

**Figures in the Shadows:
Identities in Artistic Prose from the Anthology of the Elder Seneca**

by

Bart Huelsenbeck

Department of Classical Studies

Duke University

Date: _____

Approved: _____

Mary T. Boatwright, Supervisor

Christina S. Kraus

Grant Parker

Jennifer C. Woods

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
Classical Studies in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2009

ABSTRACT

**Figures in the Shadows:
Identities in Artistic Prose from the Anthology of the Elder Seneca**

by

Bart Huelsenbeck

Department of Classical Studies
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Mary T. Boatwright, Supervisor

Christina S. Kraus

Grant Parker

Jennifer C. Woods

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Classical Studies in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2009

Copyright by
Bart Huelsenbeck
2009

Abstract

The anthology of the elder Seneca (c. 55 BC – c. 39 AD) contains quotations from approximately 120 speakers who flourished during the early Empire. The predominant tendency in modern scholarship has been to marginalize these speakers and the practice they represent (declamation): they are regarded as a linguistic and literary monolith, and their literary productions while recognized as influential are treated as discrete from those of other, “serious” authors. The present dissertation challenges this viewpoint by focusing on the following questions: To what extent can a speaker quoted in Seneca’s anthology be said to have a distinct and unique literary identity? What is the relationship of a speaker, as represented by his quotations, relative to canonical texts?

Since most of the quoted speakers are found exclusively in the anthology, the study first examines the nature of Seneca’s work and, more specifically, how the quotations of the anthology are organized. It is discovered that the sequence in which excerpts appear in a quotation do not follow a consistent, meaningful pattern, such as the order in which they might have occurred in a speech. Instead, excerpts exhibit a strong lateral organization: excerpts from one speaker show a close engagement with excerpts in spatially distant quotations from other speakers. A fundamental organizing principle consists in the convergence of excerpts around a limited number of specific points for each declamatory theme.

The remainder, and bulk, of the dissertation is a close analysis of the quotations of two speakers: Arellius Fuscus and Papirius Fabianus. The distinct identities of these

speakers emerge from comparisons of excerpts in their quotations with the often studiedly similar excerpts from other speakers and from passages in other texts. Fabianus' literary identity takes shape in a language designed to construct the persona of a philosopher-preacher. The identity of Fuscus resides in idiosyncratic sentence architecture, in a preference for Presentational sentences, and in methodically innovative diction. Further substantiating Fuscus' identity is evidence that he assimilated the language of authors, such as Cicero and Vergil, and established compositional patterns that became authoritative for later authors, such as Ovid, the younger Seneca, and Lucan.

Contents

Abstract	iv
Abbreviations and Commonly Used Terms	ix
Acknowledgements	xii
Introduction	1
1. The Organization of Seneca's Quotations	11
1.1 Seneca's anthology: <i>thema, sententiae, divisiones, colores</i>	11
1.2 Quotations: sequence, sources, reliability	15
1.3 <i>Sententiae</i> are non-sequential	25
1.4 Seneca's collection limited by supporting documents	34
1.5 Quotations converge around a limited number of <i>loci</i>	44
1.6 A culture of shared <i>loci</i>	56
1.7 Shared <i>loci</i> are signaled through keywords, formulae, and labels.....	59
1.7.1 <i>Controversia</i> 1.1	60
1.7.2 <i>Controversia</i> 1.2	62
1.7.3 <i>Controversia</i> 1.3	66
1.8 Conclusion.....	69
2. Papirius Fabianus: voice of a philosopher.....	73
2.1 Objectives.....	73
2.2 Fabianus' reputation in ancient sources: a re-evaluation	81
2.3 Quest for strength of utterance.....	95
2.4 Archaic eloquence: phonetic architecture, parataxis, <i>guttatim</i> style.....	98

2.5 Fabianus' traditional sentence architecture	104
2.5.1 Fabianus <i>philosophus</i> attacks wealth itself (C. 2.1.25).....	107
2.5.2 Phonetic structuring and Civil War (C. 2.1.10-13)	114
2.5.3 Phonetic Structuring and the imitation of nature by the rich (C. 2.1.10-13)....	126
2.5.4 Precise architecture in the description of the tortured wife (C. 2.5).....	132
2.6 Fabianus' complete, tabular eloquence (C. 2.6, 2.2, 2.3).....	145
2.6.1 <i>Controversia</i> 2.6	146
2.6.2 <i>Controversia</i> 2.2.....	153
2.6.3 <i>Controversia</i> 2.3	156
2.7 Conclusion.....	158
3. Arellius Fuscus: presentational architecture and verbal presence.....	161
3.1 Introduction.....	161
3.2 Fuscus' biography and his alleged Asianism	166
3.3 Sentence architecture and prose rhythm.....	175
3.4 Fuscus creates word-groups possessing highly defined boundaries.....	180
3.5 Word-groups serve as informational frames.....	190
3.6 Subject-final word order, Presentational sentences,thetic perspective.....	199
3.6.1 Fuscine Entries that contain subject-final order	203
3.6.2 V-S order and descriptive sentences.....	207
3.6.3 Presentational sentences and theticity.....	211
3.6.4 Thetic sentences in S. 5.1 and C. 2.5.4.....	216
3.6.5 Theticity and the Entry-type 'Proposition and Elaboration'	221
3.6.6 <i>Exempla</i> of virtuous women	227

3.7 Conclusion.....	234
4. Arellius Fuscus: a presence in literary traditions	237
4.1 Introduction.....	237
4.2 <i>Suasoria</i> 3.....	239
4.2.1 An orderly and traditional description of the moon’s phases	241
4.2.2 Impressive language in a technical exposition.....	248
4.2.3 A Fuscine presence among poets: the image of the Despairing Farmer	252
4.2.4 Fuscine presence in moral philosophy: excess rain and the Despairing Farmer	258
4.3 <i>Suasoria</i> 4.....	262
4.3.1 A thought pattern (Entries #1-3): ‘we can dwell among the heavenly gods’..	266
4.3.2 Fuscine mediation in the tradition of the planetary list (Entry #4)	273
4.3.3 Textual corruption and broad scope Focus in Fuscus’ planetary list	281
4.3.4 Two complementary <i>loci</i> constructed on the authority of Vergil.....	287
4.4 <i>Suasoriae</i> 6 and 7.....	291
4.4.1 Fuscus builds <i>loci</i> from a collection of Cicero passages.....	293
4.4.2 The tradition of the Ciceronian Epitaph	302
4.5 <i>Suasoria</i> 5.....	308
4.5.1 The ‘fused nominal’ creates impressive language and images.....	313
4.5.2 Psychological darkness.....	317
Conclusion	326
Works Cited	335
Biography.....	359

Abbreviations and Commonly Used Terms

‘C. ‘	<i>Controversia(e)</i>
‘S.’	<i>Suasoria(e)</i>
<i>colon</i>	A string of words that exhibit a degree of internal coherence marking them as a group and setting them apart from what precedes and what follows. Coherence is determined by a number of factors, including: syntactical agreement, parallelism, metrical patterns, clausulae, phonetic correspondence and iteration.
Entry	A segment of continuous text presented by Seneca as a direct record of what an author said or wrote. An Entry is typically juxtaposed with other Entries and gathered in a discontinuous series under the name of its author.
Presentational sentence	A sentence that describes the appearance or existence of an object or scene. Typically all the content information in a Presentational sentence is new and cannot be analyzed according to the pragmatic roles of Topic and Focus. Presentational sentences are thetic (q.v.).
Proposition and Elaboration	A type of organization found in Entries, especially in the Entries of Arellius Fuscus. It consists of a thesis statement (Proposition) that is then followed by a set of details (Elaboration) meant to illustrate the thesis statement. Often the Entry is then rounded off with a creative restatement of the Proposition.
quotation	Any words that Seneca presents as a direct record of what one author said or wrote. A quotation can consist of one Entry or several.
shared <i>locus</i> (<i>locus mutuus</i>)	A point of engagement between two or more speakers that is effected through the composition of overtly similar Entries. Authors who contribute to a shared <i>locus</i> advertise this engagement through shared keywords and formulaic phrases.

theme (<i>thema</i>)	The fictitious scenario which is stated at the beginning of every declamation and which declaimers used as guidelines when they composed Entries and speeches.
thetic sentence	A sentence whose informational content is structured as a single unit rather than divided between the grammatical roles of subject and predicate. Thetic sentences are associated with certain semantic roles and discourse functions – e.g., descriptions of things and events, existential verbs and verbs of becoming or appearing.
thought pattern	An assemblage of ideas appearing in passages from two or more authors. A thought pattern witnesses an imitative and emulative convergence similar to that seen in shared <i>loci</i> . However, the influence evidenced by a thought pattern is less direct and, consequently, less precise in terms of shared vocabulary. A thought pattern possesses authority, but no author can claim responsibility for its genesis.
V-S word order	A sentence in which a subject noun is preceded by its verb.
Version	An Entry that is similar to another Entry by the same declaimer in such a way that the two Entries seem to offer themselves as alternatives of each other.
Bursian	C. Bursian (1857). <i>Annaei Senecae Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores</i> . Leipzig.
Edward	W. A. Edward (1928). <i>The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder</i> . Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Håkanson	L. Håkanson (1989). <i>L. Annaeus Seneca Maior. Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, diuisiones, colores</i> . Leipzig, Teubner.
Kiessling	A. Kiessling (1872). <i>Annaei Senecae Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores</i> . Leipzig.

Müller

H. J. Müller (1887). Reprint, 1963. *L. Annaei Senecae oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*. Hildesheim, Georg Olms.

Winterbottom

M. Winterbottom (1974). *Seneca the Elder. Declamations*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Acknowledgements

Assistance, encouragement, and inspiration came from several quarters during the research and writing of this dissertation. I am grateful to the members of my dissertation committee for their feedback and support. Although not officially part of the committee, Francis Newton and Larry Richardson, jr. were integral to this study. I thank both of them for wonderful conversations and generous loans of materials. I owe thanks to Joline Ezzell and the librarians at Duke University for the purchase of copies of manuscripts. Among my fellow graduate students I owe special thanks to Marcello Lippiello and Alexander Loney for conversations and access to a job at a critical moment. Thanks also to Robert Babcock, Cecil Wooten, and John Briscoe for helpful conversations and communications. A Julian Price Fellowship made an extended stay in Belgium possible. In Belgium, I am thankful for the hospitality of Jacqueline Hamesse, Hendrik D.L. Vervliet, and especially Baudouin Van den Abeele, who welcomed my family. I owe thanks to Frank T. Coulson of Ohio State, who has remained a source of support and friendship. From my days at Ohio State I must also thank June Allison: memories of reading Thucydides together instilled confidence in the value of the kind of study undertaken in this dissertation. Thanks to Larry and Edie Jaerger, to my mother Cheryl Brunscheen and Bill Brunscheen, for every variety of support. I cannot fail to express gratitude and love to my father, to whom I suspect this dissertation would have seemed strange music indeed – but meaningful nonetheless. Finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife Amy for her love and support and to my son Willem for his love and astonishing radiance.

Introduction

The anthology of the elder Seneca – the *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*, to use the title applied by modern editors¹ – is a fascinating and tantalizing work. Part of the work’s fascination lies in its ability to offer a unique glimpse into the mass of ancient literature now lost to us. With its quotations from more than one hundred little-known speakers, the anthology opens a window into literary obscurity. Moreover, since many of these quotations can be securely assigned to the Augustan Age, Seneca’s anthology surprisingly makes us aware of our ignorance about a period of Latin literary history that has received the greatest attention from readers and the greatest praise.

A picture of Augustan Age literature has long been firmly established: it includes the well-known and highly regarded works of Vergil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, and Livy. The traditional picture overlooks or scorns the literary productions of the likes of Porcius Latro, Cestius Pius, and Arellius Fuscus – figures now obscure and long despised because they are associated with the practice of declamation. In addition to these largely unknown literary figures, the elder Seneca’s collection contains quotations from Augustan Age authors who are generally recognized as important but whose works have been almost entirely lost: Asinius Pollio, T. Labienus, Cassius Severus, Cremutius Cordus, Aufidius Bassus, Albinovanus Pedo, Cornelius Severus. What can the quotations in Seneca’s anthology teach us about these authors’ literary interests? What were these authors like? What did they contribute to Latin literature?

¹ Thus, Bursian 1857; Kiessling 1872; Müller 1887; Håkanson 1989a. The title is pieced together from the colophons of our manuscripts; Seneca himself, at least in what is extant of his work, does not give a title.

These questions, which set the reader face to face with the quotations in Seneca's work, quickly lead to a realization: the anthology is often a difficult, intractable text that does not readily yield to what to most readers are intuitive reading strategies. Whereas it is clear the anthology contains quotations from a multitude of speakers, much less certain is how the quotations operate: What is the internal organization of a quotation? Is it a continuous and coherent whole, or does it consist of excerpts? Is the quotation from one speaker somehow interrelated with the quotations from other speakers appearing under the same declamation?

A second set of difficulties arises when we attempt to discover the literary interests and ambitions of select speakers in the anthology. Although quotations can range in length from a few words to a full page or more of a Teubner edition, they are on average fairly short – a small to moderate-sized paragraph. Further, if we are interested in a particular speaker, his quotations will typically appear scattered throughout the collection, rather than concentrated together and focused on only one or two topics. Under these conditions, we might fairly ask whether an adequate sense of a given speaker's literary identity and contributions is possible. Can the quotations of the anthology effectively contribute to our understanding of literary history and traditions? Can they change what we believe constitutes the literary contexts and textual interrelationships in which the better known, canonical authors composed their works?

The above are the fundamental questions with which the present study is concerned. And, as these questions are meant to suggest, a reading of the quotations in Seneca's anthology is inseparable from our perceptions of how the anthology and its quotations are organized. The anthology's unfamiliar and challenging organization

exposes readerly assumptions; it forces us to scrutinize reading practices that we thought elemental and had taken for granted. This heightened awareness of our basic reading practices, in turn, advises us that we need well-reasoned, supported conclusions about the kinds of reading procedures that the organization of the anthology expects and allows.

Accordingly, in preparation for the subsequent close literary study of Seneca's quotations, the dissertation begins in Chapter 1 with an investigation into how the quotations organize themselves. We confirm the consensus belief of modern editors (Håkanson 1989a, Winterbottom 1974,² Bornecque 1902a) concerning the internal continuity of quotations: a quotation is not consecutive but consists of discontinuous pieces. These pieces I call Entries. The term 'Entry' is adopted in the course of Chapter 1 (Section 1.3) and is employed throughout the remainder of the study. 'Entry' is preferable to other terms that might be used, such as *sententia* or 'excerpt,' since 'Entry' does not bear the misleading connotations of these latter two terms. *Sententia* is often taken to mean "epigram," which many Entries quite plainly are not. 'Excerpt' implies that the passage is fragmentary and that it originally was attached to a larger text. However, as we discover in Chapter 1, at least some Entries were composed independently of a speech; and, certainly, Entries were able to circulate separately from speeches. This latter fact is clear from our knowledge of a variety of collections in antiquity (now no longer extant) that consisted not of entire speeches but of separate passages.³

² In the remainder of the study, references to Håkanson and Winterbottom without the date refer to the former's Teubner edition (1989a) and the latter's Loeb edition (1974).

³ For a survey of the different kinds of collections and rhetorical works that the elder Seneca could have drawn on for his anthology, see Sussman 1978: 75-83.

Next, an analysis of representative passages reveals that not only are Entries discontinuous, also the sequence in which Entries appear within a quotation is unpredictable and lacks any discernible significance: Entries do not follow, for example, an order in which they might have been spoken in a speech. Among the evidence in support of the non-sequentiality of Entries is the appearance within the same quotation of Entries that are variations – or what I call Versions⁴ – of each other. The fact that Entries are not to be regarded as broken, imperfect fragments affords them a certain independence and internal coherence; now, the additional discovery that Entries are non-sequential further corroborates their independence.

The issue of the sequence of Entries has scarcely been touched on by studies of Seneca's work. Yet, it is a question with the most profound implications, capable of changing not only how we read the anthology but even our understanding of the contextual forces by which Latin literature was generated. Involved here is the possibility that Entries – these isolable, self-sufficient passages that represent a basic organizing principle within Seneca's work – reflect also a fundamental principle organizing literary practice more generally. Do Entries, particularly in their independent brevity, represent an order of *thinking* that informs basic practices of reading and literary composition? From Quintilian, Tacitus, and the younger Pliny⁵ we were already aware of a widespread practice of collecting and circulating short passages, typically done with the

⁴ The similarity of Versions is such that it is difficult to imagine they could be used in the same speech. In Seneca's anthology, Versions seem to offer themselves as alternatives, though each having its own slightly different point of emphasis: e.g., compare *Suas.* 5.1 (*quid Marathona, quid Salamina referam? pudet dicere: dubitamus adhuc, an vicerimus.*) and 5.2 (*quid dicam Salamina? quid Cynaegiron referam et te, Polyzele? et hoc agitur, an viceris!*), both attributed to Arellius Fuscus. Versions may have been spoken and recorded on separate performative occasions, or they may represent different records of the same performance, or their author may himself have written them up as alternatives.

⁵ Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.120; 9.1.24; Tac. *Dial.* 20.4; Plin. *Ep.* 3.5; see also Cic. *Inu.* 2.4.

support of writing tablets. Now, in the anthology of the elder Seneca we actually possess some of these short circulating passages: with these passages is the opportunity to trace in detail the dimensions and order of thought processes.⁶

But it is not only the narrow scope and independence of Entries that arouse investigative attention. Entries appearing in a quotation from one speaker show a direct, imitative and emulative engagement with Entries of other speakers: the unsystematic, non-sequential arrangement of Entries *within* a quotation seems to be compensated for by a systematic correspondence *between* quotations. From a close reading of the quotations Seneca has collected for a given declamation, we discover that Entries have not been arbitrarily selected for inclusion in the anthology: they tend to converge around approximately seven critical points relating to the declamatory premise, or “theme” (*thema*).⁷ A point of engagement between two or more speakers – as defined by similar details of argument, vocabulary, word arrangement, and mode of treatment (e.g. narrative, description) – I call a *locus mutuus*, or “shared *locus*.” In order to signal such engagement, speakers employed keywords and formulaic phrases. These same keywords and phrases were useful also to those who, like the elder Seneca, collected quotations, since keywords would help a collector choose which portions of a performance to record and how to organize the collection.

As regards wider implications, this close engagement means that in Entries we witness a performative dynamic – an interactive, social machinery that served to assign

⁶ For the wide-reaching effects of the use of commonplace books, see e.g. Moss 1996 (*Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*), who includes (pp. 1-23) a discussion of the practice in antiquity.

⁷ The term *thema* is ancient; see *Contr.* 7.5.12; 9.5.11; *Quint. Decl.* 309.1; *Quint. Inst.* 7.1.4 (*in schola certa sunt et pauca et ante declamationem exponuntur, quae themata Graeci uocant, Cicero proposita*).

values to what the declaimers said. Engagement established what topics, arguments, and diction counted and must be observed when a declaimer spoke on a given declamatory theme. Further, engagement furnished the performative space in which a speaker would stand as an individual figure: it supplied the criteria by which one speaker could be seen to be different from his peers – a single performer with his own character and identity. In short, engagement of speakers through select passages established both *what* mattered and *who* was *who*.

The opportunity afforded by the anthology to observe a dynamic process of literary creation is remarkable, perhaps even unparalleled among our surviving ancient texts: we see – blow-by-blow and in close detail – the establishment of authoritative passages and the formation of authorial identities. Typically our reading of ancient authors and our understanding of the intertextual forces that determine their compositions are hampered by large gaps in the literary record; in Seneca’s anthology, by contrast, we often see speaker responding to speaker directly. An evolutionary process can be followed step-by-step; gaps in the record of literary creation do not intervene, or at least these gaps are not so vast.

In this regard, again, Seneca’s anthology can impact our understanding of literary creation more broadly. We see speakers converge, producing similar, overlapping passages. However, in these same overlapping passages there is also a critical divergence. The outlines of an authorial figure, a literary identity, can be traced (as it were) in the interstices that result from overlaying, one atop the other, these similar but divergent passages. We must consider, then: Is the degree of difference, or “space,” that we see between speakers the same degree of space that we should expect separated

authors more generally – that is, that separated authors’ compositions (written and oral) before most of these compositions vanished from the historical record? Does Seneca’s anthology give us the correct proportions of creative sameness and difference that constituted literary individuality and identity in the early empire?

It is these far-reaching issues of literary authority and identity that are involved in the investigations of Chapters 2, 3, and 4. These three major chapters take the following questions as their starting point: To what extent can we discern linguistic and literary identities in the quotations of Seneca’s anthology? Do the obscure figures contained therein find a meaningful place within literary traditions?

Rather than attempting to consider these questions with respect to all those quoted in the anthology, we have chosen to focus on the quotations of two speakers in particular, Papirius Fabianus (b. ~35 BC) and Arellius Fuscus (b. ~60 BC). The quotations of both speakers are among the most ample and, in terms of their capacity to exhibit a unified and recognizable literary program, are among the most forceful of the anthology. As further recommendation to the study of their quotations, both speakers have connections with prominent Latin authors. Arellius Fuscus, as the elder Seneca informs us (*C.* 2.2.8),⁸ was rhetor to Ovid. And Fabianus, though it is unclear to what degree exactly, is thought to have been a teacher of the younger Seneca. It is at least certain that Fabianus was a productive author, since he composed at minimum as many philosophical works as Cicero (*Sen. Ep.* 100.9) and is frequently cited as authority by the elder Pliny.⁹

⁸ Throughout this study, ‘*C.*’ refers to *Controversiae*, ‘*S.*’ to *Suasoriae*.

⁹ Pliny cites Fabianus in his index to the following books: 2, 7, 9, 11-15, 17, 18 (‘Sabinus Fabianus?’), 23, 25, 28, 36. See also *Plin. Nat.* 2.121; 2.224; 9.25; 12.20; 15.3; 18.276; 23.62; 28.54; 36.125.

In Chapter 2, which examines the quotations attributed to Fabianus, a Fabianic identity emerges from the consistent appearance of distinctive linguistic features. Among the most important of these are parataxis, in combination with a bit-by-bit presentation of ideas; a calculated deployment of phonetic iteration (e.g. alliteration) that shapes sentence structures and contributes integrally to meaning; and a sentence architecture consisting of word-pairs or binary word groups. All these features show Fabianus cultivating a type of speech meant to evoke an austere and “traditional” eloquence: the predominant, distinguishing features of Fabianus’ language just listed are the same that are often used to characterize ancient Latin *carmina*, ritualistic formulae, and the early Latin poets.¹⁰ However, it is doubtful that Fabianus was an archaizing author. The appearance of such features in the quotations of Fabianus is best explained by contemporary interest in traditional Latin language, as can be seen most notably in the poetry of Vergil.¹¹

The distinctiveness of certain features of Fabianus’ language is highlighted by their contrast with the language of other speakers, especially when the speakers are directly engaged with Fabianus in the context of shared *loci*. Nonetheless, traditional linguistic features do not by themselves constitute a Fabianic identity. Also distinctive in the quotations of Fabianus is an insistence on understanding events and presenting arguments according to moral principles. The traditional features of Fabianus’ language serve to embody and to perform this moralizing perspective; they fashion Fabianus as moral philosopher.

¹⁰ Courtney 1999: 3-6.

¹¹ For Vergil, see Norden 1903: 369-77; Eden 1975: 70.

Chapters 3 and 4 study the more numerous and more diverse quotations of Arellius Fuscus. Chapter 3 employs a methodology similar to that of Chapter 2. A Fuscine identity emerges from the quotations attributed to him by virtue of our ability to discern consistent and idiosyncratic features of his language. These idiosyncratic features consist of a preference for certain kinds of sentence architecture (e.g. long, cohesive word-groups defined by enclosing syntax and phonetic correspondences). And, as most immediately recognizable, Fuscus' features consist of often "impressive" diction: his language is methodically and meaningfully innovative. In several cases the same impressive words or phrases appear in two or more quotations.

A further crucial identifying feature of Fuscus' language is the high incidence in his quotations of what linguists call Presentational sentences. Fuscus, as represented by Seneca's anthology, appears especially interested in descriptions. From the perspective of theoretical linguistics, we see that the informational design of his language is often such that it poses the existence of an object or state of affairs rather than offers comment about an object or state of affairs. By this method readers / auditors are compelled to process Fuscus' language in large, cohesive units; and they are forced to concentrate attention on his language as product rather than to disregard it as transparent medium.

Chapter 4 focuses directly on the question of how the quotations of Arellius Fuscus fit into literary traditions. Several long quotations are analyzed from the small surviving collection of *Suasoriae* (3, 4, 5, 6), where Fuscus is more abundantly represented than any other author. This analysis discovers that, far from being uncreative and slavishly derivative, Fuscus appropriated the language of authors such as Vergil and Cicero, and recombined and reinvented this language to help establish canonical literary

traditions for later authors such as Ovid, the younger Seneca, and Lucan. In the Entries of Fuscus we see elements culled from diverse sources and joined together in new, authoritative patterns.

Thus the patterns established by a rhetor such as Fuscus not only determined the material of declamatory performances (in the form of shared *loci*), they exerted a wider influence that endured over time. We are hereby made sensitive to the significant role played by *patterns* – not just authors – in shaping literary traditions. When authors in written works adopted these authoritative patterns they typically did so without notice, and (I suspect) without real knowledge, of authorial responsibility. The patterns possessed authority, but it was the impersonal and ineluctable authority of tradition, of social practice and social dynamics. The patterns, while built from the competing and idiosyncratic contributions of individuals, are representative of something larger and deeper. They are the expressions of a culture.

Once regarded from this perspective, the precise language of the speakers of Seneca's work can no longer be diminished and dismissed as superficial ornament, ultimately separable from the speakers' thinking and social identities. Identity, we learn, is constituted in every detail of language. We realize (perhaps for the first time) what must be included in an accurate, thick social history of the declaimers of Seneca's anthology: a full and sensitive account of their language, and an understanding of the performative interrelationships between speakers, as evidenced in this language. Here social and literary history begin to overlap and join.

1. The Organization of Seneca's Quotations

1.1 *Seneca's anthology: thema, sententiae, divisiones, colores*

Before examining quotations from select speakers in Seneca's anthology, we must first understand the nature of the anthology¹ – specifically, the principles of organization that inform its quotations.

Seneca's work is a generic anomaly among our surviving ancient texts. Nothing – not even other ancient declamatory collections² – is exactly like it. Despite the uniqueness of the work, some basic structural features are patently clear.³ Each book is prefaced by stylistic portraits of one or more speakers. Next, Seneca ranges relevant material under declamatory 'themes' (*themata*): a theme is a fictitious premise out of

¹ Over three decades ago Lockyer 1971: 2-5, commented on scholars' habit of shirking the most basic questions concerning Seneca's work while turning their attention to other aspects of the text. Cf., also, p. 12: "Seneca's work remains an important source book for modern scholars, while Seneca's own sources remain in turn unexamined." To a large extent this habit has persisted. Since the 1970's there has been increased interest in declamation, including the work of the elder Seneca (see Lentano 1999, Sussman 1984, and Fairweather 1984). However, studies tend to concentrate on the sociology or psychology of declamation; they examine its reflections of social reality; they debate its utility for the courts; or they demonstrate the "baleful" influence it exercised on authors of the first century AD. Meanwhile, fundamental questions languish. E.g., Bloomer 1997a argues that Seneca produced the collection to help him and his family achieve social distinction; that the quotations are not an objective snapshot of speech under Augustus, but have been carefully selected to meet this objective. Although it has a significant bearing on Bloomer's argument, he nowhere mentions the question of the reliability and sources of the quotations. For a stimulating challenge both to traditional and to some current modes of reading Seneca, see Gunderson 2003: 1-25.

² Besides Seneca's work, the Latin declamation collections from antiquity are the *Major* and *Minor Declamations*, both of which traditionally (and, at least in the former case, erroneously) have been ascribed to Quintilian; and the small collection of Calpurnius Flaccus. The *Major* (i.e. "Longer") *Declamations* alone offer declamation speeches in their entirety. For Greek declamation, Russell 1983, is fundamental; see also, for example, Heath 2004; Heath 1995; Innes and Winterbottom 1988. For a recent collection of articles on the practice of declamation over the centuries, see Schröder and Schröder 2003.

³ On the structure of Seneca's anthology, Berti 2007: 25-8; Fairweather 1981: 27-49; Fairweather 1984: 538-40; Sussman 1978: 34-62.

which declaimers composed their speeches.⁴ Six to eight *themata* appear per book. The material subsumed under the *themata* consists of quotations, rhetorical-technical analyses, critical comments, and personal anecdotes. Quotations of speakers appear throughout the material; however, each declamation has been formally partitioned into three sections, with somewhat different types of material appearing under each section. These sections are the *sententiae*, the *divisiones*, and the *colores*.⁵

The *sententiae* are quotations, presented almost exclusively without comment from Seneca.⁶ They are introduced with the speaker's name in the genitive.⁷ This formality is significant: the appearance of a name, as a heading, in the genitive case signals that what follows is a quotation uninterrupted by authorial comment. The quotation is thus isolated from authorial remarks in the same way as a lemma from its commentary.⁸ By contrast, quotations in the *divisiones* and *colores* are not introduced

⁴ On *themata*, Berti 2007: 46-51; Dingel 1988: 16-17. From the perspective of narratology, Pianezzola 1981.

⁵ Hence the title that modern editors apply to Seneca's work: *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*.

⁶ Some violations of this rule: *C.* 1.5.1; 1.7.10. '*Sententiae*' is an unfortunate name for this section. It quickly leads to confusion for the following reasons: 1) Seneca uses the term *sententia* very broadly. It does not strictly refer to an 'epigram,' one of the most common translations of '*sententia*.' It is a quotation – generally short, but otherwise of an unspecified nature. 2) These quotations appear not just in the *sententiae* section, but in every section. In the course of this chapter, starting at the end of Section 1.3, terminology will be introduced to alleviate potential confusion. For Cicero's use of the term *sententia* occasionally to refer to a short speech, see Crawford 1984: 16-19.

⁷ Generally the formula is found solely in the section of *sententiae*; however, it also appears outside this section at *S.* 6.16-26, where Seneca gives a series of quotations from historians writing of Cicero's death.

⁸ Comparable is the organization in the *Declamationes Minores*, where we find parts of fair copies of speeches introduced by the heading *Declamatio* and commentary introduced by the heading *Sermo*. In antiquity lemmata were typically isolated from commentary by projection of the lemma into the left-hand margin (*ekthesis*), by spacing, and by editorial marks, especially the *diple* and *paragraphos*; Turner 1968: 114-18; Del Fabbro 1979: 87-90. An interesting example is Didymos' commentary on Demosthenes (P. Berol. 9780, ~2nd cent. AD): Harding 2006; Gibson 2002. Similar methods of graphic separation of lemmata and commentary appear in our three principal Seneca manuscripts (9th and 10th cent.); the potential impact this may have for interpreting Seneca's work shall be explored in a future study.

with names as headings; names appear in whatever case is required by the syntax of the introductory sentence (e.g. *Albucius dixit*).

The ‘divisions’ are bare outlines of arguments.⁹ These outlines are often listed in indirect statement. The divisions, however, are not limited to outlines of arguments nor to a presentation in indirect statement; rather, they often contain direct quotations, commentary, and anecdotes.

Finally, the ‘colors’ are tendentious perspectives on the circumstances of a case, roughly equivalent to what today we call ‘spin.’¹⁰ Also here we find direct quotations, commentary, and anecdotes.

Although, as I have said, quotations occur in each of the three sections (*sententiae, divisiones, colores*), it is in the *sententiae* that quotations appear without comment. Seneca does not speak here. In addition, a quotation in this first section is often much longer than a quotation elsewhere. It is longer because, in fact, a quotation in the *sententiae* is usually not *one* quotation: it is a *series* of discontinuous excerpts which Seneca has juxtaposed without indicating where one excerpt ends and another begins. The effect of this presentation – at least on the modern reader – can be jarring.¹¹ Absent are more familiar means of maintaining textual cohesion, such as a continuous narrative,

⁹ On *divisiones*, see Berti 2007: 27; Fairweather 1981: 152-65; Sussman 1978: 38-41; Bonner 1949: 56-7.

¹⁰ Seneca is the first to use the term *color* in this sense; Berti 2007: 27-8; Fairweather 1981: 166-78; Sussman 1978: 41-3; Bonner 1949: 55-6.

¹¹ Cf. Winterbottom 1974: xvi-xvii: “Sometimes a continuous section is given. But normally the epigrams are extracted like cherries from a cake, and we are left to infer a context for them. Hence the main difficulty in understanding the book, in Latin and in English. The reader must get on the declamatory wavelength, and realise the cleverness of the declaimers (and its limits) before he can really see what is going on.”

that readers of other literary genres depend upon to make sense of texts. Discontinuity within quotations frequently makes interpretation ambiguous and difficult.

The quotations in the *sententiae*, therefore, are where we least understand the organization of Seneca's anthology. And yet, it is these quotations that form its core.¹² The formal methods by which Seneca presents the collected declamatory material imply an asymmetrical relationship between its different sections: the quotations in the section of *sententiae* stand in relation to the divisions and colors as lemmata to commentary. This is not to deny the tripartite structure of *sententiae*, *divisiones*, *colores*: but the threefold division is operating in counterpoint with a hierarchical division between the so-called *sententiae*, on the one hand, and the *divisiones* and *colores*, on the other.

Moreover, the quotations in the *sententiae*, since they are the longest, are often the richest. They are our best chance to hear a declaimer speak. A study, such as the present one, that wishes to investigate declaimers' language in their own words (rather than relying on what others said of them) will necessarily draw heavily on these quotations. It is imperative that we understand their basic organization.

Therefore, this dissertation is predominately concerned with the organization of quotations that appear in the section of *sententiae*. However, the investigation is by no means limited to these quotations. We are interested in quotations wherever they appear;¹³ furthermore, we are interested in the resources from which Seneca produced the quotations and in the principles and categories of organization that informed these resources.

¹² Sussman 1978: 58.

¹³ Series of discontinuous excerpts appear also outside the section of *sententiae*; e.g. C. 1.1.18-19.

Although Seneca assigns quotations to the different sections of the anthology, in terms of their fundamental organization – that is, in terms of what defines what a quotation is and how it functions – the quotations everywhere are essentially the same. They are, I shall argue, informed by the same principle: the *locus*, more specifically what I shall refer to as the ‘shared *locus*’ (*locus mutuus*).

1.2 Quotations: sequence, sources, reliability

It is widely recognized that quotations given under the *sententiae* consist of discontinuous excerpts and that the borders between these excerpts are often uncertain. However, in these same quotations the reader encounters another uncertainty, one surprisingly seldom mentioned: Does the sequence of excerpts follow the order in which they were included in a speech?¹⁴ My own belief, as I intend to substantiate below, is that the excerpts are non-sequential. This does not mean that the excerpts are always out of order; frequently, it must be admitted, it is difficult to tell. It means, rather, that sequentiality as a principle of organization is not one of Seneca’s priorities. Consequently, excerpts are often out of order and not infrequently even repeat the same material in a way that would likely not be done in a single speech.

Two other questions pertaining to the organization of Seneca’s collection remain matters of lingering debate. Seneca implies in the first preface (*C.* 1 pr. 2-5) that the

¹⁴ Berti 2007: 26, says only that the *sententiae* are recorded one after the other without authorial comment. The question is alluded to briefly by Fairweather 1981: 31-2; Winterbottom 1974: xvi n. 3; and Summers 1910: xxxvi-xxxvii. Bornecque 1902a: ix, implies that the *sententiae* were not couched in a cohesive speech originally, but that the declaimers spoke them one after the other just as they appear in Seneca’s text: “Une fois le sujet posé, ceux qui le traitent commencent par exposer les arguments qui, étant donné les textes de lois invoqués, prouvent la culpabilité ou l’innocence de l’accusé; **ils les présentent isolément, sans qu’on leur demande de se préoccuper de les enchaîner; ce sont les avis, les *sententiae***” [my emphasis]. I can find no mention of the problem in Sussman 1978.

quotations in the book – a book which in its current mutilated state numbers over 370 Teubner pages and in its original form would have been at least twice as long – are drawn from memory. The feat, if true, would be nothing short of astonishing. Some scholars have seen fit to take Seneca nearly at his word; others are skeptical and insist that he must have relied on written materials.¹⁵ A related question is whether the quotations are in fact genuine and accurate.¹⁶ Were the words Seneca attributes to, say, Cestius Pius actually spoken by him? Are the quotations verbatim or was the goal simply to capture the gist of what was said?

These are the most serious questions for anyone who wishes to draw on the veritable treasure that is Seneca's anthology. Unfortunately, conclusive proof on one side of the debate or the other is difficult to come by, and perhaps at times we shall have to be content with our most well reasoned convictions.¹⁷ But at the very least these convictions must be made explicit at the outset.

Some compensation for the absence of decisive proof concerning the three prominent questions – the organization of quotations, their source(s), and their reliability – derives from the fact that these problems are all interrelated. Our conclusions about them must be consistent and support one another. Records based on written materials

¹⁵ Fairweather 1981: 37-42; Fairweather 1984: 540-1. Believers include S. F. Bonner and Michael Winterbottom. Among skeptics are H. Bornecque, G. L. Hendrickson, O. Immisch, C. W. Lockyer, and Sussman 1978: 75-83.

¹⁶ Fairweather 1981: 42-9; Fairweather 1984: 541-3.

¹⁷ Cf. the remark of Gotoff 1984: 166, in his review of J. Fairweather's monograph: "A difficulty for the reader is that there is often no distinction of the relative importance of the questions and the relative level of likely success in solving them." Fairweather 1984: 541, acknowledges that certainty about the exactness of Seneca's quotations is probably unattainable.

will be more reliable than those based on memory.¹⁸ And we should expect that the organization of the anthology will in some fashion bear the imprint of the method that produced it. That is, the view that Seneca uses his memory to reproduce the quotations must take account of their organization and sequence, as does the alternative view that Seneca used notes. Patterns of organization in the quotations are crucial pieces of evidence for discovering how the anthology was made. Nonetheless, studies that involve a close examination of the quotations remain rare.¹⁹ Even arguments for the use of written records have drawn on external probabilities, or on references Seneca makes to rhetorical publications, rather than profiting from an analysis of the quotations themselves.²⁰

My own conviction is that Seneca relied on publications and private notes, his own and probably others', for the vast majority of his collection. It would be foolish to think that Seneca's memory did not play a role in the creation of the anthology, perhaps including unassisted reproduction of some of the quotations.²¹ But the number of quotations for which Seneca's memory is the sole authority must be small. Some basic,

¹⁸ Sussman 1978: 79.

¹⁹ Sussman 1971 and Sussman 1977 address the larger organizational structures of Seneca's work.

²⁰ For example, Lockyer 1971: 158-190. Fairweather 1984: 541 n. 116, points up a weakness of this method: "Lockyer is all too ready to assume that if the elder Seneca mentions a contemporary work on rhetoric he must have drawn on it when compiling his own anthology."

²¹ A debate between memory as source OR written records is possibly too rigid. There is considerable ambiguity as to what is meant by 'memory,' specifically as regards its relationship with writing. *Commentarii*, notes, and writing in general can be thought of in various ways: they may serve as *aides-mémoires*, prompting the memory when it falters; the act of recording may be regarded as remembering; and the recorded notes themselves may be seen as memories. See Pugliarello 1997: 106. Porcius Latro's declamation exercises (C. 1 pr. 17-18) are emblematic of this complexity. His memory was so powerful, Seneca says, that he made notes (*codices*) superfluous. And yet he wrote. Remembering and writing were performed simultaneously. The written record that was a product of these exercises was a record/memory of what was in Latro's head and what he spoke.

and I think persuasive, arguments in support of this view have already been presented by others. I shall give no more than a summary here of their chief points, in the process occasionally supplying my own, corroborating observations.

The challenge that the sheer volume of quotations would pose to even the most gifted memory has already been mentioned. So far as I am aware, no one has attempted to defend the view that memory was Seneca's sole or primary source with any serious, detailed discussion of how he might have done this. Even an exceptional memory has its methods,²² and if the theory is to be countenanced at all, it must support itself with something more than blind faith.²³

But there are additional grounds for doubt, I believe, if we consider just what Seneca is offering his readers. His record of quotations is invested in accuracy of detail to a degree not required of, for example, storytellers or musicians who rely upon their memory. High expectations for accuracy are raised by Seneca himself when he boasts that he will be able to reproduce quotations faithfully, correcting inveterate misattributions.²⁴ But we can only begin to truly appreciate the immensity of the task when we observe how close the declaimers often are to one another in what they say.

²² Cf. the books by the professional mnemonist Dominic O'Brien, e.g., O'Brien 2000; O'Brien 1993 (difficult to find). On memory techniques in the ancient world, some of which O'Brien uses, see Blum 1969 and Small 1997. For the middle ages, see Carruthers 1998 and Carruthers 1990. Carruthers 1998, since she is considering not just memory but the organization of thought, shows a way to move beyond the antithesis of memory versus writing.

²³ At the heart of this debate can be seen the Platonic dichotomy between orality and literacy. For an exemplary study that does not regard these two as antithetical, Haskins 2004: 10-30.

²⁴ C. 1 pr. 11: *fere enim aut nulli commentarii maximorum declamatorum extant aut, quod peius est, falsi. itaque, ne aut ignoti sint aut aliter quam debent noti, summa cum fide suum cuique reddam.* See, for instance, C. 10 pr. 12: *amabam itaque Capitonem, cuius declamatio est de Popillio, quae misero Latroni subicitur.*

Declaimers like Argentarius and Triarius are notorious for stealing from others,²⁵ and even the most skilled speaker, like Arellius Fuscus, borrows from his colleagues in an effort to outdo them.²⁶ They are not alone. As I hope to make evident in the discussion to follow, overlap between speakers in Seneca’s record is not exceptional, but typical. For the moment, two examples of overlap should suffice. First, compare Julius Bassus’ and Florus’ descriptions of a banquet of Quinctius Flamininus at which a criminal was executed.²⁷ Points of especially close overlap are underlined.²⁸

C. 9.2.4 (Julius Bassus): *inter temulentas reliquias sumptuosissimae cenae et fastidiosos ob ebrietatem cibos modo excisum humanum caput fertur; inter purgamenta et iactus cenantium et sparsam in convivio scobem humanus sanguis everritur.*

C. 9.2.24 (Florus): *refulsit inter privata pocula publicae securis acies. inter temulentas ebriorum reliquias humanum everritur caput.*

Second, Junius Gallio and the rhetor Musa explain the diversity of human nature. Both end with the point that even pirates can be merciful.

C. 7.1.13 (Junius Gallio): *mitioris natura pectoris sum, mollioris animi. non idem omnibus mortalibus natura tribuit ingenium: animus durior est illius, <illius> clementior. apud piratas quoque invenitur qui non possit occidere.*

C. 7.1.14 (Musa): *obicit mihi molliores animus: alius mitior est plus quam debet, alius saevior quam necesse est, mediis alius adfectibus inter utrumque positus totus in sua potestate est. quidam et accusare et damnare possunt et occidere; quidam tam mites sunt, ut non possint in caput ne testimonium quidem dicere. non possum hominem occidere: hoc vitium et apud piratas invenitur.*

²⁵ For Argentarius, see esp. C. 9.3.12, where Argentarius’ former teacher Cestius Pius calls him his “ape.” Also, cf. C. 1.5.1. For Triarius, see esp. C. 10.5.20, where Cassius Severus calls him a thief; cf. also C. 7.1.25, 9.6.11, and 10.5.20.

²⁶ At C. 9.1.13, Arellius Fuscus declares that he does not steal; he competes with his model: *et aiebat non commendationis id se aut furti sed exercitationis causa facere; do, inquit, operam, ut cum optimis sententiis certem, nec illas surripere conor sed vincere*.

²⁷ For the event, Cic. *Sen.* 42, Livy 39.42-3, and V. Max. 2.9.3.

²⁸ The text for these two passages, and all subsequent passages, is based on Håkanson 1989a.

Such proximity is capable not only of confounding the memory (and so causing one to misassign quotations), but by its very nature it demands precision. In cases where overlap exists, the option of being content with the gist of what was said is eliminated;²⁹ to fail to offer details would be to fail altogether. Distinction between declaimers is very often in the details.

There is much to be said for the idea that Seneca's references to his memory stem from a time-honored literary convention.³⁰ In a 1971 dissertation, C. W. Lockyer draws on the work of G. L. Hendrickson and Otto Immisch³¹ to demonstrate that the trope of a powerful memory as source arose out of the literary dialogue. How the convention could easily have spread from the dialogue to a rhetorical anthology such as Seneca's can be seen, for example, in the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus (2nd century AD) and the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius (5th century AD).³² These works are a mixture of dialogue and scholarly compilation, and their authors do not hesitate to use the trope of memory in

²⁹ According to Lockyer 1971: 14, it is the opinion of Simonds 1896 (I have not seen), that Seneca is giving us the essence of what the declaimers said. Lockyer, *ibid.*, quotes from Simonds' dissertation (p. 50): "...still we may assert that Seneca was a subjective writer with a very powerful memory which enabled him to reproduce the characteristics of the different rhetors." Mirmont 1913: 385, 387, too thinks that Seneca is capturing the gist of what was said. But, he believes that the quotations are generally in the style of Seneca and not in the styles of the individual declaimers whom he quotes; Seneca is producing the *substance* of what was said. Thus, in Mirmont's view, stylistic study of the declaimers is fruitless. I strongly disagree with Mirmont, whose opinion does not take account of the degree of overlap between quotations: since he would necessarily attribute the often slight (but important) differences between quotations to Seneca, overlaps (such as in the two examples given) would amount to little more than repetitions. At the very least, Mirmont's opinion leaves unexplained what the interest could be in overlapping quotations, if it is not in a contrast of details. Simonds' idea is part and parcel of his belief that Seneca's source is his memory, which I reject.

³⁰ The standard work is Janson 1964. But Janson's discussion of the elder Seneca is brief (pp. 49-50).

³¹ Lockyer 1971; Hendrickson 1906; Immisch 1929.

³² Lockyer 1971: 191. Also, in the same study, separate chapters are devoted to "the memory technique" in Plato, Xenophon, and Cicero.

spite of its patent artificiality. Immisch goes so far as to assert (and I agree) that Seneca likely never expected his readers to believe he was actually using his memory.³³

We must be careful not to undervalue the degree of artifice that informs Seneca's work. The tendency to take at face value Seneca's suggestion that memory is his sole source originates in part, I suspect, from an instinctive contempt for the collection or its contents. It may be easier to dismiss a work if we imagine that it has been created almost spontaneously from memory, and therefore is presumed to be disorganized. But if we are willing to entertain the possibility that Seneca has created a large compilation from written sources, the foresight, organizational acumen, and intellectual investment that this implies demands respect. To my way of thinking, such efforts in themselves validate the contents of the collection and render it worthy of close study.

And, apart from the trope of memory as source, there is much else that is artificial in how Seneca presents his material. For instance, Seneca is careful to give a portrait of speakers in the prefaces to those books in which quotations from the speakers are most abundant.³⁴ Each preface is cast in the form of a letter, itself a literary convention,³⁵ addressed to Seneca's three sons. But his sons, as Janet Fairweather rightly observes,³⁶ would have been adults at the purported time of the letters and the patronizing tone he assumes towards them is affected. Awareness of such artifice in the anthology does not

³³ Immisch 1929: 114-5.

³⁴ Sussman 1971 sees thematic unity between the first preface and that of the tenth. Also, see Sussman 1977; Sussman 1978: 45-75. Despite these important contributions, Sussman occasionally adopts a simplistic reading of Seneca's proclamations. For example, citing *C.* 10 pr. 1, Sussman 1977: 323, thinks that Seneca himself regarded declamation as a "frivolous and trivial pursuit," and that he wanted to direct his sons away from declamation towards "true literature."

³⁵ Janson 1964: 106-112.

³⁶ Fairweather 1981: 27.

render Seneca's statements meaningless or ineffective: it simply advises us that not all Seneca says should be taken at face value.

Furthermore, I would submit that Seneca is a more self-conscious, deliberate stylist than is sometimes acknowledged. Henry Bardon had a dim view of Seneca both as literary critic and stylist.³⁷ He wrote mechanically ("en automate"), Bardon thought, and was so imbued with the styles of the declaimers that he could not help but write like them – virtually a crime for any "respectable" author, but especially inappropriate in Bardon's estimation for a work of literary criticism.³⁸ The possibility does not seem to occur to him that Seneca has carefully *chosen* the style he uses, and to good effect. At *S.* 7.11-12, Seneca tells us that a certain declaimer cultivated the very distasteful stylistic feature of contrasting two words that differ by a single syllable (e.g. *scripsit* vs. *proscripsit*). Immediately following the comment, Seneca proceeds to tell us that another declaimer named Surdinus would speak *dulces sententiae*, but too often the *sententiae* were *praedulces*! Rather than being fettered by perceived shortcomings of his education, Seneca seems to wear an ironic smile here.³⁹

At the same time we know from Seneca himself, as well as from other sources, that if one had the will to avail himself of them plenty of written materials were

³⁷ Bardon 1940; Bardon 1943.

³⁸ Bardon 1943: 9.

³⁹ Play with prefixes is not an exclusively declamatory "fault"; cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1.30 (*reprimi* contrasted with *comprimi*). For similar humor in the elder Seneca, see *C.* 5.2: *Saenianus rem stultissimam dixit: dives me semper contempsit, numquam nisi pro mortuo habuit. ut aliquid et ipse simile Saeniano dicam, post hanc sententiam semper Saenianum pro mortuo habui.* A different kind of example of a formal device used to underscore a critical observation appears at *C.* 1.7.16, where Seneca uses alliteration ('t') to mimic Latro's vehemence: "Latro...summoned all his powers in such a great rush throughout the speech that his audience was dumbstruck" (*Latro...advocavit vires suas tanto totius actionis impetu, ut attonitos homines tenuerit*).

available.⁴⁰ The variety and specialized nature of the materials are impressive: editions of complete speeches, including opposition pieces to orations already in circulation;⁴¹ outlines of speeches called *commentarii*, in which some portions would have already received detailed treatment;⁴² works of literary criticism and scholarship;⁴³ collections of figures of speech;⁴⁴ and at least one collection of *colores*.⁴⁵

Very likely there were collections of *divisiones* and *sententiae* as well. Seneca's ambiguous references to well-known *sententiae* in circulation must in part mean circulation by written recordings.⁴⁶ That Porcius Latro consistently appears in the section on divisions could be because Seneca has managed to acquire his schoolmate's notes,⁴⁷ among which surely was a collection of divisions. Latro had the unusual and impressive habit of forecasting to his auditors the structure of the declamation he was about to speak. He would give them an outline of the *quaestiones* on which the logic of his argument hinged (*C.* 1 pr. 21). These outlines are *divisiones*. Because of this habit, even if Seneca

⁴⁰ The survey of sources by Sussman 1978: 75-83, on which I rely heavily here, is excellent.

⁴¹ *C.* 3 pr. 15, Cestius Pius wrote opposition speeches to Cicero's speeches; *C.* 10 pr. 8, Junius Gallio wrote a defense speech to counter Labienus' attack on Mycenus' freedman, Batthylus. References to Gallio in later authors: Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.91 (Porcius Latro also mentioned); Statius, *Silu.* 2.7.32; Tac. *Dial.* 26; Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 5.10.3.

⁴² *C.* 1 pr. 11, *C.* 3 pr. 6, and possibly *C.* 10 pr. 3 (*libelli* of Scaurus, whose published speeches, *orationes*, were burned). Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.7.30, and for *commentarii* in general, Kennedy 1972: 287.

⁴³ *C.* 9.6.18 (Votienus Montanus); Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.23 refers to a book on the letter 's' by Valerius Messala Corvinus, whose comments and criticisms appear in Seneca.

⁴⁴ P. Rutilius Lupus (early 1st cent. AD) made a Latin abridgment of a book of figures by Gorgias (mid 1st cent. BC), who was the teacher of Cicero's son and who appears in Seneca's collection (*C.* 1.4.7). Two books of Lupus' collection survive; see Halm 1863: 3-21. Also, Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.102-106.

⁴⁵ In four books by Junius Otho, *C.* 2.1.33.

⁴⁶ *C.* 2.4.9 (Romanius Hispo); *C.* 9.2.23 (a popular misattribution to Latro); *C.* 10.1.14 (Albucius Silus comments on the *sententiae* of Latro in circulation); *C.* 10.5.26 (Latro); *S.* 1.11 (Glycon); *S.* 2.11 (Dorion).

⁴⁷ Lockyer 1971: 181-2; Bornecque 1902b: 29.

did not become the curator of Latro's notes, a collection of Latro's divisions could easily have been made by auditors and circulated among interested parties. Also, Seneca's record of Arellius Fuscus' famous descriptive passages (*descriptiones* or *explicationes*) probably derives from an anthology.⁴⁸

The diverse types of rhetorical works mentioned are the products of a literary culture devoted to amassing short quotations, eagerly seeking them out like precious stones, filling private notebooks with them, and sharing them with friends.⁴⁹ In such an environment the line between collections intended for wide circulation and private notes would have been faint indeed. And as Quintilian's complaints (*Inst.* 1 pr. 7-8) about unauthorized books circulating under his name demonstrate, works could easily appear without a speaker's consent.

In addition, excerpting passages while reading seems to have been a common practice among the *litterati* – one not exclusive to Seneca's lifetime nor to Latin. Plutarch (*De tranq. anim.* 464F-465A), for example, was able to draw on an ample store of excerpts when composing a treatise.⁵⁰ In the preface (1-3) to the *Noctes Atticae* Aulus Gellius explains how his compilation was assembled from excerpts made while reading.

⁴⁸ S. 2.10, 23; 3.7.

⁴⁹ Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 20.4: *iam vero iuvenes et in ipsa studiorum incude positi, qui profectus sui causa oratores sectantur, non solum audire sed etiam referre domum aliquid inlustre et dignum memoria volunt, traduntque in vicem ac saepe in colonias ac provincias suas scribunt, sive sensus aliquis arguta et brevi sententia effulsit sive locus exquisito et poetico cultu enituit.* “But young people, those who have been set upon the educational anvil, who chase after orators to improve their skill, are not content to listen merely. They also want to have some expression to take home, something brilliant and memorable. They exchange these with one another and often send them out to their colonies and provinces – whether it is a quotation gleaming with a clever, pithy phrase, or a passage bright with choice and poetic refinement.” Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.11.7; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 42.4-5.

⁵⁰ Cf. also Cic. *Inu.* 2.4.

He then (pr. 5-9) gives a long list of titles, both Greek and Latin, typically assigned to such miscellanies.⁵¹

However, the most famous account of excerpting is the younger Pliny's description of his uncle's voracious reading habits (*Ep.* 3.5), who read or was read to constantly and never failed to have excerpts made at the same time.⁵² Upon his death he left his nephew one hundred-sixty papyrus rolls filled, front and back, with excerpts and notes. The nature of such a collection, its purpose and worth must have been readily understood, for when the elder Pliny was *procurator* in Spain a man offered to buy it (3.5.17).⁵³ Most intriguing is the fact that the elder Pliny too composed a declamatory collection that was probably very similar to Seneca's.⁵⁴ We can hardly doubt that in making his compilation Pliny employed the same method that he applied to his encyclopedia – systematized notes.⁵⁵

1.3 Sententiae are non-sequential

Now it will be worthwhile to turn to the text of Seneca itself. First, we must dispense with an assumption supported by M. Winterbottom in his 1974 Loeb edition, xvi n. 3: “My impression is that Seneca groups the epigrams in the order in which they came

⁵¹ Holford-Strevens 2003: 27-9.

⁵² *Ep.* 3.5.10: *Nihil enim legit quod non exciperet; dicere etiam solebat nullum esse librum tam malum ut non aliqua parte prodesset.*

⁵³ For discussions of excerpting and the use of excerpts in composing, see Van Den Hoek 1996; Bloomer 1992: 59-146; Mejer 1978: 16-29; Skydsgaard 1968: 101-116.

⁵⁴ *Gel.* 9.16; Bonner 1949: 77-8.

⁵⁵ On Pliny's methods, see Dorandi 2000: 27-50; Naas 1996; Locher and Rottländer 1985; Locher 1986.

in the declamation.”⁵⁶ It is very often the case that we cannot determine if *sententiae* follow the sequence of an original speech. We simply do not have enough context. However, there are a sufficient number of instances where the *sententiae* gathered under a declaimer’s name quite plainly are not arranged in linear sequence, so that we should never assume *a priori* that they are in sequential order. I offer four representative examples.

Example 1. In the theme to this declamation (C. 2.5) a woman is tortured by a tyrant to exact information about her husband’s plot to kill him. The woman reveals nothing. Afterwards, the woman’s husband kills the tyrant. The tyrannicide divorces his wife on the grounds that she is barren. A charge of ingratitude is brought against the husband. The quotation, which I reproduce in full, is spoken by Porcius Latro on behalf of the wife.⁵⁷

2.5.1. *si cum liberis torta esset, indicasset. (1) ‘escende’, inquit, ‘occide tyrannum. nisi occideris, indicabo.’ sub<it>o iniecta manu satelles ‘quid moraris?’ inquit, ‘iam exposita tormenta sunt.’ ‘bene est’ inquit mulier, ‘ad stuprum non vocor.’ instabat cotidie viro uxor, exigebat tyrannicidium: (2) ‘tempus est, escende, si nihil aliud, ut liberos habeas: in tyrannide paritura non sum. miraris, si eo tempore *** matrona potuit?’⁵⁸ (3) escende, occide tyrannum; comes sequerer, nisi me inutilem dimisisset tyrannus. (4) escende: ego iam feci tyrannicidium meum.’ eas nuptias tyrannicidium diduxit, quas non diduxit tyrannus.*

⁵⁶ Winterbottom’s opinion is not universal. Summers 1910: xxxvi-xxxvii, is closest to what I think is the truth: “Seneca gives us the ‘best things’ out of the declamations, not the declamations themselves, and as he follows no logical order in doing this the strain upon the reader’s mind is considerable.” Summers is correct that the text can be challenging; but he is wrong that there is no logical order.

⁵⁷ Håkanson capitalizes the first letter of a sentence when he believes it is disconnected from what precedes; see Håkanson 1989a: xvi, and Håkanson 1978: xiv. I have removed the capitalization here to allow for a fresh interpretation of the quotation’s organization.

⁵⁸ Asterisks mark where modern editors believe there is a lacuna in the text. Müller 1887 (adapting a conjecture from Bursian 1857), suggests: *parere non potui, quo a tyranno torqueri matrona potuit?*

The repetition of the wife’s exhortations to her husband, which I have numbered and underlined, is striking. Four times in this short passage we hear the wife commanding her husband to ascend the tyrant’s citadel to kill him. It may be there is nothing strange about a speaker repeating himself in this way; indeed, an author such as the younger Seneca sometimes applies similar repetitions of a phrase as a compositional strategy. So, for example, *Ep.* 47.1:

‘Serui sunt.’ immo homines. ‘Serui sunt.’ immo contubernales. ‘Serui sunt.’ immo humiles amici. ‘Serui sunt.’ immo conserui, si cogitaueris tantundem in utrosque licere fortunae.

In the present case, however, the intervention of material between the first exhortation and the other three,⁵⁹ renders the sequence of *sententiae* puzzling. We observe that each of the exhortations is part of a formula: exhortation followed by pointed epigram. The exhortation sets up a frame of reference,⁶⁰ while the epigram delivers the “punch” – an argument condensed into a clever phrase. *Ep.* 47.1 follows a similar formula. Therefore, if *Latro* used these repeated formulae together as a compositional strategy, such as we see in the Seneca epistle, then why are they separated in the quotation? If, on the other hand, their repetition is not part of a compositional strategy, why are they so similar?⁶¹

⁵⁹ If there were not a lacuna, we might see a break also between the second and third *sententiae*.

⁶⁰ *Escende, occide tyrannum*, and *Escende*, in the third and fourth exhortations respectively may serve as ‘context labels’ (see below, esp. Section 1.4; also, Section 1.7 and 1.8). That is, they are not full quotations but serve to indicate the context and set up the epigrams that follow.

⁶¹ A similar example is found at *C.* 9.6.8. The theme tells of a man who marries again after his first wife dies. He has a son from his first marriage and a daughter from the second. The son is killed, and when the stepmother is accused she names their daughter as accomplice. *Triarius*, quoted in full, speaks on behalf of the father (capitalization of Håkanson 1989a is retained): *‘Filia’ inquit ‘tua conscia est’; videbatur sibi post hanc vocem vicisse. Amissum fratrem fleuit in funere, totius populi lacrimas suis expressit; itaque illam noverca peius perire voluit quam privignum. ‘Filia’ inquit ‘conscia est’: hoc ultimum fuit novercae veneficium.* Observe the same formularity – repeated quotation from the stepmother, then pointed epigram.

Suspicion that the order of *sententiae* is presented non-sequentially is deepened when we observe the order of events in the case. It is only *after* the wife is tortured that she urges her husband to kill the tyrant. This is clear from the epigrams that follow the third and fourth exhortations: (3) “Ascend, kill the tyrant. I would accompany you, if the tyrant had not incapacitated me” (i.e. through torture); (4) “Ascend. I already committed *my* tyrannicide” (i.e. by submitting to torture and not talking). It is also implied in the first exhortation: (1) “Ascend, kill the tyrant. If you do not kill him, I will inform against you” (i.e. though torture could not make me do it). And yet, inserted between the first and other three exhortations, we find a description of the wife being taken away to be tortured. The order of *sententiae* is entirely indifferent to the sequence of events.⁶²

Given the apparent irregularities in sequence, it is possible to interpret these formulaic *sententiae* (exhortation + epigram) not as deriving from a single speech, but rather to view them as roughly alternative versions of each other: one or two would be used in a speech, not all of them. They may have been spoken by Porcius Latro on different occasions, and Seneca or Latro’s students may have recorded them.⁶³ Or, Latro himself may have written up these *sententiae* as alternative versions; as Seneca tells us

Both of the underlined Entries refer to the crucial moment when the stepmother seeks to hurt her husband by claiming their daughter was complicit in the son’s death.

⁶² Of course there is nothing that says a narrative of events must strictly follow a chronological order. But the formularity of the exhortations strongly argues that, if used in a single speech, they would be used together.

⁶³ Arnim 1898: 171-8, believes that repetitions in the surviving texts of Dio Chrysostom are due to the recording of his speeches, on different occasions, by auditors; a parallel is drawn (pp. 172-3) with the collection of the elder Seneca. Tachygraphy (stenography), according to von Arnim, would have made such recordings possible. On stenography in the ancient world, see e.g. Torallas Tovar and Worp 2006.

(C. 1. pr. 23), he was wont to spend days writing nothing but concluding epigrams (*epiphonemata*) and rhetorical syllogisms (*enthymemata*).⁶⁴

If this is the case, we may still wonder why the first exhortation is separated from the others. This question will be explored more below; for the moment may it suffice to point out that both the first exhortation and the sentence that precedes it (*si cum liberis torta esset, indicasset*) are concerned with the wife's power to betray the plot; both are united by a form of the verb *indicare*. Such overlapping interests and words between *sententiae* could usefully serve as organizing terms in the process of collecting quotations.

Example 2. I offer another example from the same declamation, possibly the most glaring instance in the collection. Seneca supplies a quotation, of relatively generous length, from Cestius Pius within which there are two alternative descriptions of the wife being dragged away for torture. The quotation is reproduced below from approximately the half-way point to the end. Håkanson's breaks between *sententiae*, indicated by capital letters, are retained:

2.5.3. *veniunt in domum crudelissimi carnifices, in quorum vultibus tormenta erant. iactatur misera inter satellitum manus et toto itinere non ducitur sed trahitur. hanc aliquis, si torta non sit, mirabitur non peperisse, cum cogitar<et> iste de tyrannicidio (audacter iam consilium indicamus: iam enim, puto, licet)? Nupsit isti propter liberos, sed infelices nuptias cito tyrannus oppressit; hoc publicum divortium fuit. Rapitur in arcem mulier, inter satellitum manus vexatur atque distrahitur; hanc aliquis, etiam si non torqueatur, non parere miretur? Imposita in eculeum saepius ad absentem virum respexit quam ad praesentem tyrannum. Quam multas matres audivi illo tempore: 'quidnam volui, quae peperit!'*

That the underlined portions are variants of each other is beyond dispute. Not surprisingly, the similarity has not escaped the eyes of textual critics. However, it has not

⁶⁴ For *epiphonemata* and *enthymemata*, Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.11; 11.1.52; 5.14.1-4, 24-26.

induced them to attempt to emend the text by deletion or other methods. L. Håkanson in the apparatus to his edition calls the second description a *variatio* of the first, and D. R. Shackleton Bailey suggests that Seneca has made a mistake here.⁶⁵ But this type of repetition is not unique in the collection, and there is no basis for believing that its appearance is the result of an oversight on Seneca's part.⁶⁶

Example 3. According to this theme (C. 7.1), a man loses his wife by whom he has two sons. He marries again. At a private tribunal the father convicts one of his sons of attempted parricide and entrusts him to the second son for punishment. Instead of meting out the standard punishment for parricides, the second son consigns his brother to a ship that possesses no rigging. The brother survives and ends up a pirate chief. Later on, when the father is traveling abroad, he is captured by his pirate son, who releases his father. The father renounces the second son. The quotation, which is spoken in the son's defense, is taken from Cestius Pius.⁶⁷

7.1.8. *Erat navigium – immo fuerat – sed putre, resolutis compagibus, infelix omen navigationis.*⁶⁸ *'Insue me culleo: certe sentiam maria, non et videbo.'* *Scissa quoque vela fecerant sinus, et armatas classes naufraga praecesserat ratis: scires navigare qui servaturus esset patrem. O crudelis et pertinax noverca! post omnia devicta nihilominus saevit: maria iam quiescunt, praedones iam miserentur, irati iam parcunt. Ibamus praeter sepulcrum matris, ille mortem timens, ego scelus.*

⁶⁵ Shackleton Bailey 1969: 325.

⁶⁶ There is, in fact, a second overlap within the same quotation of Cestius Pius: *Subito infelicis nuptias tyrannus oppressit* (2.5.2), and *Nupsit isti propter liberos, sed infelices nuptias cito tyrannus oppressit* (2.5.3). Gertz wanted to delete the first sentence, but Håkanson 1989a and Müller 1887 rightly retain it. Winterbottom 1974 brackets the first instance.

⁶⁷ Divisions between *sententiae* are that of Håkanson 1989a.

⁶⁸ The portion of text cited contains a textual difficulty, one however that does not impact my argument. Editors, beginning with Kiessling (who was acceding to the counsel of Fr. Haase) but followed by all subsequent editors, moved the beginning of our quotation (*Erat navigium - immo fuerat - sed*), and also a portion of the preceding quotation from Triarius, up from its position between *patrem* and *O crudelis...* to its present position.

Expectate, iudices; iam Fortuna nobis obiciet scelus. Iacebat navigium pervetus et attritum salo, vix unius capax animae.

It appears that a stock portion of this declamation was a description of the delapidated boat to which the parricide brother was confined. The two underlined *sententiae* from Cestius above attest to this, and a very similar *sententia* from Blandus corroborates this possibility.⁶⁹ What is surprising, if we assume that *sententiae* are sequentially arranged fragments taken from a single speech, is that the quotation of Cestius actually offers portions from two descriptions; fuller descriptions, I believe, would have accompanied the two sentences.

But the affinity of the two *sententiae* to each other extends beyond the fact that both describe the boat. The *sententiae* are exactly parallel in that they are both designed to introduce a *descriptio*: both begin with a verb in the imperfect followed by the subject (*navigium*) of the description. It is a formula for the introduction of a tableau that would have been quickly recognized by the ancient reader of Seneca's anthology.⁷⁰ The inevitable conclusion, then, if we are to believe the underlined sentences occurred in the

⁶⁹ 7.1.6: *Iacebat in litore navigium, quod etiam integrum infeliciter vexerat.* On *descriptions* in declamations, see Bonner 1949: 58-60. Also, it is unlikely that the *sententiae* of Blandus are in the order they would have occurred in a speech. As Håkanson 1989a has correctly delimited them with capitals, there are four *sententiae* appearing in the following order: 1) description of the boat (given above) 2) the son rejects the idea that his brother is a parricide (*Credam...reddidit*) 3) portion of narrative in which the son loses his nerve to punish his brother in the manner prescribed for parricides (*Subito...pater.*) 4) an oath by which the son swears that his brother the parricide suffered at his hand (*Ita...fratrem*). The second and fourth *sententiae* could appear almost anywhere in a speech. But since the first and third *sententiae* must each figure in the speaker's account of how he came to place his brother in a boat rather than in a sack, they would have been carefully articulated with one another. That is, the speaker would tell how he intended to punish his brother in the prescribed manner, but found that he simply could not (3rd *sententia*). Next, he would have told how the idea came to him of putting his brother in a boat, at which point he would have given a *descriptio*, portraying the boat as extremely run-down and not seaworthy (1st *sententia*).

⁷⁰ Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: 601, Anmerkung 4. This type of sentence will figure prominently in the discussions of Chapters 3 and 4.

same speech, is that there were two set descriptions of the same subject in one speech – an eventuality that is highly unlikely.⁷¹

Example 4. The premise to the fifth *suasoria* is a deliberation among the Athenians whether to remove the trophies set up at the end of the Persian Wars. Xerxes threatens to return unless they are removed. The long quotation of Arellius Fuscus contains an unmistakable overlap. In the edition of Håkanson, who in the apparatus criticus acknowledges the close similarity of the two passages,⁷² the two blocks of text are separated by twelve lines.

S. 5.1 (H 354,8-10)⁷³ tot caesa milia, nihil ex tanta acie relictum minanti, nisi quod vix fugientem sequi possit; totiens mersa classis. quid Marathona, quid Salamina referam? pudet dicere: dubitamus adhuc, an vicerimus.

S. 5.2 (H 354,23-25) extincta tot ante Xersen milia, tot sub ipso iacent: nulli nisi qui fugerunt supersunt. quid dicam Salamina? quid Cynaegiron referam et te, Polyzele? et hoc agitur, an viceris!

⁷¹ There is perhaps another repetition within the long quotation of Albucius Silus at 7.1.2 and 7.1.3. In his own defense the son says that his brother obtained nothing from him other than not to die in a sack (7.1.2): *nihil aliud impetravit, quam ut aliter quam in culleo moreretur.* At the end of the quotation of Albucius, the son quotes his parricide brother as saying essentially the same thing (7.1.3): *hoc pietatis tuae munus ad inferos perferam, licuisse mihi per fratrem aliter quam parricidae mori.*

⁷² Håkanson 1989a: *ad loc.* at lines 8-10, merely advises, “cf. l. 23-25.” He was not the first to notice the overlap. Textual critics have attempted to emend *viceris* of the manuscripts (*vicerimus* Otto, *viceritis* Kiessling, *vicerim* Gertz), clearly in part to bring it in line with *vicerimus* in the first passage. Clausen 1976 rightly defends the transmitted reading. It is significant that the second passage does not merely repeat the first, it varies it: it is an alternative approach. Other examples: *C.* 2.1.4 and 8 (H 68,9-10 and 69,18-20; for this notation, see the following note) is also a long quotation of Arellius Fuscus. Editors emend the second passage, but even after emendation it remains a variation of the first. An overlap at *C.* 1.2.9 and 10 (H 21,12-14 and H 21,22-24) induced Håkanson 1989a, to consider attributing the parallel passages to two different speakers; in the apparatus at line 22: “*fortasse uel hic uel paulo ante rhetoris nomen excidit, cum hoc loco eadem fere dicantur quae l. 13 sq. legimus.*”

⁷³ When paragraph numbers are inadequate, I give the page and line number of Håkanson 1989a. So, H 354,8-10 = page 354, lines 8-10.

The fact is, we cannot be certain of the order in which *sententiae* appear under a declaimer's name in Seneca's anthology. At the very least, it cannot be assumed that *sententiae* have been recorded in the order they occurred in a speech. Nor can it be assumed that *sententiae* are excerpts from a single speech delivered on one occasion. The above examples I believe have removed any justification for such assumptions. Apart from the fact that Seneca tells us that *sententiae* were sometimes written independently of a speech (*C.* 1. pr. 23), we observe in reading the anthology that *sententiae* can offer themselves as alternative approaches, as variants of each other, or what I shall call Versions.⁷⁴ If, then, we cannot contextualize our reading by relying on basic and seemingly intuitive reading strategies, what are we left with? Are *sententiae* just a chaotic heap? This question will be explored in the following section.

A further note on terminology. Henceforth, when referring to the brief, continuous pieces of text that together with other such pieces make up a quotation, instead of *sententia* I shall use the term 'Entry.' *Sententia*, and also 'excerpt,' are at times misleading and can prejudice interpretations; 'Entry' has been chosen to serve as a neutral term.⁷⁵ *Sententia* suggests an epigram,⁷⁶ which many of the Entries, especially

⁷⁴ The boundary between Entries that are Versions and those that are not is fluid. It should not be thought that an Entry can be definitively assigned to one category or the other. To be sure, even those Entries that are clearly Versions of each other are never exactly equivalent, since it is always possible that slight differences would lend Versions to slightly different applications. – The presence of different Versions, usually regarded as the product of disorganized notes, has been recognized in the *Declamationes Minores*; Leo 1960: 256; Winterbottom 1984: xii.

⁷⁵ 'Entry' is neutral in so far as it does not cause us immediately to associate these stand-alone units in Seneca's anthology with epigrams or fragments. However, there is also a positive rationale for 'Entry' since it usefully differentiates the database-like organization of Seneca's anthology from texts that have a primarily linear, narrative organization. For the importance of this distinction, particularly in the modern age and its rapid developments of new communication technologies, see Manovich 2001: 225.

⁷⁶ For the interpretive latitude that must accompany the term *sententia*, see Berti 2007: 26-7, who says that a *sententia* in Seneca's work can be general and gnomic, or specific to the case at hand; he adds (p. 26): "*sententia* è per Seneca ogni tipo di 'frase a effetto', caratterizzata da brevità, brillantezza di espressione,

the longer units, are manifestly not. ‘Excerpt’ necessarily implies that a piece of text has been cut from a larger body of text; that the text is fragmented and incomplete. But, as we have just seen, Entries need not be fragments, since they do not necessarily derive from a speech. And, as the survey above of Seneca’s potential sources should make clear, a good number of rhetorical compilations could have consisted predominantly of these kinds of brief, internally coherent pieces of texts. The fact that such textual pieces were able to circulate, that (as Tac. *Dial.* 20.4 tells us) enthusiasts sent them abroad, means that they were meaningful as sovereign, stand-alone units.

1.4 Seneca’s collection limited by supporting documents

The most basic, irreducible unit of organization is the individual Entry. Since Henri Bornecque’s 1902 edition, editors have demarcated the separate units within a quotation by means of punctuation.⁷⁷ Bornecque and Winterbottom 1974 use hyphens; Håkanson 1989a capitalizes the first letter of each unit.⁷⁸ There is no question but that this editorial practice provides a convenient service to the reader. However, we must be cognizant of the basis of this editorial practice and remain sensitive to its interpretive implications.

concentrazione di pensiero, che nel breve giro di un periodo ricapitola gli aspetti salienti del discorso che si sta svolgendo.” Even the latitude of this definition cannot account for Entries that are paragraph-length (5-6 sentences); e.g. Arellius Fuscus in *S.* 2-5.

⁷⁷ Bornecque 1902a: iii: “l’on a essayé de séparer les uns des autres les arguments sans lien logique, que Sénèque met dans la bouche des différents rhéteurs, et que, jusqu’ici, l’on présentait comme un texte suivi.”

⁷⁸ Winterbottom 1991: 339, observes that capitalization alone can lead to ambiguity when a sentence begins with a proper noun. Therefore, Sussman 1994: 22, in his commentary on Calpurnius Flaccus, italicizes the entire initial word or two of “each separate extract.”

None of the editors mentioned explores with sufficient depth the assumptions underlying the method he applies in detecting discontinuity between units. Different assumptions about the nature of Seneca's anthology can lead to different conclusions. If one assumes that what Seneca offers are notable expressions drawn from random points within a speech, there will be a tendency to search for *logical* discontinuity between individual *sentences*.⁷⁹ If, on the other hand, we are guided by the principle that individual units (i.e. Entries) could be written up and circulated separately, we should expect to find divisions between *blocks* of text; and these blocks of texts would have their own internal organization. Modern editors' practice of dividing groups of sentences within quotations may obscure other more subtle organizational principles that inform Seneca's collection. It is precisely these organizational structures, and also the notes that in large measure I believe are responsible for them, to which I intend to devote detailed consideration in the remainder of this chapter.

The material Seneca offers under each declamation theme varies in quantity and kind. Under some themes, quotations of one particular declaimer are in far greater abundance than those of other speakers. For example, although the end of the declamation has been lost, C. 2.7 contains a very long quotation of Porcius Latro (four

⁷⁹ This seems to be the rationale behind the practice of Håkanson 1989a: xv-xvi: *Constat integrum quoque Senecae textum magnam partem re vera nihil aliud esse quam excerpta – ab ipso Seneca facta – ex magno declamationum numero sumpta. qua re saepe sententia quaedam neque cum priore neque cum sequenti cohaeret, cum vel pauca vel multa omiserit Seneca quae rhetor ille laudatus inter has sententias posuerat. contra autem nonnumquam apparet duas pluresve sententias ita arte coniunctas esse, ut putemus Senecam plura ex eodem loco nullis omissis sumpsisse.* In this explanation *sententia* seems to mean “sentence,” rather than “epigram,” since Håkanson explains that some *sententiae* cohere while others do not. He goes on to say that he has applied the same method to the elder Seneca as he did in his edition of Calpurnius Flaccus; see Håkanson 1978: xiv. But there is no reason to believe that the internal organization of quotations in the collection of Calpurnius Flaccus follows precisely the same principles as that of the elder Seneca.

Teubner pages) with no mention of other declaimers. In *C.* 1.6 a quotation of Julius Bassus extends to two Teubner pages, whereas the quotations from just a handful of other declaimers are no longer than a few lines each. Likewise, long quotations from Arellius Fuscus dominate *Suasoriae* 2-5.

Seneca's decision whether to include a particular declamation theme in the collection would depend on the amount of material available. Resources would be especially rich for some declamations (e.g. *C.* 1.1; 7.1; 9.2), so that quotations from multiple speakers could be included and each of the three sections (*sententiae*, *divisiones*, *colores*) could be amply filled. The material for other declamations, such as *C.* 2.7 and *C.* 1.6, would be more limited. Their inclusion might be justified by the existence of only one or two rich sources – a long quotation from a particular declaimer, for instance. Thus, Seneca is able to declare that he will consistently include Fuscus' descriptions in the *Suasoriae*; at the same time, quotations from other declaimers in *Suasoriae* 2-5 are comparatively sparse.⁸⁰

Under each of the sections – *sententiae*, *divisiones*, *colores* – the amount of material varies as well. For instance, the majority of material in *C.* 1.5 consists of *divisiones*, from Porcius Latro and Arellius Fuscus in particular. And it is noteworthy that even when few of his Entries appear in the section of *sententiae*, Latro is almost

⁸⁰ According to Madvig's conjecture (accepted by Håkanson), Seneca says (*S.* 2.10) that he will record Fuscus' descriptions even when he cannot recall **what anyone else said in these *suasoriae***: *at quia semel in mentionem incidi Fusci, ex omnibus suasoriis celebres descriptiunculas subtexam, etiamsi nihil occurrerit, quod quisquam alius in his suasor<iis> dixerit*. The conjecture is unconvincing. The mss read: *quod quisquam alius nisi suasor dilexerit* ("what anyone would love except a *suasor*"). The conjecture robs Seneca's comment of the clever point that is apparent in the received text and towards which *S.* 2.10 seems built. (For the build-up, note that the passage begins *huius suasoriae feci mentionem*, which is resumed with *at quia semel in mentionem incidi Fusci*...) Since Seneca has just recalled how he and his peers intoned Fuscus' descriptions when they were young, perhaps *cantor* for *suasor* ("what anyone would love except a singer"); cf. *C.* 2.1.26 (*descripturus paene cantantis modo*).

always featured in the *divisiones*, and featured prominently, usually being listed first. The reason, as I have already suggested, may be that Seneca had access to his friend's notes or a compilation had been made of Latro's divisions.

In what other ways might the current state of the anthology shed light on the format of Seneca's supporting material? Seneca from time to time devotes a section of the material under a declamation to a single point treated by several speakers, often with the slightest of differences. *C.* 1.4.10-12 (H 35,10-30), an example of this kind of passage, is instructive. Seneca introduces the section in typical fashion by relating that everybody had something fine to say on the passage (*locus*) where the adulterers are caught in *delicto flagrante* and ultimately let go: *Omnes aliquid belli dixerunt illo loco, quo deprenti sunt adulteri <et> dimissi.*⁸¹ It is significant that though several of the declaimers are quoted more than once for this single *locus* (namely Latro, Fuscus, and Vibius Rufus) Seneca has not united the Entries attributed to each of them. This is a deliberate choice to highlight the finer points of treatment within the *locus*. Whereas generally no explicit connection is drawn between Entries, Seneca's arrangement here suddenly becomes very precise and deliberate.

At H 35,11, Entries on whether the *vir fortis* startled the adulterers from bed are quoted in succession starting with Latro, then Fuscus, Vibius Rufus, and finally Pompeius. A verb of rousing, or rising, binds together the quotations from each of them: *excitavi – excitavi – adsurrexerunt – excita.*⁸²

⁸¹ The theme of *C.* 1.4: A war hero (*vir fortis*) lost his hands in battle. He catches his wife in bed with another man and orders their son to kill the adulterer. The son does not kill him, the adulterer flees, and consequently the father renounces the son.

⁸² Even before Seneca's introduction of the *locus*, we find two contrasted Entries from Latro and Pompeius Silo bound together by the word *oculos* (H 35,7-9).

The next point likewise begins with an Entry from *Latro*, which is contrasted with a quotation of *Fuscus*. The two quotations are compound: they start with the conceit that the son will supply the avenging hands that the father has lost (*manus – manus*), then question the son’s paternity when he fails to help:

Latro: ‘erratis, qui me putatis manus non habere.’ filium vocavi, ut intravit, ab adultero salutatus est.

Fuscus: fili, tuam fidem! ostende te integro manus me non perdidisse. controversiam mihi de te facit adulter: veni, utrius sis filius, indica.

P. Vinicius (expectabant adulteri) and *Cestius Pius (risit adulter, tamquam qui diceret ‘meus est’)* follow with rival methods of expressing the same idea: ‘the son’s paternity is suspect.’

The final point of the *locus* is the exit of the adulterers from the room unharmed. An Entry from *Vibius Rufus* is followed at once by quotations of two Greek declaimers. The Greek Entries have been lost, but *Seneca’s* references to them (*hunc sensum...hunc sensum*) make it clear that all three declaimers have come up with variations on the same point.

This section, then, is organized first and foremost by *locus* and by specific points, or Entries, within the *locus*. *Locus* as an organizing term takes precedence over the names of the declaimers, otherwise all the Entries from *Latro*, *Fuscus*, and *Vibius Rufus* would be united under their names. But the specific points that compose this *locus* (the *locus deprehensionis*, as I shall call it), and that are detailed at *C. 1.4.10-12*, are not confined in this declamation to one section. If one examines *C. 1.4* in its totality (it is quite brief compared with many other declamations), it appears that except for the

divisions, where there is only *Latro*, and for the *colores*, all of which are for the son's defense, a disproportionately large fraction of the material belongs within the framework of the *locus*. Indeed, so far as I can determine, little to none of the material from the speeches for the prosecution (1.4.1-4) falls outside the outline of the *locus*, particularly as it can be sketched from the full quotation of Porcius *Latro* at 1.4.1 (H 32,1-10).

The Entries from *Latro* at 1.4.1 match point for point the component parts of the *locus* observed at 1.4.10-12. What is more, they are in the same sequence:

- 1) Discovery of the adulterers and rousing them from bed.
 1.4.1: *Adulteros meos tantum excitavi: me miserum, quamdiu iacuerunt, postquam deprehenderam!*
 1.4.10: *Adulteros meos tantum excitavi.*
- 2) The father calls the son to serve as his hands.
 1.4.1: *'Quid ridetis?' inquam, 'habeo manus!' voca⁸³ filium.*
 1.4.10: *'Erratis, qui me putatis manus non habere.'⁸⁴ filium vocavi; ut intravit, ab adultero salutatus est.*
- 3) The adulterers leave the scene unscathed.
 1.4.1: *Exierunt adulteri tantum meo sanguine cruenti.*
 1.4.12: *Latro cum exeuntis adulteros descripsisset, adiecit: adulescens, parentes tuos sequere.*

The reason for the close parallel, and for the relative homogeneity of material, is that *C.* 1.4 depends on fewer notes, and on notes less varied in kind, than many other declamations.

⁸³ Kiessling 1872 conjectured *voca<vi>* (accepted by Müller 1887, Winterbottom 1974, and Håkanson 1989a), clearly in order to bring this quotation in line with the quotation at 1.4.10. However, as we have already seen in the discussion above, discrepancy between two overlapping quotations is not in and of itself a legitimate basis for emendation. 1.4.1 is concerned to show the father's belief that his son would act as his hands; the imperative (*voca*) places us in this moment.

⁸⁴ *Latro*'s quotation at 1.4.10 seems in fact to contain two Entries that have been joined together, both sharing the phrase *filium vocavi*. The first Entry (*Erratis...habere*) is a Version of 1.4.1 (*Quid ridetis?*); the two Versions show the father/husband addressing the adulterers at the moment of discovery. *Filium vocavi* both provides the punchline to what precedes (cf. *voca filium* of 1.4.1), and it sets up the epigram that follows, which is designed to question the paternity of the son.

It is useful to think of the material Seneca presents under each declamation as consisting of layers: some declamations are composed of multiple layers of notes, while others of just two or three. C. 1.4 is of the latter kind, and because of this we can more easily tease apart its constituent parts. Here Seneca may be limited to just three kinds of supporting materials: 1) a collection of closely matched Entries on specific points within the *locus deprehensionis*, 2) Latro's divisions, and 3) *colores* on behalf of the son.⁸⁵

However, it may be objected that in the middle of Latro's quotation at 1.4.1 (H 32,3-6) there is an Entry not represented at 1.4.10-12. Despite its absence in the later section, we can detect that this Entry too held a position within the framework of the *locus*. And I suspect that its position in the middle of Latro's Entries accurately reflects the place it held in Latro's treatment of the *locus*. The father's illustrious past actions in battle are set against his humiliating incapacity to punish the adulterers. The bitter contrast would have been most keenly felt, and most effectively introduced, at the moment when the husband is desperate to punish the adulterers, that is, within the *locus deprehensionis*. What we are to imagine is a flashback, a *descriptio* of the father in battle in which the present Entry would have been embedded; or, more likely, it would have concluded the *descriptio*. No description is included but the existence of one is intimated (1.4.1): *O acerbam mihi virtutis meae recordationem, o tristem victoriae memoriam! ille onustus modo hostilibus spoliis vir militaris adulteris meis tantum maledixi*. The underlined words refer to the memory of battle. But the reference is not simply to the hero's internal recollection; it refers to a verbal sketch that Latro has just painted. The

⁸⁵ The *colores* too are of limited scope. Cf. 1.4.7: *Color pro adolescente unus ab omnibus, qui declamaverunt, introductus est: non potui occidere*. "One color on behalf of the son was introduced by all declaimers: I was not able to kill." Other declaimers have the son portray himself as caught between his obligations to his father and mother. Cf. Cestius at 1.4.9.

words underlined with dashes explicitly point to the image of the veteran in battle just now set in the imagination of Latro's audience.

That some speakers took turns in creating precisely this type of description⁸⁶ is evident from the quotations of two other declaimers, Triarius (1.4.2) and Albucius (1.4.12). The brief quotation of the former contains the following: *descriptio pugnantis viri fortis. dii boni, et has aliquis manus derisit?* Obviously the underlined words were not spoken by Triarius; they set up the epigram that follows and are what I shall call a "context label."⁸⁷ The deictic *et has* refers to the preceding description that the context label prompts us to imagine. The quotation of Albucius at 1.4.12 contains an epigram very similar to Triarius': *cum pugnantem se acie descripsisset, dixit: me miserum, quas manus adulter effugit!* Instead of a context label Seneca simply tells us that the epigram was set up by a description of the hero in battle.

The *locus deprehensionis* at 1.4.10-12, as it turns out, provides a remarkably complete framework for understanding all the Entries for the prosecution in 1.4.1-4. Since they contain clear hints at a *descriptio pugnantis viri fortis*, a slightly fuller outline can be reconstructed from the Entries of Latro in 1.4.1. From these we gather that the component parts of the *locus*, in order, are as follows: 1) Discovery of the adulterers and rousing them from bed. 2) The husband recounts his past heroics in battle. 3) The husband calls the son to serve as his hands; when he fails to help, his paternity is questioned. 4) The husband struggles with the adulterers, but they leave unharmed.

⁸⁶ There is a *descriptio viri pugnantis* at [Quint.] *Decl.* 4.5.

⁸⁷ A similar example is at *S.* 2.8: *Descriptio Thermopylarum*.

The fact that Latro's Entries appear to follow a deliberate sequence, and a sequence moreover that matches the outline of the *locus deprehensionis* in 1.4.10-12, may be further proof of the relative paucity of notes for this declamation. This assertion is made from the belief that observable disorder in sequence of Entries is due to multiple layers of supporting notes; fewer layers will allow for the retention of some original order and linear, chronological sequence.

