SUMMARY (CONCLUSIONS)

That ‘narrative has a unique ability to embody concrete experience of individuals [and] make other voices heard’ (Brooks 1996) is certainly true for Cicero’s forensic narratives. 1 With typical narrative techniques, like embedded focalisation and narrative plot structures, Cicero presents history through the eyes of the main characters, indirectly shaping the listener’s ideas concerning the historical facts.

In Cicero’s forensic speeches, a narratio is found in less than half of the speeches that are still known to us. In those ten speeches, the narratio typically constitutes ten to twenty percent of the total speech. 2 The argumentative text type is clearly dominating and the narratio must be studied as part of the persuasive strategy. In this study, the differences, compatibilities and parallels between arguments and narratives are explored within a narratological-linguistic framework and ten Ciceronian speeches are analysed as to their use of arguments and narratives.

In Chapter 2, ten passages in Cicero’s forensic speeches are identified as a narratio and subjected to a first analysis of the narrative structure. The identification of the passages was achieved by looking at transition formulas and coherence relations. A narrative passage contains a set of utterances that is dominated by additive (often temporal) relations and volitional causality (providing motivations for actions), while argumentation typically contains a set of utterances that is dominated by epistemic (concluding) causal relations. The speeches with a clear narratio are Pro Quinctio, Pro Roscio Amerino, In Verrem I, Pro Caecina, Pro Sulla, Pro Archia, Pro Rabirio Postumo, Pro Milone, Pro Ligario and Pro Rege Deiotaro. The narrative structure of the passages is described in terms of chronological order (including pro- and analepses) and in terms of plot structure. Cicero’s forensic narratives usually display from the beginning a clear direction of the events towards the fulfilment of the protagonist’s wish, which is obstructed by the antagonist. The tension of the plot is based on the question how the protagonist tries to reach his goal and sometimes also on whether he will achieve his goal. Two narratives have a plot structure without any obstruction (Arch. and Rab. Post.), in which the tension is in one case evoked by the question whether the protagonist will achieve his goal (Arch.), and in another when the naïve antagonist will find out about the goal of the protagonist (Rab. Post.) In the first five speeches, Cicero surprisingly chooses to make his opponent the protagonist of the narrations, while his client or Cicero himself has the function of antagonist. The rhetorical asset of a narrative is the possibility it creates for the narrator to use the

1 See Chapter 1.
2 See Chapter 2.
characterization of the protagonist and antagonist to direct the expectations, curiosity and support of his audience.

In Chapter 3, an outline of the argumentation structure is provided for each of the ten selected speeches. As has been said, the narratio in a forensic speech must be considered as part of the argumentation. To arrive at a schematic overview of the argumentative structure of the ten selected speeches, I have proposed to fill in a ‘krinomenon-scheme’ for each speech, in which the main issue (quaestio) and its supporting arguments (rationes) are the central elements. Cicero was familiar with this method as a means to invent the argumentative structure (inventio). 3 My proposal does not, of course, intend to reconstruct Cicero’s krinomenon scheme, but is meant as a heuristic tool to analyze the argumentation structure. From an overview of the krinomenon schemes of the ten speeches we learn that the accusations in the ten selected trials are three times murder (S. Rosc. , Mil. , and Deiot.), although the Pro Milone is treated under a law concerning violence and not murder. In one case the accusation concerns violence (Sul), twice Cicero’s client is involved in a conflict over property (Quinct. , Caec.), another trial is about the right of citizenship (Arch.), and one case is part of a trial of extortion (Rab. Post.). For one speech, the accusation is unclear to us (Lig.). Among the selected speeches, Cicero once acts as prosecutor instead of the defence. Cicero accuses the defendant of extortion and malpractice as a governor (Ver.). In most defence speeches, Cicero denies the central accusation, choosing the status coniecturalis (Quinct. , S. Rosc. , Caec. , Sul. , Arch. , and Deiot.) Once, the status translationis is chosen (Rab. Post.) and twice the status qualitatis (Mil. , Lig.). The quaestio in the prosecution speech against Verres seems to be whether bribery should continue to be accepted by the court of extortion. In every speech, it is possible to find at least three rationes that support Cicero’s main claim. Interestingly, the character of the defendant is a standard part of those rationes. In the narrationes, usually this ethical ratio is elaborated on, combined, if possible, with facts and motivations that support Cicero’s claim.

