In contrast to the ways in which gender-specific roles in mourning seem to function in other traditional societies, I hope I have shown how gender division in Roman funerary practice does not require us to regard women simply as scapegoats absorbing the pollution allegedly connected with death. Rather, the use of the body in mourning reinforces, through ritual, the roles appropriate to men and women in Roman society at large. Men maintain continuity in the community, while women regulate passage into and out of that community when it is disrupted by death. Women as gatekeepers during periods of transition may have a divine analog in an obscure goddess of archaic Rome, Genita Mana, who appears to have protected the life of residents within the household.[157] Her name clearly recalls the dual liminal function of human women, encompassing the notion of not only death (Mana; cf. Manes) but birth as well (Genita). This combination renders all the more interesting Pliny's note that the ancient Romans sacrificed to this goddess puppies not yet weaned of their mothers.[158] Birth, death, and nursing appear in combination yet again.

Perhaps, then, pseudo-Servius was not so far off. The breast Uni offers Hercle, the breast Pero offers Micon, the udder suckled by Romulus and Remus, and the breast the mourning woman at Rome offers to the corpse are part of the same gesture. Far from being intimidating, the association of birth, death, and nursing provides comfort. By placing ourselves in the position of a Roman woman, faced with the control of a human being at each terminus of its existence at birth and death, we can posit the inconceivable, a kind of mourning *not* accompanied by guilt and self-degradation.[159] The gestures of mourning women in ancient Rome—their blood, milk, and tears—celebrate the rejuvenating and life-giving powers of the female body.

[157] Wissowa 1912.240; see Guarducci 1946–1948.8 for Genita Mana's possible relation to the even more mysterious Parca Maurtia.

[158] Plin. *nat.* 29.58 (*catulos lactentes*).

[159] Pace Devereux 1982.168: "it is simply not conceivable that there should exist mourning *not* accompanied by a feeling of self-degradation and by manifestations of self-depreciation" (italics in original).

Anthony Corbeill, Nature Embodied. Princeton UP, 2004.

Chapter 4

POLITICAL MOVEMENT: WALKING AND IDEOLOGY IN REPUBLICAN ROME

DAUGHTER: Daddy, why do Frenchmen wave their arms so much?

FATHER: . . . What does it make you think when a Frenchman waves his arms?

DAUGHTER: I think it looks silly, Daddy. But I don't suppose it looks like that to another Frenchman. They cannot all look silly to each other. Because if they did, they would stop it, wouldn't they?

THE SHORT dialogue of Gregory Bateson from which I have taken this excerpt is entitled "Why do Frenchmen?"[1] In his title, Bateson intentionally omits a predicate, since the predicate is always shifting. At the same time, the question mark remains constant—"Why do Frenchmen?" As one reads the dialogue, the missing verbal idea moves from "wave their arms so much," to "act differently from us (that is, act differently from non-Frenchmen)." In part, of course, the French act differently because of various social and cultural factors in France, some of which could be traced historically, but of equal importance—and, I think, more interestingly—they act differently because we perceive them as acting that way. In Bateson's dialogue a question posed about a third party becomes an opportunity for self-reflection: why do *we* think arm-waving is funny? In other words, whenever we ask "Why do Frenchmen?"—or "Why does anybody?"—we are also asking "Why *don't* we?"

In the Roman Republic of the first century BCE, Cicero publicly voices similar questions concerning segments of his own society. Marcus Tullius Cicero was a prominent speaker and politician born outside Rome who became established as an important member of the urban elite, first by absorbing and then by perpetuating its most deeply held notions of the role of the citizen in the state. Essential to these notions is the need to restrict access to the elite. In this chapter I shall focus on a particular aspect of Cicero's polemic against his political opponents: his criticism of the way they walk. I do not,

[1] Bateson1972. 9–13; the quotation is from Bateson 1972.9–10.

however, want to learn why Cicero's opponents walk a certain way, so much as what investment Cicero has in showing that his opponents have a distinctive and distinguishing form of body movement. Or, to adapt the title of Bateson's essay, "Why do popular politicians?"

Philosophy in Action

In chapter 1 I surveyed the ways in which bodily movements in Roman medicine and ritual depended on the notion that the human physique participates actively within its environment. As a consequence, physical movements, when properly orchestrated, are able to influence and manipulate the more-than-human world. In the present chapter I would like to demonstrate one way in which this notion manifests itself in the entirely human arena of Roman politics. Recent studies of bodily expression in antiquity have highlighted the importance the ancients attached to an individual's stride.[2] In the Roman Republic, as well, different forms of walking were used as a means of maintaining political and social boundaries. I am interested especially in why certain forms of movement had become standardized, and how the meanings of these movements were able to remain stable. This is what I mean by the "ideology" of this chapter's title: body movements have become systematized in such a way that some forms become perceived as natural and others as unnatural (*contra naturam*). The means available for judging the naturalness of bodily activity arise from the interplay between political posturing, audience expectations, scientific speculation, and the public spaces within which political debate occurred.

"Isn't it true that we consider many people worthy of our contempt when they seem, through a certain kind of movement or posture, to have scorned the law and limit of nature? (*nonne odio multos dignos putamus, qui quodam motu aut statu videntur naturae legem et modum contempsisse?*)"[3] This assertion, cast by the Latin particle *nonne* as a question with which the reader is expected to agree, appears near the end of Cicero's moral treatise *On the Limits of Good and Evil*. The context clarifies why Cicero must make this claim: he wishes to demonstrate that the workings of natural justice are discoverable and, for this to be so, nature must be decipherable in all its manifestations. The code for decipherment includes the marks nature fixes on the movement of its human participants. In the perfection that is Roman nature, the gods both witness and judge the actions of each individual within the community.[4] Fellow citizens have the ability to practice this kind of surveillance, as well. We read in Cicero's work *On the Nature of the Gods* that the properly discerning eye can recognize deviance in a human being's movement in the same way that it can judge an art object: the appraisal of how an artist employs color and shape and of how the individual embodies virtue and vice rests on similar assumptions.[5] In republican Rome, the reading of morality becomes an aesthetic practice, and one that can be learned. But like any aesthetic practice, the ability to make moral judgments endows authority only upon those with the time and opportunity to master its intricacies. Moral sensibilities become necessarily the sensibilities of the intellectual elite.

[2] Bremmer 1991; Gleason 1995.60–64. Church fathers: Adkin 1983. For John Wayne, see Wills 1996.

[3] Cic. *fin.* 5.47.

[4] Cic. *leg.* 2.16. Perfection of nature: for example, Cic. *de orat.* 3.178–79; nature as guide: Cic. *Lael.* 19, *Cato* 5.

In this chapter, I shall borrow the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's notion of bodily *habitus*. Every social and economic group, Bourdieu has argued at length, can be characterized by a particular set of external characteristics he calls the *habitus*, as a function of which the political mythology particular to a given group is "*em-bodied*, turned into a permanent disposition, a durable way of standing, speaking, walking, and thereby of feeling and thinking."[6] Simply put, socioeconomic origins determine body language. According to Bourdieu's system, the various forms of the *habitus* affect and help define one another. In other words, in Cicero's day, the elite-based body of texts—both clearly prescriptive moralizing texts such as *On the Limits of Good and Evil* and public works of oratory, which play a less apparent but no less crucial role in political self-definition—all serve to enforce a particular aristocratic *habitus*. In response to this *habitus*, those persons who have been denied access to the elite create their own particular notions of behavior. From this perspective, bodily movements are not only the product of individual idiosyncrasies, but are an integral part of the way the individual interacts with the social world. All members literally embody the values of their *habitus*—the way you move your mouth or blow your nose or walk all become a function of background, both past and present.[7]

This theory of *habitus* is especially helpful in understanding political competition in the Roman world, for two reasons. First, it can allow access to the beliefs and manners of largely inaccessible members of Roman society—those not belonging to the traditional elite. In fact, an analysis of *habitus* may

[5] Cic. *nat. deor.* 2.145: *oculi in his artibus quarum iudicium est oculorum, in pictis, fictis, caelatisque formis, in corporum etiam motione atque gestu multa cernunt subtilius, colorum etiam et figurarum venustatem atque ordinem et, ut ita dicam, decentiam oculi iudicant, atque etiam alia maiora; nam et virtutes et vitia cognoscunt*; see, too, *off.* 1.128, *Lael.* 88. On modern linkings between aesthetics, ethics, and *habitus*, see generally Bourdieu 1984, esp. 44–50.

[6] Bourdieu 1990.69–70 (emphasis in original); 1984.170–75, passim, applies *habitus* to class structures in contemporary France.

[7] Bourdieu 1990.68 allows the possibility of changing one's *habitus* only "by a slow process of co-option and initiation which is equivalent to a second birth." Jenkins 1992.76–84 critiques Bourdieu's imprecision on this matter.

provide more insight than an explicit written work precisely because we are not asking what these people consciously think, but observing how beliefs have been embodied. *Habitus* expresses not what has been taught in the traditional sense, but what has been experienced: "It is because agents never know completely what they are doing that what they do has more sense than they know."[8] Second, Bourdieu's theories state in essence, but in a more objective and politically correct way, notions of social constructionism that are similar to those underlying the passage from Cicero I quoted earlier, about certain physical postures scorning the laws of nature. The properly discerning eye, concurs this respected twentieth-century critic of class structures, *can* judge the social status of a person by bodily movement: by being born into a certain *habitus*, each person becomes naturally inculcated as a representative, and a potential reproducer, of that *habitus*.

I do not wish to claim, however, that Romans continually monitored movements such as their walk. On the contrary, the very fact that physical movement is so often unconscious makes it a significant resource for gaining access to a given person's—or a given set of persons'—thoughts and beliefs, thoughts and beliefs that might otherwise be inaccessible. Our movements give ourselves away. In the particular case of Cicero, this hypothesis provides a nice tool of interpretation. We may not—and probably should not—always believe what Cicero says in a political speech about the nature of justice, but we have much less reason to doubt the accuracy of how he describes the physical movements of his enemies and allies. His audience, after all, was ever present, and the speaker held its attention with continual reminders to "look" at the evidence offered, as either physically present or accessible to the imagination. These frequent enjoinders to remain alert and use the eyes help explain why "Ciceronian oratory was . . . characterized by its constant allusions to 'things.' "[9] Oratory among the Romans, more than among the Greeks, appealed to the physical senses as much as to reason and emotion.[10] In a period when government was enacted most clearly in the exchange between orator and audience, the visual element of Roman oratory cannot be undervalued. Hence it is going too far to claim that for "Cicero this sort of dialogue with the crowd was a dangerous innovation which was all too like the uncontrolled license of Greek democracies."[11] While it is true that Cicero was no fan of what he perceived to be democracy, it does not necessarily follow that, as an orator, he neglected to take into account the power of his audience. It is instead through the very reliance on the concrete and the visible that the possible license of the crowd could be checked. In cases where Cicero offers

[8] Bourdieu 1990.69.
[9] Vasaly 1993.256.
[10] Pöschl 1975.215; A. Bell 1997.
[11] Millar 1995.112.

up physical movement for public scrutiny, his audience, presumably, could easily verify the validity of his descriptions. At the same time, however, I do not mean to claim that every description reveals a true and historically specific deviant act. Cicero is, of course, capable of exaggeration. But what cannot be doubted are the modes of representation that Cicero employs in describing ways of walking (and manner of dress), modes that must have had recognizable meaning to his contemporary Romans. As a result, when Cicero calls attention to an opponent's body language, I have decided to join his audience in taking notice, and in trying to make sense.

