The Elder Seneca: A Review of Past Work.

by J.E.G. Whitehorne*

The Controversiae and Suasoriae of the Elder Seneca (c. 55 BC - between AD 37 and 41), often referred to less correctly as Seneca Rhetor, are our main contemporary source of knowledge for the practices of the Roman schools of declamation, the system of education that produced not only writers like Seneca's own son, Seneca the Younger, the younger Pliny and Juvenal but also Saints Basil, Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, and was still being praised as late as the time of Erasmus and Sir Thomas More. And yet, while L'Année Philologique lists yearly a great number of works devoted to the son and his importance and influence as philosopher and dramatist, there are few, if any at all, concerned with the father, and then they are mainly devoted to the schools of declamation in general, rather than to Seneca himself. Such a situation seems surprising, especially when one considers that a knowledge of at least the rudiments of the declamatory system is essential to a full understanding of practically every Silver Age writer. Here is a field, admittedly not of the first importance but important nevertheless, relatively free from bibliographical impediments, and yet it is left virtually unworked! The only recent bibliographical works to take account of Seneca, of which I know, are Bonner's chapter on Roman Oratory in Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship (First ed., 1954; unfortunately this chapter was not updated for the second edition) and Hayment's survey of Rhetoric in CW 52 (1958), 75-91. Both these accounts cull a much wider field and the present article will therefore, I hope, function as both a guide and a stimulus to interest in an author who has been unduly neglected. I have taken the second edition of Bornecque's text in 1932 as a convenient starting point, and in my abbreviations I have followed the conventions of L'Année Philologique throughout.

Texts, Translations and Commentaries.

The only modern text of Seneca's works is that of Bornecque (second ed., Paris 1932) and that is now out of print. Admittedly, Bornecque's work leaves a lot to be desired and suffers especially from bad typography, but the text is preferable to that of Kiessling (1872; repr. by Teubner, 1967) or H. Müller (1887; repr. 1963), the text that Bornecque himself took as
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his starting point, although one must still turn to these for an apparatus. Bornecque's edition is also still the only complete translation of Seneca's work into a modern language and the only one to provide the reader with notes, useful though short. Edwards had provided an English translation and commentary upon the Suasoriae in 1928 but shrank from the larger work, the ten books of the Controversiae. The task of translating the whole has now been undertaken for the Loeb Classical Library by M. Winterbottom, editor of the OCT Quintilian, and the work should be ready by 1971. The present writer has plans for writing some notes upon the Controversiae but the project is a long-range one.

The Manuscript Tradition.

The MSS of Seneca were first collated by Bursian (1857) and all later editors record their indebtedness to him. Kiessling and Müller, as far as they were able to, re-examined the MSS for their respective editions but since that time critical work has languished somewhat. Bornecque did not examine the MSS himself but adopted Müller's text, incorporating his own emendations into his first edition (Paris 1902), together with the others that were poured forth in the last decades of the nineteenth century. By the time of his second edition (1932) this flood of emendation had died almost to a trickle and since then there have been so few conjectures offered that it seemed a poor return for the time spent to track them all down to their obscure resting places in journals that are, for the most part, unavailable in Australasia.

By an odd coincidence all except one of the main MSS of Seneca are located in Belgium and it is Belgian scholars who have done the only recent work upon them. The text was studied by one Patris as a doctoral thesis (Thesis, U. de Bruxelles 1940) but I find no later writer mentioning this work. The most active scholar in this field recently has been a Flem, H. D. L. Vervliet. In 1957 he published a study of the early printed editions of Seneca (De Gulden Passer 35 [1957], 179-222) demonstrating their importance for the textual critic in that they may often contain handwritten marginalia or record readings from MSS that are now no longer extant. Following Müller Vervliet divides the MSS into three groups:

1. ABV, the three main MSS of the ninth and tenth centuries that preserve a complete, or almost complete, text and form the backbone of our tradition.

2. About ninety MSS containing the Excerpta (abridgments that were made of the Controversiae for
school use at quite an early date) and the prae-
fationes of the Controversiae, which are not giv-
en by our main MSS.
3. About thirty MSS containing mediaeval commentar-
ies on the Excerpta.
The latter groups are a good illustration of the pop-
ularity and longevity of the declamatio, albeit in an
adulterated form, and it would be interesting to know
more about these MSS. Their importance for the text-
ual tradition is slight but they would be of consid-
erable interest to anyone investigating Seneca's in-
fluence in the Middle Ages.

