

GREEK MYTH IN CICERO'S ORATIONS *

by

DAMIAN PIERZAK

Ancient oratory was a realm where everything had its fixed place, everything served a specific purpose, and, perhaps most importantly, had to be adjusted to the specific circumstances, tastes, and expectations of the audience gathered for a trial or assembled for a public meeting. Considering both the severe restrictions of the art, and the sometimes prejudiced attitude of the Romans, one of the most striking features of Cicero's orations, often completely neglected by the scholars, seems to be the occasional references to Greek mythology, as they belong to the so-called *exempla externa* – examples from outside the native Roman tradition. Why would so accomplished a speaker, who had already been nicknamed a *Graeculus*, take further risks by employing such a tool? What was he trying to achieve by alluding to mythical stories? What were his sources of inspiration? These are the main points which I aimed to raise in my doctoral thesis.

Despite the fact that there is a vast amount of secondary literature on almost every aspect of the great orator's life and literary output, it turned out that such a research project has virtually no antecedent. Commentators have usually been satisfied with merely picking up an allusion and explaining who the mythological character in question was¹. A book by C. STEELE which offers an interpretation of the motifs of Telephus, Orpheus, and partly Medea, and a few articles, though instructive, cannot be said to treat the subject comprehensively, thus

* The paper is a summary of my PhD thesis written under the supervision of Prof. Jerzy STYKA, to whom I hereby express my gratitude, and presented to the committee of the Faculty of Philology at the University of Silesia in Katowice in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, defended on 2.12.2015. The referees were Prof. Katarzyna MARCINIAK and Prof. Antoni BOBROWSKI.

¹ Among the editions with commentaries, these two deserve a special mention: H. VRETSKA, K. VRETSKA (eds.), Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Pro Archia Poeta*, Darmstadt 1979, and J.T. RAMSEY (ed.), Cicero, *Philippics I–II*, Cambridge 2003, as they contain a little more substantial discussion regarding mythology.

forming but a foundation for a more detailed discussion². Some other branches of Ciceronian studies, however, have been developing since the beginning of the last century. Three of them, above all, proved useful regarding the mythological *exemplum*, one of which concerned the interrelations between the stage and the rostra³, the second the use of Latin poetry by Cicero in both his speeches and his treatises⁴, and the third the question of Roman myths and the status of mythology in Roman literary and “popular” culture⁵. Some pieces of information on this subject, moreover, can be found in an extensive literature devoted to the rhetorical strategies of Cicero, which does not require close inspection for the present purposes⁶. None of the surveys known to me, however, provides an adequate methodology nor is there any serious approach to the matter. My primary concern was to supply both.

First, then, it seemed necessary to establish what the mythological *exemplum* was according to ancient theory, and whether there are reasons to speak of such

² See C.E.W. STEELE, *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire*, Oxford–New York 2001; D.P. KUBIAK, *Piso's Madness (Cic. In Pis. 21 and 47)*, *AJPh* CX 1989, pp. 237–245; A.R. DYCK, *Evidence and Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Roscio Amerino: The Case against Sex. Roscius*, *CQ* LIII 2003, pp. 235–246; P. ASSEMAKER, *Pignus salutis atque imperii. L'enjeu du Palladium dans les luttes politiques de la fin de la République*, *LÉC* LXXV 2007, pp. 381–412. By the time I was preparing the dissertation I was unfortunately unable to reach I.K. KÖSTER, *Feasting Centaurs and Destructing Consuls in Cicero's In Pisonem*, *ICS* XXXIX 2014, pp. 63–79.

³ See esp. C. KLODT, *Prozessparteien und politische Gegner als dramatis personae. Charakterstilisierung in Ciceros Reden*, in: B.-J. SCHRÖDER, J.-P. SCHRÖDER (eds.), *Studium declamatorium. Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, München–Leipzig 2003, pp. 35–106. For some other recent scholarship, cf. J. AXER, *Śmierć gladiatora. O pewnych aspektach techniki retorycznej w mowie Cyncerona Pro Milone*, *Eos* LXXVII 1989, pp. 31–43 (at p. 41, n. 19).

⁴ The standard work is still W. ZILLINGER, *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter*, diss. Würzburg 1911. See more recently e.g. E. MALCOVATI, *Cicerone e la poesia*, Pavia 1943; H. NORTH, *The Use of Poetry in the Training of the Ancient Orator*, *Traditio* VIII 1952, pp. 1–33; D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Cicero and Early Latin Poetry*, *ICS* VIII 1983, pp. 239–249; M.R. PETACCIA, *Der Orestes-Mythos in der lateinischen archaischen Tragödie und im politisch-religiösen Zusammenhang der römischen Republik*, in: G. MANUWALD (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frühromischen Tragödie*, Würzburg 2000, pp. 87–111.

