The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Dionysios or Longinos on Sublimity of Style

John B. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 300 - 302

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184215, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184215

How to cite this article:

John B. Bury (1887). Dionysios or Longinos on Sublimity of Style. The Classical Review, 1, pp 300-302 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184215

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

matics.' They are quite out of place in such a volume: no numismatist cares to hear that thirty or forty third brass of the Antonines were found at such and such a place. On the other hand the information is invaluable to the student of Roman Britain. I would suggest that a list be added to Part 2 of all the coin-finds, indicating simply the place of discovery and the supposed dates.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to add that there are a few slips of less importance, such as occur in most books. Thus a Housesteads inscription is printed under Cumberland (p. 26). The references to the *Corpus* are very often omitted (e.g. pp. 22-24), and are given rather clumsily. One would prefer 'C.I.L. vii. 171' to 'Haebeuer p. 49.' There are also a few misprints.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that the book is very unsatisfactory, but that the defects can be greatly remedied in Part 2. The most disappointing feature is the incompleteness. Mr. Gomme in his preface lays great stress on the value of the work as a contribution to an index of all the Roman remains in England, and it is rather trying to find that so far this contribution is worthless. He complains that the Index Society have been deaf to appeals to undertake the work. I am afraid that, unless Part 2 of the *Romano-British Remains* is better than Part 1, the Society will continue to be deaf. And yet the work is sorely needed. I suspect, however, that more has been done towards it than Mr. Gomme thinks, and that what is really wanted is unity. At present we are all by ourselves doing the same things and wasting labour. Thus that indefatigable antiquarian, Mr. Thompson Watkin, had indexed the *Gentleman's Magazine* for his own use long before Mr. Gomme's book was thought of. With division of labour a new *Britannia Romana* ought to be possible, only the labour must be thorough and scholarly. Absolute completeness may be unattainable, though Mr. Watkin's works on Cheshire and Lancashire, and Hübner's *Corpus*, show that one can come very near it. But an imperfect index is as bad as none, and the contribution now before us is decidedly imperfect.

F. HAVERFIELD.

DIONYSIOS OR LONGINOS ON SUBLIMITY OF STYLE.¹

It is a matter of uncertainty who was really the author of the treatise 'On sublimity of style' which used generally to be attributed to Cassius Longinos, the teacher of Zenobia. That it was written by him there is positively no evidence; but that it was written by some rhetor whose name was either Longinos or Dionysios is probable from the fact that the title of the work in the best MS. is *Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου περὶ ὑψους*: and thus those who attribute it to Dionysios of Halikarnassos or Dionysios of Pergamos are more likely to be right than those who attribute it to Plutarch.

One of the first things to be observed about this striking treatise—for it is striking in ability, in delicacy of judgment, in cultured urbanity—is the high spiritual tone which we can detect, and sometimes are not obliged to detect, behind the scientific analysis. Take the following passage, for example, which occurs in a comparison drawn between a Plato who often slips and a Lysias who is always correct.

'Of what did those divine ones who aimed at the

highest effects of literary composition take regard? As well as of many other things they had regard of this—that nature namely did not judge man to be a mean or ungenerous animal, but that introducing us into life, into the universe, as into a great assembly, to be spectators of her contests, and to be keen competitors in their rivalries, she implanted in our souls from the beginning an irrepressible love of whatever was great and nobler than ourselves—τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς δαιμονιωτέρου. And therefore the whole world, even, is not enough to satisfy the speculation and apprehension of human understanding, but our reflexions often travel beyond the bounds of our environment; and if one consider life in all its aspects, and behold the abundance of greatness and beauty in its sundry spheres, he will soon be aware to what things we are born. And thus it is the guidance of nature that we follow when we admire not small streams, translucent and of service though they be, but admire the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and yet more the Ocean. . . .'

In this passage there is no attempt at effect, there is not the faintest touch of rhapsody; the writer does not exceed the strict limits of the matter in hand. But we can feel the high-spirited tone behind the Hellenic reserve and penetrating it.

Whether the author's name be Longinos or not, he certainly deserves the fame for critical acumen which attached in later times to a rhetor of that name, just as Dionysios was noted for his much learning. The judgments and the critical observations contained in this treatise are so good, so penetrating, that when we have read a few pages we feel complete confidence in the writer's powers; they are also full of surprises—a subtle remark meets us when we fancied that the criticism was complete.

