

ARELLIUS FUSCUS AND THE UNITY OF THE ELDER SENECA'S *SUASORIAE*

In an article which appeared in a recent journal, I concluded that the prefaces to the individual books of the elder Seneca's *Controversiae* were the connecting thread which imposed a sense of artistic, thematic, and structural unity upon the entire work¹). Each surviving preface was shown to be linked to the others in style by the epistolary form, and in motive by Seneca's continual reiteration of his objective, usually in the opening sections, to provide specimens for emulation or avoidance according to the contemporary theory of imitation²). Two methods of transition connect each preface to the following book. In what might be classed as the direct transition, at the end of a preface Seneca mentions the main figure treated in it and a particular declamation of his. Then the body of the book immediately following begins with a quotation from that man in the same declamation. Also in the following book this main figure is treated more fully than in any of the other books. In the less direct mode of transition,

1) Lewis A. Sussman, "The Artistic Unity of the Elder Seneca's First Preface and the *Controversiae* as a Whole," *A.J.P.*, XCII (1971), 285-291. For the sake of brevity the elder Seneca will be referred to as just "Seneca." The edition of his works employed in the preparation of this article is the one of H. J. Müller (Hildesheim, 1963; reprint of Wien, 1887). The rhetorical works of Seneca form two entities: (1) The *Controversiae*, ten books of extracts from *controversiae* grouped within the respective books according to the legal declamation themes from which they were taken with an introductory preface accompanying each book, and (2) two (or more) books of extracts from *suasoriae*, the deliberative practice speeches. The inclusive title given to the entire collection of extracts from the *controversiae* and *suasoriae* is *Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae, Divisiones et Colores*, though commonly each of the two works is referred to separately as either the *Controversiae* or the *Suasoriae*. In the main MSS only five books of the *Controversiae* (I, II, VII, IX, X) and the first book of *Suasoriae* remain. The prefaces to *Contr.* I and II, and also to the *Suas.* are lacking. A fourth or fifth-century excerptor prepared a summary, still extant, of all ten books of the *Contr.* to which he added six of the original prefaces (to books I, II, III, IV, VII, X).

2) Sussman (above, n. 1), p. 286. Seneca addressed each preface as a letter to his three sons, Novatus, the younger Seneca, and Mela.

at the end of a preface Seneca promises to recall in the following book with special fullness the sayings of the man who was the major figure of that preface, and then in fact actually does so. Thus by both content and transition, where the state of the text allows us to check, Seneca relates each preface to the book it introduces.

In addition, the theme of *meliores annos* which artistically unifies the first preface also recurs in the tenth and last preface, as does his oft-repeated promise to provide examples of rhetoric for the benefit of his sons. Therefore the entirety of the *Controversiae* was shown in the article to have been carefully unified through both thematic and structural means insofar as the anthology format allowed.

* *
*

Seneca's later work, a collection of extracts from *suasoriae*, survives in an incomplete state, lacking a preface, the opening section of *Suas.* 1, and at least a second book³). Thus the present textual state of the work would apparently not permit us to investigate how Seneca might have attempted to unify this work as he did the *Controversiae*. However, there is sufficient internal evidence which allows an identification of the thematic and structural links which Seneca employed to unify the individual *suasoriae* of this particular book to each other, and also enables us to reconstruct with some degree of accuracy the subject of

3) Cf. above, n. 1. On the order of composition, see *Contr.* II, 4, 8. In the schools, however, students first worked on *suasoriae* (because of their simpler argumentation), and then graduated to *controversiae*. The reasoning for this apparent inversion in order may be as follows: At the time when Seneca's sons began asking questions about the declaimers and declamation of the past (and when Seneca became concerned about the effect these artificial exercises might have on their courtroom oratory), they were already composing *controversiae* or actually beginning their legal careers. At this stage, study of *controversiae* would be desirable. After some time in the courts, the sons would then be readying themselves for political careers in which exercises of deliberative oratory (i.e., *suasoriae*) would be more useful. In addition, at approximately this stage a Roman gentleman would consider in what fields to direct his literary energies. Seneca, as we shall see later, vehemently desired that his sons become interested in higher forms of literary expression than the currently popular declamation. This, in my opinion, accounts also for the emphasis in the *Suas.* on literary matters and the contrast of stylistic tastes between declaimers and literary people. On this, see below.

the missing preface. Certain basic themes also emerge, undoubtedly related to the preface, which unify the book as a whole.

The key to this reconstruction is Arellius Fuscus, an excellent declaimer whom Seneca ranked among the top four in the field⁴). His great fame attracted many talented students to the school which he conducted, among them Ovid, Fabianus, and Vibius Gallus⁵). Seneca himself must have been a constant visitor to his school, judging from the great number of quotations from Fuscus which he included in his works⁶).

An examination of the role Fuscus plays in the *Suasoriae* leads to an important observation: there exists in this work more material relating to Fuscus than to any other declaimer⁷). The significance of this fact becomes clearer after a brief discussion of Fuscus.

Seneca tells us that in *controversiae* Fuscus delivered dry introductions, arguments, and narrations (II, *Praef.*, 1); and also that, by implication, his style was obscure (II, *Praef.*, 2).

4) X, *Praef.*, 13; he was ranked after Latro and Gallio. On his excellence as a declaimer, cf. *Suas.* 4, 5; also *Contr.* I, 6, 10 and *Suas.* 2, 10. He had faults too, discussed below.

5) On Ovid, cf. *Contr.* II, 2, 8-9; on Fabianus, cf. II, *Praef.*, 1, 5; on Gallus, cf. Henri Bornecque, *Les déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le père* (Lille, 1902), pp. 197-198.

6) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 150, where Bornecque points out that Seneca mentions Fuscus at least once in all the extant *controversiae* and *suasoriae* themes, often twice, and occasionally four times. *Suas.* 4 is almost entirely made up of quotations from him. The only other declaimer similarly honored is Latro (*Contr.* II, 7) whose quoted words dominate the *Controversiae*.

