This volume brings together the three most original and influential ancient Greek treatises on literature.

Aristotle's *Poetics* contains his treatment of Greek tragedy: its history, nature, and conventions, with details on poetic dic
tion. Stephen Halliwell makes this seminal work newly accessible with a reliable text and a translation that is both accurate and readable. His authoritative introduction traces the work's debt to earlier theorists (especially Plato), its distinctive argument, and the reasons behind its enduring rele-
vance.

The essay *On the Sublime*, usually attributed to "Longinus" (identity uncertain), was probably composed in the first century A.D.; its subject is the appreciation of greatness ("the sublime") in writing, with analysis of illustrative passages ranging from Homer and Sappho to Plato and *Genesis*. In this edition, Donald Russell has judiciously revised and newly annotated the text and translation by W. Hamilton Fyfe and provides a new introduction.

The treatise *On Style*, ascribed to an (again unidentifiable) Demetrius, was perhaps composed during the second century B.C. It seems to reflect the theoretical energy of Hellenistic rhetorical works now lost, and is notable particularly for its theory and analysis of four distinct styles (grand, elegant, plain, and forceful). Doreen Innes’
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INTRODUCTION

Aristotle's *Poetics* occupies a highly special, indeed unique, position in the long history of Western attitudes to literature. It is, in the first place, the earliest surviving work to be exclusively concerned with the discussion and analysis of poetry as an art, and this fact has turned it into a document standing apparently near the very beginning of, and effectively inaugurating, an entire tradition of literary theory and criticism. In part, this is the result of considerable contingency, since there had been earlier Greek authors who had devoted writings (now lost) to the subject of poetry, as well as thinkers, above all Plato, who had examined literary works in relation to differently defined sets of concerns (philosophical, historical, biographical, etc.). Moreover, if the *Poetics* inaugurated a tradition of thought, it is far from obvious that it did so in virtue of any direct or persistent influence upon subsequent critics of antiquity. In the ancient world itself, the treatise seems never to have been widely known or read, though that is not to deny the existence of recurrent elements of Aristotelianism within the development of Greco-Roman literary criticism.\(^1\) What may now look to

---

\(^1\) This Aristotelianism may have stemmed partly from Ar.'s published dialogue *On Poets*, as well as from the writings of Peripatetics such as Theophrastus and Neoptolemus of Parium.
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our retrospective gaze to be the "inaugural" significance of the Poetics owes much to the way in which the work was rediscovered, disseminated, and established as canonical by certain sixteenth-century Italian theorists and their successors elsewhere in Europe. In that sense, the book's uniqueness is far from being a pure reflection of its original creation or purpose, and is intimately bound up with its involvement in the construction of competing views of literary criticism since the Renaissance.

Yet it would, for all that, be superficial to suppose that the status of the Poetics is irredeemably a consequence of historical accident and arbitrariness. We need only consider that even since its decline from the preeminence and authority with which, as late as the eighteenth century, it had been endowed by neoclassicists, it has continued tenaciously to provide a valuable point of reference within the debates of literary criticism and theory—even, often enough, for those who have found its contents uncongenial. At the very least, therefore, we need to recognise that the work's own character, despite the many difficulties which it has always posed for interpreters, lends itself with peculiar force to use (and abuse) in urgent, continuing disputes about the nature, form, and value of literature. To try to understand this character, we need to approach it against the background of the work's historical setting.

The Poetics, like virtually all the extant works of Aristotle, represents something in the nature of teaching materials or "lecture notes," produced not as a text for private reading by anyone interested, but for instructional use in an educational context. In view of this circumstance, with its implication of a less than tidy occasion of
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composition (still less, "publication"), it is not surprising that we cannot safely date the work to a single point in Aristotle's career. An indefinite amount of revision and redrafting is readily conceivable, especially given some of the work's many loose ends; and certain sections may originally have been compiled at appreciably different times from one another. Chs. XX–XXII, for example, which discuss "diction," lexis, in terms that are more linguistic than stylistic, are closely related to bk. III of the Rhetoric and to De Interpretatione, both of which there is some reason to suppose were of relatively early date. But other elements in the Poetics, such as the views on the relation between action and character in ch. VI, might suggest a more mature stage of Aristotle's thinking—in this particular case, a stage reflected in some of the ideas of the ethical treatises. We can be fairly confident that the Poetics was mostly compiled later than both the dialogue On Poets (to which 54b18 is probably a reference) and the six-book discussion of interpretative difficulties in Homer, Homeric Problems (of which Poetics ch. XXV appears to provide a summary). All in all, it is highly plausible that the Poetics, whatever its history of composition, was at any rate available for use during the final phase of Aristotle's career, after the founding of his own school, the Lyceum, at Athens in 335.²

Why should Aristotle, whose supreme intellectual interests lay elsewhere, have concerned himself philosophically with poetry? We can identify, to begin with, both a general and a more specific impetus behind his

² Halliwell (1986), appendix 1, collects views and evidence on the date of the Poetics.
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decision to address (and, indeed, to help define) the subject: the first, a response to poetry’s vital, long established importance within Greek culture and education, and its consequent interest for a philosopher widely concerned with the forces influencing the life and mind of his society; the second, a reaction to the passionate critique—by turns, moralistic, psychological, political, and religious—which Plato had directed, especially in bks. 2–3 and 10 of his *Republic*, against both Homeric epic and Athenian drama. Within the immediate context of Athenian culture, where he was first a member of Plato’s Academy (367–47) and later the head of the Lyceum (335–23), Aristotle even came to develop a documentary interest in the history of Attic drama. Whatever the relationship of the *Poetics* to the works which he compiled on theatrical records, it is clear that he discerned an importance in drama which prompted him to make it, together with the two great Homeric epics, the basis of a fresh and distinctive approach to “poetry in general” (47a8)—an approach which expresses not only his divergences from Plato’s and other earlier thinkers’ views on the subject, but also the concepts, methods, and tendencies of his own philosophical outlook.

In attempting to characterise what was distinctive about the *Poetics*, we cannot do better than concentrate on what might be called its “foundational” strategy. By this I mean its explicit attempt to scrutinise poetry in a systematic and analytic manner—beginning, in typical Aristotelian fashion, from what are taken to be the most fundamental propositions about the field of enquiry

---

3 Details in *DFA* 2, pp. 70–71.
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("first principles," 47a12-13); developing an argument whose main stages are carefully signalled, often by the introduction and definition of key terms, and whose progressive plan is highlighted by a large number of cross references; and striving, if less than perfectly (at any rate in the surviving state of the text), to make the connections between its basic tenets and its individual judgements as tight as possible. This foundational quality, with its implicit faith in a rational procedure of criticism, has elicited admiration in some readers, and discomfort in others. What is pertinent here is that it is this aspect more than any other which, so far as we can tell, marked off Aristotle's undertaking from those of his predecessors, and which has made the Poetics an abiding paradigm of the application of intellectual method and conceptual precision to the interpretation of literature.

If we seek to clarify what is entailed by Aristotle's attempt to construct a stable framework for the understanding of Greek poetry, at least three essential elements in his perspective can be isolated. The first is the placing of poetry, alongside the visual arts, music, and dancing, within a general category of artistic mimesis or representation. This dimension of the work, which gives its thought a breadth of reflectiveness that was not lost on post-Renaissance developers of mimeticist aesthetics, is initially prominent in the principles and distinctions set out in chs. I-IV. But it recurs at a number of later points, including the repeated analogies between poetry and painting, and the pregnant remarks on the multiple relationship of mimetic art to "life" in ch. XXV. Ideas of mimesis had been active in a great deal of earlier Greek thinking about poetry and other arts. Aristotle has debts
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to this tradition; his account of mimetic modes in ch. III, for example, is closely related to Plato *Republic* 3.392d ff. But unlike Plato, or indeed any other predecessor of whom we know, Aristotle perceives a function for mimesis which does not threaten to reduce it to a static or inflexible model of artistic activity. Without ever offering a definition of the term (a perhaps sagacious reticence), Aristotle employs mimesis as a supple concept of the human propensity to explore an understanding of the world—above all, of human experience itself—through fictive representation and imaginative “enactment” of experience. His views are sketched, not fully elaborated, but we can see that they hope to connect art to a vital part of human nature (48b5 ff) and that they discern in poetry a capacity to convey ideas whose depth Aristotle regards as reaching towards the significance of the “universal” (ch. IX).

The second distinctive element in the *Poetics*’ perspective is the recognition that poetry has a history of its own, and that this history is indispensable for the interpretation of certain conventions and possibilities of poetic practice. Literary criticism and literary history are here simultaneously delineated and conceptually intertwined. This aspect of Aristotle’s approach is particularly obvious in chs. IV–V, where he reconstructs the patterns of cultural evolution which saw tragedy and comedy emerge from the earlier branches of serious and humorous poetry. It must be added that, somewhat ironically (given his own comments, in chs. IX and XXIII, on the chronicle-type character of history), Aristotle’s perspective on poetic history is hardly straightforward or neutrally factual. It is, on the contrary, permeated by an interpretative
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vision—a vision of poetic history as an area in which “nature,” working of course through human nature (48b4–5) yet promoting practices which have a dynamic of their own (49a15, 24, 60a4), brings into being the distinct cultural forms, the poetic kinds or genres, which count as the primary material for Aristotle’s analysis of poetry.

The mention of genres brings us to the third, and in some ways the most important, element of the Poetics which deserves to be highlighted in an introduction. The establishment and deployment of a concept of genre lies at the basis of Aristotle’s enquiry; the main purpose of the scheme of mimetic media, objects, and modes in chs. I–III is precisely to suggest how genres can be delimited in terms of their particular combinations of these features. It is also the steadiness of focus upon genres which was to be subsequently responsible for a large part of the work’s appeal to, and influence on, neoclassical trends of thought. By organising discussion around juxtaposed and interlinked consideration of his chosen “species” of poetry, Aristotle aims to ensure that the judgement of particular poems is controlled by standards which refer to the character and goals of a shared generic “nature” (cf. 49a15).

This quasi-naturalistic framework, which we have already seen to be associated with Aristotle’s view of literary history, is reinforced by a central emphasis on form and structure as fundamental to the understanding of poems as “objects” in their own right. This point, which contrasts so strongly with the overtly moral and political approach to poetry typically urged by Plato, should be perceived on a theoretical not a practical level. Aristotle
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does not in fact undertake anything like a close analysis of any individual work; "explication de textes" is scarcely glimpsed in the Poetics. What he does do, in a way which itself epitomises what I have called his foundational strategy, is to assert the significance of formal design and unity for both the composition and the appreciation of literary works, and to offer a conception of artistic form which relates it to the organic forms crucial to his understanding of nature (50b34–51a6).

In one sense, therefore, it might seem tempting to call the Poetics' perspective "formalist." But this term inevitably brings with it implications of views which treat form as guaranteeing a self-sufficient and autonomous nature for literary works. This, indeed, is the kind of view which has often been overtly ascribed to Aristotle. Yet it remains vital to see that the formal emphases of the treatise are coupled with concepts which make it hard to sustain such a reading of its author's position: such concepts include the "necessity and/or probability" which provide criteria of what makes coherent sense in the dramatic depiction of human life (51a12–13, etc.); the "universals" which poetry has the potential, according to ch. IX, to convey or intimate; and the emotions, pity and fear in the case of tragedy (and epic too), which help to define the essential nature of particular genres. Given all this, it seems appropriate to suggest that Aristotle's concern with form is with nothing less than the shaping and structuring of poetic meaning.

In each of the three respects I have picked out—the general or "aesthetic" category of artistic mimesis; the sense of poetry's history/evolution; the centrality of concepts of genre and form—there were partial antecedents
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in Plato and others for Aristotle's attitudes and emphases. But the Poetics combines these and other salient concerns with a new argumentative firmness and detail, and the result is a work which demarcates poetry as an independent subject for study, and does so in a manner copious, if sometimes frustratingly unclear, in philosophical and conceptual implications. Aristotle's original plan (49b21-2) was evidently to elaborate his argument by concentrating on each of three genres: epic, whose surpassing Homeric achievements made it an inescapable focus of attention; and both of the branches of Attic drama, tragedy and comedy. But this intention has, from the point of view of modern readers, been overshadowed by two factors: one, the loss of the discussion of comedy, which belonged to what some ancient critics called the Poetics' "second book"; the other, Aristotle's decision to make the treatment of epic (chs. XXIII-XXV) subordinate to that of tragedy, on the grounds that tragedy could be judged to have carried to superior fulfilment certain goals which had been powerfully adumbrated, but not wholly crystallised, in the poetry of Homer. The combined result of these two factors, one contingent and one conceptual, is that the Poetics now stands as above all a treatise on tragedy; and it is to the discussion of this genre

---

5 The most recent attempt to reconstruct parts of the second book is that of Janko (1987) pp. 43-55 (with notes, pp. 159-74), building on the more specialised treatment in Janko (1984). The subject remains inevitably speculative and controversial.
6 See esp. 49b9-20, and the comparison of the two genres in ch. XXVI.
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(VI–XXII) that some further introductory remarks must therefore be devoted.

Modern attitudes to tragedy, especially in the wake of such German theorists as Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche, have been predominantly influenced by metaphysical and existentialist inclinations to identify a dark essence, an irreducible conception of "the tragic," at the heart of the matter. Such attitudes were in a sense prefigured by Plato, who, as an opponent of the psychological power of tragedy (within which, like Aristotle after him, he sometimes included Homeric epic), saw in it an expression of corrosive despair over the possibility of true happiness. Aristotle's distance from this Platonic view, as well as from many later theories of tragedy, can perhaps best be regarded as part of a more general disinclination to discover a single core of significance in Greek tragic drama. Aristotle's treatment of tragedy has many facets, and is not the formulation of one dominant insight into the genre. It combines, as does the whole work, descriptive and prescriptive elements. It brings to bear, above all in identifying the six "components" of tragedy (ch. VI), the analytic method which functions throughout Aristotle's approach to poetry. It contains many principles—such as the priority of action over character (ch. VI), the requirements of structural unity (chs. VII–VIII), and the criteria of necessity and probability (e.g. ch. IX)—whose applicability is much wider than tragedy as such. We should not, therefore, expect the Poetics to yield a neatly circumscribed account of the quintessentially tragic.

7 See esp. Republic 10.605c–6b.
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Rather than the identification of a hard kernel of tragic meaning, Aristotle’s goal can best be seen as the progressive demarcation of an area of possibilities which simultaneously codifies existing achievements of the tragedians, and legislates for the ideal scope of tragedy. This demarcation is initially embodied in the definition of the genre (49b24–8), which accentuates two features peculiar to tragedy (and to its Homeric adumbration): the structure of an “elevated” action, and the arousal of “pity and fear.” The first of these features, both of which are elucidated and refined in the subsequent chapters, represents partly a generic gravity of tone, but also (or at the same time) a matter of ethical intensity. “Elevated,” spoudaios, is the term used to denote the typical level of characterisation found in tragedy and epic (chs. II–III); the subject matter of serious in contradistinction to comic poetry (48b34, 49b10); and the quasi-philosophical universality of poetry, as opposed to history’s particularity (51b6). As the definition indicates, the elevation of tragedy is a quality principally of its action, and a quality which will arise, in Aristotle’s terms, from events involving and determining the lives of characters who can be generally regarded as striving for both practical success and ethical virtue.  

But “elevation,” with its implications for tone and ethical interest, delimits the range of tragic action in only the broadest fashion. Aristotle narrows this range further by employing a model—deeply embedded in Greek

---

8 Ar.’s views leave no real room for tragedies that hinge around seriously corrupt characters: this is the cumulative implication of 48a16–18, 52b36 ff, 54a16–17. Only 56a21–23, a very obscure passage, appears to contemplate plays whose central figures have substantial vices.
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tragedy's own language of human experience—of movement or "transformation" (metabasis)\(^9\) between extreme poles of fortune: "prosperity" (eutuchia) and "adversity" (atuchia, dustuchia). This polarity, first mentioned at the end of ch. VII (51a13–14), provides a formula which attempts to capture the crucial life-affecting shifts in the status of tragedy's central characters. One striking fact about Aristotle's use of the formula is that he more than once appears to leave open the direction in which a tragic transformation may take place.\(^{10}\) But although this involves him in the perhaps problematic preference for plays of averted catastrophe in ch. XIV (54a4–9), its general import is not as paradoxical as might at first appear. Aristotle assumes that any tragic transformation from adversity to prosperity must give prominence to the first of these extremes, and will take place in the context of events entailing, or threatening, great suffering: at 54a12–13 the "families which such sufferings have befallen" include those whose life histories contain the plots of averted catastrophe which have just been singled out for praise. Whatever one may feel about the fore-grounding of such plots, they are not an invention of the Poetics but a fact about the established possibilities of

---

\(^9\) Ar. applies metabasis (52a16–18), with its cognate verb, to the movement of fortune which he regards as essential to all tragedy; metabolē (52a23, 31), "change," also with its cognate verb (51a14 being an exception), is reserved for the more abrupt twists which characterise the elements of the "complex" plot. But what Ar. means by metabasis is often expressed, in tragedy itself and elsewhere, by metabolē.

\(^{10}\) See 51a13–14, 52a31 (perhaps), 55b27–8, as well as ch. XIV's preference for averted catastrophe.
Greek tragedy itself.

The centrality of “transformation” in Aristotle’s conception of tragedy links up with his estimation of the “complex” plot (chs. X–XI etc.) as the ideal for the genre. The elements of the complex plot—recognition and reversal—are themselves defined in terms of dramatic, sharp twists in the action. They are, in other words, hinge-like junctures at which the general tragic pattern of transformation is encapsulated in a particularly intense and decisive manner. Accordingly, they exemplify in a special degree the way in which, within the Poetics’ account of tragedy, the idea of a change of fortune is closely related to two further elements: on the one hand, pity and fear,¹¹ on the other, the exhibition of human fallibility, for which *hamartia* is Aristotle’s chosen expression in ch. XIII.

Pity and fear were traditionally held to be the combination of emotions appropriately evoked by tragedy, in life as well as fiction. Aristotle gives his own definitions of them in Poetics XIII, and much more fully in Rhetoric II.5 and II.8. He takes them to be felt for the undeserved afflictions of those “like ourselves” (53a5–6), and this condition implies a response to sufferings of kinds to which we can, implicitly at any rate, imagine ourselves too as vulnerable. The combination of pity and fear therefore represents tragedy as tapping a deep and quasi-universal¹² sense of human vulnerability—a vulnerability which

¹¹ Both 52a3–4 and 52a36–b3 allude, in effect, to the special capacity of complex plots to arouse the tragic emotions.

¹² Part of the importance of tragic fear, which is focussed on the dramatic characters (53a4–5) but contains a tacitly self-regarding element, lies in its connection with the “universals”
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is dramatically projected by events in which transformations of fortune, and thus great swings in the potential happiness\textsuperscript{13} of the central agents, are dominant. Tragedy, on this view, contains patterns of suffering which explore the experience of limitations upon human control of life. But it enlarges and heightens this experience by focussing it upon events that are typically “awesome”\textsuperscript{14} in scope and impact, and by connecting it with characters who, while “like us” in their basic nature, are nonetheless “better than our normal level” (48a4) in the heroic scale and sweep of their lives.

When, therefore, in Poetics XIII Aristotle prescribes that the tragic agent should fall into adversity not “because of evil and wickedness, but through some kind of error (hamartia)” (53a8–10), it is not easy to see how hamartia, repeated a few lines later, can serve as much more than a token for the various sources of fallibility which could activate a tragic calamity, while still falling short of serious ethical culpability on the character’s own part. Hamartia can perhaps most readily be construed as involving a piece of profound ignorance, particularly given the requirements of a complex plot (for reversal

that poetry has the power to intimate (51b6–7): to regard tragic agents as “like ourselves” is to move towards perceiving the universal significance latent in their stories.

\textsuperscript{13} Ar. does not take tragedy to be concerned with all the details of “happiness,” eudaimonia, which he examines in his own ethical writings. But he does see it as concerning itself with the decisive impingement of material circumstances, “prosperity” and “adversity,” upon the possibilities for realising happiness in action: see esp. 50a16–20.

\textsuperscript{14} See on 52a4.
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and recognition) which Aristotle has in mind in this context (cf. 52b30–32). But neither the larger shape of the argument, nor the list of examples at 53a20–21, allows one to restrict hamartia to matters of factual ignorance; elements of limited culpability on the agent's part, including certain deeds of passion, cannot be ruled out. Rather, in any case, than a precise formula for a quintessential tragic causality, hamartia can best be understood as designating a whole area of possibilities, an area unified by a pattern of the causal yet unintended implication of tragedy's characters in the pitiable and terrible "transformation" of their own lives. Hamartia, in short, embraces all the ways in which human vulnerability, at its extremes, exposes itself not through sheer, arbitrary misfortune (something inconsistent with the intelligible plot structure which Aristotle requires of a good play), but through the erring involvement of tragic figures in their own sufferings.

The Poetics repeatedly emphasises that the exhibition of tragic vulnerability or mutability is the ground of pity and fear. Only once, yet that in the definition of the genre, does Aristotle add that the experience of these emotions conduces to catharsis ("through pity and fear accomplishing the catharsis of such emotions," 49b27–8). In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Greek term katharsis, whose senses include "cleansing," "purification," and "purgation," has long been the most vexed in the entire work. Opinion has been divided over the extent to which interpretative help can be found in Poli-

15 See Stinton's article, the most thorough and cogent modern contribution to the longstanding argument over hamartia; cf. also Nussbaum (1986), pp. 382–3.
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tics VIII.7, where Aristotle mentions catharsis in connection with certain kinds of music, associates it with both religious and medical forms of experience, and promises further elucidation of it “in my treatment of poetry.” It is not inconceivable that this cross reference is to part of the lost second book of the Poetics, but more likely that it is to the early dialogue On Poets, where Aristotle may have explicitly introduced catharsis to block the Platonic charge that the arousal of emotions by tragedy tended dangerously to increase susceptibility to the same emotions in life.\textsuperscript{16} If catharsis was conceived in anything like this spirit, then we should expect its function to emphasise resistance both to the idea of emotions as dangerous and to the notion of increased susceptibility.

Such dissension from Plato’s position would draw on Aristotle’s general and positive view, as revealed especially in his ethical writings, that emotions are cognitively based responses to experience, and can correspondingly be justified if the judgements which occasion and underlie them are themselves appropriate to the objects of the emotions.\textsuperscript{17} It is evident throughout the Poetics that pity and fear are regarded as apt and indeed necessary emotions to be felt towards the suffering characters of tragedy. This alone makes it difficult to sustain what was for long the dominant modern view that catharsis is purely a matter of emotional outlet and release (the

\textsuperscript{16} The attribution of a statement on catharsis to On Poets is accepted by e.g. W. D. Ross, Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 69, fr. 5. The Platonic doctrine in question is developed especially at Republic 10.603c–6d.

\textsuperscript{17} This aspect of Ar.’s moral psychology is discussed by Nussbaum (1992).
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extreme "purgation" view). Such a function would be a contingent by-product of tragedy, not the essential element which ought to explain its presence within ch. VI’s definition. While, in the absence of an Aristotelian elucidation of the term for tragedy, the significance of catharsis cannot be conclusively established, we are more likely to approximate to the truth if we keep in view the ethical importance of emotions for Aristotle, the Poetics’ treatment of tragic pity and fear as the basis of a special form of pleasure (53b10–13), and, finally, the wider principle that the pleasure derived from mimetic works of art rests on an underlying process of comprehension. This configuration of factors allows us, however tentatively, to make of catharsis a concept which is interconnected with various components in Aristotle’s theory of tragedy, and which in some sense completes his account of the genre by framing the experience of it as psychologically rewarding and ethically beneficial. Tragedy, on this reading, may revolve around the exhibition of sufferings which stem from profound human fallibility, yet by engaging the understanding and the emotions in contemplation of these phenomena it succeeds in affording an experience which deeply fulfills and enhances the whole mind.

The selective and highly compressed survey of some major features of the Poetics has taken us from an initial concern with the systematic and "foundational" strategy of the work, to the discussion of ideas—most notably, hamartia and catharsis—which, not least by their intriguing elusiveness, provide material for ongoing controversy. It may now be worth drawing the explicit moral that this

18 For this and other interpretations of catharsis, see Halliwell (1986) ch. 6 and appendix 5.
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combination of the methodical and the suggestive, the analytic and the elliptical, is surely one of the main reasons why the treatise has recurrently stimulated such interest and such sharp reactions, both positive and negative, from literary critics and theorists between the sixteenth century and the present. Partly because of its frequent terseness, partly on account of the damaged state in which it has reached us, the *Poetics* is a document which somewhat offsets its intellectually orderly and progressive approach with elements which have the effect of encouraging an indefinite process of reflection and reinterpretation. For this and other reasons the treatise has, since its late Renaissance "rediscovery" in Italy, maintained a persistent status as a conspicuous point of reference—a repeatedly cited model (whether for good or bad, depending on the interpreter’s own allegiances) of certain kinds of assumptions and judgements about the nature of literary works, yet a model which never quite permits the reading of its arguments to reach a point of equilibrium.

No other document has had a history parallel to that of the *Poetics*: a canonical text for neoclassical thinkers, and in fields beyond those of literature itself, over a period of two and a half centuries; a locus of keenly contested debate, as well as a certain amount of revisionist interpretation, during the rise of Romantic conceptions of art; and a sporadically cited work even in the heavily ideological era of modern hermeneutics and literary theory.\(^{19}\) It is
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tempting to say that this long, sometimes fraught story has left its scars on the work's standing. But it has also marked it out as a somewhat indomitable "survivor," whose historically formative role and continued salience no one interested in the development of Western attitudes to literature can afford to ignore.

Text and translation

The text printed has been broadly based on the edition by Rudolf Kassel, *Aristotelis de Arte Poetica Liber* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965; corr. repr., 1968). But as well as sometimes preferring different readings from Kassel's, I have occasionally repunctuated the text and introduced some additional paragraph divisions. I have also deliberately printed as "clean" a text as possible, minimising such things as editorial brackets.

In keeping with the aims of the Loeb series, the apparatus criticus is highly selective; its guiding purpose is not to give full information about the textual tradition, but to notify (or remind) interested readers of salient elements of textual uncertainty. The apparatus is accordingly limited largely to those contexts where a conjectural emendation is printed, or where the manuscript evidence contains variants with substantive implications for the sense. It should be noted, additionally, that I do not mention places where readings taken from *recentiores* involve a practically certain correction of the medieval manuscripts; I do not record differences between A and B which are inconsequential for the meaning, even where they may be important for understanding the textual tradition as such; and I cite the medieval Latin translation
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and the Arabic translation only for a few striking points, not as supplementary evidence to the manuscripts.

The following abbreviations are used in the apparatus; the introduction to Kassel's edition should be consulted for further details:

A: 10th cent. ms., Parisinus gr. 1741.
Arab.: readings implied by the 10th cent. Arabic translation from an earlier Syriac translation of the Poetics.
B: 14th cent. ms., Riccardianus gr. 46 (which has substantial lacunae at 1447a8–48a29, and 1461b3–62a18).
Lat.: readings implied by the Latin translation of William of Moerbeke, completed in 1278.
rec.: readings of one or more Renaissance ms. (15th/16th cent.)

The translation printed here was drafted without reference to the version which I published in 1987 (see Bibliography). While subsequent comparison of samples yielded some similarities of wording between the two, in most cases I have not taken any active steps to remove these. The present translation aims to give a somewhat closer rendering than the earlier, though I have continued to follow the principle of preferring, wherever reasonable, intelligibility in English to a literalness which requires knowledge of Greek to decode.

The following conventions in the translation should be noted:

<> = words deemed to be missing from the Greek text and conjecturally supplied by editors.
( ) = parts of the text conveniently rendered as parentheses; round brackets are used more often in the translation than in the Greek text.
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[ ] = transliterated Greek terms or translations of such terms, included to clarify verbal points.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following abbreviated references are used in the notes to the translation (abbreviations for ancient authors and works generally follow the Oxford Classical Dictionary, see below, though I use Ar. not Arist. for Aristotle).


P. Oxy.: The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1898–.


INTRODUCTION

The following selection of publications is restricted to writings in English; works in other languages can be traced through the bibliographies in many of the items listed here.

Commentaries


Monographs


Translations

The following contain extensive annotation or commentary.

INTRODUCTION


Other works

INTRODUCTION


ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ
ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ

1447a Περὶ ποιητικῆς αὐτῆς τε καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν αὐτῆς, ἢν
tων δύναμιν ἔκαστον ἔχει, καὶ πῶς δεῖ συνιστασθαι
tοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς ἔξειν ἡ ποίησις, έτι δὲ
ἐκ πόσων καὶ ποίων ἐστὶ μορίων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ
tῶν ἄλλων ὦσα τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ μεθόδουν, λέγωμεν
ἀρξάμενοι κατὰ φύσιν πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν πρῶτων.

ἐποποιία δὴ καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποίησις ἐτι δὲ
κωμῳδία καὶ ἡ διθυραμβοποιητική καὶ τῆς αὐλητι-
κῆς ἡ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι τυγχάνονσιν
όνται μιμήσεις τὸ σύνολον· διαφέρονσι δὲ ἄλληλων
τρισίν, ἡ γὰρ τῷ ἐν1 ἐτέρως μιμεῖσθαι ἡ τῷ ἐτερα ἡ
τῷ ἐτέρως καὶ μη τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον. ὢσπερ γὰρ καὶ
χρώμασι καὶ σχῆμασι πολλὰ μιμοῦνταί τινες ἀπει-
κάζοντες (οἱ μὲν διὰ τέχνης οἱ δὲ διὰ συνηθείας).

ἐτέρως δὲ διὰ τῆς φωνῆς, οὔτω καὶ ταῖς εἰρημέναις
tέχναις ἀπασάι μὲν ποιοῦνται τῇ μίμησιν ἐν
ῥυθμῷ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἀρμονίᾳ, τούτοις δ’ ἡ χωρίς ἡ

1 ἐν Forchhammer: γένει Α

a A major genre of choral lyric, performed in honour of Dionysus; cf. 49a10–11 for its relation to tragedy.
POETICS

I. We are to discuss both poetry in general and the capacity of each of its genres; the canons of plot construction needed for poetic excellence; also the number and character of poetry's components, together with the other topics which belong to the same enquiry—beginning, as is natural, from first principles.

Now, epic and tragic poetry, as well as comedy, dithyramb, and most music for aulos and lyre, are all, taken as a whole, kinds of mimesis. But they differ from one another in three respects: namely, by producing mimesis in different media, of different objects, or in different modes. Just as people (some by formal skill, others by a knack) use colours and shapes to render mimetic images of many things, while others again use the voice, so too all the poetic arts mentioned produce mimesis in rhythm, language, and melody, whether separately or in

---

^b A reed pipe (akin to an oboe) used to accompany parts of drama and some other forms of poetry, but also for purely instrumental music; cf. 48a9, 61a18, b31.

^c The foundational aesthetic concept of the Poetics; my translation generally retains the Greek noun, but sometimes, to avoid awkwardness, I use the verb "represent." See the Introduction.

^d For vocal mimicry, including that of actors; cf. Rh. 1404a21–3.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΗΛΕ

μεμιγμένοις· οἴον ἁρμονία μὲν καὶ ῥυθμῷ χρῶμεναι μόνον ἢ τε αὐλητικὴ καὶ ἡ κιθαριστικὴ καὶν εἰ τινὲς ἐτεραὶ τυγχάνωσιν οὖσαι τοιαῦται

25 οἴον ἢ τῶν συρίγγων, αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ ῥυθμῷ ἡ χωρίς ἁρμονίας ἡ τῶν ὀρχηστῶν (καὶ γὰρ οὖσιν διὰ τῶν σχηματιζομένων ῥυθμῶν μιμοῦνται καὶ ἡθη καὶ πάθη καὶ πράξεως). ἢ δὲ μόνον τοῖς λόγοις ψυλοῖς ἡ
tois métrouς καὶ τούτους εἴτε μηγνόσα μετ' ἀλλήλων εἰθ' εἰν τοῖς γένει χρωμένη τῶν métrwn ἀνώνυμος
tυγχάνει οὖσα μέχρι τοῦ νῦν οὐδὲν γὰρ ἂν ἔχοι-
μεν ὁνομάσαι κοινῶν τοὺς Σάφρωνος καὶ Ξενάρχου

10 μίμους καὶ τοὺς Σωκρατικοὺς λόγους, οὐδὲ εἰ τις διὰ τριμέτρων ἢ ἐλεγείων ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τινῶν τῶν τοιοῦ-
tων ποιοῦτο τὴν μῆμησιν. πλὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποί γε συν-
άπτοντες τῷ métrῳ τὸ ποιεῖν ἐλεγειοποιοῦσι τοὺς δὲ
ἐποποιοῦσι ὁνομάζουσιν, οὔχ ὡς κατὰ τὴν μῆμησιν

15 ποιητὰς ἄλλα κοινῆς κατὰ τὸ métrou προσαγορεύον-
tες· καὶ γὰρ ἂν ἰατρικῶν ἢ φυσικῶν τι διὰ τῶν métrων ἐκφέροσιν, οὐτοῦ καλεῖν εἰώθασιν· οὐδὲν δὲ
cοινὸν ἐστὶν Ὀμήρῳ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ πλὴν τὸ

1 τοιαῦτα rec.: om. A
2 ῥυθμῷ μιμοῦνται A: μμ. del. Spengel (om. Arab.)
3 ἡ rec.: οἱ A
4 δὲ ἐποποιῶ A: ἑπ. del. Ueberweg (om. Arab.)
5 ἀνώνυμος add. Bernays (Arab.)
6 τυγχάνει οὖσα Suckow: τυγχάνουσα A
7 φυσικῶν Heinsius (Arab.): μουσικῶν A
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combinations. That is, melody and rhythm alone are used by music for aulos and lyre, and by any other types with this capacity, for example music for panpipes; rhythm on its own, without melody, is used by the art of dancers (since they too, through rhythms translated into movements, create mimesis of character, emotions, \(^{a}\) and actions); while the art which uses either plain language or metrical forms (whether combinations of these, or some one class of metres) remains so far unnamed. \(^{b}\) For we have no common name to give to the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus\(^{c}\) and to Socratic dialogues; nor even to any mimesis that might be produced in iambic trimeters\(^{d}\) or elegiac couplets\(^{e}\) or any other such metres. Of course, people attach the verbal idea of “poetry” [\textit{poiein}] to the name of the metre, and call some “elegiac poets,” others “epic poets.” But this is not to classify them as poets because of mimesis, but because of the metre they share: hence, if writers express something medical or scientific in metre, people still usually apply these terms. But Homer and Empedocles\(^{f}\) have nothing in common except

\(^{a}\) Or perhaps “sufferings.”

