I

B.L. HIJMANS

STYLISTIC SPLENDOR, FAILURE TO PERSUADE*

1. Introduction

Intermissa, Venus, diu rursus bella moues?
Parce precor, precor.

It is hard to return to an author after having neglected him for fifteen years, partly through a sense of frustration, partly through an irrational but growing dislike — in fact just such a confused emotion as Seneca himself tells me to suppress and, if possible, eradicate. I shall not dwell on the frustration, but the fact that the dislike is shared by many makes it a little more interesting. The dislike, I think, is in part due to the fact that today Seneca *philosophus* fails to persuade. Towards the end of this contribution I hope I shall have identified — for myself at least — some of the reasons for this failure.

---

2. An instance of *sermocinatio*

I should like to start with an old controversy: does Seneca imitate the emperor Claudius' style in *Polyb*. 14-16? Dahlmann 1936, 374 f. thought he did and Kennedy 1972, 469 still agrees, Abel's objections (1967, 89 n. 50) notwithstanding. Rather than addressing the question in terms of personal style I should like to determine whether and in what ways Claudius' speech differs stylistically from the preceding praise of Claudius. To begin with the rhythms of the respective sections, it appears that there is a difference in the length of the cola:

	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21 and more syll.
Polyb.						
12-13	13.1	23.7	33.6	11.5	12.7	6.6%
14-16	3.5	18.2	27.8	27.8	9.6	12%[1]

The most obvious difference is that Seneca makes Claudius use far more cola of some considerable length than he allows himself in his praise of Claudius. I do not wish to jump to a simple and impressionistic answer to the question as to why he does so: a simple observation raises a preliminary question.

---

[1] Though the sample is very small I use percentages in order to be in a position to compare the numbers here to samples of different lengths. Presently I shall argue that not only Seneca but other authors, too, use colon length as a means of expression, a fact that usually remains hidden in the overall statistics used to determine an author's «personal style and its development».

3. A mesorhythmic technique

a. Very long cola occur in both sections. In Seneca's praise of Claudius I note:

12,3 *quanto melius beneficiis imperium custodiatur quam armis* (26 syllables)

12,4 *nonne protinus ipse conspectus per se tantummodo cogitatusque Caesar maximo solacio tibi est* (32 syllables)

12,5 *Sera et nepotibus demum nostris dies nota sit qua illum gens sua caelo adserat* (25 syllables)

13,1 *patere quidquid prioris principis furor concussit in suum locum restituere ac reponere* (30 syllables)

13,2 *et in praeceps euntem leniter diuinae manus usus moderatione deposuit* (27 syllables)

and, finally, towards the end of the section (14,1):

(Iam te omni confirmauit modo (9 syll.)*,)*
iam omnia exempla quibus ad animi aequitatem compellereris tenacissima memoria rettulit (31 syll.)*,*
iam omnium praecepta sapientium adsueta sibi facundia explicuit (23/4 syll.)*.*

In the whole section these are the only cola showing more than 21 syllables[2] and I note that all of them deal directly with the emperor, in itself perhaps not all that surprising in a passage that sings his praise and in which quite a few of the shorter cola

---

[2]   I do not list 12,4 *cum tanta illi aduersus omnes suos sit mansuetudo tantaque indulgentia,* since the cretic + trochee of *mansuetudo* constitutes one of Seneca's most common clausulae and hence presumably the end of a colon.

do the same. Nevertheless it is interesting that something very similar appears to be the case in the very long cola in Claudius' consolatory speech:

14,3   *Nemo non ex istis in ornamentum saeculorum refulgentibus uiris* (22 syllables)

14,5   *illam familiae suae super ipsum Pauli triumphum concidentis subitam uastitatem* (27 syllables)[3]

15,1   *cuius morte optime cohaerentis Romanae pacis uincula resoluta sunt* (22 syllables)

15,2   *Innumerabilia undique exempla separatorum morte fratrum succurrunt* (23 syllables)

ibid.   *immo contra uix ulla umquam horum paria conspecta sunt una senescentia* (23 syllables)

15,3   *et ne ei quidem rerum natura lugendi necessitatem abstulit cui caelum destinauerat* (28 syllables)[4]

ibid.   *Tamen tot tantosque luctus cepit rerum omnium capacissimum eius pectus* (22 syllables)

ibid.   *uictorque diuus Augustus non gentium tantummodo externarum sed etiam dolorum fuit* (28 syllables)

15,4   *princeps iuuentutis principem eiusdem iuuentutis amisit in apparatu Parthici belli* (28 syllables)

ibid.   *et grauiore multo animi uulnere quam postea corporis ictus est* (22 syllables)

16,2   *Eo ipso tempore quo Marcus Antonius ciuium suorum uitae sedebat mortisque arbiter* (28 syllables)

---

[3]   The hyperbaton *illam... uastitatem* secures the colon.

[4]   In this case an ancient reader (see below pp. 16 ff.) may well have spoken the sentence with a pause after *abstulit*, though usually brief relative clauses do not form separate cola, cf. FRAENKEL 1968, 127; HIJMANS 1976, 84 n. 6.

ibid. Tulit hoc tamen tam triste uulnus eadem magnitudine animi Marcus Antonius (26 syllables).

All of these deal with an elevated person either dying or mourning the death of a brother or sister, or a very closely related thought. Again, this is not surprising in view of the main subject of the passage, and again there are shorter cola that deal with the same subject. In one case we may have a counter instance: at first sight I had listed 15,5 *intima Germaniae recludentem et gentes ferocissimas Romano subicientem imperio* (29 syllables) as a single colon, but the two participial constructions, of which the first shows an excellent clausula (cretic + trochee), require a pause after *recludentem*.

b.   Having thus tentatively isolated a technique employed in both passages[5] I must return to the equally observable differences: Claudius' speech not only presents more very long cola, but if we look at the cola of more moderate lengths we observe that the longer ones occur with considerably more frequency than they do in Seneca's praise of Claudius; the conclusion is obvious: mesorhythmically considered Claudius' speech makes an entirely different impression[6] and as a result the fewer very

---

[5]   I had not found this technique in my analysis of seven letters of Seneca, though I did suggest that on several occasions very long cola may be illustrative of their own content (HIJMANS 1976, 89 f.).

[6]   I employ the terms microrhythm, mesorhythm, and macrorhythm on the respective level of syllabic lengths, colometric lengths, and the lengths and arrangement of major sections of a text: in the first two cases the employment of the word rhythm is self-evident, in the third (I have described some interesting instances in the final section of my *Inlaboratus et facilis*) it may be useful to note its most common definition: the arrangement of sound and/or movement in time.

long cola of Seneca's praise of Claudius are at the same time
more conspicuous. Let us look at the sentence that — more than
80 years ago — aroused the ire of Mr. Steyns (1907, 125 f.):
«Sénèque ne craint pas d'appeler l'empereur Claude: 'Cet astre
brillant qui...' etc., égalant ainsi en basse adulation les courtisans
les plus plats du 'Roi Soleil'.» Seneca writes (13,1)

> *sidus hoc*
> *quod praecipitato in profundum et demerso in tenebras orbi refulsit*
> *semper luceat*

3 + 20 + 5 syllables. The image[7] is linked with the emperor's divi-
nity, cf. 12,3 *numinis*; *fulgor eius*. That divinity, we understand,
is a shining light, a sun, which draws the eye and dries the eyes
of Polybius. In that connection I draw attention to the anapho-
ric *illo... illo* (referring to the emperor) and the anaphoric *illos...
illos* (referring to Polybius' eyes) in the same paragraph. That
paragraph also has the asyndeton *praesidii, solacii*. The emperor,
rebus humanis praesidente, is to be regarded by Polybius as his
praesidium, a rich notion that involves both protection and aid,
defence and remedy; *praesidere* of course means «watch over»
and is regularly applied to tutelary gods (*OLD*). It would seem
to me that the two asyndetically linked notions apply both to
Polybius and to Seneca: *solacium* as a quality of the emperor
occurs twice in § 4 with reference to Polybius, once in 13,3 with
reference to Seneca and finally in 14,1 where the emperor is cal-
led the *publicum omnium hominum solacium*. *Praesidium* is not

---

[7] Seneca uses the same image, though in a rather more restrained manner,
at *Clem.* I 3, 3 *tamquam ad clarum ac beneficum sidus certatim aduolant.*
In this context, especially since presently Claudius' representation as
Jupiter will be alluded to, the words *maximus* and *optimus* at *Clem.* I 19,
8-9 are suggestive as Gordon WILLIAMS, *Change and Decline. Roman
Literature in the Early Empire*, Sather Classical Lectures, 45 (Berkeley
1978), 158 f. rightly points out.

developed on the surface, but stealthily returns in the phrase (13,2) *et in praeceps euntem leniter diuinae manus usus moderatione deposuit. Moderatio, iustitia* and *clementia* (13,3) are the main characteristics of this divinity as far as Seneca is concerned (or at least as far as he wants to emphasise here) and in the end the totality of the notions used culminates in the image of the authority of a divine oracle. The divinity may even be identified: 13,4 *scias licet ea demum fulmina esse iustissima quae etiam percussi colunt.* In the Vatican there is a statue of Claudius represented as Jupiter.[8]

It should be noted, too, that the long descriptive adjectival clause is flanked by two extremely brief commatia. There are sixteen of these in Seneca's introduction, a mere four in the speech he puts in Claudius' mouth. Seeing that we are dealing with two fairly brief passages, that fact accounts for much of the mesorhythmic difference one feels between the two sections — indeed far more so than the numerical variation in the clausulae employed at the colon-ends. If we except the small commatia the introduction has 24 instances of clausulae of type 1 (cretic + trochee, including its several variations) as against Claudius' speech 29, type 2 (dicretic + variations) occurs respectively 21 and 17 times, type 3 (ditrochee + variations) 30 and 33 times , hypodochmic type 4 (+ variations) 37 and 31 times respectively. The variation in these numbers is entirely consistent with the small size of both passages. But the two aspects of meso- and

---

[8]   Described in G. LIPPOLD, *Die Skulpturen des Vaticanischen Museums* III (Berlin 1936), 137 f. The statue is more than life size, the Jupiter aspect unmistakable because of the eagle at the emperor's right foot. According to Lippold the *patera* in the emperor's right hand is a mistaken restoration: it should have been a lightning bolt. For Claudius as Jupiter on cameos see A. FURTWÄNGLER, *Antike Gemmen* III 320 f. Cf. *ILS*[2] 219, inscr. on a porticus consecrated jointly to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus and Claudius (*divus* before his death?) at Salonae near Split.

microrhythm are of course not to be seen entirely separately. The total impression on the audience includes the impact of the small commatia (rhythmic units themselves) of which there are a considerable number in Seneca's introduction and very few in Claudius' speech. The first few chapters of *De beneficiis* and of *De clementia* show much the same difference with 34 and 7 such items in 200 respectively. Now these include only those small commatia that cannot, or had better not be listed under the symbol of a known clausula. If we add the instances that coincide with a clausula rhythm the numbers are as follows:

Polyb. (S)	*Polyb.* (C)	*Ben.*	*Clem.*
23	9	52	18

These absolute numbers are not comparable since the samples from *Polyb.* are shorter than those from *Ben.* and *Clem.*, hence percentages:

Polyb. (S)	*Polyb.* (C)	*Ben.*	*Clem.*
18.8	7.8	25	8.7

It is obvious that the differences are considerable. For the evaluation of the phenomenon, however, we first need some further materials for comparison and secondly some discussion of the questions that may be asked of the observations.

