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

Ooms, S.

Chapter 5
TO BE ATTIC OR NOT TO BE ATTIC: THE FLUIDITY OF ATTICISM IN ORATORY, POLITICS AND LIFE

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters, I have studied several major topics in the Greek and Latin discourse on prose style: in each case, we have seen that some features are universal to the common discourse, while others are particular to its various participants on account of their specific preferences, purposes and programs. The present chapter will demonstrate the same two crucial points with respect to the topic of Atticism: again, I will argue that the views of the critics and rhetoricians in Rome are built on a shared conceptual framework, while each author at the same time interprets elements from this common repertoire so as to suit their own goals and motivations. Specifically, we will see that there is a remarkable interplay between, on the one hand, the stylistic views of three prominent scholars, viz., Calvus, Cicero, and Dionysius, and, on the other hand, the contemporary political situation in Rome.

There was hardly a greater compliment for an orator or prose author in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome than to be called 'Attic' (Ἀττικός, *Atticus*). Our record of the city's obsession with Attic style, now standardly referred to as Atticism, goes back to the middle of the first century BC, when a group of Roman orators, presumably led by C. Licinius Macer Calvus, started to present themselves as Attic orators (sections 1.4 and 3.4). These men censured Cicero, the leading orator of the day, for being not Attic enough and even 'Asian' (Ἀσιανός, *Asianus, Asiaticus*), which prompted the latter to write extensively about the nature of Attic and Asian oratory in his *Brutus, De Optimo Genere Oratorum* and *Orator*, insisting that his own style was in fact as Attic as Athens itself.[1] After Cicero, Atticism remained a crucial feature in the discourse about prose style in Rome: under Augustus, for instance, the intricacies of Attic style were discussed by the Greek critics Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Caecilius of Caleacte.[2] In both Latin and Greek stylistic theory, the epithet 'Attic' was used as

[1] Cic. *Orat.* 23 praises Demosthenes, Cicero's principal model: 'I believe that not even Athens itself was more Attic than he' (*quo ne Athenas quidem ipsas magis credo fuisse Atticas*). The translation is mine.

[2] On Caecilius' works, which survive only in a limited number of fragments, see section 1.5 above. The *Suda* lists several works that touch on the topic of Attic oratory and style, viz., *On the Stylistic Character of the Ten Attic Orators* (Περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τὼν δέκα ῥητόρων), *How the Attic and Asian Styles Differ* (Τίνι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ζῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ) and *Against the Phrygians* (Κατὰ Φρυγῶν), which probably was a lexicon of 'Asian' diction 'in alphabetic order' (κατὰ στοιχεῖον). Cf. esp. section 1.5 n. 101 above.

a shorthand for literary excellence: 'speaking in an Attic way' (*Attice dicere*), to paraphrase one of Cicero's favorite maxims, was thought to be the same thing as 'speaking in the best way' (*optime dicere*).[3]

This chapter explores the various conceptions of Attic style in Rome in the first century BC. We will see that the term 'Attic' was not a technical term that referred to a single, clearly defined, type of style. Rather, it was a flexible slogan whose meaning was continuously renegotiated. On the one hand, Greek and Latin sources attribute roughly the same defining features to the style of classical Athens: discussions of Attic style evoke such notions as masculinity, purity, sanity and moderation. Yet, on the other hand, the authors in Rome each highlight different aspects from this web of associations, not only to suit their respective stylistic programs, but also to demarcate their position in contemporary society. Style, after all, is the man himself: by presenting their stylistic views as Attic, our authors also associated their political ideas and their moral character with the venerable name of Athens, the undisputed symbol of freedom, democracy, vigor, self-restraint, wisdom, and kindred virtues.[4] Thus, Atticism was an effective strategy to assert oneself not only as an author or as a critic, but also as a citizen and as a man: indeed, to be Attic or not to be Attic, that was the question.

After an assessment of previous scholarship on Atticism (section 5.2), I will explore the most salient recurring features in the discourse about the culture, politics and literature of Classical Athens in Rome (section 5.3). Subsequently, I will compare the metaphors that Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius use for Attic style, illustrating the flexibility of Atticism (section 5.4). The latter point will be further demonstrated by studying the individual conceptions of the notion in the three aforementioned authors, focusing first on Cicero and

[3] See Cic. *Brut.* 291, *Opt. gen.* 12 and Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.26.

[4] The idea that style is the man himself is an ancient commonplace. Diog. Laert. 1.58 credits Solon with saying 'that speech is the mirror of action' (τὸν λόγον εἴδωλον εἶναι τῶν ἔργων). Cic. *Tusc.* 5.47 (possibly referring to Pl. *Resp.* 400d) attributes another version of this idea to Socrates, who is said to have held 'that, as is man himself, so is his speech' (*qualis homo ipse esset, talem eius esse orationem*). Similarly, Sen. *Ep.* 114.1 has the following much-cited phrase, presented by the author as a Greek proverb: 'Men's speech is just like their life' (*talis hominibus fuit oratio, qualis vita*). See Mansfeld (1994) 186–191 for more ancient articulations of this idea. In modern usage, the maxim gained popularity through the French naturalist Georg Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon, who argued that 'le style, c'est l'homme même' (*Discours sur le style*, August 25, 1753). Likewise, the Irish playwright Oscar Wilde wrote in a letter covering his newspaper submission 'Fashions in Dress' (*Daily Telegraph*, 2 February 1891): 'I don't wish to sign my name, though I am afraid everybody will know who the writer is: one's style is one's signature always.'

Dionysius (section 5.5), whose views have already been discussed at length in the foregoing chapters of this dissertation, and next on the orator Calvus (section 5.6), whose opinions merit a closer look. The various conceptions of Attic style that we encounter in these instances are closely connected to contemporary political circumstances. We will see that Calvus' Atticism, for one, is not only directed against Ciceronian eloquence, but also against the behavior of the triumvirs Caesar and Pompey (late 50s BC). Cicero, next, articulates his ideas about Attic style during the dictatorship of Caesar (48–44 BC): we will see that his conception of Atticism is as much a commentary on current oratorical trends as it is a grim warning against tyranny. Dionysius, lastly, comes to Rome after the fall of the republic: his Atticizing program ties in very well with the politics of the young emperor Augustus (27 BC–14 AD). Throughout the turbulent first century BC, Athens stood as a malleable icon not only of brilliant eloquence, but also of good government and impeccable ethics.

5.2 Atticism in Modern Scholarship

As we saw, the term Atticism refers, in very broad terms, to the tendency in both Greek and Latin prose literature to admire and imitate the models of the Classical Athenian period, especially the Attic orators (section 1.6).[5] At this point, the reader may wonder why we need yet another discussion of this rather trite topic: it has, after all, been amply discussed in countless articles, books and lexical entries. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the issue of Atticism engaged such German philologists as Erwin Rohde, Georg Kaibel, Wilhelm Schmid, Eduard Norden, Ludwig Radermacher and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf.[6] Yet, frustratingly, their debates were ridden with controversy and misunderstanding, which have trickled down into later discussions: the twentieth century saw a continuous quarrel about the origins, historical development and nature of Atticism, based largely on the problematic assumptions that were formulated by the philologists of imperial Germany.[7]

[5] For the relation between classicism and Atticism, see section 1.6 n. 120 above.

[6] See, e.g., Rohde (1876) and (1886), and Kaibel (1885), who focus on the relationship between the notions of Atticism and Asianism on the one hand and the Second Sophistic (ca. 50–ca. 250 AD) on the other hand. Schmid (1887–1897) and Norden (1898) discuss the importance of Atticism in the wider context of the ancient history of Greek and Latin prose style. Radermacher (1899) zooms in on the origins and antecedents of Atticism, while Wilamowitz (1900) aims to write a synthesis of the foregoing literature. Goudriaan (1989) 595–677 offers an extensive survey of the debates of Wilhelmine Germany, providing illuminating expositions about the underlying motives and assumptions of the scholars concerned.

[7] See Goudriaan (1989) esp. 601–606, who shows that the debates about Atticism in Germany were influenced to a large extent by contemporary discussions about educational and cultural politics (the so-called 'Schulkrieg'):

Jakob Wisse has appropriately compared the secondary literature to a dense, overgrown jungle: 'Not only is a real consensus still difficult to reach, but also the various opinions are often hard to disentangle.'[8] As modern scholarship often seems to obscure rather than illuminate the ancient phenomenon of Atticism, we have sufficient reason to take up the issue once again.

A major problem that has frustrated modern scholarly discussions about Atticism, in my view, is this: many classicists tend to understand Atticism as a closed school of thought, a 'movement' with a long history, several subdivisions and many identifiable adherents.[9] In the disputes of the nineteenth century, this is the one idea that remained unchallenged. In *Die antike Kunstprosa*, for instance, Norden presents the entire history of style from the second century BC onwards as a battle between the rival schools of Atticism and Asianism, the archaizing 'old style' ('der alte Stil') versus the baroque 'new style' ('der neue Stil') respectively.[10] In his famous article 'Asianismus und Atticismus', however, Wilamowitz has

---

according to Goudriaan, it is regrettable 'that later generations have adopted the results of philological science in Wilhelmine Germany without sufficiently criticizing it' ('afkeurenswaardig is alleen dat latere generaties de resultaten van de filologische wetenschap van het wilhelmische Duitsland hebben gerecipieerd zonder er afdoende kritiek op uit te oefenen').

[8] Wisse (1995) 66–7.

[9] See e.g. Leeman (1963) 142 ('movement'), Dihle (1992) 1163 ('Stilrichtung'), Hidber (1996) 42 ('Bewegung'). We should be aware of the shortcomings of the terminology ('movement', 'school', etc.) that we inherited from the scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Cf. Wisse (1995) 70–71: 'When I call Atticism a 'movement,' that is only because I know no better term. It was in fact a movement, if we understand the term loosely. For what Cicero describes, and what Dionysius describes, is not a movement in the sense of a closed school of thought, with official members, and an official policy and programme.' Wisse's 'loosely' understood conception of the Atticist movement is still quite rigid, as he recognizes a 'development' of Atticism, with 'stages' and a 'transmission'. In this dissertation, however, the designation 'Atticist movement' is reserved for the group of Roman 'Attic' orators, presumably led by Calvus, who were active between ca. 55 and ca. 45 BC: see the end of the present paragraph. I do not consider Dionysius, Caecilius and others to be exponents of any such movement.

[10] Norden (1898) esp. 216–21. The binary scheme is, of course, an oversimplification. It was the basis, however, of the nineteenth-century debate about the antecedents of the Second Sophistic: according to Rohde (1876), for instance, the latter movement was a continuation of Asianism, while Kaibel (1885) argued that it was an offshoot of Atticism. Cf. Schmid (1887–1897): in the five volumes of *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, he traces the history of Greek Atticism from Dionysius until Philostratus. In section 4.5.3 above, we have seen that the opposition between 'old' and 'new' style did in fact play an important role in the stylistic discussions of the first century BC. Yet, the categories of old and new style should not be conflated with the notions of Atticism and Asianism.

already convincingly shown that Asianism rarely referred to a positive stylistic category: the label 'Asian' was simply a 'slogan' ('Schlagwort'), a polemical term of abuse that few ancient authors willingly applied to themselves.[11] Although the traditional conception of Asianism as a rigid stylistic denomination was thus debunked as early as the year 1900, it took all but another century before classicists gradually became aware that the ancient evidence does not support the thesis that there ever existed a rigid, centuries-spanning movement of Atticism.[12] Hence, the customary interpretation of Atticism dramatically overstates the importance of any alleged Atticist movement in Antiquity—I use the term 'movement' only for the close-knit and briefly flourishing group of self-styled Attic orators around Calvus (sections 1.4 and 5.6).

Still, it has proved to be difficult to shake off the traditional, monolithic interpretation of Atticism. It will be instructive to see how scholars have dealt, for instance, with the disparate views of Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius, the three authors who are the focus of this chapter. The two Roman authors exchanged their conflicting stylistic views in the so-called 'Atticist controversy' of the late 50s and early 40s of the first century BC.[13] As Cicero was the prime opponent of Calvus' Atticist movement, he is usually considered an enemy of Atticism,

[11] Wilamowitz (1900) esp. 4–8, 26; he does not challenge the notion of a large Atticist movement. For a rare instance of a positive use of the term 'Asian', see Sen. *Controv.* 10.5.21: 'Craton, a very witty man and professed Asianist, who waged war with everything Attic' (*Craton, venustissimus homo et professus Asianus qui bellum cum omnibus Atticis gerebat*). Cf. ibid for an example for Craton's witty anti-Atticism. When the emperor Augustus gave Craton twenty-four sesterces, the equivalent of an Athenian talent, the orator said: 'Either add something, or take something off, to stop it being Attic' (ἢ προσθὲς ἢ ἄφελ', ἵνα μὴ Ἀττικὸν ᾖ). On the basis of this passage, Luzzatto (1988) 238 concludes that 'the label 'Asian' is a positive and generally acknowledged term denoting a specific style of declamation' ('l'etichetta "asiano" individua in positivo, e in modo condiviso dai diretti interessati, uno specifico stile declamatorio'). Huelsenbeck (2018) 164 n. 43, however, rightly objects that this cannot be inferred from the Craton passage alone: 'It is conceivable that a speaker might embrace the term Asianism (…) as an act of reappropriation—i.e., the assertive co-optation of a derogatory term. This practice is suggested by modern example, e.g., reappropriation of the word "queer".' Note that Cicero's treatment of Asianism is also not unequivocally negative: see section 1.6 above and section 5.6.1 n. 143 below.

[12] See e.g. Gelzer (1979) 25–26: 'Das sind alles sehr vage und allgemeine Bestimmungen, und sie bestätigen nur, dass "das Attische" nicht eine Bezeichnung für konkret definierte, feststehende Qualitäten oder gar für von Werken attischen Herkunft hergeleitete, sachliche oder stilistische Eigenschaften ist, sondern ein allgemeines Ideal, das als symbolische Qualitätsmarke den Werken und den Bestrebungen klassizistischer Gestaltungsweise und ihren Vorbildern zugelegt wird.' Cf. n. 9 for Wisse (1995) 70–71. See also Whitmarsh (1996), quoted at the end of the present section, and Porter (2006b) 34–39 with section 1.6 on the flexibility of classicism. Douglas (1955), (1966) and (1973) already noted that the significance of Atticism 'has been greatly exaggerated by modern scholars'; he focuses on Roman (not Greek) Atticism.

[13] For the chronology of Calvus and his self-styled 'Attic' movement, see section 1.4 above.

tout court.[14] Calvus, conversely, who is the earliest Atticist on record, is often used as a touchstone for Roman Atticism: authors who, like Calvus, adopted a sober, unadorned style, are likely to be classified as Atticists, whereas authors who do not meet these standards, are usually excluded from the canon. Gualtiero Calboli, for example, lists T. Pomponius Atticus, C. Asinius Pollio, M. Iunius Brutus, Caesar and Sallust as Atticists, while he numbers Q. Hortensius Hortalus, Cicero and Marc Antony among the Asianists.[15] Furthermore, on the basis of Calvus' purist program, scholars have associated 'Roman Atticism', whatever that phrase may refer to, with analogist theories of grammar and with Stoic views about simple style.[16]

We should, however, not suspend our entire understanding of the Roman conception of Attic style upon Calvus: his movement (the only sure 'Atticist movement' on record) was, by all appearances, short-lived, with little tangible influence in the following decades.[17] In the

[14] Cicero was considered 'not Attic enough' (*parum Atticus*) and 'Asian' (*Asianus*) by Calvus and his movement: see section 5.6.1 below on Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.12 and Tac. *Dial.* 18.4. This view is often repeated in modern scholarship, explicitly in e.g. Norden (1898) 212–33, Leeman (1962) 91–111 and Calboli (1997a) 79, but also implicitly, as Cicero's stylistic views are simply not classified under the heading of Atticism.

[15] Calboli (1997a) 79–80 and (1997b) 262–263. Inscribing any author into Calvus' Atticist movement is a tricky business, as our sources record virtually no direct links between Calvus and any other Roman authors: arguments are based largely on stylistic resemblances. Yet, the styles of the presumed Atticists listed above are quite disparate, differing in important respects from Calvus' program. Leeman (1963) 136–167 proposes that Roman Atticism evolved in three phases, the first imitating Lysias (Calvus, Calidius, Brutus), the second following Thucydides (Asinius Pollio) and the third archaizing (Sallust, Cimber, L. Arruntius). The Atticist affiliations of Calidius and Caesar have been convincingly disproved: see Douglas (1955) and Garcea (2012) 49–77 respectively. Brutus was probably sympathetic to Calvus' views, but that he was an Atticist in Calvus' terms is by no means certain: see esp. Douglas (1966) xiii-xiv and Bowersock (1979) 63–64. As for the presumed Asianists listed above, they were all associated with Asian rhetoric by other ancient authors: for Hortensius, see Cic. *Brut.* 325; for Cicero, see e.g. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.12; and for Marc Antony, see Suet. *Aug.* 86.

[16] For the connections between Atticism and analogist grammar, see esp. Dihle (1957) and (1992) 1166. The alleged connections are used as arguments to link Caesar, who composed a treatise *On Analogy*, to Calvus' movement: see Hendrickson (1906) 97–98 and Garcea (2012) 49–77. For the link between Atticism and Stoicism, see Dihle (1957) 185 and Moretti (1990) 94–95.

[17] See section 1.4 above; on the notion 'Atticist movement', see n. 9 above. Already in 45 BC, Cic. *Tusc.* 2.3 declares that the self-styled Atticists 'have fallen silent' (*conticuerunt*). I do not follow Douglas (1955) 241 and (1966) xiii, who argues that 'the term "Atticist" should be reserved for the coterie centering on Calvus', which means that Atticism only had a 'temporary importance' in Rome. While it is true that Calvus' conception of Atticism is especially relevant in the stylistic debates of the late 50s and early 40s of the first century BC, the admiration of Attic style remained central in both Latin and Greek stylistic theory, long after Calvus' death.

brief span of their activity, Calvus and his followers did not create a definitive program of Atticism, but they did manage to provoke the great Cicero, instigating a lively and long-lasting debate about Attic style in Rome. As for Cicero, the fact that Calvus and others considered him thoroughly un-Attic should not exclude him from the present discussion of Atticism. After all, Cicero himself wrote about Attic style quite extensively and enthusiastically: if Atticism is not a fixed stylistic program but simply a tendency to admire and imitate classical Athenian literature, Cicero is an Atticist just as much as Calvus. Sure enough, Cicero offers a benign discussion of Asian style, and his conception of Attic style is a far cry from Calvus' ideas—Cicero does not favor the simple style and his preferred model is Demosthenes rather than Lysias.[18] Yet, such discrepancies only underscore the flexibility of Atticism: the meaning of the term 'Attic' could be manipulated to accommodate diverse, even opposing views about style.

Another major bone of contention in modern debates about Atticism is the relationship between the Greek and Roman conceptions of Attic style. Scholars generally suppose that there was a difference of scope dividing Roman and Greek authors: Calvus' program, for instance, focuses on the simple style, purportedly accepting only Lysias and Hyperides as the true models of Atticism, whereas Dionysius, Caecilius, and later Greek authors adopted a much broader approach, taking virtually all classical Attic authors in consideration.[19] Therefore, some scholars have concluded that Roman and Greek Atticism are in fact two separate self-contained movements that have very little to do with each other.[20] Others, conversely, have tried to establish links between Roman and Greek views: taking into account that the earliest extant sources are actually in Latin, scholars have either argued that Roman Atticists somehow influenced Greek stylistic theory, or that the two groups build on an older,

[18] For Cicero's not unfavorable discussion of Asian style, see section 1.6 above and section 5.6.1 n. 143 below. Cic. *Orat.* 155 declares the author's allegiance to anomalist grammar. Cicero's preference for Demosthenes and his views on the simple style have been discussed at length above, esp. sections 2.3.2 and 3.4.

[19] See for this analysis, e.g., Bowersock (1979) 57–9, Dihle (1992) 1169–1170, and Hidber (1996) 38–9. Yet, cf. n. 22 below on the possibility that Calvus also admired Demosthenes as a model of passionate oratory.

[20] Douglas (1973) 125 n. 89 and Hidber (1996) 30–44, for instance, argue that Roman Atticism forms a coherent, self-sufficient unit that just happens to predate the extant Greek articulations of Atticism. According to Dihle (1977) the Greek and Roman views of Atticism 'are only related to each other indirectly and through a different relationship with grammatical Atticism' ('hatten nur indirekt und zwar durch eine jeweils andere Beziehung zum grammatische Atticizmus miteinander zu tun'): according to him, Roman authors specifically turned to Greek grammar, aiming to apply its rules to the analysis of the Latin language, whereas Greek authors did not need to imitate the grammatical intricacies of Attic prose in detail.

now lost, Greek tradition. This issue is closely connected to the debate about the beginnings of Atticism: was the movement founded in the Greek world by Greeks, in Rome by Greeks, or did it actually start with the Roman orator Calvus and his entourage?[21] Such problems concerning the origin, evolution and transmission of Atticism are as yet unresolved.

