How to compose great prose: Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and stylistic theory in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome

Ooms, S.

Chapter 1
GENERAL INTRODUCTION: CICERO AND DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS ON PROSE STYLE

1.1 The Purpose of this Study

At first sight, M. Tullius Cicero (106–43 BC) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ca. 60–after 8 BC)[1] have little in common. Both men made their career in Rome during the first century BC, but their paths never actually crossed: when Dionysius settled in the city around 30 BC, Cicero had been dead for well over a decade.[2] When Cicero composed his last speeches, letters and treatises, Rome was still a republic, but when Dionysius started to teach rhetoric in Rome, the city was ruled by Octavian, who emerged as emperor under the title Augustus. In addition, Cicero is considered an exponent of Roman eloquence and a master of Latin prose, whereas Dionysius was a Greek historian and a critic of Greek literature. As a consequence of these apparent dissimilarities, modern scholars, with a few notable exceptions (section 1.2), rarely mention Cicero and Dionysius together in the same paragraph, section or chapter. Still, their names are printed jointly on the cover of the present book, which is concerned with stylistic theory. Indeed, it is on the topic of style, particularly prose style, that the views of Cicero and Dionysius lend themselves to a careful comparison.

In ancient rhetorical theory, style (λέξις, *elocutio*) was usually considered the third task of the orator, after invention (εὕρεσις, *inventio*) and arrangement (τάξις, *dispositio*) of the subject matter: while the two prior tasks focus on finding and organizing one's materials and one's thoughts, style is all about putting these into words. In Late-Republican and Augustan Rome, Cicero and Dionysius stand out as our most important sources for stylistic theory: their

[1] Dionysius himself claims that Plato (born in 427 BC) was his senior by more than twelve generations (*Pomp.* 1.15) and he tells us that Crassus' expedition against the Parthians (55–53 BC) took place in his time (*Ant. Rom.* 2.6.4). Most scholars assume that Dionysius was born around or shortly after 60 BC: see e.g. Hidber (1996) 2 and Fromentin (1998) xiii. The last known date from Dionysius' life is 8 or 7 BC (the consulship of Claudius Nero and Calpurnius Piso), when he published the first book of *Ant. Rom.* (cf. ibid. 1.3.4): see Cary (1937) vii and Hidber (1996) 1. Dionysius probably lived on for quite some time after 8/7 BC, as he had yet to publish the remaining nineteen books of *Ant. Rom.*

[2] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2: 'I arrived in Italy at the very time when Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war, in the middle of the one hundred and eighty-seventh Olympiad ...' (ἐγὼ καταπλεύσας εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἅμα τῷ καταλυθῆναι τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἑβδόμης καὶ ὀγδοηκοστῆς καὶ ἑκατοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος μεσούσης ...). Thus, Dionysius arrived in Italy in 30 or 29 BC: see Hidber (1996) 1–2.

rhetorical and critical treatises are virtually the only surviving works from that era that include lengthy discussions of the intricacies of prose style (sections 1.4 and 1.5). Moreover, their interest in style was by no means purely academic, as both men contributed to the city's prolific output of artistic prose: Cicero's works, for one, quickly became stylistic models in their own right for generations to come, while Dionysius' literary aspirations were enshrined in his twenty-volume history of early Rome, commonly known as his *Roman Antiquities* (Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία). Cicero and Dionysius offer us unique first-hand perspectives on prose style in the last fifty-or-so years BC, a time traditionally celebrated as the Golden Age of Latin literature,[3] during which Greek literature (according to Dionysius) also flourished.[4]

The rhetorical and critical works of Cicero and Dionysius can be read as masterclasses on how to compose great prose in the literary heyday of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome. By comparing their stylistic views, this study aims to reconstruct the ancient discourse on prose style in Rome. Specifically, I will focus on the four major themes that permeate the stylistic discussions in the works of both Cicero and Dionysius, namely the selection of models for imitation (chapter 2), the use of threefold stylistic divisions (chapter 3), theories of word arrangement (chapter 4) and the ideology of Atticism (chapter 5). Each of these subsequent chapters substantiates the three central theses of this dissertation:

1. By and large, Cicero and Dionysius draw on similar stylistic theories, they apply similar analytical methods and they articulate their views using a similar technical vocabulary. Elements from this shared apparatus can be found in various other contemporary or near-contemporary discussions of style in Rome, such as *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and the sources on the orator C. Licinius Macer Calvus (section 1.4) as well as, in Greek, the fragments of Caecilius of Caleacte and Philodemus' *On Rhetoric* and *On Poems* (section 1.5). In sum, the various extant stylistic discussions in Rome draw on and contribute to a common discourse on prose style.

[3] The Golden Age of Latin literature is usually defined as the period between the start of Cicero's career (ca. 80 BC) and the end of emperor Augustus' reign (14 AD), followed by the so-called Silver Age. This classification, based on the ancient myth of the ages of man, was first articulated in the nineteenth century by Teuffel (1870) and Cruttwell (1877). Although the value judgments, which are implied in the words 'golden' and 'silver', are controversial, the terms are still used in modern scholarship, e.g. Wilkinson (1963): *Golden Latin Artistry.*

[4] At *Ant. orat.* 3.2, Dionysius notes that in his day many fine works (συντάξεις) of literary prose 'have proceeded from the pens of Romans and Greeks and will probably continue to do so' (καὶ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησιν εὖ μάλα διεσπουδασμέναι προεληλύθασί τε καὶ προελεύσονται κατὰ τὸ εἰκός).

2. The shared framework of stylistic theories, methods and vocabulary was by no means rigid or monolithic, but rather flexible and fluid. Hence, Cicero, Dionysius and their contemporaries could articulate diverse ideas about style, whilst using the same basic critical tools: they could bend the commonplace topics of the stylistic discourse to suit their personal aesthetic tastes, to pursue specific writing purposes, to cater for their intended audiences, to reflect differences between the Greek and Latin language, and, lastly, to demarcate their own position as authors and citizens in Rome.

3. The common flexible language of style allowed Greek and Roman authors alike to participate in a mutual exchange of ideas about the topic.[5] In this dissertation, we will see Greeks and Romans 'interacting rather than assimilating':[6] the apparent connections between Greek and Latin sources should not be taken as evidence for the hellenization of Roman rhetoric or for the merging together of Greek and Latin stylistic theory. Rather, we will see that both Greek and Roman authors exploited a common cultural repertoire, or 'koine' (to borrow a useful concept from recent scholarship on material culture) in order to communicate views about the present-day Roman society by focusing on the rich legacy of the Greek literary past (section 1.7).[7]

In a word, Cicero and Dionysius participated in and contributed to a flexible discourse on prose style, shared by Greeks and Romans alike, through which they not merely exchanged ideas about style and literature, but also negotiated their identity in the public life of Rome. In the remainder of this introductory chapter, I will explain how my approach to Cicero and

[5] I am aware of the inherent ambiguity of the terms 'Roman' and 'Greek'. Scholars have emphasized the fluidity of these categories, distinguishing between ethnic and cultural identities: it is possible, for instance, that ancient authors present themselves as Greeks or Romans, while they are in fact not originally from Greece or Rome. See e.g. the seminal work of Hall (2002) on the construction of Greek identity during the Persian Wars, and Dench (2017) on the interplay of ethnicity, culture and identity among Greeks living under Roman rule during the Second Sophistic. In this dissertation, I simply refer to the authors of Latin texts as 'Roman authors' and to the authors of Greek texts as 'Greek authors': as we will see (cf. n. 141 below), these authors often explicitly present themselves as Romans (Cicero, and the author of *Rhet. Her.*) or as Greeks (Dionysius, Longinus).

[6] Cf. Wallace-Hadrill (1998) 84.

[7] Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 3–37 offers a thorough discussion of the historical debates over the interrelations between hellenization and romanization: he debunks popular models such as fusion, creolization, hybridity and other metaphorical representations that rely on the model of acculturation. On the concept of a cultural 'koine', see section 1.7 below and the literature cited there.

Dionysius builds on and reacts to existing scholarship on ancient stylistic theory (section 1.2), I will offer an introduction to the relevant texts about prose style from Late-Republican and Augustan Rome (sections 1.3–1.5) and I will discuss the classicism in the works of Cicero and Dionysius, providing a convenient starting point for exploring the dialogue between Greek and Roman authors in the ensuing chapters (sections 1.6–1.7).

1.2 Modern Approaches to the Stylistic Views of Cicero and Dionysius

This dissertation is not the first study to point out the remarkable connections between the stylistic views of Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. As early as 1910, the German classicist Franz Nassal published his dissertation on the 'aesthetic and rhetorical connections' ('aesthetisch-rhetorische Beziehungen') between the two authors, focusing particularly on their kindred views on style.[8] Nassal's monograph deserves to be mentioned here for two reasons: first, it is the only work to date that presents a detailed and systematic comparison between the stylistic views of Cicero and Dionysius, and secondly, it is the first study to explicitly offer an explanation for the striking parallels between them.[9] Nassal argues that Cicero and Dionysius must rely on a common source, that can only be 'a work by a highly educated Greek'.[10] In Nassal's assessment, this Greek ancestor was probably Caecilius of Caleacte, whose rhetorical and critical works are only known to us through testimonies and a handful of fragments (section 1.5). In all likelihood, however, Caecilius was younger than Cicero: the Byzantine encyclopedia *Suda* states that he flourished in Augustan Rome and Dionysius calls him a 'very dear friend'.[11] Therefore, Nassal's attempt to make him Cicero's and Dionysius' senior as well as their common source is unconvincing.[12]

---

[8] Nassal (1910). The book is divided into two main sections, the first focusing on Cicero's and Dionysius' 'rhetorical and technical views' ('rhetorisch-technische Anschauungen'), the second on their 'aesthetic and rhetorical judgments of Greek authors' ('ästhetisch-rhetorische Urteile über griechische Schriftsteller'). In both of these parts, Nassal focuses on their views on style.

[9] Before Nassal, Ammon (1889) had included Cicero in his discussion of sources for Dionysius' rhetorical treatises, but he did not do so 'ex professo und bis in die Einzelheiten', according to Nassal (1910) 3.

[10] Nassal (1910) 6–7: 'Ein Werk eines hochgebildeten Griechen.'

[11] *Suda* κ 1165 (= Caecilius T1 Woerther) states that Caecilius was a 'rhetorician who gave lectures in Rome under Augustus Caesar and until Hadrian' (ῥήτωρ, σοφιστεύσας ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ). The reference to Hadrian cannot be correct. See also Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 3.20: τῷ φιλτάτῳ Καικιλίῳ. On Caecilius' role in the stylistic discourse in Rome, see section 1.5 below.

[12] Nassal follows the argumentation of Wilamowitz (1900) 15: according to the latter, the titles of Caecilius' works *Against the Phrygians* and *How the Attic and Asian Styles Differ* suggest that the battle between Atticists

Nassal's study exemplifies two implicit presuppositions that have, for a long time, set the parameters of modern scholarship on ancient rhetoric and style. First, scholars have in the past generally taken a positivist approach to ancient stylistic theory: they perceived it as a fixed system of abstract guidelines that can be reconstructed by piecing together the evidence from the extant sources.[13] From this perspective, classicists such as Nassal have scoured the works of Cicero and Dionysius for nuggets of otherwise lost theoretical wisdom, treating Cicero and Dionysius themselves as passive recipients of earlier scholarship.[14] Secondly, in their search for the Greek foundations of stylistic theory, scholars have traditionally adopted a hellenocentric view, interpreting Latin texts as mere echoes of Greek theory. The evidence for this view, as we will see, is usually quite flimsy, as the alleged Greek sources are often not extant.[15] This problem is starkly visible in the following words of Richard Janko: 'Cicero's whole account of euphony and rhythm is indebted to the κριτικοί; one could easily turn his words back into Greek.' Flamboyantly, Janko actually produces his own Greek translation of Cicero's Latin, thereby inventing his own proof for the claim that Cicero copied from his Greek predecessors.[16]

---

and Asianists was ongoing at the time of publication, whereas Dionysius proclaims the victory of Atticism in *Ant. orat.* 1.1–7. Accordingly, Wilamowitz and Nassal reason that Caecilius' works must predate Dionysius. Yet, as De Jonge (2008) 216 n. 205 notes, 'we should avoid presenting the conflict between Atticists who objected to "Asianic" style as a real "battle" that was decided at a particular moment'. On the date of Caecilius, see also Bowersock (1965) 124 and Hidber (1996) 41 n. 184. On Atticism and Asianism, see esp. section 5.2 below.

[13] On the positivist view of rhetorical theory, see Copeland (1991) 4: rhetoric 'has been viewed as a neutral perceptive system, a descriptive taxonomy of style, or as an academic discipline whose history is constituted by its manifest meanings and whose claims to truth about the nature of discourse and language are accepted on their own terms.' Lausberg (2008) is a good example of this approach, as he aims to provide a comprehensive description of the ancient rhetorical system by collecting material from a wide variety of sources. While the book is an extremely useful reference work, it tends to elide important differences between the ancient sources, giving the false impression that ancient rhetoric functioned as a unified system.

[14] See May and Wisse (2001) 38–39 on the limitations of source criticism in the study of Cic. *De or.* See also De Jonge (2008) 7–9 on the same issue in the study of Dionysius' rhetorical works.

[15] We will encounter instances of the hellenocentric approach on several occasions in this dissertation: see e.g. section 3.1 (on the three styles), section 4.1 (on the theory of word arrangement) and section 5.2 (on Atticism).

[16] Janko (2000) 361 n. 3. The passage is Cic. *Orat.* 162: *Sed quia rerum verborumque iudicium in prudentia est, vocum autem et numerorum aures sunt iudices, et quod illa ad intelligentiam referuntur, haec ad voluptatem, in illis ratio invenit, in his sensus artem.* Janko's translation reads: Ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ μὲν τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων κρίσις ὑπάρχει ἐν τῇ νοήσει, τὰς δὲ φωνὰς καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς κρίνουσιν αἱ ἀκοαί, καὶ ἐπεὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀναπέμπεται, τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν τέρψιν, ἐν ἐκείνοις μὲν ἡ διάνοια ἐξεῦρε τὴν τέχνην, ἐν τούτοις δ' ἡ αἴσθησις. On the views of οἱ κριτικοί, who focused on euphony and word arrangement, see esp. section 4.1 below.

To be fair, the scholarly trends signaled above are by no means pertinent to every single study of ancient stylistic theory from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: I have simply aimed to describe general tendencies.[17] At any rate, toward the end of the millennium the predominant scholarly approach started to shift: this change of attitude can be illustrated in the following selection of recent work on Ciceronian and Dionysian rhetoric.[18] Among the students of Cicero, to begin with, the hellenocentric bias has in recent decennia lost ground: in the first-ever English monograph on Cicero's *De Oratore*, for one, Elaine Fantham emphatically situates Cicero's theories in the 'Roman world'.[19] Likewise, the positivist focus on source criticism is now largely abandoned, clearing the path to study the goals and motivations that underlie Cicero's rhetorical treatises: following Emanuele Narducci's suggestion that these works are engaged in a conscious cultural program,[20] John Dugan interprets Cicero's views in the light of his program of self-fashioning, making his rhetorical theory an expression of his identity as a 'new man'.[21] Others, in addition, have highlighted the political dimensions of Ciceronian rhetoric: Joy Connolly discusses Cicero's views with respect to their civic and political context,[22] while Caroline Bishop, whose dissertation

[17] A case in point is the longstanding debate over the origins of Atticism: although most scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have focused on the allegedly Greek roots of the phenomenon, various classicists have, with varying degrees of confidence, suggested that it might have originated as a Roman movement. See Radermacher (1899a) 360, Heck (1917), Kennedy (1972) 245–246 and 351–353, Bowersock (1979) 67, Innes (1989) 245–246 and Wisse (1995). For their views, see section 5.2 n. 21 below.

