

Review

Author(s): Andrew M. Riggsby

Review by: Andrew M. Riggsby

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 127, No. 3 (Autumn, 2006), pp. 473-476

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3804893>

Accessed: 09-06-2015 19:08 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

familiar to, and thus had meaning for, an increasingly diverse and dispersed population. Many of the chapters, however, are quite wide-ranging, and much of the material seems to have only a tenuous relationship to lawmaking. In some ways Williamson may have attempted to connect too many developments to this one process. What gives laws and legislative assemblies their central position in the present study is her conclusion, which can be contested, that officials introduced measures to resolve controversies, that assemblies produced clear majorities of those concerned with an issue, and that these assemblies steadily drew into this consensus individuals from ever-more-distant parts of Italy.

DANIEL J. GARGOLA

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
e-mail: djgarg01@uky.edu

JOHN DUGAN. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. x + 388 pp. Cloth, \$120.

The title somewhat undersells this book in two respects. First, in addition to treating several of the *rhētorica* (*De Oratore*, *Brutus*, *Orator*), it also offers readings of two actual orations (*Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*). Second, and more importantly, self-fashioning in the narrow sense is only half of the project Dugan analyzes. As interested as Cicero was in offering versions of himself to a variety of audiences, he seems to have been at least as interested in fashioning an audience that would evaluate those versions properly (that is, positively). The theatrical character some have noted in much of Roman culture might lead one not to be surprised to find late Republican interest in self-fashioning; and, as Dugan points out, a “new” man such as Cicero would have been particularly self-conscious about the matter. One might even have expected that attempts to change the rules on the fly would be fair game (cf. Pliny *Ep.* 4.17.3, 6.17.4, 7.4.10). Still, the scale of Cicero’s enterprise seems to have no classical parallel and was badly in need of description and analysis. This is the work carried out effectively by Dugan’s book. The Cicero being fashioned is in part the togate general and hero of the Catilinarian affair. He is also, however, the cultural producer who tests cultural limits and standards of acceptability and is eventually displaced by his own product.

The first chapter argues that *Pro Archia* adopts an essentially epideictic form to exploit, on the one hand, the ludic associations of that genre and, on the other, its proximity to the aristocratic *laudatio funebris*. The former licenses Cicero’s valuation of literary polishing (roughly, *ornatus*), explicitly in poetry, but also in history and oratory. The latter co-opts a highly traditional mode of fashioning for a new man who might not have literal access to it. The speech is both an argument for a certain set of values and a demonstration of Cicero’s possession of the same: the value of cultural production to the community, the

value of formal polish and aestheticization to that production, the role of texts in processes of exchange, personal *auctoritas* as the ultimate guarantor of value, and semiotic transparency. This speech and its hoped-for responses would be able to canonize Cicero's version of the Catilinarian conspiracy, a version in which he was the hero. *In Pisonem* attempts to canonize a vice-ridden Piso by similar means and also sets him in a world where the same values (especially transparency) break down.

The second chapter reads *De Oratore* as a defense of a novel, Ciceronian construct of the ideal orator as in fact traditional. The key to the new aesthetic (beyond its being an aesthetic in sometimes moralizing terms) is "controlled transgression," that is, a tolerance for the metaphorical, the theatrical, the humorous, and in general the potentially indecorous and effeminate. This is made tolerable by a variety of strategies. The overt arguments of the text constantly police the boundaries of *decorum* (even if they protest too much). The whole is projected back onto ancestors who are automatically respectable and from whom Cicero personally can construct an intellectual genealogy. (Here again we have potential contact with the *laudatio funebris*.) At the same time, parts of the reputations of some of those *maiores* are cleaned up to suppress potential controversy. The dialogue form displaces responsibility for any particular claim of characters in the text, even though Cicero does in places stress his own authorship of the whole. Not only are Cicero's would-be weaknesses (such as his perhaps over-ready wit) justified, but he also assumes the role of the regulator. Heavy use of bodily metaphors and refusal of the conventional form/content distinction serve to naturalize Cicero's preference for risking effeminacy for the sake of *ornatus*.

Brutus, the topic of chapter 3, gives a "history" of oratory with a point. Cicero and his preferred style were the natural culminations of that history, or a least would have been had political changes not cut the story a little short. Hence, Cicero lets the shape of the narrative do work that would have seemed arrogant if done by explicit self-praise. Moreover, in addition to telling the story of progress in his own terms, Cicero takes aim at specific, potentially competing views of speaking and speakers. Caesar is greatly praised but for quasi-natural gifts rather than the *ratio* his own explicit theorizing advocated. Hortensius is given a role as (another) valuable virtual ancestor but within an evolutionary system in which ancestors were doomed to be surpassed by their descendants. (Once again, there is contact with the *laudatio funebris*.) Calvus and the Atticists were resisting the natural flow of progress. Cicero can also position himself between them and Hortensius to justify his own approach as avoiding excess in either direction.