Any communis opinio on these issues is thwarted by the fact that concepts such as 'Roman Atticism' and 'Greek Atticism' are vague and misleading. As we have seen, the extant Roman conceptions of Attic style are exceedingly varied: Cicero, like many later Greek critics, already accepted a much wider range of Attic models than his rival Calvus, while other Romans reportedly imitated only Thucydides or Xenophon.[22] Likewise, we should not lump all Greek Atticists together: the conceptions of Atticism that we encounter in the works of Dionysius, Caecilius and the authors of the Second Sophistic are far from uniform, sometimes exhibiting striking parallels with Roman views.[23] It seems more plausible, therefore, that

[21] Cf. section 1.2 above on the reluctance on the part of modern scholars to consider the possibility that Roman views could influence Greek theory. Norden (1898) 258–263, for one, posits that the extant Greek and Roman sources represent two independent offshoots of an originally Greek tradition, going back to the second century BC, while Wilamowitz (1900) 31–51 suggests that Atticism was founded by Greeks in Rome ca. 60 BC. More recently, Gelzer (1979) 15 connected Roman Atticism to Greek grammatical theory, and O'Sullivan (1997) 42 thought that 'Caecilius was, if not the father of Atticism, at least present at its birth'; yet, on the probability that Caecilius did not flourish before the Augustan period, see again section 1.2 above. The possibility that Atticism is an originally Roman phenomenon was first considered by Radermacher (1899a) 360: 'Es scheint mir hierbei durchaus unbewiesen, dass es nothwendig ein Grieche gewesen sein muss, der in Rom die Fahne des Streites erhob, so allgemein verbreitet auch heutzutage diese Annahme sein mag.' Cf. also Kennedy (1972) 241–242, 351–353, Bowersock (1979) 67 and Innes (1989) 245–246. According to Heck (1917) 56, Dionysius' Atticism is a 'compromise between the Ciceronian and ultra-Atticist movement' ('Kompromiss der ciceronischen und der ultraattizistischen Richtung'). Wisse (1995) 74 offers the most confident claim about the Roman influence on Greek Atticism: 'I think the movement was originally Roman, and was passed on to Greeks working in Rome.'

[22] For the presence of imitators of Thucydides and Xenophon in Rome, see Cic. *Orat.* 30–32. Additionally, Cic. *Brut.* 289 seems to react to Atticists who imitated Demosthenes. There is even some evidence that Calvus is among the admirers of Demosthenes: Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.8, for one, notes that 'his forensic style is vigorous on the model of Demosthenes, with nothing sedate or gentle about it—everything excited and stormy' (*conpositio quoque eius in actionibus ad exemplum Demosthenis viget: nihil in illa placidum, nihil lene est, omnia excitata et fluctantia*). Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.2 also mentions Calvus and Demosthenes together. Lebek (1970) 83–97 adduces the example of Calvus' imitation of Demosthenes as evidence that his movement of Roman Atticists was not as homogeneous as is often assumed: similar observations have been made by Stroh (1982) 27–28, Narducci (1997) 130, and Dugan (2005) 311 n. 204.

[23] Caecilius, for instance, seems to have taken a more grammatical approach than Dionysius: the list of his works in *Suda* includes two works that are listed as alphabetically arranged lexica, viz., *Against the Phrygians* (Κατὰ

Romans and Greeks participated in a shared discourse on Attic style. While admiration for Attic oratory is attested throughout the Hellenistic period,[24] we can safely say that it was the vehement controversy between Calvus' movement and Cicero, immortalized in the latter's rhetorical treatises of 46 BC, that marked the definitive breakthrough of Atticism into the rhetorical-stylistic discourse in Rome. Subsequently, both Romans and Greeks in the city took up this hot-button issue, appropriating the concept of Attic style and redefining it to suit their own purposes.

All in all, we should unequivocally discard the false notion that the ancient students of Attic style can be linked together or separated from each other on the basis of their subscription to any kind of fixed stylistic program. Rather, 'Attic' was a versatile term that authors could employ to assert the superiority of their own work versus the ineptitude of their ('Asian') opponents. Therefore, it would be best, to quote Tim Whitmarsh, 'to consider Atticism to have been an ever-negotiable concept, malleable according to the predilections and ambitions of the writer in question.'[25] Rather than making conjectures about the history of Atticism by establishing links between Atticists through the centuries, I will review the Atticizing views of Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius in their contemporary contexts, as part of the aesthetic, cultural and political programs of the respective authors.

5.3 Attic Style and the Athenian Cultural Repertoire

Before I move on to the various conceptions of Atticism in Rome, I will first establish the common set of parameters on the basis of which these views were articulated. One thing that Greek and Roman Atticists conspicuously have in common is their classicizing perspective: they invariably hark back to the Athenian prose models of the classical period, whilst rejecting the so-called 'Asian' authors of the subsequent Hellenistic era.[26] In addition, the

---

Φρυφῶν) and *Demonstration that Every Word of Elegant Language has been Spoken* (Ἀπόδειξις τοῦ εἰρῆσθαι πᾶσαν λέξιν καλλιρρημοσύνης). Cf. section 1.5 n. 101 above. The Atticists of the Second Sophistic pay even more attention to linguistic matters: see Swain (1996) 20. O'Sullivan (2015), however, rightly notes that so-called 'rhetorical' and 'linguistic' Atticism should not be strictly separated. On the claim of Nassal (1910) 9–10 that Caecilius is the common source for the rhetorical and critical theories of Cicero and Dionysus, thus representing a link between the views of the two authors, see section 1.2 n. 12 above.

[24] See the discussion of the Hellenistic antecedents of Atticism in Radermacher (1899a). In addition, we already saw that Agatharchides (second century BC) admired Attic oratory: see section 2.4.1 above. Note that Cic. *Brut.* 286 and *Orat.* 226 presents Hegesias (fl. ca. 300 BC) as an imitator of Lysias: cf. section 2.2 n. 28.

[25] Whitmarsh (1998) articulates this view in response to Hidber (1996) 37–44: cf. n. 9 and 20 above.

[26] On classicism and its inherent tripartite division of history, see section 1.6, esp. n. 114 above.

extant descriptions of Attic style, despite the overwhelming diversity between them, draw on a shared repertoire of attributes and virtues: they invoke the notions that are traditionally associated with the culture and politics of classical Athens. In this section, I will cursorily examine these notions, on which the discourse on Attic style in Rome is built.

As we have seen, it is a much-cited adage in ancient stylistic theory that an author's style reveals a lot about his character: style, indeed, is the man himself.[27] It naturally follows that Attic style should reproduce the national character of classical Athens.[28] In his speech in defense of Flaccus, Cicero offers us a glimpse of the prevailing reputation of the ancient polis in Rome: 'There are present men from Athens, where reportedly civilization, learning, religion, agriculture, justice and laws were born and spread thence into every land. Tradition relates that even the gods competed for the possession of their city, so beautiful was it. It is so ancient that it is thought to have produced its own citizens, and the same soil is said to be their mother, their nurse and their home. Its prestige is so great that the present enfeebled and shattered renown of Greece is sustained by the reputation of this city.'[29] This laudatory account of Athenian culture stands in a long and influential tradition,[30] that ultimately goes

[27] See section 5.1 n. 4 above.

[28] Cic. *Orat.* 25 explicitly connects a region's literary style to the moral character of its inhabitants: 'The eloquence of the orators has always been controlled by the good sense of the audience' (*semper oratorum eloquentiae moderatrix fuit auditorum prudentia*). Hence, Cicero explains the difference between Asian, Attic and Rhodian oratory by pointing out that Asian audiences are 'the least civilized and least refined' (*minime politae minimeque elegantes*), whereas the judgments of the Athenians is 'sound and discerning' (*prudens sincerumque*) and the national character of Rhodians holds a middle between Asia and Athens. On Cicero's reference to Rhodes as part of his apology for his rhetorical education, see section 1.6 above.

[29] Cic. *Flac.* 62: *Adsunt Athenienses, unde humanitas, doctrina, religio, fruges, iura, leges ortae atque in omnis terras distributae putantur; de quorum urbis possessione propter pulchritudinem etiam inter deos certamen fuisse proditum est; quae vetustate ea est ut ipsa ex sese suos civis genuisse ducatur, et eorum eadem terra parens, altrix, patria dicatur, auctoritate autem tanta est ut iam fractum prope ac debilitatum Graeciae nomen huius urbis laude nitatur.* Cic. *Flac.* 65 also discusses the inhabitants of Caria, Phrygia and Mysia, addressing them not as Greek, but as Asian peoples. The three regions mentioned by Cicero often feature together in discussions of Asianism: see section 1.2 n. 36–37 above.

[30] Cf. Lucr. 6.1–6: 'It was Athens of illustrious name that first in former days spread abroad the corn-bearing crops amongst suffering mankind; Athens bestowed on them a new life and established laws; Athens first gave the sweet consolations of life, when she brought forth a man, endowed with such wisdom, who in past days poured forth all revelations from truth-telling lips' (*primae frugiparos fetus mortalibus aegris / dididerunt quondam praeclaro nomine Athenae / et recreaverunt vitam legesque rogarunt, / et primae dederunt solacia dulcia vitae, / cum genuere virum tali cum corde repertum, / omnia veridico qui quondam ex ore profudit*). The 'man' (*vir*), introduced in the penultimate verse quoted above, is Epicurus.

back to democratic Athens itself: Cicero's words above resonate with the image of Athens that the Attic authors themselves had advertised.[31] It is this tradition that the critics and rhetoricians in Rome exploit in their discussions of Attic style.

Athens / Attic style	Persia / Asian style
purity, integrity	impurity, corruption
toughness, vigor	softness, weakness
wisdom, sanity	ignorance, insanity
freedom, democracy	slavery, monarchy
moderation, restraint	excess, extravagance
masculinity	effeminacy

Table 9: typical attributes associated with Atticism and Asianism

Thus, our Atticists in fact anchor their diverse conceptions of Attic style in the patriotic rhetoric of Thucydides, Plato, Isocrates, Demosthenes and the other authors from the Attic canon that they admire. By appealing to the old Athenian stereotypes, authors can convincingly present their own stylistic theories as truly Attic. What, then, are the essential Athenian values that they take away from the age-old discourse? The table above presents several virtues and corresponding vices that, in Classical Attic literature, are associated with Athenian and Asian culture respectively: as we will see, these same notions are invoked in discussions about Attic and Asian style in the first century BC.[32] The list is not exhaustive, but merely aims to give an overview of the most salient recurring concepts, which the Greek and Roman Atticists in Rome could exploit to articulate their various interpretations of Attic style. The style of Asia, conversely, is typically presented as a foil to Atticism: the Asian vices are diametrically opposed to the Attic virtues. The biased description of Asian style goes back to the bashing of Persian culture in such Classical works as Aeschylus' *Persians*,

[31] Isoc. *Paneg.* 28–39, for instance, claims that the Athenians invented religious rites, agriculture, laws and justice. Cf. ibid. 25 with Cic. *Flac.* 62 (esp. *parens, altrix, patria*): 'For we alone of all the Greeks have the right to call our city at once nurse and fatherland and mother' (μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν αὐτὴν τροφὸν καὶ πατρίδα καὶ μητέρα καλέσαι προσήκει). For Isocrates' influence on Cicero, see Hubbell (1913) 16–40.

[32] The ancient sources for the attributes in the list are discussed in the notes accompanying the text below. Forsdyke (2001) shows that the depictions of Greece and Persia from the fifth century BC are built on articulations of Athenian democratic ideology.

Herodotus' *Histories* and Isocrates' *Panegyricus*. The denotations and connotations of Asia that these authors present accord well with the discourse on Asianism in Rome, and indeed with the cliché-ridden representation of the East throughout the history of Western Europe, which Edward Said has famously dubbed 'Orientalism'.[33]

The first item listed in the table above is concerned with autochthony: the Athenians often stress the purity of their race, claiming that they are indigenous to the soil of Attica. Isocrates, for example, boasts: 'We did not become dwellers of this land by driving others out of it, nor by finding it uninhabited, nor as a mixed horde composed of many races, but we are of a lineage so noble and so pure that throughout our history we have continued in possession of the very land which gave us birth.'[34] Atticists in Rome apply these notions of purity and autochthony to style: in his famous series of oratorical allegories, Dionysius, for one, describes the Attic muse as 'old and indigenous' (ἀρχαία καὶ αὐτόχθων), while the Asian harlot is referred to as an 'upstart who arrived yesterday or the day before' (ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῴην ἀφικομένη).[35] Likewise, Cicero claims that Attic eloquence remained 'uncorrupted' (*incorrupta*), until it was exported abroad, especially to Asia, where it was inevitably stained by foreign ways.[36] The Atticists, then, advocate a return to the unadulterated language of Athens by stripping away barbarisms, solecisms and other alien elements.[37] It is important,

[33] Said (1978), esp. 10–11: 'Orientalism can accommodate Aeschylus, say, and Victor Hugo, Dante and Karl Marx.' Much has been written on the stereotypical ways in which the Greeks depicted the 'barbarian' or the 'other' as means to articulate their own identities: see esp. Hartog (1980) on the representation of others in Herodotus, Hall (1989) on the 'invention of the barbarian' in Greek tragedy, and Cartledge (1993), who offers a description of Greek identity through a series of antitheses, including 'Greek v. barbarian'. More recently, Gruen (2011), esp. 351–358, has problematized the emphasis on otherness that has dominated the recent scholarly debate, showing that the Greeks 'postulated links with, adaptation to, and even incorporation of the alien'.

[34] Isoc. *Paneg.* 24: Ταύτην γὰρ οἰκοῦμεν οὐχ ἑτέρους ἐκβαλόντες οὐδ' ἐρήμην καταλαβόντες οὐδ' ἐκ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν μιγάδες συλλεγέντες, ἀλλ' οὕτω καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόναμεν, ὥστ' ἐξ ἧσπερ ἔφυμεν, ταύτην ἔχοντες ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον διατελοῦμεν. Cf. also e.g. Thuc. 1.2.5, Eur. *Ion* 589, Ar. *Vesp.* 1076, Isoc. *Pac.* 49, *Panath.* 124–125.

[35] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.6–7. This passage is quoted and discussed in section 5.4 below as one of three metaphors representing the fluidity of Atticism in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome.

[36] For the uncorrupted nature of Attic style, see e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 51, a passage quoted and discussed in section 1.6 above. Cf. also Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.19, who reproduces the view of the grammarian Santra (a contemporary of Cicero) that Attic style was corrupted through contact with foreign speech: cf. section 1.6 n. 129 above.

[37] Through its emphasis on purity, Atticism is linked to Hellenism (ἑλληνισμός) and Latinity (*Latinitas*): see Porter (2006) 34–39. See also Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 2.1: Lysias is considered 'pure' (καθαρός) and therefore the 'perfect model of the Attic dialect' (Ἀττικῆς γλώττης ἄριστος κανών). Cf. Cic. *Opt. gen.* 7 on the 'uncorrupted

however, not to overdo it: according to Cicero, Calvus not only cleansed his speech from Asian errors, but also from its essential vigor.[38]

Next, there seems to be a direct link between Attic style and the geography and ecology of Attica. The Athenians themselves stressed the ill-favored conditions of their land: the summers are dry and hot, and the soil is generally described as 'thin' (λεπτός).[39] According to Plato, the landscape resembles the 'skeleton of a sick man, all the fat and soft earth having wasted away, and only the bare framework of the land remaining.'[40] This ecological discourse may be connected to Calvus' interpretation of Atticism: his speech is described by his opponents as 'dry' (*aridus, siccus*) and 'thin' (*exilis, tenuis*), revealing its bare 'bones' (*ossa*).[41] Thus, Calvus' rugged oratory accurately reflects the landscape of Attica. Alternatively, Atticism could also be associated with the hard-bodied work of the farmers who have to cultivate the land: Cicero, accordingly, teaches us that Attic style should not merely attain 'good health' (*valetudo*), but also 'strength, muscles, blood and even, as it were, an attractive tan' (*vires, lacerti, sanguis, quaedam etiam suavitas coloris*).[42] The situation in Asia is wholly different: everything grows bigger, nature is tamer and richer, and

---

health' (*incorrupta sanitas*) of Attic style. Note also that the terms 'solecism' (σολοικισμός), after the town of Soli in Asia Minor, and 'barbarism' (βαρβαρισμός) are readily associated with Asianism.

[38] See e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 283: 'From excessive self-examination and fear of admitting error he lost true vitality' (*nimium inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque ne vitiosum colligerat, etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat*). For the lack of vigor in the oratory of Calvus and his movement, see Cicero's critique in section 3.4 above and section 5.6.1 below.

[39] See Thuc. 1.2.5, Pl. *Criti.* 111b–c, Men. *Dys.* 3, Str. *Geogr.* 9.1.8, Plut. *Sol.* 22, Lucian. *Tim.* 31. Redressing the Athenian descriptions of their own soil, Garnsey (1988) 95–96 shows that the climate in Attica is well-suited to the cultivation of barley and olives: cf. Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 8.8.2. Connors (1997) 69–72 shows that 'natural connections between landscape and language' underly the stylistic discourse in Rome: 'The perceived differences between Attic and Asian rhetorical styles correspond exactly to perceived differences between the landscapes of Attica and Asia and the resulting physiognomic and psychological contrasts attributed to their inhabitants.'

[40] Pl. *Criti.* 111b: Οἷον νοσήσαντος σώματος ὀστᾶ, περιερρυηκυίας τῆς γῆς ὅση πίειρα καὶ μαλακή, τοῦ λεπτοῦ σώματος τῆς χώρας μόνου λειφθέντος.

[41] For the meagerness and aridity of Calvus' style, see esp. Cic. *Brut.* 68, 284–5, Tac. *Dial.* 21 and section 5.6.1.

[42] Cic. *Opt. gen.* 8. In addition, Cic. *Brut.* 25 extols the 'soundness' (*salubritas*) and 'health' (*sanitas*) of Attic style. Note that Calvus and his followers also claimed that their meager style was 'healthy' (*sanus*) and 'wholesome' (*integer*): see Cic. *Brut.* 284. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 32.1, who compares Dem. *De cor.* to 'bodies developed by hard work in the sunlight' (ἐν ἡλίῳ πόνοις τεθραμμένα σώματα), while Pl. *Menex.* is said to resemble bodies 'that pursue a life of ease in the shade' (σκιὰς καὶ ῥᾳστώνας διώκοντα). The Athenians were particularly proud of their agricultural feats: see, e.g., Pl. *Menex.* 237e–238a, Isoc. *Paneg.* 28 and Cic. *Flac.* 62.

the conditions are mild and unvarying.[43] Consequently, Asian style is naturally exuberant and characterized by the softness and idleness of those who live under the mellow sun of Asia Minor.[44]

According to Cicero, a region's weather conditions may also influence the intelligence of its population: hence, he asserts that the 'thin climate' (*tenue caelum*) of Attica rendered the Athenians 'more intelligent' (*acutiores*) than their neighbors.[45] Hence, virtues such as wisdom, sanity and cleverness are generally associated with both Athens and Attic style. The city was, of course, famous for its philosophers and sophists: the Athenians advertised their home as the 'school of Greece' (Ἑλλάδος παίδευσις) and the 'sanctuary of wisdom' (πρυτάνειον τῆς σοφίας).[46] Likewise, Calvus and his followers considered themselves, as cultivators of Attic style, 'wise men' (*prudentes*).[47] In *On the Ancient Orators*, moreover, Dionysius describes Attic oratory as 'philosophic' (φιλόσοφος), while he presents its Asian counterpart, conversely, as 'insane' (ἄφρων), 'ignorant' (ἀμαθής), 'brainless' (ἀνόητος) and 'not partaking in either philosophy or any other aspect of liberal education' (οὔτε φιλοσοφίας οὔτε ἄλλου παιδεύματος οὐδενὸς μετειληφυῖα ἐλευθερίου).[48] Cicero, likewise, compares the

[43] Cf. Connors (1997) 70, who quotes Hippoc. *Aer.* 12, 16: 'Everything grows much bigger and finer in Asia and the one region (i.e., Asia) is less wild than the other (i.e., Europe), while the character of the inhabitants is milder and less passionate' (πολὺ καλλίονα καὶ μέζονα πάντα ἐν Ἀσίῃ, ἥ τε χώρη τῆς χώρης ἡμερωτέρη καὶ τὰ ἤθεα τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠπιώτερα καὶ εὐοργητότερα).