4. Semiotic function of rhythms

The following tables show the data observed in several samples of Senecan prose as well as some from Cicero and Apuleius. The Seneca samples do not include all dialogues, the sample of the letters combines data from the seven letters

I studied earlier? In the present context it might have been better to choose new letters, preferably selected by subject. I shall return to that point later. The data include both colon-lengths and clausula-rhythms, but those could not, of course, be combined in a table designed for comparison.

TABLE I

colon lengths in percentages

syllables	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21 and over
Cic. *Dom.*	6.5	30	33	20.5	6	5
Sen. *Marc.*	10	27.5	30	19.5	10	5.5
Polyb. (S)	13	23.7	33.6	11.4	12.7	6.5
Polyb. (C)	3.5	18.2	27.8	27.8	9.5	12
Apoc.	10	29	40	17	3	1.5
Clem.	3	26.5	31.5	27.5	10	5
Ben.	14.5	34.5	32.5	13	7	1.5
Ep.	8.2	35.1	32.6	15.9	5.6	2.4
Nat. I praef.	5.5	22.5	32.5	21.5	8.5	4
Nat. I 1 f.	7	25	29	23.5	10	5
Apul. *Met.*	7.7	22.1	29.7	24.1	10.6	5.6
Apul. *Socr.*	3	33	26	20.5	11	5.5

TABLE II

«clausulae» in percentages

claus.[10]	1	1*	2	2*	3	3*	4	4*	«X»
Marc.	12.5	16.5	8	8	11.5	15	6	9.5	18.5
Polyb. (S)	8.2	10.6	12.3	4.9	15.5	10.6	9	21.3	13.1
Polyb. (C)	12.2	14.8	8.7	6.1	17.4	9.5	7.8	20.8	0.8
Apoc.	9.5	14	8	4.5	15.5	22	4	11.5	10.5
Clem.	14.4	16.5	6	8	11.5	19	10	14	3.5

---

[9] *Inlaboratus et facilis.*

[10] For the notation used in this contribution see *Inlaboratus et facilis*, 10 and 107. For the purposes of this table all derivatives of type 1 have been lumped together as 1*, and the same has been done for the derivatives of the other main types.

claus.	1	1*	2	2*	3	3*	4	4*	«x»
Ben.	9.5	17.5	7.5	7	12	18	3	11.5	17
Ep.	23	20.5	11.8	6.2	13.1	10.7	5.9	8.4	10.3
Nat. I praef.	18.5	17	14	5.5	7.5	10	7.5	4	4.5
Nat. I 1 f.	21.5	15	14	9.5	13	9	6	4	7
Apul. Met.	9.8	9.4	4.7	5.8	23.7	19.9	6.2	9.16[11]	
Apul. Socr.	13.5	16	13	4	19.5	20	4	9	3.5

In *De deo Socratis* Apuleius is standing in front of a large audience; in fact its character of «formal address» is obvious throughout the work. The meso-rhythmic fact of a dearth of small commatia is all the more striking in comparison with the same author's *Metamorphoses*.[12]

But one of the most striking facts in the table of colon lengths is that the differences observed between Seneca's introduction and Claudius' speech in *Ad Polybium* are similar to the differences between the beginnings of *De beneficiis* and *De clementia*.[13]

If we then look at the handling of the *clausulae*, which within the very small samples from *Ad Polybium* showed inconclusive variation, we see that now rather more striking differences may

---

[11] For the values of Apuleius' *Met.* I have made use of the statistics I presented in my «*Asinus numerosus*». No value for «x» was presented there.

[12] A sample from the *Apology* would be helpful here, but had to be left out *propter breuitatem uitae*. The scarcity of short commatia becomes even clearer if we look at the clausulae percentages, where «x» combines various returning rhythms of up to six syllables (cf. HIJMANS 1976, 113) exclusive of those very short ones that coincide with a recognised clausula rhythm. If we add the latter to «x» we get for

Marc.	Polyb. (S)	Polyb. (C)	Apoc.	Clem.	Ben.	Nat. I praef.	Nat. I 1 f.	Apul. Socr.
25	18	7.5	19	9	26	9.5	8.5	7%

Though here the percentages show smaller differences, still the speeches of «Claudius» and Apuleius yield the lowest percentage.

[13] On the speech character of the first book of *Clem.*, see GRIMAL 1978, 83.

be observed. The most striking among them concerns the percentages shown with the sample of *Epistulae* as against the other samples. To check the dependability of the figures for «Ep.» I listed the percentages for the *clausulae* of *Letter 29*, where I found:

1	1*	2	2*	3	3*	4	4*	«X»
14.5	17.5	16	3.7	13.8	14.5	3.6	5.8	11

The difference with the values for the larger sample of letters is obvious and needs to be accounted for. I start with the figures for the individual *epistulae* that made up the larger sample:

	1	1*	2	2*	3	3*	4	4*	«X»
1	23	21.5	12.3	12.3	4.6	7.7	4.6	6.1	6.1
26	14.8	18.7	10.9	7	7.8	5.5·	4.7	8.6	22.6
41	19.4	19.4	11.9	4.2	8.4	9.3	3.3	9.3	13.5
75	16.4	14.2	11.6	3.1	15.8	13.2	9	5.3	11.6
80	25.8	15.5	12	3.4	12	7.7	2.5	5.2	15.5
100	26.3	11	9.8	6.1	13.4	5.5	4.9	8	13.4
122	17.7	22.4	6.7	5.5	11	11.3	4.6	8	13.5

The impression is strong that, viewed microrhythmically, the various letters differ considerably among each other. It is true of course that the samples are very small and therefore not a very good base for statistical generalizations. But the differences may well have been audible. On the other hand the distribution of colonlengths shows rather less variation, but the group as a whole differs considerably from several of the other works in this respect:

	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21 and over
1	6.1	46.1	38.4	4.6	1.5	3
26	14.8	39	28.9	12.5	3.1	1.5
41	9.3	34.7	33	11.8	6.7	4.2
75	6.9	35.9	33.3	15.8	6.3	2.5
80	5.1	32.7	34.5	17.2	6.9	4.2
100	8.6	33.1	33.7	15.9	5.5	2.4
122	7.1	32	30.8	22.3	6.3	1.3
29	9.5	28.6	37.5	17.6	5.1	3.6

One result that seems clear enough from this exercise is that *Letter* 1 stands out both micro- and mesorhythmically from the rest. It has the largest percentage of clausulae of type 1 and its derivatives, as well as by far the largest percentage of cola in the 5-12 syllable range. If we regard the figures statistically it must be admitted that this may be due to the fact that it is the shortest letter in the group. But since we are speaking of audible phenomena, an ancient reader may have linked the fact with its position as the introductory letter of the collection as a whole![14] *Letter* 26 with its relatively many very short cola and fewer clausulae of type 1 with derivatives must have had an entirely different auditive effect. The difference signalled here is parallelled by some differences of movement: in *Letter* 1 very serious advice for Lucilius is turned around towards the end to become a somewhat ironic[15] statement about Seneca's own

---

[14] I see no argument here in the debate whether the correspondence is «real».

[15] MAURACH 1969, 169 notes that Seneca very rarely becomes ironic. In my opinion it is his one saving grace that at least he can sometimes treat himself and his own reactions ironically. RUSSELL 1974, 79 ff., quotes some fine instances, especially *Ep.* 83,4 *Hic* [sc. *Pharius*] *quidem ait nos eandem crisin habere, quia utrique dentes cadunt.* But he can also treat

situation. *Letter* 26 starts with Seneca's half-ironic treatment of his own old age which further on turns into a very serious *meditatio mortis*. However, not by any stretch of the imagination can this difference of rhythm and movement of mood be ascribed to a difference of genre. On the other hand we must recognise that *Letter* 26 starts as if it were the continuation of a conversation and runs into an *adlocutio sui*, whereas *Letter* 1 is formally the answer to a letter from Lucilius (1,1 *scribo*; 1,2 *scribis*).[16]

Letters 41 and 80 like *Ep.* 1 have fairly high percentages of clausula 1 and derivatives, make a somewhat sparing use of very short commata and have the highest count of very long cola. The two letters share an element of *contemplatio* — the famous *Letter* 41 of signs of *religio*, *Letter* 80 of the vain and the valuable. *Letters* 75 and 100 share to a large extent subject and colometry, but not so much their microrhythm. But, whatever the varia-

---

both persons and subjects with a measure of humorous irony: cf. e.g. *Ep.* 58 in which he asks Lucilius quite humbly to allow him — «please» — to use the word *essentia* and assures him that the licence will probably be enough.