Underlying my investigation is the assumption that Cicero consistently applies his philosophical speculations to political practice. Even the casual reader of Ciceronian oratory, especially invective, is struck by the frequency with which opponents are characterized by descriptions that emphasize their sheer physicality. Cicero's oratory, I shall claim, attempts to represent physically the dominant political agendas of his period. Rather than involving simply ad hominem attacks, Roman invective against the gait is informed by a complex and yet coherent combination of physiognomics—the study of how physique indicates character—natural philosophy, and political competition. The urban elite, as the dominant force not only in the political sector of Roman society but in the cultural and educational sectors, as well, constructed an understanding of nature, a will to truth, by which they could maintain their own ascendancy.[12] When the senatorial-based party refers to itself as the *optimates*—that is, as literally "the best people"—they are not simply using transparent rhetoric. They are affirming their self-perceived and self-defined role as those who are by nature best suited to rule.

Body Movement and Political Competition

In assessing the interrelationship between physical movement and political ideology, I shall be focusing both upon those politicians designated in extant texts as "popular" (*populares*) as well as upon other politicians perceived as presenting a threat to urban-based aristocratic politics in Rome. I shall try to explain, insofar as our sources permit, how these politicians walked. By this term *popularis*, I do not refer to a "political party" in the modern sense. Ancient historians now generally agree that these "popular" politicians were not so much defined by their membership since, like their opposition, the *optimates* or "best men," those labeled as *populares* came entirely from the Roman senate or senatorial class.[13] As is usual in the ancient world, attempts at political change—even of an apparently populist bent—originated from divisions

[12] For the will to truth, Foucault 1984.114.
[13] L. R. Taylor 1949.13 and n. 52; Meier 1965.572–83 can name only one *eques* who is called a *popularis* (L. Gellius Poplicola, at Cic. *Sest.* 110).

within the dominant classes, not as a result of protest from below.[14] In fact, these two groups, the *optimates* and the *populares*, were not even defined by a specific political program, but rather by their method: the *populares*, for example, took advantage of those aspects of the Roman political system that allowed them to bring about change through the people assembled as a whole, such as through public assemblies led by the tribunes of the plebs; the *optimates*, on the contrary, tended to act through the oligarchic senate.[15] The distinction between these groups, however, constantly blurs. Even the venue of the speaker could affect self-presentation, so that during his consulship Cicero could, when addressing the people, maintain he was a *popularis consul*.[16] One fact remains indisputable: *popularis* could provide an alluring label for Cicero, who uses it well over one hundred times in his orations to describe at times himself, but more often his most hated opponents. It is in what Cicero's use of this label evoked in the Roman audience that I am interested.

Perhaps the most fitting description for my purposes would be that the popular politicians were those individuals who presented themselves as not subscribing to the traditional values of the aristocracy at Rome. The historical record shows that this group had frequent successes in achieving its goals. In light of these successes, modern historians, most recently Fergus Millar, have used the abundant ancient testimonia describing the interaction between populace and speaker to argue that the Republic was structured much more as a democracy than has been previously acknowledged.[17] This may be true on a purely structural level, on what we might call a "constitutional" level, but on an ideological level things were different. An important feature distinguishes Roman politics from Athenian democracy: the fact that republican Rome was dominated by a firmly established oligarchy, one that has been claimed to wield "inherited, unchallenged authority."[18] And yet if the people as a whole had the potential to create change, why did elite ideology continue to dominate Roman politics? One fruitful approach to explaining this stability lies in examining the self-conscious exploitation of public display, as embodied in funeral processions, triumphs, and art.[19] Yet there simultaneously existed

[14] MacMullen 1966, esp. 242–43. Millar 1998 offers a model in which popular protest plays a more active role.

[15] L. R. Taylor 1949.12; Seager 1972; Gruen 1974, e.g. 27–28. Perelli 1982.5–21 offers a concise overview of scholarly debate on the issue.

[16] *Leg. agr.* 2.7–9; see, too, *Rab. perd.* 11. I follow the thesis of Perelli that *popularis* was meaningful as a label for a particular person at a particular time—an ambitious politician who advances his views by appealing to the voting potential of the disempowered citizenry (1982.5–21); compare North 1990b.18–19, Vasaly 1993.74, A. Bell 1997.3.

[17] Millar 1984, 1986, 1995, and 1998. Among the many responses to Millar, see Jehne 1995, Pina Polo 1996, and their bibliographies.

[18] North 1990b.15–17.

[19] For the role of display in promoting dominant values, see Gruen 1996 and the perceptive analysis of spectacle in Polybius by A. Bell 1997.3–5.

an equally effective way of maintaining ascendancy: in the assumptions and biases that were displayed less prominently by the very fact that they were encoded in the body. Regardless of how we may try to reconstruct actual factions and parties, public texts performed before the public eye constructed the popular politician as constituting a class of persons against whom any clear-thinking Roman must rebel. In other words, the elite as a body created a defense against the power that the Roman people held in theory.[20] I focus on nonverbal forms of representation because, as will become increasingly clear, Roman audiences were trained to decipher a speaker's politics without a word being spoken.

Jean-Michel David has focused on speaking styles as a way of showing what distinguishes the established orator in Rome from the fledgling provincials who are relatively new to big-city politics: their accent, pronunciation, sense of humor, and speaking gestures distinguish them as incompatible with the urban elite.[21] In turn, their opponents in Rome mark with a specific vocabulary these perceived threats to the dominant politics—their movements become labeled as "fierce" (*acer, vehemens*), their way of speaking as "rustic" (*rusticus*).[22] The belittling of fierceness and alacrity that we find in Rome has a parallel in fifth-century Athens, especially in the figure of the demagogue Cleon, whose violent movement, public shouting, way of dress, and frenetic stride marked his nontraditional approach to democratic politics.[23] This portrait is closely echoed in Plutarch's description of Gaius Gracchus, a figure whose innovative physical presence became the prototype for future politicians wishing to associate themselves with his style of antiestablishment politics: "intense and vehement, . . . Gaius was the first Roman to walk around on the rostra and to pull the toga from his shoulders while speaking."[24] Cicero's own physical descriptions, then, inherit a tradition that aims not at specific individuals or specific programs, but at any perceived threats to the status quo. Moreover, the structures existing at Rome for the political advancement of young orators only served to validate the accuracy of these labels. To make a name for themselves, political outsiders commonly took on the role of prosecutors in the criminal indictment of established politicians.[25] This path to success, so common as to be almost traditional, could understandably lead to unpopularity

[20] Gruen 1991, esp. 252–54 discusses the importance of inquiring into the elite's "stimulus to unity rather than the mechanism of [its] fragmentation."

[21] David 1980 and 1983a; Ramage 1961 provides a collection of the evidence.

[22] *Acer* and *vehemens*: *Brut.* 130, 136, 186; *Clu.* 140. *Rusticus*: Ramage 1961.483–86. This behavior is to be distinguished from the use of *amplificatio*: Rhet. Her. 2.48–49; Cic. *inv.* 1.100–5, *S. Rosc.* 12; David 1979.153–62.

[23] Ps. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 28.3, with Rhodes 1981.351–54; Plut. *Vit. Nic.* 8.3.

[24] Plut. *Vit. Ti. Gracch.* 2.2; David 1983b.

[25] David 1979 traces the political risks and rewards of this practice; see, too, David 1992.497–589.

among the powerful; as a result, rising newcomers ended up being objects of elite invective. In my subsequent remarks, then, I shall assent to the labels of the elite at Rome and refer to as "popular politicians" not persons representing a definable political platform or even necessarily a specific individual who has received the label *popularis*, but rather all those enemies whom the elite attack in their rhetoric for allegedly demagogic behavior.

Movement in Oratory and Philosophy

A young orator at Rome would have heard something like the following at an early stage in his rhetorical training: "Every movement of the soul is endowed by nature with its own corresponding facial expression, voice quality, and gesture"; "gesture is used not merely to emphasize words, but to reveal thought—this includes the movement of the hands, the shoulders, the sides, as well as how one stands and walks."[26] In the early Empire, the rhetorician Quintilian was to continue this pedagogical tradition in his own treatise on the education of the orator. Among the fifty or so pages that he devotes to the various ways in which the orator should best position his head and fingers, Quintilian includes numerous references to how the gait conveys thought and intention, and how the speaker is justified in reproaching his opponent for the way he walks.[27] And yet stride reveals more than simply the presence or lack of refinement. Human beings, argues Cicero in his *On Duties*, are disposed by nature to disapprove morally of ways of sitting and standing that displease the eyes and ears. He includes among the postures especially to be avoided those of the effeminate and the rustic.[28] A letter by the philosopher Seneca further demonstrates that gait was believed to reveal not only temporary thought, but permanent dispositions of character. In attempting to teach his correspondent Lucilius how to distinguish between true and false praise, Seneca draws an analogy from daily life, an analogy that indicates common attempts to standardize body language: "Everything," he writes, "has its own indicator, if you pay attention, and even the smallest details offer an indication of a person's character. An effeminate man (*impudicus*) is revealed by his walk, from [the way] he brings his finger up to his head, and from his eye-movement. . . . For those qualities come into the open through signs."[29] The gait is an emerging indicator to watch for in oneself and to be wary of in others.

[26] See, for example, Cic. *de orat.* 3.216: *omnis . . . motus animi suum quendam a natura habet vultum et sonum et gestum* (for the triad of expression, voice, and gesture consult TLL 6.2: 1970.42–1971.45 [I. Kapp and G. Meyer]); *Brut.* 141 (Antonius's opinion); Val. Max. 8.10.1–2 (Hortensius); Sen. *epist.* 114.22.

[27] Quint. *inst.* 11.3.66, 124, 126, 150; *inst.* 1.2.31, 5.13.39.

[28] Cic. *off.* 1.128–29.

[29] Sen. *epist.* 52.12.

