

New Europe College Yearbook 2014-2015



OLGA BARTOSIEWICZ
OLGA BUDARAGINA
MARCO CASSIOLI
BEATA HUSZKA
BENJAMIN KEATINGE
ANGELO MITCHIEVICI
VIKTOR PÁL
CĂTĂLIN PAVEL
ANNA PIOTROWSKA
ALEXANDRA PRUNEA BRETONNET
BRIAN SHAEV
ALINA VAISFELD
CAMELIA DIANA YÜKSEL

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



OLGA BUDARAGINA

Born in 1968, in Ukraine

Ph. D., St. Petersburg State University

Thesis: *Portrayal of Nature in Later Latin Language Poetry: Claudius Claudianus*

Assistant Professor, St. Petersburg State University, Department of Classics

Fellowships and grants:

Visiting scholar (Faculty of Classics, Cambridge), 2009, 2010, 2013

Collegium Budapest ("Communism and Classics – GNÔTHI SEAUTON!"
international project), 2010

Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique, 2001

Conferences in Hungary, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden

Articles on Latin literature, history of Classical scholarship, translation from
Latin (C. Cornelius Fronto)

Book:

Latin Inscriptions in St. Petersburg, Kolo, St. Petersburg, 2010, ²2014

M. CORNELIUS FRONTO – A MAN OF LETTERS AND HIS LETTERS

Abstract

The article touches upon literary tastes of a prominent orator of the second century C. E. M. Cornelius Fronto, which are reflected in the correspondence with his two royal pupils – Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. After discussion of literary canons in antiquity, the reading list of Fronto is compared to the most famous canon of Greek and Latin authors compiled by Quintilian at the end of the first century C. E. The main difference between these two lies in neoclassical tastes of Quintilian and pre-classical of Fronto who is guided by his archaist interests. A separate section studies Fronto's account of Cicero in the light of these predilections.

Keywords: Cornelius Fronto, literary canon, archaism, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius

Contemporary readers do not know M. Cornelius Fronto, and there are two objective reasons for this. The first has to do with the fact that he was not an outstanding Latin author – at least, on the grounds of the preserved literary heritage. Even the last editor Michel van den Hout, who dedicated the whole life to studying Fronto, calls him “only a third-class writer”.¹ The other reason for oblivion can be explained by the late discovery of his only manuscript, which occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The more surprising for us looks extremely high appraisal of Fronto in antiquity, who was called the best orator of his time² and “non second but another one glory of Roman oratory”³ (obviously, in comparison to Cicero). Unfortunately, Fronto's speeches, so highly estimated in antiquity are almost lost today: the only extant fragment of considerable size comes from a letter of Marcus Aurelius, his student, who is quoting his teacher's text.⁴ So the largest part of Fronto's heritage, as we have it today, is his correspondence with the members of the Antonine dynasty – Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus and Antoninus Pius (altogether ca 250 letters are preserved).

The present article intends to focus upon the question of Fronto's literary tastes in the light of his interest in archaic literature as an important source of vocabulary. Though this point has already been given some scholarly attention, it seems to me that it needs serious revision: the most detailed study of this subject matter was undertaken by René Marache⁵ in the 1950s and it became quite antiquated by now (not in the least owing to the fact that the scholar had at his command the first – far from perfect – edition of Fronto's works by M. van den Hout)⁶. I shall try to imply holistic approach to Fronto's literary preferences and to investigate the way they contribute towards making a literary canon (or rather reading list) of his own.

Cornelius Fronto's Life and the Text of His Letters

The orator was born at the very end of the first century C. E. between 90 and 95 in Numidian Cirta, which is now Constanta in Algeria,⁷ and became the first famous Latin writer to come from the Northern Africa⁸ – as later Apuleius, Tertullian, and St. Augustine. His rhetoric studies began at Alexandria in Egypt and were continued in Rome. Fronto's brilliant political and oratory career, which peaked in 142⁹ C. E. after his appointment as consul, was closely connected with the Antonine dynasty: Emperor Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus. It fell to Fronto's lot to live during one of the most peaceful periods in the history of the Roman Empire with almost no war conflicts inside and outside the country.¹⁰ Fronto was born into a wealthy family and was a very well-to-do man: he owned a villa at Surrentum (modern Sorrento), which previously belonged to the Emperor Augustus. But his main pride and glory was, of course, a famous house on the Esquiline Hill in Rome facing the Colosseum: the villa was once owned by Maecenas and remained a property of Fronto's descendants at least till the end of the third century.¹¹ This house became the center of an elite literary community where Fronto was meeting his friends and pupils.

Fronto was a man of high reputation, and this led to his appointment as a tutor of the two adoptive sons of the Emperor Antoninus Pius – Marcus Aurelius (122–180 C. E.) and some time later of his younger brother Lucius Verus (130–169 C. E.). This puts Cornelius Fronto into a wider context of famous teachers and their royal pupils – such as Aristotle and Alexander the Great or Seneca and Nero. Fronto taught Marcus for approximately

six years between 139 and 145 C. E. until the latter became a co-regent of his father. This time turned out to be very happy for both the teacher and pupil because they became passionate friends (though Fronto could not approve of Marcus' growing interest in Stoic philosophy vs. rhetoric). Teacher's attitude to Lucius was more ambivalent: "on the one hand, he refused with Marcus to denounce the poor qualities of the man [such as dissipation and extravagance – OB]; on the other hand, we see that they did not hit it off too well."¹² So this correspondence is of vital historical importance because it gives us a unique chance to look into private lives of the best orator of the second century and two future emperors.

However, this could have not happened at least for two reasons: first, the correspondence was not intended for "publication"¹³ by Fronto during his lifetime, and this was, probably, done only in the fourth century C. E.¹⁴ Secondly, Fronto's works were considered to be completely lost until the beginning of the nineteenth century. Another birth to his literary heritage was given by an accidental discovery of Angelo Mai (1782–1854), a famous Italian philologist and paleographer, who in 1838 was ordained a cardinal. His hunting for manuscripts began in 1811 when he was appointed custodian of the Ambrosian Library in Milan and eight years later of the Vatican Library. During twenty years he brought back to life more than 350 names of Ancient Greek and Latin authors, which can be compared only to achievements of Italian Humanists. But the most famous event associated with Mai's activities was his discovery of a large fragment of the considered to be lost Cicero's dialogue "On the State" ("De re publica"). The clamor aroused by the announcement was so great that at the beginning of 1820 G. Leopardi composed a poem "Ad Angelo Mai" for the occasion.

Discovery of Fronto's text, which occurred several years before and whose writings became a disappointment to the most of contemporary scholars,¹⁵ did not bring Mai the same fame, but it was a sort of detective story per se. The scholar paid attention to the manuscript¹⁶ of "The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon" ("Acta Concilii Chalcedonensis")¹⁷ kept in the Ambrosian Library and after careful examination found out that there was something below this text. The script turned out to be a triple palimpsest (a very rare case in codicology) with the writings of Fronto being inside of this paleographical "sandwich." The second part of the same manuscript was discovered by Mai in the Vatican Library several years later.¹⁸ In order to read and publish the parchment, Mai used strong chemicals made of gallic acid. This organic matter is received from gallnuts, which are slight

protuberances on tree caused by insects. These “nuts” were used since antiquity for making ink, but Mai made a discovery of a different kind: he found out that gallic acid when put on a parchment reveals the text underneath. However, this working method badly damages the manuscript because later its pages grow black and become unreadable. Among other aggravating factors was Mai’s reluctance to permit any other scholar to study the codex until his death in 1854. The chance was lost, which resulted in an inevitably unsatisfactory quality of later Fronto’s editions. Even the standard modern edition (Liepzig, 1988), carried out by M. van den Hout, who spent more than forty years studying Fronto, is far from being perfect because the scholar did not consult the manuscript and used only notes and conjectures of his predecessors. So there is no doubt that a new modern-technology based edition of Fronto’s works is needed: in this connection I would like to mention a successful interdisciplinary attempt undertaken recently by *The Archimedes Palimpsest Project* (<http://archimedespalimpsest.org/about/>).

In spite of textual problems, Fronto’s letters can and should be studied because they are a unique documentary of vivid historical and literary importance, which in a very informal way bring back to life voices of the most important political and intellectual figures of the second century, such as Marcus Aurelius and his teacher.

Literary Canons in Antiquity

The term ‘literary canon’ is used widely today of a group of literary works that are considered the most important of a particular time period or place. Or in other words: “In modern literary studies [...] the term normally refers to a more or less authoritative or standard list of works representing the best literary products of a specific culture or era”.¹⁹

“The Greek κανών is of Semitic origin and has a meaning «measuring rod» or «measuring stick».”²⁰ In Ancient Greek it was used as a technical word for a straight rod or bar, for a riddled line of masons or – in Plural – reeds of a wind-organ.²¹ The word could also have a metaphorical meaning, such as ‘rule’ or ‘standard’ (of law, for example, or Attic dialect)²², and in art it could define a ‘model’.²³ In Classical Latin the word ‘canon’ is very rare: in the literary texts up to the second century C. E. there are only two occurrences of it: in Vitruvius (X, 8, 3) it means “the sound-board of a water-organ”; and in Pliny the Elder, who is talking about certain rules of

art introduced by the Greek sculptor Polyclitus, the meaning is “model” or “standard” (NH XXXIV, 55).²⁴ The earliest examples of modern meaning of ‘canon’ can be traced in Latin ecclesiastical texts of the fourth century C. E., which imply a corpus of sacred writings of the Old and New Testament approved by the church.²⁵ So what is important for us, neither in Classical Greek nor in Latin does the word apply to literature. This seems to be a reason that not all modern scholars approve of using the term ‘canon’ for the selections of Ancient Greek and Roman authors: Rudolf Pfeiffer, for example, calls this usage “catachrestic”, but states, at the same time, that “the expression is sanctioned by its age and convenience” and believes that it will “never disappear”.²⁶

In Ancient Greek the words to describe the process of selection are the verb ἐγκρίνειν (to select, admit) and the participle ἐγκριθέντες (selected, included).²⁷ Latin parallels from Quintilian’s “Institutes of Oratory” are ‘excerpere’ (Inst. X, 1, 45), ‘recipere’ (Inst. X, 1, 59) or ‘redigere’ (Inst. X, 1, 54; I, 4, 3), while the corresponding nouns are ‘ordo’²⁸ and ‘numerus’ (Inst. X, 1, 54).²⁹ But regardless of the name, “the tendency to select the best writers for various reasons is a very old one”³⁰ – one can recall, for example, a hot debate in the “Frogs” by Aristophanes on the greatest tragic poet question. We know that literary lists of the best authors existed since Hellenistic period of time, being especially associated with Alexandrian grammarians Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus.³¹ Probably, the most famous Classical list is the so-called “Canon of the Ten Attic Orators”, which is dated to the period between the third century B. C. E. and the second century C. E.³² In 1768, a celebrated German classical scholar David Ruhnken “set in motion an important shift in the modern history of a ‘canon’ by applying the word to the editorial activities of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus”³³ and he called their list of ten orators a ‘canon’.³⁴