[18] For general trends in the scholarship on Ciceronian rhetoric, see Dugan (2007) and Dugan (2013) 25–27. An up-to-date overview of literature on Dionysius' critical works is offered by De Jonge and Hunter (2019) 17–24.

[19] Fantham (2004) studies the 'Roman world of Cicero's *De Oratore*'. Fantham aims to illuminate the political climate in Rome in the period between the dialogue's fictional date (91 BC) and its date of composition (55 BC). In chapter 7, Fantham argues that Cicero reviewed Aristotelian rhetorical theory in the light of the judicial and political situation in Rome.

[20] Narducci (1997) collects five articles on Cicero's rhetorical theory that aim to illuminate the ideological presuppositions that control Cicero's construction of the orator and his culture. Narducci's discussions are more suggestive than conclusive: cf. the reviews in Dugan (1998) and Steel (1998).

[21] Dugan (2005) reads *De or., Brut.* and *Orat.* not only as sources for Ciceronian rhetorical theory but also as sources for the author's 'cultural program'. According to Dugan, Cicero cultivates a 'transgressive' approach to aesthetics: in his view, Cicero presented himself as a 'new man' by subverting established aesthetic tastes and oratorical customs, e.g. by adopting a stagey, highly emotional instead of a subdued style. See however the review of Connolly (2006) on the limited usefulness of the notion of transgression in Cicero's works.

[22] Connolly (2007a) analyzes Latin rhetorical works, especially Cicero's, as serious analyses of the role of the citizen and as practical guides for their readers toward a contructive integration of rhetoric with public life. Here and more fully in Connolly (2007b), the author also addresses the obsession of ancient orators and rhetoricians

examines Cicero's engagement with Greek scholarship, understands the rhetorical treatises *Brutus* and *Orator* as reactions to Caesar's dictatorship.[23]

In recent scholarship on Dionysius, similar trends can be detected. The Greek critic's works are no longer studied exclusively in connection to the Greek tradition: according to Jakob Wisse, for example, Dionysius' views on Attic style were influenced by Roman ideas that reached him through a 'Graeco-Roman network' of scholars in Rome.[24] In addition, scholars have gradually become more willing to contemplate the originality and individuality of Dionysius' views: Koen Goudriaan has argued, for instance, that a personal program of civilization underlies Dionysius' historical and critical works,[25] and Nicolas Wiater has more recently interpreted Dionysius' entire oeuvre as a model for Greek cultural identity, through which the Greek scholar presents the Romans as dependent on the superior culture of Classical Greece.[26] Additionally, Casper de Jonge has shown that the various theories in Dionysius' critical treatises do not merely reiterate earlier views, but rather that Dionysius selects theories for a practical reason, that is, to instruct his audiences on the composition of effective texts.[27] Dionysius' works are now often reviewed in the context of Augustan Rome: a brand-new volume explores the complex ways in which Dionysius' oeuvre fits into the

---

with gender: they often presented themselves as thoroughly virile and their opponents as emasculated or effeminate. Cf. on this latter point sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 below.

[23] Bishop (2011) explores Cicero's emulation of the Greek authors Aratus, Plato and Demosthenes. Bishop (2016) shows that Cicero presents himself as a Roman Demosthenes in *Brut.* and *Orat.*: just as Demosthenes vociferously attacked Philip of Macedon, Cicero in his day struggled with the rule of Caesar. In his *Phil.* of 44–43 BC, Cicero famously uses the eponymous speeches of Demosthenes as his model: see esp. Wooten (1983).

[24] Wisse (1995) distinguishes between a Roman phase of Atticism (Calvus and Brutus) and a subsequent Greek phase (Dionysius and Caecilius): according to Wisse, 'it was in the coterie of Calvus that Atticism took shape ca. 60 BCE; it spread through a Graeco-Roman network, to emerge, for us, as a Greek phenomenon in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' (ibid. 81). For the debate about the origins and nature of Atticism, see esp. section 5.2 below.

[25] Goudriaan (1989) explores Dionysius' classicism in his critical treatises as well as *Ant. Rom.*: according to Goudriaan, the overarching ideal of civilization (παιδεία) that emerges from Dionysius' oeuvre resembles Nietzsche's notion of 'formale Bildung', that is, the comprehensive education of a human being through intensive linguistic training. See esp. ibid. 581–586.

[26] Like Goudriaan, Wiater (2011) focuses on the ideology of classicism: he argues that Dionysius' works create 'a distance between Greek and Roman readers' (ibid. 222), supplying the former with a means to assert their superiority over the latter. Yet, the review of De Jonge (2012b) shows that there are many striking links between Dionysius' classicist program and Roman forms of classicism: cf. sections 1.6 and 5.5.2 below.

[27] De Jonge (2008) explores Dionysius' views on language, linguistics and literature, showing that the critic combines various ancient language disciplines into a coherent program of rhetorical education.

intellectual and political world of Rome under Augustus.[28] Among the more intriguing issues that have come to the fore are the striking connections between Dionysius' critical doctrines and contemporary Latin poetry: following the suggestions of Richard Hunter and others, De Jonge exposes several conspicuous links between Dionysius' treatise *On the Arrangement of Words* on the one hand and Virgil's *Aeneid* and Horace's *Ars Poetica* on the other hand.[29]

Thus, the positivist, hellenocentric approach to ancient stylistic theory is largely debunked, yielding valuable new insights into the rhetorical and critical views of Cicero and Dionysius. Now, more than a century after Nassal's dissertation, it is time for a thorough reassessment of the connections between the two ancient authors: how can we explain the striking similarities between their views about prose style? Whereas it is chronologically impossible for Cicero to have known Dionysius' works, some scholars have suggested that Dionysius drew on the works of Cicero.[30] Glen Bowersock, for instance, has argued that Dionysius must have been aware of Cicero's ideas through Q. Aelius Tubero, who was the recipient of Dionysius' treatise *On Thucydides* and who also knew Cicero through his father Lucius.[31] Indeed, even without Tubero, it seems hardly possible for someone like Dionysius, who was actively involved in Roman society, not to be au fait with Cicero's ubiquitous legacy. Therefore, De Jonge lists Cicero as a probable source for Dionysius' works: 'Despite the modern reluctance to make a Greek scholar dependent on a Roman author, parallels

[28] De Jonge and Hunter (2019): the editors present Dionysius as 'a writer positioned between Greece and Rome and between rhetoric and historiography'. De Jonge and Hunter divide the topics of the various contributions to the volume into four categories, i.e., Augustan politics, Augustan historiography, Augustan rhetoric and, lastly, Augustan criticism and Latin poetry.

[29] De Jonge (2018a) calls attention to the ideal of noble simplicity, which plays a role in *Comp.* (through the swineherd Eumaeus), in Verg. *Aen.* (through king Evander) and in Augustus' self-presentation as a good ruler. De Jonge (2019) shows that both Dion. Hal. *Comp.* and Hor. *Ars. P.* advocate the skillful arrangement of common words: cf. section 4.1 n. 4 below. Freudenburg (1993) 109–184, Fuhrer (2003) 355–356, and Hunter (2009) 126–167 already suggested that Dionysius' theory of word arrangement can shed new light on Hor. *Sat.* According to Hunter, Dionysius and Horace 'are in touch with similar streams of criticism' (ibid. 165).

[30] Cf. already Ammon (1889), who included Cicero in his list of Dionysius' sources, and Egger (1902) 77, who briefly considered the possibility that Dionysius drew on Cicero for his theory of word arrangement.

[31] Bowersock (1965) 130 and Bowersock (1979) 68–70. Cicero refers to his relationship with both Lucius and Quintus throughout his *Pro Ligario*. At *Lig.* 1, he calls Quintus 'my kinsman' (*propinquus meus*) and at *Lig.* 12 and 21, he refers to his friendship with Lucius and Quintus. Dionysius mentions Quintus at *Thuc.* 1.1, *Amm. II* 1.1 and *Ant. Rom.* 1.80.1. There is no evidence for Bowersock's claim that Q. Aelius Tubero was Dionysius' patron: see De Jonge (2008) 28. Wisse (1995) 78 rightly notes that we should not suppose that Dionysius' knowledge of Roman ideas was dependent on any single individual like Tubero.

between Cicero and Dionysius may be based not only on their use of earlier theories, but also on Dionysius' knowledge of Cicero's treatises.'[32]

Still, it is difficult to find ironclad evidence for direct Ciceronian influence in Dionysius' works: the Greek critic never explicitly refers to Cicero and, whenever he expounds stylistic doctrines that Cicero also mentions, these doctrines are, as we will see, usually attested in other contemporary sources as well. To support the argument that Dionysius knew Cicero's works, a passage from *On Thucydides* is sometimes adduced, in which Dionysius rejects the view of 'some professors of repute' (τινες οὐκ ἄδοξοι σοφισταί) that the work of Thucydides may serve as a good model for the writing of history.[33] This contested view corresponds with the one that Cicero presents in *Brutus* and *Orator*: according to Cicero, Thucydides is a paragon of serious and dignified historiography, though his style is unsuitable for oratory.[34] It is not unlikely that Dionysius is thinking of Cicero as one of the 'professors of repute', but Thucydides was a much-discussed author in Rome and the various arguments about his suitability as a model were widely available.[35] A passage from the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* presents a similar case: Dionysius describes Asian rhetoric as a 'Mysian or Phrygian or a Carian creature', seemingly echoing Cicero's reference to the same three regions in his critique of Asianism.[36] Again, Dionysius may allude to Cicero, but it is equally possible that he simply repeats a cliché of their shared stylistic discourse.[37]

---

[32] De Jonge (2008) 41.

[33] Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 50.2–3.

[34] Cic. *Brut.* 287, *Orat.* 31. Goudriaan (1989) 266 thinks that Cicero's praise of Thucydidean historiography is insincere ('onoprecht'), because he elsewhere prefers Isocrates and Theopompus as stylistic models (*Orat.* 207). Yet, De Jonge (2008) 215 n. 199 rightly objects that Cicero's preference for the periodic style of Isocrates and Theopompus does not preclude the use of Thucydides as a model, whom he praises for different virtues.

[35] The identity of the 'professors of repute' is a topic of much debate: Cicero, Didymus and Tubero have been suggested as possible referents. See for a recent survey of the discussion De Jonge (2008) 215–220, who argues that 'we should at least mention the possibility that Cicero was one of them'. Porter (2016) 217 shows that in the first century BC the work of Thucydides attracted 'an entire critical industry', whose origins are unknown but whose terminology and thinking 'was completely available to Aristotle and Theophrastus, and even earlier'. De Jonge (2017) connects Dionysius' attitude to Thucydides with the latter's reputation in Rome.

[36] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.7: Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 25: *Caria et Phrygia et Mysia.* Bowersock (1979) 65–66 notes that Dionysius repeats Cicero's 'refrain', while De Jonge (2008) 15 suggests that 'it is not impossible that Dionysius knew Cicero's ideas and alludes to them'.

[37] Hidber (1996) 111 and De Jonge (2008) 15 rightly explain that Caria, Phrygia and Mysia stand for Asian style in general. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 57 (*Phrygia et Caria*). The title of Caecilius' work *Against the Phrygians* underscores the status of Phrygia as a shorthand for Asian rhetoric: see section 1.5 below. Cf. also Cic. *Flac.* 65.

Hence, although it is perfectly possible, even plausible, that Dionysius read and used Cicero's rhetorical works, it is impossible to prove it. It would be better, therefore, not to focus on ambiguous vestiges of direct influence, but rather to assume that Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues tapped into a shared repertoire of stylistic theories, techniques and terminology, through which they could articulate and exchange ideas about prose style. To summarize, this dissertation is built on the following basic principles of method that correlate with each of the three central theses listed above (section 1.1):

1. This study is no 'Quellenforschung': although source criticism can be extremely useful in revealing the origins and the historical development of ancient doctrines, this dissertation aims to reconstruct the Greek and Roman stylistic discourse in a specific time at a specific place. Therefore,
   (a) I will adopt a synchronic approach to ancient stylistic theory, focusing on Late-Republican and Augustan Rome (roughly first century BC);
   (b) I will not attempt to map the direct lines of influence between individual authors in Rome, as such connections can seldom be demonstrated unequivocally. Instead, the various parallels between Cicero, Dionysius and others will be treated as elements of a common critical discourse on prose style.

2. The elements of this shared stylistic repertoire will not be read as the monolithic dogmas of any definitive theory. Unlike traditional positivist readings, therefore, this study does not understand ancient stylistic theory as a neutral system of fixed doctrines, but rather as a construct that ancient rhetoricians and critics could adopt and adapt to suit their own preferences, purposes and programs.[38]

3. In exploring the intriguing cross-connections between Greek and Roman views on prose style, this study presupposes no intrinsic hierarchy between Greek and Latin texts. All sources, whether they be written in Greek or in Latin, should each be discussed as contributions to Rome's stylistic discourse in their own right. From this vantage point, we will see that Greek and Roman scholars participated in a dialogue, each negotiating their own position in the city as authors and as citizens on the basis of a shared repertoire of theories, techniques and terminology.

[38] Cf. Yunis (2019) 86–87: 'Although the common ground between Cicero and Dionysius on this issue (i.e., Atticism) is considerable, it is limited in ways that reflect the different contexts in which they operated.'

1.3 Theories of Style in Rome: Four Major Themes

In the previous sections, I have referred several times to the shared discourse in which the Greek and Latin discussions of prose style in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome participate. Before we turn to the extant texts of Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues, I will now briefly list the four major recurring themes that are at the core of their stylistic discourse. These four leitmotivs will be discussed in depth in the four main chapters of this dissertation (chapters 2–5). In the following sections (1.4 and 1.5), we will see that the surviving discussions of prose style from Late-Republican and Augustan Rome each exhibit some or all of the four central themes. For discussions of the relevant secondary literature for each of these topics, the reader is advised to consult the appropriate chapter.

- Chapter two deals with the selection of models for imitation. In their search for appropriate prose models, the critics and rhetoricians in Rome generally turn to the orators, historians and philosophers of Classical Greece, specifically Athens. Lysias, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Thucydides and Plato are among the most frequently discussed literary giants. As we will see, both Cicero and Dionysius present Demosthenes as the most perfect exponent of artistic prose, while they denounce the Hellenistic historian and orator Hegesias as the ultimate antimodel of good taste.

- Chapter three focuses on various doctrines of three styles. At several points in their oeuvre, Cicero and Dionysius distinguish between three types of style, or stylistic registers (*genera dicendi*, χαρακτῆρες τῆς λέξεως). While Cicero divides style into a plain, intermediate and grand type, Dionysius articulates two three-style divisions, one concerning the selection of words, the other concerning the arrangement of words. Some contemporary authors also recognize three stylistic registers (Varro, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*), while others rather identify four styles (Philodemus, Demetrius).

