



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Dionysius and Quintilian: Imitation and emulation in Greek and Latin literary criticism

Schippers, A.M.

Citation

Schippers, A. M. (2019, September 4). *Dionysius and Quintilian: Imitation and emulation in Greek and Latin literary criticism*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/76431>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/76431>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/76431>

Author: Schippers, A.M.

Title: Dionysius and Quintilian: Imitation and emulation in Greek and Latin literary criticism

Issue Date: 2019-09-04

CHAPTER 4

FROM DIONYSIUS TO QUINTILIAN. QUINTILIAN'S READING LISTS OF GREEK AND LATIN LITERATURE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In turning from Dionysius to Quintilian, we bridge a period of decades in which many Greek and Roman critics contributed to rhetorical theory and practice. A selection of Greek and Roman authors who explicitly reflected upon the notion of (rhetorical) imitation will be discussed in chapter 5, which puts in broader perspective the discussions of Dionysius' and Quintilian's mimetic terminology and ideas. The present chapter explores the structure of Quintilian's reading lists of Greek and Latin literature and the choices made in them in comparison with Dionysius' canon, and as such forms a diptych together with chapter 3.

First, some remarks about the role of oratory during the first century AD should be made.¹ It has long been thought that from the establishment of the principate onwards, oratory stopped fulfilling the vital function it always had in the different political systems of classical Greece and Republican Rome. However, recent research has shown that political oratory remained important, especially in the senate and in the assemblies in (the eastern part of) the Roman Empire.² Also the branches of epideictic and forensic oratory continued to play a considerable role in public life.³

¹ For a brief overview of the history of rhetoric in the first century AD, see e.g. Kennedy (1972), 428-442; Leeman & Braet (1987), 27-30; Steel (2006) and esp. Rutledge (2007).

² See e.g. Steel (2006), 20: 'one of the curious aspects [...] of oratory at Rome is how much continuity there is in the functions of oratory between Republic and Empire'. On the role and influence of rhetoric in the first century AD in the eastern part of the Roman Empire, see esp. Goudriaan (1989), 29-38, who addresses the topic as part of his discussion of Dionysius' views on rhetoric. Rutledge (2007), Ramsey (2007) and Rees (2007) offer useful discussions of respectively 'Oratory and Politics in the Empire', 'Roman Senatorial Oratory' and 'Panegyric'.

³ See e.g. Steel (2006), 22. She rightly notes that although epideictic oratory remained important in the Empire, its role was 'fundamentally transformed' (*ibid.*). Quintilian displays a remarkable judicial orientation of oratory, especially in his discussion of Latin orators. Cf. e.g. 10.1.110 (*iudicem ferat*); 10.1.112 (*regnare in iudiciis*); 10.1.115 (*in accusando multa urbanitas*); 10.1.119 (*privatis tamen causis quam publicis melior*); 10.1.122 (*consummati [...] patroni*). Cf. also the introduction to the canons: 10.1.16 (*fortuna [...] iudicii*); 10.1.22 (*utrimque habitas legere actiones*); 10.1.36 (*non tamen eandem esse condicionem sciamus litium ac disputationum*).

Notwithstanding the passage of time and the developments that literary and rhetorical tastes necessarily experienced, Quintilian, like Dionysius, admired the literary treasures of classical Greece, and recommended these for rhetorical imitation. In his reading lists of Greek and Latin literature presented in the tenth book of his *Institutio*, Quintilian urges future orators to study and imitate authors like Sophocles and Euripides, Herodotus and Thucydides, Demosthenes and Aeschines. This chapter shows that although Quintilian shares his preference for the literature of classical Greece with Dionysius, his choices of authors and judgements passed on them also clearly mirror a different rhetorical program of classicism.

A brief discussion of the *status quaestionis* (4.2) will show that many scholars have been wrongly inclined to emphasise the similarities between Quintilian's canons and those of others (esp. Dionysius'). Section 4.3 is dedicated to key concepts in Quintilian's theoretical discussion of imitation in *Institutio* 10.2, and compares these to the important ideas on imitation aired by Dionysius.

Section 4.4 provides insight in the general structure of Dionysius' and Quintilian's canons, whereas the following sections discuss their order of authors (4.5) and Quintilian's insertion of Hellenistic authors (4.6). These three sections establish that the various differences – in arrangement, accents and choices of authors – are essential to our understanding of the relationship between Dionysius' and Quintilian's views on imitation.

Section 4.7 embarks on important correspondences and differences between Dionysius and Quintilian in their judgements of authors, and offers suggestions to explain these. Next, Quintilian's application of literary virtues in his Greek and Latin canons (4.8), as well as the clusters of virtues that can be composed (4.8.1-3), will be discussed. As such, section 4.8 runs parallel to section 3.6, in which Dionysius' Greek canon was subjected to a similar analysis.

The last analytical section (4.9) of this chapter is dedicated to the ways in which Greece and Rome and their literary identities come to the fore in Quintilian's canons. This section sheds light on the different metaphors and motifs by which Quintilian frames the Greek and Latin reading lists – the former as a completed and rather unanimously accepted unity, the latter as an incomplete and hybrid list in which literary potential and competition are crucial concepts.

The conclusion (4.10) recapitulates all sections, and suggests that for Dionysius, imitation means a revival of the illustrious Greek literary history in order not only to strengthen the identity of Greeks in Rome, but also to inspire both Greek and Latin authors, whereas for Quintilian, imitation pertains to the use of Greek literature as cradle of and

legitimation for Latin stylistic competence, as well as to the adequate, adaptive and especially competitive use of Greek literary treasures in a Roman context.⁴

The specific aims of this chapter are 1) to argue that Quintilian often arranges his Greek canon differently than Dionysius, and makes the structure of his list serve his own rhetorical purposes, which are to emphasise the importance of or coherences between authors, to parallel the (rather compelling) order of equivalent authors in the Latin reading lists, and to bridge the chronological gap between Greek and Latin literature, 2) to explain the differences between Dionysius and Quintilian in their choices of and judgements passed on Greek authors by pointing to Quintilian's salient pedagogical differentiation between novice students and mature orators – a differentiation which is less decisive in Dionysius' canon –, his different interpretation of (the status of) rhetorical 'usefulness' of reading lists, his different audience, and developments in classicism and literary taste, 3) to argue that Quintilian, though recommending many Greek literary virtues that also appear in Dionysius' canon, emphasises different stylistic qualities to be imitated, 4) to claim that Quintilian presents his Latin canon, which is dominated by the idea of literary competition between Greece and Rome, as a strongly redefined continuum of the Greek reading list, and 5) to establish that the connections between Dionysius' and Quintilian's ideas on imitation relate to a similar discourse and conceptual framework, from which they could select those elements that suited their own rhetorical agendas, and that helped them preserve the integrity of their Greek respectively Roman identity.

4.2 *STATUS QUAESTIONIS*

Over the centuries, much effort has been made to assess the relationship between Quintilian and his rhetorical predecessors – not only for the *Institutio* as a whole, but also for his canons of Greek and Latin literature incorporated in book 10. After briefly discussing some important views on Quintilian's originality in general, the focus of this section on the *status quaestionis* will be on literature concerning the originality displayed by Quintilian in his ideas on imitation and in the composition of his two canons.

With regard to Quintilian's originality throughout the *Institutio*, Odgers published a concise and enlightening article in which he tries to establish not only the extent of

⁴ On the revival of classical Athens in Augustan Rome, see Hidber (1996), 75-81.

Quintilian's indebtedness to earlier rhetorical theorists, but also that of his originality.⁵ Odgers showed that Quintilian, who knew the works of both Greek and Latin theorists thoroughly, refers to approximately 50 Greek and 30 Roman authorities, with whom he disagrees in most cases.⁶ According to Odgers, 'he [i.e. Quintilian, M.S.] exhibits a wholesomely critical attitude toward his predecessors, disagreeing at times even with Cicero, whom he regards as his greatest authority'.⁷ Quintilian's method, as Odgers argues, runs midway between uncritical and unscrupulous imitation of predecessors and unrestrained eagerness to display independence and originality.⁸

Odgers' (relatively early) article is quite remarkable in a persistent scholarly tradition in which Quintilian is seen as a critic who followed (whether or not consciously) the footsteps of others. One exponent of this view is Kennedy, who framed Quintilian as original only in his capacity as synthesist and evaluator of earlier discussions for his own purposes.⁹ After him, a similar idea is expressed e.g. by Barilli.¹⁰ Fairly recently, Logie pointed out that Quintilian's dependence gradually decreases in the *Institutio*, and that he supposes his students to follow – from cradle to lawcourt – this growing distance from tradition, a development described by Logie as a progression 'from relatively passive consumption of exemplary texts, to competent imitation, building finally to the creation of original compositions'.¹¹

Not only Quintilian's originality has been doubted; also his knowledge of the Greek literature he was commenting on has been deemed scant.¹² It is in this light that Quintilian's

⁵ Odgers (1935), 25-36. On Quintilian's originality, see Odgers (1933), 182-188.

⁶ Odgers (1935), 31-32. When Quintilian does not refer to his sources, one is to infer that he is in complete agreement with them, according to Odgers (*ibid.*, 28).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 27-28.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁹ Kennedy (1969), 123.

¹⁰ Barilli (1989), 35.

¹¹ Logie (2003), 359. For a more detailed discussion of the ideas of Kennedy and Barilli (and also of Butler, who published a translation of the *Institutio* in the Loeb Classical Library Series 1920-1922), see Logie (2003), to whom I owe the reference to Barilli (1989).

¹² The impression of Quintilian as a mere imitator might have been powered by such lists as the 'Index scriptorum et artificum' in the edition of Halm, as has been suggested by Peterson (1891), xxviii. Odgers (1933) published an article on Quintilian's references to passages not only in Latin, but also in Greek literature. According to Odgers, 'almost 85% of his [i.e. Quintilian's, M.S.] identified references to Greek and Latin literature, including quotations, are concerned with Latin literature alone' (*ibid.*, 183). As an explanation, he suggests that Quintilian 'probably felt that a large number of his readers knew or remembered but little Greek'

canons have frequently been judged to be based primarily on former reading lists – especially Dionysius'.¹³ This view was still persistent in 1873, when Claussen argued for Dionysius as Quintilian's direct source.¹⁴ In 1889, however, Usener claimed that Quintilian composed his canons independently from Dionysius, and established the idea that Dionysius and Quintilian relied on a common source which was based on the Alexandrian canons.¹⁵ As a side effect, Usener initiated a fairly heated academic debate on the origin and the history of library lists or canons.¹⁶

Rather harsh in his verdict on Quintilian's putative dependence and lack of originality in his canons was Nettleship in an article published in 1890. He wrote that 'in the case of the first list, or list of Greek authors, he [i.e. Quintilian, M.S.] gives his readers fair warning that he is only repeating other people's criticisms, not pronouncing his own'.¹⁷ In his elaborate commentary (1891, repr. 1967) on the tenth book of the *Institutio*, Peterson responded that 'he [i.e. Quintilian, M.S.] is not slavishly following any single authority' and that 'his career as teacher had probably impressed on his memory many *dicta* which he could hardly fail to reproduce, in one form or another [...]'.¹⁸ Peterson concluded that Quintilian, instead of

(*ibid.*, 185). An exponent of the tradition of criticizing Quintilian for his smattering of Greek is Kennedy (1962), 143, who argues that 'it is the nature of the references as much as their relatively small numbers which seems to indicate a lack of familiarity with the subject'.

¹³ For this brief overview, I gratefully made use of the research of Citroni (2006a), 1, n. 1, who gives a summary of the debate on the originality of Quintilian's canons. See also Rutherford (1998), 40-42. For a more profound discussion of (ideas expressed with regard to) Quintilian's originality and integration of other sources, see Nicolai (1992), 251-322.

¹⁴ Claussen (1873), 348 calls Dionysius Quintilian's *primus et praecipuus fons*.

¹⁵ Usener (1889), 110-111, 132 ff. Among the supporters of the idea of a common source of Dionysius and Quintilian is Steinmetz (1964), 456, who followed Radermacher. Battisti (1997), 35 does not take a position. Also Citroni (2006a), 9 leaves the question more or less open: '[...] Quintilian knew Dionysius, or used a source that he also had used'. A scholar who thought of Quintilian having a direct knowledge of Dionysius' work is e.g. Heydenreich (1900). Kennedy (1962), 142 remains vague: 'The [i.e. Quintilian's, M.S.] Greek list [...] is derived from some Hellenistic rhetorician; we have an example in the fragmentary work *On Imitation* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and it has been thought that Quintilian used this, or something very like it'.

¹⁶ For a discussion of Quintilian's canons in the light of the old canons of Callimachus and the Alexandrians, cf. e.g. Steinmetz (1964), 456-466; Zetzel (1983), 97 ff.; Schmidt (1987); Vardi (2003). I dedicated some words to the origin and history of canons in section 3.5.1.

¹⁷ Nettleship (1890), 258. Nettleship refers to Quintilian's numerous references to other critics, e.g. in 10.1.27, 10.1.52-53, 10.1.58-59.

¹⁸ Peterson (1891), xxxii, xxx.

relying upon one single source, made use of an amalgam of various Greek and Roman sources (of whom Dionysius was certainly an important one), with the contribution of his rich experience as a teacher and scholar.¹⁹ In my opinion, Peterson justly tried to rehabilitate Quintilian by putting forward the idea of a shared cultural memory or common discourse from which Quintilian – as Quintilian himself often readily admitted – borrowed and adapted (whether or not consciously), and to which he evidently also contributed.²⁰

In the first half of the twentieth century, scholars like Lemarchand and Cohoon tended to emphasise the similarities between the canons of Dionysius and Quintilian, but they also included the reading list of Dio Chrysostom (*Oration* 18) in their comparison. The recent observations of Rutherford, Billault and De Jonge also take Dionysius, Dio and Quintilian into account. Rutherford and Billault pay due attention to the similarities between their lists; De Jonge fruitfully focuses on the differences between Dio (and Quintilian) on the one hand, and Dionysius on the other.²¹ More on these discussions can be found in section 5.1.

Other scholars are concerned with Dionysius and Quintilian alone. In 1953, Tavernini emphasised that the coincidences between Dionysius and Quintilian are formal rather than substantial, and that the substratum of thought (*‘il substrato di pensiero’*) is different.²² In more recent years, however, many scholars again shared the propensity to disregard the important divergences between Dionysius’ and Quintilian’s canons in favour of stressing rather superficial similarities. In his Loeb edition of Quintilian’s ninth and tenth book, Russell claims that Quintilian appears to be ‘heavily dependent’ on Dionysius’ *On Imitation*.²³ Although Vardi notices deviations in choices of authors in Quintilian, he emphasises that we

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. Hutchinson (2013), 12, n. 14, who thinks that Dionysius was one of Quintilian’s Greek sources. Like Peterson, Cousin (1935) and Tavernini (1953) considered Ciceronian influence on Quintilian important. For a comparison between Dionysius’ and Quintilian’s canons, see Peterson (1891), xxx-xxxiv.

²⁰ This idea was already expressed by Claussen (1873), 343: *[...] nonnullos locos memoria tenuit, adeo ut inscius interdum auctorum verba referret*. For contributions of Quintilian to literary theory, see Peterson (1891), xxxix-lvii.

²¹ Rutherford (1998), 43; Billault (2004), 505; De Jonge in J. König & N. Wiater (forthc.).

²² For a discussion of similarities and differences between Dionysius and Quintilian, see Tavernini (1953), 17-51 (esp. 50-51).

²³ Russell (2001), 246. Cf. also Russell (1979), 6: ‘for the Greek material, he [i.e. Quintilian, M.S.] relies almost word for word on Dionysius [...]; in the Latin part of the chapter, on the other hand, he airs his own views [...].’

cannot escape noting a ‘striking resemblance’ between him and Dionysius in names of authors, evaluative criteria and, at times, in wording.²⁴

Thus, the gist of the scholarly comments concerning Dionysius and Quintilian is that their canons yield several similarities concerning textual structure, focus and concept. However, on closer inspection these canons also reveal substantial divergences both in choices of authors and critical judgements passed on them. A more detailed and comparative investigation will allow us to address precisely these issues.²⁵ For example, how are Quintilian’s contributions to and adaptations of Dionysius’ canon to be explained within the broader framework of the development of Roman literary taste?²⁶ And what exactly made Quintilian insert a Greek canon to enhance his readers’ eloquence in Latin?

In a 2004 article, Citroni dealt with these questions and, more broadly speaking, with the estimation of Quintilian’s tenth book as an account with a more general literary interest rather than a narrow rhetorical focus.²⁷ He claims that Quintilian, whose source – he thinks – must have been either Dionysius or one that was common to Dionysius and himself, explicitly

²⁴ Vardi (2003), 136. Vardi stresses the uniformity of the lists of the literary critics and rhetoricians Horace, Dionysius, Quintilian, Diomedes (*De Poem.*), Caesius Bassus (*De Metr.*), Proclus apud Photium, Tzetzes (*ad Lyc.*), and Byzantine MSS (cf. table in *ibid.*, 151). See *ibid.*, 143: ‘but to come back to the extensive lists of both literary critics and teachers of rhetoric, let us note that the uniformity they reveal goes beyond the authors they name, and is even more manifest in their structure’.

²⁵ An interesting, detailed discussion of Quintilian’s canons and the internal order of authors is e.g. provided by Schwindt (2000), esp. 160-164, but his approach is not comparative in essence.

²⁶ Cf. Kühnert (1969), 45: ‘[...] dass Quintilian bei den einzelnen Autoren eine meist kurze Charakteristik und Beurteilung gibt, in der sich offenbar die *communis opinio* seiner Zeit widerspiegelt’.

²⁷ Citroni (2006a), 2, n. 2 refers to the works of Cova (1990) and Taekema (2003), who, like him, assume a more general literary interest in Quintilian. On the contrary, Schneider (1983), 118 is of the opinion that Quintilian’s reading list is entirely focused on the development of rhetorical progress: ‘[...] auch innerhalb der Literaturübersicht betont er [i.e. Quintilian, M.S.] immer wieder, dass es ihm hierbei nur um die Förderung des rednerischen Vermögens geht’. That Quintilian has both a rhetorical and general literary interest, is argued by Steinmetz (1964), 455, who observes that ‘Rhetorik und Stilkritik sich in vieler Beziehung eng berühren [...]’. According to him, Quintilian adapted the ‘stilkritische Literaturgeschichte’ (*ibid.*, 456) of the Alexandrians and used it for his own rhetorical purposes. Sometimes, however, traces of the literary-historical character of the Alexandrian sources can still be discerned in Quintilian’s ‘glänzende philologische und literar-historische Bemerkungen’ (*ibid.*, 457). His observation seems to be rather in line with that of Schwindt (2000), 164, who argues: ‘die Literaturgeschichte ist das Koordinatensystem, in dem die rhetorische Pragmatie des Quintilian sich bewegt’.

broke with (in Citroni's words) the 'Varronian-Ciceronian canon'.²⁸ This 'canon', with its focus on drama and its reverend admiration for ancient writers such as Ennius, is characterised by a 'framework of emulative correspondences between the Roman and Greek production'.²⁹ According to Citroni, Quintilian aligned himself with the taste of the Flavian poets of his own age, who accepted as reference points 'no longer the great poets of the Greek canon, but the Augustan poets'; in so doing, he rejected the archaising tradition of Varro and Cicero.³⁰

The role played by Dionysius in this process – which is not assessed by Citroni – will throw a different light on the interpretation and contextualisation of Quintilian's Greek and Latin canons. In my analysis of Quintilian's lists, I will argue that classical Greek literature can be considered an essential part of Quintilian's rhetorical program of imitation. First, however, I will briefly discuss Quintilian's theory of imitation, and make a comparison with key concepts of imitation in Dionysius. Then I will pass on to the general structure of Quintilian's canons, the internal order of authors, and the inclusion of writers who do not appear in Dionysius' list.