If the concept of canon is at all applicable to the Classical world, I will stick to the definition of Amiel Vardi who talks about “(a) a list (b) of selected literary works, (c) which are regarded as sharing a special value (being the only ones extant, the best, the most representative, or the most suitable for a specific purpose); in addition such a list should also be (d) more or less standard and generally known, as well as (e) authoritative, in the sense that it is generally accepted or at least acknowledged when it is rejected”.³⁵

At the same time, Ancient Greece was already well acquainted not just with selective but also with comprehensive lists of writers, so-called

“Pinakes”.³⁶ The first one is ascribed to the famous Alexandrian poet and scholar of the third century B. C. E. Callimachus of Cyrene who arranged all Greek literary works according to subject and genre.³⁷ It is probably more accurate not to call these catalogues “comprehensive canons”³⁸ because canons are a priori selective. The difference between two types of records is well attested in our sources. Thus Quintilian makes a conscious distinction between ‘indices’³⁹ (lists) and ‘ordo/numerus’⁴⁰ (canon). He mentions these extensive catalogues in connection with the fact that he realises the existence of many poets not included in his canon and assumes that some profit may be derived from every author. At the same time, according to him, it is better to wait “till our powers have been developed and established to the full before we run to these poets”⁴¹ (Inst. X, 1, 57).

Before going into a discussion of more specific details we should look at the basic difference between Ancient Greek and Latin canons on the one hand and the Biblical canon on the other. As distinct from Jewish and Christian texts, Classical do not refer to a sacred scripture.⁴² I would agree with Tomas Hägg who argues that “a religious canon aims at drawing a definite borderline between books that are in and books that are out, the literary canon is mostly a priority list without such intentions of censorship, and with an open or arbitrary end.”⁴³ That is why Karl Sandnes seems to be right assuming that “the literary canon in the Graeco-Roman world is certainly more open and less religious. It is utilitarian rather than aimed at drawing definite borderlines”.⁴⁴ At the same time, one must not overestimate the openness of Classical canons. One of the main features of such lists is their quite conservative nature, which could be best of all illustrated by a very similar structure of the Greek authors’ lists compiled by Greeks and Romans at different time periods and kept to the established order of genres and personalities.⁴⁵

To what criteria did authors of such canons stick? Unfortunately, we know very little about this. Quintilian mentions the custom introduced by Alexandrian grammarians Aristarchus and Aristophanes of Byzantium that later became a rule – not to include contemporaries in the canon: in such a way they excluded, for example, Apollonius of Rhodes, the author of the “Argonautica.” The same approach was adopted in the “Roman History” by Velleius Paterculus (1st B. C. E. – 1st C. E.), who argues that though “we admire the living writers greatly, it is difficult to evaluate them” (“Nam uiuorum ut magna admiratio, ita censura difficilis est” – II, 36).

Another criterion mentioned by Quintilian is personal judgment (iudicium), which Aristarchus was using in approving of three iambic

poets⁴⁶ selected for the canon (Inst. X, 1, 59): this personal approach, as we shall see later, is very true as regards Quintilian himself. Glen Most who discusses other possible grounds for selection argues: "We can only surmise that popularity, multifunctionality, ideological serviceability, and the personal taste of certain key figures may have played a role, together of course with estimates of quality and, sometimes at least, claims for moral utility."⁴⁷ Nevertheless, even the fact that the text was well known and read did not necessarily mean that it would be included into the canon – none of the preserved lists mention, for example, epigrammatic poetry,⁴⁸ which was very popular in antiquity.⁴⁹ At the same time, moral guidelines indeed could be taken in consideration at least by some compilers. The canon that Quintilian has in mind in the first book of "Institutes of Oratory" is, of course, of a didactic type and is intended for younger students, so there is no surprise that he talks about strict treatment of the reading canon by the old school teachers of grammar and literature (grammatici).

It seems important to comment here upon two distinctive canon types in the ancient world, which were marked out by Amiel Vardi.⁵⁰ The first one was introduced by the Alexandrian grammarians and included names of the best representatives in a particular genre. The purpose of these canons is stated by George Kennedy: "The point of such lists was to indicate, sometimes in order of quality, the writers of a particular genre whom a librarian or grammarian approved and recommended and whose works belonged in a library."⁵¹ I find it hard to except the argument of Neil O'Sullivan who asserts that "this of course is something quite different from a 'canon'; it is merely a list and need carry no authority at all."⁵² These canons do not seem to be directly associated with the school tradition: they rather created guidelines for issuing copies of the authors selected and thus were aimed at the preservation of the Greek literary heritage for future generations. In short, they were canons for eternity.

The second variety also arose in the Hellenistic Greece in an important centre of Pergamum, which, unlike Alexandrian school, was much interested in rhetoric. These didactic canons appeared in a more practical context, being associated with the compilation of lists of authors who could become models of style for future orators. Though didactic lists had a different goal, they "were often compiled on the basis of Alexandrian canons".⁵³ One can observe that most of the preserved canons are of a didactic type. The only exception here is the list of the best Latin comic writers provided by a Roman literary critic Volcatius Sedigitus (ca 100 B. C. E.), which is extant owing to the fact that Aulus Gellius quotes a

passage from the book of the former “*De poetis*” written in iambic senarii (XV, 24). Volcatius Sedigitus does not give any grounds for his selection, except once when he explains the last, tenth, place given to Ennius by his “antiquity” (*causa antiquitatis*).

As was said above, such selections cannot be compared to censorship lists, but the fact is that very few works of ancient authors survived having been not included into canons, though the opposite is also quite true: such lists could not a priori guarantee preservation of texts.

In the present article I can only briefly touch upon the question of school actual reading lists, which were guided by didactic canons of some types. Our evidence is a scattered one and incomplete, but it seems quite obvious that neither in Greece nor in Rome there was a state institution of any kind willing to control the syllabus.⁵⁴ Teresa Morgan in her comprehensive study of school-text papyri from Egypt, which focuses mainly on lower levels of education,⁵⁵ speaks of the “core” authors and variable “periphery” studied at schools.⁵⁶ The core had to be rather stable, as it was based on a long tradition that governed education in antiquity. In such a way Pliny the Younger, who is writing to his junior friend Fuscus Salinator in order to improve his literary skills, advises him about a reading list, which is, according to him, fixed, well known and does not need specification (Pliny does not even mention whether he has in mind Greek literature, Latin or both – Epist. VII, 9, 15–16).

At the same time, the school reading lists were likely to differ at some points owing to personal predilections of a teacher, time, and place – as it was observed by Peter J. Parsons, “there is a world between Quintilian and the Egyptian market town.”⁵⁷ But even in Rome one cannot be sure that an extensive canon by Quintilian, who discusses all stages of education⁵⁸ but whose primary concern is the *schola rhetoris*, could really affect the schools’ “curriculum”, because an allowance should be, of course, made “for the normal discrepancy between theory and practice.”⁵⁹ The future tendency in education was quite obvious though. If one compares Quintilian’s list with the later ones, it is easy to see how the syllabus narrowed by the time of the late Empire:⁶⁰ We have a piece of evidence from the fourth-century rhetorician Arusianus Messius who in the “*Exempla Elocutionum*”⁶¹ picks out examples of expressions and phrases from Vergil, Terence, Cicero, and Sallust:⁶² this choice attests that they were the four main Latin authors believed to be the best representatives of a specific genre. In the sixth century this “quadriga Messii” was adopted by Cassiodorus (Inst. I, 15, 7).

M. Fabius Quintilianus' Canon of Greek and Latin Authors

Now let us shortly look at the most famous literary canon compiled at the end of the first century C. E. by a prominent rhetorician and teacher M. Fabius Quintilianus (c. 35–c. 100 C. E.). His opus magnum, an impressive twelve-volume treatise called the “Institutes of oratory” (“*Institutio oratoria*”), discusses theory and practice of Roman school training. In the tenth part of the textbook Quintilian gives an account of his canon of Ancient Greek and Latin writers, which is the most extensive in the Roman tradition and for this reason cannot be omitted in the discussion.

Two main things should be said about this canon. First, this list was part of Quintilian’s didactic program: that is why he deals with the authors “from the standpoint of their appropriateness in the training of aspiring orators and in shaping their styles.”⁶³ Various genres of literature are seen by him as means for improving oratory skills. Secondly, he is highly concerned about making comparison between Romans and Greeks. From his point of view, both Greek and Latin literature have reached “a certain plateau”⁶⁴ with their summits of glory in the past. So it was time to sum up highs and lows and to define merits and deficiencies of Roman literature vs. Greek. Quintilian evaluates ancient authors according to genres and keeps to the same order, when talking about Greeks and Romans. The scheme he makes use of is a traditional one, and it is borrowed from the Greek sources⁶⁵ where poetic genres precede prose works. If to look at Quintilian’s further division, epic is discussed as number one genre in poetry, which is followed by lyric (elegy, iambic poetry, and lyric in a narrow sense), and drama (old comedy, tragedy, and new comedy). In prose section he discusses history at first, then oratory and gives the last place to philosophy. Quintilian’s judgments of Latin literature seem to be much more independent than of Greek.⁶⁶ He believes, for example, that Virgil “most nearly approaches to Homer” (Inst. X, 1, 85) and that he excels all other Greek or Roman epics. Quintilian also believes that the Romans “challenge the supremacy of the Greeks in elegy” (Inst. X, 1, 93) and that satire is totally a Roman invention (“satire [...] is all our own” – Inst. X, 1, 93). It is worth to note a different approach towards Latin prose and poetry in the canon: Quintilian does not name any prose author before Cicero but gives many names of those who lived after him; in poetry it is vice versa: he mentions many Republican poets but only a few of post-Augustan date.⁶⁷ In his canon Quintilian makes one peculiar exception to the rule that none of the living authors should be included

in the list: this lucky man is an epic poet called Germanicus Augustus, but, of course, he is better known as Emperor Domitian (51–96 C. E.) – so it is clear that this “exception” is nothing but flattery to the mighty ruler. Sometimes the orator comments upon authors not just in the framework of their utility for future orators, but he also tends to share his personal literary judgments⁶⁸ – this point will be discussed later in connection with Fronto. If to define Quintilian’s literary preference in the most general way, he could be called a neoclassicist and his motto is: “Back to Cicero!”