[44] For the influence of the Asian climate on the character of the Persians, see e.g. Isoc. *Paneg.* 132. Hippoc. *Aer.* 16 notes: 'With regard to the lack of spirit and of courage among the inhabitants, the chief reason why Asiatics are less warlike and more gentle in character than Europeans is the uniformity of the seasons, which show no violent changes either toward heat or toward cold, but are equable' (περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀθυμίης τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῆς ἀνανδρείης, ὅτι ἀπολεμώτεροί εἰσι τῶν Εὐρωπαίων οἱ Ἀσιηνοὶ καὶ ἡμερώτεροι τὰ ἤθεα αἱ ὧραι αἴτιαι μάλιστα, οὐ μεγάλας τὰς μεταβολὰς ποιεύμεναι οὔτε ἐπὶ τὸ θερμὸν οὔτε ἐπὶ τὸ ψυχρόν, ἀλλὰ παραπλησίω). For the association between Asia and wealth, and between Athens and poverty, see e.g. Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.4 and Cic. *Opt. gen.* 9 as well as Aesch. *Pers.* 827–831, Hdt. 7.83.2, Pl. *Leg.* 694e, 695c–696a, Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.7, 8.8.9–12, 8.8.15–19, 8.8.26. On Asian softness and femininity, see the remainder of the present section and section 5.6 below.

[45] Cic. *Fat.* 7 gives us another example of this kind of geographical determination: he mentions that the climate at Thebes is 'dense' (*crassum*), which has made the Thebans 'stout and sturdy' (*pingues et valentes*). For 'thin' and 'fat' as descriptions of Attic and Asian style respectively, see section 3.2 above. Cf. also section 3.2 n. 21 and tables 1 and 2 above. The adjective 'thin' (*tenuis*) refers to the simple style in, e.g., Cic. *Orat.* 20, 29, 53.

[46] See, e.g., Thuc. 2.41.1, Pl. *Prot.* 337d–e, Isoc. *Paneg.* 48–50, *Antid.* 296.

[47] See, e.g., Cic. *Orat.* 236, with section 3.6 above.

[48] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.3–7. Cf. Hdt. 8.86 on the intelligence of the Athenians and the foolishness of the Persians. Aesch. *Pers.* 374–402 also contrasts the good sense of the Greek forces to the thoughtless disorder of

Attic and Asian styles on the basis of the 'good sense' (*prudentia*) of the citizens of Athens and the Asian towns: he attributes the success of Attic oratory to the 'sound and discerning judgment' (*prudens sincerumque iudicium*) of the Athenians, while the regions of Asia, which are 'the least sophisticated and refined' (*minime politae minimeque elegantes*), have yielded an inferior type of oratory.[49]

In addition, Atticism and Asianism appeal to two diametrically opposed political systems and social models. Athens, for one, was regarded as the paradigm of freedom, democracy and the rule of law, stimulating its citizens to be self-restrained (σώφρονες).[50] According to Cicero, it is only in a 'well-established civic order' (*bene constituta civitas*) like Periclean Athens that eloquence can flourish.[51] Moderation and restraint, likewise, are archetypal Atticist virtues: Calvus and his movement, for example, insist that Attic style be 'bound down by laws' (*devinctum legibus*) and not embellished 'beyond measure' (*supra modum*).[52] Asia, conversely, stands for monarchy, slavery and disorder: the Persians, who once ruled the area, are generally referred to as a 'mob without discipline' (ὄχλος ἄτακτος), whose 'whole existence consists of insolence toward some, and servility toward others' and who can be seen 'falling on their knees before a mortal man, addressing him as a divinity'.[53] Accordingly, slavery, excess and impiety are hallmarks of Asianism.[54] It is no coincidence that Dionysius portrays the Attic muse as a good Athenian citizen, 'free and moderate' (ἐλευθέρα καὶ σώφρων), whereas her Asian challenger behaves like a Persian king, as she

---

the Persian army. Isoc. *Paneg.* 150–156, lastly, enumerates the faults in the education (παίδευσις) of the Persians, while he praises Athens, as we have seen in n. 46 above, as the 'school' (παίδευσις) of Greece.

[49] Cic. *Orat.* 25: cf. n 28 above.

[50] The virtues of democracy and the rule of law are extolled in e.g. Thuc. 2.37, Dem. *Arist.* 206, *Timocr.* 210. The importance and various meanings of the term σωφροσύνη in Athenian society are discussed, by North (1966), who thinks that the word's original sense is intellectual prudence, and by Rademaker (2005), who lists eighteen uses of the word. Cf. also section 5.5.2 and 5.6 below on Dionysius' and Calvus' focus on restraint.

[51] Cic. *Brut.* 45. Cf. section 5.5.1, where we will see that Cicero contrasts the democratic constitution of Periclean Athens to the political situation of the Roman Republic in 46 BC.

[52] See Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.15 and Tac. *Dial.* 18.4. Cf. section 3.5 above and section 5.5.2 below for Dionysius' focus on the 'mean' (μεσότης), 'appropriateness' (πρέπον) and 'due measure' (μέτρον).

[53] Isoc. *Paneg.* 150–151: Ἅπαντα δὲ τὸν χρόνον διάγουσιν εἰς μὲν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντες τοῖς δὲ δουλεύοντες. Ibid.: Θνητὸν μὲν ἄνδρα προσκυνοῦντες καὶ δαίμονα προσαγορεύοντες. For the depictions of Greeks as free and well-disciplined, and of Persians as servile and weak-willed, see also Aesch. *Pers.* 230–245, Hdt. 5.78, 7.102–104, Pl. *Leg.* 693d–694a, 697c–e, and Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.5.

[54] See, e.g., Cic. *Orat.* 230: Asian authors are 'slaves to rhythm' (*numero servientes*). Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.17 associates Asianism explicitly with lack of restraint: it is 'bombastic' (*tumidior*) and 'redundant' (*redundans*).

'claims control of the whole estate, treating the other like dirt and keeping her in a state of terror'.[55]

The vocabulary of gender, which permeates the Atticist discourse, lastly, is also borrowed from the Classical testimonies about Athenian and Persian culture from the fifth and fourth centuries BC. The Athenian authors of that era enthusiastically asserted their 'courage', or 'virility' (ἀνδρεία), whereas they depicted Persian men as soft and effeminate, having no stamina for warfare at all.[56] Hence, it was an effective strategy for our Atticists to present themselves as true men, whilst challenging the manhood of their opponents.[57] Dionysius, for example, condemns Hegesias, the paradigm of Asianism, as effeminate: 'His words are likely to be uttered only by women or emasculated men, and not even by them in earnest, but in the spirit of mockery and ridicule.'[58] Similarly, Calvus and like-minded Atticists claim that Cicero is 'softer than a man' (*viro mollior*), taunting him for being 'emasculated' (*enervis, elumbis*).[59] Our Latin sources also use a variety of terms that refer less explicitly to femininity, such as 'soft' (*mollis*), 'loose' (*solutus*) and 'broken' (*fractus*): they present Attic style, by contrast, as 'whole' (*integer*).[60] Calvus more than any other Atticist stresses his own masculinity, accusing not only his oratorical opponents (esp. Cicero and Hortensius), but also his political foes (esp. Caesar and Pompey) of effeminate behavior (section 5.6).

As we will see in the remainder of this chapter, the Athenian virtues that I have discussed in the present section provide the Greek and Roman Atticists in Rome with a

[55] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.5: Πάσης ἀξιοῖ τῆς οὐσίας ἄρχειν, σκυβαλίζουσα καὶ δεδιττομένη τὴν ἑτέραν. The behavior of Dionysius' Asian harlot resembles the reign of terror of the Persian king, as described in Isoc. *Paneg.* 151: the orator portrays the Persians as 'keeping their souls in a state of abject fear, parading themselves at the door of the royal palace, prostrating themselves, and in every way schooling themselves to humility of spirit, addressing him as a divinity' (τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ταπεινὰς καὶ περιδεεῖς ἔχοντες, ἐξεταζόμενοι πρὸς αὐτοῖς τοῖς βασιλείοις καὶ προκαλινδούμενοι καὶ πάντα τρόπον μικρὸν φρονεῖν μελετῶντες, θνητὸν ἄνδρα προσκυνοῦντες καὶ δαίμονα προσαγορεύοντες).

[56] Roisman (2005) discusses the importance of manhood (as well as the flexibility of that notion) in the rhetoric of the Attic orators. On the effeminacy of the Persians, see already Aesch. *Pers.* 845–851 with Hall (1989) 117–120, and Hdt. 1.155.4.

[57] Richlin (1997) 106–107 discusses the role of gender in the extant Latin articulations of Atticism and Asianism. Connolly (2007b) explains how Roman orators and rhetoricians could draw on the language of gender so as to assert their own superiority over their opponents.

[58] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.28: Ὡς δὲ ὁ Μάγνης εἴρηκεν, ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἢ κατεαγότων ἀνθρώπων λέγοιτ' ἂν καὶ οὐδὲ τούτων μετὰ σπουδῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χλευασμῷ καὶ καταγέλωτι. Cf. section 2.4.3 above.

[59] See Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.12 and Tac. *Dial.* 18.4, quoted and discussed in section 5.6.1 below.

[60] See esp. section 5.6 below on Calvus' conception of Attic style as sober, pure and masculine.

common, though by no means uniform, conceptual framework: Calvus, Cicero, Dionysius and their colleagues each make a different selection from this shared repertoire of Athenian cultural products to suit their various purposes. Specifically, the authors tailor their conceptions of Athens and Attic style not only to their respective stylistic programs and aesthetic tastes, but also to their political views, demarcating their own position as citizens of Late-Republican or Augustan Rome respectively.

5.4 Atticism Personified: the Various Attic Muses of Rome

Metaphors can offer quick, clear and pleasant insights into difficult matters. This section briefly discusses three metaphors that illustrate the Atticist stylistic theories of Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius. In each of these cases, the sources compare eloquence to a fair and chaste lady: Calvus' lady is an 'unadorned woman' (*mulier inornata*), Cicero's is an 'orphaned virgin' (*virgo orba*) and Dionysius' is a 'freeborn and faithful wife' (ἐλευθέρα καὶ σώφρων γαμετή).[61] As we will see, these three Attic muses each stand for a different conception of Atticism (sections 5.5 and 5.6). Thus, the various feminine personifications illustrate at a glance the versatility of the Atticizing stylistic discourse in Rome.

For Calvus' muse, first, we should turn to his oratorical adversary: when Cicero discusses the wholesome qualities of the sober, unadorned orator, 'whom some deem to be the only true Attic orator',[62] he introduces the image of a naturally beautiful woman whose figure is perfectly in line with Calvus' views about oratorical style.[63]

> *Nam ut mulieres pulchriores esse dicuntur nonnullae inornatae quas id ipsum deceat, sic haec subtilis oratio etiam incompta delecta; fit enim quiddam in utroque, quo sit venustius sed non ut appareat. Tum removebitur omnis insignis ornatus quasi*

[61] The fact that most ancient allegorical personifications are feminine has baffled modern scholars: Paxson (1998) and Stafford (1998) show that this predilection for femininity should not simply be attributed to grammatical formalism, that is, the idea that the personfication of rhetoric (ῥητορικὴ τέχνη, *eloquentia*) is female because of the grammatical gender of the noun. Paxson argues that 'personification as a concept could be thought of as having the gendered qualities of the feminine', as figurative language was associated with 'ornamentation, seduction, excess'. According to Stafford, the form of the female body, as the object of men's desire, 'conveys the desirability of the abstract values' that it embodies. Leidl (2003) collects and discusses various female personifications of eloquence from the works of Cicero, Tacitus, Dionysius and Porphyry.

[62] Cic. *Orat.* 75: *Quem solum quidam vocant Atticum.* The word 'some' (*quidam*) refers to the self-styled Attic orators in Rome: see section 3.4 above for Cicero's attack on their conception of the plain style.

[63] Cic. *Orat.* 78–79.

> *margaritarum, ne calamistri quidem adhibebuntur. Fucati vero medicamenta candoris et ruboris omnia repellentur: elegantia modo et munditia remanebit.*
>
> Just as some women are said to be handsomer when unadorned—this very lack of ornament becomes them—so this plain style gives pleasure even when unembellished: there is something in both cases which lends greater charm, but without showing itself. Also, all noticeable ornaments, pearls as it were, will be excluded; not even curling-irons will be used; all cosmetics, artificial white and red, will be rejected, only elegance and neatness will remain.

Without referring to his opponent explicitly, Cicero personifies Calvus' Atticizing oratory: the image of the unembellished woman tallies neatly with Calvus' program of purity and restraint. Moreover, as we will see, the orator attacks Cicero for the degenerate effeminacy of his bombastic speeches: in the terms of the allegory, Calvus takes offense at the use of eye liner, rouge or lipstick to adorn one's oratory (section 5.6.1). The keywords 'elegance' (*elegantia*) and 'neatness' (*munditia*) that Cicero uses to describe the unadorned woman, are both closely connected to the plain type of style, which Calvus holds so dear.[64] In addition, Roman rhetoricians often associate the use of lavish ornamentation with luxurious make-up for women: according to Suetonius, for example, the emperor Augustus compared the frivolous style of his friend Maecenas to 'perfume-dripping locks' (*myrobrechis cincinni*).[65] Likewise, the younger Seneca argues that style should not be 'trimmed' (*circumtonsa*), 'dyed' (*fucata*) or 'groomed' (*manu facta*): the Stoic philosopher concludes that such extravagance does not constitute a 'masculine ornament' (*ornamentum virile*).[66] As we will see, this purist approach lies at the core of Calvus' Atticist program: in his view, ostentation and

[64] The virtue of 'elegance' (*elegantia*) is typically associated with the simple style. *Rhet. Her.* 4.17, for one, defines the term as 'that which makes each and every topic seem to be expressed with purity and perspicuity' (*quae facit ut locus unus quisque pure et aperte dici videatur*), dividing it into the subsections of 'Latinity' (*Latinitas*) and 'clarity' (*explanatio*), two typical attributes of simple rhetoric. López Moreda (2003) reviews the various uses of *elegantia* as a grammatical, rhetorical and critical term: she notes that the concept is closely connected to the notion of Latinity also bearing on the 'balance between the mean and the redundant, overloaded style' ('equilibro entre el estilo bajo y el redundante y sobrecargado'). As for the word 'neatness' (*munditia*), Quint. *Inst. orat.* 8.3.87 associates it with 'plain and unaffected simplicity' (ἀφέλεια *simplex et inadfectata*). Cf. Gell. *NA* 1.23.1 and 10.3.4 on the 'neatness of words' (*munditia verborum, mundities orationis*).

[65] Suet. *Aug.* 86.2. See Sen. *Ep.* 114.4–8 for the allegedly effeminate style of Maecenas. Cf. section 5.6.1 below.

[66] Sen. *Ep.* 115.2–3. Cf. section 4.5.1 n. 89 above and section 5.6.1 n. 140 below.

extravagance are corrupting, feminizing and Asianizing elements that have no place in Rome, neither in Attic oratory nor in the public life of the Forum.

Cicero, as we have seen, thinks that Calvus' approach to Attic style is misguided (section 3.4). In his *Brutus*, he presents an alternative portrait of Lady Eloquence, which illustrates his own conception of Atticism. The passage below concludes Cicero's eulogy of the great orator Hortensius, who had died a few years earlier, in 50 BC, just before the outbreak of the civil war between the armies of Caesar and Pompey.[67]

> *Nos autem, Brute, quoniam post Hortensi clarissimi oratoris mortem orbae eloquentiae quasi tutores relicti sumus, domi teneamus eam saeptam liberali custodia et hos ignotos atque impudentis procos repudiemus tueamurque ut adultam virginem caste et ab amatorum impetu, quantum possumus, prohibeamus.*
>
> As for us, Brutus, since with the death of Hortensius, the brilliant orator, we are left to be the guardians of orphaned eloquence, let us keep her within our own walls, protected by a private custody. Let us repel the pretensions of these ignoble and impudent suitors, and guard her purity, like that of a virgin grown to womanhood, and, so far as we can, shield her from the advances of rash admirers.

In 46 BC, two years into Caesar's dictatorship, Cicero represents 'oratory' (*eloquentia*) as an orphan: after the death of Hortensius, she now requires new 'legal guardians' (*tutores*) to keep her at home in 'private custody' (*liberalis custodia*), where she will be safe from malevolent 'suitors' (*proci, amatores*), who are out to corrupt her.[68] Like Calvus, then, Cicero wants to preserve the purity of eloquence by warding off perverting elements. Yet, unlike Calvus, Cicero is not so much worried about the baleful influence of effeminate Asianists; if anything, he shows himself quite lenient to the so-called Asianist oratory of his rival Hortensius

[67] Cic. *Brut.* 330. On Hortensius, in whose hands Cic. *De or.* 3.228-230 placed his hope for the future of eloquence, see esp. section 5.6.1 below.

[68] Leidl (2003) 35–38 notes that orphanage is a recurring metaphor in Cicero's works: see, e.g., *Red. sen.* 4, *Quir.* 11, *De or.* 3.1, *Fam.* 3.11.3, *Leg.* 3.3.9 and *Flac.* 54. Cicero usually uses the image to illustrate the deplorable state of the Republic, which he considers deprived of the necessary support in a time of turmoil, like a child bereft of its mother. According to Leidl, therefore, the passage quoted here is 'merging the literary and political judgment through the use of metaphor'. In one of the mss (L), 'armed men' (*armatorum*) is transmitted instead of 'lovers' (*amatorum*): the error may have been elicited by the fact that Cicero refers to the detrimental effects of civil war and Caesar's violent reign.

(sections 1.6 and 5.6.1). Rather, he fears the freedom-restricting policies of Caesar and his cronies: now that Lady Eloquence has become a 'grown-up woman' (*adulta virgo*), these 'ignoble and impudent suitors' (*ignoti et impudentes proci*) will launch an 'attack' (*impetus*) on her chastity.[69] According to Cicero, Caesar's dictatorship has effectively destroyed the freedom of the republic, making it extremely hard for the orators in Rome to practice their art (section 5.5.1). Therefore, Cicero's Attic muse is a damsel in distress, in need of a strong, passionate defender, that is, not a subdued Lysias or an emaciated Calvus, but rather a vigorous Demosthenes or a vehement Cicero.

What, finally, is the situation in Augustan Rome? According to Dionysius, the new autocratic regime did not bring about the death of eloquence, as Cicero had feared. On the contrary, Dionysius praises the rulers of Rome for restoring the Attic muse to her former glory (section 5.5.2). In the introductory essay to *On the Ancient Orators*, the Greek critic not only personifies Attic oratory, but also its Asian counterpart.[70]

> Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείναις ἡ μὲν ἐλευθέρα καὶ σώφρων γαμετὴ κάθηται μηδενὸς οὖσα τῶν αὐτῆς κυρία, ἑταίρα δέ τις ἄφρων ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τοῦ βίου παροῦσα πάσης ἀξιοῖ τῆς οὐσίας ἄρχειν, σκυβαλίζουσα καὶ δεδιττομένη τὴν ἑτέραν· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐν πάσῃ πόλει καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἧττον ἐν ταῖς εὐπαιδεύτοις (τουτὶ γὰρ ἁπάντων τῶν κακῶν ἔσχατον) ἡ μὲν Ἀττικὴ μοῦσα καὶ ἀρχαία καὶ αὐτόχθων ἄτιμον εἰλήφει σχῆμα, τῶν ἑαυτῆς ἐκπεσοῦσα ἀγαθῶν, ἡ δὲ ἔκ τινων βαράθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῴην ἀφικομένη, Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν, Ἑλληνίδας ἠξίου διοικεῖν πόλεις ἀπελάσασα τῶν κοινῶν τὴν ἑτέραν, ἡ ἀμαθὴς τὴν φιλόσοφον, ἡ μαινομένη τὴν σώφρονα.
>
> Just as in such households there sits the lawful wife, freeborn and faithful, but with no authority over her domain, while an insensate concubine, bent on destroying her livelihood, claims control of the whole estate, treating the other like dirt and keeping her in a state of terror; so in every city, and in the highly civilized ones as much as any

[69] Note that Cicero depicts his Lady Eloquence as 'grown-up' (*adulta*), implying that Roman oratory has for a long time been immature, until it finally reached maturity during the lifetime (and because of the efforts) of Hortensius and Cicero. Cf. Stroup (2003) on Cicero's personification of eloquence as a grown-up woman.

