

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/79382>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2019-04-22 and may be subject to change.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

I·S·H·R

International Society For the History of Rhetoric
Retorica • Rhétorique • Rhetorik • Rhetoric • Retórica

The Use of exempla in Roman Declamation

Author(s): Marc van der Poel

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, Vol. 27, No. 3, Special issue: An International Project on the Pseudo-Quintilianic Declamationes maiores Special issue: An International Project on the Pseudo-Quintilianic Declamationes maiores (Summer 2009), pp. 332-353

Published by: [University of California Press](http://www.ucpress.edu) on behalf of the [International Society for the History of Rhetoric](http://www.ishr.org)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/RH.2009.27.3.332>

Accessed: 26/09/2012 10:21

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and International Society for the History of Rhetoric are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

MARC VAN DER POEL

The Use of *exempla* in Roman Declamation

Abstract: In this paper I present a list of the *exempla* used in the four surviving ancient collections of declamations (see Appendix: checklist of *exempla*), with a brief survey of the theory of the *exemplum* in rhetorical handbooks and discussion of a few samples from the *Controversiae* and the *Declamationes maiores*. My observations suggest that Seneca's criticism of the use of *exempla* in declamations (*Contr.* 7.5.12–13) is exaggerated.

Keywords: *exempla*, Seneca, ps.-Quintilian, Calpurnius Flaccus, *Controversiae et Suasoriae*, *Declamationes maiores*, *Declamationes minores*

1. INTRODUCTION

In this contribution I will discuss the use of *exempla* in the four extant compilations of ancient Roman declamations. After a few introductory remarks on the role of *exempla* in ancient Greco-Roman culture and their place in the ancient theory of eloquence I will briefly present the list of *exempla* included in the Appendix at the end of this article. I will also discuss a few samples of *exempla* against the background of Seneca the Elder's criticism that declaimers used *exempla* ill-advisedly (*Controversia* 7.5.12–13).

Examples for instruction or proof played a very important role in both Greek and Roman culture. From Homer and Hesiod onward, Greek authors used mythological and historical examples to illustrate thoughts, events or actions evoked in their writings. In Rome, great deeds of men from the recent and remote past were praised and pre-

sented as models for new generations of young Romans according to ancient custom. Thus, we know from a famous passage in the *Histories* of Polybius that it was customary that during funeral ceremonies for deceased men of prominent families, a son or another relative delivered a speech to honour the virtues and successful achievements of the deceased and to foster a spirit of bravery in the audience.¹ When the Romans developed their own literature under the influence of the Greeks, the task of commemorating *exempla* as models of virtue and vice was as a matter of course appropriated by historians. Thus, Livy writes in the preface to his monumental *Ab urbe condita libri*:

What chiefly makes the study of history wholesome and profitable is this, that you behold the lessons of every kind of experience set forth as on a conspicuous monument; from these you may choose for yourself and for your own state what to imitate, from these mark for avoidance what is shameful in the conception and shameful in the result (1, *praefatio* 10; tr. B. O. Foster).²

Testimonies from Terence and Pliny the Younger, among others, show that *exempla* were commonly used as models of behaviour in the education of young people,³ and the memory of famous deeds and persons was present literally everywhere in the form of inscriptions on statues and buildings.⁴

2. THE *EXEMPLUM* IN THE THEORY OF RHETORIC

Given the prominent role of *exempla* in Greco-Roman culture, their importance in rhetoric need not surprise us.⁵ As early as the

¹Polybius, *Histories* 6.53–55, ed. W. R. Paton, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922), 389. Cp. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 1.3, where it is recorded that guests used to sing at banquets in honour of the virtues of famous men, but Cicero says that a speech of Cato shows that this talent was not held in respect.

²*Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in illustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vitas.* Cp. Tacitus' introduction to his *Histories* 1.2–3, where a similar statement is made on historical *exempla*.

³See, e.g., often cited passages such as Terence, *Adelphoe* 414–19; Horace, *Sermones* 1.4.105–21; Pliny, *Letters* 8.14.6; see J. D. Chaplin, *Livy's Exemplary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 11–13.

⁴Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 37.14.

⁵See on the theory of the *exemplum* in rhetoric the old, but still very useful study of K. Alewell, *Über das rhetorische ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ. Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (diss. Leipzig: Druck von August Hoffmann, 1913), 5–35. A list of all the source texts on *exemplum* can be found in

pre-Aristotelian *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* attributed to Anaximenes, the example (παράδειγμα) is part of the *inventio*, which forms the core of the theory of eloquence. In this oldest surviving classical handbook on rhetoric, the example is ranged under the category of the so-called proofs drawn from persons and their actions and words, or, to use the term coined later by Aristotle, artistic proofs (πίστεις ἔντεχνου), that is, proofs which the orator must construct by means of the art of invention. Their use is discussed systematically and in detail: παραδείγματα are defined as “actions that have occurred previously”; they must be used to illustrate the orator’s statement of a case that is unconvincing by itself and cannot be proved by an argument from probability; comparison of the example with the statement will lend the statement probability.⁶ The author distinguishes two modes (τρόποι) of the example, namely examples that illustrate something which is according to reasonable expectation and hence produces credibility, and examples which do the exact opposite because they go against the audience’s expectation. Several specimens of examples taken from the recent political relations between Athens, Sparta and Thebes are presented to illustrate the distinction between the two modes.⁷ In Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* the παράδειγμα occupies a central position in the *inventio* on the basis of the juxtaposition of rhetoric and dialectic, because just as reasoning by means of rhetorical syllogisms (ἐνθυμηματα) is parallel to deductive reasoning in dialectic, so reasoning by means of παραδείγματα forms the counterpart of inductive reasoning in dialectic. Thus, Aristotle defines the example as a rhetorical induction,⁸ forming one of the two categories of artistic proof. In his analysis of the modes of persuasion common to all three species of rhetoric, Aristotle discusses the παράδειγμα in detail; unlike the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, he not only considers and discusses specimens of historical examples (τὸ λέγειν πράγματα προγεγήμενα), but also invented ones (τὸ αὐτὸν ποιεῖν), subdivided into

G. Calboli’s commentary on the *Rhetorica ad C. Herennium* (Bologna: Pàtron Editore, seconda edizione, 1993), 415–16.

⁶*Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* VII 1428a 19–23 (definition) and VIII 1429a 21–28 (discussion), ed. H. Rackham (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), 318–20; 326. A probability (εἰκόσις) is defined as “a statement supported by examples present in the mind of an audience” (chapter VII 1428a 27–28; tr. Rackham); thus, when accusing a person, the orator may point out that this person has committed the same act or similar acts before, or that it was profitable for him to do it (1428b 12ff.).

⁷*Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* VIII 1429a 29–1430a 13.

