QUINTILIAN

THE ORATOR'S EDUCATION

BOOKS 3–5

Edited and Translated by

DONALD A. RUSSELL

QUINTILIAN

THE ORATOR'S

EDUCATION

BOOKS 3–5

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

DONALD A. RUSSELL

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON, ENGLAND

2001

QUINTILIAN

II

LCL 125

INSTITUTIO ORATORIA
THE ORATOR'S EDUCATION

ABBREVIATIONS

A general Bibliography is in Volume One. Abbreviations used for journals are generally those given in the Oxford Classical Dictionary.

Anon. Seg.	Anonymus Seguierianus, ed. M. Dilts and G. A. Kennedy, in *Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire*. Leiden, 1997.
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. W. Haase and H. Temporini. Berlin, 1974–.
AP	G. A Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. London, 1963.
ARRW	G. A. Kennedy, *Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton, 1972.
AS	*Artium Scriptores*, ed. L. Radermacher. Vienna, 1951.
CA	D. A. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity*. London, 1981 (ed. 2, 1995).
CHLC	*The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 1, *Classical Criticism*, ed. G. A. Kennedy. Cambridge, 1989.
CRHP	*Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC–AD 400*, ed. S. E. Porter. Leiden, 1997.
F Gr Hist	F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*.

FOR	H. Meyer, *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta,* ed. 2. 1842.
FPL	*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum,* ed. W. Morel. Leipzig, 1927 (1963).
GD	D. A. Russell, *Greek Declamation.* Cambridge, 1983.
GL	*Grammatici Latini,* ed. H. Keil, 7 vols. Leipzig, 1855–1880.
HRR	*Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae,* ed. H. Peter. Leipzig, 1906.
Lampe	G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* Oxford, 1961.
Lausberg	H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric,* ed. and trans. D. E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Leiden, 1998.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library.
L–H–S	Leumann–Hofmann–Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* 2.2.2). Munich, 1965.
OCD³	*Oxford Classical Dictionary,* ed. 3, edd. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. Oxford, 1996.
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary,* ed. P. G. W. Glare. Oxford, 1968–1982.
ORF	*Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta liberae rei publicae,* ed. H. Malcovati. Ed. 2, Turin, 1955.
PMG	*Poetae Melici Graeci,* ed. D. L. Page, Oxford, 1962.
QHAR	*Quintiliano. historia y actualidad de la retórica,* edd. T. Abaladejo, E. del Rio, J. A. Caballero. Calahorra, 1998.

RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum.* Stuttgart, 1941–.
RD	S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation.* Liverpool, 1949.
RE	G. Wissowa, etc., *Paulys Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.* 1893–1980.
RLM	*Rhetores Latini Minores,* ed. C. Halm. Leipzig, 1863.
ROL	*Remains of Old Latin,* ed. E. H. Warmington, 4 vols. LCL, 1935–1940.
RP	R. Syme, *Roman Papers,* 7 vols. Oxford, 1979–1988.
Spengel	*Rhetores Graeci,* ed. L. Spengel, 3 vols. Leipzig, 1853–1856.
Spengel–Hammer	*Rhetores Graeci* 1.2, ed. L. Spengel and C. Hammer. 1894.
SVF	*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta,* ed. H. von Arnim. 1905 (reprint Stuttgart, 1964).
VPH	[Plutarch] *De vita et poesi Homeri,* ed. J. F. Kindstrand. 1990. Commentary: M. Hillgruber, 1994–1999.
Walz	*Rhetores Graeci,* ed. C. Walz. 1832–1836 (reprint Osnabruck, 1968).

SIGLA

A	Ambrosianus E 153 sup.
a	Its contemporary corrections
B	Bernensis 351
Bg	The older part of Bambergensis M.4.14

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

b	Its corrections
G	The later part of Bambergensis M.4.14
N	Parisinus lat. 18527
J	Cantabrigiensis Ioannensis 91
E	Parisinus lat. 14146 (Breviarium of Stephen of Rouen)
D	Parisinus lat. 7719
K	Parisinus lat. 7720 (corrected by Petrarch)
H	Harleianus 2664
T	Turicensis 288 (corrected (= *t*) by Ekkehard IV of St. Gall, c. 1050)
X	Parisinus lat. 7696
Y	Parisinus lat. 7231
recc	One or more of the later MSS listed in Winterbottom (1970), v–vii
edd.	One or more of the editions listed under (a) in the Bibliography, in Volume I
Regius	R. Regius, in ed. Ven. 1493, or in *Ducenta problemata in totidem Institutionis Oratoriae Quintiliani depravationes* (1492)
D.A.R.	Suggestions by the present editor
M.W.	Suggestions made in discussion with the editor by M. Winterbottom. See also *More Problems in Quintilian, BICS* 44 (2000) 167–177

CONTENTS

BOOK THREE

INTRODUCTION

There is a detailed commentary on this book by J. Adamietz (1966). Quintilian begins with a recapitulation (3.1.1–7) and a historical account of the development of rhetoric from Corax and Tisias down to his own day (3.1.8–21). In more general terms (3.2) the origin of rhetoric is seen in the gift of speech which Nature has given mankind; Quintilian takes issue with Cicero (3.2.4) by pointing out that nomadic peoples, who do not live in cities, also possess rhetorical skills. Much of the parallel material to all this is in Radermacher, *AS* pp. 1–27.