⁵ Esp. the book by J.N. BREMMER and N. HORSFALL, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, London 1987, and the articles in F. GRAF (ed.), *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft. Das Paradigma Roms*, Leipzig–Stuttgart 1993. Cf. R. CARRÉ, *L'utilisation politique du mythe dans la Rome républicaine*, *Civilisations* XLVI 1998, pp. 151–192.

⁶ For an up to date bibliography, the reader is referred to: J.M. MAY (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden 2002. For Cicero's rhetorical strategies, the works most useful to me were W. STROH, *Taxis und Taktik: die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden*, Stuttgart 1975 and C.J. CLASSEN, *Recht – Rhetorik – Politik. Untersuchungen zu Ciceros rhetorischer Strategie*, Darmstadt 1985 and for his use of *exempla* in general H. VAN DER BLOM, *Cicero's Role Models. The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*, New York 2010. A recent collection of essays, M.S. CELENTANO, P. CHIRON, P. MACK (eds.), *Rhetorical Arguments. Essays in Honour of Lucia Calboli Montefusco*, Hildesheim–Zürich–New York 2015, which seems to contain a good deal of discussion on the subject, has been inaccessible to me.

a category at all. For the most part, unfortunately, our sources are silent about this sort of paradigm, but the way some of the authors writing on the subject of rhetoric, above all Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero, express themselves, would imply that a clear line of demarcation between the historical and the mythological example cannot or does not need to be drawn⁷. From their point of view, the broadly conceived “past” (πρότερον γεγενημένα παραδείγματα) alongside the actual historical records encompassed what one would currently define as “myth”. It could therefore be anything from the past useful to convince the audience (“ex omni antiquitate utile ad persuadendum”). U. REINHARDT observed that what differentiates the mythological paradigm from a common metonymy is its ingrained quality to refer to a specific plot, a narrative possessing a context⁸.

This very *point of reference* – as a distinguishing factor of myth in the *text* – became a landmark on our way in search of a proper methodology. From a wide range of various theories concerning myth, two notions of Ernst CASSIRER were particularly serviceable to our purposes, i.e. “the unity of feelings” (emotions are at the centre of mythical thinking), and especially “the law of metamorphosis”, according to which each element of a mythical narrative may represent virtually everything, and in the case of symbolical reality even temporarily *turn into this*⁹. In this form, it was a philosophical idea pertaining primarily to the sphere of language. Such an understanding of the function of myth, however, was then introduced to literary criticism by Northrop FRYE when he stated that “the basic structure of myth is a metaphor, which is very similar in form to the equation, being a statement of identity of the ‘A is B’ type”¹⁰. “The law of metamorphosis”, together with terms from literary criticism such as the point of reference and the designate, the *illustrans* and the *illustrandum*, or the signifier and the signified, yielded us suitable foundations for the system created by Quintilian¹¹. The

⁷ See Cic. *Inv.* I 49; *Rhet. Her.* III 9; Quint. *Inst.* V 11, 6, etc. Cf. BREMMER, HORSFALL, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 5; F. GRAF, *Der Mythos bei den Römern. Forschungs- und Problemgeschichte*, in: IDEM (ed.), *Mythos...* (n. 5), pp. 25–43 (at p. 26).

⁸ See U. REINHARDT, *Mythologische Beispiele in der Neuen Komödie (Menander, Plautus, Terenz)*, vol. I, diss. Mainz 1974, p. 10: „Doch fehlt ihnen meist jenes Mindestmaß an mythischem Geschehenhintergrund, jene Konkretisierung, die erst ein mythologisches Beispiel ausmacht”.

⁹ See E. CASSIRER, *Language and Myth*, transl. by LANGER, New York 1953, pp. 32, 56; IDEM, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*, ed. by C. ROSENKRANZ, Hamburg 2010, p. 47: „Das <Bild> stellt die <Sache> nicht dar – es ist die Sache; es vertritt sie nicht nur, sondern es wirkt gleich ihr, so daß es sie in ihrer unmittelbaren Gegenwart ersetzt”.

