

CHAPTER 7
SELF-FASHIONING IN POLITICAL TURMOIL
POWER, TRUTH, AND RHETORIC IN CICERO

Johnson Segun Ige

ABSTRACT. The central argument of this paper is that power within the context of Ciceronian rhetoric is misrepresentative and that the regime of power is not always truly represented in its deployment by the subject. For Foucault, power is possessed by the social individual. More specifically, Foucault's position sits very well with Cicero's rhetorical practice in affirming that power is everywhere and that through a nexus of relationships, hegemony is gradually produced.

Throughout history, managing political crises is one prime requirement in politics that has accounted for the success or failure of most of the acclaimed public figures. Political opposition helps in ascertaining the political stature of political figures, because the situation provides a basis for comparison, and in the present context, makes possible a critical evaluation of the oratorical hegemony. Oratorical hegemony is simply the ascendancy and functioning of a political institution through the performance of rhetoric.

The main thrust of the argument in this paper is that power, in Ciceronian rhetoric, is misrepresentative, and that the regime of power is not always truly represented in its deployment by the subject (*i.e.* the orator). For Cicero to fit into the framework of the prevailing oratorical hegemony of the first century BCE, in publishing the speeches, he simply adopts a style of writing that is consistent with the position of power in which he is located. For the modern philosopher, Michel Foucault, the basic assumptions of both liberalism and Marxism in respect to power are:

1. power is possessed by a social individual,
2. power is characterized in the law, the economy, the state, and
3. power is primarily repressive.

However, Foucault maintains a mild stand on the possession and deployment of power. He recommends that power should be exercised rather than possessed; decentralized rather than exercised from top down, and productive rather than repressive.¹ Foucault's position fits in very well with

¹ Foucault 1980: 98.

Cicero's rhetorical practice, in identifying that power is everywhere, and that, through a nexus of relationships, hegemony. All the dichotomies imaginable within the Foucaultian framework are accommodated in Ciceronian rhetoric, that is, it functions not seeking to be oppressive, but to achieve an oratorical end. Power in rhetoric is fluid, dynamic, and serves as a tool for constructing, legitimizing and entrenching the hegemony of the orator in a speech event. Furthermore, due to the psychological nature of the performance of rhetoric, and the deployment of power in rhetoric, there is a universal embrace and manipulation of all means and agents of power to generate some kind of movement (Latin: *movere*) in the perlocutionary phase of the delivery. This is what Mackendrick (emulating an expression attributed to the seventeenth-century CE French king Louis XIV) would call a *l'état-c'est-moi* approach.

Truth and probability have been age-old conceptual antagonists in rhetoric situations. Foucault's generic idea of production of truth as a means of domination, i.e.,

men [*sic*] govern themselves (...) through the production of truth

is rather problematic in its rhetorical application. Indeed, rhetoric serves as a means of governing others, but it is advisable for the orator to avoid pleading with truth as the essence of his speech. The orator's dilemma is his negotiation between truth and probability. Quintilian, an ancient professor of rhetoric, encourages the orator to operate within the bounds of probability rather than truth.² Kennedy, a modern classical rhetorician, has observed that probability appeared to the ancients a safer rhetorical technique to use than a witness, because witnesses can be corrupted too easily. For him, neither the plaintiff nor the defendant could cheaply buy probabilities. Aristotle advises that an orator should advance probability rather than evidence (*empeiria*) since the latter is considered as un-artistic (*a-tekhnos*). In other words, though a speaker must seek every possible means of enhancing the tenacity of argumentation in court, either probability (*to eikos*) and/or truth (*alētheia*), his main tool of persuasion must be the spoken word (*logos*). Conclusively, the major characteristic of any rhetorical delivery is the conflict between truth and probability. However, for Cicero, the problem seems quite manageable. The goal of the orator should be to achieve vivid description (*evidentia*) by his choice of words. For him, orators should strive at creating, *avant la lettre*, cinematic effects by reducing events, objects, people, architecture, or the world at large, to verbal (rhetorical) expressions,

² Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 2. 17. 30-40.

