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

Ooms, S.

Chapter 2
HERO VERSUS ZERO: DEMOSTHENES AND HEGESIAS AS PARADIGMS OF GOOD AND BAD STYLE

2.1 Introduction

In the foregoing introductory chapter we saw that the extant stylistic discussions from Late-Republican and Augustan Rome generally exhibit an enthusiastic admiration for the authors of Classical Athens, while these same texts often present the authors of the Hellenistic period as inherently inferior. Although the surviving stylistic discussions refer to various Attic models and Hellenistic antimodels (section 2.2), the present chapter will focus on the two authors that Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus identify as their favorite and least favorite authors respectively. We will see, for one, that they both single out the Athenian orator Demosthenes as the best prose author who surpasses all other exponents of Greek prose, whereas they select the Hellenistic orator and historian Hegesias of Magnesia as the very worst writer in the history of literature. The purpose of this chapter is to establish what motivates Cicero and Dionysius to nominate Demosthenes as the epitome of literary perfection and Hegesias as the paradigm of bad taste. Thus, we will be able to see what Cicero and Dionysius consider to be the distinctive qualities of good and bad literature.

The figures of Demosthenes and Hegesias offer us convenient shortcuts to the stylistic discourse of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome: Cicero and Dionysius not only analyze Demosthenes and Hegesias in superlative terms, setting them up as incontestable icons of good and bad style, but they also apply a similar theoretical apparatus in their praise and censure. What is more, the focus on Demosthenes and Hegesias not only characterizes the stylistic discussions of Cicero and Dionysius, but it is actually an integral feature of the Greek and Roman stylistic discourse in which they participate. The extreme praise for Demosthenes, to begin with, seems to be a novelty in the first century BC (section 2.3).[1] Cicero, the first

[1] Anastassiou (1966) connects the 'uneingeschränkte Anerkunnung des Demosthenes' to the second half of the first century BC. Cooper (2000) argues that Peripatetic philosophers equated Demosthenes' political dishonesty with oratorical dishonesty, which influenced the reception of his speeches in the Hellenistic era: according to Cooper, it is in Late-Republican and Early-Imperial Rome that Demosthenes' reputation as a stylistic icon was established. Cf. Pernot (2006) 61–62, who shows that the ancient appreciation for Demosthenic oratory (or the lack thereof) is inextricably bound up with the appreciation or depreciation of his behavior as a man and as a politician. For Demosthenes' political reputation, see section 2.2 below. Cf. also sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 below on the importance of Demosthenes as a political model for Late-Republican and Augustan Rome.

surviving source to declare him the indisputable champion of Greek prose, describes him as 'the perfect orator who lacks absolutely nothing', saying that 'it is amazing how much one man has pre-eminence over all'.[2] Dionysius, next, claims that 'he uses judiciously the best style, and the one which is most perfectly adapted to all aspects of human nature'. The critic pits passages from Demosthenes against specimens from other authors such as Lysias, Thucydides, Plato and Isocrates, concluding that the latter writers 'are not worthy to compete for the palm with Demosthenes'.[3]

The name of Hegesias, by contrast, is used as a virtual synonym for bad taste. He was native to the Lydian town of Magnesia on the river Sipylus and he probably flourished in the early third century BC.[4] Only a few fragments of his extensive literary output survive: most of these either come from his history of Alexander the Great or from his epideictic speeches.[5]

---

[2] Cic. *Brut.* 35: *Nam plane quidem perfectum et quoi nihil admodum desit Demosthenem facile dixeris.* Cic. *Orat.* 6: *Admirabile est quantum inter omnis unus excellat.*

[3] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 33.1: (Ἡ πρόθεσις ἦν μοι καὶ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα τοῦ λόγου) κρατίστῃ λέξει καὶ πρὸς ἅπασαν ἀνθρώπου φύσιν ἡρμοσμένῃ μετριώτατα Δημοσθένη κεχρημένον ἐπιδεῖζαι. Ibid. 33.5: (Ἵνα δείξαιμι) Δημοσθένει γε οὐκ ἀξίους ὄντας ἁμιλλᾶσθαι περὶ τῶν ἀριστείων. Dionysius considered the method of comparing authors (σύγκρισις) the best method of assessing literature (*Pomp.* 1.6–8); Caecilius also used it (section 1.5 above): on σύγκρισις as a critical tool in the exegesis of Demosthenes, see section 2.3.1 below.

[4] Hegesias himself gives us the name of his hometown at Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.11 (= F17 Jacoby). It is not possible to give more than an approximate date for his *floruit*: see Radermacher (1910) 2607–2608 and Staab (2004) 127. There are two main clues for a date in the early third century BC: Str. *Geogr.* 14.1.41 declares him the instigator of the Asian style of rhetoric (cf. n. 23 below), and Cic. *Brut.* 286 reports that he aimed to imitate Charisius, an Attic orator contemporary to Menander and Demetrius of Phalerum, who flourished around 300 BC and whose fame seems to have been limited to his own lifetime: cf. Blass (1880) 318, and n. 27 below.

[5] In referring to the fragments and testimonies of Hegesias, I use the numbering of Jacoby (1929), *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIB 142. Piotrowicz (1925), Jacoby (1930) and Prandi (2016) supply commentaries on the surviving texts. There is one substantial fragment (F5) on Alexander's siege of Gaza (332 BC), which is preserved in Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.26 as a sample 'from his history' (ἐξ ἱστορίας), but no details about the work are known: see Prandi (2016). Spina (1989) compares Hegesias' version of the siege to other sources; Donadi (1999) discusses the problems in the transmission of the text. The other fragments are much shorter, varying from one to a few sentences: it is often unclear whether such fragments belong to his historiographical works or to his speeches: cf. section 2.4.1 n. 98. He is often called a rhetor (T1, T7, F30–31 Jacoby) or a sophist (F5 Jacoby). It is likely that he composed epideictic speeches: he is credited with a *Praise of Rhodes* (ἐγκώμιον Ῥόδου, F1–2 Jacoby). There is some evidence that he wrote judicial speeches: Rutilius Lupus, *On Figures of Speech* 1.7 (= F27 Jacoby) contains an address to a jury, but this could also be a school exercise, as Jacoby (1930) 529 points out. Hegesias possibly also composed dialogues, although only three titles survive: a Rhodian inscription (= T11 Jacoby) attributes *The Lovers of Athens* (Οἱ φιλαθήναιοι), *Aspasia* and *Alcibiades* to Hegesias.

Virtually all of his extant words are preserved in hostile contexts as examples of bad taste: his first appearance is in the work of the historian and geographer Agatharchides of Cnidus (second century BC), but, just as Demosthenes receives his highest praise in the first century BC, Hegesias receives most of his scorn in that era as well (section 2.4). Although Varro is said to have approved of his style, Cicero claims that 'anyone acquainted with him needs to look no further for an example of ineptitude'.[6] Dionysius diagnoses him with mental illness and depicts him as a 'high-priest of humbug'. In addition, Dionysius predicts that 'one could not find a single page that is felicitously composed' in the entire corpus of Hegesias' writings. He claims that Hegesias' words 'are likely to be uttered only by women or emasculated men, and not even by them in earnest, but in the spirit of mockery and ridicule'.[7]

The gist of the matter seems to be that Demosthenes does virtually everything right and that Hegesias does almost everything wrong. While the surviving stylistic analyses of Demosthenes' and Hegesias' works do not reveal much about the actual hallmarks of their styles, they do offer us valuable insights into the stylistic views of the critics.[8] In this chapter, I will first explore the apparent preoccupation with Demosthenes and Hegesias against the background of the dominant stereotypes of Athens and Asia in Rome (section 2.2). Next, I will focus particularly on the stylistic analyses in the works of Cicero and Dionysius: what is it exactly that they like about Demosthenes' style (section 2.3) and what is it that they dislike about Hegesias' style (section 2.4)? By answering these questions, I will be able to make inferences about the shared literary tastes of Cicero and Dionysius, and about the shared

[6] Cic. *Orat.* 226: (Hegesias' style is so bad) *ut non quaerat quem appellat ineptum qui illum cognoverit.* In *Att.* 12.6.1, Cicero produces a parody of the 'style of Hegesias, which Varro commends' (*genus Hegesiae, quod Varro laudat*): cf. section 2.4.2 below for a rhythmical analysis of this pastiche. About 'Asian' features in Varro's style, see Traglia (1982). Philodemus and Rutilius Lupus (late first century BC) mention Hegesias without an obvious negative assessment: see section 2.2 n. 25 on Philodemus and section 2.4 n. 94 on Rutilius.

[7] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.21: Διαφθορὰ τῶν φρένων. Ibid. 4.11: Τῶν λήρων ἱερεύς. Ibid. 18.23: Μίαν οὐκ ἂν εὕροι τις σελίδα συγκειμένην εὐτυχῶς. Ibid. 18.28: Ὡς δὲ ὁ Μάγνης εἴρηκεν, ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἢ κατεαγότων ἀνθρώπων λέγοιτ' ἂν καὶ οὐδὲ τούτων μετὰ σπουδῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χλευασμῷ καὶ καταγέλωτι.

[8] Indeed, it has been observed that Cicero's and Dionysius' observations are often not pertinent to the works that they analyze: see e.g. Wooten (1989), who argues that Dion. Hal. fails to grasp the essence of Demosthenes' style. Wooten (1997) 177–187 likewise argues that Cicero's criticisms of Demosthenes are not valuable for students of Demosthenes: cf. section 3.4 below. According to Wiater (2008) 111–114, Dionysius' criticism of Hegesias is not based on any real study of his texts, but only on prejudice. Cf. section 3.1 below on the limited usefulness of the ancient three-style theories for the stylistic analysis of Greek and Latin prose, and section 4.4 below on the applicability of Dionysius' theories of composition and euphony. Vaahtera (1997) shows that Dionysius' theories of euphony often do not work for the passages that he cites: see esp. section 4.4 n. 68 below.

critical framework on which they build their arguments (section 2.5). It should be noted that this chapter is chiefly concerned with the similarities between the views of Cicero and Dionysius: it aims to present a synopsis of their common approach to good and bad prose. The relevant differences between their stylistic views, specifically with respect to Demosthenes' oratory, will be dealt with in the ensuing chapters of this dissertation.

2.2 Demosthenes and Atticism, Hegesias and Asianism

The prominence of Demosthenes and Hegesias in the stylistic discussions of Cicero, Dionysius and their contemporaries must be understood as a concomitant of the preoccupation of these scholars with the classicist categories of Atticism and Asianism (section 1.6). Demosthenes was associated more than any other prose author with the literary, cultural and political legacy of Classical Athens, or, as Cicero puts it, 'I believe that not even Athens itself was more Attic than he.'[9] Hegesias, on the other hand, was reviewed as a prototype of the degenerate literature, culture and politics of Asia. Thus, Demosthenes and Hegesias were not only singled out on the basis of their stylistic attributes, but also on the basis of their suitability as cultural and political icons. In this section, I will examine how Demosthenes and Hegesias came to be regarded as the archetypes of Attic and Asian style respectively on the basis of the biases about Athens and Asia that were current in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome.

In the first century BC, the city of Rome saw an increased focus on the Athenian literary heritage, which raised a number of fundamental questions. Which Attic authors should be imitated, and which authors should not be imitated? In what respects and to what extent should the various selected models be imitated? Cicero and Dionysius, whose treatises are the only extant texts from Late-Republican and Augustan Rome that explicitly address such questions, emphasize the tremendous variety within the category of classical Attic prose. In his *Brutus*, for example, Cicero provokingly asks: 'Who are more unlike than Demosthenes and Lysias? Than either of them and Hyperides, than all of these and Aeschines? Whom then are you going to imitate? If one only, do you mean that all the others did not speak pure Attic? If all, how can you imitate them when they are so unlike each other?'[10] Dionysius sets out to answer similar questions in *On Imitation* and *On the Ancient Orators*: 'Who are the most

[9] Cic. *Orat.* 23: *Quo ne Athenas quidem ipsas magis credo fuisse Atticas*. The translation is mine.

[10] Cic. *Brut.* 285: *Nam quid est tam dissimile quam Demosthenes et Lysias? Quam idem et Hyperides? Quam horum omnium Aeschines? Quam igitur imitaris? Si aliquem, ceteri ergo Attice non dicebant? Si omnes, qui potes, cum sint ipsi dissimillimi inter se?* Cicero continues to ask such questions up to *Brut.* 291.

important orators and historians? What manner of life and style of writing did they adopt? Which characteristics of each should we imitate, and which should we avoid?'[11]

If the critics and rhetoricians in Rome could draw on such a large pool of Attic prose models, it seems all the more surprising that Demosthenes should emerge as such a dominant model. Sure enough, the reputation of Demosthenes as the king of eloquence was not unchallenged. Cicero, for instance, notes that Calvus and his movement of self-proclaimed Attic orators preferred the simple oratory of Lysias, while there were others on the Forum who imitated the obscurity of Thucydides or the sweetness of Xenophon.[12] Caecilius, Demetrius and Longinus do not profess a clear allegiance to a single model, but Demosthenes is certainly among their favorites. Caecilius, for instance, was not only a staunch defender of Lysias, but he also wrote several treatises on Demosthenes (section 1.5). Demetrius, in addition, presents Demosthenes as the principal exponent of the 'forceful style' (χαρακτὴρ δεινός), while Longinus numbers him among the main models of sublime literature.[13] All in all, the dominance of Demosthenes in the stylistic discourse is undeniable.[14] Even Calvus, whom Cicero presents as a passionate aficionado of Lysias, did not spurn Demosthenes: both the elder Seneca and the younger Pliny recognize in Calvus an imitator of Demosthenic vigor.[15]

---

[11] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.5: Τίνες εἰσὶν ἀξιολογώτατοι τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο προαιρέσεις τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τῶν λόγων καὶ τί παρ' ἑκάστου δεῖ λαμβάνειν ἢ φυλάττεσθαι. Dionysius lists the contents of *Imit.* at *Pomp.* 3.1: he discusses the nature of imitation (book 1), the authors that should be imitated (book 2), and the process of imitation (book 3).

[12] On the self-styled Atticists see esp. section 1.4 above and sections 3.4, 4.5.3 and 5.6 below. For the Roman imitators of Thucydides and Xenophon, see Cic. *Orat.* 30–32. Thucydides influenced several Roman historians, such as Sallust and Quintus Aelius Tubero: see Leeman (1963) 179–187 and De Jonge (2017) 644–646.

[13] Demetr. *Eloc.* 240–342 refers more often to Demosthenes than to any other author as an example of 'forcefulness' (δεινότης), although the critic does not associate his stylistic registers explicitly with individual authors, as Dionysius does. Demosthenes is Longinus' main model for sublimity through emotion: cf. Innes (2002) 278. Long. *Subl.* 36.2 presents Demosthenes as a 'flawed genius' on a par with Plato and Homer. Wooten (1991) explains that Demetrius and Longinus particularly admire Demosthenes for his 'conciseness' (συμτομία) and 'abruptness' (διάλυσις). Innes (2002) argues that Demosthenes is Caecilius' main model (cf. section 1.5 above), while Longinus has a more varied taste. See also Porter (2016) 105–106 on Longinus' preference for Demosthenes as a rhetorical model.

[14] The general attitude toward Demosthenes evolved from ambivalent in the Hellenistic era to laudatory in Late-Republican Rome: this has been the *communis opinio* since Drerup (1923). Cf. section 2.1 n. 1 above.

[15] Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.8, Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.2: see section 5.2 below. The references to Demosthenes show that Calvus' Atticism is not as monolithic as Cicero wants his audience to believe it to be: indeed, the concept of 'Attic' style

To understand what sets Demosthenes apart from the other Attic orators, we should turn to Cicero and Dionysius: it is in their works, after all, that Demosthenes is set up as the ultimate paragon of Athenian genius. In 46 BC, when Cicero was preoccupied with his polemic against the so-called Atticists, he emphatically equates the style of Demosthenes with the greatness of Athens, claiming that his opponents could benefit from reading Demosthenes' speeches: 'Let them learn what is Attic, and measure eloquence by his strength, not by their own weakness.'[16] Moreover, Cicero presents his translation of Demosthenes' speech *On the Crown* as a 'norm by which to measure the speeches of those who may wish to speak in the Attic manner'.[17] In a flash of sarcasm, Cicero expresses his disbelief at the Atticists' neglect of Demosthenes as a model for their oratory: 'As if Demosthenes comes from Tralles!'[18] Needless to say, the famous orator was not an inhabitant of this Lydian town, but a prominent citizen of Athens. Indeed, according to Cicero and Dionysius, he is the man who embodies the city's legacy more than any other Attic author, admiring his oratorical genius, but also the political and cultural values that he stands for, i.e., democracy and freedom (section 5.5)

Faced with Caesar's dictatorship and its aftermath, Cicero turned to Demosthenes as a model for his own role in the city. It is not for nothing that Cicero calls his fourteen speeches against Marc Antony (44–43 BC) his *Philippics*, after Demosthenes' orations (351 BC) against the expansive politics of king Philip of Macedon: in his Latin *Philippics*, Cicero presents himself as a champion of Roman freedom, just as Demosthenes defended the independence of Athens in his original Greek *Philippics.*[19] Dionysius, too, pays attention to Demosthenes' role as a guardian of Athens. The samples that he quotes from Demosthenes'

---

is a flexible construct that can incorporate diverse elements from the Attic literary repertoire. On the 'vigor' (*vis*) of Demosthenes, see sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 below.

[16] Cic. *Orat.* 23: *Quid enim sit Atticum discant eloquentiamque ipsius viribus, non imbecillitate sua metiantur.*

[17] Cic. *Opt. gen.* 23: *Erit regula, ad quam eorum dirigantur orationes qui Attice volent dicere.*

[18] Cic. *Orat.* 234: *Quasi vero Trallianus fuerit Demosthenes.* For the use of geographic names as shorthand formulas for Asian rhetoric, see section 1.2 above on Cic. *Orat.* 25 and Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.7 (Mysia, Phrygia and Caria).

[19] Cicero refers to the speeches as *Philippics* in *Ad Brut.* 2.4.2. They were also known as his *Speeches against Antony* (*Orationes in Antonium* or *Antonianae*): e.g. Sen. *Suas.* 6.15, Gell. *NA* 1.22.17. On Demosthenes as a political model for Cic. *Phil.*, see Wooten (1983) and Ramsey (2003) 16–18. Cf. Wooten (1977), Dugan (2005) 309–314, Bishop (2016) and section 5.5.1 below on Cicero's use of Demosthenes as a model to negotiate his own role in Caesar's Rome (46 BC). Usher (2008) argues that not Dem. *Phil.*, but rather Dem. *De cor.* was by far the most influential of Demosthenes' speeches for Cic. *Phil.*: it seems that Dem. *De cor.* was the text Cicero admired on two accounts, both as a political and as a stylistic masterpiece (cf. Cic. *Orat.* 133).

speeches often have a notable patriotic flavor.[20] From Demosthenes' *Third Olynthiac* (349 BC), for instance, Dionysius quotes a passionate appeal to the Athenians to take up arms against Philip, noting: 'If we, who are so far removed in time and unaffected by the events, are so carried away and overpowered that we follow wherever the speech leads us, how must the Athenians and the rest of the Greeks have been excited at the time by the orator addressing them on live and personal issues.'[21] Dionysius and Cicero clearly not only admire Demosthenes for his style, but also for his politics.[22] Indeed, Demosthenes could be seen as the last true exponent of Athenian democracy and freedom: after all, the conquests of Philip and his son Alexander brought an end to the independence of the Greek poleis, and ushered in the rule of Eastern monarchs over the Greek world.

This is where Hegesias comes into the picture: a generation younger than Demosthenes, his floruit roughly coincides with the alleged beginning of literary decline from the Classical into the Hellenistic era. Thus, according to the authors of the first centuries BC and AD, Hegesias was a founding father of the rhetorical and cultural decline of Asianism. Strabo (64/63 BC–ca. 24 AD) paints the default picture of Hegesias as 'the orator who more than any other initiated the so-called Asian style (Ἀσιανὸς ζῆλος), whereby he corrupted the established Attic custom (τὸ καθεστὼς ἔθος τὸ Ἀττικόν)'.[23] In other sources, too, Hegesias is

[20] Cf. section 5.5.2 below. Like Cicero, Dionysius was fond of *De cor.*: see esp. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 14.1. He quotes *De cor.* 1 three times (at *Comp.* 6.9, 18.17–22 and 25.26): 'First of all, men of Athens, I pray to all the gods and all the goddesses …' (πρῶτον μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς θεοῖς εὔχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις …). The passage is also cited by Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.63. De Jonge (2008) 340–347 shows that Dionysius gives two incompatible scansions of this passage, demonstrating that the local contexts can account for the differences: cf. section 2.4.3. See also Long. *Subl.* 17–18 for patriotic passages from Dem. *Phil. I* and esp. *De cor.* 208 (the oath by the fighters of Marathon): Whitmarsh (2001) 57–71 connects the politics of Demosthenes to Longinus' conception of the sublime. Yunis (2019) shows that Dionysius uses Demosthenes as a model 'not only of wonderful, effective writing, but also of what the citizens of the Augustan empire, both Greeks and Romans, can achieve.'

[21] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 22.4: Ὅπου γὰρ ἡμεῖς οἱ τοσοῦτον ἀπηρτημένοι τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ οὐθὲν πρὸς τὰ πράγματα πεπονθότες οὕτως ὑπαγόμεθα καὶ κρατούμεθα καὶ, ὅποι ποτ' ἂν ἡμᾶς ὁ λόγος ἄγῃ, πορευόμεθα, πῶς τότε Ἀθηναῖοί τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες ἤγοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀληθινῶν τε καὶ ἰδίων ἀγώνων. The passage that Dionysius quotes is Dem. *Olynth. III* 23–32.

[22] Cf. sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 below on the different ways in which Cicero (under Caesar) and Dionysius (under Augustus) interpret the political legacy of Demosthenes.