For example having explained in a phrase worth remembering that ὕψος, 'the grand style,' is an echoed reflex of grandeur of soul, μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα, he observes that in some lofty moods silence is more than all echoes—the silence for instance of Aias among the shades:

ὡς ἐφάμην ὁ δὲ μ' οὐδὲν ἀμείβετο· βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλας
ψυχὰς εἰς ἔρεβος νεκρῶν κατατεθνηῶτων.

Again in explaining the difference between real and false grandeur of style, he quotes some lines from the *Arimaspeia* of Aristeas (a history of the Hyperboreans), describing the perils of sailors, of which one verse was

ὁμματ' ἐν ἀστροῖσι ψυχὴν δ' ἐνὶ πάντῳ ἔχουσιν.

'It is manifest,' he says, 'that this description is less fearful than flowery'—πλέον ἄνθος ἔχει τὰ λεγόμενα ἢ δέος. This criticism is happy, and is without a superfluous syllable: the writer always knows where to stop. The urbanity is also to be observed; another critic would not hesitate to call the lines frigid—ψυχρά, whilst our critic with an urbanity that is really more crushing says, they are 'less fearful than flowery.' He then takes an example of true ὕψος from Homer to set beside the false ὕψος of Aristeas:

ἐν δ' ἔπεισ' ὡς ὅτε κῆμα βοῇ ἐν νηὶ πέσῃσι
λαβρὸν ὑπαι νεφέων ἀνεμοτρεφές, ἡ δὲ τε πᾶσα
ἄχρη ὑπεκρύφθη, ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτης
ἰστίῳ ἐμβρέμεται, τρομέουσι δὲ τε φρένα ναῦται
δεϊδίδτες· τυτθὸν γὰρ ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο φέρονται.

The idea of the last line Aratos tried to express more vividly by

ὁλίγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον αἰδ' ἐρύκει.

¹ *Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου περὶ ὑψους*. Editit O. Jahn, 1867. Iterum editit J. Vahlen, 1887. (Bonn.) 2 Mk. 40.

But the turn thus given to the idea is observed to be *γλαφυρόν*, 'elegant'; it has not the austerity of grandeur. And besides, says the so-called Longinos, 'he bars the danger by saying *ξύλον αἰδᾷ ἀπείργει*—a plank keeps death off. Why then, it does keep death off, *οὐκοῦν ἀπείργει*.' What criticism could be more complete, more happily expressed! That is the sort of criticism that gives us confidence in the writer. 'Homer, on the other hand, does not bar the danger once for all, but portrays those who are continually exposed to risks by sea, in which they frequently perish.' And now we suppose that he has nothing more to say, and are prepared to pass to some new topic or example. But no, there is a surprise awaiting us; the critic reveals yet a new excellence in the passage of Homer before he leaves it. He points out that by compressing the prepositions *ὑπό* and *ἐκ* into a conjunction contrary to the nature of prepositions, and therefore with a certain violence or torture, the poet has excellently imitated and 'all but engraved in his phrase the violence of the danger which he describes in the words *ὑπὲρ θανάτοιο φέρονται*.'

Again the comparison instituted between Cicero and Demosthenes is really masterly in its way. Pointing out that the grandeur of the Greek orator has something 'abrupt' about it, while the Roman excels in diffusiveness (*χρῆσις*), he compares the former to a lightning flash which carries all before it in a straight line, while Cicero resembles the spreading fire that advances more leisurely and consumes all things round about it on its way. This comparison most felicitously expresses the directness and impetus of Demosthenes, and the diffusiveness, the *Umsichgreifen* of Cicero.

The unfailing urbanity, to which I already drew attention, is accompanied by a kindred quality, freedom from dogmatism. While the author finds fault with Kekilius, who had written before him on the same subject, he excuses him, and speaks of him with respect. He is fond of introducing his judgments with an undogmatic *μήποτε*, 'perhaps.' At the same time, he is quite unprejudiced, and deals with the poet—for whom he has the profoundest admiration—in a critical manner which would have astonished Strabo. He considers that the Odyssey bears unmistakable marks of having been composed in old age—but, as he gracefully adds, it was the old age of Homer. Throughout the whole treatise is conspicuous Greek moderation of judgment and expression.

In one place, speaking of the *Dii maiores*—Homer, Plato, Demosthenes—he says that all time, unable to be misled by envy, has given them a prize of victory which cannot be taken away, and will last 'as long as water flows and tall trees bloom'—*ἔστω ἄν ὕδωρ τε ῥέῃ καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ*. Here is an ancient parallel to Swinburne's

'Earth and ocean shall be shadows when Prometheus shall be dead.'