[16] For *dicere* and *scribere* as indicators of genre one may compare e.g. *Ep.* 89, 23, of letters close to conversation *Ep.* 10 is a good example, of letters more formally conceived as written *Ep.* 23. In *Ep.* 24 I get the impression that the «sollicitum te esse *scribis*» at the beginning soon after recedes for the fiction of the spoken word, but the formal written letter returns in § 21 in the context of paraenetic writing. I cannot develop the distinction here, but it may well be worth further investigation. Cf. Apuleius, who plays interesting intertextual games throughout the *Met.* and who uses such phrases as (IX 14, p. 213, 6 ff. Helm) *fabulam... bonam... ad auris uestras adferre decreui* and (X 2, p.237, 2 f. Helm) *ut uos etiam legatis, ad librum profero* as signals to the reader to expect different types of intertextual situations, as was shown recently by Maaike ZIMMERMAN in a paper read at the *Second International Conference on the Ancient Novel* (Dartmouth, July 23-29, 1989). See J. TATUM and G.M. VERNAZZA (edd.), *The Ancient Novel: Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives* (Hanover, N.H., 1990), 129 f.

tions shown by the individual letters, the group of letters as a whole shows a markedly different distribution of colon-lengths and of clausula-rhythms when compared to the samples of other prose.

I must emphasise again that my samples were very small,[17] and I am fully aware that this means that they are unsuitable for *statistic* comparison. On the other hand their very brevity ensures a reasonable degree of generic homogeneity. To the notion of genre I shall return later. Here I suggest that the differences observed appear to indicate that micro- and meso-rhythms in their audible effect help the ancient reader to recognise the multiple levels of genre and subgenre he was faced with in contemporary prose.[18] If we note a similarity in the rhythms of Claudius' speech in *Polyb.* and of the first few pages of *De clementia*, an ancient reader may well have known these rhythms to be appropriate for speeches and acted accordingly — in other words, if my hypothesis is right and there truly is a demonstrable link between micro- and meso-rhythmic features of a text and its genre(s), we may well have to treat these features as signs to the reader how he is to perform.

---

[17]   Cic. *Dom.* (taken from FRAENKEL 1968, to which I added a small section to reach 200 cola); Sen. *Marc.* 1, 1-3, 1; *Polyb.* (S) 12, 1-14, 2; *Polyb.* (C) 14, 2-16, 1; *Apoc.* 1-7 (verse excluded); *Clem.* I 1, 1-I 3, 5; *Ben.* I 1, 1-I 2, 5; *Ep.* 1, 26, 41, 75, 80, 100, 122 (*Inlaboratus et facilis*) and 29; *Nat.* I praef.; *Nat.* I 1, 1-I 2, 4; Apul. *Met.* VII («*Asinus numerosus*»); Apul. *Socr.* 115-129. Had time permitted I would have added a sample from Cicero's *philosophica* and from Apuleius' *Apology*.

[18]   This is not the place to discuss other functions of rhythm, such as the mnemotechnic assistance it gives, not only in verse, but also in such very prosaic situations as the need to remember a long telephone or bank account number: many people will arrange a series of numbers in groups of three or two and then repeat it, often aloud and with marked pitch differences at the points of accent.

But of course the characterisation «speech» is not sufficient, for Claudius is made to give a consolatory speech as different from a consolatory letter[19] or a consolatory treatise. The latter, I believe, must be seen as the framing genre which may encompass such subgenres as consolatory speech and e.g. consolatory discussion between (implied) author and (implied) audience. Another such consolatory speech is referred to in the *Cons. ad Marciam* where Seneca «quotes» (4, 3-5, 6) a speech such as Areus might have held (4,3 *Hic, ut opinor, aditus illi fuit*) to Julia Augusta and in applying the example to Marcia uses the words: *tibi Areus adsedit* thus giving us a hint as to what circumstances we are to imagine on such occasions. If that speech of consolation is an instance of a practised genre in domestic rhetoric, how are we to classify Seneca's introductory *laudatio Claudii*? It certainly looks like a sort of panegyric. But a panegyric properly speaking was a formal *oratio* pronounced in public. Here we have a passage within a treatise, a treatise purporting to have an audience of one at that, and though its vocabulary and imagery lack all informality, its colometry marks it as much closer to the openings chapters of *Marc.* or of *Ben.* — let us say, for the time being: dialogue.

---

[19] Such as e.g. the well-known letter in which Servius Sulpicius consoles Cicero (*Ad fam.* IV 5). In that letter the writer clearly refers to a formal speech of consolation: *qui si istic adfuissem neque tibi defuissem coramque meum dolorem tibi declarassem*. He subsequently refers to *genus hoc consolationis* which R.Y. TYRRELL and L.C. PURSER, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, V ([2]1915), 19, gloss with «consolation generally». W.W. HOW and A.C. CLARK (edd.), *Select Letters*, II (Oxford 1926), 428 and D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY (ed.), *Epistulae ad familiares*, II (Cambridge 1977), 415 undervalue the generic reference in speaking of mere «condolences».

5. Reading and performing

What I have so far been engaged in was a rather primitive rendering in numerical and visual form of something which for both author and audience was an auditive situation. At this point it may be useful to note a few facts and surmises about the reading practices of roughly contemporary Romans. I should like to start with a glaring, but too often forgotten fact, viz. that a very large number of Romans could not read at all, not because they had not learnt to do so, but because their eyesight would no longer allow them to read.[20] The *lector*, then, played an important practical role as an indispensable intermediary between a text and its recipient. The younger Pliny (*Epist.* III 5, 5) has the following anecdote about a reading-scene at his uncle's: *Memini quendam ex amicis, cum lector quaedam perperam pronuntiasset, reuocasse et repeti coegisse; huic auunculum meum dixisse: «Intellexeras nempe?» cum ille annuisset: «Cur ergo reuocabas? Decem amplius uersus hac tua interpella-*

---

[20] *The Encyclopedia Brittannica, Macropedia,* Vol. 27 (15th ed. 1985), 180, notes that the near point of accommodation for normal eyes (*sic*) at 40 years of age is about 16 centimeters, at 60 ca. 100 centimeters. *Chamber's Encyclopedia,* Vol. 5 (1973), 524, says that between 45 and 50 normal eyes can no longer read fine print, even if very clearly defined. For us it is important to realize that the papyri, even in pristine state, would not count as clearly defined. One should add, of course, the apparently high incidence of eye infections — *lippitudo* is mentioned regularly from Plautus (*Rud.* 632), through Horace (*Sat.* I 5, 30) and Celsus (I 5, 1) to Arnobius, *Nat.* VII 34 (*lippulus*). *CIL* XIII 10021 has a fascinating collection of *signacula oculariorum* several of which mention *lippitudo* (e.g. nrs. 50, 55, 78), among several other eye complaints. It is interesting, then, that in all likelihood Seneca during the time most of his extant works were written could himself — if he had normal eyes — barely read and progressively less well during the time he was associated with the Imperial court.

tione perdidimus.» Obviously *pronuntiare* here refers to an appropriate performance and the anecdote, while characterising the elder Pliny's voracious appetite for knowledge, tells us that the audience could be critical precisely on the point of performance. Even a large audience could be very appreciative: when Cicero discusses (*Orat.* 214) the nature of commata, cola and periods, he records the loud applause of a *contio* when a particularly impressive period ended in a well turned ditrochee?[21] Clearly even an audience of one, as in the case of private letters, or letters to be published at a later time, would very often be reached through a *lector*, and, what is more, speeches, treatises, presumably indeed all Seneca's extant works were composed orally, aloud, and dictated to a scribe. They were in fact heard, however piecemeal, before they were written?[22]

For a trained reader, then, serving an appreciative but critical audience, a text would contain (and would need to contain) sufficient signs to enable him to produce a creditable performance. Unfortunately we are not very well informed about the training of professional *lectores*. It must have been a careful training and presumably its aims and methods did not differ all that much from those at play in the training of a young orator. If so, Quintilian's rather extensive remarks on the training of the young orator in appropriate performance may be used here to form a

---

[21]   In 1939 H.M. HUBBELL said in a foot note to his translation in the Loeb edition that the applause must have been at least partly due to the political circumstances in which the words were uttered: an interesting instance of refusing to believe what one does not experience oneself.

[22]   So Pliny the Younger's practice: *Epist.* IX 36, 2 where A.N. SHERWIN-WHITE nastily notes (*The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary* [Oxford 1966], 517) that Pliny's *Panegyric* is a good instance of such piecemeal oral composition with insufficient attention paid to the «architectonics».

mental picture, especially the passage in which he discusses the
combination of rhythm and gesture (XI 3, 108 f.):

> Sunt quaedam latentes sermonis percussiones et quasi
> aliqui pedes ad quos plurimorum gestus cadit, ut sit unus
> motus: «nouum crimen», alter «Gai Caesar», tertius «et
> ante hanc diem», quartus «non auditum», deinde «propin-
> quus meus» et «ad te» et «Quintus Tubero» et «detulit».[23]
> Unde id quoque defluit uitium, ut iuuenes cum scribunt
> gestu praemodulati cogitationem, sic componant quo
> modo casura manus est.

Obviously Quintilian in characterising this *uitium* is not say-
ing that everyone in his time goes to such extremes, but at the
same time the passage shows unmistakably that the rhythms of
a prose passage would be accompanied by marked gesticulation.
One would dearly love to know whether professional *lectores*[24]
(for the most part presumably trained slaves) were taught to use
such methods in Seneca's time, or whether they, like readers of
books for the blind in the present-day Netherlands, on the con-
trary were told to keep voice-inflection, phrase-music and the

---

[23] This abomination of a performance concerns the opening sentence of
Cicero's *Pro Q. Ligario* (Cicero editions print *hunc*). In accordance with
the criteria developed by E. Fraenkel in his several colometric studies the
sentence, in print, would look as follows:

> Nouum crimen Gai Caesar
> et ante hunc diem non auditum
> propinquus meus ad te Quintus Tubero detulit.

Note that the two short cola together are almost equalled in length by
the longer one.

[24] Cic. *De orat.* I 136 refers to Crassus' *scriptor et lector Diphilus*; cf. *ibid.*
II 223; Suet. *Aug.* 78, 2. Cf. also e.g. the professional pride in the grave
inscription *Carmina Latina epigraphica* 1012: *Grammaticus léctorque fui
set lector eorum / móre, incorruptó qui placuere sonó.* Fr. Buecheler notes
ad loc.: «incorruptae pronuntiationis studium etiam elogii huius apices plu-
rimi ostendunt rectissime impositi.»

like to a minimum, because these might interfere with the listener's freedom of interpretation. The passage from Pliny quoted above argues the opposite.

