

Historical problems in late Republican and Augustan classicism

Autor(en): **Bowersock, G.W.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **25 (1979)**

PDF erstellt am: **12.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660794>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

II

G. W. BOWERSOCK

HISTORICAL PROBLEMS IN LATE REPUBLICAN AND AUGUSTAN CLASSICISM

In literature as in statesmanship most nations find it necessary to identify certain golden moments in their past that can be invoked to stimulate excellence in the present. The undisputed achievements of a classic age provide the standards for measuring later work, and they serve as models for educating the young as well as inspiring the mature. Where classic antecedents have not been identified, they have often to be invented by a careful review of the past; or models are borrowed from a neighboring nation. It is one of the ironies of history that a literary group at Rome was struggling to find models of excellence precisely when Cicero, who was himself destined to become the classic writer that Latin letters had hitherto lacked, was still alive. That literary group turned to the classics of the Greeks and adopted as its models the fourth-century authors whose authority had long dominated the Hellenistic world. This was the beginning of the Atticist movement in Latin literature.

The movement did not last very long, and few of its members are known to us. Neither its eagerness to set standards for good Latin nor its admiration of classic Greek authors was controversial. As Cicero was easily able to point out, its weakness was its narrowness, its insistence on the spare and simple

style of Lysias and his followers. The Atticists failed to appreciate the range of styles required of a proficient writer and speaker; they failed to appreciate that Demosthenes and Hyperides were, in their own way, as Attic as Lysias¹. The debate over the appropriate Greek models for Latin prose can be recovered from two Ciceronian works of the year 46 B.C., the *Brutus* and the *Orator*. After a scathing reference in the *Tusculan Disputations*, of the following year, to the Atticists' inability to command public respect (*paene ab ipso foro irrisi*)², these antagonists disappear from Latin literature except in allusions back to the time of Cicero.

Curiously, as many scholars have observed, the issue of Attic classics returns under Augustus in the treatises of Greek men of letters³. The views of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and his contemporaries were less narrow than those of the Roman Atticists, but in trying to effect a purification of style through the use of classic models they had similar aims. The classicism of these Greek writers fits neatly with Augustus' aspirations for ancient virtue in his restored republic. Dionysius, like Horace, was no mere antiquarian or *fautor veterum*. Both critics were interested in the masterpieces of the past as a basis for new ones in the present. When Horace denounced to Augustus the indiscriminate worship of anything old⁴, he was treading on

¹ Cic. *Brut.* 82, 285. I should like to thank here, in addition to my colleagues at Vandœuvre, Wendell Clausen, C. P. Jones, and D. R. Shackleton Bailey for their helpful comments on the present paper.

² Cic. *Tusc.* II 1, 3.

³ For a selection of more recent statements, see H. G. STREBEL, *Wertung und Wirkung des thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* (Diss. München 1935), 42; S. F. BONNER, *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (Cambridge 1939), 13; A. E. DOUGLAS, « M. Calidius and the Atticists », in *CQ* 49 = N. S. 5 (1955), 242; A. DIHLE, « Der Beginn des Attizismus », in *A & A* 23 (1977), 164.

⁴ Hor. *Epist.* II 1, 18 ff. (to Augustus): *Sed tuus hic populus sapiens et iustus in uno / te nostris ducibus, te Graeis anteferendo, / cetera nequaquam simili ratione modoque | aestimat, et nisi quae terris semota suisque | temporibus defuncta videt, fastidit et odit...*

safe ground: the first *princeps* was interested in antiquity not for its own sake but rather as a means of shaping the new dispensation. But, for all its reasonableness in the Augustan context, Greek literary classicism is clearly the heir of that short-lived Roman debate of the late Republic. The circumstances of the transference from Roman circles to Greek have never been fully explained, nor indeed is there perfect clarity in the accounts of Roman classicism. Some historical problems need to be addressed.

I. ROMAN ATTICISM

Cicero and the Atticists were in agreement about the value of classical Greek writers as models for style, and it may therefore be said that classicism as such was not in dispute. The question was which authors could be designated Attic and thus become acceptable models. The Roman *Attici* espoused a lean style, which Cicero was entirely willing to recognize as a possible form of expression but not (as the Atticists would have it) the only one. It is clear from Cicero's treatment of the controversy, as well as from references to it in later authors, that the leader of the Atticists was C. Licinius Calvus¹. Accordingly, we ought first to look at him; and immediately there is trouble.

It is customary to observe that since there is no hint of the Atticist dispute in the *De oratore* of winter 55-54 B.C. whereas there is so much about it in Cicero's rhetorical studies of 46 B.C. the whole issue must have blown up in the interim². We are invited to imagine a surprised Cicero returning from Cilicia to

¹ Cic. *Brut.* 82, 284 (*Atticum se, inquit, Calvus noster dici oratorem volebat*); Tac. *Dial.* 18.