This conception of the body and its visible manifestations as a text to be read contributes also to the ambivalent relationship Roman orators had with theatrical actors. As is clear from epigraphic and other textual evidence, those actors at Rome who were citizens had limited civic rights, since their profession, predicated on public display and the need for profit, marked them as dishonorable.[30] Yet in spite of this lower status, recent studies justly remark on the orator Cicero's emphasis on theatricality, and accordingly the ancient rhetorical treatises continually stress how much a political speaker can gain from observing an actor.[31] In fact, Cicero and Demosthenes, the two ancient orators best known for their impeccable delivery, were both reputed to have trained with the best actors of their day. But these same treatises also include a caveat: imitate actors, but only up to a point.[32] What is signified by that point has been the topic of much recent discussion. Most obviously, the respectable orator could sacrifice his reputation from too close an association with the dishonorable character of the actor's profession. Too close a resemblance to acting could also endanger the masculine status of the speaker.[33] More importantly, the association will have had implications for the speaker's relation to truth. Treatises repeatedly stress how important it is that an orator's speech reflect true feelings; Cicero clearly draws this distinction between actor and public speaker in *On the Orator*, when he defines the medium of actors as "imitation" (*imitatio*) and that of the orator as "truth" (*veritas*; *de orat.* 3.215).[34] Hence the orator should cease from using the actor as a guide at that point at which the body stops imitating the movements of the soul and begins to display emotions that are no longer actually being felt internally. When Cicero finds himself in the potentially difficult position of speaking in defense of the comic actor Quintus Roscius, he steps over himself in apologizing for his client's chosen profession: "I swear to god! I speak with confidence: Roscius has in him more trustworthiness than artful skill, more truth than training. The Roman people judge him a better man than actor—his talent makes him as worthy of the stage as his restraint makes him worthy of the senate house."[35] In Roscius's case, humanity overshadows histrionics. Only through such an appeal can Cicero convince the jury of Roscius's believability.

[30] Iulian. *Dig.* 3.2.1, citing the praetor's edict (further, Ulp. *Dig.* 3.2.2.5); Gardner 1993.138–49; Edwards 1993.123–26 and Edwards 1997.

[31] See bibliography in Axer 1989, esp. 299–303, who offers a salutary refinement of previous views.

[32] A very select list: Rhet. Her. 3.26; Cic. *de orat.* 3.220, *Brut.* 203; Sen. *contr.* 3 praef. 3; Quint. *inst.* 1.11.3, 11.3.184; Mart. Cap. 5.543.

[33] Gleason 1995.105–7, 114–16; Richlin 1997.99–108. Edwards 1997, esp. 79–81.

[34] Select parallels: Phld. *Rh.* 1.195 (Sudhaus); Cic. *de orat.* 3.220, *Brut.* 87–88, *div.* 1.80; Quint. *inst.* 4.2.127; Gleason 1995.117, on Quint. *inst.* 1.11.9; Narducci 1997.77–96, who treats the apparently contradictory claim at Cic. *Tusc.* 4.55. Actors cannot blush: Sen. *epist.* 11.7; contrast Quint. *inst.* 6.2.36.

[35] Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 17. Cic. *de orat.* 1.132 preserves Roscius's own comments on propriety.

The careful distinction between actor and orator also explains the force behind a cryptic joke of Cicero. An opposing speaker had given a particularly serene performance in court, although he was referring to a time when Cicero's client had attempted to poison him. Cicero rebuked his opponent with the sarcastic question: "if you weren't faking it, would you be *acting* like that?" The pun on "acting" works in Latin as it does in English; in both languages the verb (*agere* / "to act") can describe the natural actions of the body as well as its self-conscious performance.[36] In this case, the speaker's bodily movement did not accurately reflect his expected internal anguish. The tirade did not simply involve an attempt at winning over the jury with his humor. Cicero recalls later how this remark helped dilute the believability of the charge of poisoning; the audience accepted the orator's contention that the body should not lie.[37] In his treatise *On the Orator*, Cicero has the great orator Antonius give the following praise to Lucius Crassus: "You are in the habit of representing such strength of spirit, such force, such grief, by using your eyes, expression, gesture—even with a single finger— . . . that you seem not only to ignite the judge, but to catch fire yourself."[38] And yet Crassus was known for his calm demeanor when speaking—his vehemence was projected instead through his language and the slight bodily indications noted by Antonius.[39] Not present was the physical excess that marked the actor. Crassus could convey emotions without appearing emotional, perform convincing actions without acting.[40] For the political speaker, then, gesture and idea must cohere. Marcus Scaurus, to cite another example, receives praise from Cicero for possessing such natural authority as an orator "that you'd think he wasn't pleading a case, but rendering testimony."[41] In light of these repeated assertions of how bodily demeanor contributes to persuasion, it comes as little surprise that the Romans were fond of repeating a story about Demosthenes, the finest orator of Athens; when asked what he thought were the three most important aspects of public speaking, Demosthenes replied, "Delivery, delivery, delivery."[42]

[36] *Brut.* 278: *tu istuc, M. Calidi, nisi fingeres, sic ageres?*; compare Val. Max. 8.10.3. Gotoff 1986.128 discusses a similar contrast in *On behalf of Caelius*; see, too, Cic. *S. Rosc.* 82, with Gotoff 1993.307–8.

[37] *Brut.* 278.

[38] Cic. *de orat.* 2.188. The "single finger" seems to be the index (Quint. *inst.* 11.3.94).

[39] Cic. *Brut.* 158: *non multa iactatio corporis, non inclinatio vocis, nulla inambulatio, non crebra supplosio pedis.*

[40] The illustrated manuscripts of Terence do not seem to illuminate the relationship between acting and rhetorical training. Weston 1903.37 and Aldrete 1999.54–67 attempt to connect these illustrations with the oratorical gestures in Quint. *inst.* 11.3; Maier-Eichhorn 1989.145–49 effectively casts doubt on such attempts.

[41] Cic. *Brut.* 111.

[42] Phld. *Rh.* 1.196 (Sudhaus); Cic. *Brut.* 142, *de orat.* 3.213; Val. Max. 8.10. ext. 1; Quint. *inst.* 11.3.6; Plut. *Vit. Dem.* 8.

Movement in Daily Life

This attention to fine points of movement was not confined to those trained in rhetoric and philosophy. As early as the third century BCE, the family of Claudia described on her epitaph not merely her skills as a conversationalist, but how her walk was appropriate to her station in life (*sermone lepido, tum autem incessu commodo*; CLE 52.7). I mentioned in the previous chapter how, in the public staging of funeral processions, the elite hired actors to impersonate deceased ancestors. Among the features of these ancestors that our sources single out as worthy of imitation is their particular way of walking.[43] The audience of Roman comedies was also expected to recognize correlations between movement and character—members of the dominant class move slowly upon the stage, whereas slaves, attendants, and workers were marked by stereotypically swift movements.[44] Further proof that the different codes for walking were widespread is found in the fact that transgressing them provided opportunities for mockery. In the *Poenulus* of Plautus, some pretentious legal advisors are made to justify their calmness by proclaiming that a moderate gait marks a freeborn person, whereas to run about in a hurry bespeaks the slave.[45] In fact, the "running slave" appears so often in Roman comedy as to render the expression almost tautological.[46] The literary tradition depicts the gods themselves as conscious of the ways human beings move. In Vergil's *Aeneid*, Cupid's impersonation of the young Ascanius involves mimicking his gait, whereas Iris's disguise as Beroe is penetrated in part because the goddess fails to walk appropriately.[47] Indeed, when hymns request the appearance of a deity, Greeks and Romans commonly paid special attention to the gait the divinity should adopt upon visiting the person praying.[48]

The type of walk adopted could also convey an individual's sexuality. Among Ovid's instructions in his *Art of Love* are details on the carriage that a woman should adopt to best attract a man.[49] In this area, a particularly telling anecdote comes from Petronius's romance, the *Satyricon*. The maid Chrysis remarks at one point in the story to the hero Encolpius: "I don't know how to predict the future from bird signs, and I don't usually bother with the zodiac, and yet I infer character from the face (*ex vultibus*), and when I see somebody

[43] Diod. Sic. 31.25.2: μιμητὰς ἔχοντες ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ βίου παρατετηρηκότας τήν τε πορείαν καὶ τὰς κατὰ μέρος ἰδιότητας τῆς ἐφάσεως (see, too, Polyb. 6.53.6: ὡς ὁμοιοτάτοις εἶναι δοκοῦσι κατά τε τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὴν ἄλλην περικοπήν).

[44] Quint. *inst.* 11.3.112.

[45] *Poen.* 522–23: *liberos homines per urbem modico magis par est gradu / ire; servile esse duco festinantem currere*; see, too, Turp. *com.* 102.

[46] See esp. Ter. *Haut.* 37; Lindsay 1900.294–95.

[47] Verg. *Aen.* 1.690; 5.646–49 (Apul. *met.* 10.32 describes the walk of "Venus").

[48] Fraenkel 1957.204 n. 4.

[49] Ov. *ars* 3.298–310.

walking, I know what they're thinking."[50] This Petronius passage, I should note, depicts the maid discussing the walk that characterizes a male prostitute. This is not an irrelevant coincidence. It's not a big step to move from the walk of the effeminate male to that of the popular politician of the late Republic. In fact, I will argue that it is the same step.

Incessus in Cicero

The word most commonly used in invective texts to describe a person's walk is *incessus* (the corresponding verbal form *incedo*, on the contrary, occurs only twice in Cicero outside of quotations). The words alone appear to be colorless, meaning simply "to travel by foot," and they can designate any type of gait, from a slow stride to speedy determination.[51] Like the maid in Petronius or the watchful Seneca, however, the spectator of Roman oratory would have had no trouble discerning the reasons why a public speaker such as Cicero would choose to call attention to his opponent's gait. A passage from his speech on behalf of Sestius exhibits Cicero's two principal uses of this practice. Amid vicious invective against two of his favorite enemies, Piso and Gabinius, Cicero exclaims to the jury:

> quorum, per deos immortales! si nondum scelera vulneraque inusta rei publicae vultis recordari, vultum atque incessum animis intuemini. (*Sest.* 17)

> By the immortal gods! if you're not ready yet to recall the crimes and wounds with which Piso and Gabinius have branded the state, then consider in your minds their expression (*vultus*) and their walk (*incessus*).

As I shall demonstrate below, Cicero refers here to two distinct types of stride: in the case of Piso, to an affected stately gait; in the case of Gabinius, to an effeminate stroll. These two types correspond to the dichotomy of the walk offered by the extant surviving texts on physiognomy—those scientific texts that are predicated on the notion that the universe is rational, consistent, and decipherable.[52] On the one hand, writers describe the feigned gait (*incessus affectatus*), by which individuals try to suppress their true nature; and on the other, the "natural" walk (*naturalis*), which a spectator can use to read character. Piso's walk, in fact, is too impressive—"how monstrous was his walk, how aggressive, how frightening to behold!"[53] His gait exceeded the moderation of the normal magistrate, cultivating instead a showy appearance worthy of the excesses of the trendy shopping districts of Capua, where his arrival is likened

[50] Petron. 126.3.