4.3 QUINTILIAN'S THEORY OF IMITATION

Before turning to Quintilian's theory of imitation, to which he dedicated especially the second section of *Institutio* 10, let us recall that there are some substantial differences between Quintilian's understanding and use of the terms *imitatio* and *aemulatio* throughout his *Institutio*, and Dionysius' understanding and use of the terms μίμησις and ζῆλος throughout his rhetorical treatises. As we have seen in chapter 2, Dionysius presents μίμησις as involving an original, technical re-expression of the model, while he frames ζῆλος as an aspiring state of mind caused by the contemplation of beauty. For Dionysius, μίμησις cannot do without ζῆλος; neither can ζῆλος without μίμησις. By contrast, Quintilian tends to make a rather clear

²⁸ On the dependence of Quintilian on Dionysius, see Citroni (2006a), 7, 9. On the break of Quintilian with the archaising tradition of Varro, Cicero and the academics and grammarians, see Citroni (2006a), 12-14. More on the Varronian 'canon' in Fantham (1989), 242-244. See argues that this canon was determined 'indirectly at least' by Varro, who probably started his literary research by investigating the archives of the magistrates of dramatic festivals. The Varronian canon was 'certainly known to Cicero when he composed the *Brutus*' (*ibid.*, 244). For connections between Varro's and Quintilian's ideas on *latinitas*, see Grebe (2000a).

²⁹ Citroni (2006a), 12.

³⁰ Citroni (2006a), 16.

distinction between *imitatio* and *aemulatio*. The former designates technical, basic repetition of models, the latter comprises competitive change and completion of models in order to transcend them. Consequently, Quintilian's notion of *imitatio* is merely limited to the first stages of an orator's career, whereas *aemulatio* is reserved to describe the mimetic activities of the mature rhetorician. In this section, which contains an overview of Quintilian's theory of imitation unfolded in *Institutio* 10.1-2, we will see that both Quintilian and Dionysius, notwithstanding the differences in the meaning and use of mimetic idiom in their works, construct a theory of imitation grounded on remarkably similar ideas.³¹

Not only do Quintilian's canons give voice to his theory of imitation; the entire tenth book of the *Institutio* is devoted to the acquisition of stylistic competence by reading – hence the two canons of Greek and Latin literature –, writing and speaking. As such, it continues the account of *elocutio* in books 8 and 9, but, as Russell notes, there is a 'change of perspective'.³² Whereas books 8 and 9 are highly technical and theoretical in their discussions on *elocutio*, book 10 aims at offering the reader some models and practical guidelines on how to obtain 'firm facility, which the Greeks call *hexis*' (*firma [...] facilitas, quae apud Graecos hexis nominatur*).³³ Quintilian's main intention is to discuss those authors whose works are most valuable and practically useful for acquiring this facility.³⁴ He shares this aim with Dionysius, who also emphatically insists on the practical usefulness of his own canon and on the achievement of ἔξις, which, as we have seen in section 3.3.1, consists of a clever nature, careful study and laborious exercise (fr. II U-R).³⁵ Quintilian's book 10 covers the following subjects: acquisition of stylistic competence (1.1-45), canons of Greek and Latin literature (1.46-84, 1.85-131), imitation (2.1-28), methods of writing (3.1-33), correction (4.1-4), objects of writing exercises (5.1-23), mental preparation (6.1-7) and improvisation (7.1-33).

In 10.1.1-45, Quintilian presents some preliminary remarks to the reading lists of Greek and Latin literature. After his insistence on *facilitas*, which is acquired first and

³¹ For an analysis of Quintilian's argument in sections 10.1-2, see also Peterson (1891), 1-6; Russell (2001), 246-249.

³² Russell (2001), 246.

³³ Quint. 10.1.1. For Greek rhetorical terminology in Quintilian, see Cousin (1936).

³⁴ Quintilian's references to (imitating what is useful in) rhetorical practice are abundant; see e.g. 10.1.4; 10.1.15-16; 10.1.40; 10.1.57.

³⁵ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* fr. II U-R = 1 Aujac = 1 Battisti. For Dionysius' reference to the practical usefulness of his canon, see *Thuc.* 1.1-2. For references to usefulness in *Imit.*, see e.g. 3.8; 5.4; 5.7. Other references to ἔξις in Dionysius are *Lys.* 11.5; *Dem.* 52.1, 52.5.

foremost through ‘speaking’ (*dicere*), then through ‘imitation’ (*imitatio*) and then through ‘the discipline of writing’ (*scribendi diligentia*), Quintilian proceeds to his main goal, which is to make clear ‘by what kind of exercise the athlete, who has learned all the standard moves from his trainer, can be prepared for the competition’ (*athleta qui omnis iam perdidicerit a praeceptore numeros quo genere exercitationis ad certamina praeparandus sit*).³⁶ In 10.1.6-16, it turns out that this preparation for rhetorical practice mainly consists of the development of two capacities that are essential to an orator: ‘wealth’ (*copia*, also called *ubertas* or *divitia*) and ‘sound judgement’ (*iudicium*).³⁷ These capacities are the fruits of frequent reading of and listening to the best models.³⁸ It is not immediately clear what the exact difference is between being endowed with *firma facilitas* or *copia*.³⁹ Both terms seem to be closely intertwined – the former referring merely to the *application* of wide literary knowledge, the latter pertaining to the *possession* of it. In this way, we could say that *copia* is the prerequisite of *firma facilitas*.

‘Sound judgement’ (*iudicium*) also seems to be inextricably linked with *copia*, as Quintilian’s advice reveals that ‘we should pair wealth with sound judgement’ (*nobis autem copia cum iudicio paranda est*) ‘by reading and hearing the best’ (*optima legendo atque audiendo*).⁴⁰ But what exactly does *iudicium* refer to? As Taekema points out, the term is ambivalent.⁴¹ On the one hand, it indicates having gained a keen eye for literary qualities and a sound understanding of which of these qualities fit one’s own capabilities.⁴² Seen in this way, it is a wide reading experience (*copia*) that results in a rather general *iudicium* – which, in turn, should form the basis of the actual process of imitation, as Quintilian makes clear.⁴³

On the other hand, the term *iudicium* seems to pertain to a sharp sense of what is appropriate in various contexts. Thus, *iudicium* also has a strong applicatory-oriented connotation and makes up a crucial part not only of critical literary study, but also of the actual imitative process. In this practical sense, it is connected primarily to the level of words, for Quintilian argues that ‘reading will provide us with an abundance’ (*ubertatem ac divitias*

³⁶ Quint. 10.1.3-4.

³⁷ Quint. 10.1.8, 13. Peterson (1891) *ad loc.* notices that *ubertatem ac divitias* is a hendiadys consisting of synonymous nouns; he refers to Cic. *De or.* 1.161 for the metaphorical use of *divitia*.

³⁸ Quint. 10.1.10, 8.

³⁹ On *copia*, see e.g. Lausberg (2008), 676. On *facilitas*, see *ibid.*, 703.

⁴⁰ Quint. 10.1.8. On *iudicium*, see e.g. Lausberg (2008), 733.

⁴¹ Taekema (2003), 255.

⁴² Cf. Quint. 10.2.18-19.

⁴³ Quint. 10.1.8.

dabit lectio) of synonymous terms to be applied not only at pleasure, ‘but also as is fitting’ (*sed etiam quo modo oportet*).⁴⁴ Elsewhere, Quintilian points out that reading will enable us not only to learn the proper names of things, but also what name is ‘the most appropriate in each place’ (*quoque loco [...] aptissimum*).⁴⁵ Hence, *iudicium* involves not only the sound assessment of literature as such and in relation to one’s own capacities, but also the estimation of its usability in given situations.⁴⁶

In his *On Imitation*, Dionysius too proclaims the necessity of a profound knowledge of literary models. The closing paragraph of this treatise mentions the ‘method of attentive reading’ (τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐπιμελοῦς ἀναγνώσεως), which does not approach the ancients ‘casually’ (παρέργως) nor ‘obliviously waits for the profit to come’ (λεληθότως τὴν ὠφέλειαν προσγινομένην περιμένειν), but ‘knowingly’ (ἐπιστημόνως).⁴⁷ In this passage, sound judgement – which is equal to knowledge – is bound to the contemplation of literature, not to its actual incorporation in a new context. The stage of literary contemplation is in fact very important in Dionysius’ conception of the process of imitation. Nevertheless, we have seen that Dionysius also insisted on knowledge during the stages of selecting models and eclectically composing new masterpieces, for instance in his programmatic narrative on Zeuxis, who thoughtfully picked out and painted only those parts of his models which were worth reproducing.⁴⁸

In the rest of the prelude to his canons (10.1.17-36), Quintilian discusses the usefulness of reading the different genres of oratory, poetry, historiography and philosophy, and pays due attention to the differences between these genres.⁴⁹ In 10.1.37-46, Quintilian

⁴⁴ Quint. 10.1.13.

⁴⁵ Quint. 10.1.8.

⁴⁶ Its Greek counterpart κρίσις has a similar ambivalence, designating the judgement of literary qualities as well as the estimation of situation and context. On κρίσις, see e.g. Lausberg (2008), 234-235.

⁴⁷ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 5.7. For a discussion of this passage, see also section 3.4.

⁴⁸ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 1.4. For this story, see sections 1.1-3.

⁴⁹ With respect to oratory, he insists again on repeated and careful reading (10.1.19) of only the best models (10.1.20) for the development of a ‘more sure judgement’ (*certius iudicium*, 10.1.17) regarding the structure of speeches. Furthermore, he advises to take note of the pleadings on both sides (10.1.22) and not to imitate those passages of the best authors which are worse (10.1.25; cf. 10.2.14-15). (For the idea of authors falling below their own standards, cf. Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 1.1). Reading poetry is useful and inspiring, but should be done prudently by the orator; after all, unlike rhetoric, the genre of poetry ‘aims at pleasure alone’ (*solam petit voluptatem*, 10.1.28) and, forced to making digressions because of metrical restrictions, often derogates truth. Historiography can nurture the orator ‘with its rich and delicious milk’ (*uberi iucundoque suco*, 10.1.31) and

elaborates on the selection criteria he adopted in the composition of his reading lists. Although he admits that every writer can be of some use, he declares to select only those authors who contribute ‘to the formation of style’ (*ad faciendam [...] phrasin*), and of them only ‘the best’ (*eminentissimi*) and the most appropriate ‘for those who intend to become orators’ (*intendentibus ut oratores fiant*).⁵⁰

In book 1 of the *Institutio*, Quintilian provides an explanation for offering a novice learner only the highlights of literature: although the young man is not yet able to grasp their qualities completely, his mind rises by reading their ‘honourable texts’ (*honestas*).⁵¹ Later, when he is endowed ‘with a firmer judgement’ (*firmiore iudicio*), he is allowed to venture to tragic and, with certain reservations, lyrical poets, who also ‘nourish’ the mind (cf. *alunt et lyrici*).⁵² This pedagogical differentiation within the reading program (which will be further discussed in this chapter) is very prominent in Quintilian’s theory of imitation, but is a less easily recognizable catalyst for the choices he makes in his Greek and Latin canons.⁵³

By conspicuously paying attention to his own method of choosing authors, Quintilian is casting himself as an exponent of sagacious selection, for the authors he recommends have all been subjected to his own severe criteria pertaining to practical usefulness, as he makes clear.⁵⁴ Although the analogy between his own selective methods and those supposed to be carried out by his students is not explicit, the similarities are unmistakable. This is less prominent in Dionysius, who indeed singles out only those authors worth imitating, but does

provide him with sound *exempla* (10.1.34); nevertheless, it should be approached with caution as well, for ‘it is written to narrate, not to prove’ (*scribitur ad narrandum, non ad probandum*, 10.1.31). To the philosophers, the rhetoricians gave up the best of their task, which is the discussion of moral concepts (10.1.35). Although the argumentations, interrogations and debates of philosophers can help the orator in his preparations, he should keep in mind that the condition in legal processes and philosophical debates differs (10.1.36).

⁵⁰ Quint. 10.1.42, 45. For the idea that every writer has useful qualities, cf. also 10.1.57. For the idea of selecting only the best authors, see also 10.1.20. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 1.1-2, where *On Imitation* is discussed: οὐς ὑπελάμβανον ἐπιφανεστάτους εἶναι ποιητάς τε καὶ συγγραφεῖς (‘I discussed those poets and prose authors whom I considered to be outstanding’) and *Orat. Vett.* 4.4, where the selection of orators in the essays *On the Ancient Orators* is at issue: τοὺς δὲ χαριεστάτους ἐξ αὐτῶν προχειρισάμενος (‘after having selected the most elegant of them’). For Dionysius’ description of the intended audience of his reading list, which resembles Quintilian’s description, see *Thuc.* 1.2: τοῖς προαιρουμένοις γράφειν τε καὶ λέγειν εὖ (‘for those who intend to write and speak well’).

⁵¹ Quint. 1.8.4.

⁵² Quint. 1.8.5-6.

⁵³ For the idea of pedagogical differentiation, see also Quint. 1.8.12.

⁵⁴ Quint. 10.1.44-45.

not reflect upon his own method of selecting authors in a way that overtly invites the reader to consider it an illustration of selective imitation.⁵⁵ As we have seen in section 3.4, Dionysius does cast himself as a theoretical example worth following regarding his ‘method of attentive reading’.⁵⁶

Institutio 10.2 is more theoretical in nature. Like Dionysius, Quintilian frames the process of imitation in terms of a mental movement or elevation (cf. *mens derigenda*).⁵⁷ He proceeds to discuss the successive stages of *imitatio* (i.e. basic repetition of the model) and *aemulatio* (i.e. original adaption of and addition to the model) are discussed.⁵⁸ Although his reading lists of Greek and Latin literature are intended ‘for those who intend to become orators’ and who are necessarily concerned with *imitatio*, Quintilian here reveals that he attaches more value to *aemulatio*. *Imitatio*, he argues, is insufficient on its own, since it does not facilitate stylistic progress.⁵⁹ Moreover, the scope of *imitatio* is limited: those qualities of an orator which are the most important (i.e. ‘genius’ (*ingenium*), ‘invention’ (*inventio*), ‘force’ (*vis*) and ‘facility’ (*facilitas*)), are inimitable.⁶⁰

Again emphasising the importance of understanding (cf. *intellegat*) the object of imitation and knowing (cf. *sciat*) why it is good, Quintilian advises novice students to investigate whom they should imitate (10.2.14), what elements they should imitate (*ibid.*), and what their own capacities allow for (10.2.19).⁶¹ Quintilian points out again that they should be aware of differences in the ‘law’ (*lex*) and ‘standard of appropriateness’ (*decor*) of the genres, but also hastens to notice that ‘all eloquence has something in common’ (*habet [...] omnis eloquentia aliquid commune*).⁶² It is this common element that should be imitated. After some remarks on the need of imitating a wide range of models instead of following only one, Quintilian concludes this section by insisting that imitation is not limited to words; it also

⁵⁵ For Dionysius’ remarks on his criteria for selection and evaluation and his aims in *On Imitation*, see *Thuc.* 1.1-2. Cf. *Orat. Vett.* 4.2 and 4.4, where Dionysius elaborates on the selection and presentation of orators.

⁵⁶ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 5.7.

⁵⁷ Quint. 10.2.1. Cf. 1.8.5: *animus adsurgat*. Dionysius, however, explicitly connects this mental movement with the concept of ζῆλος (*Imit.* fr. III U-R = 2 Aujac = 2 Battisti). Cf. sections 2.2.1 and 2.3.1, where the idea of mental movement is also touched upon.

⁵⁸ For Quintilian’s understanding and use of the notions of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, see section 2.3.

⁵⁹ Quint. 10.2.4.

⁶⁰ Quint. 10.2.12.

⁶¹ For the reference to knowledge, see Quint. 10.2.18.

⁶² Quint. 10.2.22.

deals with how these words are applied.⁶³ The orator who is ‘perfect’ (*perfectus*) should ‘see through’ (*pervideri*) e.g. an author’s appropriateness, strategy and composition, and should try to improve his models by tapping into his ‘own good qualities’ (*propria bona*).⁶⁴ It is in hopeful expectation that Quintilian waits this *perfectus orator* to come.

4.4 STRUCTURE OF DIONYSIUS’ AND QUINTILIAN’S CANONS

In the previous section, we have seen that Quintilian’s theory of imitation revolves around prominent concepts such as ‘facility’ (*facilitas*), ‘wealth’ (*copia*), ‘sound judgement’ (*iudicium*), selection of the best features of different authors, and eclectic and original composition. These concepts are also quintessential to Dionysius’ understanding of imitation. By offering an analysis of the structure of Quintilian’s and Dionysius’ canons, the present and following sections intend to show that within a rather similar conceptual framework of imitation, different choices are made concerning the selected authors (4.4 and 4.6) and the order of their appearance (4.5).

As the section on the *status quaestionis* (4.2) makes clear, the canons of Dionysius and Quintilian have been examined and interpreted by several scholars who frequently tended to emphasise the points of contact in structure and content. Many of them thought the resemblances were so striking that it was likely either that Quintilian knew Dionysius’ *On Imitation*, or that their works could be traced back to a common Alexandrian source.⁶⁵ In my opinion, both options may well be true, even at the same time, although it cannot be substantiated that Quintilian had direct access to Dionysius’ treatise. After all, similarities in structure, in thought, in phrasing – however remarkable – may all go back to a common source. More important to establish, therefore, is that within the tradition of compiling canons, Dionysius’ and Quintilian’s reading lists are, if only because of their strong rhetorical focus, inextricably connected and, what is more, testify to a shared discourse of imitation.

In his Greek and Latin canons, Quintilian distinguishes, like Dionysius, two main categories: poetry (10.1.46-72) and a threefold prose category divided into history (73-75),

⁶³ For the idea of imitating a range of models, cf. e.g. Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 1.3, 5.7.

⁶⁴ Quint. 10.2.27-28.

⁶⁵ In any case, Quintilian was familiar with some of Dionysius’ works, since he refers to him three times in his *Institutio*: 3.1.16, 9.3.89, 9.4.88. Cf. section 1.1, n. 10. In his canon of Greek literature, Quintilian explicitly refers to the Alexandrian canon makers Aristarchus (10.1.54, 59) and Aristophanes (10.1.54).

oratory (76-80) and finally philosophy (81-84).⁶⁶ In total, 44 Greek authors and two groups of authors (Socratic and old Stoics) are listed, as well as no fewer than 60 Latin authors, whereas in the epitome of Dionysius' *On Imitation*, only 26 Greek writers and the group of Pythagoreans are chronicled.⁶⁷ The order of treatment in Dionysius is different: he has philosophy third and completes his canon with oratory.⁶⁸ The poetic genre, which comprises many more names than in the epitome of Dionysius' *On Imitation*, is built up from authors representing epic, lyrical, tragic and comic poetry.⁶⁹ In the Greek (as well as in the Latin) canon, there is also the cursory addition of two second-rank subgenres not included in Dionysius' canon: elegiac and iambic poetry, represented by Callimachus, Philetas and Archilochus, of whom only the latter is stylistically characterised.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ On the macro structure of Quintilian's canons, cf. e.g. Peterson (1891), xxx-xxxiv; Rutherford (1998), 40-43; Schwandt (2000), 159-160.

⁶⁷ In Dionysius' canon, Xenophon occurs twice.