7) Counting lines in the Müller edition (above, n. 1), we have of 204 in *Suas.* 1, one line of Fuscus; in *Suas.* 2, 47, 5 lines of 249; in *Suas.* 3, 43 lines of 90; in *Suas.* 4, 50 lines of 55; in *Suas.* 5, 32, 5 of 81, 5; in *Suas.* 6 (nearly half of which is a long digression on historical writers), 18 of 325; and in *Suas.* 7, 14 of 172. Thus Seneca devotes a total of 208 lines to Fuscus out of 1178, 5, or close to 18% (17.7%). The opening of *Suas.* 1, including the *suasoria* theme itself (which, however, can easily be reconstructed), and the attribution of what remains of the first quotation are lacking. From the pattern seen in the opening sections of *Suas.* 2, 3, 4 and 5, in each of which Fuscus appears first, it is tempting to ascribe the opening 13 lines of *Suas.* 1 (plus whatever has been lost) likewise to Fuscus. Certainly the style is reminiscent. We can explain the lower proportion of Fuscian material in the last two *suas.*, 6 and 7, since they represent a break in the flow from the first five *suasoriae* in which the themes are exclusively concerned with Greek history. Since the last two *suasoriae* deal with subjects from recent Roman history (i.e., the last days of Cicero), Fuscus, a Greek, may have found these themes less attractive for declamation. On the Greek origin of Fuscus, see Bornecque (above, n. 5), p. 150.

He was apparently unsuited to argumentation: a *color* of his meets with serious objections (*Contr.* VII, 2, 12), and even in the simpler arrangement of argumentation found in *suasoriae*, his division is termed *vulgaris* (*Suas.* 2. 11). Therefore Fuscus was not especially suited to the composition and delivery of *contro-versiae*.

On the other hand it emerges that his style was much better adapted to the more poetic *suasoriae*. This may have resulted from his early training, since his own teacher of rhetoric was fond of employing Homeric lines in declamations, a practice which Fuscus also adopted (*Contr.* I, 7, 14; cf. I, 8, 15). But Fuscus was fonder of Vergil whose lines he frequently imitated (*Suas.* 3. 4-5) or even quoted in his declamations (*Suas.* 4. 4). The poetic flavor of Fuscian style is immediately apparent in the many selections which Seneca preserves, and indeed, Seneca's own comments emphasize this point⁸). His observation that Fuscus greatly preferred to declaim *suasoriae* is therefore hardly surprising (*Suas.* 4. 5; cf. 2. 10). Two famous students of Fuscus, Ovid and Fabianus, themselves also preferred *suasoriae*, and undoubtedly for the same reason – their attraction to a poetic prose style (II, *Praef.*, 3; II, 2, 12).

Of the four men whom he ranks in his first tetrad of declaimers (X, *Praef.*, 13), Seneca assigns major portions of the surviving prefaces of the *Controversiae* to two of them: Latro (I, *Praef.*, 13-24) and Albucius (VII, *Praef.*, 1-9). In these prefaces, as is his custom, Seneca examines in great detail the character and talent of these men. Since one of Seneca's most important motives in writing was to provide critical information of this nature concerning the great declaimers, we should readily expect that the other two members of this tetrad, Gallio and Fuscus, similarly received prominent mention in two of the lost

8) Poetic influence is especially noticeable in his descriptions; e.g., *Contr.* I, 3, 3; II, 5, 4; *Suas.* 3. 1; cf. II, *Praef.*, 1. These were famous; *Suas.* 2. 10, 23; 4. 5. As a member of the Asian school (if we accept an emendation here), he would naturally favor poetic diction and figures (*Contr.* IX, 6, 16). His *compositio* was rather *mollis* (II, *Praef.*, 1) and *fracta* (*Suas.* 2. 23). There is no contradiction in this assessment; see William A. Edward, *The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 108, note *ad loc. ipse sententiam* ..., *Suas.* 2. 10. 20. Edward also notices the poetic flavor of the words Fuscus employed (*ibid.*). Seneca himself observes the poetic aspects of Fuscian style: ... *vestri arbitrii erit utrum explicationes eius luxuriosas putetis an vegetas* (*Suas.* 2. 10). He refers also to the ... *nimius cultus et fracta compositio* (*Suas.* 2. 23); cf. *Suas.* 4. 5: ... *nemo videretur dixisse cultius*. Also on the poetic style of Fuscus, see Bornecque (above, n. 5), pp. 151-152.

prefaces⁹). And since, as we have already seen, Fuscus was more adept in *suasoriae* than in *controversiae*, we should also expect that Seneca would find it more appropriate to treat him in the preface to a book of *suasoriae*.

Bearing in mind our previous discussion which revealed that Seneca habitually treated the declaimer or declaimers who figured prominently in a preface with corresponding fullness in the book following, and recalling the overwhelming statistical role of Fuscus in what remains of the *Suasoriae*, we can, I believe, safely theorize that he was a subject of the now lost preface to the first book of *Suasoriae*¹⁰). Additional evidence in the work supports such a conclusion, the strongest being the thread of continuity central to this collection which consists of direct references to Fuscus, and the desire of Seneca's sons to know more about him and his style.

In *Suas.* 1 there is only one identifiable reference to Fuscus, and this may be due to the text difficulties in the beginning¹¹). However, the second *suasoria* begins with a long quotation of him (*Suas.* 2. 1-2), and an important remark appears later in which Seneca admits the reason for including this *suasoria* theme in the collection:

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 vegetas (*Suas.* 2. 10).

After referring to the great popularity enjoyed by the *explicationes*¹²) of Fuscus, Seneca promises that he will add the most celebrated little descriptive passages (*descriptiunculae*) from

9) The brief references to Fuscus in II, *Praef.* are not to be interpreted as a general critical portrait. He is mentioned and his style referred to only in relation to the effects produced upon the style of Fabianus.

10) I have assumed, as have Edward (above, n. 8), p. xxxvi, and J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* (2 vols.; New York, 1952), II: *Graeco-Roman*, p. 147, that there was a preface to the first book of *Suas.* Certainly, given Seneca's practice in the *Contr.*, we should expect him to continue prefacing the books of rhetorical extracts. Also, the mutilated opening of *Suas.* 1 (see above, n. 7) would easily explain the loss of the preface.

