# PREVENTING CICERONIANISM: C. LICINIUS CALVUS' REGIMENS FOR SEXUAL AND ORATORICAL SELF-MASTERY

JOHN DUGAN

IN HIS *NATURAL HISTORY,* Pliny's discussion of the medical uses of lead provides us with a surprising reference, namely, that the orator Calvus put lead plates on his kidneys to control his wet dreams. Pliny, moreover, connects this therapy with Calvus' literary activity, stipulating that the orator's treatment was designed to "preserve the strength of his body for the labor of his studies" (*viresque corporis studiorum labori custodisse, HN* 34.166). Attention to the larger Graeco-Roman medical context that frames Calvus' therapy reveals precise points of contact between his medical regimen and his rhetorical program: the treatment is designed to bring about effects upon Calvus' body that are identical to the apparently figurative goals of Atticism. His regimen of bodily control literally fulfills the metaphorical terms of his rhetorical aesthetics.

As an instantiation of his Atticist rhetorical program within his very body, Calvus' therapy is a remarkable example of the nexus in Roman thought between the body, oratory, and the self.[1] His medical program is a logical extension of the body's role within Roman rhetoric. The body is not limited to the domains of gesture and delivery (both falling under the rubric of *actio*), but constitutes a discourse that runs throughout the Roman rhetorical tradition.[2] The body is the locus not only of the Atticism/Asianism controversy, but also of theories concerning the registers of style, oratorical training and development, and the orator's voice. Moreover, 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

I owe many thanks to Rebecca Krawiec, Martha Malamud, and *CP*'s anonymous referees for their valuable criticism and suggestions. I read an earlier version of this paper at the Society of Ancient Medicine's "Medicine and Rhetoric" panel at the APA meeting in Dallas, December 1999. I would like to thank Lawrence Bliquez and Lesley Dean-Jones for organizing that session, and the audience members for their comments and questions. Special thanks, however, are due to Deborah Kamen, who brought Pliny's account of Calvus' medical regimen to my attention and thus allowed this project to take shape. All errors are, of course, my responsibility alone.

1. Gleason (1995) broke new ground on the issue of the interrelation between the body and rhetoric. Other contributions to this inquiry include Dominik 1997a; Richlin 1997a; and Gunderson 1998.

2. On the body's place in rhetorical theory, see Gunderson 1998, esp. 174: "Accordingly the body itself is opened up to the full critical vocabulary of the Roman rhetorical tradition." See also the brief comments of Desmouliez (1955). Van Hook (1905, 18–23) has a section devoted to the appearance in rhetorical theory of "The Human Body: Its Condition, Appearance, Dress, Care, Etc."

*Classical Philology* 96 (2001): 400–428
 0009-837X/01/9604-0004$02.00

Roman rhetoric, and revealing continuities between rhetorical and medical conceptions of the body. Calvus' regulation of his body in line with the aesthetics of his rhetorical program is an anticipation of the sort of *askesis* culture that Michel Foucault and Maud Gleason have revealed as integral to the thought and practice of the second century C.E.[3] The goal of this essay is to restore the lost context of Calvus' medical therapy, while also restoring the convergence that it enacts between medicine and aesthetics, and the self and words, to a more prominent position within the study of late republican oratory.[4]

## CALVUS' THERAPY AND GRAECO-ROMAN MEDICAL TREATMENTS FOR NOCTURNAL EMISSIONS

In the drama of late republican Roman literary history, C. Licinius Calvus has, due to the fragmentary survival of his poems and speeches, largely played the role either of Catullus' poetic sidekick or of the target of Cicero's anti-Atticist polemics.[5] This accident of survival disguises the fact that Calvus occupied a position of importance in his own right as a member of the avant-garde of both rhetoric and poetry. During his short life—he was born in 82 and was dead by 47 (but perhaps as early as 54)[6]—Calvus was both a younger rival for Cicero's forensic supremacy and a leading "new poet" on a par with Catullus.[7]

Amid the fragments of Calvus' writings and the scattered testimonia, Pliny's reference to Calvus' regimen stands as an exception to the obscurity that has enveloped the orator. Much of Calvus' public literary career is forever lost to us, and yet, paradoxically, we know about a distinctly personal practice that he used to regulate his body, specifically, his sexual desires (*HN* 34.166):

3. See Foucault 1986 and Gleason 1995. See also Bowersock 1969, 59–75 (chap. 5, "The Prestige of Galen"), on the privileged role that medicine played in the intellectual discourses of the second century, including rhetoric. Cf. Foucault 1986, 99. On the reception of Graeco-Roman *askesis* by Christianity, see Shaw 1998, esp. 27–78.

4. In this project I have drawn inspiration from the "New Historicism," especially for its interest in how apparently insignificant anecdotes can enact larger cultural phenomena. See Veeser 1994 and Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000, esp. 20–48 (chap. 1, "The Touch of the Real") and 49–74 (chap. 2, "Counterhistory and the Anecdote"). For an example of a New Historicist essay that analyzes the interaction between medical and literary texts, specifically Galenic gynecology and Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, see Greenblatt 1988. For a response to Greenblatt see Fineman 1989. For an essay that analyzes an anecdotal medical remedy in Pliny (*HN* 28.76: Pliny's remark that tying a woman's brassiere on his head brings him relief from headaches) for broader cultural signification, see Richlin 1997b.

5. For the oratorical fragments and testimonia see Malcovati 1955, 492–500. For the poetic fragments see Morel et al. 1995 (*FPL*), 206–16; and Courtney 1993, 201–11. Cf. Bardon 1952, 225–26, 341–44.

6. On the date of Calvus' death see Bowersock 1979, 60–61, and cf. Wisse 1995, 68.

7. The affectionate, intimate, and appreciative poems that Catullus addresses to Calvus (14, 50, 53, 96) attest to their vital personal and artistic relationship, while later references link the two as a natural pairing of comparably important poets: see Hor. *Sat.* 1.10 and Porphyrio ad loc.; Plin. *Ep.* 1.16.5, 4.27.4; Prop. 2.25.4 and 2.34.87–90; Ov. *Tr.* 2.427–32, *Am.* 3.9.62; Suet. *Iul.* 73; Mart. 24.195–96; Gell. *NA* 19.9.7; Non. 291L (for these references I am indebted to Gruen 1966, p. 232, n. 79, and Wiseman 1974, p. 52, nn. 43 and 45; cf. Batstone 1998, 132). Quintilian attests to the continuation of Calvus' popularity even into his day (*Inst.* 10.1.115): "inveni qui Calvum praeferrent omnibus"—no small compliment coming from so staunch a champion of Ciceronianism. Seneca refers to Calvus' rivalry, albeit on unequal footing, with Cicero over preeminence in oratory (*Controv.* 7.4.6: "Calvus, qui diu cum Cicerone iniquissimam litem de principatu eloquentiae habuit"). On Calvus in general see Gruen 1966 and Bowersock 1979, esp. 59–65.

in medicina per se plumbi usus cicatrices reprimere adalligatisque lumborum et renium parti lamnis frigidiore natura inhibere inpetus veneris visaque in quiete veneria sponte naturae erumpentia usque in genus morbi. his lamnis Calvus orator cohibuisse se traditur viresque corporis studiorum labori custodisse. Nero, quoniam ita placuit diis, princeps, lamna pectori inposita sub ea cantica exclamans alendis vocibus demonstravit rationem.

In medicine, lead by itself is used to prevent scars from forming and, when plates of lead are bound to the area of the loins and kidneys, it is used, owing to its rather cooling nature, to check the attacks of sexual desire and sexual dreams in one's sleep that cause spontaneous eruptions to the point of becoming a sort of disease. 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. Nero, Emperor (since such was the will of the gods), has shown a method for strengthening the voice by loudly singing songs with a plate of lead covering his chest.

Pliny's telegraphic account leaves much unstated: he mentions neither the source of his information about Calvus' therapy nor its exact relationship to Calvus' "studies."[8] Yet the text bears several indications that Pliny did not think of Calvus' regimen as a random curiosity, but as specifically pertinent to his oratorical practice. Pliny's identification of Calvus as *orator*[9] suggests that the anecdote has significance to Calvus in his capacity as orator. Moreover, Pliny's claim that Calvus' regimen preserved his strength for his hard work on his studies corresponds to the reputedly recherché quality of both his poetry and speeches.[10] Finally, Pliny's mention of Nero's use of lead plates in his vocal exercises indicates that the regimen may bear some relationship to Calvus' oratorical performance.

Greek medicine provides further context that connects Calvus' therapy and his "studies." The use of lead plates to control nocturnal emissions reappears throughout the extant Graeco-Roman medical corpus, from Galen,[11] to the emperor Julian's physician Oribasius,[12] and to the fifth-century

8. Isetta (1977) suggests that Calvus' lost work *De aquae frigidae usu* may be the ultimate source of Pliny's information. Although this text (all that we know is its title from Martial 14.196) may have been a typically learned Alexandrian poem that investigated, in a recherché fashion, medical uses of cold water, including its anaphrodisiac properties, it seems prima facie unlikely that Calvus would have included an account of his own therapy within such a work. Other possible sources present themselves, but are pure speculation: Calvus' correspondence; a Suetonian-style biography featuring revelations concerning Calvus' private life—or perhaps the story came into circulation from a rhetorical invective, a political or oratorical rival's attempt to show that Calvus engaged in unusual private medical practices and thus unmask his depraved nature or excessive fondness for the latest Greek fads in line with his neoteric verse and Atticist oratory. Pliny does credit Calvus as an authority used in Book 33 (see *HN* 33.140, where Pliny reports that Calvus complained about cooking vessels being made of silver: "vasa cocinaria ex argento fieri Calvus orator quiritat") and in the table of contents in the first book (*HN* 1.33b), but, following his usual practice, does not mention the title of this work. For Pliny's attitudes towards medicine, see Beagon 1992, 202–40, French and Greenaway 1986, and Richlin 1997b, 198–200.

9. Pliny refers to *Calvus orator* elsewhere in *HN* (33.140) but see also *HN* 7.165: "M. Caelius Rufus et C. Licinius Calvus eadem die geniti sunt, oratores quidem ambo, sed tamen dispari eventu."

10. Cic. *Fam.* 15.21.4 (to C. Trebonius, December of 46): "multae erant et reconditae litterae. vis non erat" (cf. *Brut.* 283, discussed below); Prop. 2.34.89: "haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calvi."

11. See Gal. *De sanitate tuenda* 6.14 (6:446 Kühn) and *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* 9.23 (12:232 Kühn) on athletes' use of lead plates to control wet dreams. See Shaw (1998, 58 [with n. 113]) and Isetta (1977, 112), who provide these references.

12. Oribasius *Ad Eunapium* 1.13. See von Staden (1992, p. 28, with n. 22), to whom I am indebted for this reference.

Latin translator of Soranus, Claudius Aurelianus.[13] The early-fifth-century Christian monastic leader John Cassian's teachings on the avoidance of nocturnal emissions synthesize Greek medical and Egyptian monastic thought.[14] His stipulation to his monks that they should put lead sheets on the area of their kidneys to control wet dreams serves as a testament to the longevity and wide diffusion of this practice.[15]

Lead plates were also prescribed for three sexual disorders that were considered to be related to nocturnal emissions, namely, 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*).[16] The late-fourth-/early-fifth-century medical writer Theodore Priscian groups satyriasis, priapism, and gonorrhea under the same rubric and provides a full account of their treatment, which is identical for each.[17] He advises first massage over the entire body, then rest, followed by the application of astringent vapors and unguents, then additional massage to the afflicted areas. Priscian also prescribes the consumption of astringent foods with vinegar and the avoidance of warming foods that are able to cause flatulence, for, he says, these latter foods often bring about sexual desire. He advises that one ingest similar (i.e., astringent and nonflatulent) sorts of drinks, and suggests that both food and drink should be consumed sparingly in order to bring about hunger and thirst. Only in the case of prolonged symptoms does Priscian recommend, as a last resort, placing lead sheets on the area of the kidneys, as well as the application of cupping glasses and the use of depilatories in that area.

13. Claudius Aurelianus *On Chronic Diseases* 5.7 (Drabkin 1950, 960–63): "tum stramenta duriora atque frigerantia procuranda. iubendi etiam supra latus iacere cum se somno dederint, †et ante se,† vel subponenda tenuis ac producta lammina plumbea clunibus; vel spongiae circumdandae pusca frigida infusae, vel inicienda loca rebus frigidae virtutis ex anterioribus, ut balaustio vel acacia aut ypoquistida vel psyllio herba, quae sunt singularia vel cum palmulis adhibenda. cibus etiam constrictivus dandus vel densabilis et frigidus, ut de sanguinis fluore conscripsimus. poto quoque frigido nutriendi vel constrictivis non quidem curiose confectis constringendi. tum adhibenda fortificatio ex communi resumtione, et facienda consuetudo frigidi lavacri, quod Graeci psycrolusian appellant; loca etiam in passione constituta forti impressione fricanda. sunt enim haec sufficientia constrictionis faciundae." See Isetta 1977, 110–11.