⁶⁸ An explanation for putting the category of philosophers last may be Quintilian's aversion against philosophers, who had usurped what Quintilian believed to belong to rhetoricians alone. On this aversion against philosophers in general and Seneca in specific, see Peterson (1891), xxiv-xxviii. Dominik (1997), 53 argues that 'the fact that philosophy is the last genre treated by Quintilian [...] is a strong indication not only of his view of its relative importance to the practice of oratory but also of his general aversion to the philosophers, including Seneca'. Rutherford (1992), 361, n. 26 provides two other possible explanations, suggesting that Quintilian either wanted to end with the philosopher Seneca and thus had to change the order of the Greek canon (which I find very convincing), or that he thought of philosophy as a 'more advanced stage in the curriculum'. Regarding this last suggestion, cf. Laureys (1991), 124, who argues that 'Seneca must be read by students who have already been trained by 'safer' authors'. Dominik (1997) explains Seneca's last place by suggesting that he was difficult to assess, and 'does not really conform to Quintilian's generic expectations of a writer. Certainly his style does not fit into any of the three traditional stylistic classifications of plain, grand and intermediate mentioned by Quintilian as a prelude to his survey (10.1.44, cf. 12.10.58 ff.)' (*ibid.*, 56).

⁶⁹ As in the Alexandrian lists, poetical genres are defined only by metre, not by content. See Steinmetz (1964), 462; Zetzel (1983), 97.

⁷⁰ In 10.1.58, Quintilian explicitly notices that he is not unique in including Callimachus and Philetas in his list: *princeps habetur Callimachus, secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit* ('Callimachus is regarded as the leader, and Philetas is generally admitted to have taken second place'). For recording Archilochus, Quintilian relies upon the authority of Aristarchus, who selected two other writers of iambs besides Archilochus (i.e. Semonides of Amorgos and Hipponax of Ephesus) (10.1.59): *ex tribus receptis Aristarchi iudicio scriptoribus iamborum* ('of the three writers of iambs accepted by Aristarchus' ruling').

This generic division, which is tailored to Greek literature, is also used for Latin literature, which, however, was much more characterised by a blending of genres.⁷¹ Satire, too, gets separate mention – a genre which Quintilian calls ‘entirely ours’ (cf. *satura [...] tota nostra est*).⁷² As a result of the rather artificial use of a fixed, traditional scheme, Ovid and Horace oddly enough appear in three sections, and Cicero in two. In the case of the Latin authors, it seems very likely that Quintilian composed a list which ‘probably reflects more authentically [than is the case in the Greek canon, M.S.] the attitudes and judgements of Quintilian and of the culture of his time [...]’, in the words of Citroni.⁷³ It is also striking that Quintilian refers more frequently to the opinions of other critics in the Latin canon than in the Greek one.⁷⁴ Moreover, in the Latin canon he often takes a more confident (and more critical) stance with respect to the opinions of others than in the Greek list, in which the language of consensus prevails. Quintilian’s relatively larger independence from other critics in the Latin list may have to do with the fact that we do not know of a Latin canon compiled in the comprehensive way Quintilian did.⁷⁵ All pre-existing lists were limited in scope, from the first

⁷¹ Cf. Zetzel (1983), 89, who elaborates on the blending of genres and of literary elements (both classical and Hellenistic) with Roman themes.

⁷² Quint. 10.1.93.

⁷³ Citroni (2006a), 1. Cf. Citroni (2005), 15–16. Cf. also Peterson (1891), xxxvii; Kennedy (1962), 142; Schwindt (2000), 167; Russell (2001), 248.

⁷⁴ The following expressions in the Latin canon are Quintilian’s references to other critics: 10.1.86: *verbis isdem quae ex Afro Domitio iuvenis excepi* (‘let me quote the words I heard from Domitius Afer when I was a young man’); 10.1.89: *ut est dictum* (‘as has been said’); 10.1.93: *sunt qui [...] malint* (‘some prefer’); *ibid.: quosdam [...] amatores* (‘some admirers’); 10.1.97: *Accio plus tribuitur* (‘Accius is given more credit’); *ibid.: qui esse docti adfectant* (‘people who claim to be learned’); 10.1.98: *senes [...] putabant, [...] confitebantur* (‘older men thought [...], but admitted’); 10.1.99: *Varro [...] dicat* (‘Varro holds’); *ibid.: veteres laudibus ferant* (‘older critics extol’); *ibid.: Terenti scripta ad [...] referantur* (‘Terence’s works are attributed to’); 10.1.102: *mihi egregie dixisse videtur Servilius Nonianus* (‘it seems to me that Servilius Nonianus was absolutely right to say’); 10.1.104: *habet amatores – nec inmerito* (‘has its admirers, and rightly so’); 10.1.109: *ait Pindarus* (‘Pindar says’); 10.1.112: *non inmerito ab hominibus aetatis suae [...] dictus est* (‘it was not without reason that his contemporaries said’); 10.1.113: *quibusdam [...] videatur* (‘some think’); 10.1.115: *inveni qui [...] praeferrent [...], inveni qui [...] crederent* (‘I have found some who prefer [...], and I have found others who believe’).

⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. Kennedy (1962), 142: ‘there is no known precedent for the idea of a Latin reading list [...]’. Citroni (2006b), 220 ff., however, does speak of an ‘archaic Latin canon’, but he apparently conceives of a ‘canon’ as a set of names widely esteemed and mentioned. This ‘archaic Latin canon’ to which Citroni refers, was formed over a period of time between the age of Caesar and that of Augustus, and contained only names of the past (Ennius, Naevius, Livius Andronicus, Pacuvius, Accius, Plautus, Caecilius, Terence, Afranius). Among the critics who contributed to this ‘canon’ were Cicero, Velleius Paterculus and Varro. This archaic ‘canon’ was,

known ‘canon’ of Latin comic authors by Volcacius Sedigitus dating from around 100 BC, to the literary criticisms uttered by Cicero (*Hortensius*), Horace and others.⁷⁶

A schematic representation will help to clarify the structure of Dionysius’ and Quintilian’s canons:

	Dion. Hal. <i>Imit.</i>	Quint. (Greek canon)	Quint. (Latin canon)
<u>POETS</u>			
hexametric	Homer Hesiod Antimachus Panyasis	Homer Hesiod Antimachus Panyasis Apollonius Aratus Theocritus Pisander Nicander Euphorion Tyrtaeus	Vergil Macer Lucretius Varro of Atax Ennius Ovid Cornelius Severus Serranus Valerius Flaccus Saleius Bassus Rabirius Pedo Lucan Domitian
elegiac		Callimachus Philetas	Tibullus Propertius Ovid Gallus
satirical			Lucilius Horace Persius Terentius Varro
iambic		Archilochus	Catullus Bibaculus Horace
lyrical	Pindar Simonides Stesichorus Alcaeus	Pindar Stesichorus Alcaeus Simonides	Horace Caesius Bassus

according to Citroni (*ibid.*, 220), ‘soon to be largely supplanted’ by the Augustan poets, who wanted to introduce their own, new standards of Latin literature which would make the Greek canon superfluous. Cf. also Zetzel (1983), 101, who observes that the great Augustan poets aimed for ‘canonicity in a new way’.

⁷⁶ References to the work of Volcacius Sedigitus can be found in Gell. *NA* 15.24.

tragic	Aeschylus Sophocles Euripides	Aeschylus Sophocles Euripides	Accius Pacuvius Varius Ovid Pomponius Secundus
comic	All authors, incl. Menander	Aristophanes Eupolis Cratinus Menander Philemon	Plautus Caecilius Terence Afranius
<u>HISTORIANS</u>	Herodotus Thucydides Xenophon Philistus Theopompus	Thucydides Herodotus Theopompus Philistus Ephorus Clitarchus Timagenes Xenophon	Sallust Livy Servilius Nonianus Aufidius Bassus Cremutius
<u>RHETORICIANS</u>⁷⁷	Lysias Isocrates Lycurgus Demosthenes Aeschines Hyperides	Demosthenes Aeschines Hyperides Lysias Isocrates Demetrius of Phal.	Cicero Asinius Pollio Messala Julius Caesar Caelius Calvus Servius Sulpicius Cassius Severus Domitius Afer Julius Africanus Trachalus Vibius Crispus Julius Secundus
<u>PHILOSOPHERS</u>	Pythagoreans Xenophon Plato Aristotle	Plato Xenophon Socratics Aristotle Theophrastus Stoics	Cicero Brutus Cornelius Celsus Plautus Caius Seneca
<u>Total:</u>	27	46	60

The structural similarities suggest a strong connection between the lists. Quintilian enumerates the same hexametric poets as Dionysius in like order, but with the addition of the names of five Hellenistic authors who are, as Quintilian explicitly admits in the case of

⁷⁷ In this scheme, I adopt the order in Quint. 10: rhetoricians before philosophers.

Apollonius, not named ‘in the list of the grammarians’ (*in ordinem a grammaticis datum*).⁷⁸ Quintilian also refers to an established canon of ‘nine lyrical poets’ (cf. *novem [...] lyricorum*), but chooses to list only Pindar, Stesichorus, Alcaeus and Simonides – the only four who also appear in Dionysius’ list, though differently arranged.⁷⁹

The famous triad of the tragic poets Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides can be found in both Dionysius and Quintilian. But whereas Dionysius starts with tragic poetry and then only names Menander as the representative of comic poetry, Quintilian begins with old comedy – recording Aristophanes, Eupolis and Cratinus –, then proceeds to tragedy and eventually dwells on the importance of Menander, the great figurehead of new comedy who closes the line of poets in which Homer (who is also discussed at length) takes first place.⁸⁰ A similar arrangement can be discerned in the Latin canon, in which Vergil leads and Afranius closes the chain of poets.⁸¹ As in Dionysius’ canon, it is Euripides who marks the transition to Menander, who ‘greatly admired him’ (*hunc et admiratus maxime est*).⁸² However, as Citroni rightly notices, ‘the final position of Menander is even more notable than in Dionysius, seeing that Quintilian had already dealt with comedy in a previous section [...]’.⁸³ Moreover,

⁷⁸ Quint. 10.1.54. Curiously, also the poets Pisander and – inserted under the influence of Horace – Tyrtaeus (10.1.56) are placed among the Hellenistic authors, though they lived well before them and Tyrtaeus was not an epic poet, but an elegist and lyricist. On Quintilian’s insertion of Tyrtaeus, see Citroni (2006a), 8, n. 20 and esp. his references to other literature. The additions made by Quintilian not only in the poetry sections but also in the prose sections will be examined in section 4.6.

⁷⁹ Quint. 10.1.61-64. Besides those authors mentioned here, Alcman, Sappho, Ibycus, Anacreon and Bacchylides belong to the canon of nine lyricists.

⁸⁰ On Homer-Menander, cf. Steinmetz (1964), 457-458; Citroni (2006a), 9-12. The connection between Homer and Menander as formally expressed in Dionysius and Quintilian is probably a reflection of the opinion of Aristophanes of Byzantium (ascribed to him on a herm), who took Menander as being second only to Homer. Homer and Menander are paired in several double herms. More on their conjunction in art and literature in Körte (1936); Citroni (2006a), 11, n. 27; esp. Fontaine (2014), 549 (with useful references). As comic poets, Quintilian names, besides Menander, Aristophanes, Eupolis, Cratinus (belonging to old comedy) and Philemon (belonging to new comedy), whereas Dionysius recommends all comic poets, and particularly Menander (*Imit.* 2.14).

⁸¹ This is also observed by Steinmetz (1964), 458. Afranius, unlike Menander, is not highly regarded by Quintilian (10.1.100). Welsh (2010), 120 explains Quintilian’s negative judgement on Afranius by assuming a ‘scant knowledge of the dramatist’. Goldberg (1987) elaborates on the curious prominence of Greek comedy in relation to the negative discussion of Latin comedy.

⁸² Quint. 10.1.69. Cf. Peterson (1891), xxxii; Steinmetz (1964), 457-458.

⁸³ Citroni (2006a), 10.

Quintilian explicitly presents Menander as imitator of Euripides (cf. *secutus*), while such a connection is not pointed out in the epitome of *On Imitation*.⁸⁴

As for the historians, Quintilian mentions all five names that are also singled out by Dionysius, though again three Hellenistic authors (i.e. Ephorus, Clitarchus and Timagenes) are added. Remarkably enough, Polybius, whose Greek work concerns the Roman Republic in the Hellenistic World, is not mentioned. As a historian, Xenophon is only mentioned to facilitate the transition to the philosophers, to which category Quintilian thinks he actually belongs.⁸⁵ Moreover, the order of historians differs, and remarkable precedence is given by Quintilian to the minor historian Theopompus, who comes third, right after Thucydides and Herodotus.

In the case of the rhetoricians, Quintilian refers to a canon of ten whom ‘a single age produced at the same time in Athens’ (*simul Athenis aetas una tulerit*).⁸⁶ Like Dionysius, though in a different sequence, Quintilian mentions Lysias, Isocrates, Demosthenes and Aeschines, but he includes Demetrius of Phalerum, with whom he closes the section on rhetoric, instead of Lycurgus.⁸⁷ In the genre of philosophy, Plato, Xenophon and Aristotle appear in different order both in Dionysius and Quintilian.⁸⁸ Quintilian adds the Socratics (others than Xenophon) before and Theophrastus right after Aristotle. The old Pythagoreans who headed this section in Dionysius are replaced by the Hellenistic Stoics, who close the line of philosophers in Quintilian – and therewith the entire Greek canon.

⁸⁴ Quint. 10.1.69.

⁸⁵ Quintilian mentions Xenophon among the historians (10.1.75), but only to avoid the impression that he did not think about him. He considers him merely a philosopher (10.1.82), as was common in his days (cf. Dio *Orat.* 18.13-17, where Xenophon is reckoned among the Socratic writers; cf. also Diog. Laert. 2.48), and thus ‘probably followed an older tradition’, as Peterson (1891), xxxiii argues by pointing to Cic. *De Or.* 2.58. Xenophon’s classification as a philosopher is designated by Steinmetz (1964), 463 as a ‘Zeittendenz’.

⁸⁶ Quint. 10.1.76. For literature on the (alleged) canon of ten Attic orators (Aeschines, Andocides, Antiphon, Demosthenes, Dinarchus, Hyperides, Isaeus, Isocrates, Lycurgus, Lysias), see section 3.5.1, n. 165.

⁸⁷ Demetrius of Phalerum is not one of the ten Attic orators. Except for Demetrius of Phalerum, Cicero (*De Or.* 3.28) selects the same orators as Quintilian, though presents them in different order. For praise of Demetrius of Phalerum in Cicero, see e.g. *De or.* 2.95; *Orat.* 92.

⁸⁸ Peterson (1891), xxxiv rightly notices that both Dionysius and Quintilian place Xenophon and Plato before Aristotle.

4.5 THE ORDER OF AUTHORS IN DIONYSIUS AND QUINTILIAN

Structural deviations in arrangement which come to the fore when observing the canons of Dionysius and Quintilian have often been dismissed in favour of stressing the general points of contact. Nevertheless, these differences between Dionysius and Quintilian in the order of authors belonging to the same genre suggest that ‘order’ is in fact a matter of significant importance. Thus, we are confronted with the question what kind of organizing principle lays behind the internal structure of the individual sections. Steinmetz argues that in the Greek canon of Quintilian, the order is not just a reflection of chronology, but is determined by the interdependence of the authors listed.⁸⁹ As he argues, the marked transition from Euripides to Menander, suggestive of their close interrelationship, is an illustration of this, as well as the placement of Homer at the beginning and Menander at the end of the poetry section. These broad structural devices, however, also occur in Dionysius’ canon. How then can the more detailed deviations in the sequence of poets, historians, philosophers and rhetoricians in Dionysius and Quintilian be explained?

Three factors of varying influence on the internal order of authors within the various generic sections can (and already have been) distinguished: chronology, coherence and literary importance.⁹⁰ I define these factors as follows. Chronology means that the oldest author comes first. Coherence pertains to an explicitly mentioned stylistic interconnection between authors which is often based on the principle of imitation. The literary importance of an author is determined by an amalgam of factors: traditional consensus on an author’s pre-eminence, the critic’s personal taste and rhetorical agenda, and the preferences of the contemporary literary scene.

In my view, chronology seems to be the most important factor for sequencing the authors in Dionysius’ canon, whereas Quintilian more frequently ignores it.⁹¹ We can see it (almost) perfectly at work in no less than four out of six sections in Dionysius: in that on tragic poetry, and in all prose sections (history, philosophy and rhetoric).⁹² Within the sections

⁸⁹ Steinmetz (1964), 457, who speaks of ‘innere Zusammenhänge’.

⁹⁰ ‘Coherence’ is what Steinmetz calls ‘innere Zusammenhänge’. Different scholars have pointed to (some of) these factors; see e.g. Steinmetz (1964); Aujac (1992); Schwindt (2000); Citroni (2006a).

⁹¹ Of course, chronology can run parallel with literary significance, as is for example true for Homer, who is both the oldest and the best author.

⁹² The section on comic poets is not taken into consideration, because there is no sequence of authors here (Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.14).

on hexametric and lyrical poetry, however, chronology is not rigidly maintained by Dionysius when it does violence to the coherence of authors, or when the undisputed superiority of an author strongly requires a top position.⁹³ Two examples will show this.

First, the sequence of the hexametric poets Antimachus and Panyasis in Dionysius (and also Quintilian) illustrates the ultimate prevalence of coherence over chronology. Here, Panyasis is, in spite of his earlier birth, placed after Antimachus, apparently because ‘Panyasis combines the virtues of both [i.e. Hesiod and Antimachus, M.S.] and surpasses these in subject matter and in peculiar disposition’ (Πανύασις δὲ τὰς τε ἀμφοῖν ἀρετὰς ἠνέγκατο, καὶ αὐτὰς πραγματεία καὶ τῆ κατ’ αὐτὸν οἰκονομία δῆνεγκεν).⁹⁴ Like Dionysius, Quintilian places Panyasis last and commends him in strikingly similar terms, referring to grammarians (cf. *putant*) who think that Panyasis is ‘mixed from both’ (*ex utroque mixtum*) and that ‘Hesiod is surpassed by him in subject matter, Antimachus in disposition’ (*alterum [...] ab eo materia, alterum disponendi ratione superari*).⁹⁵

Secondly, the sequence of lyrical poets in Dionysius (and also in Quintilian) suggests that literary superiority takes precedence over chronology. Both Dionysius and Quintilian have the youngest poet Pindar at the head of the list.⁹⁶ The sequence of the following authors, however, seems to be determined first and foremost by the principle of coherence; chronology is maintained only when it does not disturb the line of coherence. What is remarkable, is that Dionysius and Quintilian conceive of this coherence in different ways. Let us first look at their order. Dionysius gives second place to Pindar’s contemporary Simonides, who was born only some decades earlier (a choice which is, hence, rather in line with chronology). Simonides is followed by the much older Stesichorus (for reasons of coherence, as we will see) and Alcaeus. In Quintilian’s list, it is Stesichorus who directly follows Pindar, and who

⁹³ In explaining a deviation from chronology in Dionysius’ placement of Pindar, Aujac (1992), 17 points to factors of hierarchy and internal cohesion rather than chronological structure of lists of poets circulating at schools: ‘les listes de poètes qui circulaient dans les écoles cherchaient à établir un classement hiérarchique plutôt que chronologique, et à relever des liens d’affinités entre les auteurs’.

⁹⁴ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.4.

⁹⁵ Quint. 10.1.54.