But earlier in the same chapter (XI 3, 4) Quintilian makes a sharp distinction between acting and reading:

> *Documento sunt uel scenici actores, qui et optimis poeta-rum tantum adiciunt gratiae, ut nos infinito magis eadem illa audita quam lecta delectent; et uilissimis etiam quibus-dam impetrant aures, ut, quibus nullus est in bibliothecis locus, sit etiam frequens in theatris.*

Against this passage one might quote the younger Pliny's reference to his own practice (VII 17, 7 f.) of first reading to himself, then to a few friends, and later to a large audience: proper reading is to be practised. Of course there must have been many levels of formality between the simple reading of a note from a friend or colleague and the reading of newly written literary work to an invited audience. However, it seems undeniable that even the most informal reading of a simple letter was done viva voce either by the receiver or his *lector*. But it is interesting to note that Pliny in the passage just referred to remarks that he does not do so to gain praise when reciting, but when being read by others[25], and his routine described above in fact serves to produce as good a published text as possible, that is to say a text that contains everything needed for a successful performance.

The difference between performing and reading, even good reading, is referred to again by Quintilian in the same chapter when he cites the instance of Hortensius, in whose extant writings he cannot find sufficient reason for his great fame.[26]

---

[25] *Nec uero ego, dum recito, laudari, sed dum legor, cupio. Itaque nullum emendandi genus omitto.*

[26] XI 3, 8 *Cuius rei fides est, quod eius scripta tantum intra famam sunt, ... ut appareat placuisse aliquid eo dicente, quod legentes non inuenimus.*

6. A technique of persuasion

Seneca's *Letter* 100 deals with a very similar difficulty. Lucilius has professed himself disappointed by the written work of Fabianus and one of the main points Seneca makes in reply is «If you had heard Fabianus himself you would have been much more impressed than you are now by reading the text». I believe, however, that in this case there are some undercurrents that go well beyond Quintilian's disappointment with Hortensius. The letter contains a few specific expressions that I should like to look at more closely. Seneca starts by summarising and initially criticising Lucilius' disappointment with Fabianus' work.[27] He then says (1)

Puta esse quod dicis
et effundi uerba, non figi.

The phrasing implies that Lucilius had expected the text to have a structure that leaves an immediate impression on him. Let us assume that he hoped for a text full of quotable quotes, full of phrasings that stick in one's memory. Seneca then rejects Lucilius' literary criticism expressed in the word *effundere*[28], replaces it by the word *fundere*, but for the sake of the argument sub-

---

[27] Fabianus' style of public discourse is mentioned also *Ep.* 40,12: *disputabat expedite magis quam concitate, ut posses dicere facilitatem esse illam, non celeritatem* — unlike the Serapio heard by Lucilius (see the next footnote). Furthermore *Ep.* 52,11 and 58,6 (*orationis etiam ad nostrum fastidium nitidae*).

[28] Cf. *Ep.* 40,2 where Lucilius is quoted as saying about the philosopher Serapio: *solet magno cursu uerba conuellere, quae non effundit [ima] sed premit et urguet.* The image is taken from a mountain torrent (cf. W.C. SUMMERS and F. PRÉCHAC-H. NOBLOT, *ad. loc.*). In this case we have no criticism but description. Nevertheless it is to be noted that *effundere* is used here without the implied criticism of *Ep.* 100,1.

sequently withdraws his rejection in order to come with his next objection to Lucilius' attitude: literary criticism is not relevant:

mores ille, non uerba composuit
et animis scripsit ista, non auribus. (2)

In the word *auribus* we have admittedly the pregnant meaning of «ears finely tuned to the beauties of literary form», but of course we must not forget that any impact of content would reach its target auditively, as I have discussed above. To that discussion I should like to add here the passage in which Quintilian implies that, apart from proper enunciation, there is a proper use of gesture: *abesse enim plurimum a saltatore debet orator, ut sit gestus ad sensus magis quam ad uerba accommodatus quod etiam histrionibus paulo grauioribus facere moris fuit* (XI 3, 89). The appropriate gesture, marked by appropriate rhythms, may well have been one element that Lucilius (or the Lucilius implied by Seneca) was unable to find in Fabianus' text. Fortunately Seneca not only phrases Lucilius' complaint — *effundi uerba, non figi* — but he also expresses what (the implied) Lucilius himself wants (10)

contra uitia aliquid aspere dici,
contra pericula animose,
contra fortunam superbe,
contra ambitionem contumeliose.

And Seneca has Lucilius continue:

uolo
luxuriam obiurgari,
libidinem traduci,
impotentiam frangi.
Sit aliquid
oratorie acre,
tragice grande,
comice exile.

Apart from the very interesting reference to literary genres (to which I shall return presently) the very phrasing here comes as close to a demonstration of «*figi*» as one can imagine. Very close, also, to one of the major characteristics of Seneca's own paraenetic style. In fact *figi* in Lucilius' mouth may well be regarded as a veiled reference to Seneca's manner of writing. Thus we have the interesting situation in which Seneca in his defence of Fabianus causes his implied correpondent to say, or at least hint, that Seneca's style is preferable to Fabianus'.

Seneca counters by saying *uis illum adsidere pusillae rei, uerbis*, thereby picking up the theme of *compositio* from the beginning of the letter and at the same time a theme that runs like Ariadne's string through the labyrinth of the *epistulae*, but occurs in the other works, too. The contrast is very clearly expressed in e.g. *Ep.* 20,2 *facere docet philosophia, non dicere* and is immediately linked there with the demand *ne orationi uita dissentiat*. Much the same contrast turns up in the context of philosophers misspending their time on words and games of logic instead of the serious business of living and dying (e.g. *Ep.* 45,5; I shall return to this point) and of course in *Ep.* 75,3, where in a discussion of appropriate style (to which I shall also return below) Seneca says *multum tamen operae impendi uerbis non oportet.*[29] In a rather more veiled manner the question of words and action is referred to in the rather despondent passage of *Ep.* 68 in which Seneca describes himself as a sick man whose only activity is to try to do something about his moral ulcer and advises Lucilius to depart with the words (9) *ego istum beatum hominem putabam et eruditum, erexeram aures: destitutus sum, nihil uidi, nihil audiui quod concupiscerem, ad quod reuerterer.*

---

[29]   Cf. *Ep.* 115,1 *Nimis anxium esse te circa uerba et compositionem, mi Lucili, nolo: habeo maiora quae cures. Quaere quid scribas, non quemadmodum e.q.s.*

The close connection of the contrast with Cato's famous rhetorical precept is quite apparent in *De tranquillitate animi* 1,13.[30] The theme, I think, is directly connected with the great moral dilemma as expressed e.g. in *Ep.* 26,5 *Non timide itaque componor ad illum diem quo remotis strophis ac fucis de me iudicaturus sum, utrum loquar fortia an sentiam.*[31] That sentence is significantly placed in a self-address, and is in fact a good instance of a common technique in moral (self-)training[32]: here Seneca is busy with himself (but like many a teacher at the same time with his student: *Ep.* 26,7). Conversely we find the common question asked of philosophers (and church ministers and, interestingly enough, quite often now of American politicians): *quare ergo tu fortius loqueris quam uiuis* (*Vit.* 17,7). The notion that *res* (c.q. action)[33] in principle are to be valued above words also occurs in quite practical situations, e.g. *Ben.* II 11,6, where the advice is given not to use much verbiage if one wants gratitude: actions speak more loudly.[34] The accusation directed at philosophers of dealing in words, not action is mentioned

---

[30] Serenus, writing to his spiritual counselor (cf. HADOT 1969, 66), notes that he is trying to convince himself that a very simple style (*inelaborata... oratio... simplici stilo*) is to be preferred to works *duratura saeculis.*

[31] For this major theme, closely connected as it is with the *res-uerba* dichotomy see e.g. GRIMAL 1978, 301.

[32] See e.g. my diss. *Askesis. Notes on Epictetus' educational system* (Assen 1959). I. HADOT (1969) does not go deeply into the educational tradition of *haec mecum loquor* (*Ep.* 26,7).

[33] Of course there are many passages (such as e.g. *Ep.* 122,3) in which *agere* is valued highly without being especially contrasted with *uerba, loqui* and the like.

[34] *Praecipue, ut dixi, parcamus auribus; admonitio taedium facit, exprobratio odium. Nihil aeque in beneficio dando uitandum est quam superbia. Quid opus arrogantia uultus, quid tumore uerborum? Ipsa res te extollit.*

Ep. 24,15 and in the same letter Seneca had emphasized earlier
(9) *non in hoc exempla nunc congero ut ingenium exerceam, sed
ut te... exhorter,* an exhortation which consists in showing that
courage in the face of death restricted to a small group of *uiri
fortes.*

It must not be forgotten, however, that we also find words
and action in harmonious coexistence such as at *Tranq.* 4,5 in
the climactic phrase *uoce adhortatione exemplo animo milita*
(the interlacing of the four elements seems to be heavily under-
lined by striking synaloephe. Noteworthy is also the string of
cretics).

But as I noted many years ago[35] it seems possible to interpret
the «quotation» of the implied Lucilius in another way, viz. as
a stylistic caricature, that is to say as a caricature of the contem-
porary tendency towards pointed *schemata* — a tendency which
Seneca himself does not entirely disapprove of, but which must
not be overdone, and which certainly should not become more
important than the sense conveyed. By and large, however, I
still find it hard to believe that this latter interpretation is cor-
rect: schemata of this nature occur too often in a perfectly
serious context, conveying perfectly serious sentiments. One of
those, made famous by Norden's sarcasm[36], suggested the title
of my little book[37].

What Seneca omits to do in *Letter* 100 is take into account
the possibility — something which, in case we are dealing with

---

[35] *Inlaboratus et facilis,* 158 n. 49.

[36] *Quod sentimus loquamur, quod loquimur sentiamus: concordet sermo cum
uita (Ep.* 75,4). Ed. NORDEN's comment: «aber wird es uns nicht
schwer, einem zu glauben, der eben diese *propositi summa* in ein poin-
tiertes σχῆμα kleidet?» (*Die Antike Kunstprosa* I [Leipzig 1898], 307).