[51] Köstermann 1933; Horsfall 1971.

[52] Gleason 1995.29–37 provides a review of the physiognomical writings.

[53] Sest. 19: *quam taeter incedebat, quam truculentus, quam terribilis aspectu.*

to a *pompa*, a formal procession.[54] Since he does not have the gentle inclination of the head that the physiognomists ascribe to the *magnanimus*, he betrays himself by being too serious, too *gravis*.[55] Cicero advises in *On the Limits of Good and Evil* against affecting a walk that is too pompous, and the physiognomic treatises declare this practice to be especially dangerous, warning that those who feign a dignified walk are "easily uncovered as their true nature conquers them, and leaves them naked."[56]

The tribune Rullus also adopted an outward appearance, resembling Piso's in its intent to deceive. Cicero claims that one of the credentials that allowed Rullus to present the land bill of 63 BCE was his ability to project an exceptionally aggressive persona. Among the external features he adopts—worn clothing, shaggy beard and hair, a generally unkempt countenance—Cicero includes aspects of his physical demeanor. Rullus presents to the Roman people a new countenance, voice, and walk. Cicero suggests that Rullus adopted these elements of deportment to convey bodily the power of the office of tribune.[57] These attacks by Cicero would seem to provide rare instances in which seeming is not being, since his invective normally depends upon the ability to read morality from a person's appearance. And sure enough, Cicero spends the bulk of his invective speeches against Piso and Rullus exposing their hypocrisy and demonstrating that they are not, and never have been, what they seem. As a result, in both cases Cicero is careful to stress that the appearances of his opponents are far from natural. In fact, the word *truculentus*, commonly used to denote the behavior of beasts or of men who act like beasts, occurs only twice in Cicero's speeches: to describe the physical deportment of Rullus and Piso. Like the actor whose extreme showiness the training orator is warned to avoid, these men adopt walks that go over the top. Their motions are calculated to deceive the people. By appealing to gait, Cicero can prove this assertion through visual cues. In the case of Rullus he recalls the tribune's dissimilar appearance in the past; Piso is exposed by his overly solemn eyebrows and the revelation that he has assumed a false name.[58]

The exposure of Rullus and Piso depends upon showing the audience how to penetrate and read through appearances. More commonly the relationship between internal character and its external manifestation is more direct: Cicero claims that a walk directly reveals a depraved character. The popular poli-

[54] *Pis.* 24: *fuit pompa, fuit species, fuit incessus saltem Seplasia dignus et Capua*; for criticism of walking as if in a *pompa*, see Cic. *off.* 1.131.

[55] Physiogn. 76; see, too, Hor. *sat.* 2.3.310–11: *corpore maiorem rides Turbonis in armis / spiritum et incessum.*

[56] *Fin.* 2.77. Physiogn. 74; Gleason 1995.76–81.

[57] *Leg. agr.* 2.13: *truculentius se gerebat quam ceteri. iam designatus alio voltu, alio vocis sono, alio incessu esse meditabatur, vestitu obsoletiore, corpore inculto et horrido, capillatior quam ante barbaque maiore, ut oculis et aspectu denuntiare omnibus vim tribuniciam et minitari rei publicae videretur.*

[58] Rullus: *Leg. agr.* 2.13; Piso: *Pis.* 1 and frg. 8; see further Corbeill 1996.169–73.

tician in particular seemed to have his own distinct gait. In a digression on the sensitivity of Roman crowds to contemporary political issues, Cicero discusses the fame of Saturninus and the Gracchi, three popular tribunes from Roman history (the word Cicero uses to describe them is *populares*). The men were always greeted wildly in public assemblies. The people, Cicero tells us, "loved these men's name, speech, face, . . . and walk" (*Sest.* 105: *horum homines nomen, orationem, vultum, incessum amabant*). Cicero calls attention to similar features of the Antonii brothers in his *Thirteenth Philippic*: their mouths, faces, breath, look, and manner of walking all indicate, in Cicero's words, that "if they have a place in this city, there will be no room for the city itself" (13.4). The walk again intrudes with teasing concision—its connotations presumably clear to Cicero's audience. A section of *On Duties* in which Cicero warns his son Marcus against an excessively slow walk permits us to reconstruct something of those connotations: deviation from a normal speed makes it more difficult for a person to observe propriety.[59] Still, precision is wanting. Cicero the orator seems unwilling to describe the walk in detail, and yet the context shows he probably did not have the need. Even when not immediately visible as Cicero delivered his attack, the opponents he describes are well-known public figures. Even if the modern reader allows room for exaggeration, this repeated emphasis on gait indicates that his audience must have recognized something behind Cicero's references.

Cinaedi and Elite Politicians

May those who love us, love us.
And those that don't love us, may God turn their hearts.
And if He doesn't turn their hearts, may He turn their ankles,
So we'll know them by their limping.
—Gaelic blessing

The modern reader of Republican Roman texts that mention bodily movement needs to go further than the words that have come down to us. It is possible, I believe, to recover from our extant texts the connotations of the popular walk by carefully considering what type of invective is applied toward whom, and by accepting Bourdieu's contention that the body languages of different social and political classes are in a constant state of mutual determination: if the dominant class behaves in one way, it does so in a negative-feedback relationship with nondominant groups. I begin from the abuse levied against three men in particular, three men closely allied to what were usually recognized as "popular" causes: Sextus Titius, Publius Clodius, and Aulus Ga-

[59] *Off.* 1.131.

binius. Gabinius, as I have already mentioned, was notorious for his effeminacy, and on one occasion Cicero calls him a "female dancer" (*saltatrix*; *Pis.* 18). Similarly, Clodius's impersonation of a woman during the Bona Dea scandal gave rise to accusations that he had the walk (*incessus*) and voice of a "Greek female lyre player" (*psaltria*; *In Clod.* 21). Titius, a tribune of the plebs, was so gentle in his bodily movements that a dance, the "Titius," was named in his honor (*Brut.* 225). Similar charges were levied against the great orator Hortensius, whose politics would seem to make him out of place in this company.[60] Perhaps it is relevant that the one attested attack on him occurred when defending an alleged ally of the Catilinarians, a particularly notorious group of *populares* who were thought to dance naked at predawn banquets.[61]

All this emphasis on dancing and graceful movement becomes suspicious in light of one of Quintilian's guarded remarks regarding the education of the public speaker. The rhetor, he says, is justified by precedent in allowing potential orators to study under instructors of bodily movement, who will teach proper positioning of the arms and hands, as well as the appropriate ways to stand and walk. During boyhood, however, the instruction must only be of limited duration and, once the boy reaches adolescence, it should be stopped altogether.[62] To show that he has given this matter sufficient consideration, Quintilian justifies the teaching of dance through such respectable precedents as Platonic philosophy, Spartan military training, and archaic Roman religious practice. The reason for Quintilian's uneasiness about dance instruction becomes clear from a complaint of Scipio Aemilianus uttered over two hundred years earlier: young Romans "are learning to sing, something our ancestors wanted to be considered disgraceful to the freeborn; they go, I say, to dancing school, freeborn girls and boys among the *cinaedi*."[63] Scipio plays here with the Greek loan-word *cinaedus*. As is commonly known, this word, a frequent term for referring to a dancer in early Latin, denoted in Greek culture the sexually penetrated male in a homoerotic relationship. By this point it should come as little surprise to learn that numerous texts—both political and nonpolitical—attest that the *cinaedus* revealed himself by his walk.[64] As was the case with studying under an actor, Quintilian seems to fear that students may learn too much.

[60] Gell. 1.5.2–3 (ORF 92.XVI offers historical testimonia); for Hortensius's histrionic delivery, see, too, Cic. *Brut.* 303, Val. Max. 8.10.2; Berry 1996.24–26.

[61] For the connotations, see Corbeill 1996.138–39.

[62] Quint. *inst.* 1.11.15–19, who particularizes the instruction as a type of dance: *neque enim gestum oratoris componi ad similitudinem saltationis volo*; 1.12.14.

[63] Macr. *Sat.* 3.14.7 = ORF 21.30.

[64] Walk of *cinaedi* or effeminate males: Varro *Men.* 301, with CIL 4.1825 and Cèbe (1987) 8.1324–25; Sen. *contr.* 2.1.6; Phaedr. 5.1.12–18; Sen. *epist.* 114.3; Petron. 119, l. 25; Juv. 2.17; Quint. *inst.* 5.9.14; Carm. *ad senat.* 13; Housman on Manil. 4.519. Compare Zeno SVF 1.82; Cic. *off.* 1.129. On the *cinaedus* in general, see Richlin 1993, Parker 1997, C. Williams 1999.160–224.

Turning to how the writers on physiognomy describe the *cinaedus*, one can discover striking correspondences between the movement of the sexually submissive male and the popular politician of the Republic. What seems to emerge is that *cinaedi* divide into two types: those that try too hard to hide their natures, and those for whom their "true" movements are observable. Among the former strides Rullus, distinguishing himself among his tribunician colleagues: he steps very slowly with a feigned aggressiveness. The latter group encompasses our dancing politicians: their arms and fingers gesticulate in a manner overexuberant for a person moving at a leisurely pace, and both the neck and the sides of the torso sway gently from side to side.[65]

In contrast, the elite politician—or the politician who wishes to appear allied with the elite—can also be described as he walks before his colleagues. Extant texts prescribe for the aristocrat a way of walking in direct contradistinction to the type I have been reconstructing for the popular politician. A full gait, according to the second-century-CE physiognomist Polemon, exhibits loyalty, efficacy, a noble mind, and the absence of anger.[66] Cicero requires the same type of stride for the proper orator, without alluding to physiognomic principles. He also adds features that directly oppose the physiognomist's vision of the *cinaedus*: keep the neck and fingers still and the trunk straight, bending it only as a man does; the right arm should remain close to the body, extended solely in times of impassioned delivery. In other words, "let nothing be superfluous" (*nihil ut supersit*).[67] As for speed, these empiricists advise the elite politician to be slow—*bradus* in Greek, *gravis*, not surprisingly, in Latin—but not too slow, for that marks a lack of effectiveness.[68] It was tricky to maintain the appropriate balance; hence Cicero's admiration of Crassus's ability to effect the difficult combination of being both dignified and elegant.[69] Criticism could also arise if the speaker was overly erect in the upper body—this overcompensation appears to be what betrayed the hypocrite Piso and was later to constitute part of Augustus's criticism of the way Tiberius carried

[65] Ps. Arist. *Phgn.* 808a 14–15: ἡ μὲν [βάδισις] περινεύοντος, ἡ δὲ κρατοῦντος τὴν ὄσφυν; Physiogn. 74: *et collum et vocem plerumque submittunt et pedes manusque relaxant; . . . plerumque etiam oscitantes detecti sunt*; 98 and 115 (numerous details); Polemon 50: *latera moventem articulosque agitantem*. Herter (1959) 4.635–36 offers evidence from other kinds of texts.

