

W. S. WATT

NOTES ON QUINTILIAN, *INSTITVTIO ORATORIA*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 121 (1998) 68–71

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON QUINTILIAN, *INSTITVTIO ORATORIA**

I 2,4 *corrumpi mores in scholis putant; nam et corrumpuntur interim, sed domi quoque, et sunt multa eius rei exempla, tam hercule quam conseruatae sanctissime utrubique opinionis. natura cuiusque totum curaque distat.*

Colson points out that *natura* and *cura* are ablatives, and that *distat* is impersonal, as at VI 4,21 *personis modo distat*. On *totum* he is silent, but since it is not the subject of *distat*, what is it? Rather than admit a strange adverbial use, and rather than adopt Aldus's change to *tantum* (which gives the wrong sense), I should write <in> *totum*. This phrase is sometimes used by Quintilian in the sense of 'on the whole', 'as a general rule', but in several places it clearly has the meaning required here, 'entirely', 'completely', e.g. III 8,58 *in totum contrarium*, IV 1,63 *in totum summouent*, IX 2,88 *neque in totum filio parcat*.

I 4,25 *scrutabitur ille praeceptor acer atque subtilis origines nominum: quae ex habitu corporis 'Rufos' 'Longos' que fecerunt (ubi erit aliquid secretius: 'Sullae' 'Burri' 'Galbae' 'Plauti' 'Pansae' 'Scauri' taliaque) et ex casu nascentium (hic 'Agrippa' et 'Opiter' et 'Cordus' et 'Postumus' erunt).*

The grammaticus will investigate the origins of proper names.

Aliquid seems a certain emendation of the manuscript reading *aliud*, but W. is justified in thinking that, even with this improvement, the text of this parenthesis still ails. We could obtain a plausible correspondence with the following parenthesis (*hic . . . erunt*) by reading *ubi erunt*, <in quibus> *aliquid secretius*, 'Sullae' e. q. s.

I 4,27 *iam quosdam illa turbabunt quae declinationibus non teruntur.*

There are some words like *tectum* which can be either adjectives or nouns.

No tolerable sense can be extracted from *non teruntur* (witness the attempt of W.¹ 63), and the conjectures *non tenentur* (the vulgate, 'are not determined') and *non feruntur* are scarcely improvements. Only Halm's *non cernuntur* (not mentioned by later editors) gives intelligible sense: the two words (*tectum* 'hidden' and *tectum* 'roof') are not distinguished by their declensions. The simple verb *cerno* is used in this sense by Cicero in his *Rhetorica* (cf. *ThLL* III 864,57ff.), but *non <dis>cernuntur* would perhaps be preferable.

I 6,2 *auctoritas ab oratoribus uel historicis peti solet (nam poetas metri necessitas excusat, nisi si quando nihil impediante in utroque modulatione pedum alterum malunt, qualia sunt 'imo de stirpe recisum' . . . et similia), cum summorum in eloquentia uirorum iudicium pro ratione, et uel error honestus est magnos duces sequentibus.*

This passage is helpfully discussed by W.¹ 65f.: he establishes the case for the punctuation given above, with the reference to poets forming a parenthesis and 'the *cum* clause attaching itself to the main part of the sentence about the need to look for authority to the great orators and historians'; the *cum* clause is then causal, and Halm's change of *est* to *sit* is 'very attractive'. As an alternative to this I would suggest the change of *cum* to *quin*; the close of the sentence then corroborates and amplifies the beginning ('authority is derived from orators and historians; indeed, the judgment of the greatest orators

* The following editions are referred to: Spalding (1798-1816); Halm (1868-69); Colson (Book 1, 1924); W. = Winterbottom (OCT, 1970). W.¹ (followed by a page-number) = M. Winterbottom, *Problems in Quintilian*, BICS Suppl. 25 (1970).

I am very grateful to Professors J. Delz and M. Winterbottom for commenting on an earlier version of these notes.

carries as much weight as reason'). It is a bonus that the final clause is not then subordinated to the first, a construction which could be regarded as awkward with so long a parenthesis intervening.

II 5,18 . . . *non ita difficilis supererit quaestio, qui legendi sint incipientibus. . . .* (19) *ego optimos quidem et statim et semper, sed tamen eorum candidissimum quemque et maxime expositum uelim, ut Liuuium a pueris magis quam Sallustium.*

A pueris has no obvious construction. If it means 'by boys', one must either understand or insert *legi* somewhere (perhaps best either before or after *uelim*). Spalding took it to mean 'from boyhood'; in that case its proper place, I suggest, is after *statim*; cf. XI 2,41 *pueri statim . . . quam plurima ediscant*; Tac. Ann. XIII 3,3 *puerilibus statim annis*.

III 7,12 *ipsius uero laus hominis ex animo et corpore et extra positus peti debet. et corporis quidem fortuitorumque cum leuior, tum non uno modo tractanda est. . . .* (15) *animi semper uera laus, sed non una per hoc opus uia ducitur.*

Quintilian is discussing *laudationes*.