- In chapter four, the art of skillfully combining one's words will be central. The extant sources for stylistic theory in Rome tend to attach great importance to the issue of word arrangement, or composition (*compositio verborum*, σύνθεσις τῶν ὀνομάτων). In their discussions of the topic, Cicero and Dionysius consistently focus on the aural effects of word arrangement, distinguishing between smooth sounds, that please the ear, and rough sounds, that grate the ear: it is specifically on the aesthetics of ear-grating sounds that this chapter will focus.

– Finally, chapter five revolves around the ideology of Atticism. Various surviving treatises from Rome insist that prose should be 'Attic' (*Atticus*, Ἀττικός), while unsuccessful prose is often condemned as 'Asian' (*Asianus*, *Asiaticus,* Ἀσιανός). As we will see, Atticism is not only concerned with the style of Classical Athenian prose, but it is also connected to such typically Athenian values as wisdom, moderation, freedom and democracy. Thus, by promoting Attic prose, Cicero, Dionysius and others can also make statements about contemporary ethics, politics and society.

It should be noted that the foregoing does not present an exhaustive overview of stylistic themes in the surviving rhetorical and critical treatises from Late-Republican and Augustan Rome. The list could be supplemented, for example, by such topics as the selection of words (ἐκλογὴ τῶν ὀνομάτων, *electio verborum*) and figures of speech (σχήματα; *exornationes, lumina, figurae*): after all, many ancient sources divide the topic of style in three parts—selection of words, arrangement of words and figures of speech.[39] Yet, concerning this triad, this dissertation will focus primarily on arrangement, as this was the biggest bone of contention among Greek and Roman scholars in Rome: word selection and figures of speech seem to have been less controversial topics, which will therefore not be addressed in separate chapters.[40] The same goes for the subject of stylistic virtues (ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως, *virtutes dicendi*): following Theophrastus, our Latin sources usually recognize four principal virtues (correct use of Latin/Greek, clarity, ornamentation and appropriateness), while Dionysius uses a complex system of 'essential virtues' (ἀρεταὶ ἀναγκαῖαι) and 'additional virtues' (ἀρεταὶ ἐπίθετοι). These various lists of virtues will come up on several occasions throughout this dissertation, especially in my discussion of threefold stylistic divisions (section 3.2).[41]

[39] Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 3.1 (= fr. 691 Fortenbaugh) tells us that Theophrastus enumerated three sources for grandeur: choice of words, their melodious arrangement (ἁρμονία), and figures of speech. Such threefold divisions can also be found in the treatment of style in Cic. *De or.* 3.171–212 and Quint. *Inst. orat.* books 8–9, distinguishing between ornamentation 'in individual words' (*in verbis singulis*) and 'in combinations of words' (*in verbis coniunctis*). The latter topic is further divided into word arrangement and figures of speech. Cf. also Long. *Subl.* 8.1, who lists the three topics as three separate sources for the sublime. Dionysius has not only written a monograph on the arrangement of words, but he also wrote a (lost) treatise on figures and he may have written another treatise on the selection of words: see section 1.5 n. 80 below. Finally, it should be noted that figures of speech are not always treated as a separate category: cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 59, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 1.8–11, *Thuc.* 22.1.

[40] See however e.g. sections 3.2 and 4.3.

[41] De Jonge (2014b) 328–329 offers a brief overview of ancient scholarship on stylistic virtues from Aristotle to Hermogenes; cf. Innes (1985) 255–260, who explores the contribution of Theophrastus to the theory of four

The ensuing sections will introduce the surviving Greek and Latin texts that discuss the four chief topics of stylistic theory listed above. I will begin with the principal Latin sources, that is, the rhetorical works of Cicero, the fragments and testimonies of the orator Calvus, and the fourth book of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (section 1.4). Next, I will discuss the extant works of contemporary Greek authors who worked in Rome, namely the critical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the fragments of Philodemus' *On Poems* and *On Rhetoric* as well as the fragments of Caecilius of Caleacte (section 1.5). In addition to these texts, I will occasionally use ancillary material from sources that do not strictly pertain to the issue of prose style in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome, such as Latin poetry (Lucilius) and two Greek treatises of uncertain date and origin (Demetrius' *On Style*, Longinus' *On the Sublime*).

1.4 Latin Stylistic Theory: Cicero, Calvus and *Rhetorica ad Herennium*

The rhetorical treatises of Cicero are unquestionably the most important sources for the debates about Latin prose style in the first century BC. In fact, Cicero eclipses all other Roman rhetoricians as an authority on stylistic theory, just as he eclipses all other Roman orators as a stylistic model. In this section, we will see that Cicero's rhetorical works pay close attention to all four major themes of the Greek and Roman stylistic discourse in Rome. Subsequently, we will see that these themes link Cicero's discussions to the other surviving sources on Latin prose style from the same era.

Cicero's views on prose style can mainly be found in the third book of his dialogue *De Oratore* (55 BC) and in three later rhetorical works (all 46 BC), namely his dialogue *Brutus*, his treatise *Orator* and the brief essay *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*.[42] Cicero's approach to style in *De Oratore* differs ostensibly from his treatment of the topic in the later works: while style all but monopolizes Cicero's attention in 46 BC, it is one of a myriad of topics in his *De Oratore*. In the latter text, addressed to his brother Quintus, Cicero discusses stylistic theory

---

cardinal stylistic virtues. Cic. *Orat.* 70 connects the name of Theophrastus to the fourfold scheme. For Dionysius' system, see Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 22–23 and *Pomp.* 3.8–10. Further relevant literature on the topic is listed in section 3.2.1 n. 36 below: see also ibid. table 4 for a list of essential and additional virtues in Dionysius.

[42] For the sections on stylistic theory in *De or.*, we have Leeman et al. (1996) and (2008), viz., the last two installments of the monumental five-volume commentary on *De or.* (the first four books are in German, the last one, on *De or.* 3.96–230, is in English). I have also consulted the annotated translation of May and Wisse (2001) and the commentary of Mankin (2011). For *Brut.*, I have used the German commentary of Kroll and Kytzler (1962) and the English commentary of Douglas (1966). For *Orat.*, I have used the German commentary of Kroll (1913). See also the notes to the Loeb texts of *Brut.* and *Orat*. by Hendrickson and Hubbell (1962), and *Opt. gen.* by Hubbell (1949).

from the vantage point of the orator's encyclopedic education: he not only pays due attention to all five tasks of the orator, but he also dwells extensively on the orator's philosophical training. In the third book, the dialogue's protagonist L. Licinius Crassus gives a long exposition about style, insisting that stylistic rules are null and void if they are not linked to an all-encompassing knowledge of human life and virtue.[43] The passage about style itself systematically addresses the four cardinal virtues of style—correct Latin (§3.37–48), clarity (§3.49–51), ornamentation (§3.148–209) and appropriateness (§3.210–213).[44]

Under the heading of ornamentation, *De Oratore* successively focuses on the selection of words (§3.149–170), the arrangement of words (§3.171–199) and figures of speech (§3.200–209). The second of these sections, which I have identified as one of the central topics of stylistic theory in Rome, discusses the combining of individual words, prose rhythm and periodic sentence structure. The other three central stylistic topics, on the other hand, are much less prominent in *De Oratore*. In the dialogue, Cicero pays little attention, for instance, to the selection of appropriate prose models: the effusive praise of Demosthenes, which is an integral feature of Cicero's later rhetorical works, is conspicuously absent in *De Oratore*.[45] In addition, Cicero barely touches on the doctrine of three styles nor does he distinguish between the Attic and Asian styles of oratory in *De Oratore*, although these issues are, again, core characteristics of his works of 46 BC.[46] In a word, Cicero pays close attention to word arrangement in *De Oratore*, but it is in the decade following its publication that he becomes intimately engaged with the three other chief topics of stylistic theory listed above.

Indeed, Cicero's later rhetorical works record a radically different approach to stylistic theory. The dialogue *Brutus*, to begin with, features Cicero himself as the main interlocutor, exploring the history of Roman oratory with his friends Atticus and Brutus.[47] The

[43] See esp. Cic. *De or.* 3.96–125. The protagonist is the rhetor Crassus (140–91 BC), not to be confused with his grandnephew Marcus, the triumvir Crassus. Marcus Antonius (143–87 BC), the grandfather of the triumvir Marc Antony, features as Crassus' foil. For a introduction to all interlocutors, see May and Wisse (2001) 14–15.

[44] At *De or.* 3.52–147, Cicero inserts an intermezzo in which Crassus argues that eloquence (*eloquentia*) and wisdom (*sapientia*), which have mistakenly been separated since Socrates, should in fact be united.

[45] Cic. *De or.* 1.58 and 3.71 refers to Demosthenes as a 'perfect' (*perfectus*) orator, but on the former occasion he has to share the title with Hyperides, and on the latter occasion with Pericles.

[46] Cic. *De or.* 3.177, 3.199, 3.212 briefly lists three 'types' (*figurae*) of style. Cf. section 3.2 below.

[47] The dialogue was published in 46 BC before the battle of Thapsus (April 6): see Hendrickson in Hendrickson and Hubbell (1962) 4–5. Recently, there has been a modest surge in scholarly attention for *Brut.*: see e.g. Fox (2007) 177–208 on Cicero's skeptical and ironic approach to writing the history of Roman oratory, Stroup (2010) 237–268 on Cicero's effort to shape the afterlife of *Brut.*, and Bishop (2016) on Cicero's veiled criticism

conversation starts as a lament over the death of the orator Hortensius and grows into an account of the latter's oratorical ancestors, whose stylistic attributes sometimes prompt more general discussions about style. When Cicero discusses the eloquence of the elder Cato and Calvus, for instance, he adds expositions about the true nature of Attic style and the best models of Attic prose (§63–69 and 283–297). To his treatment of Hortensius' oratory, alternatively, he adds an excursus on the properties of Asian style (§325–327). *Brutus* is the first text in recorded history that unconditionally declares Demosthenes the best orator of all time.[48] Cicero repeats his praise in the essay *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, which professes to be the introduction to Cicero's translations of the two opposing speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines in the trial of Ctesiphon; Demosthenes' speech is now commonly known as *On the Crown*.[49] In the succinct text, Cicero touches on such issues as the theory of three styles (§1–6) and the characteristics of Attic style (§7–18), occasionally adding arguments about the relative suitability of Lysias and Demosthenes as stylistic models for oratory in Rome.[50]

The treatise *Orator*, lastly, presents Cicero's fullest extant treatment of stylistic theory.[51] The text, in which the author sets out to define the ideal orator at the request of Brutus, is almost exclusively devoted to the subtleties of prose style and can be divided into

---

of Caesar. Dugan (2005) 172–250 discusses a striking irony in the dialogue: Cicero presents the history of oratory as reaching both its acme and its end in his own speeches. Guérin (2014) explores the apparent dissimilarities between Cicero's division of style in two types at *Brut.* 201 and the three-style divisions in *De or.* and *Orat.*: cf. section 3.4 below. Narducci (2002a) provides a useful overview of the dialogue's contents and context, as well as a review of the scholarly debate up to 2002.

[48] Cic. *Brut.* 35, 141, 289. On the extreme praise of Demosthenes in the first century BC, see section 2.1 n. 1.

[49] Doubts about the authenticity and date of *Opt. gen.* (e.g. Dihle (1955) 303–314 and Bringmann (1971) 256–260) have largely subsided: Berry (1996) has demonstrated how Cicero's use of prose rhythm in the text, which matches that in *Brut.* and *Orat.*, is a strong argument in favor of its authenticity. According to Ronconi (1998) 43–68, Cicero left the text in a rough state and he did not finish his translation, because he found a more challenging project in *Orat.* In addition, Marinone (2004) convincingly shows that *Opt. gen.* and *Orat.* must have been composed at roughly the same time. Indeed, as we will see on several occasions, the two works are thematically very closely related: see e.g. section 2.3.2.

[50] La Bua (2014) discusses Cicero's promotion of 'Demosthenic style' in *Opt. gen.*, paying particular attention to the example of his speech *Pro Milone* that Cicero himself adduces at *Opt. gen.* 10.

[51] *Orat.* was published briefly after *Brut.*, as is mentioned at *Orat.* 23. Recent discussions about the treatise focus on Cicero's self-fashioning: see esp. Dugan (2005) 251–314 and Bishop (2016). Dugan understands *Orat.* as the announcement of Cicero's definitive retreat from public life (esp. *Orat.* 140–148): cf. however the present section as well as section 5.5.1 below. Narducci (2002b) gives a general overview of the dialogue's structure and the main topics of discussion in modern scholarship up to 2002.

roughly two parts: the first half is primarily concerned with the doctrine of three styles (§20–139), while the second half is entirely reserved for the theory of word arrangement (§140–236). As in *De Oratore*, Cicero's discussion of word arrangement includes sections on combining individual words (§149–164), on balanced sentence structure (§164–167) and on prose rhythm (§168–236) respectively. Yet, unlike *De Oratore*, Cicero now adopts a classicizing perspective to stylistic theory: throughout his analyses, he sets out to identify the key properties of Attic and Asian oratory, and he assesses the merits of Lysias, Demosthenes, Thucydides and other Attic authors as stylistic models. Again, Demosthenes is repeatedly declared to be the best model for artistic prose.[52] In brief, *Orator* is not only Cicero's most extensive discussion of prose style that has come down to us, but it also combines all four major recurring themes of the Greek and Roman stylistic discourse. As such, *Orator* lends itself particularly well for comparison with the stylistic discussions in other sources, especially Dionysius, who, as we will see, also examines all four cardinal stylistic topics.

Before we turn to Cicero's colleagues, however, we should first dwell a little bit longer on the apparent dissimilarities between *De Oratore* on the one hand and *Brutus, Orator* and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* on the other hand: what has led Cicero to change his approach to style so drastically in the years between 55 and 46 BC? At least two major factors are at play—political circumstances and rhetorical debate.[53] First, Cicero's rhetorical works incorporate statements about contemporary Roman politics. In 55 BC, Cicero had just returned from exile to find Rome effectively ruled by the triumvirate of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus: by setting his *De Oratore* in 91 BC, just before the outbreak of the Social War and the civil war between Marius and Sulla, Cicero traces the ideal orator back to a period when speech, in his view, still wielded a formidable power in the political arena.[54] The dialogue ends on an optimistic note: Crassus (the triumvir's great-uncle) presents the young Hortensius as a brilliant new orator who may go on to fulfill all the requirements for the ideal orator that the interlocutors of *De Oratore* had stipulated in the course of their conversations.[55] Ironically or not, Cicero still declares himself hopefulabout the future of oratory.

---

[52] Cic. *Orat.* 6, 23, 26–27, 104–105, 110–111, 133.

[53] For the political aspects of Cicero's shift, see esp. Dugan (2005) 254–267 and Bishop (2016). For the influence of oratorical trends, specifically the rise of Calvus' Atticist movement, see e.g. Hendrickson (1926) 242–245, Dugan (2001) 409–413, Narducci (2002) 408–412 and Guérin (2014) 168–171.

[54] For a general discussion of the political circumstances of the composition of *De or.*, see Fantham (2004) 1–25. Cf. Dugan (2013) 31: '*De oratore* offered a nostalgic idealization of the orator.'

