

CICERO'S STYLE FOR RELATING MEMORABLE SAYINGS

H. C. GOTOFF

In an analysis of Cicero's *Pro Archia* ¹⁾ I noted a similarity of construction in the following three periods and described it as an anecdotal style:

atque is [Alexander] tamen, cum in Sigeo ad Achillis tumulum astitisset, "O fortunate," inquit, "adulescens, qui tuae virtutis Homerum praeconem inveneris". (x.24)

Themistoclem illum, summum Athenis virum, dixisse aiunt, cum ex eo quaereretur quod acroama aut cuius vocem libentissime audiret: eius, a quo sua virtus optime praedicaretur.²⁾ (ix.20)

quem [Sullam] nos in contione vidimus, cum ei libellum malus poeta de populo subiecisset, quod epigramma in eum fecisset tantum modo alternis versibus longiusculis, statim ex eis rebus, quae tum vendebat, iubere ei praemium tribui, sed ea condicione, ne quid postea scriberet. (x.25)

Further study has shown that the label "anecdotal" is inadequate, because too broad. The many hundreds of anecdotes in the corpus of Cicero cannot usefully be reduced to a structural formula, however flexible. The similarities in the syntax and movement of the above passages are, nevertheless, remarkable and reflect a practice frequently repeated, with variation, by Cicero.

The passages just quoted have in common the narration of a situation culminating with a memorable saying. It is clear that the ancients considered it both educational and entertaining to record the well-turned phrases of people whose occasional remarks reflect an improving attitude or exemplify, in their pith and elegance, a point in question. The history of the apophthegm has been thoroughly researched by Wilhelm Gemoll,³⁾ who demonstrates, *inter alia*, the attraction of the subgenre in many cultures throughout Western and Near Eastern history. He does not, however, treat it specifically as a

literary figure,⁴⁾ though he once mentions that the "classic" form of the apophthegm is ἐρωτηθεὶς εἶπε. Such a statement is far too limited. In many instances, an *obiter dictum* is cited simply with the attribution of its author, though such a presentation is not the concern of this paper. The formula which Gemoll refers to as classic, a straightforward repartee of question and answer, or thrust and parry, is indeed popular. But frequently the narrator seems to feel that a more detailed description of the circumstances is essential to convey the full pith of the dictum. This further embellishment of the context is found both with simple dicta, as in the Alexander and Sulla anecdotes above, and with responses to the questions or comments of others. We are now in the area of fully articulated anecdotes, or vignettes, capped by memorable sayings.

Cicero's usual formula for presenting such vignettes is a construction that begins with the identification of the speaker who produces the bon mot and ends with his dictum. Between these two elements is bracketed all the circumstantial information necessary for understanding the occasion and appositeness of the remark. This technique of bracketing makes the construction invariably periodic; the effect of limiting the description of the context to the space between the two elements is to create by hyperbaton a period that is circular, concise, and often highly intricate.⁵⁾ While the form that Cicero prefers seems an obvious choice - Cicero has a way of making his most complex constructions appear obvious - we might keep in mind alternatives that could appear equally appropriate. When the author of the *ad Herennium*, our earliest Roman authority on rhetoric, addressed himself to the style of anecdotes, he recommended the plain style of simple sentences in paratactic relationship.⁶⁾ Similarly, an informal *eiromene* style suits the telling of a vignette, allowing for the subordination of minor circumstances while avoiding the artificiality of periodic structure.⁷⁾ Again, even if periodic construction is chosen for the subordination of the incidental circumstances necessary for the context of the dictum, a more fully interwoven structure might offer a more leisurely,

better balanced distribution of the material. If the Ciceronian formula can be expressed by S C D (S = speaker, C = circumstance(s), D = dictum), there might still be occasion for a C¹ S C² D, or C¹ C² S D structure that would also have the effect of suspending the dictum to the end of the period.⁸⁾ Yet, from the *pro Archia*, the *Tusculan Disputations*, the *de Senectute* and a random check of other works, there emerges only one unquestionable example of C¹ S C² D:

tamen huic [Ulixi] leviter gementi illi ipsi qui ferunt
 saucium personae gravitatem intuentes non dubitant dicere:
 "tu quoque Ulixes, quamquam graviter
 cernimus ictum, nimis paene animo es
 molli, qui consuetus in armis
 aevum agere." (Tusc. II 49)

The introduction of a relative clause and a participial phrase creates a significant hyperbaton and may have persuaded Cicero to exclude the dative participial phrase from the bracket between subject and dictum. Examination of other, similar constructions, however, suggests that Cicero would find it little more awkward to include three circumstantial elements than two.⁹⁾

*

Before presenting and discussing some examples of the Ciceronian formula, a word may be said about the history of the form. Unfortunately, the largest collections and repositories of apophthegms post-date Cicero, e.g. [Plutarch] *Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata*, *Apophthegmata Laconica*,¹⁰⁾ and Diogenes Laertius and, in Latin, Valerius Maximus. Some such collections existed in Cicero's day, but they have perished.¹¹⁾ As a result, while we are certain that the recording of apophthegms was popular before Cicero, our knowledge of the form(s) they took is seriously limited. It is also to be remarked that the incorporation of such anecdotes in a Ciceronian narrative may create stylistic demands unimportant in the listing of discreet quotations.¹²⁾

An early example of an apophthegm set in an anecdote appears at Thuc. iv., 40, 2:

ἀπιστοῦντές τε μὴ εἶναι τοὺς παραδόντας τοῖς τεθνε-
 ῶσιν ὁμοίους, καὶ τινος ἐρομένου ποτὲ ὕστερον τῶν
 Ἀθηναίων Ξυμμάχων δι' ἀχθηδόνα ἕνα τῶν ἐκ τῆς νῆσου
 αἰχμαλώτων εἰ οἱ τεθνεῶτες αὐτῶν καλοὶ κάγαθοί,
 ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ πολλοῦ ἂν ἄξιον εἶναι τὸν ἄτρακτον,
 λέγων τὸν οἰστὸν, εἰ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς διεγίγνωσκε (δῆλωσιν
 ποιούμενος ὅτι ὁ ἐντυγχάνων τοῖς τε λίθοις καὶ
 τοξεύμασι διεφθείρετο).

From the genitive absolute to the second conditional clause, the anecdote is told in a self-sufficient periodic construction including a good amount of circumstantial detail. It is also in the form of repartee. The explanatory phrase at the end can also be paralleled in Cicero.¹³⁾ Whereas, however, it is Cicero's practice to begin the anecdote with the speaker, Thucydides, in his own special way, forces the reader to extract the subject from the anacolouthon with which he begins.

