



JACLR

*Journal of Artistic
Creation & Literary
Research*

JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research is a bi-annual, peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access Graduate Student Journal of the Universidad Complutense Madrid that publishes interdisciplinary research on literary studies, critical theory, applied linguistics and semiotics, and educational issues. The journal also publishes original contributions in artistic creation in order to promote these works.

Volume 3 Issue 2 (December 2015) Article 7

Sara Parra Mansilla
**"Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in
Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*"**

Recommended Citation

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research* 3.2 (2015): 94-105

<<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>

©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

This text has been blind peer-reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

Abstract: Considering that classical models are meant to be the basis in which the following literary movements were developed, several researchers have tried to point out to what extent this influence can be seen in modern works, as it is, in this case, the play written by William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*. This dissertation presents an analysis of the classical nuances that can be seen in this play, with an emphasis on how Shakespeare follows the skills that, according to classical authors, a well-trained orator should master when writing Brutus' and Mark Antony's speeches. After providing an explanation of what officia oratoris are, and then talking about the influence of classical plays in Elizabethan drama and therefore in Shakespeare's works, both speeches will be analyzed officium by officium looking at their structures, comparing them, and also talking about how both orators use some devices to deliver an effective, understandable and persuasive speech that would give them the victory by convincing the audience that their ideas are the right ones.

Keywords: *officia oratoris*, Shakespeare, classical influence, oratory, *Julius Caesar*, speeches.

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Sara PARRA MANSILLA

Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*

0. Introduction

In classical world, grammar, rhetoric and dialectics remained the fundamental disciplines that all Romans should study and, in fact, in the Middle Ages, they were the three arts that constituted the so-called *trivium*.

However, grammar, and the knowledge of the Humanities were a means to reach rhetoric, which was considered a superior art that allowed the orator to speak in public in all kinds of circumstances (political assemblies, judgements or special situations as funerals, celebrations...) to delight the audience exposing the arguments with clarity and accuracy, and therefore convince the listeners with their proposals. That is the reason for the importance of rhetoric in the classical world, because it was linked to literature and to the oral and written compositions but also to public life.

Nowadays, oratory is present in many aspects of our lives such as politics, as politicians use rhetorical techniques to convince their audience; or advertisements which employ skills related to oratory to persuade people to buy certain products. Apart from this purely practical purpose, Plato (1968: 268) in *Gorgias*, in the second volume of his work Dialogues, already describes rhetoric as 'the worker of persuasion' and discusses how this discipline remains essential in literature as well, as this dissertation will be focused on the presence of oratory in the literary work *Julius Caesar*.

Classical literature and its models are the foundation of the following literary productions and tendencies all over the History of literature, to the extent that it can be said that if literature were a building, Latin and Greek productions would be the basement upon which the rest of literary movements that followed would be built. Most of writers, in the process of production of their compositions, have always had in mind previous literary movements and topics such as, for instance, *carpe diem* or *tempus fugit*. Some writers have used classical topics, settings and style in their literary productions, and that is the case of Shakespeare in the work *Julius Caesar* in which, as it will be seen, Shakespeare talks about a classical story and also follows the *officia oratoris* in the speeches that can be found in the play.

In the first part of this dissertation, an explanation of what *officia oratoris* are will be provided, and then it will be analyzed to what extent Elizabethan drama was influenced by classical plays, including a brief summary of the work *Julius Caesar*. Finally, an analysis of Brutus' and Mark Antony's speeches will be made following the *officia oratoris*, comparing the characteristics of the discourses and exemplifying the arguments with quotations from the text.

1. Officia oratoris according to classical rhetoric

In Western culture, rhetoric and oratory were born in the 5th and 4th centuries BC in classical Greece, where they remained a fundamental tool to elaborate moving political and commemorative speeches (celebrations, funerals...) or were even used in a judicial environment. It is therefore not surprising that, from the 5th century onwards, we can find Greek treatises about rhetoric that establish essential notions, as the different kinds of speech and their parts, the different styles of oratory, or the *officia oratoris* which are the skills, abilities or tasks that an orator should follow when delivering an speech.