[70] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.5–7. The word ἐκείναις in the first line refers to 'households' (οἰκίαις) in *Ant. orat.* 1.5. The passage has been amply discussed as an allegorical defense of classicism: see esp. Hidber (1996) 25–30, Leidl (2003) and De Jonge (2014a); cf. n. 71–72 below. For Dionysius' praise of Rome, which will be discussed in section 5.5.2 below, see *Ant. orat.* 3.1–3.

> (which was the final indignity) the ancient and indigenous Attic Muse, deprived of her possessions, had lost her civic rank, while her antagonist, an upstart that had arrived only yesterday or the day before from some Asian death-hole, a Mysian or Phrygian or a Carian creature, claimed the right to rule over Greek cities, expelling her rival from public life. Thus, the ignorant woman drove out the philosophical one, the mad woman the sound one.

Both Cicero and Dionysius portray eloquence as a chaste woman who is in danger of being driven out of her home.[71] While Cicero, however, depicts her as an unmarried woman who needs protection from depraved (male) suitors, Dionysius presents her as a 'lawful wife' (γαμετή), who is outrageously expelled from her home by a (female) 'concubine' (ἑταίρα). Unlike Cicero, Dionysius feels no need to undertake rash action to save his Attic muse: in *On the Ancient Orators*, he emphatically celebrates the victory of Atticism and the concomitant virtues of Classical Athens.[72] the critic twice mentions that his Attic muse is σώφρων, a word that not only evokes the prudence of a loyal Athenian housewife, but also such notions as self-control and moderation, on which Dionysius builds his conception of the middle style (section 3.5).[73] The reasonable, wise and thoughtful Athenian lady is an apt personification for Dionysius' Atticism, which is infused with such notions as moderation, justice and piety. At

[71] Leidl (2003) 43–47 notices that both Cicero and Dionysius draw a contrast between 'in' and 'out'. Cicero's orphan, for one, needs to be kept 'at home' (*domi*), while her suitors need to be kept out. Likewise, Dionysius depicts the Attic muse as a house-wife, who is expelled from her house by an external force. See also De Jonge (2014a) 395–396.

[72] Cf. section 5.4 table 9 above: esp. the notions of purity, freedom, wisdom and moderation are relevant for Dionysius' discussion of Attic style. The allegory of *Ant. orat.* 1.5–7 draws on several themes that can be found in earlier sources. Hidber (1996) 25–30, for example, points out similarities between Dionysius' 'philosophical' (φιλόσοφος) Attic muse, and Isocrates' conception of rhetoric as a kind of 'philosophy' (φιλοσοφία): cf. Livingstone (2007). According to Wiater (2011) 92–100, Dionysius uses his allegory to assert the Greek superiority over other peoples, presenting the battle between Atticism and Asianism as an installment in the 'prolonged, Greek struggle against the Barbarians'; cf. section 1.2 n. 26 above. De Jonge (2014a) 395 connects the passage to Prodicus' story about 'Hercules at the crossroads', choosing between the female personification of 'virtue' (ἀρετή) over that of 'vice' (κακία): see Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21.

[73] The two translations of the Greek term σώφρων reflect the 'polysemy' of the word, as is described by Rademaker (2005). I have translated the first instance of σώφρων as 'faithful', since it is used specifically in the context of a woman's role as a 'lawful wife' (γαμετή): cf. Rademaker (2005) 252–253. I rendered the second instance of σώφρων, however, as 'sane', as it stands in opposition to the word 'mad' (μαινομένη): cf. Rademaker (2005) 260–261.

the same time, the image of the devoted spouse bears some resemblance to the self-presentation and the politics of Augustus: the emperor emphasized his own self-restraint and humility, while he introduced marital laws like the *Lex Iulia de Maritandis Ordinibus* (18 BC) and the *Lex Iulia de Adulteriis Coercendis* (17 BC), severely punishing celibacy and infidelity (section 5.5.2).

Calvus' naturally beautiful woman, Cicero's impressionable young lady, and Dionysius' loyal wife each stand for a different interpretation of Attic style. In the following sections, I will take a closer look at the Atticizing perspectives of the three aforementioned authors, focusing on the intricate connections between their stylistic views on the one hand and their respective approaches to contemporary Roman politics and society on the other hand. In what way does the Atticism in the works of Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius contribute to their cultural, moral and political self-presentation in Rome? It is to this question that I will now turn.

5.5 The Politics of Stylistic Theory: Cicero and Dionysius on Attic Style

The names of Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius can each be related to a specific stage in the transition from Republic to Empire. The record of Calvus' activity is limited to the mid-50s of the first century BC, when Caesar, Pompey and Crassus had solidified their allegiance to each other in the so-called First Triumvirate (60–53 BC). Cicero composed his *Brutus*, *Orator* and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, when Caesar had fulfilled two years of his ten-year appointment as dictator of Rome, which would end prematurely two years later (48–44 BC).[74] Dionysius arrived in the city 'right at the very time when Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war', viz., at the very beginning of Imperial Rome (ca. 30 BC).[75] In the next two sections, we will see that the views on Attic style that the three authors bring to the fore are closely connected to their opinions about contemporary politics. Once again, I will demonstrate the importance of the ancient adage that the selection and the arrangement of words should reflect the thought and the beliefs of their speaker—literary style as the emblem of a man's soul.[76]

The opinions on prose style of the oldest Atticist in our record, Calvus, not only tally with his political views but also with the information that we have about his poetry and about

[74] On Cicero's works of 46 BC and on the sources for Calvus' oratory, see section 1.4 above.

[75] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2: Ἅμα τῷ καταλυθῆναι τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος. Cf. also section 1.1 n. 2 above.

[76] Cf. section 5.1 n. 4 above.

his personal life: therefore, the pervasiveness of Atticism in Calvus' entire life merits a separate discussion (section 5.6). The present section will focus on the interplay between politics and stylistic theory in the rhetorical works of Cicero and in the critical treatises of Dionysius. In what way do these two men use their critical programs to demarcate their respective positions in the Roman political arena of their day?

5.5.1 Cicero's Sublime Oratory and the Battle for the Republic

In the last three years of his life (46–43 BC), when he had just turned sixty, Cicero suddenly increased his literary output: in this period, the former consul not only composed four rhetorical treatises, but he also added at least fourteen philosophical works to his impressive oeuvre.[77] This conspicuous turn from the oratorical practice of the Forum to theorization in Tusculum is an obvious reaction to the current political situation in Rome: without mentioning Caesar by name, the ex-consul repeatedly notes that the rule of law and the power of eloquence had dwindled under the threat of the dictator's weapons. In his *Brutus*, Cicero complains: 'It is a source of deep pain to me that the state feels no need of those weapons of counsel, of insight, and of authority, which I had learned to handle and to rely upon, weapons which are the peculiar and proper resource of a leader in the commonwealth and of a civilized and law-abiding state.'[78] Hence, Cicero saw no other viable course of action than to retreat largely from public life and turn to his literary studies, as he explains in his *Orator*: 'Who would be hard or unfeeling enough to refuse me the favor of devoting myself to letters (*litterae*), now that my forensic practice and my public career have fallen in ruins, rather than to idleness, which is impossible to me, or to grief, against which I put up a bold front?'[79]

---

[77] Cicero's rhetorical works of this period are *Brut., Opt. gen.*, *Orat.* and *Top.*; his philosophical treatises are *Parad., Hortensius, Acad. pr.* (or, *Lucullus*), *Acad. post.* (or, *Varro*), *Consolatio*, *Fin.*, *Tusc.*, *Nat. D.*, *Div.*, *Fat.*, *Sen., Amic.*, *De Gloria* and *Off.* From the same period, we have three speeches (*Marcell.*, *Lig.*, *Deiot.*) in addition to the fourteen orations against Antony (*Phil.*). Cf. the overview in Steel (2013) 374–376.

[78] Cic. *Brut.* 7: *Equidem angor animo non consili, non ingeni, non auctoritatis armis egere rem publicam, quae didiceram tractare quibusque me assuefeceram quaeque erant propria cum praestantis in re publica viri tum bene moratae et bene constitutae civitatis.* See also ibid. 21: 'Devastation of the courts and the forum' (*iudiciorum vastitas et fori*). Cf. ibid. 22: 'Eloquence has become mute' (*eloquentia obmutuit*). On Cicero's opaque criticism of Caesar, see Stroup (2003) 122 and Dugan (2012), who consider *Brut.* a good example of a 'figured' critique, which was common feature imperial literature. See Chiron (2001) 224–236 on 'figured speech' (λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος), cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 287–95, Long. *Subl.* 44.3–4, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.2.65–99.

[79] Cic. *Orat.* 148: *Quis tamen se tam durum agrestemque praeberet, qui hanc mihi non daret veniam, ut cum meae forenses artes et actiones publicae concidissent, non me aut desidiae, quod facere possum, aut maestitiae,*

Cicero's dedication to literature should not be thought to mark his complete withdrawal from politics. I do not agree with John Dugan's conclusion that the author of *Orator* is 'resigned to the loss of the republic', as he 'fills his days with social calls from both political allies and Caesarians alike, providing oratorical lessons, reading, writing, and engaging in the care of the body'. Likewise, I disagree with Dugan's view that Cicero's extensive discussion of prose rhythm 'marks a distinctive aesthetic turn in Cicero's treatment of oratory, away from oratory as a political instrument or as a product of historical development, and toward its status as an autonomous work of art'.[80] As a matter of fact, Cicero's rhetorical works of 46 BC are not the musings of a detached pensionado: his discussions of oratorical style are imbued with a genuine political engagement. After the assassination of Caesar, Cicero emphasizes the political nature of his recent theoretical treatises: 'It was in my books that I made my senatorial speeches and my forensic harangues, for I regarded philosophy as my substitute for a role in politics.'[81] Hence, as Cicero's

---

cui resisto, potius quam litteris dederem. On Cicero's apology for focusing on technical, seemingly unpractical, topics in *Orat.* 140–148, see section 4.2 n. 32–33 above. For Cicero's motivations to write philosophy, see Baraz (2012) esp. 173–182, who finds three motivations to write philosophy in the prefaces to Cicero's treatises—one political ('to serve the state and its citizens'), one personal ('to keep active even when he cannot directly take part in politics'), and one consolatory ('to find solace after the death of his daughter' in 45 BC). Baraz also notes that Cicero's retreat from public life in the 40s BC is in two important respects more dramatic than his exile in the 50s BC: first, the exile is a personal sorrow, whereas under Caesar's dictatorship he 'is living through an exclusion that is shared with others; he is part of a class, in fact more than just a part: as one of the eldest consulars to survive the civil war, he is seen by some as the leader of this group'; secondly, in the 50s, he 'saw the basic functioning of the state as still unchallenged', while under Caesar 'fundamental changes to the institutions of the state, embodied most dramatically in, but not limited to, the role of the *dictator*, resulted in a political landscape very different from the republican model'.

[80] Dugan (2005) 253–258. According to Dugan, *Orat.* anticipates a feature that would become prominent in the literary culture of the empire, that is, the domestic teaching of oratory through delivering one's own declamations and listening to those of one's pupils. For Dugan's influential readings of *Brut.* and *Orat.*, see also sections 1.2 and 1.4 above.

[81] Cic. *Div.* 2.7: *In libris enim sententiam dicebamus, contionabamur, philosophiam nobis pro rei publicae procuratione substitutam putabamus.* Cic. *Fam.* 9.18.1–2 spells out Cicero's political intentions in teaching such pupils as Dolabella and Aulus Hirtius, two supporters of Caesar: 'From your letter I gathered that my plan meets with your approval: like Dionysius the tyrant, who is said to have opened a school at Corinth after his expulsion from Syracuse, I have set up as a schoolmaster, as it were, now that the courts are abolished and my forensic kingdom lost' (*ex quibus intellexi probari tibi meum consilium, quod, ut Dionysius tyrannus, cum Syracusis pulsus esset, Corinthi dicitur ludum aperuisse, sic ego sublatis iudiciis, amisso regno forensi ludum quasi habere coeperim*).

influence in the courts and the assemblies waned, he turned to philosophy and rhetorical theory as alternative strategies to assert his political authority.

In what way do the stylistic discussions of *Brutus, Orator* and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* express Cicero's involvement in the political turmoil of the mid-40s BC? The flexible notion of Attic style provides Cicero with a twofold vehicle to combine stylistic theory and political engagement in his rhetorical treatises. First, Atticism allows him to stress the inextricable entanglement of good government and brilliant eloquence. According to Cicero, it is in the career of the orator-statesman Pericles—that is, after the Athenians had defeated Persia, and before they entered into a devastating struggle with Sparta—that oratory started to flourish for the first time in history: 'This age therefore first produced at Athens an orator all but perfect. For the ambition to speak well does not arise when men are engaged in establishing government, nor occupied with the conduct of war, nor shackled and chained by the authority of kings. Upon peace and tranquility eloquence attends as their ally; it is, one may say, the offspring of well-established civic order.'[82] As we saw before, Pericles is one of Cicero's principal models for grand oratory—the type of style that he commends as the most powerful in winning cases (sections 2.3.2 and 3.3). Needless to say, however, the situation in Rome is far removed from the Periclean ideal: the city is tormented by constitutional crises, torn apart by civil wars, and consequently bereft of oratorical brilliance.[83]

---

[82] Cic. *Brut.* 45: *Haec igitur aetas prima Athenis oratorem prope perfectum tulit. Nec enim in constituentibus rem publicam nec in bella gerentibus nec in impeditis ac regum dominatione devinctis nasci cupiditas dicendi solet. Pacis est comes otique socia et iam bene constitutae civitatis quasi alumna quaedam eloquentia.* Venini (1976) shows that Cicero highlights Pericles' outstanding statesmanship, ignoring his controversial ideas about radical democracy. Pericles' famous funerary oration is one of Cicero's (and Dionysius') favorite speeches: see sections 2.3.2 n. 59 and 2.4.3 n. 147 above. Cic. *Brut.* 46 connects the earliest beginnings of rhetorical theory in Syracuse to the expulsion of the tyrant Thrasybulus: 'Thus, Aristotle says that in Sicily, after the expulsion of tyrants, when after a long interval restitution of private property was sought by legal means, Corax and Tisias the Sicilians, with the acuteness and controversial habit of their people, first put together some theoretical precepts' (*itaque ait Aristoteles, cum sublatis in Sicilia tyrannis res privatae longo intervallo iudiciis repeterentur, tum primum, quod esset acuta illa gens et controversa natura, artem et praecepta Siculos Coracem et Tisiam conscripisse*). Cf. the next note on the ancient discourse about the political causes of corrupt eloquence.

[83] The idea that tyranny inevitably leads to 'corrupt eloquence' (*corrupta eloquentia*), in the same way as democracy fosters oratorical genius, was a common trope in discussions about rhetoric and style in the first century AD. Quintilian wrote a (now lost) treatise *On the Causes of Corrupt Eloquence* (*De causis corruptae eloquentiae*): cf. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 5.12.23, 6.Praef.3, with Brink (1982). Long. *Subl.* 44 cites an anonymous philosopher who expressed the view that literature can only prosper under the scepter of freedom and democracy, whereas the present imperial institutions impede the talents of aspiring authors. Additionally, Tac.

Secondly, Cicero presents the stylistic grandeur of Attica not only as a nostalgic counterpart to the oppression of eloquence in Rome, but also as an antidote to the current disastrous state of affairs.[84] According to Cicero's diagnosis, the city needs forceful, vehement orators in order to save the 'orphaned Lady Eloquence' (*eloquentia orba*) from her 'ignoble and impudent suitors' (*ignoti atque impudentes proci*), as we saw above (section 5.4). In addition to his other objections to the claims of Calvus and his fellow Atticists (section 3.4), this is an important reason for Cicero to reject the subdued style of his opponents: in his view, the current situation does not require a cautious and subtle orator, but rather one who relentlessly pulls out all the stops to win the day.[85] The fact that CIcero engages in a lengthy study of such stylistic intricacies as word arrangement, periodic structure and rhythmical cadences should not be taken as proof for his definitive withdrawal from forensic politics to his study room: on the contrary, it is only through these devices that, in his view, the republic can be saved. Therefore, the grand style in general and Demosthenes' conception of it in particular are presented as the best models for Rome. Cicero especially praises the force of Demosthenes' rhythm: 'Those famous thunderbolts of his would not have sped with such vibrant power, if they had not been whirled onward by rhythm.'[86] According to Cicero, it is through the exuberant rhythm and the bombastic periods of grand oratory that an orator can sway the minds of the masses on the Forum.[87]

Dial. 36–42 ascribes to the tragedian Curiatius Maternus the opinion that eloquence can only flourish, if it is free from any kind of rule: hence, he argues that it was during the anarchy of the civil wars of Republican Rome that an excellent form of oratory could arise, which would become obsolete during the quiet peace of the Empire. For a good discussion of ancient discussions of corrupt eloquence, see Caplan (1970). Cf. also Kennedy (1972) 446–464, 494–496, 515–526, who claims that the earliest treatment of oratorical decline appears in Long. *Subl.*; and Heldmann (1982) 300–308, who instead argues that Tac. *Dial.* was the first source on such decay. Yet, as we have seen in the present section, the topic already attracted the attention of Cicero: cf. Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.31 (70 BC) and *Pis.* 32 (55 BC). See, in contrast, Dionysius' optimism about imperial oratory in *Ant. orat.* (section 5.5.2).

[84] See also Cic. *Brut.* 53 for the view that in 509 BC the Tarquins could never have been expelled from Rome and the republican constitution could never have been installed, 'if it were not for the persuasion of oratory' (*nisi esset oratione persuasum*).

[85] Cf. Cic. *Opt. gen.* 10 defending the application of the grand style in *Mil.*: see section 2.3.2 n. 60–63 above. According to Cicero, one of the distinctive qualities of Demosthenes' oratory is its usefulness in life-and-death situations: see section 2.4 above.

[86] Cic. *Orat.* 234: *Cuius non tam vibrarent fulmina illa, nisi numeris contorta ferrentur.* On Pericles' and Demosthenes' thunderbolts, see section 2.3.2, esp. n. 59, and section 3.3 above.

[87] On Cicero's view that the grand style speaks to the uneducated masses, while the simple style only pleases a minority of intellectuals, see section 3.6 above. On Demosthenes' ability to mobilize Greece, see Cic. *Brut.* 289.

It has often been remarked that Cicero presents himself as a Roman Demosthenes.[88] Indeed, the Greek orator could be regarded as the last staunch defender of Greek freedom in the face of Philip's tyranny, just as Cicero sees himself as Rome's last bulwark against Caesar's violent dictatorship.[89] In the autobiographical section of his *Brutus*, Cicero forges various striking connections between his own career and Demosthenes' life, as is expounded by Caroline Bishop: 'Both trained long and hard, individually and with teachers, to conquer natural disadvantages, both came off as overly forceful before maturing into more varied styles, and both embodied a philosophical rhetoric reminiscent of Plato.'[90] It is probably no coincidence that Cicero singles out *On the Crown* as his favorite Demosthenic speech, as it sums up both the politician and the orator that Cicero aspires to be: it not only cleverly combines different stylistic registers, but it also dwells at length on the faults of tyranny, commending oratory as an effective strategy to expel tyrants such as Philip of Macedon.[91] Positioning himself as a worthy successor to Demosthenes' versatile anti-tyrannical oratory, Cicero divides his own speeches in the same four categories as those of his Greek model (i.e.,

[88] There is only one extant passage in which Cicero compares himself explicitly with Demosthenes: Cic. *Orat.* 105, cf. n. 92 below. Cicero's extreme adoration for the Greek orator is a feature of his later work, appearing for the first time in 46 BC: see e.g. *Brut.* 35, *Orat.* 6, cf. sections 1.4 (on the relative insignificance of Demosthenes in Cic. *De or.*), 2.2 (on Demosthenes' as an icon of Atticism) and 2.3.2 (on Cicero's praise of Demosthenes' style). Obviously, the Roman author modeled the fourteen speeches of his *Phil.* (44–43 BC) on Demosthenes: see Wooten (1977), Dugan (2005) 309–314, and Usher (2008), who argues that Dem. *De cor.* was the most important source of inspiration for Cic. *Phil.* Bishop (2016) discusses the parallels that Cicero draws between his own career and Demosthenes' life in his *Brut.* and *Orat.*: see n. 90 below. It was a common feature of ancient literary criticism to compare the life, the oratory and the style of Cicero and Demosthenes, and to appoint a winner: already in the first century BC, Caecilius of Caleacte composed such a 'comparison' (σύγκρισις), cf. T6 Woerther (= IX Ofenloch). In the first and second centuries AD, such comparisons can be found in Long. *Subl.* 12.4, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 10.1.106–109, Gell. *NA* 15.28.6–7, and Plut. *Dem.* 3. According to Dugan (2005) 315–332, the comparisons testify to 'Cicero's success in his challenge to Demosthenes' supremacy in the history of eloquence'. De Jonge (2018b) notes that the debate on the relative superiority of the two orators 'reenacts as it were the imaginary competition between Demosthenes and Cicero'.