But it might be countered that the *locus deprehensionis* as I have outlined it really embraces the entire theme of the declamation. Whether this is true or not (and it is impossible to assess, since we cannot know the extent to which declaimers' speeches might have fallen outside the outline of the *locus* as given by Seneca), the objection is irrelevant. What is significant is that within Seneca's record of this declamation there are very specific points around which the various Entries closely congregate. Seneca clues us into the existence of these points at 1.4.10-12. The Entries from Latro in 1.4.1 suggest an outline only slightly larger.

Based on these observations, I propose that at the heart of Seneca's material for the prosecution was an outline from Porcius Latro of select points within the declamation and the corresponding Entries that he had authored. Entries from other declaimers were later added to compare and contrast with Latro's; consequently, little else apart from those Entries that addressed the same points as Latro were included. Who would have made such an outline, and whether the same person or someone else would have added the Entries from other declaimers, cannot be answered. Seneca, Latro, one or more of Latro's students or admirers are all candidates. What is significant here is that it is possible to reconstruct the principles of organization that inform the materials out of

which Seneca composed the anthology. At what stage Seneca himself was involved in this organization – whether he is working from his own notes, and so chose these underlying principles of organization, or he is working from others’ notes – cannot be discovered from the anthology itself.

In these original notes, it may be that the select points of the *locus* received labels beneath which would appear Latro’s Entries as well as contrasting Entries from other declaimers. It is no accident that Entries from several different declaimers contain the same words or synonyms (see above). Overlapping vocabulary would have helped determine the precise word(s) to be used as a label, and in turn the labels would discriminate among the Entries as belonging under one heading or another.⁸⁸ The quotation of Latro in 1.4.1 contains words that effectively indicate the specific point within the *locus* to which each Entry pertains and that also hint at what the labels may have been: 1) *excitavi* 2) *recordationem* 3) *manus* 4) *exierunt*. The context label under Triarius’ name, *descriptio pugnantis viri fortis*, may be an unobscured glimpse at a heading in the notes.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Note that Latro’s epigram at 1.4.12 (H 35,29-30) questions the son’s paternity. It has not been placed with the other Entries in the middle of this section that do the same thing, because it has been categorized with Entries that concern the adulterers’ departure. That is, it has been defined by *exeuntis*, a word Seneca uses to set up the epigram.

⁸⁹ This organizational system is comparable to what has been observed in the work of the elder Pliny; for a summary, Dorandi 2000: 27-50. For keywords and the kinds of errors that can result from relying on keywords in the redaction of notes, Locher and Rottländer 1985: 143. For a graphical demonstration of keywords in a sample from Pliny’s work (*Nat.* 29.117-132), Pinkster 2005: 254-6. For a recent collection of articles on ordering knowledge (in multiple senses) in texts, König and Whitmarsh 2007. – A question that deserves exploration (but that cannot be taken up in this dissertation) is to what extent the organization of Seneca’s anthology is informed by the format of ancient writing supports, specifically by the format of tablets. For example, is there a correlation between the size of Entries (or series of Entries) and a particular size of tablet? Relevant for this kind of study is a surviving papyrus from Herculaneum, P. Herc. 1021, which appears to be a working draft of Philodemus’ *Index Academicorum philosophorum*. Disorder and repetitions in this draft have been attributed to the use of tablets; Dorandi 1981; Cavallo 1984: 12-17. Langholf 1989: 71, discusses an explicit reference to a tablet in the Hippocratic corpus. For the use of

From this one declamation we may gather that the notes in Seneca's possession – whether they were made by him or by others – did not consist merely of compilations of quotations arbitrarily culled from entire speeches. At least some notes were organized according to select points treated by different declaimers. But this conclusion does not go far enough. It is my belief that such organization plays a prominent role throughout the anthology, and that generally it is more useful and more accurate to see Entries in terms of the specific points shared by declaimers rather than to view them as isolated 'excerpts.'

1.5 Quotations converge around a limited number of loci

In reading through the material Seneca presents under a declamation theme, we can typically observe that the quotations from the different speakers converge on a limited number of identifiable *loci*. Once it is recognized what these are, it is not difficult to assign Entries to their respective *loci*: they are sometimes signaled by context labels or formulae, which I suspect were employed in establishing what the *loci* were and in arranging the notes out of which Seneca's anthology was composed. The sequence, however, in which the *loci* are represented within a quotation is largely unpredictable;⁹⁰

tablets in general, see Degni 1998, which includes (pp. 65-146) a useful appendix listing ancient references to tablets. For the tablets found at the Villa of the Papyri, see Capasso 1995.

⁹⁰ I have not been able to discover on any consistent basis a repeated sequence in which *loci* are represented in declaimers' quotations. Nor have I been able to discover a repeated sequence in the appearance of declaimers' names that would betray mechanical copying from sources. The paradigm for such mechanical copying is the dictionary of Nonius Marcellus; Lindsay 1901.

and, indeed, material relating to the same *locus* can be repeated in one quotation. C. 10.5 shall serve as an illustration.⁹¹

Theme: The famous Athenian painter Parrhasius purchases an old man from among the Olynthians captured and sold by Philip of Macedon. He takes the man to Athens and tortures him to serve as a true-to-life model for a portrait of the suffering Prometheus. The Olynthian dies while being tortured, and Parrhasius deposits the picture in the temple of Minerva. He is accused of treason.

Similar to what we have seen at 1.4.10-12, also in C. 10.5 Seneca gives explicit notice of the presence among his material of a *locus* shared by multiple declaimers (10.5.23): *illum locum omnes temptaverunt: quid, si volueris bellum pingere, quid, si incendium, quid, si parricidium?* The question (*quid, si...parricidium?*) is not a quotation, but serves as a convenient title or heading of a *locus*.⁹² The implication is that Parrhasius' behavior should not be condoned because it establishes a dangerous precedent. Artists should use their imagination (*phantasia*) rather than live models when depicting suffering or disasters. The notice in effect sets up Entries from two Greeks, Dorion and Metrodorus, who participate in the *locus*. A third Greek, Aemilianus, follows suit a few quotations later, at 10.5.25. We can see that earlier Gavius Silo at 10.5.1⁹³ and Fulvius Sparsus at 10.5.8 likewise participate in the *locus*. Contributions from Sparsus on this topic are the most extensive, consisting of two Entries placed one after the other.⁹⁴

⁹¹ This declamation is the subject of Morales 1996.

⁹² For the appearance of what are effectively headings in a different type of literary work, Luce 1971: esp. 285-7.

⁹³ *Nemo ut naufragium pingeret mersit.*

⁹⁴ 10.5.8 (the break between the following two Entries is Håkanson's): *Non vidit Phidias Iovem, fecit tamen velut tonantem, nec stetit ante oculos eius Minerva; dignus tamen illa arte animus et concepit deos et*

Other passages, though Seneca does not name them specifically as *loci*, so closely congregate about the same idea – often in language that by its similarity announces their affinity – that we are justified to identify them as such. Clearly a stock portion of the declamation for some of the declaimers was a description of the elderly Olynthian at the slave auction. Contributions to this *locus* from Cestius Pius and Albucius Silus are especially close:

10.5.4 (Cestius Pius): *Producitur nobilis senex longa miseriarum tabe confectus, reductis introrsus oculis, tam tristis quam si iam tortus esset. ut admoveri sibi catenas vidit, 'supervacuae sunt' inquit; 'si ad alium dominum pervenissem, Athenas fugerem'.*

10.5.11 (Albucius Silus): *Producitur senex nobilis, flens, respiciens patriam: placuit isti vultus, habuit aliquid Promethei simile etiam ante tormenta.*

Once we are accustomed to expect a description of the old man at auction among the quotations (and an ancient enthusiast of declamation would have known well to expect it under this theme without first reading through Seneca's material), the lead word *producitur* functions very effectively in making the context known immediately. The quotation of Julius Bassus no doubt also belongs here (10.5.1): *Producitur puer: 'supervacuum est', inquit 'nondum quantum satis sit Prometheo potest gemere'.* While one slave does not suit Parrhasius' interests at the auction because he is not miserable enough, the old Olynthian will: we understand that a description of him is to follow, even if Seneca has not included it.

Another much frequented *locus* is situated within the description of torture. Parrhasius gives instructions to the torturers so that the desired expression of agony,

exhibuit. – Quid facturi sumus, si bellum volueris pingere? diversas virorum statuemus acies et in mutua vulnera armabimus manus; victos sequentur victores, revertentur cruenti. ne Parrhasii manus temere ludat coloribus, interneccione humana emendum est.

namely one that Parrhasius thinks an exact replica of Prometheus', may be obtained and preserved. While the old man suffers, Parrhasius remains the exacting artist. Underlined words draw attention to the declaimers' similar attempts to convey the artist's quest for precision.

10.5.1 (Gavius Silo): *Caeditur: 'parum est' in<quit>; uritur: 'etiamnunc parum est'; laniatur: 'hoc' inquit 'irato Philippo satis est sed nondum [in] irato Iove*'.⁹⁵

10.5.3 (Argentarius): *Aiebat tortoribus: 'sic intendite, sic caedite, sic istum quem fecit cum maxime vultum servate, ne sitis ipsi exemplar*'.

10.5.10 (Fulvius Sparsus): *'Etiamnunc torque, etiamnunc; bene habet, sic tene: hic vultus esse debuit lacerati, hic morientis.*'

Seneca himself makes allusion to the *locus* when he informs us at 10.5.26 that except for the omission of a few words Sparsus imitated a well-known expression (*celebris sententia*) from Porcius Latro.⁹⁶ Seneca does not say what Sparsus' *sententia* was; but it becomes certain that the Entry above is meant when we read Latro's apparently inspiring contribution: '*Parrhasi, morior!*' *sic tene!* Both Sparsus' and Latro's Entries, we are told, come from the *descriptio tormentorum*. Diocles Carystius' Entry, which is mentioned and quoted next, belongs to the same *locus*.⁹⁷

Two *loci* in 10.5 are even more productive; there is hardly a declaimer who does not try his hand at them. The cleverness of the first of these derives from the idea that

⁹⁵ Cf. Triarius (10.5.24): *nondum dignum irato Iove genuisti*.

⁹⁶ *Latronis illa celebris sententia est, quam Sparsus quoque subtractis quibusdam verbis dixit in descriptione tormentorum*.

⁹⁷ It is noteworthy that here Seneca lets us know that he is quoting at second hand (*aiunt*) and did not himself hear Diocles. In effect, Seneca is telling us that both Diocles' *sententia* and Latro's (described as *celebris*) were in circulation. Of course we do not know whether they were shared by word of mouth or in writing or both. But wherein precisely is the value of a *sententia* such as Latro's that would make auditors and/or readers wish to record and share it? Certainly it is not a gnomic saying bearing some general truth. Its value is closely tied to a context, which in general may be identified with the theme of this declamation, but specifically (I contend) would have been understood as effective within the particular *locus*.

Parrhasius has shown himself more cruel than Philip. In the second, the declaimers liken Parrhasius to Jupiter, thus accepting the artist's perverse transformation of the Olynthian into Prometheus and deploying it against him. But rather than citing the numerous Entries I believe belong to these two *loci*, it will be more profitable at this point to reproduce in their entirety all the quotations given under the section of *sententiae* in C. 10.5. This will allow us to observe a) how the quotations of declaimer after declaimer are overwhelmingly devoted to the identified *loci*; and b) the variety of sequences in which Entries occur within a quotation: although the declaimers contribute Entries to the same *loci*, the order in which these Entries appear is unpredictable. This variety of order is further evidence that the Entries are non-sequential, especially since a quotation can contain two or more Entries that are separated from each other spatially but belong to the same *locus*.

Before turning to the quotations, I list the *loci* identified thus far: **1)** artists should use their imagination when depicting violence and destruction; **2)** the slave auction; **3)** description of torture, specifically Parrhasius' instructions to the torturer(s); **4)** even Philip is less cruel than the Athenian Parrhasius; **5)** the Olynthian is literally Prometheus, Parrhasius is literally Jupiter. Two more *loci*, which are less common but nonetheless shared among declaimers, can be added: **6)** profanation of the temple of Minerva; **7)** the old man was innocent, unlike the Olynthian traitor Lasthenes.

I do not claim that this identification of *loci* is perfect and exact. There may have been slightly more, or even slightly fewer, *loci* in Seneca's notes, and of course they may have been defined a little differently from how I have done: it should be remembered that although we can often piece together what the *loci* were, Seneca is generally not

concerned to identify them precisely. These shortcomings, however, do not detract from my central assertions that a large proportion of the quotations narrowly converge at a small number of points, or *loci*, within the declamation; and that this degree of convergence would not occur if a significant percentage of Seneca's supporting documents was not organized by *loci*.

In what follows, boldfaced numbers indicate to which of the *loci* in the list above the Entry belongs. The numbers have no purpose other than to identify the *loci*; they have nothing to do with the order in which the *loci* might have appeared in a speech. A question mark means the identification is uncertain. The text, including demarcation of *sententiae*, is that of Håkanson 1989a.

10.5.1. *GAVI SILONIS. 2?)*⁹⁸ *Infelix senex vidit iacentis divulsae patriae ruinas; abstractus a coniuge, abstractus a liberis super exustae Olynthi cinerem stetit. iam ad figurandum Promethea satis tristis est. [quo] 5) Pro Iuppiter! quem enim melius invocem adversus Parrhasium quam quem imitatus est? 1) Olynthium tantum picturae tuae excipio? nemo, ut naufragum pingeret, mersit. 3) Caeditur:*⁹⁹ *'parum est' in<quit>; uritur: 'etiamnunc parum est'; laniatur: 'hoc' inquit 'irato Philippo satis est sed nondum [in] irato Iove'.*

10.5.1. *IVLI BASSI. 2) Producitur puer: 'supervacuum est', inquit 'nondum quantum satis sit Prometheo potest gemere'. 4) Vltima Olynthi deprecatio est: 'Atheni<ens>s, redde me Philippo!' 6) Non est istud donum, sacrilegium est. 4) 'Servus' inquit 'meus fuit'; putes Philippum loqui. 4) or 6) Aedem Minervae tamquam castra Macedonum fugiunt.*

10.5.2. *CLODI TURRINI. 2?)*¹⁰⁰ *'Parum' inquit 'tristis est'; aliquis Olynthius parum tristis est? *** nisi qui Atheniensem dominum sortitus est. vis [Parrhasi] tristem videre? dabo tibi, Parrhasi, maiora tormenta: duc illum ad iacentem Olynthum, duc illo, ubi liberos, ubi domum perdidit. scis certe, quam tristem illum*

⁹⁸ This Entry does not have the identifying formula (*producitur puer*) for the slave auction that was discussed above. Nonetheless, it is similar to other "slave auction" Entries, esp. 10.5.11 (*respiciens patriam*); also 10.5.2 (*parum tristis est*).

⁹⁹ Note how *Caeditur* signals the context; it is a context label.

¹⁰⁰ See note on the first Entry at 10.5.1.

emeris. **6)** *Olynthiis urbem aperuimus, templa praeclusimus.* **4)** *Ergo nemo Olynthius tortus esset, si omnes illos Macedones emissent.* **4)** or **5)** *Torqueatur; hoc nec sub Philippo factum est. moritur; hoc nec sub Iove.*

10.5.3. ARGENTARI. **4?)** *Hoc hospitio Olynthius Athenis exceptus est?* **6)** *Tantum [porro] Olynthium torsit Parrhasius? quid <porro>? non et oculos nostros torquet? ibi ponit tabulam, ubi fortasse nos tabulam foederis posuimus.* **1)** *Hoc Promethea facere est, non pingere.* **3)** *Aiebat tortoribus: 'sic intendite, sic caedite, sic istum quem fecit cum maxime vultum servate, ne sitis ipsi exemplar'.*

10.5.4. CESTI PII. **4?)** *'Emi' inquit; immo, si Atheniensis es, redemisti.* **6)** *Si nescis, Parrhasi, in isto templo pro Olynthiis vota suscepimus; <ita per te vota> solventur?* **4)** *Crudelis ille Graeciae carnifex istum tamen nihil amplius quam vendidit.* **2)** *Producitur nobilis senex longa miseriarum tabe confectus, reductis introrsus oculis, tam tristis quam si iam tortus esset. ut admoveri sibi catenas vidit, 'supervacuae sunt' inquit; 'si ad alium dominum pervenissem, Athenas fugerem'.* **7)** *Istud tibi in nullo Olynthio permitto, nisi si Lasthenen emeris.*

10.5.5. TRIARI. **?)**¹⁰¹ *Corrupisti duo maxima Promethei munera, ignem et hominem.* **2)** *Quemcumque praeco flentem viderat, sciebat emptorem: miserebantur omnes.* **4)** *Te fortasse ipse Philippus reduci iussisset, nisi Atheniensem vidisset emptorem.* **5)** *<Promethea torsisse ferunt Iovem,> quod ego fabulosum esse non dubito; sed utrum vult Parrhasius eligat: parum pie aut infamavit Iovem aut imitatus est.* **2)** *Clamabat iste: 'nondum satis tristis es, nondum satis, <in>quam, adiecisti ad priorem vultum.' talis in auctione Philippus?*

10.5.6. MVSAE. **4)** *Narraturus sum Olynthi senis ignes, verbera, tormenta; aliquis nunc me queri de Philippo putat? dii deaque te perdant! misericordem Philippum fecisti.* **4)** *Si isti creditis, iratum Iovem imitatus est; si nobis, iratum vicit Philippum.* **4)** *Pinge Philippum cru<re> debili, oculo effosso, iugulo fracto, per tot damna a dis immortalibus tortum.*

10.5.6. CORNELI HISPANI. **5)** *Vltima membrorum tabe <consumptus> tormentis immoritur. Parrhasi, quid agis? non servas propositum: hoc supra Promethea est. tantum patiendum est pingente Parrhasio quantum irato Iove.*

10.5.7. ARELLI FVSCI. **?)**¹⁰² *Pinge Promethea, sed homines facientem, sed ignis dividentem. pinge, sed inter munera potius quam inter tormenta.* **6)** *Inter altaria*

¹⁰¹ This Entry perhaps should not be categorized among the identified *loci*. It seems to be a contribution to an additional, underrepresented *locus* (e.g. 'Prometheus benefitted humans'), to which also Entries at 10.5.7 and 10.5.11 would belong.

¹⁰² See note on the first Entry at 10.5.5.

Olynthi senis crucem posuit. 4) Miserrime senex, aliquis fortassis ex servis tuis felicius servit; utique felicius est quisquis Macedoni servit.

10.5.8-10. *FVLVI SPARSI. 2?) Si ad succurrendum profectus es, queror, quod unum emisti; si ad torquendum, queror, quod ullum. 4) Vtinam, Philippe, auctionem cum exceptione fecisses, ne quis Atheniensis emeret! 1) Non vidit Phidias Iovem, fecit tamen velut tonantem, nec stetit ante oculos eius Minerva; dignus tamen illa arte animus et concepit deos et exhibuit. 1) Quid facturi sumus, si bellum volueris pingere? diversas virorum statuemus acies et in mutua vulnera armabimus manus; victos sequentur victores, revertentur cruenti. ne Parrhasii manus temere ludat coloribus, internecione humana emendum est. 7) Si necesse est aliquem torqueri, eme nocentem servum, ut eodem tempore <et> exem<plum> sumas et supplicium. 3) Statuitur ex altera parte Parrhasius cum coloribus, ex altera tortor cum ignibus, flagellis, eculeis. ista aut videntem aut expectantem, Parrhasi, parum tristem putas? 4) or 7) Dicebat miser: ‘non prodidi patriam. Athenienses, si nihil merui, succurrite, si merui, reddite Philippo.’ 3) Inter ista Parrhasius dubium est studiosius pingat an ille saeviat: ‘torque, verbera, ure!’ sic iste carnifex colores temperat. 4) Quid ais? parum tristis videtur quem Philippus vendidit, emit Parrhasius? 3) ‘Etiamnunc torque, etiamnunc; bene habet, sic tene: hic vultus esse debuit lacerati, hic morientis.’*

10.5.10. *PORCI LATRONIS. 6) Si videtur tibi, istis muneribus aram Misericordiae orna. 4) Nemo ergo ex Olynthiis miserius servit quam qui Atheniensem dominum sortitus est? 4) Miser ubicumque Philippum non viderat, pacem putabat. 4) ‘Alliga’ inquit; aiebat: ‘solutus apud Philippum fui.’*

10.5.11. *ALBVCI SILLI. 7) Expecta, dum Euthycrates aut Lasthenes capiantur. 1) Phidias omnia opera sine tortore fecit. 4) Philippus quoque vendidisse contentus est. 2) Producitur senex nobilis, flens, respiciens patriam: placuit isti vultus, habuit aliquid Promethei simile etiam ante tormenta. 4?) Quam diligenter causam agit! ut Philippus Olynthio *** non est, ego pecuniam perdidit. redi ad auctorem. ?)¹⁰³ ‘Propter homines Prometheus distortus, propter [me] Promethea homines ne torseris. 4) Philippus sic rogabatur: ‘liceat Olynthios vivere’; Parrhasius aliter rogandus: ‘Olynthiis mori liceat’. 4) ‘Tristem volo facere’: nemo faciet, si Philippus non fecit.*

In Section 1.2 of this chapter, by referring to passages that contain the most conspicuous repetitions I wished to make suspect the assumption that excerpts – what I prefer to call Entries – are recorded in the order that they appeared in a speech. The

¹⁰³ See note on the first Entry at 10.5.5.

exercise just carried out above should advance our thinking even further. Glaring repetitions do not occur in this declamation. However, once we become sensitive to the fact that declaimers' quotations so often overlap with one another, once we recognize the points of convergence among declaimers and we are able to read the Entries with reference to these points, it can be sensed that sequential disorder among the material is not anomalous, but pervasive. The sequence of *loci* under one declaimer's name bears little to no relation to the order under another declaimer's name. This is surprising. For, although it can not be supposed that the declaimers, when speaking, followed exactly the same order as one another in their treatment of *loci*, it is also doubtful that the order was random: the declaimers were naturally predisposed to imitation and emulation, and there may have been a certain inherent logic in making the description of the auction, for example, precede the torture scene. More tellingly, it is not uncommon (as we have seen) to have contributions to the same *locus* separated from each other when they almost certainly would have been set close together in an actual speech. The fortuitous, apparently random arrangement of Entries stands in stark contrast with the consistent overlap between the Entries themselves. In other words, organization appears to be invested not in sequence, but in *loci*.

Speculations about the degree of sequential disorder in the quotations may be set aside. The ability to identify a limited number of *loci* and assign the vast majority of the material to them fundamentally changes our understanding of how the quotations in Seneca's collection were organized and read. If an imagined entire speech is our guiding frame of reference, the practical value of collecting and reading Entries is diminished since a reader is hard put to recover the context and purpose of individual Entries. The

Entries become difficult to comprehend, and a declaimer who consults the collection to stock his declamatory arsenal is uncertain how to apply them.

In reality, a great many of the Entries have a more immediate reference point: the *loci* that are shared among declaimers. Adherence to a narrow frame of reference, to one specific section of a speech, confers upon Entries a certain amount of independence and sovereignty. Indeed, it may be precisely because many of the Entries signal to the reader their adherence to a *locus* that Seneca can largely ignore sequence. The Entries, so to speak, bear their context with them and generally do not require Seneca to provide the reader with explicit identification.¹⁰⁴

Given the significance of these overlapping passages for understanding the organization of Seneca's anthology and for interpreting the quotations found therein, it is essential to be able to refer to the passages by a name: they shall be called 'shared *loci*' (*loci mutui*). There is need of novel nomenclature, since no ancient or modern term precisely describes both the function and context of overlapping passages.¹⁰⁵ 'Communes *loci*' ("commonplaces"), which might seem a possibility, is inappropriate since the term refers to passages on 'common themes,' to arguments that are easily transferrable to a

¹⁰⁴ The organization Seneca has adopted – particularly in the section of *sententiae* where Entry is added to Entry without authorial comment – can make for demanding reading. But, it must be iterated, the organization is demanding, *not* chaotic. It is demanding because the anthology forces us not simply to read consecutively in a linear direction, but also to read laterally, comparing spatially distant quotations from multiple declaimers. In this respect, the anthology can be compared to an Internet webpage on which appears a series of links to other webpages: if we read through the main webpage, while interrupting this reading by looking at the webpages to which the hyperlinks refer us, our reading is both vertical and lateral. For how hypertext can alter reading and interpretation strategies, see Landow 1992.

¹⁰⁵ The elder Seneca does not have a single term for what I refer to as shared *loci*. I believe he would, perhaps not surprisingly, call them *sententiae*; the fact that they closely engage speaker with speaker is perhaps so culturally natural and instinctual to their practitioners that it does not seem to require comment. When Seneca introduces the series of quotations from the historians on Cicero's death, he calls them *sententiae* (*S.* 6.16): the term applies equally to quotations from authors and declaimers.

variety of cases and that can be expressed in a wide variety of ways.¹⁰⁶ By contrast, a shared *locus*, while typically also expressing a point of argument, narrowly defines itself within the specific verbal expressions given to it by its speakers. It is born of the performative moment (ὁ καιρός), of the close, often competitive, engagement of speaker with speaker.

The modern term allusion, or intertextuality,¹⁰⁷ fairly describes certain functions of the use of a shared *locus*; but these terms are quite broad. ‘Shared *locus*’ is preferable since it identifies overlapping passages specifically in the ancient social practice witnessed by Seneca’s collection: speakers closely engaging one another in a performance through the medium of select passages.

Furthermore, the term ‘shared *locus*,’ or *locus mutuus*, finds some justification in the words of Seneca himself, or rather in what Junius Gallio tells of his friend Ovid (*S.* 3.7): Gallio explains that the poet often used many verses of Vergil “not furtively, but in open exchange, with the intention that the connection with Vergil should be recognized” (*non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnosci*).¹⁰⁸ *Loci mutui* are passages that are designed to be shared (*mutuari*), to be traded back and forth between speakers (*mutui*), and in the process, to be changed (*mutari*) slightly.¹⁰⁹ The Latin root *mut-* is useful here since it expresses, through the various words which are constructed

¹⁰⁶ Cic. *Inu.* 2.48. Winterbottom 1974: 635, lists commonplaces.

¹⁰⁷ For intertextuality in Greek and Latin literature, Conte 1986; Hinds 1998; Fowler 1997. For allusion and *imitatio*, West and Woodman 1979.

¹⁰⁸ These words are used as an epigraph to the first chapter of Conte 1986: 32.

¹⁰⁹ For the etymology of these three words, Ernout and Meillet 1959: 426.

from it, both ‘exchange’ and ‘variation’ – ideas that are central to understanding how shared *loci* functioned.

The ideas of exchange and variation embrace two other important characteristics of *loci mutui*. ‘Exchange’ can apply not just to the event of one speaker imitating the quotation of another speaker; it describes the widespread practice of circulating quotations, both in writing and by word of mouth. To facilitate the circulation of quotations, they needed to be readily portable. To this end, they were relatively *short*, generally ranging in length from a single sentence to a paragraph. They were, in other words, the size of Entries appearing in Seneca’s anthology, our best witness to this practice of circulating quotations.

‘Variation’ encompasses one of the most powerful motives speakers had for composing passages similar to passages by other speakers – competition (*aemulatio*). Similar passages could serve as a foil to highlight wherein precisely one speaker was different from – and, from the author’s perspective, hopefully better than – other speakers. The practice of shared passages, and the fact that Seneca has supplied a rich record of the practice with numerous instances of shared *loci*, afford excellent opportunities for studying stylistic differences between declaimers. At the same time, it must be stressed that shared *loci* are not motivated solely by competition. They do more than highlight innovation: they *constitute* what the material of each declamation is. They create and canonize the language of declamation; and to the extent that declamation is part of and helps generate literary traditions, shared *loci* create literary language.¹¹⁰ This idea will be explored further in Chapter 4.

¹¹⁰ So, Conte 1986: 37, argues that allusion in poetic texts is not just about competition: “Imitatio and aemulatio tend to converge in much of classical poetry. The essential point is not that the imitator-poet

1.6 A culture of shared loci

As has already been suggested, the high degree of convergence of declaimers' quotations around a limited number of *loci* is revealing. Put simply, the presence of these *loci* implies an intellectual investment in them: they have somehow influenced the process of collecting and organizing quotations. It is almost certain that at least a portion of Seneca's supporting documents – whether they be his own personal notes, others' notes, published material, or all of these – were organized by passages shared among declaimers. Support for this idea is found in *C.* 1.4 (Section 1.4); and indeed support is found in a number of passages (e.g. *C.* 10.5.23) where Seneca gives explicit notice of a *locus* and then quotes a series of Entries that contributed to the *locus*. In the supporting notes we might imagine that titles of individual *loci* served as the principal organizing terms (i.e. headings), with Entries from declaimers that contributed to these *loci* underneath.

However, if it is hypothesized that notes following this kind of arrangement made up the bulk of Seneca's supporting documents, Seneca would have often needed to alter the arrangement of the notes to conform to the arrangement of his anthology. This is particularly true for the section of *sententiae* where declaimers' names – not names of *loci* – serve as headings. Seneca would have needed to extract the Entries listed in the

desires to surpass his model but that 'tradition' is a necessary pre-condition for both emulation and allusion. The tradition both conditions the later poet's work and helps him to formulate its distinctive qualities. A more rigorous definition of this tradition may perhaps be given by calling it a poetic langue, a system of literary conventions, motifs, ideas, and expressions, with its laws and constraints, that each 'speaker' (writer) will use in his or her own way. If this concept and its critical implications are absorbed by the philologist, it will become possible to avoid positing the relationship between tradition and *aemulatio* as a diametrical opposition that must then be treated as an invariable key to interpretation."

notes under the different *loci* and set them under their respective names in his anthology's section of *sententiae*. Such a process of re-arrangement would be laborious. But since throughout the anthology Seneca places much emphasis on the individuality of the declaimers – taking care to attribute quotations correctly (C. 1 pr. 11) and offering stylistic portrait sketches at the beginning of each book – such labor may have seemed justified.

It is also possible that drawing on supporting documents to fill out the sections of the anthology was easier than this, that the bulk of the notes was organized basically in the way Seneca organized his anthology – with sections devoted to *sententiae*, to *divisiones*, and to *colores*. As has already been mentioned, no exact parallel for this kind of organization survives. Consequently, it is impossible to know how widely recognized these categories of organization were and to assess the likelihood that Seneca would come across this arrangement in circulating notes or anthologies. However, the idea that the organization of Seneca's anthology reflects contemporary practices of notetaking gains support from the *Minor Declamations*, if it is accepted that Seneca's work exhibits a bi-partite structure: fair copies of parts of speeches (= *Declamatio*, in the *Decl. Min.*), and commentary (= *Sermo*, in the *Decl. Min.*).¹¹¹ In Seneca's anthology, the section containing the quotations has been sub-divided to attribute quotations to their authors and the commentary has been sub-divided to include discussions of *divisiones* and *colores*.

But in pursuing the underlying causes of overlap among quotations care must be taken not to lose the forest for the trees. Overlap of quotations in Seneca's anthology can be explained by the structure and limitations of Seneca's supporting documents. He

¹¹¹ On the structure and headings of the *Minor Declamations*, Dingel 1988: 11-20. For more general bibliography, see Håkanson 1986; Lentano 1999.

gives shared *loci* because he did not have the documentary resources to do otherwise. But it is short-sighted to assign the cause of overlap solely to the structure of notes and to Seneca's working methods. Consideration needs to be made of the cultural impulses and intellectual habits that produced the notes.

It is noteworthy how sensitive the declaimers were to one another's speeches and how interested they were to respond to and emulate each other. Probably we should not expect otherwise since competition must have been intense in this climate. But it is at least conceivable that competition could have driven the declaimers to avoid what others had said, to try to stake out their own rhetorical space rather than risk being eclipsed by others. The opposite appears to be the case. There was an impulse to come together in treatments of a select number of passages. Innovation to be sure was highly prized. But rather than seeking out new ground (to the extent that the premise of a declamation would allow), it was often deemed better to fight for distinction in small details. Passages that are shared allow for close scrutiny and effectively limit the terms of comparison.

The declaimers have been taught to seek distinction and excellence through shared passages. The *loci* are focal points that attract the attention of the practitioner, requiring him to give special care in preparation to these: he knows that these passages constitute the material for a given declamation and that he must treat them if he wishes to participate. It is through them that he has the opportunity to outperform his peers. Likewise auditors, who not only listened but recorded notable expressions, would have been drawn to the select *loci* as sites of competitive contrast. In short, the culture of declamation that motivates speakers to pay attention to similarities in speeches would naturally cause them to pay attention to the same thing when taking notes. Many of the

different kinds of declamatory notes and publications, even if (as is likely) they varied in their precise format, would have reflected interest in shared *loci*.

1.7 Shared loci are signaled through keywords, formulae, and labels

If shared *loci* are not an organizational peculiarity of Seneca's documentary sources, but (as I argue) they reflect a broader cultural practice, what are their signals? How did they advertise themselves to declaimers, to notetakers, and to readers as shared *loci*? The simple answer, as has been seen already in several passages, is that Entries show their participation in a shared *locus* through verbal overlap: they share key vocabulary and phrases. A declaimer needed to use such keywords in order to make clear to auditors the *locus* to which he was contributing: he needed to establish the *locus* and at the same time vary it and "improve" on the versions of other speakers.

In the vast majority of cases in Seneca's anthology, this overlap is inherent in the quotations themselves. The key phrases were not added by Seneca, or by whoever recorded the quotations; they reside in the original words of the declaimers. Auditors would have been sensitive to the same signals, and the signals would readily – even instinctively – inform the structure of notes. Occasionally, however, it is possible to discover in the anthology the vestiges of organizational mechanisms that would have appeared in Seneca's supporting documents.

These signals – both those stemming from the declaimers and those that are to be attributed to notetakers – are explored in this section of the chapter through example passages from C.1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. The examples are meant to suggest the range of different cues that can indicate a shared *locus*. They will also serve as preparation for the

stylistic analyses of the following chapters, as these analyses will often rely on comparisons of declaimers' contributions to shared *loci*.

1.7.1 *Controversia* 1.1

The practice of declaimer engaging with declaimer involves more than the use by several speakers of a particular argument or the inclusion, say, of a description (e.g. a description of a boat caught in a storm at sea, *C.* 7.1). Engagement extends to the use of specific keywords or key phrases. An example of keywords was seen above in *C.* 10.5; there the description of the slave auction is signaled by the introductory word *producitur*. A similar instance occurs in *C.* 1.1.

The theme: Two brothers, one of whom has a son, do not get along. When the uncle becomes destitute, the nephew looks after his uncle against the wishes of his father, who disowns his son. The nephew is adopted by his uncle. Eventually the boy's biological father becomes destitute, seeks the aid of his son who agrees against the wishes of his uncle; the uncle disowns him.

It is evident from the quotations offered by Seneca that an integral part of the declamation was a scene in which the father approached his son to seek his care. It is a *locus* shared among several speakers. Like the use of *producitur* in *C.* 10.5, the shared *locus* identifies itself through a phrase, usually in leading position: *Accessit* (or *Venit*) *ad me pater*. Once the identity of the passage has been established through this key phrase, each of the declaimers' treatments varies slightly. The quotations come from the section of *colores* (*C.* 1.1.17-19).

Albucius Silus, in the role of the son, says his father came to him as a father should. He did not humble himself, but commanded his son to care for him:

C. 1.1.17 (Albucius Silus): *Accessit, inquit, ad me pater nec summis<sis> verbis locutus est, non rogavit, sed, quomodo agendum esset cum filio, alere me iussit. recitavit legem, quam ego semper scriptam etiam patruo putavi.*

Several other declaimers (Argentarius, Blandus, Pompeius Silo) choose instead to stress how pitiable the father looked. Argentarius implies that it might be expected that he would agree to do for his father what he had done for his uncle.

C. 1.1.18 (Argentarius): *Accessit, inquit, ad me pater obrutus sordibus, tremens deficientibus membris; rogavit alimenta: interrogo vos, iudices, quid me sic facere oporteat – nam istum non interrogo: scit, quid facturus sim.*¹¹²

Blandus' treatment is similar, highlighting the father's wretched appearance and pointing out that he merely did for his father what he had done for his uncle. Since Argentarius was notorious for close imitations (C. 9.3.12), he may be following Blandus rather than the other way round:

C. 1.1.17 (Blandus): *Venit subito deformis squalore, lacrimis. o graves, Fortuna, vices tuae! ille dives modo, superbus, rogavit alimenta, rogavit filium suum, rogavit abdicatum suum. interrogas, quam diu rogaverit? ne di istud nefas patiantur, ut diu rogaverit; diutius tamen quam tu. Quaeritis, quid fecerim? quod solebam.*

Pompeius Silo, in pointed contrast to Albucius, says that his now humbled father did not act like a father.¹¹³ He had to beg – just as the boy's uncle had done:

¹¹² Another Version of this Entry, also attributed to Argentarius, appears in the section of *sententiae*, C. 1.1.8: *Venit immissa barba capilloque deformi, non senectute sed fame membris tremantibus, summissa et tenui atque elisa ieiunio voce, ut vix exaudiri posset, introrsus conditos oculos vix allevans. alui. quomodo, quaeritis? quomodo istum.*

¹¹³ Marullus (C. 1.1.19) similarly describes how wretched the father looked. However, as Seneca points out, his argument was different: *Marullus novo colore egit: cecidit in pedes meos senex squalidus barba capilloque: novit, inquam, nescio qui iste misericordiam meam. adlevavi, cum ignorarem quis esset; vultis repellam, quod pater est?* Absence of the key phrase (*accessit ad me pater*) in this Entry may be explained by the fact that contributions to the shared *locus* have been grouped together in the anthology under the *colores*; verbal signaling is less necessary to deduce context. This does not mean that in the original quotation Marullus did not use these keywords.

C. 1.1.18 (Pompeius Silo): *Movit, inquit, me quod nihil suo iure, nihil pro potestate, quod tamquam patruus accessit. ego vero non expectavi verba, non preces: complexus sum et osculatus sum patrem. dedi alimenta: hoc unum crudeliter feci, quod dixi fratrem dedisse: non alere sed exprobrare visus sum.*

Cestius' treatment is very different from the others'; nonetheless, its participation in the locus is clearly marked.

C. 1.1.19 (Cestius Pius): *venit ad me pater; quid habui facere? perducere illum ad patruum? non feci. merito irascitur: potuit enim, si aluisset, levare quidem fortunam fratris sed causam adgravare.*

1.7.2 *Controversia* 1.2

This declamation offers a more complex instance of signaling. We find the use not only of key vocabulary, but also of shared phrasal rhythms. Vocabulary and structural patterns combine to create a formula.

The theme: A virgin is captured by pirates and sold to a pimp, who prostitutes her. The girl asks all those who come to her for alms. When the virgin's petition fails to win over a soldier, she is forced to kill him. She is put on trial and acquitted. Now she seeks a priesthood.

In the speech against the girl several of the declaimers make the point that she has already been sufficiently defiled, by association with pirates and the institutions of slavery and prostitution, to disqualify her from a priesthood. Plus, there is no reason to believe that she has indeed remained a virgin. As should be expected, this point is expressed less directly – that is, more suggestively and cleverly – than I have just done. Contributions from Porcius Latro and Arellius Fuscus are in perfect lockstep with each other, adopting multiple shared cues to signal their participation in a shared *locus*.

Fulvius Sparsus and Cestius Pius also participate in the *locus*. However, to the extent that Seneca's record shows, they use only select portions of the formula employed by Latro and Fuscus in their quotations.

C. 1.2.1 (Porcius Latro): *Deducta es in lupanar, accepisti locum, pretium constitutum est, titulus inscriptus est: hactenus in te inquiri potest; cetera nescio.*

The formula of the shared *locus* consists, first, in the rapid-fire retailing of sordid details from the girl's experiences. This is effected through short phrasal bursts of similar length. In the passage above there are four clauses, which I have underlined with dashed lines, of almost identical length (six or seven syllables each). The declaimer reminds his audience that these things, embarrassing and disgraceful in themselves, are what we already know about the girl. Secondly, the declaimer says bluntly – using the verb *nescio*, or *scio* with a negative, in final position – that other details are unknown. The implication is that the audience should suspect the worst.¹¹⁴

The contribution from Arellius Fuscus contains all the elements of the formula. The proximity means the two declaimers closely, we should say emulously, engaged one another on this occasion. It bears remembering that this is not the first time we have seen Fuscus attempt to improve upon the craftsmanship of Latro (see above on C. 1.4.10-12).

C. 1.2.5 (Arellius Fuscus): *Meretrix vocata es, in communi loco stetisti, superpositus est cellae tuae titulus, venientem recepisti: cetera, etiamsi in communi loco essem, tamen potius <ne>scirem.*

¹¹⁴ The *locus*, with a portion of the formula, actually appears another time in Latro's quotation: *Inter barbaros quid passa sit, nescio; quid pati potuerit, scio*. This is further evidence of the non-sequentiality of Entries.

The structure of the Entry is identical to Latro's, falling in two halves, the first of which accumulates the shameful details. The second part hints that we *can* know of the deeds that took place behind closed doors, but they are so dishonorable as to be unthinkable. Herein, it seems, is the twist Fuscus puts on Latro's Entry: would that we could not imagine what took place, so reprehensible is it!

Although Fuscus, unlike Latro, admits of variety in the length of each of the four clauses, the desire to have them set against each other for comparison is further expressed through similarity of vocabulary. Fuscus matches Latro's *lupanar* with *meretrix*, and both of them use the nouns *locus* and *titulus*. At the end of the Entry appears *nescirem*,¹¹⁵ which seems preferable to the reading of the manuscripts (*scirem*). In any case, whether *scirem* or *nescirem*, also this element of the formula is present.

The short Entry from Fulvius Sparsus, which in other respects is rather unremarkable, clearly belongs to this shared *locus*.

C. 1.2.2 (Fulvius Sparsus): *Quid inclusa feceris, nec quaerere debemus nec scire possumus.*

Part of the formula is lacking, namely the quick paced listing of shameful details. But since what remains adheres closely to the second half of the formula, it may be the case that Seneca has simply not included it in the record. Besides the appearance of *nec scire*, observe that *quaerere* is parallel to Latro's *inquiri*. Sparsus' quotation is in fact an interesting amalgam of the innovations of both Latro and Fuscus. Instead of *cetera*, which Latro and Fuscus use to allude to behavior that was hidden from view (as opposed to more public indicators of the girl's debasement, such as a *titulus* advertising her

¹¹⁵ Conjectured by R. Novák (*apud* Håkanson 1989a: *ad loc.*).

profession), Sparsus says explicitly *quid inclusa feceris...* And he is comprehensive in his treatment by stating that a) they are not *able* to know what happened behind closed doors (cf. Latro's *hactenus in te inquiri potest*), and b) they *ought* not seek to know (cf. Fuscus' *potius nescirem*).

At first glance the long quotation of Cestius Pius (C. 1.2.7-8) might not seem to contain a contribution to the shared *locus*. More independent and formulaic signals are superficially less obvious. Nonetheless, the signals are there and meant to be noticed.

C. 1.2.7 (Cestius Pius): Stetisti, puella, in lupanari: iam te ut nemo violaverit, locus ipse violavit. stetisti cum meretricibus, (stetisti sic ornata ut populo placere posses, ea veste quam leno dederat), nomen tuum pependit in fronte, pretia stupri accepisti, et manus, quae dis datura erat sacra, capturas tulit.

Cestius begins by saying outright what is implicit in the contributions from Latro, Fuscus, and Sparsus: even if no one touched the girl, she has been defiled by association (*locus ipse violavit*). The rhythm of the clauses that follow is different from that of Latro's and Fuscus' – but only slightly. The latter two declaimers, as we have seen, employ four clauses in rapid succession detailing the experiences that have sullied the girl's character. Beginning with the first *stetisti* until the end of the passage, Cestius adopts the same sentence architecture, except that he has chosen to interrupt the sequence with a remark on the tawdry adornment of the girl. If we suppose that this remark is parenthetical (so I have set it in parentheses above), what remains are four clauses rhythmically structured and reminiscent of those of Latro and Fuscus.

1) *stetisti cum meretricibus*...2) *nomen tuum pependit in fronte*, 3) *pretia stupri accepisti*, et 4) *manus quae dis datura erat sacra capturas tulit*.

In addition to shared cadences and rhythms of expression, the clauses contain significant overlaps in vocabulary and argument (underlined). Clause one responds to

Latro's *deducta es in lupanar*; or rather, it may be seen as a combination of Latro's first two clauses (*Meretrix vocata es, in communi loco stetisti...*). The second clause corresponds to Latro's *titulus inscriptus est* and to Fuscus' *superpositus est cellae tuae titulus*. The third clause parallels Latro's *pretium constitutum est*; it also, perhaps, has absorbed something of Fuscus' *venientem recepisti*.

1.7.3 *Controversia* 1.3

Passages from this declamation illustrate how the original words of declaimers influenced how notetakers recorded and organized quotations.

The theme: A girl is condemned for unchastity. Before she is cast from a rock, she invokes Vesta. She survives the fall. It is debated whether she should be cast from the rock again.

The word *narratio* occurs four times in 1.3, seemingly serving as part of the headings that introduce quotations: *Cesti Pii narratio* (1.3.2); *Argentari narratio* (1.3.5); *Silonis Pompei narratio* (1.3.6); and *Vibi Galli narratio* (1.3.6). The appearance of this label is curious. Seneca generally does not use it. Indeed, outside *C.* 1.3, it occurs only two other times in the anthology (*C.* 1.2.7; 2.1.3). In one of these two instances (2.1.3), its use results in two quotations from Cestius Pius appearing side by side, one immediately after the other: the first quotation, as is customary, is introduced simply by the name in the genitive, *Cesti Pii*; the second quotation is introduced by the label *narratio Cesti Pii*.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ Alternatively, we might interpret this as *one* quotation, with the label *Narratio Cesti Pii* occurring in the middle of it.

It is extremely rare, in the section of *sententiae*, for quotations from the same declaimer to be presented in immediate succession.¹¹⁷ The most plausible explanation is that this interruption in Cestius' quotations, where the label *narratio Cesti Pii* occurs, indicates two layers or sources in Seneca's supporting documents. *Narratio* is not the standard heading in the anthology for introducing a quotation in the section of *sententiae*. Therefore, the label seems to be linked in a specific way to the quotation with which it occurs: it could represent a labeling practice of the source for this particular quotation¹¹⁸ and/or the label could be intended to refer specifically to the content of the quotation.

The most obvious explanation is that the quotations introduced by *narratio* are from the 'narrative' of a speech. This might be correct, particularly since Seneca not infrequently indicates that an Entry is from the *narratio*.¹¹⁹ But at least for the four quotations in *C. 1.3*, this can be only partially true. Use of the label is still more specific, as becomes clear when the quotations are set side by side and compared.

C. 1.3.2 Cesti Pii narratio. Quid agam? exponam, quando stuprum commiserit, cum quo, quibus consciis? ista quia probavi, damnata est; quid postea accessit, quod illam virginem faceret? quod iacuit in carcere, quod ducta est ad saxum, quod inde proiecta?

¹¹⁷ At *C. 2.6.2-3*, two short quotations of Blandus occur together, each introduced in the standard way with the name in the genitive. It is telling that these quotations are clearly Versions of each other: they probably represent two different sources. In two of our three principal mss (Brussels 9594; Antwerp 411), a mark precedes the second '*Blandi*.' The mark (three short horizontal lines) must have been in the archetype, but its meaning is unclear.

¹¹⁸ So, for example, *narratio* occasionally appears as a heading in the *Minor Declamations* (*Decl.* 332.3; 333.6; also at 301.2, where Winterbottom 1984: *ad loc.*, prefers the reading *declamatio* found in a 15th cent. manuscript).

¹¹⁹ E.g., *C. 9.4.16: Montanus Votienus dixit in narratione: si perseveras, fili, fratrem sequar*. Other passages with the phrase *in narratione*: *C. 1.1.21; 1.2.19; 2.6.9; 2.6.10; 7.1.21; 7.1.27; 7.6.15; 9.4.11; 9.4.16*. Sometimes Seneca indicates that an Entry is from the *narratio* with the verb *narrare*; e.g., *C. 1.4.8: Silo hoc colore narravit: non putavi mihi licere*. Similar passages: *C. 7.2.11; 10.2.13; 10.2.15; 10.2.17*. None of these passages is from the section of *sententiae*.

C. 1.3.5 *Argentari narratio. Paene, iudices, narrare coepi, qualis esset rea; sed quid efficiam, cum illam incestam probavero? nempe ut de saxo deicienda videatur; iam visa est. non imitabor istius impudentiam, ut repetendo iudicium, quod factum est, improbasse videar. quod exigebatur probavi, quod iudicastis exsequor.*

C. 1.3.6 *Pompei Silonis narratio. Quod ad rerum expositionem pertinet, iudices, non committam, ut ultionem deorum immortalium morer. incesta saxo deiciatur: lege damnata est, habetis iudicium; deiecta est, habetis exemplum.*

C. 1.3.6 *Vibi Galli narratio. Brevis expositio rerum est: adversariam incesti postulavi, accusavi, damnavi, carnifici tradidi. <si> permittis, iam ab rea accusator recedam; eamus ad absolutionem tuam.*

The four Entries above witness the declaimers formulating the same argument. In effect, they all say: there is no need to narrate the events since the case has already been tried and settled; therefore, let the punishment be carried out until the girl is dead. All four declaimers use phrases (double underlined) that are synonymous for ‘narrate’ or ‘narrative.’ The phrases serve as keywords, identifying the Entries as belonging to the same shared *locus*. The heading *narratio*, rather than introducing a quotation in the same way that names alone generally do, appears to be linked with the keywords of the *locus*.¹²⁰ Out of the keywords, which should be attributed to the declaimers, a notetaker has created a label, or heading, to better organize his notes. The label would have served to signal that these Entries should be considered together. *Narratio*, then, seems to say *not* that ‘the following quotation is from the narrative,’ but rather, that ‘this is the narrative *locus*.’ It would have been understood (to the notetaker at least) what exactly the ‘narrative *locus*’ is. In essence, the *locus* claims: “as regards the narrative – there is no need for one. We know she is guilty: punish her.” The label applies not to the

¹²⁰ It is possible that ‘*narratio*’ in fact was not meant to be construed with the names in the genitive, but was meant to be taken with the first Entry of each of the quotations.

entirety of each of the four quotations, but only to the Entries contributing to the ‘narrative *locus*.’¹²¹ Perhaps due to what we should characterize as inattention rather than error, the label has been included in the final draft of the anthology.

1.8 Conclusion

Quotations in Seneca’s anthology are not comprehensive. They do attempt to represent all that declaimers said on a given declamatory theme or to include every expression, comment, and point of argument. Instead, they show a clear tendency to record what was spoken in common. This interest in similar quotations by different speakers is not an organizational idiosyncrasy of Seneca’s anthology or of his documentary sources. It is not commonality in and of itself that made the quotations worthy of record: these similar quotations, or shared *loci*, constituted what mattered for a given declamation. All parties involved collaborated in making shared *loci* salient and important – not only the declaimers who composed them, but also the auditors who praised them, and the notetakers who recorded and circulated them. It bears remembering that those who participated in declamation would have performed all three of these functions (*declamator*, *auditor*, *notarius*) at different moments.

Given the significance of shared *loci* in determining what a declaimer would speak, there must have been well-understood conventions for signaling that a quotation participated in a shared *locus*. It is not difficult to recognize such signals, in the form of verbal overlap, in the quotations of Seneca’s anthology. These signals, for the most part, resided in the original quotations. However, the boundary between signals found in the

¹²¹ The limited application of the label *narratio* is most obvious in the quotation from Cestius Pius, which is relatively long (12 Teubner lines). There is no basis for believing that the uncommon label *narratio* comprehends the entire quotation (= five Entries, according to Håkanson).

original quotations and signals that either Seneca or his documentary sources used is not always distinct.

In the sections above I explored different methods of signaling as applied both by declaimers and notetakers. Terminology was introduced to identify these methods. ‘Keywords’ are individual words or phrases that declaimers share to advertise a shared *locus*. Examples discussed above include *producitur (senex)* in *C. 10.5*, and *accessit (or venit) ad me pater* in *C. 1.1*. Keywords belong to the original words of the declaimer. However, they would have been used also by notetakers to select what they would record and to arrange and organize recorded quotations. So, the grouping of Entries at 1.4.10-12 adumbrates the presence of keywords in the notes, perhaps as headings, although Seneca never explicitly identifies them as organizing instruments.

In the term ‘formula’ it is recognized that signaling of *loci* can be complex, involving not only keywords but also groups of phrases or larger sentence patterns. An example of this was seen in *C. 1.2*, where several declaimers adopt all or part of a sentence outline.

Within quotations occasionally ‘labels’ are found. In some cases it is obvious that the label is an organizational device and does not belong to the original words of a declaimer. So, for example, the use of *narratio* in *C. 1.3*. Similar is the use of ‘context labels’; for example, *descriptio viri pugnantis* at *C. 1.4.2*. It is clear that this phrase is not part of an original quotation. It serves to set up, or provide context, for the Entry with which it appears. However, it often happens that this distinction between label and original quotation collapses. A phrase seems to be given not strictly for its own sake, but to help set up the sentences that follow. Since the phrase is not presented as an

extraneous label, it is very difficult to know whether the words are original, precisely as given, or if they are included principally to identify the shared *locus*. An example of this kind of ambiguous context label is the phrase *Escende, occide tyrannum*, at *C.* 2.5.1 (Section 1.3).¹²²

The investigation above was meant to advance our current understanding of the organization of Seneca's anthology. The main impetus for the investigation is a desire to read – and to read without distorting the ordered language of the work – quotations from the anthology's numerous, largely unknown speakers. The unique way in which the anthology presents quotations immediately invokes the question: 'But how do the quotations work?' Although more research into how Seneca made his collection remains to be done, the foregoing investigation has identified a central organizing principle of the anthology and, it seems, of declamation in the early empire: the 'shared *locus*.' It is important to note that this recognition of the practice of shared *loci* occurred inductively, rather than through the categorical frameworks of ancient rhetorical theories. This inductive approach is both necessary and beneficial to our goal of better understanding the speakers Seneca quotes. It is necessary because, as it turns out, the practice of shared *loci* cannot be accounted for by rhetorical theory: a practice in the text is observed that does not find a theoretical corollary. It is beneficial because priority is given to the immediate presence of the evidence. Only in the actual, specific language of the text is there historical context: we understand the language of the speakers as shaped by the exigencies of events and social interactions, rather than limiting our understanding to ancient and modern preconceptions. This emphasis on the immediacy of the language of

¹²² Another example, *C.* 9.6.8 (*'Filia' inquit 'tua conscia est'*).

the anthology will be continued in the following chapters as we examine the quotations from two speakers, Papirius Fabianus and Arellius Fuscus.

2. Papirius Fabianus: voice of a philosopher

2.1 Objectives

This chapter, and the chapters that follow, originate in a central question: If all quotations assigned to a given speaker in Seneca's anthology are examined, to what extent does a linguistic and literary identity emerge?¹

The belief that there is little difference between one declaimer and another, though not universal, is widespread and long-standing in modern scholarship.² An effect of this belief can not pass unnoticed. A single literary identity for the numerous declaimers on record (120 in the extant anthology) justifies lumping them together *en masse* as a genre unto themselves, different and inferior to other, 'legitimate' literary

¹ Each adjective, 'linguistic' and 'literary,' contributes to defining what identity can be. 'Linguistic' emphasizes those features of speech that are less conscious, that are more the product of habit than of artifice; and also those features that do not originate in a literary context. 'Literary' emphasizes features that locate speech within an artistic literary corpus. For the purpose of discovering a declaimer's identity, it is undesirable (and often impossible) to differentiate between 'literary' and 'non-literary' features. Pinkster 1985: 67, criticizes the tradition of classical scholarship that examines the "language and style" of an author, stating that it is hardly clear what is meant by either term and that it is not clear whether there is a difference between the two terms. This criticism, while valid where studies have been vague in their intentions, stems from an apparent reluctance to admit interpretive issues into linguistic studies of Latin texts. Since the Latin corpus can be characterized as overwhelmingly literary, as Pinkster (p. 70) himself does, it is difficult to see how questions of interpretation can be excluded.

² Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1900: 6: "Für unsere Empfindung ist der Gradunterschied des Absurden zwischen allen diesen Declamatoren gering." Kroll 1893-: 1057: "Aus *controversiae* des P[apirius Fabianus] gibt uns Seneca sechs Proben, aus *suasoriae* eine; für uns, denen diese ganze Beredsamkeit wie eine Masse erscheint, zeigen sie kaum einen Unterschied von der Art seiner Kollegen" [emphasis (eine) original]. Kennedy 1972: 328: "The literary style of the declamations quoted by Seneca shows some, but not great, variation." Exactly the opposite view is expressed by Bonner 1949: 63: "Although there was clearly a 'declamatory' style, individual declaimers differed considerably in diction and composition." However, Bonner does not substantiate this view with examples, and it is clear from the context (and his references to D'Alton 1931 and Norden 1915-18) that his opinion stems from his faith in the existence of Asianism as a distinct, identifiable stylistic category. For the limitations of such categories, see Johnson 1971: 1-7.

genres.³ Implicit then in this question, whether it is possible to recognize important distinctions among declaimers, are other questions with broader implications: What would it mean for a declaimer to have a distinct linguistic and literary identity? What might such an identity be like? It is seldom recognized that many of Seneca's quotations are not from Latin literature's so-called Silver Age, with which declamation is so often associated, but from the Augustan Age, the Golden Age. How does a declaimer stand in relation to literary traditions, particularly if it is allowed that he has his own historical context and that he might have his own linguistic identity?

The path of research that this central question opens is readily justified by the interests of Seneca's anthology itself. Seneca's emphasis on the individual speaker and on distinctions between speakers is everywhere in evidence: in the stylistic portraits that precede each book; in the use of names as headings in the section of *sententiae*; in his concern to attribute quotations correctly (*C.* 1 pr. 11); in his ranking of declaimers (*C.* 10 pr. 13); and in critical comments (e.g. *C.* 9.2.24).⁴ Moreover, the possibility of linguistic identities applies to another question about the anthology, already mentioned in Chapter

³ Studies that consider the influence of declamation on literary authors and try to determine to what extent authors are declamatory, while appearing to be sympathetic to declamation, can in effect be quite the opposite; e.g., Rayment 1969; Bonner 1966; Bonner 1949: 149-67; De Decker 1913; Rolland 1906. Declamation is treated as existing outside literature, a contagion that infects genuine authors. Belief in the separateness of declamation from literature manifests itself also in complaints from students of a "real" author when the author is frequently confronted with the label "rhetorical"; e.g. Tarrant 1995. Studies comparing declamation and literary authors and genres are numerous; for recent examples, Berti 2007: 251-358, with bibliography; Mal-Maeder 2007: 115-45.

⁴ After quoting from a certain Florus, Seneca comments that "Latro would never have composed his sentences in this way (*sic composuisset*)"; "nor would a *sententia* from Latro ever have vanished in such an effeminate word-arrangement" (*nec in tam mollem compositionem sententia eius evanisset*).

1. If a declaimer's quotations exhibit a coherent linguistic identity, this could supply supporting evidence for the authenticity and accuracy of Seneca's quotations.⁵

But a difficulty immediately presents itself. The question of an author's linguistic and literary identity is easier to answer in the case of those authors (e.g. Cicero or Livy) whose language survives in abundance, and moreover survives in their own independent works with their own manuscript tradition. Seneca's work, as anthology, creates special challenges for getting at the essence of what a speaker was like. The most obvious challenge is simply a limitation of linguistic data: quotations of declaimers are generally short and some speakers are quoted infrequently. Consequently, quotations of a given speaker might contain what in fact were typical characteristics of his language, but because of a paucity of quotations from this speaker, characteristics cannot be recognized as typical.

A linguistic identity, therefore, cannot be expected to be seen to the same extent for all declaimers. This reality does not allow us to assume that declaimers who do not receive rich representation in the anthology did not possess separate identities; rather, it is a recognition of the constraints of the kind of record Seneca has provided, and a recognition of the only partial survival of that record.

Discovery of a linguistic identity will be most promising for a declaimer whose quotations are relatively abundant and consistently attest to a certain set of linguistic features. In fact, however, consistency by itself may not be sufficiently compelling, since

⁵ I say "supporting," because 'linguistic identity' by itself cannot prove that the quotations are authentic and accurate. It is always possible – though unjustified, I believe – to claim that Seneca fabricated the quotations and fabricated the identities we can trace. Even if the quotations were flawlessly accurate (which is all but impossible in the type of project that Seneca has undertaken, even under the best conditions), their accuracy would not be self-evident and, in the absence of independent survival of the same quotations, could never be proven.

several speakers can seem consistently to exhibit very similar linguistic features. A still more convincing demonstration will focus on a speaker whose linguistic identity is invested in features that are both consistently attested and that are markedly different from his peers.⁶

These considerations were crucial in the decision to make the quotations of two specific declaimers, Papirius Fabianus and Arellius Fuscus, the subject of the remainder of this study. Not only is there a relatively ample supply of quotations attributed to Fabianus and Fuscus, no other declaimers' quotations in the anthology create stronger impressions of unified and assertive linguistic personalities.⁷ In short, their quotations are not simply lengthy, but rich. For Fabianus, this richness consists of a concentration of quotations in the *controversiae* of Book 2. In the preface to *C. 2*, which includes a stylistic description of Fabianus, Seneca says that he has collected in one book his entire supply of quotations from Fabianus.⁸ The assembled quotations show thematic and linguistic unity and, it may be, were composed in a fairly narrow time frame. In the case of Fuscus,⁹ several long quotations from descriptive passages are given, notably in the

⁶ Gotoff 1979: 33, speaks of two kinds of stylistic categorization, "inclusive" versus "exclusive." The former unifies authors into large groups. The latter, which at least in part reflects the objectives of the present study, seeks to distinguish one individual artist from another.

⁷ This is not to deny that examination of the quotations of other well-represented speakers (e.g. Porcius Latro, Junius Gallio, Cestius Pius) would be fruitful.

⁸ *C. 2 pr. 5: in hunc ergo libellum quaecumque ab illo dicta teneo conferam.* In fact, Fabianus appears again in *S. 1*. The apparent discrepancy is not an error, but is best explained by separate publication of *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*. Evidence of separate publication comes from the excerpted tradition of Seneca's work. The excerptor had available to him all ten books of the *Controversiae*; however, he made no excerpts of the *Suasoriae*, presumably because they were transmitted separately and he did not have access to them. Bursian 1857: vii, reasonably conjectures that the excerpted text was made in the 4th or 5th cent. AD; Müller 1887: xxii; Hagendahl 1936: 300, 308.

⁹ Fairweather 1984: 541-2, recognizes the distinctiveness of Arellius Fuscus' style. However, as I shall argue, she misunderstands his style and its relationship with trends in Latin literature.

extant *suasoriae*, which, because they were designed to meet similar demands of performance, exhibit similar linguistic tendencies and patterns.

Furthermore, the study of Arellius Fuscus and Papirius Fabianus is recommended by the speakers' historical circumstances and by their connections with canonical authors. Fuscus, who was likely born between 65 and 60 BC, is among the older generation of declaimers quoted by Seneca. He is an Augustan Age declaimer, roughly contemporary with some of the most canonical of Latin authors – Vergil, Horace, and Livy. Moreover, he was a teacher of Ovid (*C.* 2.2.8). Fabianus, who was born c. 35 BC, was a generation younger than Fuscus; nonetheless, a large part of his literary career (and arguably the composition of all the quotations in the anthology) would have occurred in the Augustan Age. He was in some capacity a teacher of the younger Seneca. His literary output – which was substantial (*Sen. Ep.* 100.9) but has entirely vanished except for a few scraps in the works of grammarians – was used as source by the younger Seneca and the elder Pliny.¹⁰

Finally, an explanation of this study's theoretical foundation. It will be seen that the discussion and analyses to follow are focused on *language*, specifically on the language of Seneca's anthology and of other literary works. 'Language' in these analyses is not part of a dichotomy that sees linguistic form, on the one hand, as separable from content or meaning, on the other. My analyses reject this familiar dichotomy and instead operate on the premise that form and content are one: change in form is equivalent to change in meaning and function.

¹⁰ For the younger Seneca's and the elder Pliny's citations of Fabianus see Section 2.2.

To put the underlying philosophy of this study in its most basic terms, the language of Seneca’s anthology – and of other texts that enter the discussion – is recognized to *exist*.¹¹ Language is materially present; it is not a transparent medium for the conveyance of meaning.¹² Consequently, efforts to understand Seneca’s work and the quotations of the declaimers cannot overlook or otherwise diminish the material presence of language without risk of distorting the meaning and function of the text.

The belief that formal aspects of language must be duly accounted for to arrive at meaning is of course hardly new. Among the best representatives of this view is the work of Roman Jakobson, who insisted that language has physical substance and spoke of poetry as the “expressive intent of the *verbal mass*” [my emphasis].¹³

Traditionally scholarship with interests similar to this dissertation’s has identified ‘style’ as its focus. Affiliation with, and indeed a positive debt owed to, these stylistic studies is undeniable.¹⁴ Of particular help have been those stylistic studies that insist that formal analysis must be accompanied by interpretation, that the objective is to consider the motivation and meaning of form.¹⁵ This dissertation *is* about style – or, more

¹¹ For a summary of the theoretical debate about the material existence of language, with particular emphasis on typography, Drucker 1994: 9-47. Other studies, in the tradition of the history of the book and paleography, that have in part influenced the ideas expressed here include McKenzie 1999; McKenzie 1981; McGann 1991; McGann 1983; Petrucci 1995.

¹² Todorov 1982: 272. Also, see Todorov 1982: 280-1: “Those who accuse him [Jakobson] of ‘formalism,’ or who hasten to assure us that formalism is outmoded, are not aware that their accusations depend upon a preliminary dichotomy opposing ‘form’ to ‘substance’ or to ‘ideas.’ Jakobson’s choice – never to stop perceiving language, not to let language fade into transparency and into ‘naturalness,’ whatever the pretext – has a much more serious ideological and philosophical signification than this or that ‘idea’ that may have currency today.”

¹³ Quoted, and somewhat adapted, by Todorov 1982: 271, from Jakobson 1973: 20; Drucker 1994: 29.

¹⁴ Stylistic studies are legion. Ax 1976 gives an overview of studies of Latin texts. More recent bibliography, including studies outside of classical literature, can be found in Pinkster 1985. Discussions of Tacitus’ style have been particularly helpful; for a synopsis, Hellegouarc’h 1991.

¹⁵ Important representatives of this approach include Klingner 1955 and Richter 1972.

precisely, about ‘styles.’ Not surprisingly, then, it has sometimes seemed appropriate and necessary in the course of discussion to speak of the ‘style’ of a writer or declaimer. Nonetheless, it is recognized that style is a term heavily laden with meanings, with a long history of competing definitions and assumptions. Therefore, in addressing the central question posed above (i.e., whether a consistent literary and linguistic personality emerges from a declaimer’s quotations), it has seemed preferable to speak of ‘identity.’ This term is at once meant to point up that we are investigating whether certain linguistic features in the quotations of a declaimer exhibit *unity* and *individuality*. We wish to know whether the quotations possess coherence such that their author can be said to have a linguistic and literary identity.

At the same time, ‘identity’ is meant to point up the literary and historical obscurity in which the declaimers find themselves. To be sure, this obscurity is partially due to the fact that relatively little information about individual declaimers is available.¹⁶ But obscurity is due not merely to the accidents of survival. This is also an obscurity of disrepute and disregard, which has come about through the (artificial) creation of a literary canon. In several ancient sources and in modern scholarship declaimers have been largely despised. They have been the bastards of literary history. By considering a declaimer’s quotations in the context of wider literary trends, is it possible to restore a legitimate identity?

¹⁶ So the title of Duret 1983 (“Dans l’ombre des plus grands: I. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l’époque augustéenne”), which in part inspired the main title of this dissertation. Duret (p. 1518) too believes that the language of the declaimers is nearly indistinguishable.

Lastly, ‘identity’ is meant to liberate declaimers from the confines of ‘rhetoric,’ as conceived in the restrictive and tendentious schematic of Aristotle.¹⁷ ‘Identity,’ rather than ‘rhetoric,’ allows for multiple interpretations of the declaimers’ objectives, of the function of their language, and of the effects their language can exercise in auditors and readers. Language is not simply an instrument of persuasion in its narrow sense.¹⁸ Rather, linguistic form embodies – and is inseparable from – thought, emotion, aesthetics, and social identities.¹⁹ In accordance with this perspective, declaimers seek to produce language that “resonates” with auditors and readers on one or more of these levels (thought, emotion, aesthetics, social identity). If it is discovered that a declaimer’s quotations are distinctive – that is, if a declaimer exhibits a linguistic and literary identity – this distinctiveness should be regarded as part and parcel of an attempt to effect a sympathetic union: an identification on the part of the auditor or reader with the speaker.

¹⁷ Aristotle’s construction of rhetoric has been challenged by modern students of rhetoric, especially since the work of Kenneth Burke; see Haskins 2004: *passim*; Poulakos 1993 (e.g. chapter by Jane Sutton, pp. 75-90).

¹⁸ To understand the nature of rhetoric, Kenneth Burke first opposed its traditional definition as ‘persuasion’ with the idea of ‘identity’; see Burke 1969: 55-59; Haskins 2004: 80-107. See also Gagarin 2001. [Longinus], *Subl.* 1.4 also challenges the notion that speech is only about persuasion: “For the effect of genius is not to persuade the audience but rather to transport them out of themselves. Invariably what inspires wonder casts a spell upon us and is always superior to what is merely convincing and pleasing”; this is quoted by Pernot 2005: 139. For a similar use of the term ‘identity’ in understanding an ancient author’s literary output, see Too 1995.

¹⁹ Burke 1969: 55: “You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his” [emphasis original]. Related to ‘identity’ is Burke’s idea of ‘consubstantiality’; see Burke 1969: 20-3: two people that identify with one another share substance; they are consubstantial. The term (“consubstantial”) is suggestive since it unifies formal expression and meaning (substance).

2.2 Fabianus' reputation in ancient sources: a re-evaluation

Papirius Fabianus, Seneca tells us (*C.* 2 pr. 2), seized every opportunity the declamatory themes would allow to criticize the vices of the age. The quotations of Fabianus, all of which except for *S.* 1.4, 9-10²⁰ are collected in *C.* 2, bear out this statement, specifically: *C.* 2.1.10-13, 25; 2.5.7; 2.6.2. A related topic favored by Fabianus, and treated in 2.4.3 and *S.* 1.9-10, is the mutability of fortune.²¹ Since declaimers commonly spoke on both these themes, we should not be surprised to observe Fabianus doing the same. But it is evident from Seneca's description of his style in the preface to *C.* 2, and from reading the quotations attributed to him, that Fabianus managed to treat a group of closely related *communes loci*, practiced more or less by all declaimers, in such a way that others identified him with these *loci* and they became something of his own rhetorical property.

The appropriation of this group of moral *loci* did not come about simply because Fabianus reverted to it more frequently than others. From the quotations themselves we sense what is first and foremost distinctive about Fabianus' treatment: an insistence on seeing events and circumstances through the prism of society's moral failings. This insistence leads to extensive and digressive expositions linking moral faults to events or circumstances that, at least to many modern readers, seem to have little or no moral dimension. The best example of this, and one that has again and again piqued the

²⁰ Fabianus' quotation at *S.* 1.4 is discussed in Chapter 4.

²¹ Bornecque 1902b: 186: "Pour le fond, comme nous l'indique Sénèque (*II Préf.* 2), et comme cela est naturel chez un philosophe, Fabianus revient presque toujours à deux idées: influence néfaste des richesses et instabilité de la fortune."

curiosity of commentators,²² is a long quotation at *C.* 2.1.10-13 where Fabianus draws a connection between a rich man's desire to adopt the son of his poor friend and the trend among the wealthy to alter the natural environment. After a description of urban gardens and refashionings of the landscape, the quotation is concluded with the indignant question (2.1.13): "And you wonder that those who, on account of their distaste for what is natural, are now not even satisfied with children unless they're someone else's?"²³

A speaker who brings in material not germane to the topic of discussion exposes himself to criticisms of irrelevance and ineptitude. But nowhere is Fabianus criticized for this, as is for example Arellius Fuscus.²⁴ On the contrary, Fabianus seems to have been praised and imitated by other declaimers.²⁵ Fabianus' insistence on moral themes, even when they appear to be absent from the premise to a declamation, his determination to see the particulars of a case in a broader framework and thus to search out root causes, suggests a coherent personality, a kind of Socratic gadfly thoroughly occupied with the moral health of society.²⁶ It is through this consistent, unified personality that

²² Kaster 2005: 128-9; Edwards 2002: 137; Purcell 1987: 190; Leeman 1963: 262 ("I cannot refrain from presenting here an extensive extract from a characteristic declamation by Fabianus, which shows him as a moderate and less gifted fore-runner of the philosopher Seneca.... The text presents an intricate mixture of the *loci de divitiis, convicium saeculi, locorum descriptiones* and '*dulces*' *sententiae*"; and on p. 263: "However absurd this *mixtum compositum* of cheap *philosophemata* may seem to the modern reader, he cannot fail to discover a note of sincerity – a quality praised in him by both Senecas – and an intensity of feeling which foreshadows Juvenal. It is a good example of his oratorical fluency, which avoids syntactical subordination but goes on and on in a non-stop flow of speech"); Bonner 1949: 58-9; Summers 1910: xl-xli.

²³ *Et mirabere, si fastidio rerum naturae laborantibus iam ne liberi quidem nisi alieni placent?*

²⁴ *S.* 3.4.

²⁵ *C.* 2.4.10; 2.4.7; 2.5.19; 7 pr. 4-5.

²⁶ On the assumption of philosophical personae in rhetorical performances, see Gleason 1995: 151; Valantasis 1999: 218: "The analogy with other arts implies that the acquisition of virtue is also an art. Not only is the acquisition of virtue a performance...but also the end result is a work of art, a fabrication of an artifact of the good person."

expositions which otherwise might seem digressive and repetitive, become powerfully on-topic and effective.

As the author of several philosophical treatises and as participant in a short-lived Augustan Age philosophical school, the Sextii,²⁷ Fabianus gained a reputation as a philosopher. But, as the foregoing discussion is meant to suggest, Fabianus projects the image of the *philosophus* also in his declamations. It is my assertion that his method of treatment in the declamations is not only consistent with, but served to construct this identity. Thus the epithet *philosophus*, which often appears with Fabianus' name when his quotations in Seneca's anthology are introduced, does not refer only to his activity outside of declamation; it applies to his manner of self-presentation in the quotations themselves.

There are more explicit indications that the elder Seneca, at least, regarded Fabianus' style in delivering declamations as the style of a philosopher. Because of the tranquility of his mind, Seneca explains (*C.* 2 pr. 2), Fabianus had difficulty imitating emotions from which he had freed himself, such as grief and anger: *iam videlicet compositus et pacatus animus cum veros compressisset affectus et iram doloremque procul expulisset, parum bene imitari poterat quae effugerat.* His speech was brilliant and fluid, but it lacked the aggression and combativeness of an orator: *deerat illi oratorium robur et ille pugnatorius mucro, splendor vero velut voluntarius non elaboratae orationi aderat.* The interior calm Fabianus had attained was reflected in his

²⁷ The school lasted approximately sixty years (c. 40 BC – 19 AD). Besides Fabianus, its members included Q. Sextius (founder), Sextius Niger (son of Q. Sextius), L. Crassicius, and Cornelius Celsus (author of *de Medicina*); see Lana 1992; Lana 1990.

face when he spoke, and his voice and body were never strained: *vultus dicentis lenis et pro tranquillitate morum remissus; vocis nulla contentio, nulla corporis adseveratio, cum verba velut iniussa fluerent.*²⁸

Such a description is typical of ancient conceptions of the speech of philosophers, as is evident from Cicero, *Orat.* 62-4, which bears several similarities to Seneca's stylistic sketch of Fabianus. Speaking generally of the philosopher's style, Cicero says that it lacks *nervi* and *oratorii aculei*, "force and the orator's barbs" (cf. elder Seneca's *oratorium robur et ille pugnatorius mucro*). He proceeds (64):

mollis est enim oratio philosophorum et umbratilis nec sententiis nec verbis instructa popularibus nec vincata numeris sed soluta liberius; nihil iratum habet nihil invidum nihil atrox nihil miserabile nihil astutum; casta verecunda virgo incorrupta quodam modo.

"The philosophers' style is placid and withdrawn; it is not built up of neat phrases or words to please the public, nor is it fettered by meter but is free. There is no anger in it, no malignity, no savagery, no pathos, no cunning (cf. Seneca's *cum veros compressisset affectus et iram doloremque procul expulisset*). It is, as it were, a chaste virgin, modest and incorruptible."²⁹

From this comparison it appears that Seneca's description of Fabianus' style is to some degree stereotyped.³⁰ This does not mean necessarily that the description is inaccurate. And it should be noted that in drawing on traditional ideas about the philosopher's style Seneca is selective: he does not say (how could he?) that Fabianus did

²⁸ Also, *C.* 2.5.18: *Fabianus philosophus colorem <non> magis bono viro convenientem introduxit <quam> oratori callido.*

²⁹ Cf. *C.* 2.1.24: *aridi declamatores fidelius quos proposuerunt colores tuentur; nihil enim illos sollicitat, nullum schema, nulla sententia. sic quae malam faciem habent saepius pudicae sunt; non animus illis deest sed corruptor.* Dull speakers (*aridi declamatores*) do not stray from the *colores* they have proposed; they, unlike more gifted speakers, are not tempted to indulge in rhetorical artifices. In this respect, Seneca says, *aridi declamatores* are like ugly girls: they remain uncorrupted not because their will is stronger than their peers, but rather because no one seduces them.

³⁰ Contra D'Alton 1931: 545.

not use *sententiae*; nor does he claim that Fabianus' speech lacked cleverness (contrast Cicero's *nihil astutum*) or rhythm (contrast Cicero's *nec vincita numeris sed soluta liberius*). Moreover, Fabianus' pursuit of moralizing *loci*, evident in the quotations, makes it clear that in casting his style as "philosophical" Seneca has not set it on a Procrustean bed to fit readers' preconceptions. If Seneca's description of Fabianus' placid manner is trustworthy, then it is possible that Fabianus himself is exploiting a well recognized schema of styles in fashioning himself as a philosopher.

But the elder Seneca is not our sole source of information about Fabianus' style. By far the most abundant indirect source is the younger Seneca,³¹ Fabianus' student.³² In drawing conclusions about Fabianus' literary character, scholars have often relied on the younger Seneca's pronouncements, especially in *Ep.* 100, along with those of his father's in the second preface, while ignoring the quotations of Fabianus in the anthology.³³ This procedure is unfortunate not only because it substitutes indirect for direct evidence; to

³¹ *Ep.* 11.4; 40.12; 52.11; 58.6; 100 *passim*; *Dial.* 10.10.1; 10.13.9. Other passages mentioning Fabianus: *Dial.* 6.23.5; *Nat.* 3.27.4. Also Plin. *Nat.* 2.121; 2.224; 9.25; 12.20; 15.3; 18.276; 23.62; 28.54; 36.125. Pliny cites Fabianus in his index to the following books: 2, 7, 9, 11-15, 17, 18 ('Sabinus Fabianus?'), 23, 25, 28, 36. Fabianus is also cited by ancient grammarians, see Keil 1857-1880: I.105, 106, 142, 146, 375; IV.209, 542(?).

³² Fabianus is often called the teacher of the younger Seneca, but what this entails is far from clear. All that can be said with certainty is that the younger Seneca read and used Fabianus' work for some of his own compositions, in particular the *Naturales Quaestiones*. He also heard him speak, but it cannot be determined from Seneca's extant writings how many times he heard him or in what capacity (e.g. as a formal student with close and extensive interaction or as a casual auditor who heard Fabianus speak once or twice).

³³ Griffin 1972: 16: "...by comparing what the two Senecas say, we can see that Fabianus' oral and written style was cold, flat, and lacking in point, brilliance and precision. But he was fluent, and effective as a speaker because of his obvious sincerity and indifference to applause." Also, Griffin 1976: 39-40. Griffin is followed by Bloomer 1997a: 207, "Fabianus was, from the report of Quintilian, no great speaker"; Bloomer 1997b: 123. Since Quintilian nowhere mentions Fabianus, Bloomer has either written Quintilian's name inadvertently, or he has subscribed to an old confusion that identifies Fabianus with Sergius Plautus or Verginius Flavius; Hoefig 1852: 1-23. Also, Graver 1998: 624, "It would have to be a strange principle of style that could find much to praise in Papius Fabianus – a family friend, to be sure, but a writer whom even Seneca seems to find rather stuffy, judging by the repeated concessions in the 100th letter." Although I disagree with him on several points, Leeman 1963: 264-71, who does examine the quotations from the anthology, offers a more extensive and thoughtful discussion.

make matters worse, the younger Seneca's statements have been misread, or read only partially. The outcome is a simplistic and distorted portrait of Fabianus that represents him as sincere but boring; and the Senecas are seen as loyal apologists reluctant to admit what they know to be true, namely that Fabianus is a second-rate speaker and writer.

In order to correct this misinterpretation and to provide a thorough but succinct account of the younger Seneca's representation of Fabianus *qua* stylist, I offer a synopsis of his statements. The relative consistency of the younger Seneca's statements allows for a summary in the form of six stylistic Descriptors. Beneath each Descriptor are given the various manifestations that Seneca's pronouncements on the point in question can take, along with citations and relevant quotations of the Latin. The objective is to give the reader a sense of the context in which references are made to Fabianus, and of the younger Seneca's motives for making them:

1. F. possesses fluency of speech (*facultas*) in moderation: *Fabianus mihi non effundere videtur orationem sed fundere* (Ep. 100.2).
 - a. Like his life, the speech of a philosopher should be controlled: *hoc (sc. celeritas) non probo in philosopho, cuius pronuntiatio quoque, sicut vita, debet esse composita* (Ep. 40.2).
 - b. Philosophy is serious business, and should not be trivialized by *celeritas* (excessive fluency): *istam vim dicendi rapidam atque abundantem aptiorem esse circulanti quam agenti rem magnam ac seriam docentique* (Ep. 40.3).
 - c. F.'s fluency is not excessive, but befits a philosopher (Ep. 40.12). Excessive fluency (*celeritas*) suggests that one is more concerned about words than about substance. For it takes practice to attain *celeritas*; but even if you

possess it naturally, you should temper your ability since it is unseemly for a philosopher: *Nam quemadmodum sapienti viro incessus modestior convenit, ita oratio pressa, non audax... Tardilocum esse te iubeo* (Ep. 40.14).

- d. The philosopher must lead by an exemplary life, rather than rely only on his words. He should not be one of those who seeks to elicit applause by speaking in a rush of words, trafficking in *communes loci*, and giving private performances (Ep. 52.8). Fabianus spoke as a philosopher should. Although he would speak to an audience, the applause he received was due to the greatness of the contents of his speech, not to its form: *Disserebat populo Fabianus, sed audiebatur modeste; erumpebat interdum magnus clamor laudantium, sed quem rerum magnitudo evocaverat, non sonus inoffense ac molliter orationis elapsae* (Ep. 52.11).

Observe here that Seneca's presentation is inconsistent with what we know about Fabianus, i.e. he in fact did practice *communes loci* and he gave declamatory performances.

2. F.'s word arrangement (*compositio*) is moderate and not precious.
 - a. The younger Seneca's addressee, Lucilius, does not like F.'s *compositio*, because he forgets it is that of a philosopher: *oblitus de philosopho agi compositionem eius accusas* (Ep. 100.1). The speech of the philosopher must have an unaffected and simple arrangement: *Adice nunc quod quae veritati operam dat oratio incomposita esse debet et simplex* (Ep. 40.4).

- b. F.'s *compositio* is neither especially uniform and gentle, like Cicero's, nor is it rough and uneven, like Asinius Pollio's (*Ep.* 100.6-7).
3. F.'s speech is placid, like his mind.
- a. *Humilia praeterea tibi videri dicis omnia et parum erecta: quo vitio carere eum iudico. Non sunt enim illa humilia sed placida et ad animi tenorem quietum compositumque formata, nec depressa sed plana. Deest illis oratorius vigor stimuli que quos quaeris et subiti ictus sententiarum; sed totum corpus, videris quam sit comptum, honestum est* (*Ep.* 100.8).

Verbal echoes make it clear that the younger Seneca is aware of his father's description of F. (*C.* 2 pr. 2). There can be little doubt that he is also familiar with Cicero's description of the philosopher's style (*Orat.* 62-4).³⁴ Observe that Seneca follows Cicero's stereotype in saying that *sententiae* were absent from Fabianus' speech, a claim that his father would consider both untenable and counter-productive to the purpose of his anthology.

4. F.'s speech is sincere and unaffected.
- a. F. does not attempt multiple styles, pretending to be now an orator, now a tragedian, now a comic playwright. This would imply that he is concerned with form rather than substance. Instead, eloquence comes to F. as an afterthought, and he expresses himself simply, so you know he believes what

³⁴ Guillemin 1954: 264-5.

he writes: *Sed non praestat omnia...Denique illud praestabit, ut liqueat tibi illum sensisse quae scripsit* (Ep. 100.10-11).³⁵

Commentators have misunderstood sections 100.10 and 11, so as to reflect negatively on F. For example, A. D. Leeman (1963: 268) sees in Lucilius' stylistic desiderata (*Sit aliquid oratorie acre, tragice grande, comice exile*) "an epitome of the ideals of the New Style, as applied to philosophy," and of course Fabianus does not satisfy Lucilius. Therefore, Leeman (*ibid.*) concludes: "his [the younger Seneca's] defense of Fabianus sounds rather weak."

On the contrary, here as elsewhere the younger Seneca is making F. stand in as the idealized Philosopher. This becomes clearer when we observe that 100.10 and 11 together form a compositional unit. Seneca begins by saying that stylistically F. does not offer us everything (*non praestat omnia*), and he ends by telling us what F. *does* offer (*denique illud praestabit, ut liqueat tibi illum sensisse quae scripsit*): sincerity.³⁶ The implication is that those who speak in multiple styles do not express themselves honestly, honesty being

³⁵ The complete passage: *Sed non praestat omnia: non est fortis oratio eius, quamvis elata sit; non est violenta nec torrens, quamvis effusa sit; non est perspicua sed pura. 'Desideres' inquis 'contra vitia aliquid aspere dici, contra pericula animose, contra fortunam superbe, contra ambitionem contumeliose. Volo luxuriam obiurgari, libidinem traduci, inpotentiam frangi. Sit aliquid oratorie acre, tragice grande, comice exile.' Vis illum adsidere pusillae rei, verbis: ille rerum se magnitudini addixit, eloquentiam velut umbram non hoc agens trahit. Non erunt sine dubio singula circumspecta nec in se collecta nec omne verbum excitabit ac punget, fateor; exhibunt multa nec ferient et interdum otiosa praeterlabetur oratio, sed multum erit in omnibus lucis, sed ingens sine taedio spatium. Denique illud praestabit, ut liqueat tibi illum sensisse quae scripsit.*

³⁶ The younger Seneca's description seems also to be alluding to the doctrine of the three-styles – grand (*genus grande*), middle (*genus medium*), and plain (*genus humile*) (Cic. *Orat.* 20-1) – identifying Fabianus' style with the *genus humile*. This style is regarded as appropriate for narrative and for teaching. It does not excite the emotions of the audience nor does it include many rhetorical figures; therefore, it is supposed to be the style of philosophers; Cic. *Orat.* 62-4.

among the primary objectives of the philosopher. Lucilius' stylistic desiderata are wrongheaded because they want not only force of expression, but a variety of styles: *Sit aliquid oratorie acre, tragice grande, comice exile*.

The phrases *sed multum erit in omnibus lucis, sed ingens sine taedio spatium* (100.11) have been misconstrued to F.'s disadvantage. *Ingens sine taedio spatium* does not refer to long stretches of text covered by a reader.³⁷ These phrases are metaphorical, properly belonging to architectural or topographical description³⁸ and transferred here to describe the internal texture of F.'s language. *Spatium* does not refer to absolute and measurable spatial distance, but to the sensation of spatial organization created by a particular architecture of language.³⁹ *Ingens sine taedio spatium* is connected with the younger Seneca's descriptions elsewhere of F.'s grandeur and sincerity: F. is not interested in pedantic quibbling (see Descriptor #6 below); he speaks on noble and universal topics in unaffected, unconstrained

³⁷ So the Loeb, Gummere 1917: *ad loc.*: "There will be long stretches which will not weary the reader." Faint praise indeed! This misunderstanding is avoided by Préchac and Noblot 1999: "mais partout abondera la lumière, mais de vastes étendues se parcourront sans ennui."

³⁸ Stat. *Silu.* 3.5.88-9: *quid nunc magnificas species cultusque locorum | templaque et innumeris spatia interstincta columnis.* Cic. *Orat.* 12: *fateor me oratorem...non ex rhetorum officinis, sed ex Academiae spatiis exstitisse.* Quint. *Inst.* 4.5.22 describes how an enumerative list (*partitio*) can make arguments clearer and prevent audience fatigue: *Sed ut non semper necessaria aut utilis etiam partitio est, ita oportune adhibita plurimum orationi lucis et gratiae confert. Neque enim solum id efficit, ut clariora fiant quae dicantur...sed reficit quoque audientem certo singularum partium fine, non aliter quam facientibus iter multum detrahunt fatigationis notata inscriptis lapidibus spatia.*

³⁹ Certain kinds of *compositio* (word arrangement) were thought of in terms of "space," as may be seen for example from Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.126-136. Here it is explained that lofty (*sublimia*) and peaceful (*lenia*) subjects require space (*spatium*), which in this context refers to long syllables. See also the fascinating description of "harsh *compositio*" at Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22. Cic. *Or.* 212 speaks of how we experience different metrical patterns. Passionate speech should seem fast (i.e. consist of an abundance of short syllables), expositions slow (long syllables): *fluit omnino numerus a primo tum incitatus breuitate pedum tum proceritate tardius. cursum contentiones magis requirunt, expositiones rerum tarditatem.* For the sensations produced by different metrical patterns in poetry, see Morgan 2000.

language.⁴⁰ His speech is not artificially compact, but flows naturally and calmly.