We can find information about these *officia oratoris* in several works written by Greek and Latin authors (Aristotle, Anaximenes of Lampsaco, Cicero...) but it is in the Latin work *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (an anonymous work written around the 1st century BC, whose possible author is believed to be a disciple of Cicero called Cornificio.

divisio, a summary and an announcement of what is going to be said; *confirmatio*, defense of the own arguments; *confutatio*, the act of refuting the opposing arguments; and *conclusio* or *peroration*, farewell) where we have found a systematized analysis of the *officia*, as well as their definitions and characteristics.

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

In this part of the paper, the ideas of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* dealing with the *officia oratoris* will be summarized, as afterwards the presence of these *officia oratoris* will be analyzed in the play *Julius Caesar*.

Then, as it has just been said, in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, we find the five *officia oratoris* that a well-trained orator should master to deliver an effective speech: *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, and *actio* or *pronuntiatio*. Of these *officia*, the first three skills (*inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*) deal with the preparation of the speech, and the other two (*memoria* and *actio*) have to do with the act of pronouncing and remembering what is needed to say.

Inventio

Inventio is the technique with which the orator selects the content and the topic he is going to talk about (*res*) as well as the arguments that will be used during the exposition. Moreover, as *inventio* is a rational *officium* that focuses on the content, it establishes as well the parts of the discourse: *exordium* or the beginning; *narratio* an *dispositio*.

Dispositio

The purpose of the *dispositio* is to organize the ideas that have been obtained through *inventio* to present each argument in an appropriate order. Although, in principle, the orator must follow a logical order, this scheme can be modified if circumstances allow, to highlight a solid idea, for instance. As it is explained in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (II), as the place of the different soldiers may vary during a battle, the changes in the order of a speech may give a victory to the orator.

Elocutio

This *officium* has remained an important discipline throughout History, especially because of its relationship with literature and with the embellishment of the speech by introducing rhetorical devices. In Latin and Greek cultures, *elocutio* referred simply to the style, and in the work *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV,11,8), we find three types of style: *grave*, *medium* and attenuated or *simple*, that may be chosen depending on the topic of the speech, and that would also allow the speaker to select the lexicon, the tone and the suitable devices.

The *genus* or style *grave* employs intense and meaningful words and its content is expressed using embellishing manners and an elaborate construction, as its main purpose it to provoke an impression of elegance. However, the *medium* style preserves a certain degree of *decorum* in the vocabulary selected and in its distribution, maintaining the *ornatus*, while the attenuated or simple employs everyday words and colloquial expressions, as its objective is to provide simplicity and clearness.

It is noticeable that more than one style may be used in a single speech, as the speaker can employ a sublime style at the end of the speech to make the audience have a particular idea of him and what he has said, while the *medium genus* is more appropriate for the exposition of ideas, and the *simple genus*, as we will see in the speech of Mark Antony, is used when speaking to the people, employing impressive, and emotional devices as comparisons, metaphors, rhetoric questions, hyperbaton and repetitions, especially at the beginning of the discourse.

Memoria and pronuntiatio

Both *memoria* and *pronuntiatio* are related to the performance of the speech, as their main purpose is persuasion. *Memoria* has to do with the capacity of the orator to remember the speech, and in this respect, classical rhetoric distinguishes between natural memory or innate ability to memorise without any help, and the artificial memory that consists in the use of some resources as trees or relations that could help the orator to remember what he wants to transmit to the audience.

As for *actio* or *pronuntiatio*, it remains an essential *officium* through which the orators try to make the exposition persuasive enough to convince the public. As a consequence, the devices used in the discipline of the *actio* are marked by the *pathos* and the dramatic effect and not by the *ethos*, which deals with the moral and integrity of the topic, which are more related

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

in some way with *inventio*.

The problem with *actio* and *memoria* is that, with the passing of time, oratory lost its persuasive purpose and began to be reduced to a series of guidelines related to aesthetics. Moreover, *actio* and *memoria* were losing its importance with the popularisation of writing as the speakers no longer needed to memorise their speeches because they could have them written down.

Nevertheless, in recent times, when the art of speaking and convincing an audience (political, judicial or academic) is recognized as being vital, rhetoric has recovered its significance and it is widely believed that these *officia* are extremely useful, although the purpose of this dissertation is not to focus on its importance nowadays, but to analyse their use in the speeches of Brutus and Mark Antony in the play *Julius Caesar*, to see to what extent the author adjusted his production to them, and the differences between the two speeches.