\(^{b}\) Ar. notes the lack of a collective name for mimesis in prose or metre, and rejects the standing equation of “poetry” with verse.

\(^{c}\) Sicilian authors, father (late 5th cent.) and son, of prose mimes, i.e. comic sketches; cf. Ar. \textit{On Poets}, fr. 15 Gigon/72 Rose. Sophron allegedly influenced Plato’s dialogues: e.g. D. L. 3.18, \textit{P. Oxy.} XLIV 3219 fr. 1.

\(^{d}\) The metre both of some “iambic” poetry (e.g. Archilochus; cf. 48b31–2) and of dialogue in drama (49a21–28).

\(^{e}\) Used mostly in “elegiac” poetry such as that of Theognis.

\(^{f}\) E. (c. 495–35) composed two philosophical/scientific works, \textit{On Nature} and \textit{Purifications}, in hexameters.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΗΛΕΣ

μέτρον, διὸ τὸν μὲν ποιητὴν δίκαιον καλεῖν, τὸν δὲ φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἡ ποιητήν. ὁμοίως δὲ κἂν εἴ τις ἀπαντᾷ τὰ μέτρα μυγνύων ποιοῖ τὴν μύμησιν καθάπερ Χαιρήμων ἐποίησε Κένταυρον μυκτὴν ῥαφιδίαν ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν μέτρων, καὶ ποιητὴν προσαγορεύσεων. περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων διωρίσθω τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον. εἰσὶ δὲ τινὲς αἱ πᾶσι χρῶνται τοῖς εἰρημένοις, λέγω δὲ οἶνον ῥυθμῷ καὶ μέλει καὶ μέτρῳ, ὡσπερ ἡ τε τῶν διθυραμβικῶν ποίησις καὶ ἡ τῶν νόμων καὶ ἡ τε τραγῳδία καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία. διαφέρουσι δὲ ὅτι αἱ μὲν ἁμα πᾶσιν αἱ δὲ κατὰ μέρος. ταύτας μὲν οὖν λέγω τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν τεχνῶν ἐν ὀἷς

1 ποιοῦνται τήν μύμησιν.

Ἔπει δὲ μυρώνται οἱ μυρώμενοι πράττοντας,

ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτως ἡ σπουδαίοις ἡ φαύλους εἶναι (τὰ γὰρ ἡθη σχεδὸν ἄει τούτως ἀκολουθεῖ μόνος, κακία γὰρ καὶ ἀρετή τὰ ἡθη διαφέρουσι πάντες), ἡτοι βελτίων ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡ χείρονας ἡ καὶ τοιοῦτους, ὡσπερ οἱ γραφεῖς. Πολύγνωτος μὲν γὰρ κρέατος, Παῦσων δὲ χείρονας, Διονύσιος δὲ ὁμοίως ἐἰκαζεν. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ τῶν λεχθεῖσιν ἐκάστη μυμήσεων ἔξει ταύτας τὰς διαφορὰς καὶ ἔσται ἐτέρα τῷ ἑτέρᾳ μυμείσθαι τούτον τὸν τρόπον. καὶ γὰρ ἐν

1 oĩs Vettori: aĩs A

a 4th cent. tragedian (Rh. 1413b13, TrGF I no. 71); Centaur was probably a polymetric drama, perhaps meant only for recital (hence “rhapsody,” elsewhere used of epic recitals). Cf. 60a1–2.
their metre; so one should call the former a poet, the other a natural scientist. Equally, even if someone should produce mimesis in a medley of all the metres (as Chaeremon did in composing his Centaur, a hybrid rhapsody containing all the metres), he ought still to be called a poet. In these matters, then, we should make discriminations of this kind. There are also some arts which use all the stated media—rhythm, melody, metre—as do dithyramb and nomes, tragedy and comedy. They differ in that some employ all together, others use them in certain parts. So these are the distinctions between the arts in the media in which they produce mimesis.

Since mimetic artists represent people in action, and the latter should be either elevated or base (for characters almost always align with just these types, as it is through vice and virtue that the characters of all men vary), they can represent people better than our normal level, worse than it, or much the same. As too with painters: Polygnotus depicted superior people, Pauson inferior, and Dionysius those like ourselves. Clearly, each of the kinds of mimesis already mentioned will manifest these distinctions, and will differ by representing

\[b\] Nomes were traditional styles of melody, for string or wind instrument, to which various texts could be set; by Ar.'s time the term covered elaborate compositions closely related to dithyramb: cf. 48a15.

\[c\] See on 49b24.

\[d\] Polygnotus: major mid-5th cent. wall painter; cf. 50a27, with \textit{OCD} s.v. Pauson (cf. Pol. 1340a36): identity uncertain; a painter of caricatures? Dionysius: more than one painter of this name is known; perhaps D. of Colophon (Ael. \textit{VH} 4.3).
ἈΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

10 ὅρχησει καὶ αὐλήσει καὶ κιθαρίσει ἔστι γενέσθαι ταύτας τὰς ἀνομοιότητας, καὶ περὶ τοὺς λόγους δὲ καὶ τὴν ψιλομετρίαν, οἶον ὁμηρος μὲν βελτίως, Κλεοφῶν δὲ ὁμοίως, Ἡγήμων δὲ ὁ Θάσιος ὁ τὰς παρθένιας τοῦσας πρῶτος καὶ Νικοχάρης ὁ τὴν Δελιάδα χείρους ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοὺς διθυράμβους καὶ περὶ τοὺς νόμους, ὅσπερ γὰρ Κύκλωπας Τιμόθεος καὶ Φιλόξενος μιμήσατο ἢν τις. ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ διαφορᾷ καὶ ἡ τραγῳδία πρὸς τὴν κωμῳδίαν διέστηκεν. ἡ μὲν γὰρ χείρους ἡ δὲ βελτίως μιμεῖσθαι βουλεται τῶν νῦν.

15 III

"Ετι δὲ τούτων τρίτη διαφορὰ τὸ ὦς ἐκαστα τούτων μιμήσατο ἢν τις. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μιμεῖσθαι ἐστὶν ὡτε μὲν ἀπαγγέλλουτα ἢ ἔτερον τι γεγονόμενον ὅσπερ ὁμηρος ποιεῖ, ἡ ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ μεταβάλλοντα, ἡ πάντας ὡς πράττουσας καὶ ἐνέργους τους μιμούμενους. ἐν τρισὶ δὴ ταύτας διαφοράς ἡ μίμησις ἐστὶν, ὡς εἴπομεν κατ’ ἀρχὰς, ἐν οἷς τε καὶ ἃ καὶ ὡς. ὡστε τῇ μὲν ὁ αὐτὸς ἂν εἰπῇ μιμητῆς ὁμήρῳ Σοφοκλῆς, μιμοῦνται γὰρ ἀμφω σπουδαίους, τῇ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνει, πράττουσας γὰρ μιμοῦνται καὶ δρῶντας ἄμφω. οἴθεν καὶ ἀράματα καλείσθαι τινες αὐτὰ φασίν, ὧτι μιμοῦνται δρῶνται. διὸ καὶ ἀντιποιοῦνται τῆς τε τραγῳδίας

1 ὅστιν Vahlen: γάς A: Γαλατείας καὶ Eden

---

a Minor tragic poet; cf. 58a20 and Rh. 1408a15.
b Probably late 5th cent.; cf. OCD s.v.
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different objects in the given sense. In dancing too, and in music for aulos and lyre, these variations can occur, as well as in prose writings and metrical works without melody: for example, Homer represented superior people, Cleophon\textsuperscript{a} those like ourselves, Hegemon of Thasos\textsuperscript{b} (the first composer of parodies) and Nicochares\textsuperscript{c} (author of the \textit{Deiliad}) inferior characters. Likewise with dithyrambs and nomes: for one could represent Cyclopes as did Timotheus and Philoxenus.\textsuperscript{d} This very distinction separates tragedy from comedy: the latter tends to represent people inferior, the former superior, to existing humans.\textsuperscript{1}

There is, beside these, a third distinction—in the \textit{mode} of mimesis for these various objects. For in the same media one can represent the same objects by combining narrative with direct personation, as Homer does; or in an invariable narrative voice; or by direct enactment of all roles. These, then, are the three distinctions underlying mimesis, as we said at the outset: media, objects, modes. Accordingly, in one respect Sophocles could be classed as the same kind of mimetic artist as Homer, since both represent elevated characters, but in another the same as Aristophanes, since both represent people in direct action. Hence the assertion some people make, that dramas are so called because they represent people in action.\textsuperscript{e} Thus, the Doriens actually lay claim to

\textsuperscript{c} Probably late 5th cent.: \textit{Deiliad} is a mock-epic title (cf. e.g. \textit{Iliad}), "tale of a coward."

\textsuperscript{d} Timotheus, c. 450–360; his \textit{Cyclops}: \textit{PMG} nos. 780–83. Philoxenus, roughly contemporary; see \textit{PMG} nos. 815–24. Both were musico-stylistic innovators.

\textsuperscript{e} The noun \textit{drama} derives from the verb \textit{dran}, "do" or "act" (cf. 48b1).
καὶ τῆς κωμῳδίας οἱ Δωρεῖς (τῆς μὲν γὰρ κωμῳδίας οἱ Μεγαρεῖς οἱ τε ἐνταῦθα ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς δημοκρατίας γενομένης καὶ οἱ ἐκ Σικελίας, ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ ἦν Ἐπίχαρμος ο ποιητὴς πολλῷ πρῶτερος ὃν Χιωνίδου καὶ Μάγνητος· καὶ τῆς τραγῳδίας ἐνιοῦ τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ) ποιούμενοι τὰ ὀνόματα σημεῖον· αὐτοὶ¹ μὲν γὰρ κώμας τὰς περιοικίδιας καλεῖν φασιν, Ἀθηναῖους² δὲ δήμους, ὡς κωμῳδοὺς οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ κωμάζειν λεχθέντας ἀλλὰ τῇ κατὰ κώμας πλανὴ ἀτμαζομένους ἐκ τοῦ ἀστεώς· καὶ τὸ ποιεῖν αὐτοὶ μὲν δράν, Ἀθηναῖος δὲ πράττειν προσαγορεύειν. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν διαφορῶν καὶ πόσα καὶ τίνες τῆς μιμήσεως εἰρήθησθον ταῦτα.

IV Ἔοικασι δὲ γεννήσαι μὲν ὅλως τὴν ποιητικὴν αἰτίαν δύο τινές καὶ αὐταὶ φυσικά. τὸ τε γὰρ μμεῖ-

5 σθαι σύμφωτον τοὶς ἀνθρώποις ἐκ παίδων ἐστὶ καὶ τούτῳ διαφέροντες τῶν ἄλλων ζῶν ὅτι μιμητικότα-

τῶν ἐστὶ καὶ τὰς μαθήσεις ποιεῖται διὰ μιμήσεως ταῖς πρῶταις, καὶ τὸ χαίρειν τοὺς μμήμασι πάντας. σημεῖον δὲ τούτον τὸ συμβαίνου ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων· ἀ

gὰρ αὐτὰ λυπηρῶς ὅρομεν, τούτων τὰς εἰκόνας τὰς μάλιστα ἥκριβωμένας χαίρομεν θεωροῦντες, οἷον θηρίων τε μορφὰς τῶν ἀτμιστάτων καὶ νεκρῶν.

¹ αὐτοὶ Spengel: οὗτοι AB
² Ἀθηναῖος anon. Oxon., Spengel: -αιοι AB

ᵃ Mid-6th cent., much earlier than the introduction of comedy into dramatic festivals at Athens (cf. 49b1–2).
tragedy and comedy (comedy being claimed by the Megarians both here on the mainland, contending it arose during their democracy,\(^a\) and in Sicily, the homeland of the poet Epicharmus, a much earlier figure than Chionides and Magnes;\(^b\) and tragedy being claimed by some of those in the Peloponnese);\(^c\) and they cite the names as evidence. They say that they call villages kōmai, while the Athenians call them dēmoi; their contention is that comic performers [kōmōdoi] got their name not from revelling [kōmazein] but from wandering through villages when banned from the city. And they say their own word for acting is dran,\(^d\) while the Athenians’ is prattein. So much, then, by way of discussion of the number and nature of the distinctions within mimesis.

It can be seen that poetry was broadly engendered by a pair of causes, both natural. For it is an instinct of human beings, from childhood, to engage in mimesis\(^e\) (indeed, this distinguishes them from other animals: man is the most mimetic of all, and it is through mimesis that he develops his earliest understanding); and equally natural that everyone enjoys mimetic objects. A common occurrence indicates this: we enjoy contemplating the most precise images of things whose actual sight is painful to us, such as the forms of the vilest animals and of

\(^a\) C. and M. were, between them, active at Athens in the 480s and 470s (see on 49b3); E.’s dates are disputed: his career probably spanned the late 6th and early 5th cent.
\(^b\) Cf. the “tragic choruses” at Sicyon, Hdt. 5.67.
\(^c\) See on 48a28.
\(^d\) Here a genus of activities including imitative behaviour and artistic “image-making” as two of its species.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΗΛΕ

αὖτιον δὲ καὶ τούτου, ὁτι μανθάνειν οὐ μόνον τοῖς
φιλοσόφοις ἢδιστον ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμοίως,
ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ βραχὺ κοινωνοῦσιν αὐτοῦ. διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο
χαίροντι τὰς εἰκόνας ὑρὼντες, ὁτι συμβαίνει θεωροῦντας
μανθάνειν καὶ συλλογίζεσθαι τι ἐκαστον,
οἴον ὦτι οὕτος ἔκεινος· ἐπεὶ ἐὰν μὴ τύχῃ προεωρα
κώς, οὐχ ἢ μέμημα ποιήσει τὴν ἡδονήν ἄλλα διὰ
tὴν ἀπεργασίαν ἢ τὴν χροιᾶν ἢ διὰ τοιαύτην τυνὰ
ἄλλην αἰτίαν.

κατὰ φύσιν δὲ οὗτος ἡμῖν τοῦ μιμεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς
ἀρμονίας καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ (τὰ γὰρ μέτρα ὦτι μόρια
tῶν ῥυθμῶν ἐστὶ φαινον) ἐξ ἀρχῆς οἰ3 περικότες
πρὸς4 αὐτὰ μᾶλιστα κατὰ μικρόν προάγοντες ἐγένθα
τὴν ποίησιν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοσχεδιασμάτων. διεσπασθῆ
dὲ κατὰ τὰ οἰκεία ἤθη ἡ ποίησις· οἱ μὲν
γὰρ σεμνότεροι τὰς καλὰς ἐμμοῦντο πράξεις καὶ
τὰς τῶν τουούτων, οἱ δὲ εὐτελέστεροι τὰς τῶν φαύ
λων, πρῶτον ψόγους πουούντες, ὥσπερ ἐτερού ὕμνους
καὶ ἐγκώμια. τῶν μὲν οὖν πρὸ Ὄμηρον οὐδενὸς
ἐχομεν εἰπεῖν τουούτον ποίημα, εἰκος δὲ εἶναι πολ
λοὺς, ἀπὸ δὲ Ὄμηρον ἀρξαμένους ἔστων, οἴον ἐκεῖνον
ὁ Μαργύτης καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα. ἐν οἷς κατὰ τὸ ἀρμοτ
tον καὶ τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ἦλθε μέτρου—διὸ καὶ ἰαμβεῖον

1 τούτου Lat.: τούτο A   2 οὐχ ἢ Ellebodius: οὐχὶ AB
3 οι B: om. A   4 πρὸς B: καὶ A

a I.e. in a portrait—a deliberately rudimentary instance of an
interpretative process which could take more complex forms.
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corpses. The explanation of this too is that understanding
gives great pleasure not only to philosophers but likewise
to others too, though the latter have a smaller share in it.
This is why people enjoy looking at images, because
through contemplating them it comes about that they understand and infer what each element means, for
instance that "this person is so-and-so."a For, if one hap-
pens not to have seen the subject before, the image will
not give pleasure qua mimesis but because of its execu-
tion or colour, or for some other such reason.

Because mimesis comes naturally to us, as do melody
and rhythm (that metres are categories of rhythms is
obvious), in the earliest timesb those with special natural
talents for these things gradually progressed and brought
poetry into being from improvisations. Poetry branched
into two, according to its creators' characters: the more
serious produced mimesis of noble actions and the
actions of noble people, while the more vulgar depicted
the actions of the base, in the first place by composing
invectivesc (just as others produced hymns and en-
comia).d Now, we cannot name such an invective by any
poet earlier than Homer, though probably many poets
produced them; but we can do so from Homer onwards,
namely the latter's Margites e and the like. In these
poems, it was aptness which brought the iambic metre too

b Lit. "from the beginning": the point is a priori rather than
strictly historical.
c Satirical lampoons on individuals.
d Poems in praise of gods and outstanding humans.
e A (lost) burlesque epic, named after its crass "hero," com-
posed in a mixture of hexameters and iambic trimeters. It is not
now, and was not always in antiquity, attributed to "Homer."
καλεῖται νῦν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἱάμβιζον ἄλλη-
λονς. καὶ ἑγένοντο τῶν παλαιῶν οἱ μὲν ἡρωικῶν οἱ
dὲ ἱάμβων ποιηταί. ὁσπερ δὲ καὶ τὰ σπουδαῖα
mάλιστα ποιήτης Ὅμηρος ἦν (μόνος γὰρ οὐχ ὦτι εὗ
ἳλλα καὶ μιμήσεις δραματικὰς ἐποίησεν), οὕτως καὶ
tὰ τῆς κωμῳδίας σχῆματα πρῶτος ὑπέδειξεν, οὐ
ψόγον ἄλλα τὸ γελοῖον δραματοποιήσας· ὦ γὰρ
Μαργύτης ἀνάλογον ἔχει, ὁσπερ Ἰλιάς καὶ Ἡ
'Oδύσσεια πρὸς τὰς τραγῳδίας, οὕτω καὶ οὕτως πρὸς
tὰς κωμῳδίας. παραφανείσης δὲ τῆς τραγῳδίας καὶ
κωμῳδίας οἱ ἐφ’ ἐκατέραν τὴν ποιήσαν ὀρμῶντες
κατὰ τὴν οἰκεῖαν φύσιν οἱ μὲν ἀντὶ τῶν ἱάμβων
κωμῳδοποιοῦ ἑγένοντο, οὐ δὲ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπῶν τραγῳ-
dοδιδάσκαλοι, διὰ τὸ μεῖξι καὶ ἐντιμότερα τὰ σχῆ-
ματα ἐίναι ταῦτα ἑκείνων.

τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐπισκοπεῖν εἰ ἀρά ἔχει ἡδὴ η τραγῳ-
dία τοῖς εἰδέσσι ικανῶς ἦ οὔ, αὐτὸ τε καθ’ αὐτὸ
κρίναι2 καὶ πρὸς τὰ θέατρα, ἄλλος λόγος. γενο-
mένη3 δ’ οὖν ἄπ’ ἄρχης αὐτοσχεδιαστικῆς (καὶ αὐτὴ
καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξαρχοντων τῶν
dιθύραμβον, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ φαλλικὰ ἄ ἐτι καὶ νῦν

1 τὰ . . . σχῆμα A Lat.: τὸ . . . σχῆμα B
2 κρίναι Forchhammer: κρίνεται ἦ ναί A: κρίνεται εἶναι B
3 γενομένη rec.: -ένης AB

---
a Cf. on 47b11.
b See on 49b24.
c I.e. containing much direct/personative speech; cf. 48a21–
2, 60a5–11.
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into use—precisely why it is called "iambic" now, because it was in this metre that they lampooned [iambizein] one another.\(^a\) Of the older poets some became composers of epic hexameters, others of iambic lampoons. Just as Homer was the supreme poet of elevated\(^b\) subjects (for he was preeminent not only in quality but also in composing dramatic\(^c\) mimesis), so too he was the first to delineate the forms of comedy, by dramatising not invective but the laughable: thus Margites stands in the same relation to comedies as do the Iliad and Odyssey to tragedies. And when tragedy and comedy had been glimpsed,\(^d\) those whose own natures gave them an impetus towards either type of poetry abandoned iambic lampoons to become comic poets, or epic to become tragedians, because these newer forms were grander and more esteemed\(^e\) than the earlier.

To consider whether or not tragedy is even now sufficiently developed in its types—judging it intrinsically and in relation to audiences—is a separate matter.\(^f\) Anyhow, when it came into being from an improvisatory origin (that is, both tragedy and comedy: the former from the leaders of dithyramb,\(^g\) the other from the leaders of the

\(^d\) I.e. potentially, within the nature of Homer's poetry.
\(^e\) This applies principally to Athens, and to creation of new works rather than abstract estimation of poems.
\(^f\) A curious remark, in view of 14–15 below; but the emphasis here may fall on "types" (cf. 55b32) rather than tragedy's essential "nature."
\(^g\) See on 47a14. Ar. probably assumes that the Athenian Thespis took the crucial step, c. 534 B.C., of adding an individual voice (the first actor) to the traditional chorus of dithyramb: cf. TrGF I 62, T6.
ARISTOTLE

ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν πόλεων διαμένει νομιζόμενα), κατὰ μικρὸν ηὐξήθη προαγόντων ὅσον ἐγίγνετο φανερῶν αὐτῆς· καὶ πολλὰς μεταβολὰς μεταβαλοῦσα ἡ τραγῳδία ἑπαύσατο, ἐπεὶ ἔσχε τὴν αὐτῆς φύσιν. καὶ τὸ τε τῶν ὑποκριτῶν πλήθος ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς δύο πρῶτος Αἰσχύλος ἤγαγε καὶ τὰ τοῦ χοροῦ ἡλαττώσε καὶ τὸν λόγον πρωταγωνιστεῖν· παρεσκεύασεν τρεῖς δὲ καὶ σκηνογραφίαν Σοφοκλῆς. ἔτι δὲ τὸ μέγεθος· ἐκ μικρῶν μύθων καὶ λέξεως γελοίας διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν ὁπεὶ ἀπεσεμνύνθη, τὸ τε μέτρου ἐκ τετραμέτρου ἰαμβεῖον ἐγένετο. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον τετραμέτρῳ ἐχρόνῳ διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὄρχηστι-κωτέραν ἔναι τὴν ποίησιν, λέξεως δὲ γενομένης αὐτῆς ἡ φύσις τὸ οίκειον μέτρον εὑρεῖ· μάλιστα γὰρ λεκτικῶν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ἐστιν· σημεῖον δὲ τούτων, πλεῖστα γὰρ ἰαμβεῖα λέγομεν ἐν τῇ δια-λέκτῳ τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλους, ἐξαμετρα δὲ ὀλιγάκις καὶ ἐκβαίνουτε τῆς λεκτικῆς ἀρμονίας. ἔτι δὲ ἐπεισ-

1 πρωταγωνιστεῖν Sophianus: -ιστὴν AB

---

a Sung to accompany processional carrying of phallic icons in ritual contexts; normally obscene and scurrilous: cf. Aristoph. Ach. 241–79.

b Not consistently, as his surviving plays show, but in broad relation to his predecessors.

c The third actor was probably introduced in the 460s, early in Soph.'s career; it is required in Aesch. Oresteia of 458. Scene painting: decoration of the stage building (skênê), to give it an active dramatic status.
phallic songs which remain even now a custom in many cities), it was gradually enhanced as poets developed the potential they saw in it. And after going through many changes tragedy ceased to evolve, since it had achieved its own nature. Aeschylus innovated by raising the number of actors from one to two, reduced the choral component, and made speech play the leading role. Three actors and scene painting came with Sophocles. A further factor was grandeur: after a period of slight plots and laughable diction, owing to development from a satyric ethos, it was at a late stage that tragedy acquired dignity, and its metre became the iambic trimeter instead of the trochaic tetrameter. To begin with they used the tetrameter because the poetry was satyric and more associated with dancing; but when spoken dialogue was introduced, tragedy’s own nature discovered the appropriate metre. For the iambic trimeter, more than any other metre, has the rhythm of speech: an indication of this is that we speak many trimeters in conversation with one another, but hexameters only rarely and when diverging from the colloquial register. Further changes con-

\[\text{d I.e. with the tone of a satyr play. Did Ar. connect this tone with the early dithyrambs from which tragedy developed (49a10–11)?}\]

\[\text{e Trimeter: see on 47b11; trochaic tetrameter: apparently the main metre of early tragedy, used sporadically by later tragedians; cf. 59b37, Rh. 1404a30–31.}\]

\[\text{f Ar. seems to imply that in the earliest tragedy everything was musically accompanied.}\]

\[\text{g Cf. 49a15 above; see 60a4 for “natural” appropriateness of metre to genre.}\]

\[\text{h Sc. unintentionally.}\]
ARISTOTLE

οδίων πλήθη. καὶ τὰ ἄλλ’ ὡς ἐκαστα κοσμηθήναι λέγεται ἔστω ἡμῖν εἰρήμενα· πολὺ γὰρ ἂν ἵσως ἐργὸν εἰὴ διεξέναι καθ’ ἐκαστον.

30 Τὴ δὲ κωμῳδία ἐστὶν ὁσπερ ἐπομενείς μίμησις φαυλοτέρων μὲν, οὐ μέντοι κατὰ πᾶσαν κακίαν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ αἰσχροῦ ἐστὶ τὸ γελοῖον μόριον. τὸ γὰρ γελοῖον ἐστιν ἀμαρτημά τι καὶ αἰσχρός ἀνώδυνον καὶ οὗ φθαρτικόν, οὗν εὐθὺς τὸ γελοῖον πρόσωπον αἰσχρόν τι καὶ διεστραμμένον ἀνευ ἀδύνης. αἱ μὲν οὖν τῆς τραγῳδίας μεταβάσεις καὶ δι’ ἄν ἐγένοντο οὐ λελήθασιν, ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία διὰ τὸ μὴ σπουδάζεις τοι ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐλαθεν· καὶ γὰρ χρονὸν κωμῳδίων υψε ποτε ο ἀρχων ἐδωκεν, ἀλλ’ ἐθελουντα ἦσαν. ἡδη δὲ σχήματα τυχα αὐνῆς ἐχουσης οἱ λεγομενοι αὐνῆς πουηται μημονεύονται. τὶς δὲ πρόσωπα ἀπέδωκεν ἦ προλόγους ἦ πλῆθη ὑποκριτῶν καὶ ὅτα τοιαῦτα, ἤγονται. τὸ δὲ μύθους πωεῖν

35 1 τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ Σικελίας ἔλθε, τῶν δὲ Ἀθήνησιν Κράτης πρῶτος ἧρξεν ἀφέμενος τὴς ιαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου πωείν λόγους καὶ μύθους.

1 πωεῖν 'Επίχαρμος καὶ Φόρμις ΑΒ: Ε. κ. Φ. secl. Susemihl (om. Arab.)

---

a Early tragedy's plots were shorter, less complex (cf. “slight plots,” 49a19).
b 48a17–18; cf. 48b26.
c Aischros, “shameful,” also covers “ugly,” and is so translated in the next sentence.
cerned the number of episodes. And we shall take as
read the ways in which other features of tragedy are said
to have been embellished; it would no doubt be a large
task to discuss them individually.

V Comedy, as we said, is mimesis of baser but not
wholly vicious characters: rather, the laughable is one cat-
egory of the shameful. For the laughable comprises any
fault or mark of shame which involves no pain or destruc-
tion: most obviously, the laughable mask is something
ugly and twisted, but not painfully. Now, tragedy’s stages
of development, and those responsible for them, have
been remembered, but comedy’s early history was forgot-
ten because no serious interest was taken in it: only at a
rather late date did the archon grant a comic chorus;
previously performers were volunteers. It is from a time
when the genre already had some formal features that the
first named poets of comedy are remembered. Who
introduced masks, prologues, various numbers of actors,
and everything of that kind, has been lost. The composi-
tion of plots originally came from Sicily; of Athenian
poets Crates was the first to relinquish the iambic manner
and to create stories and plots with an overall structure.

\[d\] The archon (a major magistrate) chose plays, and arranged
funding, for official production at the City Dionysia festival: this
happened first for comedy only in 487/6; tragedies had been so
performed since the late 6th century.

\[e\] The 480s/70s, the era of e.g. Chionides and Magnes; see on
48a34.

\[f\] Sicily was home of Epicharmus (see on 48a33). Crates was
active in the 440s and 430s; “iambic manner” implies satire of
individuals (cf. 48b31–2). “Overall structure,” *katholou*, is the
same term used for “universals” at 51b7.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

ή μὲν οὖν ἑποποιία τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ μέχρι μὲν¹ τοῦ μετὰ² μέτρου λόγῳ μέμησις εἶναι σπουδαίων ἥκο-
λούθησεν τῷ δὲ τὸ μέτρον ἄπλοῦν ἔχειν καὶ ἀπαγ-
γελίαν εἶναι, ταύτῃ διαφέρονσιν· ἔτι δὲ τῷ μῆκεν· ἦ
μὲν οτι μάλιστα πειρᾶται ὑπὸ μίαν περίδον ἡλίου εἶναι ἦ μικρὸν ἐξαλλάττειν, ἦ δὲ ἑποποιία ἄριστος τῷ
χρόνῳ καὶ τοῦτῳ διαφέρει, κατοί τὸ πρῶτον
ὁμοίως ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις τούτῳ ἑποίουν καὶ ἐν τοῖς
ἔπεσιν. μέρη δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μὲν ταύτα, τὰ δὲ ἰδία τῆς
τραγῳδίας· διότερ ὅστις περὶ τραγῳδίας οἴδε σπου-
δαίας καὶ φαιλῆς, οἶδε καὶ περὶ ἑπών· ἂ μὲν γὰρ
ἑποποιία ἔχει, ὑπάρχει τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, ἂ δὲ αὐτῇ, οὐ
πάντα ἐν τῇ ἑποποιίᾳ.

VI Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἐν ἔξαμετρῷς μιμητικῆς καὶ
περὶ κομῳδίας ύστερον ἐροῦμεν· περὶ δὲ τραγῳδίας
λέγωμεν ἀναλαβόντες ³ αὐτῆς ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων τῶν
γνώμενον ὅρον τῆς οὐσίας. ἔστων οὖν τραγῳδία
μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας καὶ τελείας μέγεθος
ἐξουσίας, ἥδυσμένων λόγω χωρίς ἑκάστῳ ⁴ τῶν εἰδῶν
ἐν τοῖς μορίοις, δράστην καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας, δι'
ἐλέουν καὶ φόβοι περαινουσα τῆν τῶν τοιούτων
παθημάτων ⁵ κάθαρσιν. λέγω δὲ ἥδυσμένον μὲν

¹ μὲν τοῦ Tyrwhitt: μόνου AB
² μετὰ μέτρου λόγῳ Kassel: μέτρου μετὰ λόγου B: μέτρου μεγάλου A
³ ἀναλαβόντες Bernays: ἀπο- AB
⁴ ἑκάστῳ Reiz: -ον AB
⁵ παθημάτων B: μαθημάτων A Lat.
Epic matches tragedy to the extent of being mimesis of elevated matters\textsuperscript{a} in metrical language; but they differ in that epic has an unchanging metre and is in narrative mode.\textsuperscript{b} They also differ in length: tragedy tends so far as possible to stay within a single revolution of the sun, or close to it, while epic is unlimited in time span and is distinctive in this respect (though to begin with the poets followed this same practice in tragedy as in epic). Epic and tragedy have some components in common, but others are peculiar to tragedy. So whoever knows about good and bad tragedy knows the same about epic, as epic’s resources belong to tragedy,\textsuperscript{c} but tragedy’s are not all to be found in epic.

