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

Ooms, S.

Chapter 4
OFFENDING THE EARS: GREEK AND LATIN VIEWS ON ROUGH WORD ARRANGEMENT

4.1 Introduction

Like the doctrine of three styles, the arrangement of words (in Greek σύνθεσις τῶν ὀνομάτων, in Latin *compositio verborum*) is a hot topic in the stylistic discourse of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome. There are roughly two ancient approaches to word arrangement, or 'composition', as the topic is usually referred to in modern scholarship.[1] First, there is the logical-syntactical perspective, which evaluates word order on the basis of grammatical rules, e.g. 'nouns should precede verbs' or 'verbs should precede adverbs'.[2] In his monograph *On the Arrangement of Words* (περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων), Dionysius of Halicarnassus explores and ultimately rejects this approach, because 'at times the arrangement became charming and beautiful by these and similar principles, but at other times not by these, but by the opposite sort.'[3] Instead, Dionysius adopts an alternative perspective that is better suited to evaluate

[1] The modern usage of the term 'composition', however, has a much wider application: cf. 'the action or act of producing a creative work such as a poem or piece of music' (*OED* s.v. 2.1). The term can also give the false impression that it is related to the arrangement of subject matter, which can be avoided by using 'literary composition', 'stylistic composition' or 'verbal composition'. I recognize that the designation 'word arrangement' is also somewhat imperfect (i.e., it does not account for the attention that our sources pay to arranging letters, syllables, clauses and sentences), but it aptly brings out the meaning of the ancient terminology, which consists of the nouns σύνθεσις/*compositio* (a process of 'putting together' or 'arranging') and ὀνόματα/*verba* ('words'). Cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 2.1, who defines σύνθεσις τῶν ὀνομάτων as 'a certain process of arranging the parts of speech' (ποιά τις θέσις παρ' ἄλληλα τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων).

[2] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 5 discusses these and six similar syntactical rules: the critic presents the logical-syntactical approach as a 'natural starting point' (φυσικὴ ἀφορμή) for his investigation of word arrangement. De Jonge (2008) 273–315 shows that Dionysius' discussion of natural word order is largely inspired by Stoic works on language, e.g., Chrysippus' *On the Order of the Parts of Speech* (Περὶ συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν), quoted by Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.17, 4.20. Other texts which apply a logical-syntactical approach to word order are Demetr. *Eloc.* 199–201, Long. *Subl.* 22.1 and Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.23–27: see De Jonge (2001) and (2008) 315–327. Cf. n. 4 below on Horace's 'clever combination' (*callida iunctura*).

[3] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 5.10: Τοτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τούτων ἐγίνετο καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς ἡδεῖα ἡ σύνθεσις καὶ καλή, τοτὲ δ' ἐκ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων ἀλλ' ἐναντίων. Dionysius' rejection of the logical-syntactical approach to word arrangement in *Comp.* does not preclude his use of grammatical terminology throughout the work: cf. his references to the theory of the parts of speech at *Comp.* 2.1, 6 and 22–24, which are discussed by De Jonge (2008) 183–213. I agree with De Jonge (2008) 47 that Dionysius' use of grammatical teachings does not make

charm and beauty in word arrangement: this second approach, which can be described as musical-aesthetic, focuses on the sound that supervenes on the word order, or, more accurately, on the audience's aural perception (αἴσθησις, *sensus*) of tone (μέλος, *sonus*) and rhythm (ῥυθμός, *numerus*). The latter approach is dominant in the stylistic discourse of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome.

The aural evaluation of word arrangement features prominently in most extant stylistic discussions of prose and poetry from the second century BC onwards: it is not only attested in Greek sources (Demetrius, Philodemus, Dionysius, Longinus), but in Latin texts as well (Lucilius, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero, Quintilian).[4] The shared Greek and Latin discourse on word arrangement, which emerges from these texts, is built on the assumption that the judgment of word order ultimately resides not in the mind, but in the ear (ἀκοή, *auris*), which bases its assessment not on logical principles, but on the 'irrational criterion of perception' (ἄλογος αἴσθησις, *tacitus sensus*).[5] According to the authors, the acoustic effects of word order can be divided into two categories: some collocations produce sounds that 'please the ear' (γλυκαίνειν τὴν ἀκοήν, *permulcere auris*), while others produce sounds that 'grate the ear' (πικραίνειν τὴν ἀκοήν, *offendere auris*).[6] Dionysius' threefold system of

---

his work a grammatical treatise: 'Dionysius combines a wide knowledge of many different disciplines on the one hand with a focus on the practical purposes of his own work on the other hand.'

[4] Demetr. *Eloc.* esp. 38–74, 179–184, 204–208, 241–271; Philod. *Poem.* passim; Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 36–49, *Comp.* passim; Long. *Subl.* 39–42; Lucil. fr. 74–76, 367–370, 1188 Krenkel (= fr. 84–86, 389–392, 419 Warmington); *Rhet. Her.* 4.18; Cic. *De or.* 3.171–199, *Orat.* 149–236; Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4. This chapter will not pay much attention to the notion of 'clever combination' (*callida iunctura*) in Hor. *Ars. P.* 46–48 and 240–243, for the poet does not refer to tone or rhythm, but rather to syntax and semantics: in his view, a poet can add distinction to his style, 'if a clever combination makes a familiar word new' (*notum si callida verbum reddiderit iunctura novum*). Cf. Brink (1971) 139. Yet, De Jonge (2019a) points out four striking parallels between the views of Dionysius and Horace about word arrangement: both men stress the importance of commonplace words, clever skill, metamorphosis and distinction.

[5] Schenkeveld (1975a) and Damon (1991) 45–49 discuss the role of ἄλογος αἴσθησις and the opposite notion of the 'rational criterion' (λογικὸν κριτήριον) in Dionysius' critical works. The importance of ἄλογος αἴσθησις was also stressed by οἱ κριτικοί, who argued that the value of poetry was defined by the arrangement of the words, and that the latter aspect was judged upon by the irrational judgment: see Pohl (1968) 145–159 and Janko (2000) 120–189. Following Geigenmüller (1908) 34 and Nassal (1910) 37, Schenkeveld (1988) 304–305 convincingly argues that *tacitus sensus* at *De or.* 3.195 and *Orat.* 203 is Cicero's translation of ἄλογος αἴσθησις. On the connection between Cicero's 'silent perception' and Dionysius' 'irrational perception', see section 4.3 n. 62.

[6] See e.g. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 15.12, Cic. *Orat.* 150 and ibid. 163. In section 4.3 below, we will see that rough arrangement was considered a disruption of the natural acoustic order.

'arrangement types' (χαρακτῆρες τῆς συνθέσεως) is based on this distinction: 'smooth harmony' (ἁρμονία γλαφυρά) consists largely of pleasing sounds, 'rough harmony' (ἁρμονία αὐστηρά) is dominated by grating sounds, and 'well-mixed harmony' (ἁρμονία εὔκρατος) is an appropriate combination of the two opposite effects (section 3.2.1).[7] In this chapter, we will focus on the aesthetics of rough word arrangement, that is, on harsh, ear-jarring compositions that produce vexing rhythms and dissonant successions of tones.

The significance of roughness in the Greek and Latin stylistic discourse can easily be overlooked: scholars usually discuss the acoustic effects of word arrangement under such headings as 'euphony' or the 'euphonist tradition'.[8] Yet, for a fuller understanding of the ancient views of word arrangement, we should also pay close attention to roughness and cacophony: if musicality is so important for the critics and rhetoricians in Rome, why do they concern themselves so extensively with disharmonious sounds that offend their ears? To be sure, roughness was not considered inherently vicious: when critics describe the acoustics of a passage as jarring or painful, they are not necessarily condemning it. Indeed, we already saw in the previous chapter that Dionysius associate rough word arrangement with such virtues as 'beauty' (κάλλος) and 'grandeur' (μεγαλοπρέπεια), and we will see below that his Greek and Roman colleagues also appreciate roughness in various ways and to various extents.[9] What is more, we will see that roughness played a major role in the lively debate about classical style in Rome: the production of harsh, grating sounds was sometimes seen as a means to echo, almost in a literal sense, the crude acoustics of centuries-old prose or poetry (section 4.5.3). Thus, rough composition could harness the sound of the Greek classics for the audiences in Rome. Yet, the opinions about the appropriate application of this procedure varied. It is the purpose of this chapter to outline the shared discourse on rough word arrangement and to shed

[7] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 21–24, *Dem.* 37–41. There appear to be close connections between Dionysius' three types of arrangement and similar systems attributed to musicians (in Demetr. *Eloc.* 176) and to οἱ κριτικοί (in Philod. *Poem.* 5): in the latter two cases, a distinction is made between the adjectives 'smooth' (λεῖος), 'rough' (τραχύς) and 'solid', or 'well-proportioned' (εὐπαγής). See esp. Pohl (1968) 99–100, 149–153.

[8] Cf. e.g. Janko (2000) 165–189 and Porter (2016) 239–245. Of course, classicists are not unaware of the ancient appreciation of rough word arrangement. See e.g. Stanford (1967) 63–64: 'A language, like an orchestra, needs clashing, clanging, and thundering instruments as well as a lighter wood-wind group; and a versatile author will need cacophonous sounds at times to express the harsher aspects of what he wants to say.' Yet, as far as I am aware, the only study to date that focuses on the positive evaluation of roughness in ancient theories of word arrangement is Rispoli (1998): cf. the present section below.

[9] See esp. section 3.2.1, table 6 above. On the connection between grandeur and roughness, see also section 4.5 below.

light on the goals and motivations that underlie the diverse evaluations of harsh and clashing combinations of words.

In exploring the Greek and Latin discourse on rough word arrangement, we can build on several modern studies that touch on the ancient art of 'composition'. Much work, for instance, has been done on ancient theories of prose rhythm and on ancient views about periodic sentence structure.[10] Aldo Scaglione's monograph *The Classical Theory of Composition* will be of limited use for my purposes, as it exclusively tackles the 'genuinely syntactical aspects of style', while glossing over the musical-aesthetic aspects, which in the author's view 'have been studied extensively and rather satisfactorily'.[11] Ironically, however, the aural evaluation of word arrangement went on to receive considerable scholarly attention in the decades following the publication of Scaglione's book. From the frazzled remains of Philodemus' *On Poems*, for example, various classicists have been able to reconstruct the views of a group of Hellenistic critics, referred to by Philodemus as οἱ κριτικοί, who held that the value of poetry consisted primarily in its acoustic qualities.[12] In addition, scholars have

[10] A good starting point for Latin theories of prose rhythm is Schmid (1959), who connects Cicero's discussions about the topic to Arist. *Rh.* 3.8–9. As for Greek theory, one may start from Dover (1997), who offers a scathing review of the discussion in Dion. Hal. *Comp.* Gentili (1990) shows that Dionysius makes the abstract rules of meter and rhythm concrete by connecting them to the principle of irrational perception ('instintiva percezione aurale'). Hutchinson (2013) 233–240 notes that the polemic about prose rhythm among Roman orators in Cicero's day is related to 'the Hellenistic system of rhythm, started, it is said, by Hegesias' and to the practice of Greek declaimers in Rome. Concerning sentence structure, Innes (1994) has focused on Dionysius' and Longinus' conceptions of the period and the colon, while Viljamaa (2003) has addressed Dionysius' use of the term colon and the comma. For good discussions of Dionysius' use of linguistic and grammatical theories, see Schenkeveld (1983) and esp. De Jonge (2008). For Latin views on sentence structure, see Lieberg (1956) on the use of the term 'structure' (*structura*).

[11] Scaglione (1972) 24. The author traces the history of the theory of word arrangement from Antiquity to the present and, as a consequence, he is mostly interested in those aspects of the ancient discourse that have influenced later English, French and Italian theories, not necessarily the aspects which were considered paramount by the ancients themselves. This approach sometimes causes him to distort ancient notions by conflating them with later ones: thus, Aristotle's views on the period are fitted into those of Quintilian and even equated with modern concepts. See the reviews of Winterbottom (1974) and Schenkeveld (1975b).

[12] Schenkeveld (1968) was the first to discuss Philodemus' οἱ κριτικοί as a unified school of aesthetic thought, which focused on euphony and word arrangement. Porter (1995) reevaluates the material and shows that Crates of Mallos was the main source of Philodemus' information about οἱ κριτικοί: he concludes that Crates shared their obsession with the acoustic qualities of poetry, although the critic considered them his opponents. Janko (2000) 120–189 discusses the meaning of the term οἱ κριτικοί and links the various theses associated with them to individual authors, such as Heracleodorus and Pausimachus of Miletus, whose names survive only in Philod.

been successful in uncovering the connections between musical theory and literary criticism: especially the discussions of melody and rhythm in the fragments of the *Elements of Harmony* and the *Elements of Rhythm* by the Peripatetic philosopher Aristoxenus of Tarentum (born ca. 370–365 BC) touch on several themes and topics that went on to become central to the discourse on word arrangement: both Dionysius and Cicero were familiar with his musicological work.[13]

One theme that permeates the views of Aristoxenus, οἱ κριτικοί as well as the students of word arrangement in Rome is the focus on sensory perception in the critical evaluation of music, poetry and prose. James Porter has coined the helpful phrase 'aesthetic materialism', which refers to a focus on the audible, visible and tactile aspects of art: by shifting our attention from the dominant formalism and idealism of Plato and Aristotle to the 'counter-tradition' of sensualism and materialism, Porter has been able to demonstrate the centrality of perception and euphony throughout the history of Greek aesthetic thought.[14] Another recurring feature in ancient discussions about the acoustic effects of word arrangement is their imitative aspect, which scholars have subsumed under various categories, such as 'expressiveness', 'onomatopoeia', 'mimesis' and 'iconism'.[15] Like ancient musicians, critics

---

Poem. See also Porter's works listed in n. 14 below, which discuss the views of οἱ κριτικοί in the context of the history of ancient aesthetic thought.

[13] Both Aristox. *Harm.* and *Rhythm.* survive incompletely; for the former we have the edition of Da Rios (1954), for the latter the editions of Pearson (1990) and Marchetti (2009). The extant data about the life and works of Aristoxenus are presented by Marchetti (2009) 1–25. Dionysius (*Comp.* 14.2, *Dem.* 48.2) and Cicero (*Tusc.* 1.19, 1.24) both refer twice to Aristoxenus. According to Kroll (1907) 91–101, Dionysius knew the musical theories of Aristoxenus through the work of Theophrastus. Koller (1954) 174–179, 193–202 traced the musical foundations of the theory of word arrangement further back to Democritus and the Pythagoreans; cf. Porter (1986) on the importance of atomism. Pohl (1968) links Dionysius' theory of three harmonies to the musical doctrines of Aristoxenus and to the euphonic views of οἱ κριτικοί. The latter group is central in the discussion of Janko (2000) 173–189, who also summarizes the scholarly findings up to the end of the previous millennium. Recently, Rocconi (2010) has discussed four points of contact between Aristoxenus and Dionysius, including their focus on σύνθεσις and their attention to the relation between musical and conversational melody: cf. Barker (2014).

[14] Porter (1986) presents materialist aesthetics as 'a distinct counter-tradition, or else tendency, which occasionally breaks through the surface of the canonical, idealist and formalist tradition of Plato and Aristotle', and which reaches its fullest known articulation in the lost works of οἱ κριτικοί, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* and Vitr. *De arch.* With this in mind, Porter (2010) revisits the history of ancient aesthetics, and Porter (2016) reevaluates the history of the sublime. Cf. also Porter (2001) on the sublime in Cicero, οἱ κριτικοί, Dionysius and Longinus.

[15] A seminal study of mimesis in rhetorical theory and poetic criticism is Koller (1954), who stressed the influence of the Pythagorean idea that song, music and dance could cleanse the soul through the expression of

and rhetoricians (especially among the Greeks) advocated a correspondence between sound and substance: tone and rhythm should imitate and hence reinforce the meaning of the words (section 4.5.2). All in all, the art of word arrangement is a multifaceted subject, as Karin Pohl and Casper de Jonge have emphasized in their studies of Dionysius' monograph on the topic: like many of his colleagues, the critic 'incorporates views from all ancient language disciplines that are relevant to the subject'.[16] Lastly, I should mention the article by Gioia Rispoli on 'roughness of sound' (δυσφωνία), which, like the present chapter, focuses on the positive evaluation of harshness and cacophony.[17]

Thus, the present study touches on various topics that have already been discussed in previous scholarship. Nonetheless, focusing on roughness and dissonance, it aims to contribute in two important ways to our understanding of the ancient theory of word arrangement. First, while classicists have been mostly interested in identifying the origins of the various doctrines that contribute to the discipline of word arrangement, I will adopt a synchronic perspective: I will not be concerned, therefore, with identifying the various sources of the critics and rhetoricians of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome, but I will rather focus on the programs, preferences and ambitions that govern their discussions. Secondly, this chapter will explore the relationship between Greek and Latin views on word arrangement. As we will see, Roman rhetoricians were acutely aware of the Greek

---

'ethos' and 'pathos'. In addition, Pohl (1968) 69–126 has connected several elements from Dion. Hal. *Comp.* to a 'Mimesis-Lehre' that she attributes to Peripatetic musical theory, esp. Aristoxenus. Wilkinson (1963) 46–88 discusses the 'expressiveness' of words in Latin. See also Asmis (2004), who argues that οἱ κριτικοί did not separate euphony and meaning, as is usually thought, but that they in fact insisted that sound served to emphasize substance. Calcante (2005a) presents a multidisciplinary approach to 'iconism', studying sources on music, poetry, prose, philosophy of language and the psychology of perception. In line with the previous study, Calcante (2005b) draws up a 'system of euphony', based predominantly on his readings of Dion. Hal. *Comp.* and Pl. *Cra.* (mentioned at *Comp.* 16.4).

[16] De Jonge (2008) 42–43. De Jonge rightly emphasizes Dionysius' pragmatic approach to his sources: 'We find Dionysius selecting the workable ideas from different language sciences, while at the same time avoiding elaborate discussions of technical details that are not useful for his intended audience.' Pohl (1968) offers a rich study into Dionysius' system of three types of arrangement: she distinguishes between three groups of sources, namely musical, rhetorical and poetical theory. Due to this interdisciplinary application, it is all but impossible to assign the individual notions associated with word arrangement to any single source or tradition: cf. the discussion about Dionysius' sources for his chapter on rhythm (*Comp.* 17) in De Jonge (2008) 341–342 n. 60.

[17] Rispoli (1998) takes Philod. *Poem.* as her starting point and notes that there are striking parallels with Demetr. *Eloc.* and Dion. Hal. *Comp.*, which she traces back to Greek musical doctrines on the connections between music and speech. Unlike Rispoli's diachronic approach, this chapter adopts a synchronic perspective to composition.

achievements in the discipline (section 4.2), and they applied similar theories, techniques and terminology as their Greek colleagues (sections 4.3 and 4.4). Yet, there is notable variation among the extant evaluations of rough word arrangement (section 4.5): these differences can sometimes be attributed to ad hoc writing purposes and individual tastes, but we will also see that Roman ears did not appreciate roughness in the same way as Greek ears.