Vervliet treats the printed editions in four sec-
tions:
1. The Italian incunabula, published between 1490
and 1503, and the early editions from Basle, be-
tween 1515 and 1555, with Erasmus' corrections
and notes.
2. The sixteenth and seventeenth century editions,
with which the names of Muretus and André Schott,
once the owner of the Antverpiensis MS (A), are
associated.
3. Modern publications.
4. Translations.

V. has also argued (Scriptorium 13[1959], 80-81)
from the comparative length of the gaps in three of the
quaternions of the Antverpiensis that this MS, like B,
must have repeated chapters one to five of the Suasor-
iae as well as omitting the first preface of the Con-
troversiae. In the same article he dispels the doubts
that Muller felt about the identification of the Antver-
piensis with the Augustodunensis, mentioned by Schott.
Finally in AC 33(1961+), 431-441, he has examined a lit-
tle known thirteenth century MS in Cambridge, that he
elsewhere suggests may have been used by Erasmus⁵, and
has proved that, like E (Bruxellensis 9768), it is de-
rived from the Toletanus MS.

Seneca as a literary critic.

In his choice of material from the many declamat-
ions that he had heard, in his disposition of that mat-
erial and comments upon it and in the whole raison
d'être of his collection of sententiae, divisiones and
colores, Seneca's primary function was that of the lit-
erary critic and there is general agreement among mod-
ern writers that, in this role, he acquitted himself
exceedingly well. J.F.D'Alton in his Roman Literary
Theory and Criticism (London 1931), 545, considers that
Seneca occupies "a place of distinction" among Roman
critics and has high praise for his attempts to under-
stand and explain the psychology of the declaimers whom
he quotes. He also makes the good point that Seneca
can provide the personal note, so important to the modern reader, that is lacking in the critical writings of Quintilian or Cicero and it is indeed a pity that students are often asked to read Cicero's rather tedious comments on early oratory, when dealing with that period, but are never introduced to Seneca's prefaces, when the literature of the Silver Age is taught. However D'Alton was surely mistaken in describing Seneca's language, packed as it is with sententiae of his own and allusions to Cicero and other writers and works with which he was familiar, as "simple and unstudied."

Atkins, too, in Literary Criticism in Antiquity (Cambridge 1934), 11.147-153, has kind words to say of Seneca's abilities as a critic and S.F. Bonner (Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire [Liverpool 1949, Chapter VII], who follows D'Alton's favourable judgement, gives more detail about Seneca's literary views and concludes by terming Seneca the "Horace of Augustan prose criticism." By comparison the most recent writer to deal with ancient criticism, G.M.A. Grube (The Greek and Roman Critics [London 1965], 257-261), seems to treat Seneca in a very superficial manner.

Turning from general judgements to particular investigations of Seneca's critical thought, a most important work is H. Bardon's Le vocabulaire de la critique littéraire chez Sénèque le Rhéteur (Paris 1940). Mention should also be made of his article on Seneca's style in AC 12(1933), 5-28, while A. Sochatoff (CJ 34 [1939], 345-354) has written about Seneca's basic theories and assumptions about oratory.

Perhaps the best known of Seneca's critical statements is that concerned with Ovid. In Contr. 11.1(10), 5-12, he tells us that Ovid was a pupil of Arelius Fuscus and an admirer of Porcius Latro, one of the best known teachers of the day, that he was a good declaimer and that he preferred suasoriae to controversiae because he found the argumentation required by the latter tiresome. He also quotes a declamation or part of a declamation that he had heard the young Ovid deliver before Fuscus. This evidence is treated by L.P. Wilkinson in Ovid Recalled (Cambridge 1955), 5-10, and, with a slightly different emphasis, by H. Fränkel (Ovid, a Poet between Two Worlds [Berkeley 1945], 5-8). There is, however, some dispute as to the implication of Seneca's words for our assessment of Ovid. K. Büchner (MH 13[1956], 180-184) thinks that Ovid's change of teachers marks a definite change in his interest from oratory to poetry but T.P. Higham (Ovidiana ed. N.I. Heslop [Paris 1958], 32-48), in a close examination of the relevant passages, has de-emphasised the influence
of declamation upon Ovid and challenged the convention­
al view of Ovid as a "rhetorical" poet. It is interest­
ing that, in the same volume and using the same evid­
ence, F.Arnaldi (op.cit., 23-31) has argued that Ovid
should be regarded as "Rhetorical" in the widest sense
of the word. Seneca is indeed not as clear at this point
as we would like him to be!