[23] Str. *Geogr.* 14.1.41: Ἡγησίας τε ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὅς ἦρξε μάλιστα τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ λεγομένου ζήλου παραφθείρας τὸ καθεστὼς ἔθος τὸ Ἀττικόν. Strabo was active in Rome at least between 44 and 29 BC: for (the dates of) his live, see Dueck (2017) 1. Strabo's statement that Hegesias was native to Magnesia on the river Meander (Str. *Geogr.* 14.1.61 = T1 Jacoby) must be mistaken: Hegesias himself tells us that he came from Magnesia on the river

depicted as a leading Asianist: Aelius Theon (probably first century AD), for instance, refers to 'the orator Hegesias and the so-called Asian orators' (Ἡγησίας ὁ ῥήτωρ καὶ οἱ Ἀσιανοὶ καλούμενοι ῥήτορες).[24] To be sure, Hegesias is not the only author from the Hellenistic era, who is severely criticized in later times: Philodemus, Dionysius and Longinus, for instance, supply the names of several other Hellenistic orators and historians whose styles they consider below par.[25] Yet, no author is as fiercely criticized and as confidently equated with Asian degeneracy as Hegesias. Typically, Cicero associates six Greek authors with Asianism, but the only one he unequivocally rejects is Hegesias.[26]

We should remember that the designation 'Asian' was mostly used as a derogatory term: ancient authors rarely referred to themselves as Asianists.[27] Hegesias is no exception to this rule. On the contrary, Cicero pictures him as an aspiring Atticist, an imitator of the Attic orators Lysias and Charisius. Jestingly, Cicero suggests that Hegesias 'regards himself so thoroughly Attic that he considered the native Attic writers almost uncouth rustics in comparison with himself'.[28] Cicero uses the example of Hegesias as a stern warning to the

---

Sipylus (Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.11 = F19 Jacoby). The word ζῆλος (LSJ 'jealousy, rivalry, emulation, zeal') is also associated with Asianism at Plut. *Ant.* 2.5. Cf. the title of Caecilius' treatise *How the Attic and Asian Styles Differ* (*Suda* κ 1165 = Caecilius T1 Woerther), where the word ζῆλος is applied to both Attic and Asian style. For the various uses of ζῆλος in ancient literary theory, see Schippers (2019) 36–40, 45–50.

[24] Theon *Prog.* p. 71.7–11 Spengel. On the date of Theon, see Kennedy (2003) 1: the terminus post quem is the late first century BC (Theon mentions Dion. Hal. and Theodorus of Gadara), 95 AD is a possible terminus ante quem, as a certain Theon, who wrote on stasis theory, is mentioned at Quint. *Inst. orat.* 3.6.48 and 9.3.46. The appearance of Hegesias in Theon's text is connected to prose rhythm: see section 2.4.2 below.

[25] Philod. *Rhet.* 4 col. 21.15–25 p. 180 Sudhaus lists Hegesias and the Hellenistic historian Clitarchus of Alexandria (next to the fourth-century rhetorician Alcidamas) as lovers of metaphor; Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.14–22 censures the lack of attention to word arrangement in several Hellenistic historians (Phylarchus, Duris, Polybius, Psaon, Demetrius of Callatis, Hieronymus, Antigonus, Heraclides, Hegesianax) and the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus: see Aujac and Lebel (1981) 203–204. Long. *Subl.* 3.2 charges Hegesias as well as the aforementioned Clitarchus, Callisthenes of Olynthus, Amphicrates of Athens and Matris of Thebes with the stylistic vice 'tumidity' (ὄγκος): cf. Mazzucchi (2010) 150–151 and section 5.6.1 below.

[26] Cic. *Brut.* 325 mentions Timaeus, the brothers Hierocles and Menecles of Alabanda, Aeschylus of Cnidus and Aeschines of Miletus. On Cicero's discussion of the two 'types of Asian styles' (*genera Asiatica dictionis*) and his ambivalent verdict on the aforementioned 'Asian' authors: cf. section 1.6 above. For the Roman authors, who are associated with Asianism, such as Hortensius, Marc Antony and Maecenas, see section 5.2 below.

[27] The only recorded example is the Augustan declaimer Craton, who according to Sen. *Controv.* 10.21 was a 'professed Asianist' (*professus Asianus*). Cf. section 5.2 n. 11 below.

[28] Cic. *Brut.* 286: *Isque se ita putat Atticum, ut veros illos prae se paene agrestis putet.* According to Cicero, Hegesias 'wants to imitate Lysias' (*imitari Lysiam volt*) and he 'wants to be like Charisius' (*Charisi vult esse*

self-styled Atticists in Rome: even those who fashion themselves genuine Attic orators, may in fact be poorly disguised Asianists. Cicero's mockery of Hegesias' Atticist aspirations makes it abundantly clear that the categories of Attic and Asian oratory are highly fluid: for Cicero, however, it is self-evident that the man who stood at the cradle of the Hellenistic kingdoms and the cultural dominance of Asia is an Asianist.[29] Cicero connects the style of Hegesias to several cultural stereotypes about Asia, such as servitude, greed and insolence: he describes Hegesias and his fellow-Asianists, for instance, as 'slaves to rhythm' (*numero servientes*), while he associates him elsewhere with desire for gold (*aurum*). The fact that the man from Magnesia considered himself more Attic than the native Attic orators, lastly, fits with the bias that the peoples of Asia were generally rude, vain and hubristic.[30]

Dionysius does not explicitly refer to Hegesias as an Asian author, but he does implicitly associate him with Asia. The critic consistently connects the style of Hegesias to immoral behavior, describing the 'Hegesian style' (Ἡγησιακὸν σχῆμα) of word arrangement, for instance, as 'precious' (μικρόκομψον), 'ignoble' (ἀγεννής) and 'effeminate' (μαλθακόν): these words resonate with Dionysius' description of Asian rhetoric in the preface of *On the Ancient Orators* (section 1.6).[31] In addition, we have seen that Dionysius claims that Hegesias' words 'are likely to be uttered only by women or emasculated men'.[32] Dionysius also quotes one extensive passage from Hegesias' history of Alexander.[33] This passage has a

---

similis), who was himself an imitator of Lysias: *Brut.* 286, *Orat.* 226. Wooten (1975) 95–98 suggests that Hegesias' style is indeed a continuation of the style of Charisius (and Cleochares), but there is too little surviving material from Charisius to substantiate this claim.

[29] Further evidence of Hegesias' interest in Athens can be found in the titles of the dialogue *The Lovers of Athens, Aspasia* and *Alcibiades*, attributed to him in a Rhodian inscription containing a catalogue of various writings (T11 Jacoby). Staab (2004) thinks that the majority of fragments of Hegesias (esp. F6–13 Jacoby) come from *The Lovers of Athens*, arguing that the work mocked Demades, Demosthenes and other important characters of Athenian politics in the second half of the fouth century BC: thus, Hegesias' affected style (cf. section 2.4 below) may have been an intentional parody. Staab's argument, which is built on a study of the word φιλαθήναιος in Greek poetry and prose of the fourth century BC, does not immediately replace the traditional view that most of Hegesias' fragments come from his historiographical work, but Staab does demonstrate how little we know about the nature of Hegesias' work other than the prejudice that we find in his later detractors.

[30] See Cic. *Orat.* 230 (on slavery) and *Att.* 12.6.1 (on gold): cf. section 2.4.2 below. For the Asian stereotypes in Greek and Roman thought, see section 5.3 below.

[31] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.12. For Dionysius' view of Hegesias' style of word arrangement, see section 2.4.3 below.

[32] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.28: Ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἢ κατεαγότων ἀνθρώπων λέγοιτ' ἂν.

[33] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.26 (= F5 Jacoby). Dionysius compares the rhythm of Hegesias to Hom. *Il.* 22.395–411: in both passages, a victor (Alexander the Great resp. Achilles) drags the body of his vanquished foe (the eastern

particularly Asian color: it relates how Alexander decided to tie an Eastern king with his feet to a chariot and to drag him around on his encampment. Hegesias describes how the king 'was yelling like a barbarian, begging Alexander for mercy and addressing him as lord' (βάρβαρον δ'ἐβόα, δεσπότην καθικετεύων). Thus, Dionysius gives his readers a sample of slavish behavior, which was considered quintessentially un-Greek. Hegesias goes on to describe the king's 'strange language' (σολοικισμός) and 'his fat and the hollow span of his belly' (τὸ στέαρ καὶ τὸ κύτος τῆς γαστρός), which makes the man resemble a 'Babylonian beast rather than a man' (βαβυλώνιον ζῷον ἕτερον ἀνδρός). By quoting this particular passage, Dionysius reinforces the suggestion that Hegesias and his works are extravagant, unmanly and undignified—in a word, deeply Asian.

To conclude, Demosthenes and Hegesias owe their prominence in the stylistic discourse of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome to a large extent to their positions on either side of the putative watershed between the Classical and Hellenistic eras: Dionysius was considered the last true champion of Athenian freedom, whereas Hegesias was firmly associated with the subsequent rule of the Eastern monarchs over the Greek world. The surviving judgments of their styles evoke the clichés of Athens and Asia (section 5.3), connecting Demosthenes to such virtues as freedom, democracy and good taste, and Hegesias to such vices as slavery, monarchy and impertinence. These stock features are also highlighted in the quotations from their works: the passages are not only selected on the basis of their stylistic attributes, but also because their contents call to mind the Attic and Asian values with which their authors are identified. Yet, Cicero and Dionysius do not only build their judgment on cultural bias, but also on stylistic analysis: what do they appreciate about the style of Demosthenes, and what do they disparage in the style of Hegesias?

2.3 How To Compose Great Prose: Demosthenes as the Canon of Style

According to Quintilian, Athens may have produced ten great orators, but Demosthenes is 'by far the greatest' (*longe princeps*): he is the 'standard of oratory' (*lex orandi*).[34] In this section,

---

king resp. Hector) behind his chariot, but according to Dionysius the rhythm in Hegesias displays 'baseness' (ταπεινότης), whereas Homer's lines ooze 'nobility' (εὐγενεία). Cf. sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 below.

[34] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 10.1.76. There is much disagreement about the role of Caecilius of Caleacte in the creation of the canon of ten Attic orators. Esp. the precise nature of the work *On the Stylistic Character of the Ten Attic Orators*, attributed to him in *Suda* κ 1165 (= T1 Woerther) is a bone of contention: the debate is succinctly summarized by Woerther (2015) 46–47 n. 8. While Douglas (1956) and Smith (1995) attribute the origins of the canon to different periods (Douglas second century AD, Smith third/second century BC), several scholars have

I will turn to Cicero's and Dionysius' verdicts on Demosthenes' style, which, as we will see, are consistent with Quintilian's: Cicero and Dionysius consider the works of Demosthenes a veritable canon of style.[35] Thus, the variety that was thought to characterize the literary legacy of Classical Athens could be found in the works of a single man. The aim of this section is not to present an exhaustive list of the stylistic criticisms of Demosthenes in the works of Cicero and Dionysius; rather, I will focus on the most prominent points that the critics raise, including his almost kaleidoscopic versatility, his forcefulness in high-stakes contexts, and his knack for word arrangement. After a brief survey of the Hellenistic reception of Demosthenes' oratory (section 2.3.1), I will successively explore the discussions of Demosthenes' style in the rhetorical treatises of Cicero (section 2.3.2) and in the critical essays of Dionysius (section 2.3.3).

2.3.1 Demosthenes in Hellenistic Scholarship

The critical reception of Demosthenes' speeches starts in his own time. In general, his eloquence seems to have impressed his contemporaries, including his rivals and opponents: although such men as Aeschines, Dinarchus and Hyperides all have axes to grind with Demosthenes, they acknowledge that he is a 'skillful' speaker (δεινός).[36] In *Against Ctesiphon*, Aeschines describes him as 'skillful of speech, infamous of life' (δεινὸς λέγειν, κακὸς βιῶναι): Aeschines makes Demosthenes' rhetorical skills suspicious by exposing the

convincingly argued that Caecilius may have played an important role in the establishment of the canon: Worthington (1994) points out that the traces of the canon's existence do not appear before the first century BC, and O'Sullivan (1997) adopts a nuanced approach, arguing that 'the exact contribution that Caecilius made to this conception cannot now be known; he may well have been behind particular lists of writers recommended for imitation, but such lists were subject to variation and were only the expressions of deeper ideas'.

[35] The one possible weakness of Demosthenes, according to Cic. *Orat.* 90, is his lack of humor: cf. Wooten (1997) 184–185. Cicero defends Demosthenes by claiming that the orator was not so much 'witty' (*dicax*) as he was 'humorous' (*facetus*): Cicero attributes the former to talent, and the latter to training. This judgment fits well with the general view that Demosthenes' genius was a product of technique rather than of nature: cf. section 2.3.1 below. On his lack of humor, see also Long. *Subl.* 34.3, who also mentions his incompetence in the domain of characterization, his lack of fluency, his unsuitability for epideictic oratory and his lack of charm.

[36] Anastassiou (1966) 55–66. See, e.g., the references to Demosthenes as a 'skillful speaker' (δεινὸς λέγειν) in Aeschin. *Ctes.* 174 and 215, 'verbal trickster' (τεχνίτης λόγων) in Aeschin. *Tim.* 170 and *Ctes.* 200, 'outstanding speaker' (περιττὸς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις) in Aeschin. *Tim.* 119 and *Fals. leg.* 114. Note that the word δεινός is not yet used with its later stylistic connotation of forcefulness (cf. esp. Demetrius, Hermogenes): see Voit (1934) 12–15, who connects the negative connotation of δεινός in the fourth century BC to the general mistrust of the art (or trickery) of the sophists. Cf. Grube (1961) 136–137.

deceitful, dishonorable conduct that his words supposedly aim to cover up.[37] In the Hellenistic period, Aeschines' cynical representation of Demosthenes landed on fertile ground: Demosthenes was, especially among Peripatetic philosophers, often considered a corrupt politician who seduced his audience with verbal trickery.[38] The scarcity of our Hellenistic sources makes it difficult to follow the development of Demosthenic criticism in the centuries after his death, but it seems that Demosthenes' style remained suspect for a long time: criticized by such philosophers as Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phalerum, he seems to have received much acclaim among the rhetoricians and literary critics of the second century BC, only to emerge from the mist as an all-round genius in the first century BC.[39]

There are several elements in the Hellenistic treatment of Demosthenes that seem to foreshadow the extreme praise that he receives in the works of Cicero and Dionysius. First, his ancient biographers, beginning with Demetrius of Phalerum, almost invariably mention that the orator had to overcome many natural defects in order to become a skilled speaker: he stuttered, he had a shortness of breath, he could not pronounce his rhos, he was unable to project his voice and he had a shoulder spasm, which forced him to subject himself to bizarre exercises in order to train his voice and body.[40] These stories are almost certainly romantic fictions, but they have to a large extent determined the later approaches to his style. Already

[37] Aeschin. *Ctes.* 174. Cicero and Dionysius were familiar with Aeschines' insulting depictions of Demosthenes: Cicero translates Aeschin. *Ctes.* (cf. Cic. *Opt. gen.*), Dionysius quotes several passages from Aeschin. *Ctes.* to show that even Aeschines was aware of Demosthenes' amazing ability as a speaker (Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 35).

[38] See esp. Cooper (2000) 234–238. Lossau (1964), who attempts to reconstruct the early exegetical tradition of Demosthenes' speeches, argues that the Hellenistic assessment of Demosthenes is not as negative as is often assumed, but Lossau's reconstructions of Peripatetic and Alexandrian scholarship on the basis of later sources are unwarranted, as Gibson (2002) 31 shows. The latter offers an edition with translation and commentary of the papyri containing the exegesis of Arius Didymus (second half of the first century BC) and later commentators.

[39] Anastassiou (1966) 66–81 discusses the criticism of Demosthenes in the early Peripatos. According to Cooper (2000) 238, Demosthenes owed his rehabilitation to the fact that his proficiency as an orator was the product of training rather than talent: 'By the second century, Demosthenes would become the darling of rhetoricians, whose own reputations depended on successfully teaching rhetoric and on showing how the skill could be learned.' The Peripatetic reproach of Demosthenes continues in Dionysius' day, as is evidenced by *Amm. I* 1.1.

[40] See Demetrius of Phalerum fr. 165 Wehrli, Libanius 296.62, Zosimus 299.60, Anonymous *Vita* 305.66, *Suda* δ 456, Plut. *Mor.* 844d–e. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 53.4, who mentions as his sources 'Demetrius of Phalerum and all other biographers' (Δημήτριός τε ὁ Φαληρεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες οἱ τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ συγγράψαντες). See Pomeroy (1997) 173–174, who lists the stories about Demosthenes' struggle with his physical defects, concluding that it is unlikely that 'an adolescent would invent bizarre devices', such as reciting with a mouthful of pebbles, discoursing while running, and hanging a sword over his shoulder to correct his shoulder spasm.

at an early stage he was characterized as 'painstaking rather than naturally gifted' (ἐπιμελὴς μᾶλλον ἢ εὐφυής): his outstanding oratorical performance was more the product of technique (τέχνη, *ars*) than of any natural talent (φύσις *natura*).[41] Interestingly, Cicero and Dionysius continue to focus on Demosthenes' application of rhetorical technique: according to them, Demosthenes had learnt every trick in the rhetorical handbook and his speeches can thus be adduced to illustrate virtually all aspects of stylistic theory.[42]

Another feature that persisted throughout the history of ancient scholarship on Demosthenes is the custom of comparing him to other authors (σύγκρισις): we have seen that Caecilius compares him to Aeschines and to Cicero, while Dionysius compares samples of his works to thematically related passages from Lysias, Thucydides, Isocrates and Plato.[43] In the third century BC, Demosthenes was most often compared to Isocrates: Cleochares of Myrlea is credited with one of the earliest explicit comparisons, claiming 'that the speeches of Demosthenes are a lot like the bodies of soldiers, whereas the speeches of Isocrates resemble the bodies of athletes'.[44] The contrast between training for war and training for parades and festivals touches on the dichotomy between practical and epideictic oratory: Demosthenes is usually presented as a particularly effective exponent of the former genre, whereas Isocrates is considered to be more at home in ceremonial settings.[45] In the first century BC, Cicero and

[41] *Suda* δ 455. Cf. Cooper (2000) 241 n. 4: the extant biographies usually draw a clear contrast between his 'nature' (φύσις) and his 'exercise' (μελέτη).

[42] We have seen that Cic. *Orat.* 90 uses the distinction between nature and training to explain Demosthenes' alleged lack of humor: section 2.3 n. 35 above. Dion. Hal. *Amm. I* aims to refute the claim of an unnamed Peripatetic that Demosthenes' eloquence is based on the orator's knowledge of Arist. *Rh.*, but at *Amm. I* 3.1, he does submit that Demosthenes' speeches are indebted to 'other introductory treatises' (ἑτέραι τινὲς εἰσαγωγαί).

[43] On the importance of σύγκρισις as a critical tool, see Focke (1923) and Vardi (1996). See also De Jonge (2018c) on σύγκρισις as a form of competition between Greece and Rome. Comparison was a favorite tool of both Dionysius (cf. *Pomp.* 1.9) and Caecilius (*Suda* κ 1165 = T1 Woerther): see section 1.5 above. The comparisons between Demosthenes and other Attic prose authors occupy a substantial part of Dion. Hal. *Dem.*: see *Dem.* 9–10 (with Thucydides), 11–13 (with Lysias), 17–22 (with Isocrates) and 23–32 (with Plato).

[44] Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 176: (Κλεοχάρης δὲ ὁ Σμυρλεανός φησι) τοὺς μὲν Δημοσθενικοὺς λόγους τοῖς τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐοικέναι μάλιστα σώμασι, τοὺς Ἰσοκρατικοὺς τοῖς τῶν ἀθλητῶν. The comparison is attributed to Philip of Macedon in [Plut.] *X orat.* 845d and may be related to the distinction between 'real bodies' (ἀληθινὰ σώματα) and 'statues' (ἀδριάντες) in Alcidamas (fourth century BC): see O'Sullivan (1992) 79. The comparison between military and ceremonial bodies/weapons became a commonplace in stylistic theory, cf. Wollner (1886): e.g. Cic. *De or.* 2.94, *Brut.* 37, *Orat.* 42, Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 32.1, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 10.1.33. Cf. section 2.3.3 below.

[45] Cf. Yunis (2019) 101–104. On the distinction between the practical, or 'performative style' (λέξις ἀγωνιστική) and the epideictic, or 'written style' (λέξις γραφική) in Arist. *Rh.* 3.12, see Innes (2007) 151–156.

Dionysius also discuss Demosthenes' aptitude as a model for real-life speeches on urgent matters: it is on this kind of actively involving, performative oratory that both Cicero and Dionysius focus.[46]

Already during his own lifetime, Demosthenes was regarded, as we have seen, as 'skillful' (δεινός); in the centuries after his death, the word δεινός remained inseparably connected to his name, but its meaning gradually shifted to denote 'vigor' or 'forcefulness' (δεινότης, *vis*).[47] The idea that Demosthenes has the power to overwhelm his audience is clearly articulated in Demetrius' *On Style*, which presents the orator as the principal model of the 'forceful style' (χαρακτὴρ δεινός), whereas he is rarely mentioned in connection to the other three stylistic registers.[48] We will presently see that Cicero and Dionysius also stress the tremendous power of Demosthenes' style, highlighting the spellbinding lightning-like quality of his oratory. After Cicero and Dionysius, the identification of Demosthenes with forcefulness remained a commonplace feature of literary criticism: in his work *On Types of Style*, Hermogenes of Tarsus (second century AD) presents forcefulness (δεινότης) as the style that constitutes an ideal combination of all stylistic types, most perfectly exemplified by Demosthenes.[49]

2.3.2 Cicero on Demosthenes' Style

Cicero's discussions of Demosthenes' style can mainly be found, as we saw, in his three rhetorical treatises of 46 BC (section 1.4). In these works, there are two major stylistic features that Cicero associates with Demosthenes: he emphasizes the orator's versatility and

[46] See Ooms and De Jonge (2013) 100–102 for Dionysius' focus on 'speeches suited to performance' (ἐναγώνιοι λόγοι). For the similar focus in Cicero on 'real-life forensic cases' (*verae causae forenses*), see Cic. *Orat.* 12–13, 30, 32, 36, 62, 120, 143, 148, 170, 208–209, 221. Cf. esp. sections 3.6 and 5.5.1 below.