⁹⁶ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.5; Quint. 10.1.61. Cf. Schwindt (2000), 160: ‘innerhalb der einzelnen Gattungsabschnitte wird in der Regel der als führend anerkannte oder von Quintilian für führend gehaltene Autor zuerst genannt’. According to Schwindt, the same holds true for the Latin canon (*ibid.*, 161).

gets due attention.⁹⁷ After him come Alcaeus and Simonides, who are treated more summarily. The judgements passed on the authors at stake shed light on the motivations for this difference in order in Dionysius and Quintilian.⁹⁸

Dionysius compares and connects Simonides with Pindar by arguing that ‘he is regarded’ (εὐρίσκεται) as even better than Pindar where ‘the evocation of pity’ (τὸ οἰκτιρίζεσθαι) is concerned.⁹⁹ Quintilian argues that ‘his [i.e. Simonides’, M.S.] main merit is in arousing pity’ (*praecipua tamen eius in commovenda miseratione virtus*).¹⁰⁰ However, he dissociates himself from the idea that with regard to this virtue Simonides is the best. This view is held by ‘some’ unnamed critics: because of Simonides’ ability to arouse pity ‘some even prefer him to all other writers of the same genre in this respect’ (*quidam in hac eum parte omnibus eiusdem operis auctoribus praeferant*).¹⁰¹

What is striking, is that Quintilian does not observe a specific connection between Pindar and Simonides. Hence, there seems to be no need of marking a stylistic coherence between these authors by placing them in succession. Instead of mentioning Simonides next to Pindar, Quintilian links Stesichorus with Pindar. To both of these lyrical poets Quintilian attributes a grand style, and he uses similar imagery to make their connection even more obvious. He employs the metaphor of a river to characterise the expressions of Stesichorus, who ‘bursts his banks’ (*effunditur*) as a ‘fault of wealth’ (*copiae vitium*) – which is, of course, a good thing *per se*.¹⁰² Like Stesichorus, Pindar also excels ‘in enormous wealth’ (*beatissima*

⁹⁷ Aujac (1992), 16 regards Quintilian’s placement of Stesichorus before Simonides as a chronological correction of the order in Dionysius, which, of course, is true. However, I think that the coherence between Pindar and Stesichorus plays an even more crucial role in Quintilian’s ranking.

⁹⁸ It does not become clear from the judgements passed on Simonides in the epitome that Dionysius regards him as a more significant writer than Stesichorus and Alcaeus. On the contrary, Stesichorus and Alcaeus get more space, and the former is even ‘dominating in those aspects in which they [i.e. Pindar and Simonides, M.S.] are inferior’ (ὄν ἐκεῖνοι λείπονται κρατοῦντα) (Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.7). Thus, here coherence seems to influence the sequence rather than literary significance. Quintilian on the other hand pays much more attention to Stesichorus than to Alcaeus and Simonides, whom he discusses rather critically. Here, in addition to coherence, literary significance may determine the order. It seems to be of secondary importance that coherence and literary significance are in line with chronology.

⁹⁹ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.6.

¹⁰⁰ Quint. 10.1.64.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* *Quidam* may perhaps also include Dionysius; though he too refers to a tradition (cf. εὐρίσκεται) of considering Simonides the champion of τὸ οἰκτιρίζεσθαι, he does not explicitly distance himself from this view.

¹⁰² Quint. 10.1.62.

copia) and ‘in a flood of eloquence’ (*quodam eloquentiae flumine*), though without the rampant redundancy exhibited by Stesichorus.¹⁰³ Still, they are closely related in style.¹⁰⁴

As stated before, chronology plays a less important role in most of the sections of Quintilian’s Greek canon, though it can be (more or less flawlessly) discerned in his discussions on tragic poetry and philosophy. Where the order of the hexametric poets Homer, Hesiod, Antimachus and Panyasis is concerned, Quintilian sides with Dionysius and adopts a chronology in which only Antimachus and Panyasis seem to be reversed; however, in his addition of Hellenistic hexametric poets, Quintilian leaves chronology behind. As we have already seen in passing, the internal coherence and the importance of the authors mentioned in Quintilian’s list are more crucial determinants for the specific order of their appearance, whether this is in accordance with chronology or not.¹⁰⁵ ‘Coherence’ is probably why we have the young minor historian Theopompus, who – Quintilian thinks – was ‘closest’ (*proximus*) both to Thucydides and Herodotus, directly placed after these two models, and after him in turn the older Philistus, who is said to have been only an ‘imitator of Thucydides’ (*imitator Thucydidi*), not of Herodotus.¹⁰⁶

However, literary importance also plays a role in this ranking: Theopompus was ‘inferior’ (*minor*) to his two models, whereas Philistus was ‘feebler’ (*infirmior*) than Thucydides. ‘Literary importance’ is apparently also why the slightly older Xenophon (who is extremely useful for rhetoricians *in spe*) does not precede the great Plato in the section on philosophy (as he does in Dionysius’ list).¹⁰⁷ We can see this principle of literary importance at work in many (though not all) sections of Quintilian’s canon, and especially in the first rank positions: the best authors per genre (Homer, Callimachus, Pindar, Demosthenes, Plato) are mentioned first of all.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Quint. 10.1.61. I will elaborate on the metaphor of the stream in section 4.9.2.

¹⁰⁴ Alcaeus, who comes third in Quintilian, is also praised because of e.g. magnificence in eloquence, but he ‘played games’ (*lusit*, 10.1.63); Simonides, who is ‘lightweight’ (*tenuis*, 10.1.64), comes latest.

¹⁰⁵ This observation comes close to the claim of Schwindt (2000), 161: ‘die Abfolge der den Führenden nachgeordneten Autoren ist bald von chronologischen (Epos, Lyrik, Philosophie), bald qualitativen (Geschichtsschreibung), bald technisch-ästhetischen Rücksichten (Rhetorik) bestimmt’.

¹⁰⁶ Quint. 10.1.74. Schwindt (2000), 162 argues that Theopompus, being called *proximus* to Herodotus and Thucydides, ‘steht dem Rang nach am nächsten’. Although *proximus* certainly pertains to the (lower) level of Theopompus as a historian, I also think *proximus* refers to similarities in historical style and thought.

¹⁰⁷ Quint. 10.1.82; 10.1.73.

¹⁰⁸ Literary importance is not a determinant in the section on tragedy, which starts with the ‘coarse’ (*rudis*) and ‘unpolished’ (*incompositus*) Aeschylus (10.1.66).

This being said, the order of the names of Thucydides and Herodotus deserves further attention. In his remarkably brief section on the Greek historians, Quintilian opens with a *synkrisis* between the most important representatives, Thucydides and Herodotus. Quintilian does not seem to cherish any preference for one or the other, for, as he makes clear, ‘their different excellences have deserved almost equal praise’ (*quorum diversa virtus laudem paene est parem consecuta*).¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, Thucydides comes first, which is in contradiction with Dionysius’ list, in which the *synkrisis* is opened (and closed) by Herodotus.¹¹⁰ Why does Quintilian have Thucydides first when he understands of Thucydides and Herodotus as being rather evenly matched?¹¹¹

The order of their appearance may reflect Thucydides’ greater general prestige in Quintilian’s days, whereas the judgements Quintilian passes on him and Herodotus are mainly based on the specific criterion of usefulness for the improvement of rhetorical style.¹¹² Still, it remains curious that Quintilian nowhere expresses Thucydides’ general literary pre-eminence, and – referring to the authoritative Cicero – casts doubt on Thucydides’ usefulness for rhetorical purposes rather than on Herodotus’.¹¹³ Moreover, it is puzzling that Quintilian’s order deviates not only from that of Dionysius, but also from that of Cicero and Dio Chrysostom.

In his discussion of the historians, Quintilian often seems to adhere to the opinions of Cicero who, though giving Herodotus and Thucydides equal praise, mentions Herodotus before Thucydides.¹¹⁴ Also Quintilian’s contemporary Dio Chrysostom has Herodotus first

¹⁰⁹ Quint. 10.1.73.

¹¹⁰ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 3.1. The qualities Quintilian attributes to these historians differ from those expressed by Dionysius.

¹¹¹ Theopompus, the historian who comes third in Quintilian, is, as we have seen, ‘very close’ (*proximus*) to Thucydides and Herodotus equally (10.1.74). Therefore, his third place is not likely to have influenced the order in the *synkrisis* between Herodotus and Thucydides.

¹¹² Citroni (2006a), 4 argues that not so much the order as the selection of authors is based on their prestige, and that the judgements passed on these authors are based on the criterion of rhetorical usefulness (see section 4.6). Especially in the first century BC, Thucydides enjoyed great popularity among Roman historians and rhetoricians.

¹¹³ In 10.1.32-33, Quintilian argues that Sallust and Livy are of limited use for the orator *in spe*, and that Cicero had the same opinion regarding Thucydides and Xenophon.

¹¹⁴ For Cicero’s influence on Quintilian’s choices (especially in dealing with the historians), see e.g. Peterson (1891), xxxiii ff. Like Quintilian, Cicero gave equal praise to Herodotus and Thucydides (*Orat.* 39), but he mentions Herodotus before Thucydides (*De Or.* 2.55-56).

and Thucydides second, but considers the latter the most useful for his addressee – an active politician.¹¹⁵ Then, what could explain Quintilian’s different order? My suggestion is that there is another organizing principle at work in Quintilian’s Greek canon: the desirability of parallelism to the order of authors in the Latin canon.¹¹⁶

Especially the high-ranked Greek prose authors seem to be aligned to the order in which Quintilian presents their Latin counterparts.¹¹⁷ At the head of the section on the Latin historians, first Sallust is mentioned, then Livy. They stand in a mimetic relationship: Livy ‘has followed Sallust’s immortal rapidity with different virtues’ (*illam immortalem Sallusti velocitatem diversis virtutibus consecutus est*).¹¹⁸ It is said of Sallust and Livy that they are ‘rather equal than alike’ (*pares [...] magis quam similes*), just like Thucydides and Herodotus.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, elsewhere Quintilian confesses that though Livy is more useful for children, he considers Sallust a better historian.¹²⁰ Thus, the order of Sallust and Livy is, for reasons of literary importance and chronological-mimetic connection, quite compelling.

Quintilian does not hesitate ‘to match Sallust with Thucydides’ (*opponere Thucydidi Sallustium*), and argues that ‘Herodotus should not be indignant about the fact that Livy is put on the same level with him’ (*nec indignetur sibi Herodotus aequari Titum Livium*).¹²¹

¹¹⁵ Dio *Orat.* 18.10.

¹¹⁶ Many scholars have rightly pointed to the steering influence of Quintilian’s Greek canon on his Latin list. See e.g. Peterson (1891), xxxviii, who argues: ‘it is this idea of making ‘canons’ of Latin writers, to correspond as nearly as possible with those which he [i.e. Quintilian, M.S.] had accepted from former critics for the classical writers of Greece, that gives an air of artificiality to Quintilian’s criticism of Latin literature [...]’. Citroni (2006a), 18 argues that Quintilian’s Greek canon ‘offers the guidelines for the subsequent review of Latin works’. I suggest that it is sometimes also the other way round: Quintilian’s Latin canon also influences (the order of authors within) the Greek canon.

¹¹⁷ Of course, the parallels between Greek and Latin authors can also be distinguished in the poetry sections, but here the Latin canon seems to have no salient influence on the order of Greek writers, because Quintilian makes use of an order which is rather undisputed (cf. Dionysius’ list). On top of each section is the author who is undeniably the best. E.g. Vergil is linked with Homer (10.1.85); Varius with ‘whomever of the Greeks’ (*cuilibet Graecarum*, 10.1.98). Pindar is strongly tied to and explicitly brought into connection with Horace as a critic (10.1.61). Horace is also connected with him as the first and foremost representative of Latin lyrical poetry (10.1.96).

¹¹⁸ Quint. 10.1.102.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ Quint. 2.5.19.

¹²¹ Quint. 10.1.101.

Thucydides and Herodotus seem to have been arranged in such a way that their close connection with Sallust and Livy is prepared for and strengthened.

The desired parallelism between the Greek and Latin canon may also well explain the placement of the discussion of philosophy at the end of Quintilian's Greek reading list.¹²² It is obvious that in the Latin canon, Quintilian wants to close with the talented philosopher Seneca, whose 'corrupted' style had an alarmingly large influence on the young and thus formed the ultimate test for students of rhetoric who were involved in imitation.¹²³ In analogy with the placement of the section on Latin philosophy, the section on Greek philosophy takes a final, isolated place, which is in remarkable deviation from Dionysius' canon in which, as we have seen, the philosophers are treated before the rhetoricians.

Also within the section on Greek philosophy, it cannot be a coincidence that Quintilian, in deviation from Dionysius and Dio, puts Plato ahead of the row of philosophers – to this choice, as he states, inspired by Plato's imitator Cicero – whereas Cicero himself is presented as the frontrunner in the corresponding Latin section.¹²⁴ Plato's status was, of course, still huge, but wouldn't also Xenophon, whose prestige was immense in Quintilian's days, be an obvious choice for a first rank position in the row of philosophers?¹²⁵ The answer is, apparently, 'no': here too, the required parallelism between Greek and Latin writers seems to have a steering influence on the order of their appearance.

Likewise, in deviation from Dionysius, Quintilian places Demosthenes at the top of his list of six rhetoricians, instead of the older, venerable Lysias, who comes fourth in Quintilian and first in Dionysius.¹²⁶ Quintilian not only considers Demosthenes 'by far the most important' (*longe princeps*), but probably also ranks him first because he wants to prepare for the *synkrisis* in the Latin canon between Demosthenes and the undisputed Roman rhetorical

¹²² This has already been suggested by Rutherford (1992), 361, n. 26. Cf. n. 68.

¹²³ Quint. 10.1.125-131. On Quintilian's judgement of Seneca, see e.g. Gelzer (1970), 212-223; Laureys (1991); Dominik (1997), 50-68; Taoka (2011).

¹²⁴ For Cicero's imitative connection with Plato, see Quint. 10.1.81; 10.1.108; 10.1.123.

¹²⁵ On Xenophon's popularity among first-century Roman authors, see De Jonge in J. König & N. Wiater (forthc.) and bibliography. Xenophon is the author who is placed on top by Dio Chrysostom (*Orat.* 18.14), for reasons of usefulness.

¹²⁶ Quint. 10.1.78. Dio considers both Demosthenes and Lysias (mentioned in this order) the best orators (*Orat.* 18.11). In Quintilian, between Demosthenes and Lysias come Aeschines and Hyperides (10.1.77). Literary importance or coherence between these authors do not seem to be at stake; it is rather the degree of usefulness which determines their order.

champion Cicero.¹²⁷ Dionysius, however, notwithstanding his exceptional admiration for Demosthenes, lets chronology and usefulness prevail in the section on rhetoric, arguing that ‘the eloquence of Lysias is sufficient for utility and necessity’ (ὁ Λυσιακὸς λόγος πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν ἀτάρκτης).¹²⁸ By contrast, Quintilian is more concerned not only with stressing the pre-eminence of Demosthenes, but also with the coherence between this Greek orator and Cicero, which is to be expressed in the structure of his canons.

In the past, the interconnections between the Greek and Latin authors listed in Quintilian’s canons have been frequently noticed and commented upon. It is said – and rightly so – that the Latin authors are constantly presented as involved in a contest with the Greeks, and that the Latin canon mirrors the structure of the preceding Greek list.¹²⁹ I hope to have shown that it is worth noticing that the Greek canon also seems to be shaped by Quintilian in accordance with the Latin list. With his emphasis not so much on chronology as on literary superiority and coherence, Quintilian attunes and structures the Greek canon in such a way that it is tied to and prepares for the list of Latin literature, which is framed as a strongly redefined continuum of Greek literary history.¹³⁰ An analysis of Quintilian’s additions of Hellenistic authors will confirm this preparatory function of the Greek canon in relation to the Latin list.

4.6 HELLENISTIC AUTHORS IN QUINTILIAN’S GREEK CANON

As we have seen, in his Greek canon Quintilian chooses to name a selection of Hellenistic authors. Dionysius does not pay attention to these authors; scholarly attempts to indicate a possible source for their inclusion in Quintilian have been fruitless. In an interesting attempt to explain the additions of Hellenistic authors, Citroni suggests that Quintilian’s proclaimed criterion of rhetorical usefulness mainly, though not exclusively, pertains to the judgements he passes on the single authors, not to the choice of the authors listed.¹³¹ This choice, as

¹²⁷ Quint. 10.1.76; 10.1.105-108. For a discussion of four different comparisons of Demosthenes and Cicero (in Caecilius, Plutarch, Longinus and Quintilian), see De Jonge (2018).

¹²⁸ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 5.1.

¹²⁹ See e.g. Peterson (1891), xxxviii.

¹³⁰ Cf. Kühnert (1969), 45: ‘das Bewusstsein einer einheitlichen griechisch-römischen Kultur spricht sich darin [i.e. in Quintilian’s canons, M.S.] aus’. Feeney (2016) analyses i.a. how the Romans developed a literature which presented itself as a continuation of Greek literature.

¹³¹ Citroni (2006a), 2 ff.

Citroni says, is instead motivated by the popularity and genre-representativeness of these authors in poetic circles in Quintilian's own time: '[...] the list includes, as a rule, those authors who were considered to be most prestigious in the culture of the time, and for each of them, Quintilian gives the reader his opinion about his usefulness for the creation of the rhetorical style'.¹³² Contrary to Citroni's view, the present section argues that Quintilian's criterion of rhetorical usefulness also motivates his choice of Hellenistic authors.

For the section on Greek poetry, Citroni has in my opinion convincingly argued that the addition of less useful or not further characterised (late-) Hellenistic poets, who are not or only sporadically attested in the Greek catalogues before Quintilian known to us, may well be explained by the influence of contemporary authors like Statius, Propertius and especially Martial, who took these authors as models for their poetic compositions whenever there were no Augustan or Neronian models.¹³³ Still, I am strongly inclined to think that Quintilian in his mention of Hellenistic authors was less inspired by the opinions of his contemporaries – whom he does not mention at all – than by the Augustan poets, who frequently turn out to be an important touchstone for his own criticisms.¹³⁴ Moreover, I certainly do not believe that the prestige of the Hellenistic poets mentioned is the most important explanation of their appearance in Quintilian's Greek list.

The names of the Hellenistic poets included by Quintilian comprise the epic poets Apollonius Rhodius, Aratus, Theocritus, Nicander and Euphorion, the elegiac poets Callimachus and Philetas, and the comic poets Menander (who also appears in Dionysius) and

¹³² Citroni (2006a), 2. Cf. also Citroni (2005), esp. 18, 30. Strange omissions of Greek poets who were greatly admired in Roman literary circles – Sappho, for instance, who is also absent in Dionysius –, as well as anomalous additions of Greek poets with minor influence – Pisander and Panyasis, the latter also chronicled by Dionysius – are, although noticed, not explained by Citroni.

¹³³ Citroni (2006a), 2-3, esp. 7, 14-19. Apollonius Rhodius, Aratus and Theocritus are sometimes included in Greek lists of epic poets. So are Callimachus and Philetas. Nicander and Euphorion are excluded from the Greek lists of epic poets known to us. More on this in Kroehnert (1897) (*non vidi*). For a discussion of the adherence of Flavian poets to Augustan models, see e.g. Mayer (1982), 317, who argues that 'the Flavians [...] look to Augustans and Neronians as models'.

¹³⁴ E.g. Quint. 10.1.56: *Quid? Nicandrum frustra secuti Macer atque Vergilius? Quid? Euphorionem transibimus? Quem nisi probasset Vergilius idem [...] Quid? Horatius frustra Tyrtaeum Homero subiungit?* ('Were Macer and Vergil wrong to follow Nicander? Shall we leave out Euphorion? If Vergil had not approved of him [...] And has Horace no reason for putting Tyrtaeus next to Homer?'). Cf. 10.1.61: *propter quae Horatius eum merito nemini credit imitabilem* ('Horace rightly thinks him [i.e. Pindar, M.S.] inimitable for these reasons').