Chapter 4 provides the historical context of the ten selected speeches. The situations of speaker and addressee have justly been claimed to have a major impact on the forensic discourse. 4 Special
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3 See, for instance, Orator 128.
4 For remarks concerning the importance of the contextual situations of the speaker and addressee in Cicero’s forensic discourse, see, for instance, May 1988 and 2002, Gotoff 1993 and Von Albrecht (2003: 6).
emphasis is given to Cicero’s authority, which augments steadily from his youth to his consulate due to his forensic and political successes, but which subsequently drops at the time of his political exile. After his return, Cicero gradually finds a new base for authority in his experience and knowledge. This chapter also contains a small investigation of Cicero’s reading public, which is referred to in Cicero’s letters and which plays a detectable role in the final version of Ver. II. 1. Some attention is given to the spatial setting of the trial, which could be a quiet spot near the Curia, or a more prominent place on the rostra facing either the Curia or the Forum, or even Caesar’s private palace. Lastly, I have discussed the two main groups of addressees of the speeches: the judges and the opponents. The judges may be part of a large jury or a small committee, or they may act as a single appointed judge or as the dictator Caesar. The opponents may have lost a relative (in murder cases) or suffer an economic loss (heritage or banking business) or they may have some personal clash of which the trial is the last phase. All these contextual factors have an impact on the form of the forensic speech and therefore enhance the interpretative value of linguistic analyses.

Chapter 5 is a first step towards a description of the roles of speaker, addressee and third person characters in the forensic speeches. In this chapter, the question is addressed how we should describe the relations between the speaker, addressee and third person characters. In order to describe the presentation, features and functions of the speaker and addressee, I have used linguistic concepts like dialogicality and diaphony (5. 2 and 5. 3) and rhetorical concepts like apostrophe and irony (5. 4, 5. 5), while for a description of the role of third person characters narratology and discourse linguistics provide useful concepts like focalisation, subjectivity, anaphora, deixis, and tenses (5. 6-5. 10).

In Chapter 6, the influence of the addressee on the form of the discourse is investigated. This general question is concretized in the question whether a change in addressee leads to a change in linguistic features. Subsidiary issues that are addressed concern the kinds of different addressees in Cicero’s speeches, the possible difference in diaphony between dialogical and monological speeches, the function of second-person narratives, the determination and presence of apostrophe and the use of diaphonic elements in relation to the text type.

The main conclusions of these investigations are as follows. A change in addressee leads to a change in linguistic features. More specifically, the type of addressee seems to influence the frequency of
second person predicates, pronouns, vocatives, particles, and interrogative and directive sentences. The addressees of Cicero’s forensic speeches explicitly include the judges, the litigants, and the listening crowd, and implicitly include the reader. Dialogical speeches do not contain more diaphony than monological speeches. Second-person narratives are addressed to the judges when the trial itself is part of the facts treated in the narratio. They are also found addressed to the opponents as digressiones, usually as an emotional repetition of past events or conveying information that is not appropriate for the judges. Apostrophe occurs in all selected speeches, usually in argumentation. In five speeches more than one quarter of the entire speech is in apostrophic passages with varying length. Transitions to a new addressee are usually linguistically marked.

In Chapter 7, the main question is how Cicero as a forensic speaker attempts to overrule the natural scepticism towards his biased position in the narrative. In general, the forensic speaker may either withdraw as much as possible from the discourse, or, by contrast, use his authority to fortify his version of the facts. A first investigation concerned the quantity and (semantic) quality of self-references in narratives and argumentations. In a second investigation, confined to narratives, the presence of the speaker was further explored. As a means of withdrawing from the discourse, Cicero may employ story-based narrative for his factual account, let situations and characters speak for themselves in descriptions, insert argumentation from the character’s point of view, insert ‘objective’ major premises which lead to an unspecified but clear conclusion, provide objective, generic information on certain situations, events or persons, and use irony. If, by contrast, he wants to impose his person on the narrative, he may use retrospective narrative, summarize events by presenting them as minor premises, insert ‘subjective’ conclusions in the narratio, or insert personal comments. The speeches in which Cicero mostly relies on withdrawing strategies are the Pro Quinctio, Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino, In Verrem I and Pro Milone. The speeches in which Cicero imposes his authority on the discourse with various strategies are the Pro Caecina, Pro Sulla, Pro Archia, Pro Ligario and Pro Rege Deiotaro. The natural follow-up question is whether the choice for the type of strategies is relatable to the historical context. Interestingly, the quantity and strength of the self-references and the presence of withdrawing and self-imposing strategies seem to follow the curve of Cicero’s political authority.