11) See above, nn. 7 and 10

12) These were the developments of themes or arguments in the *narratio*; Cicero, *Part. Or.*, 9. 31; cf. Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (2 vols.; München 1960), I, 164-165, 168; II, 700.

all of the *suasoriae* which he delivered¹³). At the end of this *suasoria*, Seneca refers to his previous pledge that he would provide examples of the *explicationes* of Fuscus, and as in the above passage he brings up the matter of stylistic taste, though rather more sharply:

Sed ne vos diutius infatuem, quia dixeram me Fusci Arelli explicationes subiecturum, hic finem suasoriae faciam. Quarum nimius cultus et fracta conpositio poterit vos offendere, cum ad meam aetatem veneritis; interim non dubito, quin nunc vos ipsa, quae offensura sunt, vitia delectent (*Suas.* 2. 23).

As promised, the third *suasoria* starts with the Fuscan development of a descriptive subject, meteorological phenomena (*Suas.* 3. 1.). Seneca refers to this very passage as description (*Suas.* 3. 4), and then comments critically about the style of Fuscus; in this case, his unsuccessful imitation of Vergil. In doing so, he has broken his word that he would not himself pass judgment on Fuscus but would leave this up to his sons (*Suas.* 2. 10).

After digressing upon a topic related to Vergilian imitations (*Suas.* 3. 6-7), Seneca returns to Fuscus at the end of this *suasoria* (3. 7), and reiterates his pledge to present this declaimer's famous descriptions. A detectable note of sarcasm appears in his threat to satiate his sons immediately (*statim satiabo*) with a Fuscan passage which developed the theme of probability, here in regard to the impossibility of knowing what the future may bring¹⁴).

In the opening sections of the fourth *suasoria*, Seneca makes good his promise, and even as stated, to the point of satiation (*Suas.* 4. 1-3, 4). At the end of this short *suasoria*, devoted nearly in its entirety to Fuscus, Seneca refers to his sons' incessant questions about Fuscus and his style (*Suas.* 4. 5). In response, he says that he will heap upon them (in apparently the same mildly sarcastic tone of *Suas.* 3. 7) additional *explicationes* of Fuscus:

Et quia soletis mihi molesti esse de Fusco, quid fuerit, quare nemo videretur dixisse cultius, ingeram vobis Fuscinas explicationes (*Suas.* 4. 5).

13) *At quia semel in mentionem incidi Fusci, ex omnibus suasoriis celebres descriptionunculas subtexam, etiamsi nihil occurrerit, quod quisquam alius nisi suasor dilexerit* (*Suas.* 2. 10).

14) *Iam, si vultis, ad Fuscum revertar et descriptionibus eius vos statim satiabo ac potissimum eis, quas in verisimilitudinis tractatione posuit, cum diceret omnino non concessam futurorum scientiam* (*Suas.* 3. 7).

Edward has observed that this statement could well be another reference to the promise Seneca made in *Suas.* 2. 10¹⁵). But Seneca's phrasing regarding the deep interest of his sons in Fuscus and his style is closely reminiscent of numerous passages in the extant prefaces to the *Controversiae*¹⁶) and leads me to believe that he is referring to a similar remark in the lost preface to the *Suasoriae*. In addition, the nature of the information mentioned – *quid fuerit, quare nemo videretur dixisse cultius* – strongly suggests the type of material which Seneca customarily presents in the prefaces to the *Controversiae* where he regularly analyzes at length the character of a declaimer and its relationship to his style. And this is precisely what the phrase quoted above intimates. Then Seneca's practice in the book of the *Controversiae* which follows is to provide numerous examples of style which illustrate the general discussion of the preface, as he has done most notably for Fuscus in the *Suasoriae*.

Seneca fulfills the pledge made at the end of the fourth *suasoria* in the beginning of the fifth, since this theme starts with a long *explicatio* quoted from Fuscus (5. 1–3), and then discusses his division of the argument (5. 4).

Thus far it has been evident that Fuscus not only dominates *Suas.* 2–5 by his presence, but also forms the link uniting each theme to the other. In the last two *suasoriae*, however, his role diminishes and material relating to him amounts only to a total of 32 Müller lines. Perhaps this can be attributed to the subject matter of *Suas.* 6 and 7, the last days of Cicero. As a born Greek Fuscus may not have found the themes congenial¹⁷). However, Seneca may also have deliberately changed his pace, and for a specific reason which ultimately relates back to some of the literary points which arose in the first five *suasoriae*.

An observation at the end of *Suas.* 5 is important in this regard. Up until this point each *suasoria* demonstrated a clear link to the one following¹⁸). Yet at the end of *Suas.* 5 there is a

15) Edward (above, n. 8), p. 127 note *ad loc. cultius*, *Suas.* 4. 19. 27.

16) E. g., I, *Praef.*, 1, 3, 4, 6, 10; VII, *Praef.*, 1; X, *Praef.*, 1, 9. Cf. I, *Praef.*, 22; IX, *Praef.*, 1; X, *Praef.*, 2, 4.

17) Cf. above, n. 7 *ad finem*.

18) One might possibly submit that the end of *Suas.* 1 does not exhibit a clear linkage to the following *suasoria*. But there is an important discussion of a recurring and dominant theme in the *Suas.* – stylistic taste (*Suas.* 1. 16), on which see below, n. 45. The end of *Suas.* 6 displays a very direct transition to *Suas.* 7.

cryptic statement which apparently does not anticipate the opening of the next *suasoria*:

Hoc loco disertissimam sententiam dixit, dignam quae vel in oratione vel in historia ponatur... (*Suas.* 5. 8).

Upon further examination this apparently chance remark proves to be a linking device of great significance. Let us see how.

The next *suasoria*, "Cicero deliberates whether he should entreat Antony for his life," proceeds normally, and perhaps should have ended in section 14. But here there is an abrupt entry into a long digression which itself relates back to Seneca's closing words in *Suas.* 5. 8. He says in 6. 14 that since this *suasoria* theme revolves around the events of Cicero's last days, it would not be irrelevant to show how the various *historici* dealt with the death of the great orator. The remainder of the *suasoria* (6. 14-27) consists of material from or relating to writers of history.

Recalling Seneca's remark in *Suas.* 5. 8 quoted above, we may well ask whether he is not now purposely implying an unfavorable comparison between the efforts of the declaimers on the one hand, and true literary people on the other, when he divides this *suasoria* between them.

