LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

QUINTILIAN

THE ORATOR'S EDUCATION

BOOKS 9–10

Edited and Translated by

DONALD A. RUSSELL

QUINTILIAN

THE ORATOR'S EDUCATION

BOOKS 2

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

DONALD A. RUSSELL

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
LONDON, ENGLAND
2001

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 2001016920
CIP data available from the Library of Congress

ISBN 0-674-99594-5

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

FOUNDED BY JAMES LOEB 1911

EDITED BY

JEFFREY HENDERSON

EDITOR EMERITUS

G. P. GOOLD

QUINTILIAN

IV

LCL 127

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.
OCD[3]	*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. Liepzig, 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

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. Call, 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 NINE

INTRODUCTION

9. 1. discusses the distinction between Tropes and Figures. This was not clearly made in early theory (and is not made in *Ad Herennium*) but by Quintilian's time it was orthodox: Tropes are "unnatural" (i.e. abnormal) uses of words, and Figures are "unnatural" configurations of words or turns of thought. Like the theory of Tropes and Figures in general, the popularity of this distinction and of its underlying concept of "the unnatural" (*παρὰ φύσιν*) is probably due in the main to Caecilius of Caleacte. Later rhetoricians discuss it: e.g. Alexander Numeniu (3. 9–10 Spengel) and Phoebammon (3. 43–45 Spengel). See Lausberg §§ 600–602, and, for the historical development, R. Granatelli, *Rhetorica* 12 (1994) 383–425. The theory conspicuously neglects the fact that some Figures (e.g. Anaphora, Antithesis, Chiasmus) reflect the need of oral speech to articulate thoughts in a way readily understood by the hearer (see S. R. Slings, "Figures of Speech and their Lookalikes" in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *Grammar and Interpretation* (Leiden, 1997) 169–214).

Next (9.1.15–18) follows the distinction between Figures of Speech and Figures of Thought, and then (19–21) some remarks on their usefulness. Quintilian then turns to Cicero, whom he sees as taking a middle course between strict adhesion to the principle of "unnaturalness" and a

concept which makes every possible emotional attitude correspond to a different Figure. He proceeds (26–45) to quote Cicero at length (*De oratore* 3.201–208, *Orator* 134–139) and regards his own subsequent discussion as more or less a commentary on the master's (often obscure) text. This procedure (unique in Quintilian) recalls that of many later ancient and medieval rhetoricians for whom commentary on *Ad Herennium* or *De inventione,* or the works of Hermogenes, became an art form. We do not of course know whether Quintilian used this method in school.

Comparative material may be found in the texts mentioned in connection with Tropes (Book Eight), and also in Rutilius Lupus, whose work, which Quintilian cites, was based on that of Gorgias, the Athenian rhetor who taught Cicero's son. Another source of parallel material, often valuable, is "Longinus" 17–29.

Figures of Thought come first, as in *De oratore.*

In 9.2.1–5, Quintilian introduces the subject by pointing out how all rhetorical effects, though not in themselves Figures, allow or require Figures for their enhancement. Take Questions, for example (6–16; Lausberg §§ 767–770). They may of course be genuine inquiries, but often they are Figures employed to lend emotive force to the context. In this connection, Quintilian deals with a further set of devices, which he groups together as *praesumptio* (16–18; Lausberg § 785) and which consist of comments on the speaker's own approach to his theme, or anticipations of his opponent's. Their main object is to add credibility, and this is also true of pretended doubt (*dubitatio,* 19–20; Lausberg §§ 776–779) and the devices which take the form of consulting the adversary or the judge (*com-*

municatio, 20–26; Lausberg § 779). More emotional are exclamations and outbursts of frankness (26–29; Lausberg § 761, § 809); bolder still, Prosopopoeia (29–37; Lausberg §§ 826–829), Apostrophe (38–39; Lausberg §§ 762–765), and various kinds of "vividness," which aim to make the events come alive, as if seen happening at the present moment (40–44; Lausberg §§ 810–819).