[47] For the evolution of the meaning of δεινός and its cognates, see esp. Voit (1934), who argues that the word originally carried a meaning similar to that of δυνατός ('capable') and was a virtual antonym of ἰδιώτης ('layman'): according to Voit, δεινός appears as a technical term for the first time in Demetr. *Eloc.* (which he mistakenly attributes to Demetrius of Phalerum, fl. ca. 300 BC), specifically denoting the agonistic, passionate style of Demosthenes.

[48] Demetr. *Eloc.* 240–342. Cf. section 2.2 n. 13 above.

[49] Rutherford (1998) connects Hermogenes' discussion of Demosthenes to the contemporary literary interests of the Second Sophistic: Demosthenes' proficiency in all stylistic types, for instance, can be linked to the focus on 'versatility' (ποικιλία) in the Antonine era. Rutherford also discusses the surviving texts of [Aristid.], who favored Demosthenes as well as Plato. For the all-encompassing nature of the forceful type of style, see the convenient diagram of Wooten (1987) xii.

his tremendous force, which is connected to his talent for word arrangement. The former element touches on Cicero's very definition of the ideal orator: 'He will be eloquent, who can discuss commonplace matters simply, lofty subjects impressively, and topics ranging between in a tempered style.'[50] Thus, Cicero's consummate orator masters all three oratorical styles (*genera dicendi*), for which Cicero uses a versatile terminology (section 3.2): they are now commonly referred to as the 'plain' (e.g. *genus subtile*), the 'grand' (e.g. *genus grave*) and the 'intermediate style' (e.g. *genus mediocre*). In chapter three, we will have a closer look at Cicero's application of this three-style doctrine (esp. section 3.4), but for now, we should simply note that Cicero's threefold scheme closely connects style to substance: the language of the orator should be adapted to the subject matter at hand.[51] An orator who masters all three types of style, will be able to speak in an appropriate manner about any topic on any occasion.[52]

According to Cicero, certain men have been successful in individual registers, but it is virtually impossible to attain perfection in all three types: as we will see, Cicero asserts that Lysias triumphed only in the simple style, Pericles merely in the grand style and Demetrius of Phalerum only in the intermediate style (section 3.3). Cicero insists that all-round perfection is something divine, a Platonic Form that we can only conceive in our minds, but that will never actually exist on the Forum: 'As there is something perfect and surpassing in the case of sculpture and painting—an intellectual ideal by reference to which the artist represents those objects which do no themselves appear to the eye, so with our minds we conceive the ideal of perfect eloquence, but with our ears we catch only the copy.'[53] Thus, no orator, dead or alive,

---

[50] Cic. *Orat.* 100: *Is est enim eloquens qui et humilia subtiliter et alta graviter et mediocria temperate potest dicere.* Cf. *Orat.* 101 for a definition in similar words: *Is erit igitur eloquens, ut idem illud iteremus, qui poterit parva summisse, modiaca temperate, magna graviter dicere* ('he, then, will be eloquent, to repeat my former definition, who can discuss trivial matters in a plain style, matters of moderate significance in the tempered style, and weighty affairs in the grand manner').

[51] Cf. Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 12.4: Βούλεται ἡ φύσις τοῖς νοήμασιν ἕπεσθαι τὴν λέξιν, οὐ τῇ λέξει τὰ νοήματα ('nature demands that the words should follow the thought, not that the thought should follow the words').

[52] Cf. section 3.2, table 3 below, where we will see that Cicero connects the three styles not only to three types of subject matter, but also to the so-called 'functions of the orator' (*officia oratoris*). On 'appropriateness' (τὸ πρέπον, *decorum*) as a guiding principle, see Cic. *Orat.* 70–74.

[53] Cic. *Orat.* 9: *Ut igitur in formis et figuris est aliquid perfectum et excellens, cuius ad cogitatam speciem imitando referuntur ea quae sub oculos ipsa non cadunt, sic perfectae eloquentiae speciem animo videmus, effigiem auribus quaerimus.* Dell'Innocenti Pierini (1979) explains that Cicero's reference to Plato's theory of Forms is relevant to his discussion of the three stylistic types, as the Greek and Latin terms for Platonic Forms

can wholly comply with Cicero's high standards, not even Demosthenes: 'Although he stands pre-eminent among all in every single style of oratory (*in omni genere dicendi*), he still does not always satisfy my ears, so greedy and insatiate are they and so often do they yearn for something vast and boundless.'[54]

Although even the best orator on earth can only create an imperfect reproduction of the perfect Form of oratory, Cicero finds that Demosthenes comes closest to this heavenly ideal. The rhetorician finds a veritable catalogue of samples from each of the three stylistic types in the orator's oeuvre: 'Many of his speeches are simple throughout—the one *Against Leptines* is an example; many are elevated throughout, as certain of his *Philippics*; many are varied—the one against Aeschines *On the False Embassy*, and the one against Aeschines *For Ctesiphon.* The middle style he adopts whenever he will, and after an elevated passage he glides generally into this style.'[55] Cicero singles out *For Ctesiphon* (now standardly known as *On the Crown*), as a tour de force of the three styles: 'In his masterpiece *For Ctesiphon*, he began rather calmly, then in his discussion of the laws he continued rather concisely; after that, he gradually aroused the jury, and when he saw them on fire, throughout the rest of the oration, he boldly overleapt all bounds.'[56] Although perfection is only theoretically possible, Cicero submits that orators can approach the ideal through an appropriate application of all three styles, and in this respect Demosthenes is second to none.[57]

Cicero, then, praises Demosthenes because he is versatile in employing all three styles. The rhetorician reserves his highest admiration, however, for Demosthenes' command of the grand style, in which his oratory has the power of thunderbolts (*fulmina*). Cicero warns any orator who employs the grand style to temper his impressive rhetoric with elements from the

---

(ἰδέαι, *figurae*) are both used in stylistic theory to describe types of style: cf. Cic. *Orat.* 36, where the word *forma* is used as a translation of χαρακτήρ. On Cicero's ideal orator as a Form, see Long (1995).

[54] Cic. *Orat.* 104: *Qui quanquam unus eminet inter omnis in omni gener dicendi, tamen non semper implet auris meas; ita sunt avidae et capaces et saepe aliquid immensum infinitumque desiderant.*

[55] Cic. *Orat.* 111: *Multa sunt eius totae orationes subtiles, ut contra Leptinem; multa totae graves, ut quaedam Philippicae; multae variae, ut contra Aeschinem falsae legationis, ut contra eundem pro causa Ctesiphontis. Iam illud medium quotiens vult arripit et a gravissimo discedens eo potissimum delabitur.*

[56] Cic. *Orat.* 26: *In illa pro Ctesiphonte oratione longe optima summissius a primo, deinde, dum de legibus disputat, pressius, post sensim incendens iudices, ut vidit ardentis, in reliquis exsultavit audacius.*

[57] Cf. Wooten (1977) 39: Cicero 'discovered, I think for the first time, not only in Cicero's life but in Demosthenic criticism, what is truly great about his (i.e., Demosthenes') oratory', that is, his versatility. Wooten (1997), however, describes Cicero's treatment of Demosthenes as 'tendentious and a defense of his own rhetorical practices'.

simple and intermediate styles, but still, it is in the highest register that rhetoric has the 'greatest force' (*maxima vis*), specifically the force to 'sway' (*flectere*) the minds of the audience.[58] To Cicero's mind, 'force' (*vis*) is precisely the stylistic virtue that is most typical for Demosthenes' oratory: in this respect, Cicero agrees with the dominant trend in Demosthenic criticism that presents the orator as 'forceful' (δεινός), as can be seen in the Greek critics Demetrius, Dionysius and Hermogenes (section 2.3.1). This forcefulness can be compared to a 'thunderbolt' (κεραυνός, *fulmen*).[59] Cicero uses the image of lightning to describe the devastating effect of the grand style in general, and of Demosthenes' forceful rhetoric in particular. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero presents Demosthenes' thunderbolts as quintessentially Attic: 'You have only to call to mind Demosthenes' thunderbolts (Δημοσθένους *fulmina*) to realize that a speaker can both be impeccably Attic (Ἀττικώτατα) and profoundly impressive.'[60]

The grand orator, wielding lightning bolts like a Zeus or Jupiter, can wreak havoc with his opponents and his audience. According to Cicero, therefore, the topics of the grand style are especially at home in real-life oratory, when the stakes are high. He adduces one of his own speeches as an example: 'If they think that at the trial of Milo, when the army was stationed in the Forum and in all the temples round about, it was fitting to defend him in the same style that we would use in pleading a private case before a single referee, they measure

[58] Cic. *Orat.* 69, 99. On the correspondence between Cicero's doctrine of three styles and his doctrine of three oratorical tasks (*officia oratoris*), see section 3.2.1 table 3 below. On the dangers and the rewards that Cicero connects to the grand style, see esp. section 3.4 below.

[59] See Porter (2016) 385–386: 'The sublime attributes of Pericles, his capacity to thunder and send forth lightning with his magnificent oratory, were gradually assimilated to Demosthenes in the rhetorical tradition (possibly because Pericles' speeches did not survive).' For the association of the thunderbolt with Pericles, see e.g. Plin. *Ep.* 1.20.17–19 (= Eupolis fr. 94), Aristoph. *Ach.* 530–531, Plut. *Per.* 8.3–4 (= com. adesp. 701 Kassel-Austin), Cic. *Brut.* 44, *Orat.* 29, Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 12.10.65. Beside Cicero, the association of lightning with Demosthenes can be found in Longinus. At *Subl.* 12.4–5, the author compares Demosthenes to Cicero, claiming that the former 'may be compared to a flash of lightning or a thunderbolt' (σκηπτῷ τινι παρεικάζοιτ' ἂν ἢ κεραυνῷ), while Cicero is more 'like a widespread conflagration' (ὡς ἀμφιλαφής τις ἐμπρησμός). At *Subl.* 34.4, Demosthenes is said to 'out-thunder, as it were, and outshines orators of every age' (ὡσπερεὶ καταβροντᾷ καὶ καταφθέγγει τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ῥήτορας). Cf. ibid. 1.4: 'A well-timed flash of sublimity shatters everything like a bolt of lightning and reveals the full power of the speaker at a single stroke' (ὕψος δέ που καιρίως ἐξενεχθὲν τὰ τε πράγματα δίκην σκηπτοῦ πάντα διεφόρησε καὶ τὴν τοῦ ῥήτορος εὐθὺς ἀθρόαν ἐνεδείξατο).

[60] Cic. *Att.* 15.1a.2: *Sed si recordabere* Δημοσθένους *fulmina, tum intelleges posse et* Ἀττικώτατα *et gravissime dici.* Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 21 (on lightning as a weapon of the grand style) and ibid. 235 (on lightning as characteristic for Demosthenes).

the power of eloquence (*vis eloquentiae*) by their own limited ability, not by the nature of the art.'[61] The other two types of style would not suffice in such circumstances: Cicero thinks that the plain style of Lysias is suitable only for 'small private cases' (*parvarum rerum causulae*), while the middle style is more suited to the 'parade-ground' (*palaestra*) than to the 'battlefield' (*arma*).[62] Thus, Cicero insists that the forcefulness of the grand style is required in urgent life-and-death cases: in a time when Rome is ruled by the weapons of Caesar, Cicero will not settle for anything less than a thunderous Demosthenes.[63]

How does Demosthenes succeed in making his words rumble like thunder and flash like lightning? Cicero does not go into much detail, but in his *Orator*, he offers us a beginning of an answer: 'Those famous thunderbolts (*fulmina illa*) of his would not have sped with such vibrant power, if they had not been whirled onward by rhythms (*numeri*).'[64] Cicero's remark comes at the end of a lengthy passage about the theory of word arrangement (*collocatio verborum*), which not only discusses rhythm, but also the method of combining individual words (*compositio*) and the creation of balance (*concinnitas*) in periodic sentences through figures of speech:[65] I will discuss the principles and motivations underlying Cicero's views of word arrangement in more detail later (chapter 4). Cicero mentions Demosthenes on several occasions in the course of his long exposé on the intricacies of arrangement: he associates him with the practice of avoiding hiatus in combining words and with the practice of using appropriate rhythmical cadences (so-called clausulae) to round off his sentences.[66]

---

[61] Cic. *Opt. gen.* 10: *Sed si eodem modo putant exercitu in foro et in omnibus templis, quae circum forum sunt, conlocato dici pro Milone decuisse, ut si de re privata ad unum iudicem diceremus, vim eloquentiae sua facultate, non rei nature metiuntur.* 'They' in this sentence refers to the so-called Atticists, who only accepted simple, Lysianic oratory as truly Attic: see section 1.4 above, and sections 3.4, 4.4 and 5.6.1 below. According to ancient tradition (e.g. Asc. *Mil.* 41.24–42.2c), Cicero was thrown off balance by the unfavorable circumstances at the trial of Milo: the extant *Pro Milone* was written after the trial. La Bua (2010) 36–37 argues that Cicero uses *Opt. gen.* to rehabilitate himself: 'Conscious of the canonicity that his speeches had achieved, he could not let stand the stigma conferred by his inability to deliver a good oration under difficult circumstances.'

[62] Cic. *Opt. gen.* 9 (on the simple style), *Brut.* 37 (on the intermediate style): cf. section 3.2.2 and 3.4 below. See also Cleochares' comparison between Isocrates and Demosthenes (Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 176): section 2.3.1 above.

[63] Cf. Bishop (2016) 190.

[64] Cic. *Orat.* 234: *Cuius non tam vibrarent fulmina illa, nisi numeris contorta ferrentur.*

[65] Cic. *Orat.* 149–236, more specifically ibid. 149–162 on *compositio*, ibid. 162–167 on *concinnitas*, ibid. 168–236 on *numerus.* For the terminology, see ibid. 201. Cf. also section 4.2 below on the terminological incoherence of Latin discussions of word arrangement.

[66] On hiatus, see Cic. *Orat.* 152, who claims that Demosthenes 'generally avoids' (*magna ex parte fugit*) hiatus: this accords well with Cicero's insistence that hiatus in Latin prose is vicious. See however section 2.3.3 below

Furthermore, Demosthenes is mentioned together with Isocrates and Aeschines as prime examples of 'well-knit rhythmical prose' (*numerosa et apta oratio*).[67]

Thus, the devastating force of Demosthenes' lightning bolts is derived, to Cicero's mind, from his talent for word arrangement in general and prose rhythm in particular. Indeed, Cicero argues that these aspects are crucial in approximating his ideal, the Platonic Form of the orator: 'Our words can win the praise at which we aim only by being properly arranged, and, as it were, bound together into a neat structure of words.'[68] In the next section, we will see that the discussions of Demosthenes' style in Dionysius overlap to a large extent with Cicero's *Orator*, be it that the Greek critic goes into more detail about the orator's rhythmical word arrangement.

2.3.3 Dionysius on Demosthenes' Style

The focus on Demosthenes is typical for Dionysius' so-called middle period (section 1.5): he discusses the orator's style at length in *On Demosthenes* and in the roughly contemporary treatise *On the Arrangement of Words.*[69] Stylistically, his praise of Demosthenes is built on three main pillars, that we have also encountered in Cicero's treatment of the orator: Dionysius praises Demosthenes' stylistic versatility, the suitability of his forceful rhetoric for life-and-death situations, and his talent for word arrangement.

The first of these elements is stressed throughout *On Demosthenes* and *On the Arrangement of Words*. According to Dionysius, Demosthenes had created a style that was a

---

on Dionysius' discussion of hiatus in Demosthenes. On clausulae, see Cic. *Orat.* 226, where Demosthenes and Hegesias appear side by side. Cf. also section 4.4 below on Cicero's and Dionysius' insistence on ending periods on appropriate rhythmical endings.

[67] Cic. *Orat.* 235.

[68] Cic. *Orat.* 140: *Sed haec nisi collocata et quasi structa et nexa verbis ad eam laudem quam volumus aspirare non possunt.* The demonstrative *haec* refers to the foregoing passage (*Orat.* 134–139) on stylistic 'ornaments' (*lumina*), viz., figures of speech and figures of thought.

[69] The middle-period treatise *Amm. I* is also concerned with Demosthenes: the letter does not discuss the orator's style, but it supplies chronological arguments for Dionysius' thesis that Demosthenes owed nothing to the rhetorical precepts of Arist. *Rh.* On the relative chronology of Dionysius' works, see section 1.5 above. In his early works, Dionysius does not profess his preference for Demosthenes, as the extant early works are mainly concerned with the older orators Lysias, Isocrates and Isaeus. The brief discussion of Demosthenes at *Imit.* 5.4, however, does foreshadow his later praise: he notes that the orator 'combines charm with dignity' (μετὰ τοῦ σεμνοῦ τὴν χάριν ἔχων), which praises the orator's versatility (cf. the present section and section 3.2 below), and he notes that Demosthenes possesses the qualities through which 'juries are most often swayed' (μάλιστα δικασταὶ κατέχονται), stressing the 'practical use' (τὸ συμφέρον) of his oratory (cf. the present section).

perfect mixture of the various styles of his predecessors, such as Lysias, Thucydides, Isocrates and Plato: 'Having found that public oratory had gone through a variety of changes, Demosthenes found himself following in the footsteps of some illustrious men, but refused to make any single orator or any single style his model, for he considered every one to be incomplete and imperfect, but instead he selected the best and most useful elements from all of them, weaving them together to make a single, perfect style.' In this way, Demosthenes devised 'a style that is a mixture of every form' (χαρακτὴρ ἐξ ἁπάσης μικτὸς ἰδέας).[70] The orator's method of combining all kinds of style not only makes him an ideal model (as he exhibits everything that is praiseworthy about Attic prose), but it also exemplifies the method of imitation that Dionysius recommends to his readers: in the same way as the critic thinks that an original style can be created by studying and selecting the best qualities from the best authors, so did Demosthenes select the most appropriate features from every style and every author in order to devise his own unique form of eloquence.[71]

As we will see in chapter three, Dionysius uses two three-style divisions to demonstrate the superior flexibility of Demosthenes' oratory (esp. sections 3.2 and 3.5), which I will discuss only briefly here. With respect to his three 'types of word selection' (χαρακτῆρες τῆς λέξεως), Dionysius uses a diverse terminology, calling one level 'plain' and 'thin' (e.g. λέξις ἀφελής, ἰσχνή), another 'elevated' and 'extraordinary' (e.g. λέξις ὑψηλή, περιττή), and a third 'mixed' (e.g. λέξις μικτή), incorporating the best elements from the other two styles.[72] He ties up this tripartite scheme to his system of stylistic virtues (ἀρεταί),

[70] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 8.2–4: Τοιαύτην δὴ καταλαβὼν τὴν πολιτικὴν λέξιν ὁ Δημοσθένης οὕτω κεκινημένην ποικίλως, καὶ τηλικούτοις ἐπεισελθὼν ἀνδράσιν ἑνὸς μὲν οὐθενὸς ἠξίωσε γενέσθαι ζηλωτὴς οὔτε χαρακτῆρος οὔτε ἀνδρός, ἡμιέργους τινὰς ἅπαντας οἰόμενος εἶναι καὶ ἀτελεῖς, ἐξ ἁπάντων δ'αὐτῶν ὅσα κράτιστα καὶ χρησιμώτατα ἦν ἐκλεγόμενος συνύφαινε καὶ μίαν ἐκ πολλῶν διάλεκτον ἀπετέλει. Dionysius compares Demosthenes to the mutable sea-god Proteus: see section 3.5 below. Cf. section 2.4.3 below for Dionysius' comparison between the power of word arrangement and Athena's ability to change the appearance of Odysseus.

[71] Cf. Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 1.1–5, which survives through a later epitome: he tells the story of (1) an ugly farmer, who fathers a beautiful child by showing his wife pictures of several beautiful women before sleeping with her, and (2) the painter Zeuxis, who painted a naked Helen by selecting and reproducing the beautiful body parts of various local girls. The anecdotes serve to show what can be achieved, 'if one adopts what seem to be the best features of each of the ancient writers' (ἐπὰν ζηλώσῃ τις τὸ παρ' ἑκάστῳ τῶν παλαιῶν βέλτιον εἶναι δοκοῦν). The stories have recently attracted much attention: Hunter (2009) 107–127 discusses Dionysius' subscription to Platonic imagery, Wiater (2011) 77–84 focuses on the notion of re-enacting the classical past, Schippers (2019) 1–11 expounds the origin of the stories as well as the critic's conceptions of imitation and emulation.

[72] Section 3.2, table 2 below. For the three types of word arrangement, see briefly the present section, and esp. section 3.2 and 3.3, and chapter 4 below.

distinguishing between virtues that are 'essential' (ἀναγκαῖαι) and those that are 'additional' (ἐπίθετοι): according to Dionysius, the plain style exhibits only the essential virtues (e.g., clarity, purity), the elevated style focuses on the additional virtues (e.g., emotion, grandeur), and the mixed style is an appropriate combination of both classes of virtues.[73] Consequently, the stylistic middle stands at the center of Dionysius' attention: it is in this well-blended style, which is characterized by such values as 'balance' (συμμετρία), 'timing' (εὐκαιρία), 'diversity' (ποικιλία) and 'appropriateness' (τὸ πρέπον), that he considers Demosthenes at his best.[74] Thus, whereas Cicero had stressed the orator's talent for grand oratory, Dionysius presents him as a master of the ideal mean (section 3.5).

In *On Demosthenes*, Dionysius goes to great lengths to demonstrate Demosthenes' superiority over the principal exponents in each of the three types of word selection: the critic considers Demosthenes better than Lysias in the simple style, better than Thucydides in the elevated style, and better than Plato and Isocrates in the mixed style. Dionysius submits, for instance, that Lysias' simplicity is well-suited for expositions of facts, but that his style grows 'faint' (ἀμυδρός) and 'weak' (ἀσθενής), and eventually 'burns out' (ἀποσβέννυται) in other parts of his speeches; Demosthenes, conversely, possesses all of Lysias' essential virtues, but he can also draw on a large reservoir of additional virtues.[75] Next, Dionysius finds fault with Thucydides' unrestrained style which often compromises the indispensable virtue of clarity; Demosthenes, however, at times uses the same kind of extraordinary, striking language as the historian, but without sacrificing the perspicuity of his words.[76] In the mixed style, lastly, Dionysius argues that Plato and Isocrates aim to create a style that occupies a middle ground

[73] See esp. section 3.2, tables 4 and 5 below.