14. See Shaw 1998, 112–24; Brakke 1995; and Rouselle 1988, 172–75.

15. John Cassian *Institutes* 6.7.2: "atque in tantum se mundos ab omni coitus pollutione custodiunt, ut, cum se praeparant agonum certamini, ne qua forsitan per somnum nocturna delusi fallacia vires minuant multo tempore conquisitas, lamminis plumbeis renium contegant loca, quo scilicet metalli rigor genitalibus membris adplicitus obscenos umores valeat inhibere, intellegentes se procul dubio esse vincendos nec iam posse propositum certamen demptis viribus adinplere, si provisam pudicitiae soliditatem fallax noxiae voluptatis imago corruperit."

16. For the grouping of these diseases as related conditions, see Foucault 1986, 112–16, and von Staden (1992, pp. 29–30 and n. 26), who discusses the "'pneumatic' etiology" of these conditions: an excess of *pneuma* causes both the swelling of priapism and satyriasis and the excess of semen that is thought to be related to gonorrhea. On the role *pneuma* plays in these conditions see Gal. *De loc. aff.* 6.6 (8:437–52 Kühn).

17. Theodorus Priscianus *Euporiston lib.* 2.33 (Rose 1894, 131): "cibos stypticos omnes cum aceto ministrabo, vitans calidos et qui inflationem possint concitare corporibus. hi etenim frequenter usum erigere venerium consuerunt. sic etiam potus subministrandus erit. sed tamen omnia haec mediocriter et rarius exhibenda sunt, ut ex hoc veluti famem vel sitim procurare possimus. si vero passionis huius molestia diutius perseveraverit, ut et tensio et desiderium inpatientissime protendatur, lamminam plumbi renibus et partibus vicinis appono. nam et ventosis cucurbitis assiduis eadem loca fatiganda sunt. dropaces quoque imponendi erunt. ab omnibus carnosis cibis et multum nutrientibus abstinendi sunt, ab odoribus bonis vel thymiamatibus, ab aspectu vel communione pulcrarum penitus figurarum, ut neque tangendi neque visendi eis copia praebeatur." See Isetta 1977, 111.

Finally, he reprises his dietary prescriptions by saying that fleshy and very nutritious foods ought to be avoided, as should pleasant odors. He concludes with the suggestion that those suffering from these disorders ought to avoid entirely associating with "beautiful forms," in order that the afflicted not have an opportunity either to see or touch them.[18]

In Priscian's thorough account of these treatments we see many elements common to therapies that other Graeco-Roman doctors employed for this group of related sexual disorders, including nocturnal emissions. These include cooling and astringent regimens, foods, and drinks; the avoidance of flatulent foods; and the general reduction of the intake of both food and drink. For example, we find in other medical texts cooling and astringent prescriptions such as cold baths, plasters made up of cooling substances, cooling food and drinks, as well as bedding made up of herbs that were supposed to have a cooling or drying effect on the body.[19] The dietary prescriptions include long lists of flatulent foods that one should avoid and antiflatulent foods that one should consume, as well as suggestions for the general abstinence from food and drink.[20]

These treatments arise from the elemental and humoral basis of Greek medical thought. Proper health depended upon the maintenance of a balance between the four elements (fire, earth, air, and water) that correspond to the four qualities (warm, cold, dry, and moist) and humors (blood, black bile, yellow bile, and phlegm). Since the humors were the products of digestion, they were subject to regulation through dietary and topical therapies.[21] For wet dreams, or the similar involuntary discharge of semen involved in gonorrhea, cooling, drying, and astringent therapies were called for, since such treatments were supposed to hinder the production of semen within the body. In *On the Generation of Animals,* Aristotle provides an influential account of how the production of semen was supposed to take place. Semen has its genesis within an animal through the process of the "concocting" or "cooking" of blood together with "vital breath" or *pneuma,* which is added to blood from the heart when it passes from the stomach to the diaphragm.[22] Galen refines Aristotle's explanation when he claims that the process of concocting semen from blood and *pneuma* takes place in a man's coiled spermatic vessels to the point where the humor turns white

18. Cf. Sor. *Gyn.* 3.46 for similar prescriptions for women suffering gonorrhea, including the application of lead plates on the loins. See von Staden 1992, 30. Greek physicians also thought that women could suffer from satyriasis: see Gourevitch 1995.

19. Gal. *De simpl. med. temp. ac fac.* 6.2 (11:807–8 Kühn). See von Staden 1992, p. 29 and n. 23 for discussion of this passage.

20. On nourishing, flatulent foods that increase semen, and drying and cooling ones that repress it, see Gal. *De sanitate tuenda* 6.14 (6:443–48 Kühn) (cf. Gal. *De loc. aff.* 6.6 [8:449–50 Kühn]); *De simpl. med. temp. ac fac.* 5.23 (11.776–77 Kühn); Oribasius *Collectiones medicae* 1.18 and 14.66, *Libri incerti* 7, 8, 9. On the avoidance of flatulent foods: Gal. *De simpl. med. temp. ac fac.* 6.2 (11:807–8 Kühn); Oribasius *Coll. med.* 1.33 (see von Staden 1992, p. 28 and n. 23). On the relationship between diet and the production of semen and, in general, the genesis of the humors as the result of digestion, see Rouselle 1988, 16–20, and Shaw 1998, 53–72.

21. On Greek doctors' belief in the importance of achieving a proper balance (*krasis*) of the humors, see Shaw 1998, 53–54; on Galen's belief that certain types of foods had intrinsic heating, cooling, drying, or moistening effects on the body, see Shaw, 56–64.

22. Arist. *Gen. an.* 725a11–22. See Dean-Jones 1994, 60–61; and Laqueur 1990, 35–43.

when it arrives in the testicles.[23] Since semen production resulted from heating blood and *pneuma,* therapies that both cooled the body and decreased the consumption of gaseous food would naturally stem the excessive production of semen that was thought to cause nocturnal emissions.

The medical danger posed by the loss of semen in wet dreams stems from the loss of *pneuma* and its vitalizing powers, as Galen attests in his warning in *De semine* about the loss of *pneuma* resulting from immoderate sexual activity.[24] Moreover, the perils of excessive semen loss are not limited to compromised physical vigor (to whose wasting effects on the body the sources repeatedly refer), but also include dulled mental acuity, since the vital *pneuma* lost in ejaculation cannot then be transformed into the more refined "psychic *pneuma*." According to Galen, vital *pneuma* mixed with blood passes from the heart to the base of the brain, where the transformation from vital to psychic *pneuma* was supposed to take place, that is to say, when *pneuma* becomes transformed from a more generally vivifying substance to one with the particular function of enabling thought.[25] Aretaeus, a contemporary of Galen (c. 150–200 C.E.), describes in *On the Causes and Signs of Chronic Diseases* the effects that result from the excessive loss of semen caused by gonorrhea as a general weakening of the body's vigor, premature aging, and feminization. He says that it is "semen with vitality" (ζωοῦσα ἡ θορή) that causes men to be hot, to have physical and mental vitality, and to be "well voiced" (εὐφώνους). However, men without this vital semen become "shriveled, weak, high-voiced, hairless, beardless, and effeminate" (ῥικνοί, ἀσθενέες, ὀξύφωνοι, ἄτριχες, ἀγένειοι, γυναικώδεες), as, Aretaeus says, eunuchs demonstrate. It is by having mastery over his semen that a man becomes "bold, daring, strong."[26]

23. Gal. *De usu partium* 14.10 (4:184 Kühn = Helmreich 1907, 2:316): ἐν δὲ τῇ πλοκῇ ταύτῃ πέττεται μέχρι πλείστου τὸ φερόμενον ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄρχεις αἷμα καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ σαφῶς ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἐν μὲν ταῖς πρώταις ἕλιξιν αἱματῶδες ἔτι τὸ περιεχόμενον ὑγρόν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἑξῆς λευκότερον ἀεὶ καὶ μᾶλλον γιγνόμενον, ἕστ' ἂν ἀκριβῶς ἀπεργασθῇ λευκὸν ἐν ταῖς ἁπασῶν ὑστάταις, αἳ δὴ περαίνουσιν εἰς τοὺς ὄρχεις ("In this web the blood that is being carried to the testes is greatly cooked along with the *pneuma,* and one may clearly see that the humor contained in the first coils is still bloody, but in the next coils is increasingly whiter, until it is made completely white in the last coils, the ones which end at the testicles.") Cf. Galen *De usu partium* 9.4 (3:699–700 Kühn) and *De sanitate tuenda* 1.2 (6:3 Kühn). See also *De usu partium* 14.9 (4:183 Kühn), where semen is described as "full of vital *pneuma*" (τὸ σπέρμα πνευματῶδές ἐστι). On the concoction of blood and *pneuma* into semen see Foucault 1986, 108–11; Rouselle 1988, 13–15; Shaw 1998, 54.

24. Gal. *De semine* 1.16.30–32 (4:588 Kühn = De Lacy 1992, 138–41): οὐ μόνον δὲ τῆς θορώδους ὑγρότητος ἀφαιρεῖσθαι πᾶσι τοῦ ζῴου τοῖς μέρεσι συμβήσεται κατὰ τοὺς τοιούτους καιρούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ζωτικοῦ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν ἀρτηριῶν ἐκκενοῦται μετὰ τῆς σπερματώδους ὑγρότητος. ὥστ' οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, ἀσθενεστέρους ἀποτελεῖσθαι τοὺς λαγνεύοντας ἀμετρότερον, ἀφαιρουμένου τοῦ σώματος ἅπαντος ἑκατέρας τῶν ὑλῶν τὸ εἰλικρινέστατον, προσερχομένης δὲ καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς, ἥτις καὶ αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐστιν ἱκανὴ διαλύειν τὸν ζωτικὸν τόνον· ὥστ' ἤδη τινὲς ὑπερησθέντες ἀπέθανον. ("And the loss that all the parts of the animal undergo at such times will be not only of seminal fluid but also of vital *pneuma;* for this too is emptied from the arteries along with the seminal fluid. So it is not at all surprising that those who are less moderate sexually turn out to be weaker, since the whole body loses the purest part of both substances; and there is besides an accession of pleasure, which by itself is enough to dissolve the vital tone, so that before now some persons have died from excess of pleasure" [trans. De Lacy].) On the dangers that sexual activity in general poses, see Rouselle 1988, 14–15, and Foucault 1986, 116–18.

25. See Gal. *De usu partium* 9.4 (3:696–703 Kühn) and cf. Oribasius *Libri incerti* 41 and *Coll. med.* 24.13. See also *De usu partium* 8.13 (3:674 Kühn), where Galen discusses the relationship between the fineness of psychic *pneuma* and intelligence. See Rouselle 1988, 15; Shaw 1998, p. 60 and n. 117; Gleason 1995, p. 85 and n. 15.

26. Aretaeus *On the Causes and Signs of Chronic Diseases* 4.5 (Hude 1958, 71). See Foucault 1986, 115–16.

The details of Pliny's account of Calvus' medical regimen are therefore readily explicable within the terms that Greek medicine used to explain the pathology of nocturnal emissions. Calvus' use of lead sheets on the area of the kidneys was an established practice in Greek medicine. Moreover, he undertook this treatment because of widespread concern, which is systematically rationalized and explained within the medical sources, that the uncontrolled loss of *pneuma* in semen could lead to physical enervation, the blunting of one's mental edge, feminization, and the loss of a properly masculine vocal tone. The linkage between cooling therapies and the control of wet dreams supports Sandra Isetta's suggestion that Calvus' lost *De aquae frigidae usu* (known only from Martial's enigmatic reference to it) may have discussed the anaphrodisiac properties of cold water in line with the prescriptions that these medical texts make.[27] It is this understanding of physiology—and the use of drying, astringency, antiflatulence, and starvation as methods to hinder semen production and thus control unwanted semen loss—that resonate with the extant accounts of Calvus' Atticist oratory.

## ATTICISM, ROMAN RHETORIC, AND THE BODY

Atticism as an intelligible literary movement is a phenomenon limited to the Roman rhetorical culture of the middle of the first century B.C.E.[28] These Roman Atticists laid claim to the authentic purity and restrained simplicity of Attic prose style, as opposed to the florid, excessively ornate, stylistically and emotionally unrestrained oratory that they attributed to Hellenistic orators from Asia Minor. Our knowledge of the Atticists is largely dependent upon Cicero's accounts in the *Brutus* and *Orator* (both of 46 B.C.E.), where the orator defends himself against the accusations of Asianism made by his Atticist critics.[29] The Atticists appear to have used the label "Asianist" in their polemics without much geographical or historical precision, but rather as a term designed to denigrate oratory they deemed bloated and excessively emotional.[30] Within this literary controversy "Attic" became a conventional term that the Atticists employed to designate the authenticity of their own

27. Mart. 14.196: "*Calvi de aquae frigidae usu:* haec tibi quae fontes et aquarum nomina dicit, / ipsa suas melius charta natabat aquas." See Isetta 1977.