[37] Apparently it is necessary to note that that title was mildly jocular (cf.
M. LAUSBERG's review, in *Gnomon* 54 [1982], 199) and that jokes should
not be explained.

a real letter of Lucilius which he is replying to, would immediately have been noticed by his correspondent — that in *effundi uerba, non figi* Lucilius' complaint is not so much stylistic criticism, but based on the observation that Fabianus' work is paraenetically not effective, not *adhortatio efficax*. Such an observation would imply that insistence on *uerba* and *compositio* is a quite proper attitude in one engaged in moral persuasion — a point well taken if indeed meso- and micro-rhythmic qualities have a mnemotechnical usefulness. If we subsequently compare *Ep*. 114,11 on the narrow relationship between style and *mores* (*itaque ubicumque uideris orationem corruptam placere, ibi mores quoque a recto desciuisse non erit dubium*) — a familiar subject which in one sense (that of purity of genre) goes right back to Plato[38] — we must conclude that Seneca at once praises the style of Papirius Fabianus because the man validates the style, vituperates Lucilius for preferring another style, indeed insinuates that Lucilius listens to words, not meanings — but himself practices the very style that Lucilius prefers. And when Seneca towards the end of his letter beats a retreat by saying that he has not recently read Fabianus, but that he remembers the effect he had when performing in person, the possibility that a real Lucilius may have meant such efficacy gets some further confirmation.

But the situation of *Ep*. 100 gives occasion for a further remark. *Effundi uerba, non figi* is interpreted by Seneca as referring to *compositio*. But when he has initially defended Fabianus'

[38]   See now e.g. an excellent study by Daniel L. SELDEN, «Genre of Genre: Theorizing Ancient Fiction» [The paper was recently read at the *Second International Conference on the Ancient Novel*, Dartmouth, July 23-29, 1989; see J. TATUM and G.M. VERNAZZA (above n. 16 p. 000), 69 f.], who notes that «a formal theory of literary genres first emerges as part of political philosophy» and refers i.a. to Plato, *Rep*. III 397d.

compositio, he continues (3) *Praeterea ipso dicente non uacasset tibi partes intueri, adeo te summa rapuisset.* On the surface this refers to the manner of performance. But *partes* is a general word which may refer to all major phases of rhetorical creativity — *inuentio, dispositio, elocutio* (including what Seneca calls *compositio*), *memoria* and *pronuntiatio*. Therefore, while ostensibly speaking about the immense impact of Fabianus' *pronuntiatio* (*adeo te summa rapuisset*) he hints at the same time that he cannot remember having had a chance to form a proper judgment on — for instance — the *dispositio* of the material. Yet that is an aspect of great importance for him, cf. *Ep.* 64,7 f. *hoc semper nouum erit, usus et inuentorum ab aliis scientia ac dispositio.* Is it unthinkable that Lucilius' criticism *effundi uerba, non figi* was in part directed at the *dispositio* in Fabianus' *ciuilium libri, dispositio* in the sense of proper application of the precepts of philosophy to people and circumstances? Indeed, if Lucilius wrote a real letter to Seneca (and the possibility still cannot be excluded) we have to reckon with a good chance that Seneca's handling of Lucilius' complaint first twists it in such a way that his correspondent would have reason first to turn to *De ira* in order to suppress his anger and then composedly write back again in the words of *De vita beata* (10,1): *dissimulas... quid a me dicatur.* If on the other hand the correspondence is «fictitious» I hope I have shown that it is possible to find within *Letter* 100 some evidence for that common pattern of having an interlocutor stating an objection and then twisting it in such a way that it becomes untenable or at least more easily rejected.

7. Generic mixture and rhythm

As said above, the «quotation» from Lucilius contains references to genre, quite obviously in the words *oratorie*, *tragice* and *comice*, recognisably so in *obiurgari, traduci* and

frangi, but also in *aspere, animose* and *superbe*. The first three-some refers to a generic distinction of the highest level, though the terms are here transferred to stylistic characterisation of parts of a paraenetic speech; in the second set *obiurgari* is often used in Seneca's own work as a technical term for specialised speech acts[39]; *traducere* is employed in similar ways[40]; *frangi*, a far more general term, gets its special colour as a reference to paraenetic speech from the other two. Of the third group *aspere* often refers to style (in our letter e.g. § 6), often to tone of voice (e.g. *Ben.* I 9,2); for *animose* cf. e.g. *Vit.* 24,4 *non est ergo quod perperam exaudiatis quae honeste, fortiter, animose a studiosis sapientiae dicuntur*; and *superbe*, finally, like *frangi* above, appears to take its reference to appropriate philosophical speech from the other two as well as, of course, from its application to the great enemy *fortuna* (the latter word should probably be capitalised as in ch. 3 of *De prouidentia*).

It seems, then, that the movement of the «quotation» is from rather general characteristics of speech acts through references to sub-genre to the grand genres of ancient literature as employed in paraenesis. It should not be difficult to find instances of each of these in Seneca's own works. Doubtless Socrates' truncated speech that for us constitutes the end of *De uita beata* may count as *oratorie acre*. For *tragice grande* of course the spectacle provided by Cato in *De providentia* springs to mind[41] and *comice exile* seems an appropriate description

---

[39]   E.g. *Vit.* 17,3 *cotidie aliquid ex uitiis meis demere et errores meos obiurgare* with the edition of P. GRIMAL, Coll. «Erasme» (Paris 1969), 84.

[40]   E.g. *Ep.* 108,14 *uoluptates nostras traducere*, in the description of Attalus' performance (*perorantem*).

[41]   See e.g. my «Drama in Seneca's Stoicism», in *TAPA* 97 (1966), 237-251 for a large number of dramatic passages (which I there called «playlets») of both tragic and comic character. ABEL 1967, 137 says with respect to

of the presentation of the worthies turning night into day in *Ep.* 122,9-16.

At this point I may be permitted to add a few remarks about what exactly I am referring to when I employ the word «genre». It is well known[42] that by Hellenistic times the classification of *eide* had become a very complex system full of overlaps and that both in prose and in poetry works were produced which combined *topoi* from varying generic origin. The process had started early, much to Plato's disgust.[43] At the same time these varying generic features retained sufficient signs of their identity to be recognised. What I have so far been trying to do in this contribution is show that Seneca was not only aware of the generic composites he was producing (the «quotation» from Lucilius, whether «real»[44] or not, as just discussed, constitutes sufficient proof for that assertion) but that their constituent parts, apart from the verbal elements of topoi and signal-words, also had a concomitant system of micro- and meso-rhythmic signs. I am

---

Cato in *De const. sap.* that «die Gestalt des helden-mütigen Streiters in tragische Beleuchtung gerückt wird».

[42] See W. KROLL, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924; repr. 1964), 202-246 («Die Kreuzung der Gattungen»). He notes p. 216 Seneca's letters as a particularly good instance. For the rest he chiefly deals with poetry, as does Francis CAIRNS, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972), who is mainly concerned with what I would prefer to call sub-genres. The phenomenon properly understood is of major importance in the interpretation of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses.*

[43] Cf. Plato, *Lg.* 700a-701c. See also D.L. SELDEN as quoted above in note 38.

[44] For the debate on that question (after ALBERTINI 1923, 44 ff.) see MAURACH 1970, 21 n. 37; RUSSELL 1974, 72 f.; GRIMAL 1978, 315 ff. They plead respectively for fictitious correpondence, a middle position, and real correspondence. In this contribution I avoid taking sides, since the question does not materially affect my subject.

using the term «concomitant» because in the sign systems sign will specify sign. Thus it is quite obvious that when at *Polyb.* 14,2 the ancient reader comes across the words *Hunc itaque tibi puta dicere* he is alerted to further signs that will enable him to perform the subsequent passage as a (consolatory) speech.[45] Cicero, though he states that the use of rhythm in prose is aimed *ad delectationem*, is well aware of its varied application to different parts of a speech: *Ita, si numerus orationis quaeritur qui sit, omnis est, sed alius alio melior atque aptior (Orat.* 203).[46]

To me, then, it would seem by no means impossible that an ancient reader — if properly trained — would be able to pick up the micro- and meso-rhythmic elements accompanying certain generic elements in composite texts and fashionable in a certain period. In fact Seneca sketches a Lucilius who is such a well trained reader. The accusation of bad, or at least wrongly directed, reading in *Letter* 100 had been preceded by a discussion

---

[45] The fact that prose rhythm can perform such a function is implicitly recognised also in modern semiological studies, see e.g. C. MORRIS, *Writings on the general theory of signs*, Approaches to Semiotics, ed. by Th.A. SEBEOK, 16 (The Hague 1971), 33: «Pauses, speech melodies, and emphasis help to perform such functions in spoken language; punctuation marks, accents, parentheses, italics, size of letter, etc., are similar aids in written and printed languages. Such signs within the language perform primarily a pragmatical function.»