[55] Cic. *De or.* 3.228–230. Cf. section 5.6.1 below on Cicero's discussion of Hortensius' style.

When he returned to writing rhetorical theory nine years later, it was clear, however, that Hortensius had been unable to deliver on Crassus' prophecy: every trace of Cicero's optimism about the fate of eloquence had faded away.[56] In 46 BC, Caesar was the unmistakable master of Rome and Cicero was preoccupied with the tyrannical silencing of free speech: Cicero no longer resorts to happier days for a nostalgic idealization of the orator, bluntly stating that 'eloquence has become mute' (*eloquentia obmutuit*).[57] In his *Orator*, according to Dugan, Cicero acquiesces in the new political reality by focusing mainly on minor stylistic issues such as the intricacies of prose rhythm: 'Ambitious claims for oratory would ring hollow after the triumph of the force of Caesar's armies.'[58] Yet, as we will see in this dissertation, Cicero's rhetorical works of 46 BC are not declarations of submission but they rather reflect his preparedness to fight for his ideals (section 5.5.1). This pugnacity is especially reflected in his insistence on the superiority of Attic oratory in general and of Demosthenes in particular: Cicero underscores the importance of Athenian values such as freedom and democracy, while he casts himself as a Roman Demosthenes, rebelling against the tyranny and censorship of Caesar, who is Cicero's Philip of Macedon.[59]

The second aspect that can explain the shift in Cicero's approach to stylistic theory is the rise to fame of a group of Roman orators, who called themselves 'Attic' (*Attici*). Cicero does not refer to these self-styled Atticists in *De Oratore*, but they feature prominently in his rhetorical works of 46 BC. It is not clear when exactly these orators were active, but the movement seems to have been centered around the orator (and neoteric poet) C. Licinius Macer Calvus, the only name that can be connected beyond doubt to the Atticist movement (section 5.2).[60] The record of Calvus' activities is limited to the period between 56 and 54 BC;

---

[56] Cf. Dugan (2013) 35: 'The idealism of *De oratore*'s investigation of the ideal orator meets with the hard facts of history.' Dugan shows that *Brut.* takes the form of a *laudatio funebris*, not only for Hortensius, but also for the art of eloquence in Rome. On the evolution of Cicero's opinion of Hortensius ('from rivals into partners'), see Dyck (2008). Cf. section 5.6.1 on the role that Hortensius played in the stylistic debates in Rome in the 50s BC.

[57] Cic. *Brut.* 22.

[58] Dugan (2013) 38. Cf. Dugan (2005) 253–267.

[59] Cf. Bishop (2016) 190: 'The comparison Cicero drew between Rome under Caesar and Demosthenes' Athens allowed him to get a pointed political message across: Caesar had put an end to Roman oratory, just as Philip and Alexander had stifled and eventually silenced Athenian free speech.' In section 5.5.1 below, we will see that it is Cicero's mission to succeed where Demosthenes had ultimately failed, that is, to salvage democratic eloquence.

[60] See section 5.2 below on the origins and the nature of Atticism, which has attracted a vast amount of secondary literature in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. As we will see, modern scholarship on Atticism is fraught with misconceptions: with Whitmarsh (1996), I will argue that Atticism was a 'malleable'

he probably died not much later, certainly no later 47 BC.[61] Two years later, in the summer of 45 BC, Cicero proudly reports that, after the death of their leader, the self-styled Atticists 'have fallen silent' (*conticuerunt*), as they were 'almost jeered out of the Forum' (*paene ab ipso foro irrisi*).[62] To summarize, in 55 BC Cicero apparently does not yet consider the views of the Atticists worthy of a lengthy refutation, and in 45 BC Cicero no longer considers them an important factor in the public life of Rome: it is fair to assume, therefore, that the peak of their activities lies sometime in the intervening decennium.

In his *Brutus* and *Orator*, Cicero defends himself against the attacks that Calvus and the so-called Atticists launched against his oratory. Calvus insisted that only speeches that are frugal and devoid of lavish ornamentation are deserving of the title 'Attic'; he considered Cicero's extravagant, passionate rhetoric, conversely, quintessentially un-Attic and even 'Asian' (section 5.6.1). Naturally, Cicero does not agree with that assessment: he goes to great lengths to show that Calvus 'was in error and caused others to err with him'.[63] Thus, Calvus' opinions about prose style are crucial for our understanding of Cicero's approach to stylistic theory in his rhetorical works of 46 BC. At the same time, these works are the most important surviving sources of the stylistic views of Calvus. From Cicero's hostile account and several less scathing later sources, we know that Calvus dealt with all four main themes of the stylistic discourse in Rome:[64] favoring the simple rhetoric of Lysias, he was not only involved in the debates about the nature and models of Attic oratory (sections 5.2 and 5.6), but his views also pertain to the theory of stylistic registers (section 3.4) and word arrangement (sections 4.2 and 4.5). Hence, we should understand Calvus not merely as a foil to Cicero, but also as an important participant in the stylistic discourse in Rome.

---

construct that could be adapted to suit specific purposes. For the historical problems surrounding Calvus and his group of Roman Atticists, see esp. Bowersock (1979) 59–65 and Wisse (1995) 67–69.

[61] See esp. Münzer (1926) 428–436, cf. section 5.6 n. 118 below. Calvus is spoken of as dead in Cic. *Brut.* 283–284 (early 46) and *Fam.* 15.21.4 (december 46). According to Douglas (1966) xiii, Calvus died in 47 BC. The consensus, however, is that he died in 54 or 53 BC: see Münzer (1926) 433, Shackleton Bailey (1977) 428–429, Bowersock (1979) 61 and Wisse (1995) 68–69. The most important reason for this date is, in the words of Münzer: 'Ein Mann mit seinen Fähigkeiten und Leidenschaften, Erfolgen und Aussichten wäre in den nächsten, an Ereignissen reichen und bis in zahllose Einzelheiten wohlbekannten Jahren nicht von der Bühne des öffentlichen Lebens gänzlich verschwunden, wenn er das J. 54 noch längere Zeit überlebt hätte.'

[62] Cic. *Tusc.* 2.3.

[63] Cic. *Brut.* 284: *Et ipse errabat et alios etiam errare cogebat.*

[64] The main sources for Calvus' views of style are Cic. *Brut.* 283–284, Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.6, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.1, 12.1.22, 12.10.12–14 and Tac. *Dial.* 18.4–5, 21.1–2.

A third major Latin voice in the discourse about prose style is the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which draws on a similar stylistic framework as Cicero and Calvus. Although date and authorship of the four-volume treatise are still somewhat controversial, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is generally assumed to have been written by an unknown author in the mid- to late 80s of the first century BC.[65] The discussion of style, which covers the entire fourth book, begins with a long preface (§4.1–10), in which the author censures Greek authors of rhetorical handbooks for not using their own examples to illustrate stylistic principles, but instead drawing examples from famous orators and poets.[66] Next, the author divides the topic of style in two parts: he first explores the three types of style and the corresponding faulty types (§4.11–16), adding self-written passages to illustrate each of them, and subsequently he expounds the crucial qualities of style, including correct Latin and clarity (§4.17), the proper arrangement of words (§4.18) and figures of speech (§4.19–69).[67] Thus, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* exhibits two recurring leitmotivs of the Greek and Roman stylistic discourse—the three styles and the theory of word arrangement.

As we will see, there are several other Latin sources from Late-Republican and Augustan Rome that can shed some light on the four main themes of contemporary stylistic theory. M. Terentius Varro (116–27 BC), for instance, appears to have used a threefold stylistic division and he was aware of the theory of euphonious word arrangement.[68] Additionally, the satirist Lucilius (latter half second century BC)[69] also refers to the art of

[65] The work cannot be older than 86 BC, as the author mentions Marius' seventh consulship and his death in January of that year (*Rhet. Her.* 4.68). There is no obvious *terminus ante quem*, but a date in the mid- or late 80s seems the most plausible on account of (1) the many references in the work to events that took place in that period and (2) the similarities between the work and Cicero's *On Invention*, which can be more securely dated to the mid- or early 80s: see e.g. Caplan (1954) xxvi, Adamietz (1960), Achard (1985) and Gaines (2007) 174–177. Still, several scholars have made arguments that *Rhet. Her.* was published a decade or more later: see e.g. Douglas (1973) and Winkel (1979). Some attribute the anonymous work to a certain Cornificius, who is only known to us through a number of remarks in Quintilian: see e.g. Calboli (1969) 3–11. Yet, the evidence is slight, as is shown by Achard (1989) ix-x. Calboli (1969) offers a commentary to the text.

[66] On the author's (inconsistent) approach to using examples, see Calboli (1969) 46–50.

[67] The author treats these topics under three headings: first 'taste' (*elegantia*), which includes correct Latin and clarity, secondly 'arrangement' (*conpositio*) and thirdly 'distinction' (*dignitas*), which discusses figures of speech. These categories correspond to three traditional virtues of style (correct Latin, clarity and ornamentation)—the fourth (appropriateness) is lacking: see Calboli (1969) 301–303.

[68] For Varro's division of three styles, see section 3.3 below. For his views on euphony, see section 4.4 n. 76.

[69] For a good discussion of the date of Lucilius' birth and death, see Herbert-Brown (1999), who follows the dates given at Jer. *Chron.* 143e and 148e, that is, 148–103 BC.

word arrangement (section 4.2), as does the Augustan poet Horace (65–8 BC), although the latter's views will not be discussed at length in this study.[70] Concerning the notions of Attic and Asian style, to conclude, I will also turn to Suetonius' report on the oratorical style of the emperor Augustus (63 BC–14 AD), whose sensitivity to the intricacies of prose style suggests a close familiarity with the works of contemporary critics and rhetoricians (section 5.5.2).

1.5 Greek Stylistic Theory in Rome: Dionysius, Caecilius and Philodemus

The extant Greek texts on prose style can be linked to contemporary Latin works, listed in the previous section, through the aforementioned main themes of stylistic theory (section 1.3). The present section introduces the three Greek protagonists in the record of the stylistic discourse in Rome: I will mainly focus on the large corpus of critical treatises by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but I will also touch on the surviving bits and scraps from the works of Caecilius of Caleacte, and the ever-expanding number of fragments of Philodemus of Gadara. Finally, I will briefly discuss Demetrius' *On Style* and Longinus' *On the Sublime*, that do not (necessarily) originate in Rome, but that nonetheless provide illuminating parallels to the (other) Greek and Latin texts from the city.

The vast legacy of Dionysius' critical treatises, often referred to as his 'essays', not only contains invaluable information about ancient stylistic theory, but also about the interrelations between Greek and Roman scholars in Rome. There is no way of knowing when exactly Dionysius published his various critical treatises, but their chronological order can be partly reconstructed: in several passages, Dionysius refers to other works that he has already published.[71] On the basis of Dionysius' explicit remarks, it is generally accepted that he published his oeuvre in three phases, which represent distinct stages in the evolution of his critical methods: several modern scholars have established that Dionysius' later works exhibit more sophisticated methods and a larger apparatus of technical vocabulary than his earlier works.[72] It is possible that the Greek teacher gradually became more acquainted with various

[70] Chapter 4 focuses on the musical-aesthetic approach to word arrangement: Hor. *Ars. p.* 46–48 and 240–243, however, refers not to tone and rhythm, but to syntax and semantics. See section 4.1 n. 4. For good discussions of the similarities between Hor. and Dion. Hal. *Comp.*, see Hunter (2009) 126–167 and De Jonge (2019).

[71] On the chronological order of Dionysius' works, see esp. Bonner (1939) 25–38 and De Jonge (2008) 20–23, who offers an extensive bibliography up to 2008.

[72] See esp. Bonner (1939) and Lebel (1973). Schenkeveld (1975a) considers Dionysius' evaluative methods incoherent, but his view is challenged by Damon (1991), who concludes that the critic's methods are coherent but incomplete, arguing that we should take the relative order of his works into account. Porter (2016) 221 posits

grammatical, philosophical and literary doctrines during his stay in Rome: his contacts with the many Greek and Roman scholars in Augustan Rome may have played an important role in the development of his knowledge.[73] By exploring his extant critical works and his known relationships with various Greek and Roman colleagues in Rome, we can partly reconstruct Dionysius' network and intended audience.

Twelve of Dionysius' critical essays have come down to us.[74] The early phase consists of the treatises *On Imitation* (which partially survives in fragments and an epitome)[75] and the first part of *On the Ancient Orators* (which was intended to comprise six separate essays on individual Attic orators),[76] including the famous preface and the essays *On Lysias, On Isocrates* and *On Isaeus*.[77] The works of the middle period are *On Demosthenes* (which belongs to the second part of *On the Ancient Orators*), *On the Arrangement of Words* (also known as *On Composition*), the *Letter to Pompeius* (on Plato and the historians) and the *First Letter to Ammaeus* (on the claim that Demosthenes was influenced by Aristotle's *On Rhetoric*).[78] The later essays, finally, are *On Thucydides*, the *Second Letter to Ammaeus* (which is an appendix to *On Thucydides*) and *On Dinarchus.*[79] The treatises *On Figures* and

---

that modern scholars are too worried about issues of consistency, arguing that Dionysius never meant his categories to be taken 'in a hard-and-fast way' and that 'the various surface inconsistencies in Dionysius' theory and evaluative practice are best explained by the provisional nature of his schemas'.

[73] This has been suggested by Schenkeveld (1983) 69 and De Jonge (2008) 33–34.

[74] All surviving critical essays have been edited, with notes, in five Budé volumes: Aujac (1978), (1988), (1991), (1992), Aujac and Lebel (1981). I have also used the notes in the two Loeb editions: Usher (1974) and (1985).

[75] Battisti (1997) offers a critical edition, with Italian translation and commentary, of *Imit.* See now also Schippers (2019), who explores the discourse on imitation in Early-Imperial Rome, comparing Dionysius' views on the topic in *On Imitation* to other Greek and Latin discussions of the topic, e.g. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 10.

[76] In *Ant. orat.* 4.5, Dionysius announces that he will write essays on three orators 'from the older generation' (ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων), namely Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, all of which survive. He also refers to a second set of essays on three orators 'from the those who flourished after these' (ἐκ τῶν ἐπακμασάντων τούτοις), that is, Demosthenes, Hyperides and Aeschines. Only a treatise on Demosthenes survives.

[77] Hidber (1996) provides an introduction and commentary to the preface of *Ant. orat.*

[78] Ronnet (1952) provides a commentary in French on *Dem.* Van Wyk Cronjé (1984) focuses on the purpose of *Dem.*, its place within *Ant. orat.* and its chronological relation with *Comp.* For *Comp.*, we have three editions with introductions, translations and notes: in English Roberts (1910), in French Aujac and Lebel (1981), and in Italian Donadi and Marchiori (2013). See also Pohl (1968), who focuses on the theory of three types of word arrangement (*Comp.* 21–24). Roberts (1901) provides an edition, with introduction, translation and notes, of Dionysius' three extant literary letters. Fornaro (1997) offers an Italian introduction and commentary to *Pomp.*

[79] See the commentaries of Pavano (1958) and Pritchett (1975) on *Thuc.*, Marenghi (1971) on *Din.* and Roberts (1901) on *Amm. II.*

On Political Philosophy do not survive; it is doubtful if Dionysius ever wrote the essays *On Hyperides*, *On Aeschines* and *On the Selection of Words.*[80] In his surviving works, Dionysius occasionally devotes some attention to the first two tasks of the orator, i.e., invention and disposition, but on the whole he overwhelmingly focuses on style.