Chapter 8 deals with the role of the third person characters. As in the case of the addressee, the speaker creates the persona of a third
person in the discourse, but unlike the addressee, the third person is not an intrinsic part of the discourse situation, but comparable to any discourse topic. In this chapter, the following questions are addressed: Are pronominal references to third person characters in forensic narratives deictic or anaphoric? How can we explain the low presence of subject references to Cicero’s client in the first speeches? Does Cicero make use of character focalisation in his speeches? How does Cicero exploit the possibility to use embedded focalisation? Does the text type make a difference in the use of embedded focalisation? And in the end, the more general question is asked, how the literary and linguistic domains of research relate to each other in the explanation of discourse phenomena.

The conclusions of this chapter are as follows. Pronominal references to present persons are best understood as deictic rather than anaphoric, even in narratives. The choice to make the opponent protagonist of the story in the first five speeches (Chapter 2) leads to a low presence of subject references to Cicero’s client in those speeches. Analysis of the focalisation in the narrationes shows that Cicero regularly makes use of character focalisation. This narrative technique enables him at times to insert argumentative content in the narratio without switching to an argumentative mode. It is certainly rhetorically effective that the opponents frequently occur as speaking and desiring focalisers, while Cicero’s clients occur as observing and processing focalisers. Moreover, in narrationes, the focalisation is more often indirect and sometimes free indirect, while in argumentationes, we find more direct embedded speech. In narrationes, embedded focalisation concerns internal focalisation, while argumentations contain more examples of external focalisation. The various literary and linguistic phenomena are evidently related to each other and to the historical and rhetorical context. Various discourse-linguistic theories have proposed a model of language in which contextual and linguistic domains are interrelated. Similar to these proposals, I introduce a chain of domains, in which influences from left to right seem to occur. These domains concern the historical context, the rhetorical content, the discourse structure, focalisation, syntax and semantics and finally the encoding of the discourse.

At the end of this study, I come back to the question I posed in Chapter 1, concerning the roles of the three main discourse participants, addressee, speaker, third person character in forensic discourse. Cicero, as a forensic speaker, uses his personal situation either by emphasizing his authority, or by asking for sympathy for his
weak position. In narrationes, he may disappear from the discourse and let ‘facts’ or third person characters speak for themselves or he may narrate past events from a reflective, distant narrator’s point of view.

The speaker creates the role of the second discourse participant, the addressee, in his discourse. However, he needs to respect the historical context of and social relation with the addressee, in order to maintain the cooperation of the addressee (his attention, at least). Interaction devices involve the addressee in the discourse in various ways, for instance by stressing his power or knowledge, or, contrastively, by questioning his authority. A manipulative strategy is the use of factive verbs, which may induce the addressee to accept a supposition for a fact. A change in addressee appears to have an immediate effect on syntactic and semantic features of the discourse. With apostrophe, the speaker may employ linguistic means that are not ‘compatible’ with the primary addressee, but only with a secondary, embedded addressee. This device provides the speaker with an indirect way to persuade the primary addressee, the judge.

The advocate’s client and his opponent function as main third person characters. Although some information about these characters might be known to the primary addressee (the judge), there is still a lot of room for especially ethos-argumentation. Moreover, thoughts and plans of the main characters may be inserted in the discourse as powerful explanations/motivations of their actions. In fact, volitional causality is a coherence device that is typical for (forensic) narrative. Furthermore, the narrative text type enables the speaker to turn his client or the opponent into a protagonist. This is a way to guide the addressee’s expectations along the lines of the protagonist’s direction/goal.

That a forensic speaker may mislead his audience by a clever use of stories in his speech has been amply demonstrated. This may worry a professor of Law (Dershowitz 1996), but should not lead to the abolishment of forensic narratives, but rather to the education of students of Law in detecting narrative techniques.  
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5 See Chapter 1 for a relevant quote of Dershowitz, and Dershowitz 1996 for his reluctance to employ narratives in forensic discourse.