Seneca also finds occasion to mention and quote
from a number of other contemporary poets and it is to
him that we owe the survival of the only two fragments
of any length that we have of the work of Albinovanus
Pedo and Cornelius Severus. Twenty three lines from
Albinovanus' poem "The Voyage of Germanicus" are quoted
at Suas.I.15 (=p.351 Baehrens, p.115 Morel) and V.Bongi
(RIL 82[1949], 28-48) has provided an analysis of this
passage and suggested that the poet's work was known
and used by Tacitus in his descriptions of storms in
Ann.II.23-24 and Germania XXXIV.2. More recently
V.Tandoi (SIFC 36[1964], 129-168) has shown how the
passage can be related to other dramatic descriptions
of nature in the works of the younger Seneca and Lucan.
Line 19 in this fragment - atque alium liberris intact­
um quaerimus orbem - has long given trouble and T.
would read bellis or dominis for liberis while Alfonsi
(Aevum 39 [1965], 129-130) has suggested lembis as a
reading. The fragment of Cornelius Severus, twenty
five lines on the death of Cicero quoted at Suas.VI.26
(= p.353 Baehrens, p.118 Morel) has been analysed by
H.Homeyer (AUS 10[1961], 327-334) and what is other­
wise known of both poets is outlined by Vardon, La lit­
térature latine inconnue (Paris 1956), II.69-73 and
61-64 respectively.

Individual rhetoricians mentioned by Seneca.

Bornecque's valuable book on this topic, Les dé­
clamations et les déclamateurs d'après Seneque le Père
(Paris 1902), which records all that is known of the
different declaimers and teachers mentioned by Seneca,
is happily now back in print (repr.1967). For basic
information one can still do worse than to refer to
Schanz-Hosius, sections 334-336, and there are, of
course, the individual entries in RE. In French there
is a short account, based mainly on Bornecque's work,
given by Bardon (op.cit., II.83-91) and in English
A.D.Lee man (Orationis Ratio [Amsterdam 1963], I.227-
231) gives an account, illustrated by quotations, of
Latro, Arellius Fuscus, Haterius and Cestius Pius while
his pages on Papirius Fabianus (op.cit., I.261-271) in
reference to the younger Seneca's Philosophical writ­
ings are also worthy of notice.

Apart from these works there is little on indiv­
dual declaimers. L.Bieler (WS 53[1935], 84-94)
examined the religious element in Arellius Fuscus' art, with particular reference to Suas. IV, while Lebek (Hermes 94 [1966], 360-372) has argued that we should prefer Seneca's biography of Albucius Silus, in Contr. VII.pr.1-9, to that of Suetonius, De Rhet. VI. Finally A. Dalzell (Hermathena 86[1955], 20-28) has tried, unconvincingly I feel, to deprive Asinius Pollio of the credit that Seneca gives him for being the first to read his books in public at Rome (Contr. IV.pr.2).

Rhetorical terminology and grammatical studies.

In his work Seneca naturally enough makes use of a number of technical terms that would have been familiar to the contemporary reader, but often seem all too vague today and are sometimes difficult to track down in the standard works of reference. Indeed the complex terminology of classical rhetoric, which was, after all, one of the main academic subjects of the ancient world, often baffles, if it does not repel, the non-specialist meeting it for the first time, but an extremely useful aid is now at hand in H. Lausberg's Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik (Munich 1960), which gives full definitions, with examples, of the terms used not only in Latin but also in Greek and French rhetoric. Surprisingly, though, the work lacks an index locorum, which considerably circumscribes its usefulness for comparative work.