- b. F. speaks his mind rather than to please an audience: *Intelleges hoc actum ut tu scires quid illi placeret, non ut ille placeret tibi. Ad profectum omnia tendunt, ad bonam mentem: non quaeritur plausus* (Ep. 100.11). This is as it should be, for philosophy ought not cater to the masses: *Quid enim turpius philosophia captante clamores?* (Ep. 52.9).

Damnum quidem fecisse philosophiam non erit dubium postquam prostituta est; sed potest in penetralibus sui ostendi, si modo non institorem sed antistitem nancta est (Ep. 52.15)

- c. A person of good character speaks with modesty (*verecundia*, Ep. 11; cf. Cicero's *verecunda virgo*).⁴¹ Seneca is impressed when speaking with a friend of his correspondent Lucilius; the friend is of good character (*bonae indolis*) as is evidenced by the fact that he blushes when he speaks (Ep. 11.1). Just so, Fabianus blushed when he was called as a witness: *Fabianum cum in senatum testis esset inductus, erubuisse memini, et hic illum mire pudor decuit* (Ep. 11.4).

5. F. is eloquent and his speech is refined.

- a. F. is cited as an authority for the use of the word *essentia*: *si recentiorem quaeris, Fabianum, disertum et elegantem, orationis etiam ad nostrum*

⁴⁰ Ep. 100.5 (*Sensus honestos et magnificos habes, non coactos in sententiam, sed latius dictos*); 100.10 (*ille rerum se magnitudini addixit, eloquentiam velut umbram non hoc agens trahit*); 100.12 (*verbis abundabat, sine commendatione partium singularum in universum magnificus*).

⁴¹ In a study of ancient emotions, *verecundia* is discussed by Kaster 2005: 13-27.

fastidium nitidae (“eloquent and tasteful, possessing a refined style even by our discriminating tastes”) (*Ep.* 58.6). The context is the creation of Latin philosophical terms. Seneca claims that he is not one to admit any neologism; Fabianus was similarly discriminating.

- b. F. is eloquent in moderation; he does not court eloquence by unnatural word order or precious diction: *Fabianus non erat negligens in oratione sed securus. Itaque nihil invenies sordidum: electa verba sunt, non captata, nec huius saeculi more contra naturam suam posita et inversa, splendida tamen quamvis sumantur e medio* (*Ep.* 100.5).
 - c. F. ranks in eloquence behind only Cicero, Asinius Pollio, and Livy (*Ep.* 100.8-9).
6. F. rejects subtle argumentation and otiose scholarship, preferring instead that his language be grand and that it immediately assault his audience’s senses.
- a. Factual knowledge is of no use when it does not make one better: *Nam ut concedas omnia eos fide bona dicere, ut ad praestationem scribant, tamen cuius ista errores minuent? cuius cupiditates prement? quem fortiorem, quem iustioem, quem liberaliorem facient? Dubitare se interim Fabianus noster aiebat an satius esset nullis studiis admoveri quam his implicari* (*Dial.* 10.13.9).
 - b. F.’s language ravishes one’s judgment rather than appeals to it: *Praeterea ipso dicente non vacasset tibi partes intueri, adeo te summa rapuisset; et fere quae impetu placent minus praestant ad manum relata; sed illud quoque multum*

est, primo aspectu oculos occupasse, etiam si contemplatio diligens inventura est quod arguat. Si me interrogas, maior ille est qui iudicium abstulit quam qui meruit; et scio hunc tutiorem esse, scio audacius sibi de futuro promittere (Ep. 100.3).

- c. The philosopher's language must be regarded as a weapon to be exercised in combat.⁴² You must fight with main force, not with intellectual niceties:
- Solebat dicere Fabianus, non ex his cathedrariis philosophis sed ex veris et antiquis, contra adfectus impetu, non subtilitate pugnandum, nec minutis vulneribus sed incursu avertendam aciem; [non probat cavillationes] <vitia> enim contundi debere, non vellicari (Dial. 10.10.1).*⁴³

By bringing together disparate passages from the younger Seneca's work, it is possible to see that the statements regarding Fabianus are part of a larger project that Seneca has undertaken. Put briefly, Seneca uses Fabianus to represent the model philosopher, and descriptions of his style have to an indeterminable degree been fitted to meet the younger Seneca's presentations of how the philosopher *ought* to express himself. We may reasonably suppose that some of Seneca's descriptions of Fabianus' style are applicable to how he actually spoke and wrote. But it is hard to know just how much. It is telling that all of the stylistic characteristics Seneca assigns to Fabianus he elsewhere claims for himself, or promotes as stylistic ideals: sincerity, simplicity of

⁴² Leeman 1963: 268: "Here is the new ideal of *philosophia militans*, exactly the opposite of Cicero's pronouncement."

⁴³ Descriptions of Fabianus resemble in some particulars the descriptions of the elder Sextius. With this passage compare *Ep.* 59-7-8 and *Ep.* 64.3. Also, compare *Ep.* 100.12 with *Ep.* 64.5.

expression, indifference to rhetorical ornament, the need to match speech with lifestyle, emphasis on the utility of speech in evaluating its merit, and contempt for inane scholarly questions.⁴⁴ Along with this realization, we must remember that scholars have found it notoriously difficult to reconcile Seneca's declarations about style and his own practice as witnessed in his writings.⁴⁵

Readers who compare Descriptors #3 and #6 will observe what appears to be a contradiction: How can Fabianus' style be both peaceful and combative? But Seneca does not err in including both of these, since it is precisely this kind of real contradiction in Seneca's own work that inspired A. Traina to describe the younger Seneca's style as "dramatic."⁴⁶ In Traina's view, Seneca is moved by two contrary impulses resulting in two manners of expression – the urge to withdraw peacefully within oneself ("il linguaggio dell'interiorità"), and the need to aggressively preach philosophy to the public ("il linguaggio della predicazione").⁴⁷ We may speculate that Fabianus experienced the same internal conflict as Seneca. But it is just as likely that, as is the case with the other features of Seneca's description of Fabianus, Seneca's contradiction has been projected onto Fabianus.

The writings of the younger Seneca, it must be recognized, are not a transparent lens through which to see Fabianus. No doubt he knew Fabianus' style of speaking and writing intimately, but his statements must be read with circumspection.

⁴⁴ *Ep.* 75.1-8; 88; 114; 115.1-2; *Dial.* 10.13.

⁴⁵ Currie 1966; Leeman 1963: 265-6; Norden 1915-18: 307; Merchant 1905. See also Setaioli 1985: 777-86.

⁴⁶ Traina 1984. Traina adopts the term "dramatico" from Marchesi 1944.

⁴⁷ Traina 1984: 41.

2.3 *Quest for strength of utterance*⁴⁸

Despite interpretative complications and slight variations between them, the descriptions of Fabianus by the two Senecas rest on the same widely acknowledged foundation – the identification of Fabianus as *philosophus*. As asserted above, this identity cannot be restricted to Fabianus’ philosophical writings; we witness its construction also in Fabianus’ declamatory quotations. According to the elder Seneca, Fabianus continued to declaim even after he became a follower of Q. Sextius, pursuing declamation in fact with such vigor that you would have thought his goal was eloquence for its own sake, rather than for the sake of philosophy (*C.* 2 pr. 4-5). In Fabianus the activities of declaimer and philosopher intermingle and fuse; their separate roles and functions are effectively united through a consistent personality – the moralist. In this respect especially, Fabianus can be said to anticipate the younger Seneca, who like most all Silver Latin authors has traditionally been criticized for being too rhetorical, that is too ‘declamatory.’⁴⁹

⁴⁸ London 1921: 11: “And, by the way, remember that anybody, by hard work, can achieve *precision of language*, but that very few can achieve *strength of style*. ... What the world wants is strength of utterance, not precision of utterance” [emphases original]. Traina 1984: 25, uses the second half of this quotation as epigraph to his second chapter, “Il linguaggio della predicazione.”

⁴⁹ Winterbottom 1974: xxiv: “When we call Latin after the fall of the Republic rhetorical, we mean that it was declamatory.” For the influence of declamation on the younger Seneca, Rolland 1906; Rayment 1969: 51-2, 63. For the younger Seneca’s creation of a stylistic personality, Williams 1978: 242: “Much of Quintilian’s hostility to Seneca can be put down to Seneca’s success in creating the most idiosyncratic style for himself, a style that does not vary from his *Dialogues* to his *Epistles*, and can even be seen appearing in metrical garb in his tragedies; it is a grossly self-indulgent, self-admiring style, but it not only excellently conveys the sense of a character watching himself speak, it is the effective expression of a tangible personality.”

The non-poetic writings of the younger Seneca are a landmark in the history of philosophy and Christianity⁵⁰ in the West, their impact profound; and yet, Seneca cannot be said to have generated any new ideas. His contributions, rather, consist in the re-shaping and novel presentation of traditional material. To anyone who subscribes to the standard, simplistic dichotomy between style and substance, Seneca's endeavors are likely to seem paltry. A broader view of the function and effect of language – one that acknowledges that language is not, and cannot be, purely a vehicle for the conveyance of information⁵¹ – sets Seneca's work in its proper perspective. Notably, the affective dimension of language – that is, the capacity of language to produce emotions and to inspire a sense of identity between speaker and audience – is omitted from the simplistic dichotomy, and it is this dimension in which Seneca invests much effort. Seneca, as he himself professes,⁵² is generally not interested in a systematic exposition of ideas; far more important is a uniqueness of feeling and the conjuring of emotional intensity

⁵⁰ E.g., Albrecht 2004: 130-172.

⁵¹ Besides the works of Roman Jakobson and Kenneth Burke (cited in Section 2.1), the important work of the classical philologist Jules Marouzeau and his attempts to create a grammar of style deserves mention; Marouzeau 1970: 165: "Le mot, qui passe pour être la traduction de la pensée, est en réalité beaucoup plus, ou beaucoup moins, – en tout cas autre chose que cela. L'homme parle d'ordinaire non pas pour exprimer ce qu'il a dans l'esprit, mais pour faire un impression, traduire une émotion, obtenir une adhésion, réaliser une action." Marouzeau was a student of the stylistician Charles Bally and was influenced by the work of Ferdinand de Saussure. For the same idea in more recent classical scholarship, see Charles Segal's comments in the Foreword to Conte 1986: 9: "Conte builds on the structuralist conception of language as a secondary modeling system, a system imposed upon the 'everyday' discourse of practical communication. In poetry, and in literature generally, other aspects of language besides its referential function become important, especially its metalingual functions: here language calls attention to the process and nature of its signifier-signified relations and operates with far greater self-consciousness of its autonomy and its systematizing, organizing power." The theory of a secondary modeling system derives from Yuri Lotman. Other theorists who have emphasized the non-transparency of language include George Lakoff and Marshall McLuhan. Language's mediating effects on representations of the past motivated 20th century scrutiny of the epistemological foundation of modern historiography; Clark 2004.

⁵² *Dial.* 10.10.1; Currie 1966: 80-4.

through language.⁵³ It is by virtue of these interests that Seneca stands somewhere between philosopher and preacher. The result is anything but a banal reiteration of what has been said before: it is a new and “substantive” creation. When it is allowed that the purpose of language resides not solely in its referential content, but also in its ability to create an affective resonance in its audience, then we must acknowledge that the result of Seneca’s efforts is not a re-combination of what has been said by others; it is a qualitatively different substance.⁵⁴

It is this endeavor of the younger Seneca to invent a new, more forceful and affectively charged, language of the philosopher that sets the activities of the philosopher-declamer Fabianus in a particularly instructive and significant light. Just how dramatic a change Seneca’s language represents can be seen by comparing his writings with the philosophical works of Cicero.⁵⁵ This change, however, did not occur simply with the publication of the works of the younger Seneca. The language of Papirius Fabianus, as it appears in quotations from the anthology, suggests that a distancing from Cicero’s mode of philosophical discourse happened earlier.⁵⁶ This observation cannot detract from the contributions made by Seneca the younger, but rather

⁵³ Albertini 1923: 299-300: “La part du sentiment est, chez lui, plus grande que celle de la raison. Ses attitudes, ses convictions sont déterminées moins par l’acquiescement intellectuel à une doctrine que par les réactions de sa sensibilité.” Marchesi 1944 (I have not seen), quoted by Albertini 1923: 299 n. 2: “quello che c’è di nuovo, di inimitabile, di potentemente originale in lui è la personale maniera di sentire, più che di concepire le cose.” Williams 1978: 176: “Seneca’s *Dialogues* are more like sermons than essays because of the emotional intensity of the language in which they are expressed and the peculiarity of the style.” *Ibidem*, n. 62: “The style should be regarded as devised for the purpose of making this type of impact.”

⁵⁴ Seneca’s own metaphor for proper imitation here suggests itself, *Ep.* 84.2-10: the bee gathers nectar from a variety of sources and creates from these something altogether new. On Seneca’s originality in philosophy, see Inwood 1995: 63-76.

⁵⁵ Traina 1984: 37, contrasts translations by Cicero (*Tim.* 9) and by Seneca (*Ep.* 65.10) of a passage of Plato (*Tim.* 29d-e). Summers 1910: xvi, contrasts Cic. *Sen.* 47 and 67 with Sen. *Ep.* 12.5, 6.

⁵⁶ On the reputation of Cicero in the decades after his death, see Kaster 1998; Roller 1997; Gambet 1970.

it compels us to regard him and Fabianus (and likely others) as participating in a similar project: the invention of a new voice, a new verbal identity, for the philosopher. Most significantly, it is my assertion that the answers the participants in this project arrive at differ from one another. The declaimers are not all alike, as is often assumed, nor is Seneca the younger just another – if more gifted – declaimer, nor is Fabianus, or any of the other declaimers, merely a prototypical Seneca.

2.4 Archaic eloquence: phonetic architecture, parataxis, guttatim style

What characterizes Fabianus' language as it appears in the quotations of the anthology? Apart from the above noted tendency to search out moral themes, most prominent in the quotations of Fabianus is the presence of formal features closely identified with our earliest Latin texts – specifically, *carmina*,⁵⁷ legal and religious texts, as well as the works of authors such as Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, and Cato. These features are: first, a patterned repetition of sounds (phonetic iteration) that collaborates in the creation of word-groups and sentence architecture;⁵⁸ second, sentences that consist chiefly of syntactically coordinate, as opposed to subordinate, members (parataxis). A third crucial feature, which is related but not identical to parataxis, is a sentence

⁵⁷ The *carmen* is a formulaic, often ritualistic or gnomic, utterance that relies on devices such as alliteration, assonance, and homoeoteleuton to create rhythmic structure.

⁵⁸ This broad definition allows for alliteration (repetition of consonantal sounds, usually at the beginnings of words), assonance (repetition of vowel sounds), homoeoteleuton (end-rhyme); cf. the term “iterazione fonica” of Traina 1977: 127. Literature on ‘alliteration,’ which is sometimes used to describe all these sound figures (see Traina, *ibidem*), is abundant; Ronconi 1938 is seminal, who rightly recognizes that alliteration in archaic texts often serves to organize and give structure rather than being simply ornamental. Grilli 1963: 101-261, contains a large section on alliteration. Also, see Marouzeau 1970: 45-50; Pasquali 1981: 153-60; Cordier 1939; Hellegouarc’h 1982. Ceccarelli 1986: 1-7, offers useful bibliography. His own definition of alliteration (p. 8) is too narrow. On end-rhyme, Polheim 1963.

architecture built up of small, independent, or semi-independent, units that are strung together additatively, as beads on a string.⁵⁹ Eduard Fraenkel was fond of calling this the *guttatim*, or “drop-by-drop,” style.⁶⁰ In archaic texts, a tendency towards organizing speech *guttatim* is often realized, or reinforced, through phonetic iteration.

It is these three characteristics that are observed in the two Fabianic passages below. Letters that participate in a patterned repetition are in bold and word-groups have been defined by additional spacing.

(a) C. 2.1.10

*Ecce instructi exercitus saepe civium cognatorumque
 conserturi proelio manus constiterunt et colles equis utrimque complentur
 et subinde omnis regio trucidatorum corporibus consternitur.
 <in tanta>⁶¹ multitudine cadaverum vel spoliantium sic quaesierit aliquis
 quae causa hominem adversus hominem in facinus coegit?
 nam neque feris inter se bella sunt nec si forent eadem hominem deceant
 placidum proximumque divino genus.
 quae tanta vos pestis cum una stirps idemque sanguis sitis,
 quaeve furiae in mutuum sanguinem egere?
 quod tantum malum huic generi fato vel forte <in>iunctum?*

(b) C. 2.5.7

Expecta. potest parere.

⁵⁹ Courtney 1999: 3-6, lists these three features, among others, as typical of early Latin. He usefully distinguishes between parataxis and the *guttatim* style. The two overlap in the fact that both resist hierarchical arrangement and instead prefer to tack on units indefinitely without forecasting an endpoint. However, the ‘*guttatim* style’ describes a progression by small, relatively self-contained units that may or may not be subordinate; thus Spilman 1932: 154, speaks of ‘logical’ or ‘narrative’ units as self-contained regardless of the syntactical status of these units. As is demonstrated below (and will be detailed more fully in Section 2.5.2), these small units are often structured through rhythms and sound effects; for the reliance of archaic texts on sound effects to create word-groups, see Lindholm 1931: 1-116. One suspects that discussions of parataxis in an author like Vergil, such as those of Norden 1903: 371-3, and Klemke 1990, have the *guttatim* style as their proper subject.

⁶⁰ Fraenkel 1962: 2, 202, 395.

⁶¹ My conjecture, which I believe preferable to *in illa tum* of Madvig (accepted by Håkanson), especially in light of the observations in this chapter. Cf. below at C. 2.1.11 (H 70,24-6): *tanta altitudo aedificiorum est tantaeque viarum angustiae...* The mss: *illatum* **B** *illatum* **V**. **B** = Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 9594; **A** = Antwerp, Stadsbibliotheek, 411; **V** = Vatican lat. 3872. On the textual tradition of the elder Seneca’s work, see Winterbottom 1983; and the work of Hendrik D.L. Vervliet, who generously lent me a copy of his dissertation: Vervliet 1955; Vervliet 1964; and Vervliet 1957.

*non respondet ad propositum nec ad certam diem fecunditas.
sui iuris rerum natura est nec ad leges humanas componitur;
modo properat, modo vota praecurrit, modo lenta est et demoratur.⁶²
expecta, pariet.*

These passages exhibit a committed departure from the periodicity of Ciceronian prose. As such they testify to the emergence during the Augustan Age of a stylistic tendency more commonly associated with the Silver Latin authors of the first century AD. For reasons that I shall take up later in the discussion (Section 2.5.4), both passages were probably spoken around 15 BC.⁶³

However, Fabianus is certainly not the first Latin prose writer / speaker of the first century BC or later to compose chiefly in paratactic sentences; Sallust, most notably, is earlier. Because the stylistic features highlighted here are typical of archaic Latin, and also because it is well-known that Sallust actively sought out archaic vocabulary and constructions, parataxis among them,⁶⁴ there may be justification for calling Fabianus' style archaizing. The suggestion that a Latin declaimer is pursuing a type of eloquence that is meant to conjure the past may seem counterintuitive, perhaps even absurd. By definition declamation belongs to a *New Rhetoric*; it is the catalyst that brings about a

⁶² Note the elision of *e* in *est: lentast et demoratur*.

⁶³ Against Fairweather 1981: 271-3, who thinks Fabianus probably made this speech after a "conversion" to philosophy.

⁶⁴ Suet. *Gram.* 10, 15; *Aug.* 86.3; Lebek 1970.

literary Modernism.⁶⁵ The declaimers, and especially their young audiences, are thought to condemn Latin authors that are as old or older than Cicero.⁶⁶

Before addressing the question directly whether ‘archaizing’ is a fitting label for Fabianus’ prose (see Section 2.5), it will be instructive to compare (a) and (b) with Cato *Agr.* 141, a prayer to Mars to be made during the ritual of the *suovetaurilia*. The prayer is not a good example of parataxis. However, it is an excellent illustration of the *guttatim* style in the ancient Roman *carmen* and, specifically, of how the *carmen* can deploy phonetic devices – alliteration, assonance, and homoeoteleuton – to construct rhythm, give architectural shape, and organize meaning.⁶⁷ It is precisely this kind of functional application of phonetic devices that we shall observe in a close analysis of Fabianus’ language.

(c) *Mars pater,*
te precor quaesoque
uti sies volens propitius
mihī domo familiaeque nostrae...

uti tu morbos visos invisosque,
viduertatem vastitudinemque
calamitates intemperiasque
prohibessis defendas averruncesque;

utique tu fruges frumenta vineta virgultaque
grandire dueneque evenire siris,

⁶⁵ For the terms ‘New Style’ and ‘Modernism,’ Norden 1915-18: 270-300; Leeman 1963: 258; Fairweather 1981: 304-25; Duret 1983: 1518-25; Berti 2007: 162.

⁶⁶ *C.* 3 pr. 15-17; *S.* 7.13; Tac. *Dial.* 26.9; Quint. *Inst.* 10.5.20. As shall be demonstrated in Chapter 4, the declaimers were anything but indifferent to the works of authors such as Cicero and Vergil. Indeed, the ancient passages just cited show not indifference, but a preoccupation with canonical authors.

⁶⁷ The Catonian prayer has been the centerpiece for studies, and debate, on the ancient Roman *carmen*, particularly as regards its structural and rhythmic aspects. See Luiselli 1969: 19-20, 36, 39, 45, 47-8, 50-51, 60-1, 85-6, 89, 113-14, 151, who reproduces some of the many visual representations the prayer has undergone. I have adapted the layout of the prayer from Crusius and Rubenbauer 1958: 133. See also Courtney 1999: 9, 46-7, 62-7; Watkins 1995: 197-213; Grilli 1963: 133; Pasquali 1981: 154-5.

*pastores pecuaque salva servassis
dusque duonam salutem valetudinemque
mihi domo familiaeque nostrae*

The distinct binary architecture in most of the verses, which I have emphasized through spacing, is typical of *carmina*.⁶⁸ The integral role that alliterative pairs, or pairs conjoined by similar formal devices, play in shaping this structure should be obvious.⁶⁹ They are in fact one of the most identifiable features of *carmina* and Italic ritualistic formulae. A section of the Iguvine Tables, which are in Umbrian, offers an extreme example where the architecture consists solely of these pairs. The following is from a curse on the neighboring peoples of Iguvium (Table VIIa 49):⁷⁰

tursitu tremitu hondu holtu ninctu nepitu sonitu sauitu prepolatu preui(ś)latu

In passage (a) Fabianus employs a high number of these kinds of phonetically linked pairs relative to the length of the passage: *civium cognatorumque; cadaverum vel spoliantium; placidum proximumque; stirps idemque sanguis; fato uel forte*. A primary function of the phonetic pairs is the same: to organize language and give it shape. Phonetically linked word-pairs are lacking in passage (b), but nonetheless alliteration is pervasive and sound effects do play a decisive role in structuring the passage. So, note

⁶⁸ It should not be thought from “verses” that the *carmen* is strictly speaking a poem; it does not follow a rigorous metrical scheme. *Carmina* occupy a gray area between poetry and prose and are only loosely rhythmic. According to Luiselli 1969: 32, Eduard Norden was the first fully to appreciate *carmina* not as poetry, but as rhythmic prose; Norden also insisted on the binary architecture of *carmina*.

⁶⁹ Wölfflin 1977 (orig. 1933): 225-284; Norden 1939: 17-20; Lindholm 1931: 80-7; Haffter 1934: 10-43. See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 702-4, for further bibliography.

⁷⁰ Watkins 1995: 214-225; Poultney 1959: 292. Also, cf. Marcellus Empiricus (early 5th cent. AD): *exi, <si> hodie nata, si ante nata | si hodie creata, si ante creata;| hanc pestem, hanc pestilentiam | hunc dolorem, hunc tumorem, hunc ruborem, | has toles, has tosillas, | hunc panum, has panuclas, | hanc strumam, hanc strumellam,| hac religione evoco educo excanto | de istis membris medullis.*

the contrast in sound between these two groups: *non respondet ad **propositum** | nec ad certam diem fecunditas*.⁷¹

Two clear differences between Fabianus' word-groups and the string of pairs from the Iguvine Tables are that the latter use no connectives, which is the most ancient method, and Fabianus' rhythmic structuring is far more diverse. But the ancient *carmina* themselves often betray diversity and a rich complexity in their structuring; the structural complexity of the Catonian prayer, for instance, has proved spellbinding to its students and allowed the prayer to be analyzed in diverse ways. A prayer reported by Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.9.7-8) will provide another example of the ancient *carmen*.⁷² Important to note in this example is that phonetic devices not only link words on the same line, that is horizontally (e.g., *metum formidinem oblivionem*), but they occasionally link words across lines, that is vertically. Vertical correspondence is marked by underlining (e.g. *deseratis ... abeatis*):

(d)

*Si Deus, si Dea est,
cui populus civitasque Carthaginiensis est in tutela,
teque maxime ille, qui Urbis huius populi que tutelam recepisti,*

precor venerorque, veniamque a vobis peto,

⁷¹ The two passages might fairly represent a distinction, first attempted by Pasquali 1981: 156, between how phonetic devices are used in *carmina*, on the one hand, and by the archaic poets (Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Naevius, etc.), on the other. Both groups use phonetic devices more frequently than classical authors; but whereas the archaic poets have a tendency to apply the devices liberally and without distinction, in *carmina* the devices are integral elements of the (rhythmic) structure of the formula. There may be some utility in this distinction, but it is can be very difficult to adhere to: first, the archaic poets can use phonetic devices to structure their language (Hellegouarc'h 1982); second, the poets in creating a poetic language naturally draw on the language of *carmina*.

⁷² Other examples typical of *carmina*: *Macr. Sat.* 3.9.10-12; *Varro, L.* 7.8; *Livy* 1.24 and 32; 8.9.6-8; 29.27.1-4. More examples can be found in Appel 1909. *Pl. Am.* 69-72, is a parody of ritualistic language; Fraenkel 1972: 332, discusses Plautus' language as imitating the solemn language of tragedy (*Pl. Am.* 203-61).

ut vos populum civitatemque Carthaginiensem deseratis,
loca templa sacra urbemque eorum relinquatis, absque his abeatīs,

eique populo civitatieque metum formidinem oblivionem iniciatis,
proditique Romam ad me meosque veniatis:
nostraque vobis loca templa sacra urbs acceptior probatiorque sit:
mihique populoque Romano militibusque meis praepositi sitis,

ut sciamus intellegamusque. si ita feceritis,
voveo vobis templa ludosque facturum.

2.5 Fabianus' traditional sentence architecture

A sensitive reading of the quotations of Fabianus reveals that phonetic iteration is often used in diverse and sophisticated ways to structure rhythms. The analyses that follow are meant to corroborate this fact. They will, at the same time, allow us to identify in detail the idiosyncracies that make up a Fabianic linguistic identity.

Furthermore, the analyses will substantiate what the above quotations of Fabianus have already suggested – that the heart of Fabianus' eloquence is fundamentally, and purposefully, traditional. 'Traditional' is a better descriptor of Fabianus' language, as regards its relationship with archaic Latin, than archaizing. At issue in the choice of labels – 'archaizing' or 'traditional' language – is how we understand Fabianus' purpose in the use of the observed formal features and how these features operate in their literary context. What is the effect and meaning of Fabianus' language?⁷³ 'Archaizing' implies that Fabianus (or his teachers, who then passed their lessons on to him) had been actively

⁷³ Herescu 1960: 124, describes how the same formal devices change their meaning according to context: "L'extrême diversité de ces exemples n'a pas à surprendre. Si les mêmes sons concourent à une si grande variété d'effet, c'est qu'ils ne sont expressifs qu'en puissance; ils ne deviennent effectivement expressifs qu'en raison des contextes. Un lien concret s'établit entre l'énoncé et les sons qui le composent, mais dans certaines conditions seulement, et toujours *a posteriori*. Nous avons là une autre loi de la stylistique, l'une des rares lois certaines que l'on peu formuler en la matière: **Rien n'est expressif en soi, mais tout peut le devenir par la mise en forme de l'écrivain**" [emphasis original]; Hellegouarc'h 1994: 262.

studying old Latin literature in order to draw on it to shape his own prose. It implies that his language advertises itself as studied and erudite, in the manner of Fronto; that it draws overt and specific associations with archaic texts and authors, such as Sallust does with the works of Cato the elder.⁷⁴ By contrast, Fabianus' language is not conspicuously erudite or abstruse; and while it shares formal features with archaic texts, no specific connection with an author or work emerges.

Moreover, there is a more plausible, and chronologically more proximal, explanation. Fabianus' traditional language can be connected with a powerful, contemporary literary trend: the combination of a predominantly paratactic syntax, a drop-by-drop presentation of ideas (the *guttatim* style), and frequent recourse to phonetic structuring appears in the poems of Vergil. The appearance of these features together – and it is their synthesis that is stressed – distinguishes Vergil's language from that of his modern predecessors, Catullus and Lucretius.⁷⁵

The observation is significant, and it deserves a more in-depth exploration than the outlines of this dissertation permit. Its explanation, surely, is complex. It should not be assumed that the innovation of combining these stylistic features belongs to Vergil, or at least not to Vergil alone. Of course, simply on account of chronology, it is almost impossible that Fabianus influenced Vergil; but the generation to which his teachers belonged were contemporaries of the poet. They may have shaped Vergil's language

⁷⁴ Suet. *Gram.* 10, 15; *Aug.* 86.3.

⁷⁵ Parataxis and a drop-by-drop presentation of ideas, often in pairs (*dicolon*) or triplets (*tricolon*), have long been recognized as basic, distinguishing characteristics of Vergil's language. Henry 1873-1892: 745-51 (*A.* 1.546-551), describes Vergil's use of 'theme and variation' – that is, the paratactic coordination of small sense-units to state and re-state an idea; Norden 1903: 369-73; Crittenden 1911 discusses Vergil's "primitive" (i.e. paratactic) sentence structure; Eden 1975 discusses Vergil's parataxis (p. 9) and compares the poet's use of repetition and of doublets to *carmina*, (p. 70 on *A.* 8.171): "In Latin poetry it was Virgil who first exploited doublets and triplets of this kind to such an extent that they became the chief feature of his style."

more than Vergil's legacy impacted the art of declaimers like Fabianus. In this light, ancient criticisms directed against Vergil that he was rhetorical,⁷⁶ that he was "the founder of a novel kind of corruption"⁷⁷ may require new, more nuanced interpretations. Declamation, both in the ancient world and in the modern era, has been held responsible for a "corruption" in eloquence and Latin literature. However, the language of Vergil, from which succeeding generations of Latin authors have been thought to degenerate, may itself be implicated in the "corruption."

To a degree, it is not at all surprising if we should see that some declaimers, along with Vergil, embrace traditional stylistic features. It is a reminder that the Augustan Age, in literature as well as in politics and art and architecture,⁷⁸ sought creatively to invest itself in the forms of an idealized past. The age, it seems, was especially sensitive to the proper attributes of archaic language and to its potential efficacy. And such language would not have been difficult to find. One need not go rooting through old volumes for archaic diction, phraseology, and word arrangements. Some archaic language is always current, and nonetheless retains its archaic flavor. I refer to the language of ritual, procedure, and ceremony, specifically to religious and judicial language.⁷⁹ Fabianus' style betrays a calculated awareness of what his contemporaries would feel to be

⁷⁶ For example, P. Annius Florus' treatise *Vergilius orator an poeta*; the question whether Vergil is a better poet or orator is considered in Macrobius, *Sat.* 4. For Vergil's use of speeches in the *Aeneid*, see Highet 1972.

⁷⁷ Aelius Donatus, *Vita Vergilii* 44: *M. Vipranus a Maecenate eum suppositum appellabat novae cacozeliae repertorem, non tumidae nec exilis, sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis*. Exhaustive discussion of the passage can be found in Jocelyn 1979.

⁷⁸ Zanker 1988: 167-263; André 1949: 105, 107.

⁷⁹ E.g., Cic. *Leg.* 2.59 calls the Twelve Tables (Luiselli 1969: 128, for its alliterative word-pairs) a *carmen necessarium*, which he says he had to memorize in his youth. Cicero goes on to say that no one learns it anymore. For the language of prayer in Vergil and Livy, see Hickson 1993.

traditional, elevated, hallowed language. Livy demonstrates a similar awareness when he reports prayers in his history,⁸⁰ unlike the *carmina* preserved by Cato, Varro, and Macrobius, the antiquity of at least some of Livy's *carmina* is suspect.⁸¹

2.5.1 Fabianus *philosophus* attacks wealth itself (C. 2.1.25)

The theme of C. 2.1: *Dives tres filios abdicavit. petit a paupere unicum filium in adoptionem. pauper dare vult; nolentem ire abdicat.* “A rich man disinherited his three sons. He requests from a poor man to adopt his only son. The poor man is willing to give up his son; since the son is unwilling the poor man disowns him.”

At C. 2.1.25, in the section of *colores*, Seneca indicates what was distinctive about Fabianus' treatment of this declamation theme: in his defense of the abdicated son, Fabianus spoke not against the rich man, but rather against wealth itself; the son is *unwilling* to be the son of a rich man because wealth corrupts.⁸² Here is the characteristic Fabianic strategy: a specific issue is made subject to a broad, moral purview.

The speech must have impressed his audience. There are in fact indications that it created something of a sensation and that other declaimers thought it worthy of direct response and emulation. Vibius Rufus (2.1.28) attempts to diminish Fabianus' success and asserts that his own approach is better: “Someone (*alius*) can talk big and try to win

⁸⁰ 25.12.9-10 (note alliteration, assonance): ‘*amnem, Troiugena, fuge Cannam, ne te alienigenae cogant in campo Diomedis conserere manus. sed neque credes tu mihi, donec completeris sanguine campum, multaque milia occisa tua deferet amnis in pontum magnum ex terra frugifera; piscibus atque auibus ferisque quae incolunt terras iis fuat esca caro tua; nam mihi ita Iuppiter fatus est.*’ Also: Livy 1.24.7-8; 1.32.6-13; 8.9.6-8; 25.12.9-10; 29.27.1-4. On Cicero's use of traditional language in *de Legibus*, see Powell 2005: 124-6.

⁸¹ Pasquali 1981: 153; Timpanaro 1988: 258 n. 1.

⁸² *Fabianus philosophus hoc colore usus est ut diceret: etiamsi sustinerem [ad] alicui tradi, diviti nollem. et in divitias dixit, non in divitem.*

glory by despising wealth. For my part I don't say that I am *unwilling* to be rich, but rather that I don't know *how* to be rich."⁸³ Immediately preceding Rufus' remark Seneca sets the context by repeating Fabianus' *color* ("I am unwilling to be rich," *nolo dives esse*), which he had just mentioned at 2.1.25. Rufus' "someone" is none other than Fabianus.⁸⁴

Fabianus' speech also influenced Vibius Gallus. Gallus, Seneca informs us (2.1.25), delivered his speech the day after Fabianus. The notice concerns more than chronology but is meant to communicate that the speeches were similar in some way and conducive to comparison.⁸⁵ So Seneca (2.1.26) passes judgment on the two speeches together saying that much of Gallus' exposition was eloquent, that he spoke more corruptly (*corruptius*) than Fabianus but also more sweetly (*dulcius*).⁸⁶ Between the notice of when Gallus spoke and the summary judgment, Seneca states that there was something very unusual about Gallus' approach: he pretended to be in a state of divine frenzy (*bacchari*) and with a sing-song voice (*paene cantantis modo*) kept repeating "I

⁸³ *alius animose loquatur et ex contemptu divitiarum gloriam petat. ego non dico: 'dives esse nolo', sed 'nescio'.*

⁸⁴ After reporting Rufus' reaction to Fabianus, Seneca relates that also Albucius Silus attacked wealth (2.1.29): *et ipse divitias insecutus est et dixit pulchram de Fabricio sententiam.* Albucius was an admirer of Fabianus, despite being a generation younger (C. 7 pr. 4). From the section of *divisiones*, it seems that Pompeius Silo may have pursued a similar attack on wealth (2.1.21): *paupertatem laudavit, in divitias invectus est: dixit [si] posse se divitiis corrumpi, quibus corrumpi posset exercitus. cum in divitias inveheretur, dixit: aiunt multa vitia divites habere istos, et hoc gravissimum: suos non amant (cf. Fabianus' ne liberi quidem nisi alieni placent, C. 2.1.13).*

⁸⁵ It is perhaps significant that in the section of *sententiae* the quotations of Vibius Gallus and Fabianus appear consecutively – Gallus first (2.1.9), then Fabianus (2.1.10-13). Are they together because they were close chronologically (and so they happened to occur together in documents), or because Gallus made a response to Fabianus?

⁸⁶ *multa facunde explicuit, corruptius quam Fabianus sed dulcius.* Presumably it is Gallus' excessiveness, his feigned insanity, that Seneca considered corrupt. The "sweetness" of Gallus' speech is harder to define, particularly since Seneca identifies *dulces sententiae* (C. 2.1 pr. 2) as a hallmark of Fabianus' style.

want to describe riches” (*divitias describere volo*). Strange as this was, it seems to have been effective; for Seneca says that the audience was persuaded to despise wealth.⁸⁷

This declamation was not the only occasion Gallus employed this strategy. (Seneca says, humorously, that he feigned this frenzy with such zeal that eventually he became insane in actual fact.) On previous occasions too, for example when he would address the topic of love, Gallus assumed a frenetic pose and used the same linguistic formula (*amorem describere volo*). On the day after a speech by Fabianus in which wealth was attacked, Gallus decided to assume this pose again, adapting it to an attack on wealth. Evidently Gallus thought passionate frenzy a fitting countermatch to Fabianus’ philosophical earnestness.

Fabianus attempts to speak with a divinely inspired, oracular voice.⁸⁸ Gallus’ insanity is an (absurd) intensification of this pose. Fabianus shifts the emphasis of the declamatory debate from mundane, judicial argument to broader moral questions. The “traditional” features of Fabianus’ language that have been observed thus far, and that are detailed below, participate in constructing this oracular voice.

After Seneca explains (2.1.25) that Fabianus spoke not against the rich man but against wealth itself, Seneca supplies an Entry. The Entry, in addition to summarizing

⁸⁷ *quod voluit consecutus est ut divitias nobis in odium adduceret.*

⁸⁸ On moral criticism as oracular, see *C.* 1 pr. 9. Seneca calls the elder Cato’s celebrated definition of an orator (*orator est vir bonus dicendi peritus*) an *oraculum*. “For what is an oracle? It is divine will expressed by a human voice. And could the divine have found a more holy priest for itself than Marcus Cato, through whom it did not instruct but upbraided human kind?” *quid enim est oraculum? nempe voluntas divina hominis ore enuntiata; et quem tandem antistitem sanctiorem sibi invenire divinitas potuit quam M. Catonem, per quem humano generi non praeciperet sed convicium faceret?* Cato scolded (*convicium facere*) human kind, just as Fabianus took every opportunity to do (*convicium saeculi*, *C.* 2.1 pr. 2).

Fabianus' broad, moral positioning in *C.* 2.1, illustrates how this positioning was embodied in traditional, oracular language – that is, in language which organizes itself and shapes meaning through the same phonetic devices as those found in archaic Latin texts (prayer, poetry, etc.).

illas [sc. divitias] esse,
quae Frugalitatem quae Pietatem exPugnassent,
quae malos Patres malos Filios Facerent.

The Entry is of remarkably tight cohesiveness: nearly every word corresponds, through similarity of sound and through parallel roles in building the sentence architecture, to at least two or more other words. First, we observe that there are two parallel verses with parallel syntactical structure. In each verse are word-groups defined and associated with each other by their syntactical roles and sound correspondences: *quae frugalitatem* corresponds with *quae pietatem*; and *quae malos patres* corresponds with *malos filios*. (Cf. the phonetically linked pairs in the prayer to Mars, e.g. *viduertatem vastitudinemque*) These word-groups are followed by a verb that does not rhyme with its preceding word-group. Therefore, when analyzed horizontally each verse exhibits the pattern: **A A¹ B**.

The two verses show additional – namely, vertical – architectural patterns. The two verbs rhyme (*expugnassent ... facerent*); and the lines correspond in nearly identical number of syllables: 1st verse = 14; 2nd verse = 13.⁸⁹ It is interesting that, according to Norden,⁹⁰ this number (13) is common in verses of ritualistic formula (“altlateinische

⁸⁹ Excluding the verbs, each verse has ten syllables, since *-em* of *pietatem* elides. In order to maintain near parity of syllables, *quae* appears in the second verse only once.

Formelsprache”), as exemplified by several verses in Cato’s prayer. We may represent simultaneous correspondences within and between verses (i.e. horizontal and vertical) thus:

A A¹ B
a a¹ b

However, we become fully aware of the complexity of structuring in this Entry once it is observed that substantives contained in **A¹** and in **a¹** (*pietatem* / *malos filios*) are not only linked phonetically and syntactically with substantives of **A** and **a** (*frugalitatem* / *malos patres*), but through alliteration are linked also with their succeeding verbs (*pietatem expugnassent*⁹¹ / *filios facerent*). Recognition of the full extent of horizontal correspondence establishes a further phonetic pattern: the pattern of initial, alliterating consonants of the second line is the inverse of the first: *F P P P F F*.

Frugalitatem Pietatem exPugnassent malos Patres malos Filios Facerent.

Taking account of both alliteration and end-rhyme, we discover what may be best described as ‘serial cohesion’:⁹² each structural element is joined phonetically to immediately preceding and succeeding elements, as links in a chain:⁹³ (*quae frugalitatem quae pietatem*) (*quae Pietatem exPugnassent*) (*exPugnassent malos Patres*) (*malos patres malos filios*) (*malos Filios Facerent*).

⁹⁰ Norden 1939: 99-104.

⁹¹ Even strict definitions of alliteration (e.g., Ceccarelli 1986: 2) recognize that the initial letter of a stem in a compound word can participate in alliteration.

⁹² For a similar phenomenon in Livy, see Kraus 1994: 24.

⁹³ Cf. the “sound relay” (from *s* and *p*...to *p* and *f*...to *f* and *l*) at Verg. *G.* 4.53-55: *illae continuo saltus siluasque peragrant | purpureosque metunt flores et flumina libant | summa leues.*

While the above detailed demonstration of Fabianus' complex architecture might elevate a critic's estimation of his rhetorical skill (and so justly revise what scholars have assumed about him from a misreading of the statements of the two Senecas), it risks introducing new misunderstandings. The complexity of patterns might imply that the architecture is ornamentally exquisite and that it is perceptible only through slow, rational analysis. On the contrary, the architecture is not exquisite and it is not ornamental – or rather, not solely ornamental.⁹⁴ The architecture is functional; it is central to the production of meaning, and it is meant to be immediately sensible (though not necessarily consciously and rationally processed, as in the demonstration above).

In accordance with this view, first we observe a practical result of the architecture – a result that has particular importance for the practices of composing speeches and of recording and circulating declamatory quotations. The phonetic devices that create the multiple correspondences, grouping together smaller units and at the same time pointing up the integrity of larger units, thoroughly safeguard every part of the Entry from oblivion. They serve as a mnemonic to Fabianus, and they make the Entry eminently memorable and attractive to auditors and collectors of notable quotations. The quotation may in fact be considered paradigmatic of how to compose a speech, or other type of literary work, in a literary milieu that prizes short, self-contained passages that deliver

⁹⁴ Cicero (*de Orat.* 3.178), while discussing the rhythm and architecture of language, says that in speech as in nature what has the greatest utility often has the greatest dignity and pleasure: *sed ut in plerisque rebus incredibiliter hoc natura est ipsa fabricata, sic in oratione, ut ea quae maximam utilitatem in se continerent plurimum eadem haberent vel dignitatis vel saepe etiam venustatis*. He then (*de Orat.* 3.180-1) compares the architectural features of buildings (columns; the *fastigium* of the Capitol) to the architecture of speech; these features are as much functional and necessary as they are beautiful: *hoc in omnibus item partibus orationis evenit ut utilitatem ac prope necessitatem suavitas quaedam et lepos consequatur*.

swift impact. It was designed for oral delivery,⁹⁵ for creating an enduring emotional imprint in its auditors (cf. the younger Seneca's 'assault the senses,' Descriptor 6 in Section 2.2); and the qualities that make it memorable and impressive also make it conducive to collection.

The Entry itself can serve as a mnemonic, a souvenir token for the author and his auditors, since it efficiently encapsulates an entire speech along the lines laid out by Fabianus in 2.1.10-13.⁹⁶ All the key thematic components have a verbal representative. Besides the central characters of father (*patres*) and son (*filios*), we find the key virtue (familial piety) and vice (wealth) with which Fabianus is concerned in 2.1 drawn up into an innovative equation. The Entry, as souvenir token, summarizes how Fabianus connected the material indulgences of the wealthy with a lack of paternal affection, and how he relied on the asserted interdependence of the two (wealth *produces* lack of affection) to explain civil war.⁹⁷

Riches (destroy) temperance and a sense of familial obligations in (civil) war.
divitiae quae frugalitatem quae pietatem expugnassent

Secondly, with regard to the functionality of the architecture, we can observe that the phonetic organization of the Entry produces meaning beyond the propositional content of individual words. Again, one of the things most striking and idiosyncratic

⁹⁵ For attempts to attribute elements of a text to the exigencies of oral performance, Gagarin 1999; Marouzeau 1932.

⁹⁶ I do not believe, as for example Håkanson 1989a does, that this long quotation is continuous. See Section 2.5.2 below.

⁹⁷ The opening of the quotation (*Ecce instructi exercitus saepe civium cognatorumque...*), given above in Section 2.4 and analyzed more closely in the sub-section immediately below, is a description of a civil war battle scene.

about Fabianus' speech is his assertion that seemingly unrelated phenomena are connected: wealth weakens the natural bond between father and son; temperance (*frugalitas*) is closely associated with piety (*pietas*). By rendering temperance (*frugalitas*) and piety (*pietas*) formally parallel and by highlighting their phonetic similarities (thus creating asyndetic word-groups in the tradition of archaic *carmina*),⁹⁸ the architecture of the Entry performs Fabianus' idiosyncratic argument. The formal connection of word-groups is meant to suggest a natural, underlying semantic connection. The architecture appeals to a principle that language-users often feel instinctually, even when the principle lacks a scientific basis: words sound alike because they mean alike.⁹⁹

2.5.2 Phonetic structuring and Civil War (C. 2.1.10-13)

The prayers found in the works of Cato and Macrobius demonstrate the fundamental role sound can play in organizing archaic Latin. Sound participates in creating architecture and simultaneously in shaping meaning. The structuring in such prayers is conspicuously present; we notice immediately that alliteration, for example, is

⁹⁸ So, for example, Macr. 3.9.8 (quoted above): *eique populo civitatie metum formidinem oblivionem iniciatis*.

⁹⁹ The idea that there is a natural, rather than purely conventional, link between the sound of a word and its meaning is ancient; for example, Cratylus in Plato, *Cratylus*. The idea was maintained also by Nigidius Figulus (1st cent. BC); see Gel. 4.9. For modern interest, compare the Russian Futurist movement (early 20th cent.), which sought to create a natural, universal language (*zaum*) on the basis that sounds have meaning in and of themselves; Seifrid 2005: 53-81. See also Jakobson 1987: 413-27 ("Quest for the essence of language."). Traina 1977 documents the role sound has played in the genesis of Latin words. Words with similar sounds are created to refer to related concepts; therefore, categories of sound can reflect a culture's conceptual organization of the world. Watkins 1995 includes enlightening discussions (e.g., on the Cato prayer, pp. 197-213) of how the form of traditional expressions and archaic texts are often symbolic of their meanings (what I call "perform" above); Watkins 1995: 43: "More broadly, what is neglected in the study of formulas – and this applies not only to linguists but to students of oral literature as well – is the function of these formulas as expressions of an underlying semiotic system. These poetic formulas in archaic societies are not repeated and remembered just because they delight the ear; they are *signals*, in poetic elaboration and as verbal art, of the relations of things: of the traditional conceptualizations, the perception of man and the universe, and the values and aspirations of the society."

at play. At the same time, the patterns of order produced through phonetic and other formal devices are often complex. They admit of more than one kind of analysis, as the numerous studies of Cato's prayer testify.

Fabianus' language is similar to these ancient prayers, both in its prominent and patterned repetition of sounds¹⁰⁰ and in the complexity of the architecture that the sound patterns help produce. An instance of this complexity has just been seen in the analysis of Fabianus' *color* at C. 2.1.25. Now we turn again to the long quotation from Fabianus at C. 2.1.10-13, of which 2.1.25 is an efficiently thorough memento, to consider its architecture more precisely. In particular, we wish to see how sound is integral to the paratactic, drop-by-drop (*guttatim*) architecture of Fabianus' prose. Passages from Vergil that show comparable phonetic structuring are occasionally quoted as evidence that "traditional" elements in Fabianus' quotations should be seen in connection with (near) contemporary trends. To what extent this traditional language was nourished by direct study of choice archaic texts – that is, to what extent it is 'archaizing' – is debatable.

(e) C. 2.1.10 (H 70,7-15)

*Ecce instructi exercitus saepe civium cognatorumque
conserturi proelio manus constiterunt,*¹⁰¹

*et colles equis utrimque complentur*¹⁰²

et subinde omnis regio trucidatorum corporibus consternitur.

<in tanta> multitudine cadaverum vel spoliantium

5

sic quaesierit aliquis

quae causa hominem adversus hominem in facinus coegit?

nam neque feris inter se bella sunt

nec si forent eadem hominem deceant

placidum proximumque divino genus.

10

¹⁰⁰ The conspicuousness of Fabianus' alliteration in C. 2.1.10 is attested to, for example, by Bonner 1966: 259, who refers to the beginning of the quotation as "this high-flown alliterative sentence."

¹⁰¹ Mss: *conserturi proelium manus constituerunt*. Perhaps: *conserturi proelium acies constituerunt*.

¹⁰² Mss: *equis virumque complentur*. E. Thomas (*apud* Håkanson) conjectures: *equis virisque utrimque complentur*. Perhaps: *equis virumque armis complentur*. Or: *equis vique armorum complentur*.

*quae tanta vos pestis
 cum una stirps idemque sanguis sitis,
 quaeve furiae in mutuum sanguinem egere?
 quod tantum malum huic generi fato vel forte <in>iunctum?*

From the first word (*Ecce!*) the passage registers itself as an *imago*, an image. It intends to create verbally a tableau for its auditors to see in their mind's eye. The tableau recreates not a specific battle, but presents a typifying scene of the worst kind of war¹⁰³ – that between fellow citizens and between kin (*civium cognatorumque*). The passage has a literary genealogy that, due to the limited survival of Greek and Latin literature, we can apprehend only very partially. This is the kind of war that eventually Lucan will write about, speaking of “wars more than civil” (*bella...plus quam ciuilia*), and “kindred battle formations” (*cognatas acies*).¹⁰⁴ This was the subject of writers, from the late republic and early empire, whose works have almost entirely disappeared: Asinius Pollio, T. Labienus, Cassius Severus, Cremutius Cordus, and Aufidius Bassus, all of whom are featured in Seneca's anthology.

The Fabianic passage needs, and deserves, to be regarded as a point in the historical evolution of a literary trend; it is a momentary light into Latin civil war

¹⁰³ *Saepe* advertises the generalizing, exemplifying nature of the description. The adverb functions in the same way, for example, in Vergilian similes: *A.* 1.148; 5.273; 5.527; 10.723. At *G.* 2.279-83, we find *saepe* used to introduce a war simile: *ut saepe ingenti bello cum longa cohortis | explicuit legio et campo stetit agmen aperto, | directaeque acies, ac late fluctuat omnis | aere renidenti tellus, necdum horrida miscent | proelia, sed dubius mediis Mars errat in armis.* The Vergilian passage is an imitation of Lucr. 2.323-330, which is also a martial simile and which contains profound alliteration intriguingly similar to that in the Fabianic passage: *praeterea magnae legiones cum loca cursu | camporum complent belli simulacra cientes, | fulgor ubi ad caelum se tollit totaque circum | aere renidescit tellus subterque uirum ui | excitur pedibus sonitus clamoreque montes | icti reiectant uoces ad sidera mundi | et circumuolitant equites mediosque repente | tramittunt ualido quatientes impete campos.* See also, preceding this passage, Lucr. 2.20-43, where the poet claims that philosophy is better than vain pleasures such as sumptuous banquets and martial pomp.

¹⁰⁴ 1.1; 1.4. Cf. Isid. *Etym.* 18.1.4: *Plus quam ciuile bellum est ubi non solum ciues certant, sed et cognati; quale actum est inter Caesarem et Pompeium, quando gener et socer inuicem dimicauerunt.* See also Man. 1.904-913.

literature before it reemerges for us (in substantial length) in the work of Lucan. Fabianus has, consciously or unconsciously, absorbed contemporary literature on civil war and he has shaped it to his own ends. The above passage is an idiosyncratic expression of a shared cultural and literary tradition. Evidence for Fabianus' participation in a recognized tradition emerges from comparisons with other literary passages – Sallust, Vergil, Horace. Evidence for the individuality of the passage comes from the fact that compositional patterns and methods found here – particularly, those features which we have called 'oracular' – are consistently found in Fabianic quotations.

Phonetic iteration (in bold) in (e) is not otiose or purely ornamental. Alliteration, homoeoteleuton, and assonance contribute substantially to the grouping of contiguous words into semi-independent units, or *cola*.¹⁰⁵ The spacing and layout of the passage is an attempt to represent visually the complexity of the architecture. Stand-alone units, or *cola*, have been placed on separate lines (in passages below *cola* are sometimes divided by a vertical line (|)). Additional spacing within a line has sometimes been introduced to show the presence of a distinct, coherent word-group within a *colon*. These smaller units cannot stand alone; nonetheless, a sound pattern and/or syntax mark them as separately identifiable within a *colon*. Underlining highlights vertical correspondence.

Sound correspondence can take on a variety of patterns to contribute to architectural shape. A basic pattern is the repetition of a select sound, or group of sounds, for each *colon*. Thus, in the passage above: *quae tanta vos pestis*, which is

¹⁰⁵ A *colon* has no absolute measure, and there are various organizing devices (syntactic, phonetic, prosodic) that can be enlisted to create *cola*. The demonstration here is meant to point up especially the integral role sound plays in Fabianus' prose architecture. Fundamental contributions to the study of prose colometry include: Broadhead 1922; Fraenkel 1964a; Fraenkel 1964b; Fraenkel 1965; Fraenkel 1968; Wilkinson 1963: 135-64; Habinek 1985; Nisbet 1990.

marked by *t*, is defined separately from *cum una stirps idemque sanguis sitis*, which is marked by *s*. The same phonetic arrangement is useful also for defining minor units within *cola*. For example, *ecce instructi exercitus saepe (c t)* receives a slightly different phonetic emphasis from the word-pair *civium cognatorumque (c um)*.¹⁰⁶ Similarly, Vergil uses the technique of assigning separate sounds to separate *cola*, in a ritualistic context, at *A.* 8.274: *cingite fronde comas et pocula porgite dextris*.¹⁰⁷

Another traditional pattern, also used by Fabianus in this passage, is the repetition of similar sounds at the beginning and end of a *colon*, while a different sound or sounds intervene. This kind of ‘enclosing alliteration’¹⁰⁸ is found in *conserturi proelio manus constiterunt*. And in: *quae causa hominem adversus hominem in facinus coegit?* In the latter example enclosing alliteration functions in a manner similar to what was observed in the discussion of *C.* 2.1.25: it creates coherence in contiguous words (*quae causa*) while at the same time defining a larger coherent unit (*quae causa...facinus coegit*). Enclosing alliteration has been seen already, for example in the prayer preserved by Macrobius: *precor venerorque veniamque a vobis peto*. And it is used frequently by Vergil.¹⁰⁹ So, for example, *A.* 6.333: *cernit ibi maestos et mortis honore carentis*.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ Also, below in this same quotation, *C.* 2.1.12 (H 70,26): *ad delicias dementis luxuriae lapis omnis eruitur*. Some alliterating fragments of the archaizing historian Sisenna supply interesting comparanda: *Frg.* 26 (Peter 1914), *postquam sonu signorum proelium magno cum clamore uirorum commissum est*. *Frg.* 91, *periclitantur tormenta ac tela multaque genera machinamentorum*. *Frg.* 72, *Galli contra magno cum molimento ac perpetuo sonu procedunt*. For an insightful analysis, Perutelli 2004: 20-31.

¹⁰⁷ *G.* 1.388-9 (note preponderance of *p* and *u* in first verse and of *s* in second verse): *tum cornix plena pluuiam uocat improba uoce | et sola in sicca secum spatiat harena*. For the use of this technique in archaic texts, cf. for example *Enn. Ann.* 568 (Vahlen), *Siluarum saltus latebras lamasque lutosas*; *Ann.* 411, *Reges per regnum statuasque sepulcraque quaerunt*.

¹⁰⁸ I adapt the term from the study of Pearce 1966a and 1966b, which is concerned with enclosing, syntactical word order. Traina 1977: 102, calls this type of alliteration “allitterazione a cornice.”

¹⁰⁹ Ceccarelli 1986: 58-71.

Again in (e), though it cannot strictly be called alliteration we notice a similar enclosing phonetic pattern in the repetition of *-um*: *quod tantum malum huic generi fato vel forte <in>iunctum?* Note must be made of the effect of the alliterating word-pair *fato vel forte* in the middle of this *colon*.¹¹¹ It appears that Fabianus prefers to organize phonetically linked word-pairs as constituents in a larger *colon* rather than having them stand alone as short *cola*. *Fato vel forte* is not isolated rhythmically,¹¹² but supplies phonetic contrast in the middle of a rhythmic unit relative to its borders.

The phonetically linked word-pairs employed by Fabianus – specifically, *civium cognatorumque* (line 1) and *cadaverum spoliantiumque* (line 5) – require further comment. The joining of these words into a unit is rather peculiar, and this peculiarity may indicate more specifically the place of Fabianus in literary traditions. *Cadavera* (“corpses”) and *spoliantes* (“plunderers”) are neither antithetical nor synonymous; therefore, they do not form a semantically complementary pair in the same way as most traditional pairings, such as *sacra profana* (“sacred” and “profane”) and *oro obsecroque* (“beg” and “entreat”). Whereas the organization of these words into a phonetically linked unit follows a tradition as old as Latin *carmina*, the semantic principle that allows the Fabianic word-pair to be joined together appears to belong to the classical period, to

¹¹⁰ Other examples: *A.* 5.145, *corripuere ruuntque effusi carcere currus*; 12.93, *aedibus astatat ualidam ui corripit hastam*; *G.* 2.268, *mutatam ignorent subito ne semina matrem*.

¹¹¹ For the use of a very similar phrase (*fataque fortunasque*) by Vergil, but in a different alliterating pattern, cf. *A.* 6.682-3: *fataque fortunasque uirum moresque manusque*.

¹¹² For an example of how such a sense-unit might be isolated rhythmically, see how Cicero creates short *cola* out of syntactically and phonetically parallel word-groups, at *Cat.* 3.17: *Hunc ego hominem tam acrem tam audacem | tam paratum tam callidum | tam in scelere uigilantem | tam in perditis rebus diligentem |...* This passage has been analyzed by Fraenkel 1968: 51. Hutchinson 1995: 489, mentions how the alliterating word-pair *furta atque flagitia* occurs in *cola* of different length in the speeches of Cicero.

the first century BC. It is precisely in the context of civil war literature that these pairings can be readily recognized and processed, that they are felt as conventional.

We have already seen in the beginning verses of Lucan's epic that the word-pair *cives / cognati* became associated with narratives of Roman civil war. As for *cadavera* and *spoliantes*, we discover at the end of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* how Fabianus, in his description of a civil war battle scene, could regard these terms as appropriate for a phonetically linked word-pair. The historian describes (BC 61.8) the aftermath of a battle between Roman armies, fellow citizens and relatives: *Multi autem, qui e castris uisundi aut spoliandi gratia processerant, uolentes hostilia cadauera amicum alii, pars hospitem aut cognatum reperiabant.*¹¹³

It is possible that Sallust is responsible for canonizing these figures – corpses and plunderers – in the civil war battle scene, and for making these terms part of the contemporary vocabulary of civil war. Fabianus, for his part, creates word-pairs out of these figures in the fashion of ancient *carmina*.¹¹⁴

It is important to observe that Fabianus, in a manner quite similar to his teacher Arellius Fuscus (as we shall see), structures his speech in parallel, binary members (*cola*) that are approximate mirror images of each other. Phonetic iteration, along with syntax, is responsible for constituting the architecture. An example from (e) demonstrates how structural considerations are a priority to Fabianus.

¹¹³ “However, many who had ventured from camp in order to visit the scene or to plunder, when turning over the corpses of their opponents found now a friend, now a guest or a relative.” *Spoliari* and *cadaueribus* appear also at Sall. *Cat.* 51.9, anticipating the final battle scene.

¹¹⁴ Compare the discussion below concerning the word-pair *ventri libidinique*, which also seems to be a Fabianic creation based on a passage from Sallust.

neque feris inter se bella sunt
nec si forent eadem hominem deceant

The idea that animals, unlike humans, do not engage in warfare against each other is found most notably at Hor. *Epod.* 7.11-12.¹¹⁵ Like Fabianus, Horace incorporates this idea into a criticism of Roman civil bloodshed.

In the Fabianic passage, the anaphoric repetition of *neque / nec*, where each stands at the head of its own clause, is ordinary for parallelism. But Fabianus deepens the parallelism between clauses by extending correspondence beyond the initial word. The objective is to create *cola* that are phonetic images of each other. *Nec si forent* reflects *neque feris* in sound (*n s f*) and in number (4) of syllables; and both clauses terminate in *nt*. Thus, the first clause presents a phonetic sequence (*n c f r*) that is echoed by the second clause.¹¹⁶ However, the phonetic correspondence between *feris* and *forent*, which is at the core of this phonetic parallelism, is without semantic foundation. Words that sound alike are brought into a false parallelism to create the desired structure.¹¹⁷ A specific kind of architecture is as central to Fabianus' performance as the *philosophical* argument that attacks money itself rather than the rich man.

(f) C. 2.1.11 (H 70,15-19)
an ut convivia epulis¹¹⁸ instruuntur

¹¹⁵ *Epod.* 7.11-20: *neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus | umquam nisi in dispar feris. | furorne caecus, an rapit uis acrior, | an culpa? responsum date! | tacent et albus ora pallor inficit | mentesque percussae stupent. | sic est: acerba fata Romanos agunt | scelusque fraternae necis, | ut immerentis fluxit in terram Remi | sacer nepotibus cruor.* Also see Cic. *S. Rosc.* 63; Sen. *Dial.* 4.8.3; Plin. *Nat.* 7.5.

¹¹⁶ The letters *i* and *s*, though appearing at different points in the sequence of emphasized letters, also seems important: *neque feris nec si forent*.

¹¹⁷ On false parallelism, Gagarin 1997: 31.

*et tecta auro fulgeant parricidium **tanti** fuit?*
magna enim vero et lauta¹¹⁹ sunt
propter quae mensam et lacunaria su<os spoliare>¹²⁰
*potius quam lucem **innocentes intueri maluerint.*** 5
an ne quid ventri negetur libidinique orbis servitium expetendum est?
in quid tandem sic pestiferae istae divitiae expetuntur,
*si ne in hoc quidem ut **liberis relinquuntur?***

The sequential logic and consistency of the quotation thus far, from *Ecce* at the beginning of (e) to *relinquantur* at the end of (f), argue that we are dealing with a continuous Entry. At this point, Fabianus proposes answers to the string of questions initiated by *Sic quaesierit aliquis quae causa hominem adversus hominem in facinus coegit?*¹²¹ Two causes are suggested (*an ut convivia...tanti fuit? an ne quid ventri...expetendum est?*), both contemptible since they stem from greed and pleasure: “What motive can drive men to commit crimes against their fellow men? Is it so that their banquets can be equipped with delicacies and their ceilings shine with gold? Is it so that nothing should be denied to a man’s belly and lust?”

There are several phonetically and rhythmically corresponding *cola*. The underlying architectural principle is binary: matching occurs in pairs (lines 1 and 2; 4 and 5; 7 and 8), although this principle admits of organizational nuance. The two members of

¹¹⁸ *Epulis* is my conjecture for *populis* (accepted by Håkanson) of the mss. For similar expressions, cf. Livy 23.8.6 (*conuiuium ... omnibus uoluptatum inlecebris instructum*); Cic. *Ver.* 4.62 (*omnibus curat rebus instructum et paratum ut sit conuiuium*). *Poculis*, proposed by Gruter, also seems possible.

¹¹⁹ *laucia* **B A** *et laudanda* **V.** *et lauta* was conjectured by H. J. Müller. Cf. Col. 12.46: *Illi enim propositum fuit urbanas mensas et lauta conuiuia instruere*. Timpanaro 1978: 521-2 defends *lautia*, the reading closest to the archetype, calling it “a rare and refined synonym for *lautitiae*.” It may be that *lautia* should be retained (*magna enim vero lautia sunt propter quae*). Håkanson conjectures *solacia*, apparently from a comparison with C. 2.1.20 (Pompeius Silo: *divitem...qui tot haberet solacia*).

¹²⁰ *suos spoliare* is my conjecture. Mss: *lacunaria sua potius*. After *sua* Castiglioni supplied *nocentes* (accepted by Håkanson). See discussion below.

¹²¹ Cf. Sen. *Nat.* 5.18.6: *quae nos dementia exagitat et in mutuuum componit exitium?*

the final question (*in quid...expetuntur* and *si ne...relinquantur*) are most obviously a pair. Structurally they reflect each other, even if less precisely than just witnessed in the two sentences above (*neque feris...deceant* and *nec respondet fecunditas*): in the initial position *in hoc* reflects *in quid*, and both clauses close with *-ntur*. Some internal grouping in the middle of each member is achieved metrically: *pestiferae istae divitiae* cohere syntactically, and phonetically their endings are identical; but also both *pestiferae* and *divitiae* are choriambic (– ∪ ∪ –). *hoc quidem ut* and *liberis* form a double cretic (– ∪ – | – ∪ –).

A minor incision occurs between *an ne quid ventri negetur libidinique* and *orbis servitium expetendum est?* Within the first *colon* a word-pair (*ventri libidinique*) has been created through shared syntactical function (datives) and end-rhyme.¹²² Consistent with what was already observed concerning use of the word-pair *fato vel forte*, Fabianus prefers not to make *ventri libidinique* stand as an isolated unit; instead, the cohesive force of the word-pair is stretched, as it were, in order to give body to a larger *colon*. This is brought about by inserting a verb between the two nouns. The same tendency towards broader, rather than more limited cohesion, is observed in another word-pair (*stirps, sanguis*), already encountered in (e): *cum una stirps idemque sanguis sitis*. The

¹²² The word-pair, which does not appear before this passage and does not appear again in extant classical Latin except in the works of the younger Seneca, may have been created out of Sallust, *Jug.* 85.41 (in a moralizing speech by Marius): *in conuiuiis dediti uentri et turpissimae parti corporis*. For *turpissimae parti corporis* Fabianus substitutes the synonymous *libidini* to create a concise pairing with *uentri*. The passages in which *uenter* and *libido* appear together in the younger Seneca are *Dial.* 10.7.1 (*in uentrem ac libidinem proiectorum inhonesta labes est*), a treatise which twice cites Fabianus as an authority; *Ben.* 7.2.2 (*uentri ac libidini deditos*), where we also find the phrase *quod naturam hominis dis proximi deceat* (cf. Fabianus' *nec...eadem hominem deceant placidum proximumque divino genus*); *Ep.* 55.5 (*ille sibi non uiuit sed...uentri, somno, libidini*). Research on word incidences, here and elsewhere, were carried out with the assistance of an online database: Centre Traditio Litterarum Occidentalium. (2005-). *CLCLT Library of Latin Texts*, Brepols.

interjection of *idem* between the two nouns, along with widespread alliteration, dissipates the cohesive force of the word-pair and extends it more evenly across the *colon*.

Three separate architectural units are discernible in *an ut convivia epulis instruantur | et tecta auro fulgeant | parricidium tanti fuit?* An attempt to determine the absolute weights of the three members (are they three equal *cola*? one *colon* and a second *cola* with two subdivisions?) results in something of a brain teaser. This is because when the sentence is processed linearly, rather than viewed in its totality, architectural shapes shift and overlap. The shifting architecture is, again, a product of serial cohesion. The *guttatim*-style attaching of *et tecta auro fulgeant* to *an ut convivia epulis instruantur* creates semantically and phonetically paired word-groups. Next, *parricidium tanti fuit* is attached (as it must be to complete the syntax), which shows phonetic correspondence with the preceding member (*fulgeant / fuit*). *Parricidium tanti fuit?* also serves, semantically, as a counterpoise to what has preceded: the banquets (*convivia*) and gilded ceilings (*tecta auro*) are now grouped together, on the one side, against the price of parricide (*parricidium*), on the other.

The ironic sentence *magna...maluerint* is a variation and expansion of what has just preceded. The price of luxury items is, Fabianus has emphatically pointed out, – parricide. He now continues: “They must be great refinements indeed for which the banquet table and panelled ceilings...” (*magna enim vero et lauta sunt propter quae mensam et lacunaria...*).¹²³ *Mensam* and *lacunaria* are used as synonyms for the

¹²³ Because *mensam et lacunaria* are so clearly synonyms for *convivia* and *tecta auro* (things, we are told, for which corrupt men commit parricide) a logical inconsistency results if we try to interpret *mensam et lacunaria* as not equivalent to *quae* of *propter quae* (“on account of which”). The inconsistency can be seen in Håkanson’s text: “They must be great comforts (*solacia*) indeed for which the banquet and panelled ceilings...” But what *are* the “comforts” if they are not the luxury items Fabianus describes? Winterbottom 1974: *ad loc.*, interprets *magna enim vero et lauta* as “great and glorious objectives”

“banquets” (*convivia*) and “gilded ceilings” (*tecta auro*) just mentioned; *mensam* and *lacunaria* are further useful in that they respond phonetically to *magna* and *lautā* of the preceding *colon*.¹²⁴ At this point we encounter a textual difficulty. *Magna enim vero et lautā sunt* sets up matching twin clauses (*propter quae ...* and *potius quam...*). It is clear that the two clauses are antithetical. But just how they correspond structurally, it seems, has not been understood. This misunderstanding has led editors to suggest emendations that run contrary to Fabianus’ methods.

The following must be observed: As was seen above (*neque feris...nec si forent*), also here Fabianus enforces the parallelism by phonetic structuring at the beginnings of each member (*propter quae...potius quam*). A contrast is being drawn, but between what? Something has fallen out and editors attempt to restore it by supplying after *sua* a word such as *nocentes*,¹²⁵ to which *innocentes* is imagined to respond. But this provides neither semantic nor structural correspondence at the ends of each member, where we should expect to find the antithetical foci. The word *intueri*, which is being emphasized in the second clause, is left dangling without a corresponding term in the first clause.

In the second clause *lucem intueri* (“behold the light”) carries the connotation “to live.”¹²⁶ The alternative to living peacefully is death, destruction, murder. As already pointed out, *mensam* and *lacunaria* reproduce the banquets and gilded ceilings of the

(similarly, Bornecque 1902a); but the objective of these parricides is to acquire luxury items – again, banquets and panelled ceilings.

¹²⁴ Similar to the sentence just analyzed (*an ut convivia...tanti fuit?*), also here it is possible to see three *cola* with structural correspondence that groups the members into overlapping pairs (i.e. the middle sense-unit is shared between the two outer sense-units). Håkanson’s conjecture <so>*lacia*, rather than *lautā* or *lautia* (mss: *laucia*), seriously weakens the phonetic correspondence.

¹²⁵ Castiglioni. Other conjectures: *parricidae* (Haase), *noxii* (Gronov), *noxiosi* (Gerz).

¹²⁶ Timpanaro 1978: 521 n. 25, stresses this point; cf. Cic. *S. Rosc.* 63. The conjecture (*intueri*) belongs to Andreas Schott. Mss: *interim* **V B** *interit* **A**.

preceding sentence – and the price for these is parricide. With some such idea as this the text should be emended, and it should be done with an infinitive that in sound and shape at least loosely resembles *intueri*. Therefore, I suggest changing *sua* to *su<os spoliare>*, which recalls the two figures of death and parricide (*cadaverum vel spoliantium*) populating the *imago* of battle at the beginning of the Entry.¹²⁷

2.5.3 Phonetic Structuring and the imitation of nature by the rich (C. 2.1.10-13)

From this point (H 70,21) to the end, the continuity of the quotation is suspect. Editors have assumed the entire quotation from Fabianus in C. 2.1.10-13 to be without break or overlap. There are indications to the contrary. For example, H 70,26 – 71,9 overlaps with H 70,21-26 in speaking of the danger of extravagant houses. And H 71,10-17 and H 71,18 – end overlap in their descriptions of the imitation of nature. However, the fact that there is significant textual corruption in C. 2.1.12 (Håkanson, *ad loc.*: “*textus incertissimus*”) makes it impossible to settle the question with confidence.

Wealth corrupts everything, Fabianus asserts.¹²⁸ It perverts the natural, practical purpose of houses, which are meant to protect and shelter humans but which under the pressures of extravagance become a threat to safety.¹²⁹ The rich construct houses to an absurd *height*, while the streets are squeezed into *narrow* passages. These spatial

¹²⁷ “They must be great refinements indeed – the banquet table and panelled ceilings – for which they would rather despoil their own relatives than to behold the light of day as innocent men.” For the appositional placement of the substantives *mensam et lacunaria* within a relative clause, cf. for example Livy 4.44.12 (*eodem anno a Campania Cumae, quam Graeci tum urbem tenebant, capiuntur*); Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: 313.

¹²⁸ 2.1.11 (H 70,21): *Quod divitiae <non> corruperint?*

¹²⁹ Parallels to this idea include Sen. *Dial.* 2.12.2; *Ep.* 90.42; *Ben.* 4.6.2.

extremes, which are the result of the distorted sensibilities of the rich, are set in contrasting binary clauses.¹³⁰

(g) C. 2.1.11 (H 70,24-26)
tanta altitudo aedificiorum est
tantaeque viarum angustiae
ut neque adversus ignem praesidium
nec ex ruinis ullam in partem effugium sit.

In the first pair of clauses, the sounds *a*, *ae*, and *t* predominate. Height (*altitudo*) is contrasted with narrowness (*angustiae*) in two alliterating terms poised at the ends of two parallel *cola*. The second pair of clauses has marked correspondence at the beginnings and the ends of the *cola*. Furthermore, it must be noticed that a verb at the end of a clause (*sit*) stands just outside the phonetically structured units. It serves to show the conclusion of an established architectural pattern. This is common practice, not just in the quotations of Fabianus but also in other Latin prose authors.¹³¹

After the textual difficulties of H 71,3-9, there appears what is certainly an uninterrupted and tightly articulated Entry (H 71,10-18). Fabianus criticizes the creation of artificial landscapes; the rich have no notion of the real beauty of the natural environment.

(h) C. 2.1.13 (H 71,10-18)
Quin etiam montes silvaeque in domibus marcidis et umbra fumoque viridibus

¹³⁰ It may be that (g) contains a Version of what immediately precedes it in our text (H 70,22-24): *quid tandem est, quod divitiae <non> corruperint? primum, si inde incipere velis, aedes ipsae, quas in tantum extruxere [cf. tanta altitudo aedificiorum est], ut cum domus ad usum ac munimentum paratae sint, nunc periculo <sin> non praesidio [cf. neque...praesidium nec ex ruinis].*

¹³¹ For the isolation of the final word, see Fraenkel 1968: 31; and esp. Hutchinson 1995: 90-93. For example, Cic. *Cat.* 2.1: *non enim iam inter latera nostra sica illa uersabitur: non in campo | non in foro | non in curia | non denique intra domesticos parietes | pertimescemus.* Cic. *Marc.* 19: *de nobis...quotiens cogitabis | totiens de maximis tuis beneficiis | totiens de incredibili liberalitate | totiens de singulari sapientia | cogitabis.*

aut maria amnesque imitantur.¹³²

vix possim credere

quemquam eorum vidisse silvas | patentisque <gramine> campos¹³³

quos rapidus amnis ex praecipiti | vel cum per plana infusus est placidus interfluit.¹³⁴ 5
non maria unquam ex colle vidisse lata | aut hiberna cum ventis penitus agitata sunt.¹³⁵
quis enim tam parvis oblectare animum <fictis>¹³⁶ possit | si vera cognoverit?¹³⁷

videlicet ut infantibus <tantum illa placent>¹³⁸

¹³² For *imitor* in the passive, Cic. *Tim.* 8; Ovid, *Met.* 9.481; Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.61. – The reconstructed text of Håkanson presents this sentence as an unstructured jumble (note esp. underlined words): *Quin etiam montes silvasque in domibus marcidis ex umbra fumoque viridibus aut maria amnesque imitantur.* The mss: *montes silvaeque in [et in A] domibus marcidis et umbra.* For *imitantur*, the mss have *mittantur*. The passage as I have printed it likely requires additional emendation; but Fabianus' method of using conjunctions to divide sentences into relatively short *cola* makes improbable the jumble in the middle of the sentence in Håkanson's text.

¹³³ Between *patientisque* and *campos* the mss read *eumme* (*eamme* **B**). I am not convinced that *gramine* (Bursian) was originally written, but something must have occupied this spot – and possibly it was slightly longer than what *eumme* represents (e.g. *inter iuga*). For the expression *patentes campi*, see Verg. *G.* 4.77; *A.* 4.153.

¹³⁴ The earliest witnesses to this verb (with which should be compared the rare verb *internata* used by Arellius Fuscus, also in a geographical description, at *S.* 2.1) are the present passage and four passages from Livy: 27.29.9; 33.15.1; 33.18.12; 41.23.16.

¹³⁵ A description of the river Araxes by Mela (3.40) bears comparison: *Araxes Tauri latere demissus, quoad campos Armeniae secat, labitur placidus et silens, neque in utram partem eat, quamquam intuearis, manifestus; cum in asperiora devenit hinc atque illinc rupibus pressus, et quanto angustior tanto magis pernix frangit se subinde ad opposita cautium, atque ob id ingenti cum murmure sonansque devolvitur, adeo citus ut qua ex praecipiti in subiecta casurus est non declinet statim undam, sed ultra quam canalem habet evehat, plus iugeris spatio sublimis et aquis pendentibus semet ipse sine alveo ferens; deinde ubi incurvus arcuatoque amne descendit fit tranquillus, iterumque per campos tacitus et vix fluens in id litus elabatur.*

¹³⁶ *fictis* is my conjecture (Vahlen: *imitamentis*). *uita* (from *uicta* **A**) **A B**; Håkanson conjectures *ita*. Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 2.50.2 (*fictis oblectare legentium animos*). – Editors change *parvis* to *pravis* – wrongly, since *parvis* is perfectly consistent with what follows: *nam magna non capit exigua mens*. Cf. Sen. *Dial.* 12.9.1-3, which presents intriguing parallels with the Fabianic quotation: '*At non est haec terra frugiferarum aut laetarum arborum ferax; non magnis nec nauigabilibus fluminum alueis inrigatur; nihil gignit quod aliae gentes petant, uix ad tutelam incolentium fertilis; non pretiosus hic lapis caeditur, non auri argentique uenae eruuntur.*' *Angustus animus est quem terrena delectant: ad illa abducendus est quae ubique aequae apparent, ubique aequae splendent. Et hoc cogitandum est, ista ueris bonis per falsa et praeue credita obstare. Quo longiores porticus expedierint, quo altius turres sustulerint, quo latius uicos porrexerint, quo depressius aestiuos specus foderint, quo maiori mole fastigia cenationum subduxerint, hoc plus erit quod illis caelum abscondat. In eam te regionem casus eiecit in qua lautissimum receptaculum casa est: ne [et] tu pusilli animi es et sordide se consolantis, si ideo id fortiter pateris quia Romuli casam nosti. Dic illud potius: 'istud humile tugurium nempe uirtutes recipit? iam omnibus templis formosus erit, cum illic iustitia conspecta fuerit, cum continentia, cum prudentia, pietas, omnium officiorum recte dispensandorum ratio, humanorum diuinorumque scientia. Nullus angustus est locus qui hanc tam magnarum uirtutum turbam capit; nullum exilium graue est in quod licet cum hoc ire comitatu.'*

¹³⁷ Sen. *Ep.* 110.18: *Ad veras potius te converte diuitias.*

*quae tangi comprehendique manibus aut sinu possunt;
nam magna non capit exigua mens.*

Nothing is elided in the progression of the argument in this Entry. To put it schematically, Fabianus states: There is *x* (= artificial gardens). There is *y* (= features of the natural environment), which is a better version of *x*. How can they prefer *x* when there is *y*? The argument proceeds slowly, granting space to each term and ensuring that nothing is lost to listeners (and to readers). Here and elsewhere Fabianus demonstrates a tendency towards explication and expansion of arguments rather than contraction and condensation. This tendency, which will be explored in Section 2.6, contradicts the density and pregnant expressions considered typical of Silver Latin writers.

First, it is remarked, degenerate men have artificial mountains, forests, rivers, and seas constructed on their property. Second, it is doubtful that such people have seen these same features in the natural landscape – otherwise, so it is implied, they would never feel inclined to create replicas, which are far inferior. Fabianus’ reverential geographical description touches on the same four features of the natural landscape that the degenerate men imitate: 1) forests, 2) lush vegetation or mountains,¹³⁹ 3) rivers, and 4) seas. This is clear, despite textual difficulties. Moreover, this kind of organization of a Fabianic Entry, whereby terms are posed (here: forests, vegetation, rivers, seas) and then varied and expanded upon, was just seen in passage (f). After the expansion and variation, the Entry is rounded off by a generalizing summary.

¹³⁸ I have slightly altered Gertz’s <*haec illis placent*> and repositioned it in the sentence.

¹³⁹ See note above on *patentisque* <*gramine*> *campos*.

Of further interest is how in the second sentence (*vix possim credere...interfluit*) Fabianus plots these environmental features in *cola*. Forests and fields (and their vegetation OR their position relative to high ground, depending on how we choose to emend *patentisque <gramine> campos*) each occupies a *colon*, and together the two *cola* form a pair. The description of rivers by itself occupies a pair of corresponding *cola*. This is effected through a merism of the sort intrinsic to traditional *carmina*.¹⁴⁰ The nature of rivers is encompassed in its totality through polar opposite adjectives that resemble each other phonetically and metrically: *rapidus placidus*.¹⁴¹

The description of seas is also extended over two *cola* and, likewise, a particular attribute is assigned to each. The framework, which in the main follows that of the preceding pair, implies that also here is a merism involving opposites – stormy versus placid. But this is not fulfilled in the manner expected; and, indeed, just how the binary pair of *cola* is created is enlightening. Instead of two *cola* which describe the seas in two opposite states, placid and stormy, Fabianus concentrates attention on their occasionally stormy and agitated condition, on the one hand, and their magnitude on the other: “the seas – they have never seen them from atop a hill in their expansiveness (*lata*).” *Ex colle* is not otiose but contributes panoramic breadth to this vision. Because *lata* is semantically not an antithetical counterpoise to *hiberna*, editors have wished to emend the former term to *lenta*.¹⁴² But besides ignoring the role of *ex colle*, this change is

¹⁴⁰ A merism is, in the definition of Watkins 1995: 9, “a two-part figure which makes reference to the totality of a single higher concept.” Watkins (*ibidem*) cites the phrase “goods and chattels” as representing immovable and movable wealth – and thus, all wealth.

¹⁴¹ The same impulse to be comprehensive underlies the use of traditional alliterating Latin word-pairs, such as: *purus putus, felix faustus, sanus sartus, templum tesquum, forte fortuna, sacra profana, publica priuata maria montes, albus ater, praesente absente, deorsus retrorsus, rursus prorsus*.

¹⁴² *Lenta* for *lata* of the mss was conjectured by E. Thomas and accepted by Håkanson and H. J. Müller.

insensitive to the binary structuring of the Entry. *Lata* (“broad”), which is hardly an unusual epithet of the sea,¹⁴³ should be kept, particularly since it creates phonetic correspondence at the end of the companion *colon* (*agitata*). As we have seen already, phonetic structuring is a primary consideration for Fabianus. Here the need to achieve the desired architecture causes him to oppose two terms (*lata agitata*) that are not logically antithetical.

Punctuation in modern editions, which is primarily interested in syntactical relationships,¹⁴⁴ confounds the well-defined architecture of this sentence. It lumps together words that structurally do not belong together (*lata aut hiberna, cum...*), separates words that form a unit (*vel, cum per plana infusus est, placidus*), and as a consequence it creates the impression that the architecture of the sentence is unbalanced and arbitrary. In short, it distorts our comprehension of the passage.

The spacing and textual layout supplied above in (h) is not simply a matter of pointing up matching sounds and forms, as if sound-play for its own sake was Fabianus’ objective. Composition shapes meaning. Sound and architectural rhythms punctuate the text in the same fashion as modern punctuation signs. Each *colon* is designed to present one new idea or theme (woods | fields, rushing | calm, expansive | stormy);¹⁴⁵ and it is unity of theme operating together with sound, architectural patterns, and meter that create *cola*. How this kind of organization can sometimes be at odds with syntactically-based

¹⁴³ For *latus mare*, Varr. *Men.* 305; Cic. *Ver.* 4.103. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*TLL*), 8.380.16-35, provides similar expressions referring to the breadth of the sea.

¹⁴⁴ Müller 1964: 105-145; see also the discussion of “rhythmical and rhetorical *cola*” by Habinek 1985: 11. For a history of punctuation in the West, see Parkes 1993.

¹⁴⁵ ‘Focus’ in the language of Functional Grammar. Slings 1997 provides a helpful discussion of how rhetorical figures serve to organize information. His attempt, however, to distinguish between “literary” and “non-literary” uses of rhetorical figures is unprofitable and untenable.

punctuation is evident above where adjectives that syntactically stand outside subordinate *cum*-clauses cohere with the clauses structurally: *cum per plana infusus est placidus*; and *hiberna cum ventis penitus agitata sunt*.

2.5.4 Precise architecture in the description of the tortured wife (C. 2.5)

The architectural patterns identified thus far, and the functional role of sound in producing these patterns, are persistent and distinctive characteristics of Fabianus' prose. They appear consistently in the Fabianic Entries not only of C. 2.1 but also of other declamations. Therefore, they supply a foundation for recognizing a Fabianic literary identity. However, architecture, as pure and abstract patterns, does not in itself constitute a Fabianic identity. This is why our discussions have considered architecture not in isolation, but as central to the process of creating meaning. In other words, we have concentrated much attention on Fabianus' sentence architecture not simply because certain patterns are consistently found in the quotations; but because sentence architecture is integral to Fabianus' self-fashioning as a moral *philosophus*. It is precisely as *philosophus* that Fabianus consistently employs certain architectural patterns. As this section will show, the commitment of Fabianus *philosophus* to certain structuring patterns is set in relief where his contributions to a shared *locus* can be compared closely with the Entries of other declaimers.

A relatively lengthy quotation in C. 2.5 (a portion of which has been cited already in Section 2.4), sees Fabianus describing the tortures endured by a woman at the hands of a tyrant. The tyrant suspects that the woman's husband is plotting to kill him.

(i) C. 2.5.6 (H 106,1-6)

*Describam nunc ego cruciatus et miseram corporis patientiam
inter tyrannica tormenta saevientia?*

extincti sanguine refovebantur ignes;

<in> hoc desinebatur torqueri aliquando ut saepius posset.

exquisita verbera lamnae eculeus:

quidquid antiqua saevitia invenerat | quidquid et nova adiecerat.¹⁴⁶

quid amplius dicam?

et tyrannus torquebat

et cum de tyrannicidio quaereret.

This is a complete and closely knit Entry. It is a *praeteritio*: Fabianus pretends to omit a description of the tortures while in fact engaging in such a description. This fact has not been appreciated because modern editors have punctuated the first sentence as a statement rather than a question.¹⁴⁷ The leading question ostensibly repudiates a description of tortures as unnecessary; the question (*quid amplius dicam?*) and response (*et tyrannus...quaereret*) that effectively conclude the Entry explain why it is unnecessary: everyone knows how cruel tyrants are,¹⁴⁸ especially when their self-preservation is at stake.

Descriptions of torture are numerous in the declamation collections and appear several times in surviving works of individual authors.¹⁴⁹ The speakers recorded in Seneca's collection under this declamation are sensitive to one another's Entries.

Compare the Entry above from Fabianus with those that follow below. The quotations of

¹⁴⁶ Similar is Verg. *G.* 1.53: *et quid quaeque ferat regio et quid quaeque recuset.*

¹⁴⁷ Cf. [Quint.] *Decl.* 9.5 (*Dicam nunc ego per quos iuvenis praestantissimus navigaverit fluctus, quos accesserit scopulos, quantos lustraverit sinus?*); Zinsmaier 1993: 117. Vibius Gallus' sentence (*amorem describere volo*) at *C.* 2.1.26 is different.

¹⁴⁸ For the tyrant as a literary stock character, Tabacco 1985; Dunkle 1971.

¹⁴⁹ E.g.: Quint. *Decl.* 338, 269, 272, 307, 324, 328, 338, 363, 379, 381; [Quint.] *Decl.* 7, 18, 19; Calp. *Decl.* 12, 13; Sen. *Ep.* 14.5, Curt. 6.11.15; Tac. *Ann.* 15.57; Jer. *Ep.* 1.3.

