uses speaks to his awareness of it, and that this avoidance bespeaks intentional employment of the clausula when it appears. The heroic clausula may well be off-putting or jarring for an audience to recognize in prose speech; the fact that it is often constructed from a single, self-contained pentasyllabic word emphasizes and amplifies this inappropriateness. Yet I find that this very aspect of the clausula may contribute to Cicero's desire to use it; the clausula maintains its negative nature, but rather than constantly avoid it, Cicero explicitly avoids it until its nature can be utilized to emphasize the theme of his invective. He takes advantage of the aspects of the clausula that are inappropriate for prose speech, and uses these to heighten the inappropriate nature of the matters he discusses, heightening an already plainly apparent tone of invective nature.

This is one small contribution to the trend of modern studies that look into the nuances of prose rhythm, especially influenced by Cicero's injunction at *de Orat*. 3.175 to bind the meaning of the words to their construction. This study points to the necessity of taking not only the quantitative aspects, but also the semantics into account when textual criticism finds itself turning to prose rhythm for answers. Further studies of prose rhythm in particular works or authors may be made more effective by bearing this injunction in mind, and looking to the effect of rhythmical constructions on semantics.

Works Cited

Aili, H. 1979. *The Prose Rhythm of Sallust and Livy*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Berry, D. H. 1996. "The Value of Prose Rhythm in Questions of Authenticity." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 6, 47-74.

Bornecque, H. 1907. *Les clausules métriques latines*. Lille: Au Siege de L'Université.

Caplan, H, ed. 1954. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clark, A. 1905. Review: Zieliński*, Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden. Classical Review* 19: 164-172.

de Groot, A. W. 1921. *Der antike Prosarhythmus: Zugleich Fortsetzung des Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm*. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.

Fedeli, P. 1982. *In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae XIV*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Fraenkel, E. 1968. *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos*. Rome: Sussidi Eruditi, 22.

Geffcken, K. 1973. *Comedy in the Pro Caelio*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci.

Habinek, T. 1985. *The Colometry of Latin Prose*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hutchinson, G. 1995. "Rhythm, Style, and Meaning in Cicero's Prose." *CQ* 45: 485-99.

Lacey, W. K. 1986. *Cicero: Second* Philippic. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Laurand, L. 1911. "Les fins d'hexamètre dans les discours de Cicéron." *Revue de Philologie* 35: 75-88.

Laurand, L. 1927. *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*. Paris: Hachette.

Leeman, A. D., Pinkster, H., et al., 1981. *M. Tullius Cicero. De oratore Libri III*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Lintott, A. 2008. *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mankin, D., ed. 2011. *Cicero,* De oratore *Book III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maslowski, T. 1981. *de Domo Sua*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Merguet, H. 1884. *Lexikon zu den Reden Des Cicero*. Jena: Dufft.

Nisbet, R. 1990. "Cola and Clausula in Cicero's Speeches." In *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, Craik, E. M., ed. Oxford: Clarendon. 345-59.

Oberhelman, S. 2003. *Prose Rhythm in Latin Literature of the Roman Empire – First Century B.C. to Fourth Century A.D.* Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Ramsey, J. 2003. *Cicero: Philippics I-II*. New York: Cambridge.

Richlin, A. 1997. "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools." In *Roman Eloquence*, W. Dominik, ed. New York: Routledge. 90 – 110.

Riggsby, A. 2010. "Form as global strategy in Cicero's *Second Catilinarian.*" In *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, Berry, D. H., and Erskine, A., eds. New York: Cambridge. 92 – 104.

Ross, D., ed. 1959. *Ars Rhetorica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sandys, J. 1877. *The* Rhetoric *of Aristotle with a Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1986. *The Philippics*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Shipley, F. W. 1911. "The Heroic Clausulae in Cicero and Quintilian." *CP* 6: 410-418.

Siefert, G. 1952. "Meter and Case in the Latin Elegiac Pentameter." *Language* 28: 9-126.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1963. *Golden Latin Artistry*. New York: Cambridge.

Wüst, G. 1881. *De clausula rhetorica quae praecepit Cicero, quatenus in or. secutus sit*. Dissertation: Argentor.

Zieliński, T. 1904. *Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden*. Leipzig : *Philologus* Supplementband 9.