⁸Aristotle, *Rhetoric* I.1.1, 1354a 1 (rhetoric is a counterpart of dialectic); I.2.7–8, 1356a 30–b 5 (the example is a rhetorical induction).

comparisons (παραβολαί) and fables (λόγοι).⁹ Aristotle specifies that παραδείγματα must be used as proof when the case does not allow the use of ἐνθυμήματα.

The observations in the surviving Roman handbooks of rhetoric show that during the centuries after Aristotle, some discussion took place about the παράδειγμα/*exemplum*. Thus, the *Auctor ad Herennium*, unlike Cicero in the *Topica* and Quintilian, does not consider the use of *exempla* as a function of *inventio*, but as a stylistic device, more specifically a figure of thought, attributing to it four functions, namely, beauty, clarity, verisimilitude, and vividness (4.62).¹⁰ Furthermore, Quintilian informs us that some rhetors deviated from Aristotle and did not count *exempla* among the artistic proofs, but among the non-artistic proofs, that is, pre-existing data such as witnesses or testimony from torture, which the orator may include in his argumentation at will (*Institutio oratoria* 5.11.43–44).

We also learn from Quintilian that there was discussion about the terminology, for he observes that, while the Greeks (starting with Aristotle) used the word παράδειγμα both generally for comparisons of similar things in general and specifically for comparisons involving historical facts, Romans commonly use the Latin equivalent *exemplum* only for comparisons of the latter kind, while referring to all other kinds of comparison with *similitudo*, the Latin equivalent of παραβολή (*Institutio oratoria* 5.11.1). Quintilian, following Aristotle and—as he stresses himself—only seemingly defying Cicero,¹¹ considers both historical parallels and comparisons involving *poeticae fabulae* (stories invented by poets) as *exempla* (*Institutio oratoria* 5.11.2). He discusses both kinds of *exempla* in detail under the head-

⁹Aristotle, *Rhetoric* II.20, 1393a 23–1394a 18.

¹⁰In *De inventione*, Cicero defines comparison and example as instruments to create probability (1.49), but a discussion with specimens of both are consigned to the section on style. In *De oratore*, he mentions comparison and example as two highly effective figures to arouse emotion (3.205).

¹¹Quintilian points out that Cicero seems to disagree with him because he distinguishes between comparison (*collatio*) and *exemplum* (namely in *De inv.* 1.49), but he argues against this that Cicero did adopt Aristotle's division of all arguments into two classes, namely induction (= reasoning by means of example) and deduction (= reasoning by means of syllogism/enthymeme). It must be pointed out that Quintilian's representation of Cicero's view in *De inv.* 1.49 is not very accurate, for Cicero subdivides comparison (*comparabile*) in three parts: *imago* (likeness, a statement indicating likeness of bodies or character), *collatio* (comparison, a statement comparing two things on the basis of their likeness), and *exemplum* (that which confirms or negates something by some authority or by what has happened to a person or in the course of an event).

ings *similia*, *dissimilia*, and *contraria* (*Institutio oratoria* 5.11.5–16 and 17–35 respectively).

As one might expect, the Greek and Roman handbooks of late antiquity, which offer scholastic surveys of the theory of eloquence, reflect the ideas on the *exemplum* developed by the earlier theorists. Some mention the example among the figures, e.g. Rufinianus (*De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis liber* 23, Halm p. 44, 16–24), while others define and discuss it as an instrument to build probable arguments; for instance, Fortunatianus mentions the *exemplum verisimile* among the *loci circa rem* (*Ars rhetorica* II. 23; Halm p. 115, 27).¹²

3. EXEMPLA IN THE SURVIVING COLLECTIONS OF DECLAMATIONS

The above survey of the place of the *exemplum* in the theory of eloquence and the discussions it stirred shows that it was an important instrument for the orator. It is therefore unsurprising that we find *exempla* in declamations. In fact, Seneca the Elder states in his discussion of the case of the five-year-old who testified against the agent (*Contr.* 7.5) that

a serious disease has seized on the schoolmen. Having learnt up instances (*exempla*), they want to force them into some *controversia* theme. This is permissible when the subject allows of it; but it is very silly to struggle against one's material and go to great lengths for one's examples, as did Musa in this *controversia* (*Contr.* 7.5.12–3; tr. Winterbottom).¹³

This remark invites us to assume that the surviving declamations are full of *exempla* and that their use is ill-considered. In what follows I will attempt to show that this does not seem to be the case.

First of all, I have encountered in the four surviving collections of declamations (Seneca rhetor's *Controversiae et Suasoriae*, pseudo-

¹²For a full list of these sources see Calboli's commentary on *Ad Herennium*, cited in n. 5 above, p. 416.

¹³*Gravis scholasticos morbus inuasit: exempla cum (di)dicerunt, volunt illa ad aliquod controversiae thema redigere. [13] hoc quomodo aliquando faciendum est, cum res patitur, ita ineptissimum est luctari cum materia et longe arcessere; sic quomodo fecit in hac controversia MVSA. E. Berti, Scholasticorum studia. Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale (Pisa: Giardini, 2007), 198–202, discusses this passage in the light of a passage in Quintilian (*Inst. orat.* 2.4.29–32) criticizing injudicious use of *loci communes*.*

Quintilian's *Declamationes maiores* and *Declamationes minores*, and finally Calpurnius Flaccus' *Declationum excerpta*) not more than some 120 passages in which an example is used, featuring about 78 different *exempla*.¹⁴ The majority (61) of them are historical *exempla*, the rest (17) are mythological ones; these are for the most part "indirect" examples, that is, the reader must deduce from the context which mythological figure or figures the declaimer is referring to. Since we cannot be sure that we recognize all such indirect references, we cannot be certain of the total number of *exempla*.

The largest number of recorded *exempla* comes from the *Controversiae et Suasoriae*, namely 75 (68 in the *Controversiae*, 7 in the *Suasoriae*); the smallest number is found in the excerpts of Calpurnius Flaccus, namely 3; the *Declamationes maiores* with 25 and the *Declamationes minores* with 14 have slightly more, but hardly a large number of *exempla*.

The *exempla* used by the declaimers are mostly Roman heroes who were well-known to the Roman audience; we find them in the detailed chart of national *exempla virtutis* cited by Roman writers through Claudian composed by H. W. Litchfield.¹⁵ The declaimers use a wide selection of figures which also figure in Litchfield's list, ranging from legendary and semi-legendary heroes such as Aeneas, T. Manlius Torquatus, and Lucretia to famous Republican generals and politicians known to every Roman such as Pompey the Great and Cato Uticensis. Our list of *exempla* in the declamations also contains a few Greeks: Aristides, Cimon, Codrus, Croesus, Demosthenes, Phocion, Themistocles, and three Homeric figures, Achilles, Priamus, and Odysseus; they testify to the presence of Homer in Roman education and culture.