Hispo, Hispanius, and Gallio appear in sequence immediately before the quotation of Fabianus.

Romanus Hispo (2.5.5): *Nullum tormenti genus omisit; omnia membra laniata, omnes partes convolsae sunt. scissum corpus flagellis, <igne> exustum, convulsum tormentis. ignoscetis, puto, mulierculae, si dixero: fessa est.*

Cornelius Hispanius (2.5.5): *Adsidue tormenta variantur, accenduntur extincti ignes. tortor vocatur, sub quo mariti uxorem prodiderant.*

Junius Gallio (2.5.6): *Instabat tyrannus: torque, illa pars etiam potest. subice ignes, in illa parte iam exaruit cruor. seca, verbera, eculeo lancina; faciam ne viro placeat.*

Albucius Silius (2.5.9): *Vicerat saevitiam patientia: deerat iam sanguis, sup<er>erat fides; aliquando proiecta est. deserebatur distortis manibus, emotis articulis; nondum in sua membra artus redierant. talem uxorem tortor dimisit ad partum.*

All of the Entries emphasize that the applied torture reached the limits of cruelty.

It was relentless and no variety was omitted. Despite this similarity, each of the declaimers devises a different conclusion, or “punchline,” to the Entry.

The urge to express the tyrant’s excess cruelty leads the speakers to ever more creative inventions of what happened. Fabianus tells of fires extinguished only by the woman’s blood; the cessation of torture only to apply torture more vigorously; and when the woman is utterly exhausted, she is not let go but flung aside: *convolsis laceratisque membris nec adhuc sufficientibus non dimissa est ex arce sed proiecta* (2.5.6; not quoted in (i)). Without speculating on the direction of influence, we can note how frequently the Entries of the other declaimers and Fabianus’ intersect. Thus in a nearly identical phrase Hispanius mentions the re-lighting of the fires (*accenduntur extincti ignes*). It is revealing that Fabianus has the innovative, metaphorical verb *refovebantur* (“were

revived”)¹⁵⁰ against the more customary *accendantur* of Hispanus. Albucius too speaks of how the woman was flung aside; and certainly his Entry and Fabianus’ are engaged with each other in their use of the rhyming *patientia* and *saevitia / saevientia*. Hispo’s *omnia membra laniata, omnes partes convolsae sunt* is set against Fabianus’ *convolsis laceratisque membris*.

In spite of the declaimers’ intense engagement with each other, extending to the use of keywords to advertise the passages as contributions to a shared *locus*, Fabianus is easily recognizable. Much of the verbal architecture in his quotation follows the patterns identified in *C. 2.1*. So, again appear two sets of binary *cola* whose outlines are emphasized through phonetic, and sometimes metrical, correspondences: *quidquid antiqua saevitia invenerat | quidquid et nova adiecerat*; and *et tyrannus torquebat | et cum de tyrannicidio quaereret*. In the former set, observe that besides sounding alike the verbs that conclude the *cola* possess the same metrical shape (*invenerat / adiecerat*, – – ∪ –).¹⁵¹ In expressing the fact that the tyrant omitted no manner of torture (cf. Hispo: *nullum tormenti genus omisit*), Fabianus draws on a traditional antithesis that uses antonyms (*antiqua...nova*) to convey comprehensiveness. The latter set of binary *cola* matches tyrant with tyrannicide, and the similarity of the verbs – in length and sound – establishes correspondence between the *cola* at beginning and end. The alliteration of *t* contributes to a sense that the *cola* form a pair.

¹⁵⁰ It is unusual for *refoueo* (or *foueo*) to describe action done to fire; cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.9.15, speaking of the metaphorical fires of passion (*tepidosque refouerat ignis*). For the idea of “fire extinguished by blood,” *Sen. Thy.* 742 (*aras sanguine extinguens suo*); *Her. O.* 339; [*Sen.*] *Oct.* 830.

¹⁵¹ Both *cola* end in one of the canonical clausulae: choriamb + cretic in the first instance, double cretic in the second; Nisbet 1990: 351.

Most interesting structurally, and also in accord with what has been remarked already, is the question that opens the Entry. A bird's-eye view sees three units defined by syntax, semantics, and sound. But a linear progression through the sentence creates another impression. Fabianus seeks to compose additively, drop-by-drop; yet he is seldom content to allow an added member to be attached as a loose appendage. Instead, what is added is structurally paired with what precedes, and the attention of an auditor / reader is induced to encompass the new unit and the preceding unit together. It is, again, an instance of serial cohesion. Fabianus asks, rhetorically, whether he should describe two facets of torture – its application (*cruciatu*s) and its endurance (*patientia*m): “Should I describe tortures and the miserable endurance of the body...?” And then continues: “...the endurance of the body amidst the tyrant's raging torments?” *Inter...saevientia* is a prepositional phrase, thus syntactically it cannot stand alone; but this does not prevent it from achieving structural semi-independence.¹⁵² The desire for a third *colon* in this series leads Fabianus to build one out of a false parallelism: phonetically *saevientia* corresponds with *patientia*m, although the two words belong to different parts of speech (noun vs. participle) and syntactically do not agree. In essence, Fabianus has pulled this third unit out of the midst of the second, using *saevientia* to provide bulk and shape. The two *cola* could easily have been unified, for example: *et miseram corporis inter tormenta patientiam?* However, such a *colon* is undesirable first because it is incommensurate with the length of other *cola* (cf. *describam nunc ego cruciatu*s); second, because Fabianus prefers an architecture that is full, expansive, and complete, rather than condensed.

¹⁵² Fraenkel 1964b: 98, discusses how prepositional phrases can attain semi-independence.

Until now I have withheld from the discussion Arellius Fuscus' contribution to this shared *locus*.

C. 2.5.4 (Arellius Fuscus)

*Explicantur crudelitatis adversus infelicem feminam apparatus
et illa instrumenta virorum quoque animos ipso visu frangentia¹⁵³
ad excutiendam muliebris pectoris conscientiam proponuntur.*

None of the other speakers' Entries for this shared *locus* demonstrates the same techniques of structuring that are evident in Fabianus' Entry. They are all quite close in terms of argument and the necessary inclusion of keywords. In terms of architecture, however, they are miles apart. The Entry of Arellius Fuscus, on the other hand, is so similar to Fabianus' in its basic architectural outline, and in the artificial peculiarity of this outline, to be positively remarkable. Both exhibit three rhythmic units with exactly the same false parallelism between the second and third unit: participle (*frangentia*) is balanced against noun (*conscientiam*). There are important differences as well, among which it can be seen that Fuscus favors longer *cola*.¹⁵⁴

There can be no question but that all six of these speakers were participants in the same declamation session, whether it lasted one day or spanned several. And there is no question but that there is a performative and literary association between Fabianus and Fuscus. This is far from the sole example among the quotations of Fuscus that demonstrates that the two men adhered to similar principles of structuring: in particular, both show a preference for binary architecture that is outlined through phonetic

¹⁵³ For the idea that the tortures endured by the woman would easily cause men to cave, cf. Cornelius Hispanius' (2.5.5) *tortor vocatur, sub quo mariti uxorem prodiderant*.

¹⁵⁴ Fuscus creates three rhythmic units that are "heavier" and that have greater independence than the rhythmic units of Fabianus.

correspondences. But a thorough investigation of Fuscus' style must be postponed until the next chapter.

Because of shared stylistic traits – traits that are at the core of Fabianus' literary identity – the quotations of Fabianus most likely belong to an early period in his career when he was just recently, or was still, a student of Fuscus. This follows from Seneca's statement that Fabianus was a student of Fuscus as a young man (*adulescens admodum*; C. 2 pr. 1), when he enjoyed great success as a declaimer; eventually, Seneca continues (*ibid.*), Fabianus tried to distance himself from Arellius Fuscus' stylistic program.¹⁵⁵ The period under Fuscus' guidance would appear not to have been long, for Fabianus found another *rhetor*, Blandus, with whom he studied longer and at a time when he had become a devoted follower of Sextius (C. 2 pr. 5).¹⁵⁶ Since Fabianus' birth can reasonably be placed about 35 BC,¹⁵⁷ it can be supposed that most, if not all, the quotations of him in Seneca's collection date to circa 15 BC. It was then that his reputation as a declaimer was at its height. Nonetheless, it must be stressed once again that this reputation and Fabianus' interest in declamation were not exclusive of his identification as a moral

¹⁵⁵ If true, it should be noted that such a turnabout is anything but a rejection of rhetoric – that is, of self-consciousness about how he wants to express himself. On the contrary, it shows that Fabianus was acutely aware of how crucial manner of expression was to the construction of identity.

¹⁵⁶ Lana 1992: 111, estimates that the school of Q. Sextius began around 40 BC.

¹⁵⁷ Based on Seneca's notice, who was born c. 55 BC, that Fabianus was very much younger than he (C. 2 pr. 5: *ego tanto minorem natu quam ipse eram audiebam...*). Cf. the similar statement regarding the avid attention paid by Albucius Silus (birth c. 60-55 BC, death c. 10-15 AD) to Fabianus' speeches, C. 7. pr. 4: *memini omnibus illum omissis rebus apud Fabianum philosophum tanto iuvenioem quam ipse erat cum codicibus sedere*; on Albucius, see Kaster 1995: 313-16, 346-59; Assereto 1967; Lebek 1966. Fabianus' declamations were heard by other members of an older generation (M. Valerius Messalla (64 BC – 8 AD), C. 2.4.10; L. Vinicius, suffect consul in 5 BC, 2.5.19). It does not follow, as has been assumed, that because in 17 BC Latro declaimed on the theme of C. 2.4 in the presence of Augustus, Maecenas, and Agrippa, so too did Fabianus. There is no secure evidence placing Fabianus at the same event.

philosopher.¹⁵⁸ Properly viewed, the wish to embody and identify himself as *philosophus* is consonant with a quest for eloquence, particularly when an eloquence is sought that is deemed suitable to the desired self-image.

There is a peculiarity in the organization of the quotations of Fabianus that may further hint at the strong influence of Arellius Fuscus. As is consistent with his practice generally, Seneca devotes the preface of the second book of *controversiae* to both Fuscus and Fabianus because in this book it is their quotations that predominate. Fuscus appears throughout Seneca's collection, but Fabianus only here and in *S. 1*.¹⁵⁹ In other words, Fabianus does not appear anywhere where there is not rich material on Fuscus. The reason for this, one suspects, is that in the source(s) on which Seneca relies the quotations of Fabianus are bundled together with some notes on Fuscus. This source, then, – or sources, if we envision multiple records of the same sessions – would consist of quotations taken from declamations at Fuscus' school at a time when Fabianus was a prominent attendee and was attracting attention.¹⁶⁰ Seneca's apology (*C. 2.1 pr. 5*) that he could not hear Fabianus as much as he would have liked, that Fabianus' practice in declamation did not last long (a statement seemingly at odds with the earlier statement that Fabianus continued to declaim after becoming a follower of Sextius),¹⁶¹ are

¹⁵⁸ The assertion of Lana 1992: 118, that Fabianus abandoned (“abbandonato”) declamation once he turned to philosophy is contradicted by Seneca at *C. 2 pr. 4*: <cum> *Sextium audiret, nihilominus declamabat et tam diligenter ut putares illum illi studio parari, non per illud alteri praeparari.*

¹⁵⁹ Arellius Fuscus, though quoted more substantially than anyone else in the *suasoriae*, does not appear by name in *S. 1*. But this declamation has not been transmitted to us in its entirety. There are, however, good reasons for believing that the quotation with which our manuscripts open is that of Fuscus; this idea suggested also by Sussman 1977: 305 n. 7.

¹⁶⁰ The notes from Fuscus' school would represent but one layer in the material presented in *C. 2*.

¹⁶¹ Seneca's report of Fabianus' career remains somewhat ambiguous. When Seneca says that Fabianus did not long find time to declaim (*nec ille diu declamationibus vacavit*), does he mean that the time Fabianus

equivalent to an admission that he has limited notes of Fabianus and that the records he does have belong to a defined, early period in Fabianus' career.

As in *C.* 2.1, the quotations of Fabianus in *C.* 2.5 are insistently moralizing. Even when an Entry is not overtly philosophical, Fabianus' moral positioning may inform his arguments. For example, Seneca tells us (2.5.18) that Fabianus was praised for a *color* he introduced in defense of the husband, a color that "befitted both a good man and a cunning orator": *Fabianus philosophus colorem <non> magis bono viro convenientem introduxit <quam> oratori callido.*¹⁶² Fabianus' strategy was to claim that the husband made up his mind beforehand to kill the tyrant, and he entrusted his wife with the plan. This approach differed from some other declaimers (2.5.18-19), who said the husband decided to kill the tyrant only after his wife was tortured; and it differed from those who said that he never shared the plan with his wife.

L. Vicinius, who comments favorably on Fabianus' approach (2.5.19), offers insight into how this *color* sets the husband on moral high ground. The husband thereby

declaimed *apud Fuscum* was not long or the amount of time he practiced declamation in general? If the latter, what are we to make of Seneca's earlier statement that Fabianus' practice of declamation persisted, even after finding philosophy? The ambiguity seems to arise from the fact that Seneca is using these statements to two different purposes: 1) He emphasizes that Fabianus' practice of declamation persisted because he wishes to persuade his philosophically minded son Mela (not the younger Seneca!) that declamation and philosophy are compatible. 2) He says that Fabianus did not declaim long because it is a way for the elder Seneca to excuse the limited number of quotations he has of Fabianus.

¹⁶² That Fabianus adapts his arguments so that they operate to project his identity as *philosophus* can be seen also in *C.* 2.4, for which I do not provide a detailed analysis in this dissertation. Cf. *C.* 2.4.10, where we are told that Fabianus used a *color* that portrayed a young defendant as both good and honorable; furthermore, Fabianus made the young man speak not through argumentative indirection (*schemate*), but forthrightly: *Fabianus ex omnibus istis colorem secutus est optimum, quo aiebat Messala posse non tantum bonam partem adulescentis fieri sed etiam honestam; obiecit patri, quod fratrem abdicasset, non schemate sed <de>recto: nihil, inquit, peccaverat: 'amat meretricem': solet fieri, adulescens est; expecta, emendabitur; ducet uxorem.* The quotation of Fabianus at 2.4.3, in which a prostitute is described as having a virtuous character, is compatible with Fabianus' higher, philosophical principles. And the same passage exhibits familiar architectural patterns. For example: *Quam nihil in illa domo meretricia fide (meretriciae vitae Madvig) vidi. adsidebat mulier tristi vultu adfecta aegro simillima ipsa, demissis in terram oculis. – Indico tibi crimina mea: expirantem coheredem tuum ad vitam volui revocare.*

shows that he assumed the role of tyrannicide long ago (*honestior sum vetus tyrannicida*), and he is motivated to kill the tyrant on account of public crimes rather than private (*non privatis sed publicis malis ad ultionem impulsus*). Also, by sharing the information with his wife he demonstrates that he is an upstanding and devoted husband (*semper tam deditus*). The woman, in turn, cannot claim her silence under torture as meritorious; it was merely the duty of a virtuous woman.

Alignment with higher principles may also influence Fabianus' description of torture at 2.5.6. A refusal to detail the woman's sufferings – even if the refusal is only pretended in a *praeteritio* – is capable of implying disdain for the potency that torture is commonly assumed to have: torture is meaningless in the face of real virtue.¹⁶³ This disdain extends to the tyrant, who foolishly believes he can get whatever he wants by dreaming up ever more sadistic methods of inflicting pain: “Need I say more?” asks Fabianus. “A tyrant was torturing, and he was investigating tyrannicide.”¹⁶⁴

In the Entry at 2.5.7 (H 106,9-14) the moral positioning is explicit. Fabianus finds an opportunity to sketch a portrait of the corrupt woman. The heroine is not like other women, so common in this day and age, who compete with one another in the accumulation of expensive jewelry and modishly adorn themselves in diaphanous clothing.¹⁶⁵ This is a striking reminder how the declaimers are able to move seamlessly

¹⁶³ E.g., Sen. *Ep.* 66.21: *Hoc ut scias ita esse, ad omne pulchrum vir bonus sine ulla cunctatione procurret: stet illic licet carnifex, stet tortor atque ignis, perseverabit nec quid passurus, sed quid facturus sit, aspiciet et se honestae rei tamquam bono viro credet: utilem illam sibi iudicabit, tutam, prosperam.*

¹⁶⁴ *quid amplius dicam? et tyrannus torquebat et cum de tyrannicidio quaereret.*

¹⁶⁵ A comparable passage, from Porcius Latro, is at *C.* 2.7.3-4. A significant difference between Fabianus' portrait and that of Latro – which not only gives a portrait of the profligate woman, but also prescribes the behavior of a chaste woman – is one of ethos. Latro plays the role of a tradition-minded husband who in his modesty is slow to suspect his wife of adultery. (For this kind of character portrayal, cf. how Augustus

between the fantastic scenarios of the declamatory themes and contemporary social reality.

C. 2.5.7 (H 106,9-14)

Quid est, quare uxorem dimiseris?

*numquid premit census onerosa sumptibus
et ut saeculi mos est in deterius luxu fluent<is>*¹⁶⁶

muliebris ambitio certamine mutuo usque in publica damna privatis insanit?

numquid gemmas et ex alieno litore petitos lapillos 5

et aurum vestemque nihil in matrona tecturam concupivit?

si talis esset, facile illam corrupisset tyrannus.

Phonetic structuring is less pronounced here than in the passages discussed above. Nonetheless, a more subtle iteration of sounds contributes to an architecture (emphasized above through layout and bold letters) that is by now familiar.¹⁶⁷ Also a tendency towards exquisite vocabulary and phrases can be discerned (cf. *refovebantur ignes* at C. 2.5.6).¹⁶⁸ So, for example, *onerosus* does not appear in extant literature before Vergil's

praises a certain Spanish declaimer, Gavius Silo (C. 10 pr. 14): *numquam audivi patrem familiae disertioem.*) Fabianus, on the other hand, speaks on behalf of the woman and thus is able to assume a congenial role that admits of a much broader and contemplative perspective on the state of society's mores.

¹⁶⁶ *Fluentis* is my conjecture. Mss: *fluentem*; the excerpted tradition has *fluente*. Cf. Flor. *Epit.* 2.34.65: *hinc conversus [sc. Augustus] ad pacem pronum in omnia mala et in luxuriam fluens saeculum gravibus severisque legibus multis coercuit.* Other relevant parallels: Sen. C. 1. pr. 7: *In deterius deinde cotidie data res est sive luxu temporum – nihil enim tam mortiferum ingeniis quam luxuria est – sive, cum pretium pulcherrimae rei cecidisset, translatum est omne certamen ad turpia multo honore quaestuque vigentia.* Sen. *Ben.* 1.10.1: *Hoc maiores nostri questi sunt, hoc nos querimus, hoc posterius nostri querentur, eversos mores, regnare nequitiam, in deterius res humanas et omne nefas labi; at ista eodem stant loco stabuntque paulum dumtaxat ultra aut citra mota, ut fluctus, quos aestus accedens longius extulit, recedens interiore litorum vestigio tenuit.* See also Sen. *Nat.* 1.17.10.

¹⁶⁷ Note the prominence of *m* and *s* in lines 1-3. The first half of line 4 is unified through the sound *m*; the backbone of the second half of line 4 is the alliterative antithesis *publica...privatis*. Lines 5-6 consist of parallel grammatical constructions: unqualified accusative object (*gemmas; aurum*) + “weighted” accusative object in a participial phrase (*ex alieno litore petitos lapillos; vestemque nihil in matrona tecturam*).

¹⁶⁸ Also of interest is the frequency of *mutuus* in the quotations of Fabianus. In addition to this passage: C. 2.1.10 (*quave furiae in mutuuum sanguinem egere*); 2.2.4 (*servate totam domum amore mutuuo laborantem*); 2.6.2 (*haec est, quae auget discordiam urbis et terrarum orbem in bellum agit, humanum genus cognatum natura in fraudes et scelera <et> mutuuum odium instigat*).

Aeneid (5.352; 9.384), and it first occurs in prose in Vitruvius and in the quotations of Fabianus (here), Arellius Fuscus (*S.* 6.6), and a certain Asilius Sabinus (*C.* 9.4.20).¹⁶⁹ *In deterius* is an innovation of the latter half of the first century BC, probably originating with Sallust, where it is found first. It is later favored by Tacitus, an emulator of Sallust.¹⁷⁰ After Sallust it next appears in this passage and is not used by another declaimer in Seneca's collection.

C. 2.5.7 (H 106,14-18) is manifestly a *locus philosophumenus*¹⁷¹ – a passage that views events from a broader, philosophical perspective. Fabianus criticizes the husband's expectation that his wife should have borne him a child by now, instructing the husband how he misunderstands the position of humans relative to nature: nature follows her own laws and does not abide by human law.

Enough has been said already about the structuring in this Entry. It remains to compare it with a contribution to this shared *locus* by Triarius. Here underlining is meant to demonstrate overlap between the two Entries (compare single underlined words with each other, double underlined words with each other, thick underlined words with each other).

Fabianus, *C.* 2.5.7 (H 106,14-18)

- a) *Expecta, potest parere. non respondet ad propositum nec ad certam diem fecunditas.*¹⁷²
- b) *sui iuris rerum natura est nec ad leges humanas componitur;*
- c) *modo properat, modo vota praecurrit, modo lenta est et demoratur.*

¹⁶⁹ It is not found in Livy; it is found once each in Vitruvius (2.3.4) and Valerius Maximus (7.1.2).

¹⁷⁰ Sall. *Hist.* 1 frg. 5 (Reynolds). The phrase occurs at Sen. *C.* 1. pr. 7, in Velleius (1), the younger Seneca (5), Tacitus (11), the younger Pliny (2), [Quint.] *Decl.* 11.3; Calp. *Decl.* 6.

¹⁷¹ Seneca uses this term at *C.* 1.7.17.

¹⁷² For *fecunditas*, cf. Arellius Fuscus (*C.* 2.5.4): *paenitebat matres fecunditatis suae*; and Cestius Pius (2.5.2): *quaedam itaque elisere conceptos, quaedam fecunditatem suam moratae sunt.*

Triarius, C. 2.5.8 (H 106,23-26)

- a) *Non ex formula natura respondet nec ad praescriptum casus obsequitur.*
- b) *semper expectari fortuna mavult quam regi.*
- c) *aliubi offendit[ur] improvisa segetum maturitas, aliubi sera magno fenore moram redemit. licet lex dies finiat, natura non recipit.*

The closeness of the two Entries is extraordinary. Both follow the same progression: **a)** nature does not conform to a schedule, **b)** nature governs by her own laws, and in **c)** the willfulness of nature is spelled out in antitheses. Each of the underlined words in the Fabianic Entry finds a corollary in the Entry of Triarius; these verbal matches do not necessarily appear at the same stage (that is, a), b), or c)) in the argument. However, noticeably absent from the Entry of Triarius is any concentrated effort to employ sound figures.

Normally when examining contributions to a shared *locus* it is difficult to determine precedence. But since Triarius is infamous for near wholesale filching of others' material (C. 10.5.20), and since the same quotation of Triarius contains an Entry that is obviously engaged with an Entry of Arellius Fuscus,¹⁷³ it is almost certain that Triarius follows the two more prominent, and more influential, declaimers rather than vice versa. The quotations of Triarius, it can be supposed, were also part of the record of a declamation session that involved Fabianus and Fuscus.

¹⁷³ Arellius Fuscus, 2.5.4: *inst<at> ante denuntiationibus quam tormentis tyrannus et minando torquet: tacet. videt intentum tyranni vultum, videt oculos minaces: [et] tacet. flagellis caeduntur artus, verberibus corpus abrumpitur, exprimiturque ipsis vitalibus <sanguis>: <tac>et.* I have transposed *sanguis*, conjectured by Gertz and placed before *ipsis*. Triarius, 2.5.8: *Aiebat tyrannus: 'indica, nulla tua culpa est'; <tacet.> caeditur; tacet. uritur; tacet. utrum putas mirandum esse, tuum tyrannicidium an huius silentium?*

2.6 *Fabianus' complete, tabular eloquence* (C. 2.6, 2.2, 2.3)

Fabianus prefers completeness of expression to conciseness and brevity. In phrases or clauses that are syntactically parallel hardly a term is dispensed with that could be easily inferred from context. As was seen at C. 2.5.6 (*et miseram corporis patientiam inter tyrannica tormenta saevientia?*), he will generate new *cola* when strict efficiency of expression would counsel against it. Fabianus, in short, has little interest in *brevitas*.

In the majority of passages examined thus far, often the highlighted stylistic features – alliteration, phonetically structured and corresponding *cola*, and also the tendency towards an airy expansiveness – serve to elevate Fabianus' prose. In its embrace of rhythms and highly defined clausal shapes, his prose approaches the realm of poetry. But in other declamations, to which we turn presently, a similar rhythmic regularity does not bestow sublimity; here it is not literary high style that is Fabianus' objective. Clauses are very short, syntactically simple, and exhibit a severe regularity. Consequently, formal features that elsewhere produce a sense of elevation now render Fabianus' voice didactic, scrupulously thorough and ornamentally "flat." Nothing in this linguistic landscape, so this rhetoric means to intimate, is hidden from view. There is neither subtlety nor guile.

Fabianus' simplicity of expression is not accidental, nor is it attributable to an inability to speak otherwise. If there is any doubt about this, we know that Fabianus was self-conscious of how he spoke from Seneca's statements (C. 2 pr. 2) and from a programmatic consistency in the quotations already examined. There is no reason to doubt that, similarly, a stylistic consistency that can be seen in C. 2.2, 2.3, and 2.6 is a

deliberate and studied simplicity.¹⁷⁴ Furthermore, it should not be thought that Fabianic simplicity is a separate attempt at linguistic self-fashioning (a second persona, as it were), in addition to the ‘traditional,’ moralizing identity detailed in Section 2.5. The two basic tendencies are complementary and cooperate in constructing the same identity: a preaching, moralizing philosopher embodied in a “primitive” eloquence.

While “primitive” can have a negative connotation, none should be understood here. “Primitive” as a description of Fabianus’ linguistic identity is useful because it effectively embraces the two basic stylistic tendencies described in this chapter: a traditional (“old”) sentence architecture, and a simple (“elemental”) presentation of arguments. Fabianus’ primitive eloquence is suited to, and performs, what the *philosophus* preaches: old-fashioned, traditional morals and an honest, natural simplicity.

2.6.1 *Controversia* 2.6

The description of Fabianus’ language as simple applies, in varying degrees, to the Fabianic quotations at *C.* 2.2.4, 2.3.5, 2.6.2, and 2.6.4. The theme of 2.6, as becomes clear when reading the material gathered under it, is readily amenable to the kind of repetitive formularity that Fabianus desires. The theme: A son, who carries on an indulgent lifestyle, accuses his father of insanity when his father begins to live in the same fashion.¹⁷⁵ The identical behavior of the two men, but at different periods in life, is conducive to a kind of tabular, side-by-side comparison. One or more types of

¹⁷⁴ Simplicity has seemed, to modern and ancient critics, a characteristic also of Vergil’s language, both with respect to its syntactical organization (Eden 1975: 9) and in its “prosaic” or “ordinary” diction (Wilkinson 1959: 190-1; Jocelyn 1979: 140 n. 253). Again we think of the ancient criticism preserved by Aelius Donatus (*Vita Vergilii* 44) that calls the poet the founder of a corruption that was built “of ordinary words and thus seemed hidden” (*ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis*).

¹⁷⁵ *Quidam luxuriante filio luxuriari coepit. filius accusat patrem dementiae.*

antithetical comparisons were probably shared *loci* among declaimers. Thus in the quotation that opens Seneca's record of this declamation are the following two Entries, spoken on behalf of the father, from Porcius Latro (2.6.1). Underlining points to the terms of comparison: "I" versus "you"; "young man" versus "old."

C. 2.6.1 (Porcius Latro)

Vtriusque tamen comparetur luxuria: tu consumis patrimonium patris tui, ego accusatoris mei.

Naviga, milita, peregrinare; quaere adulescens, senex utere.

Under the *colores* Argentarius (2.6.11) observes that the behavior of the father and son is the same. They both are equally indulgent – except one of them is a young man, the other an old man (Entry #1). The second Entry contrasts the son's arguments with the father's defense: the son cannot altogether excuse his indulgent lifestyle, but at least it is customary. It is simply a phase that young people go through.¹⁷⁶ On the other hand, the father's excuse that he is imitating his son to *correct* the boy's behavior is absurd. According to this reasoning, if the grandfather were alive he too should be living it up.

C. 2.6.11 (Argentarius)

Entry #1 *Argentarius hoc colore declamavit: duo luxuriantur in domo: alter iuvenis, alter senex; alter filius, alter pater. uterque aequae licenti cultu per publicum incedit.*

Entry #2 *Alter vobis hoc ait: 'concessis aetati <voluptati>bus utor et iuvenali lege defungor; id facio quod pater meus fecit, cum iuvenis esset. negabit? bona ego aetate coepi: simul primum hoc tirocinium adolescentiae quasi debitum ac sollemne persolvero, revertar ad bonos mores.' qui qualem causam habeat, videritis: facit etiamsi non quod oporteat fieri, at quod solet.*

¹⁷⁶ This is a *communis locus*; e.g., Cic. *Cael.* 39-42 (see Austin 1960: 102, who cites C. 2.6.11); Juv. 8.163-4.

alter ait: 'scio me novum civitatis miraculum incedere, luxuriosum senem, sed hoc castigandi genus commentus sum: ut emendarem filium, ipse peccare coepi.'
<it>a, si avos viveret, ut nemo in domo luxuriosus esset, tres luxuriosi
fuis<se>tis?

Fabianus, in a quotation on behalf of the son (2.6.4), presents the same argument as Argentarius. However, Fabianus' language is punchier, more rigidly formulaic and repetitive. The quotation begins with a proverb (*Navem in portu mergis*);¹⁷⁷ then follows Fabianus' contribution to the shared *locus*:

C. 2.6.4 (H 115,14-16) (Fabianus)

*Alter solito tempore labitur, alter insolito, alter alieno, alter suo.
alter annos sequitur, alter senectuti repugnat.*

Fabianus' adherence to a strictly balanced and repetitive parallelism is again made prominent when the second of the two Entries from Latro, just quoted (2.6.1: *Naviga, milita, peregrinare; quaere adulescens, senex utere*), is compared with an Entry from Fabianus (2.6.2), which is also on behalf of the father:

C. 2.6.2 (Fabianus)

*Quidam summum bonum dixerunt voluptatem et omnia ad corpus rettulerunt.*¹⁷⁸
*nihil est mihi opus praecipientibus; habeo exemplum: proposui quidquid tu
feceris facere. navigabo, si navigaris, militabo, si militaris.
dic hodie, quid putes melius. sed illud excipio: non obicies, <quid>quid elegeris.*

The arguments of the two speakers are different, but both use the same phrase (*navigare, militare*).¹⁷⁹ The separate word arrangements by Latro and Fabianus in the use

¹⁷⁷ Otto 1890: 284-5. "You sink the ship when it's already in the harbor." That is, the father yields to indulgence just at the moment when he will be free from this temptation forever – the end of his life. Sen. Ep. 14.15: *Perit aliqua navis in portu; sed quid tu accidere in medio mari credis?*

¹⁷⁸ The reference here of course is to the Epicureans, with a disdainful unwillingness to name them.

of this phrase is telling. Latro: “Sail! Soldier! Go abroad!” Fabianus: “I will sail, if you sail. I will soldier, if you soldier.” Latro’s speech is leaner and avoids a predictable symmetry.

The antithetical formularity of the quotation from Fabianus at 2.6.4 is not confined to the *color* it shares with Argentarius (i.e. the son behaves as young people generally do, whereas the father does not behave like a *senex*). Fabianus molds into the same tabular form two additional, but complementary, arguments. These arguments, presented as two separate Entries below, are: a) The father does not pretend to lead a decadent lifestyle, he leads it in actual fact. b) As a general rule, one cannot expect to correct behavior by doing the very thing he wishes to correct.

C. 2.6.4 (H 115,16-18) (Fabianus)¹⁸⁰

*Non est luxuria tua qualem videri velis; non simulas ista sed facis.
nec amantem agis sed amas,
nec potantem adumbras sed bibis,
nec te dicis bona dissipare sed dissipas.*

(H 115,18-21)

*Nemo, puto, vitia quia odit imitatur.
quis imperator ob hoc ipse de proelio fugit ut bene pugnaret exercitus?
quis ut ambitum comprimeret ipse honores mercatus est?
quis ut seditionem leniret turbavit rem <publicam>?
non coercet vitia qui provocat.*

It is difficult to determine whether these three arguments (H 115,14-16; 16-18; 18-21) were three separate Entries or together comprised one Entry. Logically there is

¹⁷⁹ Cf. C. 2.1.4 (Arellius Fuscus): *Impera quod vis: navigabo, militabo, dummodo, ubicumque fuero, tuus sim.*

¹⁸⁰ “Your extravagance is not as you want it to seem. You do not feign it, but engage in it. You do not act like a lover, but rather you love. You do not portray a drunk, but rather you drink. You do not say that you are squandering your wealth, but rather you squander it.” “Nobody, I suppose, imitates vices because he hates them. What general has himself fled from battle so that his army will fight well? Who has himself purchased political offices in order to suppress bribery? Who has stirred up the state in order to calm civil discord? He does not restrain vices who conjures them.”

nothing to preclude them from standing next to one another in a speech. Nonetheless, it should be observed that, as elsewhere, Fabianus is careful to frame the arguments in self-contained, clearly demarcated units. The boundaries of the third argument (H 115,18-21), in particular, are well defined. It consists of thesis (*nemo...imitatur*); a demonstration of the thesis through examples (*quis...quis...quis...rem publicam*); and a conclusion that reiterates the thesis (*non...provocat*).¹⁸¹ The boundaries are reinforced through phonetic and syntactical symmetry. It is through such methods as these that a declaimer creates an independent Entry and makes it memorable and convenient for circulation.

Also noteworthy in the third argument is the broader, contemplative position from which Fabianus regards the father's actions. The father's motivation for luxuriant living is made to seem ridiculous when set against a universal law of human behavior: vices shall not be corrected through vices. Higher principles are not simply ideals, but rather they must be lived.

A close, provocative comparandum to Fabianus' third Entry (H 115,18-21) is found in Paul's Letter to the Romans (2:21-23), a passage whose argument depends on the same moral axiom that those who champion higher principles must themselves act in accordance with these principles. Moreover, both authors are guided by a near identical sense of how to instantiate – to give identity to – this argument: they share the same preference for a rhythmic, almost ritualistic regularity; repetition is not a fault but positively cultivated.¹⁸²

¹⁸¹ This kind of internal organization of an Entry is explored further in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4), where it is called 'Proposition and Elaboration.'

ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον	σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις;
ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν	κλέπτεις;
ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν	μοιχεύεις;
ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἴδωλα	ἱεροσυλεῖς;
ὡς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι,	διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου
	τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις;

No immediate, direct line of influence between the quotation of Fabianus at C.

2.6.4 (H 115,18-21) and this portion of Paul’s letter is claimed. Many other passages in Paul’s prose follow a similar formula, and indeed it can be seen in the books of the Old Testament as well, which undoubtedly is one source for this feature of Paul’s style.¹⁸³

Nonetheless, similarity between the two passages should not be thought coincidental.¹⁸⁴ Fabianus and Paul should be regarded as belonging to the same broad cultural milieu that established a language for the moralizing preacher.¹⁸⁵ Other prominent personalities and writers, active at different times during the first two centuries of the Roman empire, who could have helped establish the language of the moralizing preacher include the Sextii, some declaimers besides Fabianus (e.g. Albucius Silus, Julius Bassus, Musa), Seneca the younger, Musonius Rufus, and Epictetus. The putative source

¹⁸² Stowers 1981: 23. “You who teach another, do you not teach yourself? You who preach not to steal, do you steal? You who say not to commit adultery, do you commit adultery? You who hate idols, do you rob temples? You who vaunt yourself in the law, in the transgression of the law do you dishonor god?”

¹⁸³ E.g.: Rom. 2:12; I Cor. 8:2-3; I Cor. 9:19-22; II Cor. 9:6; Rom. 9:25 (from Hos. 2:23); I Cor. 1:19 (from Isa. 29:14).

¹⁸⁴ The kind of repetitive formularity that the two passages share is not a typical “declamatory” feature. That is, the passages do not contain concise, pregnant *sententiae*, which is the primary stylistic feature modern critics associate with declamation. Holloway 1998: 32-53, focuses on the *sententia* in an attempt to show that Paul’s prose was influenced by declamation. He argues for (p. 34) the influence of a new style of speaking “known to contemporaries as the *genus dicendi ardens et concitatum*.” The idea (which derives from J. Fairweather) of a single new style bearing a widely recognized label is simplistic.

¹⁸⁵ This possibility is not a novel idea but forms the premise of such studies as Mussies 1972, which looks for overlaps in the language of Dio Chrysostom, who portrays himself as experiencing a spiritual conversion (see Moles 1978), and that of the New Testament.

of this language, and the thread that has frequently been thought to connect Paul's style with pagan literature, is the diatribe. And, indeed, if one wishes, it is possible to see in these passages one or more of the attributes that define the diatribe – for example, an aggressive pursuit of moral vices.¹⁸⁶ But because the elements of diatribe appear in a variety of genres, because all the elements may not be present in any one literary work and authors can have different objectives in the application of these elements, the label only serves for a general, rather vague, classification. Occasionally the label has been applied so liberally as to render it nearly meaningless.¹⁸⁷

By contrast with this vague classification, the criteria that permits us to see Paul in near exact sympathy with Fabianus is quite specific. Here, if just for a moment, we witness authors embodying the same argument in similar fashion: an expansive, repetitive formularity. Their language is simple in its construction,¹⁸⁸ open and immediately appreciable to auditors and readers. The repetitive simplicity of Fabianus' language here distinguishes it from the loftier alliterative passages already discussed (e.g. C. 2.1.10); and, as stated, Fabianus' voice in passages exhibiting this formularity may be fairly

¹⁸⁶ Other defining features of diatribe: the use of an often anonymous interlocutor (cf. Persius and Seneca the younger); the use of *exempla* (which are so common in declamation); a mock-serious, often polemical tone; the use of popular expressions.

¹⁸⁷ This seems to be the near universal criticism of Oltramare 1926, whose list of Latin authors influenced by diatribe (see table of contents pp. 313-15) is very long. Of Fabianus Oltramare says (p. 183): "...le style de Fabianus devait paraître...plein de recherches, éclatant d'antithèses, émaillé d'expressions populaires; bref, paré de tous les ornements de la diatribe." Lana 1992: 110, calls this tendency in Oltramare's study "pandiatribismo." Nonetheless, Oltramare's work remains important: he is one of few scholars willing to see certain personalities in Seneca's collection (Porcius Latro, Arellius Fuscus, Fabianus, Albucius Silus, Julius Bassus, Musa) not as mere declaimers but as participants in broader cultural movements (e.g. Sextian philosophy), and he regards the quotations of these declaimers as reflections of their identities and of their involvement in philosophical discussions.

¹⁸⁸ For Paul's cultivation of plain speech in order to represent himself in a desired way – specifically, in order to reflect and represent his humility, see Auksi 1995, e.g. pp. 126-43. Auksi (p. 136) speaks of the motif in Paul's writings of "autopsychography, of revealing the person in his or her writing and expression."

characterized as didactic, even plain-spoken. Still, such a characterization, although accurate, does not capture fully the import of this formularity. Through insistent adherence to a pattern Fabianus' language intimates a patient, ritualistic solemnity. Romans 2:21-23, and other passages in the New Testament that use a similar formularity (especially when they draw on passages from the books of the Old Testament), support this. Fabianus' rhetoric, and it would seem Paul's as well, is meant to recall a simpler, purer eloquence belonging to a traditional, sometimes sacred literature. By this method the two authors expect to invest their prose with credibility and authority.

2.6.2 *Controversia* 2.2

The quotations of Fabianus in *C.* 2.2.4 and 2.3.5 are short, and for this reason they resist yielding much information about a rhetoric that within the Senecan corpus is peculiarly Fabianic. Despite the limitation, the quotations contain Entries exhibiting the same meticulous completeness, predictability, and tabular rigidity as observed in *C.* 2.6.

The theme of *C.* 2.2: A husband and wife swore an oath that if one of them should die, the other would die as well. It happened that when the husband journeyed abroad he sent a messenger to his wife to announce that he had died. The wife jumps from a precipice. She recovers, however, and her father orders her to leave her husband. When she refuses, her father disinherits her.

The material Seneca offers is particularly fascinating because it includes declamatory quotations from Ovid (2.2.8-12),¹⁸⁹ who like Fabianus was a student of

¹⁸⁹ There is no basis for the approximate date given by Griffin 1972: 7, who says that around 30 BC (at age 13) Ovid spoke the words quoted. Her estimate, which I believe is too early, rests on the observations of Bornecque 1902b: 183, 188, that probably around 30 BC a school was opened by Porcius Latro, whom Ovid admired, and that Ovid devoted himself to poetry at age nineteen (i.e. 24 BC; *Trist.* 4.10.30).

Arellius Fuscus.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, the quotations of Ovid supply the closest parallel to the Entries of Fabianus and again set the philosopher's linguistic identity in high relief. Both speakers emphasize how excess affection drives one to act contrary to his own wishes. Ovid's criticisms are directed exclusively against the father: the father criticizes the love between his son-in-law and daughter but is himself carried away by unbridled love for his daughter; he loves his daughter so much that he disinherits her; he is grieved that his daughter's life was put at risk, but then wishes to deprive her of her husband without whom she will die; he counsels a moderate affection, but because of his own immoderate affection he risks his daughter's life:

C. 2.2.9-10 (Ovid)

Ecce obiurgator nostri quam effrenato amore fertur! queritur quemquam esse filiae praeter se carum. quid est quod illum ab indulgentia sua avocet? di boni, quomodo hic amavit uxorem!

Amat filiam et abdicat! dolet periclitatam esse et ab eo abducit sine quo negat se posse vivere! quaerit periculum eius, qua paene caruit, hic, qui amare caute iubet!

However, it is entirely possible that, like almost all speakers quoted by Seneca, Ovid declaimed as an adult. On the other hand, Seneca does seem to imply that the quotations come from a time before Ovid was fully pursuing poetry (2.2.8): *oratio eius iam tum nihil aliud poterat videri quam solutum carmen*. Even if we are willing to assume that Ovid's activities as a declaimer and as a recognized poet did not overlap, the quotations still may be as late as 15 BC, roughly the date of the publication of the *Amores*, Ovid's first work.

¹⁹⁰ On Ovid's education, 2.2.8 is crucial. Because of a conjecture by Fairweather 1981: 264-70, which Håkanson accepted, 2.2.8 has become something of a *locus conclamatus*. The reading of the mss should stand: *Hanc controversiam meminisse ab Ovidio Nasone declamari apud rhetorem Arellium Fuscum, cuius auditor fuit. nam Latronis admirator erat, cum diversum sequeretur dicendi genus*. "This *controversia*, I remember, was declaimed by Ovidius Naso at the school of Arellius Fuscus, whose student he was; as for Latro, Ovid was his admirer though he [Latro] was committed to a different style. He [ille = Ovid] possessed a refined, graceful, and endearing talent." Fairweather attempts to re-write literary history by transposing *nam Latronis admirator erat* to after *dicendi genus* ("This *controversia*, I remember, was declaimed by Ovidius Naso at the school of Arellius Fuscus, whose student he was, although he pursued a different style – for he was an admirer of Latro."), thus minimizing Arellius Fuscus' influence on Ovid. Berti 2007: 290-3, and Scarcia 2000 maintain the reading of the mss for this passage, but do not bring any new arguments to bear on the question. I hope to explain this passage in full detail in a short article.

The viewpoint of Fabianus, who speaks in defense of the father, is more encompassing: excess affection is considered with respect not just to one person, but in terms of how it has impacted the entire family. It is telling that this approach takes the form of a list in which Fabianus enumerates how immoderate love has perversely motivated husband, wife, and father (2.2.4):

C. 2.2.4 (Fabianus)

*Paene qui falsum mortis nuntium miserat, verae recepit.*¹⁹¹
*vir dum nimis amat uxorem, paene causa periculi fuit;*¹⁹²
uxor dum nimis amat virum, paene causa luctus fuit;
pater dum nimis amat filiam, abdicat.
*<di,> servate totam domum amore mutuo laborantem!*¹⁹³

Repetition is meant, among other things, to point up that it is not love pure and simple that has (nearly) produced disasters, but love in excess (*nimis...nimis...nimis*).

The exclamation that concludes the Entry further clarifies Fabianus' strategy. Just as he

¹⁹¹ Since *falsus nuntius mortis* (i.e. where the adjective modifies the noun, not the genitive *mortis*) is the ordinary expression in this declamation (cf. Romanus Hispo at 2.2.7) and in authors such as Valerius Maximus (9.12.2), Curtius Rufus (3.12.5), and Apuleius (*Met.* 11.18), I am not convinced that *falsum* should be changed to *falsae*, as Müller and Håkanson believe.

¹⁹² Editors have wished to delete *paene* in this sentence, presumably from a belief that the wife did not *almost* risk her life, but *did* risk her life; plus, since the word appears in surrounding clauses, a scribe might easily have inserted it here by accident. There is, however, no reason to delete *paene*, especially since according to his rhetorical interests (i.e. repetitive formularity) as I have attempted to describe them, Fabianus could be motivated to retain it. At any rate, we do not know enough about how Fabianus treated this theme to justify its deletion. At least two considerations make the retention of *paene* logically acceptable: 1) Some declaimers chose as a *color* to assert that the wife knew the husband's message was false, so she did not actually try to kill herself (cf. Romanus Hispo, 2.2.7). 2) Apparently it was possible to claim that what the wife underwent was not a real threat to her life (*periculum*), but a test (*experimentum*); cf. Latro, 2.2.1: *Dii immortales, qua debetis providentia humanum genus regitis: effecistis ut illud non periculum esset amantis sed experimentum.*

¹⁹³ Observe that the Entry that opens the quotation of Fabianus in 2.2.4 and the last Entry of the quotation belong to the same shared *locus*. The opening Entry: *'Non possum' inquit 'relinquere virum'; quicquam non potes, quae mori potes?* The last Entry of the quotation: *Potes sine viro pati: peregrinationem eius tulisti. facilius potes carere eo qui spiritum dedit quam eo qui impendit?* The status of the Entry as a shared *locus* is signaled by references to the girl's statement that she cannot live without her husband (underlined). Similar references are made to this imagined statement at 2.2.2 by Marullus and at 2.2.10 by Ovid; however, these latter two quotations are on behalf of the girl.

attacked wealth itself rather than the wealthy man in *C. 2.1*,¹⁹⁴ here Fabianus blames excess passion rather than one person. The entire family is afflicted by it; such, unfortunately, are the miscalculations and sufferings of humans when they make themselves susceptible to harmful, irrational influences.¹⁹⁵

2.6.3 *Controversia 2.3*

The theme of *C. 2.3*: The law states that unless a rapist obtain pardon both from the girl's father and his own father within thirty days, the rapist should die.¹⁹⁶ It happened that a rapist obtained a pardon from the girl's father, but not from his own father. He accuses his father of insanity.

Under this declamation there are two short quotations from Fabianus (2.3.5; 2.3.9), one for each side of the argument.¹⁹⁷ At 2.3.5 two Entries in particular, which appear in the quotation spoken in defense of the father, are worthy of note since they further corroborate a consistent stylistic program:

C. 2.3.5 (Fabianus)

Demens sum:

vides <enim> turpiter vivo, meretricem amo, | leges ignoro, dies tuos non numero.

'Ergo moriar' inquit:

hoc si reo dicis, non curo, | si iudici, videbo, | si dementi, non intellego.

¹⁹⁴ See Section 2.5.1.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. the conclusion of this Entry with the conclusion at *C. 2.1.10-13: et mirabere si fastidio rerum naturae laborantibus iam ne liberi quidem nisi alieni placent?* Note the use of *laborare* in both these conclusions.

¹⁹⁶ Winterbottom 1974: 266 n. 1: "Doubtless a complete fiction." For the relationship between declamatory laws and Roman law, Lanfranchi 1938; Parks 1945; Bonner 1949: 84-132.

¹⁹⁷ At 2.3.12 is a brief note on Fabianus' divisions.

Once again, Entries are informed by syntactical and phonetic repetition.

Fabianus' short *cola* are simplified to produce a series of rapid bursts. This is Fabianus at his most incisive and aggressive, a fact underscored by biting sarcasm in the former of the two Entries where, in the role of the *pater familias*, he mocks his son's recent behavior.

As is evident from a reading of all the material in C. 2.3, both Entries participate in separate shared *loci*, and both are introduced by context labels (underlined). Even within the quotation of Fabianus at 2.3.5, it can be seen that Entries revisit the same shared *loci*. Below is the quotation of 2.3.5 in full. What potentially are keywords to Entries have been underlined. Contributions by other speakers to the shared *loci* can be found in the footnotes.

- A) *Demens sum*: *vides <enim>, turpiter vivo, meretricem amo, leges ignoro, dies tuos non numero.*¹⁹⁸
- B) *Ad iudices* *vocat iudicem suum.*¹⁹⁹
- C) *'Ergo moriar' inquit: hoc si reo dicis, non curo; si iudici, videbo; si dementi, non intellego.*²⁰⁰
- A) *'Demens' inquit 'es';* *et huic aliquis ignoscere potest, qui sic rogat?*
- B) *Vos mei iudices estis, iste habet suum iudicem: nec potest inexorabilem queri quem nondum expertus est.*²⁰¹

¹⁹⁸ In mock-seriousness the father addresses the reference to himself as *demens*: Junius Gallio (2.3.7): *Audi a demente exempla huic crimini <convenientia>*. P. Asprenas (2.3.8): *Demens sum*: *immo, si vis, argumentum dabo tibi: <licet> filius meus moriturus sit, nondum testamentum meum mutavi.*

¹⁹⁹ On the *pater familias* as judge, Val. Max. 2.9.2, 5.8.2 (noted by Winterbottom).

²⁰⁰ In order to lay stress to the gravity of the situation and to arouse paternal anxieties the son reminds his father, "I shall die" (*moriar*): Porcius Latro (2.3.1): *'Moriar' inquit, 'moriar'*: *<dic ergo> verum*. Arellius Fuscus (2.3.3, two contributions to the same shared *locus*): *'Moriar' inquit; etiamnunc minaris? nondum rogas? 'quousque' inquit 'rogabo' iam lassus es nec adhuc ullum rogasti. 'non possum' inquit 'exorare tam diu'; novo more obicit dementi constantiam. 'Quid ergo? tu poteris videre morientem filium?'* *fortasse non potero et ideo irascor, dum licet.*

The quotation is an exemplary reminder of the organizational complexity of Seneca's collection. It may be observed parenthetically that the order of the Entries here presents a tantalizing pattern. Twice we see the *locus patris dementis* (A) followed by a contribution to a shared *locus* on the father in his role as a judge to his son (B). It is tempting to see this as evidence for the use of two separate sources that follow a similar organizational sequence.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has investigated whether a linguistic and literary identity is discernible in the quotations attributed to Fabianus in the elder Seneca's anthology. It was found that, in Seneca's work, a distinct Fabianic identity emerges as a complex of complementary literary and cultural expressions. Fabianus' quotations consistently exhibit principles of sentence architecture: phonetic iteration, particularly in a functional capacity to create and define word-groups; phonetic correspondence that serially links word-group to successive word-group (serial cohesion); organization by binary *cola*; a tendency towards parataxis rather than hypotaxis; and a drop-by-drop presentation of ideas (*guttatim* style). These features argue for the presence of a unified voice in the quotations assigned to Fabianus. However, the features by themselves do not constitute a Fabianic identity. A fully distinct identity takes shape when we see that the listed features serve to represent Fabianus as moral *philosophus*, and that they are integral to

²⁰¹ I have altered Håkanson's punctuation.

the insistently moralizing, philosophically-minded arguments he invents in the context of the declamatory themes. A traditional morality is performed in a traditional sentence architecture. The character of this architecture, depending on how it is applied, now elevates Fabianus' speech, now informs it with an honest and solemn simplicity.

The interaction that can occur between the quotations of two or more speakers, namely in the practice of shared *loci*, often allows us to see a Fabianic identity that is distinctly and purposefully different from its peers. These moments (οἱ καιροί) of engagement are significant and can be particularly revealing. It is at these performative intersections, when a speaker knows that his speech is being closely matched with others', that he is required to assert his own performative excellence, to distinguish and identify himself. Fabianus, at these moments, adheres to the architectural principles listed above, whereas his peers show little interest in them. Arellius Fuscus, to some extent, is an exception to this since he and Fabianus show interest in similar principles of sentence organization. But this similarity, far from diluting a Fabianic identity, shows a cultivation by the two men of a particular stylistic program. It reveals them not as indifferent and homogenous in their speech, but witnesses a linguistic deliberateness and self-consciousness. Moreover, as we shall see in Chapters 3 and 4, Fuscus' application of these basic architectural principles differs from Fabianus'; they come to have a different meaning in the art of Fuscus.

If, as I have attempted to demonstrate, a strong Fabianic identity emerges in the quotations of Seneca's work, we might wonder what the conditions are both inside and outside the anthology that make this identity possible. Fabianus cannot be solely responsible for creating the Fabianic identity of the anthology: since his quotations

appear in the work of another author they were necessarily subjected to a selection process. At the same time, neither can authority for the record of quotations rest with the elder Seneca alone. As an anthology, Seneca's work is dependent on declamatory performances and on records of these performances, as well as other collections of quotations.

Therefore, authority for a Fabianic identity is shared between Fabianus, on the one hand, and the elder Seneca in conjunction with others who recorded and circulated quotations, on the other hand. In some measure Fabianus, when declaiming, used language as an instrument to fashion himself as a philosopher-preacher. His auditors understood, sympathized with, and corroborated this identity in what they selected to record of his speeches. The identity originates in Fabianus – and is perfected by auditors. It is not necessary – indeed, it is impossible – to determine precisely what proportion of this Fabianic identity of the anthology is attributable to the speaker, what proportion to Seneca and his sources. A shared authority does not compromise the strength and distinctiveness of Fabianic identity.²⁰² Seneca and other auditors are collaborators in discovering the significance of Fabianus' speech, in finding something in it that resonates within the culture of declamatory performances.

²⁰² Cf. Burke 1969: 57-8: "Longinus refers to that kind of elation wherein the audience feels as though it were not merely receiving, but were itself creatively participating in the poet's or speaker's assertion. Could we not say that, in such cases, the audience is exalted by the assertion because it has the feel of collaborating in the assertion?" See [Longinus], *Subl.* 7.2.

3. Arellius Fuscus: presentational architecture and verbal presence

3.1 Introduction

The quotations of Arellius Fuscus, who is among the most highly represented speakers in the extant anthology,¹ are far more abundant and diverse than those of Papirius Fabianus. This richness poses a challenge to an attempt to describe Fuscus' artistic identity simply and succinctly. And yet, the quotations of Arellius Fuscus, especially when taken together with Seneca's comments, have left scholars with a strong impression of who Arellius Fuscus is. We *know* Fuscus. He is an extremely talented speaker, so good in fact that Seneca (*C.* 10 pr. 13) ranks him – beside Porcius Latro, Junius Gallio, and Albucius Silo – among the top four best declaimers.² At the same time, however, we are told by modern scholars, who rely heavily on Seneca's own comments, that Fuscus' variety of eloquence is luxuriant, excessive, over-the-top, often irrelevant, ridiculous, and ultimately “corrupt.”³ In short, Fuscus has been branded an

¹ The following passages contain quotations of Fuscus that are ten consecutive Teubner lines or longer: *C.* 1.1.6, 1.5.7-8, 1.8.2, 2.1.4-8, 2.5.4, 7.6.7-8; *S.* 2.1-2, 3.1, 4.1-3, 5.1-3, 6.5-6, 7.8-9. See also the calculations of Sussman 1977: 305 n. 7.

² Seneca praises Fuscus also elsewhere: *C.* 1.6.10; *S.* 4.4 and 5. Other personalities in the collection criticize him: *C.* 2.3.11 (Latro); 7.2.12 (Passienus); *S.* 2.10 (Asinius Pollio).

³ Examples of modern praise of Fuscus' language and declamatory technique: Bornecque 1902b: 152, admires “le mouvement, la couleur, la chaleur (*C.* 1.1.6; 2.1.4-9; 7.6.7-8; *S.* 2.1-2; 4.1-3; 5.1-3),” and also “la justesse, la précision et la vigueur (*C.* 2.6.9, 10.4.21).” Anderson 1995: 86, compares *S.* 6.5 f. to the Periclean funeral oration with a touch of Plato. – Modern criticism: Bornecque 1902b: 152, remarks on the redundancy and inanity of his language. Fairweather 1981: 264-76, regards Fuscus as an inveterate Asianist, a practitioner of a corrupt, inane, and convoluted eloquence that was inherited from Hegesias (3rd cent. BC) and shared by the morally and stylistically effete Maecenas; Fuscus' style was ultimately rejected by his most prominent students (Ovid and Papirius Fabianus; p. 264), and became extinct with his death. The categorization of Fuscus as an Asianist is perpetuated by Berti 2007: 205.

Asianist – a term divergent in its identifications and definitions,⁴ so frequently polemical and *ad hominem* in its applications as to render it useless for our (descriptive) purposes.⁵

In her 1981 monograph Janet Fairweather offers a detailed and thoughtful analysis of the styles of the declaimers. However, there are two general shortcomings to her analysis. First, by her own admission her stylistic study is very far from comprehensive or sufficiently in-depth;⁶ this is no fault of hers, but is a reflection of the nature of the study that she undertook and of the state of scholarship on the elder Seneca. To her credit, Fairweather justly and refreshingly challenges old assumptions about Seneca and his collections (e.g. the personality of Seneca; the placement of the *Suasoriae*). She also, rightly, dismantles Norden’s identification of Asianism⁷ – a disparaged type of eloquence (again, “corrupt”) said to have originated in Asia – with the

⁴ Cic. *Brut.* 325: *genera autem Asiaticae dictionis duo sunt: unum sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis, qualis in historia Timaeus, in dicendo autem pueris nobis Hierocles Alabandeus, magis etiam Meneclis frater eius fuit, quorum utriusque orationes sunt in primis ut Asiatico in genere laudabiles. aliud autem genus est non tam sententiis frequentatum quam verbis volucre atque incitatum, quale est nunc Asia tota, nec flumine solum orationis sed etiam exornato et faceto genere verborum, in quo fuit Aeschylus Cnidius et meus aequalis Milesius Aeschines. in his erat admirabilis orationis cursus, ornata sententiarum concinnitas non erat. haec autem, ut dixi, genera dicendi aptiora sunt adolescentibus, in senibus gravitatem non habent.* This passage, written in 46 BC (Kennedy 1972: 97) is the first mention of the term in Greek and Latin literature as an appellation of style.

⁵ Reader 1996: 45, fittingly calls ‘Asianism’ “a cipher for *corrupta eloquentia*.” Cf. Douglas 1966: xiii, on the Asianists vs. Atticists controversy: “No reader of *Brutus* and *Orator* can mistake the temporary importance of the controversy, but its wider significance has been greatly exaggerated by modern scholars, who have treated ‘Atticism’ and ‘Asianism’ as technical terms of criticism referring to movements with long histories and many identifiable adherents. A sober study of the evidence suggests that these terms are mere polemical slogans”; and see Douglas 1955: 242. Also, Winterbotton 1975: 104 (in a review of E. Cizek (1972) *L’Époque de Néron et ses controverses idéologiques*. Leiden, Brill): “It is surely time that Atticism and Asianism were laid to rest as critical tools to be applied to any but a single decade of Roman literature (perhaps not to that either).”

⁶ Fairweather 1984: 542: “The diction and style of Seneca the Elder and the declaimers quoted by him deserve much more systematic study than they have so far received.”

⁷ Also criticized by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1900, the classic study of Asianism and Atticism.

New Style,⁸ which is often considered the basis of the writing styles of Silver Latin authors and is the label applied to the eloquence cultivated by the declaimers.

Fairweather begins her discussion by emphasizing the diversity of styles of the declaimers; but in the end she replaces Norden's scheme of the history of styles with a scheme of her own – one, in fact, that is not much different from Norden's and is only slightly less rigid.

This rigidity is the second general shortcoming of Fairweather's study of the declaimers' styles; it informs her analyses and, among other distortions, it results in a handicapping prejudice against the quotations of Arellius Fuscus. She claims that Seneca champions an ideal declamatory style, essentialized in the phrase *genus dicendi ardens et concitatum* (C. 3 pr. 7 "fiery and energetic"),⁹ which he uses in the preface to the third book of *Controversiae* to describe the speaking manner of Cassius Severus. Fairweather equates the *genus dicendi ardens et concitatum* with the New Style, insists that it has nothing at all to do with Asianism, and that its consummate practitioner was Porcius Latro. Yet, according to Fairweather, Asianism was still alive, and finds itself represented in speakers such as Cestius Pius and Arellius Fuscus. With them, it is destined to die; the style of Latro and his imitators, on the other hand, will be taken up by Silver Latin writers like the younger Seneca.¹⁰

It is very doubtful that when at C. 3 pr. 7 Seneca speaks of Cassius Severus' style as *genus dicendi ardens et concitatum* he is implying that this is *the* ideal style and that

⁸ See also Hoffa 1909: 43.

⁹ Cf. Holloway 1998: 34: "At Rome it [sc. the *sententia*] became a prominent feature of the new style of speaking known to contemporaries as the *genus dicendi ardens et concitatum*."

¹⁰ On the younger Seneca, Fairweather 1981: 276.

all good declaimers should speak in the same way. Furthermore, it should not be expected that one style would be used by a speaker on all occasions. Porcius Latro himself (*C.* 7.4.6) insists there are occasions when one should employ gentler rhythms. Whereas Seneca does often pronounce his opinions of speakers' performances, he is not dogmatic.¹¹ He is here describing the virtues of a particular speaker, virtues that Cassius Severus possessed when he spoke in actual court cases but which abandoned him in declamation. They are not the only virtues that may be had.

The belief in a homogenous, generally recognized and recognizable manner of speaking that was commonly referred to by the two adjectives *ardens* and *concitatum*¹² forms the basis of Fairweather's discussion of style and literary history. It is a belief in broad, unified, and competing schools of style with committed adherents. So, although Fairweather advises us in her criticism of Norden that there was a multitude of styles among the declaimers, in spite of herself she falls into all-too familiar categories:¹³ 1) the *corrupti*, who were Asianists, such as Arellius Fuscus¹⁴ and Cestius Pius, versus 2) the

¹¹ Seneca, as Fairweather herself says (Fairweather 1984: 529-30; Fairweather 1981: 59), is a descriptive, rather than prescriptive critic; Berti 2007: 185. At *C.* 10 pr. 10 Seneca claims that he lays down no strict rules: *Nec sum ex iudicibus severissimis, qui omnia ad exactam regulam redigam. Multa donanda ingenii puto, sed donanda vitia, non portenta sunt.*

¹² Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90 famously describes Lucan's poetry in this way. The phrase (or variations thereof) appears elsewhere in contexts that have nothing to do with language: *V. Max.* 4.6; 5.7.3; *V. Fl.* 3.583; *Sil.* 16.387.

¹³ Cf. the criticism by Douglas 1965: 326, in a review of Leeman 1963: "What is very curious is his habit of acknowledging at least implicitly modern criticisms of nineteenth-century dogmas, and then slipping comfortably back into dear old familiar ways of thought." Also, *ibid.*: "For he relies far too much on interpretation in terms of alleged schools and influences and 'isms,' many of which are merely the wreckage and débris of scholarly battle of long ago. Such interpretations his own complete familiarity and honesty with the evidence show to be at best over-schematic and at worst almost meaningless."

¹⁴ It is the presumed lushness and audacity of Fuscus' style that cause critics to call him an Asianist; it is for this that Fairweather says that he was similar to Maecenas. However, Seneca tells us that Fuscus' style often suffered from aridity, particularly in proems, argumentation, and narration. Fairweather's response to

sani, the proponents of the New Style, which proved influential in Silver Latin letters, represented especially by Porcius Latro and Junius Gallio. In this respect, Fairweather's discussion is barely different from the studies of Lindner,¹⁵ Hoffa, and Reuter in the 19th century. Reuter 1887, for example, goes through the speakers one by one separating the corrupt from the non-corrupt.¹⁶

The quotations of Arellius Fuscus require more productive, more creative and catholic modes of analysis. This chapter and the next are designed to contribute to satisfying this desideratum. The analyses below are based on the premise that the individual character – the identity – of Arellius Fuscus' language can be effectively traced through three features in particular: his word arrangement (*compositio*); his word-choice, which is marked by poetic or rare words; and to a lesser extent his syntactical constructions.

In Chapter 2 it was remarked that Papirius Fabianus shares with Fuscus fundamental techniques of organizing and giving shape to his prose. The patterns that were identified are a function of careful attention, on the part of both speakers, to word arrangement – properly referred to by ancient rhetoricians as *compositio*. In the course of the discussion I expect that the similar interests of Fabianus and Fuscus in certain techniques and patterns of *compositio* – namely, in highly defined word-groups and in binary architecture – will receive further confirmation. The discussion, however, will

this complicating piece of information is revealing (p. 257): she suspects that Fuscus' aridity originated in the schools of Asia Minor – that is, it too is a mark of Asianism.

¹⁵ Lindner 1862; Lindner 1855.

¹⁶ E.g. Fairweather 1981: 297: "An interesting possible candidate for inclusion among the Asiani is Haterius."

quickly move beyond similarities with Fabianus, whose prose ultimately represents and means something different from Fuscus', to consider Fuscus' language in its own right – which is to say, in its individual complexity, considering diverse patterns of Fuscus' *compositio* and the functions and meanings of these patterns.

We begin with an examination of the elder Seneca's critical comments about Arellius Fuscus and a re-consideration of the rhetor's life and place of origin.

3.2 Fuscus' biography and his alleged Asianism

Little is known of Arellius Fuscus' life. When Seneca was a young man, so he states (*S.* 2.10), nothing was more popular than Fuscus' expository passages, which students would intone in various, individualized cadences: *recolo nihil fuisse me iuvene tam notum quam has explicationes Fusci, quas nemo nostrum non alius alia inclinatione vocis velut sua quisque modulatione cantabat*. From this it can be deduced that Fuscus was at least as old as Seneca (born c. 55 BC) and Seneca's compatriot and peer Porcius Latro. However, Fuscus was probably not very much older than these two men, and a safe estimate places his birth between 65 and 60 BC. The fact that Fuscus quotes from the *Aeneid* (*S.* 3.4 f.¹⁷ and *S.* 4.4-5) indicates that he lived beyond 19 BC, the date of Vergil's death, shortly after which the epic poem was officially put into circulation under state sponsorship.

Fuscus preferred *suasoriae* to *controversiae*, a preference shared by his student Ovid (*C.* 2.2.12), and he delivered *suasoriae* more often in Greek than in Latin (*S.* 4.5).

¹⁷ Chapter 4 will take up the question whether in fact Fuscus is imitating Vergil.

It should not be presumed from this that Fuscus' primary language was Greek. Social, practical, and pedagogic considerations may have motivated a language preference in the case of *suasoriae*. Although strictly speaking Cicero is outside the sub-culture under discussion here, his experience makes us aware of these alternative motivations. In his youth Cicero delivered practice exercises in Greek because his eloquence benefitted more thereby than declaiming in Latin, and because the best teachers employed Greek.¹⁸

Based on what can be observed through Seneca's anthology, there does seem to have been a real division of group identities between declaimers who performed in Greek (*Graeci*) and those performing in Latin (*Latini*).¹⁹ Interestingly, these divisions were not necessarily drawn according to one's place of origin. We should suppose that nearly all speakers in Seneca's collection knew both Latin and Greek;²⁰ therefore, the establishment of an individual's identity was only loosely constrained by his linguistic knowledge. Cestius Pius and his student Argentarius were Greek but declaimed exclusively in Latin (*C.* 9.3.13-14) – this despite the fact that, because he was not a native Latin speaker, Pius' fluency sometimes suffered and he struggled to find fitting vocabulary (*C.* 7.1.27).²¹

¹⁸ *Brut.* 310: *commentabar declamitans – sic enim nunc loquuntur – saepe cum M. Pisone et cum Q. Pompeio aut cum aliquo cotidie, idque faciebam multum etiam Latine sed Graece saepius, vel quod Graeca oratio plura ornamenta suppeditans consuetudinem similiter Latine dicendi adferebat, vel quod a Graecis summis doctoribus, nisi Graece dicerem, neque corrigi possem neque doceri.*

¹⁹ See Lechi 2008; Berti 2007: 254-62. The *Graeci* and *Latini* had different styles from one another. In part this was due to differences between the natures and literary traditions of the two languages. But, in addition, the two groups had a different sense of what was eloquent; this is evident from Seneca's disparaging remarks about the *Graeci* and their insanity. This difference is also what motivates Cicero to declaim in Greek: he wishes the Greek language and rhetorical practice to impart something to his Latin that can not be gotten from Latin-speakers.

²⁰ Latro's ostentatious disdain for the Greeks is clearly designed to valorize his own eloquence (*C.* 10.4.21): *hanc sententiam Latro Porcius virilius dixit, qui non potest <de> furto suspectus esse; Graecos enim et contemnebat et ignorabat.* In the cultural milieu in which Latro thrived he must have had considerable knowledge of Greek. For the cultivation of Greek eloquence and the simultaneous disdain for Greekness, see for example Hall 1998: 23-29.

Although there was interaction between *Latini* and *Graeci* the expectation was that one belonged to one group or the other. It was unusual for a speaker to engage in performances in both languages. So, we are told that Argentarius was amazed at those speakers who were not content with eloquence in one language, but changed their declamatory personas as easily as their clothing (C. 9.3.13). And performances in Greek and Latin on the same day by a certain Clodius Sabinus elicited memorable witticisms from such prominent personalities as Q. Haterius, Cassius Severus, and Maecenas (C. 9.3.13-14).

Arellius Fuscus seems to have been one of these relatively uncommon individuals who was comfortable performing in either language. It does not follow from this that his native language was Greek, as is often assumed,²² or that he was from Asia. As befits a practitioner of Greek as well as Latin declamation, he was conversant with Greek literature and obviously had close contact with Greek declaimers and their work. These facts alone are sufficient to explain remarks in Seneca's collection that are often cited as support for the idea that Fuscus was an Easterner. Twice (C. 1.7.14; 1.8.15) Fuscus recounts how his teacher quoted verses from Homer in a particular declamation then under discussion. Greek declaimers in Seneca's collection can be seen to quote from Homer, but it was probably not unusual for Latin declaimers to do the same.²³ An

²¹ Cestius Pius' artificial choice of identity (a *declamator Latinus* whereas his cultural heritage is Greek) may tell us something about the artificiality of the language that declaimers cultivated: it was one thing to speak Latin in a way that was sufficient for daily interactions, but to be fluent in declamatory / literary Latin was another matter, requiring enduring practice.

²² Berti 2007: 205 n. 1; Bornecque 1902b: 150; Hoffa 1909: 39-40; Brzoska 1893-: 635-6; Lindner 1862: 13.

²³ For the integral role of Greek and the Homeric poems in the education of a Roman orator such as Cicero, see Clarke 1968.

explanation of the practice of literary emulation is attributed to Fuscus, who compares Sallust and Thucydides, both of whom he quotes (C. 9.1.13-14).²⁴

Fuscus occasionally emulates very deliberately the Entries of Greek declaimers. So at C. 9.1.12 he alters slightly an Entry from Adaeus, whom Seneca calls *rhetor ex Asianis, non proiecti nominis*: “an Asianist rhetor of no mean repute.” Adaeus is one of the *Graeci*, and what few quotations there are of him are in Greek; but the appellation *Asianus* refers to style and is equivalent to “corrupt.”²⁵

At C. 9.6.16, when Fuscus imitates the famous orator Hybreas, another *Graecus*, he himself is called *Asianus*: *Hanc sententiam Fuscus Arellius, cum esset ex Asia<nis>*,²⁶ *non casu dixit sed transtulit, ad verbum quidem*. “Arellius Fuscus, since he was one of the Asianists, spoke this *sententia* – not haphazardly, but word for word.”

The phrase *cum esset ex Asianis* has occasioned some debate since it is regarded as potentially expressing important, new information about Fuscus’ place of origin (Is he from Asia?), and about his stylistic allegiances (Is he an Asianist?). In actual fact, the phrase imparts nothing about Fuscus’ style that is not expressed elsewhere in the

²⁴ Curiously, the Greek quotation does not come from a work authored by Thucydides, but rather from [Dem.] *Ep. Phil.* 13.

²⁵ Timaeos, who was from Sicily and identified as an Asianist (Cic. *Brut.* 325), exemplifies how the label *Asianus* could refer not to geography, but to style.

²⁶ The emendation *Asianis* for *Asia*, which has been accepted by Müller, Winterbottom, and Håkanson, goes back to J. Schultingh, and is almost certainly correct. Schultingh’s important notes on the text first appeared in the 1672 Amsterdam edition; see Vervliet 1957. An alternative interpretation might see Hybreas rather than Fuscus as the subject of *cum esset ex Asianis*. However, in order for this to be possible, Hybreas would need to be Topic or Focus information (to use the language of Functional Grammar). The Topic is *Hanc sententiam* and Fuscus, along with what he did to this *sententia*, is Focus information.

collection; and if the correction to *ex Asianis* is correct (as I believe it is), the phrase tells us nothing about his place of origin.²⁷

The sentence is compact, and at first glance it is difficult to see how *cum esset ex Asianis* fits. A piece of geographical information would be irrelevant in this context.²⁸ Instead, the clause is a parenthetical critique of Fuscus' rhetorical aesthetics. I interpret the passage as follows: Immediately preceding this sentence, it is remarked that everybody wanted to say something new with regard to a certain shared *locus*. A series of *sententiae* are quoted from different declaimers, beginning with Hybreas. Fuscus said something similar to Hybreas – not surprisingly since, like Hybreas, he has a corrupt style (*cum esset ex Asianis*). The similarity of Fuscus' *sententia* to Hybreas' was not haphazard (*Hanc sententiam...non casu dixit*); rather, Fuscus' *sententia* was a direct translation, word for word (*sed transtulit, ad verbum quidem*).²⁹ That Hybreas' and Fuscus' *sententiae* are here regarded as stylistically corrupt – hence, motivating the remark that Fuscus was one of the Asianists – is confirmed by the following comment that Q. Haterius applied this *sententia* more moderately (*modestius*).

²⁷ Fairweather 1981: 366 n. 8, remarks that *cum esset ex Asia* would be possible in colloquial Latin, citing Pl. *Bac.* 472; *Rud.* 737.

²⁸ Contrary to Hoffa 1909: 39-40, who believes geographical information is pertinent because Hybreas never left Asia (Strabo 14.2.24), so that Fuscus would have to be from Asia to hear him. However, there is no proof that Hybreas never left Asia (Strabo does not say so). Moreover, Fuscus need not have direct contact with Hybreas to imitate one of his Entries: Fuscus may have read the Entry or he may have heard it indirectly.

²⁹ My interpretation, which agrees with Bornecque 1902a: *ad loc.*, differs slightly from that of Winterbottom 1974: *ad loc.*: "It was not by chance that Arellius Fuscus spoke this epigram – for he was one of the Asians; indeed he translated word for word." Winterbottom takes the *cum*-clause as an explanation of *non casu*; but *non casu* must be antithetical to *transtulit*.

Seneca's labeling Fuscus as an *Asianus* supplies nothing over and above the *negative* comments³⁰ that he makes elsewhere about Fuscus' style. It is a synonymous heading to these critical comments, which have been collected below:

(C. 2 pr. 1) *erat explicatio Fusci Arelli splendida quidem sed operosa et implicata, cultus nimis acquisitus, compositio verborum mollior quam ut illam tam sanctis fortibusque praeceptis praeparans se animus pati posset. summa inaequalitas orationis, quae modo exilis erat, modo nimia licentia vaga et effusa: principia, argumenta, narrationes aride dicebantur; in descriptionibus extra legem omnibus verbis, dummodo niterent, permissa libertas. nihil acre, nihil solidum, nihil horridum: splendida oratio et magis lasciva quam laeta.*

(S. 2.10) *Huius suasoriae feci mentionem, non quia in ea subtilitatis erat aliquid quod vos excitare posset, <sed> ut sciretis quam nitide Fuscus dixisset vel quam licenter. ipse sententiam <non> feram: vestri arbitrii erit, utrum explicationes eius luxuriosas putetis an †ut poetas† Pollio Asinius aiebat hoc non esse suadere <sed> lascivire.*

(S. 2.23) *Sed ne vos diutius infatuem, quia dixeram me Fusci Arelli explicationes subiecturum, hic <finem> suasoriae faciam. quarum nimius cultus et fracta compositio poterit vos offendere cum ad meam aetatem veneritis. interim <non> dubito quin haec vos ipsa quae offensura sunt vitia delectent.*

(S. 4.5) *et quia soletis mihi molesti esse de Fusco, quid fuerit, quare nemo videretur dixisse cultius, ingeram vobis Fuscinas explicationes. dicebat autem suasorias libentissime et frequentius Graecas quam Latinas.*

The adjectives and phrases underlined above are typical of discussions of Asianism:³¹ speech is excessively intricate and precious (*cultus nimis acquisitus*),

³⁰ Fairweather 1976: 271, is wrong to say that Seneca does not use this term disparagingly. The term is inherently negative. Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1900: 1: "darin aber sind alle einig, dass Asianismus etwas sehr verwerfliches ist." It is telling that Hegesias (3rd century BC), who was commonly considered the founder of Asianism (Strabo 14.1.41), thought he was a follower of Lysias (Cic. *Orat.* 226; *Brut.* 286), the model Atticist. In other words, the man whose style was regarded as the essence of Asianism does not embrace the label, as we should expect he might if Asianism were not a cipher for corrupt eloquence; rather, he wants to be a follower of Atticism (= good style). – Cicero attempts to salvage some aspects of Asianism when discussing certain orators. However, his schematic, and culturally prejudiced, narrative (*Brut.* 51) that traces the debasement of Attic speech to Asia leaves no doubt that Asianism is synonymous with inferior and corrupt eloquence: *nam ut semel e Piraeo eloquentia evecta est, omnis peragravit insulas atque ita peregrinata tota Asia est, ut se externis oblineret moribus omnemque illam salubritatem Atticae dictionis et quasi sanitatem perderet ac loqui paene dedisceret.*

effeminate (*compositio mollior; compositio fracta*),³² indulgent (*nimia licentia*), undisciplined (*permissa libertas*), and luxuriant (*oratio lasciva; explicationes luxuriosae*).

Put succinctly, Asianic rhetoric is turgid, unduly refined, and inane.³³ This last feature, a

³¹ Cic. *Brut.* 326 describes his friend, and sometime rival, Hortensius as an Asianist – a label not current in Hortensius’ lifetime. Cicero is careful to include in the description features of both kinds of Asianism (*Brut.* 325), which he says Hortensius first united. Cicero says that Hortensius’ manner of speaking lacked authority, but appealed to young people; this is very similar to Seneca’s ostensible position (*S.* 2.23, quoted above) that Arellius Fuscus’ style appeals to his sons, but as an old man is intolerable to himself. Adjectives and phrases similar to those found in Seneca’s descriptions of Fuscus are underlined: *itaque Hortensius utroque genere florens clamores faciebat adolescens. habebat enim et Meneclium illud studium crebrarum venustarumque sententiarum, in quibus, ut in illo Graeco, sic in hoc erant quaedam magis venustae dulcesque sententiae quam aut necessariae aut interdum utiles; et erat oratio cum incitata et vibrans tum etiam accurata et polita. non probabantur haec senibus – saepe videbam cum inridentem tum etiam irascentem et stomachantem Philippum – , sed mirabantur adulescentes, multitudo movebatur. erat excellens iudicio volgi et facile primas tenebat adolescens. etsi enim genus illud dicendi auctoritatis habebat parum, tamen aptum esse aetati videbatur.* – Cic. *Orat.* 27 compares the Asianist manner of delivery to singing (cf. *Sen. S.* 2.10): *cum vero inclinata ululantique voce more Asiatico canere coepisset, quis eum ferret aut potius quis non iuberet auferri?* – Cic. *Orat.* 230 emphasizes that Asianists are overly concerned with creating rhythms, their slavish adherence to which causes them to insert superfluous words (*inania verba*); their speech closely approaches poetry, and it is effeminate (*infringendis*): *apud alios autem et Asiaticos maxume numero servientis inculcata reperias inania quaedam verba quasi complementa numerorum. sunt etiam qui illo vitio, quod ab Hegesia maxume fluxit, infringendis concidendisque numeris in quoddam genus abiectum incidant versicolorum simillimum.* – Quint. *Inst.* 8, pr. 17 says Asianists are stylistically corrupt because they lack good judgment and restraint: *neque enim Asiani aut quocumque alio genere corrupti res non viderunt aut eas non collocaverunt, neque, quos aridos vocamus, stulti aut in causis caeci fuerunt, sed his iudicium in eloquendo ac modus, illis vires defuerunt, ut appareat in hoc et vitium et virtutem esse dicendi.* Also, *Inst.* 12.10.16: *Et antiqua quidem illa divisio inter Atticos atque Asianos fuit, cum hi pressi et integri, contra inflati illi et inanes haberentur, in his nihil superflueret, illis iudicium maxime ac modus deesset.* – Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.12 refers to accusations of Asianism against Cicero: *quem [sc. Ciceronem] tamen et suorum homines temporum incessere audebant ut tumidiorem et Asianum et redundantem et in repetitionibus nimium et in salibus aliquando frigidum* [cf. Seneca *C.* 1.4.10: *Fuscus Arellius illius sententiae frigidius dixit et in compositione fractum, exultantem ac paene, quod procul absit, viro molliorem.* – Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.17 is similar to the above, but again makes explicit the ethnocentrism behind the choice of the term *Asianus* as a synonym for corrupt eloquence: *mihī autem orationis differentiam fecisse et dicentium et audientium naturae videntur, quod Attici limati quidam et emuncti nihil inane aut redundans ferebant, Asiana gens tumidior alioqui atque iactantior vaniore etiam dicendi gloria inflata est.* – Dion. Hal. *Orat. Vett.* 1-3 describes Asianism as a crazy prostitute (ἑταίρα δὲ τις ἄφρων) who has supplanted true, freeborn, and chaste rhetoric. Corrupt eloquence arrived just yesterday from the pits (βαράθρων, “brothels”?) of Asia – some Mysian woman, a Phrygian, or Carian: ἡ δὲ ἐκ τινῶν βαράθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῶην ἀφικομένη, Μυσηὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν.

³² For the adjective *fractus* as “effeminate,” see Richlin 1997: 94; Gleason 1995: 112.

³³ Cf. the two shorthand labels that Leeman 1963: 94-5, devises to refer to each of Cicero’s (*Brut.* 325) two kinds of Asianism: 1) the *cultus*-type 2) the *tumor*-type. The first is marked by refinement, the other by turgidity; both aspects are salient in Seneca’s description of Fuscus, but particularly the latter type. – It should surprise no one that there are other stylistic features, not detailed here, that are sometimes subsumed under the label Asianism. Indeed, the fact that the label is often little more than a catch-all for various rhetorical ornaments explains its vagueness – and this vagueness, which allows the label to change slightly

presumed lack of real substance (also common in discussions of Asianism, as can be seen from the passages in the preceding long footnote (n. 31)), is implicit in the other criticisms above.³⁴ Asianists are seduced by, and attempt to seduce their listeners with, rhetorical splendor and ornament at the expense of content. Fuscus' aridity in argumentation, proems, and narratives (*C.* 2 pr. 1) is surely not a feature of Asianism; it is the polar opposite of Asianism. But the implication is that aridity is a consequence of Fuscus' commitment to an eloquence that values ornament above substance. Proofs and narrations of events are left stylistically bare because Fuscus finds less opportunity in them for linguistic embellishment.³⁵

It is not strictly accurate to claim that the label Asianism is meaningless, that it does not at times point to objective features of a speaker's style. But there are several reasons that require the label be barred from linguistic analyses such as the present study. First, the label is extremely broad, and indeed, extremely vague. It divides eloquence into two sweeping categories, effusive, florid speech versus spare, content-driven speech.³⁶ More damning, however, is the inherent bias of the label. Even a classification

according to the occasion, explains its utility to those who wish to apply it against an enemy. Cf. in Wooten 1975 the features that are supposed to typify Asianism – features so broad that it is impossible to confine them to certain speakers or even a single century: repeated use of the same *clausulae* (p. 95); faulty word-choice (p. 96); unusual metaphors (p. 96); short, choppy phrases (p. 96-7); antithesis, triadic structure, and rhyme (p. 101); long sentences, rhetorical figures, and poetic language (p. 101).

³⁴ On inanity, see passages in the preceding note, and, e.g., Aristides (Dindorf III.742). Criticism of Fuscus' inanity is apparent also at *S.* 3.4, where Seneca says that in describing the phases of the moon Fuscus imitated Verg. *G.* 1.427-432. Fuscus inserted this description when the context did not require it: *valde autem longe petit et paene repugnante materia, certe non desiderante, inseruit.*

³⁵ Ovid's vices are very similar, with similar consequences. Like Fuscus, he prefers *suasoriae* to *controversiae*, and will practice the latter only when it involves character development. He does not care for argumentation (*C.* 2.2.12): *Declamabat autem Naso raro controversias, et non nisi ethicas; libentius dicebat suasorias. molesta illi erat omnis argumentatio.*

³⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.1 recognizes the difference between genus- versus species-classification: *cum sit autem rhetorices atque oratoris opus oratio pluresque eius formae, sicut ostendam, in omnibus iis et ars est et*

that employs only two categories can be useful, provided the division remains descriptive. Asianism and Atticism are polemical slogans equivalent to ‘good’ speech versus ‘bad,’ ‘us’ versus ‘the other.’ The term Asianist is an instrument not to describe, but to actively disparage, simplify and diminish an opponent. It is hard to imagine that Arellius Fuscus would have accepted the label Asianist.³⁷

The tendentiousness of the label is evident from the word itself, since it is fashioned out of a long-standing cultural stereotype on the part of Romans and Greeks against the non-Greek inhabitants of Asia, who at least since the fifth century BC were regarded as intemperate, morally weak, and effeminate.³⁸ Style was supposed to

artifex, plurimum tamen invicem differunt: nec solum specie, ut signum signo et tabula tabulae et actio actioni, sed genere ipso, ut Graecis Tuscanicae statuae, ut Asianus eloquens Attico.

³⁷ The position argued here that the label *Asianus* is inherently negative and undesirable is not contradicted by Seneca’s comment about a certain Craton (*C.* 10.5.21): *hic est Craton, venustissimus homo et [pro homo et] professus Asianus, qui bellum cum omnibus Atticis gerebat.* What was most memorable about Craton, Seneca means to point out, was his clever humor (*venustissimus homo*; cf. the similar comment about Asilius Sabinus, *S.* 2.12: *venustissimus inter rhetoras scurra* followed by an example of his wit; more examples at *C.* 9.4.17-21. On this type of humor, which is often called *venustus*, see Krostenko 2001: 100-1.). Seneca illustrates Craton’s clownish humor with three quips made to, or in the presence of, Augustus. To set up the first witticism, Seneca says that he was a professed Asianist and waged war against all things Attic: when the emperor gave him a talent, which according to Athenian custom consisted of twenty-four sesterces, he humorously remarked, “Either add to or take something from this amount so that it is not Attic.” No more information is given about Craton’s alleged Asianism. Whether Craton encountered this label on this single occasion or very frequently, this alone is certain from the anecdote: Craton was capable of embracing the derogatory term to good effect. It is conceivable that a speaker might embrace the term Asianism for more serious purposes, as an act of reappropriation – that is, the assertive co-optation of a derogatory epithet. This practice is suggested to me by modern example (e.g. reappropriation of the word “queer”); for an ancient example, cp. the ultimately positive sobriquet of *Cunctator* (“Delayer”) given to the successful Roman general Fabius Maximus Verrucosus. However, even if we imagine that Craton attempted to reappropriate the term as a strategy to bolster his speaking style, this act would not substantiate the existence of a school of style called Asianism.

³⁸ See Said 1979: 56-8; Richlin 1997: 106-7. Arguably the narrative (summarized by Cic. *Brut.* 51 and subsequently adopted by classicists (e.g. Lindner 1862: 13)) of how Attic speech was corrupted as it traveled through Asia has an historic basis: the geographical expansion of Greek language and culture in the Hellenistic period produced changes in Greek speech. For the Greeks, then, the corruptness of Asianism in part consists in an *inability* to speak as native-born Greeks (cf. Wooten 1975: 94). For Latin-speakers, however, the term Asianism as applied to Latin does not have the same historic background and potentially neutral applicability; it refers directly and prejudicially (since it is not a geographic reference, but a reference imbued with a negative cultural stereotype) to stylistic *persona*.

represent a speaker's personal character,³⁹ so that negative identification of a speaker's language could be designed to create a negative perception of an individual. This is clear, for example, in Augustus' propaganda campaign against Mark Antony, whose alleged preference for Asianist speech⁴⁰ is consistent with an intemperate lifestyle and his love affair with the Easterner Cleopatra. From this perspective, the construction and various applications of the term Asianism are a fascinating cultural reality highly worthy of study. On the other hand, as a means to better understand the nature of the language of a given speaker or writer, to understand his artistic program for what it is, the term is worse than useless; it is a smoke-screen. It can obscure our vision and prevent us from seeing an individual's language on its own terms.