* *
*

The consideration of another matter will illuminate the topic we have just touched upon. Another declaimer figures prominently also in the *Suasoriae*: Lucius Cestius Pius, to whom Seneca devotes 167.5 Müller lines in contrast to the 208 occupied by Fuscus¹⁹). Seneca had both men firmly in mind while writing the *Suasoriae*. Not only does the number of lines given each attest to this, but also the pronounced tendency for Fuscus, and, to a lesser extent, Cestius, to appear at the first or second positions in the opening, division, and concluding portions of each *suasoria*:

19) The figures for Cestius are as follows: *Suas.* 1, 55 Müller lines of 204; *Suas.* 2, 19.5 of 249; *Suas.* 3, 9.5 of 90; *Suas.* 4 zero of 55; *Suas.* 5, 18.5 of 81.5; *Suas.* 6, 14 of 325; *Suas.* 7, 51 of 172; or 167.5 lines of a total 1178.5. Cestius is also important in the *Contr.* He is mentioned in each of the extant themes except 9. 2, and is prominent also in the *Excerpta* of the missing books. See also Bornecque (above, n. 5), p. 161.

		Suas. 1	Suas. 2	Suas. 3	Suas. 4	Suas. 5	Suas. 6	Suas. 7
OPENING	Fuscus *	1	—	1	1	1	7	7
	Cestius *	6	—	2	—	2	4	2 1, 4
DIVISION	Fuscus 13	1	—	1, 4	1	1	—	+
	Cestius 1, 7	2	—	2	—	2	3	+
CONCLUSION	Fuscus —	—	—	1	1	+	—	+*
	Cestius 1	1	—	—	—	+	—	2

* Text not complete: speaker unidentified

+ Not applicable

+* Text incomplete: first speaker unidentified

In the *Controversiae*, where the state of the text allows us to check, Seneca has a tendency to do exactly the same thing in the *sententiae*, division, and color sections for the man whom he has discussed in the introductory preface of that book²⁰). The

20) The opening (or *sententiae*) and *divisio* portions of a Senecan *suasoria* theme are analogous to the first two sections of a typical *controversia*. [*Sententia* is to be taken in the broad sense of "remarkable sayings," not just a terse epigram, cf. Edward (above, n. 8), p. xxxiv.] In the *Suasoriae*, after the *divisio* there occurs a definite third section, though not dealing with *colores* (twists of argument either to mitigate or enhance guilt) since these are not appropriate in deliberative speeches. Instead, in the concluding section of a Senecan *suasoria*, there are critical analyses, sometimes in great detail, of individual sentences or phrases (e.g. *Suas.* 2. 12-13), anecdotes about famous people (e.g. *Suas.* 2. 10, 15, 17; 7. 12-14), and about literary matters (e.g. *Suas.* 1. 12, 15; 3. 4-7; 4. 4-5; 6. 14-17). Seneca also places the bulk of quotations from those declaiming in Greek here.

Returning to the relative order of appearance in the three sections of the *controversiae*, the most striking example is the subject of the first preface Marcus Porcius Latro, and his prominence in the initial sections (*sententiae*, *divisiones*, *colores*) of each *controversia* theme in Book I. A chart displays it graphically:

	I, 1	I, 2	I, 3	I, 4	I, 5	I, 6	I, 7	I, 8
<i>Sententiae</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1 2	1
<i>Divisiones</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	*
<i>Colores</i>	1	2	—	1 2	1	1	5	*+ 5, etc.

* all declaimers used the same division

+ also 8, 10, 12

Latro declaimed prolifically, and apparently Seneca was very familiar with his work.

The subject of the ninth preface is Votienus Montanus, whom Seneca himself tells us did not declaim publicly, nor even as an exercise (IX, *Praef.*, 1). The quantity of his declamatory material therefore must have been small. Most of what appears in Seneca's collection is concentrated in Book IX. Montanus also tends to appear early in each section:

	IX, 1	IX, 2	IX, 3	IX, 4	IX, 5	IX, 6
<i>Sententiae</i>	5	15	6	11	4	4
<i>Divisiones</i>	2	1	—	2	1	2, 17, 23
<i>Colores</i>	1* 5	1 5	2	1, 4 6	— 5, 7	+

* with Gallio and Latro

+ all declaimers used the same

A similar pattern is apparent in Seneca's treatment of Albucius, the main figure of the seventh preface, and also Fabianus, of the second preface, of the book followings each:

(Albucius)	VII, 1	VII, 2	VII, 3	VII, 4	VII, 5	VII, 6	VII, 7	VII, 8
<i>Sententiae</i>	1	4	3 1	2	5	7 1	1	1
<i>Divisiones</i>	—	—	—	4	—	—	2	—
<i>Colores</i>	2, 6	15	2	—	—	2, 9, 16	—	— 2, 14

pattern therefore of the *Suasoriae* supports our conclusion that Fuscus was probably the main figure of the preface, although it also suggests that Seneca may also have dealt in it with Cestius. There is no doubt, however, that Seneca was thinking about both men, and a brief survey of Cestius may well be in order as an aid in understanding the *Suasoriae*.

Though persuasive and often eloquent, Cestius personified some of the worst deficiencies of declamation. In a situation exploited humorously by Cassius Severus, Cestius proved to be entirely incompetent in a court of law²¹). His style, nevertheless, was congenial to the declining tastes of the day, and he attracted numerous students to his school. Here they memorized the speeches of Cestius, but read none of Cicero's unless they were ones to which Cestius replied²²). Even when Cassius Severus threatened him with severe embarrassment, Cestius was unable to admit that Cicero's eloquence outshined his own (III, *Praef.*, 17).

The most disappointing aspect of Cestius' talent was his conscious perversion of it. Seneca records at least several occasions where Cestius reveals that he is capable of speaking well and could be a sensible and perceptive critic of rhetoric²³). But

(Fabianus)	II, 1	II, 2	II, 3	II, 4	II, 5	II, 6	II, 7
<i>Sententiae</i>	7	— 3	7 2	3	7	4 2	—
<i>Divisiones</i>	—	—	2	—	—	—	—
<i>Colores</i>	1, 6	—	—	1 4	3	—	—

Fabianus, it should be noted, was a philosopher, and only an occasional declaimer (II, *Praef.*, 1, 5). The bulk of his material is very small, and little occurs outside of Book II; nevertheless, in this book he also tends to appear initially in each section.

21) III, *Praef.*, 17-18; cf. C. S. Rayment, "Presumption Rebuked," *C. J.*, XLII (1947), 259-260. On Cestius in general, see Bornecque (above, n. 5), pp. 160-162.