Various classifications of the subject occupy 3.4.3–3.4.5. First come the Five Parts (nowadays sometimes called Canons) of rhetoric: Invention, Disposition, Elocution, Memory, Delivery (see Caplan on *Ad Herennium* 1.3; Lausberg § 255). Quintilian here dismisses the view that they are not "parts" but "functions" (ἔργα) of the orator. Bringing his "art-artist-work" division into play, he shows that Invention and the others belong to the "art," while the functions that correspond to them belong to the orator. These questions seem arid; Quintilian (3.3.14) characteristically observes that scholars have been influenced by the desire to have different words for the divisions produced by various classifications.

Of these other classifications, the most important is that

2

discussed in 3.4, the three Aristotelian "kinds of causes":
Forensic (or Judicial), Deliberative, and Epideictic (Laus-
berg §§ 59–65; Kennedy in *CRHP* 44–49). This chapter
again is largely doxographical, but Quintilian (3.4.11) ac-
cepts the orthodox view, discusses the implications of the
Greek terms Epideictic, Encomiastic, and Panegyric, and
notes the common ground (justice, expediency, honour)
which all three "kinds" share.

Chapter 5 touches briefly on some other traditional
distinctions:

5.1. "Content and words"; "nature, art, practice, imita-
tion."

5.2. The three *officia* of "instructing, moving emotions,
and giving pleasure."

5.3. Things needing proof and things not needing proof.

5.4. "Legal" and "Rational" Questions, i.e. questions of law
and questions of fact.

5.5–15. "Indefinite" and "Definite" Questions, i.e. *thesis*
and *hypothesis;* Quintilian argues for the value of "in-
definite" or general Questions in all kinds of cases, be-
cause there is usually a general principle behind any in-
dividual problem (Lausberg §§ 68–78).

5.16. "Absolute" and "Relative" Questions.

Finally (5.17–18) he gives various definitions of a "Cause."

He has now introduced most of the concepts required
for his next subject, which is the very complex Theory
of Issues *(status)*. This is the heart of theoretical foren-
sic rhetoric, and will occupy him both here and in Book
Seven. Basic ancient texts include *Ad Herennium* 1.18–27,
2.2–26; Cicero, *De inventione* 1.10–19, 2.12–end; *Topica*
93–96. On the Greek side, the theory (though it had its
origins in the sophistic period and, as Quintilian sees, is

based on Aristotelian logic) was mainly developed by Hermagoras, for whose views Quintilian is an important source. After Quintilian's time, the number of distinct Issues was considerably enlarged; many writers held that there were thirteen, and this is the scheme found in Hermogenes of Tarsus, who was particularly influential, and in most later rhetoricians. Among modern accounts, note Heath (1995), esp. 70ff.; *GD* 40–73; Heath in *CRHP* 100–103; Calboli Montefusco (1986). Lausberg §§ 79–254 is exhaustive, mainly depending on Quintilian. An unusually clear exposition (with diagrams) is given by B. Schouler, *La tradition hellénique chez Libanios* (1984) 1. 170–185; this does, of course, relate to a period much later than Quintilian.

Chapter 6 is thus unusually long and difficult, but its structure is fairly simple:

6.1. *Status* belongs to all three "kinds" of Cause.

6.2. Various names for it.

6.3. Early history.

6.4–22. Rival definitions and ways of identifying the Issue.

6.23–28. The basic elements are derived from or correspond with Aristotle's Categories.

6.29–55. How many types of Issue are there? (one, 29–30; two, 31–43; three, 44–46; four, 47–50; five or more, 51–55).

6.55–62. Theories which distinguish Rational and Legal Issues.

6.63–90. Quintilian's own views, past and present.

6.91–103. Cases involving more than one Issue, including (96–103) a detailed study of the Case of the Three Sons.