² Cf. A. E. DOUGLAS and S. F. BONNER, *loc. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3); A. DIHLE, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3) is properly circumspect: « in den 50^{er} Jahren ». For the time of composition of the *De orat.*, cf. Cic. *Att.* IV 13, 2 (Shackleton Bailey, no. 87) and *Fam.* I 9, 23 (Shackleton Bailey, no. 20); see also F. WEHRLI, « Studien zu Cicero De Oratore », in *MH* 35 (1978), 74-99.

discover his oratory under attack because of the new enthusiasm for Attic simplicity¹. Certainly the new movement scorned the bloated and impassioned rhetoric of Greek Asia Minor, and what these critics labelled pejoratively Asianism might be thought to describe Ciceronianism as well². But the civil wars kept men's minds from more gentlemanly pursuits, as Cicero's correspondence of the early forties makes plain. There is no trace of a controversy over rhetoric until 47 B.C. The first hint of the Atticist debate occurs in a letter of that year to Trebonius, and it was obviously written when Calvus was dead³. In that letter Cicero goes out of his way to justify some admiring comments that he had once sent to Calvus. There had evidently been public differences between the two men, but Cicero had wanted to encourage the much younger Calvus: *de ingenio eius valde existimavi bene*.⁴ The two men had indeed clashed at the trial of Vatinius in 54 B.C., and an exchange of letters that was known in antiquity attested to their disagreement over matters of style. But there was no visible political implication in their competition as orators,⁵ and privately they got on well enough for Cicero to feel a paternalistic interest. He must have regretted the untimely death of a gifted rival.

When exactly did Calvus die? The limits are normally taken to be the date of the *De oratore* (55-54) and 47, the date of Cicero's letter to Trebonius. The temptation to see in the

¹ A. E. DOUGLAS, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3), 247, states this position to question the importance assigned by other scholars to Atticism but not to question their chronology.

² There is no indication that the term 'Asianism' had been used before this period to denigrate rhetoric in Asia. If the *Attici* borrowed it from Greek critics, no trace has survived. Dionysius' remarks (see below under «Greek Atticism») suggest that the Romans had started the attack. Cicero as 'Asian': Quint. XII 10, 12.

³ Cic. *Fam.* XV 21 (Shackleton Bailey, no. 207).

⁴ *Ibid.*, section 4.

⁵ On this point, in detail, see E. S. GRUEN, «Cicero and Licinius Calvus», in *HSCPb* 71 (1967 [1966 on the spine]), 215-33.

Brutus and *Orator* reflections of a current and vigorous controversy has made many a reader assume that Calvus, though already dead, must have died recently and consequently that the letter to Trebonius in 47 is proof that he died in that year. But there is nothing whatever in the letter to suggest that Calvus had just died. It is simply that Trebonius had lately come across a personal letter from Cicero to Calvus¹. Students of the Atticist controversy have wanted to keep Calvus alive as long as possible so as to give the maximum piquancy to the treatises of 46. Hence, A. E. Douglas, in his commentary on the *Brutus*, stated flatly, « Calvus died in 47 »². Shackleton Bailey, however, in his commentary on the letters *ad familiares*, observed, « Calvus seems to have died in or soon after 54 »³. As so often, truth appears to be on the side of Shackleton Bailey, who has here echoed the good sense of Friedrich Münzer: « Aber Calvus muss um dieselbe Zeit wie Catull vorzeitig gestorben sein; denn ein Mann mit seinen Fähigkeiten und Leidenschaften, Erfolgen und Aussichten wäre in den nächsten, an Ereignissen reichen und bis in zahllose Einzelheiten wohlbekanntem Jahren nicht von der Bühne des öffentlichen Lebens gänzlich verschwunden, wenn er das J. 54 noch längere Zeit überlebt hätte. Als Cicero . . . sein Urteil über ihn zusammenfasste, war er nicht erst kürzlich gestorben, sondern schon lange tot »⁴. In short, no word of the living Calvus after 54, neither in the record of public affairs nor in Cicero's correspondence.

If Calvus were already dead by 54 or soon after, obviously he would not have been able to initiate the Atticist movement in the period from 54 to 47, to which it is conventionally assigned. But then the reasons for putting the movement in those years

¹ Letters between the two were known later; Tac. *Dial.* 18; Priscian, *Inst.*, *GL* II 490 Keil; Nonius, p. 469 Müller.

² A. E. DOUGLAS (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus* (Oxford 1966), p. XIII.

³ D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Comm. on Cic. Fam.*, vol. II (Cambridge 1977), pp. 428-9; cf. p. 368 (on the letter to Trebonius).

⁴ Fr. MÜNZER, in *RE* XIII 1, 433.

were never strong, since all Cicero's references to Calvus as an Atticist were written, in any case, when the young orator was dead. And the argument from the silence of the *De oratore* was frail from the start, since that work is a dialogue scrupulously set in the historical context of 91, before Calvus was even born. Apart from the lively character of Cicero's treatment of the Atticists in 46, there is no reason whatever to assume that Calvus and his rhetorical doctrines should be dated any later than 54.