4.2 Word Arrangement: a Greek Discipline in Rome

There is a major difference between Greek and Roman attitudes to rough word arrangement, which goes back to the second century BC: it is, thus, as old as our record of word arrangement in Rome. In 168 BC, the Pergamese grammarian and critic Crates of Mallos is reported to have visited the city as an envoy of the Attalid court: during his stay, he allegedly fell into a sewage hole near the Palatine, broke his leg and spent his recovery giving lectures about grammar and literary criticism.[18] According to Suetonius, Crates, whose many interests included word arrangement and euphony, inspired Romans to read, emend and annotate Latin poetry, initially only the poems written by their friends, but later also the verses of Naevius, Ennius and Lucilius.[19] I have included this quaint anecdote not in order to prove that there was no study of euphony or word arrangement in Rome before Crates' visit, but rather to illustrate the widely shared sentiment among Romans that they inherited their literary wisdom from the Greeks.[20] In this section, we will see that Roman scholars stressed their indebtedness to their Greek predecessors, all the more emphatically, in discussions of word arrangement. In fact, various Latin sources present the careful arrangement of words as a quintessentially Greek activity, to the extent that it might even be awkward for Romans to create smooth, euphonious collocations.

---

[18] The story about Crates' visit to Rome can be found in Suet. *Gramm.* 2.1–4, who dates the embassy shortly after Ennius' demise (169 BC): on the textual problems of the passage, see Vacher (1993) 40 n. 3. According to Suetonius, Crates 'was the first to introduce the study of grammar to the city' (*primus studium grammaticae in urbem instituit*). Lehmann (2004) focuses on the passage as a source for the beginning of criticism in Rome.

[19] Suetonius refers to three philological activities that the Romans learnt from Crates, i.e. 'reading' (*legere*), 'emending' (*retractare*) and making 'annotations' (*commentarii*). See Lehmann (2004) 151–162, who explores the Roman critical activities with respect to Naevius, Ennius and Lucilius in the second century BC. For Crates' intellectual accomplishments, see Pfeiffer (1968) 235–238. For Crates' critical views about arrangement and euphony, and his role in Phil. *Poem.*, see Janko (2000) 120–134.

[20] Cf. section 3.3 above on the Athenian embassy of 155 BC and the introduction of the three styles in Rome. Blaensdorf (1994) 8–10 has shown that already in the early second century BC (well before Crates' visit) the Romans adopted critical approaches to legal and religious texts.

The fragments of the satirist Lucilius are the earliest extant Latin sources on word arrangement. The poet was well-versed in the Greek terminology of acoustic criticism: he classified sonorous words as 'euphonious' (εὔφωνα) and he submitted that individual letters could be 'combined in an ugly way' (κακοσύνθετα).[21] We also have a couplet of hexameters that mock the word arrangement of the orator and infamous hellenomaniac T. Albucius. In 120 BC, Albucius filed an unsuccessful lawsuit against the praetor Q. Mucius Scaevola, in whose mouth Lucilius, in his second book of *Satires*, placed the following insult at the expense of Albucius:[22]

> *Quam lepide λέξεις compostae ut tesserulae omnes*
> *arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato.*
>
> How pleasantly *les mots* are joined together, like little cubes
> all artfully inlaid in a worm-like mosaic floor.

The point of these verses is that Albucius shows himself a true Greek (which is not a good thing in Scaevola's book) by indulging in a fundamentally Greek activity: he arranges his words neatly into an intricate, overelaborate design.[23] Architectural imagery is common in ancient discussions of word arrangement: while overly smooth combinations are like the

[21] See Janko (2000) 176: Lucilius 'knew a complete theory of σύνθεσις'. Lucil. fr. 1188 Krenkel (= fr. 418 Warmington): the text refers to 'words that are more sonorous' (*quae verba magis sonantia sunt*), and 'which Lucilius calls euphonious' (*quae Lucilius εὔφωνα appellat*). Lucil. fr. 367–368 Krenkel (= fr. 389–390 Warmington): the letter r is inherently ugly, even if it is not 'combined in an ugly way' (κακοσύνθετον) or pronounced 'in dog-language' (*canina lingua*). The word κακοσύνθετος is frequent in scholia, e.g. on Eur. *Or.* 674, *Hec.* 801, Ar. *Vesp.* 818. For Lucilius' statements on euphony, cf. also Lucil. fr. 366 Krenkel (on the letter q), fr. 369–370 Krenkel (on the letter s).

[22] Lucil. fr. 74–75 Krenkel (= fr. 84–85 Warmington), my translation; French words to express Albucius' affectation are standard in English translations, cf. Warmington (1938) 29. For the altercation between Albucius and Scaevola, cf. Gruen (1992) 257–258, 290–291 on Cic. *De or.* 2.281, 3.171; *Brut.* 102, 113; *Fin.* 1.8.

[23] For this point, see Chahoud (2004) 31–37, who shows that Lucilius' incorporation of Greek (code-switching) serves to underline an important social rule: 'The Romans must behave like Romans and *speak* like Romans, unless they aim to be laughed at, and deservingly so.' Butler (2011) 39–42 focuses on the 'worm-like' (*vermiculatus*) appearance of the mosaic (cf. the modern architectural term *opus vermiculatum*): 'From close by, the array of wriggling lines can indeed (with a little imagination) resemble a bed of worms.' Yet, 'any viewer need only move closer and the illusion dissolves': thus, under careful scrutiny, the 'worm-like' style of verbal arrangement falls short. Lucilius imitates Albucius' smooth arrangement through a series of four elisions.

cubes in a mosaic floor, rough combinations can be compared to the crudely cut building blocks of a rugged structure. In Dionysius' words, rough harmony 'does not mind admitting harsh and dissonant collocations, like blocks of natural stone laid together in building, with their sides not cut square or polished smooth, but remaining unworked and rough-hewn'.[24] Lucilius does not refer to such an uneven, jagged edifice, but rather to a sleek, well-fitting structure: he presents the view that an immaculately smooth arrangement is unbefitting a true Roman. His satirical objections are cited with approval by Cicero, who condemns Albucius' labor as 'both endless and silly' (*cum infinitus tum puerilis*), and by Quintilian, who compares the philhellene orator to a rider who kills the passion of his fiery horse by forcing it to perform a dainty dance routine.[25]

The idea that neatly ordered words are typical for Greek prose practice persists in Latin texts of the first centuries BC and AD. The Roman rhetoricians do not even exhibit a coherent Latin terminology for the topic of arrangement: *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Quintilian use *compositio*, while Cicero uses *collocatio* in his *Orator*, although he had simply subsumed the topic under the category of 'periodic structure' (*continuatio verborum*) in *De Oratore.* To complicate matters even further, in Cicero's discussions the terms *collocatio* and *compositio* sometimes denote a subtopic (and not the whole subject) of word arrangement, namely the combining of final syllables with the subsequent initial syllables, for which Quintilian uses *iunctura.*[26] On several occasions, Cicero presents Latin technical terms

[24] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.2: Τραχείαις τε χρῆσθαι πολλαχῇ καὶ ἀνιτύποις ταῖς συμβολαῖς οὐδὲν αὐτῇ διαφέρει, οἷαι γίνονται τῶν λογάδην συντιθεμένων ἐν οἰκοδομίαις λίθων αἱ μὴ εὐγώνιοι καὶ μὴ συνεξεσμέναι βάσεις, ἀργαὶ δέ τινες καὶ αὐτοσχέδιοι. This passage is discussed at length by De Jonge (2008) 204–213, with respect to Dionysius' grammatical theory of the parts of speech. For the comparison between word arrangement and architecture in Greek and Latin stylistic theory, see De Jonge (2008) 186–204, who adduces examples from Demetr., Philod., Dion. Hal., Long., Cic. and Quint. Cf. esp. Demetr. *Eloc.* 13, where the periodic style is compared to a well-fitted edifice, while 'the clauses of the disjointed style (resemble) stones which are simply thrown about near one another and not built into a structure' (τὰ δὲ τῆς διαλελυμένης ἑρμηνείας διερριμμένοις πλησίον λίθοις μόνον καὶ οὐ συγκειμένοις). De Jonge (2016) 64–65 points out similarities between Dion. Hal. and Vitruv. *De arch.* (e.g. 1.2.2: *apta conlocatio*).

[25] Cic. *De or.* 3.171, *Brut.* 274, *Orat.* 149. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.113: 'Will not his passion cool and his energy flag, just as showy riders spoil the free movement of their horses by forcing them to a mincing gait?' (*nonne ergo refrigeretur sic calor et impetus pereat, ut equorum cursum delicati minutis passibus frangunt?*). MacPhail (2014) 92–115 devotes a chapter to the comparison between mosaic and text in Antiquity (Lucil., Cic., Quint.) and in Renaissance literature. Plin. *NH* 36.185 also quotes Lucilius' verse in a his discussion of mosaic styles.

[26] *Compositio* and *collocatio* are obvious translations of the Greek word σύνθεσις: they denote the entire topic of word arrangement at e.g. *Rhet. Her.* 4.18, Cic. *Orat.* 234, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.1. The word *compositio* is used by

explicitly as translations from the Greek: he discusses, for instance, 'that rounded form of expression, which the Greeks call the περίοδος, and to which we apply the term *ambitus*, *comprehensio*, *continuatio* or *circumscriptio*'. Similarly, he refers to the phrases that make up the period as 'those forms which, as the Greeks call them κόμματα and κῶλα, we might properly call *incisa* and *membra*'. In addition, he does not introduce the Latin word for rhythm (*numerus*) without mentioning the Greek word (ῥυθμός) as well: the Latin probably reflects Aristotle's association of rhythm with 'number' (ἀριθμός).[27] Such explicit translations can still be found in Quintilian's discussion of word arrangement:[28] thus, despite their own sizeable achievements on the topic, the Romans continued to emphasize its Greekness.

As a result of this general attitude, Roman rhetoricians often display a distinct unease, when they launch into a discussion about the intricacies of word arrangement. The short passage about the topic in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, for instance, is limited to a list of six don'ts: the orator is advised to avoid frequent hiatus, alliteration, polyptoton, homoeoptoton, hyperbaton and long periods.[29] In Cicero's *De oratore*, the protagonist Crassus is constantly on his guard, lest he be denounced as 'some idle and jabbering little Greek' (*aliqui Graeculus*

Cic. *Orat.* 201 to refer to the first of three tasks of word arrangement, namely to make sure 'that final syllables may fit the following initial syllables as neatly as possible' (*ut inter se quam aptissime cohaereant extrema cum primis eaque sint quam suavissimis vocibus*): this same topic is called *collocatio* in Cic. *De or.* 3.171, and *iunctura* in Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.32. For *continuatio* (the heading of the section on word arrangement in Cic. *De or.* 3.171) as Cicero's translation of περίοδος, see n. 27 below. Cf. also section 4.4 n. 63–65 below for the Greek and Latin divisions of the subject of word arrangement.

[27] Cic. *Orat.* 204: *In toto circuitu illo orationis, quem Graeci* περίοδον*, nos tum ambitum, tum circuitum, tum comprehensionem aut continuationem aut circumscriptionem dicimus.* Ibid. 211: *Illa quae nescio cur, cum Graeci* κόμματα *et* κῶλα *nominent, nos non recte incisa et membra dicimus.* Ibid. 170: *Numerus Latine, Graece* ῥυθμός. Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.1–3: 'Now all things are limited by number, and the number belonging to the form of diction is rhythm' (περαίνεται δὲ ἀριθμῷ πάντα· ὁ δὲ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς λέξεως ἀριθμὸς ῥυθμός ἐστιν). Transl. Kennedy (1991). According to Formarier (2013), the word *numerus* allows Cicero to stress the huge variety of the possible rhythmical combinations in prose. For other explicit Latin translations of Greek terms, cf. *Orat.* 134 (χαρακτήρ, *forma ipsa*), ibid. 166 (ἀντίθετα, *contraria*) and ibid. 181 (σχήματα, *quasi formae et lumina*).

[28] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.22 (κόμμα, *incisum*; κῶλον, *membrum*; περίοδος, *ambitus, circumductus, continuatio, conclusio*), 9.4.36 (συναλιφαί, *coeuntes litterae*) and 9.4.45 (ῥυθμός, *numerus*; μέτρον, *dimensio quaedam*).

[29] *Rhet. Her.* 4.18. The author does not use the Greek or Latin technical terminology, but he rather gives descriptions, e.g., 'excessive recurrence of the same letter' (*eiusdem litterae nimia adsiduitas*) for alliteration, 'excessive repetition of the same word' (*eiusdem verbi adsiduitas nimia*) for polyptoton, and 'series of words with like case endings' (*similter cadentia verba*) for homoeoptoton. Cf. ibid. 4.10 and Calboli (1959) 305–306. The author illustrates his discussion with citations, some of which can be assigned to Ennius, e.g. *o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti.* On (the absence of) hiatus in Latin according to Cicero, see section 4.5.1 below.

otiosus et loquax):[30] he commends Lucilius' verses for their humor, but he adds that 'it is nevertheless important to pay attention to this matter of verbal arrangement'.[31] In his *Orator*, Cicero attaches a long preface to his discussion of word arrangement, which serves as an apology for his engagement with this high-brow, technical activity: 'I am going to speak about the arrangement of words and almost about the counting and measuring of syllables.' He presents the theoretical nature of this exercise as unusual for a Roman: 'I am inclined to think that most Roman orators had more talent than instruction (*doctrina*); consequently they were better able to speak than to lay down precepts (*praecipere*), but with us perhaps just the contrary is true.'[32] The activity of teaching was, of course, seen as a Greek specialty, but as Cicero submits, it is the only thing left to do for a retired orator and scholar like himself.[33]

Cicero is aware, then, that devoting half of his *Orator* to the intricacies of word arrangement might be suspect. Yet, he makes an elaborate case for its study, claiming that it helps create a style that is 'smooth' (*levis*), 'pleasant' (*suavis*) and appealing to the 'pleasure of the ears' (*voluptas aurium*).[34] By doing so, Cicero defends his own oratorical legacy against the attacks of his opponents. Specifically, his oratory was censured for its obtrusive

[30] Cic. *De or.* 1.102. See Wisse (2002) 334–341 on the relation between the portrayal of Greek learning in *De or.* and the contemporary spectrum of Roman attitudes to Greek culture: 'It was clearly important to Cicero at this point to counter the possible impression that Crassus' mastery of Greek intellectual subjects made him "un-Roman", and to leave no doubt that admiration of Greek intellectual accomplishments did not stand in the way of healthy feelings of Roman superiority.'

[31] Cic. *De or.* 3.172: *Sed est tamen haec conlocatio conservanda verborum.* Transl. May and Wisse (2001). The word *conlocatio* refers exclusively to the activity of combining final syllables with subsequent initial syllables: cf. n. 26 above. Crassus not only quotes Scaevola's remarks about Albucius' mosaic-like arrangement (Lucil. fr. 74–75 Krenkel = fr. 84–85 Warmington), but also a reference by Scaevola to Crassus himself (Lucil. fr. 76 Krenkel = fr. 86 Warmington): 'I have Crassus as a son-in-law, so don't be too much of an *orateur*' (*Crassum habeo generum, ne ῥητορικώτερος sis*). At *De or.* 171, Crassus takes this to mean that his own style of word arrangement is to be preferred over the Albucius' philhellenic style.

[32] Cic. *Orat.* 140–148. See esp. 147: *De verbis enim componendis et de syllabis propemodum dinumerandis et demetiendis loquemur.* Ibid. 143: *Atque haud scio an plerique nostrorum oratorum ingenio plus valuerint quam doctrina; itaque illi dicere melius quam praecipere, nos contra fortasse possumus.*

[33] Cicero refers to his lifelong engagement with literary studies (*Orat.* 146) and his current *otium* (ibid. 148) as excuses for taking up the technical study of word arrangement. Dugan (2005) 253–267 relates Cicero's apology at *Orat.* 140–148 to an intellectual context (the abolition of the *tirocinium fori*), a personal context (his friendship with Brutus) and a political context (the dictatorship of Caesar). I do not agree with Dugan that Cicero's turn to private teaching springs from his resignation to the loss of the Republic: cf. section 5.5.1.

[34] For Cicero's emphasis on aural satisfaction (*voluptas aurium*), see e.g. *De or.* 3.177, 3.180; *Orat.* 159, 198, 203, 208, 237. Cf. section 4.4 below on the Latin terminology for rough and smooth arrangement.

and affected rhythms by Calvus and the so-called 'Atticists': 'It seems too much like a trick to catch the ear, if the orator in the midst of his speech is hunting for rhythms. Relying on this objection, those terrible men themselves deliver broken and choppy sentences and upbraid those who produce rounded and finished periods.'[35] Cicero's focus on smooth composition remained controversial after his death: the phrase *esse videatur* (i.e., a paean followed by a spondee) became a symbol for Cicero's excessive fondness for rhythmical cadences.[36] Even Quintilian criticizes his hero on this issue, expressing his own predilection for roughness over smoothness: 'In general, however, if I had to choose, I should prefer the arrangement to be hard and harsh rather than effeminate and emasculated, such as the kind we see in many writers (and more and more day by day), that dances to the lascivious tunes of the castanet.'[37]

Thus, we may conclude that among Roman authors in Late-Republican and Early-Imperial Rome rough, unwrought collocations generally landed on sympathetic ears, while smooth, carefully arranged words were mistrusted: for this reason, Cicero's project advocating a meticulous study of euphony and word order required a lengthy preamble. Greek critics, conversely, could make more confident statements about the importance of arrangement. According to Dionysius, for instance, 'this is what makes the essential difference between one poet or orator and another—the dexterity with which they arranged

[35] Cic. *Orat.* 170: *Nimis enim insidiarum ad capiendas auris adhiberi videtur, si etiam in dicendo numeri ab oratore quaeruntur. Hoc freti isti et ipsi infracta et amputata locuntur et eos vituperant qui apta et finita pronuntiant.* For the views of Calvus and the Atticists, see section 3.4 above and esp. sections 5.2 and 5.6 below.

[36] The phrase is criticized by Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.73, 9.4.145 (the conclusion of the ninth book, which closes on the words *esse videantur*, a playful jibe at Cicero) and 10.2.18. Tac. *Dial.* 23.1 has Aper refer to the phrase as the 'tag which he tacks on as a meaningless catchphrase in every second sentence throughout his speeches' (*illud tertio quoque sensu in omnibus orationibus pro sententia positum*). Zieliński (1904) lists the rhythmical pattern of *esse videatur* (— ◡ ◡ ◡ — —) as a variation of Cicero's first 'Hauptform', i.e., — ◡ — — x with the second long syllable resolved. It seems, however, that neither *esse videatur* nor phrases with the same pattern (e.g., *posse videamur*) was unduly common in Cicero's speeches: Powell (2013) 59–65. The use of meaningless patch-words was associated with (overly) smooth word arrangement in ancient stylistic theory: see Sluiter (1997) 238–244 with e.g. Cic. *Orat.* 230, Demetr. *Eloc.* 55–58, and Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.5.