More important than the number of *exempla* is the question of how they function in the declamations, more specifically whether or not the surviving texts bear out Seneca's observation on the exaggerated and improper use of *exempla*. In what follows, I can only discuss a few passages featuring historical *exempla* which show that, in my view, Seneca's curt and general dismissal of declaimers' use of *exempla* is unjustified.

¹⁴See the Appendix at the end of this article for a full list.

¹⁵H. W. Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 25 (1914): 1–71. The chart is on pp. 28–35; the article also contains detailed observations on some typical *exempla*. Litchfield's study is to my knowledge still the most complete survey of *exempla* in Roman literature.

The son of Croesus (*Controversia* 7.5.13)

I begin with the *Controversia* which prompted Seneca to criticize the use of *exempla* by declaimers. In *Controversia* 7.5, a five year old son accuses the manager of the household of killing his father. In the course of a commonplace on the affection of children for their father, the rhetor Musa had mentioned the son of Croesus, according to Musa a boy who had not spoken for more than five years. The story of the mute son of Croesus who saved his father from death by suddenly using his voice is recorded by several authors, both Greek and Roman, and therefore was certainly well-known among the Roman audience. The oldest surviving source is Herodotus (1.85); Roman authors mention it several times, and its frequent use in oratory is attested by its occurrence in Valerius Maximus, among the foreign *exempla* of “*pietas erga parentes.*” I quote the story as it is related by Valerius Maximus:

For when Sardis was taken by Cyrus (in 546 BCE), one of the Persians, not knowing who Croesus was, came rushing headlong to kill him, the son, as though forgetting what Fortune had denied him at birth, cried out: ‘Don’t kill king Croesus’, and so recalled the blade that was already almost pressing his father’s throat. He who had until that hour lived mute for himself, found a voice for his parent’s life” (tr. Shackleton Bailey)¹⁶

Musa, in his speech, specified that the boy had been silent for more than five years. Seneca criticizes him for mentioning this number, because, according to Seneca, it shows that Musa believed that, since the boy in the theme was five years old, mentioning the word “five” would suffice to form a *sententia*:

Just because the boy is five in the theme, he imagined that whenever five years were mentioned it counted as an epigram (*sententia*). (tr. Winterbottom).¹⁷

¹⁶... cum unus e numero Persarum ignarus uiri in caedem eius (sc. Croesi) concitato impetu ferretur, uelut oblitus quid sibi fortuna nascenti denegasset, ne Croesum regem occideret proclamando paene iam inpressum iugulo mucronem reuocauit. ita, qui ad id tempus mutus sibi uixerat, saluti parentis uocalis factus est (Val. Max. 5.4 ext. 6). The story is also mentioned by Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 5.9 and Solinus, *De mirabilibus mundi* 1.112; in Greek, the son of Croesus was proverbial for taciturnity: τοῦ Κροίσου παιδὸς σιγληρότερος (“more silent than the son of Croesus”).

¹⁷Quia quinquennis puer ponitur, putavit ubicumque nominatum esset quinquennium sententiam fieri (*Contr.* 7.5.13).

In order to assess the fairness of Seneca's judgement, it is appropriate to bear in mind that several versions of the story of Croesus' son were in circulation, in which the age of the son differed. Herodotus, Valerius Maximus and Solinus (*De mirabilibus mundi* I.112) do not record the age of the son, only that he was mute, but according to Gellius (*Noctes Atticae* 5.9) he was an "adulescens," that is, a young man between 15 and 30 years (Censorinus, *De die natali* 14.2), while Pliny the Elder (N.H. 11.270) gives a version of the story in which the son is a speaking infant (*semenstris . . . et in crepundiis*).¹⁸ None of the surviving sources of the story records that the son had been mute for five years; Musa may have adopted this detail from another written source or tradition unknown to us, or he may have invented it, in order to make it fit the declamation theme more closely. Even if the latter were the case, one would not necessarily have to agree with Seneca's criticism, for it would be justified to commend Musa for using wittily the margin afforded by the story as it was known to make it a stronger argument for the credibility of a five-year old as a witness. In other words, the point he is making does not necessarily have the ring of a meaningless *sententia*, as Seneca claims.

Gurges, Manlius, Sulla, and Lucullus (*Controversia* 9.2.10)

Seneca does not discuss any other *exempla* which Musa may have used in his handling of the *locus communis* on the affection of children for their fathers. If we want to look at a case of a succession of *exempla* in one declamation, we can for instance turn to *Controversia* 9.2. The theme of this *controversia* is taken from the early history of Rome, when M. Porcius Cato was censor (184 BCE). It is the case of L. Quinctius Flaminius, a proconsul, who had a convicted criminal executed during a banquet at the request of his guest, a courtesan with whom he was in love. Livy relates that this escapade prompted Cato to remove Flaminius from the senate.¹⁹ In the theme of the *controversia*, Flaminius is accused of *laesa maiestas*,²⁰ and

¹⁸See on the two versions of the story A. S. Pease, "The son of Croesus," *Classical Philology* 15.2 (1920): 201–02. The story is also mentioned by Cicero, who says that the son was "infans," i.e. either "mute" (without specification of the age, as in Herodotus, Valerius Maximus, and Solinus) or "a young child who could not yet speak" (as in Pliny).

¹⁹There are two versions of the escapade in Livy 39.42–43. In the declamation we find the second and, according to Livy, less reliable one, recorded by Valerius Antias.

²⁰That is, a crime against the Roman people; in the time of Cato the Elder and Flaminius, this crime was not called "laesa maiestas," but "perduellio."

Seneca observes that this a case in which the crime can be defended but not excused: the only hope is that the judge will acquit the defendant, for he can never approve of his deed. Seneca reviews the various strategies of defence followed by a number of declaimers. According to Seneca, Votienus Montanus offered in a particularly brilliant way the commonplace of how much the Roman people have tolerated in their generals: “in Gurges luxury, in Manlius lack of self-control (Manlius was not harmed by killing his victorious son), in Sulla cruelty, in Lucullus luxury, in many avarice” (9.2.19; tr. Winterbottom).²¹ Seneca continues with a full citation of the conclusion of the commonplace, in which the single misstep of the virtuous proconsul is set alongside the vices of the said famous men, to bring out the unfairness of the accusation; it is cast in the form of a rhetorical question: “As to this praetor—since he undoubtedly possessed restraint and diligence—do not examine how he dined on one single night. But the charge is the death of a condemned criminal for the sake of a whore; what is demanded is the death of a praetor for the sake of a condemned criminal. Which is more unfair?” (tr. Winterbottom)²²

The enumeration of four historical figures whose inbred vices have been forgiven serves to build a strong argument, with a suggestion of a climax, in support of Flamininus. On the other hand, the list of *exempla* may seem slightly awkward because Gurges, who is mentioned first, was probably not a very frequently used *exemplum*, if one may judge by the fact that he is not mentioned by Valerius Maximus as a model of luxury. Gurges is the cognomen of the family of the Fabii, several members of which were prominent men in the Republican period. In all likelihood, the declaimer refers to Q. Fabius Maximus, consul in 292 and 276, who triumphed over the Samnites in 290.²³ According to Macrobius, this was the first Fabius who was given the nickname “Gurges” (“squanderer,” “prodigal”),²⁴ because

²¹In *Gurgite luxuriam, in Manlio impotentiam, cui non nocuit et filium et victorem occidere, in Sulla crudelitatem, in Lucullo luxuriam, in multis avaritiam*. The words *luxuriam in multis* are only attested in the manuscripts of the excerpts, but since Lucullus is associated with *luxuria* rather than *avaritia*, it is likely that they belong in the text.