In *Mem.* III 13, 1, Xenophon relates a number of anecdotes about Socrates, only one of which uses the formula under discussion:

ὀργιζομένου δέ ποτέ τινος ὅτι προσειπὼν τινα χαίρειν οὐκ ἀντιπροσερρήθη, Γελοῖον, ἔφη, τὸ εἶ μὲν τὸ σῶμα κάκιον ἔχοντι ἀπήνησάς τῳ, μὴ ἂν ὀργίζεσθαι, ὅτι δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀγροικότερως διακειμένῳ περιέτυχες, τοῦτό σε λυπεῖν.

The omission of the speaker in the body of the period is explained by Xenophon's prefatory remark that the apophthegms belong to Socrates. This accounts for the frequent recurrence of the same phenomenon in [Plutarch], where a number of apophthegms are often listed under the same author. For whatever reason it comes about, however, the difference is felt; the period, rather than being made circular by the bracketing of the speaker and dictum, is bipartite, of an interlocutory type. In Cicero, the anecdote is typically integrated into the larger context; and in cases where the speaker is already identified in an earlier sentence, the anecdote is usually contained in a semi-independent relative clause.¹⁴⁾ The other apophthegms attributed to Socrates by Xenophon are narrated in a more discursive form, with no attempt at periodicity or concision.

In *Hellenica* II, 3, 56, Xenophon tells two stories about Theramenes illustrative of his ability to maintain his wit in adversity. The second, which is also found in Cicero, will be dealt with below; the first is as follows:

οἱ δ' ἀπήγαγον τὸν ἄνδρα διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς μάλα μεγάλην τῇ φωνῇ δηλοῦντα οἷα ἔπασχε. λέγεται δὲ ἔν ῥῆμα καὶ τοῦτο αὐτοῦ. ὡς εἶπεν Σάτυρος ὅτι οἰμῶξοιτο εἰ μὴ σιωπήσειεν, ἐπήρετο, "Ἄν δὲ σιωπῶ, οὐκ ἀρ', ἔφη, οἰμῶξομαι;

Cicero would more likely have cast the anecdote in a single, concise period, e.g.: Theramenes, when they were dragging him shouting..., responded to Satyrus, (who was) threatening..., "and if I do shut up...."

Two anecdotes that turn on memorable sayings are found at the beginning of Plato's *Republic*. One of them is also reported by Herodotus. Though I reserve discussion until later in the paper (p. 307) because

Cicero narrates both stories, it may be said that Plato uses the S C D structure for one anecdote, two independent sentences for the other. Herodotus employs his distinctive, non-periodic style. Thus, though in the following section I present a number of variations, the basic form from which they derive is not just discernible but far from inevitable.¹⁵⁾

*

In its simplest form, with one subordinate element separating the speaker from his words, the Ciceronian construction appears at *Tusc.* V. 117:

Theodorus Lysimacho mortem munitanti, "Magnum vero",
inquit, "effecisti, si cantharidis vim consecutus es."

This is followed immediately (118) by another illustration of an unemotional attitude towards death. Here, the construction becomes more complex, as the circumstantial element that creates hyperbaton itself governs another subordinate element, thus extending the gap:

Paulus Persi deprecanti ne in triumpho duceretur, "Id
tua in potestate est".

In both cases the preference for a participial phrase over a clause with a finite verb increases concision.¹⁶⁾ The absence of a verb introducing the quotation is without parallel in Cicero, so far as I know.¹⁷⁾

One further level of intricacy is added in the following anecdote, in which the clause dependent on the participle in turn governs a second clause:

at vero Diogenes liberius, ut Cynicus, Alexandro roganti
ut diceret siquid opus esset, "Nunc quidem paululum",
inquit, "a sole". (*Tusc.* V. 92)

In the next example, a touch of elegance is added by bracketing a relative clause dependent on the construction complementary to the participle, thus creating a significant hyperbaton:

an Lacedaemonii, Philippo munitante per litteras se omnia
quae conarentur prohibitorium, quaesiverunt num se esset
iam mori prohibiturus. (*Tusc.* V. 42)¹⁸⁾

The suspension of *prohibiturum* allows Cicero to balance the complex participial construction and the complex predicate by polyptoton. The inclusion of the prepositional phrase *per litteras*, an added bit of narrative detail (like *ut Cynicus*, above) that is not, strictly speaking, necessary to the anecdote, contributes to the texture of this style: though structurally tight and concise, the form allows for a fullness of detail and circumstances. While indirect statement is syntactically better integrated into the period, it is not clear that the direct articulation is any more

emphatic.¹⁹⁾

Often, a full *cum* clause replaces the participial phrase:

bene Sophocles, cum ex eo quidam iam affecto aetate
quaereret utereturne rebus veneriis, "Di meliora;"
inquit, "libenter vero istinc sicut ab domino agresti
ac furioso perfugi". (De Sen. 47)²⁰⁾

Though in this case the phrase *affecto aetate* would have made a dative participial phrase awkward, the general effect of the *cum* clause is a more leisurely statement.

e quibus [Lacedaemoniis] unus, cum Perses hostis in
colloquio dixisset glorians, "solem prae iaculorum
multitudine et sagittarum non videbitis", "In umbra
igitur," inquit, "pugnabimus." (Tusc. I. 101)

This may be compared with the anecdote concerning Q. Fabius Maximus:

cum quidem me audiente Salinatori, qui amisso oppido
fuerat in arce, glorianti atque ita dicenti, "Mea
opera, Fabi, Tarentum recepisti", "Certe," inquit
ridens, "nam nisi amisisses, numquam recepissem."
(de Sen. 11)

In a story so fully detailed, the compendious participial phrase is obviously preferred. The speaker, and subject of *inquit*, had been identified in the governing clause.²¹⁾

A narrative variation on this anecdotal style is to relate the story in indirect discourse, after a verb like *ferunt*:

Asclepiadem ferunt, non ignobilem Eretricum philosophum,
cum quidam quaereret, quid ei caecitas attulisset,
respondisse, puero ut uno esset comitator. (Tusc. V. 113)

Socraten ferunt, cum usque ad vesperum contentius am-
bularet quaesitumque esset ex eo quare id faceret,
respondisse se, quo melius cenaret, obsonare ambulando
famem. (Tusc. V. 97)

Timotheum, clarum hominem Athenis et principem civi-
tatis, ferunt, cum cenavisset apud Platonem eoque
convivio admodum delectatus esset vidissetque eum
postridie, dixisse, "Vestrae quidem cenae non solum
in praesentia, sed etiam postero die iucundae sunt."
(Tusc. V. 100)

ut Themistocles fertur Seriphio cuidam in iurgio respondisse,
cum ille dixisset eum non sua sed patriae gloria
splendorem assecutum, "Nec hercule," inquit, "si ego
Seriphius essem, nec tu si Atheniensis clarus umquam
fuisses". (de Sen. 8)

This anecdote, for which there are Greek antecedents, will be further discussed below. The construction, *ut fertur respondisse*, "... inquit, which seems unexceptionable, is very rare.