[37] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.142: *In universum autem, si sit necesse, duram potius atque asperam compositionem malim esse quam effeminatam et enervem, qualis apud multos, et cotidie magis, lascivissimis syntonorum modis saltat.* Quintilian hesitantly announces his deviation from Cicero at the beginning of his chapter on word arrangement (*Inst. orat.* 9.4.1): 'On some points I may express a slightly different opinion' (*in quibusdam paulum fortasse dissentiam*). Formarier (2013) shows that Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.53–55, unlike Cic. *Orat.*, avoids the charge of confusing oratory with music by distinguishing explicitly between oratorical oratorical rhythm (which he calls *numerus*) and musical rhythm (which he calls *rhythmos*).

their words'.[38] Similar views are attributed to οἱ κριτικοί by Philodemus: 'The best poets rise to the first rank and they alone endure on no other account than the sounds.'[39] In Demetrius' *On Style*, acoustic word arrangement is arguably presented as the most important aspect of prose style: concerning Thucydides, for instance, the author says that 'while he has the full range of grandeur, it is perhaps this power of verbal arrangement which alone or chiefly secures his greatest grandeur'.[40] Longinus' *On the Sublime*, lastly, lists composition as the last, but not the least, source of the sublime, 'affecting not only the ears but the very soul' and, if used successfully, 'winning a complete mastery over our minds'.[41]

All of this does not mean that there was a complete agreement among Greek critics about the importance of careful word arrangement. Philodemus, for one, deprecates the attention paid to euphony and arrangement by οἱ κριτικοί, claiming that poetry and prose should please the intellect rather than the ear.[42] In *On the Arrangement of Words* and *On*

[38] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 4.13: Καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν σχεδὸν ᾧ μάλιστα διαλλάττει ποιητής τε ποιητοῦ καὶ ῥήτωρ ῥήτορος, τὸ συντιθέναι δεξιῶς τὰ ὀνόματα. Dionysius compares the function of word arrangement in style to the role that the goddess Athena plays in Hom. *Od.*, having the ability to change the appearance of Odysseus in whatever way she wishes: see section 2.4.3 n. 145 and section 3.5 n. 138 above.

[39] Philod. *Poem.* 1 col. 83.11–14 Janko: Οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ποηταὶ παρ' οὐδὲν ἄλλο πρωτεύουσίν τε καὶ μόνοι διαμένουσιν ἢ παρὰ τοὺς ἤχους. The text refers to euphony, not to arrangement, which may be relevant, as the two topics were sometimes carefully distinguished in Hellenistic poetic criticism. See e.g. Philod. *Poem.* 5 col. 24.27–31 Mangoni: 'Crates misunderstands the views of Heracleodorus and those who share them; for they praise not the arrangement, but the sound which supervenes upon it' (ἀποτυγχάνει τοιγαροῦν τῆς Ἡρακλειοδώρου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων δόξης· οὐ γὰρ τὴν σύνθεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπιφαινομένην αὐτῇ φωνὴν ἐπαινοῦσι). This distinction between euphony and arrangement is particular to Hellenistic criticism and is, thus, not relevant for our understanding of the sources discussed in this dissertation: see Porter (2016) 241 n. 161.

[40] Demetr. *Eloc.* 40: Κινδυνεύει τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ παντοδαποῦ ὄντος τοῦ μεγαλπρεποῦς αὕτη ἡ σύνθεσις μόνη ἢ μάλιστα περιποιεῖν τὸ μέγιστον. Word arrangement is discussed on numerous occasions throughout the treatise (cf. section 4.1 n. 4 above): the author not only describes the characteristics of word arrangement in each of the four styles, but he also opens his treatise with a long preface on periodic sentence structure (ibid. 1–35).

[41] Long. *Subl.* 39.3: Τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς, οὐχὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς μόνης ἐφαπτομένων. Ibid.: Παντοίως ἡμῶν τῆς διανοίας ἐπικρατοῦσαν. At *Subl.* 8, the author introduces arrangement as the activity, 'which gives form to all sources already mentioned' (συγκλείουσα τὰ πρὸ ἑαυτῆς ἅπαντα). On the magical powers of word arrangement according to Longinus (and Dionysius), see De Jonge (2008) 332–340 and De Jonge (2012a) 291–292.

[42] Positive articulations of Philodemus' own views in *Poem.* are scarce: yet, Philod. *Poem.* 5 col. 23.26–24.11 Mangoni stresses the importance of 'reason' (λόγος) and 'thought' (διάνοια) in the evaluation of poetry. Philodemus' objections to the emphasis on aural perception are not limited to poetic criticism: in *Rhet.* 4 col. 2.2–10 p. 163 Sudhaus, Philodemus attacks a group of 'sophists' (σοφισταί) who 'reduce' the matter of hiatus 'to the pleasure and displeasure of the ear' (πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀκοῆς ἡδονὴν καὶ ἀηδίαν ἀναφέρουσιν).

Demosthenes, Dionysius feels the need to defend the careful attention that his favorite orator paid to the topic. One of the arguments that he makes in favor of Demosthenes refers to the necessity to look after the details, when discussing important matters: 'It appears to me far more appropriate in a man who is composing political speeches which are to be permanent memorials to his powers, that he should not ignore even the smallest details, than it is for painters and engravers, who display their manual skills and industry upon perishable materials, to exhaust the refinements of their artistry on fine veins, young plumage, the first beard's down and minute details of a similar character.'[43] This passage responds to the early detractors of Demosthenes, such as Aeschines and Demetrius of Phalerum, who objected to the orator's verbal trickery.[44] Yet, Dionysius' words also call to mind Cicero's 'counting and measuring of syllables': Dionysius' defense of Demosthenes' carefully arranged words may serve to convince his skeptical Roman audience, in the first place his student Rufus Metilius, of the importance of the art of verbal composition.[45]

This section has pointed out a fundamental difference of approach between Latin and Greek discussions of word arrangement. For the Romans, the topic was generally considered a prerogative of Greek scholarship: as a result, the Roman orator whose tones and rhythms were perceived as smooth, could be denounced for spending too much time on an un-Roman, unmanly activity. Greek critics, such as Demetrius, Dionysius and Longinus, on the other hand, did not hesitate to ascribe tremendous powers to the art of arrangement, whether the words be ordered smoothly or roughly. As we will see below, this basic distinction between Greeks and Romans is reflected in their respective discussions about the stylistic applications

[43] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 25.29–44, *Dem.* 51.2–6. See esp. *Comp.* 25.35: Πολύ τε γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ προσήκειν ἀνδρὶ κατασκευάζοντι λόγους πολιτικοὺς μνημεῖα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως αἰώνια μηδενὸς τῶν ἐλαχίστων ὀλιγωρεῖν, ἢ ζωγράφων τε καὶ τορευτῶν παισίν, ἐν ὕλῃ φθαρτῇ χειρῶν εὐστοχίας καὶ πόνους ὑποδεικνυμένοις, περὶ τὰ φλέβια καὶ τὰ πτίλα καὶ τὸν χνοῦν καὶ τὰς τοιαύτας μικρολογίας κατατρίβειν τῆς τέχνης τὴν ἀκρίβειαν.

[44] Aeschines accused Demosthenes of deceiving his audience through the arrangement of his words (Aeschin. *Ctes.* 142) and by exploiting the tone of his voice (ibid. 210). Cf. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 35 for additional criticisms in Aeschin. *Fals. leg.* 34, 40. According to Porter (2010) 319–322, 'there seems to have existed already by this time a kind of theoretical reflection on the subject to which Dionysius of Halicarnassus, possibly in imitation, would later devote a treatise—using the same phrase as is found in Aeschines (and nowhere else earlier) for his title and in his writings.' Indeed, Aeschin. *Ctes.* 142 has τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων σύνθεσιν, cf. Anaximenes *Rh. Al.* 22.8, 25.1, 25.3–4. Other criticisms of Demosthenes' focus on style can be found in Demetrius of Phalerum (fr. 162, 169 Wehrli), Hieronymus of Rhodes (fr. 52a Wehrli) and other sources, listed by Marchiori in Donadi and Marchiori (2013) 383 n. 34. Cf. section 2.3.1 above on the Hellenistic reception of Demosthenes.

[45] Cic. *Orat.* 147. On the possibility that Dionysius reacts to his Roman coevals, see also section 4.5.1 below.

of roughness (section 4.5). First, however, I will argue that despite their differences Greek and Roman critics still participated in a shared discourse on word arrangement.

4.3 The Universal Law of Arrangement and the Judgment of the Ear

How do the ancient critics and rhetoricians distinguish between smooth and rough arrangements? Why, for instance, does Dionysius describe the opening line of Thucydides, beginning with the words Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε, as ear-jarring? And why does Cicero insist that a sentence by C. Gracchus, ending on the words *qui improbos probet*, is harsh-sounding?[46] As we will see, roughness and smoothness were not regarded as matters of personal taste: Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues subscribe to the thesis that there exists a universal law of nature for combining sounds. This law forms the backbone of the joint theoretical framework on which the extant Greek and Latin discussions of word arrangement are built: collocations that abide by the universal law are classified as pleasant and smooth, while those that transgress against it are considered vexing and rough. On the basis of their shared understanding of nature's dictates, the authors generally agree on the sources for roughness: hence, as we will see later, the same basic rules for creating harsh, unpleasant compositions are applied to Greek and Latin literature alike (section 4.4).

There are three essential aspects of the natural law of arrangement that we should take into consideration. These three components, or rules, do not merely recur frequently in rhetorical theory and literary criticism, but they are deeply ingrained in ancient thought about the properties of 'articulate sound' (φωνή, *vox*): as such, they are core features in many fields of knowledge, including music, rhythm, meter, grammar and the philosophy of language.[47]

---

[46] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.37 on Thuc. 1.1.1; Cic. *Orat.* 233 on C. Gracchus fr. 48.24 Malcovati. The latter fragment is taken from Gracchus' speech from 124 BC before the censors, defending himself against the charge of dereliction of duty by leaving his post as governor of Sardinia: cf. Plut. *Gracch.* 2–3. The full quote runs as follows: 'It is inevitable that the man who approves of the wicked will disapprove of the good' (*abesse not potest quin eiusdem hominis sit probos improbare qui improbos probet*). Cicero claims that the sentence would be 'better fitted' (*aptius*), if it had ended on the words *qui improbos probet probos improbare.* See the present section below.

[47] On the interdisciplinary approach to word arrangement, see section 4.1 above. For the opposition between 'articulate sound' (φωνή) and 'inarticulate sound' (ψόφος), see Ax (1978). On the concept of φωνή in rhetoric and related disciplines, see e.g. Schenkeveld (1990), who outlines the structure and influence of Stoic theories on the voice; Porter (2010) 308–404, who discusses the role of the voice in materialist aesthetics; and Schulz (2014) 351–376, who exposes the connections between rhetorical theories on the voice (esp. concerning delivery, or ὑπόκρισις/*actio*) and other sciences, such as grammar, drama, philosophy, music and medicine.

1. The universal law of arrangement posits that in composing a piece of music, poem or prose text not just any sound-unit can be placed after just any other, but rather that there are certain unchangeable rules, ordained by 'nature' (φύσις, *natura*), that limit the number of possible combinations.
2. This law of nature is firmly entrenched in the human consciousness: all human beings possess the innate ability to distinguish between acoustic combinations that follow the natural law and those that break it. This ability does not depend on education, training or logical consideration, but rather on subconscious intuition: everyone can judge combinations of sound on the basis of their 'irrational perception' (ἄλογος αἴσθησις, *tacitus sensus*).
3. This instinctive faculty is equally strong in experts and in laymen: both groups can establish *whether* a given combination is in accordance with the universal law or not. Only experts, however, can explain *why* a given combination follows or violates the dictates of nature. They do so by breaking down the composition into its primary, indivisible 'elements' (στοιχεῖα, *elementa*) that form the building blocks of any articulate utterance in music, poetry and prose.

The search for elementary sound-units (στοιχεῖα) is an inherent feature of ancient Greek thought about language and sound.[48] For most grammarians the primary elements are the individual letters (γράμματα), which can be combined into syllables and words. Rhythmicians and metricians, however, divide the composition into periods of time (χρόνοι), which form feet and verses. In musical theory, lastly, the arrangements can be broken down into such elements as notes (φθόγγοι) and their intervals (διαστήματα), which build scales and chords.[49]

[48] Porter (2010) 213–239 shows that the concept of elements (στοιχεῖα) not only plays an important role in theories about physics and metaphysics, but also in ancient analyses of music, poetry and prose: 'Atoms, the building blocks of the universe (its *stoicheia*), lie beneath the threshold of sensation; joined together in compounds (*suntheseis*) they produce visible phenomena: sounds, colors, smells, and so on.' It follows that every human being can perceive and evaluate the compounds, but the study of their constituent elements is the exclusive prerogative of expert scholars.

[49] See Koller (1955) for an overview of the different meanings of the term στοιχεῖον in Greek theories of language and music. In grammatical contexts, the words στοιχεῖον and γράμμα are often not clearly distinguished from each other, though sometimes they carry different meanings: cf. Sluiter (1990) 44 n. 19. Furthermore, note that the two partially surviving Aristoxenean treatises on music are called *Elements of Harmony* (Ἁρμονικὰ στοιχεῖα) and *Elements of Rhythm* (Ῥυθμικὰ στοιχεῖα): for the harmonic elements, see esp. Aristox. *Harm.* 27.22–32 (quoted below); for the rhythmic elements, see esp. Aristox. *Rhythm.* 2.11, Aristid.

Although the rough material is different across the various sciences, the natural law of arrangement does not change. In his *Elements of Harmony,* the musical expert Aristoxenus puts forward this point quite elegantly with respect to combining letters and musical notes: 'In speaking, it is natural (φύσει) for the voice, in each syllable, to place some one of the letters first, others second, third and fourth, and so on for the other numbers. It does not place just any letter after any other: rather, there is a kind of natural growth in the process of putting together (τοιαύτη τις φυσικὴ αὔξησις τῆς συνθέσεως). In singing, similarly, when the voice places intervals and notes in succession, it appears to maintain a natural principle of combination (φυσική τις σύνθεσις), and not to sing every interval after every other.'[50]

Aristoxenus' 'natural principle of combination' (i.e., rule 1 listed above) also applies to the art of word arrangement in poetry and prose. In critical and rhetorical theory, however, individual words are identified as the elementary building blocks: in *On the Arrangement of Words*, Dionysius aptly calls the parts of speech the 'elements of discourse' (στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως).[51] According to Dionysius, the putting together of words is quite similar to composing music: 'The science of civic oratory is, after all, a kind of musical science (μουσική τις), differing from vocal and instrumental music in degree, not in kind. In oratory as in music, the phrases possess melody, rhythm, variety and appropriateness; so that here too the ear delights in the melodies, is stirred by the rhythms, welcomes the variations, and all the time desires what is appropriate to the occasion. The distinction is simply one of degree.'[52]

Quint. *Inst. orat.* 1.14. Vollgraff (1949) discusses the early attestations of the Latin word *elementum* as a translation of στοιχεῖον.

[50] Aristox. *Harm.* 27.22–32: Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ διαλέγεσθαι φύσει ἡ φωνὴ καθ' ἑκάστην τῶν ξυλλαβῶν πρῶτόν τι καὶ δεύτερον τῶν γραμμάτων τίθησι καὶ τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον καὶ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀριθμοὺς ὡσαύτως, οὐ πᾶν μετὰ πᾶν, ἀλλ' ἔστι τοιαύτη τις φυσικὴ αὔξησις τῆς συνθέσεως. παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ μελῳδεῖν ἔοικεν ἡ φωνὴ τιθέναι κατὰ συνέχειαν τά τε διαστήματα καὶ τοὺς φθόγγους φυσικήν τινα σύνθεσιν διαφυλάττουσα, οὐ πᾶν μετὰ πᾶν διάστημα μελῳδοῦσα. Transl. Porter (2010). See also Pl. *Soph.* 253a–b, Aristox. *Harm.* 37.4–6 and *Rhythm.* 2.8, 4.27–30 make similar points. Cf. the discussion in Rocconi (2010) 180–181, who signals parallels between the passage quoted above and Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.8–10, quoted below.

[51] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 2.1. According to De Jonge (2008) 51, Dionysius combines the Stoic phrase 'elements of language' (στοιχεῖα λόγου) with a rhetorical approach to language as expression (λέξις).

[52] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.13–14: Μουσικὴ γάρ τις ἦν καὶ ἡ τῶν πολιτικῶν λόγων ἐπιστήμη τῷ πόσῳ διαλλάττουσα τῆς ἐν ᾠδαῖς καὶ ὀργάνοις, οὐχὶ τῷ ποιῷ. καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταύτῃ καὶ μέλος ἔχουσιν αἱ λέξεις καὶ ῥυθμὸν καὶ μεταβολὴν καὶ πρέπον, ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης ἡ ἀκοὴ τέρπεται μὲν τοῖς μέλεσιν, ἄγεται δὲ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς, ἀσπάζεται δὲ τὰς μεταβολάς, ποθεῖ δ' ἐπὶ πάντων τὸ οἰκεῖον, ἡ δὲ διαλλαγὴ κατὰ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.15–21 signals the differences between musical melody and the melody of language (cf. Aristox. *Harm.* 1.18.9–29); in addition, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.25 and *Dem.* 50.7 argues that prose should be 'rhythmical'

Dionysius also refers to the science of music in order to illustrate the importance of properly combining one's words: in the following anecdote, the critic aims to show that the natural law of arrangement is ingrained in all human beings, even in those with no technical knowledge whatsoever (i.e., rule 2 listed above).[53]

> Ἤδη δ' ἔγωγε καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολυανθρωποτάτοις θεάτροις, ἃ συμπληροῖ παντοδαπὸς καὶ ἄμουσος ὄχλος, ἔδοξα καταμαθεῖν, ὡς φυσική τις ἁπάντων ἐστιν ἡμῶν οἰκειότης πρὸς ἐμμέλειάν τε καὶ εὐρυθμίαν, κιθαριστήν τε ἀγαθὸν σφόδρα εὐδοκιμοῦντα ἰδὼν θορυβηθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, ὅτι μίαν χορδὴν ἀσύμφωνον ἔκρουσε καὶ διέφθειρεν τὸ μέλος, καὶ αὐλητὴν κατὰ τῆς ἄκρας ἕξεως χρώμενον τοῖς ὀργάνοις τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντα ὅτι, ἀσύμφωνον ἐμπνεύσας ἢ μὴ πιέσας τὸ στόμα, θρυλιγμὸν ἢ τὴν καλουμένην ἐκμέλειαν ηὔλησε. Καίτοι εἴ τις κελεύσειε τὸν ἰδιώτην τούτων τι ὧν ἐνεκάλει τοῖς τεχνίταις ὡς ἡμαρτημένων αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι, λαβόντα τὰ ὄργανα, οὐκ ἂν δύναιτο. τί δή ποτε; ὅτι τοῦτο μὲν ἐπιστήμης ἐστιν, ἧς οὐ πάντες μετειλήφαμεν, ἐκείνο δὲ πάθους, ὃ πᾶσιν ἀπέδωκεν ἡ φύσις. Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ῥυθμῶν γινόμενον ἐθεασάμην, ἅμα πάντας ἀγανακτοῦντας καὶ δυσαρεστουμένους, ὅτε ἢ κροῦσιν ἢ κίνησιν ἢ μορφὴν ἐν ἀσυμμέτροις ποιήσαιτο χρόνοις καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς ἀφανίσειεν.
>
> Before now I have thought I perceived, even in the most popular theatres, filled with a crowd of men of all kinds and of little culture (παντοδαπὸς καὶ ἄμουσος ὄχλος), how all of us feel naturally at home (φυσική τις οἰκειότης) with tuneful melody and good rhythm. I have seen an able and very renowned harpist booed by the public because he struck a single false note and so spoiled the melody. I have also seen a reed-pipe player who handled his instrument with supreme skill suffering the same fate because he blew thickly, or through not tightening his embouchure produced a discordant sound or what is called a 'broken note' as he played. And yet if anyone told the unskilled listener (ἰδιώτης) to take up the instrument himself and play any of the passages whose performance by professionals (οἱ τεχνῖται) he was criticizing, he would be unable to do so. Why ever is this? Because the latter is a matter of technical knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), while the former is a matter of sensation (πάθος), which nature has conferred upon all men (ὃ πᾶσιν ἀπέδωκεν ἡ φύσις). I have observed the same

(εὔρυθμος), that is, neither 'in rhythm' (ἔνρυθμος) nor wholly unrhythmical (ἄρρυθμος); cf. Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.1–3, and section 1.7 n. 151 above. See also section 2.3.3 on ancient approaches to rhythm in Demosthenes.