[46] A. PRIMMER, *Cicero Numerosus. Studien zum antiken Prosarhythmus*, SAWW Bd. 257 (Wien 1968), comes very close to a similar hypothesis when he speaks (p. 261) of «Allegrostellen» and says (p. 265) «Eine Frage für sich wäre, ob die Frequenz der Dikretiker in der Marcelliana mit dem genus laudativum zusammenhängt oder nur die allgemeine Entwicklung von Ciceros später Klauselpraxis dokumentiert. Gewiss ist, dass man die preisende Kretiker auch in den Reden (wie in anderen Schriften) der Vierzigerjahre diagnostizieren kann.» He speaks *ibidem* of the «Rhythmus der Rührung und der Trauer». Unfortunately he does not present much material from Cicero's philosophical writings.

of another complaint on the part of Lucilius. *Letter* 75 starts
with the sentence: *Minus tibi accuratas a me epistulas mitti
quereris*. Again we must take the two possibilities into account:
either Seneca is replying to a real letter, now lost, or he sets up
the fiction of having received a letter with that complaint. In the
first case it may well be that this man of letters, Lucilius[47] (not
only an eager reader cf. e.g. *Ep.* 2,2, but an accomplished author
as well, cf. e.g. *Ep.* 19,3), picked up some transgressions against
the literary code Seneca otherwise adhered to and that these
transgressions — to him at least — were a hindrance in picking
up the moral message conveyed. Even in the present day world
one can easily imagine a church minister or priest using an inap-
propriate register in his sermon — perhaps to shock his flock
into listening, but inadvertently shocking them so much that
henceforth his sheep hear the impropriety only. In the literate
Roman society of the early Empire, finely attuned as it was to
the «laws» governing generic composition and to the linguistic
decorum, something of that nature may easily have happened,
i.e. Lucilius may have picked up a set of wrong signs. In the
second case Seneca has consciously created an implied reader and
endowed him with the characteristic of reacting to what he
subsequently says was the wrong set of signs, that is to say the
literary code, rather than the moral message. Now the next
paragraph starts with an odd sentence: *Si fieri posset quid sen-
tiam ostendere quam loqui mallem*. The logical phrase *loqui
quam scribere* has in fact been made impossible by the develop-
ment of § 1 in which Seneca says he wants the language of his
letters to sound as much like that of regular conversation as
possible. The sentence as it stands actually questions the very
possibility of conveying the true sentiments of the speaker in

---

[47]   For Lucilius as a person see e.g. RUSSELL 1974, 75; GRIMAL 1978, *passim*.
      Russell sees him very much as a kind of *alter ego* of Seneca.

language. The basic content of the complaint has been neatly replaced by the Senecan topos of *res* (c.q. action) versus *uerba*. Subsequently he indeed does go into the question of *uerba*, by saying that even *disputare* should be without the rhetorical adornment of (inordinate) gesticulation[48], but he has to admit that certain signs of sincerity are required and he does that by means of the very illustrative comparison with the different ways in which people kiss their sexual partners and their children, whereupon he retreats altogether: *non mehercules ieiuna esse et arida uolo quae de rebus tam magnis dicentur — neque enim philosophia ingenio renuntiat —, multum tamen operae impendi uerbis non oportet.* But for all we know (in case Lucilius had written a real letter, he would have known), the original complaint had asked the question whether true philosophy renounces literary talent for the very reason that Seneca had stepped over the boundaries of contemporary good taste and had thus obfuscated his own philosophical message.

8. Dialectic interlude

With the permission of the present scholarly company I should like to indulge at this point in a very brief bit of imaginary dialogue (scholarly *decorum* will be preserved by the insertion of footnotes):

Ghost of Seneca	*Dissimulas quid a me dicatur.*
Scholar (c.q. Scholasticus)	I don't think so, but let me give another example. Just take your treatment of Epicurus when you call him *mollitiam professus.*[49]

---

[48] *Etiam si disputarem, nec supploderem pedem nec manum iactarem nec attollerem uocem, sed ista oratoribus reliquissem e.q.s.* Incidentally a welcome addition to what Quintilian has to say about gestures.

[49] *Ep. 33,2 mirum est fortiter aliquid dici ab homine mollitiam professo.*

Ghost of Seneca	I also mentioned his days of abstinence.
Scholar	I know the passage — as well as the phrase in which you cast doubt on his veracity.[50] And immediately afterwards you write that the highest pleasure is to be able to find pleasure even in a small bit of the plainest fare.
Ghost of Seneca	That is good Stoic doctrine.
Scholar	Yet you doubt that Epicurus could enjoy that pure pleasure.
Ghost of Seneca	All Stoics deny that he could.
Scholasticus	*Fuge multitudinem.*[51]

The rhetorical pattern of first shifting the position of the adversary in the desired direction and then opposing it with arguments suitable to one's own is common in Seneca's prose. But Seneca's prose, unlike much of Cicero's, does not form part of an institutionalised adversary system in which the method has its justification because it is used by both sides.[52] On the contrary, most of it is serious philosophical persuasion in which the method should have been avoided for the sake of mere honesty. In fact Seneca himself makes a point of extolling the *uirtus, quae mendacia et contra uerum placentia extirpet, quae nos a populo cui nimis credimus separet ac sinceris opinionibus reddat (Ep. 94,68)*.[53]

---

[50] *Ep.* 18,9 *hoc certe in iis epistulis ait quas scripsit... ad Polyaenum.* But compare *Ep.* 21,10.

[51] *Ep.* 10,1.

[52] I prefer Apuleius in this respect, because on the one hand one gets the impression that he is a formidable twister of oppositional argumentation in the *Apology,* but he is also able to poke fun at the method by giving an outrageous example in presenting both the speech for the prosecution and Lucius' defence at Hypata's Risus festival (*Met.* III 3-6, pp. 54, 3-57, 2 Helm).

[53] Cf. *Ep.* 79,18 *tenue est mendacium: perlucet si diligenter inspexeris.* («Lie», «mendacity» are among the many lacunas in A.L. MOTTO's *Guide to the*

«But» (someone will say) «such rhetorical colouring of the adversary's position is something he has in common with his contemporaries. That is how they learnt to argue at school.» True enough, but during the last few decades we have learnt to question the supremacy of the purely historical judgment. In interpreting (ancient) literature the reader has become very important, and we are no longer dealing merely with the contemporary reader (or the image we have of that contemporary reader, or even the reader an author appears to be directly addressing or could have come accross amongst his acquaintance), but we may and must take ourselves equally seriously as readers.

9. Cauillatio

This whole question of the use of rhetoric has its counterpart in Seneca's well-known dislike of the *cauillationes* of those philosophers who spend much of their lives in the study and teaching of language and logic. Seneca shares this dislike, or distrust with e.g. Epictetus. But it is equally well-known that as a School the Stoa had made major contributions in those fields. In reading Seneca we not only do not sense that he had any appreciation of the importance of those contributions — his references to the major tripartition of philosophy notwithstanding[54] — but we even get the impression that he did not really understand how organically they were linked with the posi-

---

thought of Lucius Annaeus Seneca [Amsterdam 1970].) For the Stoic definition of acceptable rhetoric cf. e.g. M. POHLENZ, *Die Stoa* (Göttingen 1948/1949), I 52 and II 31, with the interesting phrase τὸ δὲ εὖ λέγειν ἔλεγον τὸ ἀληθῆ λέγειν. See also HADOT 1969, 109.

[54] *Ep.* 88,24 and 89,9 with an intriguing difference in sequential order.

tions he himself cherished in both ethics and physics. Fragment 17 (cf. M. Lausberg, *Untersuchungen zu Senecas Fragmenten* [Berlin 1970], 102 ff.) actually gives five definitions of philosophy, all of them limiting the love of wisdom to the conduct of life. Grammar contributes nothing to virtue and reason in its aspect of the proper conduct of continuing argumentation or clean performance of dialectic debate, or, for that matter, the drawing of proper conclusions from correctly established premisses is not studied but actually scorned. Rist quite justifiably ends his book on *Stoic Philosophy*[55] with the sentence: «The most interesting positions of Zeno and Chrysippus, particularly in logic and psychology, were forgotten, ignored, or misunderstood in the school itself.» He of course refers to the Stoics of the Empire. To give but one example, Zeno, who in other contexts is held up as one of Seneca's heroes of moral life, is referred to in *Letter* 83,9 as the producer of a syllogism that makes no sense at all. Seneca subsequently produces Posidonius' defence of Zeno's position, one based on the double meaning of a word, but he rejects that defence and adds (11): *Adice nunc quod, si hoc intellexit Zenon et nos intellegere noluit, ambiguitate uerbi quaesiit locum fraudi, quod faciendum non est ubi ueritas quaeritur.* The textual uncertainty here (only one important manuscript has *uoluit* according to Reynolds) is most interesting. If *uoluit* is to be read Seneca merely says that Zeno was guilty of a fallacy, if *noluit* — as the bulk of the tradition has it — he accuses Zeno of consciously deceiving his readers. Kidd notes in his recent commentary on the fragments of Posidonius[56] quite correctly that *ambiguitate*

---

[55]   J.M. RIST, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1969), 289.

[56]   Fr. 175, see I.G. KIDD (ed.), *Posidonius. II, The Commentary* (Cambridge 1988), 645. The text of this sentence is not included in the fragment as presented in volume I and Kidd does not discuss the question.

uerbi quaesiit locum fraudi is unfair: lack of clarity is not *fraus*.

M. Grimal (1978, 256 f.) has very clearly and succinctly set out why Seneca so reduced the importance of dialectic as he did, but when he adds that Seneca nevertheless did not betray the School's tradition, I believe he goes too far in defending the Corduban — if only because the rhetorical impact of the scorn heaped on dialectic cuts it away from the system altogether — and has done so historically. And I may add that in his own practice of moral persuasion Seneca would have greatly benefited by a greater awareness of both the importance and the effectiveness of clean reasoning. Another case in point may be culled from the difficulty one frequently experiences in determining Seneca's precise position on important questions of philosophical doctrine.

10. Finally

In 1973 I had the opportunity of addressing the question whether philosophically speaking Seneca could be called a dualist[57], and I came to the conclusion that, though in the strict sense the term is not applicable to Seneca's stoicism, the rhetoric of moralist persuasion often led him to use terminology and imagery that seemed to imply a dualist position, in particular as regards the opposition soul-body.

In the present contribution I have tried to identify some compositional techniques that may be observed in Seneca's prose. They were limited to meso- and micro-rhythmic elements. Investigation of Seneca's use of period, complex sentence

---

[57]   «Two such opposed Kings», in *Theta-Pi. A Journal for Greek and Early Christian Philosophy* (Leiden), 2 (1973), 40-59.

and group[58] — closely related as they are to meso-rhythmic qualities — might well support and enrich the hypothesis.

I have further attempted to isolate some techniques of persuasion and I have been guilty of selecting those that at least in part explain my own increasingly unfavourable reaction to the prose work of this author as it lies before us. It will have been noticed that neither reasons based on Quintilian's dilemma, nor reasons deriving from the Tacitean *non liquet* figure among them. The first would mean participating in a historical debate, which is not my business on this occasion, the second passing a moral judgment on the historical person rather than on the prose texts we, their readers, are faced with.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABEL, K., *Bauformen in Senecas Dialogen* (Heidelberg 1967).

ALBERTINI, E., *La composition dans les ouvrages philosophiques de Sénèque* (Paris 1923).

DAHLMANN, H., «Zu Senecas Trostschrift an Polybius», in *Hermes* 71 (1936), 374-375.

FRAENKEL, Ed., *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros and Catos* (Roma 1968).

GRIMAL, P., *Seneca. Macht und Ohnmacht des Geistes* (Darmstadt 1978).