Philemon.¹³⁵ Also the ancient Greek poets Pisander – author of a *Heracleia* – and Tyrtaeus are included in the list of epic poets – the latter on the authority of Horace.¹³⁶ Admittedly, all these poets are mostly discussed very superficially, if characterised at all. Hence, we may wonder why Quintilian includes them – especially those who are not immediately useful for the formation of style, or to whose styles Quintilian strongly objects.¹³⁷ We should be cautious in assuming that Quintilian mentions them as a mere reflection of the prestige these authors enjoyed in the contemporary literary scene, completely irrespectively of rhetorical purposes. On the contrary, by inserting Hellenistic authors, Quintilian is able 1) to meet the existing needs of more advanced students in rhetoric and, more importantly, 2) to bridge the chronological gap between the Greek and the Latin canon.

As we have seen, Quintilian's aim is to pass judgements from a rhetorical perspective to direct his students towards achieving *firma facilitas*. In other words: his main (and openly proclaimed) intended audience consists of novice learners. However, although having underscored the selectiveness of his lists in order to meet the needs of the young, Quintilian also seems to anticipate or respond to questions of more advanced readers, who wish to be confirmed in their literary experiences and tastes, or who might reproach him for not having mentioned a particular author.¹³⁸

The added poets, though not the best, *are* useful, but only for those orators who are 'already in perfect condition' (*iam perfectis constitutisque viribus*), as Quintilian argues.¹³⁹ Consequently, he is bound not to elaborate on these poets – bound to isolate them somewhat, as he does with Seneca.¹⁴⁰ He compares their works with the cheaper dishes coming after the finest meals, and giving us the pleasure of 'variety' (*varietas*).¹⁴¹ Savouring this variety is

¹³⁵ See the scheme in section 4.4.

¹³⁶ Quint. 10.1.56.

¹³⁷ An example of a poet mentioned without being useful for the orator is Theocritus (10.1.55). An example of a poet whose work is 'of a consistent mediocrity' (*aequali quadam mediocritate*) is Apollonius (10.1.54).

¹³⁸ This is suggested by Quintilian's remark introducing the names of Pisander, Nicander and Euphoriion (10.1.56). Here, he admits that he seems 'to hear people proposing from all sides the names of many poets' (*audire [...] undique congerentis nomina plurimorum poetarum*).

¹³⁹ Quint. 10.1.58. The insertion of the elegiac poets Callimachus and Philetas (10.1.58-59) is motivated by the same criterion of differentiation: *tunc et elegiam vacabit in manus sumere* ('there will be time enough then [i.e. when our powers have become mature, M.S.] to take up even elegy').

¹⁴⁰ Quintilian considers Seneca an author who should have been imitated only by rhetoricians whose talents could meet the great talent of Seneca himself (10.1.127). Cf. n. 68 (esp. the reference to Laureys (1991)).

¹⁴¹ Quint. 10.1.58.

apparently reserved for rhetoricians endowed with a firmer *iudicium*. Thus, not only the prestige of the Hellenistic poets makes Quintilian insert them in his list, but also his inclination to give differentiated instruction instead of offering only an elementary reading list.¹⁴² In fact, this pedagogical differentiation lies at the heart of the whole *Institutio*.

Here, an observation should be made concerning the insertion of Greek poets in general. As Citroni rightly argues, Quintilian's Greek canon guides the Roman production 'in fields where there are no great Augustan models'.¹⁴³ Citroni points especially to the genres of tragedy and comedy, but the case of Archilochus, the greatest Greek representative of iambic poetry, may even be more suited to illustrate this; after all, his name is absent from Dionysius' list and explicitly added by Quintilian.¹⁴⁴ Unlike the Hellenistic poets, Archilochus' qualities are covered rather extensively because, as we should infer, he stands as the sole model of a genre which in Roman literature (Catullus, Bibaculus and Horace) is only to be found mixed with other poetic forms.¹⁴⁵ Thus, Archilochus' name seems to fill a gap in the Latin canons' section on iambic poetry.

So far, we have seen that Hellenistic poets are added by Quintilian because of their prestige or their usefulness for more advanced rhetoricians. Moreover, it has been established that insertions within the Greek canon of poetry can function as a guide for (still inferior) Roman literary production, as Citroni argued. But how can Quintilian's insertion of not particularly popular Hellenistic prose authors be explained in those genres in which the Romans also proved to be successful? The answer is that these Hellenistic prose authors are uniquely suited to bridge the chronological gap between Greek and Latin literature.

The added prose authors comprise the historians Ephorus, Clitarchus and Timagenes, the philosopher Theophrastus and the Stoics, and the orator Demetrius of Phalerum. Of the added historians, two left their marks on Roman literature. Clitarchus, whose style was considered pretentious, served as a model for the Roman historian Lucius Cornelius Sisenna;

¹⁴² This differentiation is reflected upon in e.g. Quint. 1.8.1-12, 2.5.18-23.

¹⁴³ Citroni (2006a), 18.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Citroni (2006a), 17: 'in the case of tragedy and comedy, where there were no recognized Augustan models, it was impossible to avoid making reference to the authors of the archaic canon [...]'. Citroni argues that Quintilian shows a certain disdain for what is old. Although it is true that Quintilian often prefers more recent authors to ancient writers, I think we should be cautious in assuming disdain for the ancients. In any case, in the Latin canon, Quintilian is more critical and condemnatory towards the literature of yore than in the Greek one.

¹⁴⁵ Quint. 10.1.59-60; 10.1.96. The same may be true for the addition of the representatives of old comedy: Aristophanes, Eupolis and Cratinus (10.1.66), whose level Roman comedy cannot reach (10.1.99).

Timagenes was active in Rome and connected to Caecilius of Caleacte.¹⁴⁶ Timagenes, who went to Rome around 55 BC, is not recommended for his style, but rather because he gave an impulse to Greek and Roman historiography: ‘he revived the lapsed tradition of historical writing with renewed praise’ (*intermissam historias scribendi industriam nova laude reparavit*).¹⁴⁷ This reminds us of the periodic ‘Dreischritt’ of literary splendour-decline-restoration, a principle of classicism also prominently expressed in Dionysius’ *On the ancient orators*.¹⁴⁸

Theophrastus and the Stoics (who do not appear in Dionysius’ list, which records the Pythagoreans) seem to prepare for the section on Roman philosophers containing names like Cicero, Plautus and Seneca, to whose works they gave great impetus.¹⁴⁹ In the section on the rhetoricians, the death of Demetrius of Phalerum, who is ‘almost the last of the Attics who can be called an orator’ (*ultimus est fere ex Atticis qui dici possit orator*), marks the transition to a new era of rhetorical decline: ‘he is said to have been the first to set eloquence on the downward path’ (*inclinasse eloquentiam dicitur*).¹⁵⁰ This eventually resulted in a literary revival by the efforts of Roman orators, who ‘can put Roman eloquence on equal terms with Greek’ (*Latinam eloquentiam parem facere Graecae possunt*).¹⁵¹ For instance, Calvus, who is said to have been an ‘imitator of the Attic orators’ (*imitator [...] Atticorum*), can be considered a successor of Demetrius of Phalerum, just like Domitius Afer, who one may ‘count among the old masters’ (*in numero veterum habere*).¹⁵² These Romans thus continued the venerable tradition that had ended with Demetrius of Phalerum.

The observations made above are intended to show that the insertion of authors in Quintilian’s Greek reading list can be explained in four different ways. Whereas the names of the added poets are mentioned because of their prestige, their usefulness for mature students or their ability to fill gaps in the Roman canon, the Hellenistic prose authors have been included in order to overpass the chronological hiatus between Greek and Latin literature.

¹⁴⁶ Ephorus, pupil of Isocrates, was known for his accuracy.

¹⁴⁷ Quint. 10.1.75.

¹⁴⁸ Dion. Hal. *Orat. Vett.* 1-3. For the notion of ‘klassizistische Dreischritt’, see Gelzer (1979), 278 and *ibid.*, esp. 3-13 for the concepts behind it. Hidber (1996), 3-13 applies the term in relation to Dion. Hal. *Orat. Vett.*

¹⁴⁹ In Quint. 10.1.84, Theophrastus is recommended for his style; the Stoics are listed because of their virtuous lives, power of argument and of proving their principles.

¹⁵⁰ Quint. 10.1.80.

¹⁵¹ Quint. 10.1.105.

¹⁵² Quint. 10.1.115, 118.

Hence, Quintilian strongly suggests an ongoing tradition, in which the Romans are presented as the ultimate heirs and successors of the Greeks. This is not to say that Greek literature does not have its own intrinsic values within the framework of Quintilian's rhetorical program of imitation.¹⁵³ As we will see, the discourse of Quintilian's Greek canon (section 4.9), his (motives for the) judgements of the authors belonging to it (section 4.7), as well as his theory and application of literary virtues (section 4.8) prove to be interesting testimonies to his adaptive interaction with the heritage of Greek literature and literary theory.¹⁵⁴

4.7 JUDGEMENTS OF AUTHORS IN DIONYSIUS AND QUINTILIAN

Many correspondences have been noticed between the virtues attributed to individual authors by Dionysius and Quintilian, for instance in Aujac's edition of *On Imitation* and in Peterson's commentary on the tenth book of the *Institutio*.¹⁵⁵ For example, Homer deserves praise because of μέγεθος (*Imit.* 2.1) / *sublimitas* (Quint. 10.1.46); Hesiod because of λειότης (*Imit.* 2.2) / *levitas* (Quint. 10.1.52); Pindar because of μεγαλοπρέπεια (*Imit.* 2.5) / *magnificentia* (Quint. 10.1.61); Simonides because of τὸ οἰκτιζέσθαι (*Imit.* 2.6) / *miseratio* (Quint. 10.1.64); Alcaeus because of βραχύτης (*Imit.* 2.8) / *brevitas* (Quint. 10.1.63) & μεγαλοφυΐα (*Imit.* 2.8) / *magnificentia* (Quint. 10.1.63); Herodotus because of ἡδονή (*Imit.* 3.3) / *dulcitude* (Quint. 10.1.73); Thucydides because of ἰσχὺς (*Imit.* 3.3) / *vis* (Quint. 10.1.73); Aristotle because of πολυμάθεια (*Imit.* 4.3) / *scientia rerum* (Quint. 10.1.83); Lysias because of εὐχάρεια (*Imit.* 5.1) / *elegantia* (Quint. 10.1.78); Hyperides because of χάρις (*Imit.* 5.6) / *dulcitude* (Quint. 10.1.77) – to pick out only some similarities.

A closer look at Dionysius' and Quintilian's judgements, however, reveals that Quintilian often differs from Dionysius in the attribution of virtues to specific authors.¹⁵⁶ This section argues that Quintilian, though he possibly adopted the rough frame of the Greek canon from Dionysius and/or others, and occasionally expressed judgements that can also be found

¹⁵³ I do not agree with Grebe (2000b), 300-301, 313-316, who argues that the greater space dedicated to Roman authors mirrors Quintilian's extreme chauvinism. Rather, I think that Quintilian's canon of Greek literature gives prove of his attention for the intrinsic value of Greek literature.

¹⁵⁴ This is contrary to the view of Kühnert (1969), 45: 'die Wertung der griechischen Literatur und die Urteile über die einzelnen Vertreter dieser Literatur waren z. Z. Quintilians längst festgelegt und hatten weitgehend kanonisches Ansehen gewonnen, wie Quintilian selbst wiederholt andeutet, so dass Quintilians Standpunkt in dieser Hinsicht weder originell noch besonders bemerkenswert ist'.

¹⁵⁵ Another detailed comparison can be found in Nettleship (1890), 258-262.

¹⁵⁶ These divergences are in fact too numerous to elaborate on, as they appear in every single author assessment.

in Dionysius, evaluated the literary virtues of the authors from his own point of view, which is determined by his writing goal, his audience, and the character of classicism and literary taste of his own time. As a case in point, I will focus on the section on the playwrights Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Menander, in which Quintilian particularly deviates from Dionysius.¹⁵⁷

For reasons of rhetorical usefulness, Quintilian displays great sympathy for the younger playwrights Euripides and Menander, to the disadvantage of the older Aeschylus and Sophocles. Quintilian considers Aeschylus sublime, grave and grandiloquent, but objects that he is coarse and unpolished.¹⁵⁸ In Dionysius, Aeschylus is presented as the best tragedian. He is sublime, magnificent and appropriate in his representation of characters and emotions; moreover, he is more varied in the introduction of new characters than Euripides and Sophocles.¹⁵⁹

The sublime Sophocles is praised by Quintilian, but his specific virtues (gravity, tragic style and tragic sound) are only briefly mentioned by reference to what other people have said about him.¹⁶⁰ Moreover, Quintilian thinks ‘Euripides will be much the more useful for those preparing for a rhetorical career’ (*iis qui se ad agendum comparant utiliore longe fore Euripiden*) than Sophocles.¹⁶¹ Dionysius, however, seems to prefer Sophocles over Euripides, acknowledging the former for e.g. his representation of characters and emotions, the dignity of his characters, and his sense of necessity.¹⁶²

Euripides gets Quintilian’s praise for his proverbial language, his expression of philosophical ideas, his way of speaking and responding, his use of emotions and his ability to arouse pity.¹⁶³ By contrast, in Dionysius’ comparison between Sophocles and Euripides, the latter is rather critically assessed; though Dionysius thinks he is concerned with truth and current affairs, his vices (e.g. his focus on what is dishonourable, unmanly and mean) are commented upon in more detail.¹⁶⁴ Thus, for Dionysius, the intrinsic stylistic qualities of the

¹⁵⁷ For a comparison between the judgements of Dionysius, Dio and Quintilian passed on the playwrights, see De Jonge in J. König & N. Wiater (forthc.).

¹⁵⁸ Quint. 10.1.66.

¹⁵⁹ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.10.

¹⁶⁰ Quint. 10.1.67-68.

¹⁶¹ Quint. 10.1.67.

¹⁶² Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.11-13.

¹⁶³ Quint. 10.1.68.

¹⁶⁴ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.12-13. As De Jonge in J. König & N. Wiater (forthc.) rightly argues, ‘the whole σύγκρισις of Sophocles and Euripides builds on the schematic contrast between high and low [...]’.

sublime Sophocles seems to outweigh the usefulness of the rather base Euripides, who, he admits, is ‘full of rhetorical presentation’ (πολλὸς ἐν ταῖς ῥητορικαῖς εἰσαγωγαῖς).¹⁶⁵

After Euripides comes, both in Dionysius and Quintilian, his imitator Menander, whose status is differently conceived. Quintilian dedicates a lot of space to the discussion of Menander’s qualities (more than to the tragedians altogether), arguing that careful reading of his work ‘would be sufficient to develop all the qualities we are recommending’ (*ad cuncta quae praecipimus effingenda sufficiat*).¹⁶⁶ Thus, again, usefulness is Quintilian’s argument for strongly approving of an author. He considers Menander to be outstanding in e.g. representation of life, wealth in invention, facility in phrasing, and propriety. In Dionysius, however, only one line is devoted to Menander. Being the only comic poet mentioned by name, he is praised because of his treatment of subject matter.¹⁶⁷

It is clear that Quintilian more overtly adheres to his claim of offering a list which is practically useful than Dionysius. Whereas the former considers the stylistic sublimity and gravity of the ancient writers subordinate to the rhetorical usefulness of younger authors, the latter tries to find a way to incorporate qualities of sublimity and beauty of style in his rhetorical-practical program. In chapter 3, we have seen that by insisting also on more pragmatic virtues such as clarity and pleasure, Dionysius aspires to bring ancient stylistic sublimity and modern practical needs closer together.

The divergences between Dionysius and Quintilian may also be explained by pointing to their different audiences as well as to the development of classicism and literary taste in the first century AD.¹⁶⁸ Dionysius’ Greek addressee Demetrius – and all of Dionysius’ students who read the treatise *On Imitation* – plausibly still approved of the more traditional advice to read the undisputedly sublime masterpieces of their own Greek literature rather than those less exalted works that would benefit their practical skills perhaps more effectively. By contrast, for Quintilian’s Roman students, the ancient poets Aeschylus and Sophocles, however intriguing, were far away: they wrote their works in a difficult and lofty register of the foreign, Greek language, and were a less obvious choice for imitation than the more modern

¹⁶⁵ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.13.

¹⁶⁶ Quint. 10.1.69.

¹⁶⁷ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.14.

¹⁶⁸ In order to explain the differences between the reading lists of Dionysius, Dio and Quintilian, these factors (among others) are also suggested by De Jonge in J. König & N. Wiater (forthc.). Cf. section 5.1, n. 16.

and useful writers Euripides and Menander, whose popularity increased in Rome during the first century AD.¹⁶⁹

4.8 LITERARY VIRTUES IN QUINTILIAN'S CANONS

The previous section has shown that in some cases Quintilian expresses the same judgements of authors as Dionysius, while he also frequently evaluates them from a different perspective. Quintilian's own voice in the canons of Greek and Latin literature can most clearly be heard when analysing what literary qualities function as his touchstones for determining the aptness of literature for rhetorical imitation. In the following sections, the large amounts of commendable literary qualities in the Greek and Latin canons will be arranged in categories of cognate virtues, in order to help us understand how Quintilian conceives of rhetorical imitation. First, however, let us consider what Quintilian has to say about literary virtues and the different levels to which they can be applied.¹⁷⁰

In section 3.6, we have seen that Dionysius distinguished between on the one hand three essential virtues (ἀναγκαῖαι): 'purity' (καθαρότης), 'clarity' (σαφήνεια) and 'brevity' (συντομία), and on the other the so called 'additional virtues' (ἐπιθετοί), which are by far the most prominent in the epitome of *On Imitation*. These essential and additional virtues, though clearly differentiated in theory, are used without distinction and applied to the level of 'subject matter' (ὁ πραγματικὸς τόπος) or 'style' (ὁ λεκτικὸς τόπος), which in turn are further subdivided.¹⁷¹ In many cases, it remains unclear whether the virtues discussed by Dionysius should be understood in a pragmatic or stylistic sense. However, the strong stylistic orientation of his list often favours a lexical interpretation.

Unlike Dionysius, Quintilian does not explicitly distinguish between essential and additional virtues – neither in theory, nor in practice. In the eighth book of the *Institutio*, he does mention four virtues to which every text must measure up anyway, being 1) 'correctness' (*Latinitas*), 2) 'clarity' (*perspicuitas*), 3) 'ornamentation' (*ornatus*) and 4) 'appropriateness'

¹⁶⁹ This has also been suggested by De Jonge in J. König & N. Wiater (forthc.): 'it is plausible that Dionysius' list represents a traditional Greek approach, whereas Dio and Quintilian display a more modern taste that is tailored to the needs of Roman society'.

¹⁷⁰ On Quintilian's literary qualities and the earlier systems of virtues, see Valienè (2007) (*non vidi*).

¹⁷¹ Quintilian also pays attention to the actual 'delivery' (*pronuntiatio*) of a speech in his tenth book, although this subject is more profoundly covered in book 11. See e.g. Quint. 10.1.119.

(*decor*).¹⁷² They are essentially stylistic, but *perspicuitas* and *decor* also pertain to subject matter.¹⁷³ These four virtues are accompanied by a rich stock of qualities, which is set forth in the canons. Although these canons are incorporated in a book dedicated to *elocutio*, we can see that thoughtful imitation of pragmatic virtues also plays an important role here. In fact, subject matter and style are closely related, as the student should gain a ‘wealth of ideas and words’ (*copia rerum ac verborum*).¹⁷⁴

In Quintilian’s canons (as in Dionysius’), the general levels of subject matter and style are further subdivided. Falling into the category of ‘subject matter’ (*res*) are, for instance, ‘invention’ (*inventio*) – consisting of e.g. ‘strategy’ (*consilium*), ‘arrangement’ (*ordo*), ‘division’ (*divisio*), ‘preparation’ (*praeparatio*) and ‘proof’ (*probatio*) –, representation of ‘(moral) character’ (*personae, mores*) and of ‘emotions’ (*affectus*).¹⁷⁵ Among the category of ‘style’ (*verba, elocutio*) are ‘composition’ (*compositio*), a ‘sound choice of words’ (*ars verborum*), ‘emotional treatment’ (*affectus*), ‘amplifications’ (*amplificationes*), ‘proverbial language’ (*sententiae*), ‘figures of thought’ (*figurae*), ‘metaphors’ (*trahationes*) etcetera. Whereas Dionysius goes so far as to focus on clashes of vowels in the works of Theopompus, Quintilian adopts a less meticulous philological approach of literary texts in his canons.¹⁷⁶

Literary virtues and vices mentioned by Quintilian in his two canons are connected either to the general levels of subject matter and style or to the sublevels just mentioned.¹⁷⁷ This is not always done in an explicit way, but in most cases, the context leaves no room for

¹⁷² The first three virtues of style are discussed in Quint. 8.1-3. The fourth and last virtue, *decor*, which is grouped under *ornatus* in 1.5.1, is treated separately in 11.1-93 – probably because it is the most important one, as is argued in Quint. 1.5.1; 11.1.1.