²²<In hoc>, inquit, praetore, cum illi constiterit abstinentia, diligentia, ne excutiatis, quomodo una nocte cenaverit. utrum tamen, inquit, iniqui(us) est? [quod] obiciunt quod damnatus perierit meretrici, postulant proconsulem perire damnato.

²³See *Der Kleine Pauly* (München: DTV, 1979), s. n.: Fabius 36 and Plutarch, *Parallel Stories* 3 (= 306B-C).

²⁴Cp. Plutarch's translation Λαίμαργος, and see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki: Societas scientiarum fennica, 1965), 269.

he had dissipated his inheritance.²⁵ The occurrence of Gurges is also surprising because his vice is the same as that of the far more famous Lucullus, who is mentioned only in third place. One may suppose that Gurges' relative obscurity in comparison with Lucullus and the fact that the vice for which they are included in the list is the same was the reason why the name of Gurges was erased from this list in the excerpt of this *Controversia*, which was probably made in late antiquity.

The three other *exempla* concern well-known figures in Roman history. Livy relates how, during the war with the Latins in 340 BCE, the consul T. Manlius Torquatus had his son executed, because he had disobeyed his father's order and the edict of the consuls forbidding the soldiers to fight outside the ranks, and had incited the leader of the Tusculan cavalry Geminus Maecius to fight him in a duel (*Ab urbe condita libri* 8.7.8). Although Manlius defeated his enemy and returned to the camp in triumph with his victim's suit of armour, his father accused him and had him convicted to set an example for the Roman youth. According to Livy, all present judged the father's order dreadful ("atrox"), but he adds that the *exemplum* it set was effective.²⁶ There are frequent allusions to this story in Roman literature,²⁷ but it is noteworthy that Valerius Maximus mentions Torquatus not, as in our declamation, as a negative example of lack of self-control (*impotentia*), but as a positive one of *disciplina militaris* (2.7.6).²⁸ According to Litchfield, the Christian writers were the first to be unanimously abhorrent of Torquatus' inhumanity.²⁹ P. Cornelius Sulla (ca. 138–78 BCE) was a successful general and ambitious politician; as consul in 88 he got into a conflict with his rival Gaius Marius about the supreme command in the war against Mithridates, the king of Pontus (the present-day region of Anatolia in Turkey). The Senate had given the supreme command to Sulla, and when the popular assembly decided

²⁵Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 3.13.6: *Gurgitem, a devorato patrimonio cognominatum*. Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," cited in n. 15 above, p. 31, mentions Gurges as an *exemplum* of the vice corresponding to the virtue "paupertas."

²⁶*Triste exemplum sed in posterum salubre iuventuti erimus* (8.7.17); *ut . . . Manliana imperia non in praesentia modo horrenda sed exempli etiam tristis in posterum essent* (8.7.22).

²⁷See S. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 436; only the first of Oakley's four references to Valerius Maximus concerns our Manlius Torquatus.

²⁸Valerius Maximus mentions Manlius Torquatus also as an example of change in character or fortune (6.9.1), for Manlius was a bad sort as a young man and became glorious only in his old age.

²⁹Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," cited in n. 15 above, p. 39.

to hand it over to Marius, Sulla refused to yield. After having defeated Mithridates, Sulla returned to Italy and defeated Marius in a brief but bitter civil war (83–82 BCE), and subsequently proclaimed himself dictator with permanent tenure; in this capacity he ruled with an iron hand. Hence he ranked as an enemy of the Republic; and in particular the cruelty of the proscriptions under his regime were condemned (e.g. Cicero, *Pro Fonteio* 12).³⁰ Thus, Musa's "in Sulla crudelitatem" is part of a firm tradition. The same goes for the *exemplum* of the already mentioned Lucullus. The general and politician L. Licinius Lucullus (117–56 BCE) was generally considered the richest man in Rome (Diodorus Siculus, 4.21.4), and later generations in antiquity associated his name with a luxurious, extravagant lifestyle.³¹ In spite of the fact that the vice of luxury is mentioned twice by Musa, the series forms a neat sequence: two *exempla* are taken from early Roman history, two are from the late Republic, and the concluding and generalising "in many avarice" has the force of an *epiphonema*. The vices of the four generals mentioned by name bear closely on the outrageous act of the defendant and are arranged in the form of a chiasm: the first and the fourth are the same (luxury), and the second and third are very similar (lack of self-restraint resulting in a horrid act, cruelty). Taken together, they build a strong argument in defence of the defendant, and Seneca himself states that it was presented in a brilliant way.

C. Julius Caesar (*Controversia* 10.3.1 and 5)

While the historical figures in *Controversia* 9.2.19 serve as *exempla* to substantiate an argument about a defendant of equal rank, *Controversia* 10.3 presents a comparison of persons of different status. This case is situated in the time of the civil wars of the first century BCE. A woman does not leave her husband, even though her father

³⁰Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," cited in n. 15 above, pp. 51–52, note 4, enumerates the few passages where Sulla occurs as an *exemplum virtutis* and the much larger number of passages in which he is presented as an *exemplum vitii*.

³¹Thus, Plutarch mentions that Lucullus was ill spoken of because his dinners were too expensive (*To an uneducated ruler*, 5 = 782) and Velleius Paterculus, *Roman History* 33.4, states that Lucullus set the example for the Romans' extravagance in buildings, banquets, and furnishings, and that Pompey used to call him the Roman Xerxes because of the massive piles he built in the sea and of his letting the sea in upon the land by digging through mountains (tr. Shipley). Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," cited in n. 15 above, p. 32, mentions him as a counter-example of *paupertas*.