We shall later discuss the art of mimesis in hexameters,\textsuperscript{d} as well as comedy.\textsuperscript{e} But let us now discuss tragedy, taking up the definition of its essence which emerges from what has already been said. Tragedy, then, is mimesis of an action which is elevated,\textsuperscript{f} complete, and of magnitude; in language embellished by distinct forms in its sections; employing the mode of enactment, not narrative; and through pity and fear accomplishing the

\begin{enumerate}
\item Or “characters”; for “elevated” see on 49b24.
\item Cf. the distinctions in chs. I–III; Homer’s combination of narrative with personation (48a21–2) is here left aside.
\item Cf. 62a14–15.
\item I.e. epic; cf. 59a17.
\item The discussion of comedy is lost; cf. on 62b19, and see the Introduction at n. 5.
\item \textit{Spoudaios}, the same adj. used for characters at e.g. 48a2; it denotes ethical distinction and gravity of tone. Cf. the Introduction.
\end{enumerate}
λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἁρμονίαν, τὸ δὲ χωρίς τοὺς εἴδεσθι τὸ διὰ μέτρων ἔνια μόνον περαινεσθαί καὶ πάλιν ἔτερα διὰ μέλους. ἔπει δὲ πράττοντες ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν, πρῶτον μὲν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἄν εἰη τι μόριον τραγῳδίας ὁ τῆς ὄψεως κόσμος· εἰτα μελοποιία καὶ λέξις, ἐν τούτοις γὰρ ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν. λέγω δὲ λέξιν μὲν αὐτὴν τῆς τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν, μελοποιίαν δὲ ὁ τὴν δύναμιν φανερῶν ἔχει πᾶσαν. ἔπει δὲ πράξεως ἐστὶ μίμησις, πράττεται δὲ ὑπὸ τινῶν πραττόντων οὓς ἀνάγκη ποιούσα τινας εἶναι κατὰ τε τὸ ἣθος καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν (διὰ γὰρ τούτων καὶ τὰς πράξεις εἰναι φαμεν ποιασ τινας, καὶ κατὰ ταῦτας καὶ τυγχάνουσι καὶ ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες), ἐστιν δὲ τῆς μὲν πράξεως ὁ μύθος ἡ μίμησις, λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τούτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰ δὲ ἢθη, καθ’ ὁ ποιοῦσ τινας εἶναι φαμεν τοὺς πράττοντας, διάνοιαν δὲ, ἐν ὅσοις λέγοντες ἀποδεικνύομεν τὰ ἢ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται γνώμην. ἀνάγκη οὖν πάσης τῆς τραγῳδίας μέρη εἰναι ἐξ, καθ’ ὁ ποιά τις ἢστιν ἡ τραγῳδία· ταῦτα δ’ ἐστὶ μύθος καὶ ἢθη καὶ λέξις καὶ διάνοια καὶ ὄψις καὶ μελοποιία. οἷς μὲν γὰρ μιμοῦνται, δύο μέρη ἢστιν, ὡς δὲ μιμοῦνται, ἐν, ὁ δὲ μιμοῦνται, τρία, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδέν. τούτως μὲν οὖν οὐκ ὀλίγοι

1 ἁρμονίαν καὶ μέλος AB: καὶ μ. del. Tyrwhitt
2 post τινας seq. πέφυκεν αἰτία δύο τῶν πράξεων εἶναι, διάνοια [-αν, Α] καὶ ἢθος in AB: πέφυκεν . . . ἢθος secl. Else
3 τῆς B: om. A
catharsis\textsuperscript{a} of such emotions. I use "embellished" for language with rhythm and melody, and "distinct forms" for the fact that some parts are conveyed through metrical speech alone, others again through song. Since actors render the mimesis, some part of tragedy will, in the first place, necessarily be the arrangement of spectacle;\textsuperscript{b} to which can be added lyric poetry and diction, for these are the media in which they render the mimesis. By "diction"\textsuperscript{c} I mean the actual composition of the metrical speech; the sense of "lyric poetry"\textsuperscript{d} is entirely clear. Since tragedy is mimesis of an action, and the action is conducted by agents who should have certain qualities in both character and thought (as it is these factors which allow us to ascribe qualities to their actions too, and it is in their actions that all men find success or failure), the plot is the mimesis of the action—for I use "plot" to denote the construction of events, "character" to mean that in virtue of which we ascribe certain qualities to the agents, and "thought" to cover the parts in which, through speech, they demonstrate something or declare their views. Tragedy as a whole, therefore, must have six components, which give it its qualities—namely, plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle, and lyric poetry. The media of the mimesis are two components, its mode one, and its objects three;\textsuperscript{e} there are no others. Now, these

\textsuperscript{a} The term (the most controversial in the work) is never defined; cf. the Introduction.  
\textsuperscript{b} I.e. the visual aspects of the action, esp. the appearance of the agents; cf. the end of ch. VI and the start of ch. XIV.  
\textsuperscript{c} \textit{Lexis}: see chs. XIX-XXII.  
\textsuperscript{d} \textit{Melopoii\=\=a} covers the sung parts of tragedy.  
\textsuperscript{e} This matches the components with chs. I-III's scheme: media = diction, lyric poetry; mode = spectacle (i.e. enactment); objects = plot, character, thought.
αὐτῶν τῶν κέχρηνται τοῖς ἑίδεσι. καὶ γὰρ ὁφείς ἔχει πᾶν ὡς εἴπεῖν καὶ ἢθος καὶ μῦθον καὶ λέξιν καὶ μέλος καὶ διάνοιαν ὦσαύτως. μέγιστον δὲ τοῦτων ἔστιν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων σύστασις. ἡ γὰρ τραγῳδία μίμησις ἐστιν οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ πράξεως καὶ βίου, καὶ εὐδαιμονία καὶ κακοδαιμονία ἐν πράξει ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ τέλος πράξεως τυς ἐστίν, οὐ ποιότηςἐεἰσὶν δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὰ ἡθη ποιοὶ τυνεῖ, κατὰ δὲ τὰς πράξεις εὐδαιμονεῖ η τοῦναντιον. οὐκοιν ὅπως τὰ ἡθη μιμήσωται πράττοντιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἡθη συμπεριλαμβάνουσι διὰ τὰς πράξεις· ὅστε τὰ πράγματα καὶ ὁ μῦθος τέλος τῆς τραγῳδίας, τὸ δὲ τέλος μέγιστον ἀπάντων. ἔτι ἄνευ μὲν πράξεως οὐκ ἂν γένοτο τραγῳδία, ἄνευ δὲ ἡθῶν γένοιτ' ἄν· αἱ γὰρ τῶν νέων τῶν πλείστων ἄθθεις τραγῳδία εἰσίν, καὶ ὅλως ποιηταὶ πολλοὶ τουοῦτοι, ὅτι καὶ τῶν γραφέων Ζεύξεις πρὸς Πολύγνωτον πέποιθεν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πολύγνωτος ἡγαθός ἡθογράφος, ἡ δὲ Ζεύξειδος γραφῆ οὐδὲν ἔχει ἢθος. ἔτι εὰν τις ἐφεξῆς θὴ ῥήσεως ἡθικὰς καὶ λέξει 4 καὶ διανοιαν εὐ πεποιημένας, οὐ ποιήσει ὁ ἦν τῆς τραγῳδίας ἔργον, ἀλλὰ πολὺ ἀμάλλον ἡ καταδεικτέορος τούτως κεχρημένη τραγῳδία, ἐχοῦσα δὲ μῦθον καὶ σύστασιν πραγμάτων. πρὸς

1 αὐτῶν ὡς εἴπεῖν AB: ὡς εἴπεῖν post πᾶν (a13) transpos.

Bywater

2 ὁφεῖς rec.: ὁφις AB
3 πράξεως A: -εων B
4 λέξει καὶ διανοια Vahlen: λέξεις καὶ διανοιας AB
have been used by a majority of poets as their basic elements,\textsuperscript{a} since practically every drama has items of spectacle, character, plot, diction, lyric poetry, and thought, alike. The most important of these things is the structure of events, because tragedy is mimesis not of persons\textsuperscript{b} but of action and life; and happiness and unhappiness consist in action, and the goal\textsuperscript{c} is a certain kind of action, not a qualitative state: it is in virtue of character that people have certain qualities, but through their actions that they are happy or the reverse. So it is not in order to provide mimesis of character that the agents act; rather, their characters are included for the sake of their actions. Thus, the events and the plot are the goal of tragedy, and the goal is the most important thing of all. Besides, without action there could be no tragedy, but without character there could be: in fact, the works of most of the recent poets are lacking in character, and in general there are many such poets (as with Zeuxis' relationship to Polygnotus among painters: Polygnotus is a fine depicter of character, while Zeuxis' painting contains no character).\textsuperscript{d} Again, if someone lays out a string of speeches that express character and are well composed in diction and thought, he will not achieve the stated function of tragedy; much more successful will be a tragedy which, though deficient in these other elements, has a plot and structure of events. In addition, tragedy's most

\textsuperscript{a} Text and sense are here greatly disputed; cf. 52b14.

\textsuperscript{b} I.e. not of personal qualities \textit{per se}.

\textsuperscript{c} Of either drama or life: Ar. may mean both.

\textsuperscript{d} Zeuxis (late 5th cent.) pioneered new techniques of realism; cf. 61b12 (idealisation of human form). Polygnotus: see on 48a5.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΗΛΕΣ

dè τούτους τὰ μέγιστα οἶς ψυχαγωγεῖ ἡ τραγῳδία τοῦ μῦθου μέρη ἔστιν, αὖ τε περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνωρίσεις. ἔτι σημεῖον ὃτι καὶ οἱ ἐγχειροῦντες ποιεῖν πρότερον δύνανται τῇ λέξει καὶ τοῖς ἥθεσιν ἀκριβοῦν ἡ τὰ πράγματα συνιστασθαί, οἶον καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ποιηταὶ σχεδὸν ἄπαντες.

ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἶον ψυχῇ ὁ μῦθος τῆς τραγῳδίας, δεύτερον δὲ τὰ ἥθη (παραπλήσιον γάρ ἔστιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γραφικῆς· εἰ γάρ τις ἐναλεύησε τοῖς καλλίστοις φαρμάκοις χύδην, οὐκ ἢ όμοιός εὐφράνειν καὶ λευκογραφήσας εἰκόνα). ἔστιν τε μίμησις πράξεως καὶ διὰ ταύτην μάλιστα τῶν πραττόντων. τρίτον δὲ ἡ διάνοια: τούτῳ δὲ ἔστιν τὸ λέγειν δύνασθαι τὰ ἐνότα καὶ τὰ ἀρμόττοντα, ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ ῥητορικῆς ἔργων ἔστιν· οἱ μὲν γάρ ἄρχαιοι πολιτικῶς ἐποίουν λέγοντας, οἱ δὲ νῦν ῥητορικῶς. ἔστιν δὲ ἡθος μὲν τὸ τοιοῦτον ὁ δηλοῖ τὴν προαιρέσιν, ὅποια1 τις ἐν οἷς οὐκ ἔστι δὴλον ἡ προαιρεῖται ἡ φεύγει (διόπερ οὖν ἔχουσιν ἡθος τῶν λόγων ἐν οἷς μηδ' ὀλωσ ἔστιν ὃ τι προαιρεῖται ἡ φεύγει ὁ λέγων), διάνοια δὲ ἐν οἷς ἀποδεικνύοντι τι ός ἔστιν ἡ ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ καθόλου τι ἀποφαίνονται. τέταρτον δὲ τῶν μὲν λόγων ἡ λέξις· λέγω δὲ, ὡσπερ πρότερον ἐξήτα, λέξιν εἶναι τὴν διὰ τῆς ὄνομασίας ἐρμηνείαν, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμμετρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων ἔχει τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν. τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἡ μελοποιία μέγιστον τῶν ἡδυσμά-

1 ὅποια τις AB: ὅποια τις Lat.
potent means of emotional effect are components of plot, namely reversals and recognitions.\textsuperscript{a} A further pointer is that apprentice poets can achieve precision in diction and characterisation sooner than structure the events, as likewise with almost all the early poets.

Plot, then, is the first principle and, as it were, soul of tragedy, while character is secondary. (A similar principle also holds in painting: if one were to cover a surface randomly with the finest colours, one would provide less pleasure than by an outline of a picture.) Tragedy is mimesis of action, and it is chiefly for the sake of the action that it represents the agents.\textsuperscript{b} Third in importance is thought: that is, the capacity to say what is pertinent and apt, which in formal speeches is the task of politics and rhetoric. The earliest poets made people speak politically, present day poets make them speak rhetorically. Character is that which reveals moral choice—that is, when otherwise\textsuperscript{c} unclear, what kinds of thing an agent chooses or rejects (which is why speeches in which there is nothing at all the speaker chooses or rejects contain no character); while thought covers the parts in which they demonstrate that something is or is not so, or declare a general view. Fourth is the diction of the spoken sections: as stated earlier, I define diction as expression through choice of words—something which has the same capacity in both verse and prose. Of the remainder, lyric poetry is the greatest embellishment, while spectacle

\textsuperscript{a} See ch. XI for definitions.
\textsuperscript{b} The same principle as 50a16–17.
\textsuperscript{c} Sc. from the action; cf. 54a17–19.
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tων, ἢ δὲ ὡς ψυχαγωγικόν μέν, ἀτεχνώτατον δὲ καὶ
ήκιστα οἰκεῖον τῆς ποιητικῆς· ἢ γὰρ τῆς τραγωδίας
dύναμις καὶ Ἀνέν αγώνος καὶ ὑποκριτῶν ἔστιν, ἐτὶ δὲ
κυριωτέρα περὶ τὴν ἀπέργασίαν τῶν ὅψεων ἡ τοῦ
σκευοποιοῦ τέχνη τῆς τῶν ποιητῶν ἔστιν.
20 VII Διωρισμένων δὲ τούτων, λέγωμεν μετὰ ταῦτα
ποίαν τινα δεὶ τὴν σύστασιν εἶναι τῶν πραγμάτων,
ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο καὶ πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον τῆς τραγω-
dίας ἐστίν. κεῖται δὴ 1 ἡμῖν τὴν τραγωδίαν τελείας
καὶ ολης πράξεως εἶναι μύμησιν ἔχοντος τι μέγε-
θος· ἐστιν γὰρ ὅλον καὶ μηδὲν ἔχουν μέγεθος. ὅλον
dὲ ἐστιν τὸ ἔχον ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευτήν.
ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐστιν ὁ αὐτό μὲν μὴ ἐξ ἀνάγκης μετ᾽ ἄλλο
ἐστιν, μετ᾽ ἐκείνῳ δὲ ἐπεροῦ πέφυκεν εἶναι ἡ γίνε-
σθαι τελευτὴν δὲ τοῦναντίον ὁ αὐτὸ μὲν μετ᾽ ἄλλο
πέφυκεν εἶναι ἡ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἡ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, μετὰ
dὲ τοῦτο ἄλλο οὐδὲν· μέσον δὲ ὁ καὶ αὐτὸ μετ᾽ ἄλλο
καὶ μετ᾽ ἐκείνῳ ἐπεροῦ. δεὶ ἄρα τοὺς συνεστῶτας εὖ
μῦθους μὴθ’ ὁπόθεν ἐτυχεν ἀρχεσθαι μὴθ’ ὁποὺ
ἐτυχε τελευτῶν, ἀλλὰ κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς εἰρημέναις
ἰδέαις. ἐτὶ δ’ ἐπεὶ τὸ καλὸν καὶ ζῶον καὶ ἀπαν
πράγμα δο συνεστῆκεν ἐκ τινῶν οὐ μόνον ταῦτα
30 τεταγμένα δεὶ ἔχουν ἀλλὰ καὶ μέγεθος ὑπάρχειν μὴ
tο τυχόν· τὸ γὰρ καλὸν ἐν μεγεθει καὶ τάξις ἔστιν,
διὸ οὔτε πάρμικρον ἢν τι γένοιτο καλὸν ζῶον
(συνχεῖται γὰρ ἡ θεωρία ἐγγύς τοῦ ἀναισθήτου
χρόνου γνώμενη) οὔτε παμμέγεθες (οὐ γὰρ ἂμα ἡ
θεωρία γίνεται ἂλλ’ οἶχεται τοῖς θεωροῦσι τὸ ἐν καὶ
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is emotionally potent but falls quite outside the art and is not integral to poetry: tragedy's capacity is independent of performance and actors, and, besides, the costumier's\textsuperscript{a} art has more scope than the poet's for rendering effects of spectacle.

Given these definitions, let us next discuss the required qualities of the structure of events, since this is the principal and most important factor in tragedy. We have stipulated that tragedy is mimesis of an action that is complete, whole, and of magnitude (for one can have a whole which lacks magnitude). A whole is that which has a beginning, middle, and end. A beginning is that which does not itself follow necessarily from something else, but after which a further event or process naturally occurs. An end, by contrast, is that which itself naturally occurs, whether necessarily or usually, after a preceding event, but need not be followed by anything else. A middle is that which both follows a preceding event and has further consequences. Well-constructed plots, therefore, should neither begin nor end at an arbitrary point, but should make use of the patterns stated. Besides, a beautiful object, whether an animal or anything else with a structure of parts, should have not only its parts ordered but also an appropriate magnitude: beauty consists in magnitude and order, which is why there could not be a beautiful animal which was either minuscule (as contemplation of it, occurring in an almost imperceptible moment, has no distinctness) or gigantic (as contemplation of it has no cohesion, but those who contemplate it lose a sense of

\textsuperscript{a} Responsible, above all, for mask-making.

\footnote{$\delta\eta$ Bywater: $\delta\varepsilon$ AB}
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΗΛΗ

tο ὅλον ἐκ τῆς θεωρίας), οἷον εἰ μυρίων σταδίων εἰη
ζῷων· ὥστε δεὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων καὶ ἐπὶ
tῶν ζῴων ἔχειν μὲν μέγεθος, τοῦτο δὲ εὐσύνοπτον
ἐναι, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μύθων ἔχειν μὲν μῆκος,
tοῦτο δὲ εὐμνημόνευτον εἶναι. το͜υ δὲ μῆκους ὅρος
ὁ1 μὲν πρὸς τοὺς ἀγώνας καὶ τὴν αὐσθήσειν οὐ τῆς
tέχνης ἔστιν· εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἐκατὸν τραγῳδίας ἀγωνί-
ζουσθαι, πρὸς κλεφύδρας ἢν ἡγονίζοντο, ὥσπερ ποτὲ
cαὶ ἀλλοτέ φασιν. ὦ δὲ κατ’ αὐτὴν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ
πράγματος ὅρος, ἀεὶ μὲν ὃ μείζων μέχρι τοῦ σύνδη-
λος εἶναι καλλίων ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος· ὡς δὲ
ἀπλῶς διορίσαντας εἰπεῖν, ἐν ὅσῳ μεγέθει κατὰ τὸ
εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ἐφεξής γιγνομένων συμβαίνει
eis εὐτυχίαν ἐκ δυστυχίας ἢ ἡ εὐτυχίας εἰς δυστυ-
χίαν μεταβάλλειν, ἰκανὸς ὅρος ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγέθους.

VIII
Μῦθος δ’ ἔστιν εἰς οὐχ ὥσπερ τινὲς οὖνται ἐὰν
περὶ ἕνα ἢ πολλά γὰρ καὶ ἀπειρα τῷ ἐνι συμβαίνει,
εἰς ὃν ἐνώπιον οὐδεὶς ἐστιν ἐν οὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις
ἐνὸς πολλά ἐστι, εἰς ὃν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πράξεις.
διὸ πάντες ἐοικασίων ἀμαρτάνεις ὅσοι τῶν πονητών

20 Ἡρακλῆδα Θησείδα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιήματα
πετοιήκασιν· οὖνται γὰρ, ἐπει ἐϊς ἢν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς,
ἔνα καὶ τὸν μύθον εἶναι προσήκειν. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος
ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διαφέρει καὶ τοῦτ’ ἐοικεν καλῶς

1 ὁ add. Ellebodius

a The ref. is obscure, but Ar.’s rejection of contingent conventions is clear.
unity and wholeness), say an animal a thousand miles long. So just as with our bodies and with animals beauty requires magnitude, but magnitude that allows coherent perception, likewise plots require length, but length that can be coherently remembered. A limit of length referring to competitions and powers of attention is extrinsic to the art: for if it were necessary for a hundred tragedies to compete, they would perform them by water clocks, as they say happened once before. But the limit that conforms to the actual nature of the matter is that greater size, provided clear coherence remains, means finer beauty of magnitude. To state the definition plainly: the size which permits a transformation to occur, in a probable or necessary sequence of events, from adversity to prosperity or prosperity to adversity, is a sufficient limit of magnitude.

A plot is not unified, as some think, if built round an individual. Any entity has innumerable features, not all of which cohere into a unity; likewise, an individual performs many actions which yield no unitary action. So all those poets are clearly at fault who have composed a Heracleid, a Theseid, and similar poems: they think that, since Heracles was an individual, the plot too must be unitary. But Homer, in keeping with his general superiority, evidently grasped well, whether by art or nature, this

b Probability and necessity: Ar.'s recurrent criteria of what makes "natural" sense within human lives.

c On alternative directions of "transformation," see esp. chs. XIII–XIV.

d I.e. unity of "hero" is not a sufficient (or even necessary) condition for unity of plot.

e Sc. of H.'s life.
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ιδεῖν, ἦτοι διὰ τέχνην ἢ διὰ φύσιν. Ὄδύσσειαν γὰρ ποιῶν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἀπαντα ὅσα αὐτῷ συνέβη (οἷον πληγήναι μὲν ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ, μανῆναι δὲ προσποίησασθαι ἐν τῷ ἄγερμῳ), δὲν οὔδεν θατέρου γενομένου ἀναγκαῖον ἢ ἢ εἰκὸς θάτερον γενέσθαι, ἀλλὰ περὶ μίαν πράξιν οἷαν λέγομεν τὴν Ὅδύσσειαν συνεστησάμεν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα. χρῇ οὖν, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις μυθητικαῖς ἢ μία μίμησις ἐνὸς ἔστων, οὐτῳ καὶ τὸν μύθου, ἔπει πράξεως μίμησις ἔστι, μᾶς τε εἶναι καὶ ταύτης ἔννοιας, καὶ τὰ μέρη συνεστάναι τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως ὡστε μετατιθέμενον τῶν μέρους ἢ ἀφαιρομένου διαφέρεσθαι καὶ κωφεῖσθαι τὸ ὅλον' ὃ γὰρ προσὸν ἡ μὴ προσὸν μηδέν ποιεῖ ἐπίδηλον, οὔδεν μόριον τοῦ ὅλου ἐστίν.

IX Φανερὸν δὲ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων καὶ ὅτι οὐ τὸ τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τούτα ποιητοῦ ἔργον ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οἷα ἢ γένοιτο καὶ τὰ δυνατὰ κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον. ὃ γὰρ ἱστορικὸς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς οὗ τῷ ἢ ἐμμετρὰ λέγειν ἢ ἀμετρὰ διαφέρουσιν' εἰη γὰρ ἄν τὰ Ἄριστον εἰς μέτρα τεθῆναι καὶ οὔδεν ἤττον ἢν εἰη ἱστορία τις μετὰ μέτρου ἢ ἄνευ μέτρων· ἅλλα τοῦτω διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἰα ἀν γένοιτο. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἢ δ' ἱστορία τὰ καθ' ἐκαστὸν λέγει. ἐστὶν δὲ καθόλου μὲν, τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποία ἄττα συμβαίνει λέγειν ἢ πράττειν κατὰ τὸ
point too: for though composing an *Odyssey*, he did not include every feature of the hero's life (e.g. his wounding on Parnassus, or his feigned madness in the call to arms), where events lacked necessary or probable connections; but he structured the *Odyssey* round a unitary action of the kind I mean, and likewise with the *Iliad*. Just as, therefore, in the other mimetic arts a unitary mimesis has a unitary object, so too the plot, since it is mimesis of an action, should be of a unitary and indeed whole action; and the component events should be so structured that if any is displaced or removed, the sense of the whole is disturbed and dislocated: since that whose presence or absence has no clear significance is not an integral part of the whole.

It is also evident from what has been said that it is not the poet's function to relate actual events, but the *kinds* of things that might occur and are possible in terms of probability or necessity. The difference between the historian and the poet is not that between using verse or prose; Herodotus' work could be versified and would be just as much a kind of history in verse as in prose. No, the difference is this: that the one relates actual events, the other the kinds of things that might occur. Consequently, poetry is more philosophical and more elevated\(^b\) than history, since poetry relates more of the universal, while history relates particulars.\(^c\) "Universal" means the kinds of things which it suits a certain kind of person to say or do,

\(^a\) Wounding: described, but only as recollection, at *Od.* 19.392–466. The *Od.* never mentions Odysseus' madness, feigned to avoid joining the Trojan expedition.

\(^b\) Of greater ethical import (by philosophical standards); see on 49b24.

\(^c\) On history and particulars cf. 59a21–9.
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eikòs ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, οὐ στοχάζεται ἡ ποίησις ὀνό-
10 ματα ἐπιτιθεμένη· τὸ δὲ καθ’ ἐκαστὸν, τὶ Ἀλκιβιά-
δης ἔπραξεν ἢ τὶ ἐπαθεν. ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς κωμῳδίας
ηδὴ τούτο δῆλον γέγονεν· συστήσαντες γὰρ τὸν
μῦθον διὰ τῶν εἰκότων οὔτω τὰ τυχόντα ὄνοματα
ὑποτιθέασιν, καὶ οὐχ ὡσπερ οἱ ἰαμβοποιοὶ περὶ τὸν
καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ποιοῦσιν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τραγῳδίας τῶν
15 γενομένων ὄνομάτων ἀντέχουνται. αὐτὸν δ’ οὐ τιθα-
νόν ἐστι τὸ δυνατόν· τὰ μὲν οὖν μὴ γενόμενα οὔπω
πιστεύομεν εἰναι δυνατά, τὰ δὲ γενόμενα φανερὸν
ὅτι δυνατά· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐγένετο, εἰ ἦν ἀδύνατα. οὐ
μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ἐν ἐνίαις μὲν ἐν ἣ
20 δύο τῶν γνωρίμων ἐστὶν ὄνομάτων, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα
πεποιημένα, ἐν ἐνίαις δὲ οὐθέν, οἷον ἐν τῷ Ἀγάθω-
νος Ἀνθεί. ὁμοίως γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ τὰ τε πράγματα
καὶ τὰ ὄνοματα πεποίηται, καὶ οὐθέν ἢττον εὐφραί-
νει. ὡστ’ οὐ πάντως εἰναι ζητητέον τῶν παραδεδο-
μένων μῦθων, περὶ οὗς αἱ τραγῳδίαι εἰσίν, ἀντέχε-
σθαι. καὶ γὰρ γελοιον τούτῳ ἕξτειν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ
25 γνώριμα ὀλίγοις γνώριμα ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ὁμοίως εὐφραί-
nει πάντας. δῆλον οὖν ἐκ τούτων ὅτι τὸν ποιητὴν
μᾶλλον τῶν μῦθων εἶναι δὲι ποιητὴν ἢ τῶν μέτρων,
ὅσφος ποιητῆς κατὰ τὴν μίμησιν ἐστίν, μιμεῖται δὲ
tὰς πράξεις. κἂν ἄρα συμβῆ γενόμενα ποιεῖν, οὐθέν
30 ἢττον ποιητῆς ἐστιν· τῶν γὰρ γενομένων ἐνια οὐθέν

1 Ἀνθεὶ Welcker: Ἀνθεὶ AB

a Names denote particulars.
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in terms of probability or necessity: poetry aims for this, even though attaching names\textsuperscript{a} to the agents. A "particular" means, say, what Alcibiades did or experienced. In comedy, this point has by now\textsuperscript{b} become obvious: the poets construct the plot on the basis of probability, and only then supply arbitrary names; they do not, like iambic poets, write about a particular person.\textsuperscript{c} But in tragedy they adhere to the actual\textsuperscript{d} names. The reason is that the possible seems plausible: about the possibility of things which have not occurred we are not yet sure;\textsuperscript{e} but it is evident that actual events are possible—they could not otherwise have occurred. Yet even in some tragedies there are only one or two familiar names, while the rest are invented; and in certain plays no name is familiar, for example in Agathon's Antheus:\textsuperscript{f} in this work, events and names alike have been invented, yet it gives no less pleasure for that. So adherence to the traditional plots of tragedy should not be sought at all costs. Indeed, to seek this is absurd, since even the familiar subjects are familiar only to a minority, yet nonetheless please everyone. It is clear from these points, then, that the poet should be more a maker\textsuperscript{g} of plots than of verses, in so far as he is a poet by virtue of mimesis,\textsuperscript{h} and his mimesis is of actions. So even should his poetry concern actual events, he is no less a poet for that, as there is nothing to prevent

\textsuperscript{a} Some time in the mid-4th cent.: see the Introduction.
\textsuperscript{b} See on 49b8.
\textsuperscript{c} I.e. supplied by the traditional myths (cf. 51b24–5); Ar. treats this, by simplification, as synonymous with historical fact.
\textsuperscript{d} The sentence characterises an ordinary mentality.
\textsuperscript{e} Nothing else is known about this work (TrGF I 161–2); Agathon was active c. 420–400. \textsuperscript{g} Poïētēs means both "maker" and "poet." \textsuperscript{h} Cf. 47b15.
κωλύει τοιαῦτα εἶναι οἷα ἂν εἰκὸς γενέσθαι καὶ δυνατὰ γενέσθαι, καθ’ ὁ ἐκεῖνος αὐτῶν ποιητῆς ἔστιν.

τῶν δὲ ἀπλῶν¹ μῦθων καὶ πράξεων αἱ ἐπεισοδιώδεις εἰσὶν χείρισται: λέγω δὲ ἐπεισοδιώδη μῦθον ἐν ὧ τὰ ἐπεισοδία μετ’ ἄλληλα οὔτ’ εἰκὸς οὔτ’ ἀνάγκη εἶναι. τοιαῦτα δὲ ποιοῦνται ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν φαύλων ποιητῶν δι’ αὐτούς, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἠγαθῶν διὰ τοὺς ὑποκριτάς.² ἀγωνίσματα γὰρ ποιοῦντες καὶ παρὰ τὴν δύναμιν παρατείνοντες τὸν μῦθον πολλάκις διαστρέφειν ἀναγκάζονται τὸ ἔφεξής. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ μόνον τελείας ἐστὶ πράξεως ἡ μίμησις ἀλλὰ καὶ φοβερῶν καὶ ἐλευθῶν, ταῦτα δὲ³ γίνεται καὶ μᾶλλον⁴ ὅταν γένηται παρὰ τὴν δόξαν δι’ ἄλληλα· τὸ γὰρ θαυμαστὸν οὕτως ἔξει μᾶλλον ἢ εἰ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτομάτου καὶ τῆς τύχης, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τύχης ταῦτα θαυμασιώτατα δοκεὶ ὅσα ἄσπερ ἐπίτηδες φαίνεται γεγονέναι, οἷον ὡς ὃ ἄνδρια ὁ τοῦ Μίτυνος ἐν 'Αργείη ἀπέκτεινεν τὸν αἴτιον τοῦ θανάτου τὸν Μίτυν, θεωροῦντι ἐμπεσόν· ἔοικε γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐκ εἰκῆ γίγνεσθαι· ὡστε ἀνάγκη τοὺς τοιούτους εἶναι καλλίους μῦθους.

X Ἐνδιὰ δὲ τῶν μῦθων οἱ μὲν ἀπλοὶ οἱ δὲ πεπληγμένοι καὶ γὰρ αἱ πράξεις ὅν μιμήσεις οἱ μῦθοι εἰσὶν ὑπάρχουσιν εὐθὺς οὕσα τοιαῦτα. λέγω δὲ ἀπλὴν ἀπλῶν AB (om. Arab.): ἀπελών Essen

² υποκριτάς AB: κριτάς rec.
³ δὲ A: om. B
⁴ μάλιστα καὶ μᾶλλον AB: καὶ μ. del. Ellebodius
POETICS 10

some actual events being probable as well as possible, and it is through probability that the poet makes his material from them.

Of simple\textsuperscript{a} plots and actions, the episodic are worst. By "episodic" I mean a plot in which the episodes follow one another without probability or necessity. Such plays are composed by bad poets through their own fault, and by good poets for the sake of the actors: for in composing show pieces,\textsuperscript{b} and stretching the plot beyond its capacity, they are often forced to distort the continuity. Given that the mimesis is not only of a complete action but also of fearful and pitiable matters, the latter arise above all when events occur contrary to expectation yet on account of one another. The awesome\textsuperscript{c} will be maintained in this way more than through show of chance and fortune, because even among chance events we find most awesome those which seem to have happened by design (as when Mitys' statue at Argos killed the murderer of Mitys, by falling on him as he looked at it:\textsuperscript{d} such things seem not to occur randomly). And so, such plots are bound to be finer.

Plots can be divided into the simple and complex, since the actions which plots represent are intrinsically of these kinds. I call "simple" an action which is continuous,

\textsuperscript{a} The term is defined in ch. X; its occurrence here has been questioned.
\textsuperscript{b} Works designed to lend themselves to histrionic brilliance.
\textsuperscript{c} Awe (or "wonder") will be aroused by something astonishing and suggestive of deeper significance: cf. 60a11–18.
\textsuperscript{d} Or "when he was visiting the festival"; the story is otherwise unknown, but M. (if the same) is mentioned at Dem. 59.33.
μὲν πρᾶξιν ἡς γνωμένης ὡσπερ ὁρισταὶ συνεχοὺς καὶ μιᾶς ἄνευ περιπετείας ἡ ἀναγνώρισμοῦ ἡ μετά-
βασις γίνεται, πεπλεγμένην δὲ ἐξ ἡς μετὰ ἀναγνω-
ρισμοῦ ἡ περιπετείας ἡ ἁμφοῖν ἡ μετάβασις ἐστιν. 
ταῦτα δὲ δεὶ γίνεσθαι ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ 
μύθου, ὡστε ἐκ τῶν προγεγενημένων συμβαίνειν ἡ 
ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἡ κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς γίγνεσθαι ταῦτα· διαφέ-
ρει γὰρ πολὺ τὸ γίγνεσθαι τάδε διὰ τάδε ἡ μετὰ 
tάδε.

XI

Ἑστὶ δὲ περιπετεία μὲν ἡ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν 
πραττομένων μεταβολὴ καθάπερ ἐνρηταί, καὶ τούτῳ 
δὲ ὡσπερ λέγομεν κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἡ ἀναγκαῖον, οἷον 
ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι ἐλθὼν ὡς εὐφρανῶν τὸν Οἰδίπον καὶ 
ἀπαλλάξων τού πρὸς τὴν μητέρα φόβου, δηλώσας 
ὅσ ἢν, τοῦνατίον ἐποίησεν· καὶ ἐν τῷ Δανάς ἀκολου-
θῶν ὡς ἀποκτενῶν, τὸν μὲν συνέβη ἐκ τῶν πεπρα-
γμένων ἀποθανεῖν, τὸν δὲ σωθῆναι. ἀναγνώρισις 
δὲ, ὡσπερ καὶ τούνομα σημαίνει, ἐξ ἀγνοίας εἰς 
γνῶσιν μεταβολῆ, ἡ εἰς φιλίαι ἡ ἔχθραιν, τῶν πρὸς 
eυτυχίαιν ἡ δυστυχίαιν ὁρισμένων καλλίστη δὲ ἀνα-
γνώρισις, ὅταν ἀμα περιπετεία ¹ γένηται, οἷον ἔχει ἡ 
ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι. εἰςών μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀλλαὶ ἀναγνωρί-
σεις· καὶ ² γὰρ πρὸς ἅψυχα καὶ τὰ τυχόντα ἐστιν ³

¹ περιπετεία γένηται Gomperz: περιπέτεια γένηται B; περιπέτεια γίνονται A
² καὶ γὰρ . . . ἀναγνωρίσται om. B
³ ἐστὶν ως ὡσπερ Spengel: ἐστὶν ὡσπερ A
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in the sense defined, and unitary, but whose transformation lacks reversal and recognition; "complex," one whose transformation contains recognition or reversal or both. And these elements should emerge from the very structure of the plot, so that they ensue from the preceding events by necessity or probability; as it makes a great difference whether things happen because of, or only after, their antecedents.

Reversal is a change to the opposite direction of events, as already stated, and one in accord, as we insist, with probability or necessity: as when in the Oedipus the person who comes to bring Oedipus happiness, and intends to rid him of his fear about his mother, effects the opposite by revealing Oedipus' true identity. And in the Lyceus, the one figure is led off to die, while Danaus follows with the intention of killing him, yet the upshot of events is Danaus' death and the other's survival. Recognition, as the very name indicates, is a change from ignorance to knowledge, leading to friendship or to enmity, and involving matters which bear on prosperity or adversity. The finest recognition is that which occurs simultaneously with reversal, as with the one in the Oedipus.

There are, of course, other kinds of recognition too, since what has been stated occurs, after a fashion, in

---

*a* In ch. VII's schema of beginning, middle, end.

*b* Between prosperity and adversity; see on 51a13–14.

*c* An unclear back ref.: 52a4, "contrary to expectation," is the likeliest point.

*d* Soph. OT 924–1085; Ar. refers to two stages in the scene (cf. 989 ff, esp. 1002–3).

*e* Probably Theodeuctes; see on 55b29.

*f* See on 53b15.

*g* Unclear: the reversal begins at Soph. OT 924 (cf. 52a24–6); Jocasta sees the truth by 1056, Oedipus only in the lead-up to 1182.