¹⁷³ *Latinitas* should be kept in mind in the choice of words and the combination of words (8.1.1); *perspicuitas* can be achieved by choosing words in their proper sense, by arranging these words rightly and by limiting the sentence length (8.2.22); *ornatus* can be expressed by popular expressions, brilliant words, pleasant figures of thought, magnificent metaphors and elaborate composition (8.3.12); *decor* pertains to ‘this whole ability to say the right things at the right place’ (*totum hoc apte dicere*) (11.1.7). Clarity and appropriateness are also effective in the field of subject matter. Pragmatic clarity is discussed in 4.2.36 (though the term *perspicuitas* is absent here); appropriateness should be observed during the *inventio* and *dispositio* of the subject material.

¹⁷⁴ Quint. 10.1.6.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. section 3.6, n. 190 on the ambiguous meaning of ‘moral character’ (ἠθος in Greek).

¹⁷⁶ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 3.11. For Dionysius’ focus on linguistic elements, see section 3.6, esp. n. 191.

¹⁷⁷ As in Dionysius, there are frequent shifts in level, e.g. in Quint. 10.1.61, where Pindar is called the greatest in ‘inspiration, magnificence, proverbial language, figures of thought, an enormous wealth of ideas and words and, as it were, a flood of eloquence’ (*spiritu, magnificentia, sententiis, figuris, beatissima rerum verborumque copia et velut quodam eloquentiae flumine*).

ambiguity.¹⁷⁸ Still, the overwhelming amount of virtues makes it difficult to assess what specific qualities should make an orator stand out, and how the different genres in Greek and Latin literature can provide assistance in the process of rhetorical imitation. By categorising cognate virtues of style mentioned in Quintilian's canons, the following sections will shed light on this.

4.8.1 SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Following the structure of the section on clusters of literary virtues in the epitome of Dionysius' *On Imitation* (3.6.1), closely related or even synonymous virtues mentioned by Quintilian in his Greek and Latin canons will be brought together in tables. These will allow us to see 1) what literary qualities Quintilian emphasises, and 2) how these qualities in Greek literature relate to those in the Latin reading list.¹⁷⁹ Finally, some remarks are presented on how the connection between Dionysius' and Quintilian's ideas on literary virtues can best be interpreted.

There is a difficulty in analysing recommended literary virtues in Quintilian: they appear in the form of substantives, adjectives, adverbs, metaphors and other (often flowery) expressions used to describe style and/or subject matter. I took all of them into account, converting them to nouns if possible, in order to enhance the uniformity of the tables. I also converted finite verb forms to infinitives. Those expressions with which Quintilian (neutrally or disapprovingly) notes the absence of highly preferable virtues are also taken into account, and provided with an explanation in the footnote. Sometimes I isolated words appearing in a heterogeneous combination, e.g. *persuadendi deam* (10.1.82), because they pertain to different qualities (i.e. persuasiveness and divinity of style). My corpus consisted of 10.1.46-

¹⁷⁸ This is contrary to Dion. Hal. *Imit.*, in which it is sometimes difficult to establish whether the virtues recommended are meant to be understood stylistically or pragmatically. Quintilian's rather essayistic presentation of the canons largely solves this problem.

¹⁷⁹ The size of the different sections in Quintilian's Greek and Latin canons differs so greatly, that analysing the distribution of the most important literary virtues over the different genres will provide no clear picture. In the Greek canon, the poetical genres are discussed in much more length than Greek historiography, rhetoric and philosophy. In Quintilian's Latin canon, the situation is quite different. Here, the actual size of the section on rhetoric is far more extensive than whatever section in the Greek and Latin canons, and suggests a strong rhetorical focus.

84 for literary virtues recommended in Greek literature and 10.1.85-131 for literary virtues recommended in Latin literature.

I will present five important categories of virtues in the Greek canon (tables 1-5) and four in the Latin canon (tables 6-9). The virtues in the tables below are mentioned by Quintilian either because a specific author possesses them, or because he does not (sufficiently) possess them or applies them in the wrong way. Passages indicating a lack or wrong application of literary virtues are commented upon in the footnotes. The tables below are not presented as being normative or stringent, nor do they intend to suggest that there are no other possible arrangements of cognate literary virtues. What they do show, is that in the case of Greek literature, Quintilian does not display a remarkable preference for one literary virtue in particular: the occurrences of his recommendations of qualities pertaining to pleasure, magnificence, (sacred) solemnity, tension and brevity do not differ much from each other. However, in Latin literature, virtues related to skillfulness get remarkable attention.

4.8.2 CLUSTERS OF LITERARY VIRTUES IN THE GREEK CANON

In Quintilian's Greek (and Latin) canon, qualities of pleasure are richly represented, as the first table below shows. We have seen that also Dionysius pays due attention to ἡδονή, χάρις, εὐχάρεια, κομψότης and λεπτότης. In a recently published article, Viidebaum argues that Dionysius' emphasis on χάρις, with its appeal to the 'irrational perception' (ἄλογος αἴσθησις) of the reader and its connotations of simplicity, wit and humour, could 'capture the new trends in contemporary Roman (Augustan) rhetoric'.¹⁸⁰ Though this may well be possible, we should not forget that Dionysius' main stylistic focus – i.e. magnificence – may have received little acclaim among young Roman students. In any case, we can see that Dionysius places a high value on (especially Lysias') elusive charm, and that his admiration for this quality is shared by Quintilian.

Cognate literary virtues related to pleasure in Quintilian's Greek canon can be brought together as follows:¹⁸¹

¹⁸⁰ Viidebaum (2018), 122.

¹⁸¹ In the following tables, the virtues marked with an asterisk only appear in the Greek canon, not in the Latin.

Greek canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.46-84
1. Category of PLEASURE	84
Pleasure (<i>iucunditas</i>) ¹⁸²	4
Elegance (<i>elegantia</i>) ¹⁸³	3
Grace (<i>gratia</i>) ¹⁸⁴	2
Sweetness (<i>dulcitus</i>) ¹⁸⁵	2
Adornment (<i>comptus</i>)* ¹⁸⁶	1
Loveliness (<i>venus</i>) ¹⁸⁷	1
Attractiveness (<i>suavitas</i>)* ¹⁸⁸	1
Charm (<i>venustas</i>)* ¹⁸⁹	1
	TOTAL: 15

Another important category is made up by virtues related to magnificence. In this category, I included all qualities pertaining to great dimension or the transition beyond a certain level.¹⁹⁰ The status of magnificence in Quintilian may surprise us. In 4.2.61-62, Quintilian expresses his reservations regarding *magnificentia*, which he thinks is not an indispensable virtue. Nevertheless, in his canon of Greek literature, *magnificentia* plays an important role:

¹⁸² 10.1.46, 10.1.53 (negative: Antimachus is weak in pleasure), 10.1.64, 10.1.82.

¹⁸³ 10.1.65, 10.1.78, 10.1.83.

¹⁸⁴ 10.1.65, 10.1.82 (the Graces themselves seem to have moulded Xenophon's style).

¹⁸⁵ 10.1.73, 10.1.77.

¹⁸⁶ 10.1.79.

¹⁸⁷ 10.1.79 (*dicendi veneres*).

¹⁸⁸ 10.1.83.

¹⁸⁹ 10.1.65.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. section 3.6.1 on virtues related to *μεγαλοπρέπεια* in Dionysius.

Greek canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.46-
2. Category of MAGNIFICENCE¹⁹¹	84
Magnificence (<i>magnificentia</i>) ¹⁹²	4
Sublimity (<i>sublimitas</i>) ¹⁹³	3
Grandeur (<i>granditas</i>) ¹⁹⁴	2
Eminence (<i>eminentia</i>) ¹⁹⁵	1
To excel (<i>excedere</i>)* ¹⁹⁶	1
To rise to heights rarely (<i>raro adsurgere</i>)* ¹⁹⁷	1
Grandiloquent (<i>grandilocus</i>)* ¹⁹⁸	1
To soar (<i>surgere</i>)* ¹⁹⁹	1
	TOTAL: 14

Another group of virtues can be discerned. The common element of the virtues belonging to this category is their relation to (sacred) gravity, whether or not of divine origin. There is a close affiliation to virtues of magnificence. However, whereas virtues of magnificence imply great size and dimension, virtues of (sacred) gravity carry the connotation of heaviness:

Greek canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.46-
3. Category of (SACRED) GRAVITY²⁰⁰	84
Gravity (<i>gravitas</i>) ²⁰¹	4

¹⁹¹ Indirectly pleading for magnificence and gravity are those deprecatory expressions related to baseness. For instance, in 10.1.53, Antimachus is praised i.a. because of his ‘sort of speech which is far removed from everyday language’ (*minime vulgare eloquendi genus*). I did not count such expressions.

¹⁹² 10.1.61, 10.1.63, 10.1.78 (neutral: Lysias is more like the pure spring than the *magnum flumen*), 10.1.84 (neutral: the early Stoics were acute in subject matter rather than *oratione magnifici*).

¹⁹³ 10.1.46, 10.1.66, 10.1.68.

¹⁹⁴ 10.1.65, 10.1.77.

¹⁹⁵ 10.1.46 (here, I regard *eminentia* as somewhat ambiguous: it seems to pertain to Homer’s exceptionally high status as well as to his elevated type of style).

¹⁹⁶ 10.1.50.

¹⁹⁷ 10.1.52 (negative: Hesiod rarely rises to heights; the plea for elevation is implicit).

¹⁹⁸ 10.1.66.

¹⁹⁹ 10.1.81. In the Latin canon, we find *insurgit* (10.1.96).

²⁰⁰ See n. 191 for a side note concerning virtues of gravity.

²⁰¹ 10.1.46, 10.1.53, 10.1.66, 10.1.68.

Decency (<i>honestas</i>)* ²⁰²	2
Divinity (<i>divinitas</i>)* ²⁰³	2
Dignity (<i>dignitas</i>)* ²⁰⁴	1
Goddess (<i>dea</i>)* ²⁰⁵	1
Delphic oracle (<i>Delphicum oraculum</i>)* ²⁰⁶	1
Tragic style (<i>coturnus</i>)* ²⁰⁷	1
Tragic sound (<i>sonus</i>)* ²⁰⁸	1
	TOTAL: 13

Two other important categories can be singled out: those of force and brevity:

Greek canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.46-84
4. Category of FORCE	84
Force (<i>vis</i>) ²⁰⁹	5
Power (<i>valetudo</i>)* ²¹⁰	2
Muscular tension (<i>nervis intentio</i>)* ²¹¹	1
Blood (<i>sanguis</i>) ²¹²	1
Muscles (<i>lacerti</i>)* ²¹³	1
Zeal (<i>spiritus</i>) ²¹⁴	1

²⁰² 10.1.79, 10.1.84.

²⁰³ 10.1.81 (*eloquendi facultate divina quadam et Homerica*), 10.1.83 (*nitor divinus*). Divinity can possibly also be considered a virtue related to magnificence.

²⁰⁴ 10.1.62.

²⁰⁵ 10.1.82 (*persuadendi dea*, i.e. a personification of Peitho). Divinity can possibly also be considered a virtue related to magnificence (cf. n. 203).

²⁰⁶ 10.1.81 (Plato seems to be inspired by the oracle of Delphi).

²⁰⁷ 10.1.68. The *coturnus* is a high boot of the tragic actor. As Russell (2001), 286-287, n. 72 observes, it stands by metonymy for tragic grandeur. *Coturnus* may also be reckoned among the category of ‘magnificence’ (as is true for *sonus*).

²⁰⁸ 10.1.68.

²⁰⁹ 10.1.53, 10.1.60, 10.1.65, 10.1.73, 10.1.76.

²¹⁰ 10.1.60 (*validae sententiae*), 10.1.62 (*ingenio validus*).

²¹¹ 10.1.76.

²¹² 10.1.60.

²¹³ 10.1.77 (negative: Aeschines has more flesh and less muscles).

²¹⁴ 10.1.61.

To fight (<i>pugnare</i>) ²¹⁵	1
	TOTAL: 12

Greek canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.46-84
5. Category of BREVITY	84
Brevity (<i>brevitas</i>)* ²¹⁶	5
Denseness (<i>densitas</i>)* ²¹⁷	4
Pression (<i>pressio</i>) ²¹⁸	1
Compact (<i>adstrictus</i>) ²¹⁹	1
Nothing can be taken away (<i>nihil detrahi potest</i>) ²²⁰	1
	TOTAL: 12

Other significant categories consist of virtues related to fluency and wealth.²²¹ Moreover, it is possible to compose categories of virtues which pertain to vividness, genius, diligence, purposefulness, sharpness, appropriateness, moral criticism, luminosity, and naturalness, but these virtues are less numerous.

The categories mentioned above reveal that the idea of Greek literature as a source of pleasure, magnificence, (sacred) gravity, force and brevity is quite persistent: both Dionysius and Quintilian discern these virtues, and consider them important. Of course, we should be reluctant in making a comparison between the preferences for specific Greek literary virtues expressed in the extensive, flowery list of Quintilian and in the concise epitome of Dionysius'

²¹⁵ 10.1.106 (appears in the Latin canon with respect to Demosthenes).

²¹⁶ 10.1.46, 10.1.49, 10.1.60 (*breves sententiae*), 10.1.63, 10.1.73.

²¹⁷ 10.1.68 (*sententiis densus*), 10.1.73, 10.1.76, 10.1.106 (appears in the Latin canon with respect to Demosthenes).

²¹⁸ 10.1.46.

²¹⁹ 10.1.106 (appears in the Latin canon with respect to Demosthenes).

²²⁰ 10.1.106 (appears in the Latin canon with respect to Demosthenes).

²²¹ Fluency is a good thing *per se*, but every orator should be cautious for a verbiage coming out of its banks: 'to overflow' (*redundare*) and 'to burst one's banks' (*effundere*) are vices originating from something good: *copia* (10.1.62). The category of fluency consists of 'source' (*fons*), 'fluent' (*fusus*), 'river' (*flumen*), 'ocean' (*oceanus*), 'stream' (*amnis*). The category of wealth consists of 'wealth' (*copia*), 'richness' (*plenitudo*), 'flesh' (*carnis*), 'lavishness' (*laetitia*).

On Imitation. However, we can rather safely say that both critics emphasise different qualities.

Whereas magnificence seems to be the ultimate and most important quality for Dionysius, this virtue has no such exceptional status in Quintilian, who pays attention to different virtues in a more proportional way. Moreover, Dionysius often emphasises virtues of clarity – which are considerably less important in Quintilian –, while qualities of brevity play a more important role in Quintilian than in Dionysius.²²² There may be a few explanations for this.

On the one hand, Dionysius may be more loyal to early (Aristotelian and Peripatetic) theories of virtues of style, which recognized ‘clarity’ (σαφήνεια) as essential.²²³ Moreover, the practically useful virtues of clarity are perfectly suited to counterbalance Dionysius’ great insistence on the less useful virtues of magnificence, as we have seen in sections 3.6.1-2. On the other hand, Quintilian may prefer to emphasise qualities of ‘brevity’ (*brevitas*) rather than those of ‘clarity’ (*claritas*) in Greek literature, since he does not seem to find proper examples of brevity in Latin authors.²²⁴ This would sustain the idea that the Greek canon is also designed to fill certain gaps in the Latin one.²²⁵

4.8.3 CLUSTERS OF LITERARY VIRTUES IN THE LATIN CANON

Let us consider the literary virtues in the Latin canon in some more detail. Below, three categories are defined, with the same proviso as before: they display possible arrangements of literary qualities. Many of these relate to skillfulness, which is first and foremost a personal characteristic of the *vir bonus* himself, but, of course, also finds expression in his style. Interestingly, however, this quality is not a specific stylistic virtue like, for instance, *brevitas* or *iucunditas*; it actually is the fruit of innate talent and/or the persistent study of both Greek and Latin literature – it is the *copia rerum ac verborum* that is acquired by an author in many

²²² In Quintilian, clarity is recommended by virtues such as *candor* (e.g. 10.1.73) and *lux* (e.g. 10.1.74). *Claritas* often pertains to personal glory of the authors at stake, not to style. For virtues of brevity singled out by Dionysius, cf. section 3.6.1, n. 243.

²²³ Cf. section 3.5.2. ‘Brevity’ (συντομία) was added later by Diogenes of Babylon.

²²⁴ In the Latin reading list, we only read that Servilius Nonianus was less ‘concise’ (*pressus*) than the authority of history requires (10.1.102).

²²⁵ For this idea, cf. section 4.6.

different ways, and expressed in his composition. The following virtues can be included in the category of skillfulness:²²⁶

Latin canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.85-131
6. Category of SKILLFULNESS	131
Genius (<i>ingenium</i>) ²²⁷	9
Skillfulness (<i>doctrina</i>)* ²²⁸	3
Learning (<i>eruditio</i>)* ²²⁹	3
Shrewdness (<i>consilium</i>)* ²³⁰	3
Diligent study (<i>studium</i>) ²³¹	3
Facility (<i>facilitas</i>) ²³²	2
Knowledge (<i>scientia</i>) ²³³	1
Expertise (<i>peritia</i>)* ²³⁴	1
Ability (<i>facundia</i>) ²³⁵	1
Cognition (<i>cognitio</i>)* ²³⁶	1
Natural talent (<i>indoles</i>)* ²³⁷	1
	TOTAL: 28

²²⁶ In the following tables, the qualities marked with an asterisk only appear in the Latin canon, not in the Greek.

²²⁷ 10.1.88 (negative: Ovid is too much an *amator ingenii sui*), 10.1.90, 10.1.98 (negative: Ovid should have controlled his *ingenium*), 10.1.102, 10.1.109, 10.1.115, 10.1.117, 10.1.128, 10.1.130. I tried to count those instances of *ingenium* related to/being expressed in style. As such, *ingenium* is often provided with an adjective (e.g. *vehemens et poeticum ingenium*, 10.1.90; *ingenium facile et copiosum*, 10.1.128). Sometimes, the relation to style remains implicit (e.g. in 10.1.115: *multum ingenii in Caelio*). However, in such cases it is still clear that *ingenium* first and foremost characterises the style, not the man (since style is Quintilian's focus). I disregarded the occurrences of *ingenium* designating young, promising people (10.1.96, 10.1.119, 10.1.122).

²²⁸ 10.1.91, 10.1.95, 10.1.97.

²²⁹ 10.1.94, 10.1.95, 10.1.98.

²³⁰ 10.1.106, 10.1.113, 10.1.117 (negative: Cassius Severus yielded to his temper more than to his shrewdness).

²³¹ 10.1.109, 10.1.114, 10.1.128. I tried to count those instances of *studium* related to/being expressed in style.

²³² 10.1.111, 10.1.128 (*ingenium facile*).

²³³ 10.1.95.

²³⁴ 10.1.95.

²³⁵ 10.1.121.

²³⁶ 10.1.128.