In Contr. I.pr.12, speaking of the novelty of the controversia as an exercise, Seneca draws a distinction between the controversia of his time, Cicero's causa, and the thesis, which he claims was the normal means of instruction before Cicero's time, and particular attention has been paid to these terms and what he means by them. The history of the thesis or quaestio infinita (the general "should a man marry?" as opposed to the particular "should Cicero marry?") has been investigated by H. Throm (Die Thesis, ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte. Paderborn 1932) but he did not follow it down through the Republican period. However M. L. Clarke (CQ N.S. I[1951], 159-166) has studied the use of the term during this period and concludes that Seneca's distinction, followed incidentally by Quintilian II.1,9 and Suetonius, De Rhet. I.5, is a mistaken one. It appears that the thesis was not widespread and that the usual method of training was from the earliest times at Rome a form of the controversia, but of a less extravagant variety than the Senecan examples. Following this line of investigation, E. M. Jenkinson (So 31[1955], 122-130) has shown that in the early period the thesis was regarded as belonging exclusively to the schools of philosophy and that it was only under the influence of Cicero's developed rhetorical theory that it was claimed for rhetoric.
In the same passage Seneca also speaks of the use of the Greek term scholastica for controversia, and Bonner (CR 61[1947], 86) has shown that this word should probably always be regarded as feminine rather than as a neuter form. A study of the word declamatio itself has been made by G. François (AC 32[1963], 513-540), who has compared the uses of declamatio and disputatio in Cicero, Quintilian and both Senecas, and, although not directly concerned with Seneca, an interesting study of the terms litterator and litteratus and their relationship to grammaticus has been given by E. Bower in Hermes 89(1961), 462-477.

Finally, there are a couple of points of grammatical interest that have recently been remarked upon in Seneca's work and they seem worth recording here. MacGuinness (G & R 19[1950], 89) draws attention to an example of the use of the imperfect subjunctive in primary sequence at Contr.X.pr.3 and Morse (CR N.S.6[1956], 196-198) examines the construction quid do ut(ne)? that occurs at Contr.IX.3(26), 11 and 12, and also in Seneca, Epp.79.5, and Juvenal VII.165 and concludes that the indicative is used here in a quasi-deliverative sense.

Seneca as an historian.

After setting down the Controversiae and the Suasoriae, Seneca turned his hand to historical writing and occupied his remaining years with composing a history of Rome from the beginning of the civil wars. This work, edited after his father's death by the younger Seneca, probably while he was in exile, is now completely lost except for a notice in Lactantius, Div. Inst.VII.15,14, and a reference in Suetonius, Tiberius 73, that shows that Seneca got to at least the death of Tiberius. These passages are discussed by Peter, HRF, II.cxviii-cxviii, and Klingner (MH 15[1958], 194-206) has written an article on the work's probable relationship to other historical writings of the period.

The passage from Lactantius mentions that Seneca had compared the history of Rome to the life of a man, passing through the five stages of infantia, pueritia, adolescentia, iuventus and senectus, and it was soon noticed that the same comparison is adopted by Florus in the preface to his Epitome. More recently Tibiletti (Convivium N.S.3[1959], 339-342) has pointed out that the metaphor is taken up by Tertullian, Virg.Vel.1.4-7, while Hahn (Birene 4[1965], 21-38) has paid special attention to it in examining Florus' preface and P. Archambault (REAug 12[1966], 193-228) has traced the history of the comparison through to the Renaissance. Elsewhere Hahn (AAntHung 12[1964], 169-206) has argued
that Seneca's work was used as a direct model by Appian and Grisart (Helikon 1[1961], 302-308), arguing erroneously that the Seneca at Suetonius, Caligula 53.3, is the older Seneca, has gone an unnecessarily long way round to show that our Seneca is also meant at Suetonius, Vergil 28(fr.4 in Kiessling's edition).

Returning to the firmer ground of the extant works, Wolverton (Studies in memory of W.E.Caldwell, ed.Gyles and Davis [Chapel Hill 1964], 82-90) has collected the references to Caesar in a number of authors, including both Senecas, to compare their respective historical portraits of the dictator. Then while one anecdote, that about Pollio and public recitation, has been challenged by Dalzell (loc.cit.), the historicity of another has been vindicated by epigraphical evidence. In TAPhA 77(1946), 146-150, Raubitschek published an inscription from the Agora (Agora Inv.no 3071) proving that both Antony and Octavia had indeed been worshipped as Theoi Euergetai at Athens in 39/38 BC, as the story at Suas.1.6-7 implies.