It will surely come as no surprise to readers of Cicero to find him capable of lively exposition about matters that are already *démodé*. As it happens, a comparable issue also involves Calvus; and that is the neoteric movement in poetry, which has been thoroughly and fruitfully examined in recent years¹. Catullus is the best surviving representative of this poetic revolution that championed small, elegant, erudite and allusive poems in the Alexandrian manner; but Calvus, whose verse now survives only in modest fragments, was another of those inventive poets. They were at work in the decade from 65 to 55. Although there are traces of an afterglow in subsequent decades, especially in the relationship between Parthenius and Cornelius Gallus², the principal efflorescence preceded the first triumvirate. Yet in 46 Cicero can refer to them as *poetae novi* and in the next year mock them as *cantores Euphorionis*³. We often fail to recall just how old fashioned all these issues were by then. Like any ageing person, Cicero could still feel strongly about tired topics. There is no more chronological significance to his words *ex istis novis Atticis* in the *Orator*⁴ than that the *Attici*

¹ See, for example, W. V. CLAUSEN, « Callimachus and Latin Poetry », in *GRBS* 5 (1964), 181-96; D. O. ROSS, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge 1975); R. O. A. M. LYNE, « The Neoteric Poets », in *CQ* 28 (1978), 167-187. Cf. also A. TRAGLIA (ed.), *Poetae Novi* (Roma 1962).

² See Parthenius, *Περὶ ἑρωτικῶν παθημάτων*, written for Gallus.

³ *Cic. Orat.* 48, 161 (*poetae novi*); *Tusc.* III 19, 45 (*cantores Euphorionis*). Cf. also his slighting allusion to νεώτεροι in 50 (*Att.* VII 2, 1, Shackleton Bailey, no. 125).

⁴ *Cic. Orat.* 26, 89.

were new in his lifetime and still seemed new to him a decade or more later.

Calvus' role as innovator in both verse and rhetoric deserves emphasis. If, as now seems likely, he was engaged in reform in poetry and prose at approximately the same time, it is worth noting the similarities in his methods. In both areas he turned to Greek models, Alexandrian for poetry and fourth-century Greek oratory for prose; throughout he insisted, with the aid of his chosen models, upon brevity and spareness. The narrow path of Callimachus was a reasonable poetic analogy to the thin style of Lysias¹, although Calvus obviously did not demand of poetry the simple clarity he expected in prose. It has been well argued that he and the other *poetae novi* may have received their indoctrination and possibly inspiration from a Greek at Rome, Parthenius, the freedman of Cinna². An interesting parallel has now been presented for the Atticist movement in prose. Albrecht Dihle has suggested most plausibly that the grammarian Philoxenus, teaching at Rome in the Ciceronian age (as we can now say with certainty because of Didymus' reference to him), first drew the attention of young Romans to the Hellenistic canon of classic writers³. Parthenius and Philoxenus between them would account well for the two great Hellenizing movements in Latin literature of the late Republic.

It is possible that the Atticist enthusiasms of Calvus were perpetuated by some disciples, as neoteric versification was; but it is clear that, if there were such people, Cicero felt no need to name them. His target was Calvus himself. Brutus took an interest in the issues and is known to have had reservations

¹ Call. *Aetia* Fr. 1, 26-28.

² W. V. CLAUSEN, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 62 n. 1). Cinna is presumably the poet.

³ A. DIHLE, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3). It is not necessary, however, to see Caesar as the first to be touched by Philoxenus' influence and as the spiritual father of Roman Atticism (p. 166). For the fragments of Philoxenus, see now Chr. THEODORIDIS (ed.), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos* (Berlin 1976).

about Cicero's prose rhythms¹, but that he was an Atticist exactly like Calvus has long been judged impossible. There was, however, among the *Attici* admiration for Thucydides: *Ecce autem aliqui se Thucydidios esse profitentur: novum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus*². While acknowledging his own high regard for the historian, Cicero argues incontrovertibly that his style is scarcely suited to forensic rhetoric. A classic model he is, but only for history: *Thucydides autem res gestas et bella narrat et proelia, graviter sane et probe, sed nihil ab eo transferri potest ad forensem usum et publicum... 'At laudatus est ab omnibus'. Fateor*³. The transitory passion of the Atticists (or some of them) for Thucydides led to nothing in the way of Thucydidean oratory, but it may well have engendered increased interest among the Romans in that most difficult Greek author. In any event, Cicero's advice was as good as taken, for only a few years later two historians undertook the composition of Thucydidean histories in Latin. One, Sallust, is familiar to all students of antiquity. The other is less well known but of great importance for the present enquiry. He is Q. Aelius Tubero. Dionysius of Halicarnassus inscribed to him his essay on Thucydides «for the benefit of would-be imitators»⁴. And, by using Tubero's history as a source, Livy, who disliked Thucydides, imported a number of Thucydidean locutions into his own great work⁵. This development of Thucydidean history was

¹ Tac. *Dial.* 18. Finding fault with Cicero's prose would not automatically make one an Atticist.

² Cic. *Orat.* 9, 30. Cf. *Brut.* 83, 287.

³ *Orat.* 9, 30-31.

⁴ See E. KLEBS, in *RE* I 1, 537-8; and G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965), 130; also *Prosop. Imperii Rom.*² I, A 274. The quotation: Dion. Hal. *De Thuc.* 25.

⁵ For the references, cf. H. G. STREBEL, *op. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3), 28; on Tubero as a source, see G. W. BOWERSOCK, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4), 130 n. 2. For the fragments of Tubero's history, see H. PETER (ed.), *Hist. Rom. Rel.* I (Leipzig² 1914), pp. 308-12.

perhaps the sole lasting effect of the Atticists on Latin literature, and it was not of the kind they advocated.