²³⁷ 10.1.89.

Other substantial categories are made up by virtues connected with pleasure and vehemence:

Latin canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.85-
7. Category of PLEASURE	131
Pleasure (<i>iucunditas</i>) ²³⁸	7
Elegance (<i>elegantia</i>) ²³⁹	4
Grace (<i>gratia</i>) ²⁴⁰	3
Sweetness (<i>dulcitusudo</i>) ²⁴¹	2
Delight (<i>delectatio</i>)* ²⁴²	1
	TOTAL: 17

Latin canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.85-
8. Category of VEHEMENCE	131
Force (<i>vis</i>) ²⁴³	5
Vehemence (<i>vehementia</i>)* ²⁴⁴	3
Passion (<i>concitatio</i>) ²⁴⁵	3
Spirit (<i>animus</i>)* ²⁴⁶	2
Agressiveness (<i>pugnacitas</i>) ²⁴⁷	2
Temper (<i>stomachus</i>)* ²⁴⁸	1
Heat (<i>ardor</i>)* ²⁴⁹	1
	TOTAL: 17

²³⁸ 10.1.96, 10.1.101, 10.1.108, 10.1.110, 10.1.113 (negative: Asinius Pollio is far away from e.g. Cicero's pleasure), 10.1.119, 10.1.124 (Catus is a not unpleasant author).

²³⁹ 10.1.87, 10.1.93, 10.1.99, 10.1.114.

²⁴⁰ 10.1.96, 10.1.99, 10.1.121.

²⁴¹ 10.1.101, 10.1.129 (negative: *dulcibus vitis*).

²⁴² 10.1.119.

²⁴³ 10.1.108, 10.1.109, 10.1.110, 10.1.113 (negative: Messala lacks force), 10.1.114.

²⁴⁴ 10.1.90 (*vehemens ingenium*), 10.1.110, 10.1.115.

²⁴⁵ 10.1.90, 10.1.114, 10.1.118.

²⁴⁶ 10.1.113, 10.1.114.

²⁴⁷ 10.1.106, 10.1.120 (negative: if he had lived longer, Julius Secundus would have developed more aggressiveness).

²⁴⁸ 10.1.117 (negative).

²⁴⁹ 10.1.90.

In Quintilian’s Latin canon, also virtues of (sacred) gravity are prominent. However, note that the virtues *sacertudo*, *vetustas*, *antiquitas* and *religio* are ambiguously assessed. Ennius, who is praised mainly for these qualities, is nevertheless considered old and not so useful: ‘there are others closer to us in time and more useful for our present purpose’ (*propiores alii atque ad hoc de quo loquimur magis utiles*), according to Quintilian.²⁵⁰ Still, gravity turns out to be an important concept in Quintilian’s judgements:

Latin canon	Number of occurrences in Quint. 10.1.85-131
9. Category of (SACRED) GRAVITY	131
Weight (<i>pondus</i>)* ²⁵¹	4
Gravity (<i>gravitas</i>) ²⁵²	3
Authority (<i>auctoritas</i>)* ²⁵³	3
Sacred (<i>sacer</i>)* ²⁵⁴	1
Venerability of old age (<i>vetustas</i>)* ²⁵⁵	1
Antiquity (<i>antiquitas</i>)* ²⁵⁶	1
Solemnity (<i>religio</i>)* ²⁵⁷	1
Nobility (<i>nobilitas</i>)* ²⁵⁸	1
Sanctity (<i>sanctitas</i>)* ²⁵⁹	1
	TOTAL: 16

Other considerable categories of virtues in the Latin reading list relate to e.g. carefulness and (radiant) beauty.²⁶⁰ Moreover, it is possible to discern (smaller) categories of virtues

²⁵⁰ 10.1.88.

²⁵¹ 10.1.97, 10.1.106, 10.1.123, 10.1.130 (the last two passages concern weight of subject matter).

²⁵² 10.1.97, 10.1.115, 10.1.116 (negative: Cassius Severus lacks e.g. gravity).

²⁵³ 10.1.97, 10.1.102, 10.1.111.

²⁵⁴ 10.1.88 (metaphorical: we should worship Ennius as we worship sacred woods). As far as I know, there is no current substantive of *sacer*.

²⁵⁵ 10.1.88 (further specification of the woods).

²⁵⁶ 10.1.88 (*id.*).

²⁵⁷ 10.1.88 (*id.*).

²⁵⁸ 10.1.113.

²⁵⁹ 10.1.115.

²⁶⁰ The category of diligence consists of ‘diligence’ (*diligentia*), ‘care’ (*cura*), ‘refined’ (*tersus*), ‘finish’ (*cultus*), ‘smooth’ (*compositus*). The category of beauty consists of ‘polish’ (*nitor*), ‘lucidity’ (*candor*), ‘well-formedness’ (*species*), ‘beauty’ (*pulchritudo*).

pertaining to e.g. wealth, sublimity, wit, clarity, sharpness, boldness, brevity, naturalness, and emotion.

This overview of the main categories of virtues in Quintilian's Latin reading list learns us that skillfulness has an exceptional status in Quintilian's perception of Latin literature; qualities of skillfulness are to be found in many Latin authors, and should apparently have a key role to play in rhetorical imitation.²⁶¹ In Quintilian's Greek canon, skillfulness and learning are of minor importance. An explanation for this may be that Quintilian draws from the same repertoire of ideas as Dionysius, who is also not particularly concerned with the stylistic display of learning in Greek literature – though he recommends e.g. Aristotle's πολυμαθεία and strongly advocates skillfulness and erudition especially in the process of imitation (note e.g. his insistence on κατήχησις).²⁶² However, we may also suggest that Quintilian was somewhat suspicious of Greek (philosophical) learning and argumentation, and wanted to claim these qualities as specifically Roman.²⁶³

In Quintilian's Greek canon, no virtue can be found with an exceptional status; the substantial categories of virtues of pleasure, magnificence, (sacred) gravity, force and brevity are rather of the same importance. Furthermore, it turns out that the categories of pleasure and (sacred) gravity are important both in Quintilian's Greek and Latin canons. Also virtues related to force appear in both lists; yet they bear slightly different connotations. In Quintilian's Greek canon, force frequently pertains to stylistic strength, whereas the same virtue in the Latin reading list mainly concerns emotional vehemence and hot temper.

Quintilian's judgements of authors reveal that many of his key ideas of rhetorical imitation are deeply rooted in Greek literary criticism. For both Dionysius and Quintilian, literature that is useful and suitable for imitation should be pleasant, magnificent, grave, and forceful. At the same time, however, Quintilian's Greek canon testifies to a redefinition of what is useful in and should be adapted and emulated from Greek literature. We can observe different accents, adaptations and additions in Quintilian's criticisms, which may well be considered resonances of a gradual shift in Graeco-Roman classicism under the influence of literary taste and rhetorical-practical needs: from the rather traditional proclamation of stylistic magnificence in Dionysius in order to actually revive classical Athens after Rome's

²⁶¹ This will also become apparent from Seneca's *Letter to Lucilius* 84, with its marked use of the terms *ingenium* and *animus* referring to the role of our intellect in the process of imitation. More on this in section 5.3.

²⁶² Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 4.3; *Din.* 7.5.

²⁶³ Zetzel (1983), 95 notes that the (Alexandrian) influence of erudition, learning and urbanity can be discerned from the very beginnings of Roman literature onwards.

‘restoration of the Attic Muse’, to the more practical recommendation of intellectual agility and skill in Quintilian.²⁶⁴

4.9 GREECE AND ROME IN QUINTILIAN’S CANONS

Quintilian’s canons of Greek and Latin literature are different in tone and imagery. What image do we get of Greece and Rome?

4.9.1 DISCOURSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

A rich stock of metaphors and motifs comes to the fore in Quintilian’s reading lists. In this section, I reflect on the most important ones, arguing that Quintilian’s discourse frames Greece and Rome and their literary identities in different ways.²⁶⁵ The metaphors and motifs discussed below will also throw the literary virtues reflected upon in the previous sections into relief, and show how these virtues are embedded in the discourse of the canons.

From the Greek and Latin reading lists, some important metaphors and motifs can be distilled. In the Greek canon, Quintilian uses various terms pertaining to 1) flowing, 2) strife, 3) physical power, and 4) divine inspiration. His comments on the Latin authors are mainly inflected through references to 1) strife, 2) literary (im)maturity and potential, and 3) indications of time and period.

4.9.2 THE METAPHOR OF THE STREAM

The metaphor of the stream is a very common one in Greek literature and in Greek literary theory.²⁶⁶ It is not only used with reference to the influence of one author upon another, but also to characterise a style which runs like a babbling brook or a mighty river.²⁶⁷ Dionysius’

²⁶⁴ For the restoration of the Attic Muse in Rome, see Dion. Hal. *Orat. Vett.* 2.1.

²⁶⁵ For metaphors in Quintilian, see Assfahl (1932) (*non vidi*).

²⁶⁶ For (an overview of) metaphors of water and flood in Greek literature/rhetoric, cf. e.g. Van Hook (1905), 12-13; Nünlist (1998), 178-205; Hunter (2012).

²⁶⁷ In the latter case, the metaphor of the stream is associated with ‘wealth’ (*copia, ubertas*). Cf. e.g. Quint. 10.1.62, where Quintilian argues that Stesichorus ‘bursts his banks’ (*effunditur*), which is a ‘fault of (unbridled) wealth’ (*copiae vitium*). The ‘milky richness’ (*lactea ubertas*, 10.1.32) of Livy may be another example displaying the relation between a flowing and rich style. However, as Hays (1986-1987) argues, the adjective *lactea* does not so much pertain to a fluent, as to a nutritive style.

moral attached to his story on the ugly farmer serves as a good example of the use of the metaphor as an image of the imitative relationship between authors: here, it is argued that likeness through imitation is born when ‘after having constructed one stream out of many, someone canalises this into his soul’ (ἐκ πολλῶν ναμάτων ἓν τι συγκομίσας ῥεῦμα τοῦτ’ εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν μετοχετεύσῃ).²⁶⁸ In his Greek reading list, Quintilian frequently uses the metaphor of the stream in both ways.²⁶⁹ His evaluation of Homer contains a fine example of the metaphor as an image of literary influence. As the ultimate model of imitation, Homer provides the origin of every branch of eloquence ‘like he himself says that the course of all rivers and springs takes its origin from the Ocean’ (*quem ad modum ex Oceano dicit ipse <omnium> amnium fontiumque cursus initium capere*).²⁷⁰ An example of Quintilian’s application of the metaphor of the stream as a marker of style can be found in the case of Herodotus, who is called ‘expansive’ (*fusus*).²⁷¹

4.9.3 THE METAPHOR OF STRIFE (1)

Another important metaphor in Quintilian’s Greek canon is that of strife. This metaphor is also common in Greek rhetorical criticism.²⁷² Most of the authors in Quintilian’s Greek reading list are ranked, and, as we have seen, placed in a sequence that sometimes mirrors their hierarchy.²⁷³ Also Dionysius pays due attention to the excellences of one author over another, but these excellences mostly pertain to very *specific* aspects of subject matter or style.²⁷⁴ Hence, they do not necessarily make the author better overall – a question to which

²⁶⁸ Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 1.3. Dionysius also uses water metaphors to characterise a style, e.g. ‘purity’ (καθαρότης, *Imit.* 2.14). On this metaphor, see Van Hook (1905), 12.

²⁶⁹ We can also find the metaphor in the Latin canon, e.g. *fluunt inlaborata* (10.1.111), where it is used to describe the movement of the wonderful passages of Cicero. In the following footnotes of this section, I will, for reasons of brevity, leave translations of all parallel passages behind.

²⁷⁰ Quint. 10.1.46.

²⁷¹ Quint. 10.1.73. The metaphor also occurs in other passages: *velut quodam eloquentiae flumine* (10.1.61); *redundat atque effunditur* (10.1.62); *magis fusus* (10.1.77); *puro tamen fonti quam magno flumini propior* (10.1.78). For the metaphor in the Latin canon: *non enim pluvias, ut ait Pindarus, aquas colligit* [subject: Cicero, M.S.], *sed vivo gurgite exundat* (10.1.109).

²⁷² For an overview of the terminology of strife in Greek rhetoric, cf. Van Hook (1905), 23-26.

²⁷³ Expressions related to competition and comparison are e.g. *superari* (10.1.54); *subiungit* (10.1.56); *princeps habetur [...] secundas [...] occupavit* (10.1.58); *meruit credi secundus* (10.1.72).

²⁷⁴ See e.g. Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 2.6, where it is argued that in arousing pity Simonides is even better than Pindar.

Dionysius does not seem to be particularly dedicated. By contrast, Quintilian is much more inclined to put certain authors on a pedestal because of the general quality of their work – notwithstanding the fact that other writers may surpass them in some specific points.

The language that Quintilian uses to describe who is the best in the hierarchical literary order is frequently derived from poetry festivals or footraces, in which the winners were rewarded with a victory palm.²⁷⁵ One case in point is Quintilian's description of Hesiod as the champion of the middle style: 'to him the victory palm is given in the middle style' (*daturque ei palma in illo medio genere dicendi*).²⁷⁶ Closely affiliated are those expressions pertaining to the hierarchical order in the military system. When Quintilian introduces his section on Greek rhetoricians, he raises the image of a group of soldiers coming into view: 'a vast army of orators follows' (*sequitur oratorum ingens manus*).²⁷⁷ Of these soldiers, Demosthenes 'comes with a big lead in the first place' (*longe princeps*).²⁷⁸ The language is suggestive of hierarchical competition and spatial separation between members of the group of ten Attic orators – as if they are involved in a footrace.²⁷⁹

4.9.4 THE METAPHOR OF PHYSICAL POWER

Display of power is another important concept in Quintilian's Greek canon. As we have seen in section 3.6.1, Dionysius attributes many virtues pertaining to force to the Greek writers he recommends in his reading list. In fact, virtues related to force, such as δύναμις, ῥώμη and ἰσχὺς, are remarkably important in the epitomised version of Dionysius' treatise. The

²⁷⁵ On terms derived from athletics in Quintilian, see Grodde (1997), 30-44. Also in the introduction to the canons, some references to the world of athletes occur, such as *athleta [...] praeparandus sit* (10.1.4); *labuntur* (10.1.24); *athletarum toris* (10.1.33). The leading position of authors of a certain genre is not only reflected by the language of strife in Quintilian, but also by expressions related to the antithesis between brightness and shadow: *sed longe clarius inlustraverunt* (10.1.67); *fulgore quodam suae claritatis tenebras obduxit* (10.1.72); *quem [i.e. Aristotle, M.S.] clariorem putem* (10.1.83); *loquendi nitor ille divinus (ibid.)*. In 10.1.30, a passage dealing with the brilliance of deterrent arms, we see the metaphors of strife and brightness combined (*fulgorem in iis [i.e. armis, M.S.] esse*).

²⁷⁶ Quint. 10.1.52. In his Latin canon, Quintilian incidentally refers to a laurel (*inter victrices hederam tibi serpere laurus*, 10.1.92), quoting Vergil's *Eclogues* 8.13 in his panegyric of Domitian.

²⁷⁷ Quint. 10.1.76.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁹ We can also see references to spatially conceived hierarchy in the following expressions: *proximus Homerum* (10.1.62); *his proximus* (10.1.74). Expressions referring to spatial separation and hierarchical distance also appear in the Latin canon: see n. 293.

metaphorical language of power is even more significant in Quintilian, and is often endowed with a physical connotation.²⁸⁰ For example, Archilochus is said to have ‘plenty of blood and sinews’ (*plurimum sanguinis atque nervorum*), whereas Stesichorus ‘is bearing with his lyre the weight of epic’ (*epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem*).²⁸¹ Two other examples can be found in the section on the rhetoricians, in which all of Demosthenes’ style is described as ‘strained as it were by muscles’ (*quibusdam nervis intenta*) and Aeschines is labelled with the following evocative qualification: ‘he has more flesh, less muscles’ (*carnis tamen plus habet, minus lacertorum*), which suggests that his style is voluminous rather than forceful.²⁸²

Another related metaphor designating (a lack of) physical power can be found in the description of Isocrates. This orator, who is said to be ‘polished’ (*nitidus*) and ‘adorned’ (*comptus*), is considered ‘more suited to the wrestling school than to the battlefield’ (*palaestrae quam pugnae magis accommodatus*); he aimed at ‘all the graces of speaking’ (*omnes dicendi venteres*), because he had prepared himself ‘for the lecture room, not for the courts’ (*auditoriis enim se, non iudiciis compararat*).²⁸³ The opposition between a wrestling school and the battlefield seems to be suggestive of the contrast between a rather playful, theatrical display of literary force on the one hand (which is, apparently, characteristic for Isocrates), and, on the other, the exhibition of real stylistic force required for serious speeches in court.²⁸⁴

4.9.5 THE MOTIF OF DIVINE INSPIRATION

Remarkable at last is also the language of divine inspiration used in Quintilian’s Greek canon. It is entirely limited to the relatively small section on Greek philosophy, in which Plato takes

²⁸⁰ On metaphors pertaining to the human body in Greek rhetoric, cf. Van Hook (1905), 18-23. For biological/medical metaphors used to describe language and texts, see Sluiter (2010).

²⁸¹ Quint. 10.1.60, 10.1.62.

²⁸² Quint. 10.1.76, 10.1.77.

²⁸³ Quint. 10.1.79. For terms borrowed from the battlefield in Quintilian, see Grodde (1997), 16-21. For terms derived from gladiator fights in Quintilian, see *ibid.*, 22-30. In the introduction to Quintilian’s canons, references to the battlefield occur in the following expressions: *in procinctu paratamque [...] eloquentiam* (10.1.2); *nos vero armatos stare in acie et summis de rebus discernere et ad victoriam niti* (10.1.29); *fulgorem in iis [i.e. armis, M.S.] esse* (10.1.30); *pugnamque praesentem* (10.1.31); *militum lacertis* (10.1.33).

²⁸⁴ Cf. Peterson (1891), *ad loc.*: ‘Isocrates had not the vigorous compression of style necessary for real contests’.

first place.²⁸⁵ According to Quintilian, Plato is supreme ‘for the almost divine and Homeric versatility of his style’ (*eloquendi facultate divina quadam et Homerica*), and ‘seems to be inspired not by human genius, but as it were by the oracle of Delphi’ (*non hominis ingenio sed quodam Delphico videatur oraculo instinctus*).²⁸⁶ Xenophon, passed over in the section on the historians, is fully compensated by the praise that ‘the Graces themselves seem to have moulded his style’ (*ipsae sermonem finxisse Gratiae videantur*) and that ‘some goddess of persuasion sat upon his lips’ (*in labris eius sedisse quandam persuadendi deam*).²⁸⁷ Finally, in Theophrastus, ‘there is such divine brilliance of style that he is said to have derived also his name [possibly meaning ‘he who speaks like a god’, M.S.] from this’ (*tam est loquendi nitor ille divinus ut ex eo nomen quoque traxisse dicatur*).²⁸⁸ It is with this great insistence on divinely inspired Greek philosophy in mind that the reader makes the transition to the Latin canon.

Divinity, by contrast, is almost absent from the Latin canon; in his discussion of Vergil at the beginning of this list, Quintilian explicitly notes that ‘we [i.e. the Romans, M.S.] must yield to his [i.e. Homer’s, M.S.] heavenly and immortal nature’ (*illi naturae caelesti atque immortalis cesserimus*).²⁸⁹ This comment sets the pace, and prepares for the strongly competitive gist of the entire canon of Latin literature. Whereas Greeks are presented as admiring, following and competing with each other, the Romans are not only involved in a mutual struggle, but are also and in particular competing with the Greeks.²⁹⁰ Quintilian’s Latin reading list evokes a rather hybrid impression: leaning quite heavily upon the preceding

²⁸⁵ Thus, it seems unlikely that the section on philosophy, which is dominated by language of divine inspiration, is placed last because Quintilian was not favourably disposed at philosophers, as Peterson has suggested (cf. n. 68).