The four major themes in the stylistic discourse in Rome all receive ample discussion in Dionysius' critical works. The list of titles already makes it abundantly clear, for instance, that the selection of models is a prominent issue in Dionysius' approach to style: he not only presents an annotated reading list of Classical Greek literature in *On Imitation*, but he also addresses the stylistic features of Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, Thucydides and Dinarchus in eponymous treatises. Like Cicero, Dionysius argues that Demosthenes is the most perfect exponent of artistic prose.[81] Next, one cannot fail to notice Dionysius' obsession with Attic prose: with the exception of Herodotus, Dionysius only discusses orators, historians and philosophers from Classical Athens, who composed their works in the Attic dialect.[82] The preface to *On the Ancient Orators* is particularly relevant for our understanding of Dionysius' Atticism.[83] In the brief essay, Dionysius expresses his gratitude to the rulers of Rome for restoring the 'Attic muse' (Ἀττικὴ μοῦσα) to her former glory.[84] As we will see, Dionysius' version of the history of rhetoric and style from Classical Athens up to contemporary Rome is remarkably similar to the one that Cicero and other Greek and Roman authors offer (section 1.6).

In addition to the early essays of *On the Ancient Orators*, this dissertation will focus especially on two works from Dionysius' middle period, viz., *On Demosthenes* and *On the Arrangement of Words*. These works were composed at roughly the same time: in the latter

---

[80] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.3.89 refers to Dionysius' *On Figures*. Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 2.3 mentions his work *On Political Philosophy* (Ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτικῆς φιλοσοφίας), which he had already published. Dionysius announces the composition of *On Hyperides, On Aeschines* (at *Ant. orat.* 4.5), and *On the Selection of Words* (at *Comp.* 1.10), but there is no proof that he actually proceeded to write these treatises. The *Ars Rhetorica* that has survived under Dionysius' name is spurious: see Russell (1979) and Heath (2003).

[81] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 8.2–4, 14.1, 33.1, 33.4.

[82] Note that Dionysius converts the passages from Herodotus that he quotes into the Attic dialect: see *Comp.* 4.8, *Dem.* 41.2. See Usher (1974) 398–399: 'Herodotus was something of an embarrassment to Dionysius' and 'he could never be a satisfactory model because he wrote in the Ionic dialect'. Cf. section 1.6 n. 124 below.

[83] The preface has been called 'the manifesto of classicism' ('das klassizistische Manifest') by Hidber (1996). Goudriaan (1989) regards the text as 'the manifesto of Atticism' ('het atticistische manifest'). For the relationship between the terms classicism and Atticism, see section 1.6 n. 120 below.

[84] *Ant. orat.* 3.1. For a more detailed discussion of Dionysius' praise of Rome, see section 5.5.2 below.

part of *On Demosthenes,* Dionysius mentions *On the Arrangement of Words*, while he refers to a passage from *On Demosthenes* in the first part of *On the Arrangement of Words*.[85] Therefore, most scholars agree that Dionysius interrupted his work on *On Demosthenes* in order to write *On the Arrangement of Words*: in this view, the latter work was published between two separate tranches of *On Demosthenes*.[86] In any case, the two treatises not only originate in the same period, but they are also thematically connected. There are at least two important parallels: both treatises feature threefold stylistic divisions and lengthy discussions of word arrangement. Thus, these texts are extremely valuable for the purposes of this dissertation, as they can be readily compared to Cicero's *Orator*, which, as we have seen in the previous section, also focuses on the three styles and the theory of word arrangement.

As we will see (section 3.2), Dionysius actually expounds two divisions of three styles —the 'types of diction' (χαρακτῆρες τῆς λέξεως) and the 'types of arrangement' (χαρακτῆρες τῆς συνθέσεως). The former division, which is mainly concerned with the selection of words, plays a major role in the first half of *On Demosthenes* (§1–34). The other threefold division, which concerns word arrangement, can be found in the second half of *On Demosthenes* (§35–52) and in *On the Arrangement of Words* (§21–24). The latter treatise is the only surviving work from Antiquity that is exclusively devoted to the subject of word arrangement: it systematically discusses the nature and force of word arrangement (§2–5), the activities required of the author (§6–9), the aims of word arrangement and the means of attaining them (§10–20), the three types of arrangement (§21–24) and the connections between prose and poetry (§25–26). The treatise combines a wide knowledge of various disciplines, including grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, music and meter. In addition, Dionysius applies the various doctrines of word arrangement to prose as well as poetry, not only quoting passages from oratory and history, but also from lyric (Pindar, Sappho, Simonides), drama (Sophocles, Eurpides, Aristophanes) and epic (Homer). Hence, *On the Arrangement of Words* is rightly considered Dionysius' most original contribution to the canon of ancient rhetorical theory.[87]

---

[85] In *Dem.* 49.2 and again in *Dem.* 50.10, Dionysius refers his readers, who want te learn more about the topic of arrangement, to *Comp.* In *Comp.* 18.14, conversely, Dionysius cuts his criticism of Plato's diction short, because he has given a clear exposition of the topic 'elsewhere' (ἑτέρωθι): this must be taken to refer to *Dem.* 5–7, where Dionysius exposes the errors of Plato's diction. Cf. Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) 97–99.

[86] Opinions differ on the precise sequence of publications: see De Jonge (2008) 22–23 for a comprehensive overview of the debate. For the purposes of this dissertation it suffices to know that both *Dem.* and *Comp.* were written in roughly the same period.

[87] See esp. De Jonge (2008) 41–42.

We have seen that Dionysius pays due attention to the four hottest issues in the discourse on style in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome. Interestingly, he dedicates his essays to both Greek and Roman intellectuals: these contacts are members of Dionysius' 'network' in Rome.[88] Some of the addressees of his works are only known to us through Dionysius: the Greek Demetrius, for example, to whom Dionysius dedicated his treatise *On Imitation*, cannot be identified.[89] The same goes for Ammaeus, the addressee of two extant letters as well as the multivolume project *On the Ancient Orators*, and Pompeius Geminus, who also received a literary letter: we cannot even be sure if Ammaeus and Pompeius were Greek or Roman.[90] We are on firmer ground with the two other known addressees of Dionysius' work: we know, for instance, that the young Roman aristocrat Metilius Rufus, who received *On the Arrangement of Words* as a birthday gift, went on to become proconsul of Achaea.[91] The work *On Thucydides*, lastly, was dedicated to Q. Aelius Tubero, a historian and lawyer, whose two sons both rose to the rank of consul.[92] As noted above (section 1.2),

[88] We know the names of several of Dionysius' contacts in Rome. Roberts (1900) and Hidber (1996) have described these contacts as members of a 'circle', but Wisse (1998) rightly objects that this term might wrongly suggest a 'tightly knit group', for which there is no evidence in the case of Dionysius and his contacts. Wisse (1995) 78–80 rather uses the more apt word 'network', allowing for 'many contacts, of various sorts and varying intensity, between numerous Greek and Roman intellectuals'; cf. De Jonge (2008) 26 n. 134 and De Jonge and Hunter (2019) 8–9. Wiater (2011) 22–29 uses social identity theory to analyze Dionysius' network, describing it as an 'elite community of classicists'.

[89] Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 3.1, 3.20. The argument of Goold (1961) 178–189 that this man is the same Demetrius as the one who composed *Eloc.* is unconvincing: cf. n. 106 below.

[90] For the dedications to Ammaeus, see Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.1, *Amm. I* 1.1, *Amm. II* 1.1. At *Pomp.* 1.1, Dionysius tells us that Pompeius received copies of Dionysius' treatises through their 'mutual friend Zeno' (Ζήνων ὁ κοινὸς φίλος): this suggests that Pompeius was not one of Dionysius' closer associates and that he was not necessarily in Rome with Dionysius. De Jonge (2008) 27 collects the various hypotheses that have been put forward about the identity of Pompeius. Cf. Hidber (1996) 7 n. 50 on the possibility that Pompeius was a Roman. We have no information about the aforementioned Zeno.

[91] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 1.4. Dionysius calls Rufus 'son of a good father who is my most esteemed friend' (πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ κἀμοὶ τιμιωτάτου φίλων). In addition to the fact that Dionysius includes the Metilii in his list of Alban leaders (*Ant. Rom.* 3.29.7), this may imply that Rufus' father acted as Dionysius' patron. Bowersock (1965) 132 n. 2 identifies Rufus with the Metilius who became proconsul of Achaea and perhaps legate of Galatia. Dionysius offers *Comp.* to Rufus 'as he is celebrating the first birthday of his manhood' (πρώτην ἡμέραν ἄγοντι ταυτηνὶ γενέθλιον). Weaire (2012) studies Dionysius' strategies as a Greek teacher of a Roman student in *Comp.*

[92] Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 1.1, cf. *Amm. II* 1.1. In *Ant. Rom.* 1.80.1, Dionysius mentions Tubero's historical work. See Bowersock (1965) 130 and Bowersock (1979) 68–69. De Jonge (2008) 28 is reluctant to accept Bowersock's thesis that Tubero was Dionysius' 'patron'.

Cicero knew both Tuberones (son Quintus as well as father Lucius), which makes it all the more plausible that Dionysius was (directly or indirectly) familiar with Cicero's works.

It seems, then, that Dionysius intended his critical works to be read by all civilized men, Greeks and Romans alike.[93] Hence, it is appropriate that he is often described as an author standing between Greece and Rome.[94] A similar picture emerges from his *Roman Antiquities*, in which he emphasizes the connections between Greek culture and the early Romans.[95] In the first book of his history, Dionysius claims that he learnt Latin and that he read the works of various Roman historians, including Varro.[96] For the present study of Greek and Roman stylistic theory, I take away two crucial points. First, Dionysius employs an apparatus of theories, techniques and terminology that was widely used by Greek as well as Roman scholars in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome. Secondly, Dionysius was actively involved in the public life of the city and had ample opportunity to exchange ideas and doctrines with his colleagues. On these two accounts, Dionysius' critical essays lend plausibility to my thesis that Greek and Roman scholars in Rome not only participated in a shared stylistic discourse, but that they were also engaged in a mutual dialogue about the style of artistic prose.

To the list of Dionysius' known acquaintances we should add the name of the Sicilian rhetorician Caecilius of Caleacte (fl. Augustan era), whom Dionysius calls a 'very dear friend'.[97] According to the *Suda*, Caecilius was a 'Jew clever in Greek matters', who taught rhetoric in Rome and composed numerous treatises: he was not only acquainted to Dionysius,

[93] On the intended audience of Dionysius' critical works, see De Jonge (2008) 23–25. In most cases he seems to write for scholars who are already well-versed in the study of rhetoric: cf. *Dem.* 46.4, *Thuc.* 25.2. The only exception is *Comp.*, which is primarily addressed to his young pupil Metilius Rufus, but which also caters more generally 'for young men and those who are just beginning to take up their study' (τοῖς μειρακίοις τε καὶ νεωστὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ἁπτομένοις ὑμῖν).

[94] E.g. Luraghi (2003): 'Dionysios von Halikarnassos zwischen Griechen und Römern'. See also De Jonge and Hunter (2019) 2: 'A writer positioned between Greece and Rome'.

[95] We should note that there is a vehement debate about the intended audience of his *Ant. Rom.*: see De Jonge and Hunter (2019) 31–33. Wiater (2011) 118 argues that Dionysius intended to separate Greek and Roman audiences, perhaps even provoking his Roman readers: cf. the review in De Jonge (2012b), who rightly emphasizes 'the bridge that Dionysius builds between Greeks and Romans'.

[96] See *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2, 1.7.3. In *Ant. Rom.* 1.14.1, he mentions Varro's work *Antiquities* (Ἀρχαιολογίαι).

[97] Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 3.20 (= T36 Woerther = XIV 163 Ofenloch): τῷ φιλτάτῳ Καικιλίῳ. Tolkiehn (1908) points out that the word φίλτατος is rarely used in Dionysius' work and that it hence signifies a close connection with Caecilius. On the faulty dating of Caecilius by Wilamowitz (1900) 15 and Nassal (1910) 9, see section 1.2 n. 12 above.

but also to the rhetoricians Hermagoras of Temnus and Timagenes of Alexandria, who both taught rhetoric in Rome.[98] Although only a few fragments and some titles survive, it is obvious that Caecilius took a special interest in Attic oratory and its models, i.e., two of the four central themes of the stylistic discourse in Rome.[99] He wrote the (lost) works *On the Stylistic Character of the Ten Orators*, *On Lysias* and *On Demosthenes* as well as a *Comparison between Demosthenes and Aeschines* and a *Comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero*: Caecilius is known to have criticized Plato and to have praised Lysias and Demosthenes, while his discussion of Cicero shows that his interest was not limited to Greek literature alone.[100] Among his other known works are treatises entitled *How the Attic and Asian Styles Differ* and *Against the Phrygians*, which probably was an alphabetically arranged lexicon of 'Asian' diction.[101] Even from this incomplete overview of Caecilius' lost works, it

[98] *Suda* κ 1165: Ἰουδαῖος σοφὸς τὰ Ἑλληνικά (= T1 Woerther). The text gives us Archagathus as his original name and notes that he may have been of servile parentage. Roberts (1897) gives a good summary of the available evidence for Caecilius' activities. For the association with Hermagoras and Timagenes, see *Suda* ε 3024 and τ 588 (T2–3 Woerther), and Woerther (2015) 49–50.

[99] The three subsequent editors of Caecilius have become increasingly hesitant in attributing fragments and testimonies to him: the standard edition of Ofenloch (1907) adopts the most inclusive approach, allowing various texts that do not mention Caecilius by name as sources for his works. Augello (2006), conversely, only includes texts that explicitly refer to Caecilius, while Woerther (2013) is even more rigorous in avoiding spurious or dubious attributions to the rhetorician. Recent discussions of Caecilius' stylistic views focus on his role in the creation of canons of writers (see section 2.3 n. 34 below) and on his conception of sublime literature, for which see esp. Innes (2002) and Porter (2016) 184–195.

[100] *Suda* κ 1165 (= T1 Woerther): Περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων, Περὶ Δημοσθένους, Σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Αἰσχίνου, and Σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος. For 'his work in defence of Lysias' (τὰ ὑπὲρ Λυσίου), see Long. *Subl.* 32.8: 'While he loves Lysias more than he loves himself, he hates Plato more than he loves Lysias' (φιλῶν γὰρ τὸν Λυσίαν ὡς οὐδ' αὐτὸς αὑτόν, ὅμως μᾶλλον μισεῖ Πλάτωνα ἢ Λυσίαν φιλεῖ). Yet, Caecilius also criticized Lysias: cf. T44 Woerther = VII 110 Ofenloch. Anastassiou (1966) 33–34 saw that it is impossible to ascertain Caecilius' preferred model; Innes (2002) 276–288 thinks that he favored Demosthenes; Porter (2016) 189–193 speculates that he attached himself in particular to Aeschines. The method of comparing two or more authors (σύγκρισις) was also a favorite method of Dionysius (*Pomp.* 1.6–8): see Focke (1923), Vardi (1996) and De Jonge (2018b) for the importance of this critical method, cf. also section 2.3.1 n. 42 below.