W. queries *uera*, but it is sound, as is shown by Cic. *De orat.* 2,342 *genus forma uires opes diuitiae cetera, quae fortuna dat aut extrinsecus aut corpori, non habent in se ueram laudem, quae deberi uirtuti uni putatur*. The sense must then be 'praise given to character (as opposed to physical characteristics and external advantages) is always genuine praise'.

III 7,17 *tempus quod finem hominis insequitur non semper tractare contingit, non solum quod uiuentes aliquando laudamus sed quod rara haec occasio est, ut referri possint diuini honores et decreta et publice statuae constitutae.*

Quintilian is still discussing *laudationes*.

'It is not always that we have an opportunity of dealing with the time after a man's death.' This suggests that we usually do have such an opportunity, a suggestion which is incompatible with what follows. I think that *semper* should be *saepe*, with which it is often confused.

'We sometimes praise the living.' Not only is this a ludicrous understatement but it is no sort of reason for what precedes, that we do not always get a chance to praise the dead. Perhaps the text is lacunose; e.g. *quod <plerumque> uiuentes, aliquando <tamen recens mortuos>, laudamus*. A reference to *laudationes funebres* would be quite in place.

V 10,44 . . . *interim probationes inexpugnabiles adferat (sc. tempus), quales sunt si dicatur . . . signator qui ante diem tabularum decessit, aut commisisse aliquid uel cum infans esset uel cum omnino natus non esset.*

Considerations of time can sometimes provide incontestible proofs.

W. notes that the clause beginning with *aut* (a certain emendation of *an*) 'limps' ('claudicat'). I think it does so because *commisisse (dicatur)* has no subject corresponding to *qui . . . decessit*, the subject of *dicatur (esse)*. It is easy to insert a suitable subject: read *commisisse <quis> aliquid*.

VI 3,94 *est gratus iocus qui minus exprobrat quam potest, ut idem (sc. Afer) dicenti candidato 'semper domum tuam colui', cum posset palam negare, 'credo' inquit, †et uerum†.*

The latest discussions of this passage are those of D. R. Shackleton Bailey (HSCP 87, 1983, 222) and C. E. Murgia (CQ n. s. 41, 1991, 187f.). The latter would just delete the troublesome words *et uerum*, with an explanation of their presence in the text which I find incredible. The former emends *et* to *ut*, and thinks that the point lies in the ambiguity of *ut uerum*: (a) 'as (being) true', (b) 'as is right'. I too would read *ut* for *et*, but take *ut uerum* as an ironical exclamation, 'how true!' There is a similar ironical exclamation at IX 3,43 *hoc ipsum quam nouum!*

VI 3,105 *urbanus homo [non] erit cuius multa bene dicta responsaque erunt, et qui in sermonibus circulis conuiuuiis, item in contionibus, omni denique loco ridicule commodeque dicet. risus erit quicumque haec faciet orator.*

Domitius Marsus's definition of the *urbanus homo*.

W.¹ 113 finds the last sentence very difficult, and is inclined to delete either *orator* or both *item in contionibus* and *risus*. I should merely change *erit* to <f>*eret* (the initial letter having been lost after the last letter of *risus*). The first sentence is quite general, applying both to social life and to public speaking; the second sentence is an additional note on the latter, picking up *in contionibus* and giving the reaction of the audience.

VI 4,14 *omnia †tempore† fere parata sunt meditatis diligenter quae [quid] aut ex aduerso dici aut responderi a nobis possunt. nonnumquam tamen solet hoc quoque esse artis genus, ut quaedam in actione dissimulata subito in altercando proferantur.*

omnia H: *omni* A

'In the normal course of events, every preparation has been made by the orator if he has carefully gone over in his mind what his opponent may say and what he may reply. But sometimes there is a further trick: things not mentioned in the set-speech can be brought up suddenly in the *altercatio*.' So W.¹ 114, who proceeds to express a preference for the excision of *tempore* as imported from the end of § 13 *tempora*. It is certainly possible that this word may have had an influence, but it is more likely to have done so if there stood in the original text a somewhat similar word; I suggest *semper* (the confusion of initial *s* and *t*, as in *solus/totus*, is not uncommon).

VII 3,19 *eius certus ordo est, quid sit, an hoc sit, et in hoc fere labor maior est, ut finitionem confirmes, quam ut †in finitionem† adplices.*

There is generally more difficulty in establishing a definition (*quid sit*) than in applying it (*an hoc sit*).

The vulgate inserts *rem* after *in*, 'apply the definition to the matter in question'. W.¹ 123, objecting to this construction of *adplicare*, substitutes the usual dative *rei* (in place of *in*). Murgia (l.c. 196ff.) would just delete *in finitionem*. I think it possible that Quintilian wrote *quam ut confirmatam adplices*, and that a scribe, having to repeat one of the two contiguous words *finitionem* and *confirm-*, has repeated the wrong one. This is a source of error which is not uncommon but not always recognized; there is a good example at IX 3,18 '*nam neque Pindi*' (*potest enim deesse alterum 'nam'*), where instead of repeating *nam* the scribe of A has repeated *neque*.