22) III, *Praef.*, 15-16; cf. Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, X, 5, 20.

23) Cf. *Contr.* I, 1, 24; I, 3, 9; I, 5, 3; II, 6, 8; IV, *Excerpta*, 8 extra; VII, 7, 19. Particularly notable is his discussion of propriety in delivering a speech before an absolute monarch (*Suas.* 1. 5, 8). To his credit, Cestius is very much aware of the abuses of imitation; cf. *Contr.* IX, 3, 12; IX, 6, 11-12. Nevertheless, he often did not succeed in his imitations of great writers (*Contr.* VII, 1, 27).

Cestius realized that the tastes of the declamation audiences were jaded and faulty, and so, although he knew better, he spoke purposely in a corrupt fashion to win their approval:

Cestius pueriliter se dixisse intellegebat ... et ego nunc scio me inep-
tam sententiam dicere; multa autem dico non quia mihi placent, sed quia
audientibus placitura sunt.²⁴⁾

Familiar with the great political and judicial oratory which characterized the last days of the Republic, Cestius witnessed first-hand the decline of such oratory in the Principate and the consequent redirection of rhetorical talent into declamation. Accompanying this development was a marked shift in style caused by the necessity for declaimers to please and delight their audiences on a fairly limited range of themes. Thus they constantly strove for brilliant, crowd-pleasing effects with such devices as *sententiae*, poetic diction, and jingling figures. Since there were usually no opponents in a declamation session, the speakers tended to neglect argumentation and engage in fanciful conduct which could never be tolerated in a courtroom²⁵⁾. They declaimed, it is true, using laws which have now been recognized as basically authentic Greek or Roman statutes; nevertheless, the situations applied to these laws on which they declaimed were frequently far removed from reality, bizarre, and even obscene²⁶⁾. The generation of students trained in a system of higher educa-

24) *Contr.* IX, 6, 12. The audiences preferred the styles of the declaimers Cestius and Latro to those of the far superior orators Pollio, Messalla, and Passienus; they would even prefer Cestius to Cicero, if they did not fear being stoned (III, *Praef.*, 14-15). The audiences also betrayed their lack of taste with excessive and frequent applause (IX, *Praef.*, 2; cf. *Contr.* II, 3, 19; VII, 2, 9; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, II, 2, 10), often completely unwarranted (e.g. *Contr.* VII, 4, 10). It is instructive that Bornecque (above, n. 5), p. 58, could not discover how audiences expressed their displeasure, but he theorizes that with unrestrained applause so common, its mere absence would be sufficiently damaging. On the debasement of taste see also Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, II, 5, 10. XII, 10, 73-76; J.F.D'Alton, *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism* (London, 1931), p. 338.

25) E.g., Albucius' use of a declamatory figure in a court, and the consequent destruction of his case (VII, *Praef.*, 6-7). Cf. IX, *Praef.*, 2-3, 5; also III, *Praef.*, 13.

26) On the declamation themes, cf. above; also see the works cited in Sussman (above, n. 1), p. 285, n. 1, and the additional bibliography in J.E. G. Whitehorne, "The Elder Seneca: A Review of Past Work," *Prudentia*, I (1969), 21-23. The better ancient critics recognized and censured the unreal aspects of the themes; cf. Persius, *Sat.*, III, 44-47; Petronius, *Sat.*, 1-2, 48; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, II, 10, 5; Tacitus, *Dial.*, 31, 35.

tion which consisted almost totally of exercises such as these consequently developed affected and strange tastes in style. The graduates of the schools did not necessarily abandon their student declamation exercises, but throughout adulthood continued to deliver them publicly. Attendance and participation at such sessions constituted a significant leisure time activity for the Roman upper classes by the time of Augustus' death²⁷).

Thus we can isolate two trends associated with the rise of declamation which were potentially dangerous to oratory and literature: (1) a decline of stylistic taste, and (2) a transferral of creative energies from real oratory or literary activity to the practice of declamation.

Seneca appreciated that declamation was a potentially useful and entertaining exercise. But much to his credit, he also perceived its dangers. He preserved an anthology of declamation extracts at the request of his sons who were greatly interested in the declaimers and declamation of the past, since he believed that it was a useful primary training for more serious pursuits²⁸). But as a literary critic he was careful to view declamation in its proper perspective and warn his sons of the pitfalls associated with an excessive emphasis on these exercises, particularly in regard to style²⁹).

Seneca's effort to counteract the two dangerous trends associated with declamation permeate his entire critical theory as observable in his own comments and those he preserves of other critics in the *Controversiae*³⁰). Similar efforts centering around his presentations of Arellius Fuscus and Cestius Pius

27) Included among those who frequently attended or declaimed were Pollio, Messalla, Maecenas, Agrippa, Augustus, and Tiberius. On Maecenas, Agrippa, and Augustus, cf. *Contr.* II, 4, 12-13; IV, *Praef.*, 7; X, 5, 21; Suetonius, *Augustus*, 89. On Tiberius and Messalla, cf. *Suas.* 3. 7; on Gallio and Messalla, cf. *Suas.* 3.6. For a fuller listing see Edward (above, n. 8), p. xx, and Bornecque (above, n. 5), pp. 42-43, 46. Augustus himself was a good critic of declamation and eloquence in general; e.g., *Contr.* II, 5, 20; X, *Praef.*, 14; Suetonius, *Augustus*, 86.

28) *Facilis ab hac in omnes artes discursus est; instruit etiam quos non sibi exercet* (II, *Praef.*, 3; cf. II, *Praef.*, 4, 5).

29) Although this is a recurring theme throughout the *Contr.* and *Suas.*, it is most noticeable in the prefaces, especially II, *Praef.*, III, *Praef.*, VII, *Praef.*, and IX, *Praef.*

30) See Lewis A. Sussman, *The Elder Seneca as a Critic of Rhetoric* (Diss., Chapel Hill, 1969), Chapters II and III, passim; also A. Fred Sochatoff, "Basic Rhetorical Theories of the Elder Seneca," *C.J.*, XXXIV (1939), 345-354.

pervade the *Suasoriae* and not only suggest that he discussed such matters in the lost preface, but also that he used this topic as a unifying motif for *Suasoriae*, Book I. Let us see how.

