



## The Declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus

Review Author[s]:  
Robert A. Kaster

*Classical Philology*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (Jan., 1996), 84-89.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-837X%28199601%2991%3A1%3C84%3ATDOCF%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R>

*Classical Philology* is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and her companions, the bride's father and the groom, the mothers-in-law and the couple). What discussion there is does not go much beyond Sutton's dissertation, and interested readers would be well-advised to turn there.

Those caveats aside, O. and S. have done a remarkable job with what evidence there is. The strength of the book lies in the figures and in their detailed analyses of them, and for this work we should be grateful. The book closes with a useful glossary of terms, a bibliography that is fairly complete and especially helpful because briefly annotated, and a fine index. Though brief, the book is well worth the price, remarkably low for a book with so many high-quality photographs.

Kirk Ormand  
Loyola University  
Chicago

*The Declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus.* Edited by LEWIS A. SUSSMAN. Supplements to *Mnemosyne*, 133. Leiden–New York–Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994. Pp. [vi] + 258. \$80.00.

Rhetoric was the beating heart of formal education in the Roman empire, enlivening the speech and thought of the male elite, and thereby defining the recoverable culture of discourse, in ways that are now being appreciated afresh by classical scholars working in a variety of areas and with a range of methods.<sup>1</sup> At the center of rhetorical education was the exercise of declamation, the phenomenon of argumentation and verbal display chiefly represented in Latin by the *controversiae* and *suasoriae* recalled by the elder Seneca, the *Declamationes maiores* and *minores* ascribed to Quintilian, and—least but not negligible—the declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus. The last named was a rhetor who, probably some time in the second century C.E., published a set of fifty-three exercises that were later mined for their *sententiae*, the epigrammatic jewels in declamation's crown; only the excerpted *sententiae* survive. Each of the texts just mentioned has received the serious attention of a gifted scholar in the past generation: Michael Winterbottom has produced an excellent Loeb version of Seneca (1974) and a massive edition (with commentary) of the *Declamationes minores* (1984); the late Lennart Håkanson provided new Teubner texts of Calpurnius (1978), the *Declamationes maiores* (1982), and Seneca (1989); and D. R. Shackleton Bailey has weighed in recently with a Teubner text of the *Declamationes minores* (1989). Now we have a contribution from Lewis Sussman, who in the past has also done useful work in the field of Latin declamation.<sup>2</sup>

But the stress here, unhappily, must fall on "the past": for the present volume is simply a very poor effort, each component of which—introduction, text, translation,

1. For evidence that ancient rhetoric is now, in fact, a certifiably hot topic, see Simon Goldhill's review article on four new books in the field, "Sophistry, Rhetoric, History," issued electronically by *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* on 19 June 1995.

2. See esp. S.'s *The Elder Seneca* (Leiden, 1978), which had the bad luck to appear shortly before the superior dissertation of Janet Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge, 1981); note also S.'s survey, "The Elder Seneca and Declamation Since 1900: A Bibliography," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.32.1 (1984): 557–77, and his translation, *The Major Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian*, *Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 27 (Frankfurt am Main, 1987).

and commentary—shows itself to be less competent than the preceding. The introduction is the only part that I can readily recommend: covering the expected topics—the educational background of declamation, the date, style, and content of Calpurnius' text, its manuscript tradition and modern editions—these pages are at least workmanlike and show a good (if at times oddly puritanical) feeling for declamation's educational effectiveness in its social context.<sup>3</sup> Beyond that it is difficult to find much good to say: it remains largely to survey the damage.

The text is massively dependent on Håkanson, relative to whose work it more often represents a regression than a significant advance; more generally, numerous details suggest that S. is ill at ease with the editor's role and the conventions of criticism.<sup>4</sup> He voluntarily hobbles his text with the worst feature of the Loeb Library—the absence of a critical apparatus—and justifies his choice by saying that “the Teubner is the standard and . . . readily available, and . . . in any case the textual tradition is uncomplicated” (p. 22). The latter remark suggests that S. misunderstands the purpose of an apparatus (a serious reader wants one constantly at hand, for otherwise it is not possible to know at any given point just how “complicated” the text's constitution is). The first justification raises the question “If we have to go to the Teubner for an apparatus, is there any reason that we need S.'s text at all?” The answer is “Not really.” S. says that “[m]ajor differences between my text and Håkanson are noted and usually discussed in the commentary” (ibid.). I count twenty-two such places, or fewer than one every two declamations.<sup>5</sup> The number is smaller still if one subtracts the places where S. follows up a remark in Håkanson's apparatus or adopts a suggestion made in one of the latter's other publications. When S. strikes out on his own, he pretty consistently goes astray. Anyone who already owns Håkanson's text will gain very little by owning this one as well; anyone who does not will more wisely give his money to Teubner than to Brill.