*h* I.e. in the preceding definition.
35 ὡς ὅπερ έδρηται συμβαίνει, καὶ εἰ πέπραγέ τις ἡ μὴ πέπραγεν ἔστιν ἀναγνώρισαι. ἀλλ' ἡ μάλιστα τοῦ μύθου καὶ ἡ μάλιστα τῆς πράξεως ἡ εἰρημένη ἔστιν· ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη ἀναγνώρισις καὶ περιπέτεια ἡ ἔλεον ἐξεῖ ἡ φόβου, οἷων πράξεων ἡ τραγῳδία μέμησις ὑπόκειται· ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀτυχεῖν καὶ τὸ εὐτυχεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων συμβήσεται. ἐπεὶ δὴ ἡ ἀναγνώρισις τινῶν ἔστιν ἀναγνώρισις, αἱ μὲν εἰςι θατέρου πρὸς τὸν ἑτερον μόνων, ὅταν ἡ δήλος ἀτερος τῆς ἔστιν, ὅτε δὲ ἀμφοτέρους δεῖ ἀναγνωρίσαι, οἷον ἡ μὲν Ἰφιγε- νεία τῷ Ὀρέστῃ ἀνεγνωρίσθη ἐκ τῆς πέμψεως τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ἐκείνου δὲ πρὸς τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν ἄλλης ἐδεὶ ἀναγνωρίσεως.

δύο μὲν οὖν τοῦ μύθου μέρη ταῦτ' ἔστιν, περιπέ-
τεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις. τρίτον δὲ πάθος. τοῦτων δὲ
10 περιπέτεια μὲν καὶ ἀναγνώρισις έδρηται, πάθος δὲ ἔστι πραξις φθαρτική ἡ ὀδυνηρά, οἷον οὗ τε ἐν τῷ φανερῷ θάνατοι καὶ αἱ περιωδυνίαι καὶ τρώσεις καὶ ὀστα τοιάτα.

XII Μέρη δὲ τραγῳδίας οἷς μὲν ὡς εἴδος δεῖ χρη-
σθαι πρότερον εἴπομεν, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ποσόν καὶ εἰς ἄ
15 διαφέρεται κεχωρισμένα τάδε ἔστιν, πρόλογος ἐπεισ-
όδιου ἐξουσίων χορικών, καὶ τούτου τὸ μὲν πάροδός τὸ
dὲ στάσιμον, κοινά μὲν ἀπάντων ταύτα, ὕδαι δὲ τὰ
ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ κομμοῦ. ἔστιν δὲ πρόλογος μὲν
μέρος οἷον τραγῳδίας τὸ πρὸ χοροῦ παρόδου, ἐπ-

1 ἐτὶ δὲ AB: ἐτεὶ δὴ Vahlen
2 ἐκείνου Bywater: -ω AB
relation to inanimate and even chance things, and it is also possible to recognise that someone has or has not committed a deed. But the kind most integral to the plot and action is the one described: such a joint recognition and reversal will yield either pity or fear, just the type of actions of which tragedy is taken to be a mimesis; besides, both adversity and prosperity will hinge upon such circumstances. Now, because recognition is recognition between people, a some cases involve only the relation of one party to the other (when the other’s identity is clear), while in others there is need for double recognition: thus, Iphigenia was recognised by Orestes through the sending of the letter, but for Iphigenia to recognise his relation to herself required a further recognition. b

These, then, are two components of the plot—reversal and recognition. A third is suffering. Of these, reversal and recognition have been explained, and suffering is a destructive or painful action, such as public deaths, physical agony, woundings, etc.

We spoke earlier c of the components of tragedy that must be used as basic elements; but its formal and discrete sections are as follows: prologue, episode, exodos, choral unit (further divisible into parodos and stasimon). These are common to all plays, but actors’ songs and komoi are special to some. The prologue is the whole portion of a tragedy prior to the chorus’ parodos; an episode

a Ar. ignores recognition of inanimate objects, mentioned above.
b Eur. IT 727–841.
c Cf. esp. 50a9–14.
ARISTOTLE

20 εἰσόδιον δὲ μέρος ὅλον τραγῳδίας τὸ μεταξὺ ὅλων χορικῶν μελῶν, ἐξόδους δὲ μέρος ὅλον τραγῳδίας μεθ᾽ ὣς οὐκ ἔστι χοροῦ μέλος· χορικοῦ δὲ πάροδος μὲν ἡ πρώτη λέξις ὅλῃ¹ χοροῦ, στάσιμον δὲ μέλος χοροῦ τὸ ἀνευ ἀναπαύστων καὶ τροχαίον, κομμὸς δὲ θρήνου κοινὸς χοροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς. μέρη δὲ τραγῳδίας οἷς μὲν ὡς² εἴδεσι δεῖ χρήσθαι πρότερον εἰπάμεν, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ποσὸν καὶ εἰς ᾗ διαίρεται κεχωρισμένα ταῦτ᾽ ἔστιν.

XIII Ὡν δὲ δεὶ στοχάζεσθαι καὶ ὃ δεῖ εὐλαβεῖσθαι συνυστάντας τοὺς μεθούς καὶ πόθεν ἔσται τὸ τῆς τραγῳδίας ἔργον, ἐφεξῆς ἂν εἰη λεκτέω τοῖς νῦν εἰρημένοις. ἔπειδὴ οὖν δεὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν εἶναι τῆς καλλιστής τραγῳδίας μὴ ἀπλὴν ἀλλὰ πεπλεγμένην καὶ ταῦτην φοβερῶν καὶ ἔλεεων εἶναι μμηκικὴν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦδιον τῆς τοιαύτης μμηκικῆς ἔστιν), πρῶτον μὲν δὴ λοιπὸν ὅτι οὔτε τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς ἄνδρας δεῖ μεταβάλλοντας φαύνεσθαι εὔ τυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν, οὐ γὰρ φοβερῶν οὔτε ἔλεεων τούτο ἀλλὰ μιαρῶν ἔστιν· οὔτε τοὺς μοχθηροὺς εὔ τυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν, ἀτραγῳδοτατον γὰρ τοῦτ ἐστὶ πάντων, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔχει ὧν δεῖ, οὔτε γὰρ φιλάνθρωπον οὔτε ἔλεεων οὔτε φοβερῶν ἔστιν· οὔδ᾽ αὐ τὸν σφόδρα ποιηρῶν εὔ τυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν μεταπίπτειν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ φιλάνθρωπον ἔχοι ἃν ἡ τοιαύτη σύστασις

1 ὅλῃ Susemihl: ὅλον AB  
2 ὡς εἴδεσι rec.: om. AB

a Usually accompanying their entrance onto the scene.
is the whole portion of a tragedy between complete choral songs; the exodos is the whole portion of a tragedy following the final choral song. Of choral units, the parodos is the first complete utterance\(^a\) of the chorus; a stasimon is a choral song without anapaestic and trochaic rhythms;\(^b\) a kommos is a dirge shared between chorus and actors. We spoke earlier of the components of tragedy that must be used as basic elements, while its formal and discrete sections are the ones given.

Next, after the foregoing discussion, we must consider what should be aimed at and avoided in the construction of plots, and how tragedy’s effect is to be achieved. Since, then, the structure of the finest tragedy should be complex not simple,\(^c\) as well as representing fearful and pitiable events (for this is the special feature of such mimesis), it is, to begin with, clear that neither should decent men be shown changing from prosperity to adversity, as this is not fearful nor yet pitiable but repugnant,\(^d\) nor the depraved changing from adversity to prosperity, because this is the least tragic of all, possessing none of the necessary qualities, since it arouses neither fellow-feeling\(^e\) nor pity nor fear. Nor, again, should tragedy show the very wicked person falling from prosperity to adversity: such a pattern might arouse fellow-feeling, but not pity or fear, since the one is felt

\(^a\) Both do in fact occur in stasima; Ar. may be thinking of “recitative” units, such as the marching anapaests of choral parodoi, or trochaic tetrameters (see on 49a21).

\(^b\) In the senses defined in ch. X.

\(^c\) Cf. 53b39, 54a3.

\(^d\) Philanthrōpia: a disputed concept; it may entail either a broadly humane sympathy (even with some forms of merited suffering), or a basic sense of justice. Cf. 56a21.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΗΛΕ

άλλ’ οὐτε ἔλεον οὐτε φόβον, ὦ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον ἔστων δυστυχοῦντα, ὦ δὲ περὶ τὸν ὁμοιον

5 (ἔλεος μὲν περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον, φόβος δὲ περὶ τὸν ὁμοιον), ὥστε οὔτε ἔλεεινον οὔτε φοβερον ἔσται τὸ συμβαίνον. ὦ μεταξὺ ἂρα τούτων λουπός. ἔστι δὲ τουούτος ὦ μῆτε ἅρετη διαφέρων καὶ δικαιοσύνης μῆτε διὰ κακίας καὶ μοιχηρίαις μεταβάλλων εἰς τὴν δυστυχίαν ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀμαρτίαιν τινά, τῶν ἐν μεγάλῃ δόξῃ ὄντων καὶ εὐτυχία, οἴον Οἰδίπους καὶ Θεόστης καὶ οἱ ἐκ τῶν τουούτων γενῶν ἐπιφανεῖς ἄνδρες. ἀνάγκη ἄρα τὸν καλῶς ἔχοντα μῦθον ἀπλοῦν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἡ διπλοῦν, ὥσπερ τών ἔφαινε, καὶ μεταβάλ- λεων οὐκ εἰς εὐτυχίαν ἐκ δυστυχίας ἀλλὰ τοιούτων ἐξ εὐτυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν μὴ διὰ μοιχηρίαις ἀλλὰ
di’ ἀμαρτίαιν μεγάλῃ ἡ οἴον ἔρηται ἡ βελτίωνος μᾶλλον ἡ χείρονος. (σημεῖον δὲ καὶ τὸ γεγονόμενον πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς τυχόντας μῦθον αἰτηρίθμον, νῦν δὲ περὶ ὅλιγας οἰκίας οἱ κάλλισται τραγῳδίαι συντίθενται, οἴον περὶ Ἀλκμέωνα καὶ

10 Οἰδίπους καὶ Ὀρέστην καὶ Μελέαγρον καὶ Θεόστην καὶ Τήλεφον καὶ ὅσοις ἄλλοις συμβέβηκεν ἡ παθήν δεινὰ ἡ ποιήσατο.) ἡ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν τέχνην καλλιστη τραγῳδία ἐκ ταύτης τῆς συστάσεως ἐστὶ. διὸ καὶ οἱ Ἑὐριπίδης ἐγκαλοῦντες τὸ αὐτὸ ἀμαρτάνοντιν

1 ἔλεος ... ὁμοιον om. B

Hamartia: the term, repeated at 53a16, could cover a range of possible factors in tragic agency. See the Introduction.
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for the undeserving victim of adversity, the other for one like ourselves (pity for the undeserving, fear for one like ourselves); so the outcome will be neither pitiable nor fearful. This leaves, then, the person in-between these cases. Such a person is someone not preeminent in virtue and justice, and one who falls into adversity not through evil and depravity, but through some kind of error; and one belonging to the class of those who enjoy great renown and prosperity, such as Oedipus, Thyestes, and eminent men from such lineages. The well-made plot, then, ought to be single rather than double, as some maintain, with a change not to prosperity from adversity, but on the contrary from prosperity to adversity, caused not by depravity but by a great error of a character either like that stated, or better rather than worse. (Actual practice too points to this. Originally, the poets recounted any and every story, but nowadays the finest tragedies are composed about only a few families, such as Alcmæon, Oedipus, Orestes, Meleager, Thyestes, Telephus, and as many others as have suffered or perpetrated terrible things.) So the finest tragedy of which the art permits follows this structure. Which is why the same mistake is

b T., King of Mycenae, was deceived by his brother, Atreus, into eating his own children; he also committed unwitting incest with his daughter, Pelopia. Cf. OCD s.v. Atreus.

c The same Greek adj. as “simple” in ch. X; but the context dictates a separate sense here. d Alcmæon: see on 53b24. Oedipus and Orestes: see e.g. ch. XI. Meleager: killed by the agency of his mother, Althæa, after he had killed her brother(s). Thyestes: see on 53a11. Telephus: Ar. may have in mind his unwitting killing of his uncles; cf. OCD s.v.

e As made by those who prefer double plots (53a13).
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΗΣ

25 ὁτι τοῦτο δρᾶ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις καὶ αἱ πολλαὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς δυστυχίαν τελευτῶσιν. τοῦτο γάρ ἔστιν ὀσπερ ἔρηται ὀρθῶν σημείων δὲ μέγιστον ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν σκηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων τραγικῶταται αἱ τοι- αύται φαίνονται, ἂν κατορθωθῶσιν, καὶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης, εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὴ εὐ ὁικονομεῖ, ἄλλα τραγικῶτατός γε τῶν ποιητῶν φαίνεται. δευτέρα δὴ ἡ πρώτη λεγο- μένη ὑπὸ τινῶν ἔστιν σύστασις, ἡ διπλὴ τε τῆν σύστασιν ἔχουσα καθάπερ ἡ Ὀδύσσεια καὶ τελευ- τῶσα ἐξ ἐναντίας τοῖς βελτίωσι καὶ χειροσιν. δοκεῖ δὲ εἶναι πρώτη διὰ τὴν τῶν θεάτρων ἀσθένειαν ἀκο- λουθοῦσι γὰρ οἱ ποιηταὶ καὶ εὐχὴν ποιοῦντες τοῖς θεαταῖς. ἐστιν δὲ οὖχ αὕτη ἀπὸ τραγῳδίας ἡδονὴ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῆς κωμῳδίας οἰκεία· ἐκεῖ γὰρ οἱ ἀν ἔχθιστοι ὅσιν ἐν τῷ μῦθῳ, οἶνον Ὀρέστης καὶ Αἴγιν- σθος, φίλοι γενόμενοι ἐπὶ τελευτῆς ἑξέρχονται, καὶ ἀποθνῄσκει οὖδεις ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς.

1453b Ἔστιν μὲν οὖν τὸ φοβερὸν καὶ ἐλεεινὸν ἐκ τῆς ὀψεως γίνεσθαι, ἐστιν δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὕτης τῆς συστά- σεως τῶν πραγμάτων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πρότερον καὶ ποιη- τοῦ ἀμείνονος. δεὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀνεν τοῦ ὁρᾶν οὔτω συν- εστάναι τὸν μύθον ὅστε τὸν ἀκούοντα τὰ πράγματα γινόμενα καὶ φρίττειν καὶ ἐλεεῖν ἐκ τῶν συμβαίνον-

1 καὶ αἱ Knebel: καὶ Α: αἱ Β
2 οἱ ἀν Bonitz: ἄν οἱ ΑΒ
made by those who complain that Euripides does this in his plays, and that most\textsuperscript{a} end in adversity. For this, as explained, is the right way. And the greatest indication of this is that in theatrical contests such plays are found the most tragic, if successfully managed; and Euripides, even if he does not arrange other details well, is at least found the most tragic of the poets. Second-best is the structure held the best by some people: the kind with a double structure like the \textit{Odyssey} and with opposite outcomes for good and bad characters. It is thought to be best because of the weakness of audiences: the poets follow, and pander to the taste of, the spectators. Yet this is not the pleasure to expect from tragedy, but is more appropriate to comedy, where those who are deadliest enemies in the plot, such as Orestes and Aegisthus,\textsuperscript{b} exit at the end as new friends, and no one dies at anyone's hands.

Now, what is fearful and pitiable can result from spectacle,\textsuperscript{c} but also from the actual structure of events, which is the higher priority and the aim of a superior poet. For the plot should be so structured that, even without seeing it performed, the person who hears the events that occur experiences horror\textsuperscript{d} and pity at what

\textsuperscript{a} Or, on a different textual reading, "many"; it is anyway unclear why Eur. should be singled out for such criticism.

\textsuperscript{b} Lover of Clytemnestra, Orestes' mother, with whom he plotted to kill her husband, Agamemnon. Ar. envisages a burlesque treatment which avoids the usual revenge killing of Aegisthus by Orestes.

\textsuperscript{c} See on 49b33.

\textsuperscript{d} Here, and only here, Ar. uses a verb which literally means to "shudder" with fear.
ἈΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

των ἀπερ ἄν πάθοι τις ἰκούνων τὸν τοῦ Οἰδίπου μῦθον. τὸ δὲ διὰ τῆς ὦψεως τοῦτο παρασκευάζειν ἀτεχνότερον καὶ χορηγίας δεόμενόν ἐστιν. οἱ δὲ μὴ τὸ φοβερὸν διὰ τῆς ὦψεως ἀλλὰ τὸ τερατώδες μόνον παρασκευάζοντες οὐδὲν τραγῳδίας κοινωνοῦσιν· οὐ γὰρ πάσαν δὲὶ ζητεῖν ἢδονὴν ἀπὸ τραγῳδίας ἀλλὰ τὴν οἰκείαν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ ἐλέον καὶ φόβου διὰ μυθήσεως δὲὶ ἢδονὴν παρασκευάζειν τὸν ποιητήν, φανερὸν ὡς τούτῳ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐμποιητέον.

ποία οὖν δεινὰ ἡ ποία οἰκτρά φαίνεται τῶν συμπιπτόντων, λάβωμεν. ἀνάγκη δὴ ἡ φίλων εἶναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὰς τοιαύτας πράξεις ἡ ἐχθρῶν ἡ μηδέτερον. ἂν μὲν οὖν ἐχθρῶς ἐχθρῶν, οὐδὲν ἐλευ- νὸν ὅτε ποιῶν οὐτε μέλλων, πλὴν κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος· οὐδ’ ἂν μηδέτερως ἔχοντες· ὅταν δ’ ἐν ταῖς φιλίαις ἐγγένηται τὰ πάθη, οἶον ἡ ἄδελφος ἄδελφον ἡ υἱὸς πατέρα ἡ μητέρα υἱὸν ἡ μητέρα ἀπο- κτείνῃ ἡ μέλλῃ ἡ τὶ ἄλλο τοιοῦτον δρα, ταύτα ζητη- τέον. τοὺς μὲν οὖν παρειλημμένους μῦθους λύειν οὐκ ἐστιν, λέγω δὲ ὁ Όρεστος τὴν Κλυταιμνήστραν ἀποδει- νοῦσαν ὕπο τοῦ Ἐρέστου καὶ τὴν Ἐρεύνην ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλκμέωνος, αὐτὸν δὲ εὐρύτερον δεὶ καὶ τοὺς παραδε- δομένους χρησθαι καλῶς. τὸ δὲ καλῶς τὶ λέγομεν, εἰπωμεν σαφέστερον. ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ οὔτω γίνεσθαι τὴν πρᾶξιν, ὡσπερ οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐποίουν εἰδότας καὶ

1 δὴ Spengel: δὲ AB

---

a Soph. OT, as usual; Ar. may have in mind recitation (a common Greek practice), rather than mere plot summary.
POETICS 14

comes about (as one would feel when hearing the plot of the Oedipus). To create this effect through spectacle has little to do with the poet’s art, and requires material resources. Those who use spectacle to create an effect not of the fearful but only of the sensational have nothing at all in common with tragedy, as it is not every pleasure one should seek from tragedy, but the appropriate kind. And since the poet should create the pleasure which comes from pity and fear through mimesis, obviously this should be built into the events.

Let us, then, take up the question of what sorts of incidents strike us as terrible or pitiable. Now, such actions must occur between friends, enemies, or neutrals. Well, if enemy acts towards enemy, there is nothing pitiable in either the deed or the prospect of it, except for the suffering as such; nor if the parties are neutrals. What tragedy must seek are cases where the sufferings occur within relationships, such as brother and brother, son and father, mother and son, son and mother—when the one kills (or is about to kill) the other, or commits some other such deed. Now, one cannot break up the transmitted stories (I mean, e.g., Clytemnestra’s death at Orestes’ hands, and Eriphyle’s at Alcmaeon’s), but the poet should be inventive as well as making good use of traditional stories. Let me explain more clearly what I mean by “good use.” First, the action can occur as in the early

\[ b \] Cf. the final sentence of ch. VI.
\[ c \] Philoi, “friends,” here embraces all (esp. kin) who share strong personal or social ties.
\[ d \] Defined at the end of ch. XI.
\[ e \] See on 53a37.
\[ f \] A. killed his mother (in different versions) either accidentally (in Astydamas, 53b33), or to avenge his father, Amphiarao.
ARISTOTLE

γυνώσκοντας, καθάπερ καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἔποίησεν ἀποκτείνουσαν τοὺς παῖδας τὴν Μῆδειαν· ἐστὶν δὲ πρᾶξαι μὲν, ἀγνοοῦντας δὲ πρᾶξαι τὸ δεινὸν, εἰθ' ὤστερον ἀναγνωρίσαι τὴν φιλίαν, ὤσπερ ὁ Σοφοκλέους Οἰδίπους· τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἔξω τοῦ δράματος, ἐν δ' αὐτῇ τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ οἶον ὁ Ἀλκμέων ἀστυνδάμαντος ἢ ὁ Τηλέγονος ἢ ἐν τῷ τραυματίᾳ Ὀδυσσεί. ἔτι δὲ τρίτων παρὰ ταῦτα τὸ μέλλοντα ποιεῖν τι τῶν ἀνηκέστων δι' ἄγνοιαν ἀναγνωρίσαι πρὶν ποιῆσαι. καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὖν ἔστιν ἄλλως· ἢ γὰρ πρᾶξαι ἀνάγκη ἢ μὴ καὶ εἰδότας ἢ μὴ εἰδότας. τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν γνώσκοντα μελλῆσαι καὶ μὴ πρᾶξαι χείριστον· τὸ τε γὰρ μιαρὸν ἔχει, καὶ οὐ τραγικὸν· ἀπαθὲς γάρ. διότι οὐδεὶς ποιεῖ ὁμοίως, εἰ μὴ ὀλυγάκις, οἶον ἐν Ἀντιγόνῃ τὸν Κρέοντα ὁ Ἀἰμων. τὸ δὲ πρᾶξαι δεύτερον. βέλτιον δὲ τὸ ἀγνοοῦντα μὲν πρᾶξαι, πράξαντα δὲ ἀναγνωρίσαν· τὸ τε γὰρ μιαρὸν οὐ πρόσεστιν καὶ ἢ ἀναγνώρισις ἐκπληκτικὸν. κράτιστον δὲ τὸ τελευταῖον, λέγω δὲ οἶον ἐν τῷ

1 post Μῆδειαν lacunam stat. Gudeman (cf. “quod non faciat . . . ubi cognoscunt,” Arab.)
2 Ἀλκμαίων ὁ Vettori: ἀλκμαίωνος AB
3 τὸ Theod. Rentius, Bonitz: τὸν AB

a Medea’s deliberate killing of her children, in Eur.'s play, was probably an innovation in the myth.
b Astydamas junior, active 370s-340s; OCD s.v., TrGF I no. 60.
c Apparently a variant title of Soph.'s Odysseus Akanthoplēx,
poets who made the agents act in knowledge and cognisance (as Euripides too made Medea kill her children).\textsuperscript{a} Alternatively, the agents can commit the terrible deed, but do so in ignorance, then subsequently recognise the relationship, as with Sophocles’ Oedipus: here, of course, the deed is outside the play, but cases within the tragedy are, for instance, Alcmaeon in Astydamas,\textsuperscript{b} or Telegonus in \textit{Odysseus Wounded}.\textsuperscript{c} This leaves a third\textsuperscript{d} possibility, when the person is on the point of unwittingly committing something irremediable, but recognises it before doing so. These are the only patterns; either the action is or is not executed, and by agents who either know or do not know its nature. Of these, the worst is for someone to be about to act knowingly, and yet not do so: this is both repugnant\textsuperscript{e} and untragic (since it lacks suffering). That is why no one makes such plots, or only rarely, for instance with Haemon and Creon in \textit{Antigone}.\textsuperscript{f} Next worst is execution of the deed.\textsuperscript{g} Better is the act done in ignorance, and followed by recognition: there is nothing repugnant here, and the recognition is thrilling. But best is the last option.\textsuperscript{h} I mean, for example, in \textit{Cresphontes}\textsuperscript{i} Merope is in which Telegonus, son of Odysseus by Circe, unwittingly killed his father in combat.

\textsuperscript{a} But Ar.’s first possibility, at 27–9, concealed another (about to act in ignorance, yet failing to do so: see 37–8), yielding four types altogether. \textsuperscript{b} Cf. 52b36.

\textsuperscript{c} At Soph. \textit{Ant.} 1226–34 the messenger relates Haemon’s abortive attempt to kill his father.

\textsuperscript{d} I.e. in full knowledge.

\textsuperscript{e} Often thought to contradict ch. XIII; yet Ar. sees great scope for pity and fear in narrowly averted catastrophes.

\textsuperscript{f} Eur.’s: M. recognised her son when on the very point of killing him in his sleep.
5 Κρεσφόντη ἡ Μερότη μέλλει τῶν ὦν ἀποκτείνειν, ἀποκτείνει δὲ οὐ, ἄλλ' ἀνεγνώρισε, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰφυγενείᾳ ἡ ἀδελφή τῶν ἄδελφῶν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλη ὁ ὦν τῆν μητέρα ἐκδιδόναι μέλλων ἀνεγνώρισεν. διὰ γὰρ τούτο, ὦπερ πάλαι εἰρήται, οὐ περὶ πολλὰ γένη αἱ τραγῳδίαι εἰσίν. ᾿Ζητοῦντες γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ τέχνης ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τύχης ἔφρον τὸ τουτόν παρασκευάζειν ἐν τοῖς μυθοῖς· ἀναγκάζονται οὖν ἐπὶ ταῦτα τὰς οἰκίας ἀπαντῶν ὅσαις τὰ τοιώτα συμβεβηκε πάθη. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων συστάσεως καὶ ποίους τινὰς εἶναι δεῖ τοὺς μύθους εἰρήται ἰκανῶς.

XV Περὶ δὲ τᾷ ἡθη τέταρα ἔστιν ὅν δεὶ στοχάζεσθαι, ἐν μὲν καὶ πρῶτον, ὅπως χρηστα ἦ. ἔξει δὲ ἡθος μὲν ἐὰν ὠσπέρ ἠλέηθη ποιῇ φανερὸν ὁ λόγος ἡ πρᾶξις προαιρεσίν τινα ἡ1 τις ἄν ἦ, χρηστὸν δὲ ἐὰν χρηστήν. ἔστιν δὲ ἐν ἐκάστῳ γένει· καὶ γάρ γυνὴ ἔστιν χρηστή καὶ δοῦλος, καίτοι γε ἑσώς τούτων τὸ μὲν χεῖρον, τὸ δὲ ὅλως φαυλὸν ἔστιν. δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ἁμοόττonta· ἔστιν γὰρ ἀνδρείων μὲν τὸ ἡθος, ἄλλ' οὖχ ἁμοόττον γυναικείο ὁὕτως2 ἀνδρείων ἡ δεινὴ εἶναι. τρίτον δὲ τὸ ὁμοιον. τούτο γὰρ ἔτερον τοῦ χρηστοῦ τὸ ἡθος καὶ ἁμοόττον ποιήσαι ὡς προείρηται. τέταρτον δὲ τὸ ὁμαλόν. κἂν γὰρ ἀνώμαλος τις ἦ τῇ τὴν μίμησιν παρέχων καὶ τοιοῦτον ἡθος ὑποτεῆ,3 ὁμος ὁμαλῶς ἀνώμαλον δεὶ εἶναι. ἔστιν δὲ

1 ἡ τις ἀν add. Vahlen: om. AB
2 οὕτως Vahlen: οὗ τὸ B: **τῶ A: τὸ rec.
3 ὑποτεῆ B: ὑποτεῖθεις A
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about to kill her son, but recognises him in time; likewise with sister and brother in *Iphigeneia*; and in *Helle* the son recognises his mother when about to hand her over. Hence, as I said previously, not many families provide subjects for tragedies. In their experiments, it was not art but chance that made the poets discover how to produce such effects in their plots; thus they are now obliged to turn to the families which such sufferings have befallen. Enough, then, has now been said about the structure of events and the required qualities of plots.

XV As regards characters, four things should be aimed at—first and foremost, that they be good. Characterisation appears when, as said earlier, speech or action reveals the nature of a moral choice; and good character when the choice is good. Good character exists in each class of person: there is a good woman and good slave, even if the first of these is an inferior class, the other wholly paltry. The second aim is appropriateness: there is courage of character, but it is inappropriate for a woman to be courageous or clever in this way. The third aim is likeness, which is distinct from making the character good and appropriate as indicated. Fourth is consistency: even if the subject represented is someone inconsistent, and such character is presupposed, he should still be con-

---

a Eur. *IT* 727 ff.  
b Play unknown.  
c Since “elevated” characters are a defining feature of tragedy; cf. esp. 48a16–18.  
d 50b8–10; in fact, the earlier definition was narrower, mentioning only “speech.”  
e Character encompasses intellectual virtues; cf. *Eth. Nic.* VI.  
f As the rest of the sentence suggests, likeness in basic humanity: cf. “like us” at e.g. 48a5–6.
παράδειγμα ποιηρίας μὲν ἦθους μὴ ἀναγκαίας¹ οἴον
ὁ Μενέλαος ὁ ἐν τῷ Ὄρέστῃ, τοῦ δὲ ἀπρεποῦς καὶ
μὴ ἀρμόττοντος ὁ τε θρήνος Ὅδυσσέως ἐν τῇ
Σκύλλῃ καὶ ἡ τῆς Μελανίππης ῥήσει, τοῦ δὲ ἀνωμά-
λου ἡ ἐν Αὐλίδι Ἰφιγένεια· οὖν δὲν γὰρ ἔοικεν ἡ ἱκε-
tεύουσα τῇ ύστερᾳ. χρῆ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἦθεσιν
ὁμοίως ὧσπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων συντάσσει
ἀεὶ ζητεῖν ἡ ὁ τὸ ἀναγκαίον ἡ τὸ εἰκός, ὡστε τὸν
tοιοῦτον τὰ τοιαύτα λέγειν ἡ πράττειν ἡ ἀναγκαίον ἡ
εἰκός καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τούτῳ γίνεσθαι ἡ ἀναγκαίον ἡ
eἰκός. (φανερὸν οὖν ὃτι καὶ τὰς λύσεις τῶν μύθων ἔξ
αυτοῦ δεῖ τοῦ μύθου² συμβαίνειν, καὶ μὴ ὧσπερ ἐν
tῇ Μηδείᾳ ἀπὸ μηχανῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι τὰ περὶ
τῶν ἀπόπλουν. ἀλλὰ μηχανὴ χρηστέων ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω
τοῦ δράματος, ἢ ὅσα πρὸ τοῦ γέγονεν ἢ οὐχ οἶνον τε
ἀνθρωπον εἰδέναι, ἢ ὅσα ύστερον, ἃ δεῖται προαιγο-
ρεύσεως καὶ ἀγγελίας· ἀπαντα γὰρ ἀποδίδομεν τοῖς
θεοῖς ὅρᾶν. ἄλογον δὲ μηθέν εἶναι ἐν τοῖς πράγμα-
σιν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔξω τῆς τραγῳδίας, οἴον τὸ ἐν τῷ
Οἰδίπουδι τῷ Σοφοκλέους.) ἐπεὶ δὲ μύησις ἐστὶν ἡ

¹ ἀναγκαίας Thurot: -αίον AB

² μύθου AB: ἦθους Arab.

---

*a* Eur. Or. 356 ff, 1554 ff.

*b* A dithyramb by Timotheus (see on 48a15), on the theme of Scylla the sea monster (Hom. Od. 12.85 ff); 61b32 may refer to the same work.
sistently inconsistent. An example of unnecessary wickedness of character is Menelaus in Orestes;\(^a\) of inapt and inappropriate character, Odysseus' dirge in Scylla,\(^b\) and the speech of Melanippe;\(^c\) of inconsistency, the Iphigeneia at Aulis (since the girl who beseeches bears no resemblance to her later self).\(^d\) With character, precisely as in the structure of events, one should always seek necessity or probability—so that for such a person to say or do such things is necessary or probable, and the sequence of events is also necessary or probable.\(^e\) (Clearly the denouements\(^f\) of plots should issue from the plot as such, and not from a deus ex machina as in Medea\(^g\) and the scene of departure in the Iliad.\(^h\) The deus ex machina should be employed for events outside the drama—preceding events beyond human knowledge, or subsequent events requiring prediction and announcement; for we ascribe to the gods the capacity to see all things. There should be nothing irrational\(^i\) in the events; if there is, it should lie outside the play, as with Sophocles' Oedipus.\(^j\) Since tragedy is mimesis of those superior

\(^a\) In Eur. Melanippe the Wise, frs. 480–88 Nauck; the heroine's speech showed knowledge of intellectual matters (cf. "clever," 54a24).
\(^b\) Eur. IA 1211 ff, 1368 ff.
\(^c\) I place in parenthesis some remarks which are, at the least, digressive, and perhaps misplaced.
\(^d\) The term lusis will be technically defined in ch. XVIII; its use here is comparable, though perhaps not identical.
\(^f\) Il. 2.155 ff: Athena's intervention prevents the Greeks from abandoning the war.
\(^i\) I.e. grossly contrary to what is plausible or intelligible.
\(^j\) Ar. alludes to Oedipus' ignorance about the death of Laius: cf. 60a29–30.
ἈΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

τραγῳδία βελτιώνων ἡ ἡμεῖς, δεὶ μμεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἰκονογράφους· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ἀποδίδον
tes τὴν ἱδίαν μορφὴν ὁμοίους ποιοῦντες καλλίους γράφουσιν ὦτῳ καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν μμούμενον καὶ ὀργί
λους καὶ ῥαθύμους καὶ τάλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐχον
tας ἐπὶ τῶν ἠθῶν τοιούτων ὄντας ἐπιεικεῖς ποιεῖν,
oion τὸν Ἄχιλλέα ἀγαθὸν1 καὶ παράδειγμα2 σκληró
ρότητος Ὀμηρος. ταῦτα δὴ διατηρεῖν, καὶ πρὸς
tούτοις τὰ3 παρὰ τὰς ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀκολουθοῦσα
αισθήσεις τῇ ποιητικῇ καὶ γὰρ κατ’ αὐτὰς ἔστ

XVI Ἄναγνώρισις δὲ τὶ μέν ἐστὶν, εἰρηται πρότερον
εἴδη δὲ ἀναγνωρίσεως, πρῶτη μὲν ἡ ἀτεχνοτάτη καὶ

ἡ πλείοντι χρῶνται δι’ ἀπορίαν, ἡ διὰ τῶν σημείων.
toúton δὲ τὰ μὲν σύμφωνα, οἶον "λόγχην ἢν
φοροῦσι Γηγενεῖς" ἢ ἀστέρας οἴους ἐν τῷ Θεότη
Καρκῖνος, τὰ δὲ ἐπίκτητα, καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν ἐν τῷ
σώματι, οἶον οὐλαῖ, τὰ δὲ ἐκτός, οἶον τὰ περιδέραια
καὶ οἶον ἐν τῇ Τυροὶ διὰ τῆς σκάφης. ἔστων δὲ καὶ
toútos χρῆσθαι ἡ βέλτιον ἡ χεῖρον, οἶον Ὄδυσ-

---

1 ἀγαθὸν B: ἀγαθῶν A: Ἀγάθων rec.
2 παράδειγμα σκληρ. ante οἶον habent AB: transpos. Lobel
3 τὰ rec.: τὰς AB

---

a See 48a17–18.
to us, poets should emulate good portrait painters, who render personal appearance and produce likenesses, yet enhance people's beauty. Likewise the poet, while showing irascible and indolent people and those with other such character traits, should make them nonetheless decent, as for example Homer made Achilles good though an epitome of harshness. These things are to be watched, as also are points arising from the perceptions necessarily attending the art of poetry: one can commit many errors in respect of these; I have discussed them sufficiently in my published discourses.