[66] Polemon 50; compare Ovid's *Tragoedia* (*am.* 3.1.11). For Greek precedents, see Bremmer 1991.16–20.

[67] Cic. *orat.* 59; see, too, *de orat.* 3.220; Sen. *epist.* 40.14, 66.5. Efron [1941] 1972.22 discusses how researchers of the Third Reich reached quite different conclusions about their Mediterranean neighbors, whose "mental energies are all turned rather outwards, in the Nordic inwards. . . . Mediterranean ferment stands opposed to Nordic restraint" (citing H. Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes* [Munich 1925]).

[68] Physiogn. 100, with André 1981 ad loc.; Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.11.73. *Gravitas* as a moral and political designation: Achard 1981.392–99; Hellegouarc'h 1972.279–94; Wagenvoort 1947.104–19, who speculates over the word's semantic evolution.

[69] *Brut.* 158; see, too, *Brut.* 143.

himself.[70] Instead, the neck should lean slightly forward in a sign of determination while the shoulders gently move. In a word, remarks the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise on physiognomics, the dignified man walks like that "most male of animals," the lion.[71]

This reconstruction of the elite walk recalls one of the emperor Augustus's cryptic mottoes—"hurry up . . . slowly."[72] That the emperor was conscious of the public recognition of proper modes of walking is clear from a letter he wrote to his wife Livia, in which he worries about the walk of the young Claudius.[73] In fact, the motto "Hurry up . . . slowly" may find concrete exposition in the famous statue of Augustus from Prima Porta. One art historian has argued in detail that the position of the feet in the Polykleitan antecedent of this sculpture depicts a man commencing "very slow gait activity."[74] And yet the Roman artist has adapted his model, making the original statue more tense and concentrated. The result is that Augustus, although stopped in movement, presents an impression of potential motion different from that of the Greek model: "his next step is unimaginable, as is his prior one."[75] The ready determination of Augustus's pose, in other words, quite possibly finds its inspiration not only in artistic precedents, but in an elite ideology of the body.

Types of walk provide a model for how ideology permeated Roman society at all levels. Moralizing texts of Cicero's day such as I quoted in my opening remarks assert that nature desires internal character to be manifested externally. Judging a human being according to physical movement was not simply a social construction that went unexamined. Rather, this notion, a notion upon which the entire study of physiognomy was based, depends upon an understanding of what is essential—and not constructed—about being a human being. By simple observation, we recognize that proper care of the body undoubtedly affects clarity of thought and so, it follows, the soul must conversely affect the body. Beginning from this premise, a close empirical observation of nature—"science"—combined with a speculation on the origin of the world and its inhabitants—"philosophy"—becomes a powerful *political* tool, a way of separating us from them, a way of proving, from objective, external signs, who is naturally born to lead and who, misled, is simply dancing his way through politics.

[70] Physiogn. 75; compare Cic. *off.* 1.131. Tiberius: Suet. *Tib.* 68.3, Tac. *ann.* 1.10.7.

[71] Ps. Arist. *Phgn.* 809b 15–35 (summarized in Polemon 50). Winkes 1973.902–5 considers whether Roman artists attempted to express leonine characteristics in portraiture.

[72] Suet. *Aug.* 25.4 (σπεῦδε βραδέως); Gell. 10.11.5.

[73] Suet. *Claud.* 4.5. Pliny, by contrast, praises Trajan's stride for matching the vigor of his soul (*paneg.* 83.7).

[74] Tobin 1995.52–64.

[75] Kähler 1959.13 ("Anders als beim Doryphoros ist ihr nächster Schritt undenkbar, der vorige ist es ebenso").

Enforcement

But an important question remains; if there really did exist some kind of political etiquette of bodily aesthetics, and if it really were so all-pervasive as I claim, then why would anyone even bother to try to violate it? In other words, if there were some transitive equation between being a popular politician, an effeminate male, and a social deviant, then what prevents someone like Gabinius from simply moving with more determination and holding his head and flanks still? I would like to suggest three possible answers: they entail 1) access to education; 2) the topography of political debate; and 3) willful self-definition on the part of the popular politicians themselves.

1. *Education*

I have already mentioned David's research on "popular eloquence" (*eloquentia popularis*)—that is, the speaking style of political newcomers, people who may have been important in their native communities but who, upon arrival in the big city, became labeled because of their non-Roman style of pronunciation, use of vocabulary, and even sense of humor.[76] I would add that these newcomers also probably had styles of deportment that distinguished them from their counterparts in the urban elite. Numerous examples survive, as we have seen, describing the ways in which rhetorical treatises from ancient Rome instruct their pupils in proper body language. Other ancient references make it clear that this kind of physical training would have been clarified and reinforced through constant practice before a teacher.[77] In fact the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, an anonymous rhetorical treatise from the early first century BCE containing the kind of instruction that Cicero and his elite contemporaries would have received, apologizes for even trying to discuss delivery in a written form. When he reaches the point in his discussion where he must begin to give details, the lesson abruptly ends: "the rest we'll leave for practice drills" (*reliqua trademus exercitationi*).[78] The meaning of the visible becomes, in effect, invisible to the reading audience.

So it seems likely that in the late Republic the means of learning proper gesture rested with those who had access to an urban education. Urban education at this period would have entailed intimate association with members of the elite, an education recently characterized as "wordless replication of the

[76] David 1980 and especially 1983a.

[77] Sen. *epist.* 94.5, 8.

[78] Rhet. Her. 3.27; see also 3.19: "No one has written carefully on delivery;" he either does not know or respect the work of L. Plotius Gallus (Quint. *inst.* 11.3.143). Quintilian seems to have been the first writer to describe oratorical gesture in any detail (Cousin [1935] 1.626–27); for Theophrastus's lost work on delivery, see Fortenbaugh 1985.

elite *habitus*."[79] What is more, during this period rhetorical training would have been almost entirely in Greek, not Latin, thereby further restricting the class of students who could learn at these schools.[80] When Latin teaching was eventually introduced, it gained immediate popularity, as students flocked to lessons.[81] In fact, in the early first century, rhetoricians in Rome who tried, for the first time, to establish schools for the instruction in Latin of potential orators, were rebuked in an edict from the censors on the grounds that—to quote the words of the censors—"our ancestors have decided what they wanted their children to learn and what schools they should attend."[82] Cicero puts in the mouth of Crassus, one of the censors responsible for this edict, the additional opinion: "these new teachers could teach nothing—except daring."[83] Is this a distinctly Roman appeal to tradition?[84] Or do we have here a means of maintaining the ascendancy of the elite, who of course are the *real* descendants of "our ancestors?" It is an intriguing coincidence that Lucius Plotius Gallus, one of the rhetors at whom this edict seems to have been aimed, wrote in Latin a work on gesture—perhaps the first such work entrusted to writing.[85] Here as elsewhere, we are hampered from further conclusions by the fact that direct references to the edict are confined to elite sources. But to have had available a written text on gesture would of course risk raising questions about the validity of the elite model, by which items of decorum such as stance, carriage, and gesture are not "learned" but, in the words of Bourdieu, "are able to pass directly from practice to practice without moving through discourse and consciousness."[86] A Greek philosopher, writing on rhetoric at about the same period as Plotius Gallus and probably in Italy, echoes this sentiment of Bourdieu, giving clear voice to what I believe the censors couched in their language of tradition. Philodemus writes: "Instruction in delivery is a product of recent foolishness. . . . The writers on rhetoric are in fact making clear a basic truth that is hidden by politicians, namely that they are designing their delivery to appear dignified and noble and, most of all, to mislead their audience."[87]

[79] Gleason 1995.xxv conjectures that the proliferation of written handbooks during the second century CE corresponds to a broadening of education that allowed greater permeation into the cultural elite (which can no longer be identified with the political elite); see further 162–68.

[80] Cic. *Brut.* 310; cf. Quint. *inst.* 1.1.12; Corbeill 2001.

[81] Cic. apud Suet. *rhet.* 26.1; Rawson 1985.146–47 discusses teaching resources available in Latin.

[82] Suet. *rhet.* 25.2: *maiores nostri quae liberos suos discere et quos in ludos itare vellent instituerunt*, 26.1; Cic. *de orat.* 3.93–94; Gell. 15.11.2; Tac. *dial.* 35.1. For bibliography, see Gruen 1990.179–91; Kaster 1995.273–75, 292–94; Pina Polo 1996.65–93.

[83] *De orat.* 3.94.

[84] Gruen 1990.179–91 examines the paradox of Greek training becoming an integral part of Roman tradition. See further Corbeill 2001.

[85] Quint. *inst.* 11.3.143.

[86] Bourdieu 1990.74.

[87] Phld. *Rh.* 1.200–1 (Sudhaus); my translation borrows from Hubbell 1919–1920.301.

2. *Topography*

Archaeological studies of the past two decades indicate that beginning around 290 BCE the comitium at Rome consisted of a space measuring approximately 1000 square feet, situated between the speaker's platform at the Republican rostra and the senate house, the *Curia Hostilia*.[88] By this reconstruction, in the third century the Roman citizenry assembled as a whole would have been sandwiched in an open-air space between the speaker and the senate house. It is little wonder that literary sources regard it as a popular move when in 145 BCE the tribune Gaius Licinius Crassus transferred popular legislation from this limited area to the more spacious Forum.[89] In a similar, but likely separate, move, Gaius Gracchus first began the practice of addressing from the rostra the people assembled in the Forum—and not in the comitium. The man who, as noted earlier, fashioned a public *habitus* that became identifiable with his popular intentions, also refashioned spatial relations in the forum through a move Plutarch hails as another step toward "democracy" (*demokratia*).[90] Plutarch's enthusiasm about the change in venue entices us to agree with recent claims that the Roman Republic functioned more as a popular democracy than is normally recognized.[91] In this context, Millar has appositely observed that the comitium has much greater importance in the archaeological and literary record when compared with the meeting places of the Senate.[92] And it is in open spaces like the comitium and elsewhere in the Roman Forum, as opposed to within the roofed and walled curia, where the majority of the texts I have been examining were played out. But what had the two tribunes Crassus and Gracchus achieved other than provide a larger area for popular assemblies, which could number several hundred people in the comitium but approximately six thousand in the open forum?[93] The dynamic between speaker and audience has not changed, and in fact I will argue that the new orientation, resulting in a larger and more dispersed group of auditors, serves only to increase the distinction between senatorial-based and popular-based political appeals. Cicero himself points to one feature of the new dynamic. The arrangement by which the crowd faces the speaker, framed by the senate-house, creates a situation in which "the curia watches over and presses upon the speak-

[88] Coarelli (1992) 1.148–51, summarized by him in LTUR s.v. "comitium," argues that the space was circular; Carafa 1998.132–51 reexamines the evidence to show that the space was triangular (Mouritsen 2001.18–19 is skeptical about Carafa's conclusions).