which in the end create “visual” impressions through the “eye of the mind”. For Cicero the sensory faculty that is responsible for decoding messages in the listener receives clear messages in the form of striking images. These imaginable pictures will generate responses from the audience. It seems to be as a result of this that Cicero constructs power relations which are based on true representation but on the basis of imaginative speaking (*illustris*) and vividness (*dilucidatio*). Cicero’s outstanding deliveries at strategic moments in his life won him public acclaim. Linking this manner of speaking with what has been said above regarding truth, it remains for me to say that rhetoric, and more specifically, Ciceronian oratory, does not fall within the ambit of modern ethical philosophy, nor that which has been informed by Judeo-Christian ethics – Cicero lived before the founding and spread of Christianity. For me, Ciceronian oratory is a-moral since he actually says in his *De Inventione*, “the prudence of the audience has always been the regulator for the eloquence of the orator.” In other words, Cicero counts on the audience to exercise their power of knowledge to serve as a barometer for the eloquence of the orator. More succinctly put, truth is what the audience accepts as true.

A common paradigm locates power in the state, and thereby says that power is judicial and repressive. According to this paradigm, the state, and not the offended, must punish any injury inflicted on a citizen. The question that arises is *quis custodes custodiet?* (“who will guard the guards?”) When the life and/or the reputation of a notable oratorical holder of power is at stake, power is no longer located in the state or the law, but in the “mouth” of him who holds both the law and the state together. This caricature represents the method employed by Cicero in dealing with the Catilinarian conspiracy of 64 BCE.³

Cicero and Catiline

Cicero had witnessed considerable turbulence in Roman politics before 63

³ Bell (1997) rightly says that an oratorical text is a partial record of a complex dynamic between actor and audience, neither of whom had the power to take action independently of the other. Each needs the other, simply to have dignity. What seems to be missing in Bell is that he takes for granted that Ciceronian oratory subordinates other institutions in a speech situation. Performance is aimed at dominance. The dominant role the orator plays, and the audience/actor conspiracy that the orator aims at do not give room for much legislative action on the part of the audience. Ultimately, the audience’s role is that it should “sheepishly” concur with whatever proposal the orator has made.

BCE, when he was consul. The events of the preceding years had indicated some likelihood of conflict resulting between Cicero and some members of the senate in 63 BCE. Cicero had had remarkable advancements before 63 BCE (as a *novus homo*, a newcomer to Roman politics), and in this year, he became a consul. He was already on good terms with some top-notch Roman politicians of the equestrian class. His powers of oratory had won him the favour and following among the nobles and Roman people, respectively. However, in spite of all these apparent glories, Cicero's election of 63 BCE is faced with illegal contestation from Catiline.⁴

Catiline was an active politician, a member of senate, a patrician, intelligent, and by Cicero's description,⁵ an admirable personality, but at the same time a debauchee. He also desired the consulship, the ultimate magistracy in the Roman republic, which traditionally is always filled by two incumbents at the same time. Before 63 BCE Catiline had held both military and political appointments, but had failed to win the consulship, mainly because he was involved in unsavoury allegations and court cases. Catiline contested the consulship of 63, to be defeated by Cicero. This final defeat enraged him and he resorted to unconstitutional means to fight Cicero. Catiline planned an elaborate conspiracy against Cicero, with a view to torpedoing the latter's period of office. Acting in the best interest of the state and in his capacity as consul, Cicero put up severe opposition to Catiline, which initially resulted in the latter's hasty retreat and eventually, his demise. On 8 November, 63 BCE, Cicero attacked Catiline in the senate and he presented the first speech against Catiline, the first of a series of four.⁶ This set of speeches does not contain the exact words that Cicero used, but constitutes a rhetorical monument indicating what he more or less said and how he would have said it.

Cicero's self-definition

The speeches were to be presented in the senate and general assembly (*contio*). In view of the strategic risk this entailed for Cicero's stance as the consul prosecutor in the Catilinarian proceedings, Cicero's personality needed proper definition in order to impress the members of the senate as well as the entire Roman populace, and in order for Catiline himself to

⁴ Smith 1966: 107.

⁵ *Att.* 1.2; *Sull.* 81 *Caelio.* 12ff.

⁶ Smith (1966) gives a full account of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Also see Mitchell 1979: 219ff.

recognize by which authority Cicero speaks. Self-definition is of the essence,⁷ for Cicero is speaking primarily for himself, but presents himself as if speaking primarily on behalf of the state. Self-definition consists in what and who one is (Benhabib 1992: 104), and in this case, what I propose to call “self-definition of oratorical masculine individual hegemony”⁸ involves the categorical stating of all relevant ramifications of power that have been invested in him as the custodian of the Roman republic. This move helps the orator to assert his authority, against the allegedly aggressive and lecherous Catiline and his followers.