Pupils of Cornelius Fronto

We know that Fronto was a teacher two future Emperors, which is mentioned in the inscription dedicated to his great-grandson: it describes Fronto as “orator, consul, magister imperatorum Luci et Antonini” (CIL XI, 6334). Such an appointment could have happened only due to Fronto’s high reputation as an orator and the fact that he was a man of rank (already a senator who was close to his consulship).⁶⁹ It is quite possible to reconstruct from the correspondence the course in Latin rhetoric given to Marcus and Lucius:⁷⁰ it included “thorough familiarity with the ancient poets and orators, the composition of verse, incessant practice in the invention and use of *similes* and *sententiae*, translations between Latin and Greek, and finally the composition of various exercises in rhetoric”.⁷¹ The teacher guided his pupils’ reading by sending certain excerpts from Latin authors or encouraged them to extract themselves.⁷²

But besides two royal students, Fronto had a number of other disciples, and he began to give guidance to them some time before Marcus and Lucius. This means that his teaching program took shape prior to the time when he became a tutor at the imperial palace and that it was intended for a wider circle of followers of his doctrine. What kind of community was it and what did Fronto teach? Unfortunately, our evidence is very scarce and unspecific. But what is quite certain is the fact that Fronto was not a professional teacher⁷³ like Quintilian, which means that most probably he did not accept payment⁷⁴ and that he did not associate himself with any formal educational institution.⁷⁵ Quintilian, on the other hand, gives his clear preference for school training over home education.⁷⁶

Fronto calls the circle of his disciples ‘contubernium’, which means ‘a band, crew, or brotherhood’, and he speaks of them not as ‘pupils’ (*discipuli*) but his ‘followers’ (*sectatores*) or ‘fellows’ (*contubernaes*).⁷⁷

In the correspondence one can find about ten names of people who could be more or less safely referred to as members of *'contubernium'*. They are usually mentioned by Fronto in the letters of recommendation sent to his friends and acquaintances, and he refers to participation in his *'contubernium'* (obviously, not without pride) as one of the reasons for such a recommendation. How old were Fronto's *'contubernaes'*? Some of these people definitely belonged to a younger generation than the orator, while others were older and not inexperienced.⁷⁸

It is even more difficult to answer the question about the type of instruction Fronto was giving to his *'contubernium'*. His own references are exactly of the same kind and very brief – Fronto says that he taught them *'bonae artes'* (one can translate this general expression as 'liberal arts'). At the same time, this saying very well corresponds to a passage from a letter to Marcus in which he praises his student for being "perfect and complete in all liberal arts, before adolescence a good man, before manhood a practised speaker" (Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 1, 2). There is no use, of course, as some do,⁷⁹ to see Fronto's *'contubernium'* as a school with formalized curriculum: it was rather a community that shared literary tastes and views.⁸⁰ So one can surmise that Fronto's private *'contubernium'* included a number of young people who were taught rhetoric in order to be trained for forum⁸¹ and that the program of such training was similar to the one offered to Marcus and Lucius.

"Archaizing Movement" of the Second Century C. E.

Fronto, a "literary lion",⁸² was the leading figure of Roman letters of the mid second century. Being a highly educated and wealthy man, he made his house the center of an elite community, which consisted not only of his disciples but also of friends with whom he could discuss topics he was interested in. In the history of literature Fronto is associated with most significant trend of the period which can be defined as archaism.⁸³ The term, dating back from the end of the nineteenth century, was introduced by Eduard Norden,⁸⁴ and it implies an interest in the Latin pre-classical authors, i. e. those who lived in the third – early first centuries B. C. E. In the second century such a tendency was peculiar to the Emperor Hadrian,⁸⁵ Fronto himself, and later to Aulus Gellius and Apuleius.

At the same time, it is important to bear in mind that nature and origin of this phenomenon are still under dispute. Archaism can be defined in

two possible ways: it was either a movement with a distinct ideology oriented towards the past or just a matter of personal predilections of a number of literates. The first definition also implies a strong personal role of Fronto as archaism's champion and protagonist. Besides the earlier literary historians,⁸⁶ this approach is adopted by Eduard Champlin in his important book on Fronto:⁸⁷ he believes that though the orator was not progenitor of this taste for old authors, it can be said that Fronto and "the dominion of archaism arose simultaneously"⁸⁸ and his "magisterial obsession with archaism affected the taste of an age".⁸⁹ The second approach is applied by Ulrich Schindel who doubts the possibility to mark archaism as the second century "*Epochenbegriff*" and argues that neither Fronto nor Aulus Gellius had any conscious archaistic program.⁹⁰ Though our literary evidence from this period is rather scarce, one can be sure, at least, that Fronto did not gain his interest in archaic literature at school: this is mentioned in a letter to Marcus Aurelius, in which the teacher praises his student's achievements and adds that at his age (the future Emperor was twenty two at that moment) he had hardly any knowledge of old Latin authors (Ad Marc. Caes. II, 2, 4). So one should date this tendency from the lifetime of Fronto who was sensitive to the turn literature was taking and who became genuinely interested in the use of archaism.⁹¹ But whatever serious his attraction to old writers was, I would prefer with A. D. Leeman, U. Schindel, and others⁹² not to speak of an "archaizing movement" because we are not aware of how deep Fronto's personal impact on literature of the period really was. It seems to me that it is better to talk about a literary tendency, which was in the air and which was followed by at least a number of men of letters.⁹³

Here we come to the second question concerning this tendency – the question of its origin. Did this interest in early authors come from a purely Roman context, as R. Marache and some other scholars believe?⁹⁴ Or was it influenced by a similar process in Greek culture?⁹⁵ The answer is not that simple, of course, and I tend to agree with Leonfranc Holford-Strevens, who weighs up both "internalist account" and "fortuitous resemblance between Greek Atticism"⁹⁶ and Roman archaism. What is, of course, strikingly similar between Greek and Roman culture of the second century is a strongly marked turn to the past,⁹⁷ but besides formal similarities, there is a gap between Greek and Latin way to treat it. On the Greek side this interest in old authors was practiced by the so-called Second Sophistic.⁹⁸ The Greeks of the period were writing their works in the Attic dialect which was associated with acme of the Greek oratory style in the first – fourth

centuries B. C. E. (hence the name 'Atticism'). The champions of archaic Latin, on the other side, in spite of its "wild beauty"⁹⁹ never actually tried to imitate the style of archaic authors, such as Cato the Elder or Gaius Gracchus. What they took from the past was an occasional use of rare and obsolete words in order to embellish their works and to give them a touch of variety.¹⁰⁰ The reason for this was probably the fact that they could well understand the inferiority of archaic Latin literature in comparison with that of the "Golden age" and such authors as Cicero. This imitation of the authors of the earlier period, which is limited to the use of specific vocabulary, makes the term "archaism" somewhat misleading, and that is why I would agree with Eduard Fraenkel who proposed to call its champions not "archaists" but rather "mannerists".¹⁰¹

Fronto's Reading List and Quintilian's Canon

Now we are turning to the reading list of Cornelius Fronto. I would not call it 'canon' for one main reason: as far as we know, he did not write treatises or textbooks on the topic, and private letters are not the most suitable place for a systematic discussion of the issue.¹⁰² At the same time, it makes sense to look at his literary preferences because he, like Quintilian, had fixed didactic principles and, as was shown above, had opportunities to implement them.

What authors did Fronto believe to be a new standard for those who would like to achieve success in the field of rhetoric and what criteria of choice did he apply in his list making? Though the discussion of literary issues is spread through the whole body of correspondence with Marcus and Lucius, detailed accounts are not numerous,¹⁰³ so it is not appropriate to talk about a fixed 'list' as such. Nevertheless, Fronto's literary preferences can be detected from his observations and comments. One can see that he favored pre-classical authors, which included prose writers prior to Cicero and poets before Virgil. This is very true in general, but the chronological criterion was not the only one: Fronto, for example, has a very high opinion of the historian Sallust, who was twenty years younger than Cicero. This means that stylistic account was also taken into consideration because Sallust was known for an abundant use of archaism. Besides Sallust, Fronto's list of favorite authors included such name as Ennius, Cato the Elder, Plautus, Lucretius, and a number of others known to us only in fragments.¹⁰⁴ Although Ennius and Cato seem to be number ones to Fronto

in poetry and prose respectively,¹⁰⁵ he never recommends his pupils to follow one particular model and believes that a speaker should be able to use various styles.¹⁰⁶ One can see from the correspondence that the teacher was very effective in sharing his taste for old authors with his students and that his ideas commanded their respect.¹⁰⁷

What is really striking about Fronto's reading list in comparison to Quintilian's canon and the later tradition (including Fronto's admirer Aulus Gellius) is the omission of certain names considered to be "classical". In his letters Fronto never refers to the greatest Latin epic Virgil to whom he prefers the mentioned above author of the "Annals" Quintus Ennius (239–169 B. C. E.).¹⁰⁸ Another outstanding poet Horace is mentioned only in one letter: he is called, at least, a "remarkable poet" ("*poeta memorabilis*"), but then Fronto jokingly says that he has a connection with Horace "through Maecenas" and his (Fronto's) "«gardens of Maecenas»" (Ad Marc. Caes. II, 2, 5) having in mind his villa at the Esquiline Hill.¹⁰⁹

Here we approach the main criterion of Fronto's list making. Unlike Quintilian, he does not select best representatives in a particular genre, but he makes instead a sort of stylistic hierarchy established according to the ability of writers to find suitable and appropriate words that should be looked for in pre-classical authors. He distinguishes, of course, between poets and prose writers,¹¹⁰ but otherwise in his didactic letters he easily compares and recommends those who wrote epic, tragedy, and comedy: thereby Fronto states, for example, that an epic Ennius was more careful about word selection than a writer of comedies Plautus (Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 3, 2).

It is highly probable that Fronto should have known Quintilian's "Institutes of Oratory", but he never demonstrates his acquaintance with the text. I think that this case resembles that of Virgil where we also have to do with implicit knowledge. Still, there are a few ideas shared by both authors – first, the concept that a perfect orator should be "a good man speaking well" (*vir bonus dicendi peritus*). At the same time, we know that this ideal was, of course, quite vague, and the phrase in its aphoristic form comes from Cato the Elder,¹¹¹ so I tend to believe that Fronto rather borrowed it directly from one of his favorite archaic writers than from Quintilian.

Secondly, Fronto and Quintilian share attitudes towards Cicero and Seneca. They similarly find limitations and imperfections of Seneca's the Younger style (Quint. Inst. X, 125–131; Fronto De orat. 2–3), but this does not necessarily mean that Fronto was influenced by Quintilian's judgment.

