IV. 11. 28, secundo partis suae loco. There seems to have been nothing in the schools of rhetoric which corresponded with the mock trials employed to-day for the training of law students. It would have needed little to adapt the controversiae to this more practical form, but it seems not to have been done. The declaimer dealt both with the case for the prosecution and that for the defence, as stated in section 29. But more than one declamation might be made on the The declamation which is described as being same theme. delivered secundo loco would appear to be, not a declamation for the defence, though this is conceivable, but rather a second speech in answer to the defence. The declaimer refutes the arguments which he alleges have been made by the defence, but that he may not miss the opportunity of practice in making a statement of facts, preludes his refutation with a statement of facts, inserted in the usual position immediately following the exordium. For the whole of this obscure passage cp. v. xiii. 50.

V. XIII. 49. An alternative interpretation is that certain depositions have been communicated to the prosecution by the defence and are used to supply material for contradictiones after discussion among the prosecutor's advocati.

V. XIII. 50. The reading is uncertain. Cod. Bern. reads et * * et; Cod. Bamb. et et; Cod. Ambr. enaribus. clear that something is lost. propositionibus is a harmless rather than a probable emendation. propositionibus and contradictionibus have been translated as datives. It would also be possible to treat them as ablatives: "meet our imaginary opponent's case both by statements and by objections."

V. xIV. 1 sqq. I am indebted for this note to my colleague, Dr. A. Wolf, Reader in Logic and Ethics in the University of London.

§ 1. ex consequentibus. If S is M, it is P; S is not P; therefore S is not M (a Destructive syllogism). argument is: [If Caesar's cause were not superior the gods would not support it;] the gods have supported Caesar's cause; therefore our cause is superior. The Major is omitted, thereby converting the syllogism into an enthymeme. The conclusion is stated, though it does

not follow the premise, as it should do formally.

§ 2. ex pugnantibus. The usual form would be: It would be inconsistent for S to be M and not also to be P; S is M; therefore S is also P. Quintilian's form of Minor and Conclusion is: S is not P; therefore S is not M. The argument is: [It would be inconsistent to hold that someone's death should be avenged and not also that his life should be restored, if possible;] you hold that his life was not worth restoring, even if possible; therefore you cannot hold that his death should be avenged. The Major is omitted.

§ 3. The argument is: [It would be inconsistent to hold that a man would commit a murder under unfavourable circumstances, and not to hold that he would do so under favourable circumstances;] but you know that he did not commit murder under favourable circumstances; therefore, you cannot hold that he did so under un-

favourable circumstances.

§ 4. The original argument is: If a man is guilty of an illegality which others have committed with impunity, he should not be punished; S is guilty of such an illegality; therefore he should not be punished. counter-argument (in the text) uses the same reason (i.e. the fact that the illegality in question has been frequently committed with impunity) to establish a contrary conclusion (i.e. that special punishment should be administered).

§ 5. The epicheireme is a syllogism in which either premise is supported by a reason. The reason is a premise of another syllogism, so that the reason taken together with the premise which it supports is really an enthymeme; e.g. M is P, because it is Q [and Q is P];

S is M, because it is R [and R is M]; therefore

§§ 7-9. The argument is confused. It may be expressed thus: Major. [If the universe were not controlled by reason, something could be found better governed than it is.] Reason. Because things that are governed by reason are better governed than those which are not. Minor. But nothing is better administered than the universe. Conclusion. Therefore the universe is governed by reason. (The argument is at once an enthymeme (ex consequentibus) and an epicheireme.)

§ 10. The Conclusion here is not identical with the Major, it is only expressed in the same sentence: viz. Major. Whatever derives its motion from itself is immortal. Minor and Conclusion. The soul derives its motion from

itself; therefore the soul is immortal.

§ 11. The proposition is doubtful because it is a hasty inference based on mere enumeration of instances.

§ 12. 1st Ex. The argument is: Major. That which is devoid of feeling is nothing to us. Minor (omitted). Death is a state devoid of feeling. Reason. Because a state of dissolution is a state devoid of feeling. Here we have an epicheireme with Reason substituted for Minor, and Major is misunderstood as in § 10 (q.v.).

2nd Ex. Major (omitted). If the universe were not animate, there would be something better. Reason. Because all animate things are better than inanimate. Minor. But there is nothing better than the universe. Therefore the universe is animate. Conclusion.

Major is really omitted as Quintilian suspects. § 13 (last sentence). What he calls the Minor is only its

Reason.

§ 17. The argument is: Major. If in the midst of arms laws were not silent, then he who would await their sanction is certain to be the victim, etc. Minor (omitted). But he who awaits their sanction should not be the victim, etc. Conclusion. Therefore in the midst of arms laws are silent. Here we have an enthymeme ex consequen-There is still no Reason for either premise. The Major is the Reason for the Conclusion, which is a different matter.

§ 18. Major (omitted). If the Twelve Tables permit the killing of a man under certain circumstances, it cannot

be maintained that a slayer must be killed whatever Minor. The Twelve Tables do the circumstances. permit the killing, etc. Conclusion. Therefore it cannot be maintained that a slayer, etc. Here also what is given is a Reason for the Conclusion (i.e. itself a premise) and not for the Premise.

§ 19. The Real argument is: Major. If it were wrong to kill robbers, etc., we should not be allowed escorts and swords. Reason. For escorts and swords are intended Minor. But we are to enable us to fight robbers. allowed escorts and swords. Conclusion. Therefore it

is not wrong to kill robbers, etc.

§ 20. Major. If a man confesses, etc., he should be con-Objection. If a man confesses that he has killed someone who lay in wait for him he should not be condemned.

§ 21. The Reason is one of the premises for the proposition. If the other Reason be false, the proposition will be

false, but the first Reason will still be true.

§ 23. The doctrine is false. If both premises are true, the conclusion, if valid, is true, while if both premises or either be false, the conclusion may still be true. Cp. Ar. An. Pr. ii. 2.

§ 25. Enthymema ex consequentibus . . . ex pugnantibus on § 10. Both these enthymemes omit the major

premise.

VI. 1. 20. Servium Sulpicium Messala is the reading of Scholl. The MSS. give Servius Sulpicius.

END OF SAMPLE TEXT



The Complete Text can be found on our CD:

Primary Literary Sources For Ancient Literature
which can be purchased on our Website:

www.Brainfly.net

or

by sending \$64.95 in check or money order to:

Brainfly Inc.

5100 Garfield Ave. #46

Sacramento CA 95841-3839

TEACHER'S DISCOUNT:

If you are a **TEACHER** you can take advantage of our teacher's discount. Click on **Teachers Discount** on our website (www.Brainfly.net) or **Send us \$55.95** and we will send you a full copy of **Primary Literary Sources For Ancient Literature AND our 5000 Classics CD** (a collection of over 5000 classic works of literature in electronic format (.txt)) plus our Wholesale price list.

If you have any suggestions such as books you would like to see added to the collection or if you would like our wholesale prices list please send us an email to:

webcomments@brainfly.net