[74] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 34.5, discussed in section 3.5 below.

[75] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 13.8. For the criticism of Lysias, see also *Lys.* 13.4, 19.5–6. The comparison between Lysias and Demosthenes is reminiscent of Cic. *Opt. gen.* 10: 'Demosthenes could certainly speak calmly, but Lysias perhaps not with passion' (*ita fit ut Demosthenes certe possit summisse dicere, elate Lysias fortasse non possit*). Longinus also seems to tap into a distinction between essential and additional virtues, cf. Long. *Subl.* 32.8 (= Caecilius T45 Woerther = IV 64 Ofenloch): Caecilius praised Lysias for being 'faultless' (ἀναμάρτητος) and 'pure' (καθαρός), but Longinus insists that a sublime author should aspire at greater, more risky, things.

[76] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 10.1–3: alluding to Thuc. 1.22.4, Dionysius playfully remarks that Demosthenes not only, like Thucydides, aimed 'for permanent literary value' (εἰς ἀνάθημα καὶ κτῆμα), but also 'for practical use' (εἰς χρῆσιν). On Thucydides' unclarity, see also Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 51.1–4 (on his intricate syntax), ibid. 55.1–2, Cic. *Orat.* 30 (on his rough arrangement of words), Long. *Subl.* 22.3 (on hyperbaton). Cf. De Jonge (2017), who reviews Dionysius' assessment of Thucydides in the light of his program of rhetorical education and his Roman audience, which included the historian Q. Aelius Tubero.

between Lysianic simplicity and Thucydidean elevation, but that they often fail to achieve a proper mean; Demosthenes, however, always hits the mark.[77] To Dionysius' mind, then, Demosthenes is the only prose author ever who holds a perfect equilibrium in the twisting kaleidoscope that is Attic prose.

Well-proportioned versatility is not the only stylistic feature that Dionysius associates specifically with Demosthenes: the Greek scholar also argues that no orator has more talent than Demosthenes for the real-life oratory of the courts and the assemblies, that is, for forensic and deliberative speeches: the orator's never uses ornaments merely to display his verbal artistry, but he always keeps his eye 'on practical purposes' (ἐπὶ τὸ χρήσιμον).[78] Dionysius pits the force of Demosthenes' *On the Crown*, his favorite Demosthenic speech, against the ceremonial tranquility of the funeral oration in Plato's *Menexenus*. Punning on Plato's cave allegory, Dionysius compares *On the Crown* to 'true visions' (ἀληθιναὶ ὄψεις), while *Menexenus* is said not to surpass the epistemological level of mere 'images' (εἴδωλα). Next, Demosthenes' words are said to be like 'weapons of war' (πολεμιστήρια ὅπλα) and 'bodies developed by hard work in the sun' (ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ πόνοις τεθραμμένα σώματα), whereas Plato's words are more like 'ceremonial weapons' (πομπευτήρια ὅπλα) and 'bodies that pursue a life of ease in the shade' (σκιὰς καὶ ῥᾳστώνας διώκοντα σώματα).[79] In addition, Dionysius argues that 'one would not be far wrong to compare the style of Plato to a country spot full of flowers, which affords a congenial resting-place and passing delectation to the traveler, whereas that of Demosthenes is like a field of rich and fertile land, which yields freely both the necessities of life and the extra luxuries that men enjoy'.[80]

---

[77] On Plato's mistakes in applying the mixed style, see esp. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 5–7, repeated with some modifications at *Pomp.* 2.1; for Isocrates' mistakes, see esp. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 18.3–9, cf. *Isoc.* 13.4. See section 3.5 below on the importance of 'appropriateness' (τὸ πρέπον) in Demosthenes' mixed style.

[78] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 32.2. Dionysius stresses Demosthenes' focus on 'usefulness' (χρῆσις, χρήσιμον), for 'reality' (ἀληθινόν) and for the actual 'contests' of the law courts and the assemblies (ἀγῶνες, ἐναγώνιοι λόγοι): see e.g. ibid. 10.3 (discussed in n. 76 above), 18.4, 20.3, 21.4, 32.3, 34.7, 45.1. Ooms and De Jonge (2013) 100–102 discuss the connections between Dionysius' ἐναγώνιος λόγος and Aristotle's λέξις ἀγωνιστική (*Rh.* 3.12): both terms refer to forensic and deliberative oratory, excluding epideictic speeches. Yunis (2019) 102–104 notes that Dionysius praises Demosthenes 'for mixing the goals of immediate agonistic victory and enduring literary fame'.

[79] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 32.1: Dionysius quotes Pl. *Menex.* 237c–238a, 246c–248c, and Dem. *De cor.* 199–208. For the image of soldiers/athletes, cf. section 2.3.1 n. 44 above on Cleochares' comparison between Demosthenes and Isocrates. For *De cor.* as Dionysius' favorite speech by Demosthenes, see *Comp.* 25.25.

[80] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 32.2: Καί μοι δοκεῖ τις οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτεῖν τὴν μὲν Πλάτωνος λέξιν εἰκάσας ἀνθηρῷ χωρίῳ καταγωγὰς ἡδείας ἔχοντι καὶ τέρψεις ἐφημέρους, τὴν δὲ Δημοσθένους διάλεκτον εὐκάρπῳ καὶ παμφόρῳ γῇ καὶ

Dionysius' point is that in the battles of real life Demosthenes is more useful than Plato: the former is better suited for the law-courts and the assemblies, while the latter is more at home in festivals and ceremonies. An even more dramatic picture of Demosthenes' practical force emerges, when Dionysius compares him to Isocrates.[81] The Greek critic describes his feelings after reading Isocrates as follows: 'I become serious and feel a great tranquility of mind, like those listening to libation-music played on reed-pipes or to Dorian or enharmonic melodies.' When he picks up a speech by Demosthenes, however, he is anything but lulled to sleep: 'I am transported, I am led hither and thither, (…) I feel exactly the same as those who take part in the Corybantic dances and the rites of Cybele the Mother-Goddess, and other similar ceremonies, whether it is because these celebrants are inspired by the scents, sights, or sounds or by the influence of the deities themselves, that they experience many and various sensations.'[82] To be brief, Isocrates and Plato can be read at leisure, but Demosthenes compels his listeners and readers to feel the emotions that he expresses: he has the ability to overwhelm and even control his audience. Such 'forcefulness' (δεινότης, ἰσχύς) is extremely useful in swaying audiences and winning cases.[83]

Finally, the third stylistic property that Dionysius considers typical for the style of Demosthenes is his knack for word arrangement, a topic that will be central in chapter four. Here, Dionysius deploys his threefold system of 'types of word arrangement' (χαρακτῆρες τῆς συνθέσεως), or three 'harmonies' (ἁρμονίαι), distinguishing between one type that is

---

οὔτε τῶν ἀναγκαίων εἰς βίον οὔτε τῶν περιττῶν εἰς τέρψιν σπανιζούσῃ. The combination of 'necessities' (ἀναγκαῖα) and 'luxuries' (περιττά) refers to the orator's successful application of both the essential and the additional virtues of style; the word περιττός is often used by Dionysius in relation to the elevated style of word selection, cf. section 3.2 tables 2 and 5 below.

[81] Note that in comparing Demosthenes to Plato, Dionysius compares a forensic speech (Dem. *De cor.*) to an epideictic speech (Pl. *Menex.*). In comparing Demosthenes to Isocrates, however, Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 22.1 submits that it does not matter what kind of speech by Isocrates one picks—forensic, deliberative or epideictic.

[82] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 22.1: Τὰ ἤθη σπουδαῖος γίνομαι καὶ πολὺ τὸ εὐσταθὲς ἔχω τῆς γνώμης, ὥσπερ οἱ τῶν σπονδείων αὐλημάτων ἢ τῶν Δωρίων τε καὶ ἐναρμονίων μελῶν ἀκροώμενοι. Ibid. 22.2–3: ἐνθουσιῶ τε καὶ δεῦρο κἀκεῖσε ἄγομαι, (...) διαφέρειν τε οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῷ δοκῶ τῶν τὰ μητρῷα καὶ τὰ κορυβαντικὰ καὶ ὅσα τούτοις παραπλήσιά ἐστι τελουμένων, εἴτε ὀσμαῖς ἐκεῖνοί γε εἴτε ἤχοις εἴτε τῷ δαιμόνων πνεύματι αὐτῷ κινούμενοι τὰς πολλὰς καὶ ποικίλας ἐκεῖνοι λαμβάνουσι φαντασίας. The Dorian and enharmonic melodies are associated with the sedate solemnity of the spondaic rhythm (— —): see Aujac (1988) 168 n. 3. See Jonge (2012) 286–287 for the religious imagery and the 'sublime' language of this passage: 'The emotional impact of Demosthenes' speeches is here caught in what we might call 'Longinian' terminology.' Cf. Long. *Subl.* 1.4 on being transported, ibid. 8.1, 8.4 and 15.1 on ecstasy (ἐνθουσιασμός), and ibid. 39.2 on Corybantic dancers.

[83] On Dionysius' forcefulness, see section 2.3.1 above.

'smooth' (γλαφυρά), another that is 'rough' (αὐστηρά) and a final one that is 'well-mixed' (εὔκρατος): smooth composition serves to create 'pleasure' (ἡδονή), rough composition can be used to produce 'beauty' (τὸ καλόν), while only the blended style succeeds in achieving both goals (section 3.2.2).[84] Again, Dionysius makes Demosthenes the all-round champion of the mixed style. In *On the Arrangement of Words*, accordingly, we read: 'Demosthenes, in fact, is a sort of standard (ὅρος) for both choice of words and beauty of arrangement.' In *On Demosthenes*, likewise, Dionysius confidently states that 'his arrangement of words is extraordinarily artistic and far superior to that of all other orators'.[85] To understand what it is about the orator's arrangement that Dionysius admires, we should turn to the four main tools for effective composition that the critic recognizes: he argues that pleasure and beauty in arrangement can be achieved by means of 'tone' (μέλος), 'rhythm' (ῥυθμός), 'variation' (μεταβολή) and 'appropriateness' (τὸ πρέπον).[86]

Needless to say, the latter two elements can be readily recognized in Demosthenes' ability to adapt his style to suit any occasion: 'In brief, he not only considered it necessary to vary the mixture of the styles of arrangement according to the individual requirements of his speeches and their different subject-matter, but he also saw that the constituent parts of the various forms of argument were of a different nature from one another, and tried to invest them with different styles, couching his aphoristic utterances in one kind of arrangement, his arguments in another and his examples in a different form again.'[87] Moreover, variation and

[84] For the two goals of word arrangement, see Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 10.2, 11.2, *Dem.* 47.2–4 with section 3.2, table 6 below. Donadi (1986) argues that Dionysius creates a novel approach to literary criticism by insisting on 'pleasure' (ἡδονή) and 'beauty' (καλόν), which applies to both visual and aural perception: for beauty and pleasure in sound, see esp. sections 4.3 and 4.4. Goudriaan (1989) 203–215 shows that the critic's political and moral program can be closely linked to the two goals of word arrangement, esp. beauty: cf. section 4.5.

[85] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.15: Ὅρος γὰρ δή τίς ἐστιν ἐκλογῆς τε ὀνομάτων καὶ κάλλους συνθέσεως ὁ Δημοσθένης. *Dem.* 35.1: Περιττή τίς ἐστιν ἡ τῆς λέξεως τῆς Δημοσθένους ἁρμονία καὶ μακρῷ δή τινι διαλλάττουσα τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων. Note that Dionysius declares Demosthenes the champion of word arrangement in the category of oratory: at *Comp.* 18.13–14, he posits that Plato could rival Demosthenes on the subject of word arrangement. Cf. ibid. 19.12, where he praises Herodotus, Plato and Demosthenes in equal measure, submitting that the differences can be attributed to their different genres, i.e., history, dialogue, oratory.

[86] See Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.1, *Dem.* 47.4. For μέλος as 'tone' instead of 'melody', see section 4.4 n. 64 below.

[87] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 46.1: Συνελόντι δ' εἰπεῖν, οὐ μόνον παρὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας τῶν λόγων καὶ τὰς παραλλαγὰς τῶν ὑποθέσεων διαφόρους ᾤετο δεῖν ποιεῖσθαι τὰς κράσεις τῶν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει χαρακτήρων, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ τὰ γένη τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων τὰ συμπληρωτικὰ μέρη διαφόρους ἔχοντα τὰς φύσεις ὁρῶν διαλλαττούσαις κατασκευαῖς τῆς ἁρμονίας ἐπειρᾶτο κοσμεῖν, ἄλλως μὲν τὰς γνωμολογίας συντιθείς, ἄλλως δὲ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα, διαφόρως δὲ τὰ παραδείγματα.

appropriateness are presented as Demosthenes' guiding principles in the areas of tone and rhythm. Under the heading of 'tone' (μέλος), Dionysius focuses mainly on the sound that results from the juxtaposition of final syllables and the subsequent initial syllables: clashes of vowels (e.g., εὐτυχοῦντα ὁρᾶν) or consonants (e.g., φοβερὸν προσπολεμῆσαι) produce a rough sound, while combinations that can be pronounced without a pause (e.g., εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν) are considered smooth (section 4.4). According to Dionysius, any excerpt from the orator's speeches may serve to demonstrate his well-wrought variations of tone: the Greek critic underlines this point by claiming that he quotes samples from Demosthenes' speeches that he selected 'not deliberately, but at random'.[88]

As for rhythm, finally, Dionysius again ascribes to Demosthenes an impeccable sense of propriety: the orator is said to possess the ability to make his speeches resemble beautiful poems, but the rules of decorum prevent him from creating complete verses. This is an important point that the critic makes about the orator's style: it is 'rhythmical' (εὔρυθμος) without being 'in rhythm' (ἔρρυθμος), it is 'metrical' (εὔμετρος) without being 'in meter' (ἔμμετρος), holding a perfect middle ground between prose and poetry.[89] In addition,

[88] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 43.3: Οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιτηδεύσεως, ἀλλ' οἷς ἐνέτυχον. The collocations quoted here come from Dem. *Olynth. II* 22–23, which is discussed at Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 43.3–13 in order to verify 'whether the structure is sometimes halting and broken up, sometimes coherent and compact, sometimes harshly grating on the ear, sometimes gently soothing, sometimes impelling hearers to emotion, sometimes leading gently on to moral seriousness, and producing many different effects in the actual arrangement' (εἰ τὰ μὲν ἀναβεβλημένας ἔχει τὰς ἁρμονίας καὶ διεστώσας, τὰ δὲ προσκολλώσας καὶ συμπεπυκνωμένας, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀποτραχύνει τε καὶ πικραίνει τὴν ἀκοήν, τὰ δὲ πραΰνει καὶ λεαίνει, καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς πάθος ἐκτρέπει τοὺς ἀκούοντας, τὰ δ'εἰς ἦθος ὑπάγεται, τὰ δ' ἄλλας τινὰς ἐργάζεται καὶ πολλὰς διαφορὰς παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν σύνθεσιν). Yet, Vaahtera (1997) demonstrates that Dionysius' views about euphony and phonetics are often not pertinent to the passages that he cites to illustrate them: cf. section 4.4 n. 68 below.

[89] For this point, see Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.25, 25.11–13, *Dem.* 50.7. Cf. Theon *Prog.* p. 71.7–11 Spengel, censuring Hegesias and other so-called Asian orators for applying a style that is both 'in meter' (ἔμμετρος) and 'in rhythm' (ἔρρυθμος): see n. 140 below. Dionysius attributes the criticism of overly metrical or rhythmical prose to Aristotle, cf. Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.3: 'Therefore, prose must be rhythmical, but not metrical, otherwise it would be a poem; nor must this rhythm be rigorously carried out, but only up to a certain point' (διὸ ῥυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον, μέτρον δὲ μή· ποίημα γὰρ ἔσται. ῥυθμὸν δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται, ἐὰν μέχρι του ᾖ). Transl. Kennedy (1991). In *Comp.* 25–26, Dionysius illustrates how prose and poetry may be similar: he quotes passages from Dem. *Arist.* and *De cor.*, arguing that the orator's sentences constitute near-complete verses. De Jonge (2008) 294–295, however, rightly notes that 'Aristotle would probably not have approved of Dionysius' analysis of Demosthenes' prose into almost complete verses', suggesting that 'Dionysius uses Aristotle as an authority for his own theories, albeit the philosopher's views were actually rather different'. For the dichotomy between 'rhythmical' and 'in rhythm' in Latin, cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.184–185, *Orat.* 195, 220 with section 1.7 n. 151 above.

Dionysius insists that in Demosthenes' speeches 'the most frequent rhythms will be the manly, dignified and noble ones, rarely the loose rhythm of the Ionian choral dance'. In the former category, the critic typically lists those rhythmical feet that are dominated by long syllables, such as the spondee (— —), the molossus (— — —), the bacchius (— — ⏑) and the hypobacchius (⏑ — —), while the latter category mostly features those feet that are dominated by short syllables, such as the pyrrhic (⏑ ⏑), the tribrach (⏑ ⏑ ⏑) and the amphibrach (⏑ — ⏑).[90] Interestingly, modern scholarship confirms that Demosthenes eschewed successions of more than two short syllables: this rule, which is usually called 'Blass' law' after its discoverer, seems to apply to no other fourth-century orator and it can hence be used as a negative criterion of authenticity for Demosthenes' speeches.[91]

Thus, Dionysius praises Demosthenes' ability to adapt his oratory to suit any occasion: in his view, the Athenian is a champion of the well-balanced, mixed style in the selection of his words and in their arrangement. Dionysius especially admires the orator's sense of 'appropriateness, which touches the stars in Demosthenes' (τὸ πρέπον ὃ τῶν ἄστρων ψαύει παρὰ Δημοσθένει).[92] This talent is particularly useful in the harsh reality of the law-courts and the assemblies, where any failure to observe the rules of decorum can have disastrous

[90] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 43.13: Καὶ τῶν ῥυθμῶν πολλαχῇ μὲν τοὺς ἀνδρώδεις καὶ ἀξιωματικοὺς καὶ εὐγενεῖς, σπανίως δέ που τοὺς ὑπορχηματικούς τε καὶ Ἰωνικοὺς καὶ διακλωμένους. For a complete overview of Dionysius' noble and ignoble rhythms, see section 2.4.3 n. 146 on *Comp.* 17. Cf. also section 4.4 below on the stylistic applications of long syllables in the so-called 'rough' type of word arrangement. Note, however, that Dionysius considers dactyls (— ⏑ ⏑) and the anapests (⏑ ⏑ —) noble, while he describes the amphibrach (⏑ — ⏑), which has the same number of short syllables, as unpleasant and effeminate: cf. Gentili (1990) on the role of irrationality in Dionysius' views on rhythm and meter. Confusingly, Dionysius (e.g. *Comp.* 17.7) uses the term 'choree', or 'dance-like' (χορεῖος) to refer to the tribrach (⏑ ⏑ ⏑), while Cicero (e.g. *Orat.* 193) uses the same term (*choreus*) to refer to the trochee (— ⏑). Apparently, various rhythmical feet, esp. those dominated by short syllables, could be associated with dancing: cf. the pyrrhic (⏑ ⏑), so named after the 'pyrrhic war-dance' (πυρρίχη). Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.4 posits that the trochee is 'rather like the cordax' (κορδακικώτερος), referring to the comedic dance (κόρδαξ), probably giving rise to Cicero's use of the term *choreus* for the trochee. Incidentally, Cicero (e.g. *Orat.* 193) refers to the tribrach as 'trochee' (*trochaeus*).

[91] Blass (1893) 105–112 noted that a speech is probably not composed by Demosthenes, if it has frequent tribrachs (⏑ ⏑ ⏑). This 'law' has often been reaffirmed by later authors, but it should probably be considered a strong tendency rather than a rigid law: cf. e.g. Adams (1917), Skimina (1937) 106–136 and esp. McCabe (1981), who has verified the validity of Blass' law on the basis of computer analyses. There are no extant ancient authors who explicitly mention this feature of Demosthenes' style (although Dionysius hints at it), while Aelius Aristides (second century AD) is the only other known ancient writer who applies it: McCabe (1981) 20.

[92] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 34.5. The reference to stars touches on the rhetoric of the sublime: see section 3.5 n. 118.

consequences for the orator or his client. It is therefore, in Dionysius' view, that Demosthenes does not use such extravagant gimmicks as dance-like rhythms, but he rather applies a cadence that reflects the seriousness of the case at hand.

2.3.4 Summary: the Principal Stylistic Virtues of Demosthenes

To summarize, I have observed several similarities between Dionysius' and Cicero's discussions of Demosthenes' style: both authors claim that he is the best exponent of Greek prose, while they also submit similar reasons for doing so. From the material that I have examined above, three principal stylistic virtues emerge that both the Roman rhetorician and the Greek critic adduce to substantiate their claim that Demosthenes should be awarded the crown of eloquence. In a word, the common Greek and Roman discourse on the style of Demosthenes in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome can be summarized in the following three points:

1. Cicero and Dionysius stress Demosthenes' stylistic versatility. According to Cicero, the orator's repertoire spans all three stylistic registers, allowing him to speak appropriately on every subject. Dionysius argues that Demosthenes is a champion of the mixed style, which is an appropriate combination of the best elements from the simple and elevated styles. The orator's oeuvre was thought to offer a comprehensive overview of stylistic theory put into practice, which makes him the ideal object of imitation for Greek and Roman orators alike.

2. Demosthenes was admired mainly as a practical orator, whose style is particularly effective in forensic and deliberative speeches. Cicero notes that his forcefulness is extremely useful on the oratorical battleground of the Forum. Dionysius compares the usefulness and the astonishing force of Demosthenes' style, likewise, to weapons of war, fertile fields, highly trained bodies, and the ecstatic rites of Cybele. It was thought, then, that Greek and Roman orators could overwhelm and control their audience by summoning the power of Demosthenic thunderbolts.