28. Wilamowitz 1900 persuasively demonstrates that Atticism was an event of late republican Rome without substantive antecedents in Greece. Wilamowitz's position is a reaction against Norden's claim that a tension between Atticism and Asianism animates the entire history of Greek and Roman prose (Norden 1898, esp. 216–21). On this controversy, see Fairweather 1981, 246–51. On Roman Atticism in general, see Leeman 1963, 136–67; Lebek 1970, 83–114; Douglas 1973, 119–31; Bowersock 1979; Gelzer 1979; Wisse 1995; Richlin 1997a, 106–7; O'Sullivan 1997.

29. Although our first evidence for Roman Atticism appears in 46, the origins of the movement may date from 60–55, as Wisse (1995, 69) argues. The controversy between Atticism and Asianism later reappears in Greek literature in the Augustan period, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus' preface to *On the Ancient Orators* attests. Dionysius presents Atticism as a recent development (3.3) and credits the ultimate triumph of Atticism to the influence of Roman good taste (3.1). We thus face the surprising scenario (as Kennedy 1972, 241–42 and 351–53 first proposed, and Bowersock 1979 and Wisse 1995 later developed) that the Atticist movement may have originated among Romans and later influenced Greeks writing under the Empire.

30. A point well made by Wisse (1995, 72), who credits Wilamowitz 1900, 1–8, with this observation: "'Asianism' was not, at least originally, the name of a real movement or even a real stylistic period: it was a term of abuse coined by the Atticists to disparage the period they rejected."

oratory versus the illegitimacy of their "Asianist" opponents.[31] These classifications are sufficiently nebulous to admit a range of subjective interpretations, a vagueness that (as we shall see) Cicero exploits when he claims to be more authentically Attic than the Atticists themselves.[32]

Cicero's dialogue *Brutus* provides our earliest and most complete account of Calvus' Atticism in a thorough retrospective description of Calvus' rhetorical program.[33] Cicero places his account of Calvus at a crucial juncture in the *Brutus'* history of Roman rhetoric: it occupies the penultimate position before the diptych portrait of Hortensius and Cicero himself that concludes the work. From a seemingly offhand comment about two young men, Calvus and Curio, who were both cheated by death of the oratorical success that they would otherwise have achieved, Cicero constructs a detailed digression about, and critique of, Roman Atticism. This digression stands as a bridge to the autobiography that Cicero weds to his portrait of Hortensius. Calvus' Atticism therefore stands as an implicit foil for Hortensius' Asianism.[34] Cicero begins this portrait by alluding to Calvus' *doctrina,* granting him greater learning than Curio (*eruditior*), and describing his style of oratory as being especially studied (*accuratius*) and meticulous (*exquisitius*).[35] Calvus' carefulness, however, is ultimately self-defeating: his refinements are appreciated only by a few like-minded savants, and simply pass by the unappreciative crowd.

Cicero then presents Calvus' oratory through a system of tropes based on the body and its regulation. His Atticism is a program of anxious self-scrutiny and control (*nimium tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque*). Atticism throughout is expressed in terms of the body and its humors: Calvus' Atticism compromised his "true blood," his authentic vigor (*verum sanguinem deperdebat*); it is a deliberate program of stylistic leanness

31. Cf., however, *Brut.* 325–26, where Cicero calls Hortensius' oratory "Asianist," but without disapproving of anything more than his continuing to practice this style beyond a suitable age.

32. The paradoxical circles in which this Atticist/Asianist discourse could travel are evident in the fact that Hegias of Magnesia (third century B.C.E.), an archetypal Asianist, professed himself an imitator of Lysias (*Brut.* 286, *Orat.* 226). See Wisse 1995, pp. 72–73, n. 17; and Bowersock 1979, 65.

33. *Brut.* 283.

34. Cicero takes some care to have the topic of Calvus seem to arise as if from the natural progression of discussion between his interlocutors. The analysis of Calidius' failure to achieve an impassioned style, and, in particular, the discussion of this failure in terms of oratorical "health" (*Brut.* 279: "dubitamus, inquit, utrum ista sanitas fuerit an vitium?") presents a suitably plausible segue into the discussion of Atticism and its bodily figured program. For a vigorous critique of the claim that Calidius was himself an Atticist (and a discussion of Roman Atticism in general) see Douglas 1955.

35. *Brut.* 283: "sed ad Calvum—is enim nobis erat propositus—revertamur; qui orator fuit cum litteris eruditior quam Curio tum etiam accuratius quoddam dicendi et exquisitius adferebat genus; quod quamquam scienter eleganterque tractabat, nimium tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque, ne vitiosum conligeret, etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat. itaque eius oratio nimia religione attenuata doctis et attente audientibus erat inlustris, multitudine autem et a foro, cui nata eloquentia est, devorabatur. [284] tum Brutus: Atticum se, inquit, Calvus noster dici oratorem volebat: inde erat ista exilitas quam ille de industria consequebatur. dicebat, inquam, ita; sed et ipse errabat et alios etiam errare cogebat. nam si quis eos, qui nec inepte dicunt nec odiose nec putide, Attice putat dicere, is recte nisi Atticum probat neminem. insulsitatem enim et insolentiam tamquam insaniam quandam orationis odit, sanitatem autem et integritatem quasi religionem et verecundiam oratoris probat. haec omnium debet oratorum eadem esse sententia. [285] sin autem ieiunitatem et siccitatem et inopiam, dummodo sit polita, dum urbana, dum elegans, in Attico genere ponit, hoc recte dumtaxat; sed quia sunt in Atticis alia meliora, videat ne ignoret et gradus et dissimilitudines et vim et varietatem Atticorum."

and thinning (*oratio attenuata, exilitas quam ille de industria consequebatur*) whose failure lies in the dogmatic assumption that suitably refined "fasting and dryness and poverty" (*ieiunitatem et siccitatem et inopiam*) in themselves constitute oratorical "health and soundness" (*sanitatem autem et integritatem*); and Atticism is figured as a sort of oratorical cult or chastity (*quasi religionem et verecundiam oratoris*).[36] Moreover, Cicero presents Atticism in the terms that Calvus himself, as the leader of the movement (implied in *ipse errabat et alios etiam errare cogebat*), appears to have used to describe his program (as *dicebat, inquam, ita* suggests).

The *Brutus* elsewhere presents the Atticist movement within a long-range historical narrative of weakening health. Cicero traces Atticism's genealogy from its birth in Athens to its self-proclaimed Roman heirs as one of a decline from Athenian robustness to Roman anorexia. In fourth-century Athens, Cicero claims, "juice and blood was uncorrupted and there was a naturally healthy complexion without rouge."[37] When Attic oratory departed the Piraeus for Asia and the islands, however, it "stained itself with foreign habits and lost all of that wholesomeness and, as it were, the health of Attic diction."[38] Concerning the Atticists of his time, Cicero finds fault with their desiccated interpretation of Atticism: "They say they delight in the Attic type of speech, and in fact they do so wisely. How I wish that they were imitating not just their bones but also their blood!"[39] Another of Cicero's rhetorical writings, *De optimo genere oratorum*—the introduction to an apparently unfinished translation of Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon* and Demosthenes' *On the Crown*—repeats the bodily figured criticism of Calvus and applies it broadly to the Atticist movement as a whole. He grants that the Atticists are "healthy and dry," but their soundness is like that of amateur athletes, not Olympic champions. The Olympians are not satisfied merely with being "free from fault" and possessing "good health," like the Atticists, but strive after "strength, muscles, and blood, even a pleasant tan."[40] The frequency with which the body appears in these contexts

36. See Batstone 1998 for an investigation of the programmatic significance of *arida* (*pumice*) in Catullus 1 that charts "dryness" within a constellation of related terms within rhetorical theory (dryness, fineness, polish, intelligence, health). Note esp. 132, where Batstone uses the discussion of Calvus in *Brut.* 283–85 as a bridge to Catullus' aesthetics. For the equation of stylistic "dryness" and "health" see Sen. *Ep.* 114.3: "non potest alius esse ingenio, alius animo color. si ille sanus est, si compositus, gravis, temperans, ingenium quoque siccum ac sobrium est." For a study of the influence of the bodily figured discourse of Atticism upon Roman love elegy (with particular attention paid to Calvus), see Keith 1999.

37. *Brut.* 36: "ut opinio mea fert, sucus ille et sanguis incorruptus usque ad hanc aetatem oratorum fuit, in qua naturalis inesset, non fucatus nitor."

38. *Brut.* 51: "nam ut semel e Piraeo eloquentia evecta est, omnis peragravit insulas atque ita peregrinata tota Asia est, ut se externis oblineret moribus omnemque illam salubritatem Atticae dictionis et quasi sanitatem perderet ac loqui paene dedisceret."

39. *Brut.* 68: "Attico genere dicendi se gaudere dicunt. sapienter id quidem; atque utinam imitarentur nec ossa solum, sed etiam sanguinem!"

40. Cic. *Opt. gen. orat.* 8: "haec [sc. various stylistic faults] vitaverunt fere omnes qui aut Attici numerantur aut dicunt Attice. sed qui eatenus valuerunt, sani et sicci dumtaxat habeantur, sed ita ut palaestritae spatiari in xysto ut liceat, non ab Olympiciis coronam petant. qui, cum careant omni vitio, non sunt contenti quasi bona valetudine, sed viris, lacertos, sanguinem quaerunt, quandam etiam suavitatem coloris. eos imitemur si possumus; si minus, illos potius qui incorrupta sanitate sunt, quod est proprium Atticorum, quam eos quorum vitiosa abundantia est, qualis Asia multos tulit." Cf. ibid., 12: "id vero desinant dicere, qui subtiliter dicant, eos solos Attice dicere, id est quasi sicce et integre. et ample et ornate et copiose cum eadem integritate Atticorum est." Cicero may have intended his translation of these masterpieces of Attic oratory to be a tangible demonstration of authentic Atticism in Latin.

confirms that Cicero's use of bodily tropes in his portrayal of Calvus participates in a larger discourse: the body was the central vehicle through which the Atticist/Asianist discourse was articulated.

Quintilian shows that in the Empire the body continued to set the terms of the Atticist/Asianist debate. He attacks the Atticists of the late Republic as a band of cult followers who slighted Cicero for not being sufficiently superstitious and bound to their regulations—regulations that make their admirers in Quintilian's day "dry, juiceless, and bloodless" (*aridi et exsuci et exsangues*). For Quintilian the Atticists cover over their "weakness" (*inbecillitati*) with the label of "health" (*sanitatis appellationem*). Moreover, they hide themselves beneath the shade of the impressive name of Atticism because they cannot bear the more radiant power of eloquence as if it were the sun. Then Quintilian, signaling his deference to Cicero's authority, excuses himself from further discussion of the movement since Cicero has dealt with it so often and extensively.[41]

Quintilian therefore does not hesitate to proclaim his support for Cicero's campaign against the Atticists and, in doing so, he reuses, and elaborates upon, the bodily tropes that Cicero used in his anti-Atticist polemics. Nevertheless, Quintilian has favorable things to say about Calvus himself. Even in the midst of stating that he has found some who believe Cicero's claim that Calvus lost "true blood" because of his excessive self-criticism, he mentions that he has found others who prefer Calvus above all, and claims that Calvus' speech was "pure and impressive and chaste and often forceful as well" (*sancta et gravis oratio et castigata et frequenter vehemens quoque*).[42] Elsewhere in the *Institutio oratoria,* in a catalogue of the great late republican orators, Quintilian isolates Calvus' *sanctitas* as his salient admirable quality.[43] In Calvus' case, Quintilian puts a positive valuation upon the same regimes of control, chastity, and purity that he otherwise finds culpable in the Atticist movement as a whole.

It is reasonable to assume that the Atticists also participated in this bodily discourse. In his praise of Calvus' stylistic asceticism and purity Quintilian may be repeating the terms through which the Atticists themselves expressed their stylistic creed, as Cicero did in the *Brutus*. If so, the body was therefore the chief metaphor through which the Atticists themselves framed their project. Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus* provides more direct access to the Atticists' side of the polemics and the ways in which tropes drawn from the body and its regulation functioned within them, and in so doing provides evidence that supports these assumptions. The *Dialogus* preserves fragments of an otherwise lost correspondence between Cicero, Calvus, and

41. Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.14: "praecipue vero presserunt eum qui videri Atticorum imitatores concupierant. haec manus quasi quibusdam sacris initiata ut alienigenam et parum superstitiosum devinctumque illis legibus insequebatur: unde nunc quoque aridi et exsuci et exsangues. hi sunt enim qui suae inbecillitati sanitatis appellationem, quae est maxime contraria, optendant: qui quia clariorem vim eloquentiae velut solem ferre non possunt, umbra magni nominis delitescunt. quibus quia multa et pluribus locis Cicero ipse respondit, tutior mihi de hoc disserendi brevitas erit."

42. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.115: "inveni qui Calvum praeferrent omnibus, inveni qui Ciceroni crederent eum nimia contra se calumnia verum sanguinem perdidisse; sed est et sancta et gravis oratio et castigata et frequenter vehemens quoque."

43. Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.11: "sanctitatem Calvi (laudat)."