2. Influence of Latin plays on Elizabethan drama

According to McRae (1996: 21), Renaissance means rebirth', and actually from about 1400 to 1600, European culture was reborn in several ways by which some classical values and models were recovered. Literature, architecture, sculpture or painting, among other arts, reflowered and began to follow the classical aesthetics and models. As far as English literature is concerned, Renaissance was marked by the development of the dramatic genre, being the plays of this period now known as Elizabethan plays. Elizabethan drama was characterized, among many other features, by the use of poetic lines, the combination of characters that came from different social classes-from royalty to common people-, the entanglement of several storylines, the presence of violence and conflict, and the recovery of some devices from classical plays, and that implies that, apart from being in some way influenced by the previous English or the Italian drama, Elizabethan playwrights were highly influenced by Latin works, especially those of Seneca, as Oliva (2001: 125) states.

In relation to the Latin influence on Elizabethan drama, it is known that the tragedies of Seneca reached a significant popularity in the sixteenth-century England as Spearing says in his work *The Elizabethan Translations of Seneca's Tragedies* (1912:passim). This popularity of the Latin plays and of those of Seneca in particular, made the Elizabethan playwrights 'want to write tragedies in the real classical way', according to Brooke (1917: 48).

For Elizabethan dramatists, as Miola marked in his *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca*, 'Seneca was a paragon of tragic style, grandeur, dignity, elegance, brightness, sophistication, and polish' (1992:2). Provided that Seneca was a model to imitate for playwrights, it is, as a consequence, not surprising that Elizabethan authors took stylistic and formal elements such as the five-act structure, as it is marked by Cunliffe (1893:32): 'The most obvious way in which Seneca affected the modern drama was in its external form. From Seneca, the English tragedy received the five acts which have become the rule on modern stage'.

Apart from the use of the five-act structure, Elizabethan playwrights also took some devices such as the use of some stock characters like the tyrant, the fondness for melodramatic narration, and some themes like the instability of fortune, the dangers of wealth or the problems of having the power as it is also stated by Miola (1992:2). Among these Renaissance drama authors, we find Shakespeare, who according to Miola (1992:3), continuously took Seneca's clusters of rhetorical and thematic ideas for his tragedies. This significant influence can be seen in Shakespeare's classical tragedies such as *Titus Andronicus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Julius Caesar*, the work in which the speeches that will be analyzed can be found.

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

According to Craik, for the writing of this drama, Shakespeare was influenced by an anonymous work called 'Caesar's revenge', some poetical works and especially the biographies of Brutus, Julius Caesar and Mark Antony written by Plutarch that had been translated by sir Thomas North in 1579 (1869:145). Although Plutarch, in his biographies only mentions the discourses and says that they took place on different days, but Shakespeare puts them together and places them after Caesar's assassination, creating two long speeches that are characterized by their literary shape, their dramatic tone and their effectiveness.

Julius Caesar tells the story of the assassination of the Roman leader Julius Caesar by a group of conspirators, in which Brutus will be presented as the prominent figure. After the murder of Caesar, Brutus will have to explain to the Romans why their leader has been killed, and at the same time, he will allow Mark Antony to deliver a speech praising Caesar, as it was usual in Roman funerals. As Mark Antony is given permission by the conspirators to speak in front of the crowd, he will not be authorized to criticize Brutus and the rest of the plotters nor to question the assassination of Caesar. Nevertheless, Mark Antony, by using some rhetoric devices, will manage to infuriate the crowd against the conspirators and that situation will lead to a civil war. This situation of social unrest was used by Shakespeare to depict the political problems of his epoch as Scalia indicates (1994: 3): 'Like Julius Caesar, Queen Elizabeth I had no heirs to follow her on her throne [...] people feared that civil war and religious struggle would be the only way to answer the question of succession [...] although Shakespeare was writing about Rome he was also posing questions about his own times'. By doing this, Shakespeare made his public think about the political situation in Renaissance England, and this audience could also feel in some way identified with what they saw on stage. Though in the play *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare was writing about a story set in Rome and based on classical models and ideals, he was actually talking about contemporary issues such as political uncertainty or civil war. Nevertheless, this is only a noticeable feature of Shakespeare's work as our intention is not to focus on this respect, but on the analysis of Brutus' and Mark Antony's speeches that can be found in the play.