3. According to Cicero and Dionysius, Demosthenes exhibited an unrivalled talent for word arrangement. Cicero, who does not go into much detail about the orator's style of arrangement, attributes the force of his oratory to a large extent to his attention to rhythm. Dionysius, who offers an extensive discussion of the orator's verbal

> arrangements, also praises his use of rhythm, which allowed him to compose speeches that are not only admirable as artistic masterpieces resembling beautiful poetry, but also to be reckoned with in serious oratory.

In the next chapters, I will examine the differences between the stylistic discussions in Cicero's rhetorical works and Dionysius' critical essays that I already briefly signaled above. I will, for instance, zoom in on the different motivations that underlie their three-style systems (sections 3.4 and 3.5), and I will pay attention to their diverse evaluations of musical arrangement (section 4.5). In addition, we will also see that Cicero and Dionysius have different ideas about the practical application of their doctrines: it will appear that stylistic theory is closely connected with the politics of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome (sections 5.5 and 5.6). The next section, however, will dwell a little longer on the common critical framework of our authors by turning to their discussions of Hegesias of Magnesia, whom they both consider to be Demosthenes' stylistic antipode.

2.4 How Not To Compose Great Prose: Hegesias as the Prototype of Degeneracy

According to Dionysius, Hegesias is a 'high-priest of humbug' (τῶν λήρων ἱερεύς).[93] This kind of abuse is typical for the extreme scorn that the Hellenistic orator and historian receives from virtually every extant ancient source that discusses his style.[94] Although the absolute peak of anti-Hegesias sentiment, exhibited by Cicero, Dionysius, Strabo, Aelius Theon and Longinus, lies in the first centuries BC and AD, he was already severely censured by the historian and geographer Agatharchides of Cnidus (fl. mid-second century BC).[95] In this

[93] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.11.

[94] The only clear-cut exception is the Roman scholar Varro (116–27 BC): cf. Cic. *Att.* 12.6.1 cited in section 2.1 n. 6 above. Rutilius Lupus (late first century BC) and Philodemus are not obviously hostile to Hegesias. Rutilius translates various Greek passages into Latin to illustrate the figures of speech catalogued in his excerpt of *On Figures of Speech* by the Greek rhetor Gorgias (first century BC): two books survive, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.2.102 knew four books. Rutilius has examples from Hegesias of epanaphora (ἐπιβολή, Rut. *Fig.* 1.7 Halm = Hegesias F27 Jacoby), varied construction (ἀλλοίωσις, Rut. *Fig.* 2.2 Halm = Hegesias F28 Jacoby) and feigned doubt (ἀπορία, Rut. *Fig.* 2.10 Halm = Hegesias F29 Jacoby): Rutilius refers to Hegesias in the same way as to Attic orators like Demosthenes. For Philodemus, see *Rhet.* 4 col. 21.15–25 (= p. 180 Sudhaus) in section 2.2 n. 25.

[95] Str. *Geogr.* 14.1.41, Theon *Prog.* p. 71.7–11 Spengel, Long. *Subl.* 3.2: see section 2.2 n. 14, 24 and 25 above. The available evidence for Agatharchides' life is meagre, but from a few testimonies (Str. *Geogr.* 14.2.15 = Agatharch. T1 Jacoby; Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 213, 171a6–b17 = Agatharch. T2 Jacoby) and a couple of autobiographical references in his work *On the Red Sea* (quoted at Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 250, 460b3–13 = Agatharch.

section, I will first examine the discussion of Hegesias' style by the latter author (section 2.4.1). Next, we will see that this earlier criticism foreshadows the harsh judgments in both Cicero's rhetorical works (section 2.4.2) and Dionysius' critical treatises (section 2.4.3): as their designated antimodel of style, Hegesias seems to fail on precisely the same points on which Demosthenes is said to have triumphed. Thus, we will see that Hegesias falls outside of the scope of the threefold stylistic classifications of our authors, that his style is considered utterly unpractical, not to be used in real-life oratory, and that he is thought to possess no talent whatsoever for appropriate word arrangement. In brief, Hegesias is set up to be Demosthenes' polar opposite.

2.4.1 Agatharchides of Cnidus on Hegesias' Style

The only discussion of Hegesias' style before the first century BC comes from an excerpt from the last book of Agatharchides' five-volume geographical, ethnographical and historiographical work *On the Red Sea*.[96] The author's interest in Hegesias is sparked, when he ponders the proper approach to describing the calamities of others: 'Many public orators and poets have been at a loss as to how a person whose situation is free from danger ought properly (πρεπόντως) to recount the extreme misfortunes that have befallen some men.'[97] As

---

T3 Jacoby), we can gather that he was probably born before 200 BC, he stayed at the court of Ptolemy VI Philometor in Alexandria, he was exiled around 145 BC by Ptolemy VIII, and he spent the remainder of his life in Athens: see Burstein (1989) 12–18, id. (2012). On Agatharchides' works, esp. *Erythr.*, see section 2.4.1 n. 96.

[96] Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 250 preserves two large excerpts from *On the Red Sea* (Περὶ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης), one from the first book and one from the fifth book. The relevant passage on Hegesias is Agatharch. *Erythr.* 5.21 (= Agatharch. p. 119.14–122.24 Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* 1 = Phot. *Bibl.* 445b36–447b5), containing Hegesias T3, F6–19. *Erythr.* is Agatharchides' third major work, written after his large treatises *On Affairs in Europe* (Τὰ κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην) in ten books and *On Affairs in Asia* (Τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν) in forty-nine books. He probably worked on it during his stay at the Ptolemaic court until ca. 145 BC: Agatharchides himself claims (at Phot. *Bibl.* 460b3–13) that he left *Erythr.* unfinished on account of his old age, and because he lost access to the Ptolemaic archives after his exile (cf. previous note). The accounts on the Red Sea in Diod. Sic. 3.12–48 and Str. *Geogr.* 16.4.5–20 are derived from Agatharchides. There is some discussion as to whether *Erythr.* is a separate work or rather an integral part of *On Affairs in Asia*: see Marcotte (2001) for the latter interpretation, and Engels (2004), who gives an overview of modern scholarship on the work. Burstein (2012) offers a commentary to Jacoby's collection of fragments.

[97] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 119.14–17 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 445b38–41): Ὅτι πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν ποίημα γεγραφότων διηπορήκασι πῶς τὰς ὑπερβαλλούσας ἐνίοις ἀκληρίας τὸν ἐκτὸς τῶν κινδύνων κείμενον πρεπόντως ἐξαγγελτέον. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 22.4 on Demosthenes' ability to make later generations feel the emotions that he meant to pass onto his contemporaries: see section 2.2 n. 21 above.

a case in point, Agatharchides turns to the destruction of Olynthus (348 BC) by the Macedonian king Philip II, and the sack of Thebes (335 BC) by his son Alexander: he quotes twelve (or perhaps fourteen) small samples from Hegesias' works as typical examples of how not to describe such tragedies.[98] According to the author, the Magnesian misguidedly strives for verbal artistry, where pathos is required: 'Hegesias, who often commemorated the destruction of these cities, is paltry (εὐτελής). For, not wishing to speak in a manner appropriate to the occasion (τοῖς καιροῖς οἰκείως) but compulsively seeking to display his preciosity (κομψότης) in dealing with a harsh topic, he achieves, to some extent, his personal goal, but without regard for the dignity of his subject.'[99]

Agatharchides, then, posits that Hegesias' style is unfit for serious matters: this point will return in the works of Cicero and Dionysius, who, as we have already seen, stress the importance of appropriateness in their analysis of Demosthenes. In addition, there is another aspect in the passage from *On the Red Sea* that seems to anticipate the stylistic discourse of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome: Agatharchides not only censures Hegesias, but also 'the followers of Hegesias' (οἱ περὶ Ἡγησίαν) and a certain Hermesianax, while he praises the Attic orators Demosthenes, Aeschines and Stratocles.[100] According to Agatharchides, the

[98] There is no consensus about the origins of the citations: for a discussion, see Prandi (2016). As Susemihl (1892) 464 and Jacoby (1930) 529 assumed, the fragments may derive from a historiographical work on Alexander the Great: they can easily be imagined to belong to a larger narrative, and Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.22 quotes a thematically related passage about Alexander's siege of Gaza (332 BC) 'from his history' (ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας). Yet, Sternbach (1930) 43 may be right in ascribing the fragments to various rhetorical works: Hegesias often uses direct speech, Agatharchides refers to his 'speeches' (λόγοι), and he calls him a 'sophist' (σοφιστής). Staab (2004) 136–146 suggests that the fragments come from his satirical dialogue *The Lovers of Athens*: cf. section 2.2 n. 2 above. Phot. *Bibl.* 446b35–39 (= Hegesias F25–26 Jacoby) quotes two sentences of ambiguous authorship: Jacoby (1930) 531 and Staab (2004) 146 are rightly hesitant to attribute them to either Hermesianax (who is quoted immediately before, cf. n. 100 below) or Hegesias (whose style is Agatharchides' main focus throughout the passage). It is equally possible that they come from another, unnamed Asian author, as Sternbach (1930) 44 suggests.

[99] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 119.33–120.3 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a16–21): Ἡγησίας μὲν οὖν πολλάκις τῆς ἀπωλείας μεμνημένος τῶν πόλεων εὐτελὴς ἐστιν. Ὁ γὰρ μὴ θέλων τοῖς καιροῖς οἰκείως διαλέγεσθαι, ζητῶν δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐν αὐστηρῷ πράγματι κομψότητα διαφαίνειν, τοῦ μὲν ἰδίου ζηλώματος ἐπὶ ποσὸν τυγχάνει, τῆς δὲ τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἀξίας οὐ στοχάζεται. For Hegesias' κομψότης, cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.11 (μικρόκομψον).

[100] See Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 121.12–15 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b33–36) for Hermesianax, see ibid. 121.38–122.22 (= Phot. *Bibl.* 447a17–447b3) for Demosthenes, Aeschines and Stratocles. Stratocles (fl. ca. 300 BC) was usually criticized as a politician who contributed to the downfall of the Athenian democracy after Demosthenes, esp. due to his emphatic support of Demetrius Poliorcetes: cf. Ath. 13.596, Plut. *Demetr.* 12.1, Diod. Sic.

former have described the fall of Olynthus and Thebes 'in an allegorical manner (ἀλληγορικῶς) and through extravagant expressions (περιττῶς)', whereas the latter have spoken 'in a more dignified way, maintaining the normal and proper meanings of the words, even while dealing with terrible matters'.[101] Although Agatharchides himself does not use the labels 'Attic' and 'Asian', his analysis is reminiscent of the later discussions about Attic and Asian style in Rome, which typically connect Atticism with purity, and Asianism with abundance (section 5.3). Still, we should not consider the Agatharchides a pioneer of Atticism: admiration for the Attic dialect and Athenian culture was common throughout the Hellenistic era, and, as we will see, there did not exist a unified centuries-spanning school of Atticism with actual, identifiable adherents (section 5.2).[102]

Why does Agatharchides consider Hegesias' words ill-suited to describe the tragic fates of Olynthus and Thebes? As we have seen, the geographer specifically takes offense at the 'preciosity' (κομψότης), that is produced by Hegesias' overabundant use of fancy, figurative language. Because of this vicious tendency, he is, according to the geographer, unable the express the emotion (πάθος) that is appropriate for the description of human suffering: Agatharchides divides his quotes from Hegesias into three groups that each illustrate one way in which the Magnesian destroys the genuine emotion that his subject requires. First of all, his extravagant expressions are often hard to understand, as can be seen in the examples below:[103]

– F6 Jacoby: Ὄνομα κατελάβομεν πόλιν καταλιπόντες. ('We have earned a name by abandoning a city.')

20.46.2, and, for a nuanced modern discussion, Bayliss (2011) 152–186. The identity of Hermesianax, to whom Agatharchides attributes a *Praise of Athens*, is uncertain. He is often identified with the Alexandrian poet from Colophon (fl. 300–250 BC), who composed the three-book elegiac poem *Leontion*, but his appearance 'in the midst of a long rant about the orator-historian Hegesias is slightly odd': see Tuplin (2010). Another candidate is a certain Hermesianax of Cyprus, who wrote a *Phrygian Affairs* (Φρυγιακά), mentioned at [Plut.] *Fluv.* 12.4. It is equally possible, however, that the references is to another, hitherto unknown Hermesianax.

[101] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 119.25–29 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a8–12): Εἰρήκασιν οὖν περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος ἄλλοι μὲν ἀλληγορικῶς τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ ταῖς διαλέκτοις, ὡς δοκοῦσι, περιττῶς, οἱ δ' ἐμβριθέστερον, τὰ συνήθη καὶ τὰς κυριολογίας ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς οὐ πεφευγότες.

[102] On account of Agatharchides' praise of Attic orators and his rejection of Hegesias, Norden (1898) 127 thinks that Atticism originated ca. 200 BC; see, however, the criticism of this view in Radermacher (1899a) 351–360, Wilamowitz (1900) 28, and Wisse (1995) 74–75 and section 5.2 n. 21 below.

[103] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.3–21 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a22–32).

- F7 Jacoby: Τὸν γὰρ μέγιστα φωνήσαντα τόπον ἄφωνον ἡ συμφορὰ πεποίηκε. ('For the disaster has made the place that has rung the loudest speechless.')
- F8 Jacoby: Ἐκ μυριάνδρου πόλεως ἐξῆλθον, ἐπιστραφεὶς δ' οὐκέτ' εἶδον. ('I left a city of ten thousand men, but when I turned around, I no longer saw it.')

These sentences contain witty puns that are based on assonance (κατελάβομεν, καταλιπόντες), cognates (φωνήσαντα, ἄφωνον) and paradox (a populous city vanishing into thin air) respectively: Hegesias' words are all the more puzzling for us, as we have little information about their original context.[104] According to Agatharchides, such riddles have no place in the treatment of woes: 'This makes no emotional impact at all but concentrates attention on his meaning and causes a person to struggle to understand what it is that he is talking about. For, wherever one creates uncertainty about the meaning, there one weakens a discourse.' Rather, 'a person uttering a lament must eschew witticisms (ἀστεϊσμοί) and clearly indicate the event with which the emotion is connected, if he intends not merely to adorn his speech with fine phrases (διακοσμεῖν τῇ λέξει) but to grasp the cause of the misery'.[105]

Secondly, Agatharchides not only posits that Hegesias fails to make his meaning clear, but also that he is unable to understand 'how to make the emotion (πάθος) visible through vivid description' (ἐνάργεια).[106] Indeed, the idea that historical narrative should be vivid and full of emotion appears to have been fundamental to Agatharchides' conception of his own work as a historian: he stresses the didactic force of 'vivid description which teaches the audience about the matter at hand' (ἡ διδάσκουσα τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐνάργεια) through emotional

[104] Staab (2004) 139–143 offers a discussion of various ways to understand these sentences. According to him, F6 possibly refers to the fact that only the name of the city (probably Thebes) exists after its destruction: 'Nur noch einen Namen bekamen wir zu fassen, nachdem wir die Stadt verlassen haben.' Alternatively, Hegesias may have cleverly combined the phrases πόλιν καταλαβεῖν ('to conquer a city') and ὄνομα λαβεῖν ('to take on a name') as a cynical utterance from a vanquished speaker: 'Einen Namen haben wir bekommen, indem wir eine Stadt zurückgelassen haben.' Staab submits that the 'loud ringing' in T7 refers to the vociferous resistance of Thebes against Alexander. F8, lastly, addresses the destruction of Olynthus, as Agatharchides himself indicates.

[105] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.5–9 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a23–26): Τοῦτο πάθος μὲν οὐδαμῶς ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ συνάγει πρὸς τὴν ἔμφασιν καὶ ποιεῖ ζητεῖν τί λέγει. Οὗ γὰρ ἄν τις τῇ γνώμῃ δισταγμὸν ἐνεργάσηται, ἐκεῖσε ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου τὸ δεινὸν ἀφῆκε. Ibid. 120.18–21 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a34–37): Δεῖ δὲ τὸν οἰκτιζόμενον ἀφέντα τοὺς ἀστεϊσμούς, τὰ πρᾶγμα σημαίνειν ᾧ οἰκείωται τὸ πάθος, εἰ μέλλοι μὴ τῇ λέξει διακοσμεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς συμφορᾶς αἰτίῳ προσεδρεύειν.

[106] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.45–46 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b18–19): Πῶς τὸ πάθος ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν ἀγάγοι διὰ τῆς ἐναργείας.

engagement rather than intellectual reflection.[107] According to Agatharchides, Hegesias utterly fails in this respect: his extravagant language does not contribute to bringing the gruesome destruction of Thebes and Olynthus before the eyes of his readers and listeners. Compare the following quotes that Agatharchides adduces:[108]

- F9 Jacoby: Ἀλέξανδρε, καὶ τὸν Ἐπαμινώνδαν νόμισον, ὁρῶντα τὰ λείψανα τῆς πόλεως, παρόντα μοι συνικετεύειν. ('Alexander, imagine also Epaminondas as present, and, after seeing the remains of the city, joining with me in supplication.')
- F10 Jacoby: Βασιλικῇ μανίᾳ προσπταίσασα πόλις τραγῳδίας ἐλεεινοτέρα γέγονε. ('Struck by royal madness, the city has become more piteous than a tragedy.')
- F11 Jacoby: Τί δεῖ λέγειν Ὀλυνθίους καὶ Θηβαίους, οἷα κατὰ πόλεις ἀποθανόντες πεπόνθασιν; ('Why should one mention the Olynthians and the Thebans, how they suffered, dying in their cities?')
- F13 Jacoby: Αἱ δὲ πόλεις αἱ πλησίον ἔκλαιον τὴν πόλιν, ὁρῶσαι τὴν πρότερον οὖσαν οὐκέτ' οὖσαν. ('The nearby cities bewailed the city, seeing that what formerly existed no longer exists.')

Agatharchides claims that Hegesias is unable to address the horror of his topic: taking the rhetorical question (in F11) au serieux, the geographer for instance complains that Hegesias is not even sure if it is at all necessary to commemorate the fate of the Olynthians and the Thebans. As for the other fragments, Agatharchides complains that Hegesias goes out of his way to create extraordinary phrases without any concern for the vehement emotion that they ought to convey. In the appeal to Alexander, for instance, 'the request is puerile (μειρακιῶδες) and the metaphor is harsh, but the grimness of the deed remains unaddressed'. In comparing

[107] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 122.12–13 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 447a35–36). See Zangara (2008) for a discussion of 'vivid description' (ἐνάργεια) as one of several ways in which Hellenistic historians make the events that they describe visible. See also Allan, De Jong and De Jonge (2017) on ἐνάργεια ('the power of bringing the things that are said before the senses of the audience') in Greek literary criticism and its links with the modern notion of immersion. As for Agatharchides, Gallo (2011) argues that he aimed to arouse emotions in order to get his moral messages across, while Maier (2018) posits that he uses vivid description as a means to make his audience experience history as an eyewitness, making ἐνάργεια a substitute for the author's autopsy.

[108] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.21–121.3 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a37–b25). For (the rhythm of) F12, the longest citation of Hegesias in Agatharchides, see section 2.4.2 below. For a thoughtful reconstruction of the original contexts of these passages, see Staab (2004) 143–145. Epaminondas, referred to in F9, is a Theban leader (first half of the fourth century BC), who once entertained Philip II: cf. Diod. Sic. 15.39.2, 17.2.2 and Cic. *Tusc.* 1.4.

the destruction of cities with a fictitious drama, likewise, 'he appears to have created anything except what would be appropriate for a skilled speaker (τὸ καθῆκον σοφιστῇ), since it does not touch the subject at all.' A similar point can be made about the last fragment, in which Hegesias uses a crude euphemism to refer to the ruin of the Greek cities: 'What formerly existed, no longer exists'. Hence, Agatharchides concludes that Hegesias is unable to arouse pity: 'If, therefore, someone spoke these sentences to the Thebans and Olynthians by way of consolation at the time of their conquest, they would, I think, have laughed at the author and, in a way, considered him more wretched than themselves.'[109]

This brings us to Agatharchides' third series of quotes from Hegesias, which serve to show the 'ultimate frigidity' (ψυχρότης ἐσχάτη) that the Magnesian orator and historian commits. Frigidity arises, when an author, who aims at grandeur, overshoots the expression that is appropriate for the thought and ends up with an exaggerated, affected style.[110] Hegesias incurs the charge of frigidity on account of his intricate wordplays, as the following four citations aim to illustrate:[111]

- F14 Jacoby: Δεινὸν τὴν χώραν ἄσπορον εἶναι τὴν τοὺς Σπαρτοὺς τεκοῦσαν. ('Terrible is the fact that the land that bore the 'Sown-men' is unsown.')
- F15 Jacoby: Θηβαῖοι ἐν τῇ μάχῃ τῇ πρὸς Μακεδόνας ὑπὲρ τοὺς μυρίους ἀνετράπησαν. ('The Thebans, more than ten thousand of them, were turned upside down in the battle against the Macedonians.')

[109] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.24–26 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a40–b1): Αἴτημα μὲν μειρακιῶδες καὶ μεταφορὰ σκληρά, τὸ δὲ σκυθρωπὸν τῆς πράξεως ἄρρητον. Ibid. 120.28–29 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b3–5): Πρὸς πᾶν μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ καθῆκον σοφιστῇ ἡτοιμάσθαι φαίνεται, ὅθεν οὐ λίαν ἅπτεται τοῦ προκειμένου. Ibid. 120.48–121.3 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b21–25): Εἴ τις οὖν τοῖς Θηβαίοις καὶ τοῖς Ὀλυνθίοις παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἅλωσιν τὰς περιόδους ταύτας συναχθόμενος ἔλεγε, δοκοῦσιν ἄν μοι γελάσαι τὸν γράψαντα καὶ τρόπον τινὰ αὐτῶν ὑπολαβεῖν ἀθλιώτερον. For Hegesias' puerility, cf. Cic. *Brut.* 287: *puerile*. For the ridiculousness of Hegesias' style, cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.28: οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χλευασμῷ καὶ καταγέλωτι. For Hegesias as a sophist, cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.22 with section 2.1 n. 5 above.