and her brother belong to the other side. When her husband has been killed and his party defeated, she returns to her father. When he refuses to let her enter his house, she asks: how can I make amends to you? The father replies: “die,” and she promptly hangs herself before his door. The son accuses his father of madness. Seneca discusses the declamations of some twenty rhetors. Judging from his observations, they all agreed that the daughter deserved punishment, but they differed in their judgement of the father. Some found him too severe, and Moschus even went so far as to maintain that the household gods were stained by the blood of his daughter, and confronted him with the example of Caesar’s humanity and mercy, when the head of the assassinated Pompey was brought to him (10.3.1). Caesar—I quote Valerius Maximus 5.1.10, whose version of the story Moschus follows—“forgot the role of enemy and put on the countenance of father in law and gave tears to Pompey, his own and his daughter’s too” (tr. Shackleton Bailey). Another declaimer, the already mentioned Musa, had used the same example in a slightly different way, focusing on a detail in the story which Valerius Maximus does not mention, but which is also found in Plutarch’s *Life of Pompey*: “When Pompey’s head was brought to him, Caesar is said to have averted his eyes; *you* didn’t do that even at the death of your daughter” (10.3.5, tr. Winterbottom).³² Porcius Latro, on the other hand, was one of the declaimers who argued in favour of the father, using two *exempla* of fathers killing their sons, namely T. Manlius Torquatus and M. Iunius Brutus (10.3.8). It is noteworthy that what was mentioned as a vice of Torquatus in *Controversia* 9.2.19, is brought to the fore as a good quality in the context of the present *controversia*. All in all, in the two *controversiae* discussed here, 9.2 and 10.3, the *exempla* seem to have been chosen judiciously to help construct convincing arguments.

Lucretia and Verginia (*Declamatio maior* 3.11)

The *exempla* in the *Declamationes maiores* are, perhaps unexpectedly given the extravagant nature of many of them, not very numerous and they do not offer many surprises. I confine myself to two samples. In the *Miles Marianus* (*Decl. mai.* 3) we find the famous *exemplum* of Lucretia and Verginia at the beginning of the *argumentatio*; it lends weight to the argument that although one cannot take justice into one’s own hands and soldiers must at all times obey their su-

³²Allato ad se capite Cn. Pompei Caesar avertisse oculos dicitur, quod tu ne in morte filiae quidem fecisti. See Plutarch, *Life of Pompey* 80.5 (= 662).

periors, in this case the soldier was right to kill the tribune to protect *mores* and *pudicitia*, for it was necessary to set an example for his own time, which was according to him marked by utter depravity of morals:

Need I now mention that our own national character has always exhibited a special regard for purity and modesty? Should I remind you of Lucretia who by plunging a sword into her own body inflicted punishment on herself for an act forced upon her, and, so her pure soul could be parted from her defiled body as quickly as possible, of her own accord she struck herself dead since she could not kill the man who raped her? If at this point you want to hear about a soldier, why should I (need to) tell you about Verginius, who defended his daughter's virginity in the only way he could—by her death—and plunged a sword seized from a relative into the girl, and she welcomed it? He let Appius leave unharmed, but the Roman people sought revenge by a refusal of the common people to take part in the government of the aristocracy, and nearly by a civil war. They forced him to be thrown into prison. No factor then aroused the indignation of the average citizen more than this—he tried to violate the chastity of a soldier's daughter. These are the noble examples of women, these are worthy of telling (tr. after Sussman; H 52.1–13).³³

The combined example of Lucretia and Verginia is also used in Seneca rhetor and in Calpurnius Flaccus. It is the only one that occurs in three of the four collections, and this confirms that Lucretia and Verginia were stereotypes of *pudicitia*, known to every Roman. *Controversia* 1.5 on the raped girl who may choose either marriage to her ravisher without a dowry or his death illustrates an unexpected use of this *exemplum*: Argentarius argued that the girl should not pattern herself after Lucretia and Verginia, but rather follow the example of the Sabine women who accepted marriage after their rape (1.5.3). In the *Miles Marianus*, the use of this *exemplum* seems special because Appius, the decemvir who tried to rape Verginia, is drawn into the comparison to reinforce the point: Verginia's father

³³*Dicam nunc ego praecipuam quae condito in viscera sua ferro poenam a se necessitatis exegit, et, ut quam primum pudicus animus a polluto corpore separaretur, se ipsa percussit, quia corruptorem non potuit occidere? Si nunc placet tibi miles, quid ego Virginium narrem, qui filiae virginitatem, qua sola poterat, morte defendit raptumque de proximo ferro non recusanti puellae immersit? Dimisit illaesum Appium, quem tamen populus Romanus secessione a patribus et prope civili bello persecutus in vincula duci coegit, neque ulla res tum magis indignationem plebis commovit, quam quod pudicitiam auferre temptaverat filiae militis. Haec sunt honesta, haec narranda feminarum exempla.*

killed his daughter to protect her chastity, but he did not take action against Appius. The Roman people, however, did,³⁴ according to the declaimer because it was outraged that he (Appius) had attempted to violate the virtue of a soldier's daughter. This small addition to the *exemplum* helps to make a strong argument: if the Roman people were right to act against a man who tried to violate the daughter of a soldier, then certainly the punishment of the man who tried to rape a soldier is justified.

C. Verres (*Declamatio maior* 6.9)

My second sample from the *Declamationes maiores* is Verres; it occurs in *Declamatio maior* 6, the case of the corpse that was thrown overboard. C. Verres, whose rule as governor of Sicily (73–71 BCE) was characterized by extortions and perversion of justice, does not figure in Valerius Maximus, but in the schools of rhetoric he did rank as the epitome of cruelty (“ille crudelissimus Siciliae tyrannus,” *Decl. mai.* 6.9) on the basis of the picture of him evoked in Cicero's Verrine orations (70 BCE), which were a model of Ciceronian oratory.³⁵ In the passage concerned (*Decl. mai.* 6.9), the declaimer mentions Cicero explicitly and he refers specifically to a particular passage in the fifth oration against Verres:

If you have already exhausted all your love for me, your husband, and all your compassion has vanished entirely through your eyes, even so it is just that our son was punished and that he died in suffering. Let us not talk about what is in the past; (let us accept) what Cicero demanded even from the famous cruel tyrant of Sicily: ‘let death itself be the limit of punishment.’†³⁶ When this was not permitted, grieving mothers and fathers spent the nights before the prison doors, attempting bribery to win permission for burial. You, sell what was the most cruel thing under Verres, I will certainly pay for my son, and I do not have to look far for the ransom: I have hands (ed. Håkanson, p. 119, 9–19).³⁷

³⁴This is a reference to the exodus of the plebs to the Aventine and the fall of the decemviri in 450 BCE described in Livy 3.50–54.

³⁵An indication of the frequent use of the Verrinae in the schools of rhetoric is the fact that we find many quotations from these speeches in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*.

³⁶Håkanson, whose text I follow, assumes a lacuna here in which the declaimer expresses the wish that the father may be permitted to bury his son. In my view, this addition is not necessary for the reader who knows the passage in Cicero's oration from which the quotation is taken.