The overall effect of the pattern here noticed is of

concision and swift movement. The anecdote is often part of a sustained argument or its climax. Frequently, the presentation of the anecdote is attached to what precedes by use of the semi-independent relative. The effect is a close, tight connection to the previous sentence, a smooth flow, and a sense that the anecdote offers easily adduced and obviously cogent support for the point at hand.

[Gorgias] qui, cum ex eo quaereretur cur tam diu vellet esse in vita, "Nihil habeo", inquit, "quod accusem senectutem". (de Sen. 13)

[Anaxagoras] qui cum Lampsaci moreretur, quaerentibus amicis velletne Clazomenas in patriam, si quid accidisset, auferri, "Nihil necesse est;" inquit, "undique enim ad inferos tantundem viae est". (Tusc. I. 104)

[Archytas] qui cum vilico factus est iratior, "Quo te modo", inquit, "accepissem, nisi iratus essem". (Tusc. IV. 78)

[Lacaena] quae, cum filium in proelium misisset et interfectum audisset, "Idcirco", inquit, "genueram, ut esset qui pro patria mortem non dubitaret occumbere". (Tusc. I. 102)

[Anaxagoras] quem ferunt, nuntiata morte filii, dixisse, "Sciebam me genuisse mortalem". (Tusc. III. 30)

[Lacon] qui, cum Rhodius Diagoras Olympionices nobilis uno die duo suos filios victores Olympiae vidisset, accessit ad senem et gratulatus, "Morere Diagora;" inquit, "non enim in caelum ascensurus es". (Tusc. I. 111)²²⁾

[Lacon] qui, glorianti cuidam mercatori quod multas navis in omnem oram maritimam demisisset, "Non sane optabilis quidem ista", inquit, "rudentibus apta fortuna". (Tusc. V. 40)²³⁾

The same anecdote is told by [Plutarch], *Apophth. Lac.* 234; the wealthy man is named. It will be noted that, though [Plutarch] tells this, and most other anecdotes, in a periodic sentence, an interlocutory construction (Speaker A: Speaker B) is preferred to Cicero's formula:

πρὸς δὲ τὸν μακαρίζοντα Λάμπιν τὸν Αἰγινήτην
διότι ἐδόκει πλουσιώτατος εἶναι ναυκλήρια πολλὰ
ἔχων, Λάκων εἶπεν, Οὐ προσέχω εὐδαιμονίᾳ ἐκ
σχοινίων ἀπηρημένῃ.

The final variation of the formula to be presented is in some ways the most major in that it seems to work against the goal of concision in relating such anecdotes. There are four examples of anecdotes featuring memorable sayings which, though conforming to the structural pattern of S C D, introduce a second verb into the main predicate.

[Lacon] qui, cum Rhodius Diagoras Olympionices nobilis uno die duo suos filios victores Olympiae vidisset, accessit ad senem et gratulatus, "Morere Diagora;" inquit, "non enim in caelum ascensurus es". (*Tusc.* I. 111)

Except as an example of the comparatively rare usage of a compound predicate in this formula, the passage is unexceptionable. Cicero might have gotten around the first verb in a number of ways (not least of all by merely omitting it), but its presence does not detract from the movement of the story, and perhaps enhances it.

noctu ambulabat in publico Themistocles quod somnum capere non posset quaerentibusque respondebat Miltiadis tropaeis se a somno suscitari. (*Tusc.* IV. 44)

The construction of this anecdote separates it substantially from the pattern under discussion. Cicero might easily have written: *Themistocles quaerentibus quare noctu ambularet in publico nec somnum capere posset respondebat...* It may be enough to say that there is no reason why he should adhere monolithically to his own formula, as indeed he does not. The story of Socrates' nocturnal perambulations might suggest a different articulation, one within the pattern.²⁴⁾ But there the emphasis is different; and neither that structure nor the one I suggested adequately brings out the point of the anecdote. Cicero is at *Tusc.* IV. 43ff. discussing the drives (*libidines, cupiditates*) that spur men to excellence of achievement. Themistocles imagined his dreams for the glory of Athens to be endangered by the complaisance symbolized by the monuments to Marathon. The frustration stimulates his insomnia as surely as the inquiry triggers his remark, and more pointedly. This was imperfectly understood by Kühner: *negari non potest haec verba [quod]... posset aptiorem locum post v. respondebat occupatura esse.*²⁵⁾ [Theramenes]

qui cum coniectus in carcerem triginta iussu tyrannorum venenum ut sitiens obduxisset, reliquum sic e poculo eiecit ut id resonaret; quo sonitu reddito adridens, "Propino", inquit, "hoc pulchro Critiae". (*Tusc.* I. 96)

The story is told by Xenophon (*Hell.* ii. 3. 56), not necessarily Cicero's model:

καὶ ἐπεὶ γε ἀποθνήσκειν ἀναγκαζόμενος τὸ κώνειον ἔπιε, τὸ λειπόμενον ἔφασαν ἀποκοιταβίσαντα εἰπεῖν αὐτόν, Κριτία τοῦτ' ἔστω τῷ καλῷ.

By his use of the word *propino*, Cicero has given the impression that he does not understand the ritual alluded to, or that he confuses the two distinct practices, both associated with drinking parties.²⁶⁾ His articulation of the anecdote clearly indicates that he understands the game of

cottabus, which depends on the sound produced by the wine as it is dashed against a metal basin. Cicero makes no attempt to restrict the anecdote to a single period, partly, perhaps, because he felt that the Greek practice needed detailed description. On the other hand, not only is Cicero's account fuller and more vivid than the Greek (*ut sitiens obduxisset*),²⁷ it is more dramatic. Though the imperfect subjunctive in the consecutive clause leaves it ambiguous whether the result was intended or actual, *quo sonitu reddito adridens* shows that Theramenes was reminded of the game by the sound. Thus Cicero records a sequence and an irony that was not in Xenophon, at least; and that requires the fuller construction.

It is clear that no formula for syntactic structure will outweigh considerations of context and emphasis in determining articulation.

ut Theophrastus interitum deplorans Callisthenis sodalis
sui rebus Alexandri prosperis angitur itaque dixit Cal-
listhenem incidisse in hominem summa potentia summaque
fortuna, sed ignarum quemadmodum rebus secundis uti con-
veniret.
(*Tusc.* III. 21)

The point at issue is that *res secundae* may occasion *dolor* no less than *res adversae*; the circumstance that occasions the dictum is Theophrastus' complex and paradoxical feeling. Though both propositions might have been subordinated to the dictum, emphasis demands that his conventional grief at the misfortune of his friend be subordinated to his more surprising distress at the good fortune of Alexander. Yet, this is not a case where the dictum caps or underlines what leads up to it. The dictum itself is highly rhetorical: the close parallelism of the two descriptive ablatives is subordinated to the expansion of the third member. The dictum is not, however, a restatement in epigrammatical form of the paradox of which Cicero is speaking.