[89] Evidence for Demosthenes' significance as a political icon in Rome comes mainly from imperial declamations: see Bishop (2016) 172–173. The declamations on Demosthenes are collected by Kohl (1915) 66–82; most of these texts focus on Demosthenes' opposition to Philip after the Athenian defeat at Chaeronea (338 BC). Note that both Prop. 3.21.27 and Petr. 5 refer to the orator's words as the 'weapons of Demosthenes' (*Demosthenis arma*), indicating that his verbal defense of Greek freedom was considered an important part of his legacy. On Cicero's view that he is one of the last free orators before the dark age of tyranny, see *Brut.* 22, 330.

[90] Bishop (2016) 183. Cicero gives an autobiographical description of his career in *Brut.* 313–324.

[91] Relevant passages are, e.g., *De cor.* 60–72, 95–101, 172, 199–208, 219–221, 235–236, 245–247, 277–278.

grand, simple, intermediate and varied), adding quasi-modestly: 'You are certainly aware that where I try many things, he brings many things to perfection, that where I have the desire to speak in whatever way a case demands, he has the ability.'[92]

Admittedly, the imitation of Demosthenes does not leave much room for optimism about the fate of the Roman republic: after all, even the most celebrated Attic orator was ultimately unable to prevent Philip's victory and Athens' downfall as a free city-state. Yet, in 46 BC, Cicero still believed that he could save the republic, not so much as an active orator, but rather as a teacher and as a canonical author. He emphatically exhorts his young friend Brutus to pick up the baton by studying his various orations alongside the speeches of Demosthenes: by presenting his own oeuvre as mandatory reading material for a new generation, Cicero aims to secure the survival of his passionate oratory after his imminent exit from the stage of Roman oratory and politics.[93] Through the benefit of hindsight, we now know that Brutus did not heed Cicero's instructions: he eventually chose real daggers over the proverbial weapons of Ciceronian eloquence. Cicero himself, however, never stopped believing in the power of his own exuberant oratory: after the assassination of Caesar, he briefly returned to the center stage of history as the author of fourteen vehement *Philippics* against the triumvir Marc Antony (44–43 BC).[94] Although they led to his vicious decapitation and to the exhibition of his severed head and hands on the Rostra, these speeches testify once again to Cicero's unwavering conviction that grand oratory, modeled after the elevated eloquence of Classical Athens, could save Rome from tyranny.

---

[92] Cic. *Orat.* 105: *Vides profecto illum multa perficere, nos multa conari, illum posse, nos velle quocumque modo causa postulet dicere.* In his categorizations of his own speeches and those by Demosthenes, Cicero seems to make his own personal canon correspond almost point by point to his Greek predecessor's: in *Orat.* 102 and 111, he presents his *Caec.* as the equivalent of Dem. *Lept.* in the simple style, he mentions his own *Rab. Post.* as the counterpart of Dem. *Phil.* in the grand style, and he aligns his *Cluent.* and *Corn.* to Dem. *De cor.* and *Fals. leg.* among the varied speeches. Cicero gives his own *Leg. Man.* as an example of a speech composed in the intermediate style; he does not offer us examples of such speeches from the Demosthenic corpus.

[93] Dugan (2005) 251–332 and Bishop (2016) 185–190 argue that Cicero uses the figure of Demosthenes to secure his own oratorical legacy: according to Bishop, 'Cicero the literary critic has given the Roman reading public a guide to reading and interpreting Cicero the orator'. I will only add that Cicero is not just concerned about his place in the literary canon, but that he also still trying to influence Roman politics by advertizing his passionate rhetoric to a new audience, including (not in the last place) young Brutus. In *Brut.* 22, Cicero dramatically hands over his scepter to Brutus. Cic. *Orat.* 105 presents Brutus as an exemplary student of both Demosthenes and Cicero: 'You have him (i.e., Demosthenes) constantly in your hands, and yet also find time to read my speeches over and over' (*nec eum dimittis e manibus et tamen nostra etiam lectitas*).

[94] On Cic. *Phil.*, see the literature cited in section 2.2 n. 19 above.

5.5.2 Dionysius' Middle Style and the Rule of Augustus

Notwithstanding Cicero's confidence in the thunderlike force of grand oratory, the republican constitution of Rome inevitably crumbled under the weight of civil war. Some years later, during the early days of the imperial era, Dionysius articulates his views about prose style: as we already saw, he favors a mixed type of style that holds an appropriate mean between two opposite extremes (section 3.5). According to him, such a well-balanced mean not only constitutes the culmination of brilliant literature, but it also stands for 'excellence in life and in conduct' (ἀρετὴ τῶν βίων καὶ τῶν ἔργων).[95] In the present section, I will focus on the moral and political dimensions of Dionysius' Atticism: we will see that his conception of Attic style in general and the middle style in particular resonates (1) with his views about civic virtue in Classical Greece as well as early and contemporary Rome, and (2) with the political program of the emperor Augustus. Dionysius' approach to prose style, then, is not only inseparably connected to his ethics and politics, but it also resonates with the behavior of Rome's supreme ruler.

The close connections between Dionysius' stylistic views on the one hand and his ideas about proper civic behavior on the other hand are palpable in his entire extant oeuvre. We have already seen that the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* presents Attic oratory under the guise of an exemplary citizen—a faithful wife (σώφρων γαμετή), who judiciously takes care of her household (section 5.4). In his critical works, Dionysius discusses various passages that praise the σωφροσύνη of the Athenians (usually referring to their 'self-restraint'),[96] while other citations from his favorite Attic orators evoke moral principles like 'piety' (εὐσέβεια), 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη) and manly 'valor' (ἀνδρεία).[97] It seems that

[95] Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 24.2. Dionysius cites 'Aristotle and the other philosophers of his school' (Ἀριστοτέλης τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ὅσοι κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν αἵρεσιν φιλοσοφοῦσιν) as the authorities for the view that excellence (ἀρετή) is a mean in all aspects of human activity. See section 3.5 n. 110–118 for the Peripatetic background of Dionysius' stylistic theories.

[96] On the flexible meaning of σωφροσύνη and its cognates, see section 5.3 n. 50 and section 5.4 n. 73 above: in the case of Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.5, I translated σώφρων as 'faithful', whereas I chose 'sound' to render the same word in *Ant. orat.* 1.7. For the present section, which discusses σωφροσύνη as an attribute of virtuous men, I will assume the word to refer to temperance and self-restraint: cf. Rademaker (2007) 257–260. This interpretation can be readily connected to Dionysius' conception of the middle style as well-balanced and properly measured. Moreover, the Greek scholar often replaces σωφροσύνη in political contexts with the related term ἐγκράτεια ('self-control'): see e.g. *Ant. Rom.* 2.10.4, 2.28.2.

[97] On these four virtues in Dionysius' historiographical and critical works, see Goudriaan (1989) 207–210, who argues that 'the traces of political-ethical theory in Dionysius' work point in the same direction as the

Dionysius purposely selects passages that advertise these virtues; in *On Isocrates*, Dionysius even expatiates at length on the civic virtues that the eponymous orator evokes in his middle-style prose, where 'the best possible lessons in virtue can be found' (κράτιστα δὴ παιδεύματα πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἔστιν εὑρεῖν). According to the Greek critic, Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, for instance, instills in its audience a sense of 'civic excellence' (πολιτικὴ καλοκἀγαθία), reminding them that the old Greeks were not only 'formidable warriors' (τὰ πολέμια δεινοί), but also 'noble-hearted' (τὰ ἤθη γενναῖοι), 'covetous of honor' (φιλότιμοι) and 'self-controlled' (σώφρονες), always keeping an eye to 'moderation' (μετριότης); Dionysius moreover posits that the *Letter to Philip* spurs not just the Macedonian king but all rulers to 'excellence' (ἀρετή), that *On the Peace* is a cogent exhortation 'to justice and piety' (ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν), and that *Areopagiticus* forces any reader to become a 'more orderly citizen' (κοσμιώτερος).[98] These virtues, as we have seen, are typically associated with Classical Athens (section 5.3).

Dionysius' stylistic views closely correspond to his views about civic excellence: after all, his most beloved type of style is characterized by attributes such as 'balance' (συμμετρία), 'timing' (εὐκαιρία), 'due measure' (μέτρον) and 'appropriateness' (πρέπον), befitting the pious, thoughtful and restrained behavior of his ideal citizen, personified in the faithful

---

philosophical elements of his rhetorical and stylistic theory' ('de sporen van politiek-ethische theorie in Dionysius' werk wijzen in dezelfde richting als de wijsgerige elementen in zijn rhetorische en stijlkritische theorie'). See also Wiater (2011) 67: 'The result was a world view in which the Greeks represented a set of moral and political virtues, the most important of which were ἐλευθερία, δικαιοσύνη, εὐσέβεια, ἀνδρεία, and σωφροσύνη.' On the relationship between Greece and Rome in Dionysius' work, see not only section 1.5 above, but also the present section n. 108–109 below. In addition to the passage from *Isoc.* discussed in the next note below, Dionysius quotes various passages from Attic authors that explicitly refer to the four virtues mentioned above: for σωφροσύνη, see *Isoc.* 17.1, *Dem.* 3.3, 43.3, *Comp.* 23.19, 25.19; for εὐσέβεια, see *Dem.* 1.2, 21.2, *Thuc.* 33.2, *Pomp.* 6.6; for δικαιοσύνη, see *Isoc.* 17.1, *Dem.* 30.2, *Pomp.* 6.6; for ἀνδρεία, see. *Dem.* 26.8, 30.2, *Thuc.* 12.2, *Amm. II* 17.2. Cf. n. 100 below for the attestations of these terms in *Ant. Rom.* Concerning Dionysius' selection of sample passage in his critical works, see also section 2.2 on Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 18.26 (= Hegesias F5 Jacoby): he quotes the passage from Hegesias' work not only on stylistic grounds but also on the basis of its content, as it depicts the deplorable behavior of a Babylonian (or, 'Asian') king.

[98] Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 4.3, 5.1–3, 6.3, 7.1, 8.1. These statements all belong to Dionysius' summary of the four aforementioned Isocratean speeches in *Isoc.* 4–8. According to Wiater (2011) 71–77, the passage presents 'a list of what Dionysius regards as the key elements of Classical identity', giving *Isoc.* 'the character of a "handbook of Classical identity", which provides the readers with a standardized, easily accessible definition of what it means to be Classical. Thus, Dionysius' essay demonstrates that Classical rhetoric is not simply a certain rhetorical style among others, but is coupled with a well-defined set of political and moral values.' On Wiater's view that Dionysius aims to create a separation between Greek and Roman readers, see n. 109 below.

housewife who acts as his Attic muse.[99] Strikingly, the qualities of Dionysius' mixed style not only correspond to the moral and political values that he finds embodied in Classical Greek literature: in his *Roman Antiquities*, too, he praises the early Romans for engaging in similarly virtuous conduct. In the second book of his history, for example, Dionysius dwells on the constitution of king Romulus, underlining several virtues that will be familiar to the students of Dionysius' critical essays, viz., 'self-restraint' (σωφροσύνη), 'piety' (εὐσέβεια), 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη), 'valor' (ἀνδρεία) and various other qualities.[100] Moreover, Dionysius assigns an important place to oratory in the virtuous society of primeval Rome: 'By persuading and informing one another, by yielding in some things and gaining other things from their opponents, who yielded in turn, they settled their disputes in a manner befitting fellow citizens.'[101] To be brief, oratorical excellence and civic virtue go hand in hand in Dionysius' understanding of both Classical Greece and archaic Rome. Likewise, deterioration of oratory is closely connected to political and moral decline: in Dionysius' view, this equally holds good for post-Classical Greece and for post-regal Rome.[102]

---

[99] See esp. Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 34.5 with the discussion of Dionysius' mixed style in section 3.5 above.

[100] For Romulus' constitution, see Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.1–29. See, specifically, ibid. 2.18.2: Romulus 'recognized that good laws and the emulation of worthy pursuits render a state pious, temperate, devoted to justice, and brave in war' (ἔγνω διότι νόμοι σπουδαῖοι καὶ καλῶν ζῆλος ἐπιτηδευμάτων εὐσεβῆ καὶ σώφρονα καὶ τὰ δίκαια ἀσκοῦσαν καὶ τὰ πολέμια ἀγαθὴν ἐξεργάζονται πόλιν). Cf. the discussion in Goudriaan (1989) 360–381 and Wiater (2011) 172–185, who emphasize the Greekness of Romulus' constitution. Several scholars, such as Pohlenz (1924), Gabba (1960) and Ferrara (1970), have proposed that Dionysius' description of Romulus' constitution actually derives from a political pamphlet ('Tendenzschrift') composed in the time of Sulla (Gabba), Caesar (Pohlenz) or Augustus (Ferrara). Yet, we should note that Dionysius' description of the virtues in Romulus' laws neatly ties in with his admiration for Classical Attic prose style and culture: therefore, it seems more expedient to interpret the passage in the light of Dionysius' own overarching project. Cf. the objections to the pamphlet theory in Balsdon (1971). Delcourt (2005) offers a clear overview of Dionysius' passage on Romulus' constitution and the relevant secondary literature. The four virtues mentioned above are often referred to throughout *Ant. Rom.*: for σωφροσύνη, see 1.5.3, 2.74.1, 2.75.1, 6.59.1; for εὐσέβεια, see ibid. 1.4.2, 2.62.5, 3.17.2–3, 11.43.3; for δικαιοσύνη, see ibid. 4.9.9, 8.61.2–3, 9.53.6, 10.57.3; for ἀνδρεία, see ibid. 4.3.1, 5.25.4, 6.6.1, 9.17.4. Cf. n. 97 above for several attestations of the same virtues in Dionysius' criticial treatises.

[101] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.11.3: Ἀλλὰ πείθοντες καὶ διδάσκοντες ἀλλήλους καὶ τὰ μὲν εἴκοντες, τὰ δὲ παρ' εἰκόντων λαμβάνοντες, πολιτικὰς ἐποιοῦντο τὰς τῶν ἐγκλημάτων διαλύσεις.

[102] For Dionysius' idealization of the moral heydays under Romulus, see Fox (1996) 53–63 and (2019) 193–196; for the historian's views about the subsequent decline under later kings and especially during the early Republic, see Pelling (2019) 215–218. According to Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.11.3, the Romans continued to use oratory as a means to settle disputes until the tribuneship of C. Gracchus (123–122 BC), from which point onward they 'have been perpetually slaying and banishing one another from the city and refraining from no irreparable acts in order

The consistent emphasis on the same basic virtues throughout Dionysius' historiographical and critical works raises an important question: what message does the Greek author aim to get across about the politics of Augustus? It has proven impossible to reach a consensus on Dionysius' political allegiance on the basis of his historiographical work: the Greek scholar mentions the emperor only once by name (merely as a means to date his own arrival in Rome), and it is extremely tricky to compare passages from his *Roman Antiquities* (which do not seem to convey a clear-cut message about monarchical government) to the young emperor's political program (which seems to have been in flux in the early years of his principate).[103] Still, it is undeniable that the themes that the Greek scholar addresses, like *exempla* of virtuous behavior, regime change and the relationship between Greece and Rome, are highly topical in Augustan Rome: we can safely assume, therefore, that Dionysius taps into a commonly available discourse on politics and society, in the same way as his critical treatises are built on a shared discourse on stylistic theory.[104] For a more straightforward picture of Dionysius' approach to Augustan politics, however, we should set aside the ambiguous allusions of his historiographical work and instead turn to the preface of *On the Ancient Orators.*

---

to gain the upper hand' (οὐκέτι πέπαυνται σφάττοντες ἀλλήλους καὶ φυγάδας ἐλαύνοντες ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ οὐδενὸς τῶν ἀνηκέστων ἀπεχόμενοι παρὰ τὸ νικᾶν). Thus, Dionysius lets Rome's long era of grim revolutions and civil wars coincide with oratorical decline.

[103] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2 mentions Augustus' victory in the civil war: cf. section 1.1 n. 2 above. Pro-Augustan readings of *Ant. Rom.* focus on Dionysius' positive statement about the *gens Iulia* (1.70.4), and on the similarities between Romulus' constitution and Augustus' policy: see esp. Martin (1971), Luraghi (2003) 275, and Delcourt (2005) 297. Anti-Augustan interpretations have been proposed by Hill (1961) 90–91, Hurst (1982) and Gabba (1982a) 801, who argue that Dionysius' stress on the Greek origins of Rome contradicts the focus on the city's Italic origins in the Latin literature of the Augustan era. Pelling (2019) 219–220 is more reserved, noting that 'many of the "Augustan" resonances can be taken either way, with hints of reservation or criticism as well as of acclaim'; cf. Pelling's discussion of *Ant. Rom.* 10.50–60 on the decemvirate of 451–449 BC. According to Wiater (2011) 206–216, 'Dionysius' image of the early Romans is not at odds with Augustan ideology in particular, but with contemporary Roman conceptions of Roman identity and attempts of upper-class Romans to distinguish themselves from the Greeks'. In my view, however, Dionysius makes a connection (rather than a separation) between Greeks and Romans: see esp. n. 108–109 below. On the difficulties of testing Augustan-era texts against Augustus' imperial propaganda, see esp. D.F. Kennedy (1992).

[104] Cf. Delcourt (2005) 369: 'L'ombre du principat plane sur les *Antiquités Romaines*.' See also Pelling (2019) 219–220: 'There are so many places where we might catch a contemporary whiff. (…) We should think of Dionysius echoing those preoccupations of Augustan political discourse without preaching about them, introducing ideas that meshed with the political propaganda without crudely echoing it or taking sides.'

The introductory essay is known as a 'manifesto of classicism':[105] it tells the story of a renaissance, not only celebrating the revival of Attic oratory but also the rebirth of the concomitant political and moral values. Here, Dionysius is unequivocally positive about the Rome of his day: he expresses his gratitude to the 'age in which we live' (ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνος) and specifically to 'the conquest of the world by Rome' (ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη) for bringing about a revolutionary change for the better. I have quoted the relevant passages below.[106]

> Πολλὴν χάριν ἦν εἰδέναι τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνῳ δίκαιον, ὦ κράτιστε Ἀμμαῖε, καὶ ἄλλων μέν τινων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἕνεκα νῦν κάλλιον ἀσκουμένων ἢ πρότερον, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ τῆς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους ἐπιμελείας οὐ μικρὰν ἐπίδοσιν πεποιημένης ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττω. (...) Αἰτία δ' οἶμαι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοιαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ὅλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν καὶ ταύτης δὲ αὐτῆς οἱ δυναστεύοντες κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τὰ κοινὰ διοικοῦντες, εὐπαίδευτοι πάνυ καὶ γενναῖοι τὰς κρίσεις γενόμενοι, ὑφ' ὧν κοσμούμενον τό τε φρόνιμον τῆς πόλεως μέρος ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπιδέδωκεν καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον ἠνάγκασται νοῦν ἔχειν.
>
> We ought to acknowledge a great debt of gratitude to the age in which we live, my most accomplished Ammaeus, for an improvement in certain fields of serious study, and especially for the considerable revival in the practice of civil oratory. (…) I think that the cause and origin of this great revolution has been the conquest of the world by Rome, who has thus made every city focus its entire attention upon her. Her leaders are chosen on merit (κατ' ἀρετήν), and administer the state according to the highest principles (ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου). They are thoroughly cultured (εὐπαίδευτοι) and noble in their judgment (γενναῖοι τὰς κρίσεις), so that under their ordering influence (ὑφ' ὧν κοσμούμενον) the sensible section (τὸ φρόνιμον μέρος) of the population has increased its power and the foolish have been compelled to behave rationally (νοῦν ἔχειν).

[105] The designation is coined by Hidber (1996): 'das klassizistische Manifest'. Cf. section 1.5 n. 82 above. Hidber (esp. ibid. 75–81) argues that Dionysius was a pro-Augustan proponent of cultural integration between Greeks and Romans, with Rome as the world's educational capital. See also Spawforth (2012) 20–26 on the political dimensions of Dionysius' account of Atticism and Asianism.

[106] Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 1.1, 3.1. The passage is partly quoted and discussed in section 1.6 above.