Seneca was a symbol of postclassical trend¹¹² in Latin, and Quintilian, who promoted neo-Ciceronianism, could not approve of him. At the same time, we see that he leaves his account of Seneca till last and the discussion is only “the second longest devoted to a single author”.¹¹³ This can be explained by the fact that Seneca was a major figure of the period and a very attractive one for the students of oratory. This is the reason why Quintilian could not ignore his influence and he chose to discuss not only Seneca’s stylistic defects but also his merits. In the second century, Seneca’s impact was not as strong as in the first century, nevertheless Fronto still realizes its danger for Marcus and alerts about drawbacks of this “effeminate” style: he talks about “soft and hectic plums of Seneca” (“Senecae mollibus et febriculosis prunuleis” – *De orat.* 2). Though Fronto acknowledges occasional lucky expressions in Seneca (*De orat.* 3), writings of the latter become an object of ruthless criticism for saying the same thing over and over again (*De orat.* 4).¹¹⁴ In comparison to the complex account of Quintilian Fronto’s is much more straightforward and one-sided because of his unconcealed dislike for “modernist” style of Seneca.¹¹⁵

Cicero has received the longest account of all in Quintilian’s discussion of Greek and Latin writers, having been treated in two sections (though, according to the author of the canon, he “is great in any department of literature” – *Inst.* X, 123): Cicero is spoken of as an orator, been compared to Demosthenes (X, 105–112), and as a philosopher who can rival Plato (X, 123). To Quintilian “the name of Cicero has come to be regarded not as the name of a man, but as the name of eloquence itself” (X, 1, 112).

In the following section I shall compare this purely panegyric discussion of Cicero with Fronto’s attitude, which is more diverse and mixed.

Fronto’s Account of Cicero

In this article I will speak of Fronto’s and Marcus’ attitude to Cicero together because the pupil does not seem to deviate from his teacher’s preferences and guidelines. In whole, they mention the name of Cicero and discuss him in more than twenty passages. How is the orator called? The most official variant of his name (M. Tullius) occurs in one of the earliest letters to Marcus, which dates ca 139 C. E. when Fronto has just become his tutor.¹¹⁶ Otherwise he is referred to as ‘Tullius’, ‘pater Tullios’, and most frequently as ‘Cicero’. The adjectives ‘Tullianus’ and ‘Ciceronianus’ are also used: the latter in Fronto’s letters (not in Marcus, though) always

has a possessive meaning – “belonging to Cicero” while ‘Tullianus’ is “typically Ciceronian”.¹¹⁷

Whatever Fronto’s personal literary tastes were, he could not, of course, omit Cicero in his teaching program.¹¹⁸ What is more, he underlines his good knowledge of Cicero’s writings and states that “he has most attentively read all his works” (“[...] qui scripta omnia studiosissime lectitarim” – Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 3, 3). So in a number of letters Cicero is spoken of – in a quite Quintilian’s manner – as the main Latin orator, and Fronto calls him “the head and source of Roman eloquence” (“caput atque fons Romanae facundiae” – Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 3, 3).¹¹⁹

Now let us look at two more examples of Cicero’s appraisal in Fronto. In a consolatory letter written to Marcus in 161 C. E. at the beginning the Parthian War when the political situation was quite hopeless Fronto encourages the Emperor and sends him a letter which contains a real praise of Cicero’s rhetorical art (*De bello Parthico* 10): Fronto states that no one was ever praised in a more “eloquent” way (*facundius*) than Pompeius was praised by Cicero and that his cognomen ‘Magnus’ owns a lot not only to personal virtues of the former but also to the mastery of the latter. This letter is a very rare example when a certain work by Cicero is recommended not just for stylistic purposes but because of its contents and ideas.

In a letter to his former student and future son in law Aufidius Victorinus, which dates presumably from 162–163 C. E.,¹²⁰ Fronto modestly asks for comparison of his (unpreserved) speech “Pro Bithynis” and Cicero’s “Pro Sulla” delivered about a year after the Catilina’s conspiracy. In this case one can see how Fronto’s personal feelings are involved: “Not that you should compare us as equals, but that you should recognize how far my mediocre talent falls short of that man of unapproachable eloquence” (“Non ut par pari compares, sed ut aestimes nostrum mediocre ingenium quantum ab illo eximiae eloquentiae viro abfuat” – Ad amic. I, 14, 2). I would say that this way to present his work is quite significant of Fronto: on the one hand, he pays a due tribute to his predecessor, but on the other, this shows his high aspirations and implies that his only rival would be the greatest ever Roman orator.

Apart from this favorable account of Cicero in general, one can find traces of more detailed discussion and use of his rhetorical art. Among them is the way of presentation and elaboration of arguments. Between 140 and 142 C. E. Fronto took part as a prosecutor in a trial against the famous sophist Herodes Atticus,¹²¹ who sometime later also became one of Marcus’ tutors. There is a series of letters dedicated to this occasion in

the body of correspondence.¹²² Marcus acts in a conciliatory manner and hints Fronto that he should not be too sharp on Herodes. Fronto – though unwillingly – yields to this request and assures Marcus that he will put his arguments “*singillatim*”, “*ut Ciceronis modum proferamus*” (Ad M. Caes. III, 6), which means “point by point, to follow Cicero’s way”. The adverb ‘*singillatim*’ is opposed to ‘*perpetuis orationibus*’ below in the text. These two ways of argumentation were perfectly known to Cicero who in the “De oratore” (III, 201) distinguishes between “*in perpetua oratione*” and “*in singulis verbis*”. In Herodes Atticus’ case the choice of “*singillatim*” was, obviously, less dangerous because it meant that the arguments were presented “in smaller units” and were “interrupted by hearing of witnesses and reading of documents”, while uninterrupted speech would have asked for strong emotions.¹²³

The question of Latin prose rhythm is an extremely difficult one and much ink has been spilt on this subject. What I would like to mention at the moment is that Cicero’s rhythm was quite different from that of Fronto with his short and abrupt sentences and abundant asyndeton.¹²⁴ This does not mean though that Fronto did not take care of the subject – on the contrary, he was very sensitive of rhythmical structure of his text.¹²⁵ That is why, I think, he deliberately points out to Marcus cases when he follows a dissimilar, i. e. Ciceronian, way: once Fronto quotes a passage from his future speech in honor of Antoninus Pius and tells Marcus that he is going to use a “Ciceronian clausula” (“*Tulliana conclusio*” – Ad Marc. Caes. II, 4, 1).¹²⁶ As he does not cite the end of the sentence, we are left to guess what particular type of clausula¹²⁷ he was going to put there. In another letter Fronto writes in an even more vague way: he praises Marcus’ speech about the earthquake in Cyzicus and emphasizes that in the subordinate clause he is using “*formam sententiae Tullianae*.” To draw Marcus attention, he repeats the whole clause:

Do you recognize the Ciceronian turn of the sentence? “So that not more suddenly or more violently was the city stirred by the earthquake than the minds of your hearers by your speech”.
(*Ecquid adgnoscis formam sententiae Tullianae: “ut non ocius aut vehementius terra urbem illam quam animos audientium tua oratio moverit?”* – Ad Ant. Imp. I, 2, 6).

Some believe¹²⁸ that ‘*forma*’ here also means ‘*clausula*’, but this can hardly be true at least for three reasons: first, because *clausula* as such is

not of a Ciceronian type;¹²⁹ secondly, it does not make sense to repeat the whole sentence for the sake of its rhythmical ending; thirdly, the word, according to *Theaurus Linguae Latinae*, never has such a meaning.¹³⁰ It seems to me that Fronto was using '*forma*' in this context in a more general and wider sense having in mind "a Ciceronian turn of phrase."

Does Fronto always approve of his great predecessor? On the one hand, Cicero is more than once mentioned among Fronto's beloved prose authors, such as Cato, Sallust, and Gaius Gracchus,¹³¹ which proves his high opinion of the famous orator. On the other, he does not seem to be Fronto's favorite in the art of oratory: the latter explicitly says that he prefers Cicero's letters to his speeches:

All Cicero's letters, however, should, I think, be read in my opinion, even more than his speeches. There is nothing more perfect than Cicero's letters. (Omnes autem Ciceronis epistulas legendas censeo, mea sententia vel magis quam omnis eius orationes: epistulis Ciceronis nihil est perfectius – Ad Ant. Imp. III, 8, 2).

This was an answer to Marcus' request to provide him with a selection of Cicero's letters, either in full or in parts. Fronto sends what he had himself excerpted on the matter of eloquence, philosophy, and politics, as well as some expressions that seemed to him elegant and remarkable. At the end of his epistle – and this is a sign of sincere adoration – he says that **all** Cicero's letters are worth reading. To describe Cicero's epistolary style, which he wants Marcus to study and follow, he uses an adjective '*remissus*' (relaxed) (Ad Marc. Caes. II, 2, 4). This very well coincides with Cicero's own definition of epistolary style as "intimate and full of jesting" ("*familiare et iocosum*" – Fam. II, 4, 1). His unsurpassed epistolary skill is mentioned once more in a letter addressed to Lucius Verus: Fronto discusses at length the importance of rhetoric for the ruler – a subject of great importance for him – and states the preference of a letter-form for some treatises. In this connection he discusses a non extant today work of Cicero "*De consiliis suis*", which was posthumously published by his son and which dealt with accusations against Crassus and Caesar.¹³² From Fronto's point of view, the whole thing would have become better if compiled in a letter form in order to make it "shorter, more readable, and compact"¹³³ ("*brevius et expeditius et densius*" – Ad Ver. Imp. II, 1, 15).

Fronto was very careful about selection of words and, one can say, even obsessed with word hunting: no wonder that this was the main

criterion he used in his judgment about other authors and this was his guiding star in compiling of the list of favorite writers. In his discussion of Fronto's aesthetic principles A. Leeman even speaks about "a word-crazed generation".¹³⁴ Because of the importance of the subject, it is scattered through the correspondence, and this is the point Fronto wants to teach his students in the first place. One of the earliest letters about the right choice of words is addressed to Marcus Aurelius and presumably dates from 139 C. E. when Fronto was appointed a royal tutor.¹³⁵ The letter discusses his didactic principles and contains the longest passage ever dedicated to Cicero by Fronto: the teacher intends to express and share with Marcus his non-classical stylistic values. Fronto focuses upon the danger of half-knowledge, which, according to him, can be easily concealed in almost all arts but for selection and arrangement of words (Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 4, 1).¹³⁶ He argues that even among old authors not all paid due attention to the choice of words, citing as good examples Cato, Sallust, Ennius, Plautus, and some others. A whole paragraph below is devoted to Cicero's word usage: on the one hand, Fronto acknowledges that the orator spoke "the most beautiful words" ("verba pulcherrima" – *ibid.* 3), but on the other, he believes that Cicero was not always careful in his choice of words. For this three possible reasons are given that are a) greatness of mind, b) a wish to escape toil, c) or confidence that he does not have to look for the words and the right one will come up without searching (*ibid.*). This observation obviously contradicts with Fronto's call for "unexpected and unlooked for words" ("insperata atque inopinata verba" – *ibid.*) expressed in the text below. Fronto puts a special emphasis on the fact that these words should be assiduously searched for and the source for them is to be found in old Latin authors.