Finally, *Julius Caesar* ends with the restoration of the order and the victory of Mark Antony and his colleague Octavius Augustus who will be entitled the first Roman emperor.

3. Analysis of Brutus and Mark Antony's speeches according to the *official oratoris*

In this part of the project, the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony will be analyzed focusing in every *officium*, and comparing the different devices used by the orators to convince the public and to present their arguments.

Inventio

As far as *inventio* is concerned, the speech of Brutus is more clearly divided, as the arguments are presented in a very logic and simple way. First, we find the *exordium* which goes from the beginning 'Romans, countrymen, and lovers, hear me for my cause' (line 1) to 'Censure me in your wisdom and awake your senses that you may the better judge' (line 5). In this part, Brutus prepares the crowd to listen what he is going to say, by telling them to be alert and disagree with him in case they find that his reasoning is not the right one, as a way of capturing the *benevolentia* of the public.

Secondly, we find the *narratio* that goes from 'If there be any in this assembly, any dear friend of Caesar...' (line 5) to 'not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more' (line 10). In the *narratio*, Brutus emphasizes that he killed Caesar for the good of Rome, and that if Caesar were alive the people of Rome would be all slaves.

In the third part, the *confirmatio*, from 'Had you rather were living and die all slaves' (line 10) to 'I pause for a reply' (line 21), Brutus exposes his main idea and that is that he killed Caesar to set Rome free. He repeats and reinforces his arguments by praising Caesar and telling the public to kill him if they find him guilty of ambition.

In the *conclusio*, which goes from 'Then none have I offended' (line 24) to 'when it shall please my country to need my death' (line 35), Brutus convinces the public about the fact that Caesar was ambitious by using again the arguments of the *confirmatio* again and some

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

rhetorical questions, because Brutus does not need to use *confutatio* in order to respond to the rival arguments. He has just exposed his arguments making clear that he killed Caesar because he was a tyrant. Brutus also repeats the offer of letting the crowd kill himself if they please, and presents Mark Antony, saying that he is allowed to speak and praise Caesar, as he was a good friend of the deceased leader.

As a summary concerning Brutus' *inventio* in his discourse, it can be said that Brutus' words reveal that he had already thought about what he was going to say before he delivered his speech. The arguments of Brutus are presented in a very logical way using repetitive structures, as Adamson (2001:132) marks, Brutus' discourse is 'intricately organized and thoroughly dependent on schemes of equivalence and repetition'.

However, Mark Antony's speech is not as clearly divided as Brutus' is, as this one is longer and includes several pauses and interactions with the public which is in some way indicating that it will be a more pathetic and less rational speech. The *exordium* starts with 'Friends, Romans, lend me your ears' (line 36) until 'And Brutus is an honorable man' (line 50). In this part, Mark Antony prepares the audience to listen to what he is going to say telling them what his intentions supposedly are. He says that he came to bury Caesar, not to praise him (line 37) and this statement is quite straightforward, because here Mark Antony is saying that he is going to speak on the occasion of the funeral of Caesar, and that he is not going to exaggerate about Caesar's good deeds. Mark Antony also repeats a sentence that will be afterwards said all over the speech as a kind of refrain, 'Brutus is an honorable man' (lines 45 and 50). However, in this case, as he has just begun to speak, it is quite possible that the audience has not understood that this statement is employed as a source of irony, intending to express exactly the opposite thing as we will see.

The second part, the *narratio*, starts with 'He hath brought many captives to Rome' (line 51) and goes until 'Here is himself, married, as you see, with traitors' (line 140). At the beginning of this part, from line 51 to 62, Mark Antony provides examples of three different situations in which Caesar's actions showed that he was not as ambitious as Brutus said. These examples are presented in the following way: Mark Antony asks the audience to remember a specific situation, then talks about what Caesar did, and then makes a rhetoric question openly asking the crowd if they really think that Caesar was ambitious taking into account the things he did in those moments as we can see in line 53 'Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?' and in line 60 'Was this ambition?'.