[101] *Suda* κ 1165 (= T1 Woerther): Τίνι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ζῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ and Κατὰ Φρυγῶν. About the latter, *Suda* informs us that it is 'alphabetically arranged' (κατὰ στοιχεῖον). The next book on *Suda*'s list is *Demonstration that Every Word of Elegant Language has Been Spoken* (Ἀπόδειξις τοῦ εἰρῆσθαι πᾶσαν λέξιν καλλιρρημοσύνης), also alphabetically arranged: this may have been a lexicon of Attic vocabulary, a counterpart of *Against the Phrygians.* For Phrygia as a symbol of Asianism in Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.7 and Cic. *Orat.* 25, see section 1.2 n. 36 above.

is clear that the rhetorician was actively involved in the debate about the Attic and Asian styles of oratory, and that he took an interest in both Classical Greek and recent Latin literature: in these respects, he stands on equal footing with his friend Dionysius, but also with his Roman predecessors Cicero and Calvus.[102]

For the third major Greek source of stylistic theory in Rome, we must go back in time from the Augustan to the Republican era, to the versatile Epicurean philosopher and epigrammatist Philodemus of Gadara (ca. 110–after 40 BC), who was active in Rome and Herculaneum from the mid-70s onwards.[103] His works are now gradually being recovered from the carbonized papyrus scrolls that were found in the 'Villa dei Papiri' in Herculaneum. Philodemus' aesthetic works are particularly relevant to us because of their extensive discussions of word arrangement: the topic features in some surviving bits and pieces of *On Rhetoric* and, more prominently, in the fragments of the five-book treatise *On Poems*.[104] The latter work can be read as a passionate diatribe against Crates of Mallos and various Hellenistic critics (now standardly referred to as οἱ κριτικοί), who stressed the importance of euphony and word arrangement in the evaluation of poetry.[105] Additionally, *On Poems* is also relevant to the evaluation of prose: after all, as Cicero and Dionysius assert, both poetry and prose apply tone and rhythm in the arrangement of words (section 4.5). Finally, we should note that Philodemus associated himself with various prominent Romans during his stay in

[102] We should also mention Caecilius' *On Figures* (cf. T13–27 Woerther = IV Ofenloch), which yielded the most citations in later sources, and *On the Sublime* (cf. T28–31 Woerther = V Ofenloch), to which Longinus reacts in his treatise by the same name (see the present section below), and which is linked to the doctrine of stylistic registers, as we will see in section 3.2 below.

[103] The available information about Philodemus' life is summarized by Janko (2000) 4–7. The date of his death is somewhat ambiguous: the *terminus post quem* is 40 BC, as Philodemus (*On Signs* 3 col. 2,18) refers to the pygmees that Marc Antony brough to Rome in that year. Philodemus probably died sometime in the 30s BC.

[104] The international 'Philodemus project', led by David Blank, Richard Janko and Dirk Obbink, gradually publishes Philodemus' aesthetic texts, with translations and notes. Thus far, *Poem.* 1 and *Poem.* 3–4 have come out: Janko (2000) and Janko (2011). Volumes containing *Poem.* 5 (Armstrong, Porter, Fish and Mangoni), *Rhet.* 1–2 (Blank), *Rhet.* 3 (Blank) and *Rhet.* 8 (Obbink and Hammerstaedt) are being prepared. For *Poem.* 5 we may consult the edition of Mangoni (1993) with the translation of Armstrong (1995b). The standard edition for *Rhet.* is Sudhaus (1892–1896), on which Hubbell (1920) bases his partial translation. Large sections of Sudhaus' edition (and the book order that he adopted) have now been replaced: see Longo Auricchio (1977) for *Rhet.* 1–2 and Hammerstaedt (1992) for *Rhet.* 3.

[105] Modern scholars on ancient literary criticism usually study the text of *Poem.* for the views of οἱ κριτικοί and the so-called 'euphonist tradition' to which they are reckoned to belong: see esp. Schenkeveld (1968), Porter (1995), Janko (2000) and section 4.1 below.

Italy: Cicero praises his learning, he was a protégé of Caesar's father-in-law L. Calpurnius Piso Caesonius and he knew several famous Latin poets, including Virgil and perhaps also Horace.[106]

To conclude this section about the Greek sources for stylistic theory, we should mention two works that cannot be unequivocally connected to Late-Republican and Augustan Rome. The first is the treatise *On Style* by a certain Demetrius (perhaps second or early first century BC),[107] which is thematically linked to the discourse on prose style in Rome: the author recognizes four types of style, which he distinguishes according to the criteria of substance, selection of words and arrangement of words. The work includes several passages on euphony, rhythm and periodic sentence structure (esp. §1–35, 38–74, 179–184, 204–208 and 241–271).[108] The last work to be discussed is *On the Sublime* by an unknown author, who is conventionally called (pseudo-)Longinus (perhaps first century AD).[109] This work takes the form of a polemic against the 'little treatise' on the same topic by Caecilius of Caleacte.[110]

[106] For Cicero's references to Philodemus, see *Pis* 68–72 and *Fin.* 2.119. In the former text, Cicero tells us that Philodemus was Piso's constant companion (cf. Asc. *Pis.* 68). Philodemus also knew the consul C. Vibius Pansa Caetronius, to whom he dedicated *Rhet.* 4. He was a friend of Siro, in whose Neapolitan house Virgil studied Epicurean philosophy; Philodemus dedicated his work *On Vices and Virtues* to Virgil and the young poets P. Quinctilius Varus, L. Varius Rufus and Plotius Tucca. Horace cites an epigram of Philodemus at *Serm.* 1.2.121, but it is uncertain if the two men ever met: the case for direct contact is convincingly presented by Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995) 235–236. For the influence of Philodemus on Horace, see also Brink (1963) 43–152.

[107] For good recent discussions on the date of *Eloc.* (περὶ ἑρμηνείας), see Innes in Halliwell et al. (1995) 310–321 and, more concisely, De Jonge (2009). While Grube (1961) has an earlier date (ca. 270 BC) and Marini (2007), following earlier scholarship, proposes a later date (first century AD), there is growing consensus that the work belongs to the second or early first century BC: see esp. Chiron (1993) and Innes in Halliwell et al. (1995). Schenkeveld (1964) 135–148 thinks that *Eloc.* is a reworking from the first century AD of material reflecting the second or early first century BC; Schenkeveld (2000), however, places the work firmly in the first century BC.

[108] I have consulted the rich commentary of Marini (2007) as well as the notes of Roberts (1902) and Chiron (1993). Schenkeveld (1964) contains valuable studies of Demetrius' stylistic theories.

[109] The name Longinus comes from the only manuscript for *Subl.*, which has Διονυσίου Λογγίνου in its title and Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου in the table of contents. For a brief overview of the controversy about authorship and date, see Russell in Halliwell et al. (1995) 145–148. Whereas Heath (1999) thinks that the work was written by Cassius Longinus in the third century AD, most scholars nowadays put it in the mid- to late first century AD: see esp. Russell (1964) xxii-xxx, Häussler (1995) and Innes (2002) 259. According to Goold (1961), Mazzucchi (2010) and De Jonge (2014a), the treatise might even belong to the Augustan era.

[110] Long. *Subl.* 1.1: 'The little treatise by Caecilius, which he wrote on the sublime' (τὸ τοῦ Καικιλίου συγγραμμάτιον, ὃ περὶ ὕψους συνετάξατο). I have used the commentaries of Russel (1964) and Mazzucchi (2010) on *Subl.*

The author addresses various issues that will sound familiar to the readers of Cicero and Dionysius: *On the Sublime* not only pays much attention to such Attic authors as Plato and Demosthenes, comparing the latter to Cicero (§12), but it also includes sections on the procedure of imitating these sublime models (§13–14) and on the topic of word arrangement (§39–42), which the author declares to be one of the five principal sources of sublimity in poetry and prose: he claims to have written a separate two-book treatise on the topic.[111] In this dissertation, both *On Style* and *On the Sublime* will provide illuminating parallels to the material from Cicero, Dionysius and their Greek and Roman colleagues in Rome.

1.6 Athens into Rome: the Shared Classicism of Cicero and Dionysius

Having established not only the capital themes of stylistic theory in Rome (section 1.3), but also the relevant Greek and Latin sources on these recurring topics (sections 1.4 and 1.5), I will no cursorily explore the classicism that underlies the shared discourse on prose style in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome: the topic of classicism merits a separate discussion in this introductory chapter, as it pertains to our understanding of the dialogue between Greeks and Romans in the city. The present section will show that Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues, despite their obvious differences, adopt broadly the same approach to the history of Greek oratory and the study thereof in contemporary Rome. In a word, they exhibit similar conceptions of classicism.

There exists no comprehensive, unambiguous definition of the term 'classical': it can nowadays be used to describe anything from Homer's poems to Augustan Rome and Polyclitus' *Doryphorus*, not to mention Mozart's symphonies or Newton's laws of motion.[112] The ancients themselves barely use the word 'classical' at all: at no point, for instance, do Cicero and Dionysius explicitly refer to any author, style or era as such.[113] Still, it is justified

[111] Long. *Subl.* 39.1: 'On this matter (i.e., word arrangement) I have in two books given a sufficient account of such conclusions as I could reach' (ὑπὲρ ἧς ἐν δυσὶν ἀποχρώντως ἀποδεδωκότες συντάγμασιν, ὅσα γε τῆς θεωρίας ἦν ἡμῖν ἐφικτά). There do not survive any fragments of the works nor any testimonies about its contents.

[112] See Porter (2006b) for an excellent introduction to the incoherence of ancient and modern definitions of the classical: 'It is important to realize that there were no unified views about questions of classical value in Antiquity, any more than there have been in modernity.'

[113] The modern use of the word 'classical' goes back to Fronto, cited in Gell. *NA* 19.8.5: 'A first-class, authoritative writer, not one of the common herd' (*classicus assiduusque aliquis scriptor, non proletarius*). The word *classicus* invoked not only a military connotation (a *classis* is a fleet of warships), but also social-economic status, as becomes clear in Gell. *NA* 6.13.1, quoting the elder Cato: 'Not all those men enrolled in the five classes were called *classici*, but only men of the first class, who were rated at a hundred and twenty-five thousand *asses*

to subsume their views under the heading of 'classicism', as they both apply a threefold division of history, which is an integral feature of most, if not all views, tendencies and products that can be identified as 'classicistic' or 'classicizing': tripartite periodizations not only appear in the stylistic discussions of men like Cicero and Dionysius, but also in later movements, such as the Second Sophistic, Renaissance painting and Neoclassical architecture. Basically, all these 'classicists' divide the history of art and literature into the following three phases (what Thomas Gelzer calls the 'klassizistische Dreischritt'): first an idealized golden age in the distant past, then a period of decline, and lastly a revival of the golden age in the present.[114] Needless to say, this crude scheme is extremely flexible and open for continuous renegotiation: in Antiquity, the 'classical past' was most often situated in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries BC, but classicists through the ages disagreed about the essence of Athenian genius and about the appropriate approach to renewing its glory.[115]

Thus, classicism was not a recognized school of thought in Antiquity (it did not even have a name), but the term may be adduced to shed light on ancient debates about art and literature. Art historians, for example, have for a long time studied the effects of classicism in the visual arts in Greece and Rome.[116] In recent decades, moreover, there has been a considerable surge in scholarly attention for the interplay of classicism and identity among Greek authors living under Roman rule: while it is traditionally understood as a defense of Hellenic civilization against the domination of Rome, Tim Whitmarsh has convincingly

---

or more' (*classici dicebantur non omnes, qui in quinque classibus erant, sed primae tantum classis homines, qui centum et viginti quinque milia aeris ampliusque censi erant*). Cf. Citroni (2006) 204–211, who argues that Gellius' *scriptor classicus* does not refer to an exclusive list of emblematic authors, but rather to a large group of authors considered to be reliable authorities.

[114] For the phrase 'klassizistische Dreischritt', see Gelzer in the discussion of Preisshofen (1979) 278; for the theories and observations underlying Gelzer's coinage, see, in the same book, Gelzer (1979) 3–13. The phrase is also used by Hidber (1996) 14–25 in his discussion of Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.*, which he, as we have seen (n. 82 above), describes as a 'manifesto of classicism' ('klassizistisches Manifest').

[115] Cf. Porter (2006b): 'We are evidently having to do not with a single form of classicism but with a variety of *classicisms* in the plural, each differently conceived, some less 'purely' than others, and more often than not in polemical dialogue with contemporaries and predecessors, among whom the very standards of purity will be up for debate.'

[116] The modern interest in ancient expressions of classicism goes back to the work of the German art historian and archeologist Winckelmann (1717–1768). More recent influential explorations of classicism in Greek and Roman art include Pollitt (1972), who focuses on the ancient conceptions of the Greek visual arts of the High-Classical period, and Zanker (1988) 239–264, who discusses how in Augustan Rome classicism and archaism in art and architecture were part of a conscious program to sustain the emperor's transformation of Roman society.

shown that Greek imperial classicism is too complex and variegated to be reduced to a single model.[117] The conceptions of the classical in Latin literature have been the subject of fewer studies, although Mario Citroni has published a series of articles on the conceptions of the classical exemplified in the development of Latin literary canons.[118] In this dissertation, I am primarily interested in the interconnections between Greek and Latin theories in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome.[119] We should now, therefore, zoom in on Cicero and Dionysius, starting with their threefold divisions of the history of rhetoric.

In the works of Cicero and Dionysius, the three successive stages in the history of rhetoric are not only distinguished chronologically but also geographically: the classical era is conflated with Athens, the following dark age with Asia Minor, and the ultimate rebirth with the city of Rome. Hence, the terms 'Atticism' and 'Asianism' can be used to further qualify the classicism in the stylistic discourse of Cicero, Dionysius and their fellow critics and rhetoricians (sections 5.1 and 5.2).[120] In his introduction to *On the Ancient Orators*, Dionysius offers a clear articulation of his tripartite periodization; I quote the opening lines here.[121]

> Πολλὴν χάριν ἦν εἰδέναι τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνῳ δίκαιον, ὦ κράτιστε Ἀμμαῖε, καὶ ἄλλων μέν τινων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἕνεκα νῦν κάλλιον ἀσκουμένων ἢ πρότερον, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ τῆς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους ἐπιμελείας οὐ μικρὰν ἐπίδοσιν πεποιημένης ἐπὶ τὰ

[117] Most studies of Greek classicism focus on the Second Sophistic (ca. 50–ca. 250 AD). Swain (1996), for instance, suggests that the expressions of Greek classicism in this period can often be interpreted as assertions of Greekness directed against Rome. Whitmarsh (2001), (2013a), (2013b) et alib., however, emphasizes the ambivalent approach of the Greeks to their Roman conquerors, interpreting the various expressions of Greek classicism as personal, ingenious responses to the socio-political reality. Several scholars have also paid attention to classicism in the preceding era: see esp. the collections of essays in Flashar (1979) on Rome in the first centuries BC and AD, and Porter (2006a) on classicism throughout the centuries. For Dionysius' classicism, see esp. Goudriaan (1989), Hidber (1996), De Jonge (2008) 9–20 and Wiater (2011), cf. section 1.2 n. 25–27, 77.