³⁷*Iam si totum adfectum in hunc consumpsisti virum, et omnis per oculos misericordia effluxit, tulerit sane filius noster merito poenas, dederit spiritum supplicio. Nihil de praeteritis*

The father is speaking, trying to persuade his wife to countermand her ban on the burial of their son. He confronts her with a quotation from Cicero's fifth oration of the second plea against Verres (II.5.119), to impress on her the understanding that to refuse her son burial is morally unacceptable. The quotation is taken from Cicero's detailed account of the punishment of the naval captains whose fleet had been lost in a battle with pirates, from which the declaimer adopts several words and phrases, on top of the literal quotation. These men were imprisoned and sentenced to death by Verres. Cicero dwells with much melodrama on the disgraceful treatment of their parents and relatives: they were not allowed to visit their condemned children in prison; when fathers and mothers stayed day and night at the entrance of the prison, the janitor allowed them to visit their sons and bring them food on payment of a sum of money, and the headsman asked for money to execute the sentence mercifully with one blow (II.5.117–18). Cicero then stresses that these indignations and the death of their children were not the worst the parents had to suffer through Verres, for the bodies of the executed men were to be thrown to the animals unless the parents purchased them for burial (II.5.119).

The declaimer's point is that his wife's behaviour is just as cruel and immoral as Verres'; in the light of the passage from Cicero, he brings out the contrast between her and himself in a striking way: just as the janitor and the headsman demanded from the parents of the convicted men a ransom for permission to feed their sons and bury them after their execution, so she must now sell the body of her son to her husband so that he may bury him; he, for his part, just like the parents of the naval captains, will pay the ransom and collect the money by begging. Zinsmaier has argued against this interpretation of "habeo manus,"³⁸ but in my view it may be seen, in the context of the comparison with the parents of the naval captains, as contributing to the role of victim which the father assumes.

On the whole, the comparison is at first sight a clever instance of intertextual play; underneath, this surprising turn of thought

loquamur; quod postulavit Cicero etiam ab illo crudelissimo Siciliae tyranno: mors sit extremum. † Quod quidem cum permissum non esset, pernoctabant ante ostium carceris pretio redimentes sepeliendi potestatem [quid tandem Marcus Tullius] patres matresque miserae. Tu vende saltem, quod sub Verre crudelissimum fuit. Certe ego filium redimam, nec mihi pretium diu quaerendum est: habeo manus.

³⁸Th. Zinsmaier, *Der von Bord geworfene Leichnam; die sechste der neunzehn grösseren pseudoquintilianischen Deklamationen: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1993), 135–36.

expresses with restrained pathos the father's guilt over the fact that his son had given his life by ransoming him, and it contributes to the quite negative portrayal of the mother in this declamation.

"Indirect" *exempla*

So far we have discussed *exempla* of historic figures who are mentioned by name. Besides several occurrences of the so-called "general plural" of proper names to stress that the person mentioned exemplifies a certain quality (e.g. "Camilli," men like Camillus = men who were wrongly convicted, *Declamatio minor* 300, 9), I have found indirect references to only five historical figures in four passages, namely Cincinnatus (*Contr.* 2.1.8), T. Manlius Torquatus and Spurius Cassius Vecellinus (*Decl. min.* 349.8), C. Verres, discussed above (*Decl. mai.* 6.9), and two problematic references to C. Flaminius (*Decl. mai.* 6.14), for which I refer the reader to Zinsmaier's detailed discussion.³⁹ Cincinnatus (the forefather "who stood at the very plough in awe of the symbols of authority of the lictors who surrounded them," tr. Winterbottom) is mentioned in the defence of the son of a poor man who refused to be adopted by a rich man; Winterbottom considers it an absurd generalization, but Litchfield's survey of *exempla* shows that Cincinnatus was in fact used as a model of poverty.⁴⁰ In *Decl. min.* 349, the case of the father of a rapist accused of dementia for refusing to pardon his son to save his life, the father compares himself in the presence of his son ironically with "the father who cut off his son's laurelled beard" (Torquatus, who sentenced his victorious son to death) or "the one who was content with the judgements of relations and friends" (Spurius Cassius Vecellinus, who had his son sentenced to death for plotting tyranny; tr. Shackleton Bailey). The father means to suggest that the son deserves to be abandoned because of his crime. The references to the two Republican models of sternness strike the reader as being quite vague; moreover Cassius seems to have been a much less common *exemplum* than Torquatus.⁴¹ The largest number of indirect *exempla* concern mythological examples or, to adopt the term used by Quintilian, poetic fables. In fact, all seventeen mytho-

³⁹Zinsmaier, *Der von Bord geworfene Leichnam*, 152–54.

⁴⁰M. Winterbottom, *The Elder Seneca. Declamations in two volumes* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974), vol. 1, p. 213 n. 4; Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," cited in n. 15 above, p. 34.

⁴¹See Winterbottom's note ad loc.: M. Winterbottom, *The Minor Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1984), 553.

logical *exempla* in our collection are given in the form of an allusion; it is also noteworthy that most of them (namely twelve) are found in the *Declamationes maiores*. According to Quintilian, poetic fables do not have much probative force (*Institutio oratoria* 5.11.17). A recent study of allusions to myths in the *Declamationes maiores* has shown that their function varies; they may be used to raise the declamations' characters to the rank of mythical heroes, to help build convincing arguments, or to give the declamation a learned character.⁴² In *Declamatio maior* 12.26 and 28, the case of the people who ate corpses, there is a remarkable accumulation of mythological references (Atreus, Thyestes, Ixion, Sisyphus) in the *peroratio* to inculcate the audience with the gruesomeness of the case. In this case, the mythological references seem to function primarily as a means to create a particular atmosphere on the declamatory scene, as Stramaglia has argued in his commentary.⁴³ We find a similar accumulation of four mythological references (Narcissus, Myrrha, Cydippe and Acontius, and Pasiphae) in *Decamatio maior* 15.11, where the orator impresses upon the young lover to whom a courtesan administered a hate poison that he is clinging to a passionate and destructive love.⁴⁴

4. CONCLUSION

A few words to summarize my observations: the declamations illustrate that *exempla* are an important tool of the orator, and in this regard they are perfect exemplifications of the theory of the *exemplum*. Most of the *exempla* in declamations belong to the common stock with which the Roman audience was familiar through tradition, education, and literature, but we have seen that declaimers used this traditional material in a well-considered and creative manner. Thus, in *Contr.* 7.5 we have seen an instance of a variation on the traditional

⁴²D. van Mal-Maeder, "Credibiles fabulas fecimus: mythe, rhétorique et fiction dans les déclamations latines," in M. Guglielmo, E. Bona, eds., *Forme di comunicazione nel mondo antico e metamorfosi del mito: dal teatro al romanzo* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2003), 187–200.

⁴³See A. Stramaglia, [*Quintiliano*] *La città che si cibò dei suoi cadaveri* (*Declamazioni maggiori*, 12) (Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli studi di Cassino, 2002), 185 n. 299.