Jahn's edition of the treatise appeared in 1867; Vahlen's edition in 1887 is a re-edition of Jahn's. Vahlen had, at Jahn's request, collated the chief MS. P (Parisiensis of 10th century) as long ago as 1861 and has since made many contributions to the criticism of the text, so that no one was better qualified to bring out the new edition. A complete critical apparatus is subjoined to the text; and a third division of the page is occupied with a very serviceable list of references to passages mentioned in the treatise, and quotations bearing upon such references, as in Jahn's original edition. For example on p. 19, *à propos* of the ode of Sappho, the passages in Plutarch's *Erotika* and *Life of Demetrius* referring to that ode, the translation of

Catullus, and the lines of Lucretius which contain echoes from it, are quoted in full.

I may notice that lines 6 and 7 of the ode of Sappho are printed thus:—

ὥς σε γὰρ ἴδω, βροχέως με φώνας
οὐδὲν ἔτι εἰκει.

This apparently is the reading of P., and, if so, Bergk is wrong in his critical note (P. Z. G. iii. p. 88) when he gives *ὥς γὰρ σ' ἴδω* as the reading of the MSS. It is important to remark that *βροχέως* should be taken with the apodosis in the sense of *συντόμως*. Compare Hesychios, *βρουχέων ἢ βρουκε*. . . . (read with Voss *βρουχέως ἢ βροχέως*) *σαφῶς συντόμως*. *Αἰολεῖς*. Vahlen does not mention Hartung's conjecture *ἐκ βροχίοιο, ε φαυιδίους*. In l. 13 the MSS. *ἀ δέ μ' ἰδρὸς κακχέεται* is printed, and no mention is made of the impossible reading *μίδρως* which Bergk introduced into the text of his fourth edition. I still think that the right reading may be *σίδρως*, as I suggested in *Hermathena*, 1885 (*σίδρως* = *σφίδρως*, as *σιγάω* = *σφιδάω*; cf. *σιδόρ*, *sweat*).

On p. 24 one of Bentley's most certain emendations is to be found—*οὐκ ἔψνκται μὲν ἀλλ' οὐχ οὕτως ἀπαστράπτει* (P. *ἐπέστραπται*). In the chapter on imitation we come across the following sentence (p. 26):

ἔστιν δ' οὐ κλοπὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀλλ' ὥς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἠθῶν ἢ πιασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις.

Toup translates, 'Hæc vero res non est furtum ullum sed (ut a bonis moribus fieri potest) sive simulacrum sive operum expressa effigies.' But Vahlen considers *ἠθῶν* corrupt, and accepts the *εἰδῶν* of Tollius, while Diels proposed *λίθων*. While I do not feel sure that any change is necessary, I would suggest, as nearer to the MSS. reading than either of these two conjectures, *ὥς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἢ θεῶν ἢ πιασμάτων* κ.τ.λ.: *θεῶν* = 'sights, spectacles,' compare *θεαὶ ἀμήχανοι τὸ κάλλος* in Plato's *Republic*.

In the able discussion of the *σχῆμα ὁμοτικόν* in cap. xvii. we read (p. 34), *καὶ πως παραληφθεῖσαν ἢ τοῦ πανουργεῖν τέχνην τοῖς κάλλεσι καὶ μεγέθεσι τὸ λοιπὸν δέδουκεν καὶ πᾶσαν ὑποψίαν ἐκπέφευγεν*, that is, the beauty and grandeur conceal the artifice of the artist. Vahlen adopts *παραληφθεῖσα* of Tollius. Kayser proposed *περιληφθεῖσα*, Ruhnken *παρακαλυφθεῖσα*. It seems to me that *περιλαμφθεῖσα* would be better than any of these proposals. For the sense compare cap. xv., p. 31, *ὅ τὸ πραγματικὸν ἐγκρύπτεται περιλαμπόμενον*; and for the form cf. *περιλαμφθεῖς*, Josephus *Jud. Bell. iv. 10, 1*, and *ἐλλαμφθήσεται*, Plotinus, 30, 3.