[89] Cic. *Lael.* 96; Varro *rust.* 1.9.

[90] Plut. *Vit. C. Gracch.* 5.3; I follow Coarelli (1992) 2.157–58 in distinguishing between the actions of Crassus and Gracchus, contra L. R. Taylor 1966.23–25.

[91] Millar 1984, 1986, 1995, 1998; Thommen 1995.363.

[92] Millar 1989, esp. 141.

[93] Estimates from Thommen 1995.364.

er's platform, as an avenger of rashness and a regulator of civic duty."[94] Visually, the senatorial element of the government looms larger than ever before.

Archaeologists have reconstructed the comitium in Rome in part by comparison with other extant comitia in Italy and Sicily. I am not here concerned so much with their reasoning—although the identification of these provincial structures is not entirely certain—as much as with a singular and obvious way in which the meeting places outside the capital seem *not* to be parallel.[95] Simply put, outside of Rome no traces of a rostrum survive, and there are no clear indications that a raised speaker's platform parallel to the type found in Rome ever existed.[96] Moreover, and as a result, it seems likely that, as in Greek places of assembly during the Hellenistic period, everywhere in Italy but at Rome the speaker spoke *up* to the citizens assembled around him.[97] Detienne has neatly demonstrated how this arrangement, with speaker at center (ἐς μέσον), provides a physical analog to the value Greek society placed on democracy and equality of speech.[98] Contrast then the situation in Rome, where the elevated magistrate literally looks *down* upon (*despicere*) his listeners.[99] In both civil and criminal proceedings, the presiding magistrate sits on a raised platform, at a higher level than the participants in the case and the crowd of listeners.[100] A similar relationship governs the magistrate addressing the people ranged below, a situation that presupposes the unequal position between speaker and addressees.[101] While retaining the Greek architectural form, the Romans invert the relation between speaker and citizen.[102] Insodoing, the physical relationship mirrors the relationship of political status.[103] The symbolic value of this relationship was recognized by Cicero and, in fact, the level at which one stood while addressing the people at a public assembly could

[94] Cic. *Flacc.* 57: *speculatur atque obsidet rostra vindex temeritatis et moderatrix offici curia.* The passage offers a strikingly visual illustration of the principle enunciated at Cic. *leg.* 2.30. Bonnefond 1983 speculates on other indirect means, both temporal and spatial, by which the senate dominated the political process.

[95] Krause 1976.53–61 evaluates the evidence for comitia outside Rome.

[96] F. Brown et al. 1993.27–28 consider the possibility that the speaker at Cosa spoke from a raised position.

[97] See Camp 1996, who argues that the arrangement by which the ground slopes up away from the speaker begins only with the Hellenistic period, and was not a prominent feature of the Pnyx at any stage (contra Kourouniotes and Thompson 1932).

[98] Detienne 1965, whose focus is on archaic Greece.

[99] Pina Polo 1996.23–25. See Cic. *har. resp.* 33 for the pun (*tollam altius tectum, non ut ego te despiciam*).

[100] Greenidge 1901.133–34, 458–59.

[101] Gell. 18.7.7, where Gellius claims that one of the three meanings of *contio* is the platform to which the speaker ascends.

[102] Krause 1976, following the suggestions of Sjöqvist 1951.405–11, details Greek influence on Rome's comitium; Coarelli (1992) 1.146–51 follows Krause but differs on the date when this phase of the comitium may have been introduced in Rome.

[103] A. Bell 1997.2.

depend on one's political rank at the moment. Cicero implies it was not normal for a nonmagistrate to speak from the rostra during an assembly (and he could do so only at the invitation of the presiding magistrate) and that magistrates who had not called the assembly spoke from steps lower than the speaker's platform proper.[104] This hierarchy of speaking height literalizes the notion of "rank," which is normally rendered by the Latin word *gradus* ("step"). The contrast between Greek and Roman modes of civic communication becomes especially interesting since inside the senate-house there would have persisted the Greek-style relationship of speaker below, with the audience of peers ranged above on benches (*subsellia*).[105]

Yet the simple physical relationship between political speaker and listening populace does not tell a complete story. We still need to look at the question "Why do popular politicians?" I return to the motifs that recur in Cicero's attack on opponents he designates as popular politicians, where he employs a rhetoric centering on peculiarities of the body and of physical movement. It is no coincidence that these are the very attributes that would be visible on the rostra to the *populus* gathered in the forum. The orator associates the tribune Vatinius's foul political program with an equally foul external appearance.[106] In his speech *On Behalf of Sestius*, Cicero mocks the walk of Aulus Gabinius, the Gracchi, and Saturninus, marking their gait as distinct from that of a serious politician.[107] Even the amount of control the speaker had over his mouth had political connotations.[108] The popular ideology, it is clear, has become literally embodied in its proponents. It is surely no accident that the elite virtues of *gravitas* and *constantia* stand in direct opposition to the swaying walk and gaping mouth of Cicero's popular politicians. In the section of *On Duties* where Cicero is purportedly instructing his son on the proper carriage of the body, he warns against an excessively quick walk, since it prompts "quick breathing, a changed facial expression, a misshapen mouth—these features," he continues, "make perfectly clear a lack of *constantia*."[109] The equation of physical with moral stability also informs the historiographic tradition. Pro-Gracchan sources show Tiberius Gracchus firm and silent in the face of death, whereas hostile writers depict him during the same period scurrying all

[104] Botsford 1909.149, on the basis of Cic. *Att.* 2.24.3, *Vat.* 24. Pina Polo 1996.34–38, 178–82 notes that of the *privati* known to have addressed *contiones*, two-thirds consisted of former consuls (34).

[105] LTUR 1.333 (E. Tortorici).

[106] For example, *Vat.* 4, 10.

[107] *Sest.* 17 (Gabinius); 105 (Gracchi, Saturninus).

[108] Richlin 1992.99; Corbeill 1996.99–127.

[109] *Off.* 1.131: *anhelitus moventur, vultus mutantur, ora torquentur; ex quibus magna significatio fit non adesse constantiam*; at Cic. *de orat.* 1.184 an arrogant orator, ignorant of the laws, wanders with a crowd in the forum *prompto ore ac vultu*.

around the city.[110] An unrestrained speaker such as Gracchus could not, of course, be imagined as facing death in any other manner.

Artistic representations support this contrast between elite self-mastery and popular excitability. Brilliant has posited for Roman art what he calls an "appendage aesthetic:" rather than imitating classical Greek practice by using anatomical details of the human figure to render meaning to the viewer, Roman artists concentrated principally on those attributes that are attached to the torso, especially the head, arms, and dress. The appendage aesthetic presumably finds its origin in Roman daily experience. The gestures of public figures as rendered in art rely on "the developed sensitivity for gesticulate address" possessed by those familiar with daily oratory.[111] I have already suggested how such a reliance may have affected the stance of Augustus's statue from Prima Porta. The walk functions in a way analogous to the folds of the toga in sculpture—just as the literal and metaphorical *gravitas* ("heaviness") of the garment "dematerializes the body" and makes the once-living model into a political icon, so, too, that gait impresses most that draws the least attention to itself.[112] In a study of Roman portrait busts, Luca Giuliani has suggested that the Romans tried to convey political signs in portraiture as well—the elite, for example, wished their marble not only to bear a physical likeness, but also to express sternness and steadfastness (*gravitas, constantia*), two key concepts underlying the ideological program of the conservative *optimates*.[113] At the same time it is apparent that Roman sculptors of the elite tended to avoid sculptural techniques popular in Hellenistic times that represented movement, enthusiasm, and excited breathing.[114] Giuliani even conjectures that depictions of Pompeius strike us as strange because Magnus is, characteristically, trying to have it both ways: he is *popularis* from the eyebrows up, as embodied especially in the evocation of Alexander the Great's hairstyle, but stern optimate from the eyes down (fig. 18).[115] Pompeius's portrait provides a physical analog to the multifaceted general that Cicero praises in his speech *On the Manilian Law*: both the physical and the verbal representations stress how their subject display a unique (but not precarious) blend of military might and political reserve.[116] Unlike Brilliant, however, Giuliani balks at whether these artistic practices have a direct correlation with the real physical appearance of the persons so represented.

[110] Sordi 1978.306–7, 318. Compare how the sources depict Cicero's calm acceptance of death (Livy apud Sen. *suas.* 6.17; Plut. *Vit. Cic.* 48).

[111] Brilliant 1963.10 (quoted here), 26–37.

[112] On the limited gesticulation depicted on togate statues, see Ibid. 69.

[113] Giuliani 1986.214 and 322 n. 44.

[114] Ibid.239–45, with 215.

[115] Ibid.97–100, citing Cic. *fam.* 8.13 for comparison.

[116] Giuliani 1990.111–12.

18. Portrait of Pompey the Great (courtesy of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen; cat. 597, I.N. 733).

I would like to suggest that the invective texts already cited from Cicero allow us to glimpse this elusive physical reality. It is not only the way we move, but the space within which we move that shapes personal ideology. Elite politicians, speaking within the confines of the curia, easily maintain *constantia*, or self-mastery. Cicero remarks from the rostra that consuls regularly considered it a "legal condition" (*lege et condicione*) to avoid addressing the *populus* assembled as a whole.[117] He of course exaggerates motive—but the people must have been able to judge the accuracy of his primary claim. Men of consular rank should not grandstand. When speaking from the rostra, a concern for restraint dominates: the rhetorical tradition stresses repeatedly how the serious orator moves slowly, avoiding excessive gesticulation.[118] The same reserve applies to the magistrate. In a passage from his *Florida*, Apuleius remarks that the more important a person is, the more he should expect public

[117] *Leg. agr.* 2.6.
[118] Graf 1992.46–47.

scrutiny for his speech and demeanor. As an example of this predicament, Apuleius contrasts the public restraint of a proconsul, speaking quietly and infrequently from a seated position, with the public crier who stands, walks, and shouts contentiously. "Being low class provides plenty of excuses, having status plenty of difficulties."[119]

Vocabulary is also a function of public demeanor. It is a common phenomenon in Latin for words denoting ethical and aesthetic concepts to derive from concrete and tangible notions in the external world: *rectus* means physically "straight" as well as morally "upright;" behavior that is *perversus* has "turned away" from a posited straight course, and so on.[120] The same tendency toward the concrete prevails both in political terminology—the "magistrate" (*magistratus*) has "more" (*magis*)—and in public behavior—the "heaviness" (*gravitas*) and "coherence" (*constantia*) of the admirable citizen.[121] In a world of embodied political ethics such as this, it is natural to assume that sensitivity to bodily movement be at least subliminally active in daily interaction and that any disruption of physical realities could provoke a disruption in politics. Such concerns were still felt in the twentieth century: "During the debate on restoring the House of Commons after the war, Churchill feared that departure from the intimate spatial pattern of the House, where opponents face each other across a narrow aisle, would seriously alter the patterns of government."[122] "We shape our buildings," Churchill remarked famously on this occasion, "and afterwards our buildings shape us."