Dionysius endows the present 'leaders' (δυναστεύοντες) of Rome with the very virtues that lie at the core of the Classical Attic prose that they revived. Both the ancient Athenians and the modern Romans, for instance, are described as 'noble' (γενναῖοι), and they are both preoccupied with 'excellence' (ἀρετή). Also, while the Attic muse is described as 'philosophical' (φιλόσοφος), the Roman leaders are praised as 'sensible' (φρόνιμοι); and while Isocrates is said to make his readers 'more orderly citizens' (κοσμιώτεροι), Rome's leaders are presented as 'having an ordering influence' (κοσμούμενον).[107] Hence, Dionysius' interpretation of the middle style with its emphasis on temperance and balance is not only well-equipped as a vehicle for the civic discourses of the Classical era, but it is also perfectly at home in Augustan Rome. All in all, Dionysius' coherent praise for Athenian culture, Attic prose, early Roman politics and contemporary Roman culture seems to forge a strong unity between Greeks and Romans: he presents both groups as having contributed to a shared golden age of outstanding prose style and civic excellence—the Greeks as original creators, the Romans as conquerors and reinventors.[108] I cannot, at any rate, accept the view, proposed by Nicolas Wiater, that Dionysius is engaged in a polemic with his Roman contemporaries, rubbing their noses in the superiority of Greek culture.[109]

---

[107] Cf. especially the quotations from Dion. Hal. *Isoc.* 4–8 in n. 98 above, and the passage on the Attic muse (*Ant. orat.* 1.5–7) quoted in section 5.4 above.

[108] For the notion of a renaissance shared by Greeks and Romans alike, cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 3.2: many fine oratorical, historiographical and philosophical works 'have proceeded as the products of well-directed zeal from the pens of both Greeks and Romans, and will probably continue to do so' (καὶ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησιν εὖ μάλα διεσπουδασμέναι προεληλύθασί τε καὶ προελεύσονται κατὰ τὸ εἰκός). We should not assume, as Usher (1974) 10 and Wisse (1995) 77 seem to do, that Dionysius refers specifically to Calvus and his Atticist movement as the driving force behind the revival of Attic oratory: after all, we have seen in section 5.2 above that authors with diverse stylistic preferences fashioned themselves 'Attic' without associating themselves with each other. In the absence of clear proof, Grube (1965) 212 divines that Dionysius refers to Cicero and Caesar, while Heldmann (1982) 125 argues that he is thinking of the Latin literature from the Ciceronian and Augustan periods. In addition to the city's cultural achievements, Dionysius also addresses Rome's 'violent imperialism', as Whitmarsh (1998) notes: 'The reason he gives for the revival of oratory's fortunes is 'Rome's *conquest* (κρατοῦσα) of everything, her *coercion* (ἀναγκάζουσα) of all cities to look at her, and the fact that her *despots* (δυναστεύοντες) manage public affairs virtuously and most excellently (ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου, which picks up the earlier use of the κράτος root).' The forceful language does not necessarily criticize Rome: in *Ant. Rom.* 1.3.5, Dionysius accepts Rome's violent dominion of the world as legitimate.

[109] Following such studies as Gabba (1982b), Wiater (2011) argues that the foremost concern of Dionysius' historiography and criticism is the assertion of Greek superiority over Rome: cf. section 1.2 n. 26 and the present section n. 103 above. Wiater ibid. 100 connects the reference to Rome's world dominion to Alexander's fight

Still, the question remains whom exactly Dionysius is praising, when he commends Rome's 'leaders' (δυναστεύοντες) for being chosen on merit and for governing the state according to the highest principles: does Dionysius have Augustus and his ministers in mind, or rather a larger group of influential aristocrats, such as the Tuberones and the Metilii, with whom he associated himself after his arrival in the city?[110] I consider it almost inconceivable that Dionysius would not include the emperor among Rome's praiseworthy leaders: indeed, the (self-styled) reputation of Augustus appeals to the very moral and stylistic ideals that Dionysius advertises. The emperor's policies and propaganda are focused on Augustus' role in restoring peace, justice, religion and morality; Dionysius' outrage at the Asian 'concubine' (ἑταίρα) expelling the Attic 'wife' (γαμετή) tallies with Augustus' austere laws on adultery and celibacy.[111] Furthermore, Suetonius emphasizes that the emperor was 'extremely temperate' (*continentissimus*) in his personal life, shunning excess: his house and furniture are 'modest' (*modicus*), while his diet was 'paltry' (*minimus*) and 'plain' (*vulgaris*).[112] In other

against the Persians: 'Dionysius thus re-interprets the crucial event in contemporary Roman history, Augustus' principate, as a turning point in the prolonged, Greek struggle against the Barbarian.' While Wiater rightly dwells on Dionysius' view that the Romans are indebted to Greek culture, we cannot but conclude that *Ant. orat.* contains nothing to proclaim Greece's superiority; if anything, he offers all the credits for the revival of Attic oratory to Rome, and he refers to both Greek and Roman authors, without imposing any intrinsic hierarchy (cf. the previous note). Cf. Spawforth (2012), who awards a large role to Rome in the revival of Classical Greek culture, aptly referring to the 're-hellenization' of Greece from the West.

[110] Most scholars think that the word δυναστεύοντες refers to Augustus or (as it is a plural) to Augustus and his ministers: see e.g. Wilamowitz (1900) 45, Bonner (1939) 10, Kennedy (1972) 352, De Jonge and Hunter (2019b). Goudriaan (1989) 574 thinks that Dionysius refers to 'the city of Rome as a whole, specifically the Roman elite' ('de stad Rome als geheel, de Romeinse elite in het bijzonder'); Hidber (1996) 119–120 suggests that Dionysius has the Roman aristocrates in mind who acted as patrons for Greek and Roman authors. For Dionysius' connections to the Tuberones and Metilii, see section 1.5 above.

[111] There is no shortage of modern studies on Augustus and his program of restoration. Zanker (1988) 101–166, for instance, reviews Augustus' 'program of cultural renewal' by studying Augustan visual arts and architecture. Cf. more recently, e.g., Eder (2005), who focuses on the balance that Augustus sought between raising his profile and renouncing personal power, and Richardson (2012), who similarly explores the emperor's 'restoration of the Republic' versus his 'establishment of the Empire'. On the connection between Dionysius' Atticism and Augustus' marital laws, see De Jonge (2014a) 397. Cf. Schulze (2019) 174–176, who argues that the depiction of women and families in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* resonates with Augustus' legislation, specifically his *Lex Iulia de Maritandis Ordinibus* (18 BC) and *Lex Iulia de Adulteriis Coercendis* (17 BC). According to Galinsky (1981), the laws underline Augustus' concern for the assertion of Rome's domination over other peoples.

[112] Suet. *Aug*. 61–78 discusses the emperor's 'private and domestic life' (*interior ac familiaris eius vita*). The four adjectives quoted here are taken specifically from *Aug*. 72.1, 73, 76.1 and 77 respectively.

cases, his conduct is described as holding a mean between two extremes: 'he was no less strict than gracious and merciful' toward his slaves and his clients; 'his togas were neither close nor full, his purple stripe neither narrow nor broad'; and he celebrated holidays 'lavishly as a rule, but sometimes only in a spirit of fun'.[113]

Suetonius also tells us that Augustus initially lived near the Forum in a small house which had belonged to the orator C. Licinius Macer Calvus, and that he later moved to the Palatine hill into the equally modest dwelling of the orator Q. Hortensius Hortalus.[114] It is hard not to read this move as a metaphor for the emperor's moderate, well-balanced character, and ditto literary taste. After all, as I will discuss in greater detail below (section 5.6.1), Calvus advocated an extremely sober oratorical style, which he advertised as quintessentially 'Attic', whereas Hortensius exhibited a more lavish rhetoric, which was commonly regarded as 'Asian'. Thus, Augustus could be associated both with a leading Atticist and a prominent Asianist from the recent past: the *princeps* himself naturally occupies a middle ground between these polar opposites. Similarly, Suetonius' description of the emperor's 'oratorical style' (*genus eloquendi*) is not a far cry from Dionysius' mixed stylistic register: Augustus' speech is described as 'elegant and moderate' (*elegans et temperatum*), holding a judicious mean between Asian-style 'wannabe innovators' (*cacozeli*) such as his friend Maecenas, and bland 'archaizers' (*antiquarii*) such as his stepson Tiberius.[115] Augustus is said to carefully

[113] Suet. *Aug.* 67.1: *Non minus severus quam facilis et clemens.* Ibid. 73: *Togis neque restrictis neque fusis, clavo nec lato nec angusto.* Ibid. 75: *Profusissime, nonnumquam tantum ioculariter.* The toga could be used as a metaphor for oratorical style: see Sen. *Ep.* 114.4 (with section 5.6.1 n. 139 below) on the wantonness of loose togas, and Tac. *Dial.* 26.1 (with section 4.5.1 n. 89 above) on the solemnity of rugged togas.

[114] Suet. *Aug.* 72.1. Wardle (2014) 453–454 identifies the orator Hortensius as the former occupant of the Palatine house; Suetonius carefully avoids associating Augustus with Hortensius' extravagant oratory by claiming its modesty (*aedes modicae*). De Jonge (2018a) 169–171 observes that Suetonius' description of Augustus' Palatine dwelling appeals to a taste for 'noble simplicity' that was widely shared in Augustan Rome: a similar preference is exemplified in Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 3.7–12 (on Eumaeus' shed in Hom. *Od.* 16.1–16) and Verg. *Aen.* 8.364–369 (on king Evander's modest hut on the Palatine).

[115] Suet. *Aug.* 86.1–3. The translations are mine. Giordano (2000) 36–45 notes that the term *temperatum* designates a balance between the extremes of Atticism and Asianism, connecting the term *elegans* to the stylistic virtues of correctness and clarity, exemplified in the prose of Julius Caesar. Cf. the division of *elegantia* in *Rhet. Her.* 4.17 into 'clarity' (*explanatio*) and 'correct Latin' (*Latinitas*); see also section 5.4 n. 64 above. Suetonius, however, seems to stress the emperor's obsession with clarity at the expense of correctness: it was Augustus' chief aim 'to express his thought as clearly as possible' (*sensum animi quam apertissime exprimere*), to which end he used prepositions with the names of cities, while he also repeated conjunctions. For a careful discussion of the emperor's *elegantia* on the basis of the extant fragments and testimonies, see Gutiérrez Gonzalez (2012).

avoid the 'meaningless phrases and artificial arrangement' (*sententiarum ineptiae atque concinnitas*) and the 'perfume-dripping locks' (*myrobrechis cincinni*) of the former group, whilst equally steering clear of the 'stink of far-fetched words' (*reconditorum verborum fetores*) of the latter group. He reserves his biggest scorn for Marc Antony, whom he considers 'insane' (*insanus*) for not being able to find a proper mean between the faulty opposites, hopping from one extreme to the other, resulting in a style that is unsuitable for serious subject matter.[116] The Roman emperor Augustus and the Greek immigrant Dionysius, then, share a fondness of moderation and propriety, both in speech and in action.

This section has focused on the connections between Dionysius' middle style on the one hand and his preoccupation with such civic virtues as self-restraint, piety, justice and valor on the other hand. We have seen that his favorite type of style is perfectly equipped to express the outstanding political and moral values of Classical Athens, which he also recognizes as the defining features of both Romulean and Augustan Rome. According to Dionysius, Greeks and Romans alike share in the current glorious renaissance of oratory, politics and morality. The correspondences between Dionysius' project and Augustus' self-presentation, lastly, show that the ethics and aesthetics of the middle met with great support in the highest echelons of Roman society: in a remarkable way, the Greek scholar epitomizes the zeitgeist of Augustan Rome, as the emperor himself liked to see it.

5.6 Calvus' Atticism: Challenging Rome's Rhetorical and Political Elites

Finally, we will now turn back the clock to the middle of the first century BC, when mighty Augustus was still a child named C. Octavius. In oratory, Cicero and Hortensius were the most celebrated speakers of the Forum; in politics, the alliance of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus held sway over the city. It is in this period that C. Licinius Macer Calvus makes a

---

De Jonge (2019) 264 connects Suetonius' description of Augustus' style to Dion. Hal. *Ant. orat.* 3.1: 'When Dionysius expresses his gratitude to Rome by observing that its leaders are εὐπαίδευτοι (well educated) and γενναῖοι τὰς κρίσεις (excellent in their judgment), it is therefore tempting to conclude that Dionysius is (also) thinking of the eloquence of Augustus himself.' Augustus' style (intermediate between archaizing and baroque) roughly matches Dionysius' middle style (intermediate between simple and elevated, or between rough and smooth). Cf. sections 3.5 and 4.5.3 on archaisms and modernisms in Dionysius' threefold divisions of style.

[116] Augustus' criticism of Antony's 'perverse and inconsistent taste' (*malum et inconstans iudicium*) echoes the fierce scorn that Hegesias receives for not being able to create a style that is suitable for serious discourse: in accordance with Agatharchides', Cicero's and Dionysius' criticism of Hegesias, Antony is censured by Augustus for composing 'pieces of writing rather to be admired than to be understood' (*ea quae mirentur potius homines quam intellegant*). Cf. section 2.4, esp. 2.4.1 n. 114 above.

'meteor-like' appearance on the firmament of Latin literature.[117] Like a meteor, he only lit up briefly: the record of his activities is limited to the period between 56 and 54 BC.[118] Very few fragments of his oratory and poetry are extant.[119] He died not later than 47 BC, still in his twenties or early thirties (section 1.4). Yet, much like a meteor, Calvus left an awesome impression: as a neoteric poet, he was considered on a par with his famous friend Catullus; as an orator, he was one of the most formidable challengers of Cicero. Calvus is the only author whose name can be linked indubitably to the so-called Atticist movement that was active in the late 50s and early 40s BC (section 5.2).

In this section, I will focus on the interplay of politics, ethics and stylistic theory in the extant record of Calvus, for which I will turn not only to the sources for his activities as an orator and a politician, but also to the few surviving fragments of his poetry, and to the testimonies on his private life. Despite the scanty evidence, we will clearly see that Calvus' views on Attic style are primarily designed for polemical purposes: focusing on the typically Attic values of purity and masculinity (section 5.3), he challenges at once the rhetorical and political elites of his day. First, we will see that Calvus' conception of Atticism is tailored to attack the exuberant eloquence of Rome's most successful orators Cicero and Hortensius (section 5.6.1). Subsequently, we will see that his doctrines do not only challenge Rome's predominant oratorical style, but also the behavior of the city's most powerful politicians, specifically Caesar and Pompey (section 5.6.2). Thus, Calvus presents Athens as an antidote against the decadence and degeneracy that, in his view, dominated the courts and the assemblies on the Forum. In addition, we will see that Calvus upheld his Attic ideal both in public and in his private life—possibly even during his sleep.

5.6.1 Calvus against the Rhetorical Status Quo

Often regarded—by ancient and modern scholars alike—as the prototype of Roman Atticism (section 5.2), the significance of Calvus as a key player in the history of Roman rhetoric is

[117] Münzer (1926) 428: 'C. Licinius Macer Calvus ist eine Erscheinung, die am Himmel der römischen Literatur meteorgleich aufleuchtete und einen starken allgemeinen Eindruck, aber im einzelnen nur wenige deutliche Spuren hinterliess.'

[118] The brief window onto Calvus' activities opens with his prosecution of Asitius in 56 BC (Cic. *Cael.* 23, Tac. *Dial.* 21), and it closes with his head-to-head clash with Cicero at the trial of Vatinius in 54 BC (Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.6, Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.2.25, Tac. *Dial.* 21). For the known details about Calvus' life, see Castorina (1946).

[119] Malcovati (1967) 492–500 collects the fragments of Calvus' oratory; Hollis (2007) 49–86 presents and discusses his twenty-odd extant poetical snippets. He was famous for composing an epyllion under the title *Io.*

obvious. Yet, the student of Calvus' oratory should be aware of two important caveats that complicate our interpretation of his views and achievements. First of all, ancient sources often conflate Calvus with his Atticist movement: they ascribe to the man the same views as to the entire movement. Therefore, we may cautiously use the extant notes that speak in general about Calvus' Atticist group as sources for his own views.[120] Unfortunately, next, our knowledge of Calvus' stylistic program is built to a large extent on the work of his mortal enemy Cicero: Calvus, in the words of the elder Seneca, 'for a long time waged a most hostile contest with Cicero for the supremacy in oratory'.[121] Unsurprisingly, Cicero presents a rather cynical account of the motivations and goals underlying Calvus' stylistic program. Thus, we should be aware of the inherent bias in the treatment of Calvus and his Atticist allies by Cicero and by later authors that (partly) build their judgment on Cicero's works.

Still, it is worthwhile to make ourselves familiar with the prejudice in Cicero's discussion, as it testifies to the polemic context of Calvus' stylistic views.[122] All in all, the famous rhetorician offers roughly four explanations for Calvus' meager style in his *Brutus* and *Orator*. First, he suggests that Calvus' motives were elitist: his dry oratory was only appreciated by a small group of connoisseurs, but it did not appeal to the palate of the masses. According to Cicero, this led Calvus and his Athenophile friends to the misguided conclusion that they were in fact 'wise men' (*prudentes, intellegentes*).[123] Secondly, Cicero submits that the Atticists subjected themselves to anxious self-scrutiny, avoiding at all cost to make mistakes: this over-scrupulousness rendered their style, in Cicero's words, 'bloodless' (*exsanguis*) and 'sapless' (*exsucus*).[124] Thirdly, Cicero compares Calvus' movement to a cult: the self-styled Atticists considered simplicity and lack of ornament to be 'a venerable and

[120] The conflation of Calvus and his movement is apparent in Cic. *Brut.* 284: Calvus 'was in error and caused others to err with him' (*et ipse errabat et alios etiam errare cogebat*). Moreover, the extant sources name no other orators who belong to Calvus' movement of Atticizing speakers: see section 5.2 above.

[121] Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.6: *Diu cum Cicerone iniquissimam litem de principatu eloquentiae habuit.*

[122] Dugan (2001) 412–413 offers an overview of the terms that Cicero and Calvus use in their polemic, showing that they deploy dichotomies focusing, e.g., on swelling and emaciation, extravagance and restraint, sickness and health. On the personal relationship between Calvus and Cicero, see the literature cited in n. 128 below.

[123] Cic. *Orat.* 236, for instance, claims that his Atticizing opponents considered themselves 'wise' (*prudentes*) on account of their refusal to adorn their discourse with well-knit rhythms; Cic. *Brut.* 289, however, notes that the Atticists' speeches were so boring that no-one even bothered to attend. On the close association between intellectualism and the simple style in the Roman rhetorical tradition, cf. section 3.6 above.

[124] Cic. *Brut.* 283. Cf. *Orat.* 76 on the lack of vigor of Calvus' Atticism, and *Rhet. Her.* 4.16, which designates the faulty style akin to the simple register as 'bloodless' (*exsanguis*). See also section 3.4 n. 81–82 above.

almost religious obligation for the orator' (*quasi religio et verecundia oratoris*).[125] Lastly, Cicero mockingly notes that the Atticists 'measure the power of eloquence by their own ability'. In other words, they adhere to the simple style not by choice, but by necessity: they are simply not skilled enough to attain grandeur and magnificence.[126] To summarize, Cicero submits that snobbishness, extreme caution, religious zeal and incompetence are the pillars on which Calvus' conception of Atticism is built.

Cicero's diatribe should, of course, not be taken at face value. Later discussions of Calvus' style in the works of the elder Seneca, Tacitus and Quintilian are inevitably affected by Ciceronian bias, but they add several perspectives that might complement or even correct Cicero's account. I will come back to the testimony of Seneca at the end of the present section; Tacitus and Quintilian, to begin with, attest to the popularity of Calvus in the late first and early second centuries AD. Quintilian, for one, reports that even his in day he found men 'who preferred Calvus above all others'. In addition, Tacitus still had access to Calvus' twenty-one books of 'little speeches' (*oratiunculae*): he reports that the speeches against Vatinius even served as textbooks for students of rhetoric.[127] Apparently, Quintilian and Tacitus were both familiar with Calvus' (now lost) correspondence with Cicero.[128] This

[125] Cic. *Brut.* 284. Cf. also Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.14, who compares Calvus' Atticist movement to a 'clique of initiates in some sort of mystery' (*manus quasi quibusdam sacris initiata*), who treat Cicero as an 'unbeliever' (*parum superstitiosus*).