3.3 Sentence architecture and prose rhythm

Arellius Fuscus, more than his peers, is concerned to create *cola* with well-defined boundaries. Fuscus is not seen to do this in *all* Entries; but, across the quotations attributed to him, he does so consistently and often in dramatic fashion. This fact shall be illustrated through the examples collected in this section.

In studying this tendency – indeed, in any study of language architecture, colometry, prose rhythm, or word order – it is necessary to be sensitive to a variety of

³⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.17 is quoted above. See especially Sen. *Ep.* 114.

⁴⁰ Plut. *Ant.* 2.8: ἐχρητο δὲ τῷ καλουμένῳ μὲν Ἀσιανῶ ζήλῳ τῶν λόγων, ἀνθοῦντι μάλιστα κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον, ἔχοντι δὲ πολλὴν ὁμοίτητα πρὸς τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ, κομπώδη καὶ φρυαγματίαν ὄντα καὶ κενοῦ γαυριάματος καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀνωμάλου μεστόν; see Pelling 1988: 119-20, who calls Asianism a "mere abusive slogan." See also *Ant.* 24.7, where Antony is moved by the alleged Asianist Hybreas, the same Hybreas whom Fuscus imitates at *C.* 9.6.16. On Augustus' propaganda war, cf. Zanker 1988: 239-63. On the temperance and clarity of Augustus' speech, which is compared favorably against that of Maecenas, M. Antony, and Tiberius, see especially Suet. *Aug.* 86.

organizational devices. By ‘organizational devices’ is meant both the formal linguistic features (e.g. phonetic iteration, parallelism, meter, syntax) and the principles of information structuring⁴¹ that organize language, give shape to it, and thereby collaborate in what a sentence means. These devices can conveniently be subsumed under the category heads of syntax, sound, meter, and information structuring. This point is essential and shall be insisted upon: each organizational device can potentially bear upon the definitions and cohesiveness of word-groups. Emphasizing one organizational device (e.g. syntax) to the neglect of others will almost always make the architecture of a passage seem simpler than it actually is;⁴² more significantly, it can misunderstand the motives that lie behind a certain word order and it can misconstrue a passage’s meaning.

As in the previous chapter, the passages are set out graphically so as to highlight the architectural features under discussion. I have sought to maintain consistency of presentation. Thus, word-groups that cohere (*cola*) are separated from other word-groups through increased spacing between groups and/or by a vertical bar (|). In so far as possible, **bold** forms indicate horizontal correspondence, underlined forms vertical correspondence. Where such a distinction is not strictly possible, **bold** is reserved for corresponding terms that are spatially more proximal to each other, underlined forms are spatially more distant.

⁴¹ For the viewpoint that language is structured information, I rely on linguistic studies, particularly those that utilize principles of Functional Grammar and the Communicative Sentence Perspective. Cf. the subtitle of Devine and Stephens (2006), *Latin Word Order*: “Structured Meaning and Information.” The postulate of these studies is that linguistic expression is designed to present information effectively and efficiently. Parts of a sentence are analyzed in terms of the roles they play in supplying information. For Functional Grammar, see Dik 1997; as applied specifically to Latin see Devine and Stephens 2006; Pinkster 1990; Pinkster 1972. For the Communicative Sentence Perspective, the classic study as applied to Latin is Panhuis 1982.

⁴² For example, Pearce 1966a and 1966b emphasize syntax while neglecting the importance of sound in producing word-groups.

The spacing between letters is expanded (*Sperrdruck*) at the ends of *cola* to mark clausulae.⁴³ Prose rhythm – that is, rhythm that consists of metrical patterns, particularly at the ends of *cola* – is a controversial and difficult subject. To avoid much of the uncertainty that often accompanies studies of prose rhythm, I have highlighted in the examples only those metrical patterns that are widely recognized as rhythmic by modern scholars and ancient rhetoricians alike.⁴⁴ These are:

Type I	Type II
– ∪ – – ∪ (cretic + spondee)	– ∪ – – ∪ – (double cretic)
– ∪ ∪ ∪ – ∪ (esse videatur type)	– – – – ∪ – (molossus + cretic)
– ∪ – ∪ ∪ ∪	
Type III	Type IV
– ∪ – ∪ (double trochee)	– ∪ – ∪ ∪ (cretic + iamb; hypodochmiac)

Unwillingness to attempt an intricate analysis of Fuscus' metrical preferences is more than a matter of convenience; it stems from a lack of confidence in studies that look at clausulae in isolation from other organizational devices. The fact is that what is commonly understood by the term 'prose rhythm' needs to be expanded to include the whole complex of organizational features mentioned above (syntax, sound, meter, information structuring). The idea that 'rhythm' is much more than meter is not new.⁴⁵

⁴³ This is the convention followed by Fraenkel 1968.

⁴⁴ The list is limited; most notably absent is the spondaic ending, which Hutchinson 1995: 485, also excludes. Similar lists of conventional clausulae can be found in Nisbet 1990: 351, Ramsey 2003: 22. Also on metrical patterns, see the heavily statistical study of Aumont 1996, particularly its rich table of figures (pp. 59-142).

⁴⁵ E.g., Chausserie-Laprée 1969; Primmer 1968; Salvatore 1950; Dangel 1982.

No less an authority than Cicero says the same thing.⁴⁶ However, a broad understanding of what rhythm is often does not inform how studies of prose rhythm are conducted.

There is, I hasten to acknowledge, an important exception to the limited scope of studies of prose meter – namely, an accompanying interest in colometry. Students of prose meter have recognized that if they wish to investigate clausulae not just at the ends of sentences but also within a sentence, they need to be able to discover where subdivisions occur.⁴⁷ In short, they need to pay attention to the architecture of the sentence by dividing it into *cola*.

The most prominent and important work on colometry is that of E. Fraenkel,⁴⁸ which has now found several followers and stimulated further research.⁴⁹ But Fraenkel's studies – particularly his last work on the subject, *Leseproben* (1968) – have also proved something of a puzzle and an embarrassment to some students of prose meter. The reason is precisely because he challenges standard notions of rhythm. The challenge is largely implicit, but is also expressed explicitly. In *Leseproben* Fraenkel demonstrates that clausulae can be found in just about any type of Latin prose – in Cicero's speeches, naturally, but also in Cicero's letters, in a speech by Cato the elder,⁵⁰ in a letter from Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, and even in a work of vulgar Latin with no literary pretensions such as the *Mulomedicina Chironis*. The ramifications of this demonstration

⁴⁶ Chênerie 1966 (e.g. p. 58) confirms that Cicero is aware of the functional role that figures of speech have in structuring language. Cic. *Or.* 195 and Arist. *Rh.* 3.8 state that prose is rhythmic, but its rhythm cannot be schematized like poetry.

⁴⁷ See Broadhead 1922; Cunningham 1957. For E. Fraenkel's role in this development and for a useful summary of Fraenkel's work on colometry, see Laughton 1970.

⁴⁸ Fraenkel 1964a, Fraenkel 1964b, Fraenkel 1965, Fraenkel 1968.

⁴⁹ Habinek 1985, Nisbet 1990, Sträterhoff 1995, Markovic 2006.

⁵⁰ Critized by Primmer 1970.

are highly significant: clausulae, Fraenkel states, are but a single part of a larger rhythmic complex – and they are hardly the most important part.⁵¹

Fraenkel's findings have been criticized, as unsupported by a rigorous methodology capable of differentiating between rhythmic and unrhythmic prose;⁵² or, more commonly, they have been enthusiastically adopted and built upon even while their wider implications are ignored. A disconnect between Fraenkel's conclusions and those who build upon his research can be seen, for example, in an important contribution to the subject by R.G.M. Nisbet,⁵³ who states that prose rhythm (i.e. prose meter) is by far the most valuable criterion in determining the internal structures within a sentences – a statement at odds with Fraenkel's view as just cited above and quoted in a footnote. And it is at odds with Fraenkel's stated methodology, since he insisted that meter should be looked at only *after* one has divided a sentence into *cola*.⁵⁴

⁵¹ See Fraenkel 1968: 17, and esp. 19-20: "Damit stehen wir vor einer wichtigen grundsätzlichen Erkenntnis. Für die lateinische rhythmische Prosa von Cato bis zum jüngeren Plinius, und darüber hinaus, ist es kein wesentliches Kennzeichen, wenn sich am Satzende und auch an den Enden kürzerer syntaktischer Einheiten regelrechte 'Klauseln' finden. Wohl aber ist es ein wesentliches Kennzeichen jeder wahrhaft rhythmischen lateinischen Prosa, dass ein Satz sich ganz natürlich in jene kleineren – nicht notwendig syntaktisch bestimmbare – Einheiten zerlegt, die ich Kola nenne und zwischen denen eine dauernde wechselseitige Bezugnahme, ein Widerspiel oder ein Zusammenspiel, ein Hervortreten des einen Gliedes und ein Zurücktreten anderer Glieder, stattfindet. Dass sich dann die einzelnen Kola auch rhythmisch von einander abheben, ist ein bedeutsames, aber keineswegs das wichtigste, geschweige denn das einzige, Symptom ihrer relativen Autarkie." Cf. Holford-Strevens 2003: 61.

⁵² Primmer 1970: 175; Hutchinson 1995: 486.

⁵³ Nisbet 1990: 351. Nisbet praises Fraenkel's work and takes it as the basis of his article; but he also attempts to distance himself slightly by claiming (p. 350) that Fraenkel is interested in colometry, not "rhythm" (with reference to *Leseproben*, p. 14). The distinction glosses over the vital question that Fraenkel's work raises: What is rhythm?

⁵⁴ Fraenkel 1968: 17. Nisbet criticizes Habinek 1985: 351, for focusing on colometry to the neglect of prose meter. In fact, Habinek is but following Fraenkel's example. It is curious that Nisbet (p. 350) says Habinek undervalues Fraenkel's work, given that Habinek (pp. 4-8, 16-17) heartily acknowledges his debt and sees himself as a continuator of Fraenkel.

Prose meter is made rhythmic not simply by employing select metrical patterns; select patterns are felt as now more, now less rhythmic according to the formal context in which they are set.⁵⁵ Organizational devices other than meter (e.g. syntax, sound) – for example, through correspondence and symmetry – will set a select metrical pattern in relief; and in turn the metrical pattern will re-inforce the architecture of a passage by (redundantly) marking the outlines of its parts. The architecture is most conspicuous and emphatic when several organizational devices work together, all confirming the shape and boundaries of *cola*.

3.4 Fuscus creates word-groups possessing highly defined boundaries

To begin, a straightforward example of an Entry showing well-defined *cola* boundaries. Multiple organizing devices are applied to signal sentence architecture.

C. 2.1.4 (H 68,10-12)⁵⁶

Merito abdicasti an immerito?

si immerito abdicasti
si merito

odi patrem tot eicientem innocentes,
odi domum tot facientem nocentes.

The Entry, here given in full, consists of a question followed by parallel pairs of clauses (i.e. binary architecture). The question establishes a theme, and what follows elaborates

⁵⁵ Cf. Chênerie 1966: 65-66, 67, 67 n. 45. – This viewpoint runs contrary to that of most students of prose meter: common practice is to measure *all* end-points to see which rhythms an author prefers. But such calculations are suspect: first, all speech is treated the same, even though not all modes of speech will use rhythm to the same extent or perhaps even in the same way (e.g. narratives vs. descriptions). Secondly, it must be remembered that meter is but one factor that motivates word order, and it is not credible that the word order of a prose author (no matter how metrically minded he is) is always determined by meter to the exclusion of other factors. Given this, the meter in some sentences and phrases will be more deliberate than in others; in some sentences meter will count for very little.

⁵⁶ “Was it justly or unjustly that you disowned [your sons]? If you disowned unjustly, I hate a father who rejects so many innocent men; if justly, I hate a household that makes so many guilty.”

on or specifies the theme. The development of the theme is typically done with point, cleverness, or an element of surprise that makes the Entry memorable. This constitution of Entry is common, as we have already seen in some Entries of Fabianus, and shall be called ‘Proposition and Elaboration.’

The architecture of the Entry is immediately recognizable. The divisions and contours of parallel *cola* are made manifest through identical (*odi*), near-identical (*si immerito, si merito; innocentes, nocentes*), and phonetically similar words (*eicientem, facientem*).⁵⁷ The boundaries of the two parallel sentences are further confirmed through identical clausulae (– ∪ – ∪): *innocentes* corresponds to *-tem nocentes*.

C. 1.1.16⁵⁸

Movit me natura movit pietas

movit humanorum casuum tam manifesto approbata exemplo varietas.

stare ante oculos Fortuna videbatur et dicere:

‘talía his fiunt qui suos non alunt’.

As in the previous example, we find *cola* whose boundaries are marked through identity of sounds: *movit* at the beginning of clauses, and rhyming at the end (*pietas...varietas*). The Entry concludes with what is meant as a kind of oracular statement spoken by Fortune. The well-defined shape and assumed solemnity of Fortune’s pronouncement are effected through end-rhyme, and through a nearly identical metrical pattern between the two members: – ∪ (∪) – ∪ – versus – ∪ – – ∪ –.

⁵⁷ For an example of similarly well defined architecture in Cicero, cf. *Cat. 2.1: Tandem aliquando, Quirites, L. Catilinam, furentem audacia, scelus anhelantem, pestem patriae nefarie molientem, uobis atque huic urbi ferrum flammamque minitatem, ex urbe uel eiecimus, uel emisimus, uel ipsum egredientem uerbis prosecuti sumus*. The Bristol commentary of Gould and Whiteley 1943: 71, attempts to explain Cicero’s use of synonyms and phonetically informed sentence architecture (“rather forced style”) by noting that the speech was delivered to the people rather than the Senate.

⁵⁸ “Nature affected me, loyalty affected me. The mutability of human circumstances, which has been demonstrated by so clear an example, affected me.”

Also noteworthy is the extended length combined with syntactical complexity of the third *colon* (*movit...varietas*) of the tricolon. The subject is a heavily ‘weighted’⁵⁹ noun phrase, consisting of head noun (*varietas*) + dependent participle (*approbata*) + dependent noun (*exemplo*) + dependent genitive with adjective (*humanorum casuum*).⁶⁰ The coherence of this long *colon* is mainly achieved syntactically, by the creation of syntactic expectations in the minds of auditors / readers and by differing the fulfillment of these expectations: genitive phrase (*humanorum casuum*) expects its head noun (*exemplo*), a modifier (*manifesto*) expects its noun (*exemplo*), a participle (*approbata*) expects noun (*varietas*). The subject, which is the head of the noun phrase, is postponed to the very end.

That the subject is last seems also to be characteristic of Fuscus, and shall be addressed further below. The auditor / reader knows to expect that the subject will be expressed from the pattern of the preceding phrases (*movit...natura; movit...pietas*). An initially placed verb along with a terminally placed subject syntactically enclose the *colon*. These syntactical boundaries, as mentioned, are reinforced through phonetic iteration.

C. 1.2.5,⁶¹ Arellius Fuscus

⁵⁹ For “weighted” phrases, that is phrases that achieve a certain independence on account of their length, see Habinek 1985: 5. Similarly, a syntactically complex phrase can be called ‘heavy’; Bolkestein 1998: 187.

⁶⁰ For how placement of the genitive *humanorum casuum* before its head noun (*varietas*) can alter how information is processed, see Jong 1983: 135: when preposed, the modifier is “more or less detached from its head and brought on a level with the major constituents.”

⁶¹ “You were called a prostitute, you stood available in a vulgar locale, an advertisement was set above your chamber, you received visitors. As to the rest – even if I were in a vulgar locale – I would rather not know about it.”

*Meretrix vocata es,
superpositus est cellae tuae titulus,⁶²
cetera etiamsi in communi loco essem*

*in communi loco stetisti,
venientem recepisti:
tamen potius <ne>scirem.*

This Entry does not possess extremely tight correspondences achieved through identical word-forms, as seen in C. 2.1.4. Nonetheless, the pattern of parallel pairs of clauses is the same. End-rhyme along with meter strongly mark the ends of each pair of clauses: *-co stetisti ; -tem recepisti*.

Syntactically the clauses are fairly short and simple. However, the third clause (*superpositus...titulus*) is of special interest since again we observe a terminally placed subject (*titulus*), and again the use of enclosing word order.⁶³ The desire to enclose the *colon* syntactically should be regarded as a primary factor motivating Fuscus to set the subject *titulus* at the end. (Another crucial factor motivating this word order will be discussed in Section 3.6.2.) *Superpositus*, a compound that does not occur before the Augustan Age,⁶⁴ marks the beginning of the word-group by virtue of its relative novelty. Fuscus' speech, as will become apparent in the course of the discussion, often identifies itself through uncommon or specialized compounds.

The passage was adduced in Chapter 1 as an example of a shared *locus*. A comparison with the quotations of the two other speakers who converge on this point in

⁶² Type I clausula with resolution.

⁶³ Markovic 2006 argues that this kind of hyperbaton serves as punctuation: it marks the end of a sense-unit. He is correct, but scholars (e.g., Pearce 1966a and 1966b; Hodgman 1924) have long understood this to be the case. – Another example by Fuscus of enclosing word order, C. 1.8.2: *'Numquid luxuriam' inquit 'obicis?' ego vero te etiam hortari possum in voluptates: quousque duro castrorum iacebis cubili? quousque somnum classico rumpes? quousque cruentus vives?*

⁶⁴ For example, Liv. 1.34.9; 21.27.5. The majority of attestations for this word appear in technical writers; Columella uses it far more (approximately 54 times, which is over half all attestations from antiquity) than any other single author.

Comments are concerned with the first long question of this Entry. (Håkanson begins a new Entry with *filium*, but *filium quaeris* seems to pick up on *quaesieris* of the preceding question, so it is included here.) The essential point is to recognize that word-choice and the ultimate form that the question takes have been heavily influenced by Fuscus' desire to fashion a certain rhythm and shape.

There are, again, two pairs of clauses with sufficiently strong marking of boundaries. Formal markers include clausulae and end-rhyme (*soli...frui*). There is some uncertainty about the reading *soli*;⁶⁷ in its support, it has been accepted by Håkanson, Winterbottom, Bornecque, and Müller. If *soli* is correct, a positive desire for end-rhyme can further be detected in this choice of vocabulary rather than the more common *agri* or *terrae*.⁶⁸

In addition to formal boundary markers, after *quisquis es* a discernible pattern is established of *cola* pairs of roughly the same length. The first pair consists of appositive noun phrases (head noun + genitive). The second pair presents an antithesis, contrasting 'many' and 'all' (*multa – omnibus*), 'seek' and 'enjoy' (*quaesieris – frui*).

The architecture is apparent in itself, but is made more salient when Fuscus' question is set beside others of the same type. The question can be reduced to a skeleton formula that authors variously adapt: *quisquis es* + substantive that characterizes the

⁶⁷ *sili* **V B** *fili* **A**. The source of the reading *soli* is the corrector of **T** (Brussels, B.R., 2025; 13th cent.). It is very doubtful that variants supplied by the corrector (**τ**) have any independent manuscript authority; the fundamental study of this question is Hagendahl 1936: 313-22.

⁶⁸ This passage is the only instance of *cultor* combined with *soli*. Examples of the combination *cultor* and *agri*: Sal. *Jug.* 54.3; Liv. 2.34.11; 26.35.5; 27.12.6. For *cultor* together with *terrae*, Cic. *N.D.* 2.99; Mela 1.111. Particularly relevant to the Fuscine Entry are passages that speak of a humble *cultor* of a small tract of land: Ov. *Fast.* 5.499 (*senex Hyrieus angusti cultor agelli*), and 515 (*cultorem pauperis agri*); [*Verg.*] *Moretum* 3 (*Simulus exigui cultor cum rusticus agri*).

person addressed + subordinate clause (*cum* clause or relative clause) + main clause. The sequence in which the parts of the formula appear vary somewhat.

C. 2.3.19 (Triarius): *at tu quisquis es carnifex cum strictam sustuleris securem, antequam ferias patrem respice.*

Verg. *A.* 6.388-9 (Charon reproaches Aeneas):
*quisquis es armatus qui nostra ad flumina tendis,
fare age quid venias iam istinc et comprime gressum.*

Sen. *Ben.* 2.29.4:
*Proinde, quisquis es iniquus aestimator sortis humanae cogita quanta nobis
tribuerit parens noster, quanto valentiora animalia sub iugum miserimus, quanto
velociora consequamur, quam nihil sit mortale non sub ictu nostro positum.*

Statius, *Theb.* 2.696-9:
*trepido Tydeus inmitia mandat:
'quisquis es Aonidum quem crastina munere nostro
manibus exemptum mediis Aurora videbit,
haec iubeo perferre duci:*

Each passage exhibits a division after the characterizing substantive (underlined). Syntactically this division is achieved by beginning a new construction: a *cum*-clause, relative clause, or imperative. A division, as it were, is built into the formula. The examples from Vergil and Statius further confirm the division at this point through a coincidence of a strong caesura.⁶⁹ Fuscus, in order to create the desired binary architecture, has doubled this member of the formula by including another characterizing substantive phrase fashioned as a mirror image of the first. Symmetry aids in establishing the two appositive phrases as structurally separate *cola*.

⁶⁹ Therefore, modern editions sometimes punctuate the phrase *quisquis es* (+ substantive) incorrectly by placing a comma after *es*; thus the OCT (Mynors) of Vergil, *ad loc.* Cf. also, Tib. 1.4.59 (*at tua qui uenerem docuisti uendere primus | quisquis es infelix, urgeat ossa lapis*), where *infelix* has commonly been assumed to agree with *lapis*. Similarly, punctuation should not separate *quisquis es* from a following vocative: Ov. *Met.* 2.692 (*'quisquis es hospes' ait, 'si forte armenta requiret'*); 12.80 (*'quisquis es o iuuenis' dixit 'solamen habeto'*); Pers. 1.44.

It should be observed, in addition, that Fuscus employs enclosing word order in both his versions of the descriptive phrase, whereas the phrase in the other examples do not. The version of the younger Seneca is closest as regards complexity, but the arrangement of governing and subordinate elements does not enclose. Instead, the word order is linear:⁷⁰ modifiers are set next to their nouns with no interruption between syntactical expectation and fulfillment. Thus Seneca foregoes the opportunity to create a more cohesive *colon*.

These two short Entries from Fuscus exhibit a familiar binary architecture effected through the devices now under discussion:

C. 2.1.4 (H 68,6-7)⁷¹

Ita nos pauperes sumus qui habemus quod divites rogent?

C. 2.1.4 (H 68,12-14)⁷²

*Aliquid in domo locupleti non **agendum agam**:
 quae apud nos frugalitas est apud illos humilitas est*

The clausulae in C. 2.1.4 (H 68,6-7) are identical: $_ \cup _ _ \cup _$. Fuscus makes the most of the fact that *pauperes* and *divites* are similar: in number of syllables, in endings in *-es*, and – especially – in metrical shape (cretics). Semantically the two words correspond through antithesis, and do so easily in various compositional settings.⁷³ But

⁷⁰ For the role of discontinuity in syntactical analysis, see Touratier 1994: 333-4.

⁷¹ “Are we so poor who have what rich men beg for?”

⁷² “I shall do something thought inappropriate in a wealthy household: what we consider thrift, they [*sc.* the rich] consider servility.”

⁷³ For other examples of *dives* and *pauper* used in antitheses, but in a different type of word arrangement from that seen in Fuscus’ Entry, cf. Liv. 2.9.6 (*tributo plebes liberata, ut divites conferrent qui oneri ferendo essent: pauperes satis stipendii pendere, si liberos educarent*); 34.4.14-15; V. Max. 4.4.9; Sen. C.

Fuscus creates an architecture in which this semantic correspondence will be most palpable: the question is shaped into parallel clauses, and the antithetical adjectives are placed in identical positions within their respective *cola*. The phonetic and metrical harmony between the two words concentrates the auditor's / reader's attention on these two corresponding points in the *cola*. We are made to observe similarities of meter and sound in order to induce us to compare meanings (*pauperes* vs. *divites*).

This is a fine example of how word arrangement can operate together with meter to produce a well-defined organization. Meter matters a great deal in such a structure. The fact that meter and sound direct our attention within the sentence and affect how we process the Entry exemplifies how well-defined architecture is inextricably bound with function and meaning. Very similar motives are at work in 2.1.4 (H 68,12-14), namely with respect to *frugalitas est* and *humilitas est*.

C. 2.1.5 (H 68,14-17)⁷⁴

*Colit etiamnunc in Capitolio casam | victor omnium gentium populus
cuius tantam felicitatem nemo miratur.
merito potens est: nempe ab eius origine est qui non reliquit patrem.*

Binary architecture for this Entry as a whole is largely absent. But its opening clause (*colit...populus*) merits scrutiny. Syntactically there would be little rationale for drawing a division within the clause, as I have done, if the word arrangement (*compositio*) were different. The structure serves to point up an affecting contrast: on the

(Argentarius) 2.1.23; 10.1 (in the *thema*). Closer rhythmically to Fuscus' Entry is Sen. *Ep.* 18.8: *Securius divites erimus, | si scierimus quam non sit grave pauperes esse.*

⁷⁴ "Even now on the Capitol a hut is revered by a people that is the conqueror of all nations. No one wonders at their great fortune. They are justly powerful: they trace their origin to a man [*sc.* Aeneas] who did not abandon his father [Anchises]."

one hand, a lowly hut (*casa*); the hut is revered, on the other hand, by the conqueror of all nations (*victor omnium gentium*). By means of alliteration (in bold) and word arrangement, Fuscus splits the clause in half.⁷⁵ Word order is remarkable for initial placement of the verb with terminal placement of the subject. (This phenomenon shall be given greater consideration in Section 3.6.) The first half of the clause (*colit...casam*) coheres as a group through postponement of the verb's direct object (*casam*), as well as through alliteration. The subject noun phrase (*victor ... populus*) is grouped by enclosing word order.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that also within the noun phrase *victor omnium gentium populus* Fuscus prefers a word arrangement that contributes to the desired architecture, namely rhythmically well-defined word-groups.⁷⁶ The appositive phrase *victor omnium gentium* is equivalent to an attribute modifying the noun *populus*. Pre-posing this attribute phrase, rather than placing it after the subject (e.g. *populus victor omnium gentium*), creates syntactic tension: the pre-positioned attribute expects a governing constituent (*populus*), whereas a pre-positioned head would require nothing. Syntactic tension creates cohesiveness within the word-group. Thus the weighted noun phrase gains rhythmic semi-independence and stands in counterpoise to the alliterating group that precedes (humble dwelling vs. world conqueror).

⁷⁵ The division is recognized in **V** by a medial point.

⁷⁶ The phrase or close variants thereof also occur in other authors. With post-ponement of attribute phrase: Cic. *de Orat.* 2.76; *Phil.* 4.15; *Phil.* 6.12; *Pis.* 16; Plin. *Nat. pr.* 16; Plin. *Pan.* 51.3. With pre-posed attribute phrase: Sen. *Ben.* 5.15.6; Plin. *Nat.* 3.5. – *Victor* belongs to a class of verbal substantives in *-or* (*-trix*) often used in apposition to a substantive; Nägelsbach 1905: 221-6; Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: I.232-3. Passages where the attribute phrase is pre-posed often include a form of *ille*; e.g. Cic. *Mil.* (*sustinisset crimen primum ipse ille latronum occultator et receptor locus*); *Att.* 8.3.3; Liv. 28.19.15 (*domitor ille totius Hispaniae exercitus*).

C. 2.1.6 (H 68,24 – 69,1)⁷⁷

*Ego in domum vestram intrabo tamquam ego vos eiecerim?
ego ornamenta vestra occupabo? tum me si illic quid commiserō nec meus recipiat pater.*

For the most part the binary organization of 2.1.6 is evident and comparable to passages discussed above. There is some textual uncertainty in the final quarter of this Entry (*tum me...pater*). The fact that structurally the passage becomes unpredictable and detached from what has preceded justifies editors' sense that it is in need of emendation.⁷⁸ Whatever the solution, it is to be noted that here again is another Entry in which we find terminal placement of the subject (*me...recipiat pater*).

3.5 Word-groups serve as informational frames

C. 2.1.6 (H 69,1 – 69,7)⁷⁹

*Quid est quod aut negandum mihi aut excusandum sit?
non insanissimum dispendiorum malum non erubescendos amores
neque luxuriantem habitum neque potatus obicis filio.*

haec si non potes aliqua saltem ex commentariis amici tui describe:

*madentem unguentis externis
convulneratum libidinibus
incedentem ut feminis placeat femina mollius
et cetera quae morbi non iudici sunt.*

5

⁷⁷ “Shall I enter your house, as if I was the one who threw you out? Shall I lay claim to your trappings? Then if I do anything wrong there not even my own father would accept me.”

⁷⁸ **A B:** *tu si illud quid (illi quod V) commiserō nec meus recipiat pater.*

⁷⁹ “What is there that I need to deny or excuse? You do not reproach your son with insane financial indulgences, nor with shameful love affairs, nor with luxurious clothing, nor with drinking. If you cannot criticize me on these grounds, at least offer some descriptions from the notebook of your friend: dripping with exotic perfumes, wounded by lusts, strutting more effeminately than a woman to attract women – and other things which are the product not of bad judgment, but of disease.”

The constitution of the Entry is of the ‘Proposition and Elaboration’ type. Here there are two Propositions: 1. *Quid est...excusandum sit?* (line 1). 2. *haec si non...describe* (line 4). Each Proposition is followed by an Elaboration consisting of two pairs of word-groups. The young man argues how good a son he is by listing the vices in which he might have engaged but did not; he next narrows his focus on one particular moral failure that he has avoided – the personality of the effeminate young man. This is a common topic in declamation, and can be found in various Latin authors.⁸⁰

The outlines of the architecture are well visible. Each Elaboration comprises a series of phonetically marked *cola* of similar length and identical syntactic function. The priority of this architecture is detected, for example, in the phrase *incedentem ut feminis placeat femina mollius*, where adverb and verb are separated to enclose the word-group. It is also detected in the use of an uncommon circumlocution for profligacy (= *luxuria, sumptus*): *insanissimum dispendiorum malum*. The objective of such a circumlocution, at least in part, is to create shape, to produce a group of words of sufficient length that they possess ‘body’ and semi-independence. The same objective lies behind the use of the word-pair *nego excuso*.⁸¹ Casting the pair as gerundives produces phonetic near identity between two words whose affinity rests more on semantics than sound; and it lengthens the pair into stand-alone phrases.

But recognition of the artifice employed to produce this architecture is only part of the story, since it does not account for the overall effect of the artifice. The patterns

⁸⁰ For example, *C.* 2.6.1 (Porcius Latro); 2.6.7 (Cestius Pius); 2.6.9 (Fuscus; see discussion below); *Cic. Pis.* 25; *Verg. A.* 4.215-17; *Man.* 5.146-153; *Sen. Nat.* 7.31.2. See also Winterbottom 1974: II.639 (s.v. luxury), and Edwards 2002: 63-97.

⁸¹ That it is a word-pair with some currency can be seen from *C.* 1.4.8 (Albucius Silus); *Sen. Ben.* 2.12.1; *Quint. Inst.* 4.2.8.

observed are not produced simply for themselves, as a mere technical display seeking admiration, or as an ornament to informational content. The architecture organizes information. Thus, each *colon* in the Elaboration portions of the Entry frames one, and only one, idea. In the first Elaboration, we find the sequence: expense ... love ... dress ... drink. In the second Elaboration: perfumes ... lust ... effeminate gait. The architecture renders information easy to process. In this way it conforms to a basic principle of linguistic communication, recognized by students of Functional Grammar, that only one novel idea is presented at a time.⁸²

It is crude to regard what the Entry presents to auditors / readers as ‘information.’ All the same, to consider the functionality of the architecture gets at something essential to its purpose and motivation. The well defined *cola* are a means to focus attention, to set within a framework what the auditor / reader should regard as important and should consider carefully. And what is within each frame is not simply a new piece of information, a raw datum; at the same moment, the frame showcases language. To state this more comprehensively, and more accurately (since this formulation risks seeing language as vain ornament, separate from information), the framework showcases what the speaker *does with language*. It is necessary to state it so broadly since language in any case is ‘meaningful’ – whether we consider how it constructs information or how it functions in a literary context or social setting.

The idea that in part Fuscus has built *cola* in order to highlight what is happening linguistically within their frameworks is supported by the often impressive vocabulary and constructions found there. ‘Impressive’ is a better qualification of what is being

⁸² Slings 1997: 194.

highlighted than, for instance, ‘novel.’ This is to avoid the generalization that Fuscus’ primary goal is to produce vocabulary and constructions that are unprecedented and strange. What is impressive is not necessarily new; it is seldom through novelty alone that Fuscus aims to impress.

The circumlocution *insanissimum dispendiorum malum* builds a word-group; in addition, the use of a neuter adjective as substantive, such as *malum* or *bonum*, is notable since it is typical of philosophical and technical discourse.⁸³ The gerundive of *erubesco*, which is found one other time in Seneca’s collection at *C.* 7.6.8 (again in an Entry from Fuscus), apparently becomes current only after the turn of the millennium.⁸⁴ The noun *potatus* is found only twice in the entire Latin corpus, here and in Apuleius (*Met.* 7.10.4), himself an intensely productive Latin stylist.

Two other declaimers contribute parallel Entries. Similarities to Fuscus’ Entry above show these three speakers acutely aware of one another.

2.1.14 (Cornelius Hispanus)

Quid mihi obicit? meretricis amo? aes alienum feci? dic, dives audiat.

2.1.15 (Triarius)

Quare abdicas? numquid dies noctesque impendo turpibus conviviis? plurimum vivo in lupanari? si nescis quae crimina obiciantur, ab amico disce.

All three speakers participate in a shared *locus*, as overlaps in argument and vocabulary demonstrate: “What does the father reproach the son with?” (Fuscus: *Quid*

⁸³ Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: I.228-9; Nägelsbach 1905: 105; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 154. – In Fuscus’ circumlocution (*malum dispendiorum*), the genitive defines the neuter abstract noun. So far as I am aware, there is not another example of *malum* with a defining genitive in classical Latin; see *TLL* (s.v. *malus, a, um*), VIII.227.28-34. For the use of *bonum* with a defining (or ‘appositive’) genitive, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.109 (*bonis laudis et gloriae*); *Fam.* 15.14.3 (*bono litterarum*).

⁸⁴ Once in Horace (*Carm.* 1.27.14), once in Livy (38.59.11). The remaining authors (in 16 attestations) are post-Augustan. The use is well attested in Christian authors.

obicit? Hispanius: *Quid obicit?* Triarius: *Quare abdicas?*) “Visiting prostitutes? debt? spending money on parties?” (Fuscus: *erubescendos amores; dispendiorum malum; potatus*. Hispanius: *meretricis; aes alienum*. Triarius: *lupanari; turpibus convivii*). “Compare my non-existent ‘indulgences’ with your rich friend’s real indulgences” (Fuscus: *ex commentariis amici describe*. Triarius: *ab amico disce*. Hispanius: *dives audiat*).

Conspicuously absent from the Entries of Cornelius Hispanius and Triarius is highly defined word-groups, such as is found in Fuscus’ Entry, as well as impressive diction and syntactic constructions comparable to Fuscus’. It is not unfair to remark that the Entries of Hispanius and Triarius pale in comparison to Fuscus’. This may be equally a function of the process of recording and editing quotations – that is, of interpretive reception – as it is of objective differences in how these three declaimers performed. The Entries from Cornelius Hispanius and Triarius lack the amount of elaboration and the listing of vices found in the Entry from Fuscus. It is possible that in their performances Hispanius and Triarius did not include descriptions here that are as full as Fuscus’; but it is also possible that their descriptions were simply omitted because they were eclipsed by Fuscus’. Fuscus came to be identified with his descriptions (*S.* 2.10). It is certainly not the case that other speakers did not practice *explicatio*; rather, *explicatio* is what Fuscus excelled at and was celebrated for.

The description in the second Elaboration of the dissolute, effeminate young man has several parallels in Latin literature.⁸⁵ A comparison of these passages (which both pre- and post-date Fuscus’ Entry) with Fuscus’ Entry show the rhetor operating self-

⁸⁵ Cic, *Pis.* 25; *Man.* 5.146-153; *Sen. Nat.* 7.31.2 (cf. *Verg. A.* 4.215-18).

consciously and creatively within a well-known tradition: Fuscus both receives the tradition from predecessors and he alters it as he passes it on to later authors.

The observation that Fuscus' quotation can be located in an evolutionary chain may seem obvious and hardly necessary to point out. But a thorough appreciation of this fact can profoundly alter our understanding of Arellius Fuscus, and others included in Seneca's anthology, and the role they play in literary history. Declamation has often been seen as a genre apart – lacking constructive participation in the formation of literary and intellectual traditions. Its acknowledged influence on Silver Latin authors is not an exception since it has traditionally been regarded as a corruption, an external infiltration. Recognition that an Entry, such as that of Fuscus' here, has literary antecedents and belongs *within* a tradition emphasizes what literary genres – including declamation – share in common. It allows a rhetor such as Fuscus at least the opportunity of literary legitimacy and identity. This literary identity achieves detailed clarity in the moments of performative engagement (shared *loci*) that are recorded in Seneca's anthology. At *C.* 2.1.6 (H 69,1 – 69,7) Fuscus finds a unique identity in his description of the dissolute youth.

These ideas shall be explored more fully in Chapter 4. For the moment, a brief observation on the present passage will show how Fuscus' diction and syntactical constructions betray contact with specific cultural, literary, and intellectual context(s).

The phrase *convulneratum libidinibus* ("wounded by passions")⁸⁶ appears to follow in a

⁸⁶ Except in the *Bellum Africanum* (9 times!), forms of *convulnero* are uncommon: Celsus (1), Columella (1), younger Seneca (2), Curtius Rufus (1), elder Pliny (1), Frontinus (2), younger Pliny (1), Apul. *Met.* (3). (For the *Bellum Africanum*, whose language has often been termed 'colloquial' but more recently has been seen to reflect the diversity and non-standardization of Latin in the late Republic, see Adams 2005.) Only Fuscus and the younger Seneca (*Dial.* 2.17.1; 9.11.5) use this verb metaphorically; but see also Apul. *Met.* 6.22 (quoted in the following footnote).

specific intellectual and literary lineage, traceable to Plato.⁸⁷ The use of *morbis* in reference to the perverse effects of passions on the intellect also finds its source in philosophical discourse.⁸⁸ An antithesis of “disease” and “judgment” reappears in a quotation of Fuscus at C. 2.6.9,⁸⁹ where again the topic is luxuriant living.

C. 2.1.7 (H 69,10-15)⁹⁰

*Non tibi per multos fulva liberos domus est*⁹¹ *neque turba lateri circumerrat*
nec multus intra limen heres est *nec post me ali<us> quem retineas.*⁹²
quamquam ne sic quidem debuisti dare,
quom etiam deos cum votis patris vidisses certantis:
et tutior adversus fortunam est *cui aliquid post damnum superest* 5
et habemus exemplum *posse aliquem tres filios perdere.*

This is among the most memorable and characteristic of Fuscine Entries. It is exemplary of the principles of architecture and expression identified as underlying the

⁸⁷ Plato, *Grg.* 524e; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.6.2, remarks on Tiberius’ mental sufferings with veiled reference to Plato: *neque frustra praestantissimus sapientiae firmare solitus est, si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse aspici laniatus et ictus, quando ut corpora verberibus, ita saevitia libidine malis consultis animus dilaceretur.* Apul. *Met.* 6.22 (Jupiter speaks to Cupid of the wounds Cupid has inflicted): “*Licet tu,*” inquit “*domine fili, numquam mihi concessu deum decretum servaris honorem, sed istud pectus meum quo leges elementorum et vices siderum disponuntur convulneraris assiduis ictibus crebrisque terrenae libidinis foedaveris casibus...*” Also, cf. Sal. *Hist.* frg. 77.11 (Reynolds).

⁸⁸ Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 1.59; 3.35; *Tusc.* 3.5; Graver 2002: 73-4; Booth 1997: 160-7. Also see Chapter 4’s discussion of S. 5.1.

⁸⁹ *Consilium* is used rather than *iudicium*. Other authors oppose *iudicium* to *morbis*, e.g. C. 1.6.9 (Latro); [Sal.] Cic. 1.1.

⁹⁰ “You do not have a household propped up by many children, nor does a crowd flit around you, nor do you have many an heir within the house, nor after me do you have someone in reserve. Although, not even in these conditions should you have given me away, when you saw the gods too contesting the wishes of the rich father. Consider two things: (*et*) safer against misfortune is the man who, after financial loss, possesses something in reserve; and (*et*) we have an instructive example that a man can lose three children.”

⁹¹ Type I, with resolution.

⁹² *nec potest aliquem retineas* **BA** *nec post te aliquem retineas* **V**. The impressiveness of the three preceding clauses make Müller’s conjecture (accepted by Håkanson) seem flat. Has *potest aliquem* been derived from *posse aliquem* below (line 6)?

previous Entry: pairs of well-defined *cola* organize the passage and create platforms to showcase language. Beside phonetic correspondences to mark the boundaries of *cola*, the postponement of words syntactically dependent on governing words (line 1: multos fulta liberos domus) (line 2: *multus...heres*) extends *cola* and maintains cohesiveness. Also noteworthy is the use of terminally placed subjects: *domus*; *heres*.

The first four *cola* all approach the same idea – namely, that the *pauper* father has but one son.⁹³ However, each *colon* contributes to this idea separately through a series of concise images alluding to the benefits of having many children: like pillars to a house they sustain a family’s existence (*non...domus est*); like clients they surround a father and are a visible display of his power (*neque ... circumerrat*);⁹⁴ they are heirs to the family estate (*nec...heres est*); and like a preserve of money several children are insurance against misfortune (*nec post...retineas*).⁹⁵

Several instances of remarkable diction and constructions occur within the frameworks of *cola*. The architectural metaphor – likening the animant (*liberi*) to the inanimant (*fulta*) – used to describe the essential role of children to a family closely anticipates Pliny, *Ep.* 4.21.3.⁹⁶ The compound *circumerrat* is rare in the Latin corpus, and is unique with the dative.⁹⁷ The use of the singular *multus* is markedly poetic.⁹⁸

⁹³ The author of the excerpted tradition characteristically excerpted just the first of these *cola*, presumably regarding the other three as superfluous.

⁹⁴ For similar expressions to refer to a person of authority and the command he holds over a crowd, cf. Verg. *G.* 4.215-16 (*illum admirantur et omnes | circumstant fremitu denso stipantque frequentes*); Sen. *Ep.* 17.3 (*non circumstat illam [sc. paupertatem] turba seruatorum*); Ov. *Met.* 2.394. See Fuscus in the Entry analyzed just below (*C.* 2.1.8, *quos...circumstetere lictores*).

⁹⁵ For the comparison of children with money, cf. what follows (lines 5-6): *et tutior adversus fortunam est cui aliquid post damnum [= “financial loss”] superest*.

⁹⁶ *Nam patrem illarum defunctum quoque perseverantissime diligo, ut actione mea librisque testatum est; cui nunc unus ex tribus liberis superest, domumque pluribus adminiculis paulo ante fundatam desolatus*

C. 2.1.8 (H 69,20-24)⁹⁹

Hoc <animo> scio nostros fuisse maiores:

hoc illum Aelium Tuberonem cuius paupertas virtus fuit

hoc Fabricium Samnitium non accipientem munera

hoc ceteros patres nostros

quos apud aratra ipsa mirantes decora sua circumsteter¹⁰⁰ lictores.

Again another Entry that follows the pattern of Proposition and Elaboration. The Entry commences by stating that Romans of old were of a certain mindset, namely they led a severely frugal and simple lifestyle. The Elaboration consists of a short list of *exempla* that confirm the Proposition. A very similar pattern of listing of moral *exempla*, on the same theme (*De abstinentia et continentia*) but on a larger scale, can be found in Valerius Maximus (4.3.1-14).¹⁰¹

fulcit ac sustinet. Also cf. Sen. *Dial.* 6.15.2: *exhausta Caesarum turba adoptione desertam domum fulsit*. Both passages are cited with the Fuscus passage in *TLL* s.v. *fulcio*. *Fulcio* with *per* is uncommon; perhaps the only other instances: Stat. *Theb.* 6.862; Tert. *Resurr.* 7. Similar, but without *fulcio*, is Tac. *Ann.* 1.3.24: *sed quo pluribus munimentis insisteret* [sc. *Tiberi domus*]. For the comparison of a son to the support structure of a household in Greek literature, see Aesch. *Ag.* 897-8; Eur. *IT* 44-55 (I owe these examples to Christina Kraus).

⁹⁷ For *circumerro* with an accusative object, see Verg. *A.* 2.599. For a similar compound verb (*circumfundo*) with the dative, cf. Liv. 22. 14: *contionanti Minucio circumfundebatur Romanorum multitudo*.

⁹⁸ *OLD*, s.v. *multus*, 1.c., where this passage is cited; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 162; Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: I.70, Anmerk. 3.

⁹⁹ “This, I know, was the mindset of our elders: of the great Aelius Tubero whose poverty was a virtue; of Fabricius who refuses the gifts of the Samnites; of other ancestors of ours, whom the lictors surround while, standing at the plow, they gaze in wonder at the symbols of their own authority.” For the symbolic authority (*decus*) of the fasces in connection with the *exemplum* of Cincinnatus, cf. V. Max. 2.7.7.

¹⁰⁰ *circumsteterere* appears in **D** (Brussels, B.R., 9144), and is accepted by Håkanson. *cicumsteterunt* **B** *circumsteter* (with bar over *r*) **V A**.

¹⁰¹ E.g. 4.3.6: *Idem sensit* [cf. Fuscus’ *hoc animo*] *Fabricius Luscinus...qui a Samnitibus, quos uniuersos in clientela habebat, decem milia aeris et quinque pondo argenti, totidem seruos sibi missos in Samnitium remisit*. On the use of *exempla* in Valerius’ collection, see Bloomer 1992.

The architecture of the Fuscine Entry has much in common with foregoing passages. But the discussion has arrived at a point where I think it superfluous to demonstrate at length the fact that well-defined *cola* inform Fuscus' Entries and to detail the methods by which word-groups and their definitions are built. The structures observed will remain important to the discussion and, since it is in the interest of this study to show Fuscus' consistency in this practice throughout Seneca's anthology, their presence will continue to be noted. However, the examination must now advance by considering Fuscus' *compositio* within word-groups. Specifically, we shall examine more closely the motivation(s) behind the frequency of postponed subjects in Fuscus' sentences.

3.6 Subject-final word order, Presentational sentences, thetic perspective

Already in comments on several passages I have noted the placement of the subject in the final position, or near-final position, of a *colon*. This type of word order, whereby the subject is at or near the end of its clause (and which I shall refer to as 'subject-final' order) is not altogether unusual in Latin authors. It is, however, what most Latin grammarians consider a 'marked' word order – which is to say, it is reserved for special purposes.¹⁰² (The 'unmarked,' or neutral, order has the subject at the beginning of the sentence.) Its persistence, therefore, in the quotations of Fuscus – a persistence that shall find further confirmation in additional passages – is intriguing and wants an explanation.

¹⁰² Devine and Stephens 2006: 37-9; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 401-2; Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: II.597-8; Pinkster 1990: 171, 176; Jong 1989: 524; Panhuis 1982: 125-6.

In the passage analyzed immediately above (C. 2.1.8, H 69,20-24) we find two terminally placed subjects: *maiores* and *lictiores*. (The fact that *maiores* is actually accusative does not disqualify it; it is the subject of an accusative-infinitive construction.)¹⁰³ From our examinations of previous passages we are well equipped to give at least a partial explanation for the placement of these words: *maiores* and *lictiores* correspond phonetically. They help structure the individual *cola* in which they are placed and, more broadly, they give structure to the Entry as markers of its beginning and end. But why use *subjects* to do this, which when expressed tend to be placed towards the beginnings of clauses?

Our task is to discover whether this word order can be justly regarded as a salient feature of Fuscus' practice, as witnessed in the anthology. Since terminally placed subjects frequently occur in Fuscus' quotations it is tempting immediately to regard the practice as a characteristic of his style. But this conclusion should not be made hastily. There are a variety of reasons why a subject may appear at the end of a sentence. Moreover, the placement of the subject in terminal position may not in and of itself be Fuscus' objective, but may be the effect of other motivating factors. Close examination of Entries with subject-final order is needed in order to understand its role.

To ensure that the discussion is sensitive to the diverse factors that may motivate Fuscus' word order, the following analysis will at times draw on concepts and insights from theoretical linguistics – especially on studies that look at the pragmatic, or communicative, functions of word placement. Nonetheless, since the present study insists on the potential complexity of motivating factors that underlie sentence

¹⁰³ Fraenkel 1964b: 101, demonstrates that accusative + infinitive constructions are capable of forming *cola*.

architecture and word order, the methods of analysis utilized thus far will not be abandoned: passages will continue to be spaced according to word groups; phonetic iteration when especially prominent will be marked in bold; and word groups that terminate in canonical clausulae will be demonstrated through expanded spacing between letters (*Sperrdruck*).

It has long been held as common knowledge that words occupying the final position of a Latin sentence receive ‘emphasis.’¹⁰⁴ Moreover, it is believed that one of the defining characteristics of Silver Latin is the use of epigrams containing a clever and surprising flash of brilliance at the end (*fulmen in clausula*).¹⁰⁵ It has been assumed that the tendency to create epigrams of this sort was fostered by a desire for applause from audiences at recitations and declamations.¹⁰⁶ J. Marouzeau called this tendency “l’art du final,”¹⁰⁷ and literary historians regard its impact on Latin literature of the early empire as widespread. Given the nature of Seneca’s anthology and the date of the quotations contained therein, there is reasonable basis *a priori* to speculate that terminally placed

¹⁰⁴ See Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.29. Many grammarians, notably students of Functional Grammar, now regard the term ‘emphasis’ as vague and inadequate. Jong 1989: 527, retains it but tries to apply the term with greater rigor and meaning.

¹⁰⁵ Giancotti 1992; Bonner 1966; Bonner 1949: 151-3, 165-6; Syme 1958: 199.

¹⁰⁶ Norden 1915-18: 274; and see the discussion of the ‘pointed style’ by Summers 1910: xv-xvii.

¹⁰⁷ Marouzeau 1922, 1938, 1949: III.143: “Le sujet parlant, l’écrivain surtout, réserve volontiers pour le moment où l’énoncé s’interrompt une idée notable, un mot à effet. Le procédé fait partie de l’art de la présentation. A un degré éminent, quand il s’agit de l’art oratoire ou dramatique, l’effet final est destiné à provoquer l’applaudissement. Et dans la littérature de Rome un cas s’est présenté où l’art du “finale” [my emphasis] a joué un rôle considérable: c’est lors de la diffusion des lectures publiques ou récitations. Nous voyons nettement, à partir de l’Empire, se constituer dans les œuvres littéraires des ‘morceaux’ composés pour le public et aboutissant à une clausule soignée en vue de l’effet. Il est naturel que cette nouvelle technique appelle en fin de développement, donc en fin de phrase, un terme de valeur.” Cf. *C.* 7.4.10, where Latro ridicules the audience’s love of a brilliant ending to an epigram.

subjects in Fuscus' Entries are especially emphatic – that is to say, they contain an unexpected or brilliant point.¹⁰⁸ As we shall see, however, seldom is this an apt characterization of subject-final order in Fuscus' Entries.

Fundamental to modern linguistic studies of Latin word order is the idea that a sentence often presents to the reader / auditor two basic types of information: 1) information that is known, and 2) information that is new. The known information – the contextual framework within which new information will be offered – is called Topic. The new information is called Focus: it is the Focus, more than any other part of the sentence, that demands the auditor's / reader's attention. This is best illustrated with an example:¹⁰⁹

- a) Where did you buy that hat, John?
- b) I bought it at the flea market.

The subject of this exchange is a hat John bought. In sentence b) the known information, or Topic, is 'the hat John bought.' The new and notable information, or Focus, is 'at the flea market.'

The binary categories of known and new information, as grammarians themselves concede,¹¹⁰ are too broad to explain all word orders. To provide greater flexibility, Topic and Focus are sometimes divided into sub-categories. So, for example, Devine and Stephens (2006: 13-17) recognize strong and weak Topic, as well as strong and weak Focus. Within weak Focus there is narrow focus, which is confined to a single word, and broad scope Focus, which includes more than one word. They further divide strong

¹⁰⁸ Marouzeau, *ibid.*, gives examples from the younger Seneca and Lucan.

¹⁰⁹ Taken from Pinkster 1990: 4.

¹¹⁰ Devine and Stephens 2006: 14; Pinkster 1990: 183.

Focus into ‘simple,’ ‘contrastive,’ and ‘counterassertive’ Focus. We shall concern ourselves with these only as they become relevant to our analysis.

A third pragmatic function sometimes applied is called Tail.¹¹¹ Like Topic, Tail is old information. However, Tail is different from Topic in that it is not the thing that a discourse is about; instead, Tail supplies information that is already inferable or understood and can be taken for granted. It receives explicit expression because, for instance, its presence is grammatically required or for the sake of clarity. An example (Livy 1.26.3): *Movet feroci iuveni animum conploratio sororis... Stricto itaque gladio simul verbis increpans transfigit puellam.*¹¹² Devine and Stephens (2006:17) identify the underlined word *puellam* as having Tail function since the sentence is neither about the girl – her presence in the narrative being established by what immediately precedes – nor is she new or salient information.

3.6.1 Fuscine Entries that contain subject-final order

In examining word order in the quotations of Arellius Fuscus, it was found necessary to establish a heuristic guideline for determining which nouns should count as subject-final. The criteria used needed to be both rigorous and flexible so that a comprehensive motive for this word order would not escape notice. Nouns that met the following criteria were regarded as ‘subject-final’: 1) The noun must be nominative and be the subject of a verb, whether overt or implicit. However, an accusative may be

¹¹¹ Devine and Stephens 2006: 14, 17; Dik 1997: I.311, II.401-5, who limits the term to constituents that fall outside the clause and that are not grammatically necessary. Pinkster 1990: 260, mentions this pragmatic category but does not include it in his study.

¹¹² “His sister’s lamentation affected the spirit of the fierce young man... So he drew his sword and while scolding her he strikes the girl through.”

subject-final if it is the subject of an infinitive. 2) The subject noun must occur at or close to the end of a clause. If the subject noun is not last in the clause, no restriction is placed on what type of word can be last, except: 3) The subject noun must be preceded by its verb (V-S word order).

The purpose of the third criterion was to serve as a check on the flexibility granted in the second criterion, which allows a noun to be considered ‘subject-final’ even when it is followed by other words. It is the verb, rather than another part of speech, that must precede the subject because V-S order, across languages, is correlated with a broad category of sentences called ‘thetic.’ (This is discussed in more detail below.)

To start, we cite Fuscine Entries that contain nouns placed in final position because they carry special point. Among the quotations of Arellius Fuscus, these come nearest to exemplifying the Silver Latin fashion of *fulmen in clausula*. Terminally placed subjects are printed in small capitals.

S. 6.6 (H 359,6-10)

*Vidimus furentia toto orbe civilia arma
et post Italicas Pharsaliasque acies Romanum sanguinem hausit AEGYPTUS.
quod indignamur in Ciceronem Antonio licere,
in Pompeium Alexandrino licuit spadoni.
sic occiduntur qui ad indignos confugiunt.*

The subject *Aegyptus*, postponed to the very end of the sentence, is highly anticipated syntactically, and its appearance seems to be delayed for point. With the occurrence of a direct object (*sanguinem*) followed by a singular verb (*hausit*) – which cannot have the same subject as the previous verb (*vidimus*) – the eventual appearance of the subject is made inevitable. “After battles in Italy and at Pharsalia, who was it that shed Roman blood – Egyptians, of all people!” The subject delivers an indignant

surprise. However, an interpretation that sees the terminally placed subject as bearing special point is not altogether certain, since subjects that are proper nouns (*Aegyptus*) are commonly postponed.¹¹³ Such an interpretation is more certain in the sentence that follows, where *spadoni* (“eunuch”), an especially contemptible adversary, is kept to the end; although here of course the Agent is in the dative rather than in the nominative.

C. 1.1.6 (H 10,4-6)¹¹⁴

Redite in gratiam!

inter funestas acies armatae manus in foedus porriguntur.

*perierat totus orbis nisi iram finiret MISERICORDIA.*¹¹⁵

aut si tam pertinacia placent odia, parcite.

In the third sentence (*perierat...misericordia*) initially placed *perierat* and subject-final *misericordia* are Foci. An inversion of the more typical, unmarked word order (i.e. Subject, then Verb) helps shift weight to the extremities of the sentence: *perierat* on the one end, *misericordia* on the other. *Misericordia*, which is contrasted with *iram*,¹¹⁶ is neither especially clever nor altogether unexpected; nonetheless, postponement here, as in the foregoing example, renders the subject much anticipated.

¹¹³ Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 402; Devine and Stephens 2006: 39, 210. For example, Caes. *Gal.* 7.46 (*ex grandibus saxis sex pedum murum...praeduxerant Galli*); Liv. 29.2.16 (*perculsis acriter institerunt Romani*).

¹¹⁴ “Reconcile! Amid the destructive battle formations armed hands are stretched forth to strike a truce. Destruction had been the fate of the whole world if this had not put an end to wrath – pity. Or, if you prefer enduring hatred, at least be sparing.”

¹¹⁵ Type II clausula: double cretic with resolution.

¹¹⁶ The phrase *iram finire* occurs most frequently in Fuscus’ student, Ovid: *Pont.* 1.10.43; *Ep.* 18. 203; *Ib.* 139; *Met.* 11.398; 14.582. Instances in other authors: Liv. 44.14.6; Petr. 99.4. – Cf. also Fuscus at *S.* 3.1 (H 349,9): *imbres...finit*.

Also similar to the previous example is the sequence at sentence end that helps create this anticipation (*iram finiret misericordia*): direct object – verb – subject.¹¹⁷

Other organizational features, though not connected with the placement of *misericordia*, must not go unnoticed. One quickly observes the alliteration in the final sentence (*pertinacia placent...parcite*). More subtle is the careful arrangement in the second sentence (*inter...porriguntur*).

inter funestas acies armatae manus in foedus porriguntur.

Phonetic correspondence between prepositional phrases marks them as antithetical (destructive war vs. treaty);¹¹⁸ and it gives structure to the sentence, creating two word-groups. The outstretched hands (*armatae manus*) are set iconically between the two groups. The placement is deliberate, designed to communicate the precariousness of a gesture of peace amid hostilities. The significance of Fuscus' word placement is confirmed by a passage from the quotation of Porcius Latro (C. 1.1.3), with whom it seems Fuscus is engaged in a shared *locus*. Latro represents the son as crushed between the hostilities of his father and uncle: *porrigite mutuas in gratiam manus, me foederi medium pignus addite; inter contententes duos medius elidor*.¹¹⁹

C. 2.4.4

Securior eram quoniam putaveram illi omnia praestare FRATREM,

¹¹⁷ Devine and Stephens 2006: 174-5, give instances of this word order pattern (direct object – verb – subject) in sentences that contain the subject *nemo*; e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.64 (*archipiratam ipsum uidet nemo*). Similar to proper names, it is common for *nemo* to be found at the end of a clause.

¹¹⁸ The phrase *funestae acies* is found elsewhere only at Lucan 3.312 and 7.27.

¹¹⁹ “Stretch out your hands in reconciliation, set me in the middle as a guarantee of the truce; I am crushed between you two while you fight.”

cum subito nuntiatum est in ultimis esse filium – nec hoc a fratre.

Fratrem, although not nominative, is the subject of an accusative + infinitive construction, and it carries Focus. That it has Focus is clear from context: a father is accused of insanity by one of his two sons because he (the father) adopted the child of his second son and a prostitute after the second son died. In this Entry the father blames the first son (the one who accuses him of insanity) for neglecting his brother. The father had thought that the wayward son was being looked after – by his brother, as brothers are bound to do for one another. By delaying the appearance of *fratrem* until the end, Fuscus (in the role of the father) isolates the word and makes it prominent. He thus reminds his audience of what should be obvious: the surviving son is far from innocent in these events. Absent Fuscus' word order, the point would be barely perceptible. A more overt manner of asserting this, though still dependent on word order for its effect, is supplied by the phrase attached to the end of the *cum*-clause: *nec hoc a fratre*.

3.6.2 V-S order and descriptive sentences

The quotations of Fuscus contain few instances of *fulmen in clausula*. Moreover, those cases cited above are not especially strong examples of the fashion. It follows from this that the frequency of subject-final order in Fuscus' quotations cannot be entirely accounted for by the desire for rhetorical brilliance at the end of sentences – a craze that has been so closely associated with Silver Latin and with declamation in particular. Traditionally this fashion has been cited as one way that declamation exercised a corrupting influence on literature. The quotations of Arellius Fuscus, who himself has

sometimes been blamed for practicing a corrupt eloquence, contain little evidence that he indulged in such a fashion.

A far more significant consideration in discovering what lies behind Fuscus' subject-final order is his evident fondness for descriptive passages. This fondness is noted by Seneca (C. 2 pr. 1) and can be observed firsthand in the quotations of Fuscus.

In general, descriptions in Latin correlate with V-S order, often with the verb in initial position and frequently too with the subject in final position.¹²⁰ Not surprisingly, therefore, the quotations examined below confirm a correlation between descriptive passages in the quotations of Fuscus and subject-final order.

C. 1.3.3¹²¹

*'Erat' inquit 'praeruptus LOCUS et immensae altitudinis':
decebat ubi incestam lex mori uoluit.*

*Stat MOLES abscisa in profundum frequentibus exasperata saxis
quae aut elidant corpus aut de integro gravius impellant.*

*Inhorrent scopulis enascentibus LATERA et immensae altitudinis tristis ASPECTUS:
electus <is> potissimum LOCUS ut damnati saepius deiciantur.*

The passage consists of three Entries,¹²² each with a description of the menacing location where a woman, accused of unchastity, was thrown from a rock. Before falling, she

¹²⁰ Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: II.601; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 403; Devine and Stephens 2006: 208-9. For example, Caes. *Gal.* 5.44 (*Erant in ea legione fortissimi uiri centuriones*); Col. 6.2.11 (*est etiam...mollioris generis bos*).

¹²¹ Entry #1: "There was a place (she said) precipitous and of infinite height': it was just the sort of place where the law wanted an unchaste woman to die." Entry #2: "There stood a massive structure, cut off sheer into an abyss and made jagged by numerous rocks – rocks which were meant to crush a body or send it down again, more violently." Entry #3: "The sides bristle with sprouting rocks, and (there is) a grim vision of infinite height: this place in particular was chosen so that the condemned might fall again and again."

¹²² Håkanson believes this passage is continuous. Repetition of *immensae altitudinis* (1st Entry and 3rd Entry) has caused editors to alter the 1st Entry, thus: *Erat inquit praeruptus locus et immensae altitudinis <tristis aspectus>*; and to alter the 3rd Entry, thus: *inhorrent scopulis enascentibus latera. [et immensae altitudinis tristis aspectus] electus...* However, as was discovered in Chapter 1, repetition by itself is not grounds for belief that there is textual corruption; repetition is an integral feature of the organization of quotations in the anthology. I interpret these Entries as overlapping, that is, as Versions: Each gives 1) a

invoked Vesta and lived. The case concerns whether she should undergo punishment again.

There are in fact three, synonymous descriptions each serving as a context label, what we might think of as a ‘stem,’ for the clever argument that follows. The stems differ slightly from each other, and may represent three different performances of this *locus*. However, in their functional role in supplying a context for a pointed comment the stems are interchangeable.

Each Entry begins with a verb. Clear subject-final order is seen in the placement of *latera* and *aspectus*, both in Entry #3. We may be tempted to disregard *locus* in Entry #1 and *moles* in Entry #2, which at several removes from the ends of the sentence do not strictly abide by the criteria laid out above for subject-final order. But this is to miss the forest for the trees. We are witnessing a tendency in descriptive sentences for the subject to yield position and fall back, while the verb raises to first, or near first, position. The subject need not fall back to the very end of the sentence for the sentence sufficiently to manifest this pattern (V-S order) and through this pattern to declare its type (descriptive sentence).

The exception among these subject-final nouns is *locus* in Entry #3, which unlike the other four nouns (*locus* in Entry #1, *moles*, *latera*, *aspectus*) is not part of a description. As is reinforced by the highlighting adverb *potissimum* (“that place in

context label in the form of a description, and then gives 2) a clever point. – That said, it is possible that there is corruption in the phrase *et immensae altitudinis tristis aspectus* (Entry #3) – but not because of the repetition of *immensae altitudinis*. For example, should we read: <est> *immensae* for *et immensae*? Or, perhaps more likely, *et* should be deleted (“The sides bristle with sprouting rocks, a grim vision of infinite height.”). At any rate, these considerations do not impact the basic point that the three Entries contain V-S order because they are descriptions.

particular was chosen”),¹²³ *locus* has Topic function: *is locus* (“this place”) establishes that something will be stated about the object of the preceding description. (For the lack of clearly defined Topic and Focus functions in descriptions, see below.)

Diction. Since it concerns Fuscus’ stylistic individuality, instances of impressive diction in this passage require notice. ‘Impressive,’ as suggested in an earlier section, is used as a broad descriptive label for linguistic features (diction, grammatical constructions, etc.) that through their exceptional nature draw attention to themselves. Exceptionality can stem from the fact that the features are relatively rare in the Latin corpus; are used in an uncommon manner; or are specific to a certain context, such as poetry or technical discourse. Fuscus’ diction shall be considered poetic if the Latin corpus shows that a word or construction was used predominately by poets. Similarly, diction shall be considered technical if it was used predominately by technical writers, or if the word appears predominately in technical contexts.

Accordingly, in *C.* 1.3.3, we note several impressive compounds: **1)** *exasperata*, which is not found before the Augustan Age. In compound form, moreover, it is rarely applied to geographical terrain.¹²⁴ And from the phrase *Inhorrent scopulis enascentibus latera*: **2)** *inhorrent*. The word is not used by Republican writers.¹²⁵ Its application in

¹²³ Cf. Cic. *Mil.* 53: [sc. *Milo*] *eum locum ad pugnam potissimum elegerat*.

¹²⁴ Cf. also Fuscus at *S.* 3.1 (*quidquid asperatum aestu est*), a passage explored in Chapter 4. For other authors, cf. Mela 3.79: [sc. *Arabiae*] *frontem quae inter ostia ostenditur silvae cautesque exasperant*. Apul. *Met.* 1.10. Also, though in simplex form, Luc. 6.799-802; Sen. *Nat.* 4a.2.3. – It is applied to the sea by Ovid (*Met.* 5.7) and by Livy (37.12.11), a use more frequent with the simplex verb (*aspero*) or adjective (*asper*). The compound is common in medical descriptions, esp. with reference to the skin or throat. Also common with reference to the spirit (*animus*) and mood.

¹²⁵ Also, forms of the inchoative *inhorresco* do not appear before the Augustan Age, except in a corrupt passage of Cicero (*Rep.* 4.6), quoted by Nonius. *Inhorresco* occurs in a passage of Pacuvius that Cicero (*Div.* 1.24; *de Orat.* 3.157) is fond of quoting: *Interea prope iam occidente sole inhorrescit mare...*

metaphor, as here, belongs decidedly to poetic, lofty speech.¹²⁶ 3) *enascentibus* (“sprouting”). The majority of attestations of this compound are from technical works, particularly agricultural writers.¹²⁷ Fuscus is the first to apply the compound in a description of an inanimate object.¹²⁸ His use of the rare compound *internata* at *S.* 2.1 (*uada altioribus internata*) is similar.

In all these instances (*exasperata*, *inhorrent*, *enascentibus*, *internata*), we may surmise that Fuscus chooses compounds in order to render a basic notion more specific and full, in order to grace the verbal image with intricate graphic detail. The fact that at least one of these compounds (*enascentibus*) belongs to the domain of technical discourse complicates interpretations of Fuscus’ word choice. However, one effect may be noted: the use of specialized vocabulary marks Fuscus’ speech as learned; it suggests a familiarity (whether it be superficial or authentic and profound) with the technical fields from which the vocabulary is drawn.

3.6.3 Presentational sentences and theticity

Attempts to parse descriptive passages, like those of Fuscus at *C.* 1.3.3, into the pragmatic roles of Topic and Focus generally prove ineffective. The reason is that all information in these descriptions is new. This informational newness cannot be attributed simply to the fact that the descriptions we are considering occur in an anthology, where there is not the kind of discourse continuity found in some other

¹²⁶ Besides the passage of Pacuvius above, cf. Verg. *A.* 3.195 (= *A.* 5.11): *et inhorruit unda tenebris*.

¹²⁷ *TLL* V.2.553 (Rehm).

¹²⁸ Cf. Man. 4.27 (*Roma casis enata*); Sen. *Clem.* 1.1.6; Her. *O.* 642.

genres.¹²⁹ Descriptions, across genres and across languages, present several pieces of new information, rather than assigning special emphasis to one part of the sentence – to a subject, for instance, or to an adverb.

Linguists call such descriptive sentences Presentational (or Presentative), a fitting term that recalls our discussion above of the functional role of *cola* to organize and showcase Fuscus' language, particularly in tableaux (e.g. C. 2.1.6). Now, as previously, we are interested in how Fuscus' language is made an instrument of organization in a display of images. However, whereas above we saw this organization in terms of phonetic correspondence, the building of well-defined *cola*, and symmetry between *cola*, we are now considering organization from the perspective of information structuring and how this structuring is encoded through word order.

Presentational sentences belong to a class of sentences called *thetic*.¹³⁰ Linguists, adapting terminology from philosophical literature,¹³¹ have generally contrasted *thetic* utterances with so-called 'categorical' utterances. A categorical sentence is duplex in that it contains, on the one hand, a topical subject and, on the other hand, an assertion about this subject. A *thetic* sentence is simplex:¹³² a subject is not set apart from the predication, as a separate entity, but the assertion and its subject(s) are regarded as a unit.

¹²⁹ On discourse continuity, see Pinkster 1990: 243-59.

¹³⁰ On *theticity*, see Sasse 1996; Sasse 1995; Sasse 1987; Bolkestein 1996; Bolkestein 1995; Devine and Stephens 2006: 145-72; Pinkster 1990: 183-4; McNally 1998.

¹³¹ The term *theticity* seems to have originated with Franz Brentano (see now Brentano 1995), and was brought into linguistics by Vilém Mathesius; see Kuroda 1972; Laduslaw 1994.

¹³² Devine and Stephens 2006: 167: "Thetic sentences describe events as such, without grammaticalizing them as properties predicated of a subject."

To give a simple example, we observe the difference between a sentence such as *Caesar pugnavit*, where a subject (“Caesar”) is clearly differentiated from the predicate (“fought”); and thethetic sentence *comminus gladiis pugnatum est* (“There was hand-to-hand fighting with swords,” *Caes. Gal.* 1.52.4), where an action is narrated as a whole and the Agents (here, soldiers) are subsumed within the event. In athetic sentence, the otherwise independent role of the subject is neutralized, so that it is viewed as part of the predicate rather than as something external to it and about which the predicate supplies information.

As already mentioned,thetic clauses are associated with Verb-Subject word order. But more is involved than a simple classification of sentences based on the position of the verb relative to its subject(s). This is a crucial point:theticity fundamentally alters the function of a sentence and how the information it contains is viewed and processed by readers / auditors. Thus, it is possible to speak of a sentence having a ‘thetic perspective.’ Theticity poses the existence of an object or state of affairs without further comment. It says, in effect: “X happened,” “There is X,” “X exists,” or “*Ecce X.*”

This substantive difference betweenthetic expressions versus other expressions is not defined by a single formal pattern, such as V-S order. Rather,theticity is best understood with respect both to **1)** predicational structure, and **2)** semantics and the discourse functions (e.g. description) that sentences with certain predicational structures frequently perform.¹³³ Besides V-S order, other formal devices often used to effecttheticity are the passive voice, unaccusative verbs,¹³⁴ impersonal verbs, and subject

¹³³ For discourse functions, see Devine and Stephens 2006: 145-72; Sasse 1995; Bolkestein 1995.

stress.¹³⁵ Discourse functions and semantic roles associated with theticity are eventive sentences; descriptions; existential verbs; verbs of becoming, appearing, and happening; and verbs of emotion.

Now we return to quotations from Fuscus to consider to what extent they contain thetic sentences.

C. 2.1.27

cum primum de adoptione ista cogitare[m], occurrerunt mihi tres ABDICATI, et audio in ista domo tres fuisse FILIOS nec esse.

In this Entry we find a straightforward example of a thetic clause (*occurrerunt mihi tres abdicati*) without descriptive elaboration. The sentence tells of an appearance (“there appeared to me three disinherited sons”), which is one of the discourse functions typical of theticity. Consistent with acknowledged formal devices that help effect theticity, the verb appears in initial position and the nominative substantive in final position. In the same passage we may further observe an existential thetic in an accusative + infinitive construction (*tres fuisse filios nec esse*): “There were three sons – but there are no longer.”

Two more brief, straightforward examples of thetic expressions from the quotations of Fuscus.

¹³⁴ According to Devine and Stephens 2006: 151, the following are unaccusative verbs: verbs of change of location (e.g. arrive), change of state, continuation of a pre-existing state (e.g. remain), existence and appearance (e.g. be, appear), and goal-oriented motion (e.g. run into the house).

¹³⁵ Sasse 1996: 12-14, identifies stress accent on the subject, followed by an enclitic-like low toned verb, as the most common formal means in European languages to indicate theticity. Sasse, *ibid.*, gives the example (words in capitals are stressed): My CAR broke down (thetic). vs. My CAR broke DOWN (categorical). Because there are no native Latin speakers to serve as informants, this is not a helpful criterion for Latin.

C. 7.5.9¹³⁶

*Destructa levi vulnere est CUTIS:
non credas factum manu privigni, credas amatoris.*

C. 9.5.2 (H 264,24-25)¹³⁷

*Vt vidit me, haesit complexibus meis PUER.
osculabar miser, interrogabam de fratribus.
dum interrogo, dum fleo, perveneram domum.*

In 7.5.9, the first clause (*Destructa...cutis*) isthetic. The event is paramount; accordingly, the clause is structured as a solid unit defined by the predicate. The participle takes first position and the subject, in supporting role as Tail, falls back.¹³⁸

Similarly throughout 9.5.2, information consists of action, of happenings rather than of details about participants in an action. Clauses are short and consist of little more than verbs. (Out of a total of eighteen words in the passage, no fewer than seven are verbs.) Each verb captures a particular moment in the broader event. Formal manifestation of theticity is clear in the first sentence where the verb (*haesit*) is initial and the subject (*puer*), again as Tail, appears last.

Another short example:

S. 6.5

*Ab armis ad arma discurritur:
foris victores domi trucidamur, domi nostro sanguini intestinus hostis incubat.
quis non hoc populi Romani statu Ciceronem ut vivat cogi putat?*

¹³⁶ “Her skin was scratched by a light wound: you would not think it the work of a stepson; you would think it done by a lover.”

¹³⁷ “When he saw me, the boy clung to my embrace. I kissed him grievingly, I kept asking about his brothers; while I questioned him, while I wept, we arrived at my house.”

¹³⁸ Use of *destringo* in the sense ‘to graze’ or ‘touch lightly’ is poetic. In the Augustan Age, Fuscus and Ovid alone use it in this sense (*TLL* V.1.769.57): *Ov. Ep.* 15.275; *Met.* 8.382; 10.526; 12.101.

The first sentence (*ab armis ad arma discurritur*, “There is a rushing from war to war”), which isthetic, poses a context for what follows. No one piece of information is prominent; rather, the sentence presents a happening, an event to be acknowledged and seen as an integral whole. The brevity of the sentence makes its integrity and simplicity, its lack of defined Topic and Focus functions, easy to appreciate. But formal means are also helpful – namely, the absence of a named Agent and the use of the impersonal passive (*discurritur*).

3.6.4 Thetic sentences in *S. 5.1* and *C. 2.5.4*

We proceed now to longer passages demanding lengthier explication, starting with *S. 5*. Its theme: The Athenians debate whether they should take down trophies from the Persian Wars in the face of threats from Xerxes that he will invade again if the trophies are not removed.

Suas. 5.1

Xerxes veniet?

nescio quomodo languet circa memoriam iacturae ANIMUS

et disturbata arma non repetit.

prior enim metus futuri <augur>¹³⁹ est

et amissa ne audeat amissurum monent.

ut interdum in gaudia surgit ANIMUS et spem ex praesenti metitur,

ita adversis frangitur.

omnis destituit animum FIDES;¹⁴⁰

ubi ignominia spem premit,

errat circa damna sua

ubi nullam meminit aciem nisi qua fugerit,

et quae male expertus est vota deponit.

¹³⁹ My conjecture; mss: *regnus*. The passage is discussed in Chapter 4.

¹⁴⁰ The mss have the corrupt reading: *omnis est sit animum dies*. Andreas Schott conjectured *omnis destituit animum spes*; *fides* is the conjecture of Eussner.

The passage treats of Xerxes' mental state after his defeat at the hands of the Greeks. It does not, however, address the matter in the form of a declarative statement, for example: 'Xerxes lacks the confidence to invade again,' or 'Xerxes will find it difficult to revive shattered hopes.'¹⁴¹ Rather, the reader / auditor is led to observe firsthand, as it were, the internal workings of Xerxes' mind: "His mind lingers, so to speak, about the memory of the loss (*languet circa memoriam iacturae animus; haeret circa damna sua*)."¹⁴¹ An internal, psychological moment is witnessed in real time.

This manner of treating information, whereby we are given a (mental) landscape to look upon, rather than individual bits of information to process, is thetic. There are formal indicators as well: the verb (*languet; haeret*) is placed at or near the beginning of its clause and the subject (*animus*) is in final position.

Also the gnomic statement on the mutability of the human spirit employs a thetic perspective in three clauses (*ut interdum in gaudia surgit animus et spem ex praesenti metitur, ita adversis frangitur*): just as the spirit occasionally rises in joy, measuring future prospects from its present success, just so it is shattered by adverse events. Formal support to theticity is seen in V-S order and in the use of the passive (*frangitur*). Furthermore, since it is a psychological description, naturally verbs of emotion – or 'psych-verbs' – occur, the presence of which (as mentioned) can favor a thetic perspective.

Diction. This is a rich passage, about which more shall be said in Chapter 4. For the moment, we shall merely point out salient features. There are repeated uses of the same, or nearly the same, vocabulary and constructions. So: *languet circa* and *errat circa*.

¹⁴¹ So, Fuscus at *S. 5.3: credite mihi, difficile est attritas opes recolligere et spes fractas novare et <ex> paenitenda acie in melioris eventus fiduciam surgere.*

The construction, particularly with *languet*, which is without parallel in classical Latin,¹⁴² is a Grecism (νοσέω περί). Use of the verb *surgo* with a noun referring to the psyche is peculiarly Fuscine. In addition to *in gaudia surgit animus* here, we find *surgit ingenium* (S. 2.1), *ingenia surrexerint* (S. 4.2);¹⁴³ and, in an accusative + infinitive construction, *fiduciam surgere* (S. 5.3).

C. 2.5.4

1. *Explicantur crudelitatis adversus infelicem feminam APPARATUS, et illa instrumenta virorum quoque animos ipso visu frangentia ad excutiendam muliebris pectoris conscientiam proponuntur.*
<saevius> instat¹⁴⁴ denuntiationibus quam tormentis TYRANNUS et minando torquet: tacet.

2. *Videt intentum tyranni vultum,*¹⁴⁵ *videt oculos minaces: [et] tacet.*¹⁴⁶
plus tibi praestare non potuit, *si de te liberos sustulisset.*¹⁴⁷

3. *Flagellis caeduntur ARTUS, verberibus corpus abrumpitur, exprimiturque ipsa vitalibus <VITA: ta>cet.*¹⁴⁸

¹⁴² The phrase seems to enter later Latin through the Vulgate (Tim. I.6.4).

¹⁴³ Cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.185-6: *ingenium caeleste suis velocius annis | surgit.*

¹⁴⁴ *saevius* is my conjecture. Winterbottom and Håkanson accept Bursian's conjecture: *instat ante*. The mss: *instantedenuntiationibus A B instate (instat V²) tam denuntiationibus V*. Bursian's conjecture is insipid. For the sake of example, I have printed a conjecture that I think the sense of the passage requires; I am not confident that this is precisely what was written. Another possibility: *instantius temptat denuntiationibus...*

¹⁴⁵ **A** (fol. 55v) writes *uultumuultumui | det*, where the vertical bar represents a line-end in **A**. Repetition of *uultum* is probably explained by the fact that *uultumui* occurs at line-end in the archetype; proof of this can be seen in **V**, which has *uultum* at the end of a line (I have discovered that the scribes of **V** generally try to preserve the line lengths of the archetype. I hope to offer evidence of this in a separate study.) The scribe of **A** writes *uultum* once, but then thoughtlessly matching his own line-end with the line-ending of his exemplar adds *uultumui*.

¹⁴⁶ *Et* was deleted by Kiessling. Presumably this was done to make the expression identical to the other appearances of *tacet* in this quotation. I hesitate to accept the reading of the mss, which was certainly in the archetype, only because it seems a real possibility that the *et* of *et tacet* may have come from *torquettacet*.

¹⁴⁷ Håkanson transposes *plus...sustulisset* to after the next *tacet*. Presumably this is done because he interprets the description as being of a single, continuous piece. As already demonstrated, there is no basis for assuming that passages similar in content, form, point, etc., must appear together in a quotation.

4. *Freme*bat indignatione *captae civitatis* *MARITUS*
*et consilio <mu>tuo*¹⁴⁹ *et uxoris adiutorio fortior:*
'quomodo occidam tyrannum? quae pars accedenti maxime vacat?
ubi custodiae cessant?
ubi natura loci minore munimento virtutem non summovet?'
sic vir et uxor noctes exercebant;
miraris si transit quinquennium inter uxorem tortam et occupatum virum?

5. *Sae*viebat etiam nunc *TYRANNUS:* *torquebantur in conspectu maritorum UXORES.*
paenitebat matres fecunditatis suae.

For ease of reference the Entries have been numbered. – Each Entry is descriptive, and in each appear formal devices commonly used to signal a thetic perspective. The devices here serve to open a cognitive frame in which auditors / readers shall receive images. Four of the five Entries commence with a verb; Entry #3 is hardly an exception since the verb appears second (*caeduntur*) followed by the subject. In several instances, these or similar formal devices are adopted within Entries: *instat* in near initial position in Entry #1; the passive *exprimitur* in Entry #3; and in Entry #5, both the passive *torquebantur* and the impersonal *paenitebat* in initial positions in their respective clauses. Partially in response to verb-initial order, several subjects appear at or near the ends of their clauses: *apparatus* and *tyrannus* (Entry #1); *maritus* (Entry #4); *tyrannus* and *uxores* (Entry #5).

In Entry #1 it is interesting that while the Entry opens using V-S order, the following clause reverses the order to S-V. The two clauses in fact have different

¹⁴⁸ **V** (fol. 70r): *exprimitur queipsisuitilibus licetrestat* **B** (fol. 127r): *expremiturque ipsisuitilib; etrestat* **A** (fol. 55v): *expremiturqueipsisuitilib;etrestat* – The archetype presumably read *exprimiturqueipsisuitili;cet*. Faced with the nonsensical *cet*, **B A** write *et* (the *c* of *cet* may have been marked to be deleted); **V** writes *licet*. This *cet* is the ending of *tacet*, whose first two letters could have been lost the more easily if, as I propose, *uita* preceded.

¹⁴⁹ The conjecture is mine. The mss: *tuo* **A B** *suo* **V**.

functions: the first clause (*explicantur...apparatus*) is meant to initiate the description; it establishes a scene in full visual scope. The second long clause (*et illa instrumenta ... proponuntur*) is designed to give specifics about the instruments of torture (Topic), which were such that though intended for a woman they would break a man's will.¹⁵⁰ In short, the first clause isthetic. The second clause, which has a Topic (*illa instrumenta*) and supplies information about this Topic, is not.

The first clause of Entry 4 similarly establishes a scene: the husband would grumble (note the imperfect) from indignation he felt for the capture of the city. In what follows, although formal markers of theticity are absent, the scene is further fleshed out and the reader / auditor is transported to a most private conversation between husband and wife.

In addition to the use of formal devices to achieve a thetic perspective, sound patterns contribute significantly to the organization and shaping of the Entries. The arrangement of sounds here, just as they have been shown to do in previous passages of Fuscus and Papirius Fabianus, help effect the definition and cohesiveness of *cola*; through phonetic similarities and contrasts they signal what words belong together and they signal incisions within word strings. So, observe phonetic iteration in the word-groups in Entry #2: *Videt intentum tyranni vultum*, and *plus tibi praestare non potuit*. Note the contrast of sounds (*c...s* versus *m...n*) in adjacent word-groups in Entry 4: *custodiae cessant* versus *ubi natura loci minore munimento virtutem non summovet?* Both word-groups

¹⁵⁰ For this idea, cf. C. 2.5.5 (Cornelius Hispanus): *Adsidue tormenta variantur, accenduntur extincti ignes. tortor vocatur, sub quo mariti uxorem prodiderant.*

employ a type of alliteration with a rich tradition, consisting of a variation of vowel sounds within repeated pairs of consonants (*cus...ces; min...mun...men*).¹⁵¹

Diction. The elaborate circumlocution in Entry 4 (*minore munimento virtutem non summovet?* “Where does the nature of the place, due to less fortification, not remove courage?”) testifies to the high desirability of the sound patterns just observed.¹⁵² The use of *cesso* with *custodiae* (“Where does the sentry cease?”), an alliterating combination that appears nowhere else,¹⁵³ was obviously chosen for the same reason. In the same Entry (4), the phrase *exercere noctes* is poetic, finding parallels solely in Vergil (*A.* 10.808)¹⁵⁴ and Propertius (1.1.33);¹⁵⁵ a third parallel appears in the second century among the selective diction of Fronto (*Ep.* 3.9).

3.6.5 Theticity and the Entry-type ‘Proposition and Elaboration’

Presenting information from a thetic perspective is advantageous to a speaker, such as Fuscus, whose art is deeply invested in the presentation of images. Theticity, since it guides auditors / readers to view broadly, to think in terms of contexts, scenes, images, and events in their entirety (rather than to expect new pieces of information that build on old pieces of information and that advance an argument or narrative), helps Fuscus focus attention in a particularly desirable way: discourse is made to stand still and

¹⁵¹ Ceccarelli 1986 applies the cumbersome label “allitterazione a vocale interposta variabile.”

¹⁵² Use of an abstract noun with *summoueo* is remarkable and appears to be poetic; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 11.18 (*summotus pudor*); Luc. 7.316 (*uetita uirtute moueri*).

¹⁵³ For a similar expression but without the structurally motivated alliteration, cf. Caes. *Ciu.* 3.25.4: *Haec a custodiis classium loca maxime uocabant*.

¹⁵⁴ Noted by Lindner 1862: 15.

¹⁵⁵ Similar is Man. 5.173: *otia per uarios exercet dulcia lusus*.

attention is concentrated on the image as image, the thing itself, whether this is a scene or an object.

The effect is fully exploited in those many instances where Fuscus' descriptions take the form of a list (Proposition and Elaboration), where the scenes or objects described are isolated as sub-categories, or sub-attributes, of an overarching idea. The overarching idea typically occurs first in the Entry, or sometimes is easily inferable. So, for example, we might imagine an Entry that begins by introducing the subject of trees. The list then itemizes – not as a bare list of names, but in concise visualizations – several kinds of trees: elm, oak, maple, etc. This 'list' pattern is virtually identical to the Entry type that I have called Proposition and Elaboration; the sub-categories are the Elaboration. But not all Entries of the Proposition and Elaboration type contain descriptive or thetic clauses.

The combination of these two together, Entry type and thetic perspective, produces a notable effect. Through Entry type, and through sound-play and *cola* shapes, the items in a list are given sharp structural definitions. Theticity, for its part, makes the items in the list part of a presentation; it adds the viewing, presentational element. It says about each item: 'Here it is.' 'This is monomial: merely recognize its existence and process it broadly, as a single unit.' Through this combination, Fuscus' *imagines* are set in isolation; and, like statues, they may be viewed on all sides and studied as independent objects. In this kind of discourse setting, where the expectation is that readers / auditors shall simply gaze (in their mind's eye) at a series of verbal images, the distinction between the image and the language that produces it easily vanishes. The language actively asserts itself as present, and it itself becomes viewed object. Cognitive space is

cleared for presentation, which Fuscus consistently occupies with impressive diction. The implication is that such practice is a valid and worthy use of language, an implication that may lie behind rival accusations of stylistic corruption (e.g. *S.* 2.10).

Many of the Entries that contain descriptive lists have already been quoted in other portions of this study. Nonetheless, in order to make the present arguments as apprehensible and evident as possible these are produced here again. Items in an Entry that form a list are indented in a column under the Proposition. In those cases where there is no explicit Proposition (*C.* 1.2.5; *C.* 2.1.7), I have supplied the implied Proposition in English and set it in brackets. Not every clause that forms an item in a list is descriptive or thetic; those that I regard as thetic are in bold.

C. 1.2.5

[To all appearances, you were a prostitute:]

*Meretrix vocata es, in communi loco stetisti,
superpositus est cellae tuae titulus, venientem recepisti.
cetera etiamsi in communi loco essem tamen potius <ne>scirem*

C. 2.1.6 (H 69,1-6)

Quid est, quod aut negandum mihi aut excusandum sit?