The popular politician, especially the tribune of the plebs, reached his constituency while speaking in the open spaces of the forum and in other wide-open areas such as the Circus Flaminius.[123] Even speeches in important political trials would have an audience that extended beyond the judges to the corona of interested citizens.[124] A reference in a speech of Cicero, where he describes "a packed forum and the temples filled to the brim" gives us an idea of how difficult it would have been for a speaker to make himself heard at these gatherings.[125] To reach the people gathered in such open spaces, exaggerated movement, expansive gesticulation, and open, shouting mouths were essential. In fact, recent studies of the role of charisma in mass persuasion suggest that sheer physical presence could compensate for not being heard; being

[119] Apul. *flor.* 9.1–12 (9.8: *tantum habet vilitas excusationis, dignitas difficultatis*).
[120] Corbeill 1996.34.
[121] Paul. Fest. p. 126; Wagenvoort 1947.104–27.
[122] Hall 1966.106–7.
[123] Cic. *Att.* 1.14.1–2, *p. red. in sen.* 17, *Sest.* 33; Liv. 27.21.1; L. R. Taylor 1966.20–21; Thommen 1995.367.
[124] Millar 1998.91.
[125] Cic. *Man.* 44 (the occasion is the voting on the *lex Gabinia*); see, too, *Catil.* 4.14, Tac. *dial.* 39.5.

audible, in other words, is not a necessary precondition to being persuasive.[126] In Rome, we are told, one popular tribune captivated the people not through his persuasive ability, but through, in Cicero's words, his "public appearance, his gestures, and even through his very clothing."[127] *Species, motus, amictus*—these qualities may in fact have been the only aspects of the speaker much of his audience was able to perceive. Representations of the emperor addressing the people show "an arrangement of the *populus* according to the status of its members."[128] There is no reason to think republican gatherings offered an appreciably different scenario; a clear parallel is offered by the hierarchical seating arrangements at public festivals, whereby senators sat close to the action, with those of lesser rank ascending behind in descending order of status. It is hardly surprising to read an imperial writer remark about how the "unwashed crowd" of the empire takes special pleasure in the speaker who claps, stamps his feet, and strikes his chest.[129] In a nearly inescapable double-bind, the politician becomes his demeanor, the demeanor denotes his politics.

The popular politician excited not just aesthetic revulsion. His very appearance was represented as combating truth-telling. In one of Cicero's direct confrontations with the popular tribune Rullus in 63 BCE, he spitefully remarks that, unlike the tribunes, he himself owes his popularity—the word he uses ironically is *popularis*—to "truth, not display" (*veritate, non ostentatione*).[130] In contrast, he remarks later in the same speech how the attacks of Rullus and his allies forced him to "stand firm (*consistere*) in the public assembly."[131] The subdued appearance of the consul Cicero provides direct access to truth. In his philosophical works, as well, Cicero warns against the extremes of showy *ostentatio*, since it involves the altering of an individual's "facial expressions, walk, and clothing" (*fin.* 2.77: *vultum incessum vestitum*), precisely those features of his appearance that Cicero accuses Rullus of manipulating upon taking office as tribune: "he planned to have another expression, another voice, another walk; with more worn-out clothing."[132] Display (*ostentatio*) also comes under criticism in Cicero's prose treatises as being insufficient for securing an individual's *gloria* and as inappropriate for a senator speaking in the curia. As an example of excessive display being ineffective, Cicero offers the two famous tribunes, Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus.[133] The continued contrast between

[126] Atkinson 1984.88.
[127] Cic. *Brut.* 224.
[128] Torelli 1992.90–91.
[129] Quint. *inst.* 2.12.10.
[130] Cic. *leg. agr.* 1.23; see, too, 2.15, *consul re non oratione popularis*, where *oratio* presumably refers to "way of speaking" (OLD 1) as opposed to simply "words," which would have been expressed by the common *re non verbo* (or similar; OLD s.v. *res* 6b). A similar distinction occurs at *Brut.* 116 (*simplex in agendo veritas, non molesta*), where again a comparison is made with acting.
[131] Cic. *leg. agr.* 1.25.
[132] *Leg. agr.* 2.13: *alio vultu alio vocis sono alio incessu esse meditabatur, vestitu obsoletiore.*
[133] *Off.* 2.43; *de orat.* 2.333.

ostentatio and *veritas* brings us back to Roman notions of acting, where gestures of the stage are contrasted with those of the orator, a contrast represented as being between *demonstratio* and *significatio*, between artful mimicry and the natural expression of the emotions.[134] Hence the elite politician could point to the mere physical presence of a popular opponent to demonstrate the visible violation of the elite virtues of *gravitas* and *constantia*, virtues not only endorsed in literary, rhetorical, and philosophical texts, but delineated in contemporary portraiture.

One final consideration needs to be confronted. If a popular and a senatorial speaker are both speaking in a public assembly, experience and common sense would seem to dictate that the elite speaker exhibit greater gestures in this setting than when speaking in more confined quarters. An observable fact argues against such an hypothesis. Cicero's references to walking and movement occur in all types of speeches—in juried trials, in the senate, as well as before the people. This indicates that each audience would be attuned to the same contrasts in carriage regardless of the venue. Furthermore, recent studies of the role of gesture in communication show that, when attention is drawn to excessive gesturing, the audience does indeed notice. Not only that, but drawing attention to gesture induces the hearer to find the speaker *less* persuasive because, in a sense, the body, and not the emotions, is perceived as doing the speaking.[135] Elite ideology succeeds in part by intruding the gestures of opponents on the listeners' attention. When not distracted by gesture, as would be the case in the elite construction of *gravitas*, attention focused on words. *Veritas, non ostentatio.*

3. *The Self-Made* Popularis, *or "Sulla Made Me a Homosexual"*

My third point considers the possibility that some popular politicians, by embracing the *habitus* that formed in response to their elite rivals, consciously advertised to the populace their political stance.[136] As has been recently argued, "the popular will of the Roman people found expression in the context, and only in the context, of divisions within the oligarchy."[137] The adoption of a popular persona, then, together with a popular agenda, could provide a member of the elite the opportunity to promote his own projects. The display of battle wounds, for example, seems to have been a component of popular rhetoric used by prominent politicians to contest elite claims to privi-

[134] Cic. *de orat.* 3.220.
[135] Rimé and Schiaratura 1991.272–76 (quotation is from 276).
[136] This section offers a new perspective on passages discussed in Corbeill 1996.194–97, and is inspired in part by Kennedy 1992.39, who discusses Maecenas's alleged effeminacy in similar terms.
[137] North 1990b.18.

lege of birth.[138] I use as my own test case Julius Caesar, who during his lifetime was subjected to accusations of being an androgyne, a catamite, and a wearer of effeminate clothing. Rather than rejecting, as every ancient historian does, the truth-content behind these charges, I would like to consider instead what these accusations may reveal about political competition and self-representation.

Charges of wearing nonmasculine dress appear frequently in the late Republic in connection with two major political figures, Julius Caesar and Publius Clodius.[139] References to Clodius's activities occur only in connection with his violation of the rites of the Bona Dea in 62 BCE, during a religious celebration normally restricted to Roman matrons. On this occasion, Clodius's alleged adoption of female dress did not represent the adoption of an effeminate lifestyle, in spite of Cicero's frequent claims to the contrary. Instead, the clothing simply provided Clodius a means for escaping detection, for covering up what he was *not*.[140] Caesar's choice of dress, on the other hand, seems to represent a move not toward deception, but toward political self-advertisement.

When captured by pirates in the 70s BCE, Julius Caesar was careful to continue wearing in their presence the toga, the typical mark of Roman citizenship, perhaps as a sign to his captors of his claims to sexual inviolability.[141] If we can trust our sources, Caesar had already displayed this awareness of the symbolic power of dress while a young man in Rome. The image he wished to project in the empire's capital was, however, quite different. During the rule of Sulla, a clear opponent of popular politics, the dictator warned his political allies to beware of the young man Caesar, whose style of wrapping the toga denoted an effeminate character.[142] Clothes, in this case, literally unmake the man. The threat that Sulla envisions from Caesar dressing up is not immediately clear, and one is quick to dismiss the attendant claim that Caesar's peculiar apparel almost drove Sulla to kill him.[143] Yet Suetonius, too, mentions Sulla's desire to eliminate the young Caesar: something, "either divine inspiration or personal inference," told him that the boy had "a lot of Mariuses in him" and that his rise to power would signal the end of the optimate party.[144] Jokes of Cicero, furthermore, suggest that Julius Caesar's appearance had some connection with his eventual victory in the Roman civil war. As Cicero says, "I never would have thought that a man who scratches his head with one finger and has such exquisitely arranged hair could have ever overthrown the Roman state."[145] Cicero's alleged failure to read Caesar correctly constitutes his wry commentary on the political codes of external appearance. The figure of the effeminately adorned male represents, I suggest, a recognized social construction that Caesar has adopted for a specific reason: to align himself with modes of behavior contrary to those of the dominant political class. Contrary, that is, not only to the Sullas, but also to the Ciceros, who would have adopted the elite model for their own success.

I have already mentioned Pierre Bourdieu's theory of bodily *habitus*, whereby the different segments in a given society express values through specific forms of dress, language, and gesture. According to Bourdieu's theory, the various forms of the *habitus* affect and help define one another. One of Bourdieu's contemporary examples provides a parallel to what I am suggesting about Julius Caesar. In twentieth-century France, Bourdieu claims that members of the dominant social class have acquired effeminate characteristics that stand in contradistinction with the values of the working classes. The style of the elite, Bourdieu writes, "is seen as a repudiation of the virile values."[146] In the creation and maintenance of the values of the working classes, then, two isolable vectors are at work—one that labels from above, and one that labels from within.[147] Applying these notions of the *habitus* to the case of Julius Caesar, one can observe that the optimate class, through its public invective, has identified certain forms of behavior, speech, and action as contrary to its own *habitus* and has, as a further corollary, defined these characteristics as being contrary to the proper Roman way of life.[148] It is not surprising that in the creation of this dichotomy, divisions arise along lines of gender: since the elite adopts masculine-coded walk and dress, the popular politicians become aligned with feminine traits.[149] The popular politicians were forced

[138] Leigh 1995, esp. 202–7.