[126] Cic. *Opt. gen.* 10: *Vim eloquentiae sua facultate metiuntur.* Cf. *Orat.* 234, where Cicero explains that orators who did not adopt a rhythmical style, did so, because 'they could not attain this' (*hoc assequi non potuerunt*). Tac. *Dial.* 21.2 makes a similar statement: Aper claims that Calvus' lack of elegance and elevation should not be attributed to any autonomous 'choice' (*voluntas*), but rather to a lack of 'intellectual force' (*ingenium ac vires*).

[127] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 10.1.115: *Inveni qui Calvum praeferrent omnibus.* Tac. *Dial.* 21.1–2: 'Calvus himself, although he left behind as many, if I am right, as twenty-one volumes, hardly comes up to the standard in any one, or two at the most, of his speeches. (...) Yet, the orations entitled *Against Vatinius* are a common textbook with students' (*ipse mihi Calvus, cum unum et viginti, ut puto, libros reliquerit, vix in una et altera oratiuncula satis facit ... At hercule in omnium studiosorum manibus versantur accusationes quae in Vatinium inscribuntur*). Calvus' speeches against Vatinius (54 BC) attracted the attention of later readers, because (1) they featured a direct confrontation with Cicero, cf. Gruen (1967); (2) they pertained to Caesar, who had bought Vatinius' services; and (3) Calvus' performance in the trial was the topic of a joke in Catull. 53. Cf. section 5.6.2 below on Catullus' poem and on Calvus' political views. See Gruen (1971) on the circumstances of the trial. For the popularity of Calvus in the early second century AD, see also Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.2, who admires the figures of speech of 'my beloved Calvus' (*meus Calvus*).

[128] The mutual letters are referred to in Quint. *Inst. orat.* 9.4.1, 12.1.22, and Tac. *Dial.* 18. Hendrickson (1926) thinks that the letters were primarily concerned with Cicero's and Calvus' opposing views on word arrangement.

material shows us that Calvus indeed deliberately cultivated a meager style, but for different reasons than the ones that Cicero suggests: Calvus and his supporters devised a stylistic program that was intended to be diametrically opposed to the abundant eloquence that, to their minds, unduly dominated Rome. Tacitus presents not only Calvus' views of Ciceronian oratory, but also the opinions of Brutus, who was a close friend of Cicero's, but who may also have been sympathetic to Calvus' restrained oratory.[129]

> *Satis constat ne Ciceroni quidem obtrectatores defuisse, quibus inflatus et tumens nec satis pressus, sed supra modum exsultans et superfluens et parum Atticus videretur. Legistis utique et Calvi et Bruti ad Ciceronem missas epistulas, ex quibus facile est deprehendere Calvum quidem Ciceroni visum exsanguem et aridum, Brutum autem otiosum atque diiunctum; rursusque Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male audisse tamquam solutum et enervem, a Bruto autem, ut ipsius verbis utar, tamquam 'fractum atque elumbem.'*
>
> Even Cicero himself, as is well known, had his detractors: they thought him turgid and puffy, wanting in conciseness, inordinately exuberant, redundant, and not Attic enough. You have read, of course, the letters of Calvus and Brutus to Cicero, from which it is easy to gather that, as for Calvus, Cicero thought him bloodless and attenuated, just as he thought Brutus spiritless and disjointed; while Cicero was in turn criticized by Calvus as relaxed and unmanly, and by Brutus, to use his own words, as 'broken and emasculated.'

Gruen (1967) remarks that, despite their obvious differences of opinion in political and oratorical matters, the two men underheld a cordial relationship based on mutual respect. Although Cicero and Calvus may indeed have exchanged occasional pleasantries, Dugan (2001) 426, however, rightly emphasizes the fierceness of their enmity: 'At stake in Calvus' and Cicero's polemics was their fundamental selfhood, which accounts for the fervor of their contestation.' In section 5.6.2 below, we will see that Calvus' Atticism not merely pertained to his views on oratory, but that it affected every aspect of his life.

[129] Tac. *Dial.* 18.4–5. Cic. *Att.* 15.1a.2 gives a clue concerning Brutus' sympathies for Calvus' Atticism, when Cicero emphatically claims that Demosthenes' thunderbolts are thoroughly Attic, a point which he also makes in *Orat.* 23, 234: the passage is quoted in section 2.3.2 n. 60 above. Shackleton Bailey (1999) 374 argues that Cicero's correspondence with Brutus incited the former to compose his *Brutus.* Dugan (2005) 261, likewise, claims that Brutus' Atticist tendencies made him an appropriate recipient of both Cicero's *Brutus* and his *Orator.* Yet, there is no obvious connection between Brutus and Calvus, except for the fact that they both criticized Cicero. Even if Brutus appealed to Attic style, there is no good reason to subscribe him Calvus' entourage: cf. the literature mentioned in section 5.2 n. 15 above.

Quintilian was also familiar with the letters that Cicero exchanged with his opponents about oratorical style. In his discussion of the contents of this correspondence, he does not show himself as impartial as Tacitus: he repeats, for instance, Cicero's view that Calvus' movement was a pseudo-religious cult. Yet, even without mentioning Calvus by name, Quintilian offers us some reliable information about his views, consistent with the passage in Tacitus' *Dialogus*.[130]

> *At M. Tullium non illum habemus Euphranorem circa pluris artium species praestantem, sed in omnibus quae in quoque laudantur eminentissimum. Quem tamen et suorum homines temporum incessere audebant ut tumidiorem et Asianum et redundantem et in repetitionibus nimium et in salibus aliquando frigidum et in compositione fractum, exultantem ac paene, quod procul absit, viro molliorem (...). Praecipue vero presserunt eum qui videri Atticorum imitatores concupierant. Haec manus quasi quibusdam sacris initiata ut alienigenam et parum superstitiosum devinctumque illis legibus insequebatur.*
>
> But in Cicero we have one who is not just an Euphranor, distinguished in several branches of art, but a man supreme in everything for which anyone wins praise.[131] And yet his own contemporaries had the hardihood to attack him as too bombastic, Asian, redundant, too repetitive, sometimes frigid in his humor, and broken, exuberant and —which should be unthinkable—almost softer than a man in his arrangement. (...) It was those who wanted to be thought imitators of the Attic writers who were particularly hard on him. Like a clique of initiates in some sort of mystery, this group attacked him as an outsider and unbeliever, and refusing to be bound by their rules.

The testimonies of Tacitus and Quintilian present a clear picture of the objections of Calvus and others against Cicero's style. The gist of their criticism is that Cicero was 'not Attic enough' (*parum Atticus*), but rather a 'foreigner' (*alienigena*) and even 'Asian' (*Asianus*).[132]

[130] Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.12–14. On Cicero's correspondence with Calvus en Brutus, see *Inst. orat.* 9.4.1 and ibid. 12.1.22

[131] Euphranor (fl. 364–361 BC) was a painter and sculptor from Corinth, who also wrote theoretical works on symmetry and color. Plin. *NH* 35.129 tells us that he was famous for the versatility of his talent.

[132] According to Delarue (1982), the stylistic epithet 'Asian' was invented by Calvus specifically for his polemic against Cicero. While it is difficult to prove this thesis, it is true that, as a term of abuse, the adjective 'Asian' seems to have become relevant for the first time in the controversy between Cicero and the self-styled Attic

The vocabulary and imagery that is used to articulate this view merit a closer look: the anti-Ciceronian slurs in the passages above can be divided into roughly three groups. First of all, Tacitus and Quintilian both report that the self-proclaimed Atticists take offense at Cicero's unrestrained verbosity: he was 'not concise enough' (*neque satis pressus*), 'redundant' (*redundans*), 'repetitive' (*in repetitionibus nimius*), 'inordinately exuberant and overabundant' (*super modum exsultans et superfluens*).[133] Briefly put, Cicero's style is thought to be characterized by excess, which, as we have seen, is traditionally recognized as a hallmark of Asia (section 5.3). In ancient literary criticism, likewise, futile verbosity is often associated with Asianism: Cicero himself, for instance, asserts that Asian oratory often contains 'certain meaningless words inserted to fill out the rhythm' (*inania quaedam verba quasi complementa numerorum*). Brevity, conversely, is usually presented as a defining feature of the simple style, which Calvus cultivated as the only truly Attic style.[134]

Secondly, Cicero's style is presented as a disease: it is 'inflated' (*inflatus*) and 'swollen' (*tumens, tumidior*). The medical references are connected to the analogy that many rhetoricians and critics observed between rhetorical style and the human body.[135] In this case, Cicero is diagnosed with a malignant tumor, evoking an image that is often used to criticize authors who ineptly adopt a grand, ornate style: the fourth book of *Rhetorica ad Herennium*,

---

orators surrounding Calvus: see section 5.2 above. Hence, Lucarini (2015) may be right in claiming that Cicero himself invented the twofold division of Asian oratory (*Brut.* 325) as a reaction to the sudden prominence of Asianism in the rhetorical discourse. See section 1.6 above and n. 143 below for Cicero's take on Asian style.

[133] Verbosity also comes up in the comparisons (συγκρίσεις) between Cicero and Demosthenes that start to appear briefly after Cicero's death: see section 5.5.1 n. 88 above. Quint. *Inst. orat.* 10.1.106, for instance, notes that 'nothing can be subtracted' (*nihil detrahi potest*) from Demosthenes' speeches, while to Cicero's orations 'nothing can be added' (*nihil addi potest*). Long. *Subl.* 12.4, in addition, compares Cicero's style to a 'widespread conflagration' (ἀμφιλαφής τις ἐμπρησμός), while Demosthenes is said to resemble a thunderbolt.

[134] Cic. *Orat.* 230. On the redundancy of Asian style, see also Suet. *Aug.* 86.3, who quotes Augustus mocking the 'verbose and unmeaning fluency of the Asiatic orators' (*Asiaticorum oratorum inanis sententiis verborum volubilitas*). On the connection between brevity and the simple style, see e.g. Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 4.4–5 and section 3.2.1, table 4 above.

[135] On the pervasiveness of anatomical imagery in stylistic discussions, see section 3.2 n. 21 above and the literature cited there. We already saw (e.g., Quint. *Inst. orat.* 12.10.58) that the terminology of the three styles is to a large extent based on the metaphor of the human body: the grand style can be described as 'stout' (ἀδρός, *robustus*), while the simple style can be referred to as 'slim' (ἰσχνός, *subtilis*). Dugan (2001) 413 underlines the importance of corporeal metaphors in the polemic between Cicero and Calvus: 'The body in rhetoric cannot be marked off as purely metaphorical or purely literal: rhetoric is a system of thought that constantly returns to the issue of the bodily self of the orator.' Cf. section 5.6.2 below for Calvus' treatment of his own body.

for instance, includes a passage on the 'inflated style' (*sufflata figura*), which is presented as the vicious counterpart of the grand register. The author draws an explicit comparison between this faulty style and a sick body: 'Just as a swelling (*tumor*) often resembles a healthy condition of the body, so, to those who are inexperienced, turgid and inflated language (*ea quae turget et inflata est*) often seems majestic.'[136] Physical health, then, plays a large role in the debate between Calvus and Cicero: both men describe their own style in terms such as 'health' (*sanitas*), 'wholesomeness' (*salubritas*) and 'soundness' (*integritas*), while they present their opponent's style as mortally ill. Specifically, Calvus' sparse oratory could be written off as emaciated, while Cicero's abundantly decorated speeches could be regarded as bloated.[137]

The third prominent theme in the anti-Ciceronian discourse of Calvus and his followers is effeminacy, another widely acknowledged attribute of Asian culture and oratory (section 5.3). Cicero received abuse for being 'broken' (*fractus*), 'loose' (*solutus*), 'sinewless' (*enervis*) and 'loinless' (*elumbis*)—words that each carry strong feminine connotations. The words 'sinew' (*nervus*) and 'loin' (*lumbus*), for instance, are slangy expressions that can denote male genitalia: thus, the letters of Brutus and Calvus quite literally depict Cicero as emasculated.[138] The words 'loose' (*solutus*) and 'broken' (*fractus*), additionally, are also connected to effeminacy and degeneracy.[139] The orators in Rome frequently impugned each

[136] *Rhet. Her.* 4.15: *Ita ut corporis bonam habitudinem tumor imitatur saepe, item gravis oratio saepe inperitis videtur ea quae turget et inflata est.* On bloating and inflation as a fault associated with grand oratory, see also Hor. *Ars. P.* 27, who reports that 'an author who strives for grandeur, is swollen' (*professus grandia turget*); Long. *Subl.* 3.4 on 'tumor' (ὄγκος); and Gell. *NA* 6.14.5 on 'inflated and swollen speakers' (*sufflati atque tumidi*). Cf. also Gutzwiller (1969) and section 3.2.1 n. 26 above.

[137] For Cicero's and Calvus' self-diagnosed good health, see esp. Cic. *Brut.* 51, 284, with the synoptic table in Dugan (2001) 412–413. According to Dugan, Calvus and Cicero have at their disposal a 'system of tropes based on the body and its regulation' to defend their own speech and to attack each other's oratory.

[138] Hendrickson (1926) 255–258 reckons the terms *elumbis* and *enervis*—'an offense to the Roman ear'—among the most hostile epithets in the polemic between Cicero and his opponents. For an overview of sexual and gendered vocabulary in Roman rhetoric, see Adams (1982) 149–151, who explains, for instance, that *nervus* can mean both 'tendon' and 'penis', since 'the penis could be regarded as a tendon or group of tendons'.

[139] For a discussion of these words as technical rhetorical terms, see Richlin (1997) 94. Sen. *Ep.* 114.4 applies the term 'loose' (*solutus*) to the effeminate style of Maecenas: 'Is his style not as loose as the man himself is unguirded?' (*non oratio eius aeque soluta est quam ipse discinctus*). Cf. Corbeill (1996) 160 n. 81 on the connection between unguirdedness and femininity. The word 'broken' (*fractus*), next, also typically appears in conjunction with words denoting emasculation: see, e.g., Sen. *Suas.* 2.23 on 'extreme ornamentation and broken arrangement' (*nimius cultus et fracta compositio*); Sen. *Vit. beat.* 13.4, referring to the pleasure-seeking type of

other's masculinity, usually provoked by their opponent's high-pitched voice, theatrical performance or careful for word arrangement. The jibes against Cicero's manhood focus on the latter aspect of his oratory: Quintilian, as we have seen, indignantly reports that Cicero was thought 'broken' (*fractus*) and 'almost softer than a man' (*paene viro mollior*) in the arrangement of his words. Cicero himself was aware of this critique: he notes that there are orators who think that 'speech is emasculated (*enervatur*) by a careful arrangement of words'.[140] The Roman Forum was, of course, a men's world: attacking Cicero's masculinity could be an effective strategy to defame his position as Rome's leading orator.[141]

Thus, to Calvus' mind, Ciceronian eloquence symbolized three crucial stylistic errors —unrestrained verbosity, unhealthy bombast and unmanly word arrangement. When Calvus enters our record in 56 BC, Cicero was still the principal orator of Rome, but he was more vulnerable on account of his recent exile (58–57 BC) and his diminished political position in the face of Caesar and Pompey: he was, therefore, an obvious target for Calvus' contentious spirit. Yet, Cicero's grand oratory was part of a wider trend in Roman eloquence: Q. Hortensius Hortalus (115–50 BC), whose reputation as a passionate orator was second only to Cicero's, was susceptible to the same criticisms as the ones that Calvus and his friends

---

man as 'weakly, broken, losing his manhood, and on the sure path to baseness' (*enervis, fractus, degenerans viro, perventurus in turpia*); and Quint. *Inst. orat.* 1.10.31 on 'effeminate' (*effeminata*) music, 'broken down by indecent rhythms' (*impudicis modis fracta*). Note that the word 'broken' often refers to word arrangement; as we saw in section 2.3.2 above, Cic. *Brut.* 386 censures Hegesias' composition for being 'broken' (*fractus*) and 'chopped-up' (*minutus*), while *Orat.* 170 accuses the self-styled Atticists of composing sentences that are 'broken down and minced' (*infracta et amputata*); in *Orat.* 235, by contrast, Cicero advertises his own rhythm as 'well-knit' (*aptus*). Thus, Cicero could readily defend himself against charges of effeminacy.

[140] Cic. *Orat.* 229. Cf. ibid. 231: an orator 'will weaken his rhythms' (*delumbet sententias*), if he hunts for short, monotonous jingles. Cf. also Sen. *Ep.* 115.2: 'Verbal balance is not a masculine ornament' (*non est ornamentum virile concinnitas*). On the gendered approach to oratorical performance (*actio*), see esp. Richlin (1997) 99–105. Examples are not hard to come by, e.g., in Cic. *Orat.* 54: 'There should be no effeminate bending of the neck' (*nulla mollitia cervicum*) and the orator should check himself 'through a manly attitude of his body' (*virili laterum flexione*). *Rhet. Her.* 3.22 claims that a sharp exclamation irritates the audience, as it is more similar to a 'womanish shriek' (*muliebris vociferatio*) than to 'manly dignity' (*virilis dignitas*).

[141] Gleason (1995) 71–75, 98–102 points out that the Forum was a logical setting for invectives focusing on virility, as it was the place of every Roman boy's transition to manhood. Richlin (1997) 106–107 focuses especially on the role of gender in the rhetorical schools, arguing that gendered language flowed from these schools into the controversies between adult orators. Connolly (2010) 88, lastly, approaches the role of gender in the rhetorical discourse from a social-political perspective: 'What is at stake is the inculcation and perpetuation of a particular set of attitudes and behaviors associated with masculinity and men.'

launched against Cicero.[142] In his *Brutus*, Cicero sets Hortensius up as the paradigm of 'Asian style' (*Asiatica dictio*), presenting him as a master of the two subtypes of Asianism—the 'pithy and clever kind' (*genus sententiosum et argutum*) and the 'swift and impetuous kind' (*genus volucre atque incitatum*).[143] Although Cicero's discussion is quite benevolent to Asian oratory, he says much about Hortensius' style that could give offense to Calvus: according to Cicero, Hortensius 'made a study of gracefully pointed phrases', that were 'merely graceful and of pleasant sound, though not necessary nor always useful', his prose lacked weight, wherefore it was better suited to youth than to old age.[144] It is obvious, then, that Hortensius does not meet Calvus' standards of purity and restraint: if anything, he may even be further removed from Calvus' Attic ideal than Cicero.

We also know that Hortensius was mocked for his alleged femininity. He was known to take great care in arranging his toga and he tended to gesture excessively during his performances: according to some, he behaved more like an actor than like an orator, more like a woman than like a man.[145] Aulus Gellius tells us the following anecdote about his

[142] Cf. section 5.5.2 above on Hortensius' Palatine dwelling, which would later become the house of Augustus.

[143] Cic. *Brut.* 325. Cicero's treatment of Asian style is somewhat ambivalent: he criticizes it for lacking authority (*auctoritatis parum*), being 'more condoned in youth than in old age' (*adulescentiae magis concessum quam senectuti*), but in his description of the two subtypes of Asianism he adopts a rather kind approach. This positive attitude may have several reasons: (1) as we saw in section 1.6 above, Cicero does not want to disavow the lessons of his Asian teachers, esp. Menippus of Stratonicea, Dionysius of Magnesia, Aeschylus of Cnidus and Xenocles of Adramyttium (*Brut.* 315–316); (2) by focusing on the youthful spirit of Asianism, Cicero can explain why Hortensius was a successful orator as a young man, though he has fallen from grace later in life; (3) as Vasaly (2002) 86 points out, Cicero can account for his own fondness for playful stylistic ornaments in his early speeches; and (4) Cicero could lecture his opponents, who use the epithet 'Asian' as a term of abuse, on the complexities of Asian oratory. Lucarini (2015) carefully examines Cicero's discussion of the two Asian styles and the styles of the authors that he connects to them (for the first type Timaeus, Hierocles and Menecles; for the second type Aeschylus of Cnidus and Aeschines of Miletus); given the polemic context of Cicero's discussion, however, we should be aware that Cicero's descriptions might not match any real stylistic practices.

[144] Cic. *Brut.* 326–327: *Habebat* (…) *illud studium crebrarum venustarumque sententiarum, in quibus* (…) *erant quaedam magis venustae dulcesque sententiae quam aut necessariae aut interdum utiles.* According to Dyck (2008), Cicero grew to respect his formal rival Hortensius for introducing to the Roman Forum a passionate style and for taking oratory seriously as a career. Yet, Garcea and Lomanto (2014) point out the surreptitious reservations that Cicero always keeps with respect to Hortensius, already present in the prediction of his success in *De or.* 3.228–230, which was modeled on the announcement of Isocrates' success in Pl. *Phaedr.* 229a–230b.