The declamations and the law.

The relationship of the Controversiae to contemporary Roman law poses a number of questions but there are perhaps two of especial importance. Firstly, what relationship do the laws that are quoted at the beginning of each controversia have to the Roman legal code, i.e. can the declamations be shown to have any practical application as a form of training for the courts? Secondly what effect did the use of declamation as a form of training have upon the development of Roman jurisprudence? Would its development have taken a different course in the absence of the controversia? There can, of course, never be any final answer to this latter question as rhetoric was such an obvious fact of life in Seneca's time that anybody who was educated was affected by it, like it or not, but the question does have bearing upon the problem of the composition of Justinian's Digest.

Bonner in his chapter on Romanoratory in Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship devotes the greater part of his survey of this period to our former question and presents a summary of his own conclusions upon it (second ed.,451-453). The history of this problem has shown a promising trend away from scholarly opinion towards scholarly knowledge and the general view now is that perhaps half of the laws quoted in the Controversiae have Roman parallels to a greater or lesser degree. The most accessible account of the subject is in Bonner's Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire, chapters 5 and 6, and the most detailed by F.Lanfranchi,
Il Diritto nei Retori Romani (Milan 1938). Both these writers reached much the same conclusions independently. E.P.Parks, The Roman rhetorical schools as a prepara-
tion for the courts under the early Empire (Baltimore 1945), states the same case but not nearly so convinc-
ingly, while Paoli (RD 31[1953], 175-199) has recently returned to a more Greek view of the origin of these 
laws.

For the latter question, in the same year that Bonner's book appeared, J.Stroux, one of the protagon-
ists of the view that the ideas and principles embod-
ed in the Digest are classical in origin, rather than
the work of post-classical or Byzantine interpolators, 
published an important collection of his articles in
this field under the title Römische Rechtswissenschaft 
und Rhetorik (Potsdam 1949). Stroux has argued strong-
ly for the influence of rhetorical theory upon juris-
prudence and has been followed in his beliefs by Stein-
wenter (ZRG 65[1947], 69-120) and, with reservations, 
by Meyer (ZRG 68[1951], 30-73). They have investigat-
ed the importance of the doctrine of constitutiones causae, 
the issues of the case, by which distinctions were
drawn between ius and aequitas and the verba of the law
as opposed to the voluntas or intention of the lawgiver.
The ius/aequitas distinction is exceedingly common in
the declamations and the implications of this line of
argument for the practical value of the declamatory
exercises are therefore obvious. More recently J.Santa 
Cruz (ZRG 75[1958], 91-115) has examined the system of
arguing the status of a question, secundum verba or
secundum voluntatem, and has shown how this system of
argumentation would have influenced the jurists trained
with it. Lanfranchi's book, it should be mentioned, is
also extremely useful here.

The debate then still continues. On its fringes
Fordyce, who wrote the article on Seneca for the OCD, 
has suggested that Contr.X.pr.1, adfirmem dixisse me
quae scivi quaeque audivi quaeque ad hanc rem pertinente
iudicavi, may preserve a part of the oath that was
sworn by witnesses in Roman courts (CR 52[1938], 59).
In an important study in ZRG 63(1934), 54-116, R.Düll
has shown that the practice of abdicatio, that occurs,
or rather, is threatened frequently in the Controversiae,
is not the same as the Greek apokeryxis but is Roman
in origin and Rayment (CW 45[1952], 225-228) has argued
that Contr.IX.4(27) and two passages in the "Quintilian"
declamations (Ps-Quint. Decl.Min. 358 and 372) antici-
pate an imperial edict concerned with patria potestas
and has examined the role played by exheredatio and
abdicatio in the declamations. Finally Hermesdorf (RHD
33[1965], 78-81) pointed out, though he was not the first
to do so?, that the practice of dividing an inheritance
The declamations and education.

Having seen that the Controversiae are not really as divorced from the realities of law as Bornecque and Boissier once believed, it is perhaps best to consider next the question of the general value of the declamatory system as an educational tool.