II. GREEK ATTICISM

Dionysius of Halicarnassus arrived in Rome in 30 B.C., the year of the fall of Alexandria and the true end of the triumviral wars. In his teaching and writing under Augustus he undertook to purify and refine Greek style by reviving, albeit in a less constricted fashion, the doctrines of the Roman Atticists¹. He and his contemporaries seem to have been the first Greek writers to have identified inflated rhetoric as a peculiar product of Asia. Of course, the Greek classic writers, as identified by Calvus and his associates, had long been recognized as literary masters within their own literary tradition; and that is presumably why Philoxenus, or someone like him, had brought them to the attention of the young literary rebels at Rome. Even Hegesias, whom the Atticists then singled out as a paradigm of that Asianic rhetoric they most detested, had wanted to present himself as an Attic orator in the style of Lysias². Cicero was able to make good use of this curious fact in buttressing his argument for limited flexibility in the use of the term 'Attic'. Not even he would stretch the meaning to include Hegesias, whom he condemned with the same enthusiasm as the Atticists themselves. In defining Asianism as the enemy, the Roman Atticists had sought to demolish the purple prose of Hellenistic Asia Minor. While pleading for a measure of sanity across the water on Rhodes, where he had once been a student³, Cicero was in essential agreement about Asianism: *Itaque Caria et Phrygia et Mysia, quod minime politae minimeque elegantes sunt,*

¹ Cf., e.g., A. DIHLE, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3), 164.

² Cic. *Brut.* 83, 286; *Orat.* 67, 226.

³ E.g. Cic. *Orat.* 8, 25. Perhaps special pleading, but cf. Quint. XII 10, 18.

*asciverunt aptum suis auribus opimum quoddam et tamquam adipatae dictionis genus*¹. Dionysius repeated the refrain a generation later: Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν had expelled the Attic muse from the affairs of the Greeks².

The Augustan revival of the Roman confrontation of Atticism with Asianism was not confined to Dionysius. We know that his friend and contemporary, Caecilius of Caleacte, wrote two books κατὰ Φρυγῶν and a treatise τίνι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ζῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ.³ Although the topic seemed no longer to hold the slightest interest for Latin writers, it clearly appealed to the Greek rhetoricians at Rome as a means of improving standards in their own language. As Dionysius instructed his pupil Ammaeus, things had come to a parlous state in the Hellenistic Age (ἐν... τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν χρόνοις),⁴ and φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ had been supplanted by the shameless rhetoric of Asia.⁵ One might more readily assume that Dionysius is here transmitting an opinion of certain Greeks of the previous generation rather than adapting, along with his Augustan colleagues, the rhetorical issues formulated by Roman innovators of the late Republic. But his own statement is explicit. Asianism is now on the decline, he declares, and classic rhetoric is being returned to her rightful place. The change has taken place in a short period of time, and, says Dionysius, the Romans caused it: αἰτία δ' οἶμαι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἢ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη⁶. The change has occurred in so short a time that Asianism will have vanished entirely in another generation: καὶ οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσαιμι τηλικαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βραχεῖ χρόνῳ γεγεννημένης, εἰ μηκέτι χωρήσει προσωτέρω μιᾶς γενεᾶς ὁ ζῆλος ἐ-

¹ Cic. *Orat.* 8, 25.

² Dion. Hal. *Orat. vet.* 1, 7.

³ *Suda*, s.v. Caecilius, K 1165 Adler.

⁴ Dion. Hal. *Orat. vet.* 1, 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Orat. vet.* 1-3; citation from 3, 1.

κεῖνος τῶν ἀνοήτων λόγων ¹. What Dionysius is stating, without ambiguity, is that the Romans' taste has seriously affected Greek literature for the better (τὰ κρείττω τιμιώτερα ποιεῖν τῶν χειρόνων ἤρξαντο) ², and he is building on the foundations they have laid.

Dionysius' tribute to the Romans of the Augustan age is certainly, to some extent, part of the tribute of a client to a patron ³. But there is no escaping the fact that classicism became a productive theme in Greek rhetoric under the direct influence of Roman classicism, which had itself rendered judgments on Greek style as a guide to Latin. Dionysius' cordial reception of the Atticist arguments was tempered by his own taste. He demanded, like Cicero, a more liberal interpretation of what was Attic; and he was probably not unsympathetic to the parallel that Caecilius is known to have drawn between Demosthenes and Cicero, ⁴ — a parallel that Cicero was himself at pains to suggest in his own treatment of the Atticist position. Again like Cicero, Dionysius had certain reservations about the rhetorical merits of Thucydides. In short, Dionysius' Atticism is not far removed from the more generous interpretation of Attic style so eloquently propounded by Cicero in the *Brutus* and *Orator*. Asianism was abhorrent to both men; by Dionysius' standards Cicero would have been an Attic stylist.

It is not impossible that Dionysius absorbed the substance of the debate over Atticism and Asianism in some indirect way after he reached Rome in 30 ⁵. But from what we know of literary issues in the Second Triumvirate and in the early Principate it is difficult to believe that Calvus' doctrines or

¹ *Ibid.*, 3, 3.

² *Ibid.*, 2, 3.

³ Cf. Dionysius' tribute to the Romans in *Ant. Rom.* I 6, 4.