[145] See Gell. *NA* 1.5.2: 'Because he dressed with extreme foppishness, Hortensius arranged the folds of his toga with great care and exactness, and in speaking used his hands to excess in lively gestures, was assailed with jibes and shameful charges; and many taunts were hurled at him, even while he was pleading in court, for appearing

performance during the trial of Sulla, the dictator's nephew (62 BC), when his opponent Lucius Torquatus called him 'Dionysia', after a notorious dancing girl. Hortensius reportedly replied to this taunt by saying 'in a soft and gentle voice' (*voce molli atque demissa*): 'I would rather be a Dionysia, Torquatus, indeed a Dionysia, than like you *un étranger aux Muses, à Aphrodite, à Dionysos*' (ἄμουσος, ἀναφρόδιτος, ἀπροσδιόνυσος).[146] Hortensius, then, does not deny the charges of effeminacy and preciosity, but he proudly embraces them: he repeats his new nickname twice, he answers his opponent in Greek and he even adopts a woman's voice. He almost mentions the girl's name a third time in the final word ἀπροσδιόνυσος, a clever pun meaning both 'unconnected to Dionysus' and 'not to the point, mal à propos'.[147] This quaint anecdote shows us that Hortensius' playful speeches are, even more than Cicero's oratory, prone to Calvus' Atticist criticisms.

Thus, the movement led by Calvus was first and foremost a movement of protest, largely directed against the dominant oratorical style in Rome. Under the banner of Attic style, Calvus proposed to replace verbosity with brevity, bombast with sobriety, and effeminacy with masculinity—in a word, he sought to drive out the degeneracy of Asia in favor of the purity and restraint of Athens. Yet, it seems that not even Calvus himself always lived up to his stylistic promises: the elder Seneca reports that he was a 'violent and passionate performer' (*violentus actor et concitatus*) and that he arranged his words after the example of Demosthenes. The epilogue to his speech for Messius even displays, in Seneca's view, a 'soft' (*emollita*) and 'womanly' (*infracta*) composition.[148] According to Tacitus,

---

like an actor' (*quod multa munditia et circumspecte compositeque indutus et amictus esset manusque eius inter agendum forent argutae admodum et gestuosae, maledictis compellationibusque probris iactatus est, multaque in eum, quasi in histrionem, in ipsis causis atque iudiciis dicta sunt*). Cic. *Orat.* 132 and Quint. *Inst. orat.* 11.3.8–9 posit that Hortensius' writings are better than his performances; according to Val. Max. 8.10.2, the actors Roscius and Aesopus studied Hortensius' gestures. Cf. Steel (2007) 243–244, who regrets our dependence on Cicero's testimonies on Hortensius' oratory, while 'the details resist discovery'.

[146] Gell. *NA* 1.5.3: *Dionysia, Dionysia malo equidem esse quam quod tu, Torquate*, ἄμουσος, ἀναφρόδιτος, ἀπροσδιόνυσος. For French translations to render Greek words in Latin passages, cf. section 4.2. n. 22 above on Lucil. fr. 74–75. Gunderson (2000) 127–131 and Williams (2010) 172–174 discuss Hortensius as an example of an orator who willfully bends the rules of masculinity in Rome. The three Greek words at the end of the sentences are used by Hortensius to attack Torquatus' unrefined character (esp. his unfamiliarity with the pleasures of 'Wein, Weib und Gesang'); Gellius agrees with this charge, calling Torquatus a 'man of somewhat boorish and uncouth nature' (*subagresti homo ingenio et infestivo*).

[147] For the proverbial meaning of ἀπροσδιόνυσος, see, e.g., Cic. *Att.* 16.13a.1.

[148] Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.6–8. To illustrate Calvus' passionate performance, Seneca reports that the orator, in the spur of the moment, used to rise up from his benches and run to his opponent's side of the court. In Calvus'

likewise, the second part of his speech against Vatinius was 'ornate in words and sentences' (*verbis ornata et sententiis*) and 'adapted to please the ears of the judges' (*auribus iudicum adcommodata*).[149] These testimonies are blatantly at odds with Calvus' reputation as a meager and dry orator. Yet, the inconsistency teaches us an important lesson about Calvus' Atticism: it was principally devised to challenge the dominant orators of Rome and usurp their leading position. Calvus' oratory was obviously more restrained than the style of his opponents, but his meagerness was by no means as extreme as his polemical discourse suggests.

5.6.2 Calvus against Public and Private Effeminacy

Calvus' program of Atticism is not only designed to undercut the authority of the leading orators of his day: his fervent campaigns for restraint, purity and masculinity are also expressions of a penetrating social critique aimed to provoke the city's political elite.[150] In brief, Calvus was troubled by the indecent, effeminate behavior of Rome's ruling class: he therefore not merely sought to change the dominant oratorical style of the Forum, but he also wanted to correct the underlying moral degeneracy, specifically targeting Caesar and Pompey, but certainly not sparing himself. This subsection, then, will address the relationship between Calvus' conception of Attic style and his professed desire, expressed particularly in the extant portions of his poetry, to install an austere moral code in Rome. Thus, we will see that rhetoric, poetry, politics and ethics are inextricably connected in Calvus' Atticism.

As far as we know, Calvus never held any political office nor do his oratorical activities reveal his allegiance to any politician. Yet, his activities as a forensic lawyer inevitably involved him in Roman politics: in the year 54 BC alone, for instance, he defended C. Messius, whom Pompey considered a friend, he prosecuted P. Vatinius, one of Caesar's protégés, and he spoke for C. Porcius Cato, a triumviral partisan.[151] In addition to his oratorical fame, Calvus was also an accomplished poet, a prominent sidekick to Catullus, who

---

Demosthenic composition, moverover, Seneca claims that 'there is nothing that is sedate or gentle, everything is excited and stormy' (*nihil in illa placidum, nihil lene est, omnia excitata et fluctuantia*). On the connection between Calvus' Atticism and Demosthenes, see also Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.2 and section 5.2 n. 22 above.

[149] Tac. *Dial.* 18.2.

[150] Cf. Delarue (1982) 178–179, who argues that such designations as 'broken and loinless' (*elumbis*), that we saw in Tac. *Dial.* 18.4–5 (section 5.6.1 above), do not only pertain to oratorical style, but also to moral character.

[151] Gruen (1967) expertly discusses Calvus' involvements in the trials of Messius, Vatinius and Cato, paying close attention to the political implications: 'Calvus was born to politics.' Calvus' father was a people's tribune, praetor, historian and orator: cf. Sall. *Hist.* 3.48. Gruen suggests that Calvus' defense of Cato is the fruit of his reconciliation with Caesar after they had fallen out over Calvus' anti-Caesarian verses: see n. 157 below.

jokingly recounts how one of his listeners calls Calvus an 'eloquent dwarf' (*disertum salaputium*), punning on his small physical stature and perhaps also on his restrained style.[152] There are two noteworthy connections between Calvus' Atticizing oratory and his neoteric poetry. First, the slenderness of his 'little verses' (*versiculi*) matches the meagerness of his 'little speeches' (*oratiunculae*): in both literary pursuits, he shunned wordiness, pompous grandeur and effeminacy.[153] Secondly, in his poetry, he is outspoken about the faults of contemporary politicians: in two much-cited fragments, he mocks Caesar and Pompey on account of their luxuriousness and effeminacy.[154] The moral flaws that Calvus identifies in the city's leading senators are strikingly similar to the stylistic vices for which he censures Cicero. I quote Calvus' two extant poetical bashings of the triumvirate below, starting with his 'notorious verses' (*notissimi versi*) on Caesar.[155]

... Bithynia quicquid
et pedicator Caesaris umquam habuit.

... all that Bithynia and Caesar's bugger ever possessed.

---

[152] Catull. 53: 'A fellow in the crowd made me laugh just now: when my dear Calvus had drawn out in splendid style his accusations against Vatinius, he lifted up his hands in wonder, saying 'Great gods, what an eloquent dwarf!'' (*Risi nescio quem modo e corona, / qui, cum mirifice Vatiniana / meus crimina Calvus explicasset, / admirans ait haec manusque tollens, / Di magni, salaputium disertum!*). Keith (1999) 45 suggests that Catullus' reference 'may participate in contemporary Atticist polemic'. On Calvus' diminutive posture, see Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.7: 'He was a small man' (*erat parvolus statura*). Catullus contrasts the petiteness of Calvus' physique to the awesome effects of his oratory: cf. Fordyce (1961) 223–225. Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.6 relates that Tigellius, who was prosecuted by Calvus, exclaimed during trial: 'I ask you, judges: just because *he* is eloquent, must *I* be convicted?' (*rogo vos, iudice, num, si iste disertus est, ideo me damnari oportet?*). Deroux (2008) focuses on the hapax *salaputium*, translating it as 'tiny dick' ('petite queue'). See Catull. 14, 50, 96 for other references to Calvus' oratory and poetry.

[153] Keith (1999) 42–46 discusses the similarities between Catullus' and Cicero's literary critical vocabulary. Male sexuality plays a central role in the verses of both Calvus and Catullus: cf. Wray (2001). For the dislike of lengthy and grand poetry in Alexandrian poetry and in Catullus' circles, see Johnson (2007). There is also an important difference between Calvus' oratorical style and his poetics: he used Attic prose of the Classical era as his model for his speeches, while he admired the Alexandrian poets of the Hellenistic era as a neoteric poet, cf. Bowersock (1979) 62–63.

[154] To the fragments quoted below, add fr. 36 Hollis (= fr. 3 Courtney), which mocks the venality of a certain Tigellius, a known friend of Caesar. Cf. Hollis (2007) 80: 'Calvus' attacks on him may have been meant to discredit Caesar too.'

[155] Calvus fr. 38 Hollis (= fr. 17 Courtney = Suet. *Iul.* 49.1).

This partly surviving elegiac couplet refers to Caesar's stay in Bithynia at the court of king Nicomedes IV (81–80 BC): Caesar dallied so long in Asia that it was rumored that he had a homosexual affair with the king. The story offered his friends and opponents ample ammunition to insult him: he was called 'Queen of Bithynia' (*Bithynica regina*) and his soldiers famously compared his conquest of Gaul to Nicomedes' conquest of Caesar.[156] The original context of Calvus' verses is unknown: they could be part of a discussion about a man who enriched himself from the fall of the Bithynian kingdom, or they could simply be a hyperbolic description of a vast sum of money.[157] It is not hard to see why the story was of interest to the Attic-minded Calvus: Caesar had not only stayed in Asia, but he could also be associated with a supposedly sinful Asian life-style. Calvus' words effectively embarrassed Caesar: Calvus even felt obliged to seek reconciliation.[158] The most damaging part of the poem seems to be the reference to Caesar's role as a passive sexual partner: Calvus rudely calls Nicomedes 'Caesar's bugger' (*pedicator Caesaris*), signaling the king's dominance over a weak and effeminate Caesar. In a similar vein, Calvus lashed out at Pompey:[159]

> *Magnus, quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno*
> *scalpit; quid dicas hunc sibi velle? virum.*
>
> Magnus, whom everyone fears, scratches his head with one finger. What would you say he is after? A man!

The epigram, which may be the only of Calvus's poems to survive completely, mocks Pompey's dainty habit of running a single finger through his hair, a gesture which was held to

[156] Suet. *Iul.* 49 presents the fragment from Calvus in a list of taunts that refer to the scandalous affair with Nicomedes, culminating in the song of his own soldiers on the occasion of his triumph over Gaul (46 BC).

[157] Hollis (2007) 81–83: 'The identity of the profiteer has been forgotten, but everyone remembered the insult to Julius Caesar, which may even have been aggravated by the fact that it was merely a passing reference.'

[158] Suet. *Iul.* 73: 'When Gaius Calvus, after some famous lampoons, took steps through his friends toward a reconciliation, Caesar wrote to him first and of his own free will' (*Gaio Calvo post famosa epigrammata de reconciliatione per amicos agenti ultro ac prior scripsit*). The fact that Suetonius refers to Calvus' 'famous lampoons' (*famosa epigrammata*) suggests that he may have composed a series of poems with jibes against Caesar. On Calvus' quarrel and reconciliation with Caesar, see esp. Gruen (1967) 224–225. Suetonius (ibid.) notes that Catullus, too, attacked and subsequently made amends with Caesar.

[159] Calvus fr. 39 Hollis (= fr. 18 Courtney = schol. Iuv. 9.133, schol. Luc. 7.726). Juvenal's scholiast refers to the couplet as a complete epigram (*tale epigramma*). Both scholiasts attribute it to Martial, which cannot be correct: Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.7 already quotes part of the extant words (from *digito* onwards), ascribing it to Calvus.

be a sign of effeminacy and homosexuality.[160] Plutarch also discusses Pompey's little tick, denying that it indicated anything untoward: 'An unwarranted suspicion of unmanliness (μαλακία) was aroused against Pompey on account of his habit of scratching his head with one finger, although he was far removed from effeminacy (θηλύτης) and licentiousness (ἀκολασία).'[161] As in Caesar's case, the stories about Pompey's effeminate behavior may have been prompted by his prolonged stay in Asia, where he spent the better part of the 60s BC. Calvus, in any case, has little doubt about Pompey's intentions: he wants a 'man' (*vir*)! The latter word refers specifically to a 'dominant sexual partner', putting Pompey, like Caesar, in the passive role.[162] Calvus, then, was wont to depict his opponents as weak, emasculated men: he presented not only Cicero, as we have seen, as 'loose and unmanly' (*solutus et enervis*), but also the principal rulers of the city.[163] Calvus' crusade against lasciviousness is as much directed against the in his view bombastic oratorical style as against what he considers to be degenerate conduct.

For Calvus, then, literary style and life-style must follow the same basic rules: both speech and behavior should be restrained and masculine. One remaining question is: did Calvus uphold these moral standards in his own life? While otherwise very little is known about the historical Calvus, the elder Pliny gives us an interesting snippet of evidence in a discussion about the medicinal use of lead plates: 'With these plates the orator Calvus is reported to have restrained himself and to have preserved his body's strength for the labor of his studies.'[164] At night, such sheets of lead were typically laid on the area of the loins and the

[160] The reference in schol. Iuv. 9.133 to the completeness of the poem should not be taken for granted: see Jocelyn (1996). The poem has received its share of scholarly attention: see, e.g., Courtney (1993) 210, Jocelyn (1996) and Hollis (2007) 83–84. Jocelyn offers a thorough reading of the epigram, examining in great detail its textual problems, the scholarly tradition and its cultural context: he concludes that the verses comment on Pompey's 'desire for an active male sexual partner'. Zanker (2016) 61 thinks that the principal pun in the poem is derived from the ambiguity of *sibi velle*: 'The point of Calvus' epigram lay in the fact that *sibi velle* can be interpreted as both 'to want for oneself' and 'to mean'.' The connection between Pompey's strange tic and homosexuality is widely referred to in Antiquity: see, e.g., Sen. *Ep.* 52.12, Juv. 9.133, and Plut. *Mor.* 89e, 800d, *Pomp.* 48, *Caes.* 4, and Amm. Marc. 17.11.4.

[161] Plut. *Mor.* 89e: Βάδισμα τρυφερώτερον εἰς μαλακίαν διέβαλε, καὶ Πομπήιον τὸ ἐνὶ κνᾶσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν δακτύλῳ πορρωτάτω θηλύτητος καὶ ἀκολασίας ὄντα.

[162] On this connotation of the word *vir*, see Jocelyn (1996) 254.

[163] See Tac. *Dial.* 18.4–5, quoted in section 5.6.1 above.

[164] Plin. *NH* 34.166: *His lamnis Calvus orator cohibuisse se traditur viresque corporis studiorum labori custodisse.* While Pliny himself already connects Calvus' self-therapy to the 'labor of his studies' (*studiorum labor*), Dugan (2001) 401–6 further explores the relationship between Calvus' use of lead and his stylistic

kidneys, in order to check sexual disorders, such as involuntary erections and spontaneous discharges of semen, which in ancient medicine were thought to make men 'shriveled, weak, high-voiced, hairless, beardless and effeminate' (ῥικνοί, ἀσθενέες, ὀξύφωνοι, ἄτριχες, ἀγένειοι, γυναικώδεες).[165] Thus, Pliny's testimony suggests that Calvus used lead to control his sexual urges, to restrain himself and to preserve his manliness. Likewise, it has been suggested that his lost work *On the Use of Cold Water*, known only from an enigmatic reference in Martial, may have discussed the anaphrodisiac properties of cold water.[166]

Although the anecdote in Pliny may be apocryphal, it is consistent with Calvus' other activities: his mantras of self-restraint and masculinity are linked to all aspects of his legacy—to his rhetorical theory, to his poetics, to his approach to politics, to his moral views and even to the stories about his personal life. In fact, his purism is already apparent in his two cognomina—'meager' (*macer*) and 'bald' (*calvus*)—corresponding not only to his slender physical appearance but also marvelously appropriate for the Atticist (life-)style that he so passionately advertised. Thus, in Calvus' case it is undeniable that style is the man himself.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter has been concerned with the overwhelming admiration for Attic oratory that pervades the extant Greek and Latin sources on prose style of the first century BC. Following recent scholarship on Atticism, which has rejected the misguided thesis that there existed a

---

discourse, which, as we have seen (section 5.6.1 above), often refers to the imagery of the human body: 'The body discourse within these domains of rhetorical theory follows the same logic as Calvus' medical program, thus demonstrating the vitality of these metaphors within rhetoric, and revealing continuities between rhetorical and medical conceptions of the body.'

[165] Aretaeus, *On the Causes and Signs of Chronic Diseases* 4.5. On the basis of the medical volumes of Aristotle, Aretaeus, Galen and Priscian, Dugan (2001) 403 notes that lead plates were specifically prescribed for curing 'satyriasis (an insatiable desire for sexual activity), priapism (a chronic desireless erection), and the involuntary discharge of semen that the Greeks called gonorrhea (in Latin, *seminis lapsus* or *seminis effusio*)'.

[166] See Mart. 14.196: 'These pages that tell you of fountains and the names of rivers were better swimming in their own water' (*haec tibi quae fontes et aquarum nomina dicit / ipsa suas melius charta natabat aquas*). The title of Martial's epigram is 'Calvus' *On the Use of Cold Water*' (*Calvi de aquae frigidae usu*). The joke appears to be that the treatise on the applications of cold water is worthless to the extent that it might just as well be tossed back into the very water, whence the book (that is, the papyrus) came. That it is indeed our Calvus who is the author of the work is suggested by the fact that the foregoing epigram (14.195) is entitled 'Catullus', after his friend. Isetta (1977) argues that *On the Use of Cold Water* is the ultimate source of Pliny's reference to Calvus' use of lead plates. Her argument is supported by Dugan (2001) 406: 'The linkage between cooling therapies and the control of wet dreams supports Sandra Isetta's suggestion.'

uniform school promoting the revival of Attic prose style, I have argued that there was in fact more than one Attic muse in Rome: Calvus, Cicero and Dionysius could each confidently present their own stylistic programs, despite the conspicuous differences between them, as thoroughly Attic. Thus, our authors each painted a different picture of their ideal form of eloquence: Calvus depicts his muse as a natural beauty who does not need any feminine jewelry or make-up, Cicero imagines her to be a damsel in distress who must be saved by all mean necessary from ruthless villains, and Dionysius presents her as a faithful housewife who judiciously holds sway over her domestic domain. These interpretations of Attic style are all built on a shared conception of the defining virtues of Athenian oratory, politics and moral character: while Classical Athens was consistently associated with such attributes as purity, vigor, wisdom, democracy, restraint and masculinity, the authors in Rome each highlighted different elements from this Athenian cultural repertoire not only in accordance with their aesthetic tastes, but also in order to suit their views on contemporary society.

During the turbulent transition from Republic to Empire, Athens and Attica could be used as flexible buzzwords to demarcate one's moral, political and civic views in stylistic terms: after all, an author's style was regarded as a window onto his very soul. Thus, the extant discussions of prose style offer us interesting perspectives on famous episodes in the history of Rome, such as the first triumvirate, Caesar's dictatorship and the early reign of Augustus. We have seen, for instance, that Calvus' simple and subdued Atticism resonates with his crusade against extravagance and effeminacy, for which he denounces the triumvirs Caesar and Pompey. Furthermore, I have observed that Cicero's grand and vigorous Atticism accommodates his vehement struggle for the preservation of the republican constitution, which was threatened by Caesar's violent policies. The moderation and balance of Dionysius' middle-style Atticism, lastly, suits the Greek teacher's conviction that the city of Rome has brought about a renaissance of the civic values that once formed the basis of Athens' glory: the emperor himself, by all appearances, seems to have agreed with this optimistic assessment. In my project of recovering the goals and motivations that underlie the stylistic discourse of Late-Republican and Augustan Rome, this chapter has shown how closely the theories of style are connected to the authors' views of politics, society and life.