Then, Mark Antony, from lines 65 to 73, appeals to the audience's emotions telling them that they loved Caesar once (line 65) and that if they did so it was because they had a reason to do so.

Dispositio

In relation to *dispositio*, in Brutus' discourse, three main arguments can be distinguished that support the assassination of Caesar: Brutus' love to Rome, Caesar's ambition, and the fact that, according to Brutus, if Caesar were alive, the crowd would be all slaves. These arguments are presented in an extremely logical manner, mostly by the use of rhetorical and repetitive questions to manipulate the public and make them think what the orator wants.

Several examples are found in the speech, especially when Brutus openly tells the public that Caesar wanted all the Romans to be slaves: 'Who is here so base that

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

would be a bondman? [...] Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? [...] Who is here so vile that will not love his country?'(lines from 16 to 20). In these examples, as it can be seen, Brutus employs a fixed structure for the three questions, as he blames Caesar and justifies his own behavior having killed the Roman leader.

Moreover, there is another part in which we can see how logic and simple Brutus' speech is. Here, Brutus talks about his feelings about Caesar in a very straightforward way presenting one reaction as a consequence of a certain feeling:

'As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as
 he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I Honour him, but, as he
 was ambitious, I slew him. There is tears for his love; joy for his fortune;
 honour For his valour; and death for his ambition'. (lines 13-17)

In this fragment, Brutus, as usual, makes a series of logical structures which are an evidence of the simplicity of Brutus' arguments that present Caesar's assassination as a logical fact, something that had to happen because, as Brutus says, Caesar was ambitious. In this description, Caesar is portrayed as affective, fortunate, valiant, and ambitious, being this last quality the highest and therefore most significant in the gradation presented by Brutus, as it was the reason for his death.

However, in the speech delivered by Mark Antony, we find three different arguments, contrary of those of Brutus. First, Mark Antony uses a method to show that Caesar was not ambitious by providing an example of a certain event in which Caesar acted honestly. This example and the ones he will use afterwards make the speech more vivid to the public. Then he talks about what Caesar did making a rhetorical question suggesting that Caesar was not ambitious as Brutus said, but without saying it openly. Here, it can be seen that the speech of Mark Antony is intended to negate the arguments of Brutus, but what is more, that he has done it without criticizing Brutus, just showing that Caesar was not ambitious. After that, Mark Antony appeals to people's feelings and ask them directly the reason why they loved Caesar, and why they do not love him anymore. Another element Mark Antony uses is the will of Caesar, which, according to him, establishes that the Romans are Caesar's heirs, giving another example of Caesar's lack of ambition.

One example of Mark Antony trying to infuriate the crowd without openly saying it is found where he talks about Caesar's will:

'Hearing the will of Caesar,
 It will inflame you, it will make you mad. 'Tis good you know that you are his
 heirs;
 For if should, O, what would come of it?' (lines 95-98)

Here it can be seen that Mark Antony is managing to madden his audience against the plotters, but although he is actually the one that is doing it, by the use of the pronoun '*it*' it seems like what would enrage his audience is not him speaking but the will of Caesar which would make the Romans the real owners of their country.

One thing that seems to characterize Mark Antony's speech is the fact that most of his arguments are not openly stated, and for the purpose of defending his ideas without criticizing the plotters, he uses irony. Mark Antony, all through his speech, repeats a sentence just as it was a refrain and that sentence is 'Brutus is an honorable man'. With the constant repetition of this statement, Mark Antony turns it, according to McDonald (2001:126), 'from a praising epithet to irony'. Irony, as it is explained by McDonald, 'implies a silent background of agreed knowledge', and that means that, although at the beginning the audience could have believed that Mark Antony means simply what he is saying, at a certain point of his speech, as McDonald indicates, 'the crowd accepts that the word 'honorable' is twisted when applied to Brutus, for he is now a traitor'. As a result, Mark Antony, by the use of irony, says something as a way to express exactly the opposite, and does what he wants to do, criticize the conspirators, keeping his word of not doing it, as he does not say that they are not honorable men.