*

Once the structure of the anecdote is established, the dictum itself can be expressed in a variety of forms. Most common, perhaps, is a terse, epigrammatic, elegant expression that just misses the ability to stand on its own without reference to context. Such sayings, of general or universal application, come under the heading of maxims and will be mentioned later.

As the anecdote of Themistocles and the Seriphian indicates, the dictum, so long as it is elegantly expressed, need not be terse. So:

Cyrenaenum Theodorum...nonne miramur? cui cum Lysimachus
rex crucem minaretur, "Istis, quaeso", inquit, "horribilia

minutare purpuratis tuis; Theodori quidem nihil interest humine an sublime putescat". (*Tusc.* I. 102)

The antithesis is disposed over two sentences in asyndeton; *istis* and *Theodori* are the lead words of their respective sentences; each sentence ends with a favored cadence (double cretic// cretic+trochee).

From the depths of his agony, Dionysius of Heraclea manages an elegant, perhaps characteristic syllogistic response after a formulaic introduction to the anecdote:

quem cum Cleanthes condiscipulus rogaret quaenam ratio eum de sententia deduxisset, respondit, "Quia si cum tantum operae philosophiae dedissem, dolorem tamen ferre non possem, satis esset argumenti malum esse dolorem. plurimos tamen annos in philosophia consumpsi nec ferre possum: malum est igitur dolor". (*Tusc.* II. 60)

Within the formulaic construction, Socrates manages to be informal and colloquial:

cum enim de immortalitate animorum disputavisset et iam moriendi tempus urgeret, rogatus a Critone quemadmodum sepeliri vellet, "Multam vero", inquit, "operam, amici, frustra consumpsi; Critoni enim nostro non persuasi me hinc avolaturum nec mei quicquam relicturum. verum tamen, Crito, si me adsequi potueris aut sicubi nactus eris, ut tibi videbitur, sepelito. sed mihi crede, nemo me vestrum, cum hinc excessero, consequetur". (*Tusc.* I. 103)

In the same passage, Cicero relates two other anecdotes revealing the attitudes of individuals on the disposition of the body after death. The Anaxagoras story is told in the classic form:

praeclare Anaxagoras, qui cum Lampsaci moreretur, quarentibus amicis velletne Clazomenas in patriam, si quid accidisset, auferri, "Nihil necesse est;" inquit, "undique enim ad inferos tantundem viae est".

The polish and concision of the formula would not, apparently, do to convey the acid personality of Diogenes, whose story immediately follows the Socrates anecdote and contrasts with its gentleness. The structure is entirely different:

durior Diogenes, et is quidem eadem sentiens, sed ut Cynicus asperius: proici se iussit inhumatum. tum amici: "Volucribusne et feris?" "Minime vero," inquit, "sed bacillum propter me quo abigam ponitote". "Qui poteris?", illi, "non enim senties". "quid igitur mihi ferarum laniatus oberit non sentienti?"²⁸)

The colloquial, paratactic exchange fully brings out the impatience and contempt of Diogenes for his solicitous friends.

De Senectute 25 provides another example of an anecdote ending in a

handsome antithesis, this time from the unlikely mouth of a farmer:

nec vero dubitat agricola, quamvis sit senex, quarenti cui serat respondere, "Dis immortalibus, qui me non accipere modo haec a maioribus voluerunt, sed etiam posteris prodere".

The sentiment is found in the *Synephebi* of Caecilius Statius, as cited by Cicero both in this context, *de Sen.* 24, and at *Tusc.* I. 31. In neither place - and this is true in general for citations from literature as opposed to bon mots - does Cicero use the anecdotal formula or give circumstantial detail. When, however, the subject of an anecdote quotes an author as part of the vignette, Cicero generally uses the classic S C D formula:

tamen is [Appius Claudius], cum sententia senatus inclinaret ad pacem cum Pyrrho foedusque faciendum, non dubitavit dicere illa quae versibus persecutus est Ennius:

quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant
antehac, dementes sese flexere viai? (*de Sen.* 16)

tum Cleanthem, cum pede terram percussisset, versum ex Epigonis ferunt dixisse:

audisne haec, Amphiaræ, sub terram abdite?
(*Tusc.* II. 60)

The bon mot of Cyrus on the point of death is told at *de Senectute* 30 in the circular formula, though it is not quite clear whether the circumstances describe the situation or the source (*Cyropaedia* 8. 7, 6) or both:

Cyrus quidem apud Xenophontem eo sermone quem moriens habuit, cum admodum senex esset, negat se umquam sensisse senectutem suam imbecilliolem factam quam adolescentia fuisset.

When the citation, whether prose or poetry, is not incorporated into a vignette, its introduction does not typically resemble the formula for introducing apophthegms, e.g., the translation of the *Apology* (*Tusc.* I. 97-99); of Xen. *Oecon.* 4, 20-25 (*de Sen.* 59); or the mention of Africanus quoting Xenophon at *Tusc.* II. 62.

At *Tusc.* III. 29-30 Cicero argues that mortality is a foregone conclusion and one that should cause neither shock nor excessive disappointment. He first cites some lines of an earlier Latin poet (Ennius *Telem.* sc. 312) with the words: *Ex hoc et illa iure laudantur*. Next, he quotes some lines of Euripides, in his own translation; and finally, a brief anecdote about Anaxagoras (see p. 300). It is remarkable that in section 58 of the same book Cicero can refer back to these three passages in abbreviated form. This time the apophthegm of Anaxagoras is given without

context:

atque hoc idem et Telemo ille declarat, "ego cum genui...", et Theseus, "futuras mecum commentabar miserias" et Anaxagoras, "sciebam me genuisse mortalem".

*

As a further insight into Cicero as a stylist - the purpose and justification for a study such as this one - we are fortunate to have a single apophthegm related in three different works. While it may in general be said that Cicero's articulation of the apophthegm itself is dictated by stylistic concern for brevity, variety, point, and the like, content and intention may, on the other hand, have a great deal to do with the wording of the dictum.

At *De Oratore* II, 299, Themistocles' paradoxical dictum is cited as a surprising reflection on its author's prodigious powers of memory but should not dissuade others from trying to improve theirs:

[Themistocles] ad quem quidam doctus homo atque in primis eruditus accessisse dicitur eique artem memoriae, quae tum primum proferebatur, pollicitus esse se traditurum; cum ille quaesisset quidnam illa ars efficere posset, dixisse illum doctorem ut omnia meminisset; et ei Themistoclem respondisse gratius sibi illum esse facturum si se oblivisci quae vellet quam si meminisse docuisset.