Contemporary detractors of the system were many and their names make an impressive list. Messalla in Tacitus’ Dialogus and Encolpius in Petronius’ Satyricon complain the loudest and longest, but they receive strong support from both Plinys, Velleius, Juvenal, Lucian, Martial and "Longinus." The damning evidence of these writers, linking the decay in oratory directly with the rise of the schools, is most conveniently summarized in translation by H. Caplan (Studies in speech and drama in honor of A. M. Drummond [Ithaca 1944], 295-325) and this evidence has exerted a profound effect upon the traditional view of the value of declamation. Thus A. Gwynn in Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian (New York 1926), 164, speaking of the schools of rhetoric, says "their influence on Roman education was wholly disastrous," a view that is followed by M. L. Clarke (Rhetoric at Rome [London 1953], chapter 8) and most recently by G. M. A. Grube (op. cit., 257-261). Grube’s statement that "there is something frightening about an educational method unanimously condemned by all the best minds in Rome throughout the century, which yet carries on by its own momentum until it outlives them all" (op. cit., 261) could be applied equally well, mutatis mutandis, to the excessive faith placed in a classical education up till recent times in our own society and his view is best modified, I feel, by Caplan’s sensible observation (op. cit., 322) that no-one is ever entirely satisfied with his own educational system.

Indeed there is a very real danger of disregarding the other side of the coin, that Seneca himself, although he deprecates the excesses of the modernists (Contr. I.pr. 6-9) never doubts the value of declamation per se, and that Quintilian, a former lawyer as well as an outstanding teacher, likewise emphasises its worth for both training and practice (Quint. X. 5, 14). A more balanced view is presented of the practice of declamation by Marrou in his History of Education in Antiquity (English tr., New York 1956), 385-387, and by Bonner (op. cit., Chapter 4) who gives Quintilian’s favourable testimony its proper weight. The same line is followed by D. L. Clark in his chapter on declamation in Rhetoric.
in Greco-Roman Education (New York 1957), 211-261. In 1922 in his Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance (New York 1922), 39, he had spoken of "the utter unreality and hollowness of such rhetoric" but I suspect that the work of Stroux and his followers did much to change his mind, for in 1949 we find him prepared to admit (Quarterly Journal of Speech 35 [1949], 280-283) that the system of arguing the status of a case would have provided a good training in the manipulation of probabilities and the use of conjecture, as well as useful practice in the field of epideictic oratory, views that he repeats in Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education.

It should perhaps be allowed, then, that, although the declamatory system was far from perfect and was certainly capable of abuse if handled too academically, it was far from being as disastrous as its opponents would claim. We should also remember that its detractors, especially Tacitus, Petronius and Juvenal, were more than ready to use the literary tricks of the trade that the declaimers were teaching. That there still exists a tendency to underestimate the declamation and its worth is seen by the attempt of Leeman (op.cit., I.235) to deny the declamation any place in the history of literature. In fact, the declamation is not only of importance for its part in the development of the romance and its influence upon other fields of literature, as Norden saw, but it must be regarded as an art form in its own right, with links with the theatre and the mime, a natural development of the love of acting innate in the Roman character from the earliest times. This is an important aspect of the declamatory system that is unduly neglected by modern scholars and it is an area that is well worth further investigation.

Seneca's influence.

We have seen how Seneca's Histories may have had some influence upon the work of Appian and Florus, although the evidence for solid proof is unfortunately lacking, and it could be argued, as Atkins (op.cit., II.153), that Seneca's handbook helped smooth the way for the acceptance of Quintilian's neo-classicism in the next century, but it is perhaps impossible at such a distance to speak of an influence of Seneca himself rather than that of the declamatory system in general. Of this latter there is no doubt. E.Norden's Die antike Kunstprosa (Leipzig 1898), 1.270-300, is still basic here but there are good general accounts in English given by J.F.E.Raby, A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages (second ed., Oxford 1957). 1.25-42, and with more particular reference to Seneca and the declamations, by Bonner (op.cit., chapter 8).

The history of declamation is a long and distinguished one, extending from the time of Seneca to the
Renaissance and beyond. It had a strong influence upon Christian apologetic and, after going underground in the Dark Ages, it emerges as one of the links that binds mediaeval secular culture to the old classical learning. Then interest seems to languish again for a while until the tradition is revived in the Renaissance by Erasmus, and the sixteenth century sees a great spate of editions, annotated by Erasmus and others. The path is not always an easy one to follow but it is there nevertheless, one of the byways of humanism that has yet to be explored fully.