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Elocutio

As for *elocutio*, Brutus employs an *grave genus* with a certain degree of *ornatus*, that can be seen in statements such as 'awake your senses that you may hear' where personification can be found, or in 'His death is enrolled in the Capitol; his glory not extenuated, wherein he was worthy; nor his offences reinforced, for which he suffered death' where the logical order of the sentence has been altered by the use of hyperbaton, and the vocabulary chosen is quite formal. Another device that can be found in Brutus' speech is oxymoron: 'Had you rather were living/ And die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead, to live/ All free men?' (lines 10-13). In this fragment, Brutus contrasts the pair of words 'live' and 'die' and 'slaves' and 'free men' with which Brutus explains that if Caesar were alive, they would be all slaves, so it is better for them that Caesar is dead because they can now be free men. This argument is presented in a logical and clear way, and in the form of a rhetoric question inviting the public to think about this point.

This elevated style creates a distance between the public and the *orator*, that can make the people not to identify themselves with the person delivering the speech and therefore the message could not be fully understood.

While in the case of Mark Antony, he employs *simple genus*, down-to-earth language, as it can easily be seen by the use of proverbs 'The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones', or by the use of straightforward questions such as 'You will compel me to read the will?'. As McDonald says (2001:125): 'Mark Antony uses proverbs, common knowledge the listeners will accept and therefore begin to find common ground with the speaker', Mark Antony, by the use of this style, gives clearness and simplicity to his discourse making it easy to understand for the public, and making the public think that he is one of them, using the words they use every day or employing proverbs that they would also use.

However, although Mark Antony presents simple language, he also uses some rhetorical figures in his speech such as metaphors as it can be seen in the following fragment: 'But yesterday the word of Caesar might/ Have stood against the world, now lies he there/ And none so poor to do him reverence.' (lines 72-74). Here, Mark Antony is playing with verbs of position, 'stood', 'lies', and 'make reverence', to say that Caesar should be up, and all the people around him should be making him reverence, but in fact, the audience is bowed but not to honor him but to see him corpse.

Another metaphor that can be found in Mark Antony's speech is in line 156: 'Show you Caesar's wounds, poor poor dumb mouths'. Mark Antony, by the use of figurative language, tries to express that Caesar's wounds are speechless because Caesar is already dead, and therefore the wound no longer bleed nor 'speak' to tell what happened with Caesar and the way he was murdered.

A good example of the difference in *genus* that these speeches present can be seen in the way the two orators, Brutus and Mark Antony, begin their speeches. While Brutus starts his speech by saying 'Romans, countrymen and lovers, hear me for my cause' (line 1), Mark Antony reverses this formula beginning with 'Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears' (line 36) according to McDonald (2001:125) this device is used not only to draw the audience's attention, but also to make the audience first identify themselves as Mark Antony's 'friends', making their relationship with Mark Antony closer than the one they had with Brutus just by the way Mark Antony addresses them.

Memoria and pronuntiatio

In relation to *memoria*, it can be said that both speeches employ natural memory as we infer that the orators have not used a written copy of their words, or resources such as trees or relations that could help them to remember what they wanted to transmit to the audience.

As far as *pronuntiatio* is concerned, we can not forget that, although the speeches are found in a play, this play was written to be performed and therefore the speeches present characteristics and devices of discourses delivered in ancient Rome. Moreover, in *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare tells what happened although he does not do it literally, as we have already pointed out, because he bases his work in Plutarco's story, so what Shakespeare does it to write an approximate reproduction of what actually happened, and of Brutus and Mark Antony's speeches.

Regarding *pronuntiatio*, it seems that Brutus' speech is marked by its *ethos*, which is based on moral and logical devices. The fact that Brutus' speech seems to be highly marked by *ethos* makes it weak in persuasion and lacking of some dramatic effect, as McDonald says (2001: 125) : 'Brutus uses weak logical devices for persuasion because they are self-justifying'. In that respect, the reader may feel that the result is that Brutus does not fully convince the public, as his arguments are not enough and he does not include some emotional devices in his speech to really appeal to the audience's feelings.

Contrary to what Brutus does, Mark Antony's speech seems to be characterised by *pathos*, and that means that, as McDonald (2001: 125) says, Mark Antony employs devices that may move the audience's feelings as it can be seen in the following lines:

'Look, in this place ran Cassius' dagger through;
See what a rent the envious Casca made;
Through this the well-beloved Brutus stabbed,
And as he plucked his cursed steel away.