⁴ *Suda*, s.v. Caecilius; Plut. *Dem.* 3, 2. Cf. [Longinus], *De subl.* 12,4, with the commentary of D. A. RUSSELL (Oxford 1964), *ad loc.*

⁵ Thus A. DIHLE, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 58 n. 3), 176: « Was den Zusammenhang der attizistischen Bewegungen in der römischen und der griechischen Rhetorik

Cicero's replies were current at that time. The relation between the two Atticist movements can be most naturally explained by reference to Q. Aelius Tubero, the patron of Dionysius.

Tubero's history, with its Thucydidean flavor, was not only in Dionysius' mind when he composed his essay on Thucydides. It was also available as a source for the first book of Dionysius' own history of early Rome¹. Tubero ultimately became famous as a lawyer as well as a historian², and he was well placed in Augustan society. His two sons both reached the consulate under the first *princeps*, one in 11 B.C. and the other in A.D. 4.³ His cognomen shows up in the family of no less a person than Sejanus. The name of L. Seius Tubero, consul in A.D. 18, implies an adoption from the family of the Aelii Tuberones or, just possibly, a relationship on the maternal side. It is evident that Dionysius' association with Quintus Tubero brought him close to the social and cultural world of the Augustan aristocracy; and at the same time it acquainted him with that conspicuous literary legacy of the Atticists, the imitation of Thucydides in Latin historiography. Among the φιλόλογοι whom Dionysius expected to read his work⁴, admiration for Thucydides was unanimous and uncritical. He therefore felt it incumbent upon him to provide an account (δήλωσις) of that author's character designed to assist those who would imitate him, σκοπὸν ἔχουσα τὴν ὠφέλειαν αὐτῶν τῶν βουλευσομένων μιμεῖσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα⁵. It is a fair conjecture that when Dionysius praised the superior taste and salutary influence of the recent

angeht, so ergibt unsere Betrachtung, dass sie wohl nur indirekt, und zwar durch eine jeweils andere Beziehung zum grammatischen Attizismus, miteinander zu tun hatten.»

¹ Observe Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* I 80, 1: Tubero δεινὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπιμελής.

² Cf., e.g., *Dig.* XXXII 29, 4; XXXIII 6, 7.

³ Q. Aelius Tubero (*cos.* 11 B. C.); Sex. Aelius Catus (*cos.* A. D. 4).

⁴ Dion. Hal. *De Thuc.* 2; 25; 35.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 25.

generation of Romans, he had Q. Aelius Tubero particularly in mind.

If Tubero brought to Dionysius' attention contemporary Roman interest in Thucydides, he must equally have reviewed with him the whole controversy over Atticism and Asianism from which it sprang. Cicero had been an intimate friend of Tubero's father, Lucius; he knew Quintus well; and he was related to their family: *Novi enim te [namely Quintus], novi patrem, novi domum nomenque vestrum... Haec ego novi propter omnis necessitudines, quae mihi sunt cum L. Tuberone: domi una eruditi, militiae contubernales, post adfines, in omni denique vita familiares*¹. That these remarks are no mere rhetorical exaggeration is certain from Cicero's comment in a letter to Atticus about either the father or the son: *neque Tuberonem volo offendere; mirifice est enim φιλαίτιος*². It was indeed one of the miracles of Cicero's speech on behalf of Ligarius that he succeeded in being so complimentary to the Tuberones while opposing the case which they had chosen to bring before Caesar in 46 against a former Pompeian legate of Africa. By identifying himself as an old Pompeian and playing cleverly on his high regard for the family of the Tuberones, Cicero managed to persuade Caesar to acquit Ligarius. Prosopographers and students of politics should mark this case well, for Cicero leaves us in no doubt of his personal devotion to his antagonists at the trial. He prized especially the literary tastes of his old friend, Lucius Tubero (*isdem studiis semper usi sumus*)³, and the promising talent of his son, Quintus (*eius ingenio studiisque delector*)⁴. The remark about Quintus is strikingly reminiscent of Cicero's opinion of Calvus (*de ingenio eius valde existimavi bene*)⁵, with whom he also disagreed in public.

¹ Cic. *Lig.* 5, 12 and 7, 21.

² Cic. *Att.* XIII 20, 2 (Shackleton Bailey, no. 328).

³ Cic. *Lig.* 7, 21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3, 8.

⁵ Cic. *Fam.* XV 21, 4 (Shackleton Bailey, no. 207).

Cicero's intimacy with the Aelii Tuberoes and their common literary interests put it altogether beyond doubt that Dionysius' patron Quintus Tubero, was fully apprised of Cicero's observations on Roman classicism in the *Brutus* and *Orator*. One could scarcely imagine a more likely person to transmit and expound to Dionysius, on his arrival in Rome, the literary issues that had evolved in rhetorical circles of the late Republic. Under Roman assault Asianism may already have been dethroned, in Dionysius' view; but he obviously still found it necessary, as did Caecilius, to attack it in the context of Greek rhetoric for at least the generation of life he thought it had left to it. Strabo, writing in all probability before 2 B.C., alluded to Asianism as a style still current and initiated by the much reviled Hegesias: ἤρξε μάλιστα τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ λεγομένου ζήλου, παραφθείρας τὸ καθεστηκὸς ἔθος τὸ Ἀττικόν¹.