The definition of recognition was stated earlier. As for its kinds, first is the least artistic and the one used the most from uninventiciveness: recognition through tokens. Some tokens are congenital, as with "the spear the Earth-born bear," or stars like those Carcinus uses in Thyestes; others are acquired, and can be divided into the bodily, such as scars, and external, such as necklaces or the boat in Tyro. Even these things can be put to better or worse

---

b The sense of this obscure clause has never been cogently elucidated; "points arising from" might alternatively mean "contraventions of."

c Presumably in the dialogue On Poets: cf. the Introduction.

d Ch. XI.

e Quotation from an unknown tragedy (fr. adesp. 84 Nauck): the "spear" is a birthmark of the "earthborn" men sown from dragon's teeth by Cadmus.

f The 4th-cent. tragedian of this name, OCD s.v. (2); the ref. may be to a play elsewhere called Aérope: TrGF I 210–11.

g In Soph.'s Tyro, T. identified her children by the boat in which they had been placed as infants.
ARISTOTLE

σεύς διὰ τῆς οὐλῆς ἄλλως ἀνεγνωρίσθη ὑπὸ τῆς τροφοῦ καὶ ἄλλως ὑπὸ τῶν συμβοτῶν· εἰσὶ γὰρ αἱ μὲν πίστεως ἐνεκά ἀτεχνότεραι, καὶ αἱ τυαῦται πᾶσαι, αἱ δὲ ἐκ περιπετειῶς, ὅσπερ ἢ ἐν τοῖς Νίπτροις, βελτίωσ. δεύτεραι δὲ αἱ πεποιημέναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ, διὸ ἀτεχνοῦ. οἴον Ὑρέστης ὡς Ἰφιγενεία ἀνεγνώρισεν οτι Ὕρέστης· ἐκείνη μὲν γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ἐκεῖσ εὖς αὕτης λέγει ὁ βούλεται ὁ ποιητὴς ἀλλ’ οὖχ ὁ μῦθος· διὸ τι ἐγγύς τῆς εἰρημένης ἁμαρτίας ἐστίν, ἔξιν γὰρ ἂν ἐννιά καὶ ἐνεγκείν. καὶ ἐν τῷ Σοφοκλέους Τηρεῖ ἡ τῆς κερκίδος φωνῆ. ἡ Τρίτη διὰ μνήμης, τῶν αἰσθήσεων τι ἰδόντα, ὅσπερ ἢ ἐν Κυπρίους τοῖς Δικαιογένους, ἵδων γὰρ τὴν γραφὴν ἐκλασεν, καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἔλεγχο ἀπολόγημα, ἀκοῦν γὰρ τού κυθαριστοῦ καὶ μνησθεὶς ἐδάκρυσεν, ὅσον ἀνεγνωρίσθησαν· τετάρτη δὲ ἡ ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ, οἴον ἐν Χοφέρως, ὅτι ὁμοίος τις ἔληλυθεν, ὁμοίος δὲ οὐθεὶς ἄλλ’ ἡ Ὕρέστης, ὁμοίος ἄρα ἐληλυθεν. καὶ ἡ Πολυδόκου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ περὶ

1 Ὕρέστης Α: om. B
2 ἡ τρίτη Spengel (τρίτη ἡ rec.): ἦτοι τῇ ΑΒ

---

a Od. 19.386 ff (Eurycleia sees the scar when washing Od.), 21.205 ff (Od. shows it to the swineherds for proof).

b I.e. the case of Odysseus and Eurycleia (last note); “Bath Scene” was a standard title for this episode (cf. 60a26): the Homeric poems were not yet divided into books.

c See on 52b6.
use (e.g. through his scar Odysseus was differently recognised by his nurse and the swineherds), since recognitions for the sake of proof, and all of this type, are less artistic, but those linked to reversal, like the one in the Bath Scene, are superior. The second kind are those contrived by the poet, and hence inartistic. For example, Orestes in Iphigeneia causes recognition of his identity; Iphigeneia reveals herself by the letter, but Orestes himself says what the poet, not the plot, wants him to: so it is close to the fault I described, as he might even have carried some tokens. Also the voice of the shuttle in Sophocles' Tereus. The third kind is through memory, when the sight of something brings awareness, like the case in Dicaeogenes' Cyprians (on seeing the painting he cried), and the one in Odysseus' tale to Alcinous (on hearing the singer he was reminded and wept); whence they were recognised. Fourth is recognition by reasoning—such as the inference in Choephori that someone like her has come, no one is like her except Orestes, therefore he has come. And the recognition used by Polyidus the

\[d\] Philomela used her weaving to reveal to her sister, Procone, that she had been raped by the latter's husband, Tereus.

\[e\] A late 5th cent. tragedian (TrGF I no. 52): work and context unknown.

\[f\] Od. 8.521 ff: Od. weeps on hearing Demodocus sing of the sack of Troy.

\[g\] Electra's reasoning at Aesch. Cho. 168 ff.

\[h\] Identity obscure; a dithyrambic or tragic poet of the same name is known (TrGF I 248–9). P.'s work may have been a showpiece oration discussing or fictionalising the reunion of Orestes and Iphigeneia; cf. 55b10–11.
ἈΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

τῆς Ἰφιγενείας· εἰκὸς γὰρ ἐφη¹ τὸν Ὀρέστην συλ-
λογίσασθαι ὅτι ἡ τ’ ἀδελφὴ ἐτύθη καὶ αὐτῶν συμ-
βαίνει θύεσθαι. καὶ ἐν τῷ Θεοδέκτου Τυδεῖ, ὅτι
ἐλθὼν ὃς εὐρήσων τὸν ὕδων αὐτὸς ἀπόλλυται. καὶ ἡ
ἐν τοῖς Φυείδαις· ἴδονσα γὰρ τὸν τόπον συνελογί-
σαντο τὴν εἰμαρμένην ὅτι ἐν τούτῳ ἐξαρτό ἀποθα-
νεὶν αὐταίς, καὶ γὰρ ἐξετῆσαν ἐνταῦθα. ἔστην δὲ
τις καὶ συνθετῇ ἐκ παραλογισμοῦ τοῦ θεάτρου,² οἶνον
ἐν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ τῷ ψευδαγγέλῳ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τόξον
ἐντείνειν,³ ἄλλον δὲ μηδένα, πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ
ποιητοῦ καὶ ὑπόθεσις, καὶ εἰ γε τὸ τόξον ἐφη γνώ-
σεσθαι,⁴ δὴ ὁ ὕμω ἐωράκει· τὸ δὲ ὡς δι’⁵ ἐκείνων ἀνα-
γνωριοῦντος διὰ τούτου ποιήσαι παραλογισμός.

πασῶν δὲ βελτίωτη ἀναγνώρισις ἢ εἰς αὐτῶν τῶν
πραγμάτων, τῆς ἐκπλήξεως γνωσμένης δι’ εἰκότων,
οἶνον ἐν τῷ Σοφοκλέους Οἰδίποδα καὶ τῇ Ἰφιγενείᾳ·
eikōs γὰρ βούλεσθαι ἐπιθεῖναι γράμματα. οἱ γὰρ
τοιαῦται μόνοι ἀνεύ τῶν πεποιημένων σημείων καὶ

περιδεραίων. δεύτεραι δὲ αἱ ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ.

XVII. Δὲι δὲ τοὺς μύθους συνιστάναι καὶ τῇ λέξει συν-
aperagáześthei ὅτι μάλιστα πρὸ ὁμμάτων τιθέμενον,
οὖτω γὰρ ἄν ἐναργεῖστα πρὸς ὅσπερ παρ’ αὐτοῖς

γιγνόμενος τοῖς πραττομένοις εὐρίσκου τὸ πρέπον

¹ ἐφη B Arab.: om. A
² θεάτρου AB: θατέρου Hermann
³ ἐντείνειν ... τόξον B: om. A
⁴ γνωσθῆναι: ἐντείνειν B
⁵ δι AB: δὴ Tyrwhitt
sophist in Iphigeneia’s case: it was probable, he said, that Orestes should reason that his sister had been sacrificed, and his fate was to be sacrificed too. Also in Theodectes’\textsuperscript{a} Tydeus, the reflection that having come to find his son he was doomed himself. Again, the instance in the Phineidae:\textsuperscript{b} when the women saw the place, they inferred it was their destiny to die there, where they had also been exposed. There is also compound recognition which depends on the audience’s mistaken reasoning, as in Odysseus the False Messenger:\textsuperscript{c} that he and no one else could bend the bow is contrived by the poet and a premise, even if he said he would recognise the bow which he had not seen; but to have him recognised by this means, when he was expected to cause recognition in the other way, involves false reasoning. Best of all is recognition ensuing from the events themselves, where the emotional impact comes from a probable sequence, as in Sophocles’ Oedipus and the Iphigeneia (where it is probable she should want to entrust a letter).\textsuperscript{d} For only such recognitions do without contrived tokens and necklaces. Second-best are those by reasoning.

One should construct plots, and work them out in fiction, with the material as much as possible in the mind’s eye. In this way, by seeing things most vividly, as if present at the actual events, one will discover what is appo-

\textsuperscript{a} Rhetorician, tragedian, and friend of Ar.’s; OCD s.v. Nothing is known of this play (TrGF I 233).

\textsuperscript{b} I.e. the sons of Phineus (subject of tragedies by Aesch. and Soph.); but the ref. is opaque (TrGF II 22), and we cannot identify the women mentioned.

\textsuperscript{c} Apparently an unknown tragedy (TrGF II 15), related to the events of Hom. Od. bk. 21; the following clauses are irredeemably dark.

\textsuperscript{d} Eur. IT 578 ff.

87
καὶ ἦκιστα ἃν λαμβάνοι τὰ ύπεναντίᾳ. σημεῖον δὲ τούτου ὁ ἐπέτυμματο Καρκίνῳ. ὁ γὰρ Ἀμφιάραος ἢ ἵ ἐρωτό ἂνη ἤ, ὁ μη ὀρῶντα ἐλάνθανεν, ἔπει δὲ τῆς σκηνῆς ἢ ἐξέπεσεν δυσχερανάντων τούτῳ τῶν θεατῶν. ὅσα δὲ δυνατοὶ καὶ τοῖς σχήμασιν συναπεργαζόμε- νον· πιθανότατοι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀργῆς φύσεως οἱ ἐν τοῖς πάθεσιν εἰσὶν, καὶ χειμαίνει ὁ χειμαζόμενος καὶ χαλεπαίνει ὁ ὀργιζόμενος ἀληθινῶτατα. διὸ εὐφυ- οῦς ἡ ποιητικὴ ἐστιν ἡ μανικουτών τούτων γὰρ οἱ μὲν εὐπλαστοί οἱ δὲ ἐκστατικοὶ εἰσιν. τοὺς τε λόγους καὶ τοὺς πεποιημένους δεὶ καὶ αὐτὸν ποιοῦντα ἐκτί- θεσθαι καθόλου, εἰθ’ οὕτως ἐπεισοδιοῦν καὶ παρα- τείνειν. λέγω δὲ οὕτως ἢν θεωρεῖσθαι τὸ καθόλου, οἷον τῆς Ἰφιγενείας· τυθείσης τινὸς κόρης καὶ ἀφα- νισθείσης αὐτής τοῦς κύριας, ἱδρυμαχίας δὲ εἰς ἀλλήν χώραν, ἐν ἡ νόμοις ἢν τούς ἐξένους θύειν τῇ θεῷ, ταύτην ἐσχε τὴν ἱερωσύνην· χρόνῳ δὲ ὑστερον τῷ ἀδελφῷ συνεβή ἐλθεῖν τῆς ιερείας, τὸ δὲ ὅτι ἀνείλεν ο θεός ἔλθειν ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐφ’ ὅ τι δὲ ἔξω τοῦ

---

1 ὀρώντα τῶν θεατῶν AB: τῶν θ. secl. Butcher
2 τῆς αὐτῆς AB: αὐτῆς τῆς Tyrwhitt
3 ἡ AB: μᾶλλον ἡ Tyrwhitt
4 post θεὸς seq. διὰ τινα αἰτίαν ἔξω τοῦ καθόλου in AB: διά . . . καθ. secl. Christ

---

a See on 54b23. Both play and situation referred to are unknown; TrGF I 211–12.
b The Greek verb implies that the work was hissed off stage; cf. 56a18–19, 59b31.
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site and not miss contradictions. An indication of this is
the criticism that was made of Carcinus: Amphiaraus was
returning from a shrine, which was missed by one who
failed to visualise it; in performance the audience was
annoyed at this and the play foundered. So far as possi-
ble, one should also work out the plot in gestures, since a
natural affinity makes those in the grip of emotions the
most convincing, and the truest distress or anger is con-
veyed by one who actually feels these things. Hence
poetry is the work of a gifted person, or of a manic: of
these types, the former have versatile imaginations, the
latter get carried away. With both ready-made stories and
his own inventions, the poet should lay out the general
structure, and only then develop the sequence of
episodes. For what I mean by contemplating the general
structure, take the Iphigeneia. A girl was sacrificed, and
vanished without trace from her sacrificers; settled in a
different country, where it was a custom to sacrifice
strangers to the goddess, she became priestess of this rite.
Later, the priestess’ brother happened to arrive there
(that the god’s oracle told him to go there, and for what

\(c\) Ar. implies that acting out a role will help to induce the con-
comitant feelings.

\(d\) A textual emendation would make this “rather than,” on the
grounds that “manic” sounds too passionate for the psychology of
composition posited by Ar.

\(e\) Cf. 51b15–26.

\(f\) Katholou, the same term as “universal” at 51b8–9: the sense
is not different here (it refers to the kinds of event), though its
emphasis is more limited than in ch. IX.

\(g\) Eur. IT.
Aristotle

μήθων ἐλθὼν δὲ καὶ ληφθεὶς θύεσθαι μέλλων ἀνεγνώρισεν, εἴθ᾽ ὡς Εὐριπίδης εἴθ᾽ ὡς Πολύδως ἐποίησεν, κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς εἰπὼν ὦτι οὐκ ἂρα μόνον τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδει τυθῆναι, καὶ ἐντεύθεν ἡ σωτηρία. μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἦδη ὑποθέντα τὰ ὅνομα ἐπεισοδιοῦν ὡπως δὲ ἔτσται οἰκεία τὰ ἐπεισοδία, οὗν ἐν τῷ Ὄρεστῃ ἡ μανία δὲ ἡς ἐλήφθη καὶ ἡ σωτηρία διὰ τῆς καθάρσεως. εἰν μὲν οὖν τοῖς δράμασιν τὰ ἐπεισοδία σύντομα, δὴ ἐποποιεῖ τούτοις μηκύνεται. τῆς γὰρ Ὅδυσσείας οὐ¹ μακρὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστίν· ἀποδημοῦντός τινος ἐτη̣ πολλὰ καὶ παρα-φυλαττομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Ποσειδώνος καὶ μόνον ὄντος, ἔτι δὲ τῶν οἴκων οὕτως ἐχόντων ἠοτε τὰ χρήματα ὑπὸ μνηστήρων ἀναλύσκεσθαι καὶ τῶν ὧν ἐπίβου-λεύσθαι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀφικνεῖται χειμασθεῖς, καὶ ἀναγνωρίσας τωμᾶς ἐπιθέμενος αὐτὸς μὲν ἐσώθη τοὺς δὴ ἐχθροὺς διέφθειρε. τὸ μὲν οὖν ῥιδον τοῦτο, τὰ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἐπεισοδία.

XVIII Ἔστι δὲ πάσης τραγῳδίας τὸ μὲν δέσις τὸ δὲ λύσις, τὰ μὲν ἐξωθεὶ καὶ ἕνα τῶν ἐσωθεὶ πολλάκις ἡ δέσις, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἡ λύσις· λέγω δὲ δέσιν μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἄπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τοῦτον τοῦ μέρους ὁ ἑσχατὸν ἐστιν εὖ οὗ μεταβαίνει εἰς εὐτυχίαν ἡ εἰς ἀτυχίαν, λύσιν δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς μεταβάσεως μέχρι τέλους· ὅσπερ ἐν τῷ Λυγκεί τῷ Θεο-δεκτοῦ δέσις μὲν τὰ τε προπεπραγμένα καὶ ἡ τοῦ παιδίου λήψις καὶ πάλιν ἡ αὐτῶν ** λύσις² δ' ἡ

¹ οὐ Arab.: om. AB
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purpose, is outside the plot). Captured after his arrival, and on the point of being sacrificed, he caused his recognition—whether as in Euripides, or as Polyidus\textsuperscript{a} designed it, by saying (as was probable) that it was not just his sister’s but his own fate too to be sacrificed—and hence was rescued. The next stage is to supply names and devise the episodes; but care must be taken to keep the episodes integral: thus, in Orestes’ case, the mad fit that caused his capture, and his rescue by purification.\textsuperscript{b} Now, in plays the episodes are concise, but epic gains length from them. The Odyssey’s story is not long: a man is away from home many years; he is watched by Poseidon, and isolated; moreover, affairs at home are such that his property is consumed by suitors, and his son conspired against; but he returns after shipwreck, allows some people to recognise him, and launches an attack which brings his own survival and his enemies’ destruction. That is the essential core; the rest is episodes.

II

Every tragedy has both a complication\textsuperscript{c} and denouement: the complication comprises events outside the play, and often some of those within it; the remainder is the denouement. I define the complication as extending from the beginning\textsuperscript{d} to the furthest point before the transformation to prosperity or adversity; and the denouement as extending from the beginning of the transformation till the end. Thus, in Theodectes’ Lynceus\textsuperscript{e} the complication covers the preceding events, the

\textsuperscript{a} See on 55a6.  
\textsuperscript{b} IT 281 ff, 1029 ff.  
\textsuperscript{c} Not to be confused with the “complex” plot of ch. X etc.  
\textsuperscript{d} Of the imagined “action,” not necessarily of the play.  
\textsuperscript{e} TrGF I 232; cf. 52a27–9. Theodectes: see on 55a9.

\textsuperscript{2} \lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\varsigma \delta’ \eta rec., Arab.: δ\eta (om. \lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\varsigma) AB
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΣ

ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτιάσεως τοῦ θανάτου μέχρι τοῦ τέλους.
τραγῳδίας δὲ εἴδη εἰσὶ τέσσαρα (τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ
τὰ μέρη ἔλεξθη), ἢ μὲν πεπλεγμένη, ὡς τὸ ὅλον
ἔστων περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις, ἢ δὲ παθητικὴ,
οἶον οἱ τε Άιαντες καὶ οἱ Ἰξίωνες, ἢ δὲ ἡθικὴ, οἶον αἱ
Φθιώτιδες καὶ ὁ Πηλεὺς· τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ἡ ἀπλὴ,
οἶον αἱ τε Φορκίδες καὶ ὁ Προμηθεὺς καὶ ὁσα ἐν
ἀδευ. μᾶλιστα μὲν οὖν ἀπαντά δεὶ πειράσθαι ἕχειν,
εἰ δὲ μή, τὰ μέγιστα καὶ πλείστα, ἀλλὰς τε καὶ ὡς
νῦν συκοφαντούσιν τοὺς ποιητάς· γεγονότων γὰρ
καθ’ ἐκαστὸν μέρος ἀγαθῶν ποιητῶν, ἐκαστὸν τοῦ
ἰδίου ἀγαθοῦ ἀξιωτότι τοῦ ἐνα υπερβάλλειν. δύκαιον
δὲ καὶ τραγῳδίαν ἄλλην καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς λέγειν
οὐδενὶ ς τῷ μύθῳ· τοῦτο δὲ, ὅπως ἄκουσθαι καὶ
λύσις. πολλοὶ δὲ πλέξαντες εὐλύσοις κακῶς· δεὶ δὲ
ἀμφῶς ᾧ ἀκούσθαι. χρὴ δὲ ὅπερ εἰρηταὶ πολλά-
κις μεμνήσθαι καὶ μή ποιεῦν ἐποποικόν σύστημα
τραγῳδίαν—ἐποποικόν δὲ λέγω τὸ πολύμυθον—
οἶον εἶ τις τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος ὀλον ποιοῦ μύθον. ἐκεῖ
μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὸ μῆκος λαμβάνει τὰ μέρη τὸ πρέπου

---

1 ἡ ἀπλὴ Bursian: οὐς B: οὖς A: ὄψις Bywater
2 οὐδενὶ ς Zeller: οὐδενὶ ἵσως AB
3 ἀμφῶς ᾧ ἀκούσθαι A (κρατεῖσθαι Vahlen): ἀμφότερα
ἀντικροτεῖσθαι B: ἀμφότερα ἀρτικροτεῖσθαι Immisch

---

a This claim (perhaps spurious) does not match the enumeration of components at 50a7–14. Cf. 59b8–9.
b “Suffering” as defined in ch. XI. Plays about Ajax, such as Soph.’s, would centre on his suicide; those about Ixion, on his punishment on the wheel in Hades.
seizure of the child, and again their ***, while the
denouement runs from the accusation of murder to the
end. There are four types of tragedy (as that is the num-
ber of components we mentioned):\textsuperscript{a} the complex, whose
essence is reversal and recognition; the kind rich in
suffering,\textsuperscript{b} such as those about Ajax and Ixion; the char-
acter-based, such as Phthiotides\textsuperscript{c} and Peleus;\textsuperscript{d} and, fourth,
<the simple>,\textsuperscript{e} such as Phorcides, Prometheus, and those
set in Hades. Now, ideally one should strive to have all
qualities; failing that, the best and the most, especially in
view of current censure of the poets: because there have
been poets good in various respects, people expect the
individual to surpass the special quality of each of them.
It is right to count plays as different or the same princi-
pally by plot: that is, “the same” means having the same
complication and denouement. Many poets handle the
complication well, the denouement badly: but constant
proficiency in both is needed. As noted several times, the
poet must remember to avoid turning a tragedy into an
epic structure (by “epic” I mean with a multiple plot), say
by dramatising the entire plot of the Iliad. In epic,
because of its length, the sections take on an apt magni-
tude, but in plays it\textsuperscript{f} goes quite against expectation.

\textsuperscript{c} Women of Phthia, perhaps Soph.’s play of this name: its sub-
ject is unknown; TrGF IV 481–2.

\textsuperscript{d} Both Soph. and Eur. wrote plays about P., father of Achilles.

\textsuperscript{e} The text is badly damaged here; the passage needs a ref. to
the “simple” tragedy (ch. X, cf. 59b9). Phorcides, “Daughters of
Phorcys” (guardians of the Gorgons), may be Aesch.’s work of
that name (TrGF III 361: a satyr play?), as may Prometheus: but
we cannot be sure.

\textsuperscript{f} I.e. a plot of epic scope.
ARISTOTLE

μέγεθος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς δράμασι πολὺ παρὰ τὴν ύπόλη-
ψυν ἀποβαίνει. σημείων δὲ, ὡσοι πέρσων Ἰλίου ὅλην
έπούσαν καὶ μὴ κατὰ μέρος ὦσπερ Ἐυριπίδης, ἡ
Νιόβην καὶ μὴ ὦσπερ Αἰσχύλος, ἢ ἐκπίπτουσιν ἢ
κακῶς ἀγωνίζονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὦ Αγάθων ἐξέπεσεν ἐν
tούτῳ μόνῳ. ἐν δὲ ταῖς περιπετείαις καὶ ἐν τοῖς
ἀπλοῖς πράγμασι στοχάζονται ὡς βουλοῦνται τῷ
20 θαυμαστῷ τραγικῶν γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ φιλάνθρωπον.
ἐστὶν δὲ τούτῳ, ὅταν ὁ σοφὸς μὲν μετὰ πονηρίας δ’
ἐξάπατηθῆ, ὦσπερ Σίσυφος, καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος μὲν ἄδι-
κος δὲ ἄττηθῆ. ἐστιν δὲ τούτο καὶ εἰκὸς ὦσπερ
Ἀγάθων λέγει, εἰκὸς γὰρ γίνεσθαι πολλὰ καὶ παρὰ
tὸ εἰκός. καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἐνα δεὶ ὑπολαμβάνειν
τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, καὶ μόριον εἶναι τοῦ ὅλου καὶ συν-
ἀγωνίζεσθαι μὴ ὦσπερ Ἐυριπίδης ἀλλ’ ὦσπερ Σοφο-
κλεῖ. τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς τὰ ἀδόμενα3 ὀὐδὲν4 μᾶλλον
tοῦ μῦθου ἢ ἄλλης τραγῳδίας ἐστίν. διὸ ἐμβόλια
ἀδοκοῦν πρῶτον ἄρξαντος ὦ Αγάθωνος τοῦ τουρύτου.
30 καίτοι τί διαφέρει ἡ ἐμβόλια ἄδεω ἢ εἰ ῥήσων εἴ
ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλο ἀρμόττοι ἢ ἐπεισόδιον ὅλον;

XIX Περὶ μὲν ὦν τῶν ἄλλων εἰδῶν5 εἰρηται, λοιπὸν δὲ

1 ἡ add. Vahlen
2 τῷ θαυμαστῷ Castelvetro: θαυμαστῶς AB
3 ἀδόμενα Arab.: διδόμενα AB
4 οὐδὲν Arab. (Vahlen): om. AB
5 εἰδῶν B: ἡ δ’ A
An indication of this is that those who have treated the entire fall of Troy, rather than part of it (like Euripides), or Niobe's whole story (instead of what Aeschylus did), either founder or do badly in competition; even Agathon founndered through just this flaw. In reversals and simple structures of events, poets aim for what they want by means of the awesome: this is tragic and arouses fellow-feeling. This occurs when an adroit but wicked person is deceived (like Sisyphus), or a brave but unjust person is worsted. These things are even probable, as Agathon puts it, since it is probable that many things should infringe probability. The chorus should be treated as one of the actors; it should be a part of the whole and should participate, not as in Euripides but as in Sophocles. With the other poets, the songs are no more integral to the plot than to another tragedy—hence the practice, started by Agathon, of singing interlude odes. Yet what is the difference between singing interlude odes and transferring a speech or whole episode from one work to another?

The other components have now been discussed; it

---

a In Trojan Women.
b We do not know what was distinctive about Aesch.'s treatment of Niobe's suffering (cf. OCD s.v.); TrGF III 265–80.
c Cf. on 55a28.
d Ref. unknown; for Agathon, see 51b21.
e A difficult sentence; but Ar. apparently allows that "awe" (see on 52a4) can be achieved by simple as well as complex plots.
f Cf. on 52b38.
g We cannot identify the stories/plays about Sisyphus (OCD s.v.) which Ar. has in mind.
h Fr. 9 TrGF (1164); see Ar.'s quotation at Rh. 1402a9–13.
i Sc. "in the action."
περὶ λέξεως καὶ1 διανοίας εἰπείν. τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ
tὴν διάνοιαν ἐν τοῖς περὶ ῥητορικῆς κείσθω· τούτο
gὰρ ἰδιον μᾶλλον ἐκείνης τῆς μεθόδου. ἔστι δὲ κατὰ
tὴν διάνοιαν ταύτα, ὡσα ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου δεῖ παρα-
σκευασθῆναι. μέρη δὲ τούτων τὸ τε ἀποδεικτικών
cαὶ τὸ λύειν καὶ τὸ πάθη παρασκευάζειν (οἶον ἔλεον
ἡ φόβου ἡ ὄργην καὶ ὡσα τοιαῦτα) καὶ ἔτι μέγεθος
καὶ μικρότητας. δὴν δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν
ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἱδεὸν δεὶ χρήσθαι ὅταν ἡ ἔλεεν ἡ
δεινὰ ἡ μεγάλα ἡ εἰκότα δὲ παρασκευάζειν· πλὴν
τοσοῦτον διαφέρει, ὅτι τὰ μὲν δεὶ φαινεσθαι ἄνευ
didaskalίας, τὰ δὲ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ λέγοντος
παρασκευάζεσθαι καὶ παρὰ τὸν λόγον γίγνεσθαι.
tί γὰρ ἂν εἶ ὃτι λέγοντος ἔργον, εἰ φαίνοιτο ἡ2
dέοι καὶ μὴ διὰ τὸν λόγον; τῶν δὲ περὶ τὴν λέξιν ἐν
μὲν ἐστὶν εἴδος θεωρίας ἡ σχῆματα τῆς λέξεως, ἡ
ἐστὶν εἴδεναι τῆς ὑποκριτικῆς καὶ τοῦ τὴν τοιαύτην
ἔχοντος ἀρχιτεκτονικῆς, οἶον τί ἐντολὴ καὶ τί εὐχὴ
cαὶ διήγησις καὶ ἀπειλὴ καὶ ἐρωτήσις καὶ ἀπόκρισις
καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον. παρὰ γὰρ τὴν τούτων γνώ-
σιν ἢ ἄγνοιαν οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐπιτύμμα
φέρεται ὃ τι καὶ ἄξιον σπουδῆς. τί γὰρ ἂν τις ὑπο-
λάβοι ἡμαρτήσθαι ἡ Πρωταγόρας ἐπιτιμᾶ, ὅτι εὐχε-
σθαι οἰόμενος ἐπιτάπτει εἰπὼν "μὴν ἂειδε θεὰ"; τὸ
γὰρ κελεύσαι, φησίν, ποιεῖν τι ἡ μὴ ἐπιτάξεις ἐστὶν.
dιὸ παρείσθω ὡς ἀλλής καὶ οὐ τῆς ποιητικῆς ὃν
θεώρημα.

1 καὶ Hermann: ἡ AB  2 ἡ δέοι Vahlen: ἧ δέοι AB
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remains to speak about diction and thought. The discussion of thought can be left to my discourses on rhetoric,a for it is more integral to that enquiry. “Thought” covers all effects which need to be created by speech: their elements are proof, refutation, the conveying of emotions (pity, fear, anger, etc.), as well as enhancement and belittlement. It is clear that the same principles should also be used in the handling of events, when one needs to create impressions of what is pitiable, terrible, important, or probable—with this difference, that the latter effects must be evident without direct statement, while the former must be conveyed by the speaker in and through speech. For what would be the point of the speaker, if the required effects were evident even without speech? As for matters of diction, one type of study concerns forms of utterance (knowledge of which belongs to the art of deliveryb and the person with this mastery)—namely, what is a command, prayer, narrative, threat, question, reply, and all the like. Knowledge or ignorance of these things can support no serious criticism of poetry. Why should anyone think it is a fault where Protagoras criticises Homer for purporting to pray but giving a command by saying “Sing, goddess, of the wrath . . .”?c (To bid someone do or not do something, says Protagoras, is a command.) So, let this study be put aside as part of some other art, not poetry.

a Whether or not this means the surviving Rhetoric, “thought” (dianoia) certainly denotes the general sphere of argumentation in that work (Rh. 1403a36).

b The vocal art of the actor (hupokritēs) and orator: cf. 57a21, with Rh. III.1.

c We do not know where P. (c. 490–20) made his pedantic criticism of Il. 1.1.
Τῆς δὲ λέξεως ἀπάσης τάδ’ ἔστι τὰ μέρη, στοιχεῖον συλλαβῆ σύνδεσμος ὅνομα ρῆμα ἄρθρον πτῶσις λόγος. στοιχείον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν φωνῆ ἀδιαίρετος, οὐ πάσα δὲ ἄλλ’ ἔστιν συνθέτη γίγνεσθαι φωνῆ, καὶ γὰρ τῶν θηρίων εἰσὶν ἀδιαίρετοι φωναί, ὃν οὐδεμίαν λέγω στοιχεῖον. ταύτης δὲ μέρη τὸ τε φωνῆν καὶ τὸ ἡμίφωνον καὶ ἄφωνον. ἐστὶν δὲ ταῦτα φωνῆν μὲν τὸ ἄνευ προσβολῆς ἐχον φωνῆν ἀκουστήν, ἡμίφωνον δὲ τὸ μετὰ προσβολῆς ἐχον φωνῆν ἀκουστήν, οἶνον τὸ Σ καὶ τὸ Ρ, ἄφωνον δὲ τὸ μετὰ προσβολῆς καθ’ αὐτὸ μὲν οὐδεμίαν ἐχον φωνῆν, μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἐχόντων τινὰ φωνῆν γνώμενον ἀκουστόν, οἶνον τὸ Γ καὶ τὸ Δ. ταῦτα δὲ διαφέρει σχῆμασι τε τοῦ στόματος καὶ τόποι καὶ διαστήματι καὶ ψιλότητι καὶ μῆκει καὶ βραχύτητι ἐτι δὲ ἐξύπτωσι καὶ βαρύτητι καὶ τῷ μέσῳ περὶ ὧν καθ’ ἑκαστὸν ἐν τοῖσ μετρικοῖσ προσήκει θεωρεῖν. συλλαβῆ δὲ ἐστὶν φωνῆ ἄσημος συνθέτη ἐστὶν ἄφωνον καὶ φωνῆν ἑχοντος καὶ γὰρ τὸ ΓΡ ἄνευ τοῦ Α συλλαβῆ καὶ μετα τοῦ Α, οἶνον τὸ ΓΡΑ. ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων θεωρῆσαι τὰς διαφορὰς τῆς μετρικῆς ἐστὶν. σύνδεσμος δὲ ἐστὶν φωνῆ ἄσημος ἡ οὕτε κωλύει

1 συνθέτη Arab.: συνθέτη ΑΒ
2 τὸ add. Reiz
3 συλλαβῆ καὶ ΑΒ: (?)οῦ συλλαβῆ, συλλαβῆ δὲ Arab.

...What follows, in chs. XX-XXI, is not “stylistics” but an outline of grammatical/linguistic categories...