[110] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 121.12 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b33). For frigidity as a vicious form of grandeur, see e.g. Demetr. *Eloc.* 114–127 (quoting Theophrastus); Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 3.1, *Dem.* 20.6, 21.3, *Thuc.* 46.2, 48.3; Long. *Subl.* 3.4. Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 2.4 connects frigidity to Asianism. For Hegesias' frigidity, cf. Plut. *Alex.* 3.6. Van Hook (1917) notes that the modern term 'frigidity' (i.e., flatness, dullness, insipidity) does not correspond with the meaning of the Greek term ψυχρότης, which refers to extravagance; instead, he proposes 'fustian' as a translation; 'frigidity' seems to go better with the Latin *frigidum*. Cf. Gutzwiller (1969).

[111] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 121.3–38 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b25–447a16). See Staab (2004) 146–148 for a discussion of the possible meaning of these passages.

- F16 Jacoby: Τῆς μὲν πόλεως κατασκαφείσης οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες παίδων συμφορὰς ὑπομένουσιν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες μετήχθησαν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, τὴν πόλιν θάψασαί τινα τρόπον. ('After the city had been razed, the men put up with the miseries of their sons; the women were transported to Macedonia, having in a way buried the city.')
- F17 Jacoby: Ἡ δὲ φάλαγξ τῶν Μακεδόνων εἰσβιασαμένη τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐντὸς τείχους τὴν πόλιν ἀπέκτεινεν. ('The Macedonian phalanx, having used its weapons to force its way within the walls, killed the city.')

The first fragment above refers to the myth which relates how Cadmus planted a handful of dragon's teeth in the barren Theban land, from which subsequently emerged a group of fully equipped warriors, known as the 'Sown-men' (Σπαρτοί). Agatharchides is particularly unhappy about the antithesis, which is derived from the pun on two cognates (Σπαρτοί, ἄσπορος), both connected to the verb 'to sow' (σπείρω): far from inciting pity or grief, such tongue-in-cheek plays on words will only arouse laughter.[112] The remaining examples are selected for their unfortunate figurative expressions: Hegesias, for instance, uses the verb 'to turn upside down' (ἀνατρέπω), which evokes the image of capsizing ships, to describe the killing of ten thousand Thebans, a number which is probably exaggerated. 'What a marvelous image,' Agatharchides remarks cynically, 'so many men unexpectedly turned upside down!'[113] Similarly, Hegesias remarks that the women of Thebes 'buried' their city (F16), after it had been 'killed' by Macedonian invaders (F17). Unsurprisingly, the metaphors do not please the geographer: 'There the grave of the city and here its death: all that is required is to add a funeral and compose an epitaph and the business would be complete!' These 'frigid' quotes lead Agatharchides to diagnose their author with 'madness' (μανία).[114]

---

[112] According to Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 121.6–12 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b27–33), Hegesias adapted this sentence from a phrase by Demosthenes of unknown origin, discussing the barrenness of Attica, which had been the birthplace of the cultivation of crops: Agatharchides submits that the Demosthenes' antithesis is derived from the thought, while Hegesias derives it from the words. Agatharch. *Erythr.* 121.12–19 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b33–39) cites a similar pun from Hermesianax, and two from an ambiguous source (cf. n. 98 above).

[113] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 121.26–27 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 447a5–7): Ὢ καλῆς ἐμφάσεως· ἄνθρωποι τοσοῦτοι παραλόγως ἀνατετραμμένοι. The word ἀνατρέπω can refer to anything that is turned upside down, such as men (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 6.164), ships (e.g. Pl. *Lg.* 906e), tables (e.g. Dem. *Fals. leg.* 198) and stomachs (e.g. Gal. 12.911). Diod. Sic. 17.14.1 and Ael. *VH* 13.7 report a grand total of 6.000 victims for the sack of Thebes in 335 BC.

[114] Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 121.34–36 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 447a12–14): Ἐκεῖ μὲν ταφὴ πόλεως, ἐνταῦθα δὲ θάνατος· λοιπὸν ἐκφορὰν δεῖ προσθέντας ἐπιγράμματι χρήσασθαι, καὶ παντελὴς ἡ πρᾶξις. For the madness of Hegesias, cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.22: διαφθορὰ τῶν φρενῶν.

To summarize, Agatharchides criticizes Hegesias' obsession with fancy, extraordinary language, which renders his style obscure, devoid of vividness and frigid. Accordingly, he is, in Agatharchides' view, utterly incapable of arousing the emotions that are appropriate to serious topics. As we have seen, the author of *On the Red Sea* reviews Hegesias' style from the vantage point of his own historiographical enterprise: still, several elements of his harsh judgment will return in the rhetorical works of Cicero and in the critical essays of Dionysius. For all three detractors of Hegesias, inappropriateness seems to be a key word to understand his degeneracy.

2.4.2 Cicero on Hegesias' Style

Cicero focuses mainly on one aspect of Hegesias' prose, that is, his rhythmical word arrangement. To be brief, the Roman rhetorician makes three interrelated points about the Asian author's prose rhythm: (1) it is fragmentary, consisting almost exclusively of short phrases that create a staccato effect; (2) it has a strong poetical flavor, resembling an incessant stream of little verses; and (3) it is monotonous, as it applies the former two features throughout the entire discourse. By analyzing the rhythm in the three longest extant fragments of Hegesias' works, we will see that Cicero's assessment, despite its obvious bias, is founded in a serious stylistic analysis.

Toward the end of his *Orator*, Cicero discusses the rhythmical errors that are typical for Asian orators.[115] He connects one of these mistakes specifically to the style of Hegesias, who in his view is always 'in pursuit of short rhythms' (*minutos numeros sequens*): 'There are also those, who in the vicious manner which stems from Hegesias, by cutting and breaking up their rhythms (*infringendis concidendisque numeris*) fall into an insipid type of style (*genus abiectum*) that resembles verselets (*versiculi*).' According to Cicero, the Magnesian consistently pursues such chopped up sentences, refusing to vary their length: 'There is no style better or stronger than to strike with phrases of two or three words, sometimes with single words, and at other times with several, in the midst of which comes sparingly the

[115] Cic. *Orat.* 230–231. In addition to the error discussed below, Cicero mentions (1) orators who insert 'certain meaningless words just to fill out the rhythm' (*inania quaedam verba quasi complementa numerorum*), and (2) orators, like the brothers Hierocles and Menecles of Alabanda, whose sentences 'all end in the same way' (*omnia fere concludebantur uno modo*). The use of silly patch-words was associated with overly smooth word arrangements: cf. Sluiter (1997) 238–244 with e.g. Cic. *Orat.* 230, Demetr. *Eloc.* 55–58, and Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.5. Note that Cicero himself was associated with the vice of ending all of his sentences in a similar fashion, viz., by applying the cadence — ◡ ◡ ◡ | — — (e.g. *esse videatur*): see section 4.2 n. 36 below.

rhythmical period (*numerosa comprehensio*) with varying cadences (*variis clausulis*). Hegesias perversely avoids this, and while he, too, tries to imitate Lysias, who is almost the equal of Demosthenes, he hops about (*saltat*), cutting his style into little fragments (*particulae*).'[116] Cicero's casual reference to Demosthenes serves to highlight an important contrast between the Attic orator and the Asian author: whereas the former is the incontestable icon of stylistic versatility, Hegesias' prose is utterly unvarying.[117]

To make sense of what Cicero means, when he refers to 'fragments' (*particulae*) and 'verselets' (*versiculi*), we may turn to the only three surviving passages from Hegesias that contain more than one single sentence. Encouraged by Cicero's remarks about Hegesias' rhythmical prose, I have chopped the sentences in these texts up into short phrases and I have scanned the endings, or clausulae, of each phrase according to the rhythmical feet that Cicero acknowledges. We should be aware that this exercise is fraught with various difficulties. There is no clear-cut, unambiguous method, for instance, for the division of ancient texts into phrases, or colons: I concede, therefore, that the divisions below are mere suggestions, although I think that the conspicuous rhythmical conclusions in the majority of the phrases lend credibility to my divisions.[118] Moreover, scansion of prose is a precarious business, for which modern scholars have adopted various approaches.[119] In analyzing the passages cited below, I have applied the following principles: (1) the last syllable of each phrase, whether long or short by nature, is simply marked as long;[120] (2) syllables that are short by nature are

[116] Cic. *Orat.* 230: *Sunt etiam qui illo vitio, quod ab Hegesia maxime fluxit, infrgingendis concidendisque numeris in quoddam genus abiectum incidant versiculorum simillimum.* Ibid. 226: *Nec ullum genus est dicendi aut melius aut fortius quam binis aut ternis ferire verbis, nonnumquam singulis, paulo alias pluribus, inter quae variis clausulis interponit se raro numerosa comprehensio; quam perverse fugiens Hegesias, dum ille quoque imitari Lysiam volt, alterum paene Demosthenem, saltat incidens particulas.*

[117] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 50.11 praises Demosthenes for the varying length of his sentences, alternately using colons and periods. Cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 241–245, who, like Cicero, advises to use rhythmical periods sparingly. Cicero mentions Hegesias' admiration for Lysias as a warning to the self-styled 'Attic' orators in Rome, who also preferred Lysias as their model: cf. section 2.2 esp. n. 28–29 above.

[118] Cf. Hutchinson (2015) 796–798 on prose rhythm in Appian (second century AD): 'Phrase is only a shorthand, since a sizeable single word can form a separate entity for these purposes, and a brief beginning to a sentence or part of it can be followed by a break and the main start. (…) Closes that appear rhythmical occur in Appian not just at the end of sentences or half-sentences but throughout the sentence.'

[119] For scansions of Hegesias' prose, see Norden (1898) 135–137 on F12 and F24 Jacoby, Blass (1905) 19–23 on F5 and F12 Jacoby. Cf. also De Groot (1919a) 128–131, (1919b) 6, (1921) 64, and Skimina (1937) 144–148.

[120] Short syllables at phrase-end are considered to be 'lengthened by quasi-metrical pause': cf. Hutchinson (2015) 789. It is a widely accepted convention in modern scansion of Greek poetry to mark naturally short

marked as either long or short (i.e., ⏑̄), if they precede a juxtaposition of mute and liquid (but they are marked as long, if they precede γμ, γν, δμ or δν);[121] and (3) collisions of vowels will be assumed to result in hiatus.[122]

With these ground rules in mind, we can address the rhythmical phrases in the three longest extant fragments of Hegesias, preserved in Dionysius' *On the Arrangement of Words* (F5 Jacoby), Agatharchides' *On the Red Sea* (F12 Jacoby) and Strabo's *Geography* (F24 Jacoby).[123] The accompanying notes to the former fragment show that the transmission of Dionysius' citation is flawed in several places.[124]

F5		ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἔχων τὸ σύνταγμα προηγεῖτο.	⏑̄ ⏑ — | — —
		Καί πως ἐβεβούλευτο τῶν πολεμίων τοῖς ἀρίστοις,	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — | — ⏑ | — —
	3	ἀπαντᾶν εἰσιόντι·	— — | — ⏑ | — —
		τοῦτο γὰρ ἔγνωστο,	— ⏑ ⏑ — | — —
		κρατήσασιν ἑνὸς συνεκβαλεῖν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος.	— ⏑ — | — ⏑̄ | — —
	6	Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐλπὶς αὕτη συνέδραμεν εἰς τὸ τολμᾶν,[125]	⏑̄ ⏑ ⏑ | — ⏑ | — —
		ὥστ' Ἀλέξανδρον μηδέποτε κινδυνεῦσαι πρότερον οὕτως.	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —

---

syllables at verse-end as long, regarding them as (*syllaba*) *brevis in* (*elemento*) *longo*: cf., e.g., Korzeniewski (1968) 28 and West (1982) 35. Note that in ancient discussions of prose rhythm, there was some disagreement about the quantity of the final syllable of the period. Cic. *Orat.* 217–218, for instance, insists that it is indifferent: 'For it never makes any difference whether the dactyl (— ⏑ ⏑) or cretic (— ⏑ —) be used last, because even in verse the quantity of the final syllable is a matter of indifference' (*nihil enim interest dactylus sit extremus an creticus, quia postrema syllaba brevis an longa sit ne in versu quidem refert*). Yet, Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.6 insists that the period 'should be broken off by a long syllable' (δεῖ τῇ μακρᾷ ἀποκόπτεσθαι), while Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.94 notes: 'I am aware of course that a short is treated as a long in final position, because there seems to be a bit of vacant time accruing to it from what follows; however, when I consult my own ears, I realize that it makes a great difference whether the closing syllable is really long or merely treated as long' (*neque enim ego ignoro in fine pro longa accipi brevem, quia videtur aliquid vacantis temporis ex eo quod insequitur accedere: aures tamen consulens meas intellego multum referre verene longa sit quae cludit an pro longa*).

[121] Cf. Smyth (1920) 35–36 and West (1982) 16.

[122] This is in accordance with most Greek discussions of vowel collision in prose: cf. section 4.4 below. Hutchinson (2015) shows that Appian (second century AD) deliberately created hiatus in order to produce more desirable clausulae. On a related note, Nisbet (1990) and Hutchinson (1995) have demonstrated that Cicero uses *atque* (instead of *ac* or *et*) before a consonant, if the combination yields a more favored clausula. There are only two instances of vowel collision in the clausulae of the texts below: see the notes at lines 20 and 26 of F5 Jacoby.

[123] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.26, Agatharch. *Eryhtr.* 120.35–42 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446b9–15), Str. *Geogr.* 9.1.16.

[124] I have used the edition of Aujac and Lebel (1981). Donadi (2000a) 338–342 compares the variant readings of the two mss F and P., noting that Aujac and Lebel select the readings that yield Hegesias' favorite clausulae.

[125] Usener and Radermacher read συνέδραμεν εἰς τόλμαν, yielding an uncommon rhythm (⏑ ⏑̄ ⏑ ⏑ — \| — —).

	Ἀνὴρ γὰρ τῶν πολεμίων εἰς γόνατα συγκαμφθεὶς[126]	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — | — —
9	ἔδοξεν τοῦτ’ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῆς ἱκετείας ἕνεκα πρᾶξαι.	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏒ | — —
	προσέμενος δ’ ἐγγὺς	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — | — —
	μικρὸν ἐκνεύει τὸ ξίφος ἐνέγκαντος ὑπὸ τὰ πτερύγια τοῦ θώρακος,	— — | — —
12	ὥστε γενέσθαι τὴν πληγὴν οὐ καιριωτάτην.	— ⏑ | — ⏑ —
	ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν αὐτὸς ἀπώλεσεν	— ⏑ ⏑ | — ⏑ —
	κατὰ κεφαλῆς τύπτων τῇ μαχαίρᾳ,	— — | — ⏑ | — —
15	τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους ὀργὴ πρόσφατος ἐπίμπρα.[127]	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
	Οὕτω γὰρ ἑκάστου τὸν ἔλεον ἐξέστησεν	— — | — —
	ἡ τοῦ τολμήσαντος ἀπόνοια[128]	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
18	τῶν μὲν ἰδόντων,	— ⏑ ⏑ | — —
	τῶν δ’ ἀκουσάντων	— ⏑ — | — —
	ὥστε τετρακισχιλίους ὑπὸ τὴν σάλπιγγα ἐκείνην[129]	— ⏑ ⏑ | — —
21	τῶν βαρβάρων κατακοπῆναι.	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
	τὸν μέντοι Βαΐτιν αὐτὸν	— — | — ⏑ | — —
	ἀνήγαγον ζῶντα Λεόννατος καὶ Φιλτᾶς.	— — | — —
24	Ἰδὼν δὲ πολύσαρκον καὶ μέγαν καὶ βλοσυρώτατον	— ⏑ ⏑ | — ⏑ —
	(μέλας γὰρ ἦν καὶ τὸ χρῶμα),	— ⏑ — | — ⏒ | — —
	μισήσας ἐφ οἷς ἐβεβούλευτο καὶ τὸ εἶδος[130]	— ⏑ | — ⏑ | — —
27	ἐκέλευσεν διὰ τῶν ποδῶν	— ⏑ ⏑ | — ⏑ —
	χαλκοῦν ψάλιον διείραντας	— ⏑ — | — —
	ἕλκειν κύκλῳ γυμνόν.	— ⏒ — | — —
30	Πιλούμενος δὲ κακοῖς περὶ πολλὰς τραχύτητας ἔκραζεν.	— ⏑ — | — ⏒ | — —
	Αὐτὸ δ’ ἦν, ὃ λέγω, τὸ συνάγαγον ἀνθρώπους.	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — | — —
	Ἐπέτεινε μὲν γὰρ ὁ πόνος,	— ⏑ — | ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ —
33	βάρβαρον δ’ ἐβόα.	— ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ —
	δεσπότην καὶ ἱκετεύων·	— ⏑ ⏑ | — —
	γελᾶν δὲ ὁ σολοικισμὸς ἐποίει.	— ⏑ ⏑ | — —
36	Τὸ δὲ στέαρ καὶ τὸ κύτος τῆς γαστρὸς ἐνέφαινε	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
	Βαβυλώνιον ζῷον ἕτερον ἀνδρός.[131]	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
	Ὁ μὲν οὖν ὄχλος ἐνέπαιζε,	⏒ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
39	στρατιωτικὴν ὕβριν ὑβρίζων	— ⏒ ⏑ ⏒ | — —
	εἰδεχθῆ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ σκαιὸν ἐχθρόν.	— ⏑ — | — ⏑ | — —

[126] F has εἰς γόνατα συγκαθίσας, which gives an unusual rhythm (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ —)

[127] P has πρόσφατος ἐπὶ παλαιαῖς, resulting in a rarely encountered cadence (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —).

[128] F has τολμήσαντος ἀπόνοια, yielding an uncommon ending (— — | — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —).

[129] In poetry, a short final α is often elided: cf. West (1982) 10. This would yield a ditrochee (— ⏑ | — —).

[130] In poetry, τό often blends with the subsequent vowel: cf. West (1982) 13. This results in one of Hegesias’ favorite endings (— ⏑ — | — —).

[131] F has ζῷον ἕτερον ἀδρόν, which possibly gives a slightly different cadence (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | ⏒ —).

F12		Ὅμοιον πεποίηκας, Ἀλέξανδρε,	— ⏑ ⏑ — | — —
		Θήβας κατασκάψας,	— ⏑ — | — —
	3	ὡς ἂν εἰ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐκ τῆς κατ᾽ οὐρανὸν μερίδος ἐκβάλοι τὴν σελήνην·	— ⏑ — | — ⏑ | — —
		ὑπολείπομαι γὰρ τὸν ἥλιον ταῖς Ἀθήναις.	— ⏑ — | — ⏑ | — —
		Δύο γὰρ αὗται πόλεις τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἦσαν ὄψεις.	— ⏑ ⏑ | — ⏑ | — —
	6	Διὸ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἑτέρας ἀγωνιῶ νῦν·	— ⏑ | — ⏑ | — —
		ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἷς αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμὸς ἡ Θηβαίων ἐκκέκοπται πόλις.	— ⏑ — | — ⏑ —
F24		Ὁρῶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν	⏑ — — | ⏒ ⏑ ⏑ —
		καὶ τὸ περιττῆς τριαίνης ἐκεῖθι σημεῖον,	— ⏑ — | — —
	3	ὁρῶ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα,	— ⏑ — | — —
		καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γέγονα μύστης·	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
		ἐκεῖνο Λεωκόριον,	⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ —
	6	τοῦτο Θησεῖον·	— ⏑ — | — —
		οὐ δύναμαι δηλῶσαι καθ᾽ ἓν ἕκαστον.	— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —

I do not wish to make any claims about Hegesias' stylistic practices; I simply submit that one can see, on the basis of the scansions above, why Cicero might consider Hegasias' prose to be a string of rhythmical chunks. Indeed, one who follows Cicero's rules for dividing rhythmical feet may recognize two types of clausula in Hegesias. First, between eleven and fourteen phrases end on a so-called ditrochee (— ⏑ | — —), covering about a quarter (between 20,4% and 25,9%) of the fifty-four quoted phrases.[132] In his *Orator*, Cicero connects this cadence to Asian oratory, praising its devastating effect, but warning that it must be used sparingly: 'This ending ought not to be used too frequently, for first it is recognized as rhythm, next it wearies, and when it begins to seem an easy trick, it is despised.'[133] In the samples above, final ditrochees are often, in three to six cases, preceded by a cretic (— ⏑ — | — ⏑ | — —).[134]

[132] Hegesias' fondness of ditrochaic clausulae is well attested: cf. Norden (1898) 135–137, Blass (1905) 20, De Groot (1919a) 128. Note that Blass, dividing F5 Jacoby into thirty-nine rhythmical phrases, argues that twenty-one end on a ditrochee, including ten cases in which the first syllable is allegedly resolved (⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —). As we will see in the present paragraph, this variant cadence can often be treated as paean + spondee (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —), a clausula that Cic. *Orat.* 232 seems to recommend (cf. section 4.4 n. 80 below).

[133] Cic. *Orat.* 215: *Sed id crebrius fieri non oportet; primum enim numerus agnoscitur, deinde satiat, postea cognita facilitate contemnitur.* On the ditrochee as typical for Asian oratory, see ibid. 212: 'Asia prefers the one called ditrochee' (*unum est secuta Asia macime qui dichoreus vocatur*). Cf. section 2.3.3 n. 90 above on Cicero's terminology (*choreus*) for the trochee, and section 4.4 below on Cicero's praise of one-word ditrochees, citing two examples from C. Carbo, viz., *persolutas* and *comprobavit*.

[134] Cf. De Groot (1919a) 128 and (1921) 64.