The final chapter turns to *Orator*, and Dugan returns to the question of the specifically textual self. *Orator*'s unique close study of prose rhythm is a response to the problem of presence in (merely) written oratorical scripts. How can such texts stand in for performances and thus for the orator himself? At least in part because of the collapse of the form/content distinction mentioned above. Great thought must be expressed in great language, and richness in both domains is

inseparable. And in this timeless textual world, Cicero can be present both to the past (in rivalry with Demosthenes) and the future (posterity reading and admiring his works).

A brief afterword treats changes in Cicero's self-fashioning when he rejoined the world of politics after Caesar's assassination.

This is a long, somewhat discursive book, and, while I have attempted to give the main line of its arguments, there is much I have omitted. For instance, in reading the *rhetorica*, Dugan pays considerable attention to potentially surprising intertexts: Cicero's *De Officiis* and his famous letter to Lucceius on history, Caesar's *De Analogia*, Brutus' *De Virtute*. (Obviously, considerable reconstruction has to be done in the latter two cases.) Similarly, he is quite interested in the posthumous reception of Cicero's attempts by the likes of Quintilian, pseudo-Longinus, and the declaimers recorded in Seneca's two *suasoriae* on Cicero. For the most part this contributes to the richness of the book, although I did occasionally wish for a more focused, linear argument for the sake of clarity. The material on reception, for instance, might have been gathered together at the end or even transformed into an article. *In Pisonem* might have been treated more briefly, especially as the chapter about it (chapter 1) has already appeared in article form.

Dugan's Cicero operates with a good deal of delicacy. *De Oratore* operates with a good deal of misdirection in general (76–77), and in particular much hangs on the fairly minor character of C. Julius Caesar Strabo. Moreover, the book must mystify (and therefore not specify) much of what actually makes individual orators good (95, 132). *Brutus* is highly ironic (204–5), especially in its treatments of Hortensius, Cicero himself, and the titular character. If one allows for this kind of disjunction between authorial aims and textual voice, that allows for a lot of interpretive freedom, which, I suspect, is more than some readers will be comfortable with. Yet it seems to me that Dugan's judgment in these matters is very sound. The key here is his always keeping the whole work in view, even as he analyzes individual passages. A reading that is slightly suspect at the lower level may well be obligatory in the broader context. Dugan is also right not to let the short-term failure of many of Cicero's attempts influence his interpretation too much. Finally, the book seems to me to strike a good balance in regard to the consistency of the whole corpus. Scholars who wish to show respect for Cicero as a rhetorical or philosophical theorist often try to impose excessive consistency across his various works. Dugan is able to demonstrate interest in a fairly standard agenda over time while admitting differences due to the differing tactics of the various works (a more "forthcoming" version of Strabo in *Brutus* than in *De Oratore*; higher praise of Hortensius in *De Oratore* than in *Brutus*; more explicit aestheticization in *Orator* than in the others).

There are two areas in which I would like to question Dugan, although not necessarily to disagree with his central arguments. First, how far does the self-fashioning project exclude others? For instance, in arguing for the self-fashioning function of Cicero's speeches, Dugan denies the relevance of much of *Pro Archia* to the case and discounts Cicero's claim to publish his speeches for pedagogical

reasons. I have argued elsewhere that the former would deviate from Cicero's practice, and the close parallels between *Pro Archia* and *Pro Balbo* suggest that something about the formal charge does actually shape both speeches (as pointed out to me by a seminar student, Dan Hanchey). As for pedagogy, the reasons to doubt Cicero go out the window if we imagine he is teaching something more complex than the content of the handbooks through his writings (as Dugan himself seems to describe; see 203, 283). The problem here is that these arguments need not have been advanced in the first place. Self-fashioning can go on in texts with other ends and is perhaps most effective in such contexts. Moreover, as the work of, for instance, Thomas Habinek and Joy Connolly has shown, the *rhetorica* and *philosophica* are designed to affect Roman politics in the broadest sense. That is, Cicero wants to adjust not just his fellow-citizens' reactions to himself, but to others. Dugan does not reject such readings, nor, given what I have said above, do I think he should be held responsible for investigating them. Rather, I want to emphasize that the aestheticization correctly identified here is anything but unworldly or apolitical.

Second, how novel is Cicero's position? Dugan rightly stresses the novelty of a work like *De Oratore* and the ambition of the entire Ciceronian program to reshape his own reception, but are the ends as innovative as the means? So, for instance, Dugan shows that the intellectual genealogy Cicero constructs for himself in *De Oratore* is appropriate, among other reasons, for the similarity of objections made to Strabo and some of the other characters and those made to Cicero. In general, I wonder if we are not seeing a standing tension between metrics of masculinity and magnificence. Cicero attempts throughout this project to subordinate the former to the latter. But this is not new. At least in Livy's version, the same tension lay behind the *Lex Oppia* debate, and observations like those of Pierre Bourdieu (*Distinction* [Harvard, 1984], 382–83) might even suggest that it is near-universal.

But even if my suspicions on these points are warranted, that would undercut neither the validity nor the value of Dugan's study. This is a book that needed to be written, and Dugan's fine series of sensitive readings have filled the need more than satisfactorily.

ANDREW M. RIGGSBY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
e-mail: ariggsby@mail.utexas.edu