Apart from Caecilius of Caleacte, it is difficult to be certain about the identity of Dionysius' professional colleagues in the Augustan age. The Aelii may provide a link with Strabo, who would in any case have been interested in what Dionysius was writing. Of Dionysius' younger colleagues or pupils, nothing substantial can be said of Ammaeus or Pompeius Geminus². Metilius Rufus was the son of an esteemed friend of Dionysius and himself passed to the praetorian proconsulate of Achaëa. No doubt because of this relationship Dionysius included a Metilius in the list of Alban *principes* made senators by Tullus Hostilius, whereas Livy did not³. But little more can be made of the connection with the Metilii.

¹ Strab. XIV 1, 41, p. 648. On the date of composition for most of the *Geography*, see J. G. C. ANDERSON, « Some Questions bearing on the Date and Place of Composition of Strabo's *Geography* », in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay* (Manchester 1923), 1-13.

² Certainly not that Pompeius Geminus was the author of the *De subl.*: G. P. GOULD, « A Greek Professorial Circle at Rome », in *TAPhA* 92 (1961), 172.

³ See G. W. BOWERSOCK, *op. cit.* (*supra* p. 64 n. 4), 132 with n. 2.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that Q. Aelius Tubero was married to a Sulpicia, the daughter of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus and the patrician Postumia; Tubero's daughter subsequently married Cassius Longinus (consul, A.D. 11), who was himself father of the jurist of the same name¹. Now the treatise *On the Sublime*, written in direct response to the writings of Caecilius, happens to be dedicated to a Postumius Terentianus². It is therefore of significance that the mother-in-law of Dionysius' patron was a Postumia. The continuing conjunction of Sulpicii and Postumii is reflected in the Augustan age by the praetorian associate of Messalla Corvinus in work on the water supply, a certain Postumius Sulpicius³. An intriguing hypothesis becomes possible and at least deserves consideration. The link between the family of Tubero's wife on the maternal side and the *nomen*, not at all common at this time, of the recipient of the work *On the Sublime* suggests that the explanation of the traditional ascription of that famous essay, Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου (or Διονυσίου Λογγίνου), may well lie in the connection of the family of Dionysius' patron, through his daughter's marriage, with Cassius Longinus. The text, written for an otherwise unknown relative by some forgotten Greek instructor at Rome, could have easily survived in the family. The close attention which both author and pupil gave to the writings of Caecilius has long implied, together with other intimations of date, that the work was probably composed only a few generations after Dionysius.⁴

¹ For the references, *RE* IV A 1, 857 (Fr. MÜNZER).

² *De subl.* I, 1. The name Terentianus is corrupt at this point, but it is certain in later occurrences in the text. Invocation of *T. Vibii Postumi Terentian[i]* on a lead pipe (*CIL* XV 2, 7373) is not helpful, since the name with Vibius must be Postumus, not Postumius. Cf. *RE* VIII A 2, 1979, no. 46, next to C. Vibius Postumus, *cos. suff.* A. D. 5.

³ Frontin. *De aquis* 99.

⁴ See D. A. RUSSELL (ed.), *op. cit.* (*supra* p. 67 n. 4), pp. xxviii-xxx.

Another name that should be considered in the context of Dionysius' classicism is that of the author of the surviving *Progymnasmata*, Aelius Theon. While we lack any secure indication of his date, both substance and style tend to point to the first century A.D.¹ He is himself an Atticist who refers to Hegesias καὶ τῶν Ἀσιανῶν καλουμένων ῥητόρων² in language similar to Strabo's (τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ λεγομένου ζήλου)³. None of this is decisive, but the name may well be. Why Aelius? The best explanation is the patronage of an Aelius, and no one is more likely to have been interested in Theon's studies than Dionysius' friend, Aelius Tubero. After all, it is attested that a descendant of Dionysius himself was called Aelius Dionysius; and the best supposition is that the name entered the family with the Augustan rhetorician⁴. Let us postulate a similar fortune for Theon and thereby enlarge the circle of Augustan classicists.

III. SOME FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Greek literary classicism in Augustan Rome found a remarkable resonance elsewhere in the Greek world. The theme of classicizing art quite properly belongs to others at Vandœuvres, but it has a historical importance in reflecting the taste of Dionysius' contemporaries. In Greece itself the instinct to recover and exalt a glorious past is particularly clear. A major classical temple of Ares at Acharnae was transferred stone by stone from its original site and rebuilt in the Athenian Agora under Augustus⁵. Parts of fifth-century temples were moved from Thorikos and Sunium to be built into other temples in the

¹ U. von WILAMOWITZ, in *Hermes* 35 (1900), 5 ff.; A. DIHLE, in *A & A* 23 (1977), 177.

² Theon, *Prog.*, in *Rhetores Graeci*, ed. L. SPENGLER, II p. 71.

³ Strab. XIV 1, 41, p. 648.

⁴ *PIR*² I, A 169. Cf. G. W. BOWERSOCK, *op. cit.* (*supra* p. 64 n. 4), 130 n. 1.

⁵ See H. A. THOMPSON, in *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 350-1.

Agora¹. These transferred remains served as palpable reminders of the past and models for the present. In epigraphy the well known use of early Attic lettering in the imperial age seems to have begun at Athens in the time of Augustus². All these developments occurred within the context of extensive building both in the Agora and on the Acropolis, much of which is clearly due to Roman initiative or in direct response to the Roman presence.