HADOT, I., *Seneca und die griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung* (Berlin 1969).

HIJMANS, B.L. Jr., *Inlaboratus et facilis. Aspects of Structure in Some Letters of Seneca*, Mnemosyne, Suppl. 38 (Leiden 1976).

— «*Asinus numerosus*», in *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass. A collection of original papers*, ed. by B.L. HIJMANS Jr. and R. Th. VAN DER PAARDT (Groningen 1978), 189-209.

KENNEDY, G., *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, A History of Rhetoric, 2 (Princeton 1972).

---

[58]   For the distinction see *Inlaboratus er facilis*, 100 ff.

MAURACH, G., *Der Bau von Senecas Epistulae morales* (Heidelberg 1970).

RUSSELL, D.A., «Seneca's Prose», in *Seneca*, ed. by C.D.N. COSTA (London 1974).

STEYNS, D., *Etude sur les métaphores et les comparaisons dans les œuvres en prose de Sénèque le philosophe* (Gent 1907).

DISCUSSION

M. Grimal: Nous possédons un exemple du style oratoire de Claude, la *Table de Lyon*. Ne peut-on y trouver la confirmation de ce que vous dites des différences entre le discours de Claude dans la *Consolation à Polybe* et les paroles de Sénèque? La longueur et la complication des phrases, sur la «table claudienne», semblent bien vous donner raison. Qu'en pensez-vous?

M. Hijmans: I have not had the time to do a rhythmical analysis of Claudius' extant speech and for that reason I am not in a position to judge whether the consolatory speech Seneca puts in Claudius' mouth shows any rhythmical similarities.

M. Grimal: Analysé selon la méthode que vous proposez, le début du *De clementia* semble très oratoire. Cela peut-il nous confirmer dans l'idée qu'il s'agit du texte d'un discours effectivement prononcé par Sénèque — peut-être en janvier 55?

M. Hijmans: Certainly the figures in the tables I have presented show a marked mesorhythmic similarity between the various speeches, including e.g. Apuleius' *De deo Socratis*. To speak of confirmation of your theory concerning *De clementia* seems a bit strong, but the rhythmic element could well be used in support. It seems possible however that the author just wrote the work *like* a speech. I do not believe that any arguments concerning chronology can be advanced on the basis of the rhythmic differences between the various works.

M. Lana: Mi chiedo se alla relazione, che il prof. Hijmans ha rigorosamente sviluppata procedendo internamente agli scritti di Seneca, possa gio-

vare — come verifica dei risultati raggiunti — l'analisi sia del discorso di Claudio nella *Tabula Lugdunensis* (come già ha proposto il prof. Grimal), sia del rifacimento tacitiano del discordo claudiano (*Ann.* X 1, 24), sia del breve editto di Claudio *De civitate Anaunorum* (*CIL* V 5050). Tale verifica servirebbe, io penso, a mettere in chiaro che Seneca, oratore efficace, che audiva a fare spiccare la sua oratoria su quella degli altri oratori romani (v. Suet. *Nero* 52) — nel *Polyb.* 14-16 ha applicato uno schema suo senza tenere presenti le preferenze stilistiche dell'imperatore e, anzi, contrapponendosi ad esse.

M. Hijmans: A close comparison between the text of the *Tabula Lugdunensis*, Tacitus' rendering of that speech in the *Annals* and Claudius' speech in Seneca's *Polyb.* also with respect to their rhythms would be useful. In evaluating the results of such a comparison one would have to take some facts into account. Tacitus puts a rather strong imprint of his own historical style on the speeches he renders (one thinks e.g. of Suillius' denouncement of Seneca, *Ann.* XIII 42 f., of Seneca's final address to Nero and Nero's answer, *Ann.* XIV 53-56). That imprint is very clear in his rendering (*Ann.* XI 24) of Claudius' largely extant speech. Secondly one has to remember that there is also a generic difference between the speech on citizenship Claudius gave in the Senate and the consolatory speech Seneca puts in Claudius' mouth: the first a public one of the *genus deliberativum*, the second a paraenetic one in domestic setting. I do not actually believe that Seneca here attempts to render Claudius' stylistic preferences and I would try to explain any rhythmic similarities and differences between the *Tabula Lugdunensis* and *Polyb.* 14-16 in terms of genre and subgenre.

M. Mazzoli: Anche se mi rendo conto che la questione non tocca direttamente il problema da Lei studiato, desidererei conoscere il Suo punto di vista circa l'incidenza avuta sulla prassi stilistica di Seneca dalle teorie scolastiche, e in particolare dalla dottrina paneziana del πρέπον, che sembra rispecchiarsi nello sforzo di adeguamento, da Lei così puntualmente documentato, che il filosofo compie tra gli elementi ritmici e le specifiche istanze dei «generi» in cui la parenesi si esprime.

M. Hijmans: Thank you for your suggestive question. It is not an easy
one. In 1976 I stated (p. 151) concerning *Letter* 75 that Seneca indicates «that
he follows the demands of his school» and that «Seneca's rhetorical practice
is... linked to his philosophical activity». The link, I then said, could be
demonstrated in that very letter. I see no reason now to depart from that sta-
tement and I am grateful to you for pointing out that it is in need of further
development. As to the question concerning the link I have tried to demon-
strate between rhythmic elements and various (sub)genres I am somewhat
hesitant: I think we are dealing here with a more general rhetorical practice
rather than one to be specifically connected with Stoic/Panaetian doctrine.
To me it seems significant that my two samples of Apuleius tend to show
a very similar trend. I only regret that I had insufficient time to subject a
number of samples from Cicero to the same scrutiny.

M. Grimal: M. Mazzoli vient de soulever un point très important. L'esthé-
tique du «convenable» diffère totalement de ce que Sénèque attend du dis-
cours d'un philosophe, qui ne doit pas avoir pour but la beauté mais l'effica-
cité. Il s'agit de «faire violence» à l'âme, non de la charmer. Il y a là deux for-
mes différentes de persuasion, que Lucilius tend à confondre. D'où son juge-
ment critique concernant Fabianus.

M. Hijmans: In my contribution I have perhaps overoptimistically assu-
med a Lucilius (whether «real» or «implied») who is Seneca's intellectual
equal and who demands *exhortatio efficax* rather than the pleasures of a char-
ming style. I based that assumption in part on my interpretation of *figi*. It
is of course only if the assumption is tenable that one may say that Seneca
twists Lucilius' criticism of Fabianus in a convenient way.

M. Grimal: Comment interprétez-vous *figi* dans ce passage de la *Lettre*
100?

M. Hijmans: I take *figi* to mean here «be fixed (in the mind)» (cf. *ThLL*
s.v. *figo* 719, 12 where it is defined as *figendo firmare, stabilire*). There are in
fact few parallels for the verb in contexts similar to ours (however, cf. e.g.

Stat. *Ach.* I 380 *arcanaque murmura figit | auribus*). It seems possible that the image of decrees, regulations affixed to public buildings is present here. Existent translations, I think, gloss over the word a little: e.g. Préchac-Noblot: «placarde»; Gummere: «places»; Aiber: «fije»; Verhoeven: «op hun plaats gezet worden»; Schweighäuser's comment (1809) is still interesting: «refertur ad *stimulos*, quos desideraverat» (quoted from N. Bouillet, *L. Annaei Senecae opera philosophica* [Parisiis 1829], IV 162).

M. Grimal: Le problème de l'éloquence, pour le stoïcien, paraît avoir admis des solutions différentes. Le cas de Rutilius Rufus était resté célèbre. Accusé injustement par un jury de chevaliers qui lui était hostile, Rufus se défendit en s'interdisant de recourir aux procédés habituels de l'éloquence. Il parla brièvement, se fiant à la vérité de sa cause. Il fut condamné. Sénèque a évidemment renoncé à cette «rhétorique» austère. Il n'hésite pas à préconiser une emprise émotionnelle du «maître» sur l'élève. La pure dialectique lui semble insuffisante.

M. Gigon: La tension entre les deux perspectives: «Il suffit de dire la vérité qui, elle, saura vaincre toute seule» et «Il faut trouver les moyens appropriés pour atteindre le lecteur, pour le toucher et le convaincre», cette tension est visible dès le début de l'*Apologie de Socrate* de Platon. Socrate ne veut dire que la vérité, et pourtant tout son exposé est d'un style hautement élaboré; la structure de l'ensemble est parfaitement calculée!

M. Grimal: Ce rôle est indéniable. Mentionnons seulement le fait que Lucrèce a recours à la poésie pour persuader. Sénèque lui-même, dans les *Lettres*, utilise l'épicurisme comme propédeutique à la vie intérieure. C'est peut-être là l'apport essentiel des cercles épicuriens à la philosophie romaine.

M. Hijmans: The discussion appears to indicate that I have not made my basic objections sufficiently clear. When Seneca twists an opponent's position in order to combat it, I think he is in fact misusing his rhetorical abilities in a particular area that, in my opinion, touches on a precise point of ethics: honesty. The case of Rutilius Rufus in this respect is very welcome because

it represents an extreme. I have not been asking for that extreme: it should have been possible for a man of Seneca's great verbal and imaginative powers to avoid this particular dishonesty. In this respect M. Gigon's reference to Plato's *Apology of Socrates'* is most welcome. Surely, there is a difference between saying of Epicurus *mollitiam professus* and e.g. «even Epicurus, whose basic position I reject, knew and practised the simple life». On other occasions Seneca himself uses or implies just such a formula, e.g. *Ep.* 2, 5.

Mme Armisen-Marchetti: L'exposé de M. Hijmans, par lequel s'ouvrent ces Entretiens, introduit d'emblée le problème fondamental qui se pose lorsque l'on étudie la prose de Sénèque. Que Sénèque soit un grand prosateur, cela n'a jamais été contesté. Mais précisément, parce qu'il écrit bien, on l'a accusé de faire passer ses préoccupations littéraires avant ses préoccupations philosophiques. Sénèque lui-même est partiellement responsable de ce mauvais procès, lorsqu'il oppose *res* et *verba* et proclame la préséance des premières sur les secondes. Il est alors facile de prétendre qu'il n'obéit pas à ses propres principes. En réalité un style transparent, qui ne serait que l'énonciation brute des *res*, cela n'existe pas. L'énonciation des *res* passe par le travail sur les *verba*, la fonction de l'*ars* étant de rendre ceux-ci fidèles à la dignité de celles-là.