¹⁰ See N. FRYE, *Myth as Information*, *The Hudson Review* VII 1954, pp. 228–235 = IDEM, *Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays*, Princeton–Oxford 2000, p. 123. I have outlined his views in a more detailed way in D. PIERZAK, *A Reading of Greek Myth in Cicero's Speeches. The Case of Medea*, in: M. BUDZOWSKA, J. CZERWIŃSKA (eds.), *Ancient Myths in the Making of Culture*, Frankfurt a. M. 2015, pp. 57–66 (esp. at pp. 57 f.).

¹¹ See Quint. *Inst.* V 11, with a valuable discussion by B.J. PRICE, *Paradeigma and exemplum in Ancient Rhetorical Theory*, diss. Univ. of California, Berkeley 1975, esp. p. 155. Cf. now

rhetorician divided examples into four main categories. The *exemplum (totum) simile* is a relation in which a point of reference and a designate have almost equal status, and perform nearly the same action in nearly the same circumstances (A = B); the *dissimile* occurs wherever one difference between “A” and “B” regarding a point of comparison (*genus, modus, tempus, locus*, etc.) is discernable, provided that it does not concern the main verb (*Inst.* V 11, 7 ~ *Liv.* VIII 7, 1); *exemplum impar* which in turn becomes divided into *exemplum ex maiore ad minus (ductum)* and *exemplum ex minore ad maius*. The difference between *imparia* lies in the unequal nature and status of the protagonists whose actions are much the same; finally, *exemplum contrarium*, which aims at pointing to the clash between “A” and “B” that vary in two respects, one of which concerns the main verb. To put it simply, despite the number of words, according to the above-mentioned scheme, the speaker avails himself of the mythological paradigm in order to juxtapose an element of symbolical reality alongside a participant in a trial on a level of similarity which would influence the emotions of the hearers in a way most expedient to him.

A mode of describing the relationship between the speaker, the message, and the recipient, on the other hand, which best suited our task as being uncomplicated and to the point, appeared to be the one found in Aristotle’s *Art of Rhetoric* (e.g. 1358 b). A brief examination of the mutual dependence of those three items revealed to us that apart from the message, which in our case was selected passages of the speeches from the time of the late republic, one has to deal with the intellectual background (φρόνησις) of the orator and with the question of to what extent the audience was prepared to apprehend a mythological allusion. The first part of the dissertation (excluding the methodological introduction outlined above), therefore, concentrated on what might be called Cicero’s rhetorical invention on the one hand, and the level of knowledge of Greek myths among the Romans on the other.

While exploring the issues of the orator’s and his contemporaries’ education we managed to identify two of the possible sources of inspiration from Greek myth in his speeches. We have called one of them *progymnasmata*, i.e. rhetorical school exercises, which were still practiced by the orator as he got older, during his periods of *otium*¹². Short deliberations upon familiar dilemmas concerning mythological characters belonged here, e.g. whether Odysseus murdered Ajax (*Cic. Inv.* I 11), or if Orestes justly killed his own mother¹³. The second included private reading of Greek or Latin texts (Homer, Ennius’ *Annales*, etc.), whether

S. ŚNIEŻEWSKI, *Terminologia retoryczna w Institutio oratoria Kwintyliana*, Kraków 2014 (pp. 132 f.) of which I was unaware until after submitting my thesis.

¹² Cf. *Cic. Att.* IX 4, 1 = 173 SB; *Quint. Inst.* II 4, 24; *Suet. Rhet.* 25, 3.

¹³ Cf. G. CALBOLI, *La retorica preciceroniana e la politica a Roma*, in: W. LUDWIG (ed.), *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron*, Vandœuvre–Genève 1982, pp. 41–99 (at pp. 75–77);

instructed by the *grammaticus* or undertaken by a Roman as his leisure activity¹⁴. To classify these we have employed Quintilian's term *fabula poetica (sensu stricto)*.

Studies of Cicero's rhetorical theory and practice, moreover, allowed us to single out *decorum* as a category playing a significant role in shaping the mythological *exempla*. Whether or not their use was appropriate under given circumstances depended above all on at whom they were aimed. The cognitive capacities of the recipients would determine the permissible level of sophistication, as it were, of a given paradigm which must not at any point transgress the rules of clarity (*perspicuitas*, σαφήνεια)¹⁵. Additionally, whenever a character participates in a dialogue or performs an internal monologue, his or her speech should meet the expectations of the audience¹⁶. The speaker also had to take into account the form of the mythological allusion, for such digression could either make him appear G(r)reek ("ineptum et Graeculum putent") or make the audience feel illiterate¹⁷. That is why in the *Pro Sexto Roscio*, when evoking the fate of Orestes, Cicero does not give a specific author ("poetae tradiderunt"), which is also the case in the *De haruspicum responso*, where he confines himself to call upon the reports of the poets ("quos poetae ferunt") about Giants¹⁸. K. DEMOEN has provided us with useful distinctions in this respect which he himself described as "elaboration". Let us bring forth the relevant portion of his comprehensive article:

J. FAIRWEATHER, *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge 1981, pp. 117–119, 152, 158; S.F. BONNER, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool 21969, passim.