P. 37, l. 5, Vahlen is certainly right in keeping *ἀγανακτεῖ*. The conjectures *ἀγαν ἀργεῖ*, *ἀτονεῖ*, *ἀπακταίνει*, &c., are quite uncalled for. P. 41, l. 21, in the passage on the *ἐνάλλαξις προσώπων*, there is a difficulty: *διδ καὶ ἡ πρόχρησις τοῦ σχήματος τότε*, *ἡνίκ' ἂν δέξῃς ὁ καιρὸς ἂν διαμέλλειν τῷ γράφοντι μὴ διδῶ* κ.τ.λ. Here *πρόχρησις* is meaningless, and *πρόσχησις* which Manutius proposed is little better. Spengel's *ἡ χρήσις* does not account for *προ*, and Kayser's *πρόχειρος ἢ χρήσις* involves too much change. I would suggest *διδ καὶ ἡ κυρία χρήσις τοῦ σχήματος τότε* κ.τ.λ. This is just what the meaning requires, and *κυρία* might have become corrupted to *προ*. On p. 63, *συγκοπὴ μὲν γὰρ κολοῦει τὸν νοῦν, συντομία δ' ἐπ' εὐθὺ* calls for emendation. *δ' ἄγει ἐπ' εὐθύ* is the proposal of Stephanus, *δ' ἐπευθύνει* of Petra, *δὲ σπένδει* of Rohde. I would propose

συντομία δ' ἐπ' εὐθὺ δεῖ,

the omission of the verb being accounted for by the similarity of the last syllable of *εὐθύ*.

On p. 8 an extremely clever emendation of Rohde is mentioned in the notes, but has not been adopted in the text. The MSS. have *ὁ μέντοι Τιμαίος ὡς φωρίον τινὸς ἐφαπτόμενος, οὐδὲ τοῦτο Ξενοφῶντι τὸ ψυχρὸν κατέλιπεν*. Now the point is not that Timaios plagiarised, but that what he plagiarised was frigid and tasteless; therefore *φωρίον τινὸς* requires correction. Rohde reads without changing a letter, *φῶρ ἰοῦ τινὸς*. A thief stealing poison is just the simile required.

Perhaps the most provoking passage in the whole treatise is the last sentence of the 10th chapter, which Vahlen prints thus (p. 23): *λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ δλον ὡσανεὶ ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦν τὰ μεγέθη συννοικονομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετελεχμένα. ἐμποιοῦν τὰ ἐς Vahlen's emendation for ἐμποιοῦντα (P), and he explains his reading by ὡσανεὶ ψύγματα ἐμποιοῦν τὰ μεγέθη λυμαίνεται. This is not satisfactory, for there is nothing to go with ἐμποιοῦν: the insertion of *τι* before *τὰ* would be an improvement. The general sense of the passage is quite clear. The superfluities (*φλοιῶδες ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικόν*) signified by *ταῦτα*, which spoil the grand whole, are compared to ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα whose insertion in an edifice built of massive stones mutually supporting one another would spoil the effect. Perhaps the simplest change that will produce a satisfactory sentence is ἐμποιοῦμενα τὰ, the participle agreeing with ψύγματα and τὰ μεγέθη being an accusative after λυμαίνεται understood from the first clause; but palaeographically the emendation is not very neat. ἐμποιοῦντα may be a corruption of some participle of meaning similar to λυμαίνεται.*

It is to be regretted that in an edition professedly designed *in usum scholarum* some of the difficulties of interpretation are not dealt with. For example a note would have been very acceptable on the difficult word *ἀδρεπήβολον* in cap. viii. The writer enumerates five sources of lofty style (*ὑψηγορία*). The first and best of these is *τὸ περὶ τὰς νόσεις ἀδρεπήβολον*; the second is *τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος*; these two are natural sources of sublimity, in contrast with the rest which are artificial, namely, the *σχημάτων* *πλάσις*, the *γενναία φράσις*, and the *ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρσει σύνθεσις*. He treats of each of these in order, but he does not again designate the first by the same phrase; he calls it *τὸ μεγαλοφύες* or *μεγαλοφροσύνη*. Perhaps some explanation of *ἀδρεπήβολον* was given in the missing part of cap. ix., but it is certainly a most strange substitute for *μεγαλοφύες*. The word *ἄδρός* in the sense, 'compact, close, concentrated,' might be intelligibly used of the *σύνθεσις τῶν ἐμφορομένων* (c. x.), in illustration of which the ode of Sappho is cited.