*non insanissimum dispendiorum malum, non erubescendos amores,
neque luxuriantem habitum neque potatus obicis filio.*

haec si non potes, aliqua saltem ex commentariis amici tui describe:

*madentem unguentis externis,
convulneratum libidinibus,
incedentem ut feminis placeat femina mollius,
et cetera quae morbi non iudici sunt.*

C. 2.1.7

[Your prosperity depends on a single son:]

*Non tibi per multos fulsa liberos domus est,
neque turba lateri circumerrat
nec multus intra limen heres est,
nec post me ali<us> quem retineas*

C. 2.1.8

Hoc <animo> scio nostros fuisse maiores:

hoc illum Aelium Tuberonem cuius paupertas virtus fuit,

hoc Fabricium Samnitium non accipientem munera,

hoc ceteros patres nostros

quos apud aratra ipsa mirantes decora sua circumstetere lictores.

The following Entries, which have not yet been quoted, also contain descriptive lists with many items presented from a thetic perspective:

C. 2.6.9 (H 118,2-5)¹⁵⁶

in narratione hunc colorem (sc. Arellius Fuscus) habuit:

subito furore conlapsam patri MENTEM:

meretricem dependentem collo senis

et parasitorum circumfusum patri GREGEM,

turpes <iniri>¹⁵⁷ cum rivalibus RIXAS

et ebrietati¹⁵⁸ nocturnae additum DIEM.

Seneca says that Fuscus included the above *color* in a narration. There is no contradiction; in addition to being a *color* and to taking place in a narrative, it is a description. A son accuses his father, who has begun to live a luxuriant lifestyle, of insanity. The alleged insanity supplies the Proposition for the descriptive list that follows.

The manuscripts for this section of text, particularly in what precedes the Entry quoted here, are more corrupt than usual. Nonetheless, the discourse function of the sentences quoted, the definitions of word-groups, and the syntax of clauses are

¹⁵⁶ “In the narrative [Fuscus] had this *color*: in sudden madness the father’s mind caved: a prostitute hung about the neck of the old man and a gang of parasites was poured around the father, brawls with rival lovers were entered into and to drunkenness at night was added drunkenness by day.”

¹⁵⁷ My conjecture. Mss: *it*. Håkanson: *interim*.

¹⁵⁸ The abstract *ebrietas*, which occurs only once in Republican literature (Cic. *Tusc.* 4.27), appears elsewhere in Seneca’s anthology at C. 2.6.5 (Porcius Latro); 9.2.4 (Julius Bassus); S. 7.13 (Seneca the elder). It appears in the works of Ovid and is frequent in the works of the younger Seneca; *TLL* V.2.7.

sufficiently clear. For the accusative + infinitive construction – which belongs to Seneca rather than Fuscus¹⁵⁹ – compare Vibius Rufus at *C.* 2.6.10 (H 118,14-15) and Cestius Pius at *C.* 2.6.7 (H 117,8-9): all three speakers in these passages contribute to the same shared *locus*.

In a series of four vignettes the father is imagined in settings typical of a profligate youth. Each scene is set apart, assigned to its own semi-independent structural unit, or *colon*. Occasionally in Entries that contain a list, the *colon* concentrates attention on a single object, that is on a substantive put on display with its attributes (*C.* 2.1.6, H 69,2-3; *S.* 2.1); more often the *colon* frames a scene composed of more than one substantive. The latter is the case here.

Theticity resides in the fact that each unit is a broad scope study, a single block to process visually or cognitively as a whole. How is theticity expressed formally? We may note that in 2.6.9 we again find subjects in final position in their respective clauses: *mentem, gregem, rixas, diem*. (These accusative nouns are the heads of their clauses and as such they perform the same role as nominative subjects.) However, as previously, our perception of the formal manifestation of theticity is partial if we observe only the position of the subject. Theticity is better seen, in these list-type Entries, in strategies that seek to create cohesiveness within a clause and that make it an indivisible unit, so that it will not be processed as containing separate sub-units (words or phrases) with different roles and degrees of emphasis. The strategies are, first, discontinuous syntax, otherwise known as hyperbaton. Secondly, there is the strategy that builds, as it were, from the

¹⁵⁹ The accusative + infinitive construction at *C.* 2.1.6 (H 69,4-6), which likewise is a description of luxuriant living, belongs to Fuscus, not Seneca.

ground up, that takes a single idea, usually an object, and constructs a formal unit out of it by attaching attributes. The indivisibility of such units is assisted by the fact that it is anchored in a single noun.

Suasoria 2 provides an example of a list where the items consist of objects and their attributes. The thematic premise of the declamation is that the three hundred Spartans at Thermopylae debate whether they should retreat.

Suas. 2.1
At puto rudis lecta aetas,
animus qui frangeretur metu,
insuetaque arma non passurae manus,
hebetataque senio aut vulneribus corpora.

This passage, which begins the quotation, itemizes the various defects that might occasion a soldier's retreat. Since it is addressed to the reputedly invincible Spartans, it is said in sarcasm and is meant to incite their courage.

We do not know whether there was an explicit Proposition that preceded the above list; the presence of *at*, which is suitable for marking a transition in discourse, may argue against it. In any case, the list is informed by an overarching idea that may be expressed so: "You are the kinds of soldiers who are ill-prepared for battle." The list supplies the details: "No doubt, raw recruits were drafted, courage that could be shattered by fear; hands that could not endure unfamiliar weapons, and bodies blunted from decrepitude or wounds."

This list of four falls into two parts – first, psychological defects (age, courage); and, secondly, corporeal defects (hands, bodies). All four items are anchored by a single

noun (*aetas, animus; manus, corpora*). In three of the items the nominative nouns appear last in their clause.

3.6.6 *Exempla of virtuous women*

In the quotation of Fuscus at C. 2.2.1 appears another Entry organized into a list structure. The theme: A husband and wife vow that if one of them dies, the other will commit suicide. The husband, while abroad, sends a false report saying that he has died. The wife tries to kill herself, but survives. The woman's father orders her to leave her husband. She refuses and is disinherited.

C. 2.2.1 (H 82,12-15),¹⁶⁰ Arellius Fuscus
'*Moriar; habeo et causam et exemplum:*'
*quaedam ardentibus se maritorum rogis miscuerunt*¹⁶¹
quaedam vicaria maritorum salutem anima redemerunt.
quam magna gloria brevi sollicitudine pensata est!
o te felicem, uxor! inter has viva numeraris.

The list structure is apparent. The division into overarching theme (Proposition) and sub-categories (Elaboration) is formalized through what is in effect an announcement that rhetorical *exempla* shall be given: "I have cause and example...", " words that are imagined as spoken by the wife. C. 2.1.8 (H 69,20-24), discussed above, is similarly forecast.

¹⁶⁰ "I shall die. I have cause and an example": some women have mingled themselves in the burning pyres of their husbands, some have redeemed their husbands' lives by a vicarious death. How great the glory paid out through short-lived anxiety! O fortunate woman! You are counted living among these women!"

¹⁶¹ The reconstruction of the clause *quaedam...miscuerunt* is mine. I retain the verb (*miscuerunt*) transmitted by the mss (also, Winterbottom 1974; cf. *Carm. epigr.* 398.2: *quae caruit luce et tenebris se miscuit atris*). To restore what I believe a more probable word order, I place the reflexive pronoun (*se*) before *maritorum* rather than after *rogis*, where past editors (Håkanson, Winterbottom, Müller) have placed it. The mss of the full tradition read: *quaedam ardentibus rogestorum miscuerunt*. The Excerpta: *quaedam se maritorum rogis ardentibus miscuerunt*.

Exempla are typical of declamation and speeches in general. Series of examples describing the devotion of wives must have been widely practiced.¹⁶² However, the following passages are so close that all four speakers (Fuscus, Ovid, Triarius, Clodius Turrinus) show themselves very conscious of what the others have said.¹⁶³ External support for this awareness comes from the fact that it is also in the material under *C. 2.2* that we are told Ovid was a student of Fuscus (2.2.8): the implication is that the quotations from Ovid here come from a speech delivered at Fuscus' school when the poet was under the rhetor's guidance. The passage of Triarius – as already observed, a notorious filcher – is taken from the same quotation (*C. 2.5.8*), discussed in Chapter 2, in which he is seen borrowing heavily from Fabianus and Fuscus.

C. 2.2.11 (H 86,5-7),¹⁶⁴ Ovid
Non est quod tibi placeas, uxor, tamquam prima peccaveris:
perit aliqua cum viro,
perit aliqua pro viro;
illas tamen omnis aetas honorabit, omne celebrabit ingenium.

C. 2.5.8 (H 107,3-7),¹⁶⁵ Triarius
Expectasse aliqua per longum tempus maritum dicitur:
quanta laus est servasse cum expectasse tanta sit!

¹⁶² For the *exempla* used by Fuscus, Ovid, Triarius, Clodius Turrinus, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 12.19.4-5; frg. 53 (Vottero) from the lost *de Matrimonio*; on these passages of the younger Seneca, see Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1997: 113; Degl'Innocenti Pierini 2003: 348; Torre 2000: 52. Cf. also Mart. 4.75.5-8; Plin. *Ep.* 6.24.1; [Quint.] *Decl.* 9.22.

¹⁶³ Winterbottom 1974: I.251 n. 4, cites these passages together; also, for the Romans' knowledge of Indian suttee, see V. Max. 2.6.14.

¹⁶⁴ "There is no reason to be pleased with yourself, woman, as if you were the first to have transgressed [i.e. by attempting suicide]: a woman perished with her husband, a woman perished for her husband. Those women, however, every age will honor, every spirit will celebrate."

¹⁶⁵ "A woman is said to have waited for her husband for an extended duration: how praiseworthy it is to have saved your husband, if waiting is so great! Another woman, stricken by the loss of her husband, cast herself onto the burning pyre: a woman who burned *for* her husband surely would burn *with* him. For her husband's life another woman died in his place: do you believe that she, overwhelmed by torture, feared (*horruisse* Winterbottom) death?"

alia desiderio viri attonita in ardentem rogam se misisse:
haec non cum viro arsisset quae pro viro arsit?
alia pro incolumitate mariti vicaria morte decidit:
creditisne hanc in tormentis oppressum <horruisse> mortem?

C. 10.3.2 (H 302,17-20),¹⁶⁶ Clodius Turrinus
*Adeo tibi vetera exempla exciderunt bonarum coniugum, in quae filiam tuam
solebas sanus hortari?*
aliqua spiritum viri redemit suo,
aliqua se super ardentis rogam misit.

All four quotations contain two clauses presenting descriptions of a) a woman (Evadne) who killed herself by jumping on her dead husband's pyre, and b) a woman (Alcestis) who offered her own life to save her husband's. These arethetic and set in bold. The passage of Triarius contains a third description that refers to the patience of Penelope. There may be some reservation in identifying the descriptive clauses of Ovid asthetic because they contain two constituents that are contrastively focused: a woman died **with her husband** (*cum viro*); a woman died **for her husband** (*pro viro*). Nonetheless, the two clauses are constructed as predicates, and predicates alone. The verb is in initial position; the subject is neutralized by virtue of its position and because it is an indefinite pronoun. The prepositional phrases are part and parcel of the predication.

Despite the number and closeness of the passages, the individuality of Fuscus' art maintains itself. In the first place, this is seen in the sheer length of his *cola*. Only Triarius' descriptive *cola* are of similar length. But these do not manifest the same concern for cohesiveness, thus permitting the following minor incisions to be made:

alia desiderio viri attonita in ardentem rogam se misisse

¹⁶⁶ "Have you so forgotten the old models of good wives, towards which (while sane) you used to exhort your own daughter? A woman redeemed her husband's life's breath with her own; a woman cast herself on top of the pyre of her burning husband."

alia pro incolumitate mariti vicaria morte decedit

By contrast, the integrity of the descriptive clauses in Fuscus' passage is maintained through word order. In the case of the woman who perishes for her husband, a hyperbaton (*vicaria maritorum salutem anima*) serves to enclose two phrases that are separable in Triarius' description (*pro incolumitate mariti | vicaria morte*). This kind of hyperbaton is part of a more general strategy that seeks to avoid syntactic closure before the end of the clause.¹⁶⁷ Thus the sequence *vicaria maritorum salutem anima* is syntactically incomplete until the end. Similar use of hyperbaton in a descriptive passage is found at *C. 2.6.2*. A father, who is accused by his son of madness because he is living a luxuriant lifestyle, says he learned everything from his son (cf. *C. 2.6.9*, discussed above).

C. 2.6.2 (H 113,21-23),¹⁶⁸ Arellius Fuscus

Omnia a te vitia:

quod unguento coma madet, tuum est;

quod laxior usque in pedes demittitur toga, tuum est.

These indivisible unitary blocks created by Fuscus are an overt expression of a thetic perspective; they require the broad, unitary processing that is part of the nature of theticity.¹⁶⁹ In descriptive passages, it seems, Fuscus is more explicitly thetic than his

¹⁶⁷ See Habinek 1985: 151.

¹⁶⁸ "All vices derive from you. The fact that my hair drips with perfume – you're to blame. The fact that my toga hangs loosely all the way down to my feet – you're to blame."

¹⁶⁹ Sasse 1995: 5: "In categorical utterances, the predication base is clearly set off by structural means from the syntactic predicate. In a thetic utterance, the element about which the predication would be made in the corresponding categorical utterance is somehow 'subsumed' under the predicate, and the entire string forms a unitary block."

peers. His word arrangement indicates a decided interest in how his expressions are viewed and processed.

The description of the woman, identifiable as Evadne,¹⁷⁰ who sacrifices herself on her husband's funeral pyre (*quaedam ardentibus se maritorum rogis miscuerunt*) similarly testifies to the individuality of Fuscus' art. The verb *miscuerunt*, the reading of the manuscripts (including the excerpted tradition),¹⁷¹ is emulatively different from *mittere*, the word employed by Triarius and Clodius Turrinus. Such "improvements" by Fuscus on the attempts of other speakers are seen elsewhere in the collection.¹⁷² Håkanson's replacement of *miscuerunt* with *<im>miserunt*, a conjecture which he takes from Andreas Schott and which must derive from a comparison with the other passages above, is a banalization. We might also see in this word-choice (*miscuerunt*) a desire to be graphically precise in his descriptions, as discussed above in Fuscus' use of compounds. The passages of Triarius and Turrinus are interested to show the variety of ways women sacrificed themselves; therefore, they do not need to be more descriptively precise. Fuscus, on the other hand, wishes to dwell on the description as description, concentrating on the details.

Further support for keeping *miscuerunt* comes from the fact that as a double trochee it offers a better clausula than the spondaic *immiserunt*. This kind of marked

¹⁷⁰ As often happens when *exempla* are cited, Fuscus uses the plural (*quaedam*) to refer to individual legendary figures. The figures serve as models or exemplary types; to the extent that several people might follow these models, Roman authors can speak of several Penelopes, Fabricii, or Catos. See, e.g., *C.* 2.1.18 (*Fabricii, Coruncanii*); *Sen. Dial.* 2.1.3.

¹⁷¹ Retained by Winterbottom.

¹⁷² E.g., at *C.* 1.2.5, Fuscus' *superpositus est titulus* compared with Latro's *titulus inscriptus est* (1.2.1); at *C.* 2.1.6, Fuscus' *dispendiorum malum for aes alienum* (Cornelius Hispanus, 2.1.14).

closure could be particularly important given the phonetic correspondence between *redemerunt*, which with *anima* forms a cretic + spondee, and *miscuerunt*.

Finally, in the *Ars Amatoria* (3.17-22)¹⁷³ Ovid would again employ these *exempla* in a way most closely reminiscent of Arellius Fuscus. Note underlined words below, and in particular compare Fuscus' *se miscuerunt* with Ovid's *miscibimur*.¹⁷⁴ The difference in expression between Fuscus and other speakers was not lost on Ovid, who stored away Fuscus' *exempla* in his memory to adapt them here.

*Respice Phylaciden et quae comes isse marito
fertur et ante annos occubuisse suos.
fata Pheretiadae coniunx Pagasaea redemit
proque virost uxor funere lata viri.
'Accipe me, Capaneu! cineres miscibimur' inquit
Iphias in medios desiluitque rogos.*

Editors have not appreciated the significance of word order in their attempts to mend the textual corruption within Fuscus' description of the woman's self-immolation.¹⁷⁵ The manuscripts read: *quaedam ardentibus rogestorum miscuerunt*. The excerpted tradition reads: *quaedam se maritorum rogis ardentibus miscuerunt*. Müller, Winterbottom, and Håkanson print: *quaedam ardentibus rogis se maritorum*. This conjecture supposes that the place of *-torum*, which is attached to *rogis* (mss: *rogestorum*), indicates that the full form *maritorum* once stood after *rogis*.

¹⁷³ Berti 2007: 298-9, also discusses *Ars* 3.17-22 in the context of the quotations from the elder Seneca.

¹⁷⁴ The mss read *cineres miscibimus*, which Heinsius corrected to *cineres miscibimur*. In support of this reading, Gibson 2003: 95, cites: *Epiced. Drusi* 163, *miscabor cinerique cinis atque ossibus ossa*.

¹⁷⁵ The textual point argued here may seem minor, but is instructive and has broader implications. At stake are 1) the need to recognize the role of word order in creating meaning; and 2) the potential use of stylistic differentiation among the declaimers to emend Seneca's often corrupt text.

The result is unsatisfactory. Not only does it fail to observe Fuscus' stylistic practices – namely, an interest in maintaining the integrity of (often long) *cola* –, the word order thereby is made vacuous, meaningless. If *maritorum* is separated from its noun clause (*ardentibus rogis*), it receives greater emphasis than it can support in the present context. It implies that Fuscus is making some point about the fact that it is the funeral pyre of the *husband*, rather than of someone else. To appreciate this fully, we must remember that *maritorum* also appears in the following clause (*maritorum salutem*). If the first *maritorum* is somehow emphatic, how can we make sense of its repetition in the second clause? Do the two work together somehow?

It is not odd, necessarily, that Fuscus uses the same word so close together. What is odd, if we accept the word order as given by Winterbottom and Håkanson, is an absence of purpose in the position of the first *maritorum*. The repetition only makes sense if *maritorum* plays subordinate roles in both clauses. These are pure descriptions; accordingly, Fuscus is not interested in drawing points of contrast within the two clauses – as for example Ovid does at *C.* 2.2.11, making a contrast between dying *with* the husband and dying *for* the husband.

The word order in Fuscus' description of suttee needs to subsume *maritorum* within another structure, as is done in the second description where *maritorum* is embedded in a hyperbaton. Thus I conjecture: *quaedam ardentibus se maritorum rogis miscuerunt*. It may be that *maritorum* was omitted; then, to indicate that it should be read before *rogis*, it was written above the word. Subsequently, the correction was misunderstood: *-torum* was incorporated to *rogis*¹⁷⁶ and the remainder of the word lost.¹⁷⁷

3.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, we explored Fuscus' tendency to create phonetic structuring, to give well-defined boundaries and shapes to his prose. The latter half of the chapter introduced word order into the discussion. It was noticed that Fuscus often places subjects at or near the ends of clauses. The observation required further exploration since, given the frequency with which it occurs, it seemed probable that this tendency represented a distinguishing feature of Fuscus' language.

One method to explore the possibility would have been simply to count instances of subject-final order in Fuscus' quotations and compare the tally with counts from the quotations of other speakers. However, even if this resulted in higher counts in Fuscus' quotations, the results would be both inconclusive and unsatisfactory. In the first place, we would not know if we are comparing like passages with like. Word order, among other patterns of language use (e.g. diction, verbal registers), is associated with certain contexts and purposes. It is flawed methodology to compare, say, a strictly narrative passage with a descriptive passage, which we know to be associated with verb-subject order. Secondly, what would we gain to conclude that Fuscus shows a tendency to place his subjects towards the ends of their clauses? It begs the question *why* he does this. It divides form from function and fails to get at the character of Fuscus' stylistic practices.

¹⁷⁶ There is some material evidence that the corruption was due to interlinear insertion rather than simple omission. Vat. lat. 3872 (V), which (as I have discovered) generally preserves the line-lengths of the archetype, has a slightly longer line where this clause occurs: this suggests that the line contains something extra, something not part of the format as intended at one stage in the transmission.

¹⁷⁷ The order as I have given it has a further advantage in that it is closer to the text of the excerpted tradition than the order in Håkanson's text: the word order of my conjecture and that of the excerpts is the same except the excerptor has positioned the adjective *ardentibus* next to the noun it modifies.

The primary question, then, must be: What is motivating Fuscus' subject-final word order? The answer is that, indeed, verb-subject order in Fuscus' quotations corresponds to passages that are descriptions. This word order in itself does not distinguish Fuscus from other speakers or from Latin authors in general. However, the frequency of these descriptive passages is crucial: Fuscus is given to descriptions, as Seneca himself says. He is identified with descriptions in a way that other speakers are not.

But it is not merely descriptions that interest Fuscus. The idea of theticity allows us to understand his verb-subject order in broader terms. Verb-subject word order is not used solely in descriptions of things. Fuscus uses word order to determine – *overdetermine*, we might say – the function of his language, to govern how it is processed and interpreted. This function is well represented by the label 'Presentational.' Fuscus often *presents* what he says, rather than giving his audience information, compelling arguments, or directives. Part of the presentation certainly is Fuscus' impressive language. Of course other speakers were just as interested in showcasing their language; this is part of what declamation is about. But Fuscus' consistent use of Presentational sentences, as encoded through word order, shows a conscious and assertive effort to create language that is meant to be interesting and meaningful in itself. He hereby maintains the full presence of language, in all its particulars, and insists that his auditors recognize language as fully participant in meaning. Fuscus makes no apologies for making literature out of declamation, which ostensibly is about training for court cases. It is this barefaced literary approach to declamation, we can well imagine, that exposes him to critical comments from the elder Seneca and others. Even when declamation is

regarded as an activity worth pursuing in its own right, as it was for many of those quoted in Seneca's collection, you were not supposed to confess that it was.

4. Arellius Fuscus: a presence in literary traditions

4.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter discovered features of Fuscus' language that differentiate him as speaker and prose stylist from other speakers. In brief, these are a method of *compositio* that produces phonetically and metrically well-defined *cola*, especially long *cola*; binary architecture; diction that I have characterized as impressive; and a Presentational mode of discourse. With perhaps the exception of Fuscus' diction, which includes innovative and at times unprecedented words or constructions, these features are not exclusive to Fuscus. Naturally other speakers – indeed, nearly all Latin authors – use phonetic structuring and use Presentational sentences to some degree. What distinguishes Fuscus is frequency and consistency of practice.

The nature of Seneca's anthology can be especially effective in highlighting differences between speakers, since it allows us to set passages side by side that in purpose and vocabulary are close to one another (shared *loci*). In doing so, a sense that we "grasp" the character of Fuscus as prose stylist is often most compelling in specific practices. It is remarkable how consistent Seneca's quotations can be in this regard – for example, in Fuscus' unflagging efforts to find cohesion through word arrangement, resulting in distinctly long *cola*, and in the appearance of the same uncommon words or phrases (e.g. *animus surgit*) in different quotations.

Consistency in these remarkable practices persuades us that we are witnessing something of what Fuscus as stylist was about. However, there should be no illusions about the extent to which we are able to recover and know Fuscus. When we speak of

Fuscus' style, it must be understood always that this is 'Fuscus as seen in the anthology of the elder Seneca.' Fuscus, and all the other speakers, are restricted by the nature of the book in which they are contained. This, rather than the presumed homogeneity of a declamatory style, limits our capacity to discover the differentiating characteristics of the multitude of speakers in Seneca's anthology. Still, by comparison with most other speakers, Fuscus is very fortunate; he has several lengthy, rich quotations, and the quotations *do* reveal. Among the best of these are the several long quotations in the *Suasoriae*, which will form the principal focus of this chapter.

In the discussion to follow, I examine Arellius Fuscus' quotations in *S.* 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. (Because of profound textual corruptions, I do not devote a separate discussion to *S.* 2, which also contains a long quotation of Fuscus). The pathways laid out thus far for discovering Fuscus' stylistic character are not abandoned in this discussion: attention is still paid to how Fuscus organizes his prose, and there is close analysis of Fuscus' diction. But the discussion advances beyond simply identifying consistent and peculiar characteristics of Fuscus' style to examining how Fuscus fits into and inflects Latin literary traditions. The objective is to arrive at a fuller understanding of what Arellius Fuscus, as literary figure, is and what he means for literary history. This is linguistic and literary identity in a broader sense. The study is, at the same time, meant to challenge established ideas about the role of declamation relative to other kinds of literature.

4.2 Suasoria 3

The theme of *S.* 3: Agamemnon deliberates whether to sacrifice Iphigenia since Calchas declares that otherwise sailing is forbidden.

Suasoria 3.1 (Arellius Fuscus)

Entry #1 *Non in aliam condicionem deus fudit aequora, quam ne omnis ex voto iret dies. nec ea sors mari tantum est; ceterum ipsa non sub eadem condicione sidera sunt? alias negatis imbribus exurunt solum, et miseri cremata agricolae legunt¹ semina, et hoc interdum anno lex est.² alias serena clauduntur, et omnis dies caelum nubilo gravat; subsidit solum, et creditum sibi terra non retinet. alias incertus sideribus cursus est et variantur tempora, neque soles nimis urgent neque ultra debitum imbres cadunt.*

Entry #2 *Quidquid asperatum aestu est, quidquid nimio diffluit imbre, invicem temperatur altero. sive ita natura disposuit, sive ut ferunt luna cursu gerit – quae sive plena lucis suae est, splendensque pariter adsurgit in cornua, imbres prohibet, sive occurrente³ nubilo, sordidiorem ostendit orbem suum, non ante finit quam in lucem redit – sive ne lunae quidem ista potentia est, sed flatus qui occupavere annum tenent. quidquid horum est, extra iussum dei tutum fuit adultero mare.*

Entry #3 *‘At non potero vindicare adulteram.’ prior est salus pudicae. ne quid huius virginitati timerem, persequerbar adulterum.*

Entry #4 *Victa Troia virginibus hostium parcam, nihil adhuc virgo Priami timet.*

Seneca offers the above as a typical sample of Fuscus’ celebrated expositions (*explicationes*). Now that he is an old man, Seneca remarks (*S.* 2.23), the over-

¹ Haase’s conjecture *lugent* for the mss’ *legunt* is also possible.

² The phrase *hoc interdum anno lex est* must be corrupt, but I am uncertain how to repair it. A genuine reading should reinforce, through additional visual detail or by means of a summary, the disastrous effects of drought: cf. Verg. *G.* 1.224; *A.* 3.137-142 (esp. *letifer annus*); Ov. *Met.* 1.269-273 (esp. *longique perit labor inritus anni*). As in these passages, *annus* should refer not to length of time, but either to a (dry) season or to the seasonal harvest.

³ At *S.* 3.4, where Seneca again quotes Fuscus’ description of the moon, we read: *sive occupata nubilo sordidiorem*. The variant (*occupata* for *occurrente*) may imply that this passage circulated in slightly different versions.

refinement and effeminate word-arrangement of these expositions seem distasteful – but no doubt it is these very flaws that will please his sons.⁴

Given the fact that Seneca can be schematic in his stylistic descriptions (cf. Chapter 2, Section 2.2), one should not assume that the “faults” Seneca has in mind can be identified precisely within the quotation. Nonetheless, there is no question about one point in Seneca’s comments: the quotation is indeed an exposition. The bulk of it consists of an explanation of how natural phenomena – the stars, the moon, the winds – produce various and variable weather conditions. And, no doubt, it is its performance as exposition that rendered the quotation worthy of record to admirers, and to rivals made it a target of criticism. From comments by Asinius Pollio and Seneca himself we may gather the form that ancient criticism commonly took: these kinds of expositions are an irrelevant indulgence. Thus Pollio says that Fuscus’ expository manner does not wish “to persuade, but to run wild”: *non suadere sed lascivire* (S. 2.10).⁵ Irrelevance also lies behind Seneca’s criticism that, in his description of the moon in the passage above, Fuscus goes out of his way to imitate Vergil (G. 1.427f.) when the material does not require it – indeed resists it (S. 3.4).

Whatever we make of these criticisms, it should not be thought that the license Fuscus’ purportedly takes with regard to the task of persuasion (i.e. by going into details when, if his task is simply to persuade, such details may be superfluous) extends to the structuring of the expositions. J. Fairweather claims that the description of the moon is marked by “wandering effusiveness”; and more than once she singles out this passage as

⁴ *hic <finem> suasoriae faciam. quarum nimius cultus et fracta compositio poterit vos offendere cum ad meam aetatem veneritis. interim <non> dubito quin haec vos ipsa quae offensura sunt vitia delectent.*

⁵ This reading is based on a conjecture of Hoffa: *<sed> lascivire*. The mss: *inscividere*.

proof positive of Fuscus' Asianism.⁶ In fact, however, these expositions are anything but an organizational mess.

4.2.1 An orderly and traditional description of the moon's phases

Both of the two long Entries above present a hierarchical itemization articulated by verbal signposts demarcating their several divisions and, sometimes, sub-divisions. So, the first exposition (*Non in aliam...cadunt*) makes the assertion that weather is variable, inconstant. To support this assertion Fuscus gives examples in near outline form:

Weather is variable. The stars produce...

1. (*alias*) drought
 - a. effects on the ground
2. (*alias*) rain
 - a. effects in the air
 - b. effects on the ground
3. (*alias*) moderate weather
 - a. sun is not excessive
 - b. rain is not excessive

The adverb *alias* coordinates the major divisions: drought, rain, variable weather. The use of opposites – air *versus* ground, sun *versus* rain – further assists in producing a sense of systematic order and comprehensiveness.⁷

The second exposition, like the first, takes the variability of the weather as its subject. As they stand, however, the two Entries are non-coherent, each tending in a different direction on the same subject. The first Entry is concerned with giving proofs of

⁶ Fairweather 1981: 246-51(esp. 246-7), 276; Fairweather 1984: 533 and 533 n. 2.

⁷ 'Orderliness' – that is, special concern for a precise arrangement of information (*dispositio*) – and 'comprehensiveness' are characteristics of technical languages (Fachsprachen); see Fögen 2003: 38-42, who discusses non-lexical features of technical languages, including *dispositio*. For (orderly) comprehensiveness in technical languages, *a capite ad calcem* ("from head to foot") – where the several parts of the human anatomy are addressed in an orderly list – is a common method of presentation in medical texts; Zipser 2005: 112; Langslow 2000: 147, 382.

the weather's variability; the purpose of the second is to present possible causes for this variability. To be sure, these treatments – which have only slightly different emphases – could easily be united, giving both proofs and discussing causes of the variability of weather. It is only wanting a speaker or writer to adapt and join them. However, they have been recorded in Seneca's anthology as discrete items, each independently following the familiar formula of Proposition and Elaboration. *Non in aliam condicionem...dies*, of the first Entry, and *Quidquid asperatum...altero*, of the second, are functionally equivalent Propositions: both are assertions that the weather is variable. To help recognize this, it must be observed that *Quidquid... invicem temperatur altero* does not mean a “mutual blending” of elements, as Winterbottom translates, but successive alternation of weather conditions. *Invicem* makes this explicit; and the subsequent description of the effects of the moon – now clear, now rain – bears this out. By contrast, the preceding phrase, *variantur tempora*, does refer to a blending of elements, not variability. This is made explicit through the description of moderate weather: *neque soles nimis urgent neque ultra debitum imbres cadunt* (“Suns are not excessively hot nor do showers fall more than they should.”).

Below is the outline of the second Entry. The conjunction *sive* articulates both major divisions (nature, moon, winds) and sub-divisions (phases of the moon). The use of opposites (bright vs. dim) again serves to create order.⁸

⁸ The organization, a kind of Chinese nested-box structure, may be better grasped through graphic representation. Note the phonetic correspondence of *Quidquid...quidquid*, enclosing the Entry at beginning and end as frequently happens in Fuscus' quotations, further corroborates the argument that this portion of text is a discrete Entry.

Quidquid asperatum aestu est quidquid nimio diffluxit imbre
invicem temperatur altero.
sive ita natura disposuit
sive, ut ferunt, luna cursu gerit

Weather is variable. This is due to...

1. (*sive*) a fundamental law established by nature
2. (*sive*) the moon
 - a. (*sive*) when moon is bright, no rain
 - b. (*sive*) when moon is dim, rain
3. (*sive*) the winds

Fuscus' organization of these passages betrays an awareness of how exposition is conducted in technical discourse.⁹ By technical discourse is meant language used by technical authors (Varro, Columella) and/or authors writing on a technical subject (e.g. astrology, animal husbandry).¹⁰ Characteristics of technical exposition are an orderly arrangement of material (*dispositio*) and a desire for comprehensive treatment of a subject. Here Fuscus' use of opposites, as mentioned, provides a sense of order and comprehensiveness. Also typical of technical discourse is advancing alternative

*(quae sive plena lucis suae est splendensque pariter adsurgit in cornua,
imbres prohibet
sive occurrente nubilo sordidiorem ostendit orbem suum, non ante finit quam in lucem
redit)*

*sive ne lunae quidem ista potentia est, sed flatus qui occupavere annum tenent;
quidquid horum est, extra iussum dei tutum fuit adultero mare.*

⁹ In Chapter 2 (Section 2.5.3), it was noted that Fabianus uses opposites to refer to the totality of a concept (= merism). This practice, often carried out in alliterating word-pairs or word-groups, assists Fabianus in creating an oracular voice in the passages examined. In the quotations of Fuscus, although the practice is similar, the effect is different. For the ability of *similar* formal features to produce *dissimilar* results, see Langslow 2000: 5 (quoted in the following footnote), and 2005: 293; it is fitting to invoke here the words of Herescu 1960: 124, quoted already in Chapter 2: "Nous avons là une autre loi de la stylistique, l'une des rares lois certaines que l'on peu formuler en la matière: **Rien n'est expressif en soi, mais tout peut le devenir par la mise en forme de l'écrivain**" [emphasis original].

¹⁰ Langslow 2000: 5, calls technical languages "*varieties* of a language, with their own history and areas of overlap with non-technical varieties which may have influenced them and have been influenced by them"; Fögen 2003: 32. Langslow 2000: 6-26, discusses technical language as defined by its terminology. For technical languages as a discrete category and subject of research, see Fögen 2005; and the massive collection of Hoffmann, Kalverkämper and Wiegand 1998-9. Langslow 2005 and Langslow 2000: 377-430 (see also De Meo 1986: 34-6) consider non-lexical features of technical languages; this aspect of technical languages has only recently received attention and is still in need of much research.

explanations for a given phenomenon (*siue...siue*),¹¹ often concluded by the restatement of a thesis (*quidquid horum est...*).¹² Based on the facility with which Fuscus applies organizational devices typical of technical discourse, it is probable that he was aware of technical expositions dealing specifically with the effects of the moon.

Vergil in his verses from the *Georgics*, which Seneca says (*S.* 3.4) Fuscus goes out of his way to imitate, is certainly aware of the literary tradition on the effects of the moon.

Vergil, *Georg.* 1.427-435
luna reuertentis cum primum colligit ignis,
si nigrum obscuro comprehenderit aera cornu,
maximus agricolis pelagoque parabitur imber;
at si uirgineum suffuderit ore ruborem, 430
uentus erit: uento semper rubet aurea Phoebe.
sin ortu quarto (namque is certissimus auctor)
pura neque obtunsis per caelum cornibus ibit,
totus et ille die et qui nascentur ab illo
exactum ad mensam pluuiam uentisque carebunt 435

It is, however, not at all obvious that Fuscus is thinking of the *Georgics* passage rather than other texts in this tradition. Indeed, the differences between the two passages are considerable: there are no verbal borrowings; the moon's phases are in opposite order (Vergil: rain – clear; Fuscus: clear – rain); and the manner used to signal the moon's phases is dissimilar. Fuscus speaks of the waxing moon as full of its own light (*plena lucis suae*) and rising into its horns (*adsurgit in cornua*), whereas Vergil says that the

¹¹ For the use of alternatives (*siue...siue*) in legalese, Powell 2005: 146.

¹² E.g. Lucr. 5.575-8: *lunaque sive notho fertur loca lumine lustrans, | sive suam proprio iactat de corpore lucem, | quidquid id est, nihilo fertur maiore figura | quam, nostris oculis qua cernimus, esse videtur.* Also: Sen. *Dial.* 1.6.9; *Ep.* 16.4-5.

waxing moon is pure (*pura*) and its horns un-blunted (*neque obtunsis...cornibus*).¹³ The waning moon, according to Fuscus, is obstructed by cloud (*occurrente nubilo* (S. 3.1); or *occupata nubilo* (S. 3.4)) and it displays a squalid orb (*sordidiorem ostendit orbem*); Vergil writes that the moon with obscure horn encompasses black air (*nigrum obscuro comprehenderit aera cornu*).

If Fuscus is imitating *Georgics* 1.427-435, it is difficult to see in what particulars he is doing so. And if such an imitation was for Maecenas' benefit, as Seneca remarks (S. 3.5), it is reasonable to expect a more overt imitation so as to render the imitation readily perceptible.

Other descriptions of the moon's phases in fact are closer to Fuscus' exposition. So in Aratus, *Phaenomena* 799-804 we note the same progression from clear to rainy. (This seems to be the more common order, as the passages cited below indicate.) Aratus' καθαροῦ ("immaculate")¹⁴ seems to lie behind Fuscus' choice of *sordidiorem* ("dirty")¹⁵ *orbem* to describe the opposite, rainy phase. Furthermore, Fuscus' *adsurgit in cornua* seems to be inspired by Aratus' ἐς κέρασ ἀϋθις ἰοῦσαν (800).

Aratus, *Phaenomena* 799-804¹⁶

Σκέπτεο δ' ἐς πληθύν τε καὶ ἀμφότερον διχόωσαν

ἡμὲν ἀεξομένην ἢ δ' ἐς κέρασ ἀϋθις ἰοῦσαν·

800

καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ χροίῃ τεκμαίρεο μηνὸς ἑκάστου.

Πάντη γὰρ καθαροῦ κε μάλ' εὐδία τεκμήραιο·

¹³ Arat. *Phaen.* 783-5: *pura* = καθαρή; *obtunsis cornibus* = ἀμβλείησι κεραίασι. See Thomas 1988: 139-41; Mynors 1990: 88-89.

¹⁴ Also verse 783.

¹⁵ Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 53.1 (*caelum graue sordidis nubibus*); *Ag.* 462.

¹⁶ "Regard the moon when full and when split into two sides, when the moon is waxing and when retreating again into its horns. Observe the moon's surface each month. When the surface is altogether immaculate, you can predict clear skies; when the surface is very ruddy, expect gusts of wind. When black here and there, expect rain."

πάντα δ' ἐρευθομένη δοκέειν ἀνέμοιο κελεύθους·
ἄλλοθι δ' ἄλλο μελαινομένη δοκέειν ὑετοῖο.

Pliny the elder's discussion of the moon presents a similar outline. Also, this passage and Fuscus' share the adjective *splendens*.

Pliny, *Nat.* 18.347¹⁷
proxima sint iure lunae praesagia. quartam eam maxime obseruat Aegyptus; si splendens exorta puro nitore fulsit, serenitatem; si rubicunda, uentos; si nigra, pluuias portendere creditur. in quinta cornua eius optunsa pluuiam, erecta et infesta uentos semper significant, quarta tamen maxime.

Though of course writing after Fuscus' death, Pliny preserves part of the tradition that would have been available to Fuscus. So, in the same passage, Pliny quotes Varro:

Pliny, *Nat.* 18.348¹⁸
apud Varronem ita est: Si quarto die luna erit directa, magnam tempestatem in mari praesagiet, nisi si coronam circa se habebit et eam sinceram, quoniam illo modo non ante plenam lunam hiematurum ostendit. si plenilunio per dimidium pura erit, dies serenos significabit; si rutila, uentos; nigrescens imbres.

Finally, a parallel derives from the mysterious scientist-magician Nigidius Figulus (d. 45 BC), an older contemporary of Fuscus.¹⁹ The quotation is preserved in Isidore's *de Natura Rerum*, as well as in other sources.²⁰

¹⁷ “Next, rightly, are the forecasts of the moon. The Egyptians pay special attention to the moon on the fourth day. If, when risen, it shines with a brilliant, pure light, it foretells calm weather. If it is red, there will be winds. If black, it is believed to portend rains. On the fifth day [text uncertain], if its horns are blunted, it predicts rain; if the horns are upright and threatening, it always signals winds, especially on the fourth day.”

¹⁸ “In Varro it reads thus: If on the fourth day the moon is upright, it presages stormy weather at sea, unless the moon has an unblemished crown around it, since the moon thus shows that it will not storm before the full moon. If at full moon it is clear in one half, it signifies fair skies; if red, it means winds; if black, showers.”

¹⁹ Also related is the fourth century author Vegetius, *de Re Militari* 4.41: *multis quoque signis et de tranquillo procellae et de tempestatibus serena produntur, quae uelut in speculo lunae orbis ostendit. rubicundus enim color uentos, caeruleas indicat pluuias, ex utroque commixtus nimbos et furentes*

Isidore, *de Natura Rerum* 38.2²¹

Nigidius quoque ait: luna si summo in corniculo maculas nigras habuerit in primis partibus mensis imbres ait fore; si in media tunc cum plena sint in ea cornicula, serenitatem. Certe si rubet quasi aurum, uentos ostendit. (Fit enim uentus ex aeris densitate; densitate obducta sol et luna rubescunt.) Item si cornua eius obiecta fuerint nebula, tempestas futura est.

None of these comparanda is close enough to Fuscus' description to suggest that it served as a single, direct model. Still, they are enlightening because they give a sense of the literary tradition treating the moon's effects on weather that must have been available to Fuscus. The relative proximity – in terms of informational content and organization – of Fuscus' description to these comparanda shows that Fuscus was sensitive to the tradition. At the same time, it casts doubt on Seneca's statement that Fuscus is directly imitating Vergil, *Georg.* 1.427-435.

This of course does not preclude the possibility that Fuscus' exposition could be *interpreted* as an imitation of Vergil.²² The Vergil passage need only be foremost in an auditor's / reader's mind for the Fuscus' descriptions to seem a direct imitation. And, as we are about to see, there is a real, substantive connection between Vergil's and Fuscus'

procellas. laetus orbis ac lucidus serenitatem nauigiis repromittit, quam gestat in uultu, praecipue si quarto ortu, neque obtusis cornibus mutila neque infuso fuerit humore fuscata. See Edward 1928: 120-1.

²⁰ Scholia to the works of Vergil (*Georgics* 1.428-32) and to the *Aratea* of Germanicus (15 BC – AD 19) (see Reifferscheid 1860: 234) with some variation preserve the same fragment of Nigidius Figulus.

²¹ “Also Nigidius says: if the moon has black spots on the tip of its horn, there will be showers in the first portions of the month. If the spots are in the middle, then when the horns are full, the moon signals calm weather. If the moon glows like gold, it indicates winds. (For wind is produced from a dense atmosphere; the sun and moon become red when enveloped in atmospheric density.) Similarly, if the moon's horns are covered with fog, there will be stormy weather.”

²² See Hinds 1998: 17-34, for the difficulty of attempting to differentiate when an allusion is intentional and when it is accidental.

expositions. But it is hardly so slavish and direct as the elder Seneca implies.²³ The fact that the scholia tradition to Vergil's works²⁴ preserves the quotation of Nigidius Figulus in connection with the *Georgics* passage suggests another possibility: if Fuscus is imitating Vergil, he may be responding not to *Georg.* 1.427-35 alone, but to a complex of related passages that circulated together.

4.2.2 Impressive language in a technical exposition

It will have been noticed already that Fuscus omits the second of the three signs, the ruddy appearance of the moon portending wind. The omission, which is hardly accidental, shows the priority Fuscus gives to the method of organization used throughout the two long expositions – comprehensiveness through the use of polar opposites.

In general, Fuscus' two expositions are remarkable for how they animate natural forces and portray them as having volition. Shifts in weather are an outcome of struggles between forces. During drought, rains are “denied” (*negatis imbribus*); when overcast, clear skies are “pent up” by clouds and rain (*serena clauduntur*).²⁵ The moon rises into its horns and “prevents” (*prohibet*) rains; when it is rainy, the moon does not put an end to the rains (*non...finit*) until it comes back into its light (*redit in lucem*).

Even a cursory reading of *S.* 3 will suggest that there is something exceptional about how Fuscus expresses himself, that it is ‘impressive’ as defined in the preceding chapter. But *how* is it different? *how* does it impress? The response of Edward (1928:

²³ Most likely there was no single model for Fuscus. It is impossible to know since so much literature has been lost. Nonetheless, the literature we do possess is enough to suggest wherein Fuscus' treatment distinguishes itself and means to excel.

²⁴ Hagen 1902: 270 (*Georg.* 1.431); Legrand 1931: 208.

²⁵ Cf. Albinovanus Pedo (*S.* 1.15): *fugit ipse dies orbemque relictum | ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris*.

118), shown in a comment on the phrase *quidquid asperatum aestu...*, is typical: “a good example of the fondness of Arellius for saying simple things in a very strange way. ‘*nimius cultus*’, I suppose.” “Strange” implies that Fuscus is engaging in a kind of chaotic creativity, that his linguistic creations are monstrous; all that matters to him is that his expressions be shockingly different – no matter how this differentness is achieved or what the outcome is. This approach is unproductive and inaccurate.

Close reading of *S.* 3.1, together with a study of relevant comparanda, reveals in Fuscus’ expositions a complex fusion of the mechanics of technical discourse with poetry. That this fusion is being carried out in prose rather than in didactic poetry, where it has a recognized place, is groundbreaking.

The phrases that elicit Edward’s response (*Quidquid asperatum aestu est, quidquid nimio diffluit imbre...*) illustrate this fusion of elements (poetry + science + prose). This use of *quidquid*, usually combined with a genitive or a modifying neuter adjective, is properly an instrument of technical literature: it allows an author to speak with regard to abstract qualities and attributes rather than to particular objects. So, for example, one may speak of ‘heat’ or ‘dryness’ rather than the sun or sand, of ‘moisture’ rather than rain or the sea.²⁶ It does not seem to have been noticed that, although there is not a genitive or modifying accusative, Fuscus’ two phrases are modeled after this

²⁶ See Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: I.228-9; Nägelsbach 1905: 119. Examples: Sen. *Nat.* 7.8.1 (quoting the Greek astrologer Epigenes): *quidquid umidi aridique terra effluit*. Celsus 5.26: *quidquid aridum est et intentione quadam proximum quoque locum male habet, usque sanum corpus concidere*; cf. Cic. *Phil.* 8.15 (*quidquid est pestiferum amputetur*). Celsus 3.22 (*quidquid excreatum est*); Columella 3.18 (*quicquid aquarum caelestium superfluxit*); 4.24 (*dolabella conueniet expurgare quidquid emortuum est*); 9.14 (*depurgare quicquid immundi est*); 9.15 (*quidquid sordidum deciderit attrahatur*). – Cf. also the quotation of Musa ridiculed by Seneca, *C.* 10 pr. 9: *quidquid avium volitat, quidquid piscium natat, quidquid ferarum discurrit, nostris sepelitur ventribus*. Musa, in a philosophical (Pythagorean?) mode, is arguing for vegetarianism.

technical construction and that, accordingly, they refer to abstractions:²⁷ the first phrase combines as a unit to mean ‘heat’; the second combines to mean ‘water.’

We may reconstruct the process by which this has happened. Fuscus adopts the technical construction as appropriate to the subject he is treating; but he wishes to re-invent it with what might be characterized as poetic descriptions of the effects of heat and water:²⁸ the heat, which roughens; water, which decomposes. The desire to fuse elements causes him to alter the technical construction, which ordinarily places the natural elements in a genitive noun or accusative adjective, to the present construction, which has the elements in the ablative. A consequence of the change is a discrepancy between surface syntactic structure, which concentrates attention on the *objects* stricken by heat and excess water (*quidquid*), and semantic structure, which continues to express *abstractions*, heat and moisture.²⁹ This kind of logical imprecision is not at all bizarre or uncommon, but is frequent in poetry (so, the figure hypallage).³⁰

²⁷ So in the translations of Edward and Winterbottom, emphasis (underlined) is not on heat and rain, as it needs to be. Edward 1928: 55: “whatever harshness the heat has caused, whatever excess of moisture the streaming rains have brought...” Winterbottom, *ad loc.*, who nonetheless captures something of the animation of natural forces: “whatever has been made rough by heat, whatever is dissolved by excessive rain...” A translation that captures the sense (though not the aesthetic): “Whatever heat there is, whatever moisture there is...”

²⁸ As stated in Chapter 3 (Section 3.6.2), Fuscus’ diction shall be considered poetic if the Latin corpus shows that a word or construction was used predominately by poets. Diction shall be considered technical if it was used predominately by technical writers, or if the word appears predominately in technical contexts.

²⁹ This kind of discrepancy seems to be a basic condition of language and in no way is limited to literary contexts. See Dik 1997: II.331-56. A classic example in Latin is the so-called *ab urbe condita* construction (not “from the city having been founded,” as syntax dictates, but “from the founding of the city”). – A rendering that better matches surface with semantic structure: *quidquid asperantis aestus est, quidquid dissoluentis umoris est...*

³⁰ The *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. ‘hypallage,’ quotes from W. S. Landor’s *Imaginary Conversations*: “The hypallage, of which Virgil is fonder than any other writer, is much the gravest fault in language.” For the use of hypallage in poetry, see examples in Bell 1923: 315-29.

Further contributing to the impression that these two phrases are poetic is Fuscus' word choice. *Asperatum* and *diffluxit* do not describe simply meteorological conditions; they at the same time refer to human, psychological and moral states. Again, Fuscus animates natural forces: the heat agitates and makes angry;³¹ rain corrupts and makes morally degenerate.³² For the former phrase, in its syntax, vocabulary, and in its anthropomorphism, there is no closer parallel than Vergil, *Georg.* 3.434, where the poet describes the snakes that infest Calabria: (sc. *anguis*) *saeuit agris asperque siti atque exterritus aestu*.

Several other phrases in *S.* 3 may likewise be regarded as poetic: *deus fudit aequora ... negatis imbris ... exurunt solum ... miseri cremata agricolae legunt semina ... serena clauduntur dies caelum nubilo gravat*³³ ... *subsidit solum ... creditum sibi terra non retinet ... neque soles nimis urgent ... adsurgit in cornua*. Since these *poetic* phrases are used in treating a *technical* subject in *prose*, they individually

³¹ For this meaning of *aspero, are*, see *TLL* 2.827.28- 63. The verb, according to its various applications, is in one context technical, in another poetic; it does not appear in Cicero, Livy, or the younger Seneca (*TLL* s.v. (Hey)). Fuscus' specific use of it to refer to the action of heat seems unprecedented (although cf. the compound *exaspero* at Colum. 9.15.4); from a later instance by Val. Fl. 5.368-9, we may infer that it is regarded as poetic: *non secus autumno quam cum magis asperat ignes Sirius*. Fuscus prefers *aestus* to *ignis* (Avien. *Arat.* 433 *media<m> creber pecori frontem asperat ignis*) almost certainly for the alliteration; cf. *subsidit solum*, which is attested only here, while *subsidit terra* occurs a few times (e.g. Vitruv. 2.4.1; V. Max. 5.6.2).

³² *diffluo, ere* commonly expresses physical corruption and disintegration; sometimes, as here, the verb is accompanied by a noun in the ablative indicating cause: Vitruv. 2.7.2: [*sc. saxa lapicidinarum*] *secundum oram maritimam ab salsugine exesa diffiunt nec perferunt aestus*. Cf. Verg. *A.* 3.636. The verb often too expresses moral corruption, sometimes with causes given: Ter. *Hau.* 945-6 (*ut eius animus qui nunc luxuria et lascivia diffiuit*); Cic. *Off.* 1.106 (*diffluere luxuria*); Sall. *Jug.* 1.4 (*per socordiam vires tempus ingenium diffiuxere*); Colum. 12 pr. 9 (*luxu et inertia diffiuant*); Sen. *Dial.* 10.1.3 (*per luxum ac neglegentiam diffiuit*). For the enfeebling effects of water on the human body, Petr. 42.1: *ego...non cotidie laior; baliscus enim fullo est, aqua dentes habet, et cor nostrum cotidie liquescit*.

³³ The phrase is without an exact precedent. It is notable in two respects: 1) use of *grauo, are* in the active voice; and 2) conceiving of the sky as "weighted." The active voice is first used among the Augustan poets: Verg. *A.* 2.708; Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.264; Prop. 3.7.70. Fuscus' use of the verb to speak of the weight of the sky is followed by later poets: Lucan 5.627-9: *latet obsitus aer | infernae pallore domus nimisque grauatus | deprimitur*; Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 1.163-4: *nunc uomit indigenas nimbos piceaque grauatum | foedat nube diem*.

embody this synthesis of diverse literary elements: for an auditor taking notes at a performance the phrases by themselves could signal Fuscus' innovative combination of poetry + science + prose. But the phrases intimate something over and beyond the fact that they are poetic. If we pursue their patterns of use in the Latin corpus a picture arises, albeit incomplete, of the method and significance of Fuscus' art and its position relative to poetry, both contemporary and later, and to emerging developments in Latin prose.

4.2.3 A Fuscine presence among poets: the image of the Despairing Farmer

In counterpoint to his rationalist exposition of the variability of weather – that is, the two outlines given above (Section 4.2.1) – is Fuscus' human image of the humble farmer, subject to the weather's whim. The farmer entrusts his grain, and his hopes, to the soil; but he is cheated, now by drought, now by excess rain. Whereas the rationalist outlines give us an idea of the position of Fuscus' treatment relative to writers such as Aratus, Varro, and Nigidius Figulus, the image of the farmer connects Fuscus with the poets (Vergil, Tibullus, Ovid, Manilius, Lucan).

In his description of the flood at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid too gives us an image of farmers brought to despair by the destruction of their crops:

Ovid, *Met.* 1.269-273
fit fragor; hinc densi funduntur ab aethere nimbi.
nuntia Iunonis varios induta colores
concipit Iris aquas alimentaue nubibus adfert;
sternuntur segetes et deplorata colonis
vota iacent, longique perit labor inritus anni.

Arellius Fuscus (Entry #1)
Non in aliam condicionem deus fudit
aequora quam ne omnis ex voto iret dies.

alias negatis imbribus exurunt solum,
et miseri cremata agricolae legunt semina

Comparison of Ovid's *vota iacent* with *ex voto* from the Fuscus passage suggests that the rhetor's exposition is permeated with the image of the farmer: *ex voto* in this Entry does not refer to the wishes of just any mortal, but to the prayers of the farmer for beneficent,

crop-producing weather.³⁴ This interpretation is confirmed by a group of similar passages from Vergil, Tibullus, and Ovid,³⁵ in which the farmer's prayers (*vota*) and hope (*spes*) are embodied in the seed which he entrusts to the soil (so, Fuscus: *creditum sibi terra non retinet*).

Similar to Fuscus' *fudit aequora*,³⁶ Ovid describes the rain as "shed" (*funduntur nimbi*). It will be noticed that Ovid's farmers have been hurt by rain, Fuscus' by drought. The difference is due to the exigencies of a particular context and should not distract us from recognizing a fundamental similarity joining the two passages: the image of the Despairing Farmer and his wasted crops.

The image of the Despairing Farmer subsequently appears in Manilius (late Augustan period) and Lucan (39-65 AD). The Manilius passage is particularly close to Fuscus' since the fortune of the farmer's crops are seen as subject to meteorological patterns and signs. In the Lucan passage, the farmers suffer not from destructive weather, but from the deprivations of Julius Caesar and his troops. Nonetheless, the basic outline of the image is constant.³⁷

³⁴ For Fuscus' use of *uotum* elsewhere, in non-agricultural contexts, see C. 2.1.7; S. 2.1; 5.1.

³⁵ Verg. *G.* 1.47-8: *illa seges demum uotis respondet auari | agricolae, bis quae solem, bis frigora sensit.* *G.* 1.223-4: *debita quam sulcis committas semina quamque | inuitae properes anni spem credere terrae.* Tib. 2.6.21: *spes alit agricolas, spes sulcis credit aratis | semina quae magno faenore reddat ager;* 1.7.31. Ov. *Ars* 1.401.

³⁶ Fuscus' expression is not exactly parallel with Ovid's in that the former employs the active voice and makes the Agent the divine force of nature. The earliest attestation of this particular use is from Tibullus (1.1.47), a contemporary (b.~55 BC) of Fuscus: *aut gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster.* The use follows a course through the works of successive poets: Ov. *Pont.* 2.1.26 (*Auster*); Germ. frg. 4.39 (*Mars*); Lucan 1.653 (*Aquarius*); Sil. 15.364 (*Iuppiter*).

³⁷ For the close association of the words *colonus* (Manilius) and *agricola* (Lucan), cf. Cato, *Agr. pr. 2: et uirum bonum quom laudabant, ita laudabant, bonum agricolam bonumque colonum.*

Manilius, *Astronomica* 1.876-79
*numquam futilibus excanduit ignibus aether,
squalidaque elusi deplorant arua coloni,
et sterilis inter sulcos defessus arator
ad iuga maerentis cogit frustrata iuuencos.*

Lucan 3.450-2
*utque satis caesi nemoris, quaesita per agros
plaustra ferunt, curuoque soli cessantis aratro
agricolae raptis annum fleuere iuuencis.*

The Fuscus exposition and the passages from Ovid, Manilius, and Lucan relate to each other precisely as do contributions from declaimers to a shared *locus*. That is to say, they are not one author's imitation of a particular passage of another author as it appears in a particular context. They do not resemble each other in minute detail. Rather, their affinity to one another resides in their purpose to express a basic narrative or descriptive "moment" (Despairing Farmer), and to express it concisely. This is a literary building block that may be adapted and altered to suit the context. It is transmitted from author to author, recycled without a name attached to it as its source and inventor.

The fact, however, that these passages operate as shared *loci*, that they participate in a tradition without a source identifiable by name, does not mean that there is not sometimes conscious and direct borrowing or emulation by one author of another. It does not mean that there are no literary debts. The Ovid passage owes something to the Fuscus passage. But it is difficult to define the debt exactly. Did Ovid compose *Met.* 1.269-273 while thinking about this passage, or something like it, from Fuscus? It is impossible to be certain. What is significant is that, insofar as the extant sources show, the Despairing Farmer as shared *locus* does not seem to exist before the Fuscus passage. To be sure, there are numerous passages in Vergil's *Georgics* (as we shall see shortly) that are related,³⁸ but the elements are diffuse and do not come together to form a

³⁸ Cf. *G.* 1.506-7: *non ullus aratro | dignos honos, squalent abductis arua colonis.*

compact, readily transportable and applicable, image. The creation of the Despairing Farmer as a shared *locus* appears to be the invention of Fuscus and his peers.

At *Met.* 5.477-486, Ovid again deploys the image of the Despairing Farmer in narrating Ceres' sorrow over her kidnapped daughter Proserpina. The destructiveness of Ceres' grief is absolute, consuming crops, livestock, and farmers themselves. The passage is remarkable for its combination of elements found in Fuscus' exposition at *S.* 3.1 and reminiscences of Vergil, *Georg.* 1.147-159.³⁹ Vergilian phrases are underlined; striking similarities to *S.* 3.1 are in bold. Similarity of the Ovid passage to *S.* 3.1 exists on a phrasal level: compare words in bold with phrases from Fuscus' Entry #1: *neque soles nimis urgent neque ultra debitum imbres cadunt*; and: *agricolae legunt semina*. The Fuscus and Ovid passages are similar also in their informational content and expository organization: damage is caused now by the stars (*sidera*), now by winds (Ovid: *uenti*, Fuscus, Entry #2: *flatus*).

Ovid, *Met.* 5.477-486
*ergo illic saeua uertentia glaebas
 fregit aratra manu parilique irata colonos
 ruricolaeque boues leto dedit aruaque iussit
 fallere depositum uitiatique semina fecit.
 fertilitas terrae latum uulgata per orbem
 laesa iacet; primis segetes moriuntur in herbis,
et modo sol nimius, nimius modo corripit imber,
sideraque uentique nocent, auidaeque uolucres
semina iacta legunt; lolium tribulique fatigant
*triticeas messes et inexpugnabile gramen.**

Vergil, *Georg.* 1.147-159
*prima Ceres ferro mortalis uertere terram
 instituit, cum iam glandes atque arbuta sacrae
 deficerent siluae et uictum Dodona negaret.
 mox et frumentis labor additus ut mala culmos
 esset rogibo segnisque horreret in aruis
 carduus; intereunt segetes, subit aspera silua
 lappaeque tribolique, interque nitentia culta
 infelix lolium et steriles dominantur auenae.
 quod nisi et adsiduis herbam insectabere rastris
 et sonitu terrebis auis et ruris opaci
 falce premes umbras uotisque uocaueris imbrem,
 heu magnum alterius frustra spectabis aceruum,
 concussaue famem in siluis solabere quercu.*

The Ovid passage betrays a double literary inheritance: Vergil and declamation. *Georgics* 1.147-159 lies also behind Fuscus' exposition. If the connection is not readily

³⁹ Mynors 1990: 31.

apparent, it is because it is one of several Vergilian passages that contribute something to S. 3.1. Further complicating his connection with Vergil is the fact that Fuscus does not adopt passages wholesale from the poet, but selectively culls phrases from here and there. These become raw material, to be compounded with other features; for example, technical constructions, binary composition and symmetry.

Analysis of the phrases characterized above as poetic reveals a strong Vergilian presence. This possibility has already been touched upon for Fuscus' *creditum sibi terra non retinet*, for which phrase *Georg.* 1.223-4 is likely a primary source.⁴⁰ The rhetor's *negatis imbribus* is remarkable in that an element of nature (*sidera*) "refuses"; the verb *negare* is seldom applied to inanimate objects.⁴¹ The earliest attestation of this anthropomorphizing, predominately poetic, use is *Georg.* 1.149 (*uictum Dodona negaret*), quoted above. The same verb and object are applied again at *Aen.* 3.142 (*uictum seges aegra negabat*).⁴²

Use of the verb *exurere* to describe the effect of heat on the soil, as in Fuscus' *exurere solum*, occurs almost exclusively in technical writers and poets.⁴³ It finds several Vergilian precedents: *Georg.* 1.107 (*et cum exustus ager morientibus aestuat herbis*), *Georg.* 3.432 (*postquam exusta palus, terraeque ardore dehiscunt*), and *Aen.* 3.141-2

⁴⁰ *G.* 1.223-4: *debita quam sulcis committas semina quamque | inuitae properes anni spem credere terrae.*

⁴¹ Similar is *denego, are*: *Sen. Oed.* 49 (*denegat fructum Ceres*). *Sen. Oed.* 41-50 (as Edward 1928: 117, has pointed out) is influenced by the Fuscus exposition; it is also Vergilian. Also: *Cic. de Orat.* 2.126; *Ov. Ib.* 107: *terra tibi fruges, amnis tibi deneget undas.*

⁴² Other instances: *Ov. Trist.* 3.10.73 (*poma negat regio*); *Lucan* 1.647 (*segetes tellus infida negabit*); *Plin. Nat.* 21.5 (*cum terra flores negat*); *Claud. Rapt. Pros.* 2.179-81 (*cum Thessaliam scopulis inclusa teneret, | Peneo stagnante, palus, et mersa negarent | arva coli*).

⁴³ Especially pertinent is *Lucan* 9.690-2 (and entire section 9.368 ff.). Also of interest, *Catull.* 68.62: *cum grauis exustus aestus hiulcat agros* (cf. *Ovid. Met.* 6.339); *Sal. Jug.* 19.6; *Mela* 3.100; *Plin. Nat.* 2.172; 17.44; *Cic. Brut.* 16 (*exustus siti flos*); *Livy* 31.30.3 (*sata exuri*).

(*sterilis exurere Sirius agros | arebant herbae et uictum seges aegra negabat*). This last passage describing drought is interrelated with *Georg.* 4.425-8, also a description of drought.⁴⁴ And, as just mentioned (preceding paragraph), the *Aeneid* passage (3.141-2) is interrelated with *Georg.* 1.147-159 (149: *deficerent siluae et uictum Dodona negaret*; 154: *et steriles dominantur auenae*).

Combination of *serena* with *claudere* is unprecedented. However, it is not difficult to see how Fuscus arrived at the expression. The substantive *serenum* is decidedly poetic in the plural, so Lucretius 2.1100-1, Verg. *G.* 1.393-4, Germanicus frg. 4.151-4, and Manilius 2.104.⁴⁵ The verb *claudere*, “to close,” is used because of a close association of *serenum* with *apertum* (“open”).⁴⁶ *Serenum*, it seems, is first set together with *aperire / apertum* at *Georg.* 1.393-4: *nec minus ex imbri soles et aperta serena | prospicere et certis poteris cognoscere signis*.⁴⁷

Therefore, it turns out that several phrases in Fuscus’ exposition can be traced to Vergil. Furthermore, it is notable that the phrases cluster in Book 1 of the *Georgics*: 1.107; 1.147-59; 1.223-4; 1.393-4. Fuscus has studied this book and knows it well. But,

⁴⁴ *G.* 4.425-8: *iam rapidus torrens sitiens Sirius Indos | ardebat caelo et medium sol igneus orbem | hauserat; arebant herbae et caua flumina siccis | faucibus ad limum radii tepefacta coquebant*. The two passages share *Sirius torrens / exurere Sirius*, and *arebant herbae*. Similar is *Georg.* 1.66: *puluerulenta coquat maturis solibus aestas*. – Vergilian (*exurere Sirius*) and Fuscine (*asperatum aestu*) elements combine in Val. Fl. 5.368-9: *non secus autumnum quam cum magis asperat ignes | Sirius*.

⁴⁵ Lucr. 2.1100-1: *nubibus ut tenebras faciat caelique serena | concutiat sonitu...* Germ. frg. 4.151-4: *flatibus at gelidis miscet tranquilla serena | spicifera Dea iusta manu, nec Libra tenenti | dissentit diuae, sed ut haec uentura serena | nuntiat; a uentis cessat mare, cessat et aer*. Man. 2.104: *uenturasque uident hiemes, reditura serena*. Also, Lucan 9.423; Val. Fl. 1.332. In later prose, Sen. *Ep.* 107.8; Vegetius (4th cent.) 4.38.13; 4.40.5; 5.11.

⁴⁶ *TLL* II.221.17-18, s.v. *aperio*; Non. 236 (p. 352 Lindsay) *apertum, purum, serenum*. Goetz 1888-1923: VI.79: *apertus, serenus*.

⁴⁷ Ov. *Fast.* 1.681: *cum serimus caelum uentis aperite [sc. dei] serenis*; Sil. 12.665 *laeta serenati facies aperitur Olympi*. Augustine, *de Opere Monachorum* 9.10: *et conatur caro et sanguis recta deprauare, aperta claudere, serena nubilare*.

it must be reiterated, Vergil's language constitutes only a part of the creative product. It is assimilated into Fuscus' verbal raw material and compounded with other elements. It is to the rhetor's credit that the scattered elements of the Despairing Farmer in Vergil have been concentrated into a single compact image.

4.2.4 Fuscine presence in moral philosophy: excess rain and the Despairing Farmer

The fusion of prose *with* technical literature *with* poetry, as is well-known, has a stunning sequel in the prose works of the younger Seneca. The philosopher-preacher-poet represents a radical transformation of Latin prose style,⁴⁸ a literary rebirth. His originality is beyond dispute, in my estimation. Still, inevitably the works of the younger Seneca are in some measure the outcome of the writers, speakers, and poets that preceded; and in certain passages of the philosopher it is tempting to believe one hears, almost directly, the voices of Fuscus, Papirius Fabianus, and perhaps others. A passage from Seneca's *Quaestiones naturales* (3.27-30) is a case in point: the passage, a description of an apocalyptic Flood, contains strands of a tradition that can be traced in the Entries of *S.* 3.1. Moreover, *Nat.* 3.27-30 is further relevant to our study since portions of it are reminiscent of a quotation from Papirius Fabianus (*S.* 1.4); an explicit reference to the authority of Fabianus secures his influence on the Senecan passage.

Therefore, a comparison of the Senecan passage with the quotations from Fuscus and Fabianus will serve two purposes: 1) it will demonstrate the continuity of a tradition in which Fuscus and Fabianus are formative participants;⁴⁹ and 2) the continuity and

⁴⁸ Guillemin 1957 calls him the second founder, Cicero being the first.

⁴⁹ Against the view of Fairweather 1981: 276, who in order to show that the younger Seneca's style is very different from Fuscus' prejudices the evidence by comparing *S.* 3.1 with dissimilar, non-descriptive passages from the philosopher (*Nat.* 1 pr. 12; 5.3.1).

greater length of the Senecan passage can suggest (albeit imperfectly) what more extensive passages from Fuscus and Fabianus might have been like.

The younger Seneca asks (*Nat.* 3.27.1): When it is time for the world to be overwhelmed by the Flood, how will it happen? The question clears space for a series of set descriptions – precisely the kind of discourse space which Fuscus and Fabianus preferred and in which they excelled:⁵⁰ other motives are set aside; now is a chance to engage in presentation and description. Below is cited the beginning of these descriptions. Some writers believe, says the younger Seneca, that the Flood will begin with excess rain; among these, is Fabianus.⁵¹

Seneca, *Nat.* 3.27.4-6⁵²

Ut quidam putant, inter quos Fabianus est, primo inmodici cadunt imbres, et sine ullis solibus triste nubilo caelum est, nebulaque continua, et ex umido spissa caligo, numquam exsiccantibus uentis. inde uitium satis est, segetum sine fruge surgentium marcior. tunc corruptis quae seruntur manu, palustris omnibus campis herba succrescit. mox iniuriam et ualidiora sensere: solutis quippe radicibus arbusta procumbunt, et uitis atque omne uirgultum non tenetur solo, quod molle fluidumque est, † iam nec gramina aut pabula laeta aquis sustinet †. fame laboratur, et manus ad antiqua alimenta porrigitur, ilex et quercus excutitur, et quaecumque in arduis arbor commissura adstricta lapidum stetit. labant ac madent tecta et in imum usque receptis aquis fundamenta desidunt, ac

⁵⁰ C. 2 pr. 3 (about Fabianus): *locorum habitus fluminumque decursus et urbium situs moresque populorum nemo descripsit abundantius.*

⁵¹ The text is that of Hine 1996.

⁵² “As is believed by some, among whom is Fabianus, first abundant rains fall, the sky is grim with clouds and a lack of sun; there is an unbroken fog, and a murk thick with moisture; the winds do not dry up the moisture. Then, the flaw is sufficient: there is a languishing of crops, which grow without producing fruit. Next, what has been planted by hand is corrupted, marsh grass sprouts up on all fields. Soon even the more robust vegetation experiences damage. Trees, whose roots have been undone, fall over; vines and all shrubs cannot be held in the soil, which is soft and liquid... suffers from hunger, and the hand is extended to primitive food; the oak tree is shaken and any tree which stands on high land and is propped up, held fast by a juncture of stones. Houses slide and are drenched; foundations sink because water has reached the lowest depths, and all the soil stagnates. It is no use to attempt to prop up what is falling: every support structure is fixed into sliding, muddy soil; nothing can stand still.”

tota humus stagnat. frustra titubantium fultura temptatur: omne enim firmamentum in lubrica figitur et lutosa humo; nihil stabile est.

The source Seneca mentions is very likely Fabianus' *Naturalium causarum libri*.⁵³ In addition, the phrases underlined above bear resemblance to Fabianus' description, at *S.* 1.4,⁵⁴ of the terrifying, monstrous wasteland beyond Ocean. Fabianus, as counselor to Alexander, advises the king not to proceed:

S. 1.4, Papirius Fabianus⁵⁵
Quid? ista toto pelago infusa caligo navigantem tibi videtur admittere, quae prospicientem quoque excludit? ... tantus ventorum concursus, tanta convulsi funditus maris insania est. nulla praesens navigantibus statio est, nihil salutare, nihil notum. rudis et imperfecta natura penitus recessit.

Noteworthy is the interest of the two philosophers in the dense murk (*caligo*) that envelopes the earth at its unraveling (for Fabianus, this is at its border; for Seneca, this is in the earth's cathartic destruction). Observe also similarities in the descriptions of an absence of stability (Fuscus: *nulla statio...est, nihil salutare, nihil notum*; Seneca: *nihil stabile est*).

The sentences in bold in the Senecan passage show a connection with Fuscus at *S.* 3.1: the younger Seneca's description of excess rain can easily be imagined as an expansion and development of the rhetor's exposition. It has the length and continuity that we miss in the quotations of the elder Seneca's anthology. The connection between

⁵³ Lana 1990: 203-4, suggests that all of *Nat.* 3.27 derives from this work of Fabianus.

⁵⁴ There are similarities too with the opening quotation of the *S.* 1, which lacks an attribution, but in all probability belongs to Fuscus (the possibility of ascribing it to Fuscus also suggested by Sussman 1977: 305 n. 7).

⁵⁵ "Tell me. Does it seem to you that that murk shed over the sea will admit sailing into it when it excludes even gazing into it? ...there is such a collision of winds, a great fury of sea stirred to its depths. There is no resting-place for ships, no point of safety, nothing familiar. Raw and incomplete, nature receded."

the two need not be direct. Seneca need not be fully conscious of what he has inherited for there to be a real Fuscine presence here. We can observe the salient points included in Fuscus' quotation. The excess rains fall, the sun is hidden, the sky is grim; there is an unremitting gray: *inmodici cadunt imbres, et sine ullis solibus triste nubilo caelum est, nebulaque continua...* The soil becomes soft and semi-liquid (Fuscus: *diffluxit imbre*);⁵⁶ it sinks and is unable to hold vegetation: *solutis quippe radicibus arbusta procumbunt, et uitis atque omne uirgultum non tenetur solo, quod molle fluidumque est.* The crops are damaged: *inde uitium satis est, segetum sine fruge surgentium marcor. tunc corruptis quae seruntur manu.*

Furthermore, the anthropomorphizing and moralizing tendencies in Fuscus' description of nature are taken up – or rather, overmatched by the younger Seneca: Nature destroys to rid the human race of its moral corruption, so that it can rise again with renewed innocence.⁵⁷ This will happen by the vast power of water, which can undo terrain as a kind of contagion.⁵⁸

As a consequence of the destruction, Seneca says (3.27.5) that the farmer is forced to revisit the lifestyle of primitive humans and forage for acorns: *fame laboratur, et manus ad antiqua alimenta porrigitur, ilex et quercus excutitur.* Significantly, this is an adaptation of *Georg.* 1.159 (*concussaue famem in siluis solabere quercu*), which was

⁵⁶ Also *Nat.* 3.29.6: *incipiet [sc. terra] ergo putrescere, dehinc laxata ire in umorem et adsidua tabe defluere.*

⁵⁷ *Sen. Nat.* 3.29.5: *ergo quandoque erit terminus rebus humanis, cum partes eius interire debuerint abolerique funditus totae, ut de integro rudes innoxique generentur nec supersit in deteriora praeceptor, plus umoris quam semper fuit fiet.*

⁵⁸ *Nat.* 3.29.7: *quemadmodum in morbum transeunt sana et ulceri uicina consentiunt, ut quaeque proxima terris fluentibus fuerint, ipsa soluentur stillabuntque, deinde decurrent, et hiant pluribus locis saxo per fretum salient et inter se maria component.*

cited in Section 4.2.3 as one of the ingredient passages used by Fuscus to create the image of the Despairing Farmer. Further on (3.28.2) in this imaginative exploration of the apocalyptic Flood, Seneca revisits the compact image of the Despairing Farmer, this time by explicitly quoting what was probably its best known version: Ovid, *Met.* 1.272-3, also quoted and discussed above (Section 4.2.3).

From the fact that *Nat.* 3.27 shows a connection with *both* Fuscus (at *S.* 3.1) and Fabianus (at *S.* 1.4, and in his philosophical writings) we may tentatively reconstruct the progress of a tradition: 1) Fuscus, using Vergil and other sources, creates the image of the Despairing Farmer and works it into a description of excess rain. 2) Fabianus adopts the tradition, consciously or unconsciously, adapting it to a description of an apocalyptic Flood. 3) The younger Seneca adopts and emulates the passage of Fabianus.

4.3 Suasoria 4

The long quotation of Fuscus given under the theme of *S.* 4 (see below) is a companion piece to the rhetor's quotations under *S.* 3. Seneca himself intimates this in a concluding statement (*S.* 3.7) to the latter. I'll now return to Fuscus, he says addressing his sons, and satisfy you with *descriptiones* whose development is similar to that in *S.* 3.⁵⁹ The closeness of Fuscus' material in the two *suasoriae* is made more apparent at *S.* 3.5,⁶⁰

⁵⁹ *S.* 3.7: *iam <in> vultis ad Fuscum revertar et descriptionibus eius vos <af>fatim satiabo ac potissimum eis quas in simili huius tractatione posuit cum diceret omnino non concessam futurorum scientiam.* Bieler 1935 suggests that these quotations from *Suasoriae* 3 and 4 are of a piece with Fuscus' so-called *locus religionis*, mentioned at *C.* 1.1.16. This possibility is not weakened by the fact that the latter passage has to do with a religious interpretation of events, whereas the *Suasoriae* repudiate such an interpretation.

⁶⁰ *Cur iste <in> interpretis ministerium placuit? cur hoc os deus elegit? cur hoc sortitur potissimum pectus quod tanto numine impleat?* Seneca quotes Fuscus as saying that here he is imitating Vergil's '*plena deo*' – a phrase that does not occur in the works of Vergil as we have them; cf. *Ov. Fast.* 6.535-8. See discussion below (Section 4.3.4).

where Seneca provides an additional Fuscus quotation to the theme of *S.* 3. The short quotation assails the legitimacy of the self-proclaimed mouthpiece of the divine, the prophet. It is precisely this kind of attack, as we are about to see, that occupies Fuscus in much of *S.* 4. And close examination reveals that the short quotation at *S.* 3.5 is an alternative Version of an Entry (Entry #2, in my analysis below) from *S.* 4.⁶¹

The similarity of the Fuscus quotations tells us that he would reuse the same material for different declamations. The practice is common to all speakers and, as is well-known,⁶² constitutes an essential part of an orator's training. The fact that Seneca gives us the quotations consecutively, and the fact that almost no one else is quoted in *S.* 4 apart from Fuscus,⁶³ intimate the organization of the supporting documents at Seneca's disposal: the quotations from *S.* 4 seem to be an addendum to the material under *S.* 3

Also in terms of what Fuscus is doing artistically, *S.* 4 is consistent with *S.* 3. Fuscus self-consciously and with calculated effect adopts technical language belonging to the discipline that he attacks: astrology. It is a display meant to show fluency in astrological discourse.⁶⁴ However, within the standard astrological phraseology and

⁶¹ The closeness of the two Entries (*S.* 3.5 and *S.* 4, Entry #2), evident in the use of the same argument ('the prophet must be no ordinary mortal'), extends to syntactical structure (*iste / hoc* + relative clause) and to similar sound patterns (*p* and *s*): *S.* 3.5: *cur hoc sortitur potissimum pectus quod tanto numine impleat?* *S.* 4: *Magnus iste et supra humanae sortis habitum sit cui liceat terrere Alexandrum; ponat iste suos inter sidera patres.*

⁶² Cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 130-141. – Seneca (*S.* 4.4) also informs us of another declamation that, like these, found Fuscus deploying a *locus* in which he attacks divination and the notion that the gods are intensely interested in human lives. *Fuscus declamaret et a parte avi non agnoscentis puerum tractaret locum contra somnia et deorum providentiam, et male de magnitudine eorum dixisset mereri eum qui illos circa puerperas mitteret.* The alliteration (*male – magnitudine – mereri*) and the phrase *circa puerperas mitteret* (cf. *tot circa unum caput tumultuantis deos!*) seem to belong to Fuscus; at the very least, they show Seneca mimicking what he thinks Fuscine.

⁶³ Except for a very short quotation from Hybreas, consisting of only five words, no other named speaker is quoted.

⁶⁴ For the language of astrology, see De Meo 1986: 236-47, 268-70.

manner of discussion, Fuscus also displays creativity and individuality. On the one hand, stylistic tendencies can be recognized that we have come to identify as Fuscine. But this creativity – these slight variations on literary traditions – amounts to more than the use of impressive words and phrases or characteristic shapes and structurings of clauses; it resides in establishing *loci*, compositional building blocks that were circulated from speaker to speaker, author to author, and in the process were varied internally and variously combined with other compositional building blocks. This type of analysis, with its concentration on *patterns*, their genesis and constitutions, rather than on direct lines of influence between our most celebrated Latin authors, has the potential to revise how we think about literary creativity, individual genius, and authorship in the ancient world.⁶⁵

Fuscus' quotation is divided according to where I believe there are breaks.⁶⁶ The theme: Alexander debates whether to enter Babylon, after he has been told through an augur that danger awaits him there. (As was well-known to the speakers, it was in Babylon where Alexander died.)

Suasoria 4.1-3 (Arellius Fuscus)

Entry *Quis est qui futurorum scientiam sibi vindicet?*
 #1 *novae oportet sortis is sit qui iubente deo canat,*
non eodem contentus utero quo imprudentes nascimur.
quandam imaginem dei praeferat qui iussa exhibeat dei.
sic est: tantum enim regem tantique rectorem orbis in metum cogit.

⁶⁵ An emphasis on systemic, transmitted patterns is perhaps better appreciated in ancient historiography, where we know authors relied on previous historians as sources. This knowledge is in part responsible for the tradition of 'source research' (*Quellenforschung*), which has often unjustly led to disdain for certain authors on the grounds that they merely copy their sources.

⁶⁶ Håkanson and Winterbottom 1974 think there are no breaks in the quotation until almost the very end (at my Entry #6).

Entry⁶⁷ *Magnus iste et supra humanae sortis habitum sit cui liceat terrere Alexandrum;*
#2 *ponat iste suos inter sidera patres et originem caelo trahat, agnoscat suum vatem*
*deus. non eodem vitae fine aetatem agat*⁶⁸; *extra omnem fatorum necessitatem*⁶⁹
*caput sit, quod <re>gentibus futura*⁷⁰ *praecipiat.*

Entry *Si vera sunt ista, quid ita non huic studio servit omnis aetas?*
#3 *cur non ab infantia rerum naturam deosque qua licet <proseq>uimur,*⁷¹
cum pateant nobis sidera et interesse numinibus liceat?
*quid ita inutili desidet <ani>mus*⁷² *facundia aut periculosis atteritur armis manus?*
*an melius alio pignore quam futuri scientia ingenia surrexerint?*⁷³

Entry *Qui vero in media se ut praedicant fatorum misere pignora,*⁷⁴

⁶⁷ Entry #2 is an alternative Version of the preceding Entry. Both present the same argument: You must be greater than mortal, for you are giving directions to a supremely powerful king. And cf. *novae oportet sortis is sit* with *supra humanae sortis habitum sit*.

⁶⁸ Mss: *non eodem uitae fine aetatemagna*. The passage remains corrupt, in my view, despite Walter's conjecture (*aetatem agat*). Likely there is a lacuna, perhaps the length of a line in a ms preceding the archetype. An attempt to mend the passage may profit from a comparison of *non eodem uitae fine* with *non eodem contentus utero quo imprudentes nascimur* in Entry #2. Such a comparison is especially relevant if it is accepted, as I propose, that the two Entries are different Versions of the same argument.

⁶⁹ *fatorum necessitatem* (Schultingh) is almost certainly correct (mss: *futurorum necessitatem*). For example, V. Max. 1.7.ext.5; Sen Ep. 101.7. Here, as elsewhere in this quotation, Fuscus is interested in a delicate play of sound: *Extra omnem fatorum necessitatem caput sit*
quod regentibus futura praecipiat.

⁷⁰ *<re>gentibus* my conjecture. *Gentibus* is vague, indifferent, pointless. *Regentibus* serves to define the boundaries of the Entry, recalling *cui liceat terrere Alexandrum* (it has already been demonstrated how common this internal organization of Entries is); and with menacing cleverness it points up the real meaning of *omnem fatorum necessitatem* (= "death"): if the prophet does not take heed of whom he is advising, he risks losing his head (cf. the experience of the astrologer Thrasyllus: Tac. *Ann.* 6.21). For the circumspection required to address kings, note Fuscus' comment to an unnamed student (*S.* 4.4-5): if the student had in reality quoted Verg. *A.* 4.379-80 to Alexander in the context in which he did, he would have become familiar with a certain other verse from Vergil (*A.* 2.553): *capulo tenuis abdidit ense*. Cestius Pius, at *S.* 1.5-7, directly addresses the question of how to speak to kings. On freedom of speech and autocracy (particularly as represented by Alexander), see Spencer 2002: 53-79.

⁷¹ My conjecture; see discussion below.

⁷² *desidet <ani>mus* my conjecture. Mss: *inutilidesidemusfacundia*. Kiessling 1872: *inutili desudamus facundia*. See discussion below.

⁷³ Cf. Man. 2.448-52: *hinc quoque magna tibi uenient momenta futuri, | cum ratio tua per stellas et sidera curret | argumenta petens omni de parte uiasque | artis, ut ingenio diuina potentia surgat | exaequentque fidem caelo mortalia corda*; also, Ov. *Ars* 1.185-6.

⁷⁴ *pignora* mss Winterbottom *signa* Håkanson. An inexact but relevant similarity appears between Fuscus' phrase, *in media se fatorum misere pignora*, and phrases used by Manilius and Lucan (cited by Housman 1926: 330) to refer to the Zodiac: Lucan 9.532 (*medium signorum orbem*); 4.109 (*medios signorum ignes*); Man. 1.308 (*mediumque orbem quo sidera septem | per bis sena uolant contra nitentia signa*). Has Fuscus combined two thoughts: 1) the Zodiac as the centrally located heavenly band that

#4 *natales inquirunt et primam aevi horam*⁷⁵ *omnium annorum habent nuntiam:
quo ierint motu sidera, in quas discucurrerint partes:
contrane radiis restiterit*⁷⁶ *an placidus adfulserit Sol;
an plena lucis in vitia surgentis acceperit,*⁷⁷
*an abdiderit in noctis obscurum caput Luna;
Saturnus nascentem an ad bella Mars militem,
an negotiosum in quaestus Mercurius exceperit;
an blanda adnuerit nascenti Venus,
an ex humili in sublime Iuppiter tulerit, aestimant.
tot circa unum caput tumultuantis deos!*

Entry *Futura nuntiant?*

#5 *plerosque dixere victuros et nihil metuentis oppressit dies.
aliis dedere finem propincum, at illi superfuere <in>gementes*⁷⁸ *inutili animae.
felices nascentibus annos sponponderunt, at Fortuna in omnem properavit
iniuriam. incertae enim sortis vivimus. unicuique ista pro ingenio finguntur, non
ex scientiae fide.*⁷⁹

Entry *Erit aliquis orbe toto locus, qui te victorem non viderit?*

#6 *Babylon ei cluditur, cui patuit Oceanus?*

4.3.1 A thought pattern (Entries #1-3): ‘we can dwell among the heavenly gods’

As a light into expressions which Fuscus uses, into the intellectual and literary context with which he is engaged in this quotation, Manilius’ *Astronomica* is a singularly fortunate survival. It is thought that Manilius composed his poem between 9 and 16

carries the stars, and 2) the stars as symbols and guarantors (*pignora*) of earthly events? Or, more likely, Fuscus’ phrase may be his own creation but built out of a customary phrase referring to the Zodiac.

⁷⁵ *primam aevi horam* is the conjecture of Haase and Bursian; mss: *prima melioram*.

⁷⁶ My conjecture. For the textual corruption here, see discussion below.

⁷⁷ This clause and the next (*an abdiderit...Luna*) contain my conjectures; see discussion below.

⁷⁸ V punctuates: *Atilisuperfuere · Egentes inutili*.

⁷⁹ V punctuates *non ex scientiae fide. Erit aliquis*, thus: *non exui · deeritaliquis*. (V² supplies *scientiae*.) The punctuation, which seems is wrong and which our three oldest Seneca mss (V B A) show to be in the archetype, demonstrates that the corruption is old. The reader who added the punctuation, perhaps in late antiquity, tried to make sense of an already corrupt passage.

AD⁸⁰ – that is, within a few decades after the composition of Fuscus’ quotations, which we can reasonably estimate to have been delivered sometime between 15 and 5 BC. Convergence of the two texts in certain ideas and expressions is good evidence for the currency of these ideas and expressions. It suggests that during this time span they enjoyed a florescence. They would have found place in lectures, recitations, and in other types of rhetorical performances now lost to us, in informal discussions – not only in the discourses of a Nigidius Figulus but among now unnamed intellectuals, among the attendees of recitations, and among learned rhetors and their students. This last point is important because too often declamation is dismissed as an intellectual backwater, disconnected at least by one remove from really meaningful intellectual trends.⁸¹ But a rhetor such as Fuscus does not simply repeat what is current, as if he had heard it only at second hand; the rhetor himself helps create this currency and is instrumental in determining what shape these ideas and expressions assume.

The following extended passage from Book 4 of Manilius’ *Astronomica* offers parallels to the first three of Fuscus’ Entries. In Entries #1 and #2, Fuscus makes (ironical) statements that the prophet must be greater than ordinary humans, that he must be born of the heavens (*non eodem contentus utero quo imprudentes nascimur; ponat iste suos inter sidera patres et originem caelo trahat*); he must project the image of God (*quandam imaginem dei praeferat*). Manilius’ parallels to these statements are in bold. In Entry #3, Fuscus asserts (again, ironically) that the gods and the heavens lie open to

⁸⁰ On Manilius, see Volk 2002; Volk 2009, which was not yet available at the time of writing this dissertation.