[53] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.8–10. Cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.195–197 (discussed below) and *Orat.* 173 (cited in n. 59 below).

> thing occurring in the case of rhythms: everyone with one voice expresses annoyance and displeasure when a performer strikes an instrument, takes a step or makes a gesture out of time, and so destroys the rhythm.

Thus, if a musician makes even the tiniest mistake in arranging his melodies or rhythms, he ends up being booed and jeered at by his audience: the orator runs the same risk, mutatis mutandis, in arranging his words.[54] After all, Dionysius considered oratory a kind of music, containing rhythm and melody, with which every human being feels naturally at home; on a similar note, the author of *On the Sublime* describes word arrangement as 'a certain melody of words which are part of man's nature and reach not his ears only but his very soul'.[55] Dionysius and Longinus, then, believe that every human being has an inborn sensitivity to the arrangement of words. Therefore, experts rely on the same criteria as the average man on the street in the evaluation of smooth and rough collocations: Dionysius simply refers to the verdict of his 'ears' (ἀκοαί), his 'sensation' (πάθος) or to his 'irrational perception' (ἄλογος αἴσθησις).[56] The anecdote about the heckled musician also serves to show, however, that the uncultured masses lack the 'technical knowledge' (ἐπιστήμη) of the artist or the critic: hence, only the artist is capable of creating well-designed compositions, and only the trained scholar is able to substantiate why a given arrangement is smooth or rough (i.e. rule 3 listed above).

Roman rhetoricians do not discuss the analogies between rhetoric and music as openly and as confidently as their Greek colleagues: as we have seen above, they take care not to be associated with unmanly or un-Roman affectations (section 4.2).[57] Still, Cicero underlines the

---

[54] Cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.198, who thinks that orators will not suffer the same fate as the musician: he submits that orators are not heckled, when they make mistakes in the arrangement of their words, but instead, the audience silently takes offence at the poorly arranged words. The passage is discussed in the present section below.

[55] Long. *Subl.* 39.3: Ἁρμονία τις λόγων ἀνθρώποις ἐμφύτων καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς, οὐχὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς μόνης ἐφαπτομένων. Music and language have been viewed as related disciplines at least as early as the fifth century BC: Hippias of Elis worked 'on the value of letters, syllables, rhythms and scales' (περί τε γραμμάτων δυνάμεως καὶ συλλαβῶν καὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἁρμονιῶν, 86A11 Diels-Kranz). Cf. Porter (2010) 213–215.

[56] For the judgment of the ear in Dionysius, see e.g. *Comp.* 23.20: 'The irrational feeling of the ear testifies to it' (τὸ ἄλογον ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ τῆς ἀκοῆς πάθος). Dionysius refers to the effects of word arrangement on the ear on numerous occasions: see e.g. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 10.2, 16.6, 16.8, 22.12–38; *Dem.* 40.3–10. Cf. also Demetr. *Eloc.* 48, 173–174; Philod. *Poem.* 5 col. 27.18–21 Mangoni, *Rhet.* 4 col. 2.2–10 p. 163 Sudhaus; Long. *Subl.* 39.4. Cf. n. 5 above on the 'irrational criterion of perception' in Dionysius; see n. 62 for Latin texts on the same topic.

[57] Formarier (2011) argues that Cicero and Quintilian exaggerate the distinctions between delivering a speech and singing a song, so as to present their conservative ideal of the orator as an honest guardian of civic and moral

importance of word arrangement by referring to a story that is very similar to Dionysius' theatrical tale: like the Greek critic, Cicero points out the universal human talent for recognizing rhythms and melodies, and he, too, addresses the critical faculties of both the uncultured masses and trained scholars.[58]

> *Omnes enim tacito quodam sensu sine ulla arte aut ratione quae sint in artibus ac rationibus recta ac prava diiudicant; idque cum faciunt in picturis et in signis et in aliis operibus, ad quorum intellegentiam a natura minus habent instrumenti, tum multo ostendunt magis in verborum, numerorum vocumque iudicio; quod ea sunt in communibus infixa sensibus nec earum rerum quemquam funditus natura esse voluit expertem. Itaque non solum verbis arte positis moventur omnes, verum etiam numeris ac vocibus. Quotus enim quisque est qui teneat artem numerorum ac modorum? At in eis si paulum modo offensum est, ut aut contractione brevius fieret aut productione longius, theatra tota reclamant. Quid, hoc non idem fit in vocibus, ut a multitudine et populo non modo catervae atque concentus, sed etiam ipsi sibi singuli discrepantes eiciantur? Mirabile est, cum plurimum in faciendo intersit inter doctum et rudem, quam non multum differat in iudicando.*
>
> Everyone distinguishes what is good and bad in the systematic arts by means of a kind of inarticulate feeling (*tacito quodam sensu*), without the help of any art or system (*sine ulla arte aut ratione*). People do so in the case of paintings, statues, and other works of art, for the understanding of which they are less well equipped by nature; and they display this capacity to a much greater degree when judging words, rhythms, and tones, because these are deeply rooted in our natural instincts (*in communibus infixa sensibus*), and nature has wanted no one to be entirely devoid of a feeling for such matters (*nec earum rerum quemquam funditus natura esse voluit expertem*). Consequently, not only artfully arranged words stir everyone's feelings, but rhythms and the tones of the voice do so as well. After all, only a small minority understands the theory of rhythms and cadences; yet if the slightest mistake is made in these matters, and an element is contracted and becomes too short, or lengthened and

order. In distinguishing between music and oratory, Greek critics focused mainly on technical, not on moral issues: cf. n. 52 above. Yet, Aeschin. *Ctes.* 142 connects Demosthenes' careful verbal arrangement to his allegedly deceitful conduct.

[58] Cic. *De or.* 3.195–197, transl. May and Wisse (2001).

> becomes too long, the entire theater cries out in protest. And surely the same thing happens with tones: choruses and even soloists, if they sing out of tune, are hooted off the stage by the ordinary crowd. Considering the great difference between the expert and the unschooled (*inter doctum et rudem*) in terms of performance (*in faciendo*), it is remarkable how little they differ when it comes to making a judgment (*in iudicando*).

Cicero reiterates these points in his *Orator*.[59] The similarities between Cicero's and Dionysius' views on the evaluation of word arrangement are striking: their stories about slipping artists and booing audiences seem to belong to the standard repertoire of the Greek and Latin stylistic discourse in Rome.[60] Cicero also addresses a difference between theatrical and oratorical performances: 'Just as the crowd discerns mistakes in verse, it also perceives if our speech limps in some way. But while they do not forgive a poet, they do make allowance for us; nonetheless, without being able to articulate it, all of them notice if what we have said is not well fitted and finished.'[61] Cicero rightly concedes that the audience does not break into a vociferous protest, when an orator does not arrange his words neatly, but according to Cicero their silence does not make the judgment of the listeners less damning. Like Dionysius, Cicero always consults his 'ear' (*auris*), just as uneducated crowds rely on their 'subconscious intuition' (*tacitus sensus*), when assessing the quality of word arrangement.[62]

---

[59] Cic. *Orat.* 173: 'Do they (i.e. those who reject the use of rhythm in oratory) never have the feeling that something is lacking, that a sentence is harsh, mutilated, lame or redundant? People do in the case of poetry, for the whole audience will hoot at one false quantity. Not that the multitude knows anything of feet, or has any understanding of rhythm; and when displeased they do not realize why or with what they are displeased. And yet nature herself has implanted in our ears the power of judging long and short sounds as well as high and low pitch in words' (*nihilne eis inane videtur, nihil inconditum, nihil curtum, nihil claudicans, nihil redundans? in versu quidem theatra tota exclamant, si fuit una syllaba aut brevior aut longior; nec vero multitudo pedes novit nec ullos numeros tenet nec illud quod offendit aut cur aut in quo offendat intellegit; et tamen omnium longitudinum et brevitatum in sonis sicut acutarum graviumque vocum iudicium ipsa natura in auribus nostris collocavit*).

[60] Donadi in Donadi and Marchiori (2013) 31–32 suggests that Dionysius 'reproduces' ('ricalca') Cicero's passage. In my view, the similarities between the two texts can just as readily be ascribed to their participation in a common discourse, as I have also argued in in other cases: cf. section 1.2 n. 35 and 37 above.

[61] Cic. *De or.* 3.198: *Verum ut in versu vulgus, si est peccatum, videt, sic, si quid in nostra oratione claudicat, sentit; sed poetae non ignoscit, nobis concedit: taciti tamen omnes non esse illud, quod diximus, aptum perfectumque cernunt.* Transl. May and Wisse (2001). Cf. *Orat.* 203. Yet, Cic. *Orat.* 168 notes he saw the audience burst into a cheer after hearing a happy cadence.

[62] For the judgment of the ear in Cicero, see e.g. *Orat.* 159: 'Speech should gratify the ear' (*voluptati autem aurium morigerari debet oratio*). Cicero and Quintilian often use the 'pleasure of the ear' (*voluptas aurium*) and

In sum, we have seen that both authors assume that there is a natural law for arranging words, which every human being instinctively understands, but which can only be fully explained by the likes of Cicero and Dionysius.

4.4 Disrupting the Natural Order: Sources for Roughness

My next question is concerned with the sources for rough word arrangement: which types of collocation, according to Cicero and Dionysius, break the natural order and cause the ears to be vexed? In the table below I have listed the features that both authors (as well as their colleagues) discuss in their respective discussions of roughness.[63] The musical categories of 'tone' and 'rhythm' are used by Dionysius and Cicero themselves. Dionysius, for instance, lists them along with 'variation' (μεταβολή) and 'appropriateness' (τὸ πρέπον) as the four principal instruments of word arrangement.[64] Cicero, likewise, posits that 'there are two things that please the ear, tone and rhythm'.[65] I have added 'sentence structure' as a third category, as both men not only pay attention to combining words, but also to combining clauses and rounding off sentences.[66]

---

the 'judgment of the ear' (*iudicium aurium*) as their criteria for judging arrangement: see e.g. Cic. *De or.* 3.169, 3.177, 3.183, *Orat.* 168, 172–173, 177–178, 198–199; Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.114–118. The phrase 'silent perception' (*tacitus sensus*) is Cicero's translation of ἄλογος αἴσθησις. Schenkeveld (1988) 304–305 suggests that Cicero has translated the λόγος in ἄλογος αἴσθησις as 'word' instead of 'reason': hence, ἄ-λογος is rendered as 'without a word', or 'silent'. Schenkeveld argues that this translation is convenient for Cicero: while theatre audiences express their judgments by cheering or jeering, the orator's public normally does not voice its opinion about the arrangement (cf. *De or.* 3.198, *Orat.* 203).

[63] See esp. Cic. *De or.* 3.171–199, *Orat.* 149–236; Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22, *Dem.* 38–39.

[64] See Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.1: the categories constitute the four means to achieve the goals of word arrangement, that is, 'beauty' (κάλλος) and 'pleasure' (ἡδονή). On these two goals, see section 3.2.1 above and section 4.5 below. For μέλος as 'tone' instead of 'melody', see Costil (1949) 914: 'Il ne s'agit pas de chant, de mélodie, mais de l'effet particulier produit sur l'oreille par la *iunctura* des mots ainsi que par la structure interne de ceux-ci et qui est due à la qualité sonore des phonèmes constitutifs.' Cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.13–14 (quoted in n. 52 above).

[65] Cic. *Orat.* 163: *Duae sunt igitur res quae permulceant auris, sonus et numerus.* Like Dionysius, Cicero discusses the importance of variation (e.g. *De or.* 3.193, *Orat.* 215) and appropriateness (esp. *De or.* 3.210–212, *Orat.* 70–74).

[66] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 2.4–5 distinguishes between three levels of arrangement, viz. individual words, clauses (κῶλα) and sentences (περίοδοι): for the arrangement of clauses and sentences, see *Comp.* 7–9, 22.4–6, 23.5–8. Cic. *Orat.* 149 and 201 lists the arrangement of clauses, which he subsumes under the heading of 'balance' (*concinnitas*), as one of three topics of arrangement, together with tone (which he also refers to as *compositio*, cf. n. 26 above) and rhythm (*numerus*). The latter category includes rounding off periods: see *Orat.* 168–171.

Tone (μέλος, *sonus*)	– Clashes of vowels (*concursus, hiatus*; σύγκρουσις). – Clashes of consonants.
Rhythm (ῥυθμός, *numerus*)	– Successions of long syllables. – Clauses and sentences that have no appropriate rhythmical conclusion (*clausula*, βάσις).
Sentence structure	– The length of the sentence is not adapted to the thought or to the speaker's breath. – Lack of symmetry between the clauses.

Table 8: the sources for rough word arrangement according to Dionysius and Cicero

In interpreting the acoustic category of roughness, we should consider the following caveat: the table above outlines the commonly observed rules for the production of rough word arrangement, but it does not claim to say anything about actual Greek and Latin stylistic practice. It is generally agreed, for instance, that there is a considerable discrepancy between the rhythmical doctrines expounded in Cicero's rhetorical treatises and the rhythmical habits exemplified in his own speeches.[67] Moreover, Jaana Vaahtera has shown that Dionysius' views on euphony and word arrangement are only partially reflected in the passages that he cites in support of these views.[68] It speaks to the strength and durability of the common discourse on word arrangement that Greek and Roman authors alike subscribe to its core theses, even if their usefulness for the actual writing of prose is not always obvious. As we will see in the remainder of this section, Cicero and Dionysius (as well as their colleagues) link roughness to the occurrence of pauses in the flow of the sentence, caused by the effort that is required for the pronunciation of the words.[69]

[67] For an extended discussion of this discrepancy, see Bornecque (1907) 169–176. Several scholars, e.g., Laurand (1907) 152–171 and Schmid (1959), have tried to reconcile Cicero's practices with his theories, few would deny the inconsistencies. The most famous problem concerns the so-called heroic clausula (— ∪ ∪ — x): Cic. *Orat.* 217 seems to approve of it, but Zieliński (1904) 163–170 shows that only 0,6% of the clausulae follow the pattern. Shipley (1911) claims that Cicero only considers clausulae heroic, if ictus and accent coincide.

[68] Vaahtera (1997) demonstrates the arbitrariness of some of Dionysius' criteria of roughness by applying them to the sample texts provided by him. In some cases, his criteria seem to hold up: the 'rough' passage from Thuc. (*Comp.* 22.34) contains more examples of hiatus than the 'smooth' passage from Isoc. (*Comp.* 23.19), viz., 129 against 6. Yet, in other cases, theory and practice are at odds: the citation from Thucydides has fewer clashes of a final ν and a subsequent initial consonant than the quote from Isocrates, viz. 98 against 126: Cf. n. 73 below.

[69] The idea that euphony and ease of pronunciation are linked can already be found in Aristox., e.g. *Rhythm.* 2.8 (σ is difficult to pronounce) and fr. 87 Wehrli (ρ is easy to pronounce). See also Philod. *Poem.* 2 col. 22.4–23.1

In their discussions of tone (μέλος, *sonus*), to begin with, Cicero and Dionysius zoom in on the juxtaposition of final letters and subsequent initial letters.[70] The Greek critic, for example, discusses the collocation ἐν χορόν from the opening line of a dithyramb by Pindar: 'These letters cannot by their nature be combined and united, for it is not natural for ν to precede χ in the same syllable. Hence, when they form the boundaries between successive syllables, they do not produce a continuous sound, but there is bound to be a pause between the two letters, and this keeps their sounds distinct.'[71] Similarly, in the opening line of Thucydides, Dionysius explains that the collocation Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε is rough, 'since σ is never placed before ξ with a view to being pronounced with it in the same syllable: the sound of the σ must be arrested by a pause of silence before the ξ is heard'.[72] According to Dionysius, it is the combination of a 'semivowel' (ἡμίφωνον) and a 'consonant' (ἄφωνον) that creates the roughness in these cases: the same effect can be achieved through the 'collision of vowels' (σύγκρουσις τῶν φωνηέντων), or hiatus, which also creates a brief, but noticeable interval of time.[73] According to Dionysius, such pauses arise, because the consonants and vowels in question are pronounced in different parts of the mouth: 'The

---

Janko on the view of Pausimachus of Miletus that 'in general cacophony does not arise from any source other than difficulty in pronunciation' (καθόλου τὴν δυσηχίαν μὴ ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἐκ τῆς δυστομίας παραγείνεται).

[70] The fact that Dionysius refers to this topic with the musical term μέλος should not surprise us: as we have seen (n. 50 above), Aristox. *Harm.* 27.22–32 already pointed out the analogy between combining letters and arranging musical notes. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 14.1 refers to Aristoxenus' view (cf. fr. 88 Wehrli) that the letters of the alphabet can be divided into vowels (φωναί) and consonants (ψόφοι): cf. n. 73 below.

[71] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.15–16: Ἀσύμμικτα δὲ τῇ φύσει ταῦτα τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ ἀκόλλητα· οὐ γὰρ πέφυκε κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν τοῦ χ προτετάχθαι τὸ ν, ὥστε οὐδὲ συλλαβῶν δύο μόρια γινόμενα συνάπτει τὸν ἦχον, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη σιωπήν τινα γίγνεσθαι μέσην ἀμφοῖν τὴν διορίζουσαν ἑκατέρου τῶν γραμμάτων τὰς δυνάμεις. The text discussed by Dionysius is Pind. fr. 75 Schroeder.

[72] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.37: Οὐ γὰρ προτάττεται τὸ σ τοῦ ξ κατὰ συνεκφορὰν τὴν ἐν μιᾷ συλλαβῇ γινομένην· δεῖ δὴ τοῦ σ σιωπῇ καταληφθέντος τότε ἀκουστὸν γενέσθαι τὸ ξ. The text discussed by Dionysius is Thuc. 1.1.1, mentioned in the first paragraph of section 4.3 above.