Brutus concerning oratorical style, which Tacitus puts in the mouth of Aper, the dialogue's champion of contemporary oratory (18.4–5):[44]

> 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 attritum, 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."
>
> There is general agreement that not even Cicero lacked detractors who thought that he was puffed out, swollen, and insufficiently firm, but excessively unrestrained, overflowing, and not Attic enough. You have certainly read the letters that Calvus and Brutus sent to Cicero. From these it is easy to detect that, in Cicero's opinion, Calvus was bloodless and thin, and Brutus ineffectual and disconnected; in turn, Cicero was accused by Calvus of being loose and sinewless, and by Brutus of being (here I quote directly) "broken and loinless."

Aper challenges the alleged superiority of late republican orators and presents the first in a series of instances in the *Dialogus* where, in discussions of Atticist orators, the body is used as a metaphor for oratorical style. Aper continues his disparagement of antique orators by saying that he will not attack run-of-the-mill (presumably Atticist) speakers, who, "(patients) in the same hospital, approve of these bones and this emaciation," but he will criticize Calvus himself.[45] Aper implies that even as successful an Atticist orator as Calvus is guilty of the same stylistic leanness he finds in lesser talents. Later Aper criticizes Asinius Pollio, whose oratory appears to have had affinities with Atticist tastes,[46] for excessive aridity and harshness.[47] He then generalizes about speech's similarity to the human body (*Dial.* 21.8):

44. See Hendrickson 1926. Cf. Gleason 1995, 107, and Richlin 1997a, 106–7.

45. Tac. *Dial.* 21.1: "equidem fatebor vobis simpliciter me in quibusdam antiquorum vix risum, in quibusdam autem vix somnum tenere. nec unum de populo †Canuti aut Atti . . . de Furnio Toranio† quique alios in eodem valetudinario haec ossa et hanc maciem probant: ipse mihi Calvus, cum unum et viginti, ut puto, libros reliquerit, vix in una aut altera oratiuncula satis facit."

46. While ancient sources never identify Pollio as an Atticist orator, accounts of his style suggest that he shared at least some of their stylistic values and, moreover, had a marked personal and literary antipathy against their adversary Cicero. Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.113) isolates as salient characteristics of Pollio's oratory *multa inventio* and *summa diligentia* such that it seemed excessive to some (cf. Sen. *Controv.* 4.3 pr.: "illud strictum eius et asperum et nimis iratum ingenio suo iudicium"). Leeman (1963, 161) compares the accusation of excessive self-scrutiny that Cicero makes against Calvus as evidence of Pollio's Atticism. Pollio's unsuccessful imitators in Quintilian's time receive the label of *tristes ac ieiuni* (*Inst.* 10.2.17), terms that recall anti-Atticist polemic. On the question of whether or not Pollio was in fact an Atticist, see Leeman (1963, 160–63), who believes that Pollio was a Thucydidean extremist within the Atticist party, and cf. Douglas (1973, 127) and Lebek (1970, 136–46), who are skeptical of this claim. The particular area where Pollio's style clashed with Cicero's is in *compositio verborum,* as Sen. *Ep.* 100.7 suggests: "lege Ciceronem; compositio eius una est, pedem curvat lenta et sine infamia mollis. at contra Pollionis Asinii salebrosa et exsiliens et, ubi minime expectes, relictura." This stylistic gulf led to the paradox that Pollio's style seemed to predate Cicero's. See Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.113: "a nitore et iucunditate Ciceronis ita longe abest, ut videri possit saeculo prior." Pollio mixed personal with literary-critical attacks (Quint. *Inst.* 12.1.22: "nec Asinio utrique, qui vitia orationis eius etiam inimice pluribus locis insecuntur"). So strong was Pollio's hostility towards Cicero that he carried on a sustained program to discredit Cicero's political and oratorical legacy after his death (for revealing anecdotes see Sen. *Suas.* 6.14–15 and 6.27). His son Asinius Gallus carried on the vendetta by publishing a work that compared his father with Cicero (Plin. *Ep.* 7.4.3. See Winterbottom 1982, 241). On Pollio in general, see Zecchini 1982.

47. *Dial.* 21.7: "Asinius quoque, quamquam propioribus temporibus natus sit, videtur mihi inter Menenios et Appios studuisse. Pacuvium certe et Accium non solum tragoediis sed etiam orationibus suis expressit; adeo durus et siccus est."

> oratio autem, sicut corpus hominis, ea demum pulchra est, in qua non eminent venae nec ossa numerantur, sed temperatus ac bonus sanguis implet membra et exsurgit toris ipsosque nervos rubor tegit et decor commendat.
>
> A speech is like a person's body: it is only beautiful when the veins do not stick out and the bones cannot be counted, but balanced and healthy blood fills the limbs and swells in the muscles, such that a ruddy complexion covers the sinews and the person achieves an attractive appearance.

The metaphor of speech as the human body gets additional development when Aper criticizes archaizing orators for their indiscriminate admiration for Calvus' writings and disdain for those of their contemporaries. Aper claims that these antiquated speakers "acquire that very 'health' (*sanitatem*) that they boast of, not from robustness (*firmitudine*), but from fasting (*ieiunio*)," and says that "in the case of the body, doctors do not even approve of strength (*valetudinem*) that comes about because of the mind's anxiety (*animi anxietate*); it is not enough to be free from illness: I want an orator to be strong and flourishing and lively (*fortem et laetum et alacrem*). A man whose only distinction is 'health' (*sanitas*) is very close to illness."[48]

Aper's polemics against these latter-day Atticists provide further evidence that the body and its care constituted a central trope for the Atticist movement's self-presentation and were not simply a Ciceronian invention: *sanitas* was likely an Atticist rallying cry, as is implied in Tacitus' claim that this was their boast (*Dial.* 23.3: *iactant sanitatem*). Maternus' comment, immediately following Aper's speech, to the effect that Aper had turned his adversaries' theories against them, confirms that he used the Atticists' own claims of "healthiness" in his attack.[49] Messalla claims that the recriminations contained in the letters of Cicero, Brutus, and Calvus are not (as Aper asserts) evidence of their oratorical weakness, but of natural human envy.[50] Messalla reprises the body/oratory theme in his rebuttal against Aper when he claims that each of the distinguished orators from the late Republic has his own distinctive strength, and that each manifests "the same oratorical health" (*eandem sanitatem eloquentiae*): Calvus in his "constrictedness" and Cicero in his "force, fullness, and strength."[51] Messalla here presents the polemical terms of Calvus' and Cicero's correspondence in their positive guises: from *exsanguis* Calvus becomes *adstrictior,* while instead of *exsultans, superfluens, solutus,* and *enervis* Cicero is *vehementior, plenior,* and *valentior.*

48. *Dial.* 23.2–23.4: "qui rhetorum nostrorum commentarios fastidiunt, Calvi mirantur, quos more prisco apud iudicem fabulantes non auditores sequuntur, non populus audit, vix denique litigator perpetitur: adeo maesti et inculti illam ipsam quam iactant sanitatem non firmitate sed ieiunio consequuntur. porro ne in corpore quidem valetudinem medici probant quae animi anxietate contingit; parum est aegrum non esse: fortem et laetum et alacrem volo. prope abest ab infirmitate in quo sola sanitas laudatur."

49. *Dial.* 24.1: "quanto non solum ingenio ac spiritu, sed etiam eruditione et arte ab ipsis mutuatus est per quae mox ipsos incesseret."

50. *Dial.* 25.5–6: "nam quod in vicem se obtrectaverunt et sunt aliqua epistulis eorum inserta ex quibus mutua malignitas detegitur, non est oratorum vitium, sed hominum. nam et Calvum et Asinium et ipsum Ciceronem credo solitos et invidere et livere et ceteris humanae infirmitatis vitiis adfici: solum inter hos arbitror Brutum non malignitate nec invidia, sed simpliciter et ingenue iudicium animi sui detexisse."

51. *Dial.* 25.4: "nec refert quod inter se specie differunt, cum genere consentiant. adstrictior Calvus, nervosior Asinius, splendidior Caesar, amarior Caelius, gravior Brutus, vehementior et plenior et valentior Cicero: omnes tamen eandem sanitatem eloquentiae ferunt."

The evidence gathered above from Cicero, Quintilian, and Tacitus allows us to chart the terms that Cicero and Calvus (along with his Atticist comrades) deployed in the polemics:

| OF CICERO | OF CALVUS AND THE ATTICISTS |
|---|---|
| swollen | thinned/emaciated |
| *inflatus* | *oratio nimia religione attenuata* |
| *tumens* | *exilitas quam ille de industria consequebatur* |
| | *ieiunitas* |
| | *haec ossa et hanc maciem probant* |
| | *(imitantur) ossa (Atticorum antiquorum)* |
| overflowing | sparse |
| *superfluens* | *inopia* |
| | dry |
| | *aridus* |
| | *siccus/siccitas* |
| | bloodless |
| | *exsanguis* |
| | *sanguinem deperdebat* |
| | juiceless |
| | *exsucus* |
| unrestrained | restrained |
| *nec satis pressus* | *devinctum legibus* |
| *exsultans* | *oratio nimia religione attenuata* |
| *solutus* | cautious |
| | *metuens ne vitiosum conligeret* |
| *parum superstitiosum devinctumque illis [sc. Atticorum] legibus* | self-scrutinizing |
| | *nimium inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans* |
| | cultlike |
| | *quasi religionem . . . oratoris probat* |
| | *quasi quibusdam sacris initiata superstitiosum* |

of compromised masculinity
*enervis*

*fractus*

*elumbis*

pure/chaste
*(quasi) verecundiam oratoris*

*sanctitas*

*sancta . . . oratio*

"healthy"
*sanitas*

*integritas*

*bona valetudo*

*integer*

*salubritas*

*in eodem valetudinario*

*inbecillitati sanitatis appellationem . . . optendant*

These dichotomies of fullness and thinness, restraint and license, full-bloodedness and aridity create a conception of the body that underlies both the Atticist/Asianist discourse and Calvus' medical regimen. Moreover, this conception of the body is the means by which Roman rhetoric articulates other essential aspects of its enterprise, including the fundamental divisions of style, the development and training of an orator, and the cultivation of the voice. As we shall see, within these discourses in Roman rhetoric, the body and its care appear along a spectrum that ranges from more metaphorical (in the discourse on style) to more literal manifestations (in the development of the orator and the care of his voice). And yet within this spectrum 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. Rhetoric, as a performative discourse of the body and voice, is preoccupied both with the physical aspects of the orator's body as the instrument of his voice, delivery, and gesture, and with oratory's goal of self-expression. The body, therefore, has both a practical and semiotic function within rhetoric. In Roman rhetoric, there is no clear distinction between the body's more material and more metaphorical aspects, since rhetorical style is both predicated upon, and is an expression of, one's bodily and ethical self, and vice versa. This fluidity in rhetoric between the metaphorical and literal body renders explicable Calvus' regulation of his body and his speech according to the same criteria.

Discussions of the stylistic register (the "characters of style"[52]) present the degrees of ornament in terms parallel to the Atticist/Asianist debate. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* which provides the first and fullest discussion of the *tria genera* in the extant Roman tradition, divides successful oratorical style into three levels: the high (*gravis*), middle (*mediocris*), and low (*extenuata*). Each of these registers has a corresponding fault that results from a failed attempt to achieve its target. The *Ad Herennium*'s faulty versions of both the *gravis* and *mediocris* levels are identical to Atticist criticisms of Cicero's style.[53] The failed high style is "swollen" (*sufflata*) and is dangerous since, as "swelling (*tumor*) often imitates a good condition of the body," so too "swollen and inflated language (*ea quae turget inflata est*) often seems 'weighty' to the ignorant."[54] Those failing to achieve a proper middle style alternately may fall into either a "loose" (*dissolutum*) style that is "without sinews and joints" (*sine nervis et articulis*) or a "billowing" style that "flows this way and that and cannot set out in a confident or manly fashion" (*fluctuat huc et illuc nec potest confirmate neque viriliter sese expedire*).[55] In these failed figures we hear echoes of the Atticists' accusations that Cicero was *tumens, inflatus, solutus,* and *enervis*. Correspondingly, the Herennian "low" (*attenuata*) style, along with its failed counterpart, is similar to Atticism's configuration within these polemics. This "thinned" style is "lowered all the way down to the most usual habit of pure conversation," while those who fail to achieve this style "come into a dry and bloodless (*aridum et exsangue*) type of speech which it is not inappropriate to call thin (*exile*)."[56]

In the *De oratore,* Cicero also presents these registers of style in the bodily terms shared by the Atticist/Asianist debate: the high style is "full (*plena*) and yet rounded (*teres*)";[57] the low style is "slender, not without

52. See Douglas 1966, 145–46 (ad *Brut.* 202), Douglas 1957; and Hinks 1936.

53. *Rhet. Her.* 4.11: "sunt igitur tria genera, quae genera nos figuras appellamus, in quibus omnis oratio non vitiosa consumitur: unam gravem, alteram mediocrem, tertiam extenuatam vocamus"; 4.15: "est autem cavendum ne, dum haec genera consectemur, in finitima et propinqua vitia veniamus."