⁴⁴See D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "Emendations of Pseudo-Quintilian's Longer Declamations," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 187–217 (pp. 211–12) and L. A. Sussman, *The Major Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian. A Translation* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1987), 255 n. 3.

version of the story of the son Croesus in order to make it fit better in the context of the theme, and in *Contr.* 9.2 we have found a series of four *exempla*, one of which, namely Manlius Torquatus, is used untypically as a model of lack of self-control; in *Contr.* 10.3, however, Manlius Torquatus is presented in the traditional fashion as a positive example of sternness. Lucretia and Verginia are used in a similar two-sided way: in *Declamatio maior* 3 they occur as models of chastity, but in *Contr.* 1.5.3 a girl who is raped should not follow their example. Finally, *Declamatio maior* 6 shows how subtly an *exemplum* taken from an oration of Cicero can be used to convey an unspoken message to the listener. All in all, it seems safe to conclude that Seneca's criticism that declaimers used *exempla* too readily and inappropriately may be exaggerated.

APPENDIX: Checklist of *exempla*

This checklist contains the *exempla* found in the four surviving collections of declamations. Each lemma contains the name or the allusion as it is found in the declamation; some relevant information is supplied between brackets: the full name of the person referred to, a source or a reference to the pertinent note in the commentaries on ps.-Quintilian's major declamations in the Cassino series by Stramaglia (decl. 8, 1999 and 12, 2002), Krapinger (decl. 9, 2007), Schneider (decl. 3, 2004), in Zinsmaier's commentary on major declamation 6 (1993), Winterbottom's commentary on the minor declamations ascribed to Quintilian (1994), and Sussman's commentary on the declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus (1994). Finally, an asterisk after the name of an *exemplum* indicates that it also appears on Litchfield's list of *exempla virtutis* (H. W. Litchfield, "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman literature," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 25 (1914): 28–35).

A. HISTORICAL EXEMPLA

- Aelius Tubero (Q. Aelius Tubero*, 2nd cent. BCE; see Val. Max. 4.3.7):
Contr. 2.1.8
- Appius (Appius Claudius, d. 450 BCE; see Liv. III.56–58): *Decl. mai.*
 3.11 (H. 52.9)
- Aristides (5th cent. BCE; see Val. Max. 5.3 ext. 3d): *Contr.* 2.1.18
- Brutus (M. Iunius Brutus*, 1st cent. BCE): *Contr.* 10.1.8
- Brutus (L. Iunius Brutus*, 6th cent. BCE; see Liv. 2.4.5ff., Val. Max.
 5.8.1): *Contr.* 3.9; 10.3.8

- Caesar (G. Iulius Caesar*, 100–44 BCE): *Contr.* 10.3.1 (Val. Max. 5.10.1; cf. Dio 42.8) and 5 (Plut., *Caesar* 48.2; *Pompeius* 80.5); *Decl. min.* 379.2 (Plut., *Caesar* 54)
- “Camilli” (M. Furius Camillus, 4th cent. BCE): *Decl. min.* 300.9 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Carbo (Cn. Papirius Carbo*, 2nd cent. BCE): *Decl. mai.* 3.13 (H. 54.7; see Schneider’s note ad loc.)
- Cato (M. Porcius Cato Censorius*, 234–149 BCE): *Contr.* 7.6.17
- Cato (M. Porcius Cato Uticensis*, 95–46 BCE): *Contr.* 2.4.4; 6.4; 8.4; 9.6.7; 10.1.8; *Suas.* 6.1; 6.2; 6.4; 6.10; 7.4; *Decl. min.* 338.21 (“Catonnes”), 377.9 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- “illa quae Catonem peperit” (Cato’s mother): *Contr.* 6.8
- Cicero (M. Tullius Cicero, 106–43 BCE): *Contr.* 2.4.4; 10.3.3; *Decl. min.* 268.20 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Cimon (5th cent. BCE): *Decl. min.* 302.5 (cf. *Contr.* 9.1; see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- “ceteri patres nostri, quod apud aratra ipsa mirantes decora sua circumsteterunt lictores” (L. Quinctius Cincinnatus*, 5th cent. BCE; see Liv. 3.26.7–10): *Contr.* 2.1.8
- Codrus (legendary king of Athens; see Val. Max. 5.6 ext. 1) : *Contr.* 8.4
- “Coruncanii” (Ti. Coruncanius*, 3rd cent. BCE; he is mentioned as a model of virtue and wisdom, particularly by Cicero, but not specially as a model of poverty): *Contr.* 2.1.18
- Cornelia* (mother of the Gracchi) : *Contr.* 6.8
- Crassus (M. Licinius Crassus*, 115–53 BCE): *Contr.* 2.1.7; 5.1; 5.7; 7.2.7
- Croesus (6th cent. BCE): *Contr.* 2.1.7
- Croesi filius (see Herodotus 1.85, Val. Max. 5.4. ext. 6, Gellius, *NA* 5.9): *Contr.* 7.5.13
- Curtius (M. Curtius*, legendary Roman; see Liv. 7.6.1ff.): *Contr.* 8.4
- Decius (P. Decius Mus*, 3rd cent. BCE; see Val. Max. 5.6.5–6): *Contr.* 10.2.3
- Demosthenes (384–322 BCE; see Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 29–30) *Contr.* 7.3.4; *Decl. min.* 268.20 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Fabius Eburnus (Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus*, 2nd cent. BCE): *Decl. mai.* 3.17 (H. 57.20)
- Fabricius (C. Fabricius Luscinus*, 3rd cent. BCE; see Val. Max. 4.3.6; Gellius, *NA* 1.14): *Contr.* 2.1.8 and 29; 5.2; 7.2.7
- “tribunos deducimus” (probably C. Flaminius*, 3rd cent. BCE): *Decl. mai.* 6.14 (H. 126.8; see Zinsmaier’s note ad loc.)
- “candidatos ferimus” (C. Flaminius* ?, 3rd cent. BCE): *Decl. mai.* 6.14 (H. 126.8; see Zinsmaier’s note ad loc.)
- Gracchi (Ti. Sempronius Gracchus III* and G. Sempronius Gracchus*, 1st cent. BCE): *Decl. min.* 268.19 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)