In this part, Mark Antony calls the attention of the public by describing how the conspirators murdered Caesar, but this fragment is not only a description, what Mark Antony is doing, according to McDonald (2001: 125), is 'making a visual spectacle of Caesar being killed' and he seems to do so to make the people aware of what has happened with their deceased leader.

Another fragment in which Mark Antony seems to show his concern with *pathos* is the following one:

'Which all the while ran blood, great Caesar fell. O, what a fall was there, my countrymen!
Then, I, and you, and all of us fell down,
Whilst bloody treason flourished over us.' (lines 127-130)

In these lines, Mark Antony concludes that as Caesar fell, he himself and all the Romans fell down, as the pronoun 'us' used in line 129 includes Mark Antony, Caesar, and the ones who are listening to his speech. By this statement, according to McDonald (2001: 126), Mark Antony makes the public believe that 'any treason of Brutus and his friends against Caesar becomes treason against the crowd'. Therefore, the audience feels identified with Caesar, and Mark Antony could also be making an analogy by identifying Rome with Caesar. These examples could also be linked to what it was previously said regarding Mark Antony's *elocutio*, as these instances make closer the relationship Mark Antony has with the audience.

A good example to see the difference between *ethos* and *pathos* in both speeches can be found at the end of Mark Antony's discourse:

'They are wise and honorable,
And will no doubt, with reasons answer you. A come not friends to steal away your hearts; I am no orator as Brutus is,
But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man,
That love my friend; and that they know full well That gave me public leave to speak of him.
For I have neither wit, nor words, nor worth, Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech
To stir men's blood; I only speak right on.' (lines 145-154)

In this fragment, it can be seen how Mark Antony uses the word '*reason*' to refer to Brutus'

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

arguments, but also marks that the only thing he is expressing is his 'love' to his deceased friend Caesar. Mark Antony links Brutus' ideas with logic or reason identifying them in some way with *ethos*, and making a difference with his own arguments by talking about his own feelings, *pathos*, as he says that he does not know anything about speaking in public or convincing an audience, he 'only speaks right on'.

4. Conclusion

The purpose of this work was to show the classical influence that can be found in Elizabethan drama, and more precisely, in the play *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare. We have demonstrated, through the conclusions of some researchers, how Elizabethan authors take not only the five-act structure of Roman plays, but also some stylistic devices to write their own works. In fact, these nuances can be clearly appreciated in the case of William Shakespeare and his Roman plays, which were highly influenced by the classical world, not only in style or structure as we have mentioned before, but in terms of setting, argument, content and form. In this respect, the presence of the *officia oratoris*, the five skills an orator should master to deliver an effective speech, are just another evidence of the classical nuances present in the play analysed, *Julius Caesar*.

In relation to the *officia oratoris*, the main concern of our work was to analyse the speeches of Brutus and Mark Antony, indicating how Shakespeare followed every discipline and comparing them to see what are the key strengths and weaknesses of each discourse.

On the one hand, and as we have seen, Brutus' speech was characterised by its *dispositio*, as the reader can easily see how the speech can be divided in parts, and for its *grave* style, employing formal language to address the audience. Moreover, in his speech, Brutus employs *ethos* which is the use of logical devices and moral ideas to support his arguments. On the other hand, Mark Antony's speech stands out for its *inventio*, as he makes up what he is going to say at the moment of speaking, being his ideas the result of an act of improvisation. Another *officium* that remains vital in Mark Antony's speech is *pronuntiatio*, to the extent that through his gestures or movements he finally manages to catch the audience's attention, something that he also gets by employing a *simple* style with informal language, proverbs and in general vocabulary that the audience used in their everyday talks. Contrary to the speech of Brutus, Mark Antony's discourse can be an example of the use of devices related to *pathos*, which appeal to the audience's emotions and feelings, making the listeners feel in some way identified with the speaker.