When he presents extracts from the various declaimers in his rhetorical works, Seneca usually lets the quotations speak for themselves as examples of good or bad speech. In unusual cases, however, he will point out what is exceptionally eloquent or corrupt³¹). But although he trusts the judgment of his sons for the most part, he obviously harbors and occasionally vents the suspicion that their young and inexperienced tastes are not sufficiently discriminating:

Ex Gracis declamatoribus nulli melius haec suasoria processit quam Glyconi; sed non minus multa magnifice dixit quam corrupte: utrorum faciam vobis potestatem. Et volebam vos experiri non adiciendo iudicium meum nec separando a corruptis sana; potuisset enim fieri, ut vos magis illa laudaretis, quae insaniunt. At nihilo minus poterit fieri, quamvis distinxerim (*Suas.* I. 16).

Once again, in *Suas.* 2. 10, Seneca first pledges that he will allow his sons to evaluate on their own the brilliance or the license of the style of Fuscus, but he then immediately contradicts himself by adding a damaging remark of Pollio's against Fuscus and then one of his own³²). Seneca voices his lack of confidence in their taste in a more open, yet resigned manner at the end of this same *suasoriae*³³). He understands that his sons are now deeply under the influence of faults prevalent in the schools, but he has confidence that age, experience, and his own direction will point them to saner standards of style. It may not be accidental that the declaimer mentioned in the passage referred to is Fuscus,

31) E.g., *Contr.* IX, 5, 15; *Suas.* I. 12. Seneca is working within the theory of imitation; his purpose is to provide examples for his sons to emulate or avoid.

32) *Suas.* 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 arbitri erit, utrum explicationes eius luxuriosas putetis an vegetas. Pollio Asinius aiebat hoc non esse sadere, sed ludere. Recolo nihil fuisse me iuvene tam notum quam has explicationes Fuscus, quas nemo nostrum non alius alia inclinatione vocis velut sua quisque modulatione cantabat. At quia semel in mentionem incidi Fuscus, ex omnibus suasoriis celebres descriptiunculas subtexam, etiamsi nihil occurrerit, quod quisquam alius nisi suasor dilexerit.* The last remark is especially damaging. The force also of *descriptiunculas* may also be pejorative. Cf. his use of *satiabo* in *Suas.* 3. 7 and *ingeram* in *Suas.* 4. 5: he will "glut" his sons with Fuscus so they will become tired of his *explicationes* and *descriptiunculas*. Cf. II, *Praef.*, 1, 2.

33) *Suas.* 2. 23; cf. above.

and that the first two declaimers to appear in the following *suasoria* are Fuscus and Cestius³⁴).

Both men have shown that they are capable of eloquent expression. But each also is guilty of serious faults which are primarily the result of poor taste or the dictates of an educational system in which each served as a school master. Fuscus had an excessively poetic style and he was unsuited for declaiming *controversiae*, to say nothing of appearing in a law court. Although he knew better, Cestius pandered to the degraded taste of his audience. Skilled in delivering *controversiae*, he was nevertheless a dismal failure in court (III, *Praef.*, 17).

Seneca looked back to Cicero for saner standards of style³⁵, and fittingly recorded for the amusement of his sons the punishment meted out to Cestius, a noted *obtrektor Ciceronis*, by the great orator's besotted son when he learned who Cestius was³⁶). Fuscus and Cestius, then, were among the best of the declaimers. Yet both graphically illustrated the pernicious trends of the new rhetoric against which Seneca had been diligently warning his sons by examples, critical anecdotes, and pen sketches of the notable declaimers. Seneca is anxious for his sons to understand the changes occurring in rhetorical style, and to avoid those which he considers inimical to the growth of a sane prose style.

* *
*

The discussion above will perhaps now illuminate the comment Seneca made at the very end of the fifth *suasoria* that Gallio delivered a *sententia* sufficiently eloquent to be worthy of

34) In fact, Arellius Fuscus is treated very fully in *Suas.* 3 and 4: 93 Müller lines from a total of 145.

35) Cf. his laudatory remarks on Cicero: *Omnes autem magni in eloquentia nominis excepto Cicerone videor audisse; ne Ciceronem quidem aetas mihi eriperat, sed bellorum civilium furor ... alioqui in illo atriolo, in quo duos grandes praetextatos ait secum declamasse, potui adesse illudque ingenium, quod solum populus Romanus par imperio suo habuit, cognoscere et, quod vulgo aliquando dici solet, sed in illo proprie debet, potui vivam vocem audire* (I, *Praef.*, 11). Cf. I, *Praef.*, 6-7; *Contr.* VII, 4, 6; X, *Praef.*, 6; *Suas.* 7. 10. Three declamation themes in the collection deal with Cicero: *Contr.* VII, 2, *Suas.* 6, and *Suas.* 7. Seneca's literary critical vocabulary is also heavily indebted to Cicero; cf. Henry Bardon, *Le vocabulaire de la critique littéraire chez Sénèque le rhéteur* (Paris, 1940), pp. 65 ff. See in general on Seneca's appreciation of Cicero, Sussman (above, n. 30), pp. 152-155.

36) *Suas.* 7. 12-13. Hybreas, a slavish imitator of Cicero, also suffered insult from the younger Cicero (*Suas.* 7. 14).

oratory or history (*Suas.* 5. 8). This statement plainly intimates the inferiority of declamation as an area of literary activity in the eyes of Seneca, an opinion which he airs also in the *Controversiae*³⁷). It also prepares us for the following *suasoria* theme and acts as a transition, since in *Suas.* 6 Seneca is obviously trying to direct the interest of his sons from declamation to writing history³⁸). Nevertheless, in this same *suasoria* he says that none of the great historians quoted on the topic of Cicero's death matched in eloquence the words of Cornelius Severus, a poet (*Suas.* 6. 25). Similarly, Seneca had remarked previously that the Latin declaimers were unable to describe a storm scene as successfully as the poet Albinovanus Pedo (*Suas.* 1. 15). Important also is the order in which he presents the various types of quotations in *Suas.* 6: first come those from declamation (6. 1-14), next one from an oration (6. 15), then from history (6. 16-6. 25), and finally, from poetry (6. 25 ff.). Thus Seneca has constructed an informal literary hierarchy at the top of which stands poetry, then history and oratory, and finally, at the bottom rung, declamation³⁹).