98
The components of all diction are these: a element, syllable, connective, noun, verb, conjunction, inflection, statement. An element is an indivisible vocal sound, but only one from which a compound sound is naturally formed: for animals too produce indivisible sounds, none of which do I term an “element.” b The classes of sound c are vowel, continuant d and stop. A vowel is an audible e sound without oral contact; a continuant an audible sound with contact (e.g. s and r); while a stop f (e.g. g and d) involves contact but in itself produces no sound, and becomes audible by combination with elements that do produce a sound. Elements are distinguishable by the mouth shape and the points of contact; by aspiration and lack of it; by length and shortness g and also by acute, grave, and intermediate accent h detailed study of these things belongs to discourses on metre i. A syllable is a non-significant j sound, compounded of a stop and a voiced k element: gr is a syllable without a, and also with a (i.e. gra). But the study of these distinctions too belongs to metrics. A connective is a non-significant sound which neither prevents nor creates a single semantic utterance

b I.e. animals make some vocal sounds, but these do not combine to produce the syllables and words of language.
c From now on “sound,” phôné, denotes speech sounds.
d Sometimes termed “semi-vowel.”
e Sc. in itself (unlike a stop).
f Also known as “mute.”
g Of vowels.
h Pitch accent, not dynamic stress.
i Works which treated phonology within analysis of metrical patterns; cf. Part. An. 660a8.
j I.e. not a semantic unit.
k I.e. (apparently) vowel or continuant.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΗΣ

1457α οὔτε ποιεῖ φωνὴν μίαν σημαντικὴν ἐκ πλειόνων
φωνῶν, πεφυκὼν
1 συντίθεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκρῶν
καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μέσου, ἢν
2 μὴ ἄρμότερον ἐν ἀρχῇ λόγου
τιθέναι καθ’ αὐτὴν,
3 οἴον μὲν δὴ
4 τοῦ δὲ. ἢ φωνὴ
ἀσθμὸς ἢ ἐκ πλειόνων μὲν φωνῶν μίας σημαντικῶν
5 δὲ ποιεῖν πέφυκεν μίαν σημαντικὴν φωνὴν. ἄρθρον
δὲ ἐστὶ φωνὴ ἀσθμὸς ἢ λόγου ἀρχήν ἢ τέλος ἢ διο-
ρισμὸν δὴνοὶ. οἴον τὸ ἄμφι
καὶ τὸ περὶ καὶ τὰ
ἀλλα. ἢ φωνὴ ἀσθμὸς ἢ οὔτε κωλύει οὔτε ποιεῖ
φωνὴν μίαν σημαντικὴν ἐκ πλειόνων φωνῶν, πεφυ-
κὼν τιθεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μέσου.

οὔομα δὲ ἐστὶ φωνὴ συνθετὴ σημαντικὴ ἄνευ χρό-
νου ἢς μέρους οὑδὲν ἐστὶ καθ’ αὐτὸ σημαντικὸν ἐν
γὰρ τοῖς διπλοῖς οὐ χρόμεθα ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ
σημαίνον, οἴον ἐν τῷ Θεόδωρος
7 τὸ δὼρος οὐ σημαί-
νει. ῥήμα δὲ φωνὴ συνθετὴ σημαντικὴ μετὰ χρόνου
ἡς οὐδὲν μέρος σημαίνει καθ’ αὐτό, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ
tῶν ὄνομάτων. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἢ λευκὸν οὐ
σημαίνει τὸ πότε, τὸ δὲ βαδίζει ἡ βεβάδικεν προσ-
σημαίνει τὸ μὲν τὸν παρόντα χρόνον τὸ δὲ τὸν

1 πεφυκὼν B: -ἀν A
2 ἢν . . . μέσου (57α3–10) om. B
3 αὐτὴν Tyrwhitt (Lat.): αὐτόν A
4 δὴ τού Bywater: ἢτοι A
5 σημαντικῶν Robortelli: ὰν A
6 ἄμφι Hartung: φ.μ.υ. A
7 Θεόδωρος τὸ δὼρος Ritter (Arab.): θεοδώρῳ τὸ δῶρον AB

a I.e. connective particles, though the definition is corrupt.
Cf. Rh. 1407a20 ff.
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from a plurality of sounds, usually placed at the ends or in the middle of a statement, but not on its own at the start of one: e.g. *men*, *dē*, *toi*, *de.* Or a nonsignificant sound which naturally produces a single semantic utterance from a plurality of sounds that have a single significance. A conjunction is a non-significant sound which indicates the beginning, end, or division of a statement: e.g. *amphi*, *peri,* etc. Or a nonsignificant sound which neither prevents nor creates a single semantic utterance from a plurality of sounds, normally placed either at the ends or in the middle. A noun is a compound, significant, non-temporal sound, no part of which is independently significant; for in double nouns we do not employ any part as independently significant: e.g. in “Theodorus” the “-dorus” part has no meaning. A verb is a compound, significant sound with a temporal force, but no part of which is independently significant (as with nouns): “man” or “white” does not signify time, but “is walking” or “has walked” additionally signify present and past time.

*---*

b Exx. of prepositions, which do not at all fit the definition. This is one of several acute difficulties in the passage.

c The baffling replication of the first definition of “connective” points to further textual corruption.

d The term covers adjs. too; cf. 57a16.

e As in the following definitions of verb and statement, “compound” *qua* consisting of more than one phonological “element”; cf. 56b35.

f Cf. 57a32.

g I.e. no *functional* meaning (as opp. to etymology, from *döron*, “gift”) in the use of the name; cf. 57a33 f.

h In Greek, both verbs are single-word inflected forms.
ἈΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

παρέληπθότα. πτώσις δ’ ἔστιν ὄνοματος ἡ ῥήματος ἡ μὲν κατὰ¹ τό τούτου ἡ τούτω σημαίνον καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐνὶ ἡ πολλοῖς, οἴον ἀνθρωποὶ ἢ ἄνθρωπος, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὰ ὑποκριτικὰ, οἴον κατ’ ἐρώτησιν ἡ ἐπίταξιν· τό γὰρ ἐβάδισεν; ἡ βάδιζε πτώσις ῥήματος κατὰ ταύτα τὰ εἰδή ἐστίν. λόγος δὲ φωνή συνθετὴ σημαντικὴ ἦς ἐνια μέρη καθ’ αὐτὰ σημαίνει τι· οὗ γὰρ ἄπας λόγος ἐκ ῥημάτων καὶ ὄνομάτων σύγκειται, οἴον ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὀρισμός, ἀλλ’ ἐνδέχεται ἄνευ ῥημάτων εἶναι λόγον, μέρος μέντοι αἱ τι σημαίνον ἐξει, οἴον ἐν τῷ βαδιζει Κλέων ὁ Κλέων. εἰς δὲ ἔστι λόγοις διχὼς, ἡ γὰρ ὁ ἐν σημαίνων, ἡ ἐκ πλειόνων συνδέσμω, οἴον ἡ Ἰλιᾶς μὲν συνδέσμῳ εἰς, ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῷ ἐν σημαίνειν.

XXI

Ὁνόματος δὲ εἴδη τὸ μὲν ἀπλοῦν, ἀπλοῦν δὲ λέγω ὃ μὴ ἐκ σημαίνοντων σύγκειται, οἴον γῆ, τὸ δὲ διπλοῦν· τούτου δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐκ σημαίνοντος καὶ ἀσῆμου, πλὴν οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι² σημαίνοντο καὶ ἀσῆμον, τὸ δὲ ἐκ σημαίνοντων σύγκειται. εἰς δ’ ἂν καὶ τριπλοῦν καὶ τετραπλοῦν ὄνομα καὶ πολλαπλοῦν, οἴον τὰ πολλὰ τῶν Μασσαλιωτῶν,³ Ἕρμοκαϊκόξαν-θος * * *.⁴ ἀπαν δὲ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἡ κύριον ἡ γλώττα

1 κατὰ τὸ Reiz: τὸ κατὰ AB
2 ὄνοματι Vahlen: -τος AB
3 Μασσαλιωτῶν Diels (ex Arab.): μεγαλιωτῶν AB
4 Lacunam stat. edd. (cf. Arab.: “supplicans domino caelo-rum”)
respectively. An inflection is the feature of a noun or verb which signifies case ("of him," "to him," etc.), or singular and plural (e.g. "man," "men"), or aspects of delivery, such as question or command ("did he walk?" or "walk!" are verbal inflections in this classification). A statement is a compound, significant utterance, some of whose parts do have independent significance. Not every statement consists of verbs and nouns, e.g. the definition of "man," but one can have a statement without verbs; yet it will always have a part with separate significance, e.g. "Cleon" in "Cleon is walking." A statement can be unitary in two ways, by signifying one thing or by being combined from a plurality: e.g. the Iliad is unitary by combination, but the definition of "man" by signifying one thing.

Nouns can be classed as "single" (by which I mean those not comprising significant parts, e.g. gei ["earth"]) and "double." The latter can be subdivided into those formed from both significant and nonsignificant parts (though this is not their function within the noun), and those comprising only significant parts. One could further distinguish "triple," "quadruple," and "polysyllabic" (e.g. most Massaliote terms: Hermocaïcoxanthus ***).

---

a See on 56b10.  b All exx. in this para. again involve single-word inflected forms in Greek.

c i.e. a verbless phrase such as "rational, bipedal animal."

d "Combination," sundesmos, is the same term as "connec-
tive" at 56b38 ff: the word cannot have quite the same sense in both places, though the second use may imply the first.

e Cf. 57a11–14.

f Belonging to the dialect of Massilia (Marseilles): "Hermocaïcoxanthus" fuses the names of three rivers in the region of Phocaea, motherland of Massilia.
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Aristotle

η μεταφορά ἡ κόσμος ἡ πεποιημένον ἡ ἐπεκτεταμένον ἡ υφηρημένον ἡ ἐξηλλαγμένον. λέγω δὲ κύριον μὲν ὁ χρῶνται ἕκαστοι, γλώτταν δὲ ὁ ἐτεροί οἴστε φανερὸν ὅτι καὶ γλώτταν καὶ κύριον εἶναι δυνατὸν τὸ αὐτὸ, μὴ τοὺς αὐτοῖς δὲ· τὸ γὰρ σύγγνων Κυπρίων μὲν κύριον, ἦμιν δὲ γλώττα.

μεταφορά δὲ ἐστιν ὁνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορά ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴδους ἐπὶ τὸ γένος ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴδους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἡ κατὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον. λέγω δὲ ἀπὸ γένους μὲν ἐπὶ εἶδος οἶον "ηῆς δὲ μοι ἥδ' ἔστηκεν"· τὸ γὰρ ὅρμειν ἐστὶν ἐστάναι τι. ἀπ' εἴδους δὲ ἐπὶ γένους "ἡ δὴ μυρί' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργεν"· τὸ γὰρ μυρίον πολὺ ἐστιν, ὃ νῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ πολλοῦ κέχρηται. ἀπ' εἴδους δὲ ἐπὶ εἴδος οἶον "χαλκῷ ἀπὸ ψυχήν ἀρύσας"¹ καὶ "τεμὼν ταναῦχει χαλκῷ"· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸ μὲν ἄρυσαι ταμεῖν, τὸ δὲ ταμεῖν ἄρυσαι ἐξηκεν· ἀμφοῖ γὰρ ἀφελεῖν τί ἐστιν. τὸ δὲ ἀνάλογον λέγω, ὅταν ὁμοῖος ἔχῃ τὸ δεύτερον πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ τέταρτον πρὸς τὸ τρίτον· ἔρει γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ δεύτερου τὸ τέταρτον ἡ ἀντὶ τοῦ τεταρτοῦ τὸ δεύτερον. καὶ ἐνίοτε προστήθεσαι ἄνθ' οὐ λέγει πρὸς ὁ ἐστι. λέγω δὲ οἶον ὁμοῖος ἔχει φιάλη πρὸς Δίονυσον καὶ ἀστίς πρὸς ὁ ἔρει τοῖνυν τὴν φιάλην ἀσπίδα Διονύ-

¹ ἄρυσας καὶ τεμὼν Tyrwhitt (rec.): ἀερύσασκετεμῶν A: ἐρύσασκε τεμῶν B

a Onoma, used above for “noun,” but here carrying the wider sense; cf. e.g. 57b7, 25.
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Every word\(^a\) is either a standard term, loan word, metaphor, ornament, neologism, lengthening, contraction, or modification. By “standard term” I mean one used by a community, by “loan word” one used by outsiders; obviously, then, the same word can be both a loan word and a standard term, though not for the same groups: \textit{sigunon} [“spear”] is standard for Cypriots, a loan word for us.\(^b\)

A metaphor\(^c\) is the application of a word that belongs to another thing: either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy. By “from genus to species” I mean, e.g., “my ship stands here”:\(^d\) mooring is a kind of standing. Species to genus: “ten thousand noble deeds has Odysseus accomplished”:\(^e\) ten thousand is many, and the poet has used it here instead of “many.” Species to species: e.g. “drawing off the life with bronze,”\(^f\) and “cutting with slender-edged bronze”:\(^g\) here he has used “drawing off” for “cutting”, and \textit{vice versa}, as both are kinds of removing. I call “by analogy” cases were \(b\) is to \(a\) as \(d\) is to \(c\): one will then speak of \(d\) instead of \(b\), or \(b\) instead of \(d\). Sometimes people add that to which the replaced term is related. I mean, e.g., the wine bowl is to Dionysus as the shield to Ares: so one will call the wine

\(^{b}\) For Ar. a “loan word” cannot be a naturalised borrowing, but must be perceived as exotic (cf. \textit{Rh.} 1410b12–13).

\(^{c}\) As definition and exx. reveal, “metaphor” includes things which might now be classed as synecdoche or metonymy. Cf. \textit{Rh.} 1405a3 ff.

\(^{d}\) \textit{Hom. Od.} 1.185. \(^{e}\) \textit{Hom. Il.} 2.272.

\(^{f}\) Empedocles fr. 138 DK; image is the killing of an animal.

\(^{g}\) Empedocles fr. 143 DK; the ref. is to filling a bronze vessel with water.
σου καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα φιάλην Ἀρεως. ἦ δ' γῆρας πρὸς βίον, καὶ ἐσπέρα πρὸς ἡμέραν ἐρεῖ τοῖς τῆν ἐσπέραν γῆρας ἡμέρας, ἦ ὁσπερ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ τὸ γῆρας ἐσπέραν βίον ἦ δυσμᾶς βίον. ἐνώς δ' οὐκ ἔστων ὅνομα κείμενον τῶν ἀνάλογων, ἀλλ' οὖνδέν ἦττον ὅμοιως λεχθήσεται οἶνον τὸ τὸν καρπὸν μὲν ἀφίεναι σπείρειν, τὸ δὲ τὴν φλόγα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνώνυμου ἀλλ' ὅμοιως ἔχει τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν ἡλίον καὶ τὸ σπείρειν πρὸς τὸν καρπὸν, διὸ εἰρηται "σπείρων θεοκτίσταν φλόγα". ἔστι δὲ τῷ τρόπῳ τούτῳ τῆς μεταφορᾶς χρήσθαι καὶ ἄλλως, προσαγορεύ- σαντα τὸ ἀλλότριον ἀποφήσαι τῶν οἰκείων τι, οἶνον εἰ τὴν ἀσπίδα εἴποι φίαλην μὴ Ἄρεως ἄλλ' ἄοινον.

** * * * πεποιημένου δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ὅλως μὴ καλουμένου ὑπὸ τινῶν αὐτὸς τίθεται ὁ ποιητής: δοκεῖ γὰρ ἐνα εἶναι τοιάντα, οἶνον τὰ κέρατα ἔρνυγας καὶ τὸν ἱερεὰ ἀρητήρα. ἐπεκτεταμένου δὲ ἔστων ἡ ἀφηρημένου τὸ μὲν ἐὰν φωνήσαντε μακροτέρῳ κεχρημένου ἢ τοῦ οἰκείου ἢ συλλαβῆ ἐμβεβλημένη, τὸ δὲ ἄν ἀφηρη- μένου τι ἢ αὐτοῦ, ἐπεκτεταμένου μὲν οἶνον τὸ πόλεως πόλης καὶ τὸ Πηλείδου Πηληθάδεω, ἀφηρημένου δὲ οἶνον τὸ κρι καὶ τὸ δῶ καὶ μία γίνεται ἀμφοτέρων

1 ἄλλ' ἄοινον Vettori: ἄλλα οἶνον ΑΒ  
2 ἔρνυγας Vettori: ἔρνυγας Α: ἔρνυγας Β  
3 Πηλείδου rec.: Πηλέος Α: Πηλέως Β

---

a Fr. 152 DK, but it is disputed which phrase Ar. ascribes to E.; for “evening of life” cf. Alexis fr. 230 PCG, “life’s sunset” Pl. Laws 770a6.
bowl "Dionysus’ shield," and the shield "Ares’ wine bowl." Or old age is to life as evening to day: so one will call evening "the day’s old age," or, like Empedocles, call old age "the evening of life" or "life’s sunset." In some cases of analogy no current term exists, but the same form of expression will still be used. For instance, to release seed is to "sow," while the sun’s release of fire lacks a name; but the latter stands to the sun as does sowing to the seed, hence the phrase "sowing his divine fire." This type of metaphor can further be used by predicating the borrowed term while denying one of its attributes: suppose one were to call the shield not "Ares’ wine bowl" but "a wineless wine bowl."

** A neologism is a term without existing usage but coined by the poet himself; some words seem to be of this kind, e.g. erñuges for kerata ["horns"] and arêtër for hiereus ["priest"].

A lengthening uses a longer vowel than the standard form, or an extra syllable; a contraction has had some part removed: lengthenings are e.g. polēos for poleôs, and Pēleïadeô for Pēleidou; contractions, e.g. kri, dô, and "a single vision [ops] comes from both." A

---

b A usage sometimes known as "catachresis": e.g. Quint. Inst. 8.6.34–5.

c Strictly, to the sower.

d Unidentified quotation, from tragedy or lyric poetry.

e It is assumed that an explanation of "ornament," kosmos, has dropped out here; see 57b2, and cf. Rh. 1408a14.

f The second occurs 3x in the Iliad; the first is not found in extant literature.

g Genitive forms of, respectively, polis (city/citadel) and Pēleidēs (son of Peleus, i.e. Achilles); the first form in each case is epic.

h Shortened epic forms of krithē (barley) and dōma (house).

i Empedocles fr. 88 DK.
5 ὢψ". ἐξηλλαγμένον δὲ ἔστιν ὅταν τοῦ ὄνομαξιμένου τὸ μὲν καταλείπῃ τὸ δὲ ποιῆ, οἶνον τὸ "δεξιτερὸν κατὰ μαξόν" ἀντὶ τοῦ δεξίων.

αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν ὀνομάτων τὰ μὲν ἄρρενα τὰ δὲ θήλεα τὰ δὲ μεταξὺ, ἄρρενα μὲν ὁσα τελευτά εἰς τὸ Ν καὶ Ρ καὶ Σ καὶ ὁσα ἐκ τούτων σύγκειται (ταῦτα δὲ ἱστὼν δύο, Ψ καὶ Ξ), θῆλεα δὲ ὁσα ἐκ τῶν φωνη-ἐντων εἰς τε τὰ ἅπει μακρά, οἶνον εἰς Η καὶ Ω, καὶ τῶν ἑπεκτεινομένων εἰς Λῆ ὡστε ὑπάνων καὶ ἀνάων εἰς ὁσα τὰ ἄρρενα καὶ τὰ θήλεα: τὸ γὰρ Ψ καὶ τὸ Ξ σύνθετα2 ἔστιν. εἰς δὲ ἄφωνον οὐδὲν ὁσομα τελευτά,

οὐδὲ εἰς φωνήν βραχύ. εἰς δὲ τὸ Ι τρία μόνον, μέλι κόμμι πέπερι. εἰς δὲ τὸ Τ πέντε3 ***. τὰ δὲ μετάξὺ εἰς ταῦτα καὶ Ν καὶ Σ.

XXII Δέξεως δὲ ἄρετή σαφή καὶ μὴ ταπεινή εἶναι. σαφεστάτη μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ἡ ἐκ τῶν κυρίων ὀνομάτων, ἄλλα ταπεινή· παράδειγμα δὲ ἡ Κλεοφώντος ποίησις καὶ ἡ Σθενέλου. σεμνή δὲ καὶ ἐξαλλάτ-τουσα τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἡ τοῖς ξενικοῖς κεχρημένη: ξενι-κόν δὲ λέγω γλώτταν καὶ μεταφοράν καὶ ἑπέκτασιν καὶ πᾶν τὸ παρά τὸ κύριον. ἀλλ' ἀν τις ἀπαντᾷ τοι-αὕτα ποιήσῃ, ἡ αἰνιγμα ἑσται ἡ βαρβαρισμός· ἀν

---
1 ὢψ Vettori: ὅψ Α: ὅψ B
2 σύνθετα Arab.: ταῦτα ΑΒ: ταὐτά rec., Lat.
3 post πέντε add. nomina quinque Arab.

---

a Hom. II. 5.393.
b Alpha, iota, upsilon.
modification is one where part of the form is kept, part added: e.g. "in his right [dexiteron] breast,"\textsuperscript{a} instead of 
dexion.

Of nouns, some are masculine, some feminine, some
neuter: masculine, those which terminate in nu, rho, 
sigma, or letters containing sigma (there are two: psi and 
xi); feminine, those which end in vowels that are always 
long (i.e. eta and omega), or in alpha (of the vowels that 
can be lengthened).\textsuperscript{b} So the number of masculine and 
feminine terminations is the same\textsuperscript{c} (as psi and xi are comp-
ound sounds). No noun terminates in a stop, nor in a 
short vowel. Three alone end in iota: meli, kommi, 
peperi.\textsuperscript{d} Five end in upsilon \textsuperscript{e} Neuter nouns have 
these endings,\textsuperscript{f} as well as nu and sigma.

Excellence of diction means clarity and avoidance of 
banality. Now, clearest is the diction that uses standard 
terms, but this is banal: the poetry of Cleophon\textsuperscript{g} and 
Sthenelus\textsuperscript{h} exemplifies this. Impressive and above the 
ordinary is the diction that uses exotic language (by 
"exotic" I mean loan words, metaphors, lengthenings, and 
all divergence from the standard). But if one composes 
entirely in this vein, the result will be either a riddle or 
barbarism—a riddle, if metaphors predominate; bar-

\textsuperscript{c} This ignores a number of feminine nouns which end in the 
same consonants as masculines.
\textsuperscript{d} "Honey," "gum," "pepper"; there were in fact others, all of 
them rare.
\textsuperscript{e} astu, gonu, doru, napu, pōu.
\textsuperscript{f} Ar. may mean alpha as well as iota and upsilon; but he omits 
neuters ending in rho (e.g. nektar).
\textsuperscript{g} See on 48a12.
\textsuperscript{h} Tragedian of later 5th cent.; TrGF I no. 32.
μὲν οὖν ἐκ μεταφορῶν, αὐνιγμα, ἔαν δὲ ἐκ γλωττῶν, βαρβαρισμός. αὐνιγματός τε γὰρ ἰδέα αὕτη ἐστὶ, τὸ λέγοντα ὑπάρχοντα ἀδύνατα συνάψαι κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὴν τῶν ἄλλων1 ὁνομάτων σύνθεσιν οὐχ οἰόν τε τούτο ποιῆσαι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μεταφορὰν2 εὐδέχεται, οἷον „αὐδρ’ ἐγὼν πυρὶ χαλκὸν ἐπ’ ἀνέρι κολλήσαντα“, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν γλωττῶν βαρβαρισμός. δεῖ ἄρα κεκράσθαι πως τούτους τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ποιῆσει μηδὲ ταπεινῶν, οἷον ἡ γλώττα καὶ ἡ μεταφορὰ καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ τὰλλα τὰ εἰρημένα εἴδη, τὸ δὲ κύριον τὴν σαφῆνειαν. οὐκ ἐλάχιστον δὲ μέρος συμβάλλει εἰς τὸ σαφὲς τῆς λέξεως καὶ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν αἱ ἐπεκτάσεις καὶ ἀποκοπαί καὶ ἐξαλλαγαὶ τῶν ὁνομάτων· διὰ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἄλλως ἔχειν ἢ ὡς τὸ κύριον παρὰ τὸ εἰσόδος γιγνόμενον τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ποιῆσει, διὰ δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῦ εἰσόδο- τος τὸ σαφὲς ἑσται. ὡστε οὐκ ἄρθρῳς ψέγουσιν οἱ ἐπιτιμώντες τῷ τοιούτῳ τρόπῳ τῆς διαλέκτου καὶ διακαμώδουντες τὸν ποιητήν, οἷον Εὐκλείδης ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὃς ῥάδιον ὅν ποιεῖν εἰ τις δώσῃ ἐκτέινει ἐφ' ὄποσον βούλεται, ἰαμβοποιήσας εἰν αὐτῇ τῇ λέξει „Ἐπιχάρην3 εἶδον Μαραθώναδε βαδίζοντα“, καὶ „οὐκ ἐγκεράμενος4 τὸν ἐκείνον ἐλλέβορον“. τὸ μὲν οὖν φαίνεσθαι πῶς χρώμενον τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ

---

1 ἄλλων Twining (Arab.): om. AB
2 μεταφορῶν Bywater: -ἀν AB
3 Ἐπιχάρην Bursian (H- Tyrwhitt): ἡ ἐπιχαρὴν B: ἦτεi χάριν A
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barism, if loan words. For this is the nature of a riddle, to attach impossibilities to a description of real things. One cannot do this by composing with other terms, but one can with metaphors (e.g. "I saw a man welding bronze on a man with fire,"\(^a\) and such things). Passages of loan words constitute barbarism. One needs, then, a certain blend of these components: one kind (loan words, metaphor, ornaments, and the other classes listed) will create an impression that is neither ordinary nor banal, while standard terms will ensure clarity. A major contribution to clarity and unusualness of diction is made by lengthenings, shortenings, and modifications of words: contrast with the standard, and divergence from the usual, will create an out-of-the-ordinary impression; but the presence of some usual forms will preserve clarity. So those who criticise such usage, and mock the poet for it, are wrong to carp—like Eucleides the elder,\(^b\) who, supposing it easy to write poetry if one is allowed to lengthen words at whim, lampooned Homer in his very diction ("I saw Epichares walking to Marathon," and "not mixing his hellebore").\(^c\) Now, the blatant use of such a manner is

\(^a\) Cleobulina fr. 1 West, a hexameter. The ref. is to medical use of a cupping glass; cf. \textit{Rrh.} 1405b1–4.

\(^b\) Otherwise unknown.

\(^c\) Both quotations (the second very uncertain), using absurd vowel-lengthenings to satisfy hexameter rhythm, parody metrical licences in Homer. Epichares was a very common Athenian name; its choice here is probably arbitrary.

\(^4\) ἐγκεράµενος coni. Kassel: ἄν γεράµενος A: ἄν γε ἀράµενος B
Aristotle

gελοϊν. τὸ δὲ μέτρον κοινὸν ἀπάντων ἐστὶ τῶν μερῶν καὶ γὰρ μεταφοράς καὶ γλώττας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εἶδεν χρώμενοι ἀπρεπῶς καὶ ἐπίτηδες ἐπὶ τὰ γελοῖα τὸ αὐτὸ ἄν ἄπεργασάιτο. τὸ δὲ ἀρμόττον ὁσον διαφέρει ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπών θεωρείσθω ἐντιθεμένων τῶν κυρίων ὀνομάτων εἰς τὸ μέτρον. καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γλώττης δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μεταφορῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδεῶν μετατιθεῖσι ἃν τις τὰ κύρια ὀνόματα κατίδοι ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγομεν ὁ οἶνον τὸ αὐτὸ ποιήσαντος ίαμβέειν Αἰσχύλου καὶ Εὐριπίδου, ἐν δὲ μόνον ὄνομα μεταβέντος, ἀντὶ κυρίου εἰσθότος γλώτταν, τὸ μὲν φαίνεται καλὸν τὸ δ’ εὐτελές. Αἰσχύλος μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῷ Φιλοκτήτῃ ἔποιήσε 

φαγέδαιναν η μου σάρκας ἔσθει ποδός, ὦ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔσθει τὸ θουνᾶται μετέθηκεν. καὶ

νῦν δὲ μ’ ἐὼν ὀλίγος τε καὶ οὐτίδαινος καὶ ἀεικής, εἰ τις λέγοι τὰ κύρια μετατιθεῖσιν

νῦν δὲ μ’ ἐὼν μικρός τε καὶ ἀσθενικὸς καὶ ἀειδής καὶ

dίφρον ἀεικέλιον καταθεῖς ὀλίγην τε τράπεζαν, 

δίφρον μοχθηρὸν καταθεῖς μικράν τε τράπεζαν 

καὶ τὸ Ἰόνων βοώσων, Ἰόνων κράζονσιν. ἔτι δὲ Ἀριφράδης τοὺς τραγῳδοὺς ἐκωμώδει ὅτι ἀν ὀνδείς ἄν εὑπειν ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ τούτῳ χρώνται, ὁ ὁ οἶνον τὸ δωμάτων ἄπο ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀπὸ δωμάτων, καὶ τὸ σέθεν

1 ἀρμόττον rec.: ἀρμόττοντος A: ἀρμόττον πως B

2 κυρίων add. Vahlen

3 φαγέδαιναν Hermann: -α rec.: φαγάδαινα B: φαγάδενα A
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ridiculous; moderation applies equally to all components. By using metaphors, loan words, and the other classes inaptingly one could achieve the same result as by deliberate comic distortion. But the difference it makes to use them fittingly in epic should be studied by introducing the standard words into the verse. Likewise with loan words, metaphors, and the other classes, one could observe the truth of my argument by substituting the standard terms. For instance, Aeschylus and Euripides composed the same iambic line, but the latter replaced just one word, using a loan word instead of the familiar standard term; one of the lines strikes us as beautiful, the other as tawdry. Aeschylus, in his Philoctetes,\(^a\) wrote: “... the cancer which eats the flesh of my foot.” Euripides changed “eats” to “feasts on.”\(^b\) Likewise with “but now one lowly, paltry, and unseemly . . . ,”\(^c\) if one were to substitute the standard terms, “but now one small, weak, and ugly . . .” And compare “setting out an unsightly chair, and a lowly table . . .”\(^d\) with “setting out a bad chair, and a small table . . .” Or “the headlands clamour”\(^e\) with “the headlands bawl.” Again, Ariphrades\(^f\) ridiculed the tragedians for using expressions which no one would ever say in conversation, such as “the palace from” instead of “from

\(^{a}\) Fr. 253 TrGF (III 357).
\(^{b}\) Fr. 792 Nauck; here and below, translation cannot capture the pertinent nuances of tone.
\(^{c}\) Hom. Od. 9.515 (Cyclops’ description of Odysseus); in mss. of Homer the third adj. is different again (akikus, “feeble”).
\(^{d}\) Hom. Od. 20.259.
\(^{e}\) Hom. Il. 17.265.
\(^{f}\) Very likely, given the name’s rarity, the comic poet mentioned several times by Aristophanes (e.g. Knights 1280 ff).
καὶ τὸ ἐγὼ δὲ νῦν καὶ τὸ Ἀχιλλέως πέρι ἄλλα μὴ περὶ Ἀχιλλέως, καὶ ὤσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις ποιεῖ τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ἐν τῇ λέξει ἀπαντά τα τοιαῦτα· ἐκεῖνος δὲ τούτο ἦγνωε. ἐστὶν δὲ μέγα μὲν τὸ ἐκάστω τῶν εἰρημένων πρεπόν-
7 τως χρῆσθαι, καὶ διπλῶς ὀνόμασι καὶ γλώτταις,
pολὺ δὲ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν εἶναι. μόνον γὰρ
tούτο ὅπε παρ’ ἄλλου ἐστὶ λαβεῖν εὐφυίας τε
σημεῖον ἐστὶ· τὸ γὰρ εὗ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὁμοιον
θεωρεῖν ἐστὶν. τῶν δ’ ὀνομάτων τὰ μὲν διπλὰ
μάλιστα ἀρμόττει τοῖς διθυράμβους, αἱ δὲ γλῶτται
τοὺς ἡρωικοῖς, αἱ δὲ μεταφορά τοὺς ἵαμβείοις.
καὶ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἡρωικοῖς ἀπαντὰ χρῆσμα τὰ εἰρημένα,
ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἱαμβείοις διὰ τὸ ὅτι μάλιστα λέξειν μμει-
σθαι ταῦτα ἀρμόττει τῶν ὀνομάτων ὠσοὶ κἂν ἐν
λόγοις τις χρῆσαι τε· ἐστὶ δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα τὸ κύριον
καὶ μεταφορά καὶ κόσμος.

περὶ μὲν οὖν τραγῳδίας καὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ πράττειν
μιμήσεως ἐστῳ ἦμῖν ἰκανὰ τὰ εἰρημένα.

XXIII Περὶ δὲ τῆς διηγηματικῆς καὶ ἐν μέτρῳ μιμη-
τικῆς, ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς μύθους καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις
συνιστάναι δραματικοὺς καὶ περὶ μίαν πράξιν ὀλην
καὶ τελείων ἔχουσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλος, ἢ

20 ὀσπερ ζῷον ἐν ὅλον ποιή τὴν οἰκείαν ἡδονῆν, δῆλον,

---

a Two of Ar.'s exx. are of anastrophe (placing of a preposition after its noun), and two of predominantly poetic pronominal forms.
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the palace,” and “of thee,” and “I him . . .,” and “Achilles round” instead of “round Achilles,” etc. Because absent from standard speech, all such expressions make an out-of-the-ordinary impression; but Arisphrades failed to realise that. It is important to use aptly each of the features mentioned, including double nouns and loan words; but much the greatest asset is a capacity for metaphor. This alone cannot be acquired from another, and is a sign of natural gifts: because to use metaphor well is to discern similarities. Of word types, double forms particularly suit dithyramb, loan words suit epic, and metaphors suit iambic verse. In epic, everything mentioned has some use, but in iambic verse, because of the very close relation to ordinary speech, suitable words are those one would also use in prose—namely, standard terms, metaphors, ornaments.

Let that, then, count as sufficient discussion of tragedy and enactive mimesis.