54. *Rhet. Her.* 4.15: "nam gravi figurae, quae laudanda est, propinqua est ea quae fugienda; quae recte videbitur appellari si sufflata nominabitur. nam ita ut corporis bonam habitudinem tumor imitatur saepe, item gravis oratio saepe inperitis videtur ea, quae turget et inflata est." Cf. Sen. *Controv.* 10 pr. 9: "Musa rhetor . . . multum habuit ingeni, nihil cordis: omnia usque ad ultimum tumorem perducta, ut non extra sanitatem sed extra naturam essent" (here follow several examples of extravagant metaphors, giving an idea of what *tumor* encompasses). For the metaphor of stylistic "inflation" see also Sen. *Ep.* 114.1: "aliquando inflata explicatio vigeret." For the comparison of bodily and stylistic "tumors" see [Longinus] *Subl.* 3.4 and Russell 1964 ad loc.

55. *Rhet. Her.* 4.16: "qui in mediocre genus orationis profecti sunt, si pervenire eo non potuerunt, errantes perveniunt ad confinii genus eius generis; quod appellamus dissolutum, quod est sine nervis et articulis; ut hoc modo appellem 'fluctuans,' eo quod fluctuat huc et illuc nec potest confirmate neque viriliter sese expedire." Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 114.4, where Maecenas' "slackness" in his dress is an index of a slack character that is manifested in his speaking style: "non oratio eius aeque soluta est quam ipse discinctus? . . . magni vir ingenii fuerat, si illud egisset via rectiore, si non vitasset intellegi, si non etiam in oratione diffluere. videbis itaque eloquentiam ebrii hominis involutam et errantem et licentiae plenam."

56. *Rhet. Her.* 4.11: "attenuata est, quae demissa est usque ad usitatissimam puri consuetudinem sermonis"; 4.16: "qui non possunt in illa facetissima verborum attenuatione commode versari, veniunt ad aridum et exsangue genus orationis, quod non alienum est exile nominari."

57. *Teres* can refer to parts of the body (*OLD* 1b) and to a style or tone "that does not jar, smooth, rounded" (*OLD* 2).

sinews and strength" (*tenuis, non sine nervis ac viribus*); while the middle shares the characteristics of each of these extremes. Cicero concludes these bodily metaphors by saying that each of these registers should have attractive color that is not the result of cosmetics but "diffused by the blood" (*sanguine diffusus . . . color*).[58] While writing the *Brutus* (nine years after the *De oratore*) Cicero simplifies the characters of style to a twofold division that also mirrors the Atticist/Asianist discourse. While Cicero makes it clear that he regards the high style as the better of the two since it is "more splendid and more magnificent" (*splendidius et magnificentius*), he warns that each style has its own danger. The "restrained" (*pressus*) orator has to beware of "poverty and starvation" (*inopia et ieiunitas*) while the "full" (*amplus*) orator has to guard against a "puffed-out and rotten" (*inflatum et corruptum*) style of speech.[59] Using the orators Cotta and Sulpicius respectively as exemplars of the "low" and "high" styles, Cicero describes Cotta's speech as "pure and flowing" (*pure et solute*), in which there was "nothing that was not sound, dry and healthy" (*nihil erat in eius oratione nisi sincerum, nihil nisi siccum atque sanum*); while Sulpicius was the "grandest" (*maxime . . . grandis*) orator Cicero had ever heard, with a voice both "loud and pleasant and splendid" (*cum magna tum suavis et splendida*) and a style that was "excited and fluent, yet not redundant or overflowing" (*incitata et volubilis nec ea redundans tamen nec circumfluens oratio*).

Cicero presents the divisions of style not as an isolated, arbitrary taxonomy, but as the results of training that shapes the body's natural inclinations. In so doing, Cicero demonstrates a consequential link between the material body and its metaphorical use in the domain of style. Both Cotta's and Sulpicius' styles arose from deliberate programs formulated in response to their own bodily characteristics. Cotta adopted his restrained style because the weakness of his lungs did not allow him to speak in a more animated style.[60] Sulpicius, however, transformed his style, away from what Cicero describes in the *De oratore* as one marked by youthful exuberance and

58. Cic. *De or.* 3.199–200: "sed si habitum etiam orationis et quasi colorem aliquem requiritis, est et plena quaedam, sed tamen teres, et tenuis, non sine nervis ac viribus, et ea, quae particeps utriusque generis quadam mediocritate laudatur. his tribus figuris insidere quidam venustatis non fuco inlitus, sed sanguine diffusus debet color." For the metaphor cf. *De or.* 2.310: "reliquae duae, sicuti sanguis in corporibus, sic illae in perpetuis orationibus fusae esse debebunt." In his discussions of the characters of style Cicero takes an ecumenical high road that avoids dogmatic adherence to any of the registers that will later reappear in his anti-Atticist rhetoric. See *Orat.* 20, where Cicero's insistence that the ideal orator ought to excel in each of the three registers sets the stage for his polemics against the Atticists.

59. *Brut.* 202: "sed cavenda est presso illi oratori inopia et ieiunitas, amplo autem inflatum et corruptum orationis genus. inveniebat igitur acute Cotta, dicebat pure ac solute; et ut ad infirmitatem laterum perscienter contentionem omnem remiserat, sic ad virium imbecillitatem dicendi accommodabat genus. nihil erat in eius oratione nisi sincerum, nihil nisi siccum atque sanum; illudque maxumum quod, cum contentione orationis flectere animos iudicum vix posset nec omnino eo genere diceret, tractando tamen impellebat, ut idem facerent a se commoti quod a Sulpicio concitati." Douglas (1966, ad loc.) compares Quintilian's description of the *corruptum* style of speaking in *Inst.* 12.10.73: "vitiosum et corruptum dicendi genus, quod aut verborum licentia exultat aut puerilibus sententiolis lascivit aut immodico tumore turgescit." On the medical sense of *corruptus* as "infected, corrupt" see *OLD* 1.

60. *Brut.* 202: "ut ad infirmitatem laterum perscienter contentionem omnem remiserat, sic ad virium imbecillitatem dicendi accommodabat genus." See Douglas 1966 ad loc. (p. 146) for *latera* meaning "lungs" or "chest."

by redundancy that was the result of inborn qualities,[61] to one that Cicero in the *Brutus* explicitly calls not redundant (*nec . . . redundans . . . nec circumfluens*).

While Cicero's discussion of Cotta and Sulpicius sketches a link between the bodily and stylistic self, his most detailed and systematic account of the relationship between the body and oratorical style appears in his autobiography near the conclusion of the *Brutus*. He presents the development and training of his body, voice, and style as a single unified process that is receptive to transforming regimens. His autobiography thus provides a case study of the continuities between the bodily, vocal, and stylistic self within Roman rhetorical thought. As a principal player in the Atticist/Asianist debate, Cicero carefully crafts the account of his bodily development, and, in particular, the oratorical training he received in Asia, to fend off accusations that his oratory was Asianist.[62]

Cicero begins the story of his rhetorical training and development by placing his body in the foreground of his self-narrative. Although he begins with an apology for giving what might appear to be unnecessary details, he claims that a description of his "whole body" will give a more complete account of his entire self (*totum me*). It is not sufficient to relate the usual indices of identity, which he likens to conventional recognition triggers in plays—"some birthmark or a rattle."[63] Cicero here distinguishes between what is accidental to oratory (various details of his career, such as those just given in *Brutus* 311–12) and what is essential: the body itself. Cicero depicts the exceptional thinness and weakness of his body and the length and slenderness of his neck at the beginning of his speaking career. The state of his body was dangerous to his health, a situation exacerbated by the strain placed on his body from his unrelenting, unvarying, powerful vocal delivery.[64] With his friends and physicians advising that he abandon oratory altogether, Cicero resolved instead to change his oratorical style, and thus save his body and his voice. He therefore traveled to Asia Minor to seek out expert vocal training.[65] After some philosophical and rhetorical instruction in Athens, Cicero set off to Asia for rhetorical exercises with experts like Menippus of Stratonicea, who, though then the leading rhetor in Asia, was,

61. *De or.* 2.88: "Sulpicium primum in causa parvula adulescentulum audivi voce et forma et motu corporis et reliquis rebus aptis ad hoc munus . . . oratione autem celeri et concitata, quod erat ingeni, et verbis effervescentibus et paulo nimium redundantibus, quod erat aetatis."

62. See Winterbottom (1982, 258–66), who, by examining the reception of Cicero's oratory in the Empire, specifies that his "Asianism" consisted of his prose rhythm (*compositio*), epigrams (*sententiae*), and pathos, all of which he classifies under the rubric of *voluptas*.

63. *Brut.* 313: "nunc quoniam totum me non naevo aliquo aut crepundiis sed corpore omni videris velle cognoscere, complectar non nulla etiam quae fortasse videantur minus necessaria."

64. *Brut.* 313: "erat eo tempore in nobis summa gracilitas et infirmitas corporis, procerum et tenue collum: qui habitus et quae figura non procul abesse putatur a vitae periculo, si accedit labor et laterum magna contentio. eoque magis hoc eos quibus eram carus, commovebat, quod omnia sine remissione, sine varietate, vi summa vocis et totius corporis contentione dicebam."

65. *Brut.* 314: "itaque cum me et amici et medici hortarentur ut causas agere desisterem, quodvis potius periculum mihi adeundum quam a sperata dicendi gloria discedendum putavi. sed cum censerem remissione et moderatione vocis et commutato genere dicendi me et periculum vitare posse et temperatius dicere, ut consuetudinem dicendi mutarem, ea causa mihi in Asiam proficiscendi fuit. itaque cum essem biennium versatus in causis et iam in foro celebratum meum nomen esset, Roma sum profectus."

Cicero assures us, soundly Attic.[66] After traveling to Rhodes, Cicero attached himself to Molo, an expert in correcting others' errors, who took on the task of checking Cicero's "redundancy" (*nimis redundantis nos*) and "spilling over his banks" (*extra ripas diffluentis*), which Cicero ascribes to the "youthful impunity and license of [his] style" (*iuvenili quadam dicendi impunitate et licentia*).[67] Cicero presents his maturation as a process of varying and mellowing a naturally full, energetic stylistic inclination. Under Molo's guidance, Cicero calls himself two years later "not only better trained but nearly transformed" (*prope mutatus*): the excessive strain of his voice had subsided, his style "simmered down"[68] (*deferverat*), his lungs were strengthened while his body acquired a more solid build.[69] Cicero refers to this transformation in similar terms in *Orator,* in which he provides contrasting passages from two of his speeches, one before and the other after the period of Molo's intervention, to illustrate his stylistic metamorphosis.[70]

Immediately following this account of Cicero's transformed style, the *Brutus* changes settings from Asia Minor to Rome, where Cicero faces alternative models to imitate, embodied in the two leading speakers of the day: either the subdued and restrained Cotta, or the ornate and lively Hortensius. Cicero finds the latter a more congenial model, more like him in his passionate style and his age.[71] This doublet of models dovetails with Cicero's narrative of his oratorical maturation. Cicero's transformation marks him as unlike Cotta, a speaker that the *Brutus* says could not overcome the stylistic limitations that his bodily weakness imposed upon him, while Cicero's emulation of Hortensius' fuller style signals his personal and oratorical revitalization, and his discovery of a model appropriate both to his natural inclinations and his now more varied style. Cicero illustrates the converse of his own natural fullness in the person of Cotta, whose restraint he sets in contrast to, at some times, Sulpicius, and at others, Hortensius. And yet, as Cicero's self-narrative continues, Hortensius takes on the role more of a foil than a model. By continuing to use an Asianist style into his later years, a mode of speech that Cicero says is better suited to youth than

66. *Brut.* 315: "et, si nihil habere molestiarum nec ineptiarum Atticorum est, hic orator in illis numerari recte potest."

67. For the high style as one that overflows banks, see Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.61. Cf. Lausberg 1998, sect. 1079.3d.

68. Douglas' felicitous rendering (Douglas 1966 ad loc.).

69. *Brut.* 316: "is [sc. Molo] dedit operam, si modo id consequi potuit, ut nimis redundantis nos et supra fluentis iuvenili quadam dicendi impunitate et licentia reprimeret et quasi extra ripas diffluentis coerceret. ita recepi me biennio post non modo exercitatior sed prope mutatus. nam et contentio nimia vocis resederat et quasi deferverat oratio lateribusque vires et corpori mediocris habitus accesserat." Cf. Plut. *Cic.* 4.4, where Cicero's training is referred to as gymnastic exercises.

70. *Orat.* 107: "quantis illa clamoribus adulescentuli diximus de supplicio parricidarum, quae nequaquam satis defervisse post aliquanto sentire coepimus" (with quotations from *Rosc-Am.* 72 and *Clu.* 199); Cicero (*Orat.* 108), however, is careful to stipulate that he did not always in his youth speak in such an animated style (using terms used in the Atticist/Asianist discourse): "ipsa enim illa iuvenilis redundantia multa habet attenuata."