IX 2,55 *in quo est et illa, si tamen inter schemata numerari debet, cum aliis etiam pars causae uideatur, digressio; abit enim †causa† in laudes Cn. Pompei.*

causa B: *augusta* A

Cicero's panegyric on Pompey formed a digression in his (lost) speech *Pro Cornelio*.

Although W. does not obelize, his critical note tells us that he approves of neither *causa* nor *augusta*. The former can be construed, but it is probably merely a repetition of the preceding *causae*, inserted to provide a subject for *abit*; but the natural subject of *abit* is *Cicero*, easily understood. It is from the unintelligible *augusta* that emendation should start. Could this be a misreading of a badly written *actutum*? In support of this guess I adduce another passage in which Quintilian mentions this same panegyric of Pompey, viz. IV 3,13 *quo ex genere est . . . [in oratione] pro C. Cornelio popularis illa uirtutum Cn. Pompei commemoratio, in quam ille diuinus orator, . . . abrupto quem inchoauerat sermone, deuertit actutum.*

IX 4,62 *haec est sedes orationis, hoc auditor expectat, hic laus omnis †declamat†.*

Quintilian is discussing the clausula.

The available conjectures (*declamatoris* and *declamantium, exclamat, et clamor, declaratur*) are a dull lot, as well as palaeographically unsatisfactory. I suggest *detonat*, a verb which Quintilian uses at XII 9,4 of the thunderous applause at the end of a speech. In that passage the word means ‘tonare desinere’; here it would mean ‘uehementer tonare’ (*ThLL* V1 819,13ff.), of the thunderous applause at the clausula.

X 1,70 *sed mihi longe magis orator probari in opere suo uidetur* (sc. *Menander*; test. 101,6-9 Kassel-Austin), *nisi forte aut illa †mala† iudicia quae Epitrepontes, Epicleros, Locroe habent . . . non omnibus oratoriis numeris sunt absolutae*.

Mala is omitted by one of the two main witnesses; it is more probable that it fell out after *illa* than that it is a dittography of *illa*. An easy change which makes sense would be *nota*; cf. III 1,14 *noto . . . illo . . . uersu*; V 11,19 *nota illa . . . fabula*; VIII 3,29 *nec minus noto . . . epigrammate*.

X 5,10 *plurimum autem parari facultatis existimo ex simplicissima quaque materia. . . . (11) illud †uirtutis† indicium est, fundere quae natura contracta sunt, augere parua, uarietatem similibus uoluptatem expositis dare, et bene dicere multa de paucis*.

uirtutis] v.l. *uirtutum*

Paraphrasing simple material is best for developing facility in the use of language.

Both *uirtus* and *uirtutes* are out of place in this context. Read *uertatis* (an emendation which I owe to Professor Delz); there is a very similar corruption at Cic. *Off.* III,5, where *uberior* has become *uerior* in one branch of the tradition. The further corruption of *uirtutis* to *uirtutum* is due to anticipation of the ending of *indicium*.

XI 2,21 *quod de domo dixi, et in operibus publicis et in itinere longo et urbium ambitu et picturis fieri potest; etiam fingere sibi has †imagines† licet. opus est ergo locis quae uel finguntur uel sumuntur, <et> imaginibus uel simulacris, quae utique fingenda sunt; ‘imagines’ uoco quibus ea quae ediscenda sunt notamus*.

Quintilian has just described a mnemonic system in which the various things which we want to commit to memory are linked by means of symbols to various rooms in a house. He now says that things other than a house could serve the purpose, and that they could be imaginary, not real.

Spalding realized that *imagines* must be corrupt because Quintilian carefully distinguishes between the *loca*, real or imaginary, and the symbols or *imagines* by which we denote what we want to learn by heart, and which we entrust to these *loca*. Instead of *imagines*, therefore, what is required is a feminine equivalent of *loca*. W., who is the only editor to pay any attention to Spalding, tentatively suggests *regiones*, but I think that *sedes* would be preferable on every count. ‘The corruption would be psychological (there are many *imagines* hereabouts)’, W.¹ 202.

XII 10,45 *quapropter ne illis quidem nimium repugno qui dandum putant nonnihil esse temporibus atque auribus nitidius aliquid atque adfectius postulantibus*.

If one doubts the Latinity of *adfectius* = ‘more emotional’ (cf. W.¹ 214), rather than resort to the minor variant *effectius*, we might be well advised to resuscitate *adfect<at>ius*, a conjecture attributed by Spalding to Aldus. I do not think that this is ruled out by the disparaging sense of the word, or by the fact that *nitor* and *adfectatio* are elsewhere contrasted, e.g. at XI 3,10 *qui . . . in dicendo curam et artem et nitorem et quidquid studio paratur ut adfectata et parum naturalia solent improbare*; it is quite credible that Quintilian should have used the word of the oratorical taste of his contemporaries (*temporibus* has sometimes been misunderstood).