Secondly, Hegesias also seems to have liked clausulae consisting of paean + spondee (either — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — — or ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — | — —) and cretic + spondee (— ⏑ — | — —): the former ending occurs between ten and thirteen times, the latter is attested between five and eight times.[135] Considering that Cicero explicitly declares paeans and cretics to be interchangeable, we may treat these clausulae as a single group, occurring in approximately a third of the quoted phrases (between 27,8% and 38,9%).[136]

To be brief, the three most substantial fragments of Hegesias show that Cicero could readily divide them up into little verse-like phrases whose conclusions exhibit little variation: in majority (between 57,4% and 70,4%), they end either on a ditrochee or on a combination of penultimate cretic/paean and final spondee. That Cicero was aware of Hegesias' preference for these clausulae becomes obvious in one of his letters to Atticus (May 46 BC). The Roman rhetorician provides his friend with a self-written mock-specimen of Hegesias' style: 'Here you have a sample of Hegesias' type of style (*genus Hegesiae*), which Varro commends.'[137] Like Hegesias' own texts, Cicero's parody can be cut up into *particulae* and *versiculi*:[138]

	De Caelio vide quaeso,	— — ⏑ | — ⏑ — | — —
	ne lacuna sit in auro.	— ⏑ | — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | — —
3	*Ego ista non novi,*	⏑ | — ⏑ — | — —
	sed certe in collubo est	— — — | — ⏑ —
	detrimenti satis.	— — — | — ⏑ —
6	*Huc aurum si accedit*	— — | — — | — —

[135] The sequence cretic + spondee is generally recognized as one of Hegesias' favorite cadences: see Norden (1898) 135–137, De Groot (1921) 64. Blass (1905) notes that iambus + spondee (⏑ — | — —) is common, occurring in nine out of the thirty-nine clauses that he recognizes in F5 Jacoby. For the preponderance of paean + spondee, see De Groot (1919a) 128, who lists this clausula together with the ditrochee as Hegesias' 'most favored' ending. Curiously, Cicero was heavily criticized for ending his sentences frequently on the words *esse videatur*, that is, on paean + spondee, one of Hegesias' favorite rhythms: cf. section 4.2 n. 36 below.

[136] Cic. *De or.* 3.193, *Orat.* 215.

[137] Cic. *Att.* 12.6.1: *Habes Hegesiae genus, quod Varro laudat.* Cf. section 2.1 n. 6 above.

[138] I assume collisions of vowels to result in elision or prodelision: thus, I read *cert(e) in, s(i) accedit*, and *collubo (e)st.* After all, Cic. *Orat.* 150–152 himself claims that the Latin language, unlike Greek, demands its speakers to 'run vowels together' (*vocalis coniungere*) and not to 'make a pause between vowels' (*distrahere voces*): cf. section 4.5 below. Shackleton Bailey (1999) translates the parody as follows: 'Please see about Caelius and see that there is no gap in the gold. I know nothing about these matters. But surely there's enough lost on the exchange. If the gold comes up on top of that—but why talk? You'll see to it.'

—sed quod loquor? — | — ⏑ —
Tu videbis. — ⏑ | — —

In the first three consecutive clauses, we recognize the closing rhythm that we have encountered most often in Hegesias' largest fragments, that is, cretic or paean + spondee. Next, Cicero composes two parallel phrases that follow exactly the same rhythmical pattern, consisting of a molossus (— — —) and a cretic (— ⏑ —), which, to my knowledge, is not attested in Hegesias, but which was certainly recognized as a rhythmical cadence.[139] The final phrase in this quasi-Hegesian passage appropriately ends on a ditrochee, which the Hellenistic author, as we have seen, seems to employ frequently, and which, according to Cicero, is Asia's favorite clausula.

All in all, Cicero takes exception to Hegesias' overly rhythmical style: the man from Magnesia did not apply his rhythms with moderation, but he used them obtrusively throughout his discourse.[140] An interesting parallel to Cicero's position can be found in Aelius Theon: 'You should be careful in the arrangement of your words, and learn how to avoid the mistakes of bad arrangement, especially a style that is in meter (ἔμμετος) and in rhythm (ἔρρυθμος), such as most of the works of the orator Hegesias and the so-called Asian orators exhibit.'[141] Thus, both Cicero and Theon accuse him of committing the very error that Demosthenes, according to Dionysius, expertly avoided: while the Attic orator could be praised for making his style appear 'rhythmical' (εὔρυθμος) and 'metrical' (εὔμετρος), without being 'in rhythm' and 'in meter' (section 2.3.3), Hegesias was seen as a slave to his own monotone, almost singsong rhythmical format. His alleged obsession with such artistic flourish makes him Cicero's ultimate archetype of Asianism gone wrong: although the rhetorician is, as we have seen, not unequivocally negative about Asian oratory (sections 1.6

[139] See e.g. Zieliński (1904) 223–225, Berry (1996) 58 and Von Albrecht (2003) 111 on this pattern in Cicero; cf. Hutchinson (2015) 789 on molossus + cretic in Greek imperial prose.

[140] Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 220: 'It makes a vast difference whether prose is rhythmical, that is resembling definite rhythms, or is composed entirely of definite rhythms; if the latter occurs, it is an intolerable fault; if the former does not occur, the style is disordered, unpolished and vague' (*multum interest utrum numerosa sit, id est similis numerorum, an plane e numeris constet oratio; alterum si fit, intolerabile vitium est, alterum nisi fit, dissipata et inculta et fluens est oratio*). Cf. the next note below.

[141] Theon *Prog.* p. 71.7–11 Spengel: Ἐπιμελητέον δὲ καὶ τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν ὀνομάτων, πάντα διδάσκοντα ἐξ ὧν διαφεύξομαι τὸ κακῶς συντιθέναι, καὶ μάλιστα δὲ τὴν ἔμμετρον καὶ ἔρρυθμον λέξιν, ὡς τὰ πολλὰ τῶν Ἡγησίου τοῦ ῥήτορος καὶ τῶν Ἀσιανῶν καλουμένων ῥητόρων. For the distinction between 'rhythmical' and 'in rhythm', which goes back to Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.3, see section 2.3.3 n. 89 above.

and 5.6.1), he does submit that it conveys 'a rather small amount of authority' (*auctoritatis parum*), as it is better suited for youth than for old age.[142] This holds good, a fortiori, for Hegesias: 'Where will you find anything so broken (*fractum*), so minced (*minutum*), anything so immature as that balance (*concinnitate puerile*) that he cultivated?'[143]

According to Cicero, then, Hegesias' style is ill-suited for serious oratory: this point was already made, as we have seen, by Agatharchides (section 2.4.1), and it will be made again, as we will see, by Dionysius (section 2.4.3). Cicero refers twice to Hegesias' prose as a clearly demarcated 'type of style' (*genus*) on its own. Apparently, the three existing 'types of style' (*genera dicendi*) fall short in describing Hegesias' peculiar style. What is more, Hegesias is not even mentioned in Cicero's discussion of the two 'types of Asian style' (*genera Asiaticae dictionis*) in his *Brutus*: the 'pithy and clever variety' (*genus sententiosum et argutum*) is linked to the historian Timaeus and the brothers Hierocles and Menecles of Alabanda, whereas the 'swift and impetuous variety' (*genus volucre atque incitatum*) is connected with Aeschylus of Cnidus and Aeschines of Miletus.[144] Why does Cicero omit Hegesias, in his view the founding father of Asianism, in this typology of Asian oratory? While Cicero is generally ambivalent toward Asian oratory (sections 1.6 and 5.6.1), he considers the Magnesian's style too bizarre for any classification, worthy of nothing but scorn and ridicule. After all, unlike Demosthenes' near-perfect Attic prose, it conspicuously lacks variation, it is unsuitable for conveying serious thoughts, and it displays a staggering incompetence in the art of rhythmical word arrangement.

---

[142] Cic. *Brut.* 326–327, discussing Hortensius. Cf. section 5.6.1 below on Hortensius' Asianism and section 1.6 above on Cicero's ambivalent approach to Asianism.

[143] Cic. *Brut.* 286: *At quid est tam fractum, tam minutum, tam in ipsa, quam tamen consequitur, concinnitate puerile.* On Hegesias' puerility, cf. Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.24 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a40), cited in section 2.4.1 n.109 above : αἴτημα μειρακιῶδες. In Cicero, the term *concinnitas* most often refers to the use of various figures of speech to create some form of balance in the sentence: see Cic. *Orat.* 149, 164. Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.18, Sen. *Ep.* 115.2, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.1.34, 9.3.91. Hegesias' attention to such figures is clearly exhibited in the samples quoted by Agatharchides (section 2.4.1). Latin translations of some of Hegesias' figures of speech survive through Rutilius Lupus' excerpt (= Hegesias F27–29 Jacoby) of the treatise *On Figures of Speech* by the Greek rhetor Gorgias (first century BC): see n. 94 above.

[144] Cic. *Brut.* 325–327. The description of the former variant comes closest in describing Hegesias' style: it is less characterized 'by weight of thought than by the charm of balance' (*non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis*). The latter variant, which 'lacked elaborate balance of sentence' (*ornata sententiarum concinnitas non erat*), does not approximate the prose of Hegesias, who, according to Cicero, was always hunting for symmetry in his sentence: cf. the previous note. Cf. Kennedy (1994) 96; according to Leeman (1963) 95, the two types of Asianism were combined by Hegesias.

2.4.3 Dionysius on Hegesias' Style

Like Cicero, Dionysius is outraged by Hegesias' word arrangement. Unlike Cicero, however, the Greek critic does not go into the author's staccato sentences with their obvious rhythmical cadences. In *On the Arrangement of Words*, Dionysius focuses on two other aspects of Hegesias' composition: he criticizes (1) his inability to adapt his rhythm to the seriousness of the topic at hand, and (2) his affected, far-fetched word order. In order to illustrate the former point, Dionysius compares the (in his view) noble rhythms of Thucydides, Demosthenes, Plato and Homer to the Magnesian's supposedly ignoble rhythms; in order to elucidate the latter point, he recasts a passage from Herodotus into the styles of Thucydides and Hegesias respectively, merely by rearranging the original words.

First, Dionysius stresses that the grandeur or banality of any subject matter should be reflected in the arrangement of the words. In his view, the power of arrangement in literature can be compared to the role that the goddess Athena plays in the *Odyssey*: 'It seems to me that one would not be wrong to compare word arrangement to Athena in Homer, for she used to make the same Odysseus appear in different forms at different times (…). So also does arrangement take the same words and make the ideas that they convey appear misshapen, beggarly and mean, and at other times sublime, rich and beautiful.'[145] According to Dionysius, one important way of magically changing the appearance of poetry or prose is through rhythm: he distinguishes between rhythmical feet that allow an author to make his text appear 'august' (σεμνός), 'elevated' (ὑψηλός) and 'manly' (ἀνδρώδης), and others that make the words sound 'ignoble' (ἀγεννής), 'low' (ταπεινός) and 'feminine' (θῆλυς). As we have seen, Dionysius ranks rhythmical feet that consist preponderantly of long syllables in the former category, while he places rhythms that are dominated by short syllables in the latter group (section 2.3.3).[146] After cataloguing the twelve disyllabic and trisyllabic rhythmical feet

[145] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.12: Καί μοι δοκεῖ τις οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτάνειν εἰκάσας αὐτὴν τῇ Ὁμηρικῇ Ἀθηνᾷ· ἐκείνη τε γὰρ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα ἄλλοτε ἀλλοῖον ἐποίει φαίνεσθαι, (...). Αὕτη τε τὰ αὐτὰ λαμβάνουσα ὀνόματα, τοτὲ μὲν ἄμορφα καὶ πτωχὰ καὶ ταπεινὰ ποιεῖ φαίνεσθαι τὰ νοήματα, τοτὲ δ' ὑψηλὰ καὶ πλούσια καὶ καλά. Sadée was probably right in deleting the words [καὶ ἁδρά] after πλούσια, as they destroy the symmetry of the three, chiastically organized, antitheses between high and low (ὑψηλά, ταπεινά), rich and poor (πλούσια, πτωχά), and beautiful and ugly (καλά, ἄμορφα): see Aujac and Lebel (1981) 203. In addition, the adjective ἁδρός does not belong to Dionysius' terminology for the elevated style of prose: cf. section 3.2 below.

[146] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 17 ranks twelve disyllabic and trisyllabic feet according to these two categories. In the 'noble' category are ranked the spondee (— —), molossus (— — —), anapest (⏑ ⏑ —), dactyl (— ⏑ ⏑), bacchius (— — ⏑) and hypobacchius (⏑ — —); the 'ignoble' category includes the pyrrhic (⏑ ⏑), choree (⏑ ⏑ ⏑) trochee (— ⏑), and amphibrach (⏑ — ⏑). Cf. section 2.3.3 n. 90 above. Note that Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 17.5, 17.13 calls both

in this fashion, Dionysius turns to five passages that treat grand topics full of pathos, showing how rhythm may reinforce or, in Hegesias' case, destroy the dignity of the substance.

After scanning samples from Thucydides' account of Pericles' funeral oration, the encomium of the fallen sons of Athens in Plato's *Menexenus*, and Demosthenes' vehement apology for his politics in *On the Crown*, Dionysius remarks: 'So what was there to prevent the arrangement from being beautiful in a passage which contains no pyrrhic foot (⏑ ⏑), nor any iambus (⏑ —), amphibrach (⏑ — ⏑), choree (⏑ ⏑ ⏑) or trochee (— ⏑)? Now I do not say that none of these authors ever use the more ignoble rhythms also; for they do. But they have concealed them well, dispersing them and interweaving the inferior ones with the better.'[147] Indeed, Dionysius, rather arbitrarily, only recognizes rhythms in these passages that he previously marked as noble, viz., the molossus (— — —), the spondee (— —), the bacchius (— — ⏑), the hypobacchius (⏑ — —), the cretic (— ⏑ —), the dactyl (— ⏑ ⏑) and the anapest (⏑ ⏑ —).[148] Hegesias' rhythms, conversely, display the opposite tendency, according to Dionysius: 'Those authors who have not taken any precaution concerning this part of their craft have produced writings which are either mean (ταπεινός) or enfeebled (κατακεκλασμένος), or have some other deformity or disfigurement (ἄλλη τις αἰσχύνη καὶ ἀμορφία). The first, middlemost and last in this is that sophist from Magnesia, Hegesias.'[149]

---

the cretic (— ⏑ —) and the iambus (⏑ —) 'not undignified' (οὐκ ἀγεννής): yet, as we will see in the next paragraph, the critic tends to associate the former foot with nobility and the latter with a lack thereof. The paean (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ or ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ —), favored by Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.4–6, falls outside the scope of Dionysius' division, but see n. 153 below. Cf. section 4.4 below on rhythmical feet in Dionysius' theory of three styles of word arrangement.

[147] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.20: Τί οὖν ἐκώλυε καλὴν ἁρμονίαν εἶναι λέξεως, ἐν ᾗ μήτε πυρρίχιός ἐστι ποὺς μήτε ἰαμβικὸς μήτε ἀμφίβραχυς μήτε τῶν χορείων ἢ τῶν τροχαίων μηδείς; Καὶ οὐ λέγω τοῦτο, ὅτι τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων ἕκαστος οὐ κέχρηταί ποτε καὶ τοῖς ἀγεννεστέροις ῥυθμοῖς (κέχρηται γάρ), ἀλλ' εὖ συγκεκρύφασιν αὐτοὺς καὶ συνυφάγκασι διαλαβόντες τοῖς κρείττοσι τοὺς χείρονας. Dionysius discusses the rhythm in Thuc. 2.35 (Pericles' funerary speech), Pl. *Menex.* 236d, Dem. *De cor.* 1. These three speeches are among Cicero's best-loved orations: cf. *Brut.* 27, *Orat.* 29 on Pericles, ibid. 151 on Pl. *Menex.* and ibid. 133 on Dem. *De cor.*, Cicero's absolute favorite. Cf. section 2.2 n. 20 above for the ancient appreciation of *De cor.*, esp. its patriotism.

[148] De Jonge (2008) 340–347 addresses the awkwardness of Dionysius' scansions: 'Dionysius' analysis of rhythmical prose is indeed problematic: his divisions of clauses into metrical feet seem to be rather arbitrary, sometimes even inconsistent.' The critic provides two incompatible scansions of Dem. *De cor.* 1, which, according to De Jonge, can be explained by considering the 'local contexts': in *Comp.* 18.15–20, the critic aims to demonstrate the dignity of Demosthenes' rhythm, but in *Comp.* 25.26–28, he attempts to show that Demosthenes' prose can be divided into near-perfect metrical verses.

[149] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.21–22: Οἷς δὲ μὴ ἐγένετο πρόνοια τούτου τοῦ μέρους, οἱ μὲν ταπεινάς, οἱ δὲ κατακλασμένας, οἱ δ' ἄλλην τινὰ αἰσχύνην ἢ ἀμορφίαν ἐχούσας ἐξήνεγκαν τὰς γραφάς. Ὧν ἐστι πρῶτός τε καὶ

In these unmistakable terms, Dionysius introduces the Asian author as his ultimate archetype of bad rhythm.

In accordance with Agatharchides' judgment, Dionysius considers the incongruity of style and substance in Hegesias' prose a clear sign of the author's madness: 'Was he so insensitive and dense that he could not envisage which are the ignoble or the noble rhythms? Or was he so bedeviled and mentally deranged (θεοβλάβεια καὶ διαφθορὰ τῶν φρενῶν) that he still chose the worse, though he knew the better? I am inclined to believe the latter: for it is a characteristic of ignorance (ἄγνοια) that it often lands on its feet; willfulness (πρόνοια) never does.'[150] To demonstrate Hegesias' deliberate corruption, Dionysius quotes a long sample describing how Alexander ties a Babylonian king to his chariot and drags him around on his encampment in Gaza: we have already seen that this fragment, full of Asian stereotypes, confirms Cicero's view that the Magnesian's style is permeated with jerky verse-like phrases (section 2.4.2).[151] Dionysius, however, compares the passage to the equally grave episode in Homer's *Iliad*, in which Achilles attaches the body of Hector to his wagon: 'What, then, is the cause of the nobility of these lines, and of the miserable inadequacy of the other drivel (τῶν φλυαρημάτων ταπεινότης)? The main cause, if not the only one, is the difference in the rhythms. In the passage of Homer, there is not a single undignified or undistinguished line, whereas in that from Hegesias not a single sentence fails to give offense.'[152]

τελευταῖος καὶ μέσος ὁ Μάγνης σοφιστὴς Ἡγησίας. Ὧν ἐστι πρῶτός τε καὶ τελευταῖος καὶ μέσος ὁ Μάγνης σοφιστὴς Ἡγησίας. The verb 'to break short' (κατακλάω) does not seem to refer, at least not primarily, to the jerkiness of Hegesias' style, to which Cicero took exception (section 2.4.2), but rather to the effeminate character of his prose: for this connotation of κατακεκλασμένος, see e.g. com. adesp. 339.2 and Luc. *Symp.* 18. For the effeminacy of Hegesias, see Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.11 (σχῆμα μαλθακόν, cf. n. 159 below), 18.28 (ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἢ κατεαγότων ἀνθρώπων λέγοιτ' ἄν, cf. n. 7 above); see section 5.3 below on the femininity associated with Asia.

[150] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.22: Πότερα τοσαύτη περὶ αὐτὸν ἦν ἀναισθησία καὶ παχύτης ὥστε μὴ συνορᾶν οἵτινές εἰσιν εὐγενεῖς ἢ ἀγεννεῖς ῥυθμοί, ἢ τοσαύτη θεοβλάβεια καὶ διαφθορὰ τῶν φρενῶν ὥστ' εἰδότα τοὺς κρείττους ἔπειτα αἱρεῖσθαι τοὺς χείρονας, ὃ καὶ μᾶλλον πείθομαι. Ἀγνοίας μὲν γάρ ἐστι καὶ τὸ κατορθοῦν πολλαχῇ, προνοίας δὲ τὸ μηδέποτε. Cf. Agatharch. *Erythr.* 121.36 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 447a14): μανία.

[151] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.26 (= Hegesias F5 Jacoby). See section 2.2 above for the Asian flavor of the passage; see section 2.4.2 above for the complete text with an analysis of its minute phrases and rhythmical cadences. Spina (1989) compares this passage to other sources on Alexander's siege of Gaza (332 BC), i.e., Curt. 4.6.7–30, Arr. *Anab.* 25.4–27.21. Cf. section 2.4.1 n. 98 above on the identity of the work from which Dionysius quotes the passage: Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.24 refers to it as a 'passage from his history' (λέξις ἐξ ἱστορίας).

[152] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.29: Τί οὖν αἴτιον ἐκείνων μὲν τῶν ποιημάτων τῆς εὐγενείας, τούτων δὲ τῶν φλυαρημάτων τῆς ταπεινότητος; Ἡ τῶν ῥυθμῶν διαφθορὰ μάλιστα, καὶ εἰ μὴ μόνη. Ἐν ἐκείνοις μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς στίχος ἄσεμνος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐδεμία περίοδος ἥτις οὐ λυπήσει. Dionysius quotes Hom. *Il.* 22.395–411.

The comparison between Homer and Hegesias is somewhat forced: although the passages are thematically linked, it seems a bit unfair to juxtapose their rhythms, as Homer's repertoire is necessarily limited to the spondee (— —) and the dactyl (— ◡ ◡), which, in Dionysius' view, are among the noblest of feet. To make things even more complicated, the critic does not scan Hegesias' sentences; as he is not at all consistent in his scansions of other passages, there is no way of knowing how he would divide the text into rhythmical feet. We do know, however, that Dionysius considers sequences of short syllables undignified. In the quoted passages from Thucydides and Plato, there is not a single string of three or more short syllables, while Demosthenes, as we have seen, generally avoided such rhythmical patterns (section 2.3.3).[153] Hegesias' large Alexander fragment, however, already begins with four consecutive short syllables: ὁ δὲ βασιλεύς (◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ —). In addition, it contains several word combinations that suggest a propensity for swift rhythms, as can be gleaned from the complete quotation included in the previous section: take for instance τὸ ξίφος ἐνέγκαντος ἐπὶ τὰ πτερύγια (— ◡ ◡ ◡ — — ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡̄ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡), τὸ συνάγαγον (◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡), and γαστρὸς ἐνέφαινε Βαβυλώνιον ζῷον ἕτερον ἀνδρός (— ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ — — ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡). There is no doubt that Dionysius would write such rhythmical patterns off as undignified, unmanly and unsuitable for serious discourse.[154]

For Dionysius' second objection against Hegesias' word arrangement, I will turn to an intriguing self-written parody of the Magnesian's style. The critic compares the 'Hegesian style of arrangement' (Ἡγησιακὸν σχῆμα τῆς συνθέσεως) to the practice of his fellow historians Herodotus and Thucydides. Remarkably, Dionysius does not illustrate his point by selecting samples from all three authors, but he rather uses a single passage from Herodotus, which he then rewrites once in the style of Thucydides, and again in the style of Hegesias. This is a rather creative application of the method of 'rewriting' (μετάθεσις), which Dionysius

[153] In the quoted passage from Dem. *De cor.* 1, Dionysius points out two places, where there are three consecutive short syllables, that is, in ἐγὼ διατελῶ τῇ τε πόλει (◡ — ◡ ◡ ◡ — — ◡ ◡ ◡): here, the critic does not censure Demosthenes for twice using the ignoble choree, but he rather recognizes two subsequent paeans, the use of which, as we have seen, was propagated by Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.4–6, but which Dionysius himself only mentions here, vindicating his Attic hero. The scansion of πόλει (◡ ◡) is surprising: De Jonge (2008) 343 suggests that Dionysius' analysis 'may reflect certain changes in the perception of the quantities of syllables'. Similar remarkable scansions in this passage are εὔνοιαν (— — ◡̄) and τόν (—). Yet, in the scansion of the same passage in *Comp.* 25.26–28, the quantities of the syllables do follow the metrical rules: cf. n. 148 above.