6.104. Related matters (Motive, Point to Decide, Core (Basic Argument)) will be considered later.

Chapter 7 deals, fairly briefly, with the oratory of praise and blame, i.e. Epideictic. Basic ancient texts here include: Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.9; Cicero, *De inventione* 2.177–178, *De oratore* 2.43–47, 341–349 (very close to Quintilian); *Partitiones oratoriae* 70–82; Theon, *Progymnasmata* 109–112 Spengel; Menander Rhetor (with Russell and Wilson's Introduction, xi–xxxiv). Modern works include Burgess (1902), Buchheit (1960); Pernot (1993); the handbooks all include discussions, e.g. Martin 177–210, Lausberg §§ 239–254.

After some introductory remarks (3.7.1–6), Quintilian proceeds to praise of gods (6–9) and men (10–18), and then to invective (19–22). There follows a section on the relation of the encomiast to his audience (23–25), and then the main scheme resumes with "praise of cities and places" (26–28).

Chapter 8 is a similar treatment of Deliberative Oratory. The essential parallel material is to be found in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.4–8; *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 29–34; Cicero, *De inventione* 2.157–176, *De oratore* 2.333–340, *Partitiones oratoriae* 83–97. Outline in Martin 167–176, Lausberg §§ 224–238. Quintilian's discussion falls into two main parts: (a) Introductory (3.8.1–15): here it is explained that the aim of Deliberative Oratory is dignity rather than expediency (1–3); that it may however involve Conjecture, Definition, and Legal Issues as well as Quality (4–6); and that it has its own rules for Prooemium, Narrative, and Emotional Appeal (6–13); (b) a more detailed discussion of (i) the nature of the proposal (16–35), (ii) the character

of the audience (35–47), (iii) the character of the speaker
(48). There follow remarks on Prosopopoeia (49–54) and
finally (55–70) some comments on various types of school
exercises (*suasoriae*).

In 9, Quintilian returns to the Forensic Speech, with
a preliminary discussion of the Parts of the Speech—from
Prooemium to Epilogue—which he will take up in detail
in Book Four. His theme for the moment is the practi-
cal question of the order in which these elements of
a speech are to be planned. This division—usually into
five parts: Prooemium, Narrative, Arguments, Refuta-
tions, Epilogue—is central to rhetorical teaching at all
periods (see Caplan on *Ad Herennium* 1.4ff.) and gives
the basic structure of many treatises (e.g. *Rhetorica ad
Alexandrum*, Anonymus Seguierianus, Apsines). Lausberg
§ 261 summarizes the doctrine, and gives a table showing
various schemes in later Latin rhetoricians.

Chapter 10 gives a classification of Causes according
to their complexity: they are either Simple, Compound, or
Comparative. Cicero (*De inventione* 1.17) has this distinc-
tion, which is also found in later rhetors (Fortunatianus,
86–91 Halm). It is discussed briefly by Lausberg, § 67.

Chapter 11 discusses Questions, Lines of Defence,
Points for Decision and *continens* or συνέχον (I translate
this as "Core"; "Basic Argument" would also convey the
idea). This all provides a procedure for deciding what
the problem to be addressed really is. It is based on
Hermagoras, though Quintilian does not always use his
terminology, is not uncritical of him, and is generally impa-
tient with subtleties which have, he very reasonably thinks,
little practical value. Parallel material in *De inventione* and
Ad Herennium (see Caplan) enables us to reconstruct the

6

basic process as Hermagoras saw it. It involved (1) the accuser's *intentio*, (2) the defendant's *depulsio*: from these emerged the *quaestio* (*Ad Herennium* 1.18). Next (3) the defendant produced his *ratio*, and (4) the accuser tried to refute it (*Ad Herennium* calls this stage *firmamentum*, a term mentioned also by Quintilian, 3.11.1). From (3) and (4) derived the Point for Decision (τὸ κρινόμενον). The example in *De inventione* 2.78, the charge against Horatius for killing his sister, illustrates this clearly. (1) "You killed your sister without justification"; (2) "I was justified"; the Question is "Was he justified?"; (3) "She was distressed at our victory, and grieved by the enemy's death"; (4) "But she ought not to have been killed by her brother without trial." Point for Decision: "Given all the circumstances, should he have killed her without trial?"

Quintilian deals first (11.1–3) with the definition of the "principal Question"; then with Line of Defence (*ratio*) and Point for Decision (11 4–8), with a discussion of terminology and illustration from the stock case of Orestes; next comes "Core" (11.9); he then proceeds to discuss various problems, illustrating them again from stock cases (11.10–17). Inconsistencies in Cicero come in for criticism (11.18–20); but Quintilian is mainly concerned (11.21–26) with simplifying the subject and reaucing it to what the student really needs to know. His impatience with the pedantry and vanity of the scholars is clear, and characteristic. His own account is, it must be said, not at all clear: see M. Heath in *Classical Quarterly* 44 (1994) 122–123.