⁸¹ Similarly the younger Pliny’s work, which traditionally has been regarded as extraneous to intellectual trends and simply mined for information, has recently been taken more seriously; see Marchesi 2008; Méthy 2007; and *Arethusa* (2003) 36.2, a special issue devoted to Pliny.

us; we may break through appearances, abandon our terrestrial circumstances and live with the gods (*pateant nobis sidera et interesse numinibus liceat*). With these compare especially verses 876-884 (underlined).⁸²

<p><i>sed quid tam tenui prodest ratione nitentem scrutari mundum, si mens sua cuique repugnat spemque timor tollit prohibetque a limine caeli? "conditur en" inquit "uasto natura recessu mortalisque fugit uisus et pectora nostra, 870 nec prodesse potest quod fatis cuncta reguntur, cum fatum nulla possit ratione uideri." quid iuuat in semet sua per conuicia ferri et fraudare bonis, quae nec deus inuidet ipse, quosque dedit natura oculos deponere mentis? 875 <u>perspicimus caelum, cur non et munera caeli?</u> <u><mens humana potest propria discedere sede></u> <u>inque ipsos penitus mundi descendere census</u> <u>seminibusque suis tantam componere molem</u> <u>et partum caeli sua per nutricia ferre 880</u> <u>extremumque sequi pontum terraeque subire</u> <u>pendentis tractus et toto uiuere in orbe.</u></i></p>	<p><u>[quanta et pars superet rationem discere noctis]</u> <u>iam nusquam natura latet; peruidimus omnem</u> <u>et capto potimur mundo nostrumque parentem 885</u> <u>pars sua perspicimus genitique accedimus astris.</u> <u>an dubium est habitare deum sub pectore nostro</u> <u>in caelumque redire animas caeloque venire,</u> <u>utque sit ex omni constructus corpore mundus</u> <u>aeris atque ignis summi terraeque marisque 890</u> <u>hospitium menti totum quae infusa gubernet,</u> <u>sic esse in nobis terrenae corpora sortis</u> <u>sanguineasque animas animo, qui cuncta gubernat</u> <u>dispensatque hominem? quid mirum, noscere mundum</u> <u>si possunt homines, quibus est et mundus in ipsis</u> <u>exemplumque dei quisque est in imagine parua?</u> <u>an cuiquam genitos, nisi caelo, credere fas est</u> <u>esse homines?</u></p>
--	---

Similar ideas find expression also elsewhere in Manilius' poem;⁸³ however, they best come together in the above passage to demonstrate consanguinity between Manilius' work and the quotation of Fuscus.

⁸² The translation of Goold 1977: *ad loc.*: "But what avail is it to search out the secrets of the shining firmament with such subtle reasoning, if a man's spirit resists and fear banishes confidence and bars access to the gate of heaven? 'See,' he objects, 'nature is buried in deep concealment and lies beyond our mortal gaze and ken; it cannot profit us that all is governed by fate, since the rule of fate cannot by any means be seen.' What boots it to assail oneself with self-reproach, to deprive oneself of benefits ungrudged by God himself, and to renounce that mental vision which nature has bestowed? We perceive the skies, then why not the skies' gifts too? <The mind of man has the power to leave its proper abode> and penetrate to the innermost treasures of the sky; to construct the mighty universe from its component seeds; to transport the offspring of heaven about the places from which it came; to make for Ocean's farthest horizon, descend to the inverted parts of the Earth, and inhabit the whole wide world. Now nature holds no mysteries for us; we have surveyed it in its entirety and are masters of the conquered sky; **we perceive our creator, of whom we are part, and rise to the stars, whose children we are. Can one doubt that a divinity dwells within our breasts and that our souls return to the heavens whence they came?** Can one doubt that, just as the world, composed of the elements of air and fire on high and earth and water, houses an intelligence which, spread throughout it, directs the whole, so too with us the bodies of our earthly condition and our life-blood house a mind which directs every part and animates the man? **Why wonder that men can comprehend heaven, when heaven exists in their very beings and each one is in a smaller likeness the image of God himself? Are we to believe that man is born of aught but heaven?**"

Discovery of a particularly apposite comparandum of course can put us on path to mending textual corruptions. So, a corruption in Entry #3 where the archetype read: *cur non ab infantia rerum naturam deosque qua licet uisuⁱmus*.⁸⁴ The sort of verb needed to correct *uisuⁱmus* can be gathered from Man. 4.876-886, where the poet declares repeatedly, using a variety of expressions,⁸⁵ that it is possible to break through appearances and live with the gods. I propose *prosequimur*, which, unlike several of the verbs used by Manilius, is fit to be combined with both accusative objects (*rerum naturam deosque*) and which is appropriate with *qua licet*.⁸⁶

The idea in Entry #3 that a real comprehension of the operations of the celestial bodies and of what they signal requires all our time, indeed requires more than a lifetime of devoted study, is also expressed by the younger Seneca (*Nat.* 7.25.4-5). This viewpoint, namely that the object of study is essential for the reader's enlightenment, is to

⁸³ 'God dwells within us, we share in the Divine' (2.108; 116). 'Knowledge of the stars is a divine calling' (1.1-65; 4.387-392). 'The prophet of the stars is greater than other mortals' (2.136-144).

⁸⁴ *uisimus* **V** *uisuⁱmus* **B** *uisuimus* **A** *discimus* Håkanson *uisu subimus* Walter *ui subimus* Bieler. **B** has copied precisely what is in the archetype, a suprascript *i* over *u*. It is possible that this *i* was added to the archetype by the Corbie scribes of **V**, then subsequently copied by **B** and **A**. In other respects, as is so frequently the case with Seneca's text, the genesis of the corruption antedates the copying of the archetype, which (as I hope to demonstrate in a future study) was written in pre-caroline minuscule. I suspect the corruption entered the tradition when a copy of the text was made in capitals. Characteristic errors of this stage of transmission are disorder and omission of individual letters.

⁸⁵ *perspicimus caelum ... inque ipsos penitus mundi descendere census ... extremumque sequi pontum terraeque subire | pendentis tractus ... peruidimus omnem [mundum] ... nostrumque parentem / pars sua perspicimus genitique accedimus astris*. Cf. the note of Housman 1937: at 4.877, quoting Sen. *Nat.* 6.5.2: *magni animi res fuit rerum naturae latebras dimouere nec contentum exteriore eius aspectu introspicere et in deorum secreta descendere*.

⁸⁶ In different contexts, Ov. *Her.* 5.55-6 (*prosequor infelix oculis abeuntia uela | qua licet*); *Am.* 1.4.62 (*qua licet ad saeuas prosequar usque fores*). – An alternative conjecture: *qua licet uisu sequimur*. Cf. Bentley's correction, and the note of Housman 1926: *ad loc.*, for the mss' *mouentibus* at Lucan 1.639-41: *at Figulus, cui cura deos secretaque caeli | nosse fuit, quem non stellarum Aegyptia Memphis | aequaret uisu numerisque sequentibus astra*.

be expected of didactic and technical authors;⁸⁷ it validates their work and justifies the reader's investment of time. However, as with other passages quoted above (Ovid, Manilius, Lucan, younger Seneca), the similarity between this Seneca passage and Fuscus' quotation at *S.* 4 is not haphazard. The two passages are connected through a pattern – a pattern that Fuscus, and most likely others of his generation, were instrumental in producing.

A clue to a 'genetic' connection – that is, a connection that sees one passage as the descendant of the other, albeit probably at several removes – is found in the conjoining of two ideas: **1)** we need to devote all our time to study of the heavens (single underline); **2)** we degenerate morally by spending time in activities other than study (double underline).

Sen. *Nat.* 7.25.4⁸⁸
*ueniet tempus quo ista quae nunc latent
 in lucem dies extrahat et longioris aevi
 diligentia. ad inquisitionem tantorum
 aetas una non sufficit ut tota caelo uacet.
 quid quod tam paucos annos inter studia
 ac uitia non aequa portione diuidimus?*

Fuscus, Entry #3⁸⁹
*Si vera sunt ista, quid ita non huic studio
 seruit omnis aetas? cur non ab infantia
 rerum naturam deosque qua licet
 <proseq>uimur, cum pateant nobis sidera
 et interesse numinibus liceat? quid ita
 inutili desidēt <ani>mus facundia aut
 periculosis atteritur armis manus?⁹⁰ an*

⁸⁷ For example, Lucretius' (1.62-79) praise of Epicurus for how he lifted humans from an abject state; *Man.* 1.66-112.

⁸⁸ "A time will come when the day and the diligence of a longer age will draw into the light those things that are now hidden. Even if it devote itself entirely to the sky, one generation does not suffice for the investigation into matters so great. Why do we divide our years, which are so few, unequally between studies and vices?"

⁸⁹ "If these predictions are true, why is not our entire life devoted to this study? Why do we not from infancy pursue by every course possible the heavenly order and the gods, given that the stars are open to us and it is possible to dwell among the gods? Why does our mind thus sit idle in practicing eloquence? why are our hands worn down by perilous weapons? Do our talents possess a better promise of soaring than by knowledge of the future?"

⁹⁰ *desidet <ani>mus* my conjecture. The mss: *inutilidesidemusfacundia*. Kiessling conjectured *inutili desudamus facundia*, whom all subsequent editors have followed; Bieler 1935: 85, retains *desidemus* of the mss. The asymmetry of a 1st person subject (*desudamus*; *desidemus*) and 3rd person subject (*manus*) is

*melius alio pignore quam futuri scientia
ingenia surrexerint?*

From the perspective of Fuscus and the younger Seneca, the two ideas are linked, one attending immediately upon the other as if by a natural, self-evident association. The combination requires no justification; it is taken for granted.

The reader will observe, however, that on a verbal level the two passages do not seem particularly close; the younger Seneca does not follow Fuscus in the use of precise words or phrases. This is true. Apart from the fact that the books of the anthology are addressed to the younger Seneca and his brothers, there is no certain evidence that the philosopher has read this quotation. And yet, it has shaped his thought and expression. This is because comparison of the two passages witnesses not a *verbal* influence, but influence through the deployment of a *thought pattern*, a nexus of ideas. Questions of how and why these ideas occur together admit of various kinds of interpretations – literary, psychological, cultural.

It is possible further to define and expand the identified thought pattern shared by Fuscus and the younger Seneca. So, in addition to the two ideas listed above we may observe: **3)** Seneca and Fuscus apply their comments to the same basic subject, viz.

cosmology. The skies are open to us for study. This discipline is particularly suited to

improbable. *Animus* provides the required counterbalance to *manus*; cf. Fuscus at *S.* 2.1: *at, puto, rudis lecta aetas, animus qui frangeretur metu insuetaque arma non passurae manus*. The probability of *desidet* is strengthened by the final question of this Entry (*ingenia surrexerint*; presently the human mind “sits languishing” in other activities, whereas it could “soar” in intimate knowledge of the cosmos); *desidet*, together with *animus*, connote moral degeneration, an integral element of this Entry, as I argue. For a morally loaded use of *desidere* to describe rhetorical exercise, cf. the edict of 92 BC, recorded by Suet. *Gram.* 25.2, forbidding the schools of Latin rhetors at Rome: *eos sibi nomen imposuisse Latinos rhetoras, ibi homines adulescentulos dies totos desidere*. On this edict and the teaching of rhetoric at Rome in the late republic, see Kaster 1995: 273-4; Schmidt 1975. – The younger Seneca also elsewhere (*Nat.* 4a pr. 10) says that *ingenium* may become divine or be wasted: *ingenium suspicere coepisti omnium maximum et dignissimum, quod consecrari mallet quam conteri*. Also, see Lact. *Inst.* 3.2.8; Aug. *Civ.* 8.10 (these noted by Goodyear 1965: 150).

the moral antithesis that is drawn: study of the stars, which are deities, makes humans divine; failure to study them makes humans base.⁹¹ 4) After speaking of the time needed for study and how humans squander their time, both authors (Fuscus, Entry #4; Sen. *Nat.* 7.25.5)⁹² give a series of indirect questions typical of those that guide cosmological studies.⁹³

These additional observations render the link between the two passages more secure. But, it must be emphasized, the connection being drawn here is approximate rather than precise. The passages share small pieces in a larger assemblage of ideas – pieces that may be adapted and variously combined. These pieces are ‘building blocks,’ a phrase used in the previous section to describe shared *loci*.

‘Thought pattern’ and ‘shared *locus*’ are meant to be complementary, overlapping terms. They represent degrees on a continuum of influence. ‘Thought pattern’ is broader; it applies to influence that is indirect and compounded with other influences. It need not manifest itself in exact verbal matches. Also ‘thought pattern’ is meant to allow for extra-literary considerations, the cultural impact of a shared *locus*: it changes in a fundamental way how a person expresses himself, what ideas he associates together, and

⁹¹ Also the unknown author of the *Aetna* (date unknown, but probably between late Augustan period and 79 AD, the eruption of Vesuvius) speaks of the possibility of attaining divinity through knowledge, 226-7: *nosse fidem rerum dubiasque exquirere causas, | ingenium sacrare caputque attollere caelo*. Instead, we waste our time in trivialities, 257: *torquemur miseri in parvis premimurque labore*.

⁹² Sen. *Nat.* 7.25.5 (interrogatives underlined): *harum quinque stellarum quae se ingerunt nobis, quae alio atque alio occurrentes loco curiosos nos esse cogunt qui matutini uespertinique ortus sint, quae stationes, quando in rectum ferantur, quare agantur retro, modo coepimus scire. utrum <e>mergeret Iuppiter an occideret an retrogradus esset – nam hoc illi nomen imposuere cedenti – ante paucos annos didicimus*.

⁹³ It is well-known that series of indirect questions, laying out the topics of investigation, commonly appear in technical (poetic) expositions; e.g. Verg. *G.* 1.1-5; Man. 1.99-112; *Aetna* 219-50 (see Goodyear 1965: 149-50).

potentially how a person organizes his thought.⁹⁴ ‘Shared *loci*,’ on the other hand, are more proximate to one another, and their connection can be seen in the use of specific words.

4.3.2 Fuscine mediation in the tradition of the planetary list (Entry #4)

Entry #4 contains corrupt patches. Nonetheless, the organization of the Entry is easily made out. It begins with a Proposition, a statement of the business of astrologers: they claim to be able to forecast a person’s personality and life fortunes based on the positions of the stars at the time of the person’s birth; this is the art of ‘genethliology.’ Typical Fuscine language is in evidence; specifically, the presence of long *cola* with enclosing word order (*in media...pignora; primam aevi horam...nuntiam*). The phrase *discucurrerint in partes*, which is familiar from other authors,⁹⁵ is technical terminology. The verb *discurro* is commonly used to refer to the movement of celestial bodies.⁹⁶ *Partes* refers to sections (also called *loci*) of the firmament in a system, called the *dodecatropos*, that divides the heavens into twelve equal parts.⁹⁷

After the Proposition, Fuscus proceeds to give a Presentational list that touches upon each of the seven planets and gives concise example descriptions of the effects that the planets might have on the newborn, or ‘native.’ It is within this list of sub-categories

⁹⁴ For suggestive remarks on how rhetorical exercises can shape thinking, see Webb 2001: 290, 292.

⁹⁵ Sen. *Dial.* 12.6.6-7: *aspice sidera mundum inlustrantia: nullum eorum perstat. <sol> labitur adsidue et locum ex loco mutat et, quamuis cum uniuerso uertatur, in contrarium nihilo minus ipsi mundo refertur, per omnes signorum partes discurrit, numquam resistit.* The human mind is like the celestial bodies whence it has its origin. It is in continuous motion, just as are the planets. See also Macr. *In Somn.* 1.21.9-10.

⁹⁶ Luc. 1.643; Sen. *Ben.* 4.23.4; *Nat.* 7.13.1; Plin. *Nat.* 18.351; Amm. 26.1.13.

⁹⁷ Man. 2.856-967; Goold 1977: lvi-lxi; Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 284, who cites and quotes the Fuscus passage. Interestingly, Bouché-Leclercq makes an epigraph for his title page out of the Fuscus quotation (*Natales inquirunt: -- existimant tot circa unum caput tumultuantes deos*).

(the Elaboration), beginning with the description of the Sun, that more serious textual difficulties occur.

The order in which Fuscus lists the planets is significant. When astrological writers discuss the seven planets (which includes the Sun and Moon), sequence matters and is informed by a rationale – for example, their relative importance, or their distance from earth. A canonical order for *horoscopic* readings is:⁹⁸ Sun, Moon, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, Mercury.⁹⁹ Order based on *distance* from the earth gives the sequence: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon. Fuscus follows neither of these, but gives: Sun, Moon, Saturn, Mars, Mercury, Venus, Jupiter.

Fuscus' planetary order is unique in some of its peculiarities, having no exact parallel in Greek and Latin authors, so far as I am aware. Nonetheless, it is genuine, methodical, and in touch with a particular astrological tradition. He places the luminaries (Sun, Moon) first, as is common on account of their preeminent importance. Next, he groups together the remaining planets according to their influences, whether harmful or benevolent: malefics (Saturn, Mars), neutral (Mercury), benefics (Venus, Jupiter). This method, which creates antithetical groups of planets, follows a received astrological tradition that sees the planets and their powers in terms of opposing physical properties, specifically the Aristotelian principles of *hot* and *cold*, *wet* and *dry*.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ A *horoscopic* reading is interested in discovering information about a person and his life based on the position of the stars at the time of birth.

⁹⁹ Vettius Valens, writing in Greek between AD 152 and 162 (Beck 2007: 73), begins his work by introducing the planets in this order; Bara 1989. Hannah 1996: 187-8 n. 14, states that the horoscopic sequence given above is followed by about two-thirds of papyri horoscopes and by the vast majority of horoscopes edited by Neugebauer and Van Hoesen 1959. On planetary sequence, see Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 63-5, 106-7; Beck 2007: 71-3.

¹⁰⁰ Feraboli 1998: 369-70; Barton 1994: 102-9; Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 25-7; Boll, Bezold and Gundel 1926: 50.

In addition to an antithesis between groups of planets (malefics vs. benefics), also within groups planets are defined antithetically against each other by virtue of their physical constitutions. Thus, Saturn and Mars are grouped together as malefics because both are dry; but they are also opposites in that Saturn is cold and Mars is hot. Venus and Jupiter are grouped together as benefics, both being temperate rather than too hot or cold; they are at the same time antithetical, since Jupiter is dry and Venus humid (typical of males and females respectively).¹⁰¹ These antitheses, which have their basis in physical properties, were perhaps especially agreeable to Fuscus in his demonstrated preference for binary architecture.

Our earliest, most extensive exponent of this method of applying Aristotelian principles to astrology is Ptolemy, who was writing in Greek c. 150 AD. However, it was almost certainly developed earlier, as can be seen from short passages in Cicero (*N.D.* 2.46), Vergil (*G.* 1.336), Vitruvius (9.1), and the elder Pliny (2.34).¹⁰² How does Fuscus, who does not profess to be a devoted student of astrology, fit into all this? The answer is he serves to mediate the tradition, passing it on to later speakers and writers. But, most

¹⁰¹ See Bara 1989: 38-48.

¹⁰² Barton 1994: 102-7. Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 95 n. 2, supposes the system goes back to Posidonius. To the passages cited above, add Sen. *Ep.* 88.14, where Seneca pairs Mars and Saturn (*venio nunc ad illum qui caelestium notitia gloriatur*. [Verg. *G.* 1.336-7 quoted] *hoc scire quid proderit? ut sollicitus sim cum Saturnus et Mars ex contrario stabunt*); in what follows (88.16) the younger Seneca quotes also Verg. *G.* 1.424-6. There is a suggestive convergence of elements in *Ep.* 88.14-17: **a**) Seneca's treatment of astrology is concise with well-defined boundaries. It has, in other words, the same organizational definitiveness, independence and portability as a declaimer's *locus*; moreover, it is a *locus* that dismisses astrology as useless. **b**) It seems to follow an astrological system that sees planetary influences in terms of natural properties (Saturn vs. Mars). **c**) It cites *Georgics* Bk 1, which, as we have seen, supplies Fuscus with verbal raw material for his expositions on meteorology and which the elder Seneca says Fuscus imitates. Therefore, *Ep.* 88.14-17 reflects the component parts in the assembly of a tradition: Vergil is recognized as authority for a concentrated pattern. But in fact Vergil did not create this pattern; it was made into a pattern, in part from Vergil's language, by Fuscus and others in a scholastic and performative context. Vergil's authority has been constructed, has been assembled and claimed, rather than passively received. Cf. also Sen. *Nat.* 7.25.3 (which forms part of the passage discussed above, Section 4.3.1), where Seneca quotes Verg. *G.* 1.137.

importantly, in the act of mediation he alters the tradition, changing its organization and combining it with other features to establish a particular, authoritative nexus of ideas.

The purpose and meaning of the tradition are thereby redefined; a new tradition is born.

This process of mediation is best traced through certain passages of Lucan.

<p>Lucan 1.650-663 (Figulus)</p> <p><i>extremi multorum tempus in unum conuenere dies. summo si frigida caelo stella nocens nigros Saturni accenderet ignis, Deucalioneos fudisset Aquarius imbres totaque diffuso latuisset in aequore tellus. si saeuum radiis Nemeaeum, Phoebe, Leonem nunc premeres, toto fluerent incendia mundo succensusque tuis flagrasset curribus aether. hi cessant ignes. tu, qui flagrante minacem Scorpion incendis cauda chelasque peruris, quid tantum, Gradiue, paras? nam mitis in alto Iuppiter occasu premitur, Venerisque salubre sidus hebet, motuque celer Cyllenius haeret, et caelum Mars solus habet.</i></p>	<p>650</p> <p>655</p> <p>660</p>	<p>Lucan 10.199-209 (Acoreus)</p> <p><i>sideribus, quae sola fugam moderantur Olympi occurruntque polo, diuersa potentia prima mundi lege data est. Sol tempora diuidit aevi, mutat nocte diem, radiisque potentibus astra ire uetat cursusque uagos statione moratur; Luna suis uicibus Tethyn terrenaque miscet; frigida Saturno glacies et zona niualis cessit; habet uentos incertaque fulmina Mauors; sub Ioue temperies et numquam turbidus aer; at fecunda Venus cunctarum semina rerum possidet; immensae Cyllenius arbiter undae est.</i></p>	<p>200</p> <p>205</p>
--	----------------------------------	---	-----------------------

In Book 10 of Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*, Acoreus, a perhaps fictional counselor to the Ptolemaic court, teaches Julius Caesar about the influence of the stars and their role in the origins of the Nile. At the start of the disquisition, he gives an overview of the powers of the planets (10.199-209). Underlying this survey is the Aristotelian system of physical properties that will come to be explicated by Ptolemy. This is evident not only from the natural qualities assigned to the planets (e.g. *frigida Saturno glacies*, 205; *sub Ioue temperies et numquam turbidus aer*, 207), but also from the fact that Acoreus' planetary order is identical to Ptolemy, *Tetra*. 1.4, where the latter also gives an overview of the powers of the planets. This sequence is also very close to Fuscus', except for two slight variations: after the luminaries, the malefics are paired together (Saturn, Mars), then the benefics ('Jupiter, Venus,' whereas Fuscus has 'Venus, Jupiter'). Acoreus sets Mercury (*Cyllenius*) last, whereas Fuscus places the messenger god between the malefics

and benefics. Since there are seven stars in a system attempting to organize by pairs, there must be an odd man out. The neutrality of Mercury can justify his isolation, whether he is set transitionally between planets that are committed in their influences or made to follow them.

However, the Lucan passage is hardly a faithful and unmixed representative of the tradition that Ptolemy will take up. Astrological anomalies, such as the roles assigned to Mars and Mercury, as well as interpretive questions, such as the purpose of giving an overview of the planets' powers in a discussion about the Nile, advise us that other, non-astrological texts have influenced Lucan's treatment.¹⁰³ Many of these apparent anomalies in the Lucan passage arise from the fact that the poet is not operating strictly within an astrological tradition, but is using an authoritative pattern established in declamatory gatherings.

The presence and constituent parts of this pattern emerge more clearly when we compare the Acoreus passage with another passage from Lucan's epic, 1.650-663. There Lucan portrays Nigidius Figulus as giving an astrological reading to the Senate panicked about the atrocities of impending civil war. Like the Acoreus passage, therefore, the end of Book 1 contains a wise man's disquisition on learned, at times mystical, subjects. The two passages from Lucan share a circumstantial premise with the Fuscus quotation: a wise man gives counsel to a powerful audience on an erudite subject, namely the effects of the planets. It is in fact the basic premise of *suasoriae*, except that these need not explore learned subjects.

¹⁰³ This is the conclusion of Berti 2000: 175-81.

Figulus too offers a list of the planets and their activities. His planetary sequence (Saturn, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Venus, Mercury), though varying from the orders given by Ptolemy, Acoreus, and Fuscus, betrays the same motivation to set malefics and benefics in separate groups. The Sun, which can be malevolent or benevolent, is made harmful when grouped with the malefics Saturn and Mars. This group of three malevolent stars is balanced against three benefics: Jupiter, Venus, Mercury. Like the Sun, neutral Mercury changes his influence according to the company in which he is found; here he is benevolent. That antithesis motivates Figulus' planetary order was observed by Hannah (1996), in an article re-evaluating the accuracy of Figulus' astrological reading. Hannah found Figulus' planetary order to be unusual and concluded that the order owes something to literary influences, citing 'poetry' and 'rhetoric' in particular.¹⁰⁴

By juxtaposing Fuscus' exposition with Lucan's discussions of the planets, in the personae of Acoreus and Figulus, we become aware of a tradition. The disquisitions of Figulus and Acoreus are variations on a shared pattern: it is the same pattern with which Fuscus is working and which, it seems, he helped establish.

Figulus' variation is due to contextual demands. Lucan wants to make Figulus read in the stars: 'Destruction by War.' Accordingly, Figulus declares: the stars show that a multitude of people, though having different birthdays, are fated to die within the same time period (1.650-1). How will it happen? The answer is not by flood (Saturn) nor by conflagration (Sun) (1.651-7), but by war (1.660-672).¹⁰⁵ Mars, as god of war,

¹⁰⁴ Hannah 1996: 179-80, says it is "redolent of themes encountered in both poetry and prose, particularly in rhetoric." He fittingly compares Petr. 98.9: *utinam me solum inimicus ignis hauriret uel hibernum inuaderet mare*. He seems unaware of the Fuscus quotation.

¹⁰⁵ So, Ovid's Jupiter thinks of destroying humankind with lightning bolts but decides against it because it may cause fire to consume heaven and earth (*Met.* 1.253-9). Instead, he destroys by flood (1.260-1).

dominates the heavens (1.663: *caelum Mars solus habet*), and is given twice in the list (1.660, 663). The absence of the Moon may be explained by the fact that her fellow luminary and brother, the Sun, stands in antithesis with Saturn; there is no planet with which she might be coupled.

The principle of variation means that the two Lucan passages resemble the Fuscus quotation in slightly different ways. Whereas Acoreus gives a planetary order slightly closer to Fuscus', Figulus and Fuscus list their planets in the same manner – as broad scope presentations; that is, they use a thetic perspective (more on this below). All these passages together reconstruct a core pattern – a pattern that possesses authority but is at the same time flexible. This is the custom, as we have seen, among speakers in Seneca's collection. In a shared *locus* declaimers are expected to vary what a fellow declaimer has said, not repeat it.

In addition to the shared premise of the three disquisitions (i.e. a wise man imparts erudite knowledge about the heavens to a powerful audience), the following belong to this pattern: 1) a descriptive listing of the planets; 2) a list in short compass,¹⁰⁶ corresponding to the size of Entries in the elder Seneca's anthology;¹⁰⁷ 3) antithetical arrangement of the planets, based on a system that assigns natural properties to the planets.

To the last item a qualification is necessary. The planetary descriptions in this pattern tend to obscure – or more accurately, they “demote” the fact that physics

¹⁰⁶ Cf. 9.533-7, where in just five verses Lucan manages to describe all twelve signs of the zodiac, listing them in opposing pairs.

¹⁰⁷ According to Traina 1984: 25, a fundamental characteristic of the younger Seneca's prose, as opposed to that of predecessors such as Cicero, is that it reduces the classical period into a smaller 'stylistic cell' ("cellula stilistica"); the younger Seneca did not invent this reduced organization, but it is found in the collection of his father.

underlies sequence. Fuscus does not tell us why the planets are in this order, for example by retailing the physical properties of the planets and linking them to their effects, as Ptolemy does. His organization of the planets, as we have seen, is ultimately derived from an astrological model that discovers physical properties in the stars. But Fuscus appropriates the model for his own purposes, in the process allowing the order to become detached from its original rationale. Priorities are shifted. The purpose and justification of his explication is no longer invested in building up a coherent, rational system to explain the operations and powers of the stars. Instead, its governing purpose is made the same as that of poetry in general: to present language as language,¹⁰⁸ to effect in readers / auditors an emotional, meaningful experience through attention to form.

This detachment from the astrological system's original rationale, like the other pieces in the pattern, helps define the pattern and allows it to establish itself as a separate, imitable and circulating tradition. In this respect too, Lucan recognizes the pattern's intelligence¹⁰⁹ and authority, since the same detachment occurs in the Acoreus and Figulus passages. It is this detachment that, because of a failure to come to terms with Lucan's objectives, has exposed the poet to modern critics' accusations of incoherence and inaccuracy.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ So, the well-known definition of the poetic by Jakobson 1987: 378 ("What is Poetry?"): "But how does poeticity manifest itself? Poeticity is present when the word is felt as a word and not a mere representation of the object being named or an outburst of emotion, when words and their composition, their meaning, their external and inner form, acquire a weight and value of their own instead of referring indifferently to reality."

¹⁰⁹ 'Intelligence' has been chosen carefully. Use of this word here is meant to challenge any notion that we can estimate the intelligence, or worth, of an expression by analyzing it as an informational datum. Rather, the intelligence and meaning of an expression reside in the experience it creates.

¹¹⁰ As early as Scaliger; see the 'Astronomical Appendix' of Housman 1926: 325-337. Berti 2000: *ad* 10.199-208, notes that Mars is not described as hot and dry, as is expected, but possesses the winds and lightning (10.206); Mercury, inexplicably, governs the water; Getty 1960; Getty 1941.

4.3.3 Textual corruption and broad scope Focus in Fuscus' planetary list

In the section above it was briefly noted that both Figulus (Lucan) and Fuscus use a thetic perspective in their planetary lists. It is now time to return to Fuscus' Entry #4 to see if, equipped with a better appreciation of Fuscus' purpose, methods, and literary context, we may mend corruptions; or, where emendation is too difficult or tenuous, to see if we can formulate a fairly accurate idea of what was in the text originally and what was not. Close consideration of textual problems is relevant to the current investigation since, in attempting to solve them, we are forced to make interpretive decisions about Fuscus' language and his place in literary traditions.

We turn to the list of planets itself, where we find the more serious corruptions. The readings below retain textual difficulties as they appeared in the archetype:

contranedeusistetertint
an placidus adfulserit Sol;
in plenam lucem inuitia¹¹¹ surgentis acceperint,
an abdiderit innocentem obscurum caput Luna.
Saturnus nascentem an ad bella Mar[i]s militem,
an negotiosum in quaestus Mercurius exceperit;
an blanda adnuerit nascenti Venus,
an ex humili in sublim<e> Iuppiter tulerit, aestimant.

The tendency to create opposing pairs is very strong, a tendency not put in question by textual corruptions. It is equally clear that each member (*colon*) of these opposing pairs, which I have demarcated by indenting the second member, presents itself as a descriptive whole. Focus extends over the entire *colon* rather than being limited to

¹¹¹ *inuitia* **B A** *anuitia* **V**. The descendants of **V** correct to *an initia*, whence modern editors (Müller, Bornecque, Winterbottom).

one or two constituents; in other words, what Fuscus does *not* do is name a subject and give a particular piece of Focus information about that subject.¹¹² This thetic perspective is assisted formally by Fuscus' placement of subjects, which predominantly occur towards the end of their respective clauses (or, in the case of Sun and Moon, at the end of *pairs* of clauses), yielding place to the various pieces contributing to the image. This procedure has two familiar results, seen elsewhere in Fuscus' quotations: 1) a more cohesive word-group; and 2) a word-group that is overtly encoded as description.

Of the seven planets, Sun and Moon receive the most generous treatment. Opposition is created out of their mutability. The Sun can exert a harmful or a positive influence. The first option is corrupt (*contranedeusisteterint*).¹¹³ L. Bieler (1935: 90) supported keeping *deus* of the manuscripts, thus conjecturing: *contrane deus steterit*. Though sometimes an astrological term, *deus* does not make sense in this context. Gertz' proposal, *dirus* (*contrane dirus steterit*) has persuaded modern editors (Håkanson, Winterbottom, Bornecque). Nonetheless, it should not be accepted. *Dirus* has the advantage of giving us the required opposition (negative vs. positive), but it does not take full account of the organization of Fuscus' list, nor of how Fuscus positions himself within literary traditions. Specifically, the word-group *contrane dirus steterit* does not give us a broad scope construction: *steterit* amounts to hardly more than a copula (= *fuertit*), thus making *dirus* alone Focus information.¹¹⁴ Moreover, *dirus* in this context

¹¹² As is done at certain points in the disquisition of Acoreus (Lucan): "The Sun divides time into periods; it alternates day and night" (10.201-2); "the Moon mixes sea and land" (10.204).

¹¹³ The corruption is old, originating before the copying of the archetype: **A**: *contra nedeus iste terint* **B**: *contranedeus isteterint* **V**: *contranedeus steterit*. **A** and **B** preserve the confusion of the archetype; **V**, as is typical of its scribes, tries to correct.

appears randomly creative, simply a fancy synonym for “bad.” Examination of the use of *dirus* in the Latin corpus does not suggest a persuasive reason why Fuscus would adopt it here.¹¹⁵ There are better, more convincing possibilities.

I propose: *contrane radiis restiterit* (“Did the Sun, in opposition, resist with its rays?”).¹¹⁶ Change of the verb (*restiterit*) and the presence of an instrumental ablative (*radiis*) generate broad scope Focus. These are now integral pieces of information, each contributing something to a coherent image of the Sun when exerting a negative influence. It is by the strength of its rays that the Sun is imagined by astrologers to influence other planets, making them stand still (*statio*) or move backwards (*retrogradus*)¹¹⁷ and generally inhibiting their intrinsic powers. And it is with the use of rays as assault weapons that planets can attack other planets.¹¹⁸ The combat metaphor is present already in the astrological tradition. Fuscus, while recognizing this, alters the

¹¹⁴ Cf. Edward 1928: 59, who prints *durus* (Thomas’ conjecture, accepted by Müller): “if the sun stood steadily adverse,” and in his commentary (p. 125): “whether the sun was in opposition or conjunction.”

¹¹⁵ It perhaps could be argued that a literary-critical motivation for *dirus* is found at Verg. *G.* 1.488 (*dirae cometae*), a passage that (as I discuss below) seems to have a link with the Fuscus quotation. But the conjecture has little else to recommend it.

¹¹⁶ In the string of letters *contranedeusisteterint* it may be that *is* was originally a supralinear correction intended to replace *us*, but this was misunderstood by the scribes who copied error (*us*) and correction (*is*) successively. The *e* in *deus* could easily be a corruption of *i*, since *E* and *I* are frequently confused when copying from a ms in Capitalis script. From errors it is certain that our text of Seneca, at some time preceding the archetype, was once written in Capitalis. For an adverb of ‘opposition’ (*contra*) with *resisto*, cf. Nep. *Pel.* 1.3: (sc. *Lacedaemonii*) *existimabant ... eos* (sc. *Thebanos*) *esse solos qui aduersus resistere auderent*. – Also possible: *contrarius radiis restiterit*.

¹¹⁷ So Lucan above, 10.203: *radiisque potentibus astra ire uetat cursusque uagos statione moratur*. Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 117-21. Vitruvius 9.1.12: *eadem ratione solis impetus uehemens radiis trigoni forma porrectis insequentes stellas ad se perducit et ante currentes ueluti refrenando retinendoque non patitur progredi, sed ad se regredi, inalterius trigoni signum esse*; Pliny. 2.59-60, 69-70.

¹¹⁸ Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 249-52. Cf. Firm. Mat. 4.19.39: *Si uero maliuola stella dominandi licentiam sola perceperit, contra hominem acerba continuatione grassatur et licentiae suae uires cum magnae necessitatis exercet imperio. Sic beniuolae rursus stellae, si non fuerint maliuolarum stellarum minacibus radiis impeditae, omnia felicitatis et omnium dignitatum ornamenta decernunt; si uero maliuolarum stellarum inimicus impugnauerit radius, nihil possunt ex promissa felicitate decernere*; Bram 1975.

metaphor's expression, using *contra...restiterit* rather than, for example, *impugnauerit* (Firm. Mat. 4.19.39, quoted in note above). The reconstructed clause, in sense and organization, corresponds with what follows: *an placidus adfulserit Sol* ("or did the Sun shine upon (the nascent) peacefully" (*placidus*)).¹¹⁹ Verb and adjective each contribute to an image of the Sun when benevolent. The compound verb *adfulgere* is rare,¹²⁰ thus further confirming a trend already observed in Fuscus' diction.

Through the corruption of the description of the Moon, a binary opposition is evident: light (*in plenam lucem...surgentis*) versus darkness (*abdiderit...obscurum caput*). The first member of this descriptive diptych remains problematic, and editorial interventions thus far have not produced a convincing solution.¹²¹ Müller, Bornecque, and Winterbottom prefer to see the moon's alterations in three phases rather than two: bright (full), partially lit, and dark.¹²² This is a real possibility, supported by a common characterization of the moon as fickle, constantly changing its appearance. Passages from Lucan (5.546-50) and the elder Pliny (*Nat.* 2.42)¹²³ express well this perception of

¹¹⁹ Verg. *Aen.* 7.45-6: [sc. *Latinus*] *urbes | iam senior longa placidas in pace regebat.*

¹²⁰ More common in this sense is *respicio*. Hor. *Carm.* 4.5.7 is the first attestation of *adfulgeo*. It appears in a rich quotation from Julius Bassus at *C.* 1.6.5. Also, cf. Ov. *Ib.* 209-14, which exhibits something of the pattern under discussion: *natus es infelix – ita di uoluerit – nec ulla | commoda nascenti stella leuisque fuit: | non Venus adfulsit, non illa Iuppiter hora | lunaque non apto solque fuere loco | nec satis utiliter positos tibi praebuit ignes | quem peperit magno lucida Maia Ioui* [sc. Mercury]. The verb is also used by the younger Seneca, at *Ep.* 66.20. Note here the contrast of verbs, between the friendly action of the Sun (*adfulgere*), on the one hand, and its dominating, inhibiting power (double underline), on the other: *Quemadmodum minuta lumina claritas solis obscurat, sic dolores, molestias, iniurias uirtus magnitudine sua elidit atque opprimit; et quocumque adfulsit, ibi quidquid sine illa apparet extinguitur.*

¹²¹ Håkanson's proposal is nearly incomprehensible: *in plenam lucem initia surgentis acceperit*. Watt 1991: 315, in a review of Håkanson 1989a, remarks that an emendation or an obelus is needed.

¹²² *plenam lucem an initia surgentis acceperit an abdiderit in noctem obscurum caput Luna.*

¹²³ Plin. *Nat.* 2.42: *crescens semper aut senescens et modo curuata in cornua facie, modo aequa portione diuisa, modo sinuata in orbem, maculosa eademque subito praenitens, immensa orbe plena ac repente nulla.*

the moon. Though from later writers these passages, especially that of Lucan,¹²⁴ are precisely the literary context in which Fuscus' description belongs; they suggest very well what Fuscus is thinking.

However, Müller's conjecture does not produce sensible Latin: What is *surgentis* doing? What does it modify? And a comprehensible description, with a delineation of three discrete phases of the moon, would require drastic reconstruction. There is no need for this, especially since there is compelling reason to believe Fuscus is strongly motivated to create binary members. The tendency, as already observed, is common in his quotations in general; but most telling is Fuscus' binary description of the Moon in *S.* 3, where three aspects of the moon (clear, wind, storm) have been compressed into two. Therefore, I tentatively propose, for both members of the description of the Moon in *S.* 4.¹²⁵

an plena lucis in uitia surgentis acceperit, an abdiderit in noctis obscurum caput Luna.

The middle phase, when the Moon is neither full of light nor completely dark, is alluded to and compressed within the first word-group: the bright Moon waxes to fill her "flaws."¹²⁶ The conjecture brings this passage still closer to the description in *S.* 3 (*plena*

¹²⁴ Lucan 5.546-50: *lunaque non gracili surrexit lucida cornu | aut orbis medii puros exesa recessus | nec duxit recto tenuata cacumina cornu | uentorumque notam rubuit, tum lurida pallens | ora tulit uoltu sub nubem tristis ituro.* Amyclas, a poor boatman, addresses these words to Caesar before taking him out to sea where they encounter a storm. The premise resembles that in Book 10 where Acoreus discusses the stars with Caesar.

¹²⁵ "Did the Moon receive [sc. the native], when full of light that was rising into her blemishes. Or, did she hide her head in the darkness of night?"

¹²⁶ *Vitia* in effect is substituted for *maculae*. – A potential, though I think not damning, criticism of this conjecture is a logical imprecision: the moon is said to be full (*plena*), but light is still filling out the dark spots (*surgentis*). *Acceperit* would mean to "receive the native" (cf. *Mercurius exceperit* in what follows in the Entry; and Manilius' use of *excipere* at 2.833: the Horoscopos decides *qualiaque excipiant nascentis*

lucis suae est splendensque pariter adsurgit in cornua). The former passage is, it seems, an alternative Version of the latter, not surprisingly since the close connection between Fuscus' quotations in *S.* 3 and *S.* 4 has already been noted. In the second member, I have changed the manuscripts' *innocentem obscurum caput* to *in noctis obscurum caput*. This is an improvement on modern editors' conjecture *in noctem obscurum caput*, which leaves the phrase a syntactic and phonetic "slush." The homogenous *m* terminations in words that syntactically do not go together (*noctem obscurum*) and the placement of an adjective immediately beside its noun deprive the description of organizational contours, a persistent and conspicuous feature of Fuscus' prose in Seneca's quotations.¹²⁷

Unlike the other planets in this list, Saturn is not given a description. This led Konitzer, not unreasonably, to conjecture *Saturnus nascentem <ad cultum agrorum>*. If there was such a descriptive phrase, we might wonder whether it preceded the nominative *Saturnus* and was thus formally encoded as Presentational, like the descriptions of the other planets. But such word order is not obligatory and the principle of *variatio* may have a claim here. The supplement is possible, but not absolutely necessary. If we accept a supplement, then the description of Mercury is not paired against another description. The messenger planet is isolated, an isolation justified by its neutral status. If we leave the passage without supplement, then it seems Fuscus has coped with the odd number of planets by compressing Saturn and Mars into one *colon* and pairing it with a description of Mercury.

tempora prima), rather than "receive light," as this verb commonly means with *luna* (Man. 1.210). For the varying effects of the waxing and waning moon, Plin. *Nat.* 2.221; Firm. *Mat.* 4.1.5.

¹²⁷ For *obscurum noctis*, cf. Verg. *G.* 1.467-8 (*cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine textit | impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem*), and see discussion below.

4.3.4 Two complementary *loci* constructed on the authority of Vergil

In the discussion of *S.* 3 (Section 4.2.3), a connection was drawn between Fuscus' phraseology and Vergil, *Georgics* 1. The case for such a connection is further strengthened when we include Fuscus' planetary expositions from *S.* 4. Especially notable is Fuscus' diction. He personifies the moon, saying it "hid its head in darkness," *in noctis obscurum abdiderit caput Luna*. The phrase was constructed, it seems, with Vergil, *Georg.* 1.467-8 in mind, where the Sun is personified, covering its head in sympathy for Rome after the death of Julius Caesar: *cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine textit | impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem*.¹²⁸ A genuine connection between the two phrases at first glance seems only a possibility; for example, it can be objected that Fuscus uses a different verb (*abdo*) from Vergil (*tego*).¹²⁹ However, when passages from later poets, Ovid (*Met.* 15.30-1) and Lucan (1.540-3),¹³⁰ are brought into the comparison the prominence of Vergil's description in the Roman literary imagination becomes clearer.

Ovid, *Met.* 15.30-1
*candidus Oceano nitidum caput abdiderat Sol
et caput extulerat densissima sidereum Nox*

Lucan 1.540-3
*ipse caput medio Titan cum ferret Olympo,
condidit ardentis atra caligine currus
inuoluitque orbem tenebris gentisque coegit
desperare diem.*

¹²⁸ *A.* 4.177: [sc. *Fama*] *caput inter nubila condit*.

¹²⁹ However, compare Verg. *G.* 3.422: *iamque fuga timidum caput abdidit alte*. This verse comes from a compositional unit (*G.* 3.414-439) that has already been cited twice (Sections 4.2.2; 4.2.3) as containing verbal parallels to Fuscus' Entries.

¹³⁰ As further confirmation of the connection between the end of *Bellum Ciuile*, Book 1, and the end of *Georgics* 1, we note that, in sound and structure, Lucan 1.526 (*ignota obscurae uiderunt sidera noctes*) is modeled on Verg. 1.468 (*impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem*).

The Vergilian description appears to be a touchstone, a focal point for imitation and variation. But how did it become so? In fact, as I am suggesting, the line of influence from author to author (Vergil – Ovid – Lucan) is hardly so immediate and direct as it may appear, particularly given the fact that so much literature has been lost. Only with the inclusion of Fuscus’ quotations in this comparison do we begin to understand the highly prominent, but ultimately compromised and cooperative, role Vergil’s verses play in literary creation.

Building on observed verbal similarities that connect Vergil’s poetry with Fuscus’ Entries, this section advances the hypothesis that the end of Vergil, *Georgics* 1 was used by Fuscus as raw material to construct two, complementary *loci*: 1) the planetary list, and 2) a description of divine inspiration. Fuscus’ description of divine inspiration appears in *S.* 4.1 (Entries #1 and #2) and in *S.* 3.5;¹³¹ in the latter passage Fuscus is quoted as saying that he is imitating Vergil. I argue that the two *loci* were circulated and attained authority, in part because Vergil’s poetry was claimed and acknowledged as the basis of the *loci*. Evidence of the authority and currency of these *loci*, particularly in poetic traditions, is provided by passages from the works of Ovid and Lucan.

In Fuscus’ planetary description, *Georgics* 1.467-8 figures in his thoughts because of the notoriety of these verses; they are part of the celebrated end-section of *Georgics* Book 1 (1.463-514) with its list of chilling portents and premonitions of civil war. Fuscus’ uncommon and poetic use of the abstract *obscurum*¹³² – if my conjecture *in*

¹³¹ *Cur iste <in> interpretis ministerium placuit? cur hoc os deus elegit? cur hoc sortitur potissimum pectus quod tanto numine impleat?*

¹³² It is poetic during the period in which Fuscus flourished, i.e. the Augustan Age; cf. Sil. 15.591; Tac. *Hist.* 2.14.3; Amm. 25.2.3.

noctis obscurum is credible (Section 4.3.3) – would also have found its inspiration in this section (1.477-8: *et simulacra modis pallentia miris | uisa sub obscurum noctis*).

Also Lucan shows himself sensitive to the close of *Georgics* 1. Like Vergil, he applies a list of portents at the end of Book 1 of the *Bellum Ciuile* (1.526-83). Most significantly, Lucan’s description of portents contains the astrological forecast of Nigidius Figulus (1.650-663), which was examined above (Section 4.3.2) and determined to be related to Fuscus’ planetary description in *S.* 4. Nonetheless, at the end of Lucan’s Book 1 there is something more than Vergil: it is plain – for example, from the appearance of Figulus and his reading of the stars – that Lucan is not responding solely to the close of *Georgics* 1. The reason is not simply that there are *multiple* literary sources. This is a given. Rather, the process of influence and creation is greatly complicated by the fact that what is perceived in later writers and speakers as Vergil may in fact not be immediately and purely the verses of Vergil, but may be “Vergil” – a literary tradition consisting of circulating, mutable passages (*loci*) that have been built out of Vergil’s authoritative language.

We have already observed this process of constructive imitation at work in Fuscus’ quotations, which absorb Vergil’s language, but do not reproduce whole phrases or passages from the poet (except when the rhetor quotes verses directly).¹³³ Despite the

¹³³ There is an intriguing possibility that we can even detect the material dimensions of this process. It has been remarked (Thomas 1988: 145, 155, and see 12-13) that often compositional units of twenty-six lines recur in Vergil’s poetry. It is usually assumed that these units are artificial – that is, they were created as mere technical display. But could they be the product of the spatial constraints of writing supports, for example the dimensions of a tablet? A self-contained twenty-six line compositional unit would be useful in the process of creative imitation: we might imagine Fuscus and his students studying units of this size in order to create something new out of them. Thus, the end of *Georgics* 1 (1.463-514) consists of two units of twenty-six lines; from this, as is argued here, Fuscus produced two circulating *loci*. For another example, three instances of verbal comparanda (see Sections 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and this section) have been found in a twenty-six line unit in *Georgics* 3 (3.414-439).

lack of an obvious and immediate resemblance between Fuscus' explications and Vergil's poetry, the elder Seneca asserts that the rhetor imitated Vergil. This, as we have seen, is the case for the moon description in *S.* 3. And at *S.* 3.5 we are told that also Fuscus' description of the prophet derives from Vergil. Fuscus claims, according to Seneca, to imitate Vergil's *plena deo*, a phrase that does not appear in Vergil's works as they have come down to us.¹³⁴ The phrase may have been a shorthand label, a keyword, referring to a *locus* describing a prophet in a state of divine inspiration. Whether the phrase was ever actually used by Vergil is unknown and at any rate may make little difference. What is clear is that it could be used to refer to an expression of divine inspiration whose source was *claimed* to be Vergil.

Seneca proceeds to tell us that Ovid borrowed the phrase openly from Vergil in a tragedy (perhaps the *Medea*): *feror huc illuc, uae, plena deo*. The phrase also appears more than once in Lucan.¹³⁵ Significantly, it appears at the end of *Bellum Ciuile* Book 1 (1.673-95), following Nigidius Figulus' predictions, in a description of a matron possessed by Apollo. Like a Bacchante full of Dionysus (*plena Lyaeo*, 1.675), the Roman matron rushes through the city, astonished at the visions of war Apollo shows her: *Quo feror, O Paeon?* (1.678), she cries. Based on these similarities, Ovid and Lucan quite clearly are following within the same tradition. Seneca claims that Vergil is the

¹³⁴ On this question, see Berti 2007: 282-90, who summarizes the debate with relevant bibliography. Norden 1893 compares the phrase with the description of the Sibyl at Verg. *A.* 6.48-51; interestingly, the precise phrase appears in Servius at *Aen.* 6.50 (*nondum deo plena, sed adflata uicinitate numinis*). Consistent with my hypothesis that the phrase *plena deo* functioned as a shorthand reference to a shared *locus*, Berti (p. 288) concludes that it was likely a paraphrase ("parafraasi"). See also Comparelli 2003; Balbo 2001; Scarcia 1996; Della Corte 1971.

¹³⁵ 9.564 (*ille deo plenus*), where Cato rejects the idea of consulting the oracle of Ammon; in his refusal Cato speaks like an oracle.

source of this tradition; but our texts of Vergil do not substantiate the claim in a way that we might expect. The apparent discrepancy may have an explanation in a creative practice of literary reception: an engagement with Vergil's verses, in academic settings and in performative contexts, that create out of them circulating and mutable passages – *loci mutui*, “shared *loci*.”

Already we have seen that Fuscus and Lucan, at the end of *Bellum Ciuile* 1, exhibit the same traces of a pattern – in a planetary description that has limited scope, that has a particular rational organization as its basis but that departs from this rational basis. Also, in a narrative premise that has a wise man giving arcane knowledge to the powerful, we identify a common setting for this *locus*. A description of divine inspiration, which could go under the shorthand label *plena deo*, seems to be associated with the *locus* of a planetary list. They are not of the same pattern, but rather two *loci* that came to be articulated together.

4.4 Suasoriae 6 and 7

The creation of something new, the fashioning of a tradition, out of the language of a celebrated author is nowhere more obvious and explicit than in the declamations on Cicero (*C.* 7.2; *S.* 6 and 7). Here, we sense immediately, we are witness to historical evolution, to the simultaneous operations of continuity and change: through the study of Cicero's language, and biography,¹³⁶ declaimers maintained a connection with the past. But their study of Cicero is not designed to conserve; it is creative and transformative.¹³⁷

¹³⁶ The declamatory themes (*C.* 7.2; *S.* 6 and 7), and the quotations recorded under them, show the need for speakers to engage with select events in Cicero's life. However, it is not certain if these events actually happened; see Roller 1997; Wright 2001. Even the nature of Cicero's death – recorded by practitioners of

It is fair to say that no other part of Seneca's work has attracted more attention than the Ciceronian material, no part deemed more important. This is particularly true of the tantalizing quotations from historians in *S. 6* – Livy, Aufidius Bassus, Cremutius Cordus, Bruttidius Niger, Asinius Pollio, and the historian-poet Cornelius Severus. Nonetheless, much work remains to be done to understand these quotations, particularly as regards their relationship with one another and with the quotations from declaimers. How are we to understand the overlap among these passages? The quotations are traces of the formation of a tradition; but we are still far from grasping the complex process of this formation and, more specifically, the function of shared expressions.

Discussions thus far have been hampered by over-confidence in the discreteness of categories. So a debate has developed around the origin of certain pieces of information in Cicero's biography:¹³⁸ who is responsible for these pieces of information – the written sources OR the declaimers? A way forward will see declamation not as an isolable academic exercise, but as a cultural practice among several interrelated and cooperating practices all serving to socialize literature. These practices made possible a literary culture, allowing a forum in which one's literary output could be advertised,

declamation, historians, and poets – is suspiciously similar to Cicero's description (*de Orat.* 3.10) of the death of the famous orator M. Antonius (also cf. *de Orat.* 3.4, where Licinius Crassus defends the prestige of the senate in a passionate speech that brings about his death).

¹³⁷ See Richlin 1999; Kaster 1998; Håkanson 1989b; Winterbottom 1981; Homeyer 1964; Zielinski 1908.

¹³⁸ Roller 1997 regards the following as fictions that derive from what he calls (pp. 119, 120, 122) “declamatory rhetoric and modes of thought”: 1) that Popillius, Cicero's murderer, committed parricide; 2) that Cicero defended Popillius in a court case; see Lentano 1999: 597-8. But since – as Roller (p. 119) himself says – all writers would have engaged in declamation at some point in their lives, it is very doubtful that we can isolate what is “declamatory” thinking and rhetoric from what is not. Declamation is an expression of a culture; historiography and other literary genres are expressions not of a separate culture that has become infected by declamation, but of the same basic culture. Wright 2001, independently from Roller (see Wright, p. 452 n. 60), treats the question of the influence of declamation on historiography. For belief in the discreteness of these categories, his subtitle is telling: “The Death of Cicero: the contamination of history.”

receive validation and find significance. In addition to all varieties of speech performances, other social practices that served this function were recitations and the circulation of texts, both privately among friends and more formally in what can be called “publication.”¹³⁹

4.4.1 Fuscus builds loci from a collection of Cicero passages

The investigation in this section is not concerned with the Cicero tradition in all its aspects and complexity, but first and foremost with the quotations of Fuscus in *Suasoriae* 6 and 7. Despite the limited scope, the Fuscus quotations make an important contribution to the history of the reception of Cicero. They are an enlightening example of the transformative process that Cicero’s language underwent.

In order to give a more complete vision of the context, Fuscus’ quotation is provided below in full. However, Entries #1 and #4, which appeared in Chapter 3, will figure only marginally in the discussion. The theme of *S.* 6: Cicero debates whether he should beg for pardon from Mark Antony.¹⁴⁰

Suasoria 6.5-6 (Arellius Fuscus)

Entry *Ab armis ad arma discurritur: foris victores domi trucidamur, domi n<ostro>*
#1 *sanguini intestinus hostis incubat.*¹⁴¹ *quis non hoc populi Romani statu Ciceronem*
ut vivat cogi putat? rogabis, Cicero, turpiter Antonium, <rogabis> frustra.

¹³⁹ For publication in antiquity, see Starr 1987; Phillips 1981. Also, compare the correspondence between the younger Pliny and Tacitus; Marchesi 2008: 97-206.

¹⁴⁰ Edward 1928: 134-5: “The next passage is full of fire and eloquence. The flavour of Vergil, as usual, is strong.” He compares *Aen.* 2.668, 1.89, 6.723 f. However, Fuscus is looking directly at Cicero here, not Vergil.

¹⁴¹ The mss read: *foris uictores dum trucidamur dum in sanguine intestinus hostis incubat.* This sentence remains in need of emendation, but I have not yet discovered a solution. The quotation begins “We rush from war to war” (*Ab armis...discurritur*) – i.e. we fight on multiple fronts, both *at home and abroad*. This should be illustrated with details in what immediately follows, but instead editors have been content to read: “we are butchered *at home, at home* an internal enemy harrasses us.” This does not follow; *domi* (“at

Entry *Non te ignobilis tumulus abscondet, <nec> idem virtuti tuae <vitae>que finis est:*
#2 *immortalis humanorum operum custos memoria, qua magnis viris¹⁴² vita perpetua est, in omnia te saecula sacratum dabit. nihil aliud intercidet quam corpus fragilitatis caducae, morbis obnoxium, casibus expositum, proscriptionibus obiectum. animus vero divina origine haustus, cui nec senectus ulla nec mors, onerosi corporis vinculis exsolutus ad sedes suas et cognata sidera recurret.*

Entry *Et tamen, si ad aetatem annorumque numquam observatum viris fortibus*
#3 *numerum respicimus, sexaginta supergressus es, nec potes videri non nimis <diu> vixisse qui moreris rei publicae superstes.*

Entry *Vidimus furentia toto orbe civilia arma et post Italicas Pharsaliasque acies*
#4 *Romanum sanguinem hausit Aegyptus. quod indignamur in Ciceronem Antonio licere, in Pompeium Alexandrino licuit spadoni. sic occiduntur qui ad indignos confugiunt.*

In Entry #2 Cicero is addressed directly: “You will last forever in the memory of posterity.” Immortal memory is the everlasting guardian of mortal deeds (*immortalis humanorum operum custos memoria*). This phrase, as is the case with several phrases in Entries #2 and #3, is consciously and conspicuously Ciceronian.¹⁴³ Fuscus’ use of Ciceronian passages, though far from being slavish, is more overt than his use of Vergil in the passages analyzed above. The difference is a reflection of the fact that Cicero, as prominent political figure, is built into the premise of the declamation; Vergil is not. Reminiscences of Cicero’s language are expected, as a similar procedure by other declaimers makes clear.

home”) in the first clause needs emendation. (Cf. Cic. *ad Brut.* 1.10.1, *ingravescit enim in dies intestinum malum nec externis hostibus...*) Entry #4, which mentions battles that pit Roman against Roman and then Roman against Egyptian, gives precisely the details suitable to *Ab armis ad arma discurretur*. I do not believe a transposition is needed; rather, Entries #1 and #4 seem to be similar. It is interesting, but probably coincidental, that in both Entries we find *sanguis*.

¹⁴² Bursian: *qua magnis viris*. The archetype: *que manus uiri*

¹⁴³ Cic. *de Orat.* 1.18 (*quid dicam de thesauro rerum omnium memoria? quae nisi custos inuentis cogitatisque rebus et uerbis adhibeatur...*); *Part. 3* (*earum rerum omnium custos memoria*); *Opt. Gen.* 5. Also, [Cicero], *Rhet. Her.* 3.16.28 (*ad thesaurum inventorum atque ad omnium partium rhetoricae custodem, memoriam, transeamus*).

Despite use of Cicero's language, identifying features of Fuscus' prose persist in these Entries. Cicero's language is melded with Fuscus' linguistic habits and stylistic techniques. Some of these features will be noted in the course of the discussion. However, as emphasized in the previous section, Fuscus' literary character and ambitions are more fully understood when seen in broader terms, when we investigate his position in literary traditions and see how he, in collaboration with his peers, reshapes and invents traditions.

Fuscus' verbal reminiscences point to an interrelated set of passages from Cicero's works that are concerned with the immortality of the soul: *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1.32-75, esp. 32-35; 43), *de Senectute* (77-82), *de Divinatione* (1.110), *de Republica* (6.18; 6.19; 6.33), and *de Amicitia* 13-14.¹⁴⁴ These passages share the same core ideas, rehearsing them often with identical phrases, but also admitting variations in details and in extent of treatment. Fuscus also draws on the end of the last treatise, *Amic.* 102-4, where Cicero gives an epitaph of Scipio Africanus the younger.

In Entry #2 of the Fuscus quotation, a distinction is made between mind and body. The body, which is susceptible to all mortal hazards, dies. The mind, on the other hand (*animus vero*), is released from the prison of flesh and returns to its native, heavenly abode among the stars. The idea is Pythagorean and Platonic, and receives expression in a variety of authors.¹⁴⁵ However, Fuscus is not recollecting Plato or other authors, but is engaged specifically with Cicero in the set of passages just listed. This is clear from

¹⁴⁴ It may be that part of the lost *Hortensius* would be included in this set; e.g. frg. 115 (Grilli).

¹⁴⁵ Powell 1988: 253-62, gives full references to key passages. Arnold 1911: 268 (cited by Winterbottom 1974), supplies passages from the younger Seneca.

several of Fuscus' phrases: *divina origine haustus*,¹⁴⁶ *onerosi corporis vinculis exsolutus*,¹⁴⁷ *ad sedes suas et cognata sidera recurret*.¹⁴⁸

That Fuscus has Cicero in mind and that he has in mind the set of passages just listed is, I believe, beyond dispute. More remarkable is that in describing the immortality of the soul, Fuscus appears not to draw on *one* Cicero passage, but on *all* the passages in the set:

“Cicero's life and virtue are not coterminous” (<nec> *idem virtuti tuae <vitae>que finis est*) draws from *Sen.* 82 and/or *Tusc.* 1.32.¹⁴⁹ The Cicero parallels leave little doubt that the conjectured reconstruction,¹⁵⁰ or something very similar, is correct. The phrases on the origin of the soul and its return to its origin are a conglomerate.

¹⁴⁶ *Div.* 1.110 (*naturam deorum a qua...haustos animos et libatos haberemus*); *Sen.* 78 (*audiebam Pythagoram Pythagoreosque...numquam dubitasse quin ex uniuersa mente diuina delibatos animos haberemus*). Similar: *N.D.* 1.27 (*nam Pythagoras, qui censuit animum esse per naturam rerum omnem intentum et comitantem, ex quo nostri animi carperentur*); *Tusc.* 5.38 (*humanus autem animus decerptus ex mente diuina*).

¹⁴⁷ *Div.* 1.110 (*Sed uigilantes animi uitae necessitatibus seruiunt diiunguntque se a societate diuina uinclis corporis impediti*); *Rep.* 6.18 (*hi uiuunt qui e corporum uinclis tamquam e carcere euolauerunt*); *Sen.* 81 (*cum se plane corporis uinclis relaxauerint*); *Sen.* 77 (*nam dum sumus inclusi in his compagibus corporis*); *Tusc.* 1.24 (*posse animos cum e corporibus excesserint*); 1.75 (*cum illuc ex his uinclis emissi feremur, minus tardabitur cursus animorum; nam qui in compedibus corporis semper fuerunt, etiam cum soluti sunt, tardius ingrediuntur*); 1.118. Cf. *Verg. A.* 11.828-9 (death of Camilla): *tum frigida toto | paulatim exsoluit se corpore*.

¹⁴⁸ *Tusc.* 1.24 (*posse animos cum e corporibus excesserint in caelum quasi in domicilium suum peruenire*); 1.51 (*animus...exierit et in liberum caelum quasi domum suam uenerit*); 1.118. Cf. *Rep.* 6.19 (*hisque [sc. hominibus] animus datus est ex illis sempiternis ignibus quae sidera et stellas uocatis*); 6.33 (*animus uelocius in hanc sedem et domum suam peruolabit... animi...corporibus elapsi...hunc in locum reuertuntur*).

¹⁴⁹ *Sen.* 82: *an censes (ut de me ipse aliquid more senum glorier) me tantos labores diurnos nocturnosque domi militiaeque suscepturum fuisse, si eisdem finibus gloriam meam quibus uitam essem terminaturus?* *Tusc.* 1.32: *quid in hac re publica tot tantosque uiros ob rem publicam interfectos cogitasse arbitramur? isdemne ut finibus nomen suum, quibus uita, terminaretur?* Observe how close the Cicero passages are to each other.

¹⁵⁰ The conjecture is Madvig's. In *Brux.* 9144 (**D**), whose readings do not possess independent ms authority (that is, **D** has no greater claim to authenticity than Madvig's conjecture), we find *idem virtuti tuae qui finis est*. This is closer to Cicero's language; but it is difficult to decide how close to Cicero Fuscus would wish to be.

“The soul is drawn from a divine origin” (*animus vero divina origine haustus*):
Div. 1.110.

The soul is “released from the chains of the body” (*corporis vinculis exsolutus*):
Sen. 81, *Div.* 1.110, *Rep.* 6.18; *Amic.* 14 all contain the phrase *corporum uinculis* (or
uinculis corporis), but *Tusc.* 1.75 contains the verb (*soluti sunt*) closest to Fuscus’.

The soul “returns to its own seat and kindred stars” (*ad sedes suas et cognata sidera recurret*): the Dream of Scipio is the principal source, which names the stars as the birthplace of the soul (*Rep.* 6.19), and in its final sentences tells how souls can leave the body to return to their original seat (6.33).

What should we make of the fact that Fuscus gleans phrases from all these passages rather than from one source passage? Certainly we may conclude that Fuscus has read several of these passages – all of them, I would argue. But this explains the minimum. It is surprising that the reminiscences are fairly evenly shared among the passages – an outcome that is possible, but unlikely if Fuscus were haphazardly and in a general way recollecting what he had read of Cicero.¹⁵¹ The Ciceronian phrases, in short, are not drawn vaguely and uncertainly from any number of Cicero’s works; they are invested in the particular words used by Cicero. It must be pointed out that what is at issue here is not whether Fuscus is using his memory or whether he is using notes. Memory and books need not be at odds with each other but often work in concert: books,

¹⁵¹ So, for example, commentators (Edward 1928: 134-6, Powell 1988: 253-62, Woodman 1983: 144-50), perhaps as they are obligated to do, cite many potential sources without recognizing a ‘cluster’ pattern.

and other material objects, create and shape memory.¹⁵² The point is that Fuscus' verbal reminiscences of Ciceronian texts show a pattern; this pattern betrays a working method.

Looking us in the face as we read Seneca's anthology is a revealing and convincing illustration of what this method is: as was argued in Chapter 1, the anthology illustrates a cultural practice, which appears to be underrepresented in our surviving ancient texts,¹⁵³ of collecting multiple quotations on the same specific topic (*locus mutuus*). Fuscus' own conglomeration of Ciceronian phrases in *S. 6* reflects the same method. The method involves a material practice: Ciceronian passages that discuss the immortality of the soul were identified in their respective works, excerpted, and assembled side by side. (To what extent they were committed to memory is unknown.) These passages, as has been noted, are obviously similar to each other, even repetitive. The similarity was an invitation to do with them what is done with declaimer's quotations – bring them together as Versions of each other. From these passages, with their variations and occasionally lengthy treatment (particularly in the *Tusculans*), Fuscus creates a *locus* of limited scope – a *locus* meant to circulate, to be varied and reused by other speakers and writers. And, as we shall see momentarily, we have evidence that this is precisely what happened.

¹⁵² Cf. how Carruthers 1998 (e.g. pp. 32-5, 54-7) speaks of memories as *thought* patterns produced through *physical* routines. On the role of monuments in thought and memory, see Vasaly 1993.

¹⁵³ Texts, like the elder Seneca's, that preserve direct quotations are underrepresented; the collection of Stobaeus, which often introduces quotations by the author's name in the genitive case, is comparable to Seneca's anthology in offering direct quotations. Even when a literary work does not present direct quotations, the procedure of collecting quotations centered around a topic or theme seems to underlie the composition of the work (e.g. the work of Valerius Maximus). Several medieval anthologies (i.e. florilegia) containing excerpts from classical authors show systematic arrangement, including arrangement according to themes; see Munk Olsen 1980: 143-7. The systematic collection of quotations has been well represented in the modern era (15th-18th cent.) in the keeping of commonplace books; see Moss 1996 and the collection of articles in Décultot 2003.

Ultimately the *locus* Fuscus creates is built not solely out of these interrelated passages on the immortality of the soul. Part of the *de Amicitia* also has been excerpted. It, like the set of treatises listed above, contains a section (13-14) on the immortality of the soul; but the discussion there is brief and the treatise's real contribution to Fuscus' *locus* is the epitaph of the younger Scipio that closes the work (102-4). From this Fuscus derives the specific terms in the contrast between the spirit that is immortal and the body that is mortal. The body, fragile and perishable (*fragile, caducum*), dies (Cicero: *occidere*, Fuscus: *intercidere*; Fuscus' choice of a verb is close enough to Cicero's to be reminiscent of it, but is at the same time distinctively different).¹⁵⁴ Virtue does not die (Cicero: *virtutem... quae extincta non est*, Fuscus: *nec idem virtuti vitaeque finis*). Memory (*memoria*) makes immortal.

If the passages are set side by side, we can see how several keywords in Fuscus' *locus* are clustered at the end of *de Amicitia*:

Cic. *Amic.* 102-4

102: *sed quoniam res humanae **fragiles caducaeque** sunt, semper aliqui anquirendi sunt quos diligamus et a quibus diligamur. ...*

*Mihi quidem Scipio, quamquam est subito ereptus, vivit tamen semperque vivet. **virtutem** enim amavi illius viri, quae extincta non est...*

104: *Nam quid ego de studiis dicam cognoscendi semper aliquid atque discendi, in quibus remoti ab oculis populi omne otiosum tempus contrivimus? Quarum rerum **recordatio** et **memoria** si una cum illo **occidisset**, desiderium coniunctissimi atque amantissimi viri ferre nullo modo possem; sed nec illa extincta sunt, alunturque potius et augentur cogitatione et **memoria** mea.*

Suas. 6.5-6 (Fuscus), from Entry #2

¹⁵⁴ *Intercido* is uncommon before the Augustan Age, especially in prose. Its earliest attestations: a fragment from an unidentified tragedy, Cicero (once in a letter), *B. Alex.* (once), Horace (once), Livy (four times), Ovid (twice). Also clearly motivating Fuscus' choice (and Cicero's) is the suggestive proximity of *intercidere* to *excidere*, 'forget.' Thus Porphyrio on Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.6 (*quod si interciderit tibi nunc aliquid, repetes mox*) glosses *interciderit* with *exciderit*. For *intercido* with *memoria*, see e.g. Livy 2.8.5.

*Non te ignobilis tumulus abscondet, <nec> idem **virtuti** tuae <vitae>que finis est: immortalis humanorum operum custos **memoria**, qua magnis viris vita perpetua est, in omnia te saecula sacratum dabit. nihil aliud **intercidet** quam **corpus fragilitatis caducae**, morbis obnoxium, casibus expositum, proscriptionibus obiectum.*

Custos, the epithet *Fuscus* applies to ‘memory’ in Entry #2 (*immortalis humanorum operum custos memoria*), is drawn most likely from *de Oratore* 1.18.¹⁵⁵ Probably also reflecting this prominent and highly influential work is the idea, in Entry #3 (*Et tamen, si ad aetatem annorumque numquam observatum viris fortibus numerum respicimus, sexaginta supergressus es, nec potes videri non nimis <diu> vixisse qui moreris rei publicae superstes*), that dying when Cicero did was better than outliving the Republic. *Fuscus* seems to be recalling *de Orat.* 3.8 where Cicero describes the misfortunes that the orator L. Licinius Crassus escaped by his death in 91 BC.¹⁵⁶ Cicero’s description is more than a little reminiscent of his own biography, as those who spoke and wrote about Cicero – and imitated him while doing so – were well aware.

Amid the Ciceronian echoes, we observe the typically *Fuscine* inclination for compounds. In Entry #3 just quoted is *supergressus* (cf. *Fuscus*’ *superpositus* at *C.* 1.2.5), a word not appearing in the Latin corpus before the Augustan Age. *Fabianus*, possibly under *Fuscus*’ influence, employs the innovative verb at *S.* 1.10 (*Alexandrum*

¹⁵⁵ As a measure of the potential noteworthiness of Cicero’s mention of memory at *de Orat.* 1.18, it is marked with a marginal title in Harley 2736 (9th cent., copied by Lupus of Ferrière): ‘*memoria*’.

¹⁵⁶ *mihī non erepta L. Crasso a dis immortalibus uita, sed donata mors esse uideatur. non uidit flagrantem Italiam bello* (cf. *Fuscus*’ Entry #4 above), *non ardentem inuidia senatum, non sceleris nefarii principes ciuitatis reos, non luctum filiae, non exilium generi, non acerbissimam C. Mari fugam, non illam post reditum eius caedem omnium crudelissimam, non denique in omni genere deformatam eam ciuitatem, in qua ipse florentissima multum omnibus gloria praestitisset.* The parallel is noted by Edward 1928: 136. Cf. also Cic. *Brut.* 329. For the phrase *rei publicae superstes*, Cic. *ad Fam.* 6.2.3; 9.17.1.

rerum naturae terminos supergressum).¹⁵⁷ *Supergressus* is another instance of Fuscus' use of 'specialized' diction. It is specialized in two senses: 1) its novelty means the word is marked; it is conspicuous. 2) The compound nature of the word, which renders it more precise without sacrificing conciseness, makes it suitable for technical prose.¹⁵⁸

At the end of Entry #2 we find a string of compounds (...*corpus fragilitatis caducae, morbis obnoxium, casibus expositum, proscriptionibus obiectum*). Of these, *obnoxium* deserves comment. It does not appear in Cicero or Caesar and has limited use prior to the Augustan Age, particularly in the sense here of being "susceptible to harm, danger, disease."¹⁵⁹ Finally, we observe in Entry #1 the compound *incubat* (*Ab armis ad arma discurritur: foris victores domi trucidamur, domi n<ostro> sanguini intestinus hostis incubat*). The word appears but once in the extant works of Cicero (*Clu.* 72); however, what makes the verb impressive here is context. Its presence among *sanguini* and *intestinus* shows that Fuscus is imagining civil war as an affliction of the internal organs of the body politic. This is a well-known image,¹⁶⁰ at least as old as Thucydides;

¹⁵⁷ Albucius Silus (*Suas.* 1.3) adopts the word in the same *suasoria*, and to the same point ('Alexander exceeds the boundaries of nature'): *O quantum magnitudo tua rerum quoque naturam supergressa est: Alexander orbi magnus est, Alexandro orbis angustus est*. Albucius and Fabianus are certainly aware of each other's expressions; the use of this marked word makes the *locus* memorable and identifiable. – Besides these three instances, the earliest attestations: Livy 33.7.3; V. Max. 4.3.3; 7.6.3; 9.12.8; Col. 7.9; Curt. 8.2.22; Sen. *Ep.* 32.5; *Dial.* 10.4.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Plin. *Nat.* 32.133 (*sed si castoreum fibrumve supergrediatur gravida, abortum facere dicitur et periclitari partu, si superferatur.*); 8.201; Fron. *Str.* 1.5.20; Col. 7.9; Palladius, *R.R.* 12.4.

¹⁵⁹ Early uses in this sense: Acc. *trag.* 429 (*tete esse huic noxae obnoxium*); Cato, *Orig.* 83 (*in locum...fraudi et perniciei obnoxium*). *Obnoxius*, used to express susceptibility to disease and death, appears several times in technical writers: Cels. pr. 71; 1.3.26; 1.9.6; 4.6.1; 4.18.1; Plin. *Nat.* 17.221. In the same sense, also: Ov. *Met.* 14.600; V. Max. 9.2.ext.11; Sen. *Dial.* 4.10.3.

¹⁶⁰ One of the best examples is Livy 2.32.8-12, the parable told by Menenius Agrippa during the secession of the plebs about the mutual dependence of the parts of the body. For similar phraseology, cf. Liv. 32.21.27 (*intestino et haerente in ipsis visceribus...bello*); 22.38.6; most violently in Lucan 1.2-3 (*populumque potentem | in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra*); and later, Hier. *Epist.* 63.3 (*ecclesiae visceribus incubantes [sc. haeretici]*). *Incubo*, or *incumbo*, is sometimes used to describe diseases, a usage

but it has undergone an unexpected modification in that the bodily affliction is figured as a leech or other parasite.

4.4.2 The tradition of the Ciceronian Epitaph

Entries #2 and #3, which Fuscus built out of Ciceronian language, established themselves as authoritative components to be used in composing a literary epitaph – what we might call the ‘Ciceronian Epitaph.’ The components cannot be credited to Fuscus alone, but must be attributed to the entire literary culture, specifically to those participating in literary performances and circulating their own and others’ texts. Fuscus’ Entries represent variants of components in what came to be a recognized pattern: this pattern was a collection of shared linguistic formulae, all pertaining to Cicero’s epitaph, that were reused and varied. Not all formulae need be present in a given version of the Epitaph. The other, better known epitaphs of Cicero (by Livy, Asinius Pollio, Cremutius Cordus, Cornelius Severus) that appear in Seneca’s collection (*S.* 6.17-27) are significant contributions to this same pattern.

Traces of Fuscus’ contributions to the Ciceronian Epitaph reemerge among our surviving sources in Velleius Paterculus (writing under Tiberius), 2.66.3-5,¹⁶¹ which is properly an epitaph of Cicero; and they reemerge in the younger Seneca, *Dial.* 11 (*Consolatio ad Polybium*) 2.2-6,¹⁶² which is not about Cicero at all but about the deceased brother of the addressee, Polybius. These latter two passages, furthermore,

that may have influenced Fuscus here; cf. Lucr. 6.1143, on the Athenian plague, and also on the plague, Thuc. 3.87.1 (ἐπιπίπτω, a verb used to gloss *incumbo*; Goetz 1888-1923: VI.561); Hip. *Aer.* 3.

¹⁶¹ This passage’s similarity to the quotations of Fuscus has been recognized by Rossbach 1915; Winterbottom 1974: II.566 n. 1, 605 n. 1, who also notes the similarity of *S.* 7.8 to Sen. *Dial.* 11.2.6; Woodman 1983: 148-9.

¹⁶² On the *Consolatio ad Polybium*, whose authenticity has at times been questioned, see Atkinson 1985.

teach us that at least two of Fuscus' Entries in *S. 7*, another declamation in which Cicero is written into the theme,¹⁶³ are closely connected with Fuscus' Entries at *S. 6.5-6*. In other words, two or more Entries at *S. 7.8-9* belong to the Ciceronian Epitaph.

The passages from Velleius and from the younger Seneca attest their consanguinity to Fuscus' quotations differently. So, a comparison of Sen. *Dial. 2.6* and an Entry at *Suas. 7.8* shows close verbal parallels. The literary achievements of the deceased promise him immortality:

S. 7.8 (H 371,14-18), Arellius Fuscus

Quoad humanum genus incolume manserit, quamdiu suus litteris honor, suum eloquentiae pretium erit, quamdiu rei publicae nostrae aut fortuna steterit aut memoria duraverit, admirabile posteris vigebit ingenium, et uno proscriptus saeculo proscribes Antonium omnibus.

Sen. *Dial. 11.2.6*

Quamdiu fuerit ullus litteris honor, quamdiu steterit aut Latinae linguae potentia aut Graecae gratia, vigebit cum maximis uiris, quorum se ingeniis uel contulit uel si hoc uerecundia eius recusat, adplicuit.

The Velleius passage, even if there are fewer verbal matches, shows its similarity to Fuscus' Entries in its outline. Velleius, as he assembles the epitaph, is seen using many of the same pieces, the same building blocks, as Fuscus:

- Vell. 66.4-5
- Unit #1 *rapuisti tu M. Ciceroni lucem sollicitam et aetatem senilem et vitam miseriorem te principi quam sub te triumpho mortem; famam vero gloriamque factorum atque dictorum adeo non abstulisti ut auxeris.*
- Unit #2 *uiuuit uiuetque per omnem saeculorum memoriam, dumque hoc uel forte uel prouidentia uel utcumque constitutum rerum naturae corpus – quod ille paene solus Romanorum animo uidit, ingenio complexus est, eloquentia inluminauit – manebit incolume, comitem aevi sui laudem Ciceronis trahet; omnisque posteritas*

¹⁶³ The theme of *S. 7*: Cicero debates whether he should burn his writings since Mark Antony promises to spare him if he should do so.

illius in te scripta mirabitur, tuum in eum factum execrabitur, citiusque [in] mundo genus hominum quam <M. Cicero> cedet.

The Fuscus quotations in *S.* 6 and 7 reveal compositional folds in Velleius' tribute to Cicero. We can see an articulation of two or more components in what is otherwise a seamless passage. In the first component (*rapuisti...auxeris*), Velleius writes: "you accomplished nothing, M. Antony. You merely took his life, whereas you increased his fame." This corresponds to Fuscus' contrast (*S.* 6.6, Entry #2) between the body that perishes and the mind that is eternal (*nihil aliud intercidet quam corpus...animus vero*). Both authors effect this contrast using the adversative particle *vero* (Fuscus: *corpus...animus vero*, Velleius: *aetatem et vitam...famam vero*). This could be overlooked as a trivial coincidence; but the manner in which building blocks operate – as demonstrated in Seneca's anthology – advise us that select words and phrases may serve as organizing formulae. They identify a compositional unit and are often recycled by various authors while surrounding expressions are varied.

This first compositional unit seems related also to another Fuscus Entry at *S.* 7.8 (H 371,18-20):

Crede mihi, vilissima pars tui est quae tibi vel eripi vel donari potest; ille verus est Cicero, quem proscribi Antonius non putat nisi a Cicerone posse.

M. Antony can "snatch away" (*eripi*) only that part of Cicero that is insignificant. So Velleius claims as well: *rapuisti tu M. Ciceroni lucem...* Fuscus' vocabulary again may go back to Cicero.¹⁶⁴ Also Seneca, *Dial.* 11.2.2-6, employs this verb (*eripio*) in making his contrast between what is ephemeral and insignificant, on the one hand, and what is

¹⁶⁴ Fuscus again (cf. discussion on Entry #3 above, Section 4.4.1) seems to be thinking of *de Orat.* 3.18: *mihi non erepta L. Crasso a dis immortalibus uita, sed donata mors esse uideatur.*

meaningful and enduring, on the other. He states: ‘Fortune [rather than addressing M. Antony], you accomplished nothing’ (*Dial.* 11.2.2). Seneca can be seen to follow the same outline as Velleius, except that he extends the length of this first compositional unit. Its identity as an organizational unit is preserved through the use of a repeated formula containing the verb *eripio*.¹⁶⁵

Next, for the second compositional unit (*uiuuit uiuetque...cedet*), Velleius launches into his Version of Fuscus’ *locus* at *S.* 7.8: literary achievements will bring immortality to the deceased. Compare, for instance, Fuscus’ *incolume manserit* with Velleius’ *manebit incolume*.

In sum, then, Velleius 66.4-5 and Seneca, *Dial.* 11.2.2-6 show two basic compositional units: the first unit corresponds to Fuscus’ Entry #2 at *S.* 6.5-6, in combination with an Entry at *S.* 7.8 (*Crede mihi, vilissima pars...*). The second unit corresponds to another Entry at *S.* 7.8 (*Quoad humanum genus incolume manserit*), as can be seen especially in the younger Seneca passage.

If there is any doubt about Fuscus’ formative influence on the Velleius passage, since extensive verbal parallels are lacking, there is additional proof of a different order: Velleius, like Fuscus, composes his passage by using Cicero’s language in *Amic.* 102-4.

Vell. 66.4-5

rapuisti tu M. Ciceroni lucem sollicitam et aetatem senilem et uitam miseriorem te principe quam sub te triumuiro mortem; famam uero gloriamque factorum

¹⁶⁵ Sen. *Dial.* 11.2.3-6: *Pecuniam eriperes? ... eriperes illi amicos? ... eriperes illi bonam opinionem? ... eriperes bonam ualeitudinem? ... eriperes spiritum? quantulum nocuisses! longissimum illi ingeni aeuum fama promisit; id egit ipse ut meliore sui parte duraret et compositis eloquentiae praeclaris operibus a mortalitate se uindicarent.* This, the first compositional unit, is followed by the second unit quoted above, *Dial.* 11.6: *Quamdiu fuerit ullus litteris honor...*

atque dictorum adeo non abstulisti ut auxeris. uiuit uiuetque per omnem saeculorum memoriam...

Cic. *Amic.* 102

Mihi quidem Scipio, quamquam est subito ereptus, uiuit tamen semperque uiuet.

Cic. *Amic.* 104

sed nec illa exstincta sunt alunturque potius et augentur cogitatione et memoria mea.

The implications are significant. Velleius and Fuscus both direct us to the same passage of Cicero.¹⁶⁶ Even if Velleius does not always use the same phrases as Fuscus, his passage shows the same *process* of composition – namely, the creation of an epitaph with language drawn from a defined set of passages from Cicero’s works. The process necessarily involved a material dimension, textual supports. The Cicero passages were excerpted and set together, perhaps in private notebooks. Or, the observed pattern may reflect the circulation, in specific literary circles, of a Ciceronian anthology.¹⁶⁷

Naturally the forces that created this process cannot be identified solely with Fuscus; the method is larger than one person.¹⁶⁸ But, as influential rhetor and successful literary performer, he is certainly one of those responsible for instituting it. This process, whereby one composes on a topic by using a limited set of passages from an authoritative text – a process that we have observed Fuscus follow first in the case of Vergil, now with

¹⁶⁶ Woodman 1983: 148, compares Cic. *Sen.* 77 and 82, which also belong to Fuscus’ set of excerpts from Cicero. Also other Ciceronian passages are in play at Vell. 66.4-5, e.g.: *quod ille paene solus Romanorum animo uidit, ingenio complexus est, eloquentia inluminauit*, which derives from *de Orat.* 3.19-25. It is a borrowing seemingly meant to paraphrase this lengthy passage from Cicero’s *de Oratore*; Woodman (p. 150) compares *Tusc.* 1.35.

¹⁶⁷ Macrobius’ excerpting of part of Book 6 of *de Republica* (= *Somnium Scipionis*) testifies that it was seen as a set-piece, capable of standing alone.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Conte 1986: 28: “One text may resemble another not because it derives directly from it nor because the poet deliberately seeks to emulate but because both poets have recourse to a common literary codification.”

Cicero – perhaps had its origins in a scholastic exercise. However, from the passages of Velleius and the younger Seneca, the process appears not to have been limited to scholastic contexts.

There are in fact two kinds of forces of influence at work in this tradition of the Ciceronian Epitaph. The forces are closely intertwined and it is almost impossible to differentiate between them when reading Velleius and the younger Seneca.¹⁶⁹ First, there is the compositional process, just mentioned: an epitaph of Cicero is created out of Ciceronian language from *reading* Cicero. But, secondly, there is the already established *compositional pattern* and the *compositional building blocks* that derive from this process. We cannot know to what extent Velleius created his epitaph from reading Cicero himself, or to what extent he is using the authoritative building blocks of predecessors (Livy, Asinius Pollio, Fuscus, etc.). There is much that we cannot see in the tradition. It may be that the Ciceronian language seen in Velleius is not taken from Cicero, but comes from a (now lost) building block attributable to one of the several authors who helped establish this tradition (e.g. Cremutius Cordus).¹⁷⁰ Therefore, Velleius' similarity to Fuscus would be the result of the fact that Velleius' model and Fuscus both participated in forming the tradition.

¹⁶⁹ Further reinforcing the impression that Fuscus, Velleius, and the younger Seneca all adopt the same authoritative compositional framework are several phrases in Sen. *Dial.* 11.2.2-6 that, I am convinced, are linked with parts of Asinius Pollio's epitaph of Cicero (S. 6.24). For example, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 2.6 (*longissimum illi ingeni aevum fama promisit; id egit ipse ut meliore sui parte duraret et compositis eloquentiae praeclaris operibus a mortalitate se vindicaret*) with Asinius Pollio at S. 6.24: *huius ergo viri tot tantisque operibus mansuri in omne aevum praedicare de ingenio atque industria supervacuum est*. The basis of a connection between Sen. *Dial.* 11.2.2-6 and the quotation from Asinius Pollio is the sharing of Ciceronian phrases. A thorough demonstration, which I cannot attempt here, requires a comparison of passages from Cicero; on Ciceronian language in Pollio's contribution to the Epitaph, see Woodman 1988: 151 n. 48.

¹⁷⁰ Kurth 1994: 47, thinks that Sen. *Dial.* 11.2.6 derives from the Fuscus passage, or from another epitaph on the death of Cicero, perhaps Cremutius Cordus'.

4.5 Suasoria 5

This chapter shall conclude with an analysis of *S. 5*. As was done with the *Suasoriae* above, the long quotation of Fuscus that opens the declamation has been separated into Entries. There are clear overlaps between Entries. The extent and preciseness of the overlap can vary. Pairs of Entries that are particularly close may be thought of as different Versions of each other (e.g. Entries #1 and #5). When less close, the Entries can be regarded as contributions to the same argument as identified through keywords and phrases (e.g. Entries #3 and #4). It is possible that the quotations of other speakers, if we had more of them, would converge at some of these points, so that we could also refer to overlapping Entries as shared *loci*.

Where two Entries show overlap they are marked with the same capital letter. So, the reader should compare (A) with (A), (B) with (B), and so on. Preceding each Entry, in brackets, I have added a heading meant to capture the argument that overlapping Entries share. That these headings are not merely inferable but could be explicitly acknowledged is shown by Fuscus' *divisiones* (*S. 5.4*),¹⁷¹ relevant parts of which I have also quoted in brackets. Words in bold show more precise points of contact between pairs of Entries, usually in terms of key phrases or vocabulary.

The theme: The Athenians debate whether they should take down trophies from the Persian Wars in the face of threats from Xerxes that he will invade again if the trophies are not removed.