¹⁴ On the difficult question of Cicero's own reading in the mid-fifties (to a large extent inspired by his preparing of the *De oratore*) contrast ZILLINGER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 67–69 with H.D. JOCELYN, *Greek Poetry in Cicero's Prose Writings*, YCS XXIII 1973, pp. 61–111 (at p. 63, n. 93).

¹⁵ See Cic. *De or.* III 167; Quint. *Inst.* VIII 6, 14–16, VIII 6, 52; Apsines, *Rhet.* p. 373 SPENGLER. Cf. K. ALEWELL, *Über das rhetorische ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ. Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der Kaiserzeit*, diss. Kiel, Leipzig 1912, p. 32.

¹⁶ See Cic. *Off.* I 97: "ut si Aeacus aut Minos diceret 'oderint dum metuant' aut 'natis sepulchro ipse est parens' *indecorum videretur*, quod eos fuisse iustos accepimus; at Atreo dicente plausus excitantur, *est enim digna persona oratio*"; Quint. *Inst.* XI 1, 31/37: "Ipsum etiam *eloquentiae genus alios aliud decet*: [...] verba adversus Agamemnonem a Thersite habita ridetur: da illa Diomedii alii cui pari, magnum animum ferre prae se videbuntur"; Diog. Laert. VII 160.

¹⁷ See e.g. Cic. *De or.* I 102 and 222; *Pis.* 70; *Tusc.* I 86; H. SCHOENBERGER, *Beispiele aus der Geschichte, ein rhetorisches Kunstmittel in Ciceros Reden*, diss. Erlangen, Augsburg 1910, p. 34; P. DELACY, *Cicero's Invective against Piso*, TAPhA LXXII 1941, pp. 49–58 (at pp. 56, 58). Cf. Cic. *Scaur.* 4; H. GUIE, *Cicero's Attitude to the Greeks*, G&R IX 1962, pp. 142–159 (at pp. 148, 150).

¹⁸ See Cic. *S. Rosc.* 66 and *Har. resp.* 20 respectively. Cf. *Schol. Bob.* ad Cic. *Mil.* 8, p. 65, 5–7 HILDEBRANDT = 114, 8–10 STANGL: "Levitatem habent summam fictiones fabularum, sed quid adiecit? *Doctissimi homines memoriae prodiderunt*; ut scriptorum peritia det exemplo quamvis minus idoneo firmitatem".

The elaboration of the history quoted in the *exemplum* can vary from a lengthy *narration* through a short *mentioning* to an anonymous *allusion*, depending on how well known it is and on the persuasive or stylistic requirements¹⁹.

We have already stressed that the attitude and the education of the audience is of great importance in this sort of study. How well acquainted with Greek myths were the Romans who attended the trials or public meetings, and from where did they acquire their knowledge on it was the subject of another chapter of the earlier part of the dissertation. First, then, we called attention to the mythical landscape, so to speak, the representations of which were named, just for the sake of argument, *fabulae propriae*. The Greek *mythoi* here are for the most part channelled through such media as, for instance, the architectural and public space of the City itself²⁰ as well as commonplaces (*locutiones tritae*) inspired by myth²¹, and the records of Trojan genealogies of the great noble families²².

The last source of inspiration, which was perhaps the most important one, are stage performances of Latin tragedies. By referring almost word for word to the tragic phraseology, the speaker could manage to create in the minds of the listeners a clear association between a character from a play and someone participating in the trial²³. As C. KLODT rightly put it

Sie [*scil.* die Dramatisierung von prozessrelevanten Geschehen] dient vielmehr der Beeinflussung der emotionalen Disposition der Richter gegenüber den Prozessparteien in dem Sinne, dass Affekte, die sich mit einer aus der Literatur und speziell von der Schaubühne bekannten Figur bzw. einem solchen Typus verknüpfen, auf die stilisierte und fiktionalisierte Person übertragen werden sollen²⁴.