As regards narrative mimesis in verse, it is clear that plots, as in tragedy, should be constructed dramatically, that is, around a single, whole, and complete action, with beginning, middle, and end, so that epic, like a single and whole animal, may produce the pleasure proper to it. Its

---

b Cf. Rh. 1405a8–10, Top. 140a8–11.
c Because dithyramb tends towards linguistic virtuosity: cf. Rh. 1406b1–2.
d See on 47b11.
e Cf. 49a23–8.
f Cf. ch. III’s third mode of mimesis, 48a24–5.
g The periphrasis places epic (loosely) in Ar.’s scheme of media and modes (chs. I, III).
καὶ μὴ ὁμοίας ἱστορίας τὰς συνθέσεις εἶναι, ἐν αἷς ἀναγκὴ οὐχὶ μᾶς πράξεως ποιεῖσθαι δῆλωσιν ἂλλ’ ἐνὸς χρόνου, ὡστ’ ἐν τούτῳ συνέβη περὶ ἑνὴ ἡ πλείους, ὃν ἐκαστὸν ὡς ἐτυχεὶν ἐξεὶ πρὸς ἀλληλα. ὡσπερ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους ἢ τ’ ἐν Σαλαμίνι ἔγενετο ναυμαχία καὶ ἡ ἐν Σικελίᾳ Καρχηδο- 25 νίων μάχη οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ συντείνουσα τέλος, οὖτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς χρόνοις ἐνίοτε γίνεται θάτερον μετὰ θάτερον, ἐξ ὧν ἐν οὐδὲν γίνεται τέλος. σχεδὸν δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ποιητῶν τούτο δρώσι. διὸ ὡσπερ εἴπομεν ἡδὴ καὶ ταύτῃ θεσπέσιος ἄν γανείν ὁμηρος παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους, τῷ μηδὲ τὸν πόλεμον καίπερ ἔχοντα ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπιχειρήσας ποιεῖν ὅλον· λίαν γὰρ ἄν μέγας καὶ οὐκ εὐσυνοπτος ἐμελ- 30 λευ ἐστεθαί ὁ μῦθος, ἡ τὰ μεγέθει μετριάζοντα καταπεπληγμένον τῇ ποικιλίᾳ. νῦν δ’ ἐν μέρος ἀπο- λαβῶν ἐπεισοδίους κέχρηται αὐτῶν πολλοῖς, οἴον νεῶν καταλόγω καὶ ἄλλους ἐπείσοδίους οίς3 διαλαμ- βάνει τὴν ποίησιν. οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι περὶ ἑνα ποιοῦσι καὶ 35 περὶ ἑνα χρόνον καὶ μίαν πράξιν πολυμερῆ, οἴον ὁ τὰ Κύπρια4 ποιήσας καὶ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα. τουγα- ροῦν ἐκ μεν Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσείας μία τραγῳδία ποιεῖται ἐκατέρας ἡ δύο μόναι, ἐκ δὲ Κυπρίων πολ-

1 ἱστορίας τὰς συνθέσεις Sophianus, Dacier (i. t. συνθή- σεις B): ἱστορίας τὰς συνθήκες A
2 ὁ μῦθος B: om. A
3 oìς rec.: διο (sed erasum) A: om. B
4 Κύπρια Castelvetro: κυπρικά AB

116
structures should not be like histories, which require an exposition not of a single action but of a single period, with all the events (in their contingent relationships) that happened to one person or more during it.\textsuperscript{a} For just as there was chronological coincidence between the sea battle at Salamis and the battle against the Carthaginians in Sicily,\textsuperscript{b} though they in no way converged on the same goal, so in a continuous stretch of time event sometimes follows event without yielding any single goal. Yet probably most poets do this. That is why, as I said earlier,\textsuperscript{c} Homer’s inspired\textsuperscript{d} superiority over the rest can be seen here too: though the war had beginning and end, he did not try to treat its entirety, for the plot was bound to be too large and incoherent, or else, if kept within moderate scope, too complex in its variety. Instead, he has selected one section, but has used many others as episodes, such as the catalogue of ships and other episodes by which he diversifies the composition. But the others build their works round a single figure or single period, hence an action of many parts, as with the author of the Cypria and the Little Iliad.\textsuperscript{e} Accordingly, with the Iliad and the Odyssey a single tragedy, or at most two, can be made from each; but many can be made from the Cypria, and

\textsuperscript{a} Cf. 51a38–b11; Ar. reductively equates history with a chronicle narrative.

\textsuperscript{b} The battles of Salamis and Himera took place on the same day in 480 (Hdt. 7.166).

\textsuperscript{c} 51a22–30.

\textsuperscript{d} The term thespesios is itself Homeric—a deliberate allusion.

\textsuperscript{e} Two poems from the so-called Epic Cycle (OCD s.v.), dealing respectively with antecedents to the Trojan War and its earlier years, and with its later parts and aftermath.
λαὶ καὶ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἰλιάδος πλέον ἡ ὁκτώ, οἶον ὀπλῶν κρίσις, Φιλοκτήτης, Νεοπτόλεμος, Εὐρύπυ-λος, πτωχεία, Δάκαιναι, Ἰλίου πέρσι καὶ ἀπόπλους, καὶ Σίνων καὶ Τροώαδες.

XXIV Ἔτε δὲ τὰ ἐιδὴ ταύτα δὲ ἔχειν τὴν ἐποποιών τῇ τραγῳδία, ἢ γὰρ ἀπλὴν ἢ πεπλεγμένην ἢ ἡθικὴν ἢ παθητικὴν καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐξώ μελοποιώς καὶ ὠφεις ταύτα· καὶ γὰρ περιπετείων δὲ καὶ ἀναγνορίσεων καὶ παθημάτων· ἔτι τὰς διανοίας καὶ τὴν λέξιν ἔχειν καλῶς. οἷς ἀπασιν Ὀμήρος κέρχηται καὶ πρώτος καὶ ἱκανῶς. καὶ γὰρ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐκάτερον συνέ-στηκεν ἡ μὲν Ἰλιάς ἀπλοῦν καὶ παθητικόν, ή δὲ ὁδύσσεια πεπλεγμένον (ἀναγνώρισις γὰρ διόλου) καὶ ἡθικῆ πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοι λέξει καὶ διανοία πάντα ὑπερβέβληκεν.

Διαφέρει δὲ κατὰ τε τῆς συστάσεως τὸ μῆκος ἡ ἐποποιών καὶ τὸ μέτρον. τοῦ μὲν οὖν μῆκος ὠρος ἱκανός ὁ εἰρημένος· δύνασθαι γὰρ δεῖ συνοράσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸ τέλος. εἶ ὡς ἄν τοῦτο, εἴ τῶν μὲν ἀρχαῖων ἐλάττους αἱ συστάσεις εἶν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πλήθος τραγῳδιῶν τῶν εἰς μίαν ἀκρόασιν τιθεμένων

1 δὲ rec.: γὰρ AB

---

a Aesch. wrote a play with this title, on the contested award of Achilles’ arms, after his death, to Odysseus rather than Ajax (TrGF III 288).
b P. was fetched from Lemnos to Troy, for the sake of his bow (once Heracles’); cf. Soph. Phil.
c N., son of Achilles, was brought to fight at Troy after his father’s death.
more than eight from the *Little Iliad*—namely, *Judgment of Arms*,
*a* *Philoctetes*, *Neoptolemus*, *Eurypylus*,
*b* *Begging Episode*, *c* *Spartan Women*,
*d* *Sack of Troy*, and
*e* *The Fleet’s Departure*, as well as *Sinon*
*f* and *Trojan Women*.

Moreover, epic should encompass the same types as
tragedy, namely simple, complex, character-based, rich in
suffering; it has the same components, except for lyric
poetry and spectacle, for it requires reversals, recogni-
tions, and scenes of suffering, as well as effective thought
and diction. All of which Homer was the first to employ,
and employed proficiently. Of his poems, the *Iliad’s*
structure is simple and rich in suffering, while the
*Odyssey* is complex (it is pervaded by recognition) and
character-based. In addition, each excels all epics in dic-
tion and thought.

Epic is distinct in its size of structure and its metre. As
for length, the definition already given is adequate, since
it should be possible for beginning and end to be held in a
coherent view. This will be feasible with plot structures
shorter than the early epics, but equivalent to the length

\[d\] A Trojan ally killed by Neoptolemus; possibly a Sophoclean
subject (*TrGF* IV 195).

\[e\] Odysseus entered Troy disguised as a beggar; cf. Hom. *Od.*
4.244 ff.

\[f\] Helen and her maids, who helped Odysseus and Diomedes
steal the Palladium from Troy; a Sophoclean title (*TrGF* IV 328).

\[g\] S. was the Greek who tricked the Trojans into taking the
Wooden Horse into the city; Soph. wrote a *Sinon* (*TrGF* IV 413).

\[h\] Cf. *Eur. Tro.*

\[i\] Cf. 55b32–56a3, with nn.

\[j\] See ch. VII, esp. 51a9–15.
παρήκοιεν. ἔχει δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἑπεκτείνεσθαι τὸ μέγεθος πολὺ τι ἡ ἐποποιία ἰδιον διὰ τὸ ἐν μὲν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ μη ἐνδέχεσθαι ἁμα πραττόμενα πολλὰ μέρη μιμεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τῶν ύποκριτῶν μέρος μόνον· ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐποποιίᾳ διὰ τὸ διήγησιν εἶναι ἐστὶ πολλὰ μέρη ἁμα ποιεῖν περαινόμενα, ὡς ὁικείων ὄντων αὐξεῖται ὁ τοῦ ποιήματος ὄγκος. ὧστε τούτ’ ἔχει τὸ ἁγάθον εἰς μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ τὸ μεταβάλλειν τὸν ἀκούοντα καὶ ἐπεισοδιόις ἀνομοίως ἑπεισόδιοις· τὸ γὰρ ὁμοιον ταχὺ πληρῶν ἐκπίπτειν ποιεῖ τὰς τραγῳδίας. τὸ δὲ μέτρον τὸ ἡρωικὸν ἀπὸ τῆς πείρας ἠρμοκεν. εἰ γὰρ τις ἐν ἄλλῳ τύπῳ μέτρῳ διηγηματικὴ μίμησιν ποιεῖτο ἡ ἐν πολλοῖς, ἀπρέπει ἄν φαίνοιτο· τὸ γὰρ ἡρωικὸν στασιμώτατον καὶ ὀγκώδεστατον τῶν μέτρων ἔστιν (διὸ καὶ γλώσσας καὶ μεταφορὰς δέχεται μάλιστα: περιττὴ γὰρ καὶ ταύτη 1 ἡ διηγηματικὴ μίμησις τῶν ἄλλων), τὸ δὲ ἰαμβεῖον καὶ τετράμετρον κινητικὰ καὶ τὸ μὲν ὄρχηστικὸν τὸ δὲ πρακτικὸν. ἔτι δὲ ἀτοπώτερον εἴ μιγνύοι τις αὐτά, ὡσπερ Χαϊρήμων. διὸ οὔδεις μακρὰν σύντασιν ἐν ἄλλῳ πεποίηκεν ἡ τῷ ἡρώῳ, ἀλλ’ ὡσπερ εἴπομεν αὐτή ἡ φύσις διδάσκει τὸ ἀρμόττον αὐτῇ αἵρεισθαι. 2

1 ταύτη add. Twining
2 αἵρεισθαι Bonitz: διαρ- ΑΒ
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of a group of tragedies offered at one hearing. But epic has special scope for substantial extension of size, because tragedy does not allow multiple sections of action to be represented as they occur, but only the one on stage involving the actors; whereas in epic, given the narrative mode, it is possible for the poem to include many simultaneous sections, which, if integral, enhance the poem's dignity. So this gives epic an asset for the development of grandeur, variety for the hearer, and diversity of episodes, whereas sameness soon cloys and causes tragedies to founder. As for metre, the hexameter has proved apt by experience. If one were to compose a narrative mimesis in some other metre, or in several, the incongruity would be plain, since the hexameter is the most stately and dignified of metres (hence its great receptivity to loan words and metaphors: in this respect too narrative mimesis is exceptional), while the iambic trimeter and trochaic tetrameter are rhythms for movement, the latter suiting dancing, the former action. Still more absurd would be a mixture of these metres, as in Chairemon. This is why no one has composed a long epic structure other than in the hexameter; but as I said, the genre's own nature teaches poets to choose what is apt for it.

Homer deserves praise for many other qualities, but especially for realising, alone among epic poets, the place

---

a This suggests an epic of about 4,500 lines, much shorter than the Homeric poems, which must be meant by "early epics."
b See on 55a28.  c Cf. 59a9–11.
d Cf. 49a21–7.  e See 47b21–2.
f The point was made for tragedy's metre at 49a24; "experience" at 59b32 above may imply the same point.
Aristotle

εἰν αὐτοῦ. αὐτὸν γὰρ δὲι τὸν ποιητὴν ἐλάχιστα λέγειν· οὔ γάρ ἐστι κατὰ ταῦτα μιμητὴς. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι αὐτοὶ μὲν δὲ οἶλου ἀγωνίζονται, μιμοῦνται δὲ ὅλιγα καὶ ὀλιγάκις· ὁ δὲ ὅλιγα φρονημοσάμενος εὐθὺς εἰςάγει ἀνδρὰ ἡ γυναῖκα ἡ ἄλλο τι θήσος, καὶ οὐδέν' ἄρθη άλλ' ἔχοντα θήσος. δὲι μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ποιεῖν τὸ θαυμαστόν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνδέχεται ἐν τῇ ἑποποίᾳ τὸ ἄλογον,1 δι' ὤ συμβαίνει μάλιστα τὸ θαυμαστόν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὄραν εἰς τὸν πράττοντα· ἐπεὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ὶκτορος διώξει ἐπὶ σκηνῆς οὖντα γελοῖα ἃν φανείῃ, οἱ μὲν ἔστωτες καὶ οὐ διώκοντες, ὃ δὲ ἀνανεύων, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπεσει λαυθάνει. τὸ δὲ θαυμαστόν ἡδύ σημείον δὲ, πάντες γὰρ προστιθέντες ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὡς χαριζόμενοι. δεδίδαχεν δὲ μάλιστα Ὀμήρος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ψευδὴ λέγειν ός δὲι. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο παραλογισμός.

οὐν γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅταν τουδε οὖντος τοδε ἡ γυνομένου γίνηται, εἰ τὸ ὑστερον ἐστιν, καὶ τὸ πρότερον εἴναι ἡ γίνεσθαι· τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ ψεῦδος. διὸ δὲι, ἂν τὸ πρῶτον ψεῦδος, ἄλλο2 δὲ τοῦτον ὄντος ἀνάγκη ἐκεὶ ἡ γενέσθαι ἢ,3 προσθείναι· διὰ γὰρ τὸ τοῦτο εἰδέναι ἄληθες ὁν παραλογίζεται ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ὃς ὁν. παραδεχεμα δὲ τοῦτον τὸ ἐκ τῶν Νίπτρων. προαιρείσθαι τε δεὶ ἀδύνατα εἰκότα

1 ἄλογον Vettori: ἄναλογον AB
2 ἄλλο δὲ cod. Robortelli: ἄλλου δὲ A: ἄλλ' οὐδὲ BA2
3 ἢ Jortin: ἢ AB
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of the poet’s own voice. For the poet should say as little as possible in his own voice, as it is not this that makes him a mimetic artist. The others participate in their own voice throughout, and engage in mimesis only briefly and occasionally, whereas Homer, after a brief introduction, at once “brings onto stage” a man, woman, or other figure (all of them rich in character). In tragedy one needs to create a sense of awe, but epic has more scope for the irrational (the chief cause of awe), because we do not actually see the agent. The entire pursuit of Hector, if put on stage, would strike us as ludicrous—with the men standing and refraining from pursuit, and Achilles forbidding them—but in epic this goes unnoticed. Awe is pleasurable: witness the fact that all men exaggerate when relating stories, to give delight. It is above all Homer who has taught other poets the right way to purvey falsehoods: that is, by false inference. When the existence or occurrence of \( b \) follows from that of \( a \), people suppose that, if \( b \) is the case, \( a \) too must exist or be occurrent; but this is false. So, if the antecedent is false, but were it true some further fact would necessarily exist or occur, the poet should supply the latter: because it knows the truth of the consequent, our mind falsely infers the truth of the antecedent too. One example of this comes from the Bath Scene. Things probable though impossible should

\(^a\) This passage appears, through overstatement, to deny (contra 48a22–3) that narrative is a mode of mimesis.

\(^b\) Ar. uses a theatrical term to highlight Homer’s “dramatic” quality; cf. 48b35–6.

\(^c\) Il. 22.131 ff (esp. 205–6).

\(^d\) Cf. on 54b30; Ar. may mean Penelope’s false inference, at Od. 19.249–50 (cf. 215–19), that the stranger had really seen Odysseus.
ARISTOTLE

μάλλον ἢ δυνατὰ ἀπίθανα· τοὺς τε λόγους μὴ συν-ιστασθαι ἐκ μερῶν ἀλόγων, ἀλλὰ μᾶλιστα μὲν μηδὲν ἔχειν ἀλόγον, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔξω τοῦ μυθεύματος, ὡσπερ Οἰδίπος τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι πῶς ὁ Δάιος ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν τῷ δράματι, ὡσπερ ἐν Ἡλέκτρᾳ οἱ τὰ Πύθια ἀπαγγέλλουτες ἢ ἐν Μυσώις ὁ ἄφωνος ἐκ Τεγέας εἰς τὴν Μυσίαν ἤκων. ὅστε τὸ λέγειν ὅτι ἀνήρρητο ἢν ὁ μῦθος γελοῖον ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ δεῖ συνιστασθαι τοιοῦτοι. ἂν δὲ¹ θῆ καὶ φαίνηται εὐλογωτέρως εὐνέχεσθαι, καὶ ἄτοπον ἐπεί καὶ τὰ ἐν Ὁδυσσεία ἀλογα τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐκθέσειν ἀσ οὐκ ἂν ἢν ἀνεκτὰ δῆλον ἢν γένοιτο, εἰ αὐτὰ φαύλος ποιητής ποιήσετε· νῦν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀγαθοῖς ὁ ποιητής ἀφανίζει ἡδύνων τοῦ ἄτοπον. τῆ δὲ λέξει δεῖ διαπο-νεῖν ἐν τοῖς ἄργοις μέρεσιν καὶ μήτε ἡθικοῖς μήτε διανοητικοῖς· ἀποκρύπτει γὰρ πάλιν ἡ λιαν λαμπρὰ λέξις τὰ τε ἴθη καὶ τὰς διανοιάς.

XXV Περὶ δὲ προβλημάτων καὶ λύσεων, ἢ πόσων τε καὶ ποίων εἶδών ἐστιν, ὦδ' ἂν θεωρούσων γένοιτ' ἂν φανερόν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐστι μμητής ὁ ποιητής ὁσπερανεί ζωγράφοις ή τις ἄλλος εἰκονοποιοῖς, ἀνάγκη μμείσθαι τριῶν ὄντων τὸν ἄριθμον ἐν τι ἀεί, ἡ γὰρ οἶα ἢν ἢ ἐστιν, ἡ οἰα φασίν καὶ δοκεῖ, ἡ οἰα εἶναι

¹ δὲ θῆ ΒΑ²; δεθῆ Α; δὲ τεθῆ cod. Robortelli

ᵃ OT 112–13; cf. 54b6–8.
ᵇ Soph. El. 680 ff; the objection may be to the anachronism of Pythian Games in the mythological setting.
be preferred to the possible but implausible. Stories should not comprise irrational components; ideally there should be no irrationality, or, failing that, it should lie outside the plot (as with Oedipus' ignorance of how Laius died), not inside the drama (as with those who report events at Delphi in Electra, or the silent figure who comes from Tegea to Mysia in the Mysians). The excuse that the plot would have been ruined is ridiculous; one should not construct plots like this in the first place. If a poet posits an irrationality, and a more rational alternative is apparent, this is an absurdity. Even the irrational details in the Odyssey about the putting ashore would patently be intolerable if an inferior poet were to handle them; as it is, Homer uses his other qualities to soften and disguise the absurdity. The poet should elaborate his diction especially in quieter passages which involve no characterisation or thought; a highly brilliant diction, on the other hand, obscures character and thought.

With problems and their solutions, the following considerations will clarify their number and their types. Since the poet, like a painter or any other image-maker, is a mimetic artist, he must represent, in any instance, one of three objects: the kind of things which were or are the case; the kind of things that people say and think; the kind

A ref. to the long period of silence endured by Telephus in the Mysians of either Aesch. or Soph.
Sc. without one of these elements.
Of Odysseus by the Phaeacians: 13.116 ff.
Ch. XXV may summarise points from Ar.'s (lost) Homeric Problems in six books.
Εἰ δὲ τάῦτα δ' ἐξαγγέλλεται λέει ἐν Ἡ καὶ γλώτται καὶ μεταφοραί καὶ πολλὰ πάθη τῆς λέξεως ἐστὶν δίδομεν γὰρ τάῦτα τοῖς ποιηταῖς. πρὸς δὲ τούτους οὖχ ἡ αὐτὴ ὀρθότης ἐστὶν τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς οὐδὲ ἄλλης τέχνης καὶ ποιητικῆς. αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς ποιητικῆς διττὴ ἁμαρτία, ἡ μὲν γὰρ καθ' αὐτὴν, ἡ δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκός. εἰ μὲν γὰρ προείλετο μμησάοσθαι ἄνυναμιν, αὐτῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία; εἰ δὲ τὸ προελέσθαι μὴ ὀρθῶς, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἵππον ἀμφότερό τα δεξιὰ προβεβληκότα, ἢ τὸ καθ' ἐκάστην τέχνην ἁμαρτημα, οἶνον τὸ κατ' ιατρικὴν ἡ ἄλλην τέχνην ὡστε δεῖ τὰ ἐπιτυμήματα ἐν τοῖς προβλήμασιν ἐκ τούτων ἐπισκοποῦντα λύειν. πρῶτον μὲν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν τῆς τέχνης ἅδυνατα πεποίηται, ἡμάρτηται: ἀλλ' ὀρθῶς ἔχει, εἰ τυγχάνει τοῦ τέλους τοῦ αὐτῆς (τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐδρηται), εἰ οὕτως ἐκπληκτικότερον ἡ αὐτὸ ἡ ἄλλο ποιεῖ μέρος. παράδειγμα ἡ τοῦ Ῥκτορος δίωξις. εἰ μέντοι τὸ τέλος ἢ μᾶλλον ἢ μὴ ἢπτον ἐνεδέχετο ὑπάρχειν καὶ  

1 ἐν Ἡ B: Ἡ A  
2 γλώττας καὶ μεταφοραὶ Menardos: -ά καὶ -ά B: γλώττας καὶ μεταφοραῖς A  
3 lacunam stat. et ὀρθῶς, ἡμαρτε δ' ἐν τῷ μμησάοσθαι suppl. Vahlen  
4 post τέχνην seq. ἢ ἅδυνατα πεποίηται in AB: secl. Duentzer (ἡ ἅδυνατα non vertit Lat.)  
5 μᾶλλον ἢ μὴ ἢπτον Ueberweg: μᾶλλον ἢπτον B: μᾶλλον ἢπτον A
of things that ought\(^a\) to be the case. These are conveyed in a diction which includes loan words, metaphors, and many stylistic abnormalities: we allow poets these. Moreover, poetry does not have the same standard of correctness as politics,\(^b\) or as any other art. In poetry as such, there are two kinds of fault: one intrinsic, the other incidental. If the poet chose to represent <correctly, but failed through>\(^c\) incapacity, the fault lies in his art. But if the choice is not correct, but (say) to show the horse with both right legs thrown forward,\(^d\) or a technical mistake (e.g. in medicine or any other art), the fault is not intrinsic.\(^e\) So it is on these principles that one should examine and resolve the criticisms contained in problems.

First, cases involving the art itself. Say a poem contains impossibilities: this is a fault. But it is acceptable if the poetry achieves its goal (which has been stated),\(^f\) that is, if it makes this or some other part of the work more thrilling. An example is the pursuit of Hector.\(^g\) But if the goal could be achieved better, or no less well, without

\(^a\) In moral or ideal terms; cf. 60b33 ff.

\(^b\) Politike, Ar.'s general term for the ethics of both public and private life; cf. 50b6–7.

\(^c\) Without some such supplement, the passage's sense is lost.

\(^d\) Not, in fact, a physical impossibility, ctr. Ar. De incessu anim. 712a24–30.

\(^e\) Contrast Pl. Ion 537a ff.

\(^f\) Ar. probably means various remarks about plot-construction (e.g. 50a22–3) and emotional qualities of both tragedy and epic.

\(^g\) I.e. the scene (cf. 60a14–16) is dramatically thrilling, despite allegedly "irrational" elements.
ARISTOTLE

κατὰ τὴν περὶ τούτων τέχνην, οὐκ ὁρθώς· δεῖ γὰρ εἰ ἐνδέχεται ὅλως μηδαμὴ ἡμαρτήσθαι. ἔτι ποτέρων ἐστὶ τὸ ἀμάρτημα, τῶν κατὰ τὴν τέχνην ἢ κατὰ ἄλλο συμβεβηκός; ἔλαττον γὰρ εἰ μὴ ἥδει ὁτι ἐλαφὸς θήλεια κέρατα οὐκ ἔχει ἢ εἰ ἀμμητῶς ἐγραφεῖν. πρὸς δὲ τούτως ἐὰν ἐπιτυμᾶται ὁτι οὐκ ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' ἵσως ὡς δὲ, οἶον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐφή αὐτὸς μὲν οἶον δεὶ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην ὡς οἶοι εἰσίν, ταύτη λυτέων. εἰ δὲ μηδετέρως, ὅτι οὐτω φασίν, οἶον τὰ περὶ θεῶν ἵσως γὰρ οὔτε βέλτιον οὔτω λέγειν οὔτ' ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' εἰ ἐνυχεῖν ὡσπερ Ἐνοφάνει· ἀλλ' οὖν4

ημαρτήσθαι. τὰ δὲ ἵσως οὐ βέλτιον μὲν, ἀλλ' οὔτως εἶχεν, οἶον τὰ περὶ τῶν ὄπλων, "ἔγχεια δὲ σφιν ὁρθ' ἐπὶ σαυρωτήρος"· οὔτω γὰρ τότ' ἐνόμιζον, ὡσπέρ καὶ νῦν Ἰλλυριαί. περὶ δὲ τοῦ καλῶς ἢ μὴ καλῶς εἰ5 εὑρηταί τινι ἢ πέπρακται, οὐ μόνον σκεπτέον εἰς αὕτω τὸ πετραγμένον ἢ εἰρημένον βλέποντα εἰ σπουδαίον ἢ φαύλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸν πράττοντα ἢ λέγοντα πρὸς ὅν ἢ ὅτε ἢ ὅπως ἢ οὖ ἔνεκεν, οἶον εἰ μείζονος ἀγαθοῦ, ἢν γένηται, ἢ μείζονος κακοῦ, ἢν αὐτὸν εἰσαγεῖναι.

1 ante οὐκ habent ἡμαρτήσθαι (τῆμ- B, μαρτ- A1) AB: del.
2 ὡς add. Vahlen
3 Εὐριπίδην Heinsius: -δης AB
4 οὖν Tyrwhitt: οὖ AB
5 εἰ Spengel: ἢ A: om. B
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infringing the relevant art, it does matter: since, if possible, there should be no faults. Next, ask what the fault pertains to—the realm of poetic art, or something incidental? For it is less serious not to know that a female deer has no horns, than to depict one unconvincingly. In addition, if the criticism is that something is false, well perhaps it is as it ought to be, just as Sophocles said he created characters as they ought to be, Euripides as they really are. If neither solution fits, there remains the principle that people say such things, for example in religion: perhaps it is neither ideal nor true to say such things, but maybe it is as Xenophanes thought; no matter, people do say them. Other details may not be ideal, but were once like this; for instance, in the case of the weapons, “their spears stood erect on the butt-spike”: this was then their custom, as it still is among Illyrians. When the question is whether or not someone has spoken or acted well, one should examine not only whether the actual deed or utterance is good or bad, but also the identity of the agent or speaker, to whom he acted or spoke, when, with what means, and for what end—namely, whether to occasion greater good, or avert greater evil.

a Lit. “unmimetically,” which implies (again) that mimetic standards are irreducible to factual fidelity.

b See 60b11.

c Where or when is unknown.

d Cf. 60b10.

e Polemical philosopher-poet, c. 570–475: see frs. 11–16 DK for satire of anthropomorphic beliefs, fr. 30 for denial of religious knowledge.

ἈΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

tὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν ὅρων τα δεὶ διαλύειν, οἷον
gλώττη τὸ ἀυρής μὲν πρῶτον’. ὡς γὰρ οὗ τῶν
ημίονος λέγει ἄλλα τοὺς φύλακας· καὶ τὸν Δόλωνα,
"ὅς ρ’ ἥ τοι εἴδος μὲν ἐγὼ κακός”, οὐ τὸ σώμα ἀσύμ-
μετρον ἄλλα τὸ πρόσωπον αἰσχρόν, τὸ γὰρ εὑνεῖδες
οἱ Κρῆτες τὸ εὐπρόσωπον καλουῦσι· καὶ τὸ “ζωρότε-
ρον δὲ κέραυ” οὐ τὸ ἀκρατον ὡς οἰνόφλυξιν ἄλλα τὸ
θάττον. τὸ δὲ κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἰρηται, οἰον “πάν-
τες” μέν ρα θεοί τε καὶ ἀνέρες εἴδον παννύχιοι"·
ἀμα δὲ φησιν “ἡ τοῦ ὁτ’ ἐσε πεδίον τὸ Τρωικὸν ἀθρή-
σειν, αὐλών συρίγγων τε ὀμμαδον”. τὸ γὰρ πάντες
ἀντὶ τοῦ πολλοὶ κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἰρηται, τὸ γὰρ
πᾶν πολὺ τι. καὶ τὸ “οἶκη δ’ ἄμμορος” κατὰ μεταφο-
ράν, τὸ γὰρ γνωριμότατον μόνον. κατὰ δὲ προσω-
διαν, ὡσπερ Ἰππίας ἔλυεν ὁ Θάρσιος, τὸ “δίδομεν δὲ
οἱ εὐχος ἀρέσθαι” καὶ “τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται
ὀμβρψ”. τὰ δὲ διαιρέσει, οἴον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς “αἷσα
δὲ θυητ’ ἐφύοντο τὰ πρὶν μάθοιν ἀθάνατ’ εἶναι,

¹ πάντες Graefeskan: ἄλλοι AB
² ἀνέρες AB: ἀν. ἵπτοκορυσταῖ Arab., Lat.

ᵃ Hom. II. 1.50; the issue was why Apollo would have sent the
plague first upon animals. But oureis, unlike ouroi, does mean
“mules,” as also at 10.84.
ᵇ Hom. II. 10.316; the “problem” stemmed from the continu-
ation, “but was swift of foot.”
ᶜ Hom. II. 9.203; Greeks rarely drank undiluted wine.
ᵈ Hom. II. 10.1–2, garbled (but cf. 2.1–2), and 10.11, 13: “he
marvelled at” is in Homer but not Ar.’s quotation.
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Some problems should be resolved by reference to diction, such as the use of a loan word in "first against the oureis . . .": perhaps he does not mean the mules, but the guards. And with Dolon, "who in form [eidōs] was poor," perhaps he does not mean his body was misshapen, but his face was ugly, since the Cretans call facial beauty eueides. And "mix it stronger" may not imply neat wine for topers, but mixing faster. Other points involve metaphor; for instance, "all gods and men slept through the night," yet at the same time he says "whenever he gazed at the Trojan plane, he marvelled at the din of reed pipes and panpipes"; "all" has been said metaphorically for "many," as all is a kind of multiplicity. Likewise "alone without a share" is metaphorical, since "alone" means "best known." Accentuation, as in Hippias of Thasus' solutions, affects "we grant him to achieve his prayer," and "the part rotted by rain." Others are solved by punctuation, such as Empedocles' "at once things became mortal

---

*e* Cf. 57b11–13, metaphor "from species to genus."


*g* Metaphor from species ("unique") to genus ("notable"); cf. 57b11–13.

*h* Cf. Hom. *Il.* 21.297, but the ref. is to 2.15 (see *Soph. El.* 166b6–8); a change of accent makes "we grant" into (imperative) "grant": the (tortuous) aim is to exculpate Zeus of deception at *Il.* 2.15. Hippias cannot be identified with confidence.

ARISTOTLE

25 ζωρά 1 τε πρὶν κέκρητο". 2 τὰ δὲ ἀμφιβολία, "παρῴ-
χηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ"· τὸ γὰρ πλεῖόν ἀμφίβολον ἔστων.
τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐθος τῆς λέξεως· τὸν κεκραμένον
οἰνὸν φασιν εἶναι, ὅθεν πεποίηται "κινημίς νεοτεύ-
κτον κασσιτέρου"· καὶ χαλκέας τοὺς τὸν σίδηρον
ἐργαζομένους, ὅθεν εἰρήται ὁ Γαννυμήδης Διο ὀίνοχο-
εῦειν, οὐ πινόντων οἰνον. εἰ ὅ` ἃν τοῦτὸ γε καὶ 3
κατὰ μεταφοράν.

δὲ δὲ καὶ ὅταν ὄνομα τι ὑπεναντίωμα τι δοκῇ
σημαίνειν, ἐπισκοπεῖν ποσαχῶς ἀν σημήνει τούτο
ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ, οἶον τῷ 4 "τῇ ῥ’ ἐσχετο χάλκεον
ἐγχος" τὸ ταύτη κωλυθῆναι ποσαχῶς ἐνδέχεται,
ὡδὲ ἢ ὁδι, ὡς μᾶλλον κατὰ τὴν
καταντικρὺ ἢ ὡς Γλαύκων λέγει, ὅτι ἐννοοῖ 5 ἀλόγως
προὔπολαμβάνουσι τι καὶ αὐτοῖ καταπησαμένοι
συλλογίζονται, καὶ ὡς εἰρήκοτο ὅ τι δοκεῖ ἐπιτμῶ-
σιν, ἄν ὑπεναντίον ἢ τῇ αὐτῶν οἰήσει. τούτῳ δὲ
πέπονθε τὰ περὶ Ἰκάριον. οἰονται γὰρ αὐτῶν
Λάκωνα εἶναι· ἀτόπον οὖν τὸ μῆ ἐντυχεῖν τὸν Τηλε-
μαχον αὐτῷ εἰς Δακεδάιμονα ἐλθόντα. τὸ δ` ἵσως

---

1 ζωρά Vettori ex Athen. 423F: ζώξa AB
2 κέκρητο Α: κέκρητο BA
3 καὶ add. Heinsius (Arab.)
4 τῷ Bywater: τὸ AB
5 ἐννοι Vettori (Arab.): ἐννα AB

---

a Fr. 35.14–15 DK (text disputed): the ambiguity is between taking “previously” with “unmixed” or the verb.

b Hom. II. 10.252; the context is “more . . . than two thirds, but a third is still left”: it is uncertain whether Ar. wished “more
that previously had known immortality, and unmixed previously were mixed." Others by ambiguity: in "more of the night has passed," "more" is ambiguous. Others involve usage of diction. People still speak of "wine" when it is mixed; so too with the phrase "a greave of new-forged tin." And as we call iron workers "bronzesmiths," so too Ganymede is described as "pouring wine for Zeus," even though gods do not drink wine. The last could also be a case of metaphor.