Seneca is eager for his sons to engage in political careers⁴⁰) and therefore they must necessarily first become accomplished legal and then political orators. For this reason Seneca frequently in his works alludes to the defects of declamation as a preparation for court pleading, the necessity for a discriminating style, and the desirability of actual experience. Acquisition of the latter two would be unlikely if they confined their education to the schools of declamation⁴¹). Seneca desired that his sons redirect

37) E. g., *Contr.* I, 8, 16: *Diocles Carystius dixit sententiam, quae non in declamatione tantum posset placere, sed etiam in solidiore aliquo scripti genere . . .*

38) *Suas.* 6. 16; cf. 6. 27. The entire digression on historical writers who treated the death of Cicero (*Suas.* 6. 14-24), in the company of the other remarks, may be taken as an enticement for his sons to become interested in writing history.

39) Though no great admirer of them (younger Seneca *Ad Helv.* 17. 3; *Ep.* 108. 22), the elder Seneca points out that a philosopher, Attalus Stoicus, could achieve great eloquence in declamation and easily surpass one of the professional declaimers (*Suas.* 2. 12; cf. the somewhat less clear-cut case of Fabianus; II, *Praef.*, passim). His opinion of those who write for pantomimes is loaded with contempt (*Suas.* 2. 19), but comic playwrights such as Publilius Syrus could indeed be eloquent (*Contr.* VII, 3, 8) and were often imitated by declaimers. He was aware, however, that individual historians could be as foolish as any declaimer (*Suas.* 2. 22).

40) E. g., II, *Praef.*, 3-4; cf. X, *Praef.*, 16.

41) E. g., IX, *Praef.*, 5; cf. Tacitus, *Dial.* 35. See above, n. 29.

their literary energies from declamation to more substantial genres, and not follow the example of many others who rarely went beyond these school exercises. The Roman gentleman-politician, as Seneca knew, was expected to engage in literary pursuits during his leisure. But Seneca believed that declamation should not constitute the main literary interest of his sons since, aside from the dangers discussed above, he considered the exercises themselves to be trivial and puerile⁴²).

His purposes in this regard are clearest in *Suas.* 6 when Seneca marks the sharp transition (6. 14) between the opening sections of extracts from the declaimers (including Cestius and Fuscus) and the numerous quotations which follow from the historical writers. He says that he will add how the latter group treated the death of Cicero since it is relevant to the theme of this *suasoria*. Seneca begins with a discussion of Asinius Pollio's distortion of the facts in his works on this subject, and how it offered a fatuous theme for the professional school declaimers who frequently spoke on this new topic; "Cicero deliberates whether he should burn his orations since Antony promises him immunity should he do so."

Following this brief anecdote Seneca finally becomes candid regarding the ambitions which he has for his sons and also concerning the relative merits of history and declamation:

Nolo autem vos, iuvenes mei, contristari, quod a declamatoribus ad historicos transeo. Satis faciam vobis et fortasse efficiam, ut his sententiis lectis solidis et verum habentibus a scholasticis recedatis; sed, quia hoc propositum recta via consequi non potero, decipere vos cogar, velut salutarem daturus pueris potionem. Sumite pocula (*Suas.* 6. 16).

The specimens from the historians (and the one epic poet) which follow overwhelm the quotations from the declaimers in both quality and the prestige of their origin and provide a vivid contrast to the obviously fictional content of the first part. By the end of this *suasoria*, divided nearly evenly in length between the two groups, Seneca possibly believed that he had impressed the points which he wanted to make on his sons, since the following *suasoria* returns to exclusively declamatory specimens. Or, less likely, he returned to declamation because as he humo-

42) ... *sinite me ab istis iuvenilibus studiis* [i. e., declamation] *ad senectutem meam reverti. Fatebor vobis, iam res taedio est. Primo libenter adsilui velut optimam vitae meae partem mihi reducturus: deinde iam me pudet, tamquam diu non seriam rem agam. Hoc habent scholasticorum studia: leviter tacta delectant, contrectata et propius admota fastidio sunt* (X, Praef., 1).

rously remarks, his sons would not have read further than the beginning of the section on historians unless they knew that another *suasoria* followed which contained the type of extracts which they desired:

Si hic desiero, scio futurum, ut vos illo loco desinatis legere, quo ego a scholasticis recessi; ergo, ut librum velitis usque ad umbilicum revolvere, adiciam suasoriam proximae similem (*Suas.* 6. 27).

As promised Seneca attaches a seventh *suasoria* also on the last days of Cicero in which he presents extracts from only the declaimers. The theme is the hypothetical situation of the great orator debating whether or not to burn his writings, since Antony has promised him immunity should he do so: *deliberat Cicero an scripta sua comburat promittente Antonio incolumitatem, si fecisset.*

This is essentially the same theme disparagingly referred to in *Suas.* 6. 14 which arose because of a deliberate attempt to falsify the truth about Cicero's last days:

Nam, quin Cicero nec tam timidus fuerit, ut rogaret Antonium, nec tam stultus, ut exorari posse eum speraret, nemo dubitat excepto Asinio Pollione, qui infestissimus famae Ciceronis permansit. Et is etiam occasionem scholasticis alterius suasoriae dedit; solent etiam scholastici declamitare: deliberat Cicero, an salutem promittente Antonio orationes suas comburat. Haec inepte ficta cuilibet videri potest (*Suas.* 6. 14).

Seriously damaging are the repetition twice within the same sentence of the disdainful term for rhetoricians, *scholastici*, and their suggested inability to see through a lie or their excessive eagerness to grasp for a flashy *suasoria* theme – whether true or not⁴³). In his implied contrast between historians and rhetoricians Seneca has linked his statement in *Suas.* 6. 14 with the closing comment of *Suas.* 6. 27, and thereby to the entirety of *Suas.* 7 which has as its subject, popular among the rhetoricians, a patently false situation. The total effect is to stress even more forcefully the gulf between rhetoricians and literary people so tellingly demonstrated in *Suas.* 6 alone.