Another example of a difficulty which deserved a note is the remark at the end of cap. xxix. (p. 44), that passion participates in sublimity to the same extent that moral character participates in pleasure, *πάθος δὲ ὕψους μετέχει τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἦθος ἡδονῆς*. The remark is made *à propos* of the effects of artifices of style (*σχηματα*) in producing pathos. In what respect the relation of *ἦθος* to *ἡδονή* resembles the relation of *πάθος* to *ὕψος*, it is difficult to perceive; one critic considers the sentence spurious. It is perhaps the marginal note of a reader, to whom it occurred that every pleasure depends on certain subjective conditions of the sentient individual, which he loosely termed *ἦθος* (the character), and who, infelicitously conceiving that this fact was a suitable illustration of the dependence of *ὕψος* on *πάθος*, expressed his conception in equally infelicitous terms.

JOHN B. BURY.

Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum, Canones Apostolorum Ecclesiastici Ac Reliquae Doctrinae De Duabus Viis Expositiones Veleres. Edidit FRANCISCUS XAVERIUS FUNK. Tübingen: Laupp (London: Trübner), 1887. 3 Mk. 60.

THIS is a complete and exhaustive commentary on the Teaching of the Apostles. The author gives in the Prolegomena an account of the discovery by Philotheus Bryennius, in 1873, of the first complete MS. of the *Didache*. He proceeds to discuss the manner (Prolegg. chapters iii. and iv. pp. 4—22), in which the *Didache* was used by the early Fathers; he cites in full the quotations from, and the references to, that book, which are found in the patristic literature of the first five centuries. He next examines the text of the original book, 'The Two Ways,' which appears similarly in the Ep. Barnab. (xviii.—xx.), the *Didache* (i.—vi.), the Ecclesiastical Canons, and the viith book of the Apostolical Constitutions (Prolegg. chap. v. and vi. p. 23—36), and he concludes with an enquiry into the time and place, in which the *Didache* was written, the references which it contains to books of the New Testament, as well as the parallel passages in the Ep. Barnab., Eccles. Can., and Apostol. Constitut. (Prolegg. chap. vii.—xi. pp. 38—46).

The author has adopted the plan of placing immediately after the text of the *Didache* that of the Ecclesiastical Canons, the viith Book of the Apostol. Constitut., Ep. Barnabas (xviii.—xx.), as well as the Latin fragment, recently discovered, and containing the first two chapters of the *Didache*. The references in the text of the *Didache* to the Bible, as well as the references, which are found in the Ecclesiastical Canons and the other books, bearing on the *Didache*, are marked by different type, and render it easier to compare the several texts. The comments on the text of the *Didache* are very full; and at all the important passages the various explanations hitherto offered are taken into account. In several cases I am unable to accept the view which the author adopts. Chap. vi. 2 (p. 18, 19), *εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι* (scilic. *βαστάσαι* *δλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου*) *δ δυνῇ, τοῦτο ποίει*. Funk explains "*ζυγός, ut connexus docet, praecepta significat, de quibus in parte antecedente sermo est,*" and he adds, "*Auctor annuit, non omnia mandata . . . vere praecepta et omnino omnibus servanda esse.*" The preceding chapters, however, contain the 'way of life,' the moral laws; they are partly an enlargement of the Sermon on the Mount, the Decalogue, and the Prov. The last (the fifth chapter) speaks of the *φόνος, μοιχεία*, etc. . . *ῥυσθελίτε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων*. Surely these are '*mandata omnibus servanda.*' The *ζυγός* (Acts xv. 10; also Matt. xi. 29, 30) refers to a modified ceremonial law; this is rendered probable by the *περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως*, which follows immediately. To chap. ix. 4, p. 26, *τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβίδ*, the parallels given are John xv. 1, and Matt. 26, 29. But I agree with C. Taylor that the origin of this simile must be traced in the *ρίζα Δαβίδ* (Isaiah xi. 1, 10, and perhaps in Gen. xlix. 9—11). At any rate the remarkable explanation of Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 32) of those two passages should be quoted. In chap. xvi. 6, p. 48, there appears to be no reason to suspect a copyist's error—*σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως* for *σ. ἐπιφάσεως* (= *ἐπιφανείας*), or to derive the word, as Bryennius does, from *ἐκπέταμαι* or *ἐκπετάμαι* (avolo). The true explanation may be possibly obtained from a comparison of Justin Dial. 817 D, 819 A. with Ep. Barnab. xii.: Moses was spreading (*ἐκπετάσας*) or stretching out his hands crosswise. The *σημεῖον* is, then, that of the cross, appearing in the heavens, one of 'the three signs,' which announce the advent of