In the *exordium* of the first Catilinarian, Cicero depicts himself as the authoritarian severe disciplinarian, social commentator and judge (1ff). Cicero’s exclamatory rhetorical questions in the opening censure Catiline’s indecent outrages, and how the latter has long abused the patience of the senate, despite the fact that, all his misdemeanours are known to the whole republic (1). The senate also shares considerably in the blame for condoning Catiline’s harassment of the whole republic. The senate’s blame emanates from its insouciance in dealing with Catiline’s outrages (2). In Cicero’s opinion, since precedence has been set, execution would be the most appropriate recompense for Catiline’s hooliganism. The precedent cited by Cicero, that is the execution of Tiberius Gracchus for undermining the constitution of the state, is a technical comparison intended to institute a charge of treasonable felony against Catiline. Moreover Cicero asserts his position as the consul, and declares the intolerance of his consulship to activities that might destabilize the public peace. His position as the consul is the most important in this opening. Although, Cicero reckons, it is possible that the senate condones his criminal acts, the two consuls have no good disposition towards agents of crime. Cicero’s considerations for the state, the senate and the position of the consuls enhance a justifiable ground from where he might successfully plead.

We have, Catiline, a decree of the senate against you, a decree of authority and power. It is not the deliberations and decisions of this body that the Republic lacks. It is we, I say openly, we, the consuls, who are lacking.⁹

This passage states the three functional institutions of power in the Roman republic, namely the state, the senate and the consuls. The senate reserves

⁷ Jameson 1988: 33.

⁸ These concepts are further developed in my doctoral thesis, on which the present argument is based.

⁹ I have used the Loeb translation throughout in this paper, except otherwise stated: translation by Louis E. Lord.

the power to act, but has not acted, the public could act, although have not, while the consuls who should, and are prepared to, act lack the practical authority to do so. The implication of this statement of Cicero is that both the public and the senate have been passive about the Catilinarian conspiracy. Cicero's ironic reference to the lack of power by the consuls, after the senate has granted the *senatus consultum ultimum* with which to act, is certainly an act of braggadocio.¹⁰ Cicero is simply vaunting his hegemonic and superior position, in this context, against Catiline. The use of *we* (*nos*) and its repetition for the sake of emphasis shows the attitude of excitement, severity, aggression and brutality with which Cicero is handling the proceedings. *We* (*nos*) is used to state categorically from which vantage point he is prosecuting, and also to establish his hegemony.

Cicero's first-person plural comes in different shades, and the meaning is given by the context in which it is used. First, is the philosophical *we* which is mostly used at the end of an argument and as a manipulative tool to craftily foster the audience's agreement with the orator. The other *we* is the loose and rhetorical form. This is used as the royal *we* that lends authority to the voice of the speaker. This is what Mackendrick terms as the *l'état-c'est-moi* syndrome. This third *we* is neither philosophical nor rhetorical. Cicero is simply exploiting the *authority* that he possesses as consul, and making an hegemonic claim for him to be able to act in his official capacity. The extra weapon that Cicero possesses in this situation is the consular authority, otherwise, he and Catiline may be taken to constitute two equal hegemonies. This consular authority can be seen as global, because it is representative of all other institutions of power. Cicero's use of name-calling as well identifies and isolates the culprit and craftily wins the support of the members of senate for himself.

For this self-definition to have a profound effect on the hearer, Cicero constructs himself as omniscient consul (6ff; 24). The consular power includes the control of information in the state, which includes policing of recalcitrant elements. Cicero, in his capacity as the consul, has some couriers, who work for him as informants. Cicero, before this period in question, had had a long-standing history of the use of informants in his legal practice, and he himself is a proven detective.¹¹ Cicero's conscious policy of being well-informed about socio-political developments helped him to keep an "eye-of-God" perspective on Rome. In the present context,

¹⁰ Mitchell (1979: 205ff) gives a history of the *senatus consultum ultimum* and how Cicero was affected by it.

¹¹ *In Verrem* is a classic example of Cicero's ability as a detective.

despite all the factors that could have concealed Catiline's plot, Cicero asserts that they are well known to the senate, as well as the public. Cicero claims that he has surrounded Catiline with men who would keep surveillance of all Catiline's activities (6).