Without any doubt, Fronto was neither the first one nor the only one to criticize Cicero's style.¹³⁷ Mannerist aspirations of Fronto should be discussed not only against a background of the second century's C. E. tastes but also in a wider context of earlier literary theories. Though the importance of correct word usage was always an essential part of oratory training, its implicit value still remained a matter of discussion. The core of this dispute was a disagreement on content vs. form supremacy. The former approach can be best illustrated by an aphorism of Cato the Elder: "grasp the subject, the words will follow" ("rem tene, verba sequentur" – fr. 15 Jordan). This is really striking, but Fronto, who rates Cato among his favorite authors, fails to understand the essence of his literary priorities. On the other hand, Cicero, who – in spite of Fronto's

assertion – was never careless about word selection, nevertheless, backs up Cato’s opinion and uses it as an argument¹³⁸ in his polemics with the so-called Atticists, C. Julius Caesar and C. Licinius Calvus being among them. In the first century C. E., Quintilian, a true follower of Cicero, talks about ‘*res*’ (contents) and ‘*verba*’ (words) as mutually complementary (Inst. X, 1, 4) and mocks those who can never stop to hunt for something better and archaic to the detriment of sense (Inst. VIII, praef. 31). As was wittily observed by E. Fantham,¹³⁹ by saying this he could have predicted Fronto’s appearance.

The Word ‘*Classicus*’ and Cornelius Fronto

We have just looked at the importance of a well chosen word for Fronto, and now I would like to discuss one more word, which is associated with him – ‘*classicus*’. Many modern languages have derivatives from this Latin adjective – such as ‘classical’, ‘*klassisch*’, ‘*classique*’, ‘*classico*’, ‘*clásico*’, ‘*clasic*’, etc. The meaning of all these words is foreseeable and implies something standard and exemplary. In Latin ‘*classicus*’, obviously, comes from the noun ‘*classis*’, which denotes a class of people on the basis of their property; so the adjective originally was a technical term and meant someone belonging to the highest class of citizens.

It is noteworthy that the first figurative use of ‘*classicus*’ as ‘classical’ is associated with the name of Cornelius Fronto. The evidence comes from Aulus Gellius, a Latin writer who was born one generation after Fronto.¹⁴⁰ In his younger years, Gellius studied in Rome and was acquainted with most outstanding teaching figures of the time, such as philosopher Favorinus and grammarian C. Sulpicius Apollinaris. When Gellius met Fronto the orator was still Marcus’ and Lucius’ tutor. We cannot say that Gellius was Fronto’s student in a strict sense of the word, but he was given honor to be accepted at Fronto’s place and had a chance to participate in the talks of “*sociabilité savante*”.¹⁴¹

At mature age, Gellius compiled his famous “Attic Nights”, which is a collection of various notes on grammar, history, literature and which preserves fragments from the works of Latin authors otherwise unknown. In this book he gives several accounts¹⁴² of Fronto and speaks of his scholarly talks and discussions with admiration and respect. At the meeting we are going to look at¹⁴³ the topic of discussion, in which Fronto commented

on the words of one of the guests present,¹⁴⁴ was of little significance, having to do with a minor point of Latin vocabulary. The question was the possibility of usage of two Latin words in Singular and in Plural ('quadrigae' and 'harena'). Fronto gives his judgment on the question and calls upon his audience to look for rare words:

So go now and inquire, when you chance to have leisure, whether any orator or poet, provided he be of that earlier band – that is to say, any classical or authoritative writer, not the one of the common herd – has used 'quadriga' or 'harenae'. Now Fronto asked us to look up these words, I think, not because he thought that they were to be found in any books of the early writers, but to rouse in us an interest in reading for the purpose of hunting down rare words. (Transl. by J. C. Rolfe)

(Ite ergo nunc et, quando forte erit otium, quaerite, an "quadrigam" et "harenas" dixerit e cohorte illa dumtaxat antiquiore uel oratorum aliquis uel poetarum, id est classicus assiduusque aliquis scriptor, non proletarius. Haec quidem Fronto requirere nos iussit uocabula non ea re, opinor, quod scripta esse in ullis ueterum libris existumaret, sed ut nobis studium lectitandi in quaerendis rarioribus uerbis exerceret – Gell. XIX, 8).

Initially all three words – '*classicus*', '*assiduus*', and '*proletarius*' – were linked to property qualification:¹⁴⁵ '*classicus*', as was said above, means 'belonging to the highest class of citizens'; '*assiduus*' is 'land-owning, wealthy'; and '*proletarius*' – 'belonging to the lowest class of citizens'. But Fronto in Gellius' account is the first to apply these definitions to literature and writers¹⁴⁶ and in case of '*classicus*' to describe authors of high standard and to distinguish between classical and colloquial.¹⁴⁷ On the one hand, there is no indisputable evidence that Gellius is citing Fronto word-for-word, so we cannot be sure that this expression does not belong to the author of the "Attic Nights" himself, but on the other hand, mnemonic skills of the ancients were surprisingly good and it is very tempting and plausible to assume that Fronto is the father of modern usage of the word 'classical'. It is also important that 'classical' for Fronto agrees neither with Quintilian's canon nor even with Gellius' list of favorite authors,¹⁴⁸ but implies writers of the "pre-classical" period.

Conclusions

The aim of the present article was to study the correspondence of the greatest orator of the second century C. E. Cornelius Fronto with Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus from the point of view of the tutor's teaching program and literary preferences. In order to see their peculiar character, it was important to look at the notion of literary canon in antiquity and to compare Fronto's account with the comprehensive canon of Quintilian, compiled at the end of the first century C. E. I believe that on the one hand, one should not speak of a 'canon' in Fronto's case because he does not discuss the subject in a form of a treatise or textbook, but on the other, his reading list is comparable to that of Quintilian because it is also based on fixed didactic principles. The most striking difference between Quintilian's canon and Fronto's reading list is the preference of the latter for the pre-classical Latin authors, such a Cato the Elder, which should be seen against the background of archaizing tastes of the second century in general. However, what is characteristic exclusively of Fronto is his almost obsessive concern about the right choice of words. In this context a special section is dedicated to Fronto's account of Cicero, who enjoys the fame of a great orator but does not, at the same time, meet Fronto's main criterion of careful word selection.

NOTES

- 1 HOUT VAN DEN, M. P. J., *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*, Brill, Leiden; Boston; Köln, 1999, p. X.
- 2 Which was the second century C. E. Dio LXIX, 18, 3.
- 3 Eum. Pan. Lat. 8 (V), 14.
- 4 Ad Marc. Caes. I, 6, 2–8. The numeration follows that of the edition: HOUT VAN DEN, M. P. J. (ed.), *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae* schedis tam editis quam ineditis Edmundi Hauleri usus ed. Michael P. J. van den Hout, Teubner, Leipzig, 1988.
- 5 MARACHE, R., *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaisant au IIe siècle de notre ère*, Plihon, Rennes, 1952 and MARACHE, R., *Mots nouveaux et mots archaïques chez Fronto et Aulu-Gelle*, Press Universitaires de France, Rennes, 1957 [*Travaux de la faculté des lettres de Rennes*, Serie I. Vol. 1].
- 6 HOUT VAN DEN, M. P. J., *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae*, Brill, Lugduni Batavorum, 1954.
- 7 CHAMPLIN, E., *Fronto and Antonine Rome*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980, p. 5; HOUT VAN DEN 1999, VII.
- 8 In the second and third centuries “Latin literature is represented almost exclusively by African authors” (MATTIACCI, S. “Apuleius and Africitas”, in LEE, B. T., FINKELPEARL, E., GRAVERINI L. [eds.], *Apuleius and Africa*, Routledge, New York; London, 2014, p. 88).
- 9 Traditionally it was believed that Fronto was a consul of 143 C. E. (based on Ad Marc. Caes. II, 2, 4). Due to the new archaeological findings, the date of Fronto’s consulship was successfully re-examined by W. Eck and M. Roxan (ECK, W., “M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, consul suffectus im J. 142”, in *Rheinisches Museum*, 141, 1998, S. 193–196 and ECK W., ROXAN M., “Two Military Diplomas”, in FREI-STOLBA, R., SPEIDEL, M. A. (Hrsgs.), *Römische Inschriften: Neufunde, Neulesungen und Neuinterpretationen: Festschrift für Hans Lieb zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Freunden und Kollegen*, F. Reinhardt, Basel, 1995, pp. 55–99 (on Fronto: pp. 79–99).
- 10 With an exception of the Parthian War (161–166).
- 11 CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM LATINARUM XV, 7398.
- 12 HOUT VAN DEN 1999, 256.
- 13 By ‘publication’ I mean issuing of multiple manuscript copies of the collection intended for public reading.
- 14 The idea that Fronto had an intention to publish his letters was proposed by Th. Mommsen and later supported by D. A. Russel (MOMMSEN, Th., “Die Chronologie der Briefe Frontos”, in *Hermes* 8, 1874, S. 198–216; RUSSEL, D. A., “Greek and Latin in Antonine Literature”, in RUSSEL, D. A. (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990, p. 13 (“One

- can hardly believe that [...] their letters were not meant for publication"). Against see: CHAMPLIN 3 ("There is no hint that Fronto himself ever contemplated any collection of his correspondence") and GOODYEAR, F., "Rhetoric and Scholarship: Fronto", in KENNEY, E. J., CLAUSEN W. V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. 2 (Latin Literature), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 676–677 ("These letters were probably never meant for publication or published by Fronto").
- ¹⁵ With an exception of Leopardi's account: LEOPARDI, G., *Discorso sopra la vita e le opere di M. Cornelio Frontone*, Roma, 1816 (= *Biblioteca Italiana*, Roma, 2008). CHAMPLIN 2.
- ¹⁶ Bibliotheca Ambrosiana E. 147 sup. The manuscript dates from ca 700 C. E. (HOUT VAN DEN 1988, 12).
- ¹⁷ A church council held in 451 C. E. at Chalcedon, a city of Bithynia in Asia Minor, known in modern times as Kadiköy in Istanbul.
- ¹⁸ Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 5750.
- ¹⁹ VARDI, A. D., "Canons of Literary Texts in Ancient Rome", in FINKELBER, M., STROUMSA, G. G. (eds.), *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, Brill, Leiden; Boston, 2003, p. 131 [*Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture*, Vol. 2].
- ²⁰ MCDONALD, L. M., SANDERS, J. A., "Introduction", in McDonald, L. M., SANDERS, J. A. (eds.), *The Canon Debate*, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, 2002, p. 11.
- ²¹ LIDDLE, H. G., SCOTT, R., JONES, H. S. (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, ⁹1940, s. v. (repr. 1996).
- ²² Dionysius of Halicarnassus calls Lysias "the perfect model of the Attic dialect" (τῆς Ἀττικῆς γλώττης ἄριστος κανὼν – Lys. 2) (MONTANARI, F., "Kanon", in CANCIK, H., SCHNEIDER, H., LANDFESTER, M. (Hrsgs.), *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Bd 6, J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart; Weimer, 1999, Sp. 249–250). In the 9th century Photius speaks of writers who can be a 'canon' (standard) for others in a particular genre: Thucydides is, for example, a model for Cassius Dio (Bibl. 35 b 33) (EASTERLING, P., "Canon", in HORNBLLOWER, S., SPAWFORTH, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, ³2005, p. 286).
- ²³ On canon in art see also: GEBHART, E., "Canon", in DAREMBERG Ch., SAGLIO, M. E. (éds.), *Le Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*, T. 1, 2, Librairie Hachette, Paris, 1877, pp. 891–892.
- ²⁴ For the history of the term also see: OPPEL, H., "Κανὼν, Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula–norma)", in *Philologus*, Suppl. 30, 4, Dieterich, Leipzig, 1937, S. 1–108.
- ²⁵ THESAURUS LINGUAE LATINAE s. v. 7. MCDONALD, L. M., SANDERS, J. A. 7. See this volume for a profound discussion of the term 'canon' applied to collections of the Holy Bible books.