- Gracchus (Ti. Sempronius Gracchus II*, 1st cent. BCE): *Contr.* 5.2
- Gurges (Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges*, 3rd cent. BCE; see Plut., *Parallel Stories*, 3): *Contr.* 9.2.19
- Horatius (Horatius Cocles*; legendary Roman, see Liv. 2.10–11; Val. Max. 3.2.10): *Contr.* 10.2.3
- Lucretia* (6th cent. BCE; see Liv. 1.57–59): *Contr.* 1.5.3; *Decl. mai.* 3.11 (H. 52.2 and 6; see Schneider’s note ad loc.); Calp. F. 3 (H. 3.16; see Sussman’s note ad loc.)
- Lucullus (L. Licinius Lucullus*, 117–56 BCE): *Contr.* 9.2.19
- Macerio (C. Atinius Labeo Macerio, 2nd cent. BCE; see Cic., *De domo sua* 123; Liv., *Per.* 59; Plin., *NH* 7.143): *Contr.* 10.1.8
- Manlius (T. Manlius Torquatus*, 3rd cent. BCE): *Contr.* 9.2.19; 10.3.8; Calp. F. 6 (H. 6.21); “ille qui laureatas filii sui cervices amputavit” *Decl. min.* 349.8 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Manlius (Cn. Manlius Maximus, consul in 105 BCE): *Decl. mai.* 3.13 (H. 54.9; see Schneider’s note ad loc.)
- Marius (C. Marius*, 157–86 BCE): *Contr.* 1.1.3 and 5; 1.6.4; 7.2.6
- Maximus (Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator*, 3rd cent. BCE): *Contr.* 7.7.13
- Metellus (Q. Caecilius Metellus*, 2nd cent. BCE; see Cic., *De domo sua* 123; Liv., *Per.* 59; Plin., *NH* 7.143): *Contr.* 10.1.8
- Mithridates (132–63 BCE): *Contr.* 7.1.15 (see Appianus, *Mithr.* 89); 7.3.4 (see Appianus, *Mithr.* 111)
- (Scaevola) Mucius (G. Mucius Scaevola*, legendary Roman; see Liv. 2.12ff.): *Contr.* 8.4; *Contr.* 10.2.3 and 5
- Philippus (Philip II of Macedon, 382–336 BCE): *Contr.* 7.3.4
- Phocion (4th cent. BCE; Athenian general and politician): *Contr.* 2.1.18
- Pompeius (Magnus) (Cn. Pompeius*, 106–48 BCE): *Contr.* 1.6.4; 1.8.12; 5.1; 10.1.8
- Pulcher (P. Clodius Pulcher*, 1st cent. BCE; see Plut., *Cato minor* 45.1): *Contr.* 10.1.8
- Regulus (M. Atilius Regulus*, 3rd cent. BCE; see Val. Max. 1.1.14): *Contr.* 5.7
- “Rutilii” (P. Rutilius Rufus*, consul in 105 BCE): *Decl. min.* 300.9 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Scaurus (M. Aurelius Scaurus, d. 105 BCE): *Decl. mai.* 3.13 (H. 54.9; see Schneider’s note ad loc.)
- Scipio (P. Caecilius Metellus Scipio*, 1st cent. BCE): *Suas.* 6.2; *Decl. min.* 377.9 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Scipio (P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus major*, 236–184 BCE): *Contr.* 5.2; 7.7.13; “Scipiones” *Decl. min.* 338.21 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- Scipio Aemilianus (P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Numantinus, d. 129 BCE): *Contr.* 1.8.12

- Servilius (Q. Servilius Caepio, consul in 106 BCE): *Decl. mai.* 3.13 (H. 54.9; see Schneider's note ad loc.)
- Servius (Servius Tullius*, sixth legendary king of Rome, 6th cent. BCE): *Contr.* 1.6.4; 7.6.18
- Silanus (M. Junius Silanus, consul in 109 BCE): *Decl. mai.* 3.13 (H. 54.8; see Schneider's note ad loc.)
- "ille qui iudiciis propinquorum atque amicorum contentus fuit" (probably Spurius Cassius Vecellinus*, 5th cent. BCE): *Decl. min.* 349.8 (see Winterbottom's note ad loc.)
- Sulla (P. Cornelius Sulla*, ca. 138–78 BCE): *Contr.* 2.4.4; 9.2.19; *Suas.* 6.3
- Terentius (Q. Terentius Culleo, 2nd-1st cent. BCE): *Decl. mai.* 9.20 (H. 195.7; see Krapinger's note ad loc.)
- "Athenienses abdicato vicerunt duce" (Themistocles, 5th cent. BCE; see Val. Max. 6.9 ext. 2): *Contr.* 1.8.6
- Verginia (6th cent. BCE): *Contr.* 1.5.3; *Decl. mai.* 3.11 (H. 52.2 and 6; see Schneider's note ad loc.)
- Verginius* (6th cent. BCE; father of Verginia): Calp. F. 3 (see Sussman's note ad loc.)
- "ille crudelissimus Siciliae tyrannus" (C. Verres*, 120–43 BCE): *Decl. mai.* 6.9 (H. 119.12ff.; see Zinsmaier's note ad loc.)

B. MYTHOLOGICAL EXEMPLA

- "principem Graeciae virum" (Achilles): *Decl. mai.* 9.22 (H. 197.3–4; see Krapinger's note ad loc.)
- "qui non reliquit patrem" (Aeneas): *Contr.* 2.1.5
- "Romani generis auctor" (Aeneas): *Decl. min.* 388.10 (see Winterbottom's note ad loc.)
- "credibiles fabulas" (Atreus and Thyestes): *Decl. mai.* 12.26 (H. 261.12; see Stramaglia's note ad loc.)
- "fratrum fabulosa certamina et incredibilia" (Atreus and Thyestes): *Contr.* 1.1.23
- "conceptum nescientibus oculis ignoti hominis affectum" (Cydippe and Acontius, the story as told by Ovid, *Heroides* 20 and 21): *Decl. mai.* 15.11 (H. 314.4–5; see above, p. 348 and n. 44)
- "volucris rota" (Ixion): *Decl. mai.* 12.28 (H. 263.15; see Stramaglia's note ad loc.)
- "virgines patrum senectute flagrantem" (Myrrha): *Decl. mai.* 15.11 (H. 314.6; see above, p. 348 and n. 44)
- "formam suis in se luminibus ardentem" (Narcissus): *Decl. mai.* 15.11 (H. 314.5–6; see above, p. 348 and n. 44)

- “notissimus Graeciae dux” (Odysseus): *Decl. min.* 347.8 (see Winterbottom’s note ad loc.)
- “aliquos per maria terrasque asperiores fortunam amicorum tantum secutos” (perhaps Odysseus): *Decl. mai.* 9.22 (H. 197.2–3; see Krapinger’s note ad loc.)
- “mortalium ferarumque coitus usque in monstrosa fecunditatis onera perlato” (Pasiphae): *Decl. mai.* 15.11 (H. 314.7–8; see above, p. 348 and n. 44)
- “Troianus rex” (Priamus): *Contr.* 7.7.17
- “nobis stridunt ferreae turres” (Rhadamanthus): *Decl. mai.* 12.28 (H. 263.18–19; see Stramaglia’s note ad loc.)
- “nobis imminet saxum” (Sisyphus): *Decl. mai.* 12.28 (H. 263.18; see Stramaglia’s note ad loc.)
- “fugacibus cibus elusus senex” (Tantalus): *Decl. mai.* 12.16 (H. 263.16; see Stramaglia’s note ad loc.)