For what is there, Catiline, for you to wait for longer, if neither night with its darkness can hide your criminal assemblies nor a private house with its walls confine the voices of your conspiracy, if they are patent, if all burst in view? Abandon now those foul plans of yours, be persuaded by me, forget murder and arson. You are encompassed on all sides; all your plans are clearer to us than the light of day.

Cicero's personification of "night with its darkness" (*nox tenebris*) and "private house with its walls" (*privata domus parietibus*) give a vivid imagination of how strong Cicero's intelligence was. The consul's control of intelligence and information is suggestive of the strength of his private security service in the name of keeping surveillance over Catiline's nefarious activities. Cicero's goal in this situation is to intimidate Catiline, and to make him feel exposed, since the walls of protection for the Catilinarians seem to have been removed. This passage also compares Catiline's activities with darkness, and uses the paradox that all his plans are clearer than the light of day (*Teneris undique, luce sunt clariora nobis tua consilia omnia*: 6). The effectiveness of Cicero's intelligence is given a brilliant portrait when Cicero cites an instance when his guards have forestalled Catiline's assault on the state by the latter's attempt to murder some Roman influential citizens. The adulation of this success does not go to the guards, but to Cicero by whose carefulness and diligence (*mea diligentia*) the intelligence operation was carried out successfully. The use of *mea diligentia* portrays an attitude of dogged detective moves after Catiline's plans, purposes and activities. Ironically, Cicero's so-called diligence in obtaining information regarding this Catilinarian conspiracy was enhanced by a disgruntled noblewoman Fulvia, whose lover had been one of Catiline's henchmen. The lover could not meet up financially in lavish spending over her, and startled by the unjust means through which he hoped to acquire wealth, she apprised Cicero, throughout the year, of the Catilinarian moves to stage a major revolution.¹² As far as Cicero is concerned, nothing can happen in the state without the knowledge of him the consul: "You do nothing, you attempt nothing, you think of nothing which I do not hear and see and understand plainly".

Cicero's *nos* in the passage above has metamorphosed into first person singular (*ego...videam...sentiam*) in this passage. In 24, Cicero also uses the

¹² The full gender implication of this passage are discussed in the last chapter of my thesis.

word *sciam* (“I shall know” – remarkably, in the first-person singular, here) to reiterate to Catiline the amount of information he has about the latter’s evil plans. The purpose behind the use of the first-person plural is to gain some authority as he commences his speech, while the first person singular gives a more personal touch to his testimony. This passage also juxtaposes Catiline and Cicero as the pursued and the pursuer respectively. The pursuer has all the information about the pursued while the pursued is not even aware that he is being watched. The change in the personage is an egoistic feature of Ciceronian rhetoric, which comes to the fore when the orator seeks to aggrandize himself. The use of *ego* positions Cicero at the centre of power, as a result of his responsibility as the watchman for the state. This global policing of someone like Catiline stresses how extensive Cicero’s satellite influence is within the context of the Catilinarian discourse.¹³ The republic’s reaction to Catiline’s outrages is simulated in 18 when Cicero employs *prosōpopoeia* (dramatic impersonation). In 17-18, Cicero assumes the *persona* of the heraldic voice of the state and addresses Catiline directly, as he constructs a speech for the country.

Now your native country, the mother of us all, hates you and fears you and decides that you have had no single thought for a long time save for her destruction. Will you neither revere her authority nor obey her judgements, nor fear her power? She, Catiline, thus confers with you and, as it were, though silent speaks: “No crime for some years now has come into existence except through you, no outrage without you; you alone.”

Since the whole country now hates Catiline, Cicero advises him to withdraw somewhere from the common gaze. Cicero uses direct speech here to simulate the reticent republic, in order to give voice to the feeling of the state, of which he is the mouthpiece. This heraldic role-play is an expression of power because it does not only enhance Cicero’s hegemony, but also empowers him, as consul, to extirpate Catilinarian terrorism from Rome.