- 26 PFEIFFER, R., *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the*
End of the Hellenistic Age, Vol. 1, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968, p. 207.
- 27 PFEIFFER I, 206; MONTANARI 249.
- 28 Quintilian's term, 'ordo', transferred from the terms of social ranks into the
 literary sphere, was not favored by later authors (PFEIFFER I, 206).
- 29 Terms for selected authors are also discussed in: CURTIUS, E., TRASK, W. R.
 (transl.), *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, Harper Row, New
 York, 1953, p. 249.
- 30 PFEIFFER I, 204. See one of the first discussions of the term in:
 RADERMACHER, L., "Kanon", in PAULY, A. F., von, WISSOWA, G.,
 KROLL, W., WITTE K. (Hrsgs.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen*
Altertumswissenschaft, Bd 10, J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart, 1919, s. v.
- 31 Preserved canons of Ancient Greek writers and grammarians are discussed
 at length, for example, by O. Kroehnert (*Canonesne poetarum, scriptorium,*
artificum per antiquitatem fuerunt?, Diss., Officina Leupoldiana, Regimonti
 Pr., 1897). He also briefly touches upon earlier scholarly tradition (pp. 1–3).
- 32 This later date was proposed by Alan E. Douglas ("Cicero, Quintilian,
 and the Canon of Ten Attic Orators", in *Mnemosyne*, 4 Series, 9, 4, 1956,
 pp. 30–40). But see also Ian Worthington for an earlier dating: "The Canon
 of the Ten Greek Orators", in WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.), *Persuasion:*
Greek Rhetoric in Action, Routledge, London, 1994, p. 244. The author
 argues that the compilation of the canon "can be placed in the period
 between Cicero and Quintilian" and believes that an Atticist Caecilius of
 Caleacte, a contemporary of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the author of
 the treatise "On the style of the Ten Orators," would be the most plausible
 author (p. 259). Amiel Vardi hesitates between the version of a Pergamene
 provenance (in the second century B. C. E.) and I. Worthington's proposal
 (VARDI 141).
- 33 GORAK, J., *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a*
Literary Idea, Athlone Press, London, 1991, p. 51.
- 34 "Ex magna oratorum copia tamquam in canonem decem dumtaxat
 rettulerunt" [sc. Aristarchus et Aristophanes Byzantius] (RUHNKEN, D. (ed.),
Rutilii Lupi De figures sententiarum et elocutionis duo libri, Luchmans,
 Leiden, 1768, p. XCV).
- 35 VARDI 131.
- 36 PFEIFFER I, 205.
- 37 See a discussion of preserved fragments in: WITTY, F. J., "The *Pinakes* of
 Callimachus", in *The Library Quarterly*, 28, 2, Apr., 1958, pp. 132–136. Also:
 WITTY, F. J., "The Other *Pinakes* and Reference Works of Callimachus", in
The Library Quarterly, 43, 3, Jul., 1973, pp. 237–244.
- 38 VARDI 134.
- 39 TLL, s. v. II, c, 3. Cicero also mentions an 'index' of tragedians (Hort. fr.
 8 – Grilli), while Seneca that of philosophers (Epist. 39, 2).

- 40 Mentioned in Inst. X, 1, 54.
- 41 Passages of Quintilian are quoted from H. E. Butler's translation: QUINTILIAN, BUTLER, H. E. (transl.), *The "Institutio oratoria"*, 4 Vol., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1920 [*The Loeb Classical Library*].
- 42 HÄGG, T., "Canon Formation in Greek Literary Culture", in THOMASSEN, E. (ed.), *Canon and Canonicity: The Formation and Use of Scripture*, Museum Tusulanum Press, Copenhagen, 2010, p. 109.
- 43 HÄGG *ibid*.
- 44 SANDNES, K. O., *The Gospel "According to Homer and Virgil": Cento and Canon*, Brill, Leiden, 2011, p. 45, n. 53 [*Supplementum to Novum Testamentum*, 138].
- 45 See tables in: VARDI 151–152.
- 46 These were Archilochus, Simonides of Amorgos, and Hipponax.
- 47 MOST, G., "Canon Fathers: Literacy, Morality, Power" in *Arion*, 3rd Series, 1, 1, 1990, pp. 35–60, p. 55.
- 48 Marcus Aper in Tacitus' "Dialogue on oratory" (Dial. 10, 4) mentions epigrams among other literary genres that should be practiced by poetry, which is, according to him, a part of eloquence. On this wider sense of 'eloquentia' as "artistic language" see: BERG, C. S., VAN DEN, *The world of Tacitus' "Dialogus de Oratoribus": Aesthetics and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014, p. 146.
- 49 Vardi reasonably explains this by the fact that epigrams "came to be a significant literary fact type after the generic scheme of canons was established" (VARDI 145).
- 50 VARDI 140.
- 51 KENNEDY, G., *Quintilian*, Twayne Publishers, New York, 1969, p. 106 [*Twayne's World Authors Series* 59].
- 52 O'SULLIVAN, N., "Caecilius, the 'Canons' of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism", in Dominick, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, Routledge, London, New York, 1997, p. 27.
- 53 VARDI 135.
- 54 VARDI 141.
- 55 CRIBIORE, R. "Review of: Morgan Teresa «Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds», Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998", in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 1999.05.22.
- 56 MORGAN, T., *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. 67 ff. (especially 71–73).
- 57 PARSONS, P., "Review of: Ιμπραχημ, Μ.-Χ. Ἡ Ἑλληνορωμαϊκὴ Παιδεία ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ [...] Ἀθήναι, 1972", in *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 61, 1975, p. 301.
- 58 Problems concerning formal organization of school education under the Empire are thoroughly discussed by KASTER, R. A., "Notes on «Primary»

- and «Secondary» Schools in Late Antiquity”, in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 113, 1983, pp. 323–346. See especially P. 337 (for the scheme) and P. 339 (for Quintilian’s account).
- 59 KENNEY, E. J., “Books and Readers in the Roman World”, in KENNEY, E. J., CLAUSEN, W. V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. 2 (Latin Literature), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982, p. 7.
- 60 KENNEY *ibid.*; VARDI 142.
- 61 Until 1815 they were erroneously ascribed to M. Cornelius Fronto.
- 62 KEIL (ed.), *Grammatici Latini*, VII, 449–514.
- 63 DOMINIK, W. J., “The style is the man: Seneca, Tacitus and Quintilian’s canon”, in DOMINIK, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, Routledge, London, 1997, p. 42.
- 64 KENNEDY 1969, 106.
- 65 There is only one treatise preserved that dates before Quintilian and that discusses merits of Greek literary genres – “De imitatione” by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who flourished during the reign of Augustus.
- 66 KENNEDY 1969, 108.
- 67 FARREL, J., “Apuleius and the Classical Canon”, in LEE, B. T., FINKELPEARL, E., GRAVERINI L. (eds.), *Apuleius and Africa*, Routledge, New York; London, 2014, p. 78, n. 10 [*Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies*].
- 68 DOMINIK 42.
- 69 CHAMPLIN 119.
- 70 HAINES I, XXXV–XXXVII; KENNEDY 1969, 599; STEINMETZ, P., *Untersuchungen zur römischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1982, S. 174–175.
- 71 CHAMPLIN 118.
- 72 See, for example, Ad Marc. Caes. III, 13, 2; Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 2, 6; Ad Marc. Caes. III, 19, 2; Ad Ant. Imp. III, 8, 2 etc.
- 73 See, for example, G. Kennedy: “Fronto was not a sophist, nor a professional teacher but a Roman orator who was interested in sophistry and rhetoric and became a tutor” (KENNEDY 1969, 594; see also 597: “[...] Fronto was not a rhetorician, in the sense that Quintilian, for example was”).
- 74 “If a salary was involved, allusions to it are discreetly veiled” (KENNEDY 1969, 599).
- 75 As Fronto, Quintilian was made tutor at the imperial palace and in 90 C. E. he began to teach Domitian’s two grand-nephews and heirs. But unlike Fronto’s, Quintilian’s pupils “vanished into exile” (MURPHY, J. (ed.), *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing: Translations from Books One, Two, and Ten of the “Institutio Oratoria”*, Southern Illinois University Press, Edwardville, 1987, p. XX).
- 76 Inst. I, 2, 1 ss.; II, 3, 10.