As it was previously stated, there is no doubt that Shakespeare followed the classical models, and more precisely, the *officia oratoris*, and that is just an evidence of the fact that oratory was a fundamental art, not only in ancient times when it was used in politics, for example, but also nowadays being present in advertisements, for instance. The importance of oratory lies on the significance of exposing clearly the speaker's ideas or proposals, but not only to make people understand them, but also to persuade them to think the same as you. In this respect, William Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* makes a clear reference to the importance of oratory in lines from 159 to 161: 'Put a tongue/ In every wound of Caesar that should move/ The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny'. What Shakespeare is trying to say here is that the speakers put tongues to Caesar's wounds and this wounds can actually move the stones of Rome, something obviously impossible, which has a metaphorical meaning, and that is that an orator, by the use of the *officia oratoris*, can incite people to stir up and move the foundations of the established order, and that is in fact, where the importance of oratory actually resides. Oratory can move people, it can make the speakers convince their listeners of their ideas, and it makes them think what the speaker wants them to think, and that is the reason why, as it was marked in the introduction of this work, Plato already describes oratory as the 'worker of persuasion'.

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research* 3.2 (2015): 94-105
 <<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
 ©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

The *confirmatio* which goes from 'If you have tears prepare to shed them now' (line 107) until line 120 'Judge, O you gods, how dearly Caesar loved him!'. In this part, Mark Antony makes a visual image by using his words of the assassination of Caesar by the conspirators. This part stands out for the use of metaphors, and because it can be regarded as a summary of Mark Antony's arguments against the plotters trying to make the people see why Caesar's death was an act of injustice.

The *conclusio*, which is the final part and farewell of the speech, goes from line 141 'Good friends, sweet friends, let me not stir you up' until the end of the speech in line 161 'The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny'. In this part, Mark Antony summarizes all his ideas: his arguments in favour of Caesar saying that the Roman leader was not ambitious. He also reinforces the idea that Brutus, and therefore the rest of the conspirators, are honorable men, but this time this statement is clearly seen as a source of irony. Moreover, Mark Antony marks something that is highlighted all over his speech, which that he is, as he says, 'a plain blunt man' (line 149) identifying himself with the public and remarking that he 'only speaks right on' (line 154) as a way to say that Brutus, as he is an experienced orator and he does not belong to common people, has tried to deceive them with their speech.

In general, it can be said that Mark Antony's speech presents a more complex structure and this could respond to the fact that he had not prepared his speech as Brutus had, and also because he was not allowed to criticize the plotters which turned his speech into an arduous task for him. But it is noticeable how, without criticizing the plotters only by saying that Caesar was not ambitious he finally manages to make the public believe that the plotters have not told them the truth.

Works Cited

- Adamson S. *Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Language: A Guide*. New York: Arden Shakespeare, 2001. Print.
- Archard, G. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989. Print
- Bergua J. *Diálogos Volumen II*. Madrid: Ediciones Ibéricas, 1968. Print
- Brooke R. *John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama*. London: Sidgwick and Jackson Ltd, 1917. Print.
- Craik, K. *The English of Shakespeare: A Philological Commentary on his Julius Caesar*. Boston: Woolworth, Ainsworth & co., 1869. Print
- Cunliffe J.W. *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893. Print.
- McDonald R. *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print
- McRae, J. *The Penguin Guide to Literature in English (Britain and Ireland)*. London: Pearson Education Ltd, 1996. Print
- Miola, R.S. *Shakespeare and the Classical Tragedy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Print
- Oliva S. *Introducción a Shakespeare*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península, 2001. Print.
- Scalia J.E. *Julius Caesar: Maxnotes Literature Guides*. New York: English Literature Study Guides, 1994. Print
- Shakespeare, W. *Julius Caesar*. London: Penguin Books, 1967. Print.
- Spearing M. *Elizabethan Translations of Seneca's Tragedies*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1912. Print.
- Wells S. *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print
- Wiggins M. *Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.

Parra Mansilla, Sara. "Officia oratoris in the discourses of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research* 3.2 (2015): 94-105
<<https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>>
©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Bioprofile of the author: Sara holds a BA in English Studies from the University of Extremadura. Her area of interest is comparative literature, post-colonial studies and minoritarian literature. Sara currently studies at the University of Extremadura, and will complete a Masters in Education in 2016. Sara es graduada en Estudios Ingleses por la Universidad de Extremadura. Sus áreas de interés es la literatura comparada, los estudios poscoloniales y la literatura de minorías. Actualmente, Sara estudia en la Universidad de Extremadura y terminará un máster en Educación en 2016.

Contact: <sparrama@alumnos.unex.es