71. *Brut.* 317: "duo tum excellebant oratores qui me imitandi cupiditate incitarent, Cotta et Hortensius; quorum alter remissus et lenis et propriis verbis comprendens solute et facile sententiam, alter ornatus, acer et non talis qualem tu eum, Brute, iam deflorescentem cognovisti, sed verborum et actionis genere commotior. itaque cum Hortensio mihi magis arbitrabar rem esse, quod et dicendi ardore eram propior et aetate coniunctior."

old age, Hortensius spoke in a manner inappropriate to his age and status.[72] Hortensius becomes an implicit illustration of what might have happened to Cicero's style had it not been tempered by Molo's training.

While Cicero's autobiography provides a detailed example of how a particular orator viewed his body, voice, and oratorical style as fundamentally linked, Quintilian demonstrates that this link was a general tenet within Roman rhetorical educational theory. He asserts that a teacher's task was to shape his pupils' natural inclinations towards either fullness or dryness. Quintilian suggests that a teacher should attempt to correct a student who is naturally "impure and swollen" (*corruptus ac tumidus*) and that he should, "so to speak, feed and clothe one who is dry and starved" (*aridum atque ieiunum*).[73] Likewise, the instructor should discourage pupils from too extravagantly displaying their approval for fellow students' exercises since such applause encourages "swelling" and "empty pride."[74] The dichotomy of swelling versus aridity also frames the sorts of narratives that one can choose to use in students' elementary rhetorical exercises. Quintilian cautions that a student's first rhetorical exercises must follow a balance between "dry and starved" narratives (*arida, ieiuna)* and those that are "overly elaborate and far-fetched" (*sinuosa et arcessitis descriptionibus*).[75]

While Quintilian here seeks to strike a balance between these two poles, he shows a distinct tendency to favor the full and moist side of the spectrum in the training of young students. He claims that it is healthier for boys studying to become orators, as it is for babies, to be "plump" since this promises strength when they reach maturity.[76] Richness is curable—it will be "cooked away" by the passage of time—but there is no remedy for meagerness.[77] He therefore likes to see "raw material" that is "even excessively abundant and overflowing more than it ought to be."[78] Echoing a motif of anti-Atticist criticism, he warns that the teacher should not be dry so that the children may not "mistake dryness and emaciation for health"; he also de-

72. *Brut.* 325: "sed si quaerimus, cur adulescens magis floruerit dicendo quam senior Hortensius, causas reperiemus verissimas duas. primum, quod genus erat orationis Asiaticum adulescentiae magis concessum quam senectuti. . . . [327] erat excellens iudicio volgi et facile primas tenebat adulescens. etsi enim genus illud dicendi auctoritatis habebat parum, tamen aptum esse aetati videbatur." See all of *Brut.* 325–27 and cf. 317.

73. Quint. *Inst.* 2.8.9: "an si quis ingenio corruptus ac tumidus, ut plerique sunt, inciderit, in hoc eum ire patiemur? aridum atque ieiunum non alemus et quasi vestiemus?"

74. Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.12: "hinc tumor et vana de se persuasio usque adeo ut illo condiscipulorum tumultu inflati."

75. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.3: "ut sit ea neque arida prorsus atque ieiuna (nam quid opus erat tantum studiis laboris impendere si res nudas atque inornatas indicare satis videretur?), neque rursus sinuosa et arcessitis descriptionibus, in quas plerique imitatione poeticae licentiae ducuntur, lasciviat."

76. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.4: "melior autem indoles laeta generosique conatus et vel plura iusto concipiens interim spiritus . . . [2.4.5] erit illud plenius interim corpus, quod mox adulta aetas astringat. hinc spes roboris." Cf. Sen. *Controv.* 9.2.26: "illi qui tument, illi qui abundantia laborant, plus habet furoris, sed plus et corporis; semper autem ad sanitatem proclivius est quod potest detractione curari; illi succurri non potest qui simul et insanit et deficit."

77. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.6–7: "facile remedium est ubertatis; sterilia nullo labore vincuntur . . . multum inde decoquent anni, multum ratio limabit." Cf. Gowers 1994, which analyzes the metaphor of "decoction" in the satires of Persius and in portrayals of Nero. See especially 133 and 139 on decoction in the rhetorical tradition.

78. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.7: "materiam esse primum volo vel abundantiorem atque ultra quam oporteat fusam."

ploys other tropes that one finds in Cicero's anti-Atticist polemic, cautioning that students with such dry instruction will not "dare to rise above everyday speech" (*cotidianum sermonem*) and will mistakenly think that their avoidance of stylistic fault is itself a virtue.[79] Quintilian signals his allegiance and debt to Ciceronian ideas when he quotes Cicero's doctrine, formulated in relation to Sulpicius, that luxuriance in the speech of the young is healthy.[80]

Quintilian's medical and bodily metaphors get fuller development when he turns his attention to the question of the use, in early oratorical training, of *controversiae* with supernatural themes drawn from tragedies (stories of witches, plagues, oracles, and the like). Quintilian has a compromise position on the issue of *controversiae,* allowing occasional indulgence so long as they are followed by a regimen of thinning, "bloodletting," and the expulsion of "corrupt humor" in order to regain oratorical health (*Inst.* 2.10.5–7):

> numquam haec supra fidem et poetica, ut vere dixerim, themata iuvenibus tractare permittamus, ut exspatientur et gaudeant materia et quasi in corpus eant? erat optimum, sed certe sint grandia et tumida, non stulta etiam et acrioribus oculis intuenti ridicula: ut, si iam cedendum est, impleat se declamator aliquando, dum sciat, ut quadrupedes, cum viridi pabulo distentae sunt, sanguinis detractione curantur et sic ad cibos viribus conservandis idoneos redeunt, ita sibi quoque tenuandas adipes, et quidquid umoris corrupti contraxerit emittendum si esse sanus ac robustus volet. alioqui tumor ille inanis primo cuiuscumque veri operis conatu deprehendetur.
>
> Are we never to allow the young to deal with these incredible and, more precisely, poetic themes in their declamations, so that they may travel beyond their usual limits and delight in this sort of subject matter and, so to speak, come into bodily maturity? That was the best policy [i.e., complete prohibition]. But certainly these themes should be grand and high-flown (not, when closely scrutinized, foolish and laughable) so that, if we must now offer this indulgence, a declaimer may, on occasion, stuff himself, provided that he knows that, just as cattle when they have been filled to bursting with green fodder are cured by bloodletting and thus return to types of food that are suitable for maintaining strength, his fat should be thinned, and whatever corrupt humor he has contracted ought to be expelled, if he wants to be healthy and strong. Otherwise, that hollow swelling will be discovered in his first attempt at real oratorical work.

79. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.8–9: "quapropter in primis evitandus et in pueris praecipue, magister aridus, non minus quam teneris adhuc plantis siccum et sine humore ullo solum. inde fiunt humiles statim et velut terram spectantes, qui nihil supra cotidianum sermonem attollere audeant. macies illis pro sanitate et iudicii loco infirmitas est, et dum satis putant vitio carere, in id ipsum incidunt vitium, quod virtutibus carent." For the association of *sermo cotidianus* with "healthy" Atticist oratory, see Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.44: "ipsorum etiam qui rectum dicendi genus sequi volunt alii pressa demum et tenuia et quae minimum ab usu cotidiano recedant sana et vere Attica putant." Cf. *Inst.* 12.10.40–41, where Quintilian contrasts speech that resembles everyday talk (*cotidiano sermoni simillima* [sc. *eloquentia*]) with more elaborated oratory that is like the bodies of athletes which, though they are strengthened by exercise and dietary regimens, nevertheless seem unnaturally developed (12.10.41: "sicut athletarum corpora, etiamsi validiora fiant exercatione et lege quadam ciborum, non tamen esse naturalia atque ab illa specie, quae sit concessa hominibus, abhorrere"). Cf. also Cic. *Orat.* 76.

80. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.8: "quod me de his aetatibus sentire minus mirabitur qui apud Ciceronem legerit: 'volo enim se efferat in adolescente fecunditas'" [*De or.* 2.88]. Cicero's criticism of Hortensius for continuing his Asianist oratory into too advanced an age (*Brut.* 325–27) provides a concrete example of how youthful extravagance should in time yield to a more restrained style.

Here Quintilian applies to his rhetorical theory a complete metaphorical working out of the medical belief that one may both fall into excesses of fullness and, through proper dietary regulation and the expulsion of corrupt humor, regain a properly balanced health that avoids prolonged swelling (*tumor*).[81] When Quintilian deploys, in precise and elaborate detail, tropes based upon the body's humoral system in order to demonstrate how *controversiae* ought to figure in rhetorical education, he shows both the currency that this conception of the body enjoyed within rhetorical discourse, and the permeability in the Roman rhetorical imagination between medical regimens used to treat the body and educational techniques used to train orators.

The fluidity in rhetorical theory between the physical and the stylistic body made it possible for Calvus to cultivate both his body and his rhetorical style according to the same criteria, physiological and aesthetic respectively. The belief that the body and oratorical style are mutually constitutive—the one reflecting and determining the other—reveals that Calvus' rhetorical program and his medical regimen are each natural expressions and outgrowths of the other. That the body in rhetoric—whether it appears in discussions of style or of the orator's training—functions according to the same dynamics of swollen and thin, moist and dry, effeminate and masculine, demonstrates the linkage between stylistics and physiology that finds expression in the case of Calvus' therapy and his Atticism.

## REGULATING THE VOICE: MAINTAINING MASCULINITY

The voice is a central point of contact between Calvus' medical regimen and his Atticism, and it is at the heart of Roman rhetoric's discourse of the self and of masculinity.[82] The maintenance of a properly masculine vocal tone is a shared preoccupation of both rhetorical theory and medical teachings concerning the regulation of semen's escape from the body.[83] Moreover, the terminology used to discuss the voice overlaps with that of the Atticist/Asianist discourse.

Cicero likens the voice to a lyre on which one can strike different tones, including *fractum, extenuatum,* and *inflatum.*[84] Quintilian discusses the nature of the voice in quantitative (*grandis aut exigua*) and qualitative terms

81. On school exercises as lacking blood and strength see Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.12: "quo fit ut minus sanguinis ac virium declamationes habeant quam orationes, quod in illis vera, in his adsimilata materia est."

82. See Gleason 1995, especially 103–30 (chap. 5: "Voice and Virility in Rhetorical Writers"). Cf. Goldhill 1999, 100–102.

83. The idea that abstinence protected a man's voice manifests itself in the practice of infibulating vocal performers. See Celsus *Med.* 7.25.2: "infibulare quoque adulescentulos, interdum vocis, interdum valetudinis causa, quidam consueverunt"; Scholia ad Juvenal *Sat.* 6.73 (*solvitur his magno comoedi fibula*): "ut cum comoedis concubant. nam omnes pueri vocales fibulas in naturis habent, ne coeant." See also Courtney 1980 ad loc. and cf. *Sat.* 6.379; Mart. 7.82, 11.75, 14.215. Cf. Nicholas of Damascus' report that the young Augustus for an entire year "abstained from sex out of concern for his voice and strength" (*FGrH* 90.129: ἀφροδισίων ἀπείχετο φωνῆς ἅμα καὶ ἰσχύος προνοῶν). (I owe this reference to one of *CP*'s anonymous referees.)

84. *De or.* 3.216: "ut nervi in fidibus, ita sonant ut a motu animi quoque sunt pulsae. nam voces ut chordae sunt intentae quae ad quemque tactum respondeant, acuta gravis, cita tarda, magna parva; quas tamen inter omnis est suo quaeque in genere mediocris; atque etiam illa sunt ab his delapsa plura genera, lene asperum, contractum diffusum, continenti spiritu intermisso, fractum scissum, flexo sono extenuatum inflatum." Cf. the discussion of delivery (*De or.* 3.102): "deinde augetur, extenuatur, inflatur, variatur,

(*plena et exilis, et levis et aspera et contracta et fusa*) that are similar to the Atticist/Asianist dichotomies.[85] Cicero also presents proper pronunciation as a mean between excessive refinement and precision (thinness and breathlessness) on one side, and roughness (inflation) on the other: *nolo verba exiliter exanimata exire, nolo inflata et quasi anhelata gravius* (*De or.* 3.41). Moreover, Cicero proceeds to make explicit connections between this vocal dynamic and gender: he says that all agree that an orator's voice should avoid effeminacy, on one hand, and atonality and discordance, on the other.[86] In a similar fashion, Quintilian presents a series of polarities of vocal tone in which the rough, hard, and thick pronunciation opposes the slender, empty, soft and effeminate;[87] and he cautions that a boy's voice should not imitate actors and "be broken by the thinness of a woman's voice or tremble like an old man's," thus connecting vocal thinness and femininity.[88]

Quintilian also provides a concrete connection between the rhetorical and medical regulation of voice when he presents the threat of vocal feminization as subject to medical intervention (*Inst.* 11.3.19):[89]

> augentur autem sicut omnium, ita vocis quoque bona cura, negligentia vel inscitia minuuntur. sed cura non eadem oratoribus quae phonascis convenit; tamen multa sunt utrisque communia, firmitas corporis, ne ad spadonum et mulierum et aegrorum exilitatem vox tenuetur, quod ambulatio, unctio, veneris abstinentia, facilis ciborum digestio, id est frugalitas, praestat.
>
> What is true of all other things is also true of the voice: the good aspects are increased by care and diminished by neglect or ignorance. However, the care for speakers happens not to be the same as that for singing coaches; still many elements are common to both, such as the issue of bodily soundness, so that the voice is not thinned to the slenderness of eunuchs and women and the ill. Walking, rubdowns, the avoidance of sex, the easy digestion of foods, in short, a self-restrained life, are useful to achieve this state.