At *Acad.* II. 1. 2, Lucullus' memory is compared, to advantage, with that of Themistocles:

qui quidem etiam pollicenti cuidam se artem ei memoriae quae tum proferebatur traditurum respondisse dicitur oblivisci se malle discere.

At *De Fin.* II. 32. 104, the subject is not memory but the grief and the ability to endure it:

Themistocles quidem, cum ei Simonides an alius artem memoriae polliceretur, "oblivionis", inquit, "mallem; nam meminere etiam quae nolo; oblivisci non possum quae volo."

The first story is special in several respects. It does not cap or even support a philosophical argument, but rather presents an attitude towards the achievement of an ideal which, while interesting and comprehensible in itself, should *not* be used as a guide by the aspiring student. Antonius adduces the story as an equally invalid parallel to Crassus' contention that certain kinds of caution and circumspection in an orator are a vice, rather than a virtue. The place of the anecdote in the economy of Antonius' argument is different from that of the stories under discussion, all of which punctuate their arguments. The structure

of the anecdote is neither concise nor periodic; a fuller dialogue form permits Themistocles to set Simonides up for his devastating snub.

The *laus Luculli* incorporates the Themistocles anecdote as a brief, epigrammatic characterization of the man with whom Lucullus is being compared. The form is S C D. The third anecdote is fraught with almost tragic irony, suggesting, in a discussion about tolerating grief, the disadvantages of a superior memory. The antithesis is neither amusing nor elegant, but poignant. Therefore, though this is the one instance where Simonides is named, the circumstantial detail is most limited and the balanced antithesis is given full weight after the stark genitive, *oblivionis*.

*

While Cicero's clear intention is to relate anecdotes that turn on clever or improving dicta in a single structural breath, the form of which may be analysed as S C D, it would be absurd to believe that a stylist would handcuff himself to a formula. The following structures reject the formula altogether:

Curio ad focum sedenti magnum auri pondus Samnites
cum attulissent, repudiati sunt; non enim aurum
habere praeclarum sibi videri dixit, sed eis qui
haberent aurum imperari. (*de Sen.* 55)

Here again, the circumstances do not culminate in the apophthegm. Rather, the dictum, like the main verb and the initially placed dative phrase, illustrates the *hominis contentia vel temporum disciplina*.

animus advertit Gracchus in contione Pisonem stan-
tem; quaerit audiente populo Romano, qui sibi
constet, cum ea lege frumentum petat, quam dissua-
serit. "Nolim," inquit, "mea bona, Gracchi, tibi
viritim dividere libeat, sed, si facias, partem
petam." (*Tusc.* III. 48)

This and the following examples do not fall into the category of anecdotes culminating with dicta, bon mots, or apophthegms, but merely of stories containing *oratio recta*:

Xenocrates, cum legati ab Alexandro quinquaginta
ei talenta attulissent, quae erat pecunia tempo-
ribus illis, Athenis praesertim, maxima, abduxit
legatos ad cenam in Academiam; iis apposuit tantum,
quod satis esset, nullo apparatu. cum postridie
rogarent eum, cui numerari iuberet, "Quid? vos hes-
terna", inquit, "cenacula non intellexistis me
pecunia non egere?" (*Tusc.* V. 91)

On the other hand, in some cases where the whole anecdote could not be restricted to a single period, the end of the story, with a dictum, is

constructed in the S C D form:

tum Lysandrum intuentem purpuram eius et nitorem corporis ornatumque Persicum multo auro multisque gemmis dixisse, "Rite vero te, Cyre, beatum ferunt, quoniam virtuti tuae fortuna coniuncta est".

(*de Sen.* 59)

tum senex dicitur eam fabulam quam in manibus habebat et proxime scripserat, Oedipum Coloneum, recitasse iudicibus quaesisseque num illud carmen desipientis videretur.

(*de Sen.* 22)

*

The formula Cicero favors for relating anecdotes culminating in apophthegms has, I hope, been established. Before expanding on suggestions already offered on the place and function of such anecdotes in Cicero, I shall compare Cicero's preferred construction to the treatment of two of the same stories by Classical Greek authors. Cephalus, at the opening of Plato's *Republic*, defends his attitudes by referring to responses of Sophocles and Themistocles to analogous circumstances:

Σοφοκλεῖ ποτε τῷ ποιητῇ παρεγενόμενην ἐρωτωμένῳ ὑπὸ τινος, Πῶς, ἔφη, ὦ Σοφόκλεις, ἔχεις πρὸς τάφροδίσια; ἔτι οἷός τε εἶ γυναικί συγγίγνεσθαι; καὶ ὃς, Εὐφήμει, ἔφη, ὦ ἄνθρωπε· ἀσμενέστατα μέντοι αὐτὸ ἀπέφυγον, ὥσπερ λυττῶντά τινα καὶ ἄγριον δεσπότην ἀποδράς.

ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους εὔχει, ὃς τῷ Σερίφιῳ λοιδορουμένῳ καὶ λέγοντι ὅτι οὐ δι' αὐτὸν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν πόλιν εὐδοκιμοῖ, ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι οὐτ' ἂν αὐτὸς Σερίφιος ὦν ὀνομαστὸς ἐγένετο, οὐτ' ἐκεῖνος Ἀθηναῖος. (*Rep.* 329b-330a)

Cicero's Cato cites each of these instances, though at different places:

bene Sophocles cum ex eo quidam iam affecto aetate quaereret utereturne rebus veneriis, "Di meliora," inquit, "libenter vero istinc sicut ab domino agresti ac furioso profugi".

(*de Sen.* 47)

ut Themistocles fertur Seriphio cuidam in iurgio respondisse cum ille dixisset eum non sua sed patriae gloria splendorem assecutum, "Nec hercule", inquit, "si ego Seriphus essem, nec tu si Atheniensis clarus umquam fuisses".

(*de Sen.* 8)

In both cases, Cicero employs the structural formula of including the anecdote in a period of the form S C D. Plato uses the same structure for his Themistocles story, though relegated to a relative clause (see above, p. 300). He disposes the repartee of the Sophocles anecdote over two periods, the question being asked in the first, the answer given in the second. It is worthy of note, and study, that Cicero insists on

independence of syntactic structure from his Greek source. Though in any particular instance he may not have had the original text before him, the cumulative evidence for independence, found, say, in the passages adduced for a different reason by A. Weische, *Ciceros Nachahmung der attischen Redner* (Heidelberg 1972), is unmistakable. Whatever the intrinsic difference between Greek and Roman uses of the active participle, Cicero's replacement of the more compendious construction with *cum* clauses in the above examples should not be attributed to that difference alone.