- 77 On Fronto's 'contubernium' see: JOHNSON, W. A., *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, pp. 137–156; RICHLIN, A., "Old Boys: Teacher–Student Bonding in Roman Oratory", in *The Classical World*, 105, 1, Fall 2011, pp. 98–99.
- 78 Such as Cornelianus Sulpicius (Ad amic. I, 2) and Licinius Montanus (Ad amic. I, 3).
- 79 HAINES I, XL.
- 80 KENNEDY 1969, 602; JOHNSON 145.
- 81 JOHNSON *ibid*.
- 82 KENNEDY, G., *A History of Rhetoric: The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World (300 B. C. – A. D. 300)*, Vol. II. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972, p. 592.
- 83 See, for example: SCHANZ, M. (bearb. v. C. HOSIUS und G. KRÜGER), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian, 3 Teil: Die Zeit von Hadrian 117 bis auf Constantin 324*, Beck, München, ³1922, S. 88–100; TEUFFEL, W. S. (bearb. v. W. KROLL und F. SKUTSCH), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur: Die Literatur von 96 nach Chr. bis zum Ausgange des Altertums*, 3 Bd, Teubner, Berlin, ⁶1913, S. 73–77; D'ALTON, J. F., *Roman Literary Criticism: A Study in Tendencies*, Russell & Russell, New York, 1931, p. 318; LEEMAN, A. D., *Orationis ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*, Vol. 1, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam, 1963, p. 366; KENNEDY 1969, 598; WILLIAMS, G., *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*, University of California Press, Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, 1978, p. 307; KASULKE, Chr. T., *Fronto, Marc Aurel und kein Konflikt zwischen Rhetorik und Philosophie im 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, Saur, München; Leipzig, 2005, p. 280 [Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Bd 218] and others.
- 84 NORDEN, E., *Die antike Kunsprosa*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, ⁵1958, S. 361.
- 85 Scriptorum Historiae Augustae, VH 16, 6.
- 86 See note 83.
- 87 CHAMPLIN 52.
- 88 *Ibid*.
- 89 CHAMPLIN 59.
- 90 SCHINDEL, U., "Archaismus als Epochenbegriff: Zum Selbstverständnis des 2. Jhr.", in *Hermes*, 122, 1994, S. 327–341.
- 91 At the same time, we know that an interest in old authors was not a total novelty for the Roman society and its traces could be found already in Augustan literature. On archaist tastes of the first century B. C. E. and first century C. E. see, for example, Suet. Gram. 24; Sen. Epist. 58, 3–4; 108, 33–34; Plin. N. H. praef. 22; Plin. Epist. I, 16, 2); LEEMAN I, 182; JOCELYN, H. D., "Studies in the Indirect Tradition of Plautus' «Pseudolus». III The

- «Archaising Movement», Republican Comedy and Aulus Gellius «Noctes Atticae», in HORSFALL, N. (ed.), *Vir bonus dicendi peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's 80th Birthday*, pp. 60–62 [*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Suppl. 51, 1988]
- 92 LEEMAN I, 62; SCHINDEL 327–341; SWAIN, S. “Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius”, in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., VARDI, A. D. (eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, pp. 17–18.
- 93 L. Holford-Strevens speaks about “an atmosphere” that attracted Fronto to early writers (HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003, p. 356).
- 94 MARACHE, R., *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaisant au II^e siècle de notre ère*, Plihon, Rennes, 1952, 119; 8, n. 1. See also: HERTZ, M., *Renaissance und Rococo in der römischen Literatur: Ein Vortrag im wissenschaftlichen Verein zu Berlin am 25. März 1865 gehalten*, W. Hertz, Berlin, 1865, S. 29; BOMPAIRE, J., *Lucien écrivain: imitation et création*, Boccard, Paris, 1958, pp. 110–111; BOWIE, E., “Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic”, in FINLEY, M. I. (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Boston, 1974, p. 167.
- 95 This was first proposed by E. Norden (⁵1958, I, 361). See also: RUSSEL, D. A., “Greek and Latin in Antonine Literature”, in RUSSEL, D. A. (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990, p. 13.
- 96 HOLFORD-STREVENS, 2003, 361.
- 97 HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1988, p. 3.
- 98 On the term see, for example: BOWERSOCK, G., *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969 and others.
- 99 HOLFORD-STREVENS 1988, 3.
- 100 See, for example, Fronto “De eloquentia” 2, 19 (“ut [...] prisco verbo adornares, colorem vetusculum adpingeres”).
- 101 He uses the term ‘Manierismus’ (FRAENKEL, E., *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, Bd 2. Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Roma, 1964, S. 340). Fraenkel’s interpretation is followed by Holford-Strevens (2003, 6; 354). Already in the nineteenth century M. Hertz compared Fronto’s age with “rococo” (HERTZ 26).
- 102 One can say though that “De orationibus” and “De eloquentia”, in which Fronto discusses rhetoric principals, take intermediate position between letters and theoretical works.
- 103 See especially Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 3; Ad Ant. Imp. III, 1; Ad Ver. Imp. II, 1, 14; “De orationibus”; “De eloquentia”.
- 104 Such as C. Gracchus, Accius, Naevius, Lucilius, Caecilius, Laberius, and some others.
- 105 Fronto calls Ennius “many sided” (multiformis – De eloq. I, 2).

- ¹⁰⁶ STEINMETZ 185.
- ¹⁰⁷ See, for example, Ad Marc. Caes. II, 5, 1; 8, 5; Ad Marc. Caes. III, 19; Ad Ant. Imp. IV, 1, 3 etc. In a few preserved letters from Lucius Verus to Fronto the former does not mention his teacher's favourite authors, but it seems plausible to imply that his literary tastes could hardly vary from that of his tutor and brother.
- ¹⁰⁸ This demonstrative rejection contrasts with a later account of Aulus Gellius who describes Fronto quoting Virgil (N. A. II, 11–12; 18). But this can be, of course, a reflection of Gellius' own adoration for Virgil (HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., "M. Cornelius Fronto", in HORNBLOWER, S., SPAWFORTH, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, ³2005, s. v.).
- ¹⁰⁹ Fronto's praise of Horace is over exaggerated by D'Alton (321).
- ¹¹⁰ At the same time, he mentions historian L. Coelius Antipater among poets (Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 3, 2).
- ¹¹¹ The quotation "Orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus dicendi peritus" is preserved in Sen. Con. 1, praef. 9. The popularity of Cato's saying can be well illustrated by its reverse form applied by a certain Herennius Senecio to an Asianist M. Aquilius Regulus: "Orator est vir malus dicendi imperitus" (Plin. Epist. IV, 7, 5).
- ¹¹² DOMINIK 47.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁴ A poet M. Annaeus Lucanus, Seneca's nephew, is charged with the same faults (De orat. 6).
- ¹¹⁵ At the same time, Seneca and Lucan are the only "moderns" ever discussed by Fronto.
- ¹¹⁶ The same variant occurs in a letter to Aufidius Victorinus (Ad amic. I, 14, 2).
- ¹¹⁷ VAN DEN HOUT 1999, 52.
- ¹¹⁸ HAINES I, XXXI–XXXII.
- ¹¹⁹ One can compare the gloss belonging to m², which specifies that "iam M. Tullius summum supremisque os Romanae linguae fuit" (Ad Ver. Imp. II, 1, 14).
- ¹²⁰ VAN DEN HOUT 1999, 420.
- ¹²¹ For details of this trial see: VAN DEN HOUT 1999, 94–97 and RICHLIN, A., *Marcus Aurelius in Love: Marcus Aurelius and Marcus Cornelius Fronto*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2006, p. 55.
- ¹²² The trial is discussed in Ad Marc. Caes. II, 2–6.
- ¹²³ VAN DEN HOUT 1999, 106.
- ¹²⁴ BROCK, M. D., *Studies in Fronto and His Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911, p. 141.

- 125 For rhythm in Fronto see an old but still valuable article: BELTRAMI, A., "Il numerus e Frontone", in *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 36, 4, 1908, pp. 545–566.
- 126 On Ciceronian clausulae see: ZIELINSKI, Th., *Das Clausegesetz in Ciceros Reden*, Dieterichsche Verlag-Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1904; WILKINSON, L. P., *Golden Latin Artistry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1963, pp. 148–149; 156.
- 127 By 'clausula' I mean here "the metrical pattern of the word(s) or part of a word ending a rhythmical colon, a rhetorical colon, or a sentence" (HABINEK, T. N., *The Colometry of Latin Prose*, University of California Press, Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, 1981, p. 203 [*Classical Studies* 25]).
- 128 VAN DEN HOUT 1999, 232.
- 129 (tua oratio) moverit (~~) – – ~ ~ ~ – ~ –
- 130 Fronto's passage is treated as "de iis, quae litteris, verbis concipiuntur" (TLL s. v. forma).
- 131 De eloq. I, 2; II, 12; IV, 4. See also Marcus' letter: Ad Ant. Imp. IV, 1, 3.
- 132 On this work see, for example: SCHANZ, M., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*, Teil I, C. H. Beck, München, 1927, p. 533; STONE, A. M., "A House of Notoriety: An Episode in the Campaign for the Consulate in 64 B. C.", in *The Classical Quarterly*, NS 48, 2, 1998, pp. 487–491.
- 133 These are to be implicitly understood as Fronto's requirements which a good letter should meet.
- 134 LEEMAN I, 368.
- 135 HOUT VAN DEN 1999, 150.
- 136 He is also of opinion that it is better not to study philosophy at all than to be a half-baked expert (Ad Marc. Caes. IV, 1).
- 137 On Cicero's polemics with Atticists see: HENDRICKSON, G. L., "Cicero's Correspondence with Brutus and Calvus on Oratorical Style" in *The American Journal of Philology*, 47, 3, 1926, pp. 234–258 and GRUEN, E. S., "Cicero and Licinius Calvus" in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 71, 1967, pp. 215–233.
- 138 See the words of Crassus in "De oratore" (III, 93): "Verborum eligendorum et conlocandorum et concludendorum facilis est vel ratio vel sine ratione ipsa exercitatio; rerum est silva magna [...]"
- 139 FANTHAM, E., "Latin Criticism of the Early Empire", in KENNEDY, G. A. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Literary Criticism*, Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, p. 293.
- 140 According to L. Holford-Strevens, he was born between 125 and 128 C. E. (HOLFORD-STREVENES 1988, 12).
- 141 JACOB, C., "«La table et le cercle»: Sociabilites savantes sous l'Empire romain", in *Annales, Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 3, 2005, pp. 507–530.

- ¹⁴² II, 26; XIII, 29; XIX 8; 10; 13.
- ¹⁴³ XIX, 8. Titles of chapters of the book XIX are not preserved.
- ¹⁴⁴ He is described as “a well-educated man and a famous poet of the time” (“Bene eruditus homo et tum poeta inlustris” – XIX, 8, 1).
- ¹⁴⁵ Compare note 27.
- ¹⁴⁶ The passage was first discussed by: CURTIUS, E., TRASK, W. R. (transl.), *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, Harper Row, New York, 1953, pp. 249–250). See also HOLFORD-STREVENS (2003, 135, n. 35). On this chapter in general: PUGLIARELLI, M., “Aulo Gellio, Cesare e due morfemi desinenziali”, in *Civiltà classica e Cristiana*, 14, 1993, pp. 293–312. SCHINDEL 335.
- ¹⁴⁷
- ¹⁴⁸ On the difference between Fronto’s and Gellius’ literary tastes see: HOLFORD-STREVENS 2003, 135–136.