[73] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 14 divides the letters of the alphabet in vowels (ε, η, ο, ω, α, ι, υ), semivowels (λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ, including the 'double letters' ζ, ξ, ψ) and consonants (π, β, φ, τ, δ, θ, κ, γ, χ). Vaahtera (1997) 589 lists the combinations of consonants that Dionysius explicitly classifies as rough, namely ν followed by a consonant or semivowel, ς followed by ξ, and ρ followed by ρ. On the collision of vowels, see esp. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 38.3, where the author refers to the practice by metrical and musical writers of filling the gap 'by inserting semivowels' (ἑτέρων παρεμβολῇ γραμμάτων ἡμιφώνων), possibly referring to the ν ἐφελκυστικόν. On the harshness of hiatus in Greek theory, cf. e.g. Demetr. *Eloc.* 68–74, Philod. *Rhet.* 4 col. 2.2–10 p. 163 Sudhaus, Hermog. *Id.* 1.7 Rabe. Janko (2000) 173–178 and Calcante (2005) 46–50 offer overviews of the ancient 'system of euphony', based on both Greek and Latin texts.

process of the mouth's altering from one shape to another, that is neither akin to it nor like it, entails a lapse of time, during which the smoothness and ease of the arrangement is interrupted.'[74]

Like Dionysius, Cicero refers to the noticeable gaps that appear, when final and initial letters cannot be articulated continuously: especially hiatus (*concursus vocalium, hiatus*), in his view, yields 'gaping sounds' (*hiulcae voces*), as it 'tears apart the vowels and the words' (*voces distrahere, verba diducere*).[75] In addition, Cicero remarks that the Roman orators and poets of yore used to drop a letter in order to smoothen the collision of consonants, as in *dignu' locoque* (instead of *dignus locoque*) or *posmeridianus* (instead of *postmeridianus*).[76] Cicero is not as thorough in his analysis of the causes of rough tones as Dionysius, but his approach is certainly not at odds with the critical framework that the Greek scholar uses. This goes all the more for Quintilian, who gives us the following example of colliding letters: 'Consonants also, and especially the harsher ones, clash violently where words meet, for example a final s with a following initial x.' Interestingly, the combination that Quintilian adduces does not occur in Latin, but it is frequent in Greek: in fact, it appears in the Thucydidean phrase Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε that Dionysius cites as a typical example of harsh

[74] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.25: Ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταλαμβάνειν τὸ στόμα σχηματισμὸν ἕτερον ἐξ ἑτέρου μήτε συγγενῆ μήτε παρόμοιον ἐμπεριλαμβάνεταί τις χρόνος, ἐν ᾧ διίσταται τὸ λεῖον καὶ εὐπετὲς τῆς ἁρμονίας. Cf. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.34: 'When the vowels which come together are different, the roughness of the combination depends on whether the mouth is differently or similarly shaped in forming them' (*atque cum aliae subiunguntur aliis, proinde asperiores erunt prout oris habitu simili aut diverso pronuntiabuntur*).

[75] Cic. *De or.* 3.172, *Orat.* 150, 152. Cic. *Orat.* 77 compares the orator who entirely avoids hiatus to a mason, 'almost cementing together his words' (*verba verbis quasi coagmentare*): cf. section 4.2 above on the architectural imagery in Lucilius and Dionysius, and section 4.5 below on the (im)possibility of hiatus in the Latin language according to Cicero. See also *Rhet. Her.* 4.18: 'We shall avoid the frequent collision of vowels, which makes the style harsh and gaping' (*fugiemus crebras vocalium concursiones, quae vastam atque hiantem orationem reddunt*). Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.33: when hiatus occurs, 'the speech gapes, pauses, and, as it were, labors' (*hiat et intersistit et quasi laborat oratio*).

[76] In *Orat.* 153–164, Cicero professes his preference for anomaly over analogy: grammatical rules, in his view, must yield to the 'custom which favors the ear' (*consuetudo auribus indulgens*). Quoting examples from Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, Lucilius, Terence and others, he argues that it is justified to adapt words so as to avoid an ugly sound. On the euphony and cacophony of consonants, see also Lucil. fr. 367–370 Krenkel (= 389–392 Warmington) on the cacophony of the letter r and the euphony of the letter s (cf. n. 21 above), and Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.37–40 on combining x with s (cf. n. 77 below), s with s, and m with vowels. Cf. also Varro fr. 113 Götz-Schöll and August. *Dial.* 6, who call the syllables *crux* and *trux* 'harsh' (*asperae*), and the syllables *lana* and *luna* 'smooth' (*leves*).

arrangement. As the Greek and Roman conceptions of the aural effects of word arrangement are largely in agreement, Quintilian can without reservation include a Greek example in his discussion of Latin word arrangement. It is not inconceivable that Quintilian, who is familiar with Dionysius' works, has *On the Arrangement of Words* in mind in this particular passage.[77]

With respect to rhythm, again, the fluency and continuity of the pronunciation function as the main criterions for distinguishing between ear-pleasing and ear-jarring combinations. According to Dionysius, rough harmony 'favors long words with long syllables', while smooth harmony 'uses not the longest rhythms, but those of average length or somewhat shorter'. The accumulation of long syllables, Dionysius submits, 'gives rise to delay and interruption in the composition'.[78] Cicero, again, is not as precise in his rhythmical analyses as the Greek critic, but he agrees that long rhythms slow down the pace of the sentence: he considers the spondee, for instance, 'rather heavy and slow' (*hebetior et tardior*), having a 'steady movement' (*stabilis quidam gradus*).[79] Cicero pays special attention to rhythms that, like a final chord, round off periods or colons: 'Since the ear is always awaiting the end and takes pleasure in it, this should not be without rhythm.' In other words, a sentence without a closing cadence (*clausula*, βάσις) is harsh: according to Cicero, the period by C.

---

[77] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.37: *Ceterum consonantes quoque, earumque praecipue quae sunt asperiores, in commisura verborum rixantur, ut s ultima cum x prima*. Quintilian mentions Dionysius at 3.1.17, 9.3.89 and 9.4.88. To my knowledge, this striking parallel between Quintilian and Dionysius has not been noticed before.

[78] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 38.1: Ὀνόμασι χρῆσθαι φιλεῖ μεγάλοις καὶ μακροσυλλάβοις. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 23.6: Χρῆται δὲ καὶ ῥυθμῶν οὐ τοῖς μηκίστοις, μέσοις δὲ καὶ βραχυτέροις. Ibid. 22.22: Ἀναβολήν τε ποιεῖ καὶ ἐγκοπὴν τῆς ἁρμονίας. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 17 associates long syllables with grandeur (and hence with roughness) and short ones with pleasure (and hence with smoothness): the former category includes the spondee (— —), the molossus (— — —), the bacchius (— — ⏑) and the hypobacchius (⏑ — —), while the latter category features the pyrrhic (⏑ ⏑) and the tribrach (⏑ ⏑ ⏑). On the ancient terminology of the tribrach, see section 2.3.3 n. 90 above. The connection between length and grandeur is also explicit in Demetr. *Eloc.* 40 and 117: the author attributes Thucydides' dignity to a large extent to the 'long syllables in his rhythm' (ἡ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ μακρότης), while he thinks that a sentence which consists exclusively of long syllables is 'frigid' (ψυχρός). The dactyl, often simply referred to as the 'heroic' foot (ἡρῷος, *herous*), was also widely considered a source of grandeur in prose: see e.g. Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.4, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 17.11–12, Long. *Subl.* 39.4.

[79] Cic. *Orat.* 216. Cicero, who generally favors smooth arrangements, thinks that 'not even the spondee is entirely to be discarded' (*ne spondeus quidem funditus est repudiandus*), especially in short clauses: 'The heaviness and sluggishness compensate for the small number of feet' (*paucitatem enim pedum gravitate sua et tarditate compensat*). Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.83 states that 'the more time units the feet each occupy, and the more stability they receive from long syllables, the weightier they make the style' (*quo quique sunt temporibus pleniores longisque syllabis magis stabiles, his graviorem faciunt orationem*).

Gracchus that ends on *improbos probet* (— ⏑ — ⏑ —) would end in a smoother way, if the words are so rearranged that the sentence ends on *probos improbare* (⏑ — — ⏑ — —).[80] Likewise, Dionysius argues that the two initial periods from Thucydides' history ending on the words τῶν προγεγενημένων and καὶ διανοούμενον respectively (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ —) do not have an appropriate rhythmical finish: in the quoted examples, the rhythm 'appears to have no beginning and no conclusion, as if it were part of the period but not its end'.[81]

Setting aside the tricky issue as to why one clausula rounds off the sentence while another leaves it unfinished, we can conclude that Cicero and Dionysius both consider the period that has no rhythmically marked ending rough-sounding. On a related note, both men assign a disproportionate length to the rough period: as Dionysius puts it, 'another peculiarity of this style is that the periods are independent and simple, neither coming to an end simultaneously with the sense, nor calculated to suit the breathing of the speaker'.[82] Such

[80] Cic. *Orat.* 199: *Cum aures extremum semper exspectent, in eoque acquiescant, id vacare numero non oportet.* See n. 46 above for the full quotation from C. Gracchus. I scan the final syllable of a period or colon as long: cf. section 2.4.2 n. 120 above. Cicero's own version of the sentence ends on a ditrochee (— ⏑ — x, which he calls a *dichoreus*). At *Orat.* 212–215, he relates that he once saw C. Carbo end two successive periods on a ditrochee: thereupon, an enormous roar arose from the spell-bound crowd. Although Cicero associates this clausula with Asia and warns his readers not to overuse it, he seems particularly fond of it: Winterbottom (2011) 217 suggests that 'by listening to certain orators in Rome and especially to Greek *rhetores* in Asia (and Rome too), he perhaps came to feel an unconscious preference for a final ditrochaic word'. Cic. *Orat.* gives seven examples of good clausulae, four of which are one-word ditrochees, viz., *improbare* (Cicero's modification of Gracchus), *persolutas* (by Carbo), *comprobavit* (by Carbo) and *aestimasti* (by Crassus, ibid. 224). Cf. ibid. 232, where Cicero praises three clausulae from his own speech *Corn.*, i.e., *mercatoresque superarunt* and *potuisse superari,* ending on a paean and a spondee (— ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — —), and *Aegyptoque vicerunt*, ending on a cretic and a spondee (— ⏑ — — —). Incidentally, Cic. *Orat.* 217 claims that a final spondee cannot be distinguished from a final trochee, as the length of the final syllable is always indifferent.

[81] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.42: Ἀκόρυφός τις φαίνεται καὶ ἀκατάστροφος, ὥσπερ μέρος οὖσα τῆς δευτέρας, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τέλος. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 43.11. The clausulae quoted are the only ones that Dionysius discusses. He claims that smooth harmony uses pleasant, well-defined clausulae: see *Comp.* 22.5, *Dem.* 40.9. Cf. however ibid. 39.5, where Dionysius says that in rough sentences pleasing clausulae may also arise accidentally: in such cases, 'the spontaneous gift of fortune is not rejected' (τὸ συμβὰν ἐκ τῆς αὐτομάτου τύχης οὐκ ἀπωθεῖται).

[82] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 39.4· Ἔτι τῆς ἁρμονίας ταύτης οἰκεῖόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ τὰς περιόδους αὐτούργους τινας εἶναι καὶ ἀφελεῖς καὶ μήτε συναρπαζούσας ἑαυταῖς τὸν νοῦν μήτε συμμεμετρημένας τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ λέγοντος. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.5 with n. 36 above on the absense of meaningless patch-words in rough word arrangement. Arist. *Rh.* 3.9.5 uses the speaker's breathing to measure the maximum length of the period. Demetr. *Eloc.* 42–47 associates exceedingly long periods with grandeur, 'as the author hardly allows any pause to himself and the listener' (ἐκ τοῦ μόγις ἀναπαῦσαι αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν ἀκούοντα). Cf. Long. *Subl.* 38.3–4 on the sublimity of long

sentences either end prematurely or they seem to go on forever: Cicero argues that the words in the former case seem 'broken' (*infracta*) and 'minced' (*amputata*), while the words in the latter case may leave the speaker gasping for breath, which has a jarring effect on our sensitive ears.[83] The internal structure of the sentence can also contribute to the roughness of the sound: according to Dionysius, 'the members are combined in an unusual and individual way, and not as most people would expect or wish'. Thus, the speaker who aims at harshness avoids spectacular figures of speech that bring balance to the sentence.[84] Cicero's view does not deviate: he advises the orator, who aims to please the ear, to add 'symmetry' (*concinnitas*) to his sentences through the use of Gorgianic figures. The rough sentence, by contrast, is free from such polish.[85]

In conclusion, this section has demonstrated that Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues largely adopt a common approach to the sources for rough arrangement: while smooth compositions are fluent and easy to pronounce, rough collocations are limping and impossible to enunciate continuously. The analysis of harsh tones, stumbling rhythms and ill-

---

hyperbaton, 'which makes the audience terrified of a total collapse of the sentence, and forces them from sheer excitement to share the speaker's anguish' (εἰς φόβον ἐμβαλὼν τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὡς ἐπὶ παντελεῖ τοῦ λόγου διαπτώσει, καὶ συναποκινδυνεύειν ὑπ' ἀγωνίας τῷ λέγοντι συναναγκάσας).

[83] Cic. *Orat.* 170: 'Why should they prefer to let the sentence limp or stop short rather than keep pace with the thought?' (*quid est cur claudere et insistere orationem malint quam cum sententia pariter excurrere*). Cic. *De or.* 3.181 submits that, while the length of the period is conventionally derived from the duration of a single breath, 'it turns out to be so attractive that, even if someone had been endowed with unlimited breath capacity, we would still not want him to deliver his words in an unbroken flow. It was found that what gratifies our ears is precisely what is not only just bearable to human lungs, but actually easy to deliver' (*ita est suave, ut, si cui sit infinitus spiritus datus, tamen eum perpetuare verba nolimus; id enim auribus nostris gratum est, quod hominum lateribus non tolerabile solum, sed etiam facile esse potest*). Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.18: a long period 'does violence both to the ear of the listener and to the breathing of the speaker' (*et auditoris aures et oratoris spiritum laedit*). Cf. also Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 9.4.124–125 for the same point.

[84] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 39.6: Τὸ περιττῶς καὶ ἰδίως καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόληψιν ἢ βούλησιν τῶν πολλῶν συζεύγνυσθαι τὰ μόρια. Cf. *Comp.* 22.45: 'There is also a great imbalance between the clauses, great unevenness in the periods, many novel figures of speech, and frequent neglect of grammatical sequence' (πολλὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν κώλων ἀσυμμετρία πρὸς ἄλληλα καὶ ἡ τῶν περιόδων ἀνωμαλία καὶ ἡ τῶν σχημάτων καινότης καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀκολουθίας ὑπεροπτικόν). Demetr. *Eloc.* 13 describes the members of the disjointed style as haphazardly compiled stones: see n. 24 above. The flexible use of grammatical categories (e.g., case, number, mood) is often associated with grandeur and roughness: Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.6, Demetr. *Eloc.* 65–66, Long. *Subl.* 23–24.

[85] Cic. *Orat.* 164–167 describes the smoothening effect of balance: through the use of (Gorgianic) figures of speech, such as antithesis and isocolon, 'the sentence becomes rhythmical by its very nature, even if no rhythm is intended' (*suapte natura numerosa sunt, etiamsi nihil est factum de industria*).

balanced sentences is built, as we have seen, on the postulate of a universal law of composition, for which all humans are thought to possess a congenital sensitivity. Thus, the critics and rhetoricians can claim that their theories merely supply proof for something that everyone instinctively knows to be true.

4.5 Echoing Greatness: the Virtues of Roughness in Greek and Latin Prose

In the previous sections, I have laid out the shared theoretical framework on which the extant Greek and Latin discussions of word arrangement are built (section 4.3), and we have seen that these texts agree in principle on the sources for rough acoustics (section 4.4). The next issue is concerned with the stylistic applications of harsh composition, as they are advertised by the Greek and Roman critics and rhetoricians: why, and under what conditions, do they advise the author of artistic prose to produce disharmonious tones and limping rhythms that bluntly violate the universal laws of arrangement? Interestingly, Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues disagree considerably on the virtues of rough word arrangement: once again, the common discourse on stylistic theory will prove to be malleable, prone to be bent according to the specific needs and purposes of its users. It is the goal of the present section to establish the motivations that underlie the various views on stylistic roughness in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome: we will see that the divergent opinions that our authors put forward are not merely built on their personal tastes and agendas, but that they also illustrate the complex relationship between Greek and Roman views on prose style.

The surviving ancient texts on word arrangement associate three principal virtues with crude acoustics. These favorable effects, which I will discuss below under the headings of 'simplicity and sincerity' (section 4.5.1), 'grandeur and sublimity' (section 4.5.2) and 'archaism and the patina of antiquity' (section 4.5.3), are closely interrelated: in each case, roughness is interpreted as a means to reinforce the austerity and seriousness of the ideas that the words express.[86] Smoothness, conversely, is usually regarded as an emblem of luxuriousness and frivolity.

1. Roughness can invest a text with an aura of simple and straightforward sincerity, the mark of an author who is not distracted by trifling stylistic issues.

[86] Cf. section 4.1 n. 15 above on the imitative quality of language. Usher (1985), De Jonge (2008) and others refer to 'rough arrangement' (σύνθεσις αὐστηρά) as 'austere composition', stressing the austerity that is typically associated with ear-jarring combinations, not only in Dionysius, but also in Cicero and other sources.

2. Roughness can add the impression of grandeur, weight and solemnity to the words, whose slow, colliding sounds imitate, as it were, the sublime dignity of the thought.

3. Roughness can evoke a sort of venerable antiquity, a pleasant blemish that can be compared to the green moldy 'patina' (πίνος) on ancient bronze statues, or to the slowly formed 'incrustation' (χνοῦς) on timeworn objects.

In discussing each of these three major stylistic virtues of roughness, I will present evidence for a mutual exchange of ideas between Greek and Roman experts in rhetorical theory and literary criticism. To be brief, the surviving Latin discussions of word arrangement tend to focus on the virtue of sincerity, whereas Greek authors are more disposed to emphasize sublimity. Still, Greek and Roman authors do not operate in two mutually exclusive bubbles: we will see that Roman rhetoricians often react explicitly to Greek views, while the Greek critic Dionysius sometimes seems to react, albeit implicitly, to the ideas of his Roman coevals. The idea that roughness can conjure up a kind of archaic glory, lastly, is promoted by Dionysius, but it is also an important bone of contention in the polemic between Cicero and his Atticist opponents: indeed, this notion, which involves echoing, in an almost literal sense, the classic masterpieces of yore, is integral to the shared Greek and Roman discourse on style.

4.5.1 Simplicity and Sincerity

The first of the virtues to be discussed is the impression of uncontrived simplicity and guileless sincerity that may seem to emanate from rough composition. This feature is often admired in Latin sources: after all, we have seen that Roman orators, who seemed to be overly meticulous in arrangement, risked to be accused of unserious, un-Roman and unmanly behavior (section 4.2). Among their Greek colleagues, only Dionysius touches cursorily on the simplicity of harsh arrangement, possibly in response to the Roman focus on the topic.