There is another question concerning the constitution of the text that deserves some notice: in a collection of excerpts that by definition lack an argumentative context, how does one determine where significant units begin and end? At page 22

3. S. remarks that “One may . . . fault the lurid content of many themes . . . , especially when we recall that these were intended for schoolboys in their teens as, for instance, the very large proportion of cases dealing with sexual misconduct” (p. 15, sim. p. 17). Instead of being censorious, however, we might ponder the fact that such themes are not often the target of declamation's many *ancient* critics: can it be that they saw how regularly, and edifyingly, the miscreants in the declamations come to grief?

4. S. consistently misuses obeli (cf. pp. 44, 76 [with p. 198], 84 [bis], 88 [bis], with n. 5 below) and pointed brackets (Calp. 43 ad fin., p. 82; Calp. 47 bis); his manner of quoting Håkanson at p. 231 (“The confusion is probably due to perseveration [sic] from the argumentum”) suggests that S. does not recognize “perseveration” as the regular term for the kind of error that occurs when a scribe perseveres in “seeing” (and so, mistakenly writing) a sequence of letters that he has recently copied.

5. Here is a list, by declamation number (\* denotes a reading that Håkanson considered in his apparatus or proposed elsewhere, adopted now by S.): 3 *miles* deleted (after Winterbottom), 4 full stop after *reservat*, 4 question mark after *carcerem posset*, \*6 <te>, \*9 *tantum . . . amentiae, 9 aut te excaecare velit pater* (the *paradosis*, inferior to Håkanson's *ut et excaecari velit mater*), \*13 *ultio . . . vindicavit* transposed to precede *praemium . . . polliceri*, 14 *qui<a>* (plainly wrong), 21 *quacumque . . . materia* (probably wrong, with an incoherent discussion in the commentary), 22 *audiunt* (Håkanson's *laudant* is wrong, but the *paradosis*, preferred by S., is not clearly right), \*26 *non iure*, 26 *rapies* (plainly wrong), 31 *quod pudori super* (grossly wrong, though as the commentary shows, the correct way was pointed out to S. by D. A. Russell), 34 punctuated (wrongly) *solutus est ? . . . vincitur!*, 36 *iure agit* (probably wrong; *agit* is Pithou's conjecture, which S. introduces—and obelizes!), \*38 *fortuna[que]*, 43 *quibus* (plainly wrong, though the right way was again shown by D. A. Russell) \*45 *reges* (probably wrong, though the right way was again very likely shown by D. A. Russell), \*47 *num . . . cives . . .* (S. adopts—and obelizes!—a reading proposed by Håkanson at *Eranos* 70 [1972]:70), 48 *praestiterit*, \*51 *afflictos*, \*52 <me>.

S. says “I have continued Håkanson’s practice of attempting to identify where *individual thoughts break off in the excerpts . . .*” (my emph.), though this formulation results in some confusion: for while it seems to imply that S. tries to mark off each *sententia*, the commentary speaks repeatedly of distinguishing one “excerpt” from another. The two are not necessarily the same thing (one excerpt can in principle contain more than one *sententia*), and the *sententiae* can be distinguished much more reliably than the excerpts. It seems clear to me, in any case, that S. often allows the “individual thoughts” to run on too long, and that many more breaks—many more distinct *sententiae*—should be noted. A reader of Calpurnius might consider marking a new *sententia* at least in the following places: 1 “non possum . . .”; 2 “miraris si . . .”; “da mihi . . .”; “periturae . . .”; “proprium est . . .” (and punctuate with a colon after *cadat*); “vides partum . . .”; “hoc ipsum . . .”; 4 “hanc lucem . . .”; 6 “iam pridem . . .” (suggested to S. by D. A. Russell); 7 “proditores putas . . .” (so also Håkanson); 9 “ego feci . . .”; 10 “horret referre . . .”; “arcesso coniugem . . .”; 11 “<fac eum> . . .” (so also D. A. Russell); 12 “modum non habet . . .” (so also D. A. Russell); 13 “tolerabilis vis est . . .”; “ultio quidem illa . . .”; 14 “tu illud prius . . .” (where the translation does in fact seem to mark a new one); 16 “tacuit, inquit . . .”; 18 “restituet nobis . . .” (perhaps); “fateor, armatorum . . .”; 20 “nostis nos . . .”; 21 “nihil audeo filio . . .”; “simuletur hoc factum . . .”; 29 “squalor et maeror . . .”; “pauper et dives . . .”; “si vicerit . . .”; 34 “sum reus . . .”; 45 “interemi iam . . .”; 46 “non est inquit . . .”; 51 “ignoscere non potui . . .”; 52 “gladiatorem me . . .” (preceded by a period after *consenescat*).