Clearly, oratorical hegemony does not only consist in the locus of power that it holds, but also in its effort to monitor other hegemonies that may be constituting a threat to its survival. The conflicts that are generated compel a struggle for survival among the hegemonies and the more powerful triumphs. The nationalistic twist in which the self-definition is rendered gives a rather potent vibrancy to performance of Ciceronian ethos, and to be

¹³ Historically, policing is an essential feature of the domain of men. Hearn (1992: 133) says,

In the policing of crime, one set of men work against, and sometimes with, another set of men.

Although policing is a way of keeping public order, it also serves as a means of control over other masculinities.

able to subordinate other respectable institutions of power, he employs the name-dropping technique. Naming is very important, because it reiterates the recognition of oratorical hegemony and enhances authority in the course of delivery and defining its territory (*locus*). Territoriality and area of jurisdiction are tacit concepts that should be noted in a conflict situation, and claims to resolving conflicts. In other words, hegemony clearly defines its scope of operation, and establishes itself as the governing authority within that territory. Observably, too much self-definition leads to tyrannical use of oratorical power.

Tyrannical oratorical performance

Oratorical hegemony asserts itself not only by a speaker's explicit declaration to the effect that he possesses the power or the mandate to act on behalf of the state. The actual exercise of power in a forensic context translates power from mere theoretical definition to the actual exertion of force. This is exemplified in Cicero's approach when he asked Catiline to go into exile. Verbal force in oratorical performance and physical violence are two concepts to be distinguished. For Cicero, force emanating from oral performance constitutes a greater threat to life than physical violence. According to Cicero, in his *Pro Caecina* (a speech delivered in 69 BCE):

Force (*vis*) which touches our persons or our lives are not the only form of force: much more serious is the force which removes a man from a definite position or situation by exposing him to the danger of death and striking terror into his mind. Thus there are many cases of wounded men whose minds refuse to give way, though their bodies are weakened and who do not abandon the position they are resolved to defend; others, on the contrary, are driven back although unscathed; which proves that a greater degree of force is brought to bear upon the man whose mind is terror-stricken than on the man whose body is wounded. (42)¹⁴

Cicero's conclusion is that the violence which is applied in a verbal (in this case, oratorical) context, has a greater effect on one's opponent than the physical violence that is applied through the use of a weapon. His recognition that verbal violence is more potent than physical violence may have propelled him to employ such force that could disorientate Catiline and excommunicate him from Rome. The emphasis is on displacement from a place (*locus*). In modern rhetorical terms, this is what Winifred Bryan Horner, a classical rhetorician, calls "subtle appeal to force".¹⁵ Neal Wood, a

¹⁴ Translation by Neal Wood.

¹⁵ Horner 1990; cf. Ratcliffe 2000.

Ciceronian political philosopher, calls it “psychic violence”.¹⁶ Jeff Hearn, a contemporary scholar who works in the area of masculinity and management calls it “verbal, emotional, mental and psychological violence”.¹⁷ Wood rightly concludes in connection with this passage that Cicero considers psychic violence a more potent means of control and manipulation than physical violence. Wood also says, “We recognize it as one of the chief traits of the Roman political arena and the stuff of tyranny, and throughout history psychic violence is most prevalent among tyrannical regimes.”¹⁸ In the first *Catilinarian* speech that we are presently looking at, Cicero demonstrates the tyrannical side of his oratorical hegemony. One should bear in mind that his power of oratory is used on a par with other official mandates, which enhances an ethos befitting of an ordinary powerful speaker.

In 20ff, Cicero develops this trajectory by first pleading and reasoning with Catiline as to why he should leave the country, and then suddenly he switches to using the imperative:

If our country speaks to you thus, as I have said, ought she to obtain her request, even though she cannot use force? (...) Leave the city, Catiline, free the state from fear; into exile if you are waiting for this word, go. What is it, Catiline? What are you waiting for? Do you notice at all the silence of these men? They approve it; they are silent. Why are you waiting for authority of the words of those whose wishes you see when they are silent?

Cicero uses *oxymoron*¹⁹ to make his point here: the sound of silence. He plays around with the understanding of the legal maxim, *tacere consentire est* (“to remain silent is to consent”) but over and above that, Cicero makes an explicit mention of the *auctoritas* he possesses to ostracize Catiline which lies in the senators’ silence:

In your case, however, Catiline, when they say nothing they express their approval; their acquiescence is a decree. By their silence they cry aloud. And this is true not only of these men whose authority is, forsooth, dear to you, whose lives are most cheap, but also those most honourable and noble Roman knights, and the other brave citizens who are standing around the senate. You could see the crowd of them, their zeal you could perceive, and their voices you could hear a little while ago.