It is significant that Cicero alters the balance of the Themistocles story to emphasize *clarus unquam fuisses*, whereas Plato stresses the balance of homelands. Herodotus (VIII 125) tells virtually the same anecdote, with the same emphasis as Plato:

ὡς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Λακεδαιμόνου ἀπίκετο εἰς τὰς
 Ἀθήνας, ἐνθαῦτα Τιμόδημος Ἀφιδναῖος, τῶν
 ἐχθρῶν μὲν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος ἑὼν, ἄλλως δὲ οὐ
 τῶν ἐπιφανέων ἀνδρῶν, φθόνῳ καταμαργέων
 ἐνεῖκε τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα, τὴν εἰς Λακεδαιμόνα
 ἄπειξιν προφέρων, ὡς διὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔχει τὰ
 γέρεα τὰ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίων, ἀλλ' οὐ δι' ἑαυτὸν.
 ὁ δὲ, ἐπεῖτε οὐκ ἐπαύετο λέγων ταῦτα ὁ Τιμό-
 δημος, εἶπε, Οὕτω ἔχει τοι· οὐτ' ἂν ἐγὼ ἑὼν
 Βελβινίτης ἐτιμήθην οὕτω πρὸς Σπαρτιητέων, οὐτ'
 ἂν σύ, ὦνθρωπε, ἑὼν Ἀθηναῖος.

It is clear from this passage that the tight, concise period in which Cicero typically relates this kind of anecdote was by no means inevitable.

*

I suggested earlier that the anecdote culminating with a memorable saying was gradually elevated, in the course of rhetorical history, practically to the level of a figure of thought - a mode of presentation, or line of argument. Reference to such a figure is found first in Quintilian (quoted below), though significantly, the earlier *artes rhetoricae* certainly acknowledge antecedents. Aristotle²⁹⁾ has much to say both about the example and the maxim; but he limits the *exemplum* to narration of deeds. The author of the *ad Herennium* is virtually unique in extending its content to *dicta* as well as *facta* that can reinforce an argument.³⁰⁾ The maxim, on the other hand, is limited to utterances of universal application, whether attributed to a particular source or not. There is no question of supplying a context. Later rhetorical writers would specifically exclude sayings with a particular attribution from the figure of maxim.³¹⁾ The anecdote or vignette

that sketches a particular situation that gave rise to an apt, amusing, epigrammatic response finds no mention in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, the *ad Herennium*, or Cicero's *Rhetorica*. Nor is it a figure exploited by the Attic orators or, in the main, by Cicero in his speeches. The three, grouped instances in the *Pro Archia* is another indication of the unique quality of that singular performance.

That such anecdotal bon mots are ancient is clear from the examples in Herodotus, Plato, Xenophon, and even Thucydides. Their primary function in literary authors appears to have been in the area of character delineation. On a non-literary level, Spartans seem to have had the reputation of being able to express homely truths tersely or epigrammatically, extracting from the immediate circumstances practical wisdom, ironically articulated. Thus the reference in Aristotle to Laconic Apophthegms, the numerous anecdotal apophthegms attributed to Spartans by Cicero, and the extensive collections made by [Plutarch]. The very homeliness and informality of such vignettes explains their omission in the early writers who composed their *artes* at least ostensibly as practical guides for professional public speakers. So at *de Oratore* III. 203, where a distinction is made between *contio* and *sermo*, the qualification *orationis* (v.l. *in oratione*) is insisted upon (cf. *ibid.* III 177).

It has been plausibly conjectured, though proof is impossible, that this kind of story adduced in support of an argument would have come into its own in the diatribes of the Cynics preaching popular philosophy to a broad and unsophisticated audience.³²⁾ Without insisting on a technical identification of the anecdotal apophthegms with a still too little known literary subgenre, we may assume the appropriateness of such incidental and occasional appeals to the authority of common sense in practical situations to a level of discourse at once low-key, informal, and simply sensible. The frequency of the figure in *de Senectute* and more especially in the *Tusculans* says something about the history of the philosophical dialogue as a literary form.

It should be recalled that the only appearances of this

kind of vignette in Plato's *Republic* are in the characterization of Cephalus. They are employed in aid of *ethopoeia*, not as serious points in major philosophical arguments. Plato deliberately refrains from so using this kind of story in the development of his points. Besides the two stories quoted above, I have found no other anecdotes featuring bon mots in the *Republic*, *Phaedo*, *Crito*, *Apology*, or *Symposium*. Conversely, in Cicero such stories rise to the level of figures in the rhetoric of philosophy. They appear at random in the philosophical treatises (nor are they entirely absent from the speeches and letters); they are also found in significant clusters, by their numbers and diversity adding the weight of history and authority to philosophical arguments. For example, beginning at *Tusc.* I. 96:

96 - Theramenes drinking poison	bon mot
97-99 - <i>Apology</i> quoted	
100 - Spartan on death penalty	bon mot
101 - Simonides' epigram	
101 - Leonidas' exhortation	
Spartan to boastful Persian	bon mot
102 - Spartan woman on son's death	bon mot
Theodorus on burial	bon mot
103 - Socrates in <i>Crito</i>	ref. and bon mot
104 - Diogenes on burial	bon mot
Anaxagoras on burial	bon mot

There follows a series of poetic citations in illustration of arguments, not in the form of anecdotes.

Another cluster begins at *Tusc.* V. 97, where Cicero is presenting a formal argument in favor of the *vita tenuis*. He begins by telling four stories, each of which makes the point that enough is as good as a feast:

Darius in fuga cum aquam turbidam et cadaveribus inquinatam bibisset, negavit umquam se bibisse iucundius. numquam videlicet sitiens biberat; nec esuriens Ptolemaeus ederat. cui cum peragranti Aegyptum comitibus non consecutis cibarius in casa panis datus esset, nihil visum est illo pane iucundius. Socraten ferunt cum usque ad vesperum contentius ambularet quaesitumque esset ex eo quare id faceret, respondisse se, quo melius cenaret, obsonare ambulando famem. (98) quid? victum Lacedaemoniorum in philitiis nonne videmus? ubi cum tyrannus cenavisset Dionysius, negavit se iure illo nigro, quod cenae caput erat, delectatum. tum is qui illa coxerat: "Minime mirum; condimenta enim defuerunt". "Quae tandem?" inquit ille. "Labor in venatu, sudor, cursus ad Eurotam, fames, sitis. his enim rebus Lacedaemoniorum epulae condiuntur."