[139] Other examples of this charge from the Republic include Gell. 6.12.4–5 (P. Sulpicius Galus); Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.103, 5.31, 5.86 (Verres); *Catil.* 2.22 (Catiline and his followers); cf. Varro *Men.* 313. Manfredini 1985.257–71 surveys the stigma of cross-dressing from late-Republican invective to the codex of Theodosius.

[140] Cic. *in Clod.* 21; Geffcken 1973.82.

[141] Vell. 2.41.3; A. Bell 1997.15 n. 102.

[142] Suet. *Iul.* 45.3, Macr. *Sat.* 2.3.9. Clothing reveals effeminacy: Hor. *sat.* 1.2.25; Sen. *nat.* 7.31, *epist.* 114.21; Mart. 1.96. Sulla's stance has uncomfortable resonance with Nazi propagandists who claimed that bodily *habitus* determines choice of dress ("Der Stil der leiblichen Gestalt und Gebärde bestimmt den Stil der artrechten Kleidung," L. F. Clauss, quoted in Efron [1941] 1972.26 n. 7).

[143] Dio 43.43.4.

[144] Suet. *Iul.* 1.3: *satis constat Sullam . . . proclamasse, sive divinitus sive aliqua coniectura, . . . [Caesarem] quandoque optimatium partibus . . . exitio futurum; nam Caesari multos Marios inesse.*

[145] Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 4.9; see, too, Macr. *Sat.* 2.3.9, Dio 43.43.5. Corbeill 1996.164–65 discusses the head-scratching gesture. The disjuncture of effeminate appearance and masculine reality resembles Phaedrus's story of the *cinaedus* soldier who quite unexpectedly turns out to be a great warrior (Phaedr. app. 8). Gleason 1995.134 relates the story to Phaedrus's status as a freedman, speculating that "some males might deliberately opt out of the competition that governed public interaction among 'real' men."

[146] Bourdieu 1991.88.

[147] Hacking 1986.234 and, for a general discussion of societies as self-regulating systems, Bateson 1972.88–106 ("Morale and National Character").

[148] Bourdieu 1990.62; 1984.170–72.

[149] Bourdieu 1990.70–79 speculates on the origin of dividing gait along gender lines (for details, see 1990.271–83).

into their own particular *habitus* through both the power of the aristocratic ideology and through their own willingness to comply with the rhetoric of that ideology.

To return to Caesar's case. In addition to sporting a form of dress readily identifiable as feminine, Caesar flouted other traditional categories of sexual behavior. All these maneuvers should be attributed to the same identity, but it is a political, not a sexual, identity. In a public oration, the elder Curio referred to Caesar as "a man for all women, and a woman for all men;" Marcus Bibulus, Caesar's colleague in the consulship of 59 BCE, published official edicts in which Caesar's alleged sexual involvement with the Asian king Nicomedes yields for him the nickname "the queen of Bithynia"; this affair also produced for Caesar the descriptive epithet "innermost support of the royal bed."[150] The sources do not preserve Caesar's immediate reactions to this abuse; but if he had followed both the rhetorical handbooks and contemporary oratorical practice, he would have immediately denied these allegations with a quick and witty joke. One-upmanship was a skill to be pursued and mastered.[151] Another anecdote finds Caesar exposed to a similar type of abuse. His response on this occasion would have surprised his teachers of rhetoric. According to the historian Suetonius, after Caesar was granted the proconsulship of Transalpine Gaul, he boasted in a crowded senate house that he would force all his opponents to fellate him. "Whereupon," Suetonius continues, "somebody said abusively, 'That would be hard to do to a woman!' Caesar replied, in an allusive manner, 'In Syria, Semiramis had been a queen too, and the Amazons once possessed a great portion of Asia.' "[152] This refusal to deny the implications of an opponent's abuse is rare for rhetorical invective.[153] The fact that the charge here is effeminacy makes Caesar's retort all the more peculiar since, despite the numerous charges of effeminacy one finds in Roman texts, "no Roman author ever calls himself effeminate in surviving Latin literature."[154] By embracing the charges, Caesar focuses attention upon them in order to expose them to ridicule. In so doing, he positions himself in opposition to the dominant standards of appearance that this type of humorous abuse is designed to enforce. Other jokes of the future dictator reveal a desire to align himself in opposition to the normally acceptable representations of political conduct. As general, Caesar was accustomed to excuse the extravagance permitted his victorious soldiers by saying, "My soldiers can fight well even while

[150] Suet. *Iul.* 52.3; Suet. *Iul.* 49.

[151] See, e.g., Quint. *inst.* 6.3.72–74; Cic. *de orat.* 2.220.

[152] Suet. *Iul.* 22.2.

[153] Corbeill 1996.196 n. 38. Dio 43.20.4 describes Caesar after the civil war as pained by the charges concerning Nicomedes, which Suetonius contends was the only challenge to his *impudicitia* (*Iul.* 49.1). This behavior contrasts markedly with that at the senate meeting a decade earlier.

[154] Edwards 1993.66; see, too, Hortensius at Gell. 1.5.2–3 (discussed earlier in the chapter).

wearing perfume."[155] It is not necessary to assume, presumably, that the Romans fighting in Gaul actually did use the local *eau de cologne*. It is the political fact standing behind this playful fiction that Caesar is attempting to isolate.

Julius Caesar's public persona constituted an obvious target for humorous abuse.[156] Even if this invective has been preserved principally from postmortem attacks arising in the aftermath of his assassination (although the anecdote from Suetonius is likely to be historical), it is still necessary to explain why this particular kind of invective arose. I present as one possibility that this polemic finds its origins in the deliberate misrepresentation on the part of the elite of the ways in which popular politicians appealed directly to the assembled people—through self-consciously untraditional dress, gestures, and speaking styles. In the case of Julius Caesar, the three commonest areas in which abuse circulated all promote a potentially ambiguous sexuality. The opportunities that these features provided for the invective of his opponents could have been neither a secret nor a surprise to Caesar himself. In fact, Julius Caesar's intimate knowledge of "the game" is precisely what allows him to step outside and interrogate its rules.[157] We recall Quintilian's judgment: if Caesar had had the time to devote to study, his oratorical skills would have rivaled Cicero himself (*inst.* 10.1.114). The likeliest explanation, then, for Caesar's willingness to expose himself to ridicule lies in the representational tension that continually existed between senatorial and popular politics.[158] By not avoiding behavior specifically marked in his society as feminine, Caesar could be perceived as transgressing normal modes of male, aristocratic behavior. In violating the accepted relationship between appearance and reality, Caesar fashions himself as a proponent of political change.

Conclusion

The spectacle-oriented aspects of Roman culture have received much attention in recent scholarship. In the area of politics, however, to recognize spectacle simply means to recognize the existence of an audience, not necessarily to

[155] Suet. *Iul.* 67.1; it is interesting that the sole surviving fragment of Caesar's poetry mentions people anointing themselves with scent: *corpusque suavi telino unguimus* (Isid. *orig.* 4.12.7).

[156] I have not found a source that attacked him for effeminate gestures; on the contrary, Cic. *Brut.* 261 describes his oratorical style as *voce motu forma etiam magnificam et generosam quodam modo* (whatever *quodam modo* means; see, too, Suet. *Iul.* 55).

[157] Bourdieu 1990.66–67.

[158] Compare the similar findings of Gleason 1995.161–62, who believes that effeminate speakers in the second century CE adopted their persona since "there was something manly, after all, about taking risks—even the risk of being called effeminate. Then there may also have been a temptation to appropriate characteristics of 'the other' as a way of gaining power from outside the traditionally acceptable sources." She declines, however, to speculate why "this more androgynous style of self-presentation was so effective with audiences."

conclude that that audience constitutes a healthy democracy.[159] We can read about what the Romans saw, but it is much more difficult to determine how they were taught to see. It is likely, however, that a speaker's awareness of a large public will increase the performative aspects of those politicians who wish to direct their appeals primarily to that public. This is precisely the situation Cicero must exploit in his attempt to safeguard the interests of the elite.

So as we stand back from the rostra, one hundred or even one thousand heads back from the rostra, struggling to hear the speaker, who are we to believe, the calm and composed Cicero, his right arm elegantly harmonizing with his rhetorical points, or the excited, shouting popular politicians? "Why do popular politicians?" I have two answers, one Cicero's and one mine. The popular politician moves about so much because he is trying to reach me, cramped in a space arranged almost by accident and not designed for a proper political assembly—although purportedly an auditor, I am simultaneously aware of my own physical needs. Cicero's answer to the same question? The overt physicality of the popular speaker betrays his disconnectedness with *gravitas* and *constantia*, with stability and composure, with truth and reason.

And yet I do not intend to be offering a necessarily negative critique of the elite ideology that dominates our sources for ancient Rome. Roman society was able to justify some of its most deeply felt religious and social values by pointing out that such values stem from a proper understanding of nature. My primary aim in this chapter has been to narrate how the Romans pushed one specific form of bodily movement from what we would consider the learned realm (the way we walk). The Romans categorized these movements differently, as "natural" (nature has encoded in human beings that a certain kind of politician should walk a certain way). The Romans order the apparent arbitrariness of their own society by deifying nature and then by making its contemplation the greatest activity a human being can have.[160] With this model lost, aporia results. I would like, therefore, to close with an historical moment of particular uncertainty for Cicero, and for the elite ideology to whose construction and maintenance he had devoted a glorious oratorical career. During the political turmoil and shifting alliances that followed Julius Caesar's assassination on the Ides of March, Cicero learns while in his villa at Tusculum that a group of discharged soldiers has been attempting

[159] See Jehne 1995.7–8 and, in more detail, Flaig 1995, who argues that the popular assemblies acted not as a body making decisions, but as one marking consensus (*Konsensorgan*, as opposed to *Entscheidungsorgan*).

[160] Sen. *dial.* 12.8.4.

to stir up trouble in Rome. Cicero writes his friend Atticus to say that the potential for violence prevents him from returning to the capital, the site of his life's greatest glories. "Besides," he writes, " among people of *that sort*, what kind of facial expression should I adopt and how," he concludes, "how should I walk?"[161]

[161] Cic. *Att.* 15.5.3: *quis porro noster itus, reditus, vultus, incessus inter istos?*