It looks very much as if Dionysius' observations about the role of the Romans in drawing the Greeks back to their great classical models in literature can be applied equally well to the self-conscious classicism of the Greeks at Athens. The great Augustan benefactors, men like Eucles and C. Julius Nicanor³, shaped the environment of the Athenians under Roman domination just as Dionysius shaped their literary tastes. There is not the slightest evidence that this evocation of classical models represented some kind of Greek affirmation of independence in the face of Rome. On the contrary, as we have seen, all the evidence suggests that Rome initiated and encouraged the return of Greece to the traditions of her classical past. Whatever the motives that led to this policy (some may suspect political emasculation through nostalgia), it is interesting to see the Romans as patrons of Hellenism. The tastes of a Nero and a Hadrian, in later years, were by no means so eccentric as they

¹ H. A. THOMPSON, «Itinerant Temples of Attica», in *AJA* 66 (1962), 200.

² A. E. RAUBITSCHER and L. H. JEFFERY, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949), 147-9. Cf. A. WILHELM, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Wien 1909), 29; P. GRAINDOR, *Athènes sous Auguste* (Le Caire 1927), 147. Note that the dedicatory inscription (*IG* III² 3173) of the temple to Rome and Augustus on the Acropolis shows classicizing in the letter-forms (especially Π, although the stone-cutter inadvertently forgot to use the early form in the last line).

³ Eucles: P. GRAINDOR, *op. cit.*, 142-3; cf. *IG* III² 3175. Nicanor: L. ROBERT, *Stèle: Tomos eis Mnemen Nikolaou Kontoleonos* (Athens 1977), 15; C. P. JONES, «Three Foreigners in Attica: I. Julius Nicanor», in *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 222-8.

sometimes appear. It was not their philhellenism, but the excess of their philhellenism that was unusual.

In Rome, under Augustus' influence, a comparable resurrection of the past was going on. The triumviral rebuilding of the Regia, the revival of ancient priesthoods, the emergence of histories of archaic times (notably by Livy and Dionysius) show a deliberate effort to connect the present with the past¹. But Rome had no *classical* past, and it is perhaps for that reason that Roman archaism quickly lapsed when succeeding years revealed that the Ciceronian and Augustan ages were themselves the long desired classical time. Even the most eccentric archaists of the second century A.D. were unable to displace Cicero and Virgil from their preeminence.

The Atticist debate in Latin literature was of no relevance to Augustus' program, and it is scarcely surprising that this parochial quarrel of the late Republic ceased to interest anyone. The only extensive echo of the issues that Cicero had examined with such fervor comes in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, but his account is essentially historical in character and faithfully reproduces Cicero's cogent argument for a broad definition of Atticism. Like Cicero, Quintilian urges the inclusion of Demosthenes and Hyperides in the Attic canon². He reaches the thoroughly anodyne conclusion that *Attice dicere* is simply *optime dicere*³. Quintilian is evidently not addressing an important contemporary problem. He notes that a few feeble souls in his own time—persons who are *aridi et exsuci et exsanguis*—still pose as Atticists of the late Republic⁴. But they are histor-

¹ Regia: F. E. BROWN, «New Soundings in the Regia», in *Entretiens Hardt* 13: *Les origines de la République romaine* (Vandœuvres/Genève 1967), 47 ff. Priesthoods: K. LATTE, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München 1960), 294 ff.

² Quint. XII 10, 21-26.

³ XII 10, 26.

⁴ XII 10, 14.

ical anachronisms who lie hidden in the shadow of a great name: *umbra magni nominis delitescunt*¹.

Quintilian's account of the struggle of Atticism and Asianism does nothing to alter the impression that it began in the Ciceronian age on the basis of Roman observations concerning Hellenistic Greek rhetoric. He notes that the actual division into two types of rhetoric was *antiqua*, by which he obviously implies that Asianism had its origin as far back as Hegesias². But there is no suggestion that Asianism as a pejorative term in rhetorical circles antedated the first century B.C. And of scholars who studied the phenomenon he names only Santra³.

Because of the differences between Greek and Latin, Quintilian believed that the quest for Attic purity was more appropriately left to Greeks. *Atque in hac tamen opinione perseverantes Graecos magis tulerim*⁴. That is exactly what happened. The terms of the Atticist debate were ill suited to Latin, but they were naturally meaningful for the language to which they referred. The legacy of Attic purity in the literature of the Greek renaissance under the Roman Empire is ample proof that Dionysius, guided by his Roman friends, had struck a rich vein. Even Hegesias had acknowledged the supremacy of the Attic style and thought he had achieved it. It took several centuries for the Greeks to understand why he had not; but once they did there was, fortunately, no turning back.

¹ XII 10, 15.

² XII 10, 16: *Et antiqua quidem illa divisio inter Atticos atque Asianos fuit, cum hi pressi et integri, contra inflati illi et inanes haberentur.*

³ XII 10, 16.

⁴ XII 10, 27.

DISCUSSION

M. Russell: I think that what we can guess about Caecilius' comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero points to its having been to Cicero's disadvantage. Plutarch, who mentions it disparagingly, himself inherited a favorable view of Cicero's achievement; and Longinus, who opposes Caecilius whenever he can, regards Cicero (with Plato!) as a genuine example of a 'sublime' writer, though in a different kind from Demosthenes. This would fit in well enough with the general picture.