¹⁹ See K. DEMOEN, *A Paradigm for the Analysis of Paradigms: The Rhetorical Exemplum in Ancient and Imperial Greek Theory*, *Rhetorica* XV 1997, pp. 125–158 (at pp. 141f.; emphases of the original). Cf. Quint. *Inst.* V 11, 15 f.

²⁰ See Cic. *Orat.* 74; *Fam.* VII 23, 2 = 209 SB; Vitruv. VII 5, 2; Plin. *NH* XXXV 134; H.G. BEYEN, *Die pompeianische Wanddekorationen vom zweiten bis zum vierten Stil*, Bd. II, Dodrecht 1960, pp. 260–350; T. HÖLSCHER, *Mythen als Exempel der Geschichte*, in: GRAF (ed.), *Mythos...* (n. 5), pp. 67–87; A. VISCOGLIOSI, *LTUR* IV 1999, s.v. “Porticus Philippi”: “essa è spesso citata per le opere d’arte, specialmente di pittura, che vi erano esposte: la Elena di Zeuxis [...] e un ciclo Troiano di Theorus [...]”.

²¹ See Cic. *Fin.* V 55 and *Tusc.* I 92 for the myth of Endymion. Cf. A. OTTO, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim 1962 (1890), passim (esp. p. XXVII); M. SWOBODA, *De proverbii a Cicerone adhibitis*, Toruń 1963, p. 49.

²² On the treatises *De familiis Troianis*, see e.g. T.P. WISEMAN, *Legendary Genealogies in the Late-Republican Rome*, G&R, XXI 1974, pp. 153–164; H. CHANTRAINE, *Münzbild und Familiengeschichte in der römischen Republik*, *Gymnasium* XC 1983, pp. 530–545 (at pp. 539 f.); CARRÉ, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 153.

²³ Cf. e.g. Cic. *Man.* 22 and *Trag. inc.* 165–171 R.³ = Cic. *Nat. D.* III 67.

²⁴ See KLODT, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 100.

Given the joint character of the experiences of the audience and the spectators, therefore, we described all the *exempla* which could be shown to derive from tragedy as *fabulae scaenicae*.

The research material in the main part of the dissertation is divided into the following three sections: "the cyclic tradition", "the monomythical tradition", and "the mythological evocations". Thematic criterion seemed much more justified than a chronological one, although on more than one occasion in the course of the analysis we have demonstrated that an evolution of Cicero's rhetorical invention as regards mythological allusions can be discerned²⁵.

Within the Trojan cycle we have included narratives concentrated around the Achilles figure, the events leading to the capture of the city, and those which did not fit in with the two above-mentioned themes, i.e. the theft / rescue of the Palladium and the destiny of Telephus. The next subchapter was primarily devoted to the Atreides saga, encompassing the themes of matricide, madness, and the curse resting upon the house of Pelops. It is worth noticing that although the division of material had almost exclusively practical purposes, the examples from the cyclic tradition were the most numerous.

Chapter five covered these paradigms which to a greater or lesser degree concerned single characters: the fate of Medea, the labours and the legacy of Herakles, the music and / or death of Orpheus, and the dilemmas of Athenian king Erechtheus. The last chapter, "the mythological evocations", began with another king of the Attic main city-state, Theseus, to whom the battle with Centaurs and the Minotaur figure could be loosely linked; following this came the Homeric episodes serving to ridicule the opponents, i.e. the cup of Circe, Scylla, and Charybdis. The analysis closed with creatures known from the *Theogony*, such as Pegasus and the Giants, which could hardly be ascribed to any of the previous sections.

All the passages where the speaker referred to a Greek myth were discussed in the following manner: first the historical and rhetorical background of the speech was outlined, then the mythical story was traced back to its original (determinable) source, and the possible media (e.g. a stage performance, a proverb, etc.) through which the knowledge of it was accessible to the Romans were sought for. Next, the relation between the point of reference and the designate was established in order to identify the speaker's intention. Finally, each *exemplum* was classified as pertaining to either of the categories: *progymnasmata*,

²⁵ For example, there are some stylistic improvements on the Orestes paradigm (see esp. *S. Rosc.* 66 f. and *Pis.* 46 f.); moreover, after noticing that the Palladium motif, which he himself used at least twice, became *too* fashionable, if our interpretation is correct, Cicero switched to the *ancilia* of the Salii instead; finally, in the *Philippics*, nowhere did he build an *exemplum* according to Quintilian's (*totum*) *simile*-category which was previously the commonest one. Of course, in all those cases, especially the latter two, the speaker's *modus operandi* could have depended on specific circumstances of the speech, but why not allow a change in his inclinations?

fabulae poeticae, *fabulae propriae*, or *fabulae scaenicae*. Additionally, its form was described in agreement with the classification (the so-called “elaboration”) suggested by K. DEMOEN.