Quintilian's prescriptions for vocal health to maintain a properly masculine tone closely resemble the treatments that Graeco-Roman physicians suggest for maintaining manly vigor through the control of semen loss, which also include regimens of abstinence, massage, and the intake of appropriately digestible food. The humoral physiology that underlies the treatment

---

distinguitur. ita sit nobis igitur ornatus et suavis orator—nec tamen potest aliter esse—ut suavitatem habeat austeram et solidam, non dulcem et decoctam."

85. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.14–15: "natura vocis spectatur quantitate et qualitate. quantitas simplicior: in summam enim grandis aut exigua est, sed inter has extremitates mediae sunt species et ab ima ad summam ac retro sunt multi gradus. qualitas magis varia. nam est candida et fusca, et plena et exilis, et levis et aspera, et contracta et fusa, et dura et flexibilis, et clara et optusa. spiritus etiam longior breviorque."

86. *De or.* 3.41: "nolo exprimi litteras putidius, nolo obscurari neglegentius, nolo verba exiliter exanimata exire, nolo inflata et quasi anhelata gravius. nam de voce nondum ea dico quae sunt actionis, sed hoc quod mihi cum sermone quasi coniunctum videtur: sunt enim certa vitia quae nemo est quin effugere cupiat: mollis vox aut quasi extra modum absona atque absurda."

87. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.32: "deinde non subsurda, rudis, immanis, dura, rigida, rava, praepinguis, aut tenuis, inanis, acerba, pusilla, mollis, effeminata, spiritus nec brevis nec parum durabilis nec in receptu difficilis."

88. Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.1: "non enim puerum quem in hoc instituimus aut femineae vocis exilitate frangi volo aut seniliter tremere." Cf. Sen. *Controv.* 1.8 pr.: "ad muliebres blanditias extenuare vocem."

89. See Gleason 1995, 118–121 for a discussion of this passage.

that Quintilian proposes here finds corroboration both in his earlier mention that either excessive or insufficient "moisture" (*umor*) could harm the voice,[90] and in his discussion of the transition from boyhood to adolescence: he says that "moisture" (*umor*) governs adolescent vocal development (after dismissing others' claims that "warmth" [*calor*] does so).[91] Quintilian here seems to present fragments of medical ideas concerning male sexuality in which both warmth and moisture play their roles. The overlap between the realms of vocal training and medicine becomes more clearly visible in Oribasius' prescriptions of vocal exercises as a health regimen designed to promote the proper circulation of *pneuma* throughout the body. In the later medical tradition the relationship between medicine and rhetoric comes full circle. We find a transition from rhetoricians' borrowing from medicine for techniques to strengthen the voice to doctors' using vocal exercise as a general regimen for health and longevity quite apart from any direct application to oratory.[92]

Quintilian's presentation of the voice as a locus of gender anxieties, and his framing of those anxieties in the dichotomies that function within the Atticist/Asianist discourse, highlight a vital connection between Calvus' literary polemics and his medical regimen: each is concerned with the issue of the maintenance of a masculine vigor through self-mastery. The Atticists' claim that Cicero failed to achieve such self-control in his oratory is the mainstay of their attacks against him. As we have seen, Tacitus reports that Cicero not only faced general accusations of being "inflated," "swollen," "unrestrained," and "overflowing," but specifically says that Calvus thought Cicero "loose and sinewless" (*solutum et enervem*) and that Brutus called him (in a direct quotation) "broken and loinless" (*fractum atque elumbem*). While each of these terms has distinct connotations of effeminacy, *enervis* is particularly evocative since *nervi* ("sinews") is a key term within Roman rhetorical theory, where the more literal sense of "sexual power, virility" (*OLD* 6b) acquired the metaphorical sense of "literary power, talents" (*OLD* 7b) and "strength of mind, energy" (*OLD* 8).[93]

The particular area in which Cicero's adversaries appear to have criticized his style as being *enervis* was that of *compositio,* or prose rhythm.[94]

90. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.21: "umor quoque vocem ut nimius impedit, ita consumptus destituit."

91. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.28–29: "illud non sine causa est ab omnibus praeceptum, ut parcatur maxime voci in illo a pueritia in adolescentiam transitu, quia naturaliter impeditur, non, ut arbitror, propter calorem, quod quidam putaverunt (nam est maior alias), sed propter umorem potius: nam hoc aetas illa turgescit. [29] Itaque nares etiam ac pectus eo tempore tument, atque omnia velut germinant eoque sunt tenera et iniuriae obnoxia." See Gleason 1995, 114.

92. Oribasius *Coll. med.* 6.7–10. See Gleason (1995, 88–94), who notes (p. 93, n. 50) Seneca's reference (*Ep.* 78.5) to a sick friend's having his doctor prescribe reading aloud in order to exercise his patient's *spiritus* (i.e., *pneuma*).

93. See *fractus, OLD* 4 ("effeminate, womanish, affected"); Adams 1982, 149–51 on the sexual terms based on notions of cutting and splitting; cf. Gleason's discussion of the use of *fracta* and *infracta* for effeminate rhythms in prose. For *lumbus* see *OLD* 1b ("seat of sexual excitement") and Adams (48). Adams (38) says that *nervus* is used to mean "penis" and remarks that "[t]he penis could be regarded as a tendon or group of tendons" while also noting "[t]here is usually an ambiguity about the plural use; though the writer may have been thinking of the penis, his statement might be interpreted as referring to all the tendons of the body, including those of the penis."

94. Quintilian reports that Cicero's contemporaries criticized his *compositio* (*Inst.* 9.4.1: "de compositione non equidem post M. Tullium scribere auderem . . . nisi et eiusdem aetatis homines scriptis ad ipsum

Roman rhetoricians regarded prose rhythm, that area where prose comes closest to breaking into verse, as a domain where an orator's masculinity could be compromised.[95] Quintilian's report that Cicero's critics thought him as *in compositione fractum exsultantem ac paene, quod procul absit, viro molliorem* locates Cicero's alleged effeminacy in his *compositio*. He uses the same terms as the *Dialogus*,[96] making its implicit accusations of effeminacy explicit, and punctuating his own horror at such a scandalous accusation with an apotropaic parenthesis. Quintilian elsewhere says that he would rather that an oratory's *compositio* be "hard and harsh" (*duram . . . asperam*) than "womanish and sinewless" (*effeminatam et enervem*).[97] However Cicero, in what may be an attempt to counter the accusations launched against him by his rivals, insists that those who say "speech is enervated by prose rhythm" are mistaken, since without it speech cannot have "thrust and force" (*impetus . . . vis*).[98]

In Roman rhetorical theory, popular morality, and Graeco-Roman medical thought, "enervation" is a pathology arising from excessive devotion to pleasure, a soft lifestyle, or excessive refinement.[99] The elder Seneca claims

---

etiam litteris reprehendere id collocandi genus ausi fuissent"; cf. 9.4.3: "neque ignoro quosdam esse qui curam omnem *compositionis* excludant, atque illum horridum sermonem, ut forte fluxerit, modo magis naturalem, modo etiam magis *virilem* esse contendant") and later identifies Brutus and Calvus as critics of Cicero's prose rhythm (*Inst.* 12.1.22: "nec Cicero [sc. videatur esse perfectus] Bruto Calvoque, qui certe compositionem illius etiam apud ipsum reprehendunt"). On Cicero's correspondence with Calvus see *Ad fam.* 15.21.4 and cf. Lebek 1970, 84–86; and Gudeman 1914, 316–17. Freudenburg 1990 offers a reading of Horace *Satires* 2.1 in the light of rhetorical theory that conclusively demonstrates that it was particularly in his *compositio* that an author risked accusations of effeminacy. Horace's description of one group of his critics (*Sat.* 2.1.2–3: "*sine nervis* altera quidquid / *composui* pars esse putat") provides a vivid parallel to the accusations that Cicero was *enervis* in his *compositio*. See esp. Freudenburg 1990, 192–93 and 197–203.

95. See Gleason 1995, 109–13, on the elder Seneca's criticism of the orator Fuscus' singsong style for its *fracta compositio* (*Suas.* 2.23) (cf. Fairweather 1981, 200–201) and on the younger Seneca's criticism (*Ep.* 114.11) of the *infracta* style of his day that is *in morem cantici ducta*, to which she compares Demetrius' discussion (*Eloc.* 198) of "unmanly" lyric meters in prose. Though Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.8 presents Calvus' *compositio* as following the model of Demosthenic vigor ("compositio quoque in actionibus ad exemplum Demosthenis viget"), even he in the conclusion of his speech for Messius (Malcovati 1955, 499) fell into "soft," even "effeminate" rhythms: "omnia in illo epilogo fere non tantum emollitae compositionis sunt sed infractae."

96. Compare Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.12: "quem [sc. Ciceronem] tamen et suorum homines temporum incessere audebant ut tumidiorem et Asianum et redundantem et in repetitionibus nimium et in salibus aliquando frigidum, in compositione fractum exsultantem ac paene, quod procul absit, viro molliorem"; and Tac. *Dial.* 18.4–5: "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 attritum, 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.'" Seneca (*Ep.* 100.7) signals his awareness that Cicero faced accusations of effeminacy based upon his prose rhythm, and defends him against such aspersions: "compositio eius una est, pedem curvat lenta et sine infamia mollis." Cf. *Ep.* 114.16: "devexa et mollis detinens [sc. compositio Ciceronis]." See Winterbottom 1982, 243.

97. Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.142: "duram potius atque asperam compositionem malim esse quam effeminatam et enervem." See Gleason 1995, 118.

98. Cic. *Orat.* 229: "tantumque abest ut—quod ii qui hoc aut magistrorum inopia aut ingenii tarditate aut laboris fuga non sunt assecuti solent dicere—enervetur oratio compositione verborum, ut aliter in ea nec impetus ullus nec vis esse possit." Sandys (1885, ad loc.) compares Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.6: "fortius vero qui incompositum potest esse quam vinctum et bene conlocatum?"

99. *OLD* provides these examples (s.v. *enervis*): Sen. *Dial.* 7.13.4: "qui voluptatem sequitur, videtur enervis, fractus"; (s.v. *enervo* 2): Sen. *Ep.* 84.11: "relinque . . . voluptates; molliunt et enervant"; Livy 23.18.12:

that the oratorical power of Alfius Flavus was "ruined by inactivity and enervated by poetry" (*carminibus enervata*).[100] Quintilian warns that a "soft upbringing . . . breaks all the *nervi* of the mind and body."[101] He also develops the pathology of stylistic "enervation" when he claims that declamations that are composed only for pleasure "lack sinews" (*nervis carent*). Quintilian gives specific causes for the loss of *nervi* in speech, while making explicit that the phenomenon is tantamount to the radical loss of masculinity; he likens this effeminization of language to the way that slave brokers castrate boys to make them more attractive, and then proceeds to critique those who mistake polish and refinement for manly oratorical vigor.[102]

The issue of oratorical *nervi* may have had particular pertinence to Cicero's and Calvus' polemics since their dispute may have involved competing claims over which of the two more faithfully emulated the oratory of Demosthenes, the Attic orator most associated with "sinewy" speech.[103] Quintilian presents Demosthenes as a paradigm of oratorical vigor and power, in whom "everything is so compact, and so stretched out, so to speak, on its sinews." He contrasts Demosthenes' controlled force, in which there is nothing lacking or in excess, with the style of Aeschines, which he calls "fuller and more spread out" but seemingly "grander" because of his lesser restraint. He continues the bodily metaphor he started with Demosthenes by

---

"scorta balineaque . . . enervaverunt corpora animosque"; Vell. Pat. 2.86.3: "enervatum amore . . . animum." Cf. Seneca's claim that Maecenas is "effeminate," not "mild" ("apparet enim mollem fuisse, non mitem") because his thoughts, however admirable they might otherwise be, become "enervated" when they are expressed (*Ep.* 114.8: "enervati dum exeunt").

100. Sen. *Controv.* 1.1.22: "ipse [sc. Alfius Flavus] omnia mala faciebat ingenio suo; naturalis tamen illa vis eminebat, quae post multos annos, iam desidia obruta et carminibus enervata."

101. Quint. *Inst.* 1.2.6: "mollis illa educatio, quam indulgentiam vocamus, nervos omnis mentis et corporis frangit."

102. Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.17–18: "atque ad solam [sc. declamationes] compositae voluptatem nervis carent, non alio medius fidius vitio dicentium quam quo mancipiorum negotiatores formae puerorum virilitate excisa lenocinantur. nam ut illi robor ac lacertos barbamque ante omnia et alia, quae natura proprie maribus dedit, parum existimant decora, quaeque fortia, si liceret, forent ut dura molliunt: ita nos habitum ipsum orationis virilem et illam vim stricte robusteque dicendi tenera quadam elocutionis cute operimus et, dum levia sint ac nitida, quantum valeant nihil interesse arbitramur."