M. Hijmans: Mme Armisen's welcome remark gives me the opportunity to clarify my position a little further. In *Ep.* 64, 7-8 Seneca is writing to Lucilius about the way in which one should deal with the heritage left by the ancient philosophers. The metaphor of *hereditas* is beautifully expanded in the sentence *sed agamus bonum patrem familiae, faciamus ampliora quae accepimus; maior ista hereditas a me ad posteros transeat.* The word *ampliora* in this sentence is double-faced for us who make a sharp distinction between rhetoric and philosophy. The same is true for the terminology in the next sentence *hoc semper novum erit, usus et inventorum ab aliis scientia ac dispositio.* In my contribution I have not objected to this at once philosophical and rhetorical aim. It is a perfectly honourable one, but, as I have said in my answer to the previous question, it should have been possible to work toward

that aim while avoiding blatant instances of dishonesty: in those particular cases Seneca does not obey his own principles.

M. Soubiran: Je n'interviendrai que sur un problème technique, qui est un peu de ma compétence: celui des cola et des clausules.

Première remarque: quels critères avez-vous adoptés pour le découpage des cola? Il me semble que ces critères doivent être syntaxiques et/ou rhétoriques. Mais une marge d'incertitude (vous le notez vous-même dans votre *Inlaboratus et facilis*) est inévitable. Ainsi dans votre exposé, en *Polyb.* 12, 5, je serais tenté de couper après *nepotibus demum nostris dies nota sit*, coupure que soulignerait de surcroît la belle clausule dicrétique. De même, en *Polyb.* 13, 1, malgré une clausule moins brillante, j'inclinerais à couper après *furor concussit*. Sur le plan des principes, faut-il admettre qu'une clausule nettement perceptible (ainsi dichorée, crétique-trochée ou dicrétique) marque nécessairement une fin de colon?

Deuxième remarque: comment convient-il de mesurer la longueur des cola? Comme dans votre livre, vous comptez les syllabes (en généralisant la synalèphe à l'intérieur des cola — mais non pas, évidemment, aux limites des cola: c'est la solution la plus raisonnable). C'est une méthode simple, mais ce n'est pas la seule possible. On pourrait aussi:
— soit compter le nombres de mores;
— soit compter le nombre d'*elementa* métriques (demi-pieds).

Pour prendre un exemple tiré de votre livre (analyse métrique de *Ep.* 1, 4): des deux cola (46) *quid ego faciam* et (55) *omnes ignoscunt*, le premier est plus long en syllabes (6 contre 5), mais plus bref en mores (7 contre 10) et en *elementa* (4 contre 5). Quel décompte convient-il d'adopter? C'est un problème de méthode que les chercheurs devront débattre.

M. Hijmans: As to the first point of your very welcome and partly exciting remarks I fully agree with you (and did so 1976, 84) that in colometry points of hesitation remain. Very practically I understand your hesitation at 12, 5, where you would like to pause after *nota sit*. I have used Fraenkel's criteria and I must say that it is precisely in the case of adjectival clauses that his criteria have often given me cause to hesitate. In this case I share your hesitation

and would like to note that pauses are of a varying order of strength. On this particular point it seems to me that the sentence could be performed either without any pause or with a very slight one. In the case of 13, 1 a possible pause after *concussit* would probably entail an earlier one after *patere*. To me it seems quite possible to perform the phrase without pauses at these syntactical points. On the question of principle: for this contribution I have marked the cola on the basis of the three criteria I set out in 1976 *ibid.*, that is to say a) meaning, b) stylistic markers and c) common clausulae. In almost all cases all three, sometimes two of the criteria forced my decision. In fact I see the clausula as an indication not that a pause exists, but that an existing pause is reinforced.

The second point of your remarks is the exciting one, for in fact you open an entirely new way of measuring the length of a colon, one which I have not encountered in the relevant literature. Of the two possibilities you propose I prefer counting the *morae* at first sight because it seems to me that it would come closest to the aim of the whole exercise, i.e. to approach the audible mesorhythmic effect of a series of cola of different lengths. I am very hesitant about counting the *elementa*, because I am by no means sure that the metric feet (or half-feet) mentioned in ancient theory concerning prose rhythm are more than a description of sequences of longs and shorts employed for want of symbolic marks. I argued my position in this respect in *Mnemosyne* S. IV 30 (1977), 428-431.

M. Mayer: The central issue, as you define it towards the end of your essay, is a fundamental mistrust of language as a reliable indicator of one's moral position (perhaps that is less surprising in one who found himself obliged to defend a matricide; cf. Tac. *Ann.* XIV 11). Yet the moralist, if he is to be of any use to his fellow men generally, ought to publish his reflections, especially if they seem to find favour (and the numerous books of *Epistulae* suggest some demand from readers). Do you then believe that Seneca's position after his retirement was determined by an irreconcilable tension: on the one hand, a loss of faith in the tradition of formal prose, yet on the other a genuine urge to contribute something to man's moral well-being?

M. Hijmans: Thank you very much indeed for putting the central issue of the second half of my contribution so very clearly. For Seneca language as such has the final limitation that even the bravest words do not show one has the courage to live up to them, hence *ostendere quam loqui mallem*, and it seems to me he is increasingly aware of that fact. He is obviously also aware of the need for *exhortatio efficax* and the usefulness of his talents in this respect. I have tried to show that the contrast *res vs. verba* is in fact operative on several different levels. All this does not alter my impression that Seneca uses one particular rhetorical technique in an area for which it is not just unsuitable, but in view of the absence of a real opponent, morally indefensible. You refer to the many readers the *Epistulae* may or must have had: those readers are unable to reply effectively. I doubt however that Seneca towards the end of his life questioned the possibility of *exhortatio efficax* as such, but I do think that he was on a personal level dubious of his own moral strength vis-à-vis *ostendere*, on the level of moral persuasion at the same time aware however that *ostendere* was needed in order to validate the *verba*.

M. Lana: Chiedo inoltre al prof. Hijmans — a proposito del giudizio di Lucilio sullo stile dei *libri civilium* (*Ep.* 100) che lo riteneva, a differenza di Seneca, stramento poco efficace par la *adhortatio* — se l'analisi dei frammenti di Fabiano conservati di Seneca Padre nelle *Contr.* e *Suas.* (*Contr.* II 1, 10-13; 2, 4; 3, 5 e 9; 4, 3, 7 e 10; 5, 6 e 7; 6, 2 e 4; *Suas.* 1, 4) possa essere utile sia a confortare il giudizio di Seneca sia a fornire elementi di prova (anche se le citazioni di Seneca Padre riguardano l'attività di Fabiano precedente la sua «conversione» filosofica alla scuola dei Sestii).

M. Hijmans: The style, or rather styles, of Fabianus are discussed by Seneca Pater (cf. *Contr.* II *Praef.* § 1-4). As to his style in *Suasoriae* the impression of Seneca Pater is expressed by means of the same metaphor of flowing water: *numquam inopia verbi substitit, sed velocissimo ac facillimo cursu omnes res beata circumfluebat oratio*. If only for that reason I should indeed have analysed all fragments of Fabianus as preserved in Seneca Pater. But I have two reservations:

a)   The Fabianus fragments are in part summaries, and therefore useless for

rhythmical analysis, in part indeed quotations, but quotations that have come to us through the (admittedly remarkable) memory of Seneca Pater. If I see how often even verse quotations in ancient authors differ from the texts we have, I must be hesitant about the usefulness of these quotations for rhythmical analysis: even the best of memories play tricks concerning word order, synonyms and the like.

b) The exercise involved in analysing the *Fragmenta Fabiana* would be very interesting, but should be undertaken to define the subject matter of the debate and to decide whose appreciation (Seneca Pater's, Seneca Filius' or Lucilius') is most likely correct on a level of style. I raised another point, viz. whether Lucilius may have meant that Fabianus' paraenetic in his *civilium libri* is not *exhortatio efficax*, whether indeed in Lucilius' terms the question is not so much one of *effundere* vs. *fundere* but very much one of *figi* in my interpretation of that word (see p. 20 ff.; 40 f.).

M. Mazzoli: Nella prima parte della Sua esposizione Lei ha riccamente illustrato la spiccata funzione semiotica che ha nella prosa di Seneca il fattore ritmico, atto a fornire al lettore coltivato le indicazioni idonee per la sua *performance* orale. Esprime anche l'ipotesi che le opere rimastei di Seneca siano state composte oralmente, ad alta voce e dettate a uno scriba. Tutto ciò La porta a marcare la decisiva importanza dell'elemento orale e acustico nell'elaborazione dell'opera senecana. Ci sono peraltro testi che o svalutano, come *Ep.* 75, 1, la mediazione verbale della comunicazione (*ostendere quam loqui mallem*), o insistono, come la 84, 1 ss., sul momento sostanziale della scrittura presa in se stessa (*stilus redigat in corpus*). Mi domando e Le domando se non sia il caso, per una più piena valutazione della stilistica senecana, di considerare anche il problema globale del «pubblico», ipotizzando un primo livello, ristretto, di lettori esperti, attrezzati per percepire la semiotica «acustica» della scrittura e un più vasto livello secondario, quello dei lettori comuni, cui il filosofo dirige, in funzione del progresso morale, la sua scrittura «reale».

M. Hijmans: I have perhaps spent an inordinate part of my paper on the auditive aspect of ancient prose. The reason was that I fail to see a

function for rhythm unless it is experienced, and the only effective experience, I believe, is an auditive one. Your question, then, is very welcome for it gives me the opportunity to underline the auditive aspect once more and increases my urge to return to it on another occasion. As to *ostendere quam loqui mallem* (*Ep.* 75, 1) the question of effective communication seems to be raised to another level (that of the personal example, ultimately resulting in the *imago vitae*). As to *Ep.* 84, I do not believe that the process described there invalidates what I have said about audible absorption of another's writings and audible composition of one's own, and if Seneca picks up the moment of recording by means of the *stilus*, that fact says nothing about the question whether it is a *scriba* who wields the *stilus* or Seneca himself. As to your demand for a fuller evaluation of the whole process of publication: I fully agree, *sed suo ista tempori reserventur.*