The first anecdote illustrates the structural formula at its simplest articulation: S C D. Concise though the period is, it nevertheless contains a vivid and effective participial phrase, *cadaveribus inquinatam*. The second story is introduced by a transitional element that picks up *unquam* and balances *sitiens biberat//esuriens ...ederat*. It insists, that is to say, on the closest connection between the first and second story. (There is, in fact, a remarkable lack of sentence connectives right down through the Socrates story.) The second anecdote does not, properly speaking, fall into the same class as those here under discussion. There is no actual dictum; though it exhibits a circular periodic structure, and in its final cadence (double cretic) it echoes the previous story, as well as by its final word. The Socrates story fits the pattern for anecdotes culminating in apophthegms, though in texture it differs from the story about Darius. Cicero shifts into the *oratio obliqua* and uses a *cum* clause with two verbs. The structure slows down the narrative (cf., e.g., *Socrates quaerenti cuidam quare usque ad vesperum contentius ambularet respondit...*) and perhaps improves the sequence (though *Socrates, qui... ambularet, quaerenti cuidam quare id faceret respondit* is a more logical presentation), but the reason for the change in structure is primarily variation. Comparatively, there is more detail in shorter compass in the Ptolemy story (*peragranti Aegyptum, comitibus non consecutis, in casa*). In sharp distinction, the fourth anecdote, with its lively introduction, makes no attempt at periodicity or concision, though there are examples of more extensive quotations and exchanges developed from the pattern of a circular, S C D period. Again, although reasons for the structural roughness may be sought in the identity of the speaker of the present context, the vast majority of the Spartan stories are periodic, the bon mots laconic.

*

That the figure under discussion, or something like it, emerges in the rhetorical treatises of the First Century A.D. and beyond cannot be attributed exclusively to the growing respectability of such stories in discourse.³³⁾ The purpose and proposed audience of the later *artes rhetoricae* are also substantially altered. Quintilian directs his attention to the entire educational system, not to practical oratorical training; the section in which he describes a figure closely related to ours is part of the description of the duties of the

grammarian in *Inst. Or.* I. ix. 3ff:

sententiae quoque et chriae et aetiologiae subiectis dictorum rationibus apud grammaticos scribantur, quia initium ex lectione ducunt: quorum omnium similis est ratio, forma diversa, quia sententia universalis est vox, aetiologia personis continentur. chriarum plura genera traduntur: unum simile sententiae, quod est positum in voce simplici ("dixit ille" aut "dicere solebat"); alterum quod est in respondendo ("interrogatus ille" vel "cum hoc ei dictum esset, respondit"); tertium huic non dissimile ("cum quis dixisset aliquid" vel "fecisset"). etiam in ipsorum factis esse chrian putant, ut "Crates, cum indoctum puerum vidisset, paedagogum eius percussit", et aliud paene par ei, quod tamen eodem nomine appellare non audent, sed dicunt *χρηιῶδες*, ut "Milo, quem vitulum adsueverat ferre, taurum ferebat". In his omnibus et declinatio per eosdem ducitur casus et tam factorum quam dictorum ratio est.

Some of the real and unresolved problems attendant on this passage may, I hope, be skirted as unimportant for our purposes.³⁴⁾ Obviously, the second and third kinds of *chria* mentioned by Quintilian do not quite correspond to the anecdotes that have been adduced from Cicero. They appear to be restricted to repartee, whereas in Cicero circumstances as well as comments occasion the responses. This might be covered by the fourth class (reluctantly accepted by Quintilian), though his example is of non-verbal stimuli producing a non-verbal response. The first articulation is not necessarily to be dismissed as productive of a maxim, rather than a vignette. For example, at *De Natura Deorum* III. 33:

Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere solebat Harpalum, qui temporibus illis praedo felix habebatur, contra deos testimonium dicere quod in illa fortuna tam diu viveret.

What Cicero writes may be found in the description Quintilian offers, but Quintilian's purpose is not to describe a literary figure of oratory or philosophical discourse. His *chria* is a schoolboy exercise - an exercise, moreover, already ensconced in the educational process. So it appears in the *progymnasmata* of Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius, and, more or less, in the later Latin rhetoricians. As to the exercise involved in the treatment of the *chria*, two kinds of activity are mentioned. One is to take the piece of practical wisdom or wit and render it in a variety of figures of thought;³⁵⁾

the other is to express the statement in all its declensional forms.³⁶⁾

Theon, especially, says more about the *chria* as a literary form. Its essential characteristics are the following:³⁷⁾ terseness, attribution to an individual, cleverness, and particular relevance. He further distinguishes the *chria* from the maxim: the *chria* is always assigned to a speaker, the maxim never; the *chria* has a particular reference, the maxim universal; the *chria* may consist of an action or a saying, the maxim only of a saying; the maxim must have some moral value, the *chria* need only be pleasing, charming, or clever.³⁸⁾

Though he does go on to talk about schoolboy exercises deriving from the *chria*, Theon seems here certainly to be describing a figure of thought. As he leaves it, the *chria* is not necessarily an anecdote, though there are anecdotal *chriae*. So many such *chriae* are found, in fact, in later literature, that the author of a study on the Greek *chria* felt the need to add this further qualification: Der betreffende, belehrende, bündige Ausspruch erfolgt stets mit einem, wenn auch so kurz angedeuteten Spezialfall verknüpft, sei es, dass der letztere durch eine den Sprecher gerichtete Frage, durch ein Ereignis, an welchem er sehend und handelnd teilnimmt, oder durch sonst etwas geschaffen wird.³⁹⁾

It is doubtful whether a modern scholar has the right to add, unhistorically, such a qualification to an ancient definition. Yet, other scholars dealing with the *chria* as a literary figure, rather than a rhetorical exercise, seem merely to assume that it takes the form of an anecdote.⁴⁰⁾

Since unlike these other scholars, I am concerned exclusively with the structural presentation of the figure of thought, I am content with the lack of historicity for a classification, so long as a pattern of syntactic construction establishes the phenomenon. The existence of such an intricate periodic pattern - Speaker Circumstance(s) Dictum; its frequency; and its tone seem beyond question.