103. Lebek (1970, 83–97) and Narducci (1997, 130–33, building upon Lebek's foundation) propose that Calvus and Cicero clashed in their conflicting views of how best to render Demosthenic *vis*. This theory is based on the hypothesis that Atticism was not a homogeneous movement with a single-minded devotion to Lysianic rhetoric, but that some Atticists, including Calvus, chose instead Demosthenes as their stylistic model. This would account for Calvus' association with Demosthenes in ancient sources (e.g., Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.8 and Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.2). Cicero's general differences with these Demosthenic Atticists can be gleaned from his response to the suggestion of an imagined Atticist interlocutor in the *Brutus* (288: "Demosthenem igitur imitemur"): they fall short in emulating Demosthenes by failing to win popular appeal. Cicero's particular disagreement with Calvus may have focused upon the issue of *compositio*. Seneca reports that Calvus followed Demosthenes as a model for his *compositio* (*Controv.* 7.4.8: "compositio quoque in actionibus ad exemplum Demosthenis viget"), while Quintilian specifically mentions that Cicero diverged from Demosthenes in this regard (*Inst.* 9.4.145–46: "non tamen mirabor Latinos magis indulsisse compositioni quam Atticos, quo minus in verbis habeant venustatis et gratiae, nec vitium duxerim si Cicero a Demosthene paulum in hac parte descivit"). Quintilian's telegraphic reference to Cicero's correspondence with Calvus and Brutus permits the inference that muted criticism of Demosthenes may have been part of Cicero's defense of his *compositio* (*Inst.* 12.1.22): "quamquam neque ipsi Ciceroni Demosthenes videatur satis esse perfectus, quem dormitare interim dicit, nec Cicero Bruto Calvoque, qui certe compositionem illius etiam apud ipsum reprehendunt" (cf. *Inst.* 10.1.24 and Plut. *Cic.* 24.6). See also Stroh (1982, pp. 27–28, n. 3), who independently reaches the same conclusion as Lebek (cf. Narducci 1997, p. 131, n. 108).

saying that Aeschines "has more flesh, but less muscle."[104] Quintilian's comparison between Demosthenes and Aeschines borrows terms from the Atticist/Asianist debate. If Cicero and Calvus framed their disputes along competing claims on Demosthenes' mantle (with Calvus perhaps suggesting that Cicero was more an Aeschines than a Demosthenes), this may account both for Cicero's insistence that Demosthenes was a master of a variety of styles and for his proposed translation of the Attic duo's famous oratorical clash.[105]

Both Quintilian and Tacitus present the accusations against Cicero's style as constellations of related faults. His fullness, swelling, overflowing, self-indulgence, lack of restraint, and compromised masculinity are phenomena connected to each other. The bundle of symptoms that they ascribe to Cicero's oratory follows, in a precise and comprehensive fashion, Graeco-Roman medicine's views concerning the perils of excessive semen loss: the inability to control the flow of semen from the body leads to bodily weakness, compromised vigor and masculinity, and vocal feminization. The terms of the polemics launched against Cicero are a detailed replication of this medical understanding of masculinity and male vigor. Cicero's textual and oratorical self is hostilely diagnosed by the Atticists in the terms that medicine made available for the understanding of masculinity and for how one could best maintain it.

## CONCLUSION

Calvus' therapy constitutes a concrete manifestation of his literary program within his body that confounds the division between his aesthetic program and his lived reality. As such, Calvus' regimen demonstrates the consequential continuities between the orator's own body and aesthetic theory, and vice versa. In applying his rhetorical program to his person, Calvus crosses a boundary already widely considered permeable in Roman thought—the view that speech is an index of character and self: *talis oratio, qualis vita.*[106] Within Roman rhetorical discourse, the body sometimes appears in what seem more literal contexts, at other times in more metaphorical ones. And yet one cannot draw fast distinctions between the literal and the figurative body in this discourse since Roman rhetoricians believed that the physiological state of the body had a direct effect upon style. Calvus' regimen tangibly links the material body and aesthetic theory; moreover, it does so in ways that are similar to the sort of exercises that rhetoricians suggest for maintaining a masculine voice, itself the point in rhetorical theory that most draws upon medical theories of male physiology.

104. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.76–77: "tanta vis in eo, tam densa omnia, ita quibusdam nervis intenta sunt, tam nihil otiosum, is dicendi modus, ut nec quod desit in eo nec quod redundet invenias. plenior Aeschines, et magis fusus et grandiori similis quo minus strictus est, carnis tamen plus habet, minus lacertorum."

105. See *Orat.* 23, 26 (where Cicero has Aeschines accuse Demosthenes of not being "Attic"), 56, and 110. *De optimo genere oratorum* is Cicero's introduction to his (apparently never finished) translations of Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon* and Demosthenes' *On the Crown.*

106. Sen. *Ep.* 114.1: "talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita." Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.47, where the saying "qualis autem homo ipse esset, talem eius esse orationem" is attributed to Socrates.

Calvus probably engaged in his regimen without any conscious plan to replicate his aesthetic program in his body, but simply followed the seamless continuity between the body and style that his culture regarded as a certainty. A firm distinction between the realms of the voice, oratorical style, and aesthetic theory, on one side, and the body and the self on the other, is more a part of our own modern sensibility than of the Romans'. Calvus' medical regimen is not anomalous, but is a logical, if remarkable, extension of rhetorical theory and oratorical practice. Calvus did to his body that which his rhetorical program prescribed for his speech. This application of literary aesthetics to his body underscores that Roman rhetorical theory was not a purely conventional descriptive system but a dynamic discourse of the self in which literary aesthetics had real, tangible consequence for Roman orators' self-conception. The Atticist/Asianist debate, which today is liable to seem a dry theoretical exercise of lifeless abstraction, was instead a dispute over what constitutes, and how one may cultivate, a properly masculine self. At stake in Calvus' and Cicero's polemics was their fundamental selfhood, which accounts for the fervor of their contestation.

*State University of New York at Buffalo*

LITERATURE CITED

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary.* Baltimore.

Bardon, H. 1952. *La Littérature latine inconnue.* Vol. 1. Paris.

Batstone, W. 1998. Dry Pumice and the Programmatic Language of Catullus 1. *CP* 93:125–35.

Beagon, M. 1992. *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder.* Oxford.

Bowersock, G. W. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire.* Oxford.

_____. 1979. Historical Problems in Late Republican and Augustan Classicism. In *Le Classicisme à Rome aux Iers siècles avant et après J.-C.,* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 25, ed. H. Flashar, 57–78. Geneva.

Brakke, D. 1995. The Problematization of Nocturnal Emissions in Early Christian Syria, Egypt, and Gaul. *JECS* 3:419–60.

Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal.* London.

_____. 1993. *Fragmentary Latin Poets.* Oxford.

Dean-Jones, L. 1994. *Women's Bodies in Classical Greek Science.* Oxford.

De Lacy, P., ed. and trans. 1992. *Galen on Semen* (*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* 5.3.1). Berlin.

Desmouliez, M. A. 1955. La Signification esthétique des comparaisons entre le style et le corps humain dans la rhétorique antique. *REL* 33:59–61.

Dominik, W. J. 1997a. The Style Is the Man: Seneca, Tacitus, and Quintilian's Canon. In Dominik 1997b, 50–68.

_____, ed. 1997b. *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature.* New York.

Douglas, A. E. 1955. M. Calidius and the Atticists. *CQ* 5:241–47.

_____. 1957. A Ciceronian Contribution to Rhetorical Theory. *Eranos* 55:18–26.

_____. 1973. The Intellectual Background of Cicero's *Rhetorica:* A Study in Method. *ANRW* 1.3:95–138. Berlin.

_____, ed. 1966. *M. Tulli Ciceronis "Brutus."* Oxford.

Drabkin, I. E., ed. and trans. 1950. *Claudius Aurelianus: "On Acute Diseases" and "On Chronic Diseases."* Chicago.

Fairweather, J. 1981. *Seneca the Elder*. Cambridge.
Fineman, J. 1989. The History of the Anecdote: Fiction and Fiction. In *The New Historicism*, ed. H. A. Veeser, 49–76. New York.
Foucault, M. 1986. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 3, *The Care of the Self*. New York.
French, R., and F. Greenaway. 1986. *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, His Sources and Influence*. London.
Freudenburg, K. 1990. Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in *Satires* 2.1. *AJP* 111:187–203.
Gallagher, C., and S. Greenblatt. 2000. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago.
Gelzer, T. 1979. Klassizismus, Attizismus und Asianismus. In *Le Classicisme à Rome aux Iers siècles avant et après J.-C.*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 25, ed. H. Flashar, 1–55. Geneva.
Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
Goldhill, S. 1999. Body/Politics: Is There a History of Reading? In *Contextualizing Classics*, ed. T. Falkner, N. Felson, and D. Konstan, 89–120. New York.
Gourevitch, D. 1995. Women Who Suffer from a Man's Disease: The Example of Satyriasis and the Debate on Affections Specific to the Sexes. In *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*, ed. R. Hawley and B. Levick, 149–65. London.
Gowers, E. 1994. Perseus and the Decoction of Nero. In *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History, and Representation*, ed. J. Elsner and J. Masters, 131–50. Chapel Hill, N.C.
Greenblatt, S. 1988. Fiction and Friction. In *Shakespearean Negotiations*, S. Greenblatt, 66–93. Berkeley.
Gruen, E. S. 1966. Cicero and Licinius Calvus. *HSCP* 71:215–33.
Gudeman, A., ed. 1914. *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Leipzig.
Gunderson, E. 1998. Discovering the Body in Roman Oratory. In *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*, ed. M. Wyke, 169–89. Oxford.
Helmreich, G., ed. 1907. *Galeni "De Usu Partium" libri XVII*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
Hendrickson, G. L. 1926. Cicero's Correspondence with Brutus and Calvus on Oratorical Style. *AJP* 47:234–58.
Hinks, D. 1936. *Tria Genera Causarum*. *CQ* 30:170–76.
Hude, C., ed. 1958. *Aretaeus: Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*.$^2$ Berlin.
Isetta, S. 1977. Sul *De Aquae Frigidae Usu* di Calvo. *Studi e Ricerche dell'Istituto di Latino* (Genova) 1:107–12.
Keith, A. M. 1999. Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory. *Mnemosyne* 52:41–62.
Kennedy, G. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton.
Kühn, C. G., ed. 1821–33. *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*. 20 vols. in 22. Leipzig.
Laqueur, T. 1990. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, Mass.
Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Trans. M. T. Bliss et al. Leiden.
Lebek, W. D. 1970. *Verba Prisca: Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung*. Göttingen.
Leeman, A. D. 1963. *Orationis ratio*. Amsterdam.
Malcovati, E. 1955. *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*.$^2$ Turin.
Morel, W., C. Buechner, and J. Blänsdorf, eds. 1995. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*$^3$ (*FPL*). Stuttgart.
Narducci, E. 1997. *Cicerone e l'eloquenza romana: Retorica e progetto culturale*. Rome.
Norden, E. 1898. *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jh. v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. Leipzig.

O'Sullivan, N. 1997. Caecilius, the "Canons" of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism. In Dominik 1997b, 32–49.

Richlin, A. 1997a. Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools. In Dominik 1997b, 90–110.

_____. 1997b. Pliny's Brassiere. In *Roman Sexualities,* ed. J. Hallett and M. Skinner, 197–220. Princeton.

Rose, V., ed. 1894. *Theodori Prisciani "Euporiston" Libri III.* Leipzig.

Rouselle, A. 1988. *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity.* Trans. F. Pheasant. Oxford.

Russell, D. A., ed. 1964. *"Longinus" on the Sublime.* Oxford.

Sandys, J. E., ed. 1885. *M. Tulli Ciceronis "ad M. Brutum Orator."* Cambridge.

Shaw, T. M. 1998. *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity.* Minneapolis, Minn.

Stroh, W. 1982. Die Nachahmung des Demosthenes in Ciceros Philippiken. In *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron.* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 28, ed. W. Ludwig, 1–40. Geneva.

Van Hook, L. 1905. *The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism.* Chicago.

Veeser, H. A. 1994. The New Historicism. In *The New Historicism Reader,* ed. H. A. Veeser, 1–32. New York.

von Staden, H. 1992. Spiderwoman and the Chaste Tree: The Semantics of Matter. *Configurations* 1:23–56.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1900. Asianismus und Attizismus. *Hermes* 35:1–52.

Winterbottom, M. 1982. Cicero in the Silver Age. In *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron.* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 28, ed. W. Ludwig, 237–74. Geneva.

Wiseman, T. P. 1974. *Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays.* Leicester.

Wisse, J. 1995. Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism. In *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld,* ed. J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings, and I. Sluiter, 65–82. Amsterdam.

Zecchini, G. 1982. Asinio Pollione: Dall'attività politica alla riflessione storiografica. *ANRW* 2.30:1265–96. Berlin.