After all the mythological allusions were examined according to this formula, the collected results were collated in the “conclusion”, so that more exact correspondences between the discussed *exempla* could be determined. The closing remarks began with a description of “the law of metamorphosis”, followed by an investigation into the possible sources of inspiration, and a survey of the form of mythological examples. The analysis of the passages we have studied showed that mythological *exemplum* in Cicero’s orations is a rhetorical strategy which aims at developing a symbolical relation between a mythological character (point of reference) and one of the people participating in the communication situation in the 1st century BC (designate), arousing certain emotions in the third parties, both who have a direct (judges) and an indirect (the audience) impact upon the course of the trial. The speaker’s goal may be auto presentation (“I am a better man than Thyestes” – *Planc.* 49), a depiction of the defendant or the witnesses for the defence in bright colours (e.g. “even the stones respond to Archias’ poetry” – *Arch.* 19), or, conversely, a ridiculing of an opponent (“the rites were conducted by a priest descended from ‘the guardians’ tribe” – *Dom.* 134), and finally, a denigration of political enemies (“Piso is certainly even more insane than Athamas and Orestes” – *Pis.* 46). The latter function, i.e. to present the opponent as a villain, apparently predominates.

It follows that the mythological *exemplum* in Cicero’s orations served not only as either a part of the ornamentation or an illustration of an idea, but also as a means of argumentation²⁶. The late Roman republic was a time when Greek mythology, through various communication media and especially the theatre, entered into the cultural identity of the inhabitants of the Apennine Peninsula. As a result, it must have been convenient for a speaker to develop an association between a mythical character and an actual person, which contributed considerably to the overall emotional appeal. Somewhat contrary to what might have been expected, out of the four categories into which the possible sources of inspiration were divided, the least favoured turned out to be the *progymnasmata*. Although the commentators tend to ascribe most of the allusions to “some lost Latin tragedy”²⁷, we have proved that there was a wide range of various cultural phenomena in the Roman public sphere redolent of mythical stories, be it archi-

²⁶ See KLODT, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 100. *Contra* JOCELYN, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 63. Cf. H.V. CANTER, *Mythology in Cicero*, CJ XXXII 1936, pp. 39–41; M. RADIN, *Literary References in Cicero’s Orations*, CJ VI 1911, pp. 209–217 (at pp. 215 f.).

²⁷ Cic. *Mur.* 60 is an obvious example. See e.g. CLASSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 162, n. 172; J. ADAMIETZ (ed.), Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Pro Murena*, Darmstadt 1989, *ad loc.* (p. 204); C.P. CRAIG, *Cato’s Stoicism and the Understanding of Cicero’s Speech Pro Murena*, TAPhA CXVI 1986, pp. 229–239 (at p. 232 with n. 8).

teatural representations on the way to the Forum, or proverbs featuring characters known from myths. The *fabulae scaenicae*, however, seemed most suitable for Cicero whenever he was delivering a speech at a time not far removed from theatrical performances (*ludi scaenici*).

From the fact that almost all the paradigms fell into the categories of either a short mention or an allusion, an inference can be made about Cicero being generally inclined to refer only to those narratives known to the audience, which is further confirmed by a statement from Quintilian, implying that his readers must have easily recognised an *exemplum* which is relatively vague to us²⁸. In cases of giving a less popular name or detail, Cicero was particular about pretending that he was not quite familiar with its exact source, in order both not to pass as too erudite nor to make his listeners feel uncomfortable with their own lack of knowledge²⁹. He always paid special attention to shaping an allusion to Greek myth so that it would be comprehensible to a Roman, and would provide him temporary relief from the harsh rhetorical jargon of the *argumentatio*.

In addition, three tables were appended in order to present the results in a more transparent way and a bibliography singling out the primary sources (the more important editions of Cicero and the editions with commentaries) and the secondary literature (general and detailed studies) was attached.

University of Silesia in Katowice

²⁸ On the *exemplum* (mentioned in the previous note) concerning Achilles and one of his teachers, about whose identity there can (so far) be no certainty, Quintilian comments (*Inst.* VIII 6, 30): “neutrum enim nomen est positum et utrumque intellegitur”.

²⁹ Cf. n. 17 above. Add Cic. *Sest.* 48 and *Scaur.* 4.