NOTES

- 1) *Cicero's Elegant Style* (Illinois 1979), p. 181 with refs.
- 2) I find no important distinction between stories told in *oratio recta* and *obliqua*.
- 3) *Das Apophthegma, literarhistorische Studien* (Vienna 1924).
- 4) Discussion of the partial identification of this kind of vignette with the *chria* closes this paper.
- 5) See the discussion of the articulation of periods in Nägelsbach, *Lateinische Stilistik* (Darmstadt 1963), pp. 626-648; W. R. Johnson, *Luxuriance and Economy: Cicero and the Alien Style* (California 1971), pp. 8-20; and my *Cicero's Elegant Style*, pp. 214-218.
- 6) *ad Herennium* IV, x, 14 and xi, 16.
- 7) The *eiromene* style is essentially complex, but without the interweaving of dependent clauses to provide anticipation and resolution. See Hdt. VIII, 125, quoted below.
- 8) Also possible in repartee is a C S D formulation. The author of the *Laconica Apophthegmata* will often begin with a genitive absolute, then give the speaker and his response.
- 9) For dicta that are quotations appositely cited, see below p. 304.
- 10) Aristotle, *Rhet.* II, 21, 8, refers to *Laconica apophthegmata*. The number of attributions of bon mots to Spartans in Cicero also suggests a previous collection.
- 11) See Gemoll, p. 34ff.; G. A. Gerhard, *Phoinix von Kolophon* (Leipzig 1909), p. 248ff. Neither author necessarily distinguishes dicta incorporated in anecdotes from sayings recorded without context - a distinction important for this paper. There is every reason to assume that the former kind did exist in some quantity and not just in private archives and personal memorabilia.
- 12) Again, for the tone of this kind of presentation, see below p. 297. It should be noted that between sayings so general and well-known that context would be superfluous (maxims) and remarks that would be meaningless, were the circumstances that occasioned them withheld, lies a middle ground where the amount of detail offered becomes a question as much of style as of exposition.
- 13) The explanation is apparently an important ingredient of the *chria*, see Quint. I. ix, 4, quoted below. I do not consider it integral to the structural form under discussion.
- 14) See *Cicero's Elegant Style*, p. 239 and refs., for continuative or semi-dependent relative clause, also discussed below, p. 300.
- 15) Even Cicero is not invariably wedded to the form; see below, p. 306.
- 16) See *Cicero's Elegant Style*, p. 235 under participle. In general, the frequency of the construction in Latin is not to be compared with Greek. Its use in these anecdotes is perhaps a reflection of the pace and informality of their narration.
- 17) I do not, of course, refer to verbal exchanges paratactically narrated like Diogenes and his friends at *Tusc.* I. 104 or Dionysius and

the Spartan cook at *Tusc.* V. 97, both quoted below. Outside of such stichomythic exchanges, where the verb of saying is omitted occasionally, the tendency in Latin, if any, is toward redundancy. See Kroll, *Glotta* 5 (1915), 359f.; Kieckers, *Glotta* 10 (1920), 200ff. I resist the temptation, however, to supply <inquit> after *tua*.

18) I read Bentley's emendation for *minitanti*.

19) See n. 2.

20) Plato's version of the anecdote is quoted below, p. 307.

21) For *glorianti*, alone, governing a causal clause, see below on *Tusc.* V. 40. This is the only instance of the anecdote relegated to a circumstantial clause rather than a semi-independent relative (see n. 14). It is quite distinct from the *cum* clauses found in the anecdotes at *Tusc.* I. 102, II. 60, V. 113; *de Sen.* 8 and 13, all cited and discussed below.

22) For the use of two verbs in the predicate, see below, p. 301 f.

23) To these may be added *de Sen.* 27 on Milo of Croton and *Tusc.* V. 112 on Antipater of Cyrene.

24) *Tusc.* V. 97, quoted above, p. 299.

25) *Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri Quinque* (Hannover 1874), *ad. loc.*

26) *ibid.*

27) *ibid.*

28) See *de Sen.* 55 (Curius), *Tusc.* III. 48 (Gracchus and Piso); V. 91 (Xenocrates), all quoted below, for other anecdotes in non-periodic constructions.

29) Aristotle, *Rhet.* II, 20-21; *ad Her.* IV, xlix, 62 (*exemplum*) xvii 24 (*sententia*).

30) *ad Her.* IV. xlix. 62.

31) So Theon, *progymnasmata* V, 96 Sp., 202; and see below.

32) In general on the *chria*, see P. Lejay, *Oeuvres d'Horace, Satires* (Paris 1911), pp. xvii-xxii; F. H. Colson "Quintilian I. 9 and the 'Chria' in Ancient Education" *CR* 1921, pp. 150-154 and *M. Fabii Quintiliani Inst. Orat. Liber I* (Cambridge 1924), pp. 117-121. See, too, Gerhard *op. cit.* (n. 11, above), pp. 248ff.; A. S. F. Gow, *Machon* (Cambridge 1956), pp. 12ff.; K. von Fritz *RE Suppl.* VI, 87-89; and, with a different distinction, R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (Leipzig 1895), I. p. 369f. and n. 2. See, too, H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1960), I. pp. 536-540.

33) The *artes rhetoricae* in which the *chria* is treated are all designed for the instruction of a younger student at a more general level of education. So the *progymnasmata* of Theon, Hermogenes, and Aphthonius (ed. L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* [Leipzig 1854]), v. II; Priscian, *De Praeexercit. Rhet.* (ed. C. Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* [Leipzig 1863]).

34) See Colson (n. 32, above).

35) This exercise is recommended by Theon (97 Sp., 203), Hermogenes (6f. Sp., 22-23), Aphthonius (23 Sp., 63-64), and Quintilian. The author of *ad Her.* gives an example of it under *expolitio* at IV. xlii. 54-xliv. 58. H. Caplan in his Loeb *ad Her.*, reflects the confusion when he refers both to the exercise and the theme to be restated as "chria" (nn. pp. 365,

371).

36) Theon (100f. Sp. 210) recommends this exercise as well, as does Diomedes (Keil, *Gram. Lat.* [Leipzig 1857]), I. 310. Quint., in the passage quoted, seems to be referring to this exercise, though *eosdem* is troublesome. H. E. Butler's Loeb translation, "All these instances are couched in the same grammatical form", with the note, "The sense is not clear; it appears to refer to the stereotyped form in which the chria was couched", has no basis in the Latin.

37) Theon, 96 Sp., 201.

38) Theon, 96 Sp., 202.

39) G. von Wartensleben, *Die Begriffe der griechischen Chreia* (Heidelberg 1901), p. 4.

40) So Gow and Gerhard (cited n. 33, above). Gerhard (p. 251, n. 4) gives an example of a maxim being turned into a chria by the addition of particular circumstances: "aus der gnomischen Bias' - ὑποθήκη... ἐφόδιον ἀπὸ νεότητος εἰς γῆρας ἀναλαμβάνει σοφίαν ist bei Basileios... eine Chreia geworden: ὁ μὲν οὖν βίας τῷ υἱεῖ πρὸς Αἴγυπτίους ἀπαίροντι καὶ πυνθανομένῳ, τί ἂν ποιῶν αὐτῷ μάλιστα κεχαρισμένα πράττοι, Ἐφόδιον, ἔφη, πρὸς γῆρας κτησάμενος (τὴν ἀρετὴν δὴ τὸ ἐφόδιον λέγων). I have found no such example in Cicero, where the content of the saying is taken for granted.