Many Romans regarded roughness as a sure sign that a text was free from deceptive razzle-dazzle. The self-proclaimed Attic orators in the circle of Calvus, for one, deliberately produced 'broken and choppy sentences', because they considered the use of rhythm too much like a 'trick to catch the ear' (*insidiae ad capiendas auris*): hence, 'they think that the only one who attains the Attic norm is he who speaks in a rough and unpolished style.'[87]

[87] Cic. *Orat.* 170: see section 4.2 n. 35 above. Ibid. 28: *Putant enim qui horride incultuque dicat,* (…), *eum solum Attice dicere.* On the stylistic views of the Atticists and their controversy with Cicero, see esp. section 1.4

Quintilian, likewise, asserts that the orator who is caught striving for smooth rhythms, loses both his credibility and all of his emotional impact: 'If a judge thinks the man has time to spare for this, he will neither believe him nor be moved by him to grief or anger.'[88] Similar ideas about the connection between rough arrangement and artlessness can be found in the younger Seneca and in Tacitus: the former declares that 'verbal symmetry (*concinnitas*) is not a manly ornament', while the latter has the orator L. Vipstanus Messalla compare rough composition to a 'shaggy toga' (*hirta toga*) to be preferred over the 'gay-colored garb of a courtesan' (*fucatae et meretriciae vestes*).[89] To summarize, conspicuous smoothness and the concomitant attention to word arrangement were often mistrusted by Roman audiences.

Cicero, too, refers to the appearance of artless straightforwardness emanating from the jarring collocations of rough harmony: in his *Orator*, he advises his readers, for instance, not to 'cement their words together' (*verba verbis coagmentare*), 'for the hiatus and clash of vowels have something agreeable (*molle quiddam*) about it and show a not unpleasant carelessness (*non ingrata neglegentia*) on the part of a man who is paying more attention to thought than to words'.[90] Yet, Cicero, as we have seen, famously prefers euphony over dissonance: the hesitant praise of roughness quoted here is but a minor concession in an otherwise ardent apology of his own sonorous, rhythmical and neatly structured periods. Indeed, the Roman scholar devotes the bulk of his treatise to the promotion of smoothness, almost invariably writing off the topics of rough arrangement as products of 'weakness' (*imbecillitas*) and as signs of an utter 'incapacity of coherent speech' (*infantia*).[91] Thus,

---

above (on issue of chronology), section 3.4 above (on Cicero's defense against the Atticists on the basis of the three-style formula) and section 5.6.1 below (on Calvus' conception of Atticism).

[88] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.143: *Nec potest ei credere aut propter eum dolere et irasci iudex cui putat hoc vacare.* Cf. section 4.2 n. 37 above.

[89] Sen. *Ep.* 115.3: *Non est ornamentum virile concinnitas.*Tac. *Dial.* 26.1–3: Messalla (c. 45–c. 80 AD) complains that the orators of his days 'produce the rhythms of stage-dancing' (*histrionales modos exprimunt*) and that 'most of them boast that their speeches can be sung and danced to' (*iactant cantari saltarique suos commentarios*). The orator enters the scene in *Dial.* 14 to present a eulogy for the 'old orators' (*antiqui oratores*) of Cicero's era: Calboli (2003) discusses the personality of this prominent orator of the first century AD. Cf. section 5.6.1 below on the virtue of masculinity in the Roman rhetorical discourse.

[90] Cic. *Orat.* 77: *Habet enim ille tamquam hiatus et concursus vocalium molle quiddam et quod indicet non ingratam neglegentiam de re hominis quam de verbis laborantis.* These words are cited approvingly by Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.37. The phrase 'cementing together' (*coagmentare*) refers to elision (cf. n. 94 below); Cicero draws the imagery from the realm of architecture: cf. Lieberg (1956) 464–465 and section 4.2 above.

[91] Cic. *Orat.* 23, 236. On the latter passage, see section 3.4 n. 80 above. Cicero's fondness of smoothness is apparent throughout *Orat.*: see, e.g., his introduction of the three topics of arrangement in *Orat.* 149.

Cicero stands out as a dissonant voice in an overwhelming chorus of Roman authors who unconditionally praise the sincerity of rough composition: even his avid admirer Quintilian, as we have seen, criticizes him for the predominant smoothness of his oratory.[92] Still, it is worthwhile to have a closer look at Cicero's heterodox view of roughness, particularly with respect to hiatus, as it pertains to the interaction between Greek and Latin views on word arrangement.

After his initial conciliatory assessment, Cicero later in his *Orator* adopts a more inflexible approach to the collision of vowels: 'The Latin language, indeed, is so careful on this point that no one is so boorish as to be unwilling to run vowels togethers (*vocalis coniungere*).' Cicero adds that 'we are not allowed to make a pause between vowels (*distrahere voces*), even if we should wish to do so'.[93] It is generally assumed that the rhetorician means that in Latin prose, as in poetry, subsequent vowels at word junctions (including final m and initial h) do not actually clash, resulting in a pause, but that they are actually reduced to a single syllable.[94] Despite his earlier praise of hiatus, then, Cicero now insists that it is thoroughly un-Latin. The ambivalence in *Orator* stems from the author's pragmatic approach to Greek stylistic doctrines: on the one hand, Cicero relies heavily on the works of Greek predecessors, who are accustomed to praise vowel clashes, but he cannot, on the other hand, completely subscribe to their views, as they are at odds with his passionate call for smooth composition and with his polemic against the champions of sober, strident

[92] See section 4.2 n. 37 above.

[93] Cic. *Orat.* 150: *Quod quidem Latina lingua sic observat, nemo ut tam rusticus sit quin vocalis nolit coniungere.* Ibid. 152: *Nobis ne si cupiamus quidem distrahere voces conceditur.*

[94] Most studies of vowel junctions in Latin prose conclude that such junctions were subject to elision in a similar way as in poetry: see esp. Zieliński (1904) 616–617, Sturtevan and Kent (1915) and Riggsby (1991). The latter offers a discussion of the principal passages from Cicero, Quintilian and later grammarians which provide explicit rules for vowel junction in Latin prose. In addition to hiatus, there are several alternatives for dealing with vowel junction in Latin, most notably 'elision' (the complete loss of the final syllable of a word), 'prodelision' (the complete loss of the initial syllable of a word) and synizesis (the merging together of two syllables without alteration of the letters, like the final pair of vowels of Πηληϊαδεω in Hom. *Il.* 1.1 or *Oilei* in Verg. *Aen.* 1.41). Riggsby uses the word 'elision' as an umbrella term for all these processes 'in which vowel junction is resolved by some kind of reduction'. It is clear that vowel reduction (in whatever way) was generally preferred over hiatus, although the latter is often presented as a valid option: cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.18, Cic. *Orat.* 77, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.36. On the intricacies of reconstructing the phonology of vowel junction in classical Latin, see esp. Allen (1978) 78–83. So as to argue for the banishment of hiatus from the Latin language, Cic. *Orat.* 152 adduces the 'slightly uncouth speeches' (*orationes horridulae*) of the elder Cato and the poetry of Ennius: the former is said to have shunned hiatus altogether, whereas the latter is thought to exhibit it only once.

arrangement.[95] In the end, therefore, Cicero advises his readers not to follow the example of the Greeks: by allowing pauses between vowels, Roman orators apply Greek rules for creating harshness, but they break the rules of sound Latinity. Although Cicero is not altogether unambiguous about the stylistic viability of hiatus, his final advice to the Roman orator is quite straightforward: rely on your own Roman ears in assessing the sound of prose and 'let the Greeks figure it out for themselves' (*Graeci viderint*).[96]

In other words, Cicero calls into question the compatibility of Greek scholarship on hiatus with Latin literature: while Greek critics often extol the virtues of vowel clashes, the Roman author subjects the prose of his mother tongue to a different law. The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, incidentally, appears to share this view: as we have seen, he emphatically problematizes the applicability of Greek teachings on Latin prose, and he indeed advises against 'frequent collisions of vowels, which make the style harsh and gaping' (*crebrae vocalium concursiones quae vastam atque hiantem orationem reddunt*).[97] Thus, among Roman authors, hiatus could be seen as a hallmark of candid sincerity, but it could also be presented as a vicious sort of Grecism. Among the contemporary Greek sources, next, Dionysius occasionally associated hiatus and the other sources of rough word arrangement with simplicity and straightforwardness: he submits, for example, that harsh composition 'aims to emphasize its own unstudied and simple character' (τὸ ἀνεπιτήδευτον ἐμφαίνειν θέλει καὶ ἀφελές).[98] By and large, however, the extant Greek sources associate roughness with

[95] We should also take into account the different contexts of *Orat.* 77 (where hiatus is praised) and ibid. 150–153 (where it is utterly condemned). In the former passage, Cicero specifically discusses the orator of the plain style, 'whom some deem to be the only true Attic orator' (*quem solum quidam vocant Atticum*): in other words, Cicero makes allowances for the views of his Atticist opponents. In the latter passage, however, Cicero is entirely occupied by the issue of word arrangement and the apology of his own smooth composition.

[96] Cic. *Orat.* 151 offers a brief account of the various Greek approaches to hiatus: he submits that Isocrates and Theopompus carefully avoid it, that Thucydides and Plato (whose *Menex.* is mentioned) often insert it intentionally, and that Demosthenes 'generally' (*magna ex parte*) does not use it. For Cicero's review of the use of hiatus in Latin literature, see n. 94 above. Cf. section 4.5.2 below on Quintilian's treatment of hiatus, which interacts with Greek scholarship in a different way than Cicero's discussion.

[97] *Rhet. Her.* 4.18. The author cites the following phrase as a vicious instance of an obtrusive series of vowel junctions: *Bacae aeneae amoenissime inpendebant* ('the copper-colored berries hung most invitingly'). Riggsby (1991) 329 suggests that the emphasis in the passage may lay on the word 'frequent' (*crebras*): hence, the anonymous author may not be opposed to hiatus per se, but rather to the repetition of the phenomenon. On the author's approach to Greek criticism, see *Rhet. Her.* 4.1–10 with section 1.4 above.

[98] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.5. Cf. *Dem.* 39.5: rough word arrangement 'prefers a certain unaffected simplicity of construction, with mostly short phrases, imitating the artlessness of nature itself' (ἀποιήτως δέ πως καὶ ἀφελῶς

grandeur rather than with simplicity: the harsh sounds, which are interpreted as honest and humble by Roman ears, are perceived as sublime by Greek ears (section 4.5.2).

Still, Dionysius does address the simple frugality of roughness: in fact, he discusses some objections against smooth, euphonious arrangement that run along similar lines as the ones that we have encountered in Latin sources. In *On the Arrangement of Words*, he invokes a fictitious aficionado of roughness, who censures Demosthenes for the effort that he invested in the arrangement of his words: 'Was Demosthenes such a helpless creature, then, that when he was writing speeches, he laid out meters and rhythms beside him as his materials, as clay-modelers lay out their molds, and tried to fit his clauses into them, adjusting the word order this way and that, keeping careful watch on his longs and his shorts and taking great trouble over the cases of his nouns and the moods of his verbs and everything else affecting the parts of speech? An orator of his standing would cut a poor figure if he were to involve himself with such trappings and fripperies.'[99] Dionysius does not agree with such criticisms: he adduces the cases of Isocrates, who 'spent ten years over the composition of his *Panegyricus*', and of Plato, who 'even at the age of eighty, never let off combing and curling his dialogues and re-plaiting them in every way', to show that great zeal in arranging one's words can result in brilliant prose.[100]

Like Cicero, then, Dionysius goes to great lengths to defend Demosthenes' meticulous composition. Clearly, the Greek critic was familiar with the ideas of fellow scholars who

---

καὶ τὰ πλείω κομματικῶς κατεσκευάσθαι βούλεται, παράδειγμα ποιουμένη τὴν ἀκατάσκευον φύσιν). For Greek approaches to hiatus (in Demetrius, Philodemus, Dionysius), see also section 4.5.2 below.

[99] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 25.30: Ὁ Δημοσθένης οὖν οὕτως ἄθλιος ἦν, ὥσθ' ὅτε γράφοι τοὺς λόγους, μέτρα καὶ ῥυθμοὺς ὥσπερ οἱ πλάσται παρατιθέμενος, ἐναρμόττειν ἐπειρᾶτο τούτοις τοῖς τύποις τὰ κῶλα, στρέφων ἄνω καὶ κάτω τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ παραφυλάττων τὰ μήκη καὶ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὰς ἐγκλίσεις τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ πάντα τὰ συμβεβηκότα τοῖς μορίοις τοῦ λόγου πολυπραγμονῶν; Ἠλίθιος μεντἂν εἴη εἰς τοσαύτην σκευωρίαν καὶ φλυαρίαν ὁ τηλικοῦτος ἀνὴρ ἑαυτὸν διδούς. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 51.2–52.6 returns to the refutation of the critiques of Demosthenes' elaborate word arrangement: like *Comp.* 25.29–44, this passage attributes the criticism to anonymous detractors.

[100] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 25.32: Τὸν πανηγυρικὸν λόγον (...) ἐν ἔτεσι δέκα συνετάξατο. Ibid.: Τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ διαλόγους κτενίζων καὶ βοστρυχίζων καὶ πάντα τρόπον ἀναπλέκων οὐ διέλειπεν ὀγοδήκοντα γεγονὼς εἴη. For Isocrates' protracted composition of *Paneg.*, cf. Long. *Subl.* 4.2 (= Timaeus T 23 Jacoby). To illustrate Plato's zealous devotion to the arrangement of his words, Dionysius refers to the anecdote that a writing tablet was found after his death, containing the opening words of *Resp.* (i.e., κατέβην χθὲς εἰς Πειραῖα μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος) in various orders: cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 21, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 8.6.64 and Diog. Laert. 3.37. Denniston (1952) 41 analyses the style of the line, noting that 'unstudied as this opening appears, the art that goes to the making of it is yet susceptible to analysis'. For a discussion of *Comp.* 25.29-44, cf. section 4.2 n. 43–45 above.

favored the sober simplicity of rough word arrangement over the careful scrutiny exhibited by Demosthenes and others: all in all, it is not unthinkable that Dionysius' apology of Demosthenes is directed, at least partly, against the views of some of his Roman coevals. His consistent unwillingness to mention Roman rhetoricians by name might explain why the roughness-loving detractors of Demosthenes in his work remain anonymous.[101] As I argued before (section 1.2), it is very likely (though impossible to prove beyond doubt) that Dionysius, who actively interacted with Roman scholars in Rome, engaged himself with the topics that were at the center of their attention.

4.5.2 Grandeur and Sublimity

As I noted in the previous section, Greek critics associate roughness less often with sincerity and artlessness than with grandeur and sublimity. This can easily be demonstrated, if we briefly return to the topic of hiatus: while Roman rhetoricians connect hiatus almost invariably to the simple style, many of their Greek colleagues instead maintain that vowel clashes have very little to do with simplicity. Demetrius, for one, claims that the author of the 'plain style' (χαρακτὴρ ἰσχνός) should shun vowel concurrences, especially if they involve clashes of long vowels or diphthongs: 'If there is any hiatus, we should have it between short vowels, or between a short and a long, or at any rate, shorts in some shape or form.' According to the critic, hiatus is more appropriate in the grand style (χαρακτὴρ μεγαλοπρεπής), especially if it occurs between long vowels and diphthongs.[102] Philodemus, in

[101] As Dionysius speaks in general terms, it is unlikely that he directs his defense of Demosthenes against any specific critics or rhetoricians. According to Leo (1889) 286, the anonymous critics of Demosthenes were 'undoubtedly Asianists' ('ohne Zweifel Asianer'): this is not helpful in identifying the unnamed scholars, as there did not exist a unified school of Asianism to which ancient critics and rhetoricians tended to subscribe voluntarily (cf. section 2.2 above and section 5.2 below). Kirchner (2005) 175–176 connects Dionysius' apology of Demosthenes to the foregoing passage of *Comp.* 25.5, where the critic compares the topic under discussion (viz., the blurry boundaries between prose and poetry) is like the 'Mysteries' (Μυστήρια), for which certain 'initiation rites of style' (τελεταὶ τοῦ λόγου) must be observed; the critics of Demosthenes' careful arrangement, conversely, are depicted as 'uninitiated people' (βέβηλοι), who 'reduce the most serious subjects to ridicule through their own callowness' (εἰς γέλωτα λαμβάνουσι τὰ σπουδαιότατα δι' ἀπειρίαν).

[102] Demetr. *Eloc.* 207: Καὶ ἤτοι βραχέα συγκρουστέον βραχέσιν (...) ἢ βραχέα μακροῖς (...) ἢ ἁμῶς γέ πως διὰ βραχέων. For the appropriate forms of hiatus in the grand style, see ibid. 72–73. For the appropriateness of hiatus in the 'forceful style' (χαρακτὴρ δεινός), see ibid. 299–301. Demetrius' point that concurrences of long sound units are more sublime than concurrences of short sound units corresponds with the notion that the style becomes grander, if the interruptions and pauses are longer: cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.1–3, Long. *Subl.* 40.3, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.33–34 (with n. 115 below) and section 4.4 above. See, for this point, also Porter (2016) 232–234, who

addition, considers vowel collision 'quite frigid' (ὑπόψυχρος), referring to one of the principal vices associated with the failure to achieve grandeur.[103] In a word, Greek critics generally regard word combinations that contain long intervals as instrumental in achieving sublimity —the longer the pauses, the grander the effect. Dionysius' view is not different: he, too, connects hiatus and other audible interruptions in the flow of the words to such virtues as 'beauty' (κάλλος), 'grandeur' (μεγαλοπρέπεια), 'weight' (βάρος), 'solemnity' (σεμνολογία) and 'dignity' (ἀξίωμα).[104]

The extant Greek discussions of rough word arrangement are built on a shared premise, which has left few traces in Roman rhetorical theory, but which has been fundamental to Greek approaches to language and style, at least since the publication of Plato's *Cratylus*—the notion that in language and literature sound should imitate substance.[105] Hence, if an author deals with such themes as danger, war or suffering, the arrangement should be rough; if his text, however, is characterized by relaxation, peace and joy, the words should run smoothly. According to Dionysius, Homer is a master of acoustic mimesis, always seizing the appropriate occasion to apply dissonance and roughness: the critic points out that the poet uses 'the letters that are most difficult to pronounce' (τὰ δυσεκφορώτατα) in his description of the terrifying Gorgon on Agamemnon's shield; that he introduces 'clashes of syllables and delays in the rhythm' (ἀνακοπαὶ συλλαβῶν καὶ ἀναβολαὶ χρόνων) in the passage about Achilles' struggle with Scamander; and that he dwells on 'the most unpleasant and ill-sounding letters' (τὰ ἀηδέστατα τε καὶ κακοφωνότατα γράμματα) in the verses that describe how the Cyclops crushes the heads of Odysseus' companions.[106] In his analysis of Homer's

---

notes that 'Dionysius is using the aesthetics of the gap that will become the hallmark of the Longinian sublime'. Hermog. *Id.* also associates hiatus particularly with the sublimes genres of 'greatness' (μέγεθος) and 'beauty' (κάλλος), but he submits that the 'pure style' (ἰδέα καθαρά), which is characterized by simplicity and clarity, is 'not at all fussy about the collision of vowels' (μηδὲν περὶ συγρκούσεως τῶν φωνηέντων μικρολογουμένη).