The translation, as S. notes, is primarily intended to serve as a trot.<sup>6</sup> This intention is perfectly respectable, but it is too often frustrated by the errors into which S. falls. The following list comprises only the most significant slips that I found: Calp. 2 (p. 27) “love in the same way” (read: “the same thing”), (p. 28) “much of its plight may even yet be inside her womb” (read: “(mis)fortune has much power even within the womb”), “Grant as much time as you think nature allows for this process” (read: “Time has all the power that you attribute to nature”—as D. A. Russell correctly pointed out to S. [p. 99]); 3 (p. 29) “Whenever his moral purity is imperiled, a man has the law on his side” (read: “Whenever moral purity is imperiled, it has the law on its side”—as D. A. Russell pointed out to S. [p. 101]), (p. 31) “. . . is a closet homosexual, since he sexually attracts homosexuals” (read: “carries about him an air of disgrace that invites disgraceful behavior”); 4 (p. 33) “See how this light stretches out, if it is hard to bear, see how this day does, if you hate it” (read: “Endure this light, if you find it grievous, endure this day, if you hate it”); 8 (p. 39) “that you were what you were was not in her power” (read: “is not in her power”); 9 (p. 39) “After the mother was put into isolation along with their wastrel son, the father of the family retired into seclusion” (read: “After the mother was put into isolation, the father of the family retired into seclusion with their wastrel son”): this error materially affects the understanding of the theme and leads S. to much pointless “reconstruction” on p. 120), “Why should we believe that you did

6. “This English version is an attempt to provide an accurate and fairly literal translation which will allow readers both fully conversant with Latin or even rusty in their skills to work through the original text using this as a reference guide” (p. 23). This raises a question, however: if it is assumed that the reader will approach the text through the Latin and use the English only secondarily, why in the world is the English translation used (annoyingly) for the lemmata in the commentary?

this in private?” (read: “What are we to believe that you did in private?”), “Whoever took pains to do this very thing . . .” (read: “Whoever is at pains [to show / claim / insist] that he did this thing . . .”); 10 (p. 41) “But I summon . . .” (delete “But . . .”: new *sententia*, no connective); 14 (p. 49) “If only this man, since he was assigned for debt, . . .” (read: “. . . for all that / though he was assigned . . .”); 18 (p. 55) “Let your official approval restore our sons to us on the grounds that their characters have changed” (read: “Like nature acting anew, your public authority will restore our sons to us”), “I will inscribe my name added to yours on your epitaph” (read: “I will inscribe our family name on your epitaph”): S. follows Burman’s inept paraphrase, see p. 153); 20 (p. 55) “My brother was lured away . . .” (where “lured away” does not convey *raptus*), “those projecting rocks (*scopulos*) of homosexual perversion” (where “homosexual perversion” overtranslates *impudicitia*); 27 (p. 67) “You will forever be the same kind of person, you who have always been so up to now” (read: “the same kind of person you have always been . . .”); 31 (p. 71) “Suppose that this is the punishment for an adulteress, that she survive her disgrace” (read: “If this is the adulteress’s penalty, what is the advantage of chastity?”—so D. A. Russell, cited p. 190, retaining the correct text, *quid*, with Håkanson, against S.’s ludicrous *quod*); 41 (p. 81) “A certain man abducted a young lady and handed her over to be sexually violated by a youth with whom she was in love” (read: “. . . with whom *he* was in love”: the error misses the point of the whole theme and leads S. into much futile flailing about in the commentary, even though he remarks that an unnamed reader pointed out to him the correct translation); 42 (p. 81) “. . . when unexpectedly good fortune, of its own accord, as it usually does, became jealous” (read: “. . . when suddenly good fortune . . .”, a rendering of *subito* that makes more sense with *ut solet* / “as it usually does”); 43 (p. 83) “But my vision was snatched away from me . . .” (read: “But the light of day was snatched away . . .”); 49 (p. 87) “at any rate eventually his bad character will track him down” (read: “. . . his bad reputation will catch up with him”); 51 (p. 89) “. . . the other woman, because she had submitted to a man . . .” (which translates Schultingh’s text—“*altera, quod virum perpessa est*”—even though it is Håkanson’s text that S. prints, *obeli* and all—“*illa †quod virgo perpessa est†*”: see the long, confused discussion on pp. 234 f.); 52 (p. 91) “But my country—not a corsair—made me a gladiator” (delete “But”).

Though the text makes no material advance over Håkanson, and though the translation is too often defective, neither of these faults is *per se* utterly disastrous: one still can read Håkanson, and most readers who find their way to the dim corner of Latin literature where Calpurnius resides will have enough Latin to dispense with the translation. A good commentary—one that set the declamations fully in their tradition and placed vividly before the reader the educational, literary, and social context in which they must be understood—would easily balance the faults and be truly worth having. But S. has nowhere more grossly squandered his opportunity than in the commentary: to compare this production with its only true counterpart—Winterbottom on the *Declamationes minores*—is to compare a pennywhistle with a pipe organ.