[118] See e.g. Citroni (1998), (2003) and (2006): following Gelzer (1979), he submits that the ancient concept of the classical has two separate meanings, i.e., the axiological sense of exemplary excellence and the typological sense of conformity to certain formal aesthetics, such as measure, organic structure, balance, idealization and nobility: in the author's view, the latter interpretation in Latin is articulated for the first time in the Augustan age.

[119] Bowersock (1979) and Wisse (1995) discuss some links between Roman and Greek views of Atticism, focusing on the possible routes of transmission, which will not concern us here (cf. section 1.2 item 1b above).

[120] Classicism and Atticism are not identical, as Gelzer (1979) 13–14 explains: Atticism is a specific manifestation of the wider phenomenon of classicism. Incidentally, the terms Atticism and Asianism are also, like classicism, modern coinages; see section 5.2 below on the flexibility of the categories 'Attic' and 'Asian'.

[121] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.1–2. This passage is partly quoted and discussed in section 5.5.2 below.

> κρείττω. Ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν χρόνοις ἡ μὲν ἀρχαία καὶ φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ προπηλακιζομένη καὶ δεινὰς ὕβρεις ὑπομένουσα κατελύετο, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος τελευτῆς ἐκπνεῖν καὶ μαραίνεσθαι κατ' ὀλίγον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας μικροῦ δεήσασα εἰς τέλος ἠφανίσθαι.
>
> We ought to acknowledge a great debt of gratitude to the age in which we live, my most accomplished Ammaeus, for an improvement in certain fields of serious study, and especially for the considerable revival in the practice of civil oratory. In the epoch preceding our own, the old philosophic rhetoric was so grossly abused and maltreated that it fell into a decline. From the death of Alexander of Macedon it began to lose its spirit and gradually wither away, and in our generation it had reached a state of almost total extinction.

Dionysius connects the downturn of rhetorical excellence to the death of Alexander the Great (323 BC): this date is retained to this day to mark the watershed between the Classical and Hellenistic eras. The Greek critic uses an elaborate allegory to describe the opposite styles of oratory on either side of this critical moment (section 5.4): he refers to the 'old, philosophic rhetoric' as the 'Attic muse' (Ἀττικὴ μοῦσα), while its vile successor was 'an upstart that had arrived only yesterday or the day before from some Asian death-hole, a Mysian or Phrygian or a Carian creature' (ἔκ τινων βαράθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῴην ἀφικομένη, Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν).[122] In Dionysius' own day, as he himself claims, a change for the better occurs, for which he thanks his host city (section 5.6.2): 'I think that the cause and origin of this great revolution has been the conquest of the world by Rome (ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη), which has made every city focus its entire attention upon her.'[123] In a word, Dionysius celebrates the literary genius of Classical Athens, which had faded away in the Hellenistic era and would have been completely wiped out 'in my own generation' (ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας), if it were not for the civilizing effect of Rome's dominion.[124]

---

[122] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.5–7. The passage is quoted in full and discussed at more length in section 5.4 below. On Mysia, Phrygia and Caria as a shorthand formula for Asianism, see section 1.2 n. 36–37 above.

[123] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 3.1: Αἰτία δ' οἶμαι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ὅλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν. For a more extensive discussion of how Rome had contributed to the revolution according to Dionysius, see section 5.5.2 below.

[124] The prose authors whom Dionysius deems worthy of discussing at length are all from the fifth and fourth centuries BC; with the exception of Herodotus, they all write in the Attic dialect (cf. section 1.5 n. 82). The authors whom Dionysius expressly marks as inferior come from the early third century BC (Hegesias of

Dionysius does not specify the starting point of the classical era. He seems interested in all Greek literature written before the death of Alexander: among the poets, for instance, he admires Homer, Pindar and Sappho, who predate the Attic orators whom he admires.[125] Cicero does not appear to disagree: according to him, the origins of classical style are obscure through a lack of written records.[126] Like Dionysius, the Roman author adopts a tripartite periodization of the history of rhetoric, to which he refers in his *Brutus* and *Orator.*[127]

> *Nam ut semel e Piraeo eloquentia evecta est, omnis peragravit insulas atque ita peregrinata tota Asia est, ut se externis oblineret moribus omnemque illam salubritatem Atticae dictionis et quasi sanitatem perderet ac loqui paene dedisceret. Hinc Asiatici oratores non contemnendi quidem nec celeritate nec copia, sed parum pressi et nimis redundantes; Rhodii saniores et Atticorum similes.*
>
> For when once eloquence had sailed forth from Piraeus it traversed all the islands and visited every part of Asia, but in this process it contracted some stain from foreign ways and lost that wholesomeness, and what one might call the sound health, of Attic diction; indeed it almost unlearned the art of natural speech. From this source came the Asian orators, not to be despised whether for their readiness or their abundance, but redundant and lacking conciseness. The school of Rhodes however retained more sanity and more similarity to the Attic source.

While Dionysius' Attic muse was maltreated and driven away from her rightful home, Cicero imagines that *eloquentia* simply sailed away from the port of Piraeus. In accordance with his Greek colleague, he sets the date of this journey roughly around the death of Alexander.

Magnesia, Duris, Hieronymus), the late third century BC (Chrysippus, Phylarchus, Psaon, Demetrius of Callatis, Antigonus) and the second century BC (Polybius, Heraclides, Hegesianax). On Hegesias, see esp. sections 2.2 and 2.4 below; on the other authors, see Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.14–22 with Aujac and Lebel (1981) 203–204.

[125] See e.g. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 20.8–22, 22.11–33, 23.10–17. Cf. De Jonge (2008) 340 n. 62: 'For writing prose, Attic was the model, but for poetry the dialect depended on genre requirements. Therefore, Dionysius quotes not only Homer, but also Sappho and Pindar in their own dialect.' Cf. also *Comp.* 4.14, where Dionysius notes that 'almost all the ancient writers' (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ὀλίγου δεῖν πάντες) before the Hellenistic era made a careful study of word arrangement, which according to him separates good from bad authors (cf. ibid. 4.13).

[126] Cic. *Brut.* 27 claims that the written oratorical records began in the time of Pericles and Thucydides, 'who do not belong to the cradle but to the maturity of Athens' (*qui non nascentibus Athenis sed iam adultis fuerunt*).

[127] Cic. *Brut.* 51 is quoted here. Cf. esp. *Orat.* 24–27.

According to Cicero, it was actually the deaths of the last Attic orators—Lycurgus (324 BC), Demosthenes (322 BC), Hyperides (322 BC), Aeschines (314 BC) and Dinarchus (ca. 291 BC)—that marked the institution of 'certain other types of speaking, which were softer and more relaxed' (*alia quaedam dicendi molliora ac remissiora genera*), cultivated above all by the orators from Asia Minor.[128] Cicero bluntly claims that, on her travels through Asia, oratory 'almost unlearned the art of natural speech': a parallel view can be found in the contemporary Roman grammarian and tragic poet Santra (fl. mid-first century BC), who submits that 'as Greek gradually extended its range into the neighboring cities of Asia, people who had not yet secured sufficient command of the language acquired a passion for eloquence, and so began to express by periphrases what could have been said directly, and then continued in the same vein'.[129] Yet, we should note that Cicero is not as scathing about the Asian orators of the Hellenistic era as Dionysius: he not only points out their vices but also the virtues of their oratory, such as 'readiness' (*celeritas*) and 'abundance' (*copia*).[130]

Remarkably, Cicero next presents Rhodes as a golden mean between Athens and Asia, perhaps building on the tradition which held that the Attic orator Aeschines, after losing the trial of Ctesiphon against Demosthenes, founded a rhetorical school on the island; we do not know, however, if there existed a distinct Rhodian style of oratory.[131] In my view, both

[128] Cic. *De or.* 2.94–95: 'As long as imitation of these men persisted, the pursuit of this type of speaking lived on. But when, after their death, all memory of them had gradually grown dim and then vanished, certain other types of speaking flourished, which were softer and more relaxed' (*Quorum quam diu mansit imitatio, tam diu genus illud dicendi studiumque vixit; postea quam exstinctis his omnis eorum memoria sensim obscurata est et evanuit, alia quaedam dicendi molliora ac remissiora genera viguerunt*). Transl. May and Wisse (2001). Cicero connects this style explicitly to the Asian orators Menecles and Hierocles of Alabanda. Cic. *Brut.* 37, 285; *Orat.* 92–96 adduces Demetrius of Phalerum (fl. ca. 300 BC) as a transitional figure between Athens and Asia, declaring him thoroughly Attic but already displaying a florid style like the Asian orators: cf. section 3.3 below.

[129] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.16–17: *Paulatim sermone Graeco in proximas Asiae civitates influente nondum satis periti loquendi facundiam concupierint, ideoque ea quae proprie signari poterant circumitu coeperint enuntiare ac deinde in eo perseverarint.* This observation, attributed to Santra, may serve specifically to explain the puffiness, redundancy and lack of conciseness that are often associated with Asian oratory (cf. secion 5.6.1 below). For the surviving fragments and testimonies of Santra, see Mazzacane (1982).

[130] On Cicero's ambivalent approach to Asianism, see esp. Cic. *Brut.* 325–327 and section 5.6.1 n. 143 below.

[131] For Rhodes as a mean between Attic and Asian oratory, see esp. Cic. *Brut.* 316, *Orat.* 25, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.18–19. For Aeschines' alleged influence on Rhodian oratory, see Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.19, [Plut.] *X orat.* 840d–e, Philostr. *VS* 481. Portalupi (1957) aims to describe the characteristics of 'Rhodianism' (120–70 BC): the presence of such famous rhetoricians as Theodorus of Gadara, Hermagoras of Temnus and Apollonius Molon to some extent justifies the hypothesis that there existed a Rhodian rhetorical tradition. Yet, Douglas (1958) rightly

Cicero's moderate praise of Asia and his reference to Rhodes serve primarily as a defense for his own Greek rhetorical education, which follows a path that neatly matches the itinerary of the ship of eloquence that we have seen above: Cicero relates that he first spent six months in Athens, that he next 'traveled through all of Asia Minor' (*Asia tota pegrinata est*), after which he completed his training on Rhodes.[132] Of course, Cicero's tutelage in Asia made him vulnerable to charges of Asianism: by stressing the importance of his subsequent stay on Rhodes, he can stress his affinity with Attic oratory without disowning the lessons of his Asian teachers. On Rhodes, his tutor Apollonius Molon 'made it his task to repress if possible the redundancy and excess of my style, which was marked by a youthful impetuousness and lack of restraint, and to check it so to speak from overflowing its banks'.[133]

Cicero's own tour as well as the journey of *eloquentia* eventually lead back to Rome, where the young orator sets out to bring about the revival of Attic oratory. He was not the only orator in the city to lay claims to this feat: Calvus and his followers already called themselves 'Attic' on account of their Lysianic simplicity (section 5.5.1), while there were others who imitated the style of Thucydides or Xenophon.[134] Cicero, however, claims that it is in his own oratory that the stylistic variation of Athens is approximated for the first time: 'We found the ears of the city hungry for this varied type of oratory, displayed equally in all styles, and we were the first (*nos primi*), however poor we may have been and however little we may have accomplished, to turn them to an amazing interest in this style of oratory.'[135] What is

---

objects that 'Atticism and Asianism were not movements with a history but rather catchwords of literary controversy incapable of exact definition': defining Rhodianism as lying in between these vague polemical extremes is very problematic. On the fluidity of Atticism and Asianism, see esp. section 5.2 below.

[132] Cic. *Brut.* 315–316. Note the almost verbatim repetition of 'every part of Asia was visited': *peregrinata tota Asia est* (*Brut.* 51), *Asia tota peregrinata est* (*Brut.* 315).

[133] Cic. *Brut.* 316: *Is dedit operam, si modo id consequi potuit, ut nimis redundantis nos et supra fluentis iuvenili quadam dicendi impunitate et licentia reprimeret et quasi extra ripas diffluentis coerceret.* Cf. Douglas (1966) 286: 'Cicero's description of Rhodes was nothing more than a compliment to his teachers.' Stroup (2007) 28: 'As much as the *Brutus* passage professes to give a simple overview of the birth and rise of *eloquentia* in the east, it serves mainly—and importantly—to parallel *eloquentia*'s juvenile travels to the orator's own youthful course of study and present (in 46 BCE) political and social straits.'

[134] For the orators following of Thucydides and Xenophon, see Cic. *Orat.* 30–32. Cicero objects that this procedure leads to a style that is unsuitable for civic oratory: cf. section 4.5.3 below.

[135] Cic. *Orat.* 106: *Ieiunas igitur huius multiplicis et aequabiliter in omnia genera fusae orationis auris civitatis accepimus easque nos primi, quicumque eramus et quantulumcumque dicebamus, ad huius generis audiendi incredibilia studia convertimus.* On variation as typical for Attic oratory, see esp. Cic *Brut.* 285–291 with section 2.2 below. See also section 3.3 on the connections between classicism and the theory of three styles.

more, Cicero insists that it is only in his day (and especially in his own writings) that the Romans discovered prose rhythm and periodic structure, making it possible for the first time to come close to imitating the literary styles of Demosthenes and Isocrates.[136] Like Dionysius, then, Cicero situates Rome's revolutionary return to the heydays of Athens in his own lifetime—in his own prose, to be more precise.

The foregoing has shown that Cicero and Dionysius, despite their apparent differences, adopt a similar basic conception of the history of rhetoric. We may safely assume that their perspective was widely shared among contemporary Greek and Roman authors in Rome, be it that others do not articulate their views about the three-period history as clearly as Cicero and Dionysius. We have seen, for instance, that among the Romans Santra made a kindred observation about the transition from Attic to Asian oratory, while Calvus and his followers presented themselves as Attic orators incarnate. As for the Greeks, we may adduce the testimony of Strabo, who also remarked on the end of the Attic golden age and the beginning of Asian degeneracy.[137] Caecilius of Caleacte, lastly, was likewise fascinated by the distinction between Atticism and Asianism, drawing up alphabetic lists that may have served as practical tools for literary composition in Rome. Thus, although this dissertation will reveal numerous points of disagreement between the critics and rhetoricians in Rome, we may conclude that there is ample common ground to be found in their conceptions of the classical.

1.7 The Dialogue between Greek and Latin Stylistic Theory

The common classicism described in the previous section underscores one of the principal theses of this dissertation, i.e., that Greek and Roman authors alike tap into a shared repertoire of theories, techniques and terminology in their discussions of prose style (section 1.1). What can these remarkable similarities teach us about the relationship between Greek and Latin stylistic theory in Rome? In this section, I will show that the traditional terminology of

[136] Cic. *Orat.* 171: 'In fact, nearly four hundred years have passed since this became the approved style in Greece, but we have only recently recognized it' (*et apud Graecos quidem iam anni prope quadringenti sunt, cum hoc probatur; nos nuper agnovimus*). According to Cic. *Orat.* 175, Gorgias was the inventor of balanced sentence structure, and Thrasymachus was the inventor of prose rhythm: as both men were active in the second half of the fifth century BC, Cicero's reference to four hundred years makes sense, if we count back from 46 BC. See *Orat.* 226 on Cicero's own contribution to the Roman discovery of prose rhythm: 'We have written more about rhythmical prose than anyone before us' (*plura de numerosa oratione diximus quam quisquam ante nos*).