Cicero makes the occasion seem more of social rather than political extrication of the republic from Catiline who now constitutes a menace to the security of the state. Cicero uses his vantage position to manipulate the

¹⁶ Wood 1988: 187.

¹⁷ Hearn 1998: 88.

¹⁸ Wood 1988: 187.

¹⁹ As a figure of rhetoric, “oxymoron” is defined as: “placing two ordinarily opposing terms adjacent to one another. A compressed paradox”; cf. G. Burton, *Silva rhetoricae/The forest of rhetorics*, at <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/>. (Eds.)

silence of the senate to his advantage. For Cicero, the tacit decree of the senate can translate into his verbal (oral) aggression against Catiline. Continuing from the above passage, he goes further to say that he has kept Catiline away from the fury of the senators, but for the moment he would persuade them to accompany Catiline to the city gates. Without a doubt, Cicero demonstrates how manipulative, tyrannical and global his oratorical influence is in this situation. He has complete sway over both the senate and Catiline himself. He operates with the full confidence that everybody under his oratorical influence can be persuaded and moved to do whatever he has asked them to do. This claim is also an indication to Catiline to recognize his regime in the forensic space and his *l'etat-c'est-moi* position. In addition, Cicero's use of the presence and consent of the senators as his inartistic proof strengthens his case. The consensus of the men that he clearly manipulates to his advantage shows to what extent the senate is supportive of him, but this is rigged. Cicero has indicated earlier in the speech that some members of senate disbelieve him. This undue manipulation of material to corroborate argument is another tyrannical move of Cicero to exert his influence against Catiline.²⁰

In Section 30, Cicero constructs his own response to the earlier version of the appeal on behalf of the nation. Probably Cicero would have killed Catiline if the occasion had been given, but since there are some senators who are blind to the conspiracy, his action would then have been considered as unnecessarily vicious. Therefore he would rather Catiline left the country: "Under their influence, many ignorant men as well as villains would be saying that I acted cruelly and tyrannically if I had punished Catiline."

Cicero's concern that some men would not be favourably disposed to his action leads to the use of paralipsis²¹ that brings to light what his true intentions are. In this excerpt Cicero uses the word *regie* meaning (in the Republican Roman situation of that period) *tyrannically*, which is an indication of a reigning hegemony. Although he promises to use it sympathetically, the abuse of power that is inherent in tyranny cannot be divorced from its use in the present context.²² For Cicero, what will establish the authenticity of his claims will be Catiline's union with his accomplices

²⁰ Asking the senate to vote for Catiline's exclusion would have been another unjust move, because that would be very intimidating to some members of senate, who would not want to be seen as associating with Catiline. The attitude of members of senate cited in 16 shows how schizophrenic the senators were.

²¹ As a figure of rhetoric, "paralipsis" is defined as: "Stating and drawing attention to something in the very act of pretending to pass it over. A kind of irony"; cf. Burton, *op. cit.* (Eds.)

²² Earl (1966: 59) believes that *regere* connoted some degree of abuse.

when he reaches Manlius' camp. Cicero reckons (*intellego*) that killing Catiline alone will only be a temporary measure implying further risk from the side of Rome's bandits, but his expulsion along with that of his friends will be a more lasting solution (30).

As noted above, Cicero's theory of force as a means of dislocating a person or persons is an important weapon; Ciceronian oratorical hegemony has used this weapon to displace Catilinarian military hegemony. Ciceronian hegemony is being established in the use of force, a means to sustaining his ascendancy and a way of eliminating potential rivals and competition in the forensic place. This enactment of the displacement of Catiline and his group from the city justifies the claim that Cicero's theory is valid, but only to a point. In the same Catilinarian discourse, there are some inconsistencies that reveal that in social relations, hegemony is not absolute. While some of these inconsistencies can be seen as performance, others can be seen as genuine, which reflect the true state of the orator's emotions.