Tertullian and Augustine are among Christian writers upon whom declamation exerted a powerful influence and, over a century after Augustine had held the chair of rhetoric at Milan, declamation was still being taught there, as we learn from Ennodius (AD 473-521), who himself composed model declamations, Dictiones, for his pupils, before he took Holy Orders and turned his back upon secular learning. With the renewed invasions of the sixth century and the new order of Gregory I, interest in pagan culture reaches its lowest ebb but the revival of the ninth century is not far away and many of the old authors are rediscovered and MSS copied and circulated, including those of Seneca, while in this century the poet Walaafird Strabo is perhaps the first to distinguish two Senecas. The Church Fathers still form the backbone of the monastic libraries but gradually more and more classical authors creep back into the lists of those worth studying, and, although Seneca's work never becomes well known, several of the more scholarly writers, Gerbert of Aurillac (950-1003), Gilbert de la Porée (c.1075-1154) and the great John of Salisbury (1115-1180) are familiar with his writings and he is represented in the florilegia. More importantly, his influence can be seen in the Gesta Romanorum, as much as that of any other ancient author, while the susasoria, combined with the thesis "should a man marry?" seems to have given the Middle Ages a completely new and extremely popular genre in the misogynistic dissuasio. Later, in the Renaissance, the practice of declamation itself was revived by Erasmus, who praises it highly, and in the seventeenth century Milton was asked to compose declamationes as part of his course at Cambridge. Today the influence of the declamatory tradition can perhaps still be discerned in such exercises as the school debate or the moot court.

There is no over-all treatment of the influence of Seneca but a number of useful points have been noted. Arimaspus (RMAL 34[1948], 281-282) has suggested that the learned sage Craton, who appears in Reginald of Canterbury's Vita Sancti Malchi in the early twelfth
century and the English De Disciplina Scholarium in the thirteenth and who has previously eluded identification, is the result of a mediaeval misunderstanding of Contr.X.5(34), 21, Craton venustissimus homo et professus Asianus (asinius MSS). R. Falconi (GIF 13[1960], 327-335) has noted that the theme of the young man who falls ill from love for his stepmother, that is the basis for Contr.VI.7, is employed by Valerius Maximus V.7, ext.1, and that the same story is also used by the humanist Leonardo Bruni in his novella, Antioco e Stratonica. Falconi has also shown (GIF 14[1961], 214-229) that some of the characters and arguments of the declamations can be traced in Boccaccio's Decameron, while Rayment (CB 34[1958], 61-61) has examined the story De Sectanda Fidelitate in the Gesta, in which a declamation is recast. Finally, and this seems a good point on which to leave the elder Seneca, Atkins (op. cit., II.154-155) has drawn attention to the fact that Ben Jonson's famous appreciation of Shakespeare in his Discoveries is not original. It is, in fact, taken almost word for word from Seneca's criticism of Haterius in Contr.IV.pr.7-11.

NOTES

1. This is the name that occurs in the MSS; there is no evidence that Seneca himself was ever a professional rhetorician.

2. Bornecque published his critical work in RPh 26 (1902), 360-377; 27(1903), 53-63.

3. Personal communication from Doctor Winterbottom; his text is to be a corrected version of Muller's.

4. I am indebted to Miss M. de Blaauw for her assistance in translating this article.


6. The argument turns about the interpretation of Horace, Sat.I.4,73-76; D. feels that these lines suggest that the practice of recitatio in public places was well established at the time that Horace was writing, but my impression is that the poet is attacking a practice that is relatively new. Furthermore, there is in the relevant passage in Seneca a definite opposition between declamavit and pecitavit - "he would never declaim publicly (which would have involved extemporising to some degree), but he did not lack ambition in that he was the first to give public readings from his own works." There is really not enough evidence to justify any modification of Seneca's statement; in fact, all
the evidence that D. quotes suggests that before this time, although public recitationes were far from unknown, it was the practice for writers to employ special *grammatici* to read their works in public for them.

7. Its occurrence in the thirteenth century German *Sachenspiegel* is noted in passing by Dull (op.cit., 74, n.30).


12. H. Marrou, op.cit., 460.


14. Cf. the "library lists" of Alcuin and Theodulf, quoted by Raby (op.cit., I.179-180)


21. Number five in the *Gesta*.