²⁸⁶ Quint. 10.1.81.

²⁸⁷ Quint. 10.1.82. With these latter words, the writer of Old Comedy Eupolis had described Pericles’ eloquence.

²⁸⁸ Quint. 10.1.83.

²⁸⁹ Quint. 10.1.86. In the Latin canon (10.1.91), Domitian is brought in connection with divine inspiration, but this should perhaps be seen against the background of imperial panegyric and Domitian’s own claim of being a son of Minerva rather than as a serious qualification of Domitian’s style.

²⁹⁰ An example of admiration among Greek authors is Menander’s appreciation for Euripides: *hunc et admiratus maxime est* (10.1.69). An example of explicitly proclaimed imitation among Greek authors is Theopompus, who was an ‘imitator of Thucydides’ (*imitator Thucydidi*, 10.1.74).

Greek list, it lacks the sense of autarky, internal unity, completion and coherence that in a unique way comes to the fore in the Greek canon.²⁹¹

4.9.6 THE METAPHOR OF STRIFE (2)

Examples of comparative and competitive language in the Latin reading list are abundant. Almost every section of it is introduced by references to competition and strife.²⁹² The metaphors of strife are mostly derived from the battlefield or general combative situations, though some – as is predominantly the case in the Greek canon – seem to refer to poetry festivals or footraces.²⁹³ Expressions like *vincimur* (10.1.86), *pensamus* (*ibid.*), *amisimus* (10.1.89), *provocamus* (10.1.93), *comparari potest* (10.1.98), *vix levem consequitur umbram* (10.1.100), *non [...] cesserit* (10.1.101), *nec opponere [...] verear* (*ibid.*), *nec indignetur [...] aequari* (*ibid.*), *parem facere [...] possunt* (10.1.105) and *vincimus* (10.1.107) all indicate rather general combative situations between Greeks and Romans, whereas ‘strife’ in the Greek canon is framed in rather specific terms of cultural events and sports competitions among the Greeks themselves. The differences in the language of strife in Quintilian’s canons of Greek and Latin literature may well reflect his different understanding of Greek and Latin society: the former more culturally inspired, the latter more dominated by bellicose expansionism.²⁹⁴

²⁹¹ Cf. e.g. Steinmetz (1964), 463: ‘demnach erscheint dem Quintilian die griechische Literatur als eine relative Einheit [...]’. Cf. *ibid.*, 464: ‘diese Sicht der griechischen Literatur, die ohne Markierung eines epochalen Einschnitts die archaische, die klassische und die hellenistische Literatur zu einem einheitlichen Komplex zusammenfasst, findet sich nun nirgends in einer von einem Griechen verfassten Darstellung der griechischen Literatur’. Of course, the fact that Greek literature is presented as a unity may also be caused by the fact that it was produced long before and, as a whole, could be evaluated and interpreted extensively in the centuries following. Quintilian himself refers to the idea that a sound judgement passed on contemporary Latin literature is hard to achieve, e.g. in his discussion of Domitian (10.1.92).

²⁹² Quint. 10.1.85; 10.1.93; 10.1.99; 10.1.101; 10.1.105; 10.1.123.

²⁹³ E.g. *proximus* (10.1.85); *cesserimus* (10.1.86); *ceteri omnes longe secuntur* (10.1.87); *vindicaret sibi iure secundum locum* (10.1.89); *claudicamus* (10.1.99).

²⁹⁴ Apparently, oratory can (pre-eminently) bear traces of this bellicosity; Julius Caesar ‘seems to have spoken with the same spirit as he waged war’ (*eodem animo dixisse quo bellavit apparet*, 10.1.114).

4.9.7 THE MOTIF OF LITERARY (IM)MATURITY

In most literary genres, Romans had to surrender to the Greeks.²⁹⁵ As a cause of or excuse for their inability to conquer the Greeks, their literary immaturity or (partial) incompetence is frequently put forward by Quintilian. In fact, the idea of immaturity dominates the Latin canon in such a way, that it can be called topical. Two striking examples of the language of immaturity can be found in Quintilian's discussion of Serranus and Saleius Bassus.

According to Quintilian, an 'untimely death' (*mors inmaturo*) prevented Serranus from coming to fruition.²⁹⁶ There is an implied contrast here with Saleius Bassus' talent, that just 'did not mature in his elderly years' (*nec ipsum senectute maturuit*), though it had been 'vehement and poetical' (*vehemens et poeticum*), and thus very promising.²⁹⁷ Quintilian's language of immaturity, however, does not originate from a deeply rooted pessimistic view on the future of Latin literature and rhetoric.²⁹⁸ On the contrary, he often gives a positive, didactic twist to immaturity by emphasising the great opportunities and potential of the authors who nonetheless disappointed him in the end – thus encouraging his readers to take it up where they had let it go.²⁹⁹

The Latin reading list is crammed with such expressions of literary potential, either frustrated by an early death and lack of literary development or taste, as we just saw in the cases of Serranus and Saleius Bassus, or by bad personality traits, the inability of attaining one's own high standards, lack of time and the absence of some specific virtues of style. An example of the negative influence of an author's character is provided by Ovid, whose *Medea* is, according to Quintilian, indicative of 'how much this man could have achieved if he had

²⁹⁵ This is true for hexametric poetry (10.1.85-92), iambic and lyrical poetry (10.1.96), tragedy (though implicitly) and comedy (10.1.97-99), and philosophy (10.1.123-131). Thus, the only genres in which the Romans can truly compete with the Greeks are elegiac poetry (10.1.93), history (10.1.101-104) and rhetoric (10.1.105-122). Finally, satire (10.1.93-94) is an entirely Roman invention.

²⁹⁶ Quint. 10.1.89. For literary talent frustrated by an early death: e.g. *dignusque vir cui et mens melior et vita longior contigisset* (10.1.115); *properata mors* (*ibid.*); *Iulio Secundo si longior contigisset aetas* (10.1.120); *interceptus quoque* (10.1.121).

²⁹⁷ Quint. 10.1.90.

²⁹⁸ Cf. e.g. Orentzel (1978), who points to Quintilian's optimistic view on the future of Latin oratory.

²⁹⁹ The fact, however, remains that Quintilian is generally rather severe in his verdict on Latin authors and that his praise is seldom undivided. A great abundance of litotic expressions used to designate that an author is not bad or deserves no blame or oblivion may illustrate this: e.g. *non spernendus quidem* (10.1.87); *non indigni cognitione* (10.1.90); *non sine cultu ac nitore* (10.1.124); *non iniucundus* (*ibid.*).

preferred to restrain rather than revel in his genius' (*quantum ille vir praestare potuerit si ingenio suo imperare quam indulgere maluisset*).³⁰⁰ Aufidius Bassus is illustrative of a good but rather whimsical author who 'sometimes does not live up to his own abilities' (*in quibusdam suis ipse viribus minor*).³⁰¹ Quintilian's description of Julius Caesar makes it clear that lack of time could prevent an author from reaching the top, whereas Cassius Severus could have been among the greatest rhetoricians 'if only he had added colour and gravity of style to his other virtues' (*si ceteris virtutibus colorem et gravitatem orationis adiecisset*).³⁰²

4.9.8 INDICATIONS OF TIME AND PERIOD

Not only the metaphor of combat and the motifs of (im)maturity and potential permeate the Latin canon – also indications of time and period are significant, especially since these are almost completely absent from the Greek reading list. Quintilian frequently places the authors under discussion in chronological order and demarcates whether they belong to the ancients, the more recent authors – some of whom Quintilian was even able to hear himself – or the contemporaneous, on whom he does not choose to elaborate.³⁰³

It is said that Quintilian believed the authors of the distant past to be unsuitable models for the present.³⁰⁴ However, his estimation of the usefulness of their qualities is rather

³⁰⁰ Quint. 10.1.98. Cf. *indulgent ingeniorum suorum voluptati* (10.1.24); *plus stomacho quam consilio dedit* (10.1.117).

³⁰¹ Quint. 10.1.103. Cf. e.g. *si tamen (ut est dictum) ad exemplar primi libri bellum Siculum perscripsisset* (10.1.89).

³⁰² Quint. 10.1.114; 10.1.116. According to Peterson (1891) *ad loc.*, *color* in this case means 'proper tone'. For the desirable addition of some specific literary virtues, cf. also *adiecisset enim atque adiciebat ceteris virtutibus suis quod desiderari potest* (10.1.120).

³⁰³ Indications of the times in which the recommended authors lived, are e.g. *propiores alii* (10.1.88); *multum [...] nuper amisimus* (10.1.90); *dicent [...] futura saecula, nunc [...] laus ista praestringitur* (10.1.92); *primus [...] Lucilius* (10.1.93); *sunt clari hodieque et qui olim nominabuntur* (10.1.94); *prius saturae genus* (10.1.95); *quem nuper vidimus* (10.1.96); *ingenia viventium (ibid.)*; *tragoediae scriptores veterum [...] clarissimi* (10.1.97); *magis videri potest temporibus quam ipsis defuisse (ibid.)*; *eorum quos viderim* (10.1.98); *mihi egregie dixisse videtur Servilius Nonianus* (10.1.102); *paulum aetate praecedens* (10.1.103); *exornat aetatis nostrae gloriam* (10.1.104); *videri possit saeculo prior* (10.1.113); *eorum quos viderim* (10.1.118); *erant clara et nuper ingenia* (10.1.119); *eos qui nunc vigent* (10.1.122).

³⁰⁴ E.g. Citroni (2006a), 13.

nuanced, although he condemns their lack of ‘polish’ (*nitor*).³⁰⁵ Quintilian’s judgement of Ennius, for instance, who should be admired for the ‘solemnity’ (*religio*) of his works rather than for their ‘well-formedness’ (*species*), does not need to be understood as a dismissal.³⁰⁶ After all, Quintilian assures that ‘words recovered from the past’ (*verba a vetustate repetita*) possess the ‘authority of antiquity’ (*auctoritas antiquitatis*), and that reading the ancients is indeed very instructive, but only to more advanced students endowed ‘with firm judgements’ (*firmis iudiciis*) and the ability to take over from the ancients their solid force of manly genius ‘after the roughness of a coarse century has been rubbed off’ (*deterso rudis saeculi squalore*).³⁰⁷ Thus, as we have seen before, the pedagogical differentiation between novices and advanced students in rhetoric is crucial for the interpretation of the judgements Quintilian passes on all writers.³⁰⁸

To the group of beginners – Quintilian’s primary target group, of which the aim should be to achieve *firma facilitas* – more recent authors are better suited.³⁰⁹ We may, however, wonder what the predicates ‘old’ and ‘more recent’ mean exactly – chronologically speaking. Of the hexametric poets, Ennius’ style is explicitly associated with *vetustas* and *antiquitas* (10.1.88), but it is evident that also the authors Macer, Lucretius and Varro of Atax, mentioned in one breath with Ennius (10.1.87), should be judged according to the standards of the past.³¹⁰ Quintilian presents these four men as a group of good, but deficient writers, introduced by the words *ceteri omnes* (10.1.88). Also poets such as Lucilius (10.1.93), Terentius Varro (10.1.95), Accius and Pacuvius (10.1.97) and Caecilius (10.1.99) should be

³⁰⁵ Quint. 10.1.97, 10.1.113. In e.g. 10.1.118 it becomes clear that it is a privilege being reckoned ‘among the old masters’ (*in numero veterum*).

³⁰⁶ Quint. 10.1.88.

³⁰⁷ Quint. 1.6.39; 2.5.23. Ancient texts are also advantageous because of their ‘majesty’ (*maiestas*) and ‘delight’ (*delectatio*), as Quintilian poses in 1.6.39. In 1.8.8-9, other virtues of ancient literature are listed, i.e. ‘genius’ (*ingenium*), ‘wealth of words’ (*copia verborum*); in old tragedy one can find ‘gravity’ (*gravitas*); in old comedy ‘elegance’ (*elegantia*), ‘atticism’ (*atticismos*), ‘simplicity’ (*oeconomia*), ‘sanctity’ (*sanctitas*) and ‘manliness’ (*virilitas*).

³⁰⁸ The negative judgement of Quintilian passed on the modern writer Seneca should be seen in the same light of pedagogical differentiation. Seneca is best read by advanced students. Cf. 10.1.131 (*iam robustis et severiore genere satis firmatis legendus*).

³⁰⁹ E.g. Quint. 2.5.21; 10.1.88.

³¹⁰ Citroni (2006a), 12-14 argues that Quintilian displays a modern, literary taste that marks ‘a complete break with the tradition of Varro, Cicero and the academics and grammarians’ (*ibid.*, 14), who greatly adhered to such archaic writers as Ennius.

seen as representatives of ancient Latin literature.³¹¹ This means, roughly speaking, that the generations before Cicero are labelled ‘ancient’, which is confirmed by Quintilian’s telling comment on Asinius Pollio. According to Quintilian, this man ‘is so far away from Cicero in polish and pleasure that he could be thought a century earlier’ (*a nitore et iucunditate Ciceronis ita longe abest ut videri possit saeculo prior*).³¹²

Authors can be called ‘more close’ (*propiores*) from the Augustan period onwards.³¹³ Also the authors Quintilian experienced himself belong to this category: having passed away somewhere in the Augustan period or later seems to be the decisive criterion for being reckoned among the *propiores*. The contemporaneous authors are those still living at the time of the composition of the *Institutio*. They are – if mentioned at all – always discussed in *praeteritio*, because Quintilian wants to leave it to his successors to assess them soundly.³¹⁴ Whereas he can be rather critical in his assessment of the ancient and more recent authors, it is remarkable that contemporary authors are seen as extremely promising. A striking example is the description of an unnamed historian, who may probably be identified as Fabius Rusticus: ‘there still survives, to enhance the glory of our times, a man worthy to be remembered in future ages’ (*superest adhuc et exornat aetatis nostrae gloriam vir saeculorum memoria dignus*).³¹⁵

Quintilian’s discourse frames Greek and Latin literary identity in different ways. His language of flowing, strife, physical power and divine inspiration evokes the image of an influential, intraculturally competitive, powerful and authoritative Greek culture. His references to strife and literary (im)maturity, as well as his numerous indications of time and period in the Latin canon are suggestive of a Roman society which is extraculturally competitive, maturing and searching for internal structure and balance. The Roman canon can be considered a hybrid testament of progression and development characterised by trial and error, whereas the Greek reading list displays a great sense of stability and unity. However,

³¹¹ For these representatives of old poetry, see also Quint. 1.8.10-11.

³¹² Quint. 10.1.113.

³¹³ Quint. 10.1.88. Ovid is the first ‘more recent’ author mentioned here.

³¹⁴ Quint. 10.1.122.

³¹⁵ E.g. Quint. 10.1.104. Vardi (2003), 148 explains Quintilian’s insertion of very recent Latin authors as follows: ‘the impression such a representation [i.e. of recent Latin authors, M.S.] is meant to create is, I suspect, one of great but long past and gone Greek achievements, whose only successors are their lively Roman rivals’.

with their great potential, the Romans are expected to continue the reverent Greek literary tradition in their own way.

4.10 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, Quintilian's conception of imitation has been further explored in relation to the ideas on imitation aired by Dionysius. We have seen that Quintilian constructs his theory of imitation using building blocks which also give shape to Dionysius' framework of imitation. Dionysius' ideas on *ἔξις*, *ἐπιστήμη* (which comprises both knowledge and judgement), coming to the fore in the epitome of *On Imitation*, find their counterparts in Quintilian's concepts of 'facility' (*facilitas*), 'wealth' or 'a wide reading experience' (*copia*), and 'sound judgement' (*iudicium*). Moreover, Dionysius and Quintilian share an emphasis on mimetic selection and eclectic composition.

Also the structure of and choices made in Quintilian's reading lists of Greek and Latin literature were analysed in comparison with Dionysius' canon. We have seen that Quintilian frequently arranges his Greek canon differently than Dionysius, and makes the order of writers serve his own rhetorical purposes. Rather than taking chronology as a guideline (which is a more important factor in Dionysius' list), Quintilian chooses to arrange Greek authors drawing from an amalgam of criteria: literary superiority of and coherence between writers, and parallelism with the order of equivalent authors in the Latin reading list.

In the inclusion of Hellenistic and other poets, we have seen that Quintilian seems to have been guided by various principles as well. He mentions their names because of their prestige, their usefulness for more advanced students (who are formally beyond his scope), and their suitability to compensate for certain gaps within the Roman canon. The Hellenistic prose authors have been included to bridge the chronological hiatus between the glorious period of archaic and classical Greek literature on the one hand and Latin literature on the other. By inserting their names, Quintilian suggests a continuing literary tradition, in which the Romans are presented as the ultimate heirs and successors of the Greeks. The suggestion of a continuum – though a strongly redefined one – grants legitimacy to Latin literary production.

Although Quintilian possibly adopted the frame of the Greek canon from Dionysius and/or others and sometimes expressed judgements that also appear in Dionysius, his evaluations of authors clearly reflect his own rhetorical program, which is determined by his stringent aim of mimetic usefulness, his audience of novice learners, the literary taste of the

Flavian Age and developments in classicism. Thus, for Quintilian, Greek literature is not just a reference point to be emulated by Roman rhetoricians, nor a mere backup in case of deficiencies in the Latin list. On the contrary, the Greek canon has its own intrinsic value in offering a redefinition of what is useful in and can be adapted and emulated from Greek literature in a Roman context.

An overview of important literary virtues in Quintilian's Greek canon teaches us that Quintilian travels together with Dionysius in his idea of Greek literature as a source of pleasure, magnificence, (sacred) gravity, force and brevity. Unlike Dionysius, however, Quintilian is not exceptionally concerned with magnificence; he rather tends to give proportional attention to different literary virtues. Moreover, he seems to insist on 'brevity' (*brevitas*) in Greek authors rather than on 'clarity' (*claritas*), which may be explained by assuming an attempt to compensate for the lack of proper examples of the important quality of brevity in Latin authors.

In Quintilian's perception of Latin literature, skillfulness has an exceptional status, which may be a trace of the influential Alexandrian focus on erudition and learning. Other important virtues in Latin literature, pertaining to pleasure, vehemence and (sacred) gravity, also appear abundantly in Quintilian's Greek list – whether or not bearing a slightly different connotation. These virtues seem to be a mark of good literature in general rather than of Latin or Greek literature in particular. However, the specific character of Latin as opposed to Greek literature is pre-eminently reflected in Quintilian's distinctive use of metaphors and motifs. We have seen that these metaphors and motifs have a larger defining reach than literature alone: they help to construct the identity of both Greeks and Romans, and to reveal the several differences and points of contact between them.

In the extensive debate on the construction of Greek and Roman identity in the Roman World, the analysis of the classicising ideas on imitation expressed by Dionysius and Quintilian may bring us a small step further.³¹⁶ We have observed that in their recommendations of classical Greek literature, both critics tap into a common discourse and framework of imitation, selecting those elements that fit their own agenda. Preserving their own cultural identity seems to be one of their items. Dionysius' inclination to stimulate the imitation of Greek literary paragons of beauty and magnificence in Roman rhetorical practice can best be explained by his proud desire to *revive* the literature of his own people, in order not only to strengthen their identity in Rome, but also to further inspire both Greek and Latin

³¹⁶ On this debate, see section 1.4.

orators by the 'Attic Muse' who has already been restored. For Quintilian, Greek literature, – which is the reverent literature of others –, is the cradle of and legitimation for Latin literary production, and can serve as a brilliant arsenal to provide the Romans with the effective weapons to compete with their Greek heroes, to appropriate and adapt their heritage and, in the end, to establish Roman literary reign.