Bibliography

- BELTRAMI, A., "Il numerus e Frontone", in *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 36, 4, 1908, pp. 545–566
- BERG, C. S., VAN DEN, *The world of Tacitus' "Dialogus de Oratoribus": Aesthetics and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014
- BOMPAIRE, J., *Lucien écrivain: imitation et création*, Boccard, Paris, 1958
- BOWERSOCK, G., *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969
- BOWIE, E., "Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic", in FINLEY, M. I. (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Boston, 1974
- BROCK, M. D., *Studies in Fronto and His Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911 [repr. 2012]
- CANCIK, H., SCHNEIDER, H., LANDFESTER, M. (Hrsgs.), *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart, 1996–2003
- CHAMPLIN, E., *Fronto and Antonine Rome*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980
- CRIBIORE, R. "Review of: Morgan Teresa «Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds», Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998", in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 1999.05.22 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/1999/1999-05-22.html>)
- CURTIUS, E., TRASK, W. R. (transl.), *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, Harper Row, New York, 1953
- D'ALTON, J. F., *Roman Literary Criticism: A Study in Tendencies*, Russell & Russell, New York, 1931 (²1962)
- DAREMBERG Ch., SAGLIO, M. E. (éds.), *Le Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*, T. 1–5, Librairie Hachette, Paris, 1877–1919
- DOMINIK, W. J., "The style is the man: Seneca, Tacitus and Quintilian's canon", in DOMINIK, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, Routledge, London, 1997, pp. 42–57
- DOUGLAS, A. E., "Cicero, Quintilian, and the Canon of Ten Attic Orators", in *Mnemosyne*, 4 Series, 9, 4, 1956, pp. 30–40
- ECK W., ROXAN M., "Two Military Diplomas", in FREI-STOLBA, R., SPEIDEL, M. A. (Hrsgs.), *Römische Inschriften: Neufunde, Neulesungen und Neuinterpretationen: Festschrift für Hans Lieb zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Freunden und Kollegen*, F. Reinhardt, Basel, 1995, pp. 55–99
- ECK, W., "M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, consul suffectus im J. 142", in *Rheinisches Museum*, 141, 1998, S. 193–196
- FANTHAM, E., "Latin Criticism of the Early Empire", in KENNEDY, G. A. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Literary Criticism*, Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 274–297

- FRAENKEL, E., *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, Bd 2, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Roma, 1964
- GOODYEAR, F., "Rhetoric and Scholarship: Fronto", in KENNEY, E. J., CLAUSEN W. V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. 2 (Latin Literature), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 676–679
- GORAK, J., *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a Literary Idea*, Athlone Press, London, 1991
- GRUEN, E. S., "Cicero and Licinius Calvus", in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 71, 1967, pp. 215–233
- HABINEK, T. N., *The Colometry of Latin Prose*, University of California Press, Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, 1981 [*Classical Studies* 25]
- HÄGG, T., "Canon Formation in Greek Literary Culture", in THOMASSEN, E. (ed.), *Canon and Canonicity: The Formation and Use of Scripture*, Museum Tusulanum Press, Copenhagen, 2010
- HAINES, C. R. (ed., transl.), *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto with Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Lucius Verus, Antoninus Pius, and Various Friends*, Vol. 1–2, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, 1919 [*Loeb Classical Library*]
- HENDRICKSON, G. L., "Cicero's Correspondence with Brutus and Calvus on Oratorical Style", in *The American Journal of Philology*, 47, 3, 1926, pp. 234–258
- HERTZ, M., *Renaissance und Rococo in der römischen Literatur: Ein Vortrag im wissenschaftlichen Verein zu Berlin am 25. März 1865 gehalten*, W. Hertz, Berlin, 1865
- HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., "M. Cornelius Fronto", in HORNBLLOWER, S., SPAWFORTH, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, ³2005, s. v.
- HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1988 (Revised ed. Oxford, 2003)
- HOUT VAN DEN, M. P. J. (ed.), *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae schedis tam editis quam ineditis Edmundi Hauleri usus ed. Michael P. J. van den Hout*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1988 [*Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum at Latinorum Teubneriana*]
- HOUT VAN DEN, M. P. J., *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*, Brill, Leiden; Boston; Köln, 1999 [*Mnemosyne: Bibliotheca classica Batava Supplementum* 190]
- HOUT VAN DEN, M. P. J., *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae*, Brill, Lugduni Batavorum, 1954
- JACOB, C., "«La table et le cercle»: Sociabilites savantes sous l'Empire romain", in *Annales, Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 3, 2005, pp. 507–530
- JOCELYN, H. D., "Studies in the Indirect Tradition of Plautus' «Pseudolus». III The «Archaising Movement», Republican Comedy and Aulus Gellius «Noctes Atticae»", in HORSFALL, N. (ed.), *Vir bonus dicendi peritus: Studies in*

- Celebration of Otto Skutsch's 80th Birthday*, pp. 57–72 [= *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Suppl. 51, 1988]
- JOHNSON, W. A., *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010
- KASTER, R. A., "Notes on «Primary» and «Secondary» Schools in Late Antiquity", in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 113, 1983, pp. 323–346
- KASULKE, Chr. T., *Fronto, Marc Aurel und kein Konflikt zwischen Rhetorik und Philosophie im 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, Saur, München; Leipzig, 2005, p. 280 [Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, Bd 218]
- KENNEDY, G., *A History of Rhetoric: The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World (300 B. C. – A. D. 300)*, Vol. II, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972
- KENNEDY, G., *Quintilian*, Twayne Publishers, New York, 1969 [Twayne's World Authors Series 59]
- KENNEY, E. J., "Books and Readers in the Roman World", in KENNEY, E. J., CLAUSEN, W. V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. 2 (Latin Literature), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 3–32
- KROEHNERT, O., *Canonesne poetarum, scriptorium, artificum per antiquitatem fuerunt?*, Diss., Officina Leupoldiana, Regimonti Pr., 1897
- LEE, B. T., FINKELPEARL, E., GRAVERINI L. (eds.), *Apuleius and Africa*, Routledge, New York; London, 2014 [Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies]
- LEEMAN, A. D., *Orationis ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*, Vol. 1–2, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam, 1963
- LIDDLE, H. G., SCOTT, R., JONES, H. S. (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1940 (repr. 1996)
- MARACHE, R., *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaisant au II^e siècle de notre ère*, Plihon, Rennes, 1952
- MARACHE, R., *Mots nouveaux et mots archaïques chez Fronto et Aulu-Gelle*, Press Universitaires de France, Rennes, 1957 [Travaux de la faculté des lettres de Rennes, Serie I, T. 1]
- MCDONALD, L. M., SANDERS, J. A., "Introduction", in MCDONALD, L. M., SANDERS, J. A. (eds.), *The Canon Debate*, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, 2002, pp. 3–20
- MOMMSEN, Th., "Die Chronologie der Briefe Frontos", in *Hermes* 8, 1874, S. 198–216
- MORGAN, T., *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998
- MOST, G., "Canon Fathers: Literacy, Morality, Power", in *Arion*, 3rd Series, 1, 1, 1990, pp. 35–60

- MURPHY, J. (ed.), *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing: Translations from Books One, Two, and Ten of the "Institutio Oratoria"*, Southern Illinois University Press, Edwardville, 1987
- NORDEN, E., *Die antike Kunsprosa*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, ⁵1958
- O'SULLIVAN, N., "Caecilius, the 'Canons' of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism", in Dominick, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, Routledge, London, New York, 1997, pp. 27–41
- OPPEL, H., "Κανόν, Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma)", in *Philologus*, Suppl. 30, 4, Dieterich, Leipzig, 1937, S. 1–108
- PARSONS, P., "Review of: Ιμπραχημ, Μ.-Χ. Ἡ Ἑλληνορωμαϊκὴ Παιδεία ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ [...] Αθήναι, 1972", in *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 61, 1975, p. 301
- PAULY, A. F., VON, WISSOWA, G., KROLL, W., WITTE K. (Hrsgs.), *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart, 1894–1919
- PFEIFFER, R., *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Vol. 1–2, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968
- PUGLIARELLI, M., "Aulo Gellio, Cesare e due morfemi desinenziali", in *Civiltà classica e Cristiana*, 14, 1993, pp. 293–312
- RICHLIN, A., *Marcus Aurelius in Love: Marcus Aurelius and Marcus Cornelius Fronto*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2006
- RICHLIN, A., "Old Boys: Teacher–Student Bonding in Roman Oratory", in *The Classical World*, 105, 1, Fall 2011, pp. 91–107
- RUHNKEN, D. (ed.), *Rutilii Lupi De figures sententiarum et elocutionis duo libri*, Luchmans, Leiden, 1768
- RUSSEL, D. A., "Greek and Latin in Antonine Literature", in RUSSEL, D. A. (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990, pp. 1–17
- SANDNES, K. O., *The Gospel "According to Homer and Virgil": Cento and Canon*, Brill, Leiden, 2011 [*Supplementum to Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 138]
- SCHANZ, M. (bearb. v. C. HOSIUS und G. KRÜGER), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian, 3 Teil: Die Zeit von Hadrian 117 bis auf Constantin 324*, C. H. Beck, München, ³1922
- SCHINDEL, U., "Archaismus als Epochenbegriff: Zum Selbverständnis des 2. Jhr.", in *Hermes*, 122, 1994, S. 327–341
- STEINMETZ, P., *Untersuchungen zur römischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1982 [*Palingenesia* XVI]
- STONE, A. M., "A House of Notoriety: An Episode in the Campaign for the Consulate in 64 B. C.", in *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 48, 2, 1998, pp. 487–491

- SWAIN, S. "Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius", in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, HOLFORD-STREVENS, L., VARDI, A. D. (eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, pp. 13–40
- TEUFFEL, W. S. (bearb. v. W. KROLL und F. SKUTSCH), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur: Die Literatur von 96 nach Chr. bis zum Ausgange des Altertums*, 3 Bd, Teubner, Berlin, 1913
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig; De Gruyter, Berlin, 1900–
- VARDI, A. D., "Canons of Literary Texts in Ancient Rome", in FINKELBER, M., STROUMSA, G. G. (eds.), *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, Brill, Leiden; Boston, 2003 [Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture, Vol. 2]
- WILKINSON, L. P., *Golden Latin Artistry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1963
- WILLIAMS, G., *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*, University of California Press, Berkley; Los Angeles; London, 1978
- WITTY, F. J., "The Other *Pinakes* and Reference Works of Callimachus", in *The Library Quarterly*, 43, 3, Jul., 1973, pp. 237–244
- WITTY, F. J., "The *Pinakes* of Callimachus", in *The Library Quarterly*, 28, 2, Apr., 1958, pp. 132–136
- WORTHINGTON, I., "The Canon of the Ten Greek Orators", in WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*, Routledge, London, 1994, pp. 244–263
- ZIELINSKI, Th., *Das Clausegesetz in Ciceros Reden*, Dieterichsche Verlag-Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1904