[103] Philod. *Rhet.* 4 col. 2.2–10 p. 163 Sudhaus: 'Collision of vowels is rather frigid, but sometimes not inopportune' (σύμπτω[σ]ις δ[ὴ φ]ωνηέν[των] ἐστὶ μὲν [ὑπόψ]υ[χ]ρο[ς], ἡ δ' οὐκ ἄκαιρος). Transl. Hubbell (1920). For frigidity as a neighboring vice to the grand style, see section 2.4.1 n. 110 and section 3.4 n. 96 above.

[104] For the principal virtues of Dionysius' rough type of word arrangement, cf. section 3.2.1, esp. table 6 above.

[105] Calcante (2005b) recognizes a system of euphony that was based on imitation and onomatopoeia in various ancient critical sources (esp. Demetr, *Eloc.*, Philod. *Poem.*, Dion. Hal. *Comp.*, [Aristid.] *Rhet.*, Cic. *Orat.* and Quint. *Inst. orat.*), which he traces back to Pl. *Cra.* In his discussion of mimicking arrangement, incidentally, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 16.4 mentions Plato's dialogue as the first work 'on etymology' (ὑπὲρ ἐτυμολογίας).

[106] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 16.7–13 argues that Homer, 'the poet with the most voices of all' (πολυφωνότατος ἁπάντων ποητῶν), is a master in imitating the content of his poetry through the arrangement of his words:

famous description of Sisyphus' toil, lastly, Dionysius offers the following penetrating review of the mimicking force of word arrangement.[107]

> Πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ στίχοις οἷς ἀνακυλίει τὴν πέτραν, ἔξω δυεῖν ῥημάτων τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς λέξεως μόρια πάντ' ἐστὶν ἤτοι δισύλλαβα ἢ μονοσύλλαβα· ἔπειτα τῷ ἡμίσει πλείους εἰσὶν αἱ μακραὶ συλλαβαὶ τῶν βραχειῶν ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τῶν στίχων· ἔπειτα διαβεβήκασιν αἱ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἁρμονίαι διαβάσεις εὐμεγέθεις καὶ διεστήκασι πάνυ αἰσθητῶς, ἢ τῶν φωνηέντων γραμμάτων συγκρουομένων ἢ τῶν ἡμιφώνων τε καὶ ἀφώνων συναπτομένων· ῥυθμοῖς τε δακτύλοις καὶ σπονδείοις τοῖς μηκίστοις καὶ πλείστην ἔχουσι διάβασιν ἅπαντα σύγκειται. Τί δή ποτ' οὖν τούτων ἕκαστον δύναται; Αἱ μὲν μονοσύλλαβοί τε καὶ δισύλλαβοι λέξεις πολλοὺς τοὺς μεταξὺ χρόνους ἀλλήλων ἀπολείπουσαι τὸ χρόνιον ἐμιμήσαντο τοῦ ἔργου· αἱ δὲ μακραὶ συλλαβαὶ στηριγμούς τινας ἔχουσαι καὶ ἐγκαθίσματα τὴν ἀντιτυπίαν καὶ τὸ ψῦγμα καὶ ἡ τῶν τραχυνόντων γραμμάτων παράθεσις τὰ διαλείμματα τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ τὰς ἐποχὰς καὶ τὸ τοῦ μόχθου μέγεθος· οἱ ῥυθμοὶ δ' ἐν μήκει θεωρούμενοι τὴν ἔκτασιν τῶν μελῶν καὶ τὸν διελκυσμὸν τοῦ κυλίοντος καὶ τὴν τοῦ πέτρου ἔρεισιν.
>
> First, in the two lines in which Sisyphus rolls up the rock (*Od.* 11.595–596), except for two verbs all remaining words in the passage are either disyllables or monosyllables (i.e., ἤτοι, ὅ, μέν, χερσίν, τε, ποσίν, λᾶαν, ἄνω, ποτί, λόφον).[108] Next, in each of the two lines, the long syllables are half as numerous again as the short ones (i.e., nine longs against six shorts).[109] Then, all the words are so spaced as to advance

---

Dionysius not only shows how the poet imitates frightening or august situations through rough arrangement, but he also discusses instances of smooth collocations which are appropriate for gentle and pleasing scenes.

[107] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 20.13–14. The verses that are discussed in this passage are Hom. *Od.* 11.593–596: 'And Sisyphus I saw there under his great yoke of pain, with both his arms hard-straining an enormous rock to move. Buttressing that boulder with his legs and both his hands, he heaved toward the summit of the hill' (καὶ μὴν Σίσυφον εἰσεῖδον κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα, / λᾶαν βαστάζοντα πελώριον ἀμφοτέρῃσιν· / ἤτοι ὃ μὲν σκηριπτόμενος χερσίν τε ποσίν τε / λᾶαν ἄνω ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον). Dionysius cuts the last verse (11.596) off after the fourth foot. Cf. n. 113 below on Demetr, *Eloc.* 72, who discusses the same passage, and n. 114 below on Long. *Subl.* 40.4, who seems to echo Dionysius' discussion of the passage.

[108] Dionysius must refer to the verses 11.595–596, as the other two (11.593-594) contain several words with more than two syllables, viz., beside the verbs, Σίσυφον, πελώριον and ἀμφοτέρῃσιν.

[109] In this case, Dionysius' statement only holds good, if it applies to the first three verses, which scan as follows: (11.593) — — ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — —, (11.594) — — ⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — —, and (11.595) — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — — respectively. The fourth line (11.596), however, has

> in ample measures, and the gaps between them are distinctly perceptible, either because of the coincidence of vowels (i.e., ἄλγε' ἔχοντα, ἤτοι ὁ, ἄνω ὤθεσκε) or the juxtaposition of semivowels or voiceless letters (i.e., εἰσεῖδον κρατέρ', λᾶαν βαστάζοντα, σκηριπτόμενος χερσίν τε, ποσίν τε);[110] and the dactylic and spondaic rhythms are the longest possible and take the longest stride.[111] Now what is the effect of each of these details? The monosyllabic and disyllabic words, leaving many intervals between each other, portray the long duration of the action; while the long syllables, which have a holding, delaying quality, portray the resistance, the weight and the difficulty. The drawing-in of breath between the words and the juxtaposition of rough letters indicate pauses in his efforts, the delays and the hugeness of his labor; and the rhythms, when considered in respect of their length, portray the straining of the limbs, his dragging effort as he rolls his burden, and the pushing upward of the stone.

After several rough verses, the Sisyphus passage concludes with a smooth line, appropriately containing a maximum number of dactyls, imitating the speed of the boulder as it rolls down from the top of the hill: 'Do not the words', Dionysius reacts, 'when thus combined, tumble downhill together with the impetus of the rock? Indeed, does not the speed of the narration outstrip the rush of the stone?'[112] Dionysius' views about the mimetic quality of word

---

five long syllables against six short ones: — ◡ ◡ | — — | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡. Cf. Aujac and Lebel (1981) 143 n. 2. Note that I scan the final syllable of each verse as long: cf. section 2.4.2 n. 120 above.

[110] For Dionysius' division of letters into vowels, semivowels and voiceless letters, see section 4.4 n. 73. The number of hiatuses and clashes between semivowels and consonants is larger, if we take the instances of internal concurrences into account, viz., ἄλγε', ἔχοντα, λᾶαν, βαστάζοντα, ἀμφοτέρῃσιν, σκηριπτόμενος and ὤθεσκε.

[111] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 15.3–10 argues that 'there is more than one kind of length and shortness of syllables; some are actually longer than the long and some shorter than the short' (μήκους καὶ βραχύτητος συλλαβῶν οὐ μία φύσις, ἀλλὰ καὶ μακρότεραί τινές εἰσι τῶν μακρῶν καὶ βραχύτεραι τῶν βραχειῶν). Dionysius compares, for instance, the quantity of the first syllable in the following words, in increasing order of length: ὁδός, Ῥόδος, τρόπος, στρόφος. In the Homeric passage under discussion, Dionysius may be thinking of the combinations such as μὴν Σ-, -δον κρ-, μὲν σκ-. Cf. Aujac and Lebel (1981) 143 n. 3.

[112] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 20.16: Οὐχὶ συγκατακεκύλισται τῷ βάρει τῆς πέτρας ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων σύνθεσις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἔφθακε τὴν τοῦ λίθου φορὰν τὸ τῆς ἀπαγγελίας τάχος; The verse under discussion is Hom. *Od.* 11.598: 'And downwards it hurtled, the pitiless boulder, rolling to the plain' (αὖτις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδής), which scans: — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — —. Dionysius notes that the verse contains no monosyllabic words, that the majority of the syllables is short (viz., ten short against seven long), and that there are no instances of hiatus or clashes between semivowels and consonants at word junctions. The critic also

arrangement are shared by Demetrius and Longinus. The former, for instance, notices how 'in many passages, grandeur is produced by a series of ugly sounds' (δυσφωνία); after quoting a verse from the *Iliad* about Ajax doing battle with Hector, he remarks that 'in other respects the ugly clash of sounds is perhaps unpleasant to the ear (δυσήκοος), but by its very excess it brings out the greatness of the hero, since in the grand style smoothness and euphony find only an occasional place'.[113] The author of *On the Sublime*, in addition, argues that a sublime idea 'gains additional grandeur, from the fact that the rhythm is not hurried along, or, as it were, running on rollers (ἐν ἀποκυλίσματι), but the words prop one another up (στηριγμοὺς ἔχειν) and are separated by intervals, so that they stand firm and they give the impression of stable grandeur' (πρὸς ἕδραιον διαβεβηκότα μέγεθος). According to the critic, nothing is more destructive of sublimity than quick successions of short syllables, which resemble an effeminate 'dance-rhythm' (ὀρχηστικόν).[114]

Among Roman authors, we do not find much discussion of acoustic imitation: as we saw, they connect roughness and smoothness to the moral integrity of the author rather than to the content of his narrative. Quintilian, however, combines the two approaches: his discussion

---

recognizes instances of the 'irrational long syllable' (μακρὰ ἄλογος), which he presumes to be shorter than a 'perfect long' (μακρὰ τελεία): cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 17.12 with the discussion of Ruijgh (1987).

[113] Demetr. *Eloc.* 48 (on Hom. *Il.* 16.358): Ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ δυσφωνία συνθέσεως ἐν πολλοῖς μέγεθος. Ibid.: Ἄλλως μὲν γὰρ ἴσως δυήκοος ἡ τῶν γραμμάτων σύμπληξις, ὑπερβολὴ δ' ἐμφαίνουσα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ἥρωος· λειότης γὰρ καὶ τὸ εὐήκοον οὐ πάνυ ἐν μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ χώραν ἔχουσιν, εἰ μή που ἐν ὀλίγοις. Demetr. *Eloc.* 72 discusses Hom. *Od.* 11.595 (the Sisyphus passage), noting that the double hiatus of long vowels in λᾶαν ἄνω ὤθεσκε 'reproduces the stone's upward movement and the effort needed' (μεμίμηται τοῦ λίθου τὴν ἀναφορὰν καὶ βίαν). Demetrius' analyses of hiatus are not strictly limited to the topic of word arrangement, as he explicitly takes internal hiatuses (as in λᾶαν) into account; cf. esp. *Eloc.* 69–70.

[114] Long. *Subl.* 40.4: Ἀδρότερον δὲ γέγονε τῷ τὴν ἁρμονίαν μὴ κατασπεῦσθαι μηδ' οἷον ἐν ἀποκυλίσματι φέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ στηριγμούς τε ἔχειν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ ἐξερείσματα τῶν χρόνων πρὸς ἑδραῖον διαβεβηκότα μέγεθος. See ibid. 41.1 for the incompatibility of sublimity and short-syllabled rhythmical feet, such as pyrrhics (◡ ◡), tribrachs (◡ ◡ ◡) trochees (— ◡) and ditrochees (— ◡ — ◡): cf. section 2.3.3 n. 90 above for Dionysius' view on these swift rhythmical feet. There are striking similarities between Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 20.13–14 (on the Sisyphus passage) and Long. *Subl.* 40.4: on the latter text, Russell (1964) notes that 'this is the same sort of criticism as practiced by Dionysius'. Porter (2016) 407–408 points out several striking verbal correspondences: Longinus' passage, for instance, refers to a 'rock' (πέτρα) and a 'rolling-machine' (ἀποκύλισμα), which resonate with Dionysius' discussion of Sisyphus who 'rolls up his rock' (ἀνακυλίει τὴν πέτραν). Moreover, both texts refer to words as 'being a mighty stride' (Long. διαβεβηκότα, Dion. Hal. διαβεβήκασι), serving as 'proppings' (στηριγμοί) for each other. Hence, Porter can claim with confidence that 'depending on their relative dates, it is extremely likely that Longinus is showing himself to be a close reader and emulator of Dionysius'.

of rough arrangement not only draws on the discourse of simplicity and sincerity, but he also touches on themes that are typical for the treatises of Demetrius and Dionysius. Like Demetrius, for instance, the Flavian teacher ranks several types of vowel collision according to the degree of their offensiveness; like Dionysius, he pays attention to the disposition of the mouth as it produces these various types of hiatus.[115] Quintilian advises the orator-in-training not to shun the phenomenon altogether: 'Hiatus is sometimes actually appropriate and adds a certain grandeur (*faciunt ampliora*).' The rhetorician next quotes a corrupt phrase (*pulchra oratione acta* [*oratio*] *iacta te*), noting that 'the inherently long and rich syllables also take up a certain amount of time in the interval between the vowels, as though there was a pause there'.[116] Although I have distinguished between Greek and Roman approaches to word arrangement, Quintilian's discussion of hiatus demonstrates that both perspectives could be combined as parts of a common stylistic discourse.

4.5.3 Archaism and the Patina of Antiquity

To conclude the present discussion of the stylistic applications of rough word arrangement, I will now turn to the last of the three major recurring virtues of harshness, that is, its archaizing effect: the crudeness of the ear-jarring collocations could conjure up the rudimentary literary style of a long-gone epoch.[117] Apparently, roughness could be associated with primitive

[115] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.33–34. See Demetr. *Eloc.* 72–73, 207 for the different degrees of offensiveness of hiatus; cf. n. 102 above. See Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 14.7–14 on the disposition of the mouth in pronouncing vowels; cf. section 4.4 n. 74 above. Note that Quintilian, unlike Cicero, does not insist that hiatus is forbidden in the Latin language, although he does mention the possibility of mitigating the harshness of hiatus by coalescing the two vowels into a single syllable (συναλιφή). For the plausibility of Quintilian's familiarity with Dion. Hal. *Comp.*, see section 4.4 n. 77 above.

[116] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.36: *Nonnumquam hiulca etiam decent faciuntque ampliora quaedam.* Ibid.: *Longae per se et velut opimae syllabae aliquid etiam medii temporis inter vocales quasi intersistatur adsumunt.* The hiatus-filled Latin phrase that Quintilian quotes is of unknown origin: I adopt the reading of Russell (2002), who follows Halm's emendation *iacta te* for the word *iactatae*, which the mss have preserved. In this interpretation, *oratio* must be deleted. Russell proposes the following translation: 'Show pride in yourself, having delivered a beautiful speech.'

[117] For the relationship between archaism and classicism, see esp. Kim (2014), who shows that Dionysius' references to 'archaism' (ἀρχαϊσμός) and 'the archaic' (τὸ ἀρχαῖον) do not refer to a pre-Classical period (in fact, as we saw in section 1.6 above, neither Dionysius nor Cicero pay much attention to the period preceding the Classical era), but rather to a specific set of qualities that he considered fundamentally classical: 'Archaic qualities, rather than occupying their own temporal sphere, are often located by Dionysius within the classical itself; for Dionysius, archaizing, somewhat paradoxically, is an essential part of the best classical writing.' Cf.

antiquity, while smoothness could be connected to refined modernity. This raised a controversial issue among the critics and rhetoricians in Rome: should the authors of their day imitate the rough-hewn acoustics that they recognized in several of their favorite authors from Classical Greece, even though that same literary canon contains many fine examples of exquisite euphony and sophisticated smoothness? The extant opinions on this topic are divided: while some praised rough arrangements of words as emblematic of rugged, venerable old age, others dismissed it as musty and outdated. We will see that Dionysius, Longinus and the Roman authors who called themselves 'Attic' advocated the former view, whereas Cicero vigorously defended the opposite position.

In describing the archaizing effect of rough harmony, our authors often draw comparisons with the visual arts, that is, with timeworn sculptures and primitive paintings. Dionysius' favorite metaphor for harsh arrangement is 'patina' (πίνος), referring to the moldy blemish that appears on the surface of bronze statues as the result of a prolonged exposure to the elements of nature.[118] This greenish layer can not only be seen as a lamentable symptom of decay, but it can also be thought to contribute to the austere venerability of the object: Plutarch, for instance, relates that a young visitor 'marveled at the patina of the bronze' of the statues of the Spartan commander Lysander and his officers in Delphi, 'for it bore no resemblance to rust or verdigris, but it was smooth and shining with a deep blue tinge'.[119]

Porter (2006c) 327: 'The point to see is that archaism is a perspectival feature as much as a stylistic and periodizing one, and that from the later postclassical perspective all earlier writing into the fourth century seems broadly archaic.'

[118] As a metaphorical term in literary criticism, the word πίνος is diversely translated. Van Hook (1905) 44 has 'tinge of antiquity' and 'classical style'; Roberts (1910) gives 'mellowing deposit, tinge of antiquity, flavor of archaism', Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) offers 'musty antiquity', 'patina' or 'tinge'; Aujac (1992) has 'rouille, teinte de véstusté, d'archaisme, patine'. I will use 'patina' for πίνος, as do Usher (1974), (1985) and Donadi and Marchiori (2013), because this word aptly reflects the sculptural metaphor. Donadi (2000b) 56–57 suggests that the patina image was prompted to Dionysius by the state of decay of the old Doric temples in his day; Fornaro (2001) demonstrates the influence of Dionysius' use of the word patina on the aesthetic theories of Winckelmann; Porter (2006c) 327–328 and Kim (2014) 380–382 discuss the patina metaphor as part of their study of ancient classicism and archaism (cf. the previous note).

[119] Plut. *Mor.* 395b: Ἐθαύμαζε δὲ τοῦ χαλκοῦ τὸ ἀνθηρὸν ὡς οὐ πίνῳ προσεοικὸς οὐδ' ἰῷ, βαφῇ δὲ κυάνου στίλβοντος. Plutarch uses the word ἀνθηρόν to refer to the pleasing patina of the statue; πίνος denotes the dirty rust on its surface. The passage refers to the group of thirty-eight statues, depicting the Spartan victors at the battle of Aegospotami (405 BC): cf. Paus. 10.9.7–9 and Falaschi (2017). The young man in Plutarch's story thinks that the patina befits the statues of the admirals 'as they stood there with the true complexion of the sea and its deepest depths' (οἷον ἀτέχνως θαλάττιοι τῇ χρόᾳ καὶ βύθιοι ἑστῶτες).