[137] Str. *Geogr.* 14.1.41: see section 2.2 n. 14 below. Strabo asserts that the orator Hegesias of Magnesia (fl. early third century BC) initiated the Asian style of oratory: thus, Strabo's date for the watershed between the Classical and Hellenistic era is compatible with Cicero's and Dionysius' propositions.

acculturation is ill-suited to analyze the relationship between Greek and Latin stylistic theory in Rome. Next, I will demonstrate that the idea of a cultural 'koine', which is currently in vogue among archaeologists and historians studying the material culture of the Mediterranean world, offers a convenient framework to understand the points of convergence as well as the apparent differences between our Greek and Latin sources.

An obvious way to look at the common ground between Greek and Latin stylistic theory is through the conceptual lense of acculturation: in this approach, the shared discourse on prose style may be seen as the result of some form of contact or exchange between Greek and Roman culture.[138] As noted before, scholars have paid much attention to the Greek influences on Roman ideas, or to the Roman appropriation of Greek ideas (section 1.2): while this hellenocentric perspective may be helpful in studying the diachronic connections between earlier Greek theorists and later critics and rhetoricians, it is unsuitable for analyzing the synchronic relationship between Greek and Latin theories in Rome.[139] Assuming that there was a mutual exchange of ideas between Greek and Roman authors, we should turn to a more dialectical conception of their common stylistic discourse: modern scholarship on cultural contact supplies such metaphors as metallurgical 'fusion' ('two things fuse to create a third which, though blended from others, is completely new') or biological 'hybridity' ('cross-fertilization of different species creates offspring which are genetically different from both parents but retain characteristics of both') to understand such mutual influence. In these images, the categories of Greek and Roman become obsolete as a result of their interaction.[140]

[138] For 'acculturation' as an umbrella term covering a wide range of views about the interaction between two or more cultures, see Veyne (1979) 4: 'Décidément l'acculturation n'est qu'un mot, qui désigne les conséquences variées et subtiles de situations historiques qui sont autant d'intrigues variées et compliquées. A vrai dire, l'acculturation est un phénomène incessant et universel.'

[139] Much work has been done on the ambivalent Roman responses to Greek culture: see e.g. Woolf (1994), who argues that 'Roman responses to Hellenism consisted of a complex and partly incoherent mixture of adoption, adaptation, imitation, rejection and prohibition', and Stroup (2007), who regards the influence of Greek rhetoric on Rome as a story of expansion, resistance and acculturation (i.e., appropriation) successively. Again, these thoughtful studies are valuable in establishing the general Roman attitudes to Greek learning, but they do not address the interaction between Romans and Greeks working in Rome. For the Greek literature of the Roman empire as a reaction to Rome, see section 1.6 n. 117 above and the literature cited there.

[140] See Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 3–28 for a cogent argument against the traditional terminology of acculturation (fusion, hybridity, creolization, 'métissage') in favor of the model of bilingualism, or 'code-switching' (see below): 'The principal stumbling block thus appears to be the tacit assumption that culture is unitary, that you must be one thing or another, or even a blend of the two, but not both at the same time.' See Newsome (2011) 68 for the descriptions of fusion and hybridity quoted above.

The critics and rhetoricians in Rome, by contrast, participate in a shared discourse about style without compromising their identity as Greeks or Romans.[141]

What we need, then, is a model that accounts for the mutual influence of Greek and Roman stylistic views, whilst maintaining the integrity of the Greek and Roman identities of their authors. The work of Andrew Wallace-Hadrill is helpful in this respect: 'Culture does not respond to the food blender: you cannot throw in chunks of Greek and Roman, press a button, and come out at the end with a homogeneous suspension of bland pap.'[142] In his groundbreaking book *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, he argues therefore that romanization and hellenization are not mutually exclusive, but rather 'two closely interrelated aspects of the same phenomenon', that is, cultural interaction.[143] Building on the notion of bilingualism and the sociolinguistic concept of 'code-switching', he shows that the inhabitants of the Roman world could consciously alternate not only between the Greek and Latin language (e.g. the use of Greek in Cicero's letters), but also between Greek and Roman behaviors and customs (e.g. wearing a *toga* on the Forum, but a *pallium* in your private villa).[144] Thus, Wallace-Hadrill

[141] On several occasions, the authors of our sources explicitly present themselves as Romans or Greeks. Cic. *Orat.* 152, for example, distinguishes between 'Greeks' (*Graeci*) and 'us' (*nos*). Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.1–10 on several differences between Greek and Roman approaches to style, and Long. *Subl.* 12.5 referring to the Romans as 'you' (ὑμεῖς) and to Demosthenes as 'our man' (ὁ ἡμέτερος). Throughout his *Ant. Rom.*, Dionysius reflects on the connections between Greeks and Romans: cf. Peirano (2010), who shows that Dionysius paints a nuanced picture, often portraying the people of early Rome as 'Hellenized Romans', but at the end of the work depicting them rather as 'barbarized Greeks'.

[142] Wallace-Hadrill (1989) 164. This review of Zanker (1988) is entitled 'Rome's Cultural Revolution' and plants the seeds for Wallace-Hadrill's later work on the interaction between Greek and Roman culture, culminating in Wallace-Hadrill (2008), by the same title as the original review: see n. 143 below.

[143] Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 26. The work aims to describe a 'social and cultural revolution' in the Late-Republican and Early-Imperial Roman world, that according to the author is at least as dramatic as the 'political revolution' that Syme (1939) described. Its most important innovation lies in the idea that hellenization and romanization are related notions that can be compared to the two phases of the pumping of blood through the human body: the heart in this image is Rome, which draws Greek culture into Italy (the 'diastolic phase'), and next pumps away the subsequent culture into the provinces (the 'systolic phase'). The cardiovascular analogy rightly stresses the circularity of cultural contact, allowing us to move past a strictly chronological model of Greek influence on Rome: cf. Newsome (2011). One of the metaphor's shortcomings is that it seems to present Rome as 'some mighty automaton': cf. Osborne and Vout (2010) 240 and Versluys (2015) 164–165.

[144] On bilingualism and linguistic code-switching in the ancient world, see esp. Adams, Janse and Swain (2002). Wallace-Hadrill (1998) applies the concept of code-switching to material culture, e.g. domestic architecture, where rooms decorated in Greek and Roman styles could be deliberately juxtaposed. For the social and cultural implications of wearing a *toga* or a *pallium* in the Roman world, see Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 38–70.

demonstrates how 'two cultures may sit alongside one another, interacting rather than assimilating'.[145] Due to the intensive contacts between Greeks and Romans in Republican and Imperial Rome, both groups had at their disposal a wide cultural repertoire, from which they could select appropriate elements to suit particular contexts or purposes.

While the concept of code-switching in itself has little to offer to my analysis of the Greek and Latin discussions of prose style, it is worthwhile to further push the notion of a common repertoire underlying these texts. The abundant scholarship on material culture and identity provides us with further tools to do so: archaeologists and historians use the word 'koine' (κοινή) to refer to a widespread 'repertoire of material culture at hand' in a given period.[146] Studying the complexities of cultural interaction in the Hellenistic and Roman Mediterranean, Miguel John Versluys explains how such a koine may be built up: 'Through increasing connectivity, all kinds of elements (for the Hellenistic repertoire: mostly Greek, but also Egyptian, Etruscan, Persian, etc.) can be found in ever-widening contexts, acquiring new meanings there and changing in character.'[147] A similar point, mutatis mutandis, can be made about stylistic theory in Rome: Greek and Roman authors refer to a shared corpus of classical models, while they also draw on a common set of analytical approaches theoretical doctrines from various sources, such as Peripatetic scholarship (esp. Aristotle, Theophrastus), Hellenistic criticism (οἱ κριτικοί) and Roman oratory (e.g., the views of the elder Cato, the claims of the self-styled Attic orators in the city) which are constantly rearticulated and reinterpreted. Thus, the works of Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues adhere to a sort of rhetorical-critical koine, 'a common language used and supplied and further developed by all participants'.[148]

---

[145] Wallace-Hadrill (1998) 84.

[146] Versluys (2013) 429. The application of the term koine in scholarship on cultural identity evokes an analogy with 'koine Greek' (κοινὴ διάλεκτος), the common form of the Greek language of the Hellenistic era: Colvin (2011) 39 shows that 'the koine constitutes a standard to which no spoken or written variety corresponds exactly'. Likewise, in the analysis of types and styles of material culture, the word koine refers to a widely available common 'language' or repertoire whose individual local applications differ considerably, although they take their elements from the same reservoir. Scholars have described such ancient cultural 'koinai' for various times: cf. Beaujard (2010) for the Bronze-Age Aegean, Vlassopoulos (2007) for the Classical-era Greek poleis, and Versluys (2013) and (2015) for the Hellenistic and Roman eras after ca. 200 BC.

[147] Versluys (2015) 155. Cf. ibid. 158–163 for the argument that from ca. 200 BC onwards 'a *koine* of shared cultural symbols is present and functioning all around the *oikoumene*, and that, hence, we cannot but understand the cultural system as a globalised one from that period onwards'.

[148] Versluys (2015) 154.

To further explain the functioning of such a shared koine, Versluys applies the terms 'universalization' and 'particularization': 'Univerzalisation indicates that styles and elements that originally belonged to a specific culture are detached from that specific culture in order to play a role in a larger system. (…) With this common repertoire of universal (global) elements available, we subsequently see particularization in local contexts. Elements from the Hellenistic koine were only made to work and got their specific interpretation through contextual application.'[149] The so-called First Style (ca. 200–80 BC) and Second Style (ca. 80–20 BC) of Pompeian wall painting can illustrate how this works. These styles were not only found in Pompeii and Rome, but they were popular all over the Mediterranean: the local applications of the styles are all unique, although they use elements and decorations from a shared reservoir.[150] In Greek and Latin discussions of prose style, likewise, the common (i.e., universal) theories, techniques and terminology can be applied in various ways by the respective critics and rhetoricians according to their specific (i.e., particular) preferences, purposes and programs. To sum it up, the vocabulary of koine, universalization and particularization provides an elegant and convenient framework to understand both the similarities and the differences between the views of Cicero, Dionysius and their fellow critics and rhetoricians.

In my view, the most important upside of this approach is that it allows us to focus simultaneously on the overarching trends in the theories and doctrines of a given period as well as on the personal goals and motivations of the individual authors: in this way, we can review the works of ancient scholars within the larger context of their time, while doing justice to their various programs and idiosyncracies. Moreover, the history of rhetoric and criticism is not presented as a linear process, with later authors continually developing the

[149] Versluys (2015) 155. In his study of the globalizing effects of Roman imperialism, Witcher (2000) 216–218 adopts the notions of universalization and particularization from scholarship on globalization in the modern world, allowing him to explain the variety among so-called 'romanized' regions in the Mediterranean: 'Roman imperialism led to a series of (re-)negotiations, both local and global, which led to a (re-)definition of societies and identities.'

[150] See Bilde (1993) for a comparison of First-Style paintings at Pompeii with the contemporary cultural koine. See Versluys (2015) 155–156 on the Second Style: 'Each time, forms and materials from all over the Hellenistic world were combined in novel ways. Nowhere, therefore, do Second Style wall decorations look the same and there are certainly differences between (local) particularizations over the (global) Mediterranean. But the elements are all taken from the same reservoir. Through their particularization, moreover, new combinations are made that, in their turn, are added to the *koine* with the possibility of being particularized (etc.). Through processes of universalization and particularization the Second Pompeian Style is globalized and globalizing.'

views of their predecessors, but rather as following a cyclical pattern, i.e., a recurrent cycle of universalization and particularization. First, a term, notion or doctrine is used in a particular context (say, Aristotle's *Rhetoric*); next, it can be adopted by an ever expanding group of users, in the course of which it gradually gets detached from its original context and connotations (i.e., it becomes 'universalized'); it can thence be adapted to suit new contexts (i.e., it becomes 'particularized'), after which the novel interpretations can subsequently end up in the koine again and the process starts anew.[151] Admittedly, the procedure described here still offers a rough generalization of the ancient dialogue on style: in the individual case-studies of this dissertation, we will have better opportunities to see in more detail how the Greek and Roman stylistic discourse may work.[152]

The present section has aimed to provide an answer to the following question: how are the Greek and Latin stylistic theories of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome related to each other? I have argued that a plausible answer to this question can be articulated by assuming that Greek as well as Roman authors had access to a common rhetorical-critical koine, from which they selected and adapted appropriate elements to suit their various objectives. On the basis of this notion of a common language of stylistic theory, we can understand how the

[151] This cyclical process can be illustrated, for instance, by tracing the history of the maxim in Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.1 that 'the form of style should be neither metrical nor unrhythmical' (τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως δεῖ μήτε ἔμμετρον εἶναι μήτε ἄρρυθμον). Aristotle's statement, which may itself be derived from earlier theorists, can be understood in the context of his quest, in all aspects of life and the arts, for an appropriate mean between two faulty extremes: cf. section 3.5 n. 112 below. In the first century BC, Cic. *Orat.* 195, 220 adjusts Aristotle's 'universalized' thesis, so as to suit his defense of his own highly rhythmical style: speech, in his view, may be 'rhythmical' (*numerosus*), but it may not 'consist of definite rhythms' (*e numeris constare*). Although Cicero has abandoned Aristotle's notion of the golden mean, he still links the view about rhythm and meter in prose explicitly to Aristotle. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.25, next, presents great prose as being neither 'in rhythm' (ἔνρυθμος) nor 'unrhythmical' (ἄρρυθμος) without referring specifically to Aristotle: in arguing that prose may even exhibit near-verses, as long as it is not entirely 'in rhythm', Dionysius' view is closer to Cicero's than to Aristotle's. In the first century AD, the longstanding doctrine appears to have been wholly detached from its Aristotelian context: see, e.g., Theon *Prog.* p. 71.7-11 Spengel (see section 2.4.2 n. 141) and Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.56. In the latter text, we can see that the 'particularized' interpretations of Cicero en Dionysius have become part of the koine to which the Flavian teacher has access: Quintilian paraphrases Cic. *Orat.* 220 by applying the same distinction as Dionysius, viz., 'in rhythm' (*enrythmus*) versus 'unrhythmical' (*arrhythmus*). Cf. section 2.3.3 n. 89 and section 4.3 n. 52 below.

[152] The dialectical development of the stylistic discourse on the basis of both Greek and Roman contributions will be demonstrated, e.g., with respect to the evaluation of rough word arrangement (section 4.5.1) and the various notions of Atticism (section 5.2).

various critics and rhetoricians, with their disparate personal agendas, might engage in a dialogue about the style of prose, dialectically negotiating and renegotiating their shared framework. This approach to ancient stylistic theory helpfully frames the three main theses of this dissertation (section 1.1): it accounts for the availability of a common critical discourse in Rome (thesis 1), for the flexibility of its various elements (thesis 2), and for the active participation of both Greek and Roman authors in it (thesis 3). In the ensuing chapters, I will explore the principal elements of this stylistic koine, starting with Cicero's and Dionysius' assessment of the Attic model Demosthenes and the Asian antimodel Hegesias of Magnesia. Focusing on the universal and the particular, we will see that the Roman rhetorician and the Greek critic build their judgments of these authors on a common basis, which they exploit to suit their own purposes.