Like Prof. Bowersock himself, I am sensible of the paradox involved in making a Roman literary movement the source of a Greek literary revolution. But we have only very uncertain alternatives. One lies in the tradition of λεπτότης in Callimachus and his followers. The other rests on the observation that Hegesias was apparently criticized in the third century (Agatharchides, *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 250) on the ground that, in contrast to Demosthenes, he dealt in a frivolous and inappropriate manner with the tragic circumstances of war and disaster. There seems to be a connection between this attack on Hegesias for his ἀπρεπές and the similar treatment of him in [Longinus] 3, 2, where he figures as one in a set of traditionally disreputable writers. So Dionysius may inherit a long tradition.

M. Bowersock: I do indeed feel conscious of the oddity in tracing a Greek literary movement to Roman antecedents, although that is what Dionysius says and also where the evidence points. Mr. Russell's remarks are very welcome. One may certainly say that the objections to Hellenistic rhetoric were not new with the Romans. Third-century attacks on Hegesias are proof enough. But it does look as if the particular formulation of the objections in terms of Atticism vs. Asianism arose among the Romans in the first century

B.C. and, it is reasonable to assume, acquired authority because of Roman interest. In other words, the Romans refurbished the arguments for their own purposes and thereby gave the initiative to which Dionysius alludes.

M. Zanker : Am Fall des Calvus ist für mich von besonderem Interesse, dass er sich je nach Genus und Aufgabe an Vorbilder aus verschiedener Zeit hielt. Das hat seine Entsprechung in der Verwendung klassischer oder hellenistischer Statuentypen in den verschiedenen Funktionsbereichen der 'Idealplastik' je nach dem Genus. Ich werde auf diesen Punkt in meinem Beitrag zurückkommen.

M. Gelzer : Der Nachweis eines Zusammenhangs zwischen Dionys und dem Umkreis des Cicero über diese Aelii scheint mir sehr interessant. Er macht es plausibel, dass Dionys dieselben Theorien gekannt haben kann, die auch Cicero kennt. Diese Tatsache hat ja schon Wilamowitz (« Asianismus und Attizismus », 226 f.) festgestellt. Die Schwierigkeit ist, dass wir nicht wissen, in welcher Form sie auf ihn gekommen sind: als mündliche Tradition, oder als Pamphlet eines Rhetors, oder als Teil einer τέχνη.

M. Bowersock : I agree about the difficulty of determining the precise form by which rhetorical theories were transmitted to Dionysius. But I think if one accepts my argument for the mediating role of the Aelii Tuberoes, this goes a long way toward explaining the link which Wilamowitz and others have observed between Cicero and Dionysius. These personal connections naturally permitted both oral and written transmission of ideas, theories, and prejudices.

M. Lasserre : J'admire le raisonnement historique par lequel M. Bowersock, mettant en évidence les relations entre les personnes, est conduit à faire dériver la doctrine élaborée par Denys de la thèse atticiste telle que Cicéron, après Calvus, la formule. Mais je constate aussi ce paradoxe que dès l'an 56 Cicéron fait appel pour l'éducation

de son fils Marcus et de son neveu Quintus au grammairien Tyrannion, avec lequel il reste en contact au moins jusqu'en 46: on imaginerait volontiers que celui-ci conformait son enseignement à la nouvelle doctrine, l'atticisme. Or il sera aussi le maître de Strabon quand ce dernier, âgé de 20 ans, arrivera à Rome en 44 et y recevra sa formation d'écrivain. Comment expliquer alors que ni dans ses *Commentaires historiques*, ni dans sa *Géographie*, celui-ci ne donne le moindre gage à la tendance atticisante ou classicisante, alors même qu'en un passage fameux de ses prolégomènes on a reconnu un écho de la théorie de Cécilius sur les œuvres 'colossales' (I 1, 23, pp. 13-14) et qu'ailleurs il évoque — M. Bowersock l'a cité — le zèle asianique d'Hégésias ? Cette conjoncture ne suscite-t-elle pas un doute sur le rôle qu'aurait joué Cicéron dans le milieu littéraire fréquenté par Denys ? En d'autres termes, y a-t-il vraiment continuité dans la transmission de la doctrine ou n'est-il pas permis de penser que Denys a pu se référer de lui-même aux débats entre atticistes et asianistes de la génération précédente ? Il me semble qu'on peut envisager aussi qu'il s'agit d'épisodes distincts et d'effets particuliers d'une même tendance générale à définir les modèles classiques.

M. Bowersock : It would certainly have been possible for Dionysius to have informed himself about the Atticist debate of the late Republic independently of a family that had been close to Cicero. But where a liaison with that family is demonstrable and given the fact that interest in the controversy seems to have died out among Latin authors under Augustus, I see no alternative to ascribing influence to the Tiberones—even if Dionysius could have learned as much without them. The point which M. Lasserre raises concerning Tyrannio and Strabo is a valuable and interesting one. Strabo's lack of interest in rhetorical matters with which Tyrannio must have been well acquainted may reveal more about Strabo himself than the curriculum of Tyrannio. One cannot, I think, make any inferences about what the eminent grammarian taught Cicero's son and nephew; and even if one could, Cicero's own interest in the Atticist controversy would not be in doubt.