[154] In fact, both in Greek and Latin stylistic theory, long syllables are often associated with dignity, and short syllables with a lack thereof. Cf. section 2.3.3 n. 90 above on the connection between short syllables and dance. See also section 4.4 below on the aptness of long syllables for producing rough word arrangements.

frequently uses to highlight the virtues or vices of a specific text, or, as in the present case, to compare alternative styles.[155] The method seems to have been an integral part of the shared Greek and Roman critical toolkit: it can be found in Philodemus, Demetrius, Longinus, Hermogenes and Cicero.[156] The Roman scholar posits that metathesis can demonstrate the characteristics of a certain composition, 'when the order of the words is slightly changed, though the words are the same and the thought is the same' (*ordine verborum paululum commutato, isdem tamen verbis, stante sententia*). Likewise, Dionysius proposes that the quality of a given arrangement can be assessed, 'when the words are retained but their order is changed' (μενόντων μὲν τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλαττομένης δὲ τῆς συνθέσεως).[157]

Dionysius adds brief stylistic commentaries to his two rewritings as well as to the original text.[158] He describes the Herodotean original as 'relaxed' (ὑπαγωγικός) and 'historical' (ἱστορικός), while his Thucydidean rearrangement is supposed to be 'direct' (ὀρθός) and 'engaging' (ἐναγώνιος). The Hegesian version, finally, is advertised, in familiar

[155] Bonner (1939) 62–70, 102–104 has shown that Dionysius uses the method of 'metathesis', which Bonner translates as 'recasting', more often in his later oeuvre than in his earlier works: it is used sparingly in the early-period works *Isoc.* and *Is.*, it is 'increased and extended' in the middle-period treatises *Dem.* and *Comp.*, and it is employed even more frequently in the late-period works *Thuc.* and *Amm. II.* Cf. Damon (1991) 51–52. For a systematic analysis of the critic's versatile application of metathesis, see De Jonge (2005) and, in a marginally adapted form, De Jonge (2008) 367–390: De Jonge recognizes three categories of metatheses, (1) 'metatheses correcting alleged faults of the original', (2) 'metatheses bringing out virtues of the original', and (3) 'metatheses illustrating alternative compositions or particularities', which include conversions of the Ionic dialect, comparisons of arrangement styles (incl. *Comp.* 4.7–11), and illustrations of the poetical character of prose.

[156] For the role of metathesis as an evaluative tool in the ancient critical tradition, see Spina (2004a), focusing on various rewritings of Her. 1.8–14 on Gyges and Candaules, Spina (2004b), offering an introduction to grammatical, rhetorical and stylistic rewritings in Antiquity, and Grimaldi (2004), who explores examples from Demetrius, Dionysius and Longinus. As De Jonge (2005) 464 shows, the practice of rewriting texts can already by found in Plato and Aristotle. Demetrius is our most generous source for metathesis: see Janko (2000) 227 n. 2 for a full list. Philodemus and his opponents were involved in a polemic about the possibility of metathesis: see Armstrong (1995a) and Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995). For instances of rewriting in the other authors mentioned, see e.g. Cic. *Orat.* 214–215, 232–233; and Long. *Subl.* 39.4, 40.2–3.

[157] Cic. *Orat.* 233, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.7. See also Cic. *Orat.* 81 (*verbis mutatis, manente sententia*), Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.5 (τῆς μὲν ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς αὐτῆς μενούσης, τῆς δὲ συνθέσεως μόνης μεταπεσούσης). Nassal (1910) 27 points out the remarkable similarities between Cicero's and Dionysius' articulations of this idea.

[158] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.7–11. The original is Hdt. 1.6.1, which Dionysius quotes not in the original Ionic, but rather in the Attic dialect: cf. section 1.5 n. 82 above. There exists a third metathesis of the first three clauses of this passage, in Hermog. *Id.* 1.3 Rabe: the author argues that it would harm the clarity of the sentence, if Herodotus had opened it with a participle clause (Κροίσου ὄντος) instead of a nominative (Κροῖσος ἦν).

anti-Hegesian catchwords, as 'precious' (μικρόκομψος), 'ignoble' (ἀγεννής) and 'effeminate' (μαλθακός).[159] In what way do the three compositions of the same words differ? And what makes Hegesias' arrangement inferior to the other two versions?

> Herodotus' (Atticized) original:[160]
> Κροῖσος ἦν Λυδὸς μὲν γένος, | παῖς δ' Ἀλυάττου, | τύραννος δ' ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ· | ὃς ῥέων ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας | μεταξὺ Σύρων τε καὶ Παφλαγόνων | ἐξίησι πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον | εἰς τὸν Εὔξεινον καλούμενον πόντον.
>
> First rearrangement, in the style of Thucydides:[161]
> Κροῖσος ἦν υἱὸς μὲν Ἀλυάττου, | γένος δὲ Λυδός, | τύραννος δὲ τῶν ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ ἐθνῶν· | ὃς ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ῥέων | μεταξὺ Σύρων καὶ Παφλαγόνων | εἰς τὸν Εὔξεινον καλούμενον πόντον | ἐκδίδωσι πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον.
>
> Second rearrangement, in the style of Hegesias:
> Ἀλυάττου μὲν υἱὸς ἦν Κροῖσος, | γένος δὲ Λυδός, | τῶν δ' ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ τύραννος ἐθνῶν· | ὃς ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ῥέων | Σύρων τε καὶ Παφλαγόνων μεταξὺ | πρὸς βορέαν ἐξίησιν ἄνεμον | ἐς τὸν καλούμενον πόντον Εὔξεινον.

In his Thucydidean recasting, Dionysius distributes the information more systematically and straightforwardly than in Herodotus' original version. He starts off each of the three initial clauses by clearly demarcating its topic, discussing, in logical order, first Croesus' family (υἱὸς μέν), secondly his tribe (γένος δέ), and thirdly the extent of his realm (τύραννος δέ). His older countryman from Halicarnassus, by contrast, does not arrange these clauses in the same well-planned fashion: he starts with Croesus' roots, highlighting the adjective 'Lydian' (Λυδὸς μέν) instead of the noun 'tribe', while it is only in the subsequent clauses that he

[159] Cf. Agatharch. *Erythr.* p. 120.1 Müller (= Phot. *Bibl.* 446a19): κομψότης. For Hegesias' alleged femininity, see n. 149 above. See also the present section above on Dionysius' criticism of Hegesias' ignoble rhythm.

[160] 'Croesus was a Lydian by birth, | son of Alyattes, | king of the nations on this side of the river Halys, | which flows from the south | between Syria and Paphlagonia, | and drains to the north | into the sea, which is called Euxine.' I have added vertical lines between the phrases to facilitate the comparison of the three passages.

[161] Note that Dionysius, despite his promise at *Comp.* 4.7 to use the same words as in the original, replaces παῖς with υἱός, and, in his Thucydidean rearrangement, he swaps ἐξίησι for ἐκδίδωσι. Concerning the former substitution, De Jonge (2005) 477 n. 47 (= De Jonge (2008) 387 n. 69) suggests that Dionysius 'has observed that παῖς is more common in Herodotus, whereas Thucydides and Hegesias would rather use υἱός', but 'it may also be explained by the fact that the latter word is more familiar in later Greek'.

seems to adopt a more orderly approach to Croesus' other personalia, referring to his family (παῖς δ') and his kingdom (τύραννος δ') respectively.[162] In the remainder of the sentence, too, Herodotus' text is more 'relaxed' (ὑπαγωγικός) than Dionysius' Thucydidean rewriting: the nations under Croesus' rule, for instance, are gradually introduced in the original (ἐθνῶν τῶν etc.), while the restyled passage exhibits a more deliberate presentation (τῶν ... ἐθνῶν). Finally, Dionysius has also recast Herodotus' seemingly offhand discussion of the watershed of the Halys into a more careful exposition, which neatly follows the river's course from the south (ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας) to the north (πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον).[163]

According to Dionysius, Herodotus' relaxed style is typical for historiographical writing (ἱστορικός), while Thucydides' systematic presentation is suited for 'performative oratory' (ἐναγώνιοι λόγοι), as it is straightforward, to-the-point and, in a word, 'engaging' (ἐναγώνιος).[164] The imitation of Hegesias' style, conversely, is designed to appear unsuitable for any kind of serious discourse. To begin with, the focus in each of the first three clauses is haphazard: the first clause emphasizes, in the genitive case, the name of Croesus' father (Ἀλυάττου μέν), while the subsequent clauses underline his 'tribe' (γένος δέ) and the 'peoples on this side of the river Halys' (τῶν δ' etc.). In addition, the word 'king' (τύραννος) is weirdly

[162] Cf. Weil (1844) 130 on Dionysius' Thucydidean recasting of the first three clauses: 'Ces trois petites phrases répondent aux questions: quel est le père, quelle est la patrie, quel est l'empire de Crésus? υἱός, γένος, τύραννος, voilà les trois points de départ, les trois cadres à remplir.' De Jonge (2005) 477 (= De Jonge (2008) 387) notes that the Thucydidean version deals with Croesus' personalia 'in outward expansion'. Next, De Jonge mentions some features of rough word arrangement (cf. section 4.4 below) in the Thucydidean sentence, viz., hiatus, clashes of consonants, long hyperbaton (between ὅς and ἐκδίδωσι), and the smaller number of connectives (deleted τε). I do not accept De Jonge's view that 'the displacement of Λυδός breaks the parallelism between Λυδός, παῖς (υἱός) and τύραννος, and creates *anastrophe*': on the contrary, the change enhances the parallelism.

[163] Cf. De Jonge (2005) 477 (= De Jonge (2008) 387): 'The relative clause flows together with the river Halys'.

[164] For historiography and performative oratory in Dionysius' rewritings, see Bottai (1999b) 145. Ooms and De Jonge (2013) 100–102 note that the term ἐναγώνιος in Dionysius usually means 'suited for performative oratory', that is, apt for forensic and deliberative speeches, which he calls ἐναγώνιοι λόγοι: cf. section 2.3.3 n. 78 above. In non-oratorical contexts, the term ἐναγώνιος can express the idea that 'all participants in the communicative situation are directly concerned with one another and with the subject that is at stake'. Hence, the stylistic attribute 'engaging' (ἐναγώνιος) is often used in opposition to 'historical' (ἱστορικός) and 'narrative' (διηγηματικός), which imply a detachedness on the part of the audience: Long. *Subl.* 25, for instance, posits that the use of the historical present can turn a passage from a detached 'narrative' (διήγησις) into an 'engaging event' (ἐναγώνιον πρᾶγμα). Cf. also Long. *Subl.* 9.13, comparing the relaxedness of Hom. *Od.* to the action-packed drama of Hom. *Il.*, and Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.8.3, juxtaposing historical narrative for 'undisturbed entertainment' (ἀόχλητος διαγωγή) and engaging oratory: see Ooms and De Jonge (2013) 102–104.

hidden in the middle of a long hyperbaton (between τῶν and ἐθνῶν), the preposition 'between' (μεταξύ) is postponed, and the word 'northern' (βορέαν) is separated from its governing noun 'wind' (ἄνεμον). In the final part of the sentence, the word 'so-called' (καλούμενον) has been removed from its natural place: while it usually stands directly behind the name to which it refers, Dionysius has placed it the beginning of the word group, holding back the name itself until the very end (ἐς καλούμενον πόντον Εὔξεινον).[165]

It is obvious that Dionysius does not attack Hegesias' short, jerky phrases in this pastiche: after all, the phrases in Herodotus' original and in the Thucydidean rewriting are of equal length. Yet, Dionysius may imitate the Magnesian's preoccupation with a limited number of rhythmical cadences: five out of the seven clauses end on Hegesias' favorite rhythms, that is, either a final ditrochee (— ∪ | — —), appearing three times (γένος δὲ Λυδός, and τύραννος ἐθνῶν, and Παφλαγόνων μεταξύ), or a cretic + spondee (— ∪ — | — —), appearing twice (υἱὸς ἦν Κροῖσος and πόντον Εὔξεινον).[166] To compare, the Thucydidean version only exhibits such clausulae three times, and Herodotus' original once.[167] Like Cicero, then, Dionysius may have been aware of Hegesias' best-loved rhythmical cadences. In his Hegesian recasting, the Greek critic imitates the Magnesian's preparedness to arrange his words in extreme, nonsensical ways in order to create the artistic effects that he so desperately

[165] Cf. Weil (1844) 129–130 on the first three clauses of Dionysius' Hegesian rearrangement: 'Le nom d'Alyattès, placé au commencement de la phrase et suivi de la particule μέν, se prononce avec un accent fort qui ne lui convient guère. (…) Au reste, Alyattès, fût-il un père très illustre, on ne fait pas ici un panégyrique, mais une généalogie. Si le nom d'Alyattès est trop mis en relief, celui de Crésus est trop effacé, et il ne pourrait guarder cette place qui s'il eût été question de Crésus dans les phrases précédentes, et que son nom ne fût répété que pour la clarté.' De Jonge (2005) 478 (= De Jonge (2008) 388) submits that 'this metathesis is associated with the "Asianic" style, to which the Atticist Dionysius strongly objects.'

[166] For Hegesias' favorite rhythms and Cicero's familiarity with them, see section 2.4.2 above. For an explanation of my approach to distinguishing phrases and scanning prose, see ibid. n. 120–122. The hunt for well-loved clausulae may explain the strange position of τύραννος in the second phrase, and the strange arrangement of καλούμενον πόντον Εὔξεινον in the final phrase. As far the two phrases that do not end either on a dicretic or on cretic + spondee, one has a final paean (∪ ∪ ∪ —, ἐξίησιν ἄνεμον), which was Aristotle's favorite (*Rh.* 3.8.6), and which De Groot (1921) 64 recognizes as one of Hegesias' favorite clausulae. The other ends on a hypodochmiac (— ∪ — ∪ —), which is often attested in Greek imperial prose according to Hutchinson (2015) 789, but which I have not seen in the other fragments of Hegesias.

[167] In Dionysius' Thucydidean rearrangement, we encounter: υἱὸς μὲν Ἀλυάττου (— ∪ ∪ ∪ | — —), γένος δὲ Λυδός (— ∪ | — —), καλούμενον πόντον (— ∪ — | — —). In Herodotus' Atticized original, we find only καλούμενον πόντον (— ∪ — | — —). The original Ionic-Greek text, which has Ἀλυαττέω, μεσημβρίης. βορῆν and καλεόμενον contains none of Hegesias' favorite clausulae.

craves.[168] In sum, Dionysius not only takes exception to Hegesias' ignoble, short-syllabled rhythms but also to his degenerate, logic-defying word order. In both instances, the Greek critic repeats the point that Cicero and Agatharchides had made before him about the Magnesian's style: it has no place in a serious, dignified discourse.

2.4.4 Summary: the Principal Stylistic Vices of Hegesias

What do the ancient discussions of Hegesias' supposed stylistic ineptitude teach us about the authors' views of style? As we have seen, Agatharchides, Cicero and Dionysius each underline different aspects of the Magnesian's remarkable prose: Agatharchides primarily censures his figurative language, Cicero condemns his choppy, verse-like phrases, and Dionysius attacks his outrageously affected word order and his frequent clusters of short syllables. Despite these apparent differences of focus between the extant critics and rhetoricians, we may still recognize at least three shared points about the man from Magnesia:

1. Whereas Demosthenes' oeuvre was considered a veritable catalogue of stylistic theory put into practice, Hegesias' prose is not awarded a place in the stylistic categories of the surviving discussions of prose style. Neither Cicero nor Dionysius mention him in their three-style divisions: apparently, the inadequacy of the 'Hegesian type of style' (*Hegesiae genus*, Ἡγησιακὸν σχῆμα) defies classification. In contrast to Demosthenes' brilliant versatility, Hegesias allegedly knows only a handful of ostentatious tricks and he never loses an opportunity to showcase them, rendering his style formulaic and monotonous.

2. The critics and rhetoricians are unanimously shocked by the incongruity between Hegesias' stylistic attributes and the serious topics that he addresses. Perpetually

[168] The three brief samples of Hegesias' prose (= F18–20 Jacoby) that Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.11 cites immediately after his pastiche also show a tendency to favor stylistic flourishes over a clear exposition of the substance. In F18, the arrangement creates alliteration, assonance, rhyme, and the clausula paean + spondee (— ∪ ∪ ∪ | — —): 'After a good festival another good one we celebrate' (ἐξ ἀγαθῆς ἑορτῆς ἀγαθὴν ἄγομεν ἄλλην). In F19, Hegesias introduces himself in a strangely ordered sentence that resembles Dionysius' Hegesian version of the introduction of Croesus: 'From Magnesia am I, the mighty land, a Sipylean' (ἀπὸ Μαγνησίας εἰμὶ τῆς μεγάλης Σιπυλεύς). F20, lastly, exhibits a highly obscure syntax, ending its second colon on a ditrochee (— ∪ | — —), and its third on cretic + spondee (— ∪ — | — —): 'It was no small drop that into Theban waters Dionysus spew: for sweet it is indeed, but it makes men mad' (οὐ γὰρ μικρὰν εἰς Θηβαίων ὕδωρ ἔπτυσεν ὁ Διόνυσος· | ἡδὺ μὲν γάρ ἐστι, | ποιεῖ δὲ μαίνεσθαι).

hunting for frivolous rhythms and light-hearted balance, he was considered unable to handle the lofty, life-and-death issues of practical oratory, where the Attic orator Demosthenes was thought to reign supreme. The abuse that he receives in our sources reflects his reputation as an unserious author: he is described as juvenile, effeminate and insane, arousing laughter when pathos is required.

3. According to Cicero and Dionysius, Hegesias' prose betrays an utter lack of talent for word arrangement. Intriguingly, both scholars provide apposite burlesques of their antimodel's composition. Cicero, for one, mockingly imitates the 'verselets' (*versiculi*) that can indeed be found in Hegesias' extant fragments. Dionysius, in addition to his criticism of the Magnesian's ignoble rhythms, offers a striking parody of his affected word order. To be brief, word arrangement was not only considered a pre-eminent source of Demosthenes' success but also of Hegesias' failure.

In the surviving Greek and Latin discussions of prose style, then, Hegesias is presented as a virtual anti-Demosthenes: the Magnesian author is thought to have failed on the very points on which the Athenian hero is said to have triumphed. Hence, the Lydian orator and historian was a perfect prototype of 'Asian' style (Ἀσιανός, *Asianus, Asiaticus*), which, as we will see, was set up as the polar opposite of everything that the critics and rhetoricians of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome liked about Attic oratory (sections 5.2 and 5.3). The harsh ostracism of Hegesias offers us a rare concrete glimpse into the shared Greek and Roman conceptions of the 'bad' style of Hellenistic Asia, highlighting, by contrast, what Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues love about the 'good' style of classical Athens.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen that Cicero and Dionysius both select Demosthenes as the ultimate champion of brilliant prose, while they both present Hegesias of Magnesia as the prime exponent of bad taste. The prototypicality of Demosthenes and Hegesias is connected to the dominant prejudice about their places of birth and the eras in which they were active: Demosthenes lived and worked in Athens at the end of the Classical Era, whereas Hegesias was born in Asia, flourishing at the beginning of the Hellenistic Era. I have argued, however, that the lavish praise of Demosthenes and the fierce criticism of Hegesias can not only be explained as products of classicizing cultural bias, but also as the results of serious investigations into the properties of their styles: we have seen that Cicero and Dionysius stress

the same virtues in the Athenian's oratory, likewise emphasizing the same vices in the Magnesian's prose. What is more, the former's strengths are argued to be the latter's weaknesses. Cicero and Dionysius not only reveal to us what they consider the distinctive qualities of good and bad prose, but, since several important elements from their discussions can be found in other contemporary sources as well, they also shed a telltale light on the prevalent aesthetic tastes in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome.

The following are Cicero's and Dionysius' three crucial criteria for distinguishing between admirable and deplorable prose: style should (1) be adaptable to suit any circumstances, (2) hold up particularly in the treatment of the serious, dignified issues of real-life oratory, and (3) pay special attention to the art of word arrangement. These shared views are integral features of the common critical framework on which the Greek and Roman discourse on prose style is built. We should note, however, that each of the critics and rhetoricians could bend these basic parameters to suit their individual aesthetic programs. Concerning rhythm, for instance, Cicero contrasts Demosthenes' forceful thunderbolts to Hegesias' minced verse-like fragments, whereas Dionysius plays off the nobility of the former's long-syllabled rhythms against the degeneracy of the latter's short-syllabled feet. In the remainder of this dissertation, I will make a closer study of the flexible application of the shared stylistic repertoire that we encountered in the present chapter. The next chapter, to begin with, will focus on the various threefold divisions of style that the Greek and Roman authors use to classify classical literature and to analyze Demosthenes' flexible prose. Sadly, the sorry tale of Hegesias ends here: as he is denied any official status in the extant stylistic models, the man from Magnesia will only reappear occasionally in the margins of my subsequent analyses.