¹⁷¹ The list of Fuscus' *divisiones* in its entirety, *S. 5.4*: *Fuscus sic divisit: etiamsi venturus est Xerxes, nisi tollimus, non sunt tropaea tollenda: confessio servitutis est iussa facere. si venerit, vincemus. hoc non est diu colligendum: de eo dico 'vincemus' quem vicimus. sed ne veniet quidem. si venturus esset, non denuntiaret. fractus est et viribus et animo.*

Entry [(A) Xerxes' forces were enormous, and he lost; we don't know if we won? *de eo*
#1 *dico 'vincemus' quem vicimus.*]

pudet me victoriae vestrae, si sic fugatum creditis Xersen, ut reverti possit.
***tot caesa milia, nihil ex tanta acie relictum minanti, nisi quod vix fugientem
sequi possit; totiens mersa classis. quid Marathona, quid Salamina referam?
pudet dicere: dubitamus adhuc, an vicerimus.***

Entry [(B) Xerxes' confidence is gone. *fractus est et viribus et animo.*]

#2 *Xerses veniet? nescio quomodo languet circa memoriam iacturae animus et
disturbata arma non repetit. prior enim metus futuri augur est, et¹⁷² amissa ne
audeat amissurum monent. ut interdum ***in gaudia surgit animus et spem ex
praesenti¹⁷³ metitur, ita adversis frangitur.***¹⁷⁴
[Version of above?] *omnis destituit animum fides;*¹⁷⁵ *ubi ignominia spem premit,
ubi nullam meminit aciem nisi qua fugerit, **errat circa¹⁷⁶ damna sua et quae male
expertus est vota deponit.***¹⁷⁷*

Entry [(C) If Xerxes were coming, he would not announce it. *si venturus esset, non
#3 denuntiaret.*]

si venturus esset, non minaretur. suis ira ardet ignibus et in pacta non solvitur.

¹⁷² Mss: *prior enim metus futuri regnus esset amissa*. I conjecture: *futuri augur est* (Haase: *est et for esset* of the mss). A. Schott, followed by subsequent editors: *futuri pignus est et amissa*. But *pignus* here makes little sense (Winterbottom: "former fear is a guarantee of future (fear)"). The required sense is that Xerxes' fear warns him of the future, and deters him; indeed, in the familiar manner of 'Proposition and Elaboration' this is expressed in what follows (*amissa ne audeat amissurum monent*). Cf. especially Cic. *Tusc.* 1.33 (*nescio quomodo inhaeret in mentibus quasi saeculorum quoddam augurium futurorum*); also, Ov. *Ep.* 16.234 (*fallitur augurio spes bona saepe suo*).

¹⁷³ Possibly: *ex praesenti <metu> metitur*; cf. Sal. *Cat.* 31.2 (*suo quisque metu pericula metiri*); Cic. *Caec.* 31; Liv. 36.10.4.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. S. 6.24 (Asinius Pollio on Cicero), noting 1) how each passage refers to the despair that adverse events can induce, and 2) the use of the abstract *adversa / adversae res: utinam moderatius secundas res et fortius adversas ferre potuisset! namque utraeque cum euenerant ei, mutari eas non posse rebatur*. For the use of *frango* to refer to a psychological state, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 11.5.4 (*fractam ducis mentem*).

¹⁷⁵ I have combined the conjectures of Andreas Schott (*omnis destituit animum spes*) and Eussner (*fides*). Mss: *Omnis est sit animus dies*. Håkanson's conjecture: *omne excitat animum decus*. Possibly: *omnis demisit animum dies*; cf. Lucil. 699: *re in secunda tollere animos, in mala demittere*; Sen. *Dial.* 12.5.1: *nec secunda sapientem euehant nec adversa demittunt*.

¹⁷⁶ *errat* is the reading of the mss. The conjecture of Cornelissen, *haeret* for *errat*, has been accepted by Håkanson, Winterbottom, and Müller. In defense of the transmitted reading *errat*, cf. Fuscus' *circumerrat* at C. 2.1.7: *neque turba lateri circumerrat*; and, for this verb with the mind or spirit as subject, cf. Verg. *A.* 6.329, on the souls of the unburied: *centum errant annos uolitantque haec litora circum*. For the wandering of the "sick" mind, cf. Enn. frg. 174 (Jocelyn), quoted by Cic. *Tusc.* 3.5: *animus aeger semper errat neque pati neque perpeti potest, cupere numquam desinit*.

¹⁷⁷ Juv. 1.1.133. Similar is *deponere spem*: Caes. *Gal.* 5.19.1; Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.26; Ov. *Am.* 3.1.9; *Laud. Turiae* 2.32.

- Entry [(C) If Xerxes were coming, he would not announce it. *si venturus esset, non denuntiaret.*]
 #4 *non denuntiaret, si venturus esset, neque armaret nos nuntio nec instigaret victricem Graeciam nec sollicitaret arma felicia; magis superveniret improvidis, magis et¹⁷⁸ arma indenuntiata <ad>moveret.*
- Entry [(A) Xerxes' forces were enormous, and he lost; we don't know if we won? *de eo dico 'vincemus' quem vicimus.*]
 #5 *quantumcumque Oriens valuit primo in Graeciam impetu effusum est. hoc ille numero ferox et in deos arma tulerat. extincta tot ante Xersem milia, tot sub ipso iacent; nulli nisi qui fugerunt supersunt. quid dicam Salamina? quid Cynaegiron referam et te, Polyzele? et hoc agitur, an viceris!*
- Entry [(D) How can we countenance removing the trophies? *non sunt tropaea tollenda.*]
 #6 *haec ego tropaea dis posui, haec in totius conspectu Graeciae statui, ne quis timeret Xerses minantem.*
- Entry [(D) How can we countenance removing the trophies? *non sunt tropaea tollenda.*]
 #7 *me miserum! pugnante Xerse tropaea posui; fugiente tollam? nunc Athenae vincimur: non tantum credetur redisse sed vicisse Xerses. non potest Xerses nisi per nos tropaea tollere.*
- Entry [(B) Xerxes' confidence is gone. *fractus est et viribus et animo.*]
 #8 *credite mihi, difficile est attritas opes recolligere et spes fractas novare et <ex> paenitenda acie in melioris eventus fiduciam surgere.*

The ability to match Entries with *divisiones* (outlines of arguments) is helpful and enlightening. It is further confirmation that the quotations in Seneca's anthology consist of discontinuous pieces, what I have called Entries: discernible groupings within a quotation appear according to clear differences of argument. Nonetheless, even though an outline of arguments influences how a quotation organizes itself into Entries, division and Entry are not synonymous.¹⁷⁹ The value and function of an Entry is not reducible to

¹⁷⁸ My conjecture (see discussion below). Mss: *improvidis nam et arma*. Håkanson: *improvidis et<iam>, et arma*. Bursian: *improvidis, nam et <antea> arma*. *<Ad>moveret* appears to be Håkanson's; it occurs in his edition, for the first time, without attribution.

¹⁷⁹ Heath 2004: 305-7, rightly observes that scholars have neglected the role of arguments in declamation; they ignore the *divisiones*. He says (p. 207) also that argument is not given "proportionate representation" in Seneca's anthology because Seneca consciously omits much of the arguments (C. 1 pr. 22). However,

what it achieves as an argument; an Entry is not equivalent to a category of ancient rhetorical theory, or more specifically, *status* theory.¹⁸⁰ This is evident when comparing quotations with divisions in Seneca's anthology, a process that generally yields very uncertain results. In fact, the pairing of Entry with argument above is more successful than in most other declamations. Still, even here, the comparison is not entirely satisfying; for instance, it is not certain that the division *de eo dico 'vincemus' quem vicimus* is in fact the guiding principle behind Entries #1 and #5.

The specific keywords and formulae that speakers share and vary, their diction and word arrangement, the mode of treatment (descriptive, narrative, etc.), the compositional building blocks used, cannot be predicted from the *divisiones*. Engagement between speakers and engagement with canonical literary texts are major motivating forces not encompassed by ancient rhetorical theory.¹⁸¹

Fuscus' objective, as imagined counselor to the Athenians, is to convince them not to remove their victory trophies. To achieve this, insofar as the quotation above shows, he focuses much attention on states of mind, to reactions and perceptions – that of

rather than viewing the lack of details of argument in Seneca as a misrepresentation (i.e. a loss of historical record), it should be possible to regard Seneca in his choices of inclusion and exclusion as an ancient witness of priorities. Entries possess validity on their own terms and not according to how they are defined in rhetorical theory.

¹⁸⁰ *Status* theory, which is thought to have been revolutionized by Hermagoras (2nd cent. BC), attempts to classify cases and generate arguments (*inuentio*) according to the types of judicial questions raised by the theme of a declamation. For example, a declamatory theme is read to see whether it raises a question of fact ("Did X in fact kill Y?"), a question of definition ("Was it murder or self-defense?"), a question of quality ("X killed Y, but were there mitigating circumstances?"), or a question of judicial procedure ("Is this the appropriate procedure for this case?"). See May and Wisse 2001: 32-4; Achard 1994: 11-29; Kaplan 1954: xlvii; Berti 2007: 51-3, 115-127. The seminal study reconstructing Hermagoras' teachings is Matthes 1958. For *status* theory in later Greek rhetoric, see Heath 1995.

¹⁸¹ Ancient rhetorical theory, it should be acknowledged, is not a single unified entity. My point is simply that we should resist interpretations that reduce Seneca's quotations to schematized rules drawn together from rhetorical handbooks.

the victors, on the one hand, and of Xerxes on the other. The Athenians should adopt the mindset of victors. If Xerxes should return, as past victors they would defeat him again. Xerxes' mental experience is recounted in Entries #2, #3, and #8. His confidence has been shattered by the defeat; it is unlikely that he can muster the courage to return. There is, in short, an effort to give explicit notice of psychology, to expose internal experience to the (mental) view of his audience.

Just as Seneca promised (*S.* 2.10), the quotation – especially in those parts that concern Xerxes – is an exposition (*explicatio*). In this case, it is an exposition of psychology, a study in thought-description. It is this quality that distinguishes the quotation, that made it worthy of record and gave it currency. The recognition is important; but still remaining are the more difficult questions that have occupied much of the present chapter: How does Fuscus' quotation position itself in literary traditions? What is Fuscus' larger literary context for this psychological study?

These questions, since they are aimed at such a vast topic as 'psychology,' have the potential to draw an investigation in a thousand different directions. Our specific interest in the quotation is with respect to two themes that have been central to this dissertation: 1) the organization of the anthology, and 2) our ability to discern a stylistic program and a literary presence in traditions. The premise of the present study has been that these issues are indivisible. The anthology's organization defines *what* and *how* we read. This was emphasized at the beginning of the present chapter, when I spoke of the limitations the anthology imposes on what we can know about Fuscus as stylist; it was explored in comparing quotations from Fuscus and Fabianus with *Sen. Nat.* 3.27-30. *S.* 5

will further confirm and flesh out stylistic characteristics. It will also serve to adumbrate what is just beyond the confines of the record.

4.5.1 The ‘fused nominal’ creates impressive language and images

Fuscus’ quotation in *S. 5* contains several nouns with adjoined participles: *tot caesa milia, totiens mersa classis, disturbata arma, arma indenuntiata, Xersen minantem, pugnante Xerse, attritas opes, spes fractas, paenitenda acie*. It might be assumed that the participles simply act as descriptive adjectives: where a participle is found with a noun, there is more description; when there is no participle or adjective, there is less description.

However, the participles here do not simply supply descriptive detail. To varying degrees, each coalesces with the noun that it modifies to form a new, substantival complex. This is the so-called *ab urbe condita* use of the participle.¹⁸² An example of Fuscus’ use of this construction appears in a passage analyzed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.6.4), *C. 2.5.4: miraris, si transit quinquennium inter uxorem tortam et occupatum uirum?* “Do you wonder that five years have passed, what with the wife’s torture and the husband’s preoccupation?” Use of the preposition *inter* with a past participle in this construction is uncommon. It is absent from the works of Cicero and Caesar, and first appears in Sallust.¹⁸³

The effect produced by each participle-noun combination in *S. 5* is not precisely the same. Nonetheless, these combinations are all products of the same procedure and

¹⁸² Laughton 1964: 84-99; Kühner and Stegmann 1912-14: II.762-3; Leumann, Hofmann and Szantyr 1977: II.393-5; Nägelsbach 1905: 149-53.

¹⁸³ *Cat.* 43.3: *inter haec parata atque decreta*.

they all tend toward the same basic outcome: a juxtaposing of simple noun and participial modifier in order to create something new, a new meaning. The whole (a nominal abstract) is greater than the sum of its parts (a concrete noun + modifier). Concentration of these combinations in *S. 5* witnesses Fuscus experimenting with this procedure, testing it to see the various transformative effects it may achieve.

Use of the ‘fused nominal,’ as I shall call it, corroborates defining characteristics of Fuscus’ prose. The procedure has not been discussed until now, but it contributes to tendencies that we have already explored in depth. First, it is an additional pathway to innovation, to impressive language, to unexpected and unfamiliar subtleties. By this method new meanings are sought not through uncommon words, but through combinations of familiar words.¹⁸⁴ Secondly, the result of the fused nominal is often pictorial. Out of a concrete noun is made an abstract, free-standing substantive – an icon capable even of standing alone without predication.¹⁸⁵

S. 5.1, from Entry #1

tot caesa milia, nihil ex tanta acie relictum minanti, nisi quod vix fugientem sequi possit; totiens mersa classis.

So from Entry #1, *tot caesa milia* and *totiens mersa classis* amount to, respectively, “the slaughter of so many thousands,” and “the sinking of the fleet so many times.” Action and scene predominate. No verb is needed.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ Compare the technique (*callida iunctura*) of Horace and Vergil, whereby common words are used in conjunction in order to produce uncommon effects; see for example, Wilkinson 1959.

¹⁸⁵ Laughton 1964: 97, citing Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.5 (*quem enim nostrum ille moriens apud Mantineam Epaminondas non cum quadam miseratione delectat?*): “The subject of *delectat* is not *ille Epaminondas*, but the whole participial phrase; what touches the reader is the *scene* [original emphasis] of Epaminondas dying at Mantinea.” Also, *idem*: 92, for “pictorial” effect of fused nominal phrases in the nominative case.

S. 5.1, from Entry #2

Xerxes veniet? nescio quomodo languet circa memoriam iacturae animus et disturbata arma non repetit.

In Entry #2 above, Xerxes is loath to recall the “routing of his military.” It is not weapons (*arma*) – that is, a concrete object – from which his thoughts shrink; but rather a mental panorama of his forces in confusion.

S. 5.2, Entry #6

Haec ego tropaea dis posui, haec in totius conspectu Graeciae statui, ne quis timeret Xersen minantem.

In Entry #6, the speaker claims that he set up the trophies in order that no one have cause to fear “a threatening Xerxes” (Winterbottom, *ad loc.*: “the threats of Xerxes”). The participle is not a descriptive *addition* to the noun, but joins with it to create a new substantival unit: the event or scene of Xerxes making threats. Entry #7 is similar, even though the participle is in an ablative absolute:¹⁸⁷ *pugnante Xerse tropaea posui; fugiente tollam?* “I set up the trophies with a fighting Xerxes as backdrop.” Reference is not made to Xerxes the person, but to a larger situational context in which Xerxes is the central figure.

In Entry #8 (below) the effect of the fused nominals is less visual, more abstract.

S. 5.3, Entry #8

Credite mihi, difficile est attritas opes recolligere et spes fractas novare et <ex> paenitenda acie in melioris eventus fiduciam surgere.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Cic. *Mur.* 42 (Laughton 1964: 91-2); *Pis.* 28 and 67, and see the comments of Nisbet 1961: 91-2, 131, on these latter two passages, who says Cicero often uses a staccato style, omitting the copula *esse*, in vivid descriptions.

¹⁸⁷ See Laughton 1964: 99, on a possible connection between the fused nominal and the ablative absolute.

It is difficult for hope to rise from “disgrace in battle” (Winterbottom, *ad loc.*) (*paenitenda acie*). The use of *paenitendus* as adjective does not occur before the Augustan Age;¹⁸⁸ it appears in a fused nominal only here. The other two combinations (*attritas opes* and *spes fractas*), strictly speaking, cannot be classified as instances of the *ab urbe condita* construction. However, the participles do combine to create a substantival complex with an unexpected, nuanced meaning. Innovation resides in metaphorical juxtapositions of concrete (*attritas; fractas*) and abstract (*opes; spes*):¹⁸⁹ “ground down resources” and “shattered hopes.”

Arma indenuntiata, in Entry #4, poses a similar combination of abstract and concrete. However, to appreciate the peculiar, very precise meaning achieved through this combination, we must see how it operates within its Entry.

S. 5.2, Entry #4

*Non denuntiaret, si venturus esset, neque armaret nos nuntio
nec **instigare**t victricem **Graeciam** nec **sollicitaret** arma **felicia**;
magis superveniret improvidis magis et¹⁹⁰ arma indenuntiata <ad>moveret.*

Once again, Fuscus is seen to be keenly interested in structure, in the creation of binary pairs and of multiple, criss-crossing (i.e. vertical and horizontal) correspondences. That the graphic arrangement above accurately represents the architecture is quickly seen in

¹⁸⁸ Liv. 1.35.5 (*sub haud paenitendo magistro, ipso Anco rege, Romana se iura...didicisse*); 40.56.3; V. Max. 5.1.ext.6 (*vos quoque...non paenitendas sortitae estis exsequias*).

¹⁸⁹ Sal. Cat. 16.2 (*eorum fama atque pudorem adtriuerat*); Jug. 5.4 (*Hannibal post magnitudinem nominis Romani Italiae opes maxime adtriuerat*); Petr. 116.3, in a fused nominal (*quodue genus negotiationis praecipue probarent post attritas bellis frequentibus opes*). For *recolligo* used of military forces, Fron. Str. 2.13.4: *sparsa exercitu, dein recollecto*.

¹⁹⁰ *Magis et* (my conjecture from the mss' *nam et*) seems likely for two reasons: 1) *Magis* complements the parallel structuring Fuscus manifestly applies in this Entry. 2) The *et* signals that what follows, *arma indenuntiata*, is Focus information. Given the novelty of the expression and its role in the Entry (as explained in the discussion to follow), it would be surprising if it were *not* Focus information. Bursian's conjecture (*improvidis, nam et <antea> arma*), improbably makes *antea* Focus.

the second line, where we find clear phonetic correspondences between verb and verb (*instigare* – *sollicitare*), and a ‘false’ parallelism between noun and adjective (*Graeciam* – *felicia*).

The motivation and meaning of *indenuntiata*, which occurs in the Latin corpus only here and at *S.* 2.2 (also a quotation of Fuscus), are rooted in the architecture.

Indenuntiata completes the correspondences; at the same time, the correspondences invest the neologism with a meaning it does not possess on its own. To see this, we must first recognize that the third pair of *cola* is in correspondence with the first. *Superveniret* recalls *venturus*; *arma indenuntiata* recalls *denuntiaret* and *armaret nos nuntio*. This last phrase, “he would not arm us with news,” proposes that an enemy can be made deadly with news. *Arma indenuntiata moveret* makes the inverse claim that Xerxes would have applied “unnewsed weapons”: weapons can be made deadly by “non-announcing” them; passivity is conceived as a lethal act.¹⁹¹

4.5.2 Psychological darkness

Therefore, Fuscus applies the fused nominal as a means to innovation. It can also serve to invoke a pictorial response in readers / auditors: thus, Seneca (*S.* 2.10) refers to Fuscus’ expositions as *descriptiunculae* (“little descriptions”). However, this quotation assumes the status of a *psychological* description most manifestly in Entry #2.

S. 5.1, Entry #2

¹⁹¹ The impressive fused nominal here embodies this paradox. For another possible paradox in this quotation, but of a different variety, consider from Entry #3: *suis ira ardet ignibus et in pacta non solvitur*. Does Fuscus derive *pactum* (the noun “compact”) from *pangere* (“to fix”) (so, Latin allows both *pacisci pacem* and *pangere pacem*), though modern linguists derive it from *pacisco*? “Anger is not released (*solvitur*) into what is fixed (*pacta*)” The literal contradiction – released into a fixed state – effectively expresses impossibility.

Xerses veniet? nescio quomodo languet circa memoriam iacturae animus et disturbata arma non repetit. prior enim metus futuri augur est, et amissa ne audeat amissurum monent. ut interdum in gaudia surgit animus et spem ex praesenti metitur, ita adversis frangitur. omnis destituit animum fides; ubi ignominia spem premit, ubi nullam meminit aciem nisi qua fugerit, errat circa damna sua et quae male expertus est vota deponit.

Here is a miniature study of how defeat impacts thinking. It is a dark landscape that is extended before us – “dark,” in the sense that the object of exposition (i.e. thinking) lacks physical features, it cannot literally be seen. It must be portrayed through metaphor. And it is “dark” in the sense that the experience being related is gloomy:¹⁹² the mind sickens; it has been broken and withdraws into a self-consuming isolation.

An examination that considers where the above passage belongs among passages that for one reason or another might be characterized as “psychological,” would certainly involve our investigation in untold intricacies, and would likely have uncertain results. In fact, such an expansion is both unnecessary and undesirable. We actually move closer to Fuscus’ stylistic program by *not* doing this kind of analysis. This is because the potential connections the Fuscus passage has within literary traditions are narrowed and defined through the types of sentences it uses (Presentational sentences) and through its spatial definition as an Entry. The organization of the anthology, on the one hand, deprives us of more specific knowledge. It is frustratingly imperfect, an excerpt: if the passage were longer, we would know more about its intentions and stylistic character. On the other hand, the anthology’s organization brings definition: an Entry asserts itself in broader

¹⁹² For psychological darkness, cf. Johnson 1976: 97-9, who examines the simile used by Vergil at the end of the *Aeneid* (12.908-18) to portray Turnus’ psychological crisis in the face of defeat. The Vergilian simile, says Johnson (p. 99), is a “perfect representation of the monstrous and unreasoning night. . . . The darkness without and within, the big darkness and the small – Vergil has found ways of imagining them; darkness, all kinds of darkness, is finally made visible. And the boundaries of poetry are extended immeasurably.”

literary traditions precisely as Entry, as a small, portable building block, whose limited size influences its architecture and style.¹⁹³ From this perspective, it is perfect.

This tension between the Entry as productive building block and Entry as fragment certainly obtains in Entry #2. The passage is not merely ‘psychological.’ We can recognize the relatively narrow parameters within which it is working. The idea that the mind, when dejected, is suffering from illness (*languet*),¹⁹⁴ in a way comparable to bodily illness, is not new.¹⁹⁵ A chronologically proximal precedent is found in books 3 and 4 of the *Tusculans* (written in 45 BC), where Cicero outlines the different illnesses of the mind, the cure for these being philosophy.¹⁹⁶ At points in Cicero’s exposition it is possible to recognize that indeed this is something of the intellectual tradition that Fuscus is tapping into. So, at *Tusc.* 3.14, where Cicero begins to review the Stoic arguments on emotional states, we read how mental sickness (*aegritudo*) causes bravery to devolve into fear and inaction: “Mental sickness undercuts bravery. It is reasonable that if a person is affected by mental sickness, he will be affected by fear and a breaking (*infractio*) and dejection of the mind. To whomever this happens, it will also happen that he becomes

¹⁹³ This chapter especially, beginning with Section 4.2.3, has tried to demonstrate how Fuscus’ presence can be traced in literary traditions; this presence has been detected in part by the appearance in subsequent authors (Ovid, younger Seneca, Manilius, Lucan) of passages of relatively limited size corresponding to specific Fuscine Entries in Seneca’s anthology. The point here, in asserting that an Entry can be seen as “perfect,” is that we must be prepared to allow that Entries are the size they are by choice; and that this choice is not attributable to the elder Seneca alone, but to an entire culture that recognized the validity and authority of short, semi-independent quotations. Authors, I argue, used these short quotations (*loci*) as building blocks in the process of composing their works. However, recognition that later authors used these short quotations does not imply that the works of Silver Latin authors are episodic, as was commonly believed (e.g. Williams 1978: 246-53). Building blocks can be seamlessly combined; e.g. Vell. 66.4-5 and Sen. *Dial.* 2.2-6, discussed above (Section 4.4.2).

¹⁹⁴ *Languet circa* translates Greek νοσέω περί.

¹⁹⁵ For sicknesses of the mind, see Lucr. 3.824-9. Also cf. the phrase *mortales aegri* in Lucretius (6.1), a phrase which Vergil allusively applies (*G.* 1.237; also *A.* 2.268, 10.274; 12.850).

¹⁹⁶ See the introduction (pp. xi-xxxv) and commentary of Graver 2002; and the introduction (pp. ix-liv) and commentary of R. M. Henry in Dougan and Henry 1934.

servile, that he confesses he has been defeated. If these happen, it follows that he will assume cowardice and listlessness.”¹⁹⁷

This explanation does capture what Fuscus says has happened to Xerxes, but – with its strict, step-by-step, syllogistic proofs, its concentration on rational abstractions (*fortitudo, aegritudo, infractio, demissio, timiditas*) rather than on action and scene – it is far from what Fuscus gives us.¹⁹⁸

The younger Seneca, too, is attracted to the idea of mental disruption as disease, and in his works we are able to discover something still closer to Fuscus’ Entry #2. So, for example, in *de Tranquillitate animi* (*Dial.* 9), when a friend, Serenus, asks Seneca for a remedy (*remedium*) to the fluctuations of his mind, the philosopher provides (*Dial.* 9.2.6-15) a kind of clinical description of the different ways that imbalance of the *animus* can manifest itself in patients. The underlying cause is the same: disappointment (*sibi displicere*, 9.2.7). This can originate with frustrated desires. For those who suffer from this, failure is torture (*torquet illos inritum dedecus*, 9.2.7). Seneca continues:

Sen. *Dial.* 9.2.8¹⁹⁹

Tunc illos et paenitentia coepti tenet et incipiendi timor subrepsitque illa animi iactatio non inuenientis exitum, quia nec imperare cupiditatibus suis nec obsequi possunt, et cunctatio uitae parum se explicantis et inter destituta uota torpentis animi situs.

¹⁹⁷ *Ita fit ut fortitudini aegritudo repugnet. ueri simile est igitur, in quem cadat aegritudo, cadere in eundem timorem et infractionem quidem animi et demissionem. quae in quem cadunt, in eundem cadit ut seruiat, ut uictum, si quando, se esse fateatur. quae qui recipit, recipiat idem necesse est timiditatem et ignauiam.*

¹⁹⁸ Cicero says (*Tusc.* 3.13) that this proof is done in the Stoic manner, i.e. with austere restraint.

¹⁹⁹ “Then, regret for what they’ve done and fear of new beginnings hold them; and then enters that tossing of the mind that knows no end, since they are able neither to command their desires nor gratify them; then enters the hesitation of a stalled life and the wasting of the mind that lies dejected among abandoned hopes.”

The description parallels what, according to Fuscus, Xerxes is experiencing. It makes reference to the same state of mind, the same mental space where Fuscus locates Xerxes' thinking: he is pinned between failure of the past (*paenitentia coepti*) and, because of this failure, timidity towards the future (*incipiendi timore*). Trapped, the mind can only withdraw and deteriorate.

Furthermore, the Entry of Fuscus to some extent shares with the Seneca passage a desire for rational detachment and philosophical distance. Hence, I have called *Dial.* 9.2.6-15 a “clinical” description. In addition to being medical (at least metaphorically), it speaks in universals and seeks to formulate general principles. It does not attempt to recreate the drama of those who suffer in this way, to make readers *feel* as these sufferers do. This rational detachment is evident in Entry #2 insofar as it presents itself as explanation:

S. 5.1 (H 354,12-14), from Entry #2²⁰⁰
prior enim metus futuri augur est, et amissa ne audeat amissurum monent. ut interdum in gaudia surgit animus et spem ex praesenti metitur, ita adversis frangitur.

The abstract neuter nouns (*futuri; amissa; adversis; praesenti*), the indefinite participle (*amissurum*, “a man who stands to lose”), and the generalizing *interdum* (“now and again”) all serve to create a sense of rationality and universal applicability.

But this tendency towards rational description is purer in the passage from the *Dialogus* than it is in Fuscus' Entry. The latter in fact is ambiguous, showing two functional proclivities. It simultaneously follows two different trajectories, and is

²⁰⁰ “Former fear is a predictor of the future, and failures warn the man who stands to lose not to take risks. Just as the mind now and again soars in rejoicings and measures its hopes from present circumstances, just so it is shattered by difficulties.”

capable of two different compositional expansions: on the one hand, distanced philosophical discourse, and on the other, dramatic tableau.²⁰¹ To which tendency it is more committed is impossible to say due to the limitations of the anthology, more specifically due to the brevity of the quotation.

Surrounding, and even within, Fuscus' rational explanations we must not fail to observe the intense, dramatic action that is unfolded. The workings of the mind are figured in terms of human, bodily movement: the mind is sick (*languet circa*), it rises (*surgit*), it is shattered (*frangitur*); faith abandons (*destituit animum fides*), shame presses (*ignominia premit*); the mind wanders (*errat circa*) and lays down its hopes (*vota deponit*).²⁰² The dramatic element is generated in part out of each of these several verbs (so compare Fuscus' *frangitur* with Cicero's *infractio*). But, more importantly, a sense of scene arises out of Fuscus' use of a Presentational mode. The focus is on action and event, not an informational division between subject and predicate.

The kind of psychological tableau that Fuscus' description suggests – despite its imperfect fulfillment in the confines of Seneca's anthology – can be seen, for example, in Tacitus' description of the death of the emperor Vitellius (*Hist.* 3.84).²⁰³ Rome has been captured by the partisans of Vespasian. The mind of the beset emperor – like that of the despot Xerxes – wavers under the pressures of defeat and fear. Vitellius first hides in his wife's apartment to avoid his would-be killers:

²⁰¹ As evidence of this ambiguity, Edward 1928: 62, interprets the description of the *animus* in Entry #2 as referring specifically to Xerxes' *animus* ("sometimes there is joy and exultation in his soul"), whereas Winterbottom, *ad loc.*, interprets the description as universal ("a man's spirit").

²⁰² In Entry #2, I take *animus* as subject of *errat circa damna sua et quae male expertus est vota deponit*.

²⁰³ See Levene 1997: 144-7; Ash 1999: 118-25. For Tacitus' tableaux, specifically in the *Historiae*, a classic and still relevant study is Courbaud 1918.

Tac. *Hist.* 3.84.4

dein mobilitate ingenii et, quae natura pauoris est, cum omnia metuenti praesentia maxime displicerent, in Palatium regreditur uastum desertumque, dilapsis etiam infimis seruitiorum aut occursum eius declinationibus. terret solitudo et tacentes loci; temptat clausa, inhorrescit uacuis; fessusque misero errore et pudenda latebra semet occultans ab Iulio Placido tribuno cohortis protrahitur.

The essential overlap here with Fuscus' Entry is that both track the movements of the mind as dramatic events; so, note especially the series of underlined phrases above. This Presentational mode of discourse differs from what we just saw in the younger Seneca, where there is little interest in opening a visual frame.

There are perhaps other psychological tableaux²⁰⁴ that would prove fitting comparanda to Fuscus' Entry. But the passage from Tacitus' *Histories* is illuminating because, to help recreate the haunting solitude that envelopes Vitellius, the historian draws on the end of *Aeneid* 2, where the chaos of the fall of Troy is described.²⁰⁵

Tacitus' synthesis of poetry – specifically Vergil²⁰⁶ – with prose historiography is analogous to Fuscus' own creative infusion of Vergilian, and other poetic, language into prose. What is more, we have in the theme of *S. 5* fundamental material of ancient

²⁰⁴ Cf. Sal. *Cat.* 31.1-2: *Quis rebus permota ciuitas atque inmutata urbis facies erat. Ex summa laetitia atque lasciuiia, quae diuturna quies pepererat, repente omnis tristitia inuasit: festinare trepidare, neque loco neque homini quoiquam satis credere, neque bellum gerere neque pacem habere, suo quisque metu pericula metiri.*

²⁰⁵ Verg. *A.* 2.754-5 (*qua gressum extuleram, repeto et uestigia retro | obseruata sequor per noctem et lumine lustrō: | horror ubique animo, simul ipsa silentia terrent.*); 2.728-9 (*nunc omnes terrent aerae, sonus excitat omnis | suspensum et pariter comitique onerique timentem*). Wellesley 1972: 186, notes *Aen.* 2.755; for a study of Vergilian influence in Tac. *Hist.* 3, see Baxter 1971.

²⁰⁶ On Vergil and Tacitus, see Syme 1958: 194, 357-8; Hellegouarc'h 1991: 2428-2437. Baxter 1971: 98, describes Tacitus' method of borrowing from Vergil in a way that recalls Fuscus' techniques: "Tacitus never quotes Virgil word for word. Rather, he takes a Virgilian phrase and molds it to suit his own purpose."

historiography, the Persian Wars. This *suasoria*, and in fact all surviving *suasoriae* in Seneca's anthology except *S.* 3 (sacrifice of Iphigenia), either include material traditionally found in histories or prove to be readily transferable to historiography.²⁰⁷

These observations are offered not as proof of a direct connection between the literary productions of an Arellius Fuscus and Tacitus' work. Rather, they are suggestive of the largely anonymous process of literary evolution that we have already seen in operation when comparing quotations of Fuscus with passages of Ovid, Manilius, the younger Seneca, and Lucan. Tacitus' description of the death of Vitellius – particularly in its selective use of Vergilian language in a tableau of psychological darkness applied within an historiographical context – is not a fresh invention of the historian. It represents the adoption and continuation of an authoritative tradition formulated in the Augustan Age through the activities of Arellius Fuscus and others who participated in the same activities.

Therefore, Fuscus' Entry #4 is duplex in what it is and what it could be. It seems to be both rational and dramatic expositions; and if the Entry and quotation were longer, we could likely draw more certain conclusions about its literary functions and ambitions. From our vantage point, this is a disappointing limitation of the anthology. To counteract this limitation, I explored how Fuscus' psychological exposition fits within literary traditions as seen in more extensive texts.

Despite this sense of absence in the record, we cannot ignore the Entry's potential role as literary raw material. It is serviceable to literary traditions precisely because it is

²⁰⁷ *S.* 1 and 4 (Alexander the great: Curtius Rufus; cf. esp. *S.* 1 and Curt. 9.4.18); *S.* 2 and 5 (Persian Wars: Herodotus); *S.* 5 and 6 (Cicero and Mark Antony: the historians included in Seneca's anthology).

pressed into an anthology. The ambiguity of the Entry would allow the reader who is also a student, performer, or author to adapt the passage as either dramatic or philosophical description. The idea of Entry as raw material implies that what makes the Entry recognizably Fuscine can easily be diluted when adapted. This is undoubtedly true. The brevity of the quotations threatens to obliterate the declaimers' linguistic and literary distinctions. But it remains uncertain to what extent this concentration of expression into an Entry belongs to the declaimer and to what extent to the collector of quotations. We have only short quotations; nonetheless, we can trace the presence of a Fuscus in the literary tradition *through these Entries*. Their patterns – their peculiar associations and prioritizing of ideas – are discovered in later authors. Adoption of these patterns by contemporaries and later authors was both conscious and unconscious.

*There is little difference between one man and another;
but what little there is, is very important.*
William James

Conclusion

The anthology of the elder Seneca is the product of seemingly contradictory motives. On the one hand, the design of the work and the statements of its author declare a positive desire to maintain the individuality of the recorded speakers. On the other hand, the work as collection is put at the service of readers, particularly of those readers who are also speakers and authors: the reader / writer is invited to disassemble, recombine, and reuse quotations without concern for original authorial attributions. Proof that Seneca's anthology could be understood in the latter terms is found in the text of the excerpted tradition, which removes almost entirely the names of the declaimers and freely combines quotations.¹

Louis Holtz, in a study of the grammars of Donatus, discusses the position of the celebrated grammarian's works relative to the traditions of other ancient technical manuals.² Although the elder Seneca is not included in this discussion, two basic categories of school texts proposed by Holtz can help us better appreciate the complex nature of Seneca's anthology: First, says Holtz,³ there are literary texts whose purpose is

¹ On the excerpted tradition, see Hagendahl 1936: 299-313. Hagendahl's idea (praised by Winterbottom 1974: xix, and Håkanson 1989a: xv), that the excerptor often changed the word order of Seneca's text because he wanted to create better clausulae, I believe is incorrect – or, at best, the idea can only partly and occasionally explain the excerptor's motives. For example, Hagendahl does not address the fact that the excerptor sometimes changed the word order when there is a "good" clausula in the original text. See *C.* 1.1.10, where the full tradition reads: *Circumibo tecum, pater, aliena limina* (hypodochmiac). The excerpted tradition: *Circumibo, pater, aliena tecum limina* – a "bad" clausula, unless *tecum* is counted as a trochee. In that case, the rhythm is a hypodochmiac – the same as the original.

² Holtz 1981: 75-96.

³ Holtz 1981: 94.

invested in authority and authorship, that are inviolable and that do not permit the reader to alter them. The poetry of Vergil, for example, is read and preserved: it is not to be tampered with. Or, if it is altered, it can no longer be considered Vergil. In the second category are utilitarian texts, commentaries and grammars, that offer themselves as scholastic resources and raw material to those who will take advantage of them.

Authorship is not integral to what these texts are about. They belong at once to everyone and to no one. The anthology of Seneca – in its emphasis on stylistic portraits, in its urgency to preserve quotations and the names of their authors (C. 1 pr. 11; 10. pr. 14), *and* in the evident utility of its quotations as raw material – simultaneously embodies both these categories of texts.

The identity of the individual author

A paradox similar to that inherent in the motives of Seneca's anthology has become apparent also in the discoveries of the present dissertation. The first term of the paradox is supplied by the issue of individual, independent identities. In an analysis of quotations contained in the anthology, the literary identities of two obscure speakers, Papirius Fabianus and Arellius Fuscus, have found meaningful definitions and individual presences in literary history. These identities were established in our analyses through reference to several postulates. Most of these (1, 2, 3) served *a priori* as foundation to our investigation; the relevance and validity of the last postulate (4) became apparent through discoveries that occurred in the course of our study:

1) Linguistic form is inalienable from meaning. Formal difference between one quotation or Entry and another must be understood as a difference also in meaning. The

validity of this postulate is strongly supported by the fact that the anthology contains many quotations that, though identical in argument, differ slightly in form.

2) The quotations of the anthology reside within a chronological framework; for the quotations of Fuscus and Fabianus, this is the Augustan Age. This observation, which could seem unremarkable, implicitly contests the marginalization suffered by the declaimers of Seneca's work. Speakers have been marginalized by the tendency of modern critics to emphasize genre – 'declamation,' with all its connotations of artistic corruption and inferiority – over other considerations, such as temporal sequence. Furthermore, declaimers in the anthology have been isolated by a tendency to view them as being active only *after* the Augustan Age. Our analysis, instead, has emphasized the early chronology of some declaimers, an emphasis that allows for the possibility that the role of a declaimer in the formation of traditions could be equal to that of a canonical author.

The idea that the appearance of a quotation in a declamatory context does not limit the quotation's potential influence on literary works of other genres requires no lengthy defense: during the period which concerns us (the Augustan Age and beyond), it is agreed that all authors practiced declamation at some point in their lives and were exposed to its performances. Declamation was an institution that enculturated members of Roman society,⁴ particularly males of the upper classes, and contributed to the process of determining what constituted literature.

3) A sense of literary identity is most strongly felt in those cases where we observe the *consistent* appearance in quotations of *distinctive* linguistic and literary

⁴ Beard 1993 is a seminal study for understanding wider implications of declamation as cultural practice.

features. This principle, which has been cited several times already, can be stated also in slightly different terms. Very rarely are formal features or topics and arguments exclusive to a single author. However, the non-exclusivity of features does not prevent them from serving as criteria to recognize identity: what matters is patterns of use, in terms of both frequency and context.⁵ It is a given that, since much of ancient literature has been lost, the context within which speakers' quotations operate can be determined only imperfectly. Nonetheless, passages appearing both *within* the anthology and *outside* of it offer traces of this context.

For the quotations of Fabianus, a strong sense of identity emerges from his persistent self-representation as moral *philosophus*, an identity that is performed in what I have called "primitive" language. For considering the question of a Fabianic identity, contextual and temporal patterns matter. It matters that Fabianus moralizes in primitive language. It matters that he speaks of civil war in the kind of language that he does at the point in literary and political history that he does. For the quotations of Arellius Fuscus, identity is found in his innovative diction, in his combination of features from traditionally separate genres (poetry, technical literature), in the consistent application of idiosyncratic sentence architecture, and in the frequency within his quotations of Presentational sentences.

4) The performative moment, specifically the engagement of speaker with speaker in a shared *locus*, is crucial to our understanding of the anthology and its declaimers. This principle, which states the importance of comparing passages within the anthology, would appear to be contained already in 3). However, 4) points out that not all passages

⁵ Langslow 2005: 293.

in the anthology are equally comparable. Passages in which we witness speaker engaged with speaker can be more revealing of identity than passages that lack such close and immediate engagement. Again, we insist on the priority of the contextual moment – of which the shared *locus* can offer a remarkably precise snapshot. In passages that contribute to a shared *locus* we witness speakers engaging each other very deliberately; in many cases, they are doing so within a very narrow temporal frame, either during the same performative occasion or within a day or two of each other's speech. Engagement was a significant factor in determining how an author composed a passage; it is in these moments that speakers had the opportunity to define themselves.

A collective, anonymous creativity

If the first term of the paradox consists in the ability to see a distinct literary identity in the quotations attributed to a speaker, the second term of the paradox results from the discovery that a speaker's identity is sometimes most effectively discerned in *anonymous patterns*.

This was seen especially in Chapter 4, where we were able to trace how, from the language of canonical authors, Arellius Fuscus helped construct influential *loci* and thought patterns: the Despairing Farmer (Section 4.2.3-4), which appears in the works of Ovid, Manilius, Lucan, and the younger Seneca; the thought pattern 'we can dwell among the heavenly stars' (Section 4.3.1), appearing in the younger Seneca; the planetary list (4.3.2), which appears in Lucan; a description of divine inspiration (Section 4.3.4), which perhaps bore the shorthand label *plena deo* and which appears in Ovid and Lucan; and the Ciceronian Epitaph, which appears in Velleius Paterculus, the younger Seneca, and

other authors (Section 4.4.2). These patterns had the force of authority within literary traditions, but they operated with no recognized author. Or, if a pattern does bear a name, it is the name of a canonical author (Vergil or Cicero), not the name of the declaimer or declaimers who fashioned the pattern and gave it a particular shape.

In Chapter 1 (Section 1.5) it was stated that the function of a shared *locus* is not solely to afford speakers the chance to outperform their peers and show how they are different; a shared *locus* is also the mechanism by which the language of a declamation is established. The *loci* are a (tacitly) cooperative effort undertaken to define what constitutes the performance of a particular declamation. They succeed by agreement among declaimers, repetition, and – to a limited extent – sameness. The declamation is fictional; substance is given to its fictional premise (*thema*), and the performance is validated, through recognized procedure. By this method *loci* generate traditions – both within the practice of declamation and, as our investigation has seen (and as is witnessed by the numerous studies tracing the influence of declamation in Silver Latin), within literature more broadly.

The *loci*, then, are utilitarian. They serve a kind of communal purpose. Those who contribute to them help establish a fund of celebrated literary experiences. The language of these literary experiences, through performative repetition and communal recognition, has been invested with an authority and affective power that it could not otherwise possess. It is this authority and emotional power, not just the opportunity to create self-defining distinctions, that authors expect to capitalize on when they use shared *loci*.

Awareness of the utilitarian value of shared *loci*, and of the at least partial self-effacement authors undergo in using them, admonishes us to question how far we should expect to find literary identities in our texts. Perhaps, in expecting to discover creative individuality in Seneca's quotations and in other literary works, we risk imposing on ancient literature romantic preconceptions about authorship. Perhaps there is a tendency to attach too much value to the creativity of the individual, whereas the evidence gives the distinct outlines of a group, or systemic, creativity. This caution, since it has us sustain two seemingly contradictory visions of literary productivity at once, is instructive and leads to what I regard as an extremely important insight: it is challenging but necessary to see in shared passages both an assertion of individual creativity and a valorization of an impersonal literary system. We must learn to understand shared *loci* as performing both these functions, simultaneously and without contradiction.

To be sure, the idea that shared passages simultaneously offer a site of literary contest and constitute a literary system is not my own. So, for example, a system generated through imitated passages is typically recognized in studies of intertextuality. In his seminal study of intertextuality, G. B. Conte (1986: 23-31) insists that shared passages represent both *aemulatio* (competitive distinction) and *imitatio* (systemic sameness); in order to make this point, he emphasizes the integral role of shared passages in constituting a literary system. But when the number of authors and texts contributing to the system are so small, when the textual record is so lacunose, we might doubt how effectively the operation of a literary system can be demonstrated. It borders on contradiction to try to argue for a textual system (in resistance to a view that equates literature with the intentions and genius of individual authors) in analyses that consider

only the literary monuments of a few major authors who stand isolated from each other in time: Homer – Ennius – Catullus – Vergil.

My dissertation has demonstrated that this model of literature as system, which hitherto has had to rely on theoretical force to compensate for the small number of authors compared, finds rich evidentiary support in the anthology of the elder Seneca. Moreover, this is support that is contextualized in social practices and within a relatively narrow chronological frame. By virtue of the following, then, the anthology seems peculiarly suited to an exploration of the systemic nature of ancient literature: 1) the large number of speakers represented (~120), speakers who lived roughly at the same time and who, in many cases, can be seen interacting directly with one another; 2) the organization of the quotations, which reflects the prominent role of collaboration in inventing declamatory and literary material; and 3) the valuable evidence, furnished by the anthology, for reconstructing social practices that are integral to literary production, namely: performative gatherings and the collecting of quotations.

A further study that uses Seneca's anthology to fully explore the systemic character of Latin literature, while at the same time remaining sensitive to authorial identities, could take on many forms. A particularly promising and exciting possibility is suggested by the database-like structure of the anthology and the organization and potentials of so called New Media. A full explanation of this idea cannot be attempted here and must belong to a subsequent project. I shall simply intimate the relevance and possible significance of such a project.

Readers of Seneca's anthology, as we have seen, were expected not simply to read consecutively in a linear direction, but also to read laterally, comparing spatially

distant quotations from multiple speakers. Modern technologies, with their characteristic organization into small, discrete pieces of information and their remarkable ability to recombine these pieces into new variant products, are superiorly equipped to represent the database structure of an anthology like Seneca's. The ability to trace patterns (Entries, shared *loci*, thought patterns) from the anthology in other literary works suggests that passages from canonical literary works can be brought into the scope of a database. A database, containing contributions to patterns shared both by speakers in the anthology and by authors of other works, would effectively set the obscure figures of the anthology on a level with canonical texts. It would redress the shortcomings of traditional analyses of the anthology, and it would thus move towards a fulfillment of the potentials opened up by the discoveries of the present dissertation: instead of seeing in speaker's quotations only jingling rhetorical ornament, we can recognize the cooperative role of quoted speakers in constituting a substantive and fundamental literary fabric.

Works Cited

- Achard, G. (1994). *Cicéron. De l'Invention*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Adams, J. N. (2005). "The *Bellum Africum*," in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press: 73-96.
- Albertini, E. (1923). *La composition dans les ouvrages philosophiques de Sénèque*. Paris, E. de Boccard.
- Albrecht, M. von. (2004). *Wort und Wandlung: Senecas Lebenskunst*, Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, 252. Leiden, Brill.
- Anderson, G. (1995). "Ut ornatius et uberius dici posset: morals into epigram in the elder Seneca," in *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 75-92.
- André, J. (1949). *La vie et l'œuvre d'Asinius Pollion*. Paris, C. Klincksieck.
- Appel, G. (1909). *De Romanorum precationibus*. Giassae, A. Toepelmanni.
- Arnim, H. von. (1898). *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa*. Berlin, Weidmannsche.
- Arnold, E. V. (1911). *Roman Stoicism*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ash, R. (1999). *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories*. London, Duckworth.
- Assereto, A. (1967). *Gaio Albucio Silo*. Genoa.
- Atkinson, J. E. (1985). "Seneca's 'Consolatio ad Polybium'," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II 32.2*: 860-884.
- Auksi, P. (1995). *Christian Plain Style: the Evolution of a Spiritual Ideal*. Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's Univ. Press.
- Aumont, J. (1996). *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine: de Cicéron à Pline le Jeune et de César à Florus*. Paris, Honoré Champion.
- Austin, R. G. (1960). *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*. 3rd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- Ax, W. (1976). *Probleme des Sprachstils als Gegenstand der lateinischen Philologie*. Hildesheim, Olms.
- Balbo, A. (2001). "Seneca Retore, Lucano ed il sintagma *plenus / plena deo*," *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia, Linguistica e Tradizione Classica "Augusto Rostagni" 2001*: 213-18.
- Bara, J.-F. (1989). *Vettius Valens d'Antioche. Anthologies, Livre I*. Leiden, Brill.
- Bardon, H. (1940). *Le vocabulaire de la critique littéraire chez Sénèque le Rhéteur*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Bardon, H. (1943). "Mécanisme et stéréotypie dans le style de Sénèque le rhéteur," *AC* 12: 5-24.
- Barton, T. (1994). *Ancient Astrology*. New York, Routledge.
- Baxter, R. T. S. (1971). "Virgil's Influence on Tacitus in Book 3 of the *Histories*," *CPh* 66(2): 93-107.
- Beard, M. (1993). "Looking (harder) for Roman myth: Dumézil, declamation and the problems of definition," in *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms*. F. Graf. Stuttgart, Teubner: 44-64.
- Beck, R. (2007). *A Brief History of Ancient Astrology*. Malden, MA, Blackwell.
- Bell, A. J. (1923). *The Latin Dual & Poetic Diction*. London, Oxford Univ. Press.
- Berti, E. (2000). *M. Annaei Lucani. Bellum Civile Liber X*. Firenze, Felice le Monnier.
- Berti, E. (2007). *Scholasticorum Studia: Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale*. Pisa, Giardini.
- Bieler, L. (1935). "Kritisch-Exegetisches zur Suasoria de Alexandro des Arellius Fuscus (Seneca Rhetor Suas. 4)," *Wiener Studien* 53: 84-94.
- Bloomer, W. M. (1992). *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill and London, University of North Carolina Press.
- Bloomer, W. M. (1997a). "A preface to the history of declamation: whose speech? whose history?" in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 199-215.
- Bloomer, W. M. (1997b). *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

- Blum, H. (1969). *Die antike Mnemotechnik*. Hildesheim, G. Olms.
- Bolkestein, A. M. (1995). "Functions of verb-subject order in Latin," *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48: 32-43.
- Bolkestein, A. M. (1996). "Free but not arbitrary: 'emotive' word order in Latin?" in *On Latin: Linguistic and literary studies in honour of Harm Pinkster*. R. Risselada, J. R. de Jong and A. M. Bolkestein. Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben: 7-24.
- Bolkestein, A. M. (1998). "Word order variation in complex noun phrases in classical Latin," in *Estudios de lingüística latina: actas del IX Coloquio internacional de lingüística latina: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 14-18 de abril de 1997*. B. García Hernández. Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas: 185-202.
- Boll, F., C. Bezold, et al. (1926). *Stern Glaube und Sterndeutung*. 3rd ed. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Bonner, S. F. (1949). *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*. Liverpool, University Press of Liverpool.
- Bonner, S. F. (1966). "Lucan and the declamation schools," *AJPh* 87: 257-289.
- Booth, J. (1997). "All in the mind: sickness in Catullus 76," in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*. S. M. Braund and C. Gill. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press: 150-68.
- Bornecque, H. (1902a). *Controverses et Suasoirs*. 2 vols. Paris, Garnier Frères.
- Bornecque, H. (1902b). *Les déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le Père*. Lille, Au siège de l'Université.
- Bouché-Leclercq (1899). Reprint, 1963. *L'Astrologie grecque*. Brussels, Culture et Civilisation.
- Bram, J. R. (1975). *Ancient Astrology Theory and Practice: Matheseos Libri VIII by Firmicus Maternus*. Park Ridge, Noyes.
- Brentano, F. (1995). *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Broadhead, H. D. (1922). *Latin Prose Rhythm: A New Method of Investigation*. Cambridge, Deighton, Bell & Co.
- Brzoska, J. (1893-). Arellius Fuscus (3). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft*. Stuttgart. 2.1: 635-7.

- Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press.
- Bursian, C. (1857). *Annaei Senecae Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*. Leipzig.
- Capasso, M. (1995). "Le tavolette della Villa ercolanese dei Papiri," in *Volumen: Aspetti della tipologia del rotolo librario antico*. Napoli, Procaccini: 111-117.
- Carruthers, M. (1990). *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Carruthers, M. (1998). *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Cavallo, G. (1984). "I rotoli di Ercolano come prodotti scritti. Quattro riflessioni," *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8: 5-30.
- Ceccarelli, L. (1986). *L'Allitterazione a vocale interposta variabile in Virgilio*. L'Aquila, Japadre.
- Centre Traditio Litterarum Occidentalium. (2005-). *CLCLT Library of Latin Texts*, Brepols.
- Chausserie-Laprée, J.-P. (1969). *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins, histoire d'un style*. Paris, E. de Boccard.
- Chênerie, M. (1966). "Concinnitas et compositio," *Pallas* 13: 53-72.
- Clark, E. A. (2004). *History, Theory, Text*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Clarke, M. L. (1968). "Cicero at school," *Greece & Rome* (2nd ser.) 15(1): 18-22.
- Clausen, W. (1976). "On Seneca the Elder, Suas. 5.2," *AJPh* 97: 1-2.
- Comparelli, F. (2003). "Plena deo: vicende di una glossa virgiliana e una variante lucanea (6,709: deo vs. dedi)," *Riv. Cult. Class. Med.* 45: 69-81.
- Conte, G. B. (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation*. Ithaca and London, Cornell Univ.
- Cordier, A. (1939). *L'alliteration latine. Le procédé dans l'Enéide de Virgile*. Paris.
- Courbaud, E. (1918). *Les procédés d'art de Tacite dans les Histoires*. Paris, Hachette.
- Courtney, E. (1999). *Archaic Latin Prose*. Atlanta, Scholars Press.

- Crawford, J. W. (1984). *M. Tullius Cicero: The Lost and Unpublished Orations*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Crittenden, A. R. (1911). *The Sentence Structure of Virgil*. Ann Arbor, U. of Michigan. Ph.D.
- Crusius, F. and H. Rubenbauer (1958). *Römische Metrik*. 3rd ed. Munich, Max Hueber.
- Cunningham, M. P. (1957). "Some phonetic aspects of word order patterns in Latin" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 101(5): 481-505.
- Currie, H. MacL. (1966). "The younger Seneca's style: some observations," *BICS* 13: 76-87.
- D'Alton, J. F. (1931). Reprint, 1962. *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism: A Study in Tendencies*. London and New York, Longmans, Green and Co.
- Dangel, J. (1982). *La phrase oratoire chez Tite-Live*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- De Decker, J. (1913). *Juvenalis declamans: étude sur la rhétorique declamatoire dans les Satires de Juvénal*. Ghent, E. van Goethem.
- De Meo, C. (1986). *Lingue tecnica del latino*. 2nd ed. Balogna, Pàtron.
- Décultot, E., Ed. (2003). *Lire, copier, écrire*. Paris, CNRS.
- Degl'Innocenti Pierini, R. (1997). "In nome della madre: *pathos* tragico e retorica degli affetti nella *Consolatio ad Helviam matrem* di Seneca," *Paideia* 52: 109-120.
- Degl'Innocenti Pierini, R. (2003). "'Ritratto di famiglia'. Seneca e i suoi nella *Consolatio ad Helviam*," in *Gli Annei*. I. Gualandri and G. Mazzoli. Como, New Press: 339-356.
- Degni, P. (1998). *Usi delle tavolette lignee e cerate nel mondo greco e romano*, Ricerca papirologica 4. Messina, Sicania.
- Del Fabbro, M. (1979). "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea," *Studia Papyrologica* 18(2): 69-132.
- Della Corte, F. (1971). "Plena deo," *Maia* 23: 102-6.
- Devine, A. M. and L. D. Stephens (2006). *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Dik, S. C. (1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. 2nd revised ed. 2 vols. Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dingel, J. (1988). *Scholastica materia: Untersuchungen zu den Declamationes minores und der Institutio oratoria Quintilians*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Dorandi, T. (1981). "Sulla trasmissione del testo dell'*Index Academicorum philosophorum Herculensis* (PHerc. 1021 e 164)," *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology*: 139-44.
- Dorandi, T. (2000). *Le stylet et la tablette: dans le secret des auteurs antiques*. Paris, Les Belles lettres.
- Dougan, T. and R. M. Henry (1934). Reprint, 1979. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum libri quinque*. 2 vols. New York, Arno Press.
- Douglas, A. E. (1955). "Marcus Calidius and the Atticists," *CQ* 49: 241-7.
- Douglas, A. E. (1965). *CR* 15: 325-7.
- Douglas, A. E. (1966). *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus*. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Drucker, J. (1994). *The Visible Word: Experimental Typography and Modern Art, 1909-1923*. Chicago and London, Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Dunkle, J. R. (1971). "The rhetorical tyrant in Roman historiography: Sallust, Livy and Tacitus," *CW* 65: 12-20.
- Duret, L. (1983). "Dans l'ombre des plus grands: I. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l'époque augustéenne," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 30.3: 1447-1560.
- Eden, P. T. (1975). *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*, Mnemosyne Supplementum 35. Lugduni Batavorum, Brill.
- Edward, W. A. (1928). *The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder, being the Liber Suasoriarum of the Work Entitled L. Annaei Senecae Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae, Divisiones, Colores*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, C. (2002). *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ernout, A. and A. Meillet (1959). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4 ed. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Fairweather, J. (1976). *JRS* 66: 270-2.
- Fairweather, J. (1981). *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge University Press.

- Fairweather, J. (1984). "The elder Seneca and declamation," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 32.1: 514-556.
- Feraboli, S. (1998). *Claudio Tolomeo. Le Previsioni astrologiche (Tetrabiblos)*. 4 ed. [Rome], Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.
- Fögen, T. (2003). "Metasprachliche Reflexionen antiker Autorien zu den Charakteristika von Fachtexten und Fachsprachen," in *Antike Fachschriftsteller: literarischer Diskurs und sozialer Kontext*. M. Horster and C. Reitz. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner: 31-60.
- Fögen, T. (2005). "Antike Fachtexte als Forschungsgegenstand," in *Antike Fachtexte / Ancient Technical Texts*. T. Fögen. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter: 1-20.
- Fowler, D. (1997). "On the shoulders of giants: intertextuality and classical studies," *MD* 39: 13-34.
- Fraenkel, E. (1962). *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Fraenkel, E. (1964a). "Kolon und Satz I," in *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*. Rome, Storia e Letteratura: 73-92.
- Fraenkel, E. (1964b). "Kolon und Satz II," in *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*. Rome, Storia e Letteratura: 93-139.
- Fraenkel, E. (1965). "Noch einmal Kolon und Satz," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Klasse* 2: 3-73.
- Fraenkel, E. (1968). *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos*, Sussidi Eruditi 22. Rome, Storia e Letteratura.
- Fraenkel, E. (1972). *Elementi plautini in Plauto*. Firenze, La Nuova Italia.
- Gagarin, M. (1997). *Antiphon. The Speeches*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gagarin, M. (1999). "The orality of Greek oratory," in *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. E. A. Mackay. Leiden, Brill. Mnemosyne Supplementum 188: 163-180.
- Gagarin, M. (2001). "Did the sophists aim to persuade?" *Rhetorica* 19(3): 275-291.
- Gambet, D. G. (1970). "Cicero in the works of Seneca philosophus," *TAPhA* 101: 171-83.

- Getty, R. J. (1941). "The astrology of P. Nigidius Figulus (Lucan I, 649-65)," *CQ* 35: 17-22.
- Getty, R. J. (1960). "Neopythagoreanism and mathematical symmetry in Lucan, *De bello civili* 1," *TAPhA* 91: 310-23.
- Giancotti, F. (1992). "Le *sententiae* di Publilio Siro e Seneca," in *La langue latine: langue de la philosophie. Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome "La Sapienza" (Roma, 17-19 mai 1990)*. P. Grimal. Rome, École française de Rome: 9-38.
- Gibson, C. A. (2002). *Interpreting a Classic: Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators*. Berkeley, Univ. of California.
- Gibson, R. K. (2003). *Ovid. Ars Amatoria Book 3*, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Gleason, M. W. (1995). *Making Men: Sophists and Self-presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Goetz, G. (1888-1923). *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. 7 vols. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Goodyear, F. R. D. (1965). *Aetna*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Goold, G. P. (1977). *Manilius. Astronomica*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Gotoff, H. C. (1979). *Cicero's Elegant Style: An Analysis of the Pro Archia*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Gotoff, H. C. (1984). *CPh* 79(2): 166-7.
- Gould, H. E. and J. L. Whiteley (1943). Reprint, 1995. *Cicero. In Catilinam I & II*. London, Bristol Classical Press.
- Graver, M. (1998). "The manhandling of Maecenas: Senecan abstractions of masculinity," *AJPh* 119: 607-632.
- Graver, M. (2002). *Cicero on the Emotions: Tusculan Disputations 3 and 4*. Chicago and London, Univ. of Chicago.
- Griffin, M. (1972). "The elder Seneca and Spain," *JRS* 62: 1-19.
- Griffin, M. (1976). *M. Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford.
- Grilli, A. (1963). *Studi enniani*. Brescia, Paideia.

- Guillemin, A. (1954). "Sénèque directeur d'ames III: les théories littéraires," *REL* 32: 250-274.
- Guillemin, A. (1957). "Sénèque, second fondateur de la prose latine," *REL* 35: 265-284.
- Gummere, R. M. (1917). *Seneca. Epistles 93-124*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard.
- Gunderson, E. (2003). *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*, Cambridge University Press.
- Habinek, T. N. (1985). *The Colometry of Latin Prose*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Haffter, H. (1934). *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache*. Berlin, Weidmann.
- Hagen, H. (1902). *Appendix Serviana*. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Hagendahl, H. (1936). "Rhetorica I: In controversias Senecae patris quaestiones," in *Aphophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata*. Göteborg: 282-322.
- Håkanson, L. (1978). *Calpurnii Flacci declamationum excerpta*. Stuttgart, Teubner.
- Håkanson, L. (1986). "Die quintilianischen Deklamationen in der neueren Forschung," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 32.4: 2272-2306.
- Håkanson, L. (1989a). *L. Annaeus Seneca Maior. Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, diuisiones, colores*. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Håkanson, L. (1989b). "Zu den Historikerfragmenten in Seneca d. Ä., *Suas.* 6," in *Studies in Latin Literature and its Tradition in Honour of C. O. Brink*. J. Diggle, J. B. Hall and H. D. Jocelyn. Cambridge, Cambridge Philological Society: 14-19.
- Hall, L. G. H. (1998). "*Ratio and Romanitas in the Bellum Gallicum*." K. Welch and A. Powell. London, Duckworth with The Classical Press of Wales: 11-43.
- Halm, K., Ed. (1863). *Rhetores Latini Minores*. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Hannah, R. (1996). "Lucan *Bellum Civile* 1.649-65: the astrology of P. Nigidius Figulus revisited," *Papers of the Leeds Int'l Latin Seminar* 9: 175-90.
- Harding, P. (2006). *Didymos: On Demosthenes*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Haskins, E. V. (2004). *Logos and Power in Isocrates and Aristotle*. Columbia, SC, Univ. of South Carolina.

- Heath, M. (1995). *Hermogenes, On Issues. Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Heath, M. (2004). *Menander. A Rhetor in Context*. Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1982). "Les structures verbales de l'hexamètre dans les *Annales* d'Ennius et la création du vers épique latin," *Latomus* 41(4): 743-765.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1991). "Le style de Tacite: bilan et perspective," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 33.4: 2385-2453.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1994). "Métrique et oralité," in *Les structures de l'oralité en latin. Colloque du Centre Alfred Ernout, Université de Paris IV, 2, 3 et 4 juin 1994* J. Dangel and C. Moussy. Paris, Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne: 259-268.
- Hendrickson, G. L. (1906). "Literary sources in Cicero's *Brutus* and the technique of citation in the dialogue," *AJPh* 27: 184-99.
- Henry, J. (1873-1892). *Aeneidea*. 5 vols. Vol. 1. New York, Burt Franklin.
- Herescu, N. I. (1960). *La poésie latine: étude des structures phoniques*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Hickson, F. V. (1993). *Roman Prayer Language*. Stuttgart, Teubner.
- Hight, G. (1972). *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press.
- Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hine, H. M. (1996). *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum Libri*. Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner.
- Hodgman, A. W. (1924). "Latin equivalents of punctuation marks," *The Classical Journal* 19(7): 403-17.
- Hoefig, H. (1852). *De Papirii Fabiani philosophi vita scriptisque*. Breslau.
- Hoffa, W. (1909). *De Seneca patre quaestiones selectae*. Göttingen, Göttingen. Ph.D. diss.
- Hoffmann, L., H. Kalverkämper, et al., Eds. (1998-9). *Fachsprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologiewissenschaft*. Berlin and New York, Walter de Gruyter.

- Hofmann, J. B. and A. Szantyr (1965). *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich, Beck.
- Holford-Strevens, L. (2003). *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. rev. ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Holloway, P. A. (1998). "Paul's pointed prose: the 'sententia' in Roman rhetoric and Paul," *Novum Testamentum* 40(1): 32-53.
- Holtz, L. (1981). *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical*. Paris, Centre national de la recherche scientifique.
- Homeyer, H. (1964). *Die antike Berichte über den Tod Ciceros und ihre Quellen*. Baden-Baden.
- Housman, A. E. (1926). Reprint, 1950. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Ciuilis libri decem*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Housman, A. E. (1937). *M. Manilii Astronomicon Libri*. 2nd ed. 5 vols.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1995). "Rhythm, style, and meaning in Cicero's prose," *CQ* 45(2): 485-99.
- Immisch, O. (1929). "Wirchlichkeit und Literaturform," *RhM* 78: 113-123.
- Innes, D. and M. Winterbotton (1988). *Sopatros the Rhetor*. London, Institute of Classical Studies.
- Inwood, B. (1995). "Seneca in his philosophical milieu," *HSCP* 97: 63-76.
- Jakobson, R. (1973). *Questions de poétique*. Paris, Seuil.
- Jakobson, R. (1987). *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA, Belknap Press.
- Janson, T. (1964). *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis; Studia Latina Stockholmiensia. Stockholm.
- Jocelyn, H. D. (1979). "*Vergilius Cacozelus* (Donatus *Vita Vergilii* 44)," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 2: 67-142.
- Johnson, W. R. (1971). *Luxuriance and Economy: Cicero and the Alien Style*, University of California publications. Classical studies v. 6. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Johnson, W. R. (1976). *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press.

- Jong, J. R. de. (1983). "Word order within Latin noun phrases," in *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory: Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Amsterdam, April 1981*. H. Pinkster. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, J. Benjamins: 131-141.
- Jong, J. R. de. (1989). "The position of the Latin subject," in *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin*. G. Calboli. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins: 521-540.
- Kaplan, H. (1954). [*Cicero*] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Kaster, R. (1995). *Suetonius. De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Kaster, R. (1998). "Becoming 'CICERO'," in *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. P. Knox and C. Foss. Stuttgart, Teubner: 248-263.
- Kaster, R. A. (2005). *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*, Oxford Univ. Press.
- Keil, H. (1857-1880). *Grammatici Latini*. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1972). *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 BC - AD 300*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Kiessling, A. (1872). *Annaei Senecae Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*. Leipzig.
- Klemke, G. (1990). *Beobachtungen zur Vergilschen Parataxe: das Phänomen der Entfaltung in der Aeneis*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang.
- Klingner, F. (1955). "Beobachtungen über Sprache und Stil des Tacitus am Anfang des 13. Annalenbuches," *Hermes* 83: 187-200.
- König, J. and T. Whitmarsh, Eds. (2007). *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge University Press.
- Kraus, C. S. (1994). *Livy. Ab Vrbe Condita. Book VI*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kroll, W. (1893-). Papirius Fabianus. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft*. Stuttgart. 18.2: 1055-59.
- Krostenko, B. A. (2001). *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. Chicago and London, Univ. of Chicago.

- Kühner, R. and C. Stegmann (1912-14). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 2 vols. Vol. 2.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1972). "The categorical and thethetic judgment. Evidence from Japanese syntax," *Foundations of Language* 9: 153-85.
- Kurth, T. (1994). *Senecas Trostschrift an Polybius (Dialog 11), ein Kommentar*. Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner.
- Laduslaw, W. A. (1994). *Thetic and Categorical, Stage and Individual, Weak and Strong*. Santa Cruz, Linguistics Research Center.
- Lana, I. (1990). "I filosofi sestiani e l'indifferenza di fronte allo stato," in *Sapere, lavoro e potere in Roma antica*. Naples, Jovene: 169-227.
- Lana, I. (1992). "La scuola dei Sestii," in *La Lange Latine: Langue de la Philosophie. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française de Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome "La Sapienza" (Rome, 17-19 mai 1990)*. P. Grimal. Rome, Ecole française de Rome: 109-124.
- Landow, G. P. (1992). *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Lanfranchi, F. (1938). *Il diritto nei retori romani*. Milan, Giuffrè.
- Langholf, V. (1989). "Beobachtungen zur Struktur einiger Traktate des 'Corpus Hippocraticum'," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 73(1): 64-77.
- Langslow, D. R. (2000). *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- Langslow, D. R. (2005). "'Langues réduites au lexique'? The languages of Latin technical prose," in *Aspects of the Language of Latin prose*. T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press: 287-302.
- Laughton, E. (1964). *The Participle in Cicero*, Oxford Univ. Press.
- Laughton, E. (1970). *JRS* 60: 188-94.
- Lebek, W. D. (1966). "Zur Vita des Albucius Silus bei Sueton," *Hermes* 94: 360-372.
- Lebek, W. D. (1970). *Verba Prisca: Die Anfänge des Archaisieren in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lechi, F. (2008). "Greco e latino nelle scuole di retorica," in *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano*. F. Bellandi and R. Ferri. Amsterdam, Hakkert: 9-27.

- Leeman, A. D. (1963). *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*. 2 vols. Amsterdam, Hakkert.
- Legrand, L. (1931). *Publius Nigidius Figulus*. Paris, Editions de l'Oeuvre d'Auteuil.
- Lentano, M. (1999). "La declamazione latina. Rassegna di studi e stato delle questioni (1989 -1998)," *Bollettino di studi latini* 29: 571-621.
- Leo, F. (1960). "Quintilians kleine Declamationen," in *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Rome, Edizione di storia e letteratura. 2: 249-62.
- Leumann, M., J. B. Hofmann, et al. (1977). *Lateinische Grammatik*. 2 vols. Munich, C. H. Beck'sche.
- Levene, D. S. (1997). "Pity, fear and the historical audience: Tacitus on the fall of Vitellius," in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*. S. M. Braund and C. Gill. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press: 128-49.
- Lindholm, E. (1931). *Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen*. Lund, Gleerupska Univ.-Bokhandeln.
- Lindner, F. G. (1855). *De M. Porcio Latrone commentatio*. Breslau.
- Lindner, F. G. (1862). *De Arellio Fusco commentatio*. Breslau.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1901). *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*. Oxford, J. Parker.
- Locher, A. (1986). "The structure of Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*," in *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, His Sources and Influence*. R. French and F. Greenaway. London and Sidney: 20-29.
- Locher, A. and R. C. A. Rottländer (1985). "Überlegungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der *Naturalis Historia* des älteren Plinius und die Schrifttäfelchen von Vindolanda," in *Lebendige Altertumswissenschaft. Festgabe zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres von Hermann Vetters*. Vienna, Holzhausens: 140-147.
- Lockyer, C. W., Jr. (1971). *The Fiction of Memory and the Use of Written Sources: Convention and Practice in Seneca the Elder and Other Authors*, Princeton University. Ph.D.
- London, C. (1921). *The Book of Jack London*. Vol. 2. New York, The Century Co.
- Luce, T. J. (1971). "Design and structure in Livy: 5.32-55," *TAPhA* 102: 265-302.

- Luiselli, B. (1969). *Il problema dell più antica prosa latina*. Cagliari, Sarda Fossataro.
- Mal-Maeder, D. van. (2007). *La fiction des déclamations*. Leiden, Brill.
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Marchesi, C. (1944). *Seneca*. 3rd ed. Milano, G. Principato.
- Marchesi, I. (2008). *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Markovic, D. (2006). "Hyperbaton in the Greek literary sentence," *GRBS* 46(2): 127-145.
- Marouzeau, J. (1922, 1938, 1949). *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*. 3 vols. Paris, E. Champion.
- Marouzeau, J. (1932). "Le style oral latin," *REL* 10: 147-186.
- Marouzeau, J. (1970). *Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin*. Paris, Société d'édition "Les Belles lettres".
- Matthes, D. (1958). "Hermagoras von Temnos 1904-1955," *Lustrum* 3: 58-214; 262-78.
- May, J. M. and J. Wisse (2001). *Cicero. On the Ideal Orator (de Oratore)*. New York, Oxford Univ. Press.
- McGann, J. J. (1983). *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago & London, Univ. of Chicago Press.
- McGann, J. J. (1991). *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press.
- McKenzie, D. F. (1981). "Typology and meaning: the case of William Congreve," in *Buch und Buchhandel in Europa im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*. G. Barber and B. Fabian. Hamburg, Dr. Ernst Hauswedell & Co.: 81-126.
- McKenzie, D. F. (1999). *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- McNally, L. (1998). "Stativity and Theticity," in *Events and Grammar*. S. D. Rothstein. Dordrecht and Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers. 70: 293-307.
- Mejer, J. (1978). *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*. Wiesbaden, Steiner.
- Merchant, F. I. (1905). "Seneca the philosopher and his theory of style," *AJPh* 26(1): 44-59.

- Méthy, N. (2007). *Les lettres de Pline le Jeune*. Paris, PUPS.
- Mirmont, H. de la V. de. (1913). "Les déclamateurs espagnols au temps d'Auguste et de Tibère," *Bulletin Hispanique* 15: 384-410.
- Moles, J. L. (1978). "The career and conversion of Dio Chrysostom," *JHS* 98: 79-100.
- Morales, H. (1996). "The torturer's apprentice: Parrhasius and the limits of art," in *Art and Text in Roman Culture*. J. Elsner. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 182-209.
- Morgan, L. (2000). "Metre matters: some higher-level metrical play in Latin poetry," *PCPhS* 46: 99-120.
- Moss, A. (1996). *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Müller, H. J. (1887). Reprint, 1963. *L. Annaei Senecae oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*. Hildesheim, Georg Olms.
- Müller, R. W. (1964). *Rhetorische und syntaktische Interpunktion: Untersuchungen zur Pausenbezeichnung im antiken Latein*. Tübingen.
- Munk Olsen, B. (1980). "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au xiii^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 10: 115-64.
- Mussies, G. (1972). *Dio Chrysostom and the New Testament*. Vol. 2, *Studia ad corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*. Leiden, Brill.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1990). *Virgil. Georgics*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Naas, V. (1996). "Réflexions sur la méthode de travail de Pline l'Ancien," *RPh* 3 ser. 70: 305-332.
- Nägelsbach, C. F. (1905). *Lateinische Stilistik*. 9th ed. Nürnberg, Konrad Geiger.
- Neugebauer, O. and H. B. Van Hoesen (1959). *Greek Horoscopes*. Philadelphia.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1961). *In L. Calpurnium Pisonem*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1990). "Cola and clausulae in Cicero's speeches," in *Owls to Athens*. E. M. Craik. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 349-359.
- Norden, E. (1893). "Vergilstudien II," *Hermes* 28: 501-21.
- Norden, E. (1903). *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*. Leipzig, Teubner.

- Norden, E. (1915-18). *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. 3rd ed. Vol. 1. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Norden, E. (1939). *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*. Lund, C.W.K. Gleerup.
- O'Brien, D. (1993). *How to Develop a Perfect Memory*. London, Pavilion.
- O'Brien, D. (2000). *Learn to Remember: Practical Exercises and Techniques to Improve your Memory*. San Francisco, Chronicle Books.
- Oltramare, A. (1926). *Les origines de la diatribe romaine*. Lausanne, Payot.
- Otto, A. (1890). *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig, B.G. Teubner.
- Panhuis, D. G. J. (1982). *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence: A Study of Latin Word Order*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, J. Benjamins.
- Parkes, M. B. (1993). *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Parks, E. P. (1945). *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts under the Early Empire*. Baltimore.
- Pasquali, G. (1981). *Preistoria della poesia romana*. Florence, Sansoni.
- Pearce, T. E. V. (1966a). "The enclosing word order in the Latin Hexameter. I," *CQ* 16(1): 140-171.
- Pearce, T. E. V. (1966b). "The enclosing word order in the Latin Hexameter. II," *CQ* 16(2): 298-320.
- Pelling, C. B. R. (1988). *Plutarch. Life of Antony*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetoric in Antiquity*. Translated by W. E. Higgins. Washington D.C., Catholic Univ. of America.
- Perutelli, A. (2004). *Prolegomeni a Sisenna*. Pisa, Edizioni ETS.
- Peter, H. (1914). *Historicorum romanorum reliquiae*. Vol. 1. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Petrucci, A. (1995). *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*. Translated by C. M. Radding. New Haven and London, Yale Univ. Press.

- Phillips, J. J. (1981). *The Publication of Books at Rome in the Classical Period*, Yale University. Ph.D.
- Pianezzola, E. (1981). "Spunti per un'analisi del racconto nel *thema* delle *Controversiae* di Seneca il Vecchio," *Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina*: 253-67.
- Pinkster, H. (1972). *On Latin Adverbs*. Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- Pinkster, H. (1985). "Lateinische Stilistik. Eine Übersicht," *Sprache und Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 55: 67-77.
- Pinkster, H. (1990). *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Pinkster, H. (2005). "The language of Pliny the elder," in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press: 239-256.
- Polheim, K. (1963). *Die lateinische Reimprosa*. 2. Aufl. ed. Berlin, Weidmann.
- Poulakos, T., Ed. (1993). *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric*. Boulder, CO, Westview Press.
- Poultney, J. W. (1959). *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium*, American Philological Assoc.
- Powell, J. G. F. (1988). *Cicero. Cato Maior De Senectute*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Powell, J. G. F. (2005). "Cicero's adaptation of legal Latin in the *De legibus*," in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press. 129: 117-150.
- Préchac, F. and H. Noblot (1999). *Sénèque. Lettres à Lucilius*. Vol. IV. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Primmer, A. (1968). *Cicero numerosus: Studien zum antiken Prosarhythmus*. Vienna, Hermann Böhlhaus.
- Primmer, A. (1970). "Der Prosarhythmus in Catos Reden," in *Festschrift Karl Vretska*. D. Ableitinger and G. Gugel. Heidelberg: 174-80.
- Pugliarello, M. (1997). "*Disparilitas e memoria* nella trama delle *Noctes Atticae*," *Serta Antiqua et Mediaevalia* 1: 95-109.

- Purcell, N. (1987). "Town in Country and Country in Town," in *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens*. E. B. MacDougall. Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection: 185-204.
- Ramsey, J. T. (2003). *Cicero. Philippics I-II*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge, U.K., Cambridge University Press.
- Rayment, C. S. (1969). "Echoes of the declamations in the Dialogues of the younger Seneca," *Classical Bulletin* 45(4): 51-2, 63.
- Reader, W. R. (1996). *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse*. Atlanta, Scholars Press.
- Reifferscheid, A. (1860). *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Reuter, A. (1887). *De Quintiliani libro qui fuit de causis corruptae eloquentiae*. Vratislaviae, Göttingen. Ph.D. diss.
- Richlin, A. (1997). "Gender and rhetoric: producing manhood in the schools," in *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. W. Dominik. New York, Routledge: 90-110.
- Richlin, A. (1999). "Cicero's head," in *Constructions of the Classical Body*. J. Porter. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press: 190-211.
- Richter, W. (1972). "Tacitus als Stilist: ein Kapitel philologischer Forschungsgeschichte," in *Politik und literarische Kunst im Werk des Tacitus*. G. Radke. Stuttgart, Ernst Klett: 111-128.
- Rolland, E. (1906). *De l'influence de Sénèque le père et des rhéteurs sur Sénèque le philosophe*. Ghent, Librairie Scientifique E. van Goethem.
- Roller, M. B. (1997). "Color-blindness: Cicero's death, declamation, and the production of history," *Classical Philology* 92(2): 109-130.
- Ronconi, A. (1938). "Alliterazione e ritmo," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15: 297-321.
- Roszbach, O. (1915). "Velleius II 66,5 über Cicero," *BPhW* 35: 1582.
- Russell, D. A. (1983). *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York, Vintage Books.
- Salvatore, A. (1950). *Stile e ritmo in Tacito*. Napoli, L. Loffredo.

- Sasse, H.-J. (1987). "The Thetic/Categorical distinction revisited," *Linguistics* 25: 511-80.
- Sasse, H.-J. (1995). "'Theticity' and VS order: a case study," *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48: 3-31.
- Sasse, H.-J. (1996). *Theticity*. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. Vol. 27 (N.F.), Arbeitspapier. Cologne.
- Scarcia, R. (1996). "Plena deo: vicende di una glossa virgiliana," *Euphrosyne* 24: 237-246.
- Scarcia, R. (2000). "Seneca il Vecchio, « Controversiae » 2, 2, 8-12.," *Schol(i)a* 2(2): 83-95.
- Schmidt, P. L. (1975). "Die Anfänge der institutionellen Rhetorik in Rom," in *Monumentum Chiloniense*. E. Lefèvre. Amsterdam, Hakkert: 183-216.
- Schröder, B.-J. and J.-P. Schröder, Eds. (2003). *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*. Munich und Leipzig, K. G. Sauer.
- Seifrid, T. (2005). *The Word Made Self: Russian Writings on Language, 1860-1930*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press.
- Setaioli, A. (1985). "Seneca e lo stile," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 32.2: 776-858.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1969). "Emendations of Seneca 'Rhetor'," *CQ* n.s. 19(2): 320-329.
- Simonds, T. S. (1896). *The Themes Treated by the Elder Seneca*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins.
- Skydsgaard, J. E. (1968). *Varro the Scholar*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard.
- Slings, S. R. (1997). "Figures of speech and their lookalikes," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*. E. J. Bakker. Leiden, Brill: 169-214.
- Small, J. P. (1997). *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London, Routledge.
- Spencer, D. (2002). *The Roman Alexander: Reading a Cultural Myth*, Univ. of Exeter Press.

- Spilman, M. (1932). "Cumulative sentence building in Latin historical narrative," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 11(7): 153-247.
- Starr, R. J. (1987). "The circulation of literary texts in the Roman world," *CQ* 37: 213-23.
- Stowers, S. K. (1981). *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBL Dissertation series 57. Chico, Calif., Scholars Press.
- Sträterhoff, B. (1995). *Kolometrie und Prosarhythmus bei Cicero und Livius: De imperio Cn. Pompei und Livius 1,1-26,8 kolometrisch ediert, kommentiert und statistisch analysiert*. 2 vols. Oelde, R. Festge.
- Summers, W. C. (1910). Reprint, 1940. *Select Letters of Seneca*. London, Macmillan.
- Sussman, L. A. (1971). "The artistic unity of the elder Seneca's first preface and the controversiae as a whole," *AJPh* 92: 285-291.
- Sussman, L. A. (1977). "Arellius Fuscus and the unity of the elder Seneca's *Suasoriae*," *RhM* 120: 303-323.
- Sussman, L. A. (1978). *The Elder Seneca*, Mnemonyne Suppl. 51. Leiden, E.J. Brill.
- Sussman, L. A. (1984). "The elder Seneca and declamation since 1900: a bibliography," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 32.4: 557-577.
- Sussman, L. A. (1994). *The Declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Syme, R. (1958). *Tacitus*, Oxford.
- Tabacco, R. (1985). "Il tiranno nelle declamazioni di scuola in lingua latina," *Memorie della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino II. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* Ser. 5, v. 9 (1-2): 1-141.
- Tarrant, R. (1995). "Ovid and the Failure of Rhetoric," in *Ethics and Rhetoric*. D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 63-74.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae*. (1900-). Leipzig.
- Thomas, R. F. (1988). *Virgil. Georgics*. Vol. 1, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Timpanaro, S. (1978). *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina*, Ricerche di storia della lingua latina 13. Rome, Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri.

- Timpanaro, S. (1988). "Alcuni tipi di sinonimi in asindeto in latino arcaico e loro sopravvivenze in latino classico," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 116: 257-297; 385-428.
- Todorov, T. (1982). *Theories of the Symbol*. Translated by C. Porter. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press.
- Too, Y. L. (1995). *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates: Text, Power, Pedagogy*, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Torallas Tovar, S. and K. A. Worp (2006). *To the Origins of Greek Stenography*. Barcelona.
- Torre, C. (2000). *Il matrimonio di sapiens. Ricerche sul De matrimonio di Seneca*. Genoa, Università di Genova.
- Touratier, C. (1994). *Syntaxe latine*, Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain. Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters.
- Traina, A. (1977). *Forma e suono*. Rome, Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri.
- Traina, A. (1984). *Lo stile "drammatico" del filosofo Seneca*. 3rd ed. Bologna, Pàtron.
- Turner, E. G. (1968). Reprint, 1988. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Valantasis, R. (1999). "Musonius Rufus and Roman ascetical theory," *GRBS* 40(3): 207-231.
- Van Den Hoek, A. (1996). "Techniques of quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A view of ancient literary working methods," *Vigiliae Christianae* 50(3): 223-243.
- Vasaly, A. (1993). *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Vervliet, H. D. L. (1955). *L. Annaeus Seneca Pater: een onderzoek naar de tekstcritische traditie der Suasoriae van Seneca Pater*, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Ph.D.
- Vervliet, H. D. L. (1957). "De gedrukte overlevering van Seneca Pater," *De Gulden Passer* 35: 179-222.
- Vervliet, H. D. L. (1964). "Les manuscrits médiévaux de Sénèque le Rhéteur," *AC* 33: 431-441.
- Volk, K. (2002). *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press.

- Volk, K. (2009). *Manilius and his Intellectual Background*. Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press.
- Watkins, C. (1995). *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Watt, W. S. (1991). *Gnomon* 63(4).
- Webb, R. (2001). "The *progymnasmata* as practice," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Y. L. Too. Leiden, Brill: 289-316.
- Wellesley, K. (1972). *Cornelius Tacitus. The Histories, Book III*, Sydney Univ. Press.
- West, D. and A. J. Woodman, Eds. (1979). *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1900). "Asianismus und Atticismus," *Hermes* 35: 1-52.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1959). "The language of Virgil and Horace," *CQ* 9(2): 181-192.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1963). *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge, U.K., Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, G. (1978). *Change and Decline*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Winterbottom, M. (1974). *Seneca the Elder. Declamations*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Winterbotton, M. (1975). "The reign of Nero," *CR* 25(1): 103-5.
- Winterbotton, M. (1981). "Cicero and the Silver Age," in *Eloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron*. Geneva, Fondation Hardt: 237-66.
- Winterbotton, M. (1983). "The elder Seneca," in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. L. D. Reynolds and P. K. Marshall. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 356-7.
- Winterbottom, M. (1984). *The Minor Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian*. Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Winterbottom, M. (1991). "The Elder Seneca," *CR* 41(2): 338-340.
- Wölfflin, E. (1977 (orig. 1933)). "Über die alliterierenden Verbindungen der lateinischen Sprache," in *Ausgewählte Schriften*. G. Meyer. Hildesheim, Georg Olms: 225-281.

- Woodman, A. J. (1983). *Velleius Paterculus. The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41-93)*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Woodman, A. J. (1988). *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*. London, Croom Helm.
- Wooten, C. (1975). "Le développement du style asiatique pendant l'époque hellénistique," *Revue des Études Grecques* 88: 94-104.
- Wright, A. (2001). "The death of Cicero. Forming a tradition: the contamination of history," *Historia* 50: 436-52.
- Zanker, P. (1988). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan.
- Zielinski, T. (1908). "Die Cicerokarikatur im Altertum," in *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*. Leipzig and Berlin, Teubner: 347-357.
- Zinsmaier, T. (1993). *Der von Bord geworfene Leichman (Decl. Mai. 6)*. Frankfurt
- Zipser, B. (2005). "Zu Aufbau und Quellen der Σύνοψις ἰατρικῆς des Leo Medicus," in *Antike Fachtexte / Ancient Technical Texts*. T. Fögen. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter: 107-15.

Biography

Bart Huelsenbeck, son of Cheryl L. Burns and Robert L. Huelsenbeck, was born in Cedar Rapids, Iowa on September 2, 1971. He earned a B.S. in anthropology from Iowa State University (1994). From The Ohio State University he earned an M.A. (2000) in Greek and Latin and an M.Ed. (2001) in foreign language education, with teaching certificate. He has published an article: "A Twelfth-Century Manuscript of Lucan's *Bellum ciuile* (Dukianus latinus 118)," *Manuscripta* 51.1 (2007) 21-59. Among current projects is a study of borrowings from classical Latin authors in the works of the medieval hagiographer Guaiferius of Salerno; and an article-length study of the manuscript tradition of the elder Seneca. At Ohio State he was awarded the Geoffrey Woodhead Prize (1999) for best graduate student paper ("Evidence for *apragmones* in Perikles' Speeches"). At Duke University he was awarded a James B. Duke Fellowship (2003); and in 2007-8 he was awarded a Julian Price Dissertation fellowship, which funded a four-month stay in Belgium to study medieval manuscripts.