The final *suasoria*, then, returns to the artificial world of the declamation schools, although the declaimers quoted are clever and occasionally achieve eloquence on the topic of the immor-

43) A *scholasticus* is a complete devotee of declamation, either the professional rhetor or the perpetual student. See Bardon (above, n. 35), p. 52. Seneca held these people in some contempt: *Et Sparsum hoc colore declamasse memini, hominem inter scholasticos sanum, inter sanos scholasticum* (*Contr.* I, 7, 15; cf. II, 3, 19; VII, 5, 12).

tality of literature. Seneca fittingly ends the final *suasoria* with several anecdotes which relate the discomfiture of four typical products of the schools (*Suas.* 7. 12–14). First there is Surdinus who is reproached for his foolishness by none other than Cestius, his teacher (*Suas.* 7. 12). Next is it the turn of Cestius, and importantly Seneca works in the embarrassment of this man and the two who follow with the figure of Cicero, thereby again underlining the differences between true literature and declamation and leaving this as the final impression on the reader's mind.

Cestius, who was enamored by his own talent and constantly attacked Cicero (*Suas.* 7. 12), was attending a banquet given by the younger Cicero, then governor of Asia. When he finally realized who Cestius was, the orator's drunken son had Cestius beaten for the man's disparaging comments about his father (*Suas.* 7. 13). The orator's son also publicly insulted Hybreas who brazenly plagiarized Cicero to his face (*Suas.* 7. 14). The book ends with two quotations from Gargonius, a school master himself (*Contr.* I, 7, 18), about whom Seneca nevertheless says, *Gargonius, fatuorum amabilissimus, in hac suasoria dixit duas res, quibus stultiore ne ipse quidem dixerat* (*Suas.* 7. 14). Seneca has therefore in this *suasoria* continued from *Suas.* 6 the unfavorable comparison between declamation and the higher forms of literature.

* *
*

But the direct and implied contrasts between declamation and declaimers on the one hand, and real literary men on the other, are greatly in evidence not just in the two last *suasoriae* but occur throughout the fragmentary first book of *suasoriae* and may well have formed the theme of the preface as exemplified in the declaimer Arellius Fuscus. This recurring theme is one of the means by which Seneca has attempted to unify both thematically and physically this collection of extracts and thereby endow it with meaning and purpose. To summarize and conclude:

(1) The declaimer Arellius Fuscus is the dominant figure of the *Suasoriae*. If, as seems likely, Seneca continued his practice from the *Controversiae* of treating the declaimer (or declaimers) prominent in the preface with great fullness in the book following, and also his tendency to name that person first in each sub-

division within a theme, then there can be little doubt that Seneca devoted the lost preface to Fuscus⁴⁴). This disclaimer also serves to connect *Suas.* 2–5, both in content and through the transitions.

(2) Seneca displays improved literary skill in the *Suasoriae*. In contrast to the practices in the *Controversiae*, he has consciously attempted to effect physical or thematic linkages between each of the declamation topics comprising the book. At the end of each *suasoria* Seneca makes anticipatory comments intended to draw the reader on to the next one and smooth the transition between them. His comments may deal with actual content matter to follow, a broad theme, or both⁴⁵).

(3) Even with the loss of the preface where we might have expected fuller treatment, the first book of the *Suasoriae* as a whole effectively contrasts declamation with the more important genres of literature, and also juxtaposes disclaimers, especially Fuscus and Cestius, with famous writers. Although introduced in the first *Suasoria* (1. 15), this aspect becomes most pronounced in the sixth and seventh. United also by similar subjects and a transitional statement, these two final *suasoriae* are filled with contrasts which serve to demonstrate quite effectively the

44) On similar grounds it is quite possible, as mentioned above, that Cestius may have played a somewhat less prominent role in the lost preface, although this is more speculative. It is also, of course, impossible to reconstruct the manner of transition (direct or indirect) from the lost preface to the first book of *Suasoriae*.

45) The ending of *Suas.* 1 has apparently the weakest link to the next *suasoria*, but one which assumes importance as the book proceeds. At the end of *Suas.* 1, Seneca remarks upon the differences in taste between himself and his sons, and his hope for their improvement in this regard (*Suas.* 1. 16). *Suas.* 2 begins then with a quotation from Arellius Fuscus. *Suas.* 2, 3, and 4 are connected by the promise at the end of each one to provide additional material concerning Arellius Fuscus (*Suas.* 2. 23 – also referring to matters of taste, *Suas.* 3. 7, 4. 5). In each case the following *Suasoria*, as promised, begins with a quotation from Fuscus (*Suas.* 3. 1, 4. 1, 5. 1). At the end of *Suas.* 5, Seneca returns to the theme of stylistic tastes and the inferiority of declamation to other genres of literature: *Hoc loco disertissimam sententiam dixit, dignam quae vel in oratione vel in historia ponatur ...* (*Suas.* 5. 8). Here he is anticipating the extensive treatment of oratory, poetry, and especially history which appears in *Suas.* 6. 14–27. At the end of this *Suasoria* (6. 27), Seneca refers to the similarity in subject matter between *Suas.* 6 and 7, but states that he will return to the disclaimers so that his sons will read on to the end of the scroll. This too is an obvious reflection on their taste – they prefer declamation at this point to what Seneca considers the higher forms of literary activity.

differences between declamation and true literature. Here Seneca is being consistent with the literary judgment expressed in the *Controversiae*: although declamation is a useful and entertaining exercise, it should be considered only as preparation for more serious work, not as an end in itself. Seneca admits that declamation can be a charming, sometimes stimulating, and often helpful exercise for adults, but that overemphasis on it can lead to serious faults. Declamation is essentially the province of schoolboys, and as he himself directly admits, it is a frivolous and trivial pursuit for a mature man (X, *Praef.*, 1).

(4) Seneca recognized that the stylistic tastes of his sons varied considerably from his own; and this is a recurring topic of discussion in the *Suasoriae*. Seneca is attempting, in his own gentle way, to direct them towards higher standards of style and also literary aspirations through anecdotal portraits, examples, and critical discussions of both declamation and – for the want of a better term – true literature.

* *
*

As I have hoped to demonstrate, Seneca has artfully unified in both content and structure the first book of the *Suasoriae* while continuing and refining themes, goals, and methods which characterized his earlier work, the *Controversiae*. Viewed in this new light, we must cease to dismiss Seneca's works as haphazard collections of rhetorical reminiscences⁴⁶, but accept them as, in their own way, well-crafted and planned pieces of literary commentary and criticism with consistent themes, goals, and techniques.

University of Florida (Gainesville) Lewis A. Sussman

46) Cf. the account in Edward (above, n. 8), pp. ix–x, how classical scholarship has in general completely misinterpreted Seneca's works and achievements.