A central virtue of a good commentary—a sense of what needs to be said and of what should be left in one’s notes—is completely lacking. For every entry that offers useful comment on rhetorical effects in their context (e.g., p. 105, on *descriptio*), there are ten that waste space by remarking obvious stylistic effects or quarreling

over trivial points with predecessors or canvassing improbable alternatives. Nor is this surprising: for a sense of what needs to be said must follow from a sense of one's audience, a matter to which S. seemingly gave no coherent thought. From internal evidence, the implied reader appears to be someone who cannot notice "a sparkling *sententia*" or "an especially emphatic *conduplicatio*" (and so on and on) unless they are pointed out, or who must be given a reference in the form "Hieron. (i.e., Jerome), *Hebraicae quaestiones in Genesim . . .*," or who again and again requires extensive paraphrase in addition to the translation; yet this same reader, it is assumed, understands without being told *why* a *sententia* is sparkling, or why a pointed antithesis is effective, and knows so much about Roman culture that she or he does not need discussion of subjects such as the Romans' understanding of heredity and the transmission of genetically determined traits (p. 97), or the meaning of "being a *vir*" in a context of same-sex acts (p. 101), or the difference between marriage and rape (blandly equated in Calp. 16), or male prostitution (p. 155), or *praevaricatio* (p. 162), or stepmothers (*ibid.*), or the understanding of biological versus legal fatherhood (p. 222). All these topics, and many, many more, are central to Calpurnius' declamatory themes. Yet on none does S. offer anything beyond a reference or two to secondary literature; and on most occasions he says nothing at all.

The commentary, in short, is superficial, slack, and desultory, telling the reader what S. happened already to know, or what is in any case obvious, or what the Packard Humanities Institute Latin CD-ROM turned up (whether it is helpful or not: p. 242, "these are the only two instances of *perquam* in decl."). Accordingly, the reader can expect extensive parallels from Latin declamation (but *not* Greek) and citations of standard items in the bibliography of the field: if a Winterbottom or a Bonner has discussed a given matter, S. will duly give the reference. If, however, such a discussion does not already exist, the reader will not find it here. The main lesson one learns from the commentary is that with a CD-ROM, anyone can imitate the worst habits of J. E. B. Mayor. What one will not learn is anything that would have required original scholarly inquiry on S.'s part.

E. J. Brill deserve special censure for issuing this poorly conceived and poorly executed work, with no apparent vetting or even copy-editing,<sup>7</sup> and at a whopping price. Whom do they expect to pay it? Surely not students, for whom \$80 will represent a week's groceries or a good chunk of a month's rent; nor will many of their teachers be able to afford it; and the few individuals who have the ready money will more wisely spend it on Håkanson's Teubner (about \$26) and the two volumes of Winterbottom's Loeb Seneca (about \$17 each), with enough left over to buy, say, a paperback copy of *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* by S.'s former teacher George Kennedy. No, it is our libraries that will get a soaking, as Brill continue to spit out title after costly title, secure in the knowledge that institutions with standing

7. The book gives every appearance of having been produced hastily from S.'s floppy disks, before the files had received a patient proof-reading: misprints abound, too numerous to catalog here, and they appear to become increasingly common the farther into the book one goes. I note only the serious misprints found in the Latin text: in Calp. 19 (p. 54) read "mortem usque adhuc necessariam"; in 25 (p. 64), the last sentence should not be marked as the beginning of a new *sententia* (correctly in the translation); in the theme of 41 (p. 80) read "stuprandam"; at 47 (p. 84), the commentary makes clear that an obelus has fallen out before the initial <num> (though correct editorial procedure would not restore the obelus before *num* but delete it after *cuiusque*, since S. plainly does not regard the passage as irremediably corrupt).

serial orders will pick up the tab, whatever the quality of the merchandise. And the sad fact is that too many recent titles from Brill, like this one, do not even nearly give value for cost.<sup>8</sup> If, however, Brill will not responsibly perform the job of screening the titles they produce, then libraries should feel no obligation to maintain their standing orders: in times of strained and shrinking budgets, delayed and selective purchasing is the only sound defense against careless or cynical exploitation. I have already spoken with our library about this. I suggest that you do the same with yours.

*Robert A. Kaster*  
*University of Chicago*

8. See, for example, Kirk Ormand's review of Irene J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan (edd.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, Supplements to *Mnemosyne*, 130 (Leiden, 1994), issued electronically by *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* on 6 August 1994; and Nicholas Smith's review of E. de Stryker and S. R. Slings, *Plato's 'Apology of Socrates': A Literary and Philosophical Study with a Running Commentary*, Supplements to *Mnemosyne*, 137 (Leiden, 1994), in *CP* 90 (1995): 379–83. The total cost of these two books and S.'s is \$291.