Oratorical hegemony as victim

A paradox inherent in the hegemonic position held by Cicero, is the depiction of himself (Cicero), the senate, and the republic as victims of Catiline's outrages (2, 8, 16). In his portrayal as victim, Cicero employs a rhetorical *topos* to romanticize Catiline's adversarial activities in order to win the sympathy of the senate, and also to provide a justifiable ground for Catiline's exclusion. The common concern in the present situation is the security of the state, and its protection against Catiline's onslaught. In 2, Cicero goes so far as to declare to the senate that Catiline's presence in their midst is to mark members of senate out for murder:

Yes, truly, he even comes into the senate; he becomes a sharer in the public counsel; he denotes and marks out with his eyes each of us for the slaughter.

This passage locates the enemy within the sphere of political influence, and makes the senate look vulnerable.²³ Every member of the senate becomes a potential victim of Catiline's atrocious plans, however, the senate itself has been passive about it, despite their knowledge of him wanting to embark on massive political murder. Perhaps if members of the senate feel uneasy about Catiline's presence, they might be supportive of his proposal to excommunicate Catiline. To further corroborate his point, Cicero recounts a

²³ Vasaly (1993: 52) has expressed a similar opinion.

recent activity of Catiline who came to the house of Marcus Laeca, planning to kill the whole senate. Cicero tells of the scheme of how he has mapped out the city, in which areas people were to be killed; and above all, of two Roman knights who were designated to assassinate Cicero (8ff). Nevertheless, before the close of the meeting of the Catilinarians, Cicero has heard about the plans and has assigned armed guards to protect his house and before dawn he had told some eminent men in the city (10). Cicero's harangue about Catiline's victimization of the republic reaches its climax when Cicero claims that he had been pursued by Catiline when he was consul-elect, and also when he became consul (15ff). Although Catiline has tried several times without success, Cicero wonders why the former has not desisted from such moves (16). For Cicero, Catiline's presence in the state threatens the stability of the state, and he should therefore leave and go into exile (10, 18, 21, 22, 23). Cicero suggests it would be more permissible if Catiline besieged the country from outside than from inside as consul: hence, Cicero's prevention of Catiline from the consulship (27).

Such a construct of Catiline is that of military ("Rambo") masculinity that is prevalent in most modern African states. Cicero suggests (somewhat ironically) that Catiline should save his military discipline for the hardship he might encounter in the bush (27). The antagonistic role that Catiline is assuming makes a military *coup d'état* a very real threat. Whether this is a true assertion, or Cicero is trying to pre-empt the events is a different ballgame altogether. The adversarial juxtaposition of Catilinarian and Ciceronian hegemonies in this speech typifies the contestation and rivalry that ensue between the military and civilians in countries where the military are considered powerful, but – from a constitutional and bureaucratic point of view – unprofessional. In addition, this situation is identifiable in areas where there are incessant political upheavals. The subject of victimization, which Cicero develops most eloquently in this speech, is in no way compatible with the true character of Cicero. Since the orator believes that the emotion is the seat of power, Cicero simply makes a pathetic appeal to the senate in order to win their support. For technical reasons, although victimized, Cicero's consular personality still emerges as more powerful and influential than Catiline's, simply because the former is backed up with a senatorial mandate.

In conclusion, I have tried to demonstrate that power has many faces in an oratorical context. I have also argued that the duty of the orator is to identify the different kinds of power that exist within the context of his operation, and to convert them into a manipulative oratorical tool, leaving the audience to grapple with the morality of his rhetoric.

References

- Bell, Andrew J.E., 1997, "Cicero and the Spectacle of Power", *Journal of Roman Studies*, 87: 1-22.
- Benhabib, S., 1992, *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foucault, M., 1980, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hearn, Jeff, 1992, *Men in the Public Eye*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Hearn, Jeff, 1998, *The violences of men*, London: Sage.
- Horner, Winifred Bryan, 1990, ed., *The present state of scholarship in historical and contemporary rhetoric*, Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press.
- Jameson, Fredric, 1988, "Third World Literary & Cultural Criticism", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 87: 1.
- Kennedy, G.A., 1991, *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse*, New York: Oxford University Press
- Kennedy, G.A., 1998, *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, Thomas N, 1979, *Cicero, the ascending years*, New Haven / London: Yale University Press.
- Ratcliffe, Krista, 2000, "Winifred Horner", in: Moran, Michael, & Ballif, Michelle, eds., *Twentieth Century Rhetorics and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies & Sources*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 202-207.
- Smith, R.E., 1966, *Cicero the statesman*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vasaly, Ann, 1993, *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wood, Neal, 1988, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.