Next comes the *Figure* Irony (44–51; Lausberg §§ 902–904), to be distinguished from the Trope of the same name by being longer and less self-explanatory. Related to it (51–53) are various kinds of simulated attitudes: confessions, agreements, praise, exaggeration, all insincere. Aposiopesis (54–57; Lausberg § 887) is another way of enhancing emotion, whereas *ēthopoeia* (58; Lausberg § 820), the vivid description of persons and characteristic traits, belongs rather to the less emotive range of Figures. So do the reporting of one's own words or actions (59), pretended recantations or fits of forgetfulness, and various kinds of appeal to the judges (59–63). Emphasis too (64–66; Lausberg § 906) can be a Figure as well as a Trope, namely when a sentence conceals a meaning which is not obvious from the words, but has to be discovered by the hearer. This is the principle behind the "figured" themes of the declaimers, in which the speaker is supposed to aim at an object different from that which he openly avers. (The principal theoretical text on these is [Dionysius of Halicarnassus], *Ars rhetorica* 8–9 (2. 295–358 Usener–Radermacher), which contains important material bearing on the interpretation of literature in the rhetorical schools; for other relevant texts, see note on 9.2.65.) Quintilian now proceeds to discuss "figured" themes at length (65–99). He adds (100–101) a footnote on Comparison (see Lausberg § 799), and a

rather longer one (102–107) on some obscurer Figures of Thought not mentioned by Cicero, but by Rutilius and others.

9.3, on Figures of Speech, rests on the same sources as 9.2, and parallel material is to be found in the same places. Lausberg (§§ 858–910) handles most of these Figures, using the same categories as Quintilian—i.e. modification of the "natural" expression by means of Addition, Subtraction, Change, or Order; categories which go back at least to Caecilius, and are found (e.g.) in *VPH* 28–38 and Phoebammon 3.45.15 Spengel (see note on 9.3.28). Quintilian combines this classification with a comprehensive grouping of all these Figures into two sets, one consisting of innovations of language, and therefore essentially the field of the *grammaticus*, and one dependent on word arrangement, which is more the business of the rhetorician (3.1–2). (On this distinction, see D. M. Schenkeveld, *Acta Academiae Hungaricae* 40 (2000) 390–397.) The first kind is made up of deliberate oddities, which would be faults if they were not deliberate. Used in reason, and only where appropriate, they lend charm and variety (3–5). The first group of such Figures comprises, *inter alia*, apparent breaches of concord in genders or numbers and unusual constructions of various kinds (6–17). Quintilian then proceeds (or so it seems, though the lacuna in 19 obscures this) to classify his "grammatical Figures" according to the four principles of modification: Addition and Subtraction in 18, Change (e.g. comparative for positive, plural for singular or *vice versa*) in 19–22, Order (Parenthesis, Hyberbaton) in 23–26. All these give variety. The more "rhetorical" figures, it seems, begin at 28. They are naturally more important. Those which illustrate Addition (28–

57) include simple repetition (*geminatio*), various kinds of Anaphora and Epanaphora, *regressio* (36), all sorts of combinations of such effects, and finally Climax (54–57). Figures based on Subtraction (*detractio*) occupy less space (58–65). The interesting *paradiastolē* (65), which depends on the meanings of words, is introduced here; but, as Quintilian says, it is not a Figure in his sense.

Most sound figures (*Klangfiguren*, "Gorgianic" Figures) are clearly matters of word order. They are discussed at length in 3.66–86. Here we find Parison (76), Homoeoteleuton (77), Homoeoptoton (78), and finally Antitheton (81) and its subspecies. More than enough already, says Quintilian (87); but, for the sake of completeness, he adds (as in 9.2) some others, which are not in Cicero but found in other authorities (Cornificius (see General Introduction, vol. I) and Rutilius). The chapter ends (100–102) with a plea for moderation and appropriateness: most of these Figures were meant to give pleasure, and are not suitable where sincere emotion is demanded.

Compositio (*σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων*, word arrangement), which is the subject of 9.4, is naturally connected with those Figures in which the patterning of the words is decisive. It is an important and complex subject which has generated a particularly vast modern literature, because the appreciation of it is extremely difficult for us, not only on account of our necessarily inadequate knowledge of Latin, but because the notion of "rhythmical" prose is unfamiliar and has been somewhat disconcerting to many readers. We have to remember that, though the Middle Ages had their accentual *cursus* based on classical models, the rules of classical Greek and Latin prose rhythm were unknown in the Renaissance and have had to be painfully, and not