Moving from sculpture to literature, Longinus attributes to sublime texts a 'charming patina' (εὐπίνεια) and a 'bloom as on the surface of beautiful bronzes' (γάνωσίς τις ὥσπερ ἀγάλμασι καλλίστοις).[120] Dionysius uses the image of patina without referring explicitly to its original sculptural context: he describes rough arrangement as 'having a beauty that consists in its patina of antiquity' (τὸν ἀρχαϊσμὸν καὶ τὸν πίνον ἔχουσα κάλλος), conferring upon the text an 'incrustation in the form of an ancient patina' (χνοῦς ἀρχαιοπινής).[121] The comparison between rough-hewn sculpture and rough literature was widespread in the Greek and Roman critical discourse: the image recurs in the works of Demetrius, Cicero and Quintilian.[122]

Undoubtedly, Dionysius presents the archaic flavor as a commendable feature of rough composition.[123] According to him, the patina of antiquity can be found particularly in the lyric poetry of Pindar, in the tragedies of Aeschylus, and in the historiography of

[120] Long. *Subl.* 30.1. Cf. ibid. 36.3, comparing sublime literature to 'the faulty Colossus' (ὁ Κολοσσὸς ὁ ἡμαρτημένος), which he pits against Polyclitus' Doryphorus: according to the author, the latter is admired for its accuracy (τὸ ἀκριβέστατον), whereas the former, like works of nature, is commended for its greatness (μέγεθος). De Jonge (2013) argues that Longinus' Colossus refers to the golden statue of Zeus in Olympia, mentioned in Pl. *Phdr.* 236b, claiming that the critic stresses its faultiness so as to underline the archaism in Plato's style.

[121] Dionysius uses 'patina' (πίνος), 'patinated' (πεπινωμένος) and 'having the patina of antiquity' (ἀρχαιπινής): see Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 5.3 (quoted in *Pomp.* 2.1), 38.6, 39.7, 44.2, 45.4, *Comp.* 22.6. The word 'incrustation' (χνόος or χνοῦς) can refer to the light porous film on any object, e.g., the layer of sea-salt on Odysseus' body after he landed on the island of the Phaeacians (Hom. *Od.* 6.226), the fine down on a flower (Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 2.8.4), bloom on fruit (Theophr. *Caus. pl.* 6.10.7), or the first fuzzy hairs on a young man's chin (Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 51.7, *Comp.* 25.35). Usener and Radermacher consider the word χνοῦς in Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 5.3 a gloss for πίνος, but it probably belongs to the original text: *Dem.* 38.6 uses the expression 'incrustation in the form of an ancient patina' (χνοῦς ἀρχαιοπινής), combining both metaphors for rough, archaic style. Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 3.6–7 differentiates between the style of Lysias and Isocrates by comparing them to different styles of sculpture.

[122] Demetr. *Eloc.* 14: 'So the older style has something of the sharp, clean lines of early statues, where the skill was thought to lie in their succinctness and sparseness' (διὸ καὶ περιεξεσμένον ἔχει τι ἡ ἑρμηνεία ἡ πρὶν καὶ εὐσταλὲς, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα, ὧν τέχνη ἐδόκει ἡ συστολὴ καὶ ἰσχνότης). Cic. *Att.* 12.6.4 refers the slightly old-fashioned expression 'pray' (*quaeso*) as 'having a charming patina' (εὐπινές). Cf. ibid. 14.7.2, where he describes a letter from his son as 'patinated' (*litterae* πεπινωμέναι), remarking that 'the patina of the letter shows that he has learnt something' (πίνος *litterarum significat doctiorem*); see also ibid. 15.16a and 15.17.2 on the patina of young Marcus' letters. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 2.5.23 argues that the older orators should only be imitated 'after the layer of uncouthness incident to that age is removed' (*deterso rudis saeculi squalore*); later on, ibid. 12.10.7, the author compares older literature to the 'stiff' (*duriora, rigida*) statues of Callon and Hegesias (fl. c. 500 BC). Cf. also Porter (2006c) 325–326 n. 62 on the Antonine expression 'color of old age' (*color vetustatis*) in Fronto *Ep.* 2.19, 4.9; Gell. *NA* 10.3.15, 12.2.10, 12.2.12 and 12.4.13.

[123] Yet, in diction, Dionysius does not consider archaism a virtue: see section 3.2.2 and Kim (2014) 368–370.

Thucydides. Although Dionysius does not explicitly say so, the patinated incrustation is probably not an original feature of these early rough-sounding works: the noble stain takes a long period of time to emerge, and is therefore only visible to later audiences.[124] Why do harsh, ear-jarring collocations remind Dionysius specifically of the authors just listed? We should note that they are by no means older than the other authors in Dionysius' classical canon: the antiquated style of Pindar, for instance, postdates the smoothness of Sappho, and the old-fashioned style of Thucydides is preceded by the 'well-mixed' harmony of Herodotus. Still, Dionysius invariably assigns a primeval aura to the aforementioned rough authors, as their works exhibit virtues that are more appropriate for old age than for youth, such as 'weight' (βάρος), 'dignity' (ἀξίωμα) and 'solemnity' (σεμνολογία). The prototypical representatives of smooth harmony, by contrast, are associated with such youthful attributes as 'freshness' (ὥρα), 'charm' (χάρις) and 'pleasure' (ἡδονή).[125] To be brief, by applying the rules of roughness, the authors in Rome could, in a conspicuous way, exhibit their affinity with the distant classical past.

Not only Greek authors, but also Roman writers could turn to harsh composition to approximate the classical literature of yore. Cicero reports that his opponents, the self-styled Attic orators who advocated the unadorned frugality of Lysias, shunned the rhythmical finish of smooth composition, because 'this was not done by the ancients'.[126] In his *Orator*, Cicero compares his oratorical foes to the lovers of primitive painting: 'Suppose they prefer archaic painting which used only a few colors to the perfection of modern art; must we, go back to the ancients and reject the moderns? They pride themselves on the names of their ancient models. Antiquity does carry authority in the precedents it furnishes, as old age does in respect of

[124] Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 39.7 singles out Aeschylus, Pindar and Thucydides as models of 'solemnity' (σεμνότης) and the 'patina of antiquity' (ἀρχαῖος πίνος). To these three names may be added the other 'rough' authors in Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.7; cf. section 3.3 table 7 and n. 60 above. Porter (2006c) 327 proposes that Dionysius regards the old masters themselves as already archaizing: 'The implication that not only any later classical writer employing the austere or archaic style, such as Antiphon, Plato, Antimachus, and Demosthenes, but also its first exponents, Empedocles, Pindar, Aeschylus, and Thucydides, might themselves by archaizing and not archaic, is left teasingly open by Dionysius (or else simply allowed).' Cf. Kim (2014) 378: 'While one suspects that the old-fashioned quality Dionysius ascribes to the austere mode would be perceptible only to a later classicizing audience, proof is difficult to come by, because Dionysius (…) is concerned more to describe the *effect* on the listener (…) than to establish the writer's awareness of such effects.'

[125] See Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 11.2–3 and section 3.2.1 table 6 above.

[126] Cic. *Orat.* 168: *Non erat hoc apud antiquos.* On the stylistic views of the self-proclaimed Atticists, see sections 1.4 and 3.4 above and section 5.6.1 below.

years; and this authority has great weight with me.'[127] Dionysius draws on a similar analogy between literature and painting, when he compares the styles of Lysias and his younger fellow orator Isaeus: 'There are some old paintings which are worked in simple colors without any subtle blending of tints but clear in their outline, and thereby possessing great charm; whereas the later paintings are less crisply drawn but contain greater detail and a subtle interplay of light and shade, and are effective because of the many nuances of color which they contain. Now Lysias resembles the older paintings by his simplicity and charm, and Isaeus their more elaborate and more skillfully wrought successors.'[128]

The archaism of roughness and the modernity of smoothness are prominent themes in the polemic between Cicero and the advocates of harsh composition. The former reports that there was a group of orators in Rome who called themselves 'Thucydideans' (*Thucydidii*), whom he describes as a 'new and unheard-of group of ignoramuses' (*novum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus*), orators who quaintly imitated the historian's convoluted syntax: 'No one succeeds in imitating his dignity of thought and diction, but when they have spoken a few choppy, disconnected phrases (*mutila quaedam et hiantia*), which they could have formed well enough without a teacher, each one thinks himself a regular Thucydides.'[129]

---

[127] Cic. *Orat.* 169: *Quid, si antiquissima illa pictura paucorum colorum magis haec iam perfecta delectet, illa nobis sit credao repetenda, haec scilicet repudianda? Nominibus veterum gloriantur. Habet autem ut in aetatibus auctoritatem senectus sic in exemplis antiquitas, quae quidem apud me ipsum valet plurimum.* According to Plin. *NH* 35.50, the oldest painters used only four colors, viz., black, white, yellow and red. Cf. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.3, who compares the development of painting to that of literary style. In a similar way as Cicero criticizes the sober Atticizing orators, Quintilian censures the admirers of the paintings of Polygnotus (fl. 475–450 BC) and his father Aglaophon: 'Their simple color still has its admirers, enthusiastic enough to prefer these rude objects, the beginnings, as it were, of the future art, to the greatest of the later masters. I take this to be a pretentious claim to superior understanding' (*quorum simplex color tam sui studiosus adhuc habet ut illa prope rudia ac velut futurae mox artis primordia maximis qui post eos extiterunt auctoribus praeferant, proprio quodam intellegendi, ut mea opinio est, ambitu*).

[128] Dion. Hal. *Is.* 4.1–2: Εἰσὶ δή τινες ἀρχαῖαι γραφαί, χρώμασι μὲν εἰργασμέναι ἁπλῶς καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐν τοῖς μίγμασιν ἔχουσαι ποικιλίαν, ἀκριβεῖς δὲ ταῖς γραμμαῖς καὶ πολὺ τὸ χαρίεν ἐν ταύταις ἔχουσαι. Αἱ δὲ μετ' ἐκείνας εὔγραμμοι μὴν ἧττον, ἐξειργασμέναι δὲ μᾶλλον, σκιᾷ τε καὶ φωτὶ ποικιλλόμεναι καὶ ἐν τῷ πλήθει τῶν μιγμάτων τὴν ἰσχὺν ἔχουσαι. Τούτων μὲν δὴ ταῖς ἀρχαιοτέραις ἔοικεν ὁ Λυσίας κατὰ τὴν ἁπλότητα καὶ τὴν χάριν, ταῖς δὲ ἐκπεπονημέναις τε καὶ τεχνικωτέραις ὁ Ἰσαῖος.

[129] Cic. *Orat.* 30–32: *Huius tamen nemo neque verborum neque sententiarum gravitatem imitatur, sed cum mutila quaedam et hiantia locuti sunt, quae vel sine magistro facere potuerunt, germanos se putant esse Thucydidas.* Cicero's principal objection against the imitation of Thucydides is that the latter's work is an unsuitable model for oratory: cf. section 1.6 n. 134 above. Cicero does not mention the names of these supposed

According to Cicero, these followers of the Athenian historian end up with a bizarrely anachronistic and needlessly old-fashioned style: 'Are men so perverse as to live on acorns after grain has been discovered? Are we, then, to suppose that the diet of men could be improved by the assistance of the Athenians, but that their oratory could not?'[130] In this comparison, the acorns stand for the rugged style of Thucydides: Cicero complains that the Thucydidean orators in Rome prefer this meager diet over the rich nutrition provided by the Attic grains, that is, by the smooth rhythms and well-polished periods of the likes of Isocrates and Demosthenes. As Cicero continues to argue, one cannot fault the old masters for their primitive roughness, but later generations should know better:[131]

> *Nec ego id quod deest antiquitati flagito potius quam laudo quod est; praesertim cum ea maiora iudicem quae sunt quam illa quae desunt. Plus est enim in verbis et in sententiis boni, quibus illi excellunt, quam in conclusione sententiarum, quam non habent. Post inventa conclusio est, qua credo usuros veteres illos fuisse, si iam nota atque usurpata res esset; qua inventa omnis usos magnos oratores videmus.* (…) *Legi enim audivique nonnullos, quorum propemodum absolute concluderetur oratio. Quod qui non possunt, non est eis satis non contemni, laudari etiam volunt. Ego autem illos ipsos laudo idque merito quorum se isti imitatores esse dicunt, etsi in eis aliquid desidero, hos vero minime qui nihil illorum nisi vitium secuntur, cum a bonis absint longissime.*
>
> I do not demand from antiquity what it has not; rather I praise what it has, particularly because I judge their excellence of greater concern than their deficiency. There is, in fact, more good in words and ideas, in which they excel, than in a rhythmical sentence

---

aficionados of Thucydides, but the orator-cum-historian C. Asinius Pollio (76 BC–4 AD) was probably among them; the historian Sallust (86–ca. 35 BC) is also often associated with the group, although Cicero refers specifically to orators. See esp. the discussions of Roman Thucydideanism in Leeman (1955) 183–208 and (1963) 179–187. According to Bonner (1939) 83, there is an uninterrupted tradition from Cicero's *novum genus* to the supporters of Thucydides in Dionysius' era, such as Q. Aelius Tubero, the addressee of Dion. Hal. *Thuc.*: cf. De Jonge (2017). Yet, there is no real proof to establish a direct link between the Thucydides imitators of the late Republic and those of the Augustus era. On Thucydides' convoluted syntax, see De Jonge (2008) 214–216.

[130] Cic. *Orat.* 31: *Quae est autem in hominibus tanta perversitas, ut inventis frugibus glande vescantur? An victus hominum Atheniensium beneficio excoli potuit, oratio non potuit?* The passage refers to the myth that mankind had to make do with acorn, until Triptolemus sowed grain in Attic soil: see e.g. Ov. *Met.* 5.643–661.

[131] Cic. *Orat.* 169, 171.

> ending, which they lack. The rhythmical ending was a later invention, which I believe the ancients would have used if it had been known and employed in their day.[132] We see that after its invention, all great orators employed it. (…) For I have read and listened to not a few orators whose style was almost perfectly rhythmical in its cadence; but those unable to attain to this are not satisfied with not being criticized; they even wish to be praised for their failure. I, on the other hand, praise precisely those whom they profess to imitate, and I am quite right in doing so, although I find something lacking in them; but I have scant praise for these moderns who imitate only the weak points of the ancients while they are far from attaining to their real merits.

This passage encapsulates the dispute between the proponents of archaic roughness and the supporters of newfangled smoothness in Late-Republican and Early-Imperial Rome. We have seen that both Greek and Roman authors participate in this discussion, drawing on a shared set of conceptual parameters: Cicero and Dionysius, for instance, both build their expositions about the aural aspects of artistic prose on analogies with the visual arts. Hence, their opinions on the seemingly trifling issue of word arrangement touches on the core of their aesthetic taste, for they not only evaluate crude Thucydides and smooth Isocrates, but they also compare the stiffness of archaic kouroi to the well-proportioned body of the Doryphorus, and they, likewise, pit the rigid drawings of Polygnotus against the painstakingly detailed paintings of Zeuxis and Parrhasius. In a word, rough word arrangement resonates with a major category in ancient Greek and Roman aesthetic thought: it appeals to the uncomplicated beauty of ancient art that can be played off against the complex artistic charm of modernity.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has focused on one of the hottest issues in the critical discourse on prose style in Late-Republican and Early-Imperial Rome—the theory of word arrangement, which is concerned with the aural evaluation of literature. This topic, as we have seen, not only

[132] According to Cic. *Orat.* 175–176, Thrasymachus invented rhythmical prose, and Gorgias invented balanced sentence structure: thus, Cicero traces two crucial aspects of smooth composition back to the second half of the fifth century BC. Yet, he submits that Thrasymachus' style is 'too rhythmical' (*nimis numerose*) and that Gorgias used his invention 'rather immoderately' (*intemperantius*) and 'too boldly' (*insolentius*), being 'too fond' (*avidior*) of his own style. It was not until Isocrates, according to Cicero, that smoothness was applied with success, as Isocrates used rhythm 'with greater skill' (*scientius*) than Thrasymachus, and he added balance to his sentences 'with greater restraint' (*moderatius*) than Gorgias. Cf. section 1.6 n. 136 above.

attracted enthusiastic students (e.g., Cicero and Dionysius), but it also gave rise to tenacious scolders (e.g., Philodemus and the so-called Roman Atticists). Concentrating on the extant views about stylistic roughness, dissonance and cacophony, this chapter has contributed to our understanding of the classicism that underlies the critical works of the respective authors: we have seen that harsh acoustics were considered intrinsic to the aesthetic experience of the classics. Although some ancient scholars preferred euphonious composition, all surviving discussions recognize ear-jarring crudeness as inextricably connected to an important portion of the classical Greek literary canon. Hence, the aspiring heirs of the old masters often consciously arrange their words in such a way as to provide discomfort instead of pleasure to the ears of their audience. By doing so, they could achieve several aesthetic effects: as we have seen, rough word arrangement could be seen as a sign of authentic simplicity, it could be associated with sublime grandeur, and it could evoke the rudimentary beauty of venerable old age.

With respect to the complex relationship between Greek and Latin stylistic theory, next, this chapter has taught us at least three lessons. First, despite the obvious phonological and acoustic differences between the Greek and Latin languages, we have seen that Greek and Roman authors analyze the sound of prose on the basis of a shared theoretical framework: specifically, I have argued that there exists a remarkable agreement between them concerning the natural principles that govern the arrangement of words, and concerning the appropriate method of analyzing the acoustic effects of artistic prose. Secondly, this chapter has also shown that Greek and Roman appreciations of rough and smooth collocations differ considerably: Greek sources generally hold that the sound of the composition should imitate the content of the narrative, whereas Latin texts are preoccupied with composition as a means to reflect the authors' moral character. In the Roman rhetorical tradition, the careful arrangement of words could make an orator vulnerable to the charge of Greek, soft and effeminate behavior. The third point, to conclude, is perhaps the most important: we have seen that Roman authors were aware of and reacted to Greek views on word arrangement, and vice versa. In Latin discussions, for one, the topic is often explicitly labeled as a Greek activity, while Cicero emphatically deviates from Greek theory on hiatus. Dionysius, conversely, seems to defend his favorite orator Demosthenes against the Roman detractors of careful word arrangement.

Dionysius, whose views modern classicists typically connect to the works of other Greek critics (section 1.2), seems to have involved himself in a stylistic discussion that particularly concerned Roman orators and rhetoricians: this is not surprising, if we take into

account that Dionysius dedicates his major treatise *On the Arrangement of Words* to the young Roman aristocrat Metilius Rufus and that he was acquainted with various Roman scholars (section 1.5). The next chapter will focus on a topic, which links the Greek critic to yet another Roman rhetorical debate—the nature of Attic style and the political and moral virtues which it was thought to represent. We will see that Atticism became a hot item in Rome through the fierce polemic between the orators Calvus and Cicero (late 50s and early 40s of the first century BC), after which Attic style became a standard topic for both Greek and Roman scholars to engage with.