When the sense of a word seems to entail a contradiction, one should consider how many senses it could have in the context: as in "by which the bronze spear was stopped," how many senses are possible for its being blocked at this point, choosing the best assumption between alternatives. This is the reverse of what Glaucon describes, that some people adopt an unreasonable premise, base inferences on their prejugement, and, if something contradicts their opinion, blame the poet as though he had said what they merely suppose. The issue of Icarius is a case in point: people think he was a Laconian, so it is absurd Telemachus did not encounter him when he went to Sparta. But perhaps it is as the

than" to mean "the greater part of" or "full"; cf. fr. 385 Gigon/161 Rose.

*Hom. II. 21.592: i.e. "tin" means "tin alloyed with copper."

d Cf. Hom. II. 20.234; gods drink nectar.

e "By analogy": 57b16 ff.

f Hom. II. 20.272; the problem is how a spear, having penetrated two layers of bronze, could be stopped by a presumably outer layer of gold. Ar. gives no solution.

*Unidentifiable, but cf. Pl. Ion 530d. In Hom. Od. bk. 4, where Icarius (Penelope's father) does not appear.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΕ

ἐχει ὁσπερ οἱ Κεφαλὴνες φασι· παρ’ αὐτῶν γὰρ γῆμαι λέγουσι τὸν Ὄδυσσεα καὶ εἶναι Ἰκάδιον ἀλλ’ οὖν Ἰκάριον. δι’ ἅμαρτημα δὲ τὸ πρόβλημα εἰκὸς ἐστιν. ὅλως δὲ τὸ ἀδύνατον μὲν πρὸς τὴν ποίησιν ἡ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ἡ πρὸς τὴν δόξαν δεῖ ἀνάγειν. πρὸς τε γὰρ τὴν ποίησιν αἱρετῶτερον πιθανὸν ἀδύνατον ἡ ἀπίθανον καὶ δυνατῶν. * * * τοιοῦτος εἶναι οἶον Ζεῦξις ἐγραφεῖν, ἀλλὰ βέλτιον τὸ γὰρ παράδειγμα δεὶ ὑπερέχειν. πρὸς ἀ παθῶν τάλογα· οὖτω τε καὶ ὁτι ποτὲ οὐκ ἄλογόν ἐστιν· εἰκὸς γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς γίνεσθαι. τὰ δὲ υπεναντίως εἰρημένα οὖτω σκοπεῖν ὁσπερ οἱ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐλεγχοι εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ὡσαύτως, ὡστε καὶ αὐτὸν ἡ πρὸς ἀ αὐτὸς λέγει ἡ ὁ ἀν φρόνιμος ὑποθήται. ὁρθὴ δ’ ἐπιτιμησίς καὶ ἄλογία καὶ μοχθηρία, όταν μὴ ἀνάγκης· οὕσης μηθὲν χρήσηται τῷ ἄλογῳ, ὁσπερ Ἐὐριπίδης τῷ Αἰγεῖ, ἡ τῇ ποιηρίᾳ, ὁσπερ ἐν Ὀρέστῃ τῇ τοῦ Μενελάου. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐπιτιμήματα ἐκ πέντε εἰδῶν φέροντες ἡ γὰρ ὡς ἀδύνατα ἡ ὡς ἄλογα ἡ ὡς βλαβερὰ ἡ ὡς υπεναντία ἡ ὡς παρὰ τὴν ορθότητα τὴν κατὰ τέχνην. οἱ δὲ

1 δι’ ἅμαρτημα Maggi (Lat.): διαμάρτημα A
2 lacunam stat. Vahlen: καὶ ἵσως ἀδύνατον suppl. Gomperz (ex Arab.)
3 υπεναντίως Twining: υπεναντία ὡς A
4 αὐτὸν AB: αὐτέον M. Schmidt
5 ἄλογία καὶ μοχθηρία Vahlen: -a . . . -a A
6 τῇ add. Vahlen
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Cephallenians\textsuperscript{a} maintain: they say it was one of their people Odysseus married, and the father's name was Icadius not Icarius. That the problem is due to a mistake seems likely. In general, impossibility should be referred to poetic needs, to the ideal, or to popular belief. Poetic needs make something plausible though impossible preferable to what is possible but implausible. \textless It may be impossible\textgreater that people should be as Zeuxis\textsuperscript{b} painted them, but it is ideal, since a paragon should be of higher stature. Refer irrationalities to what people say;\textsuperscript{c} and there is also the defence that they are sometimes not rational, since it is probable that improbable things occur.\textsuperscript{d} Contradictions should be scrutinised as with refutations in argument,\textsuperscript{e} to see whether the same is meant, in the same relation, and in the same respect, so that the poet himself contradicts either his own words or what an intelligent person would assume. But criticism of both irrationality and depravity is right when they are unnecessary and no purpose is served by the irrationality (as with Aigeus in Euripides)\textsuperscript{f} or the wickedness (as with Menelaus' in \textit{Orestes}).\textsuperscript{g} So then, people make criticisms of five types: that things are impossible, irrational, harmful,\textsuperscript{h} contradictory, or contrary to artistic stan-

\textsuperscript{a} Cephallenia: island s.w. of (Odysseus') Ithaca.
\textsuperscript{b} See on 50a27.
\textsuperscript{c} Cf. 60b10.
\textsuperscript{d} Cf. 56a24–5.
\textsuperscript{e} The subject of Ar.'s \textit{Sophistici Elenchi}.
\textsuperscript{f} Eur. \textit{Med.} 663 ff.
\textsuperscript{g} Eur. \textit{Or.} 356 ff, 1554 ff; cf. 54a29.
\textsuperscript{h} This was implicit at 61a4–9; cf. e.g. Pl. \textit{Rep.} 3.391b4.
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΛΗ

λύσεις ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀριθμῶν σκεπτέαι. εἰσὶν δὲ δῶδεκα.

XXVI Πότερον δὲ βελτίων ἡ ἐποπουκή μύμησις ἢ ἡ τραγική, διαπορήσειν ἀν τις. εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἠττον φορτική βελτίων, τοιαύτη δ᾽ ἡ πρὸς βελτίους θεατάς ἔστιν αἱ,1 λιαν δὴλον ὅτι ἡ ἀπαντα μιμουμένη φορτική· ὡς γὰρ οὐκ αἰσθανομένων ἀν μὴ αὐτὸς προσθῇ, πολλὰ κίνησιν κινοῦνται, οὗν οἱ φαύλοι αὐληταί κυλίσμενοι ἀν δύσκολ ἀν ἡμείσθαι, καὶ ἐλκοντες τὸν κορυφαῖον ἀν Σκύλλαν αὐλῶσιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν τραγῳδία τοιαύτη ἐστίν, ὡς καὶ οἱ πρότερον τοὺς υπέρων αὐτῶν ζωντο ύποκρίτας: ὡς λιαν γὰρ ὑπερβάλλοντα πίθηκον ὁ Μυρνύσκος τὸν Κελλυπίδην ἐκάλει, τοιαύτη δὲ δόξα καὶ περὶ Πυθάρου ἤπως δ᾽ οὕτω ἔχουσι πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἡ ὅλη τέχνη πρὸς τὴν ἐποποίαν ἐχεί. τὴν μὲν οὖν πρὸς θεατὰς ἔπιεικείς φασίν εἶναι οὕτω δὲνται τῶν σχημάτων, τὴν δὲ τραγικὴν πρὸς φαύλους· εἰ οὖν φορτική, χείρων δὴλον ὅτι ἀν εἴη. πρῶτον μὲν οὖ τῆς ποιητικῆς ἡ κατηγορία ἀλλὰ τῆς ὑποκριτικῆς, ἔπει ἐστι περιεργάζεσθαι τοῖς σημείοις καὶ ῥαβδοῦντα, ὁπερ3 Σωσίστρατος, καὶ διάδοντα, ὁπερ ἐποίει Μνασίθεος ὁ Οἰσούντιος. εἰτα οὐδὲ κίνησις ἀπασα ἀποδοκιμα-

1 αἱ, λιαν Vahlen: δεκαλιαν Α
2 οὗ Vettori (Arab.): om. Α
3 ὁπερ ἐστὶ A: ἐστὶ del. Duentzer

a Attempts to make sense of this number have proved inconclusive.
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dards. Solutions should be sought from the categories set out, of which there are twelve.  

One might reasonably ask whether epic or tragic mimesis is superior. If the less vulgar art is superior, and if this is always the one addressed to a superior audience, evidently the art which represents\(^b\) everything is utterly vulgar: here, in the belief that the spectators do not notice anything unless the performer stresses it, they engage in profuse movement (e.g. crude aulos players\(^c\) rolling round to represent a discus, and mauling the chorus leader if their music concerns Scylla).\(^d\) Well, tragedy is like this, just as with the earlier actors' views of their successors: it was for an excessive style that Mynniscus dubbed Callippides an "ape," and the same opinion was also held about Pindarus.\(^e\) As the later actors stand to the earlier, so does tragic art as a whole to epic. People say that the latter is addressed to decent spectators who have no need of gestures, but tragedy to crude spectators; if, then, tragedy is vulgar, it will evidently be inferior. Now, in the first place, this charge applies not to poetry but to acting, since one can overdo visual signals both in an epic recital, like Sosistratus,\(^f\) and in a singing display, as Mnasitheus\(^g\) the Opountian used to do. Secondly, not all

\(^{b}\) Mimeisthai here implies full enactment; cf. Pl. Rep. 3.397a.
\(^{c}\) See on 47a15.
\(^{d}\) The musicians elaborate poetic themes with grotesque movements; Scylla: see on 54a31.
\(^{e}\) Mynniscus acted for Aesch., but also as late as 422 (DFA\(^2\) pp. 93, 105, 112); Callippides belongs to the later 5th cent. (Xen. Symp. 3.11, DFA\(^2\) p. 94), as probably does Pindarus.
\(^{f}\) An unknown rhapsode.
\(^{g}\) Unknown.
στέα, εἴπερ μηδ’ ὀρχησίς, ἀλλ’ ἡ φαύλων, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐνίππιλη ἐπετιμᾶτο καὶ νῦν ἄλλους ὡς οὐκ ἔλευ-θέρας γυναίκας μμονυμένων. ἔτι ἡ τραγῳδία καὶ ἄνευ κινήσεως ποιεῖ τὸ αὐτής, ὥσπερ ἡ ἐποποιία· διὰ γὰρ τοῦ ἀναγνώσκειν φανερὰ ὄποια τίς ἐστιν’ εἰ ὁὔν ἔστι τὰ γ’ ἄλλα κρείττων, τοῦτό γε οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτῇ ὑπάρχειν. ἔπειτα διότι πάντ’ ἔχει ὀσπερὴ ἡ ἐποποιία (καὶ γὰρ τῷ μέτρῳ ἐξεστὶ χρή-σθαι), καὶ ἔτι οὐ μικρὸν μέρος τὴν μονοικὴν καὶ τὰς ὀψεις, δι’ ᾧ 1 αἱ ἰδοναὶ συνιστανται ἐναργείστατα· εἴτα καὶ τὸ ἐναργές ἔχει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει2 καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων· ἔτι τῷ ἐν ἐλάττων μήκει τὸ τέλος τῆς μιμήσεως εἶναι (τὸ γὰρ ἀθροώτερον ἡδιον3 ἡ πόλλὼ κεκραμένον τῷ χρόνῳ, λέγω δ’ οἶνον εἰ τις τὸν Οἰδί-πον θείη τὸν Σοφοκλέους ἐν ἐπεσιν ὀσοὶς ἡ Ἰλιάς)· ἔτι ἢττον μία4 ἡ μίμησις ἡ τῶν ἐποποιῶν (σημεῖον δὲ, ἐκ γὰρ ὀποιασοῦν μιμήσεως πλείους τραγῳδίαι γίνονται), ὡστε ἐὰν μὲν ἕνα μῦθον ποιῶσιν, ἡ βρα-χέως δεικνύμενον μύονρον φαίνεσθαι, ἡ ἀκολού-θουντα τῷ τοῦ μέτρου μῆκει υδαρῆ· λέγω δὲ οἶνον ἕαν ἐκ πλειόνων πράξεων ἦ συγκειμένη, ὥσπερ ἡ Ἰλιάς

---

1 ἂς coni. Vahlen: ἦς Α
2 ἀναγνώσει Maggi: ἀναγνωρίσει Α
3 ἡδιον ἢ Maggi: ἡδιον ἢ Β: ἡδονῇ Α
4 μία ἢ Spengel: ἡ μία ΑΒ

---

a The point concerns acting style, not choice of roles; Callippides: see 61b35.
b Ar. probably thinks of reading aloud; cf. 50b18–19, 53b3–6.
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movement (any more than all dancing) should be eschewed, but only that of crude performers, as with the complaint levelled against Callippides and now other actors, regarding portrayals of low women.\textsuperscript{a} Besides, tragedy achieves its effect even without actors’ movements, just like epic; reading makes its qualities clear.\textsuperscript{b} So if tragedy is otherwise superior, this defect\textsuperscript{c} need not adhere to it. Add the fact that tragedy possesses all epic’s resources (it can even use its metre),\textsuperscript{d} as well as having a substantial role for music\textsuperscript{e} and spectacle, which engender the most vivid pleasures.\textsuperscript{f} Again, tragedy has vividness in both reading and performance. Also, tragedy excels by achieving the goal of its mimesis in a shorter scope; greater concentration is more pleasurable than dilution over a long period: suppose someone were to arrange Sophocles’ \textit{Oedipus} in as many hexameters as the \textit{Iliad}. Also, the mimesis of epic poets is less unified (a sign of this is that any epic yields several tragedies),\textsuperscript{g} so that if they compose a single plot, it will seem either truncated (if its exposition is brief) or diluted (if it comports with the length that suits epic metre).\textsuperscript{h} By the latter I mean a structure of multiple actions,\textsuperscript{i} in the way that the \textit{Iliad}

\textsuperscript{a} I.e. vulgar performance practices.
\textsuperscript{b} Hexameters are in fact infrequent in tragedy.
\textsuperscript{c} \textit{Mousikē} must here be equivalent to \textit{melos}, “melody,” at 47b25, and to \textit{melopoïa}, “lyric poetry,” at 49b33 etc.; epic recitals were accompanied by music of a plainer kind.
\textsuperscript{d} Cf. and contrast 50b15–20.
\textsuperscript{e} But cf. 59b2–7.
\textsuperscript{f} Epic’s hexameter suits its nature, incl. its length: cf. 59b30–60a5.
\textsuperscript{g} Cf. 59b1.
Aristotle

ἐχει πολλὰ τοιαῦτα μέρη καὶ ἡ Ὄδύσσεια ἀ καὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὰ ἐχει μέγεθος. καίτοι ταῦτα τὰ ποιήματα συνέστηκεν ὡς ἐνδέχεται ἄριστα καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα μιᾶς πράξεως μίμησις. εἰ οὖν τούτοις τε διαφέρει πᾶσιν καὶ ἐτι τῷ τῆς τέχνης ἐργῷ (δεὶ γὰρ οὖ τῆν τυχούσαν ἡδονήν ποιεῖν αὐτάς ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰρημένην), φανερὸν ὅτι κρείττων ἂν εἴη μᾶλλον τοῦ τέλους τυγχάνουσα τῆς ἐποποίας.

περὶ μὲν οὖν τραγωδίας καὶ ἐποποίας, καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν καὶ τῶν μερῶν, καὶ πόσα καὶ τί διαφέ- ρει, καὶ τοῦ εῦ ἢ μὴ τίνες αἰτίαι, καὶ περὶ ἐπιτιμή- σεων καὶ λύσεων, εἰρήσθω τοσαῦτα.1

1 seq. vestigia obscura in B, unde περὶ δὲ (?)/άμβων καὶ κωμῳδίας restitui potest
and *Odyssey* have many such parts of individual magnitude. Yet these poems are structured as well as could be, and are as close as possible to mimesis of a single action. If, then, tragedy excels in all these respects, as well as in the function of the art (for these genres should produce no ordinary pleasure, but the one stated),\textsuperscript{a} it will evidently be superior to epic through greater success in achieving its goal.

As regards tragedy and epic, the number and distinguishing features of their varieties and components, the reasons for success and failure in them, and criticisms and their solutions, let this count as sufficient discussion.

\textsuperscript{a} At 53b10–13 (for tragedy).

\textsuperscript{b} There originally followed a discussion of comedy in the work's "second book", cf. 49b21–2.
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Date and authorship

Both date and authorship of this famous and important book remain a matter of controversy. The only evidence for the author’s name is given by the conflicting statements of the tenth-century manuscript (Parisinus 2036, hereafter P) on which alone our text depends. P has, in the title, Διονυσίου Λογγάνου; in the table of contents, Διονυσίου ἡ Λογγάνου. Which represents ancient tradition? If the ἡ (“or”) is original, and its omission in the title an accident, we clearly have two guesses at the author, presumably by Byzantine scholars: he was either the Augustan Dionysius of Halicarnassus or the third-century Cassius Longinus, a pupil of Plotinus, but a scholar and statesman rather than a philosopher. Neither guess is at all probable. Dionysius’ numerous works are quite different from our book in style and in general approach. It is true that both he and our author (39.1) wrote on word arrangement (σύνθεσις), but Dionysius’ treatise is in one book, and our author says he has written two.

Cassius Longinus has been a much more popular choice; indeed, this identification was undisputed until the early nineteenth century, and the lofty tone of On the Sublime was seen as the natural reflection of the heroic
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temper of the minister of Queen Zenobia, who was put to
death after the fall of Palmyra in A.D. 273 (Gibbon, ch. xi).
Moreover, there are actually some overlaps between On
the Sublime and the fragments of Cassius Longinus' rhei-
torical treatise (conveniently printed in A. O.
Prickard's edition of On the Sublime, Oxford 1906, as in
many early editions); and the eleventh-century rhetori-
cian John of Sicily (Rhetores graeci 6.211, 6.225 Walz)
actually refers to Longinus' Φιλόλογοι ὄμιλιαι for opin-
ions which coincide with points made in On the Sblime
3.1 and 9.9 (see now G. Mazzucchi, Aevum 64 (1990)
153–63). But there is no reason why any of this should be
taken as proving Longinian authorship. Indeed there are
even differences in the details of style and language,
which surely make identification impossible: to take a
small but notable matter, On the Sublime regularly has
πάντες ἔξης for "absolutely all," whereas Longinus has
ἕφεξης in the same idiom (Russell, 1964, xxv n.1). There
are powerful arguments also in matters of content. In On
the Sublime, no writer later than Cicero, Caecilius, and
Theodorus is named; the real Longinus—if these frag-
mentary texts are to be trusted—spoke favourably of
Aelius Aristides. Again, our author is an admirer of Plato,
and much of his argument is directed to defending Plato
against unappreciative critics like Caecilius; Longinus
himself seems to have criticized Plato's "poetic" style in
terms very like those of our author's opponents (R 7–10, S
23–25 Prickard).

The principal argument against Cassius Longinus is
also a general argument against any date later than about
A.D. 100, namely that derived from the closing chapter
(44). Here, a "philosopher" presents the view that the
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"decline" of oratory is due to the loss of free speech and political liberty, while the author represents himself as countering this by attributing the decline to a moral collapse rather than external circumstances. There are indeed a lot of ambiguities and difficulties in this little dialogue; it is not easy to be sure whether the author is thinking of the contrast between the free cities of Greece in the age of Demosthenes and their subsequent subjection to Macedon and later to Rome, or of the contrast between Cicero’s republican liberty and the principate of Augustus and his successors. The setting and tone of the book, however, suggest that it is primarily this second set of circumstances that is meant. After all, the addressee, Postumius Terentianus, is a young Roman of some standing; and our author is prepared to venture an opinion about Cicero. It is all relevant to Rome. But if this is so, parallels in other authors—the two Senecas, Tacitus, Pliny—strongly suggest a date in the first century A.D. It is harder to be more precise. Good arguments have been advanced for an Augustan date (G. P. Goold, American Journal of Philology 92 (1961) 168–192), the age of Tiberius (H. Selb, “Probleme der Schrift περὶ υψωσ” diss. Heidelberg 1957), and the end of the century (e.g. K. Heldmann, Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst, Munich 1982, 286–293, making the book a response to Tacitus’ Dialogus). The third-century date still has advocates (G. W. Williams, Change and Decline, Berkeley 1978, 17–25; G. Luck, Arctos 5 (1967) 97–113; and, tentatively, G. M. A. Grube, Greek and Roman Critics, Toronto 1965, 340–352), but the case is not strong.

So what are we to call the author? He is either anony-
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amous, the Great Unknown, or, if we assume that the title of P has authority, he is Dionysius Longinus; the name is not impossible after all. It is tantalizing that his addressee, Postumius Terentianus, cannot be identified; he may, of course, be the Terentianus who served in Egypt A.D. 85/6 (Martial 1.86), or the man whose name is on a lead water pipe of the second century (C.I.L. XV.2.7373). But who these people were, and what circle they moved in, are less important questions than what the book says, and what place it holds in the history of criticism.

Analysis

Analysis of the treatise is rendered difficult by the damage which P has suffered; there are six long lacunae, and something missing at the end. We have lost about a third of the book. Nevertheless, we can see the author’s plan clearly enough, except in one important respect, the treatment given to πάθος. We can also see that some of his central theses are presented not in the course of the argument as he advertises it in chapter 8, but in the eloquent and powerful digressions. He is a sophisticated artist, both in his style and in his economy. This has always been recognized. Pope’s famous remark (Essay on Criticism 675–680) that he is “himself the great sublime he draws” has antecedents in the earliest period of Longinian criticism: Francesco Porto (1569) says of him: “non solum docet sed etiam rapit, et quodammodo vim afferit lectoribus”—exactly what “Longinus” says himself of the writers he admires.

Let us set out the analysis as far as we can.
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1–2: A formal preface, in which Caecilius of Caleacte (a friend of Dionysius, it seems: ad Pompeium 3) is criticized, Terentianus flattered, the subject defined, and the objection that ὅψ is a matter of nature, not art, raised and answered.

3–5: Following the first lacuna, we find ourselves in the midst of a discussion of faults consequent on inadequate or misconceived attempts to achieve sublimity: turgidity, frigid conceits, inappropriate emotiveness. This helps to define the subject by contrast.

6–7: A positive account of the true sublime follows, but in very general terms. It is something which stands repeated reading, and makes a powerful and lasting impression on readers of different backgrounds. It will endure.

8: There are five sources of sublimity: (i) great thoughts (9–15); (ii) strong emotion—something Caecilius left out; (iii) certain figures of thought and speech (16–29); (iv) noble diction (30–38, 43); (v) dignified word arrangement (39–42).

But where is emotion (ii) discussed? This is the problem that has most exercised critics; see, for a good discussion, J. Bompaire, REG 86 (1973) 323–343. We are told at the very end (44.12) that πάθη are to be the subject of a special treatment to follow next; on the other hand, there are many references throughout the book to emotion, seen as an integral element in sublimity, and associated with all the other four sources. The safest conclusion is that some explanation of this procedure was given in the long passage lost following 9.4.
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(i)
9.1–4: Beginning of the discussion of great thoughts.
9.5–15: Homer's greatness of thought, with a remark (9.9) on the beginning of Genesis, seen as a worthy representation of the divine, and a comparison (9.11–15) of Iliad and Odyssey.

10: Selection and accumulation of detail as a means to sublimity; including an analysis of a poem by Sappho (φαίνεται μου κήνος . . . )

12.4–13.1: Following the lacuna, we find the author still discussing amplification, with a comparison between Cicero and Demosthenes, and an example of Plato's art of combining abundance with sublimity.

13.2–14: The mention of Plato raises the question of imitation as a means of attaining sublimity, since Plato drew on Homer, and we should draw on, and try to think like, the great men of the past.

15: Phantasia—visualization or imagination—as a means to sublimity; the difference between rhetorical and poetical visualization.

(iii)
16–17: General introduction to the discussion of figures (16–29), including a detailed examination of the Marathon oath in Demosthenes (de corona 208), and advice on concealing one's ingenuity, so as not to be suspected of trickery: the best concealment is sublimity and emotion.

18: Rhetorical questions. A lacuna follows.
19: Asyndeton.
20–21: Anaphora and asyndeton.
22: Hyperbaton, including a detailed analysis of a passage in Herodotus.
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23–24: Polyptoton, singular for plural, plural for singular.
25: Historic present.
26–27: Vivid second person; abrupt introduction of direct speech.
28–29: Periphrasis.
29.2: Summary, emphasizing again the close links between emotion and sublimity.
(iv)
30: Introduction to the section on language. A lacuna follows.
31: The discussion is now about metaphor, and especially vivid and idiomatic examples.
32: Criticism of Caecilius’ rule that one should not use more than two or three metaphors on any one theme: examples from Demosthenes, Xenophon, and Plato’s Timaeus. Caecilius’ criticism of Plato and excessive enthusiasm for Lysias are seen to be motivated by contentiousness.
33–35: A “digression,” to which Wilamowitz gave the title Regeln und Genien. (It is the most eloquent part of the book, and central to its message.) Genius, even when it makes mistakes, is preferable to impeccable mediocrity. Mechanical criticism would prefer Hyperides to Demosthenes, and we see this to be absurd; the gap between Plato and Lysias is infinitely wider. Our admiration goes to the greatest works of nature, not to mere prettiness, and hence also to the products of natural genius, which all ages admire.
38: Hyperbole.
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(v)
39–42: Word arrangement: examples of the ways in which rhythm is decisive in producing sublime effects, and common words can be given grandeur by skilful placing. Dangers of excessive rhythmization and brevity. 43.1–5: seems to belong under “choice of words” not under “arrangement.” We have a lengthy discussion of a passage of Theopompus, in which the effect of a grand situation is marred by the intrusion of commonplace words and details.
43.6: In general, the opposites of the devices that produce sublimity will produce its opposite, lowness of style.
44.1–11: The deeper causes of failure are examined in a dialogue, in which an unnamed philosopher makes the case that it is loss of liberty that produces the current dearth of lofty writing, and the author attributes it rather to moral decline.
44.12: Transition to the promised discussion of πάθη, broken off short in our text.

A little about the background

“The appearance of this unknown Greek ... has something miraculous about it.” Ernst Curtius (Latin Literature and the European Middle Ages, 399 [E.T.]), in company with many, exaggerates. It is Longinus’ eloquence, and the fact that no similar work survives, that have led people to think him more mysterious than he really is. In fact he represents a tradition.

The basic division between grand and ordinary styles goes back a long way in Greek thinking: the ἀγών
between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* is a classical expression of the contrast. Indeed, later rhetoricians even found it in Homer, who contrasts Menelaus’ rapid, clear speech with Odysseus’ “winter snows” (*Iliad* 3.214). A third manner—the smoothness of Isocrates, or the honeyed words of Nestor (*Iliad* 1.243)—was, it seems, added later; and the resulting three-style theory is canonical in Cicero, Quintilian, and much later criticism. This development is not really relevant to Longinus, who is concerned only to identify the characteristics that mark out the emotionally intense and elevated from the merely pleasing and soothing. Nor is it precisely a style—a χαρακτήρ or *genus dicendi*—that is his subject: this is better described as a tone of writing, attainable only as a consequence of a developed intellectual and emotional response to life. This is not to say that his ἔγγος is conceptually unique in ancient criticism; but it resembles not so much the *genera dicendi* as what Dionysius calls “additional virtues” (*epithethoi aretai*), the possession of which lends a particular character to writers who already possess the “necessary virtues” of purity, clarity, and brevity. Even closer, perhaps, are certain of the *ideai*—forms or tones of speech—identified by the second-century rhetor Hermogenes and others of the same period. According to Hermogenes, all these *ideai* could be found in Demosthenes; but once detected and isolated, they could become patterns for imitation. Among these *ideai* were σεμνότης and σφιδρότης, solemnity and vehemence; and these, and others like them, were sharply opposed to the *ideai* of charm and delicacy, in a general contrast very like that which Longinus draws between Hyperides and Demosthenes. (The
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translation of Hermogenes by Cecil Wooten, Chapel Hill, 1988, may be consulted to form a notion of this theory and its implications.) But not even in Hermogenes is there so detailed, comprehensive, and enthusiastic a discussion of the high tone as in our treatise. Moreover, it is sharply distinguished from anything Hermogenes wrote by its firm moral basis. For Hermogenes, anyone could choose to write grandly if he selected his subject appropriately and followed the suggestions laid down about vocabulary, figures, sentence structure, and rhythm; for our author, it is only possible if you really develop your intellect and your emotions, by the study of the classics, to the point when high thoughts and their due expression come more or less instinctively to mind. This kind of attitude is quite common in the imperial period, and seems to have appealed especially to Romans. It is primarily a response on the part of teachers of rhetoric to accusations made by philosophers that their art was amoral, and could be used indifferently for good or bad ends. Longinus’ warm defence of Plato against Caecilius (and indeed Dionysius) and his assignment of the moral argument in chapter 44 to himself rather than to any philosopher point in the same direction; he wishes to commend himself to Terentianus not only as a technical teacher but as a guide to right attitudes in life. Only thus can his concern with Homer and classical poetry and his insistence on the need to look to posterity be seen to be “useful to public men,” ἀνδράσι πολιτικοῖς χρήσιμον, as he puts it in the preface (1.2).
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Influence

Parisinus 2036 was copied for Bessarion in 1468, and at least once again later in the century. Other copies of these copies were also made, and Latin translations circulated in manuscript before the first printed editions (1554–5) and printed Latin translations (1566, 1572). But the work made little impact on the literary world at large until much later. The Italian translation of Niccolo da Falgano (1560) remained in manuscript; the first published English version is by John Hall (1652). All was changed in 1674 by Boileau’s *Traité du sublime ou du merveilleux dans le discours, traduit du grec de Longin*. This made “Longinus” a central text in European criticism throughout the eighteenth century. In England, its influence was first advanced by John Dennis’ *Advancement and Reformation of Poetry* (1701), and *Grounds of Criticism in Poetry* (1704). No doubt the book’s moral stance was congenial to a thinker who regarded religion and “enthusiastic passion” as the natural subjects of poetry. But Dryden and Addison were also familiar with it, Sir Joshua Reynolds’ *Discourses on Painting* adapt many of its ideas, Gibbon and Dr. Johnson both admired it, and Burke at least used it as a starting point of speculation, though the main contentions of *The Sublime and the Beautiful* go far beyond Longinus’ scope. This eighteenth-century admiration faded with the coming of Romanticism, when that liberty of thought and comparative freedom from rule which Longinus authorized came to be taken for granted and no longer needed special defence. The eloquence of the book, however, has always continued to earn it enthusiastic readers and a wide
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response; the wealth of learned work on its text and interpretation, and the special place it always holds in histories of criticism, are testimony to its enduring significance.

Text

The text rests on Parisinus 2036 (P), supplemented by the apographa in two places where P was damaged after the primary copies were taken (viz. ὃς καὶ . . . ἡρκέσθην [8.1–9.4] and τὸ ἑπί οὐρανόν . . . ἵδεσθαι [9.4–9.10]) and also by two miscellanies (Parisinus 985 and its copy Vaticanus 285) which alone preserve the “fragmentum Tollianum,” viz. φύσις . . . θεωρίαν (2.3). Our brief and very selective apparatus mentions also (as “K marg.”) some variants (conjectures, no doubt) in the margin of Cantabrigiensis KK.VI.34, a copy of Bessarion’s copy, made by Francesco Porto, apparently in connection with the preparation of the Aldine edition of 1555.

Translation

This is a revision of W. Hamilton Fyfe’s version, and I have tried not to tamper with it where it did not seem positively misleading. Thus I have left the poetical quotations for the most part as they were, though their style is now very dated, and made even more artificial by Fyfe’s attempt to render Greek hexameters into English hexameters. I have also left some of Fyfe’s notes, but have replaced or supplied others. The text and punctuation have also been revised.
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ΠΕΡΙ ΤΨΟΤΣ
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΨΟΤΣ

1. Τὸ μὲν τοῦ Κακκίλιον συγγραμμάτιον, ὁ περὶ ὑψους συνετάξατο, ἀνασκοπομένους ἠμῖν ὡς οἶσθα κοινῇ. Ποστούμιμε Τερεντιανὲς φίλτατε, ταπεινότερον ἐφάνη τῆς ὄλης ὑποθέσεως, καὶ ἦκιστα τῶν καιρίων ἐφαπτόμενον οὐ πολλήν τε ὀφελειαν, ἢς μάλιστα δεὶ στοχάζεσθαι τὸν γράφοντα, περιποιοῦν τοῖς ἐπινυχάνουσιν, ἐϊγ’ ἐπὶ πάσης τεχνολογίας δυνὴν ἀπαιτομένων, προτέρου μὲν τοῦ δεῖξαι τί τὸ ὑποκεὶμενον, δευτέρου δὲ τῇ τάξει, τῇ δυνάμει δὲ κυριωτέρου, πῶς ἂν ἡμῖν αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ δι’ ἄντινων μεθόδων κτητὸν γένοιτο, ὅμως ὁ Κακκίλιος ποίον μὲν τι ὑπάρχει τὸ ὑψηλόν διὰ μυρίων ὁσῶν ὡς ἀγνοοῦσι πειρᾶται δεικνύναι, τὸ δὲ δι’ ὅτου τρόπου τὰς ἐαυτῶν φύσεως προάγειν ἱσχύσωμεν ἄν εἰς ποσὴν μεγέθους ἐπίδοσιν, οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον παρέλιπεν. πλὴν ἱσως τοιοῦτο μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα ὦ χ ὦ τῶς αἵτις ἐκεῖνοι τῶν ἐκελευθέρων ὡς αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπινοίας καὶ σπουδῆς ἄξιον ἐπανεῖν. ἔπει δὲ ἐνεκελεύσω καὶ ἡμᾶς τι περὶ ὑψους πάντως εἰς σὴν ὑπομνηματίσα-

1 Φλωρεντιανὲς P, corr. Manutius.
2 ἐϊγ’ Spengel: εἰτ’.
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1. You know, my dear Postumius Terentianus, that when we were studying together Caecilius' a little treatise on the Sublime it appeared to us to fall below the level of the subject and to fail to address the main points, or render its readers very much of that assistance which should be an author's chief aim, seeing that there are two requisites in every systematic treatise: the author must first define his subject, and secondly, though this is really more important, he must show us how and by what means we may reach the goal ourselves. Caecilius, however, endeavouring by a thousand instances to demonstrate the nature of the sublime, as though we know nothing about it, apparently thought it unnecessary to deal with the means by which we may be enabled to develop our natures to some degree of grandeur. Still, we ought perhaps rather to praise our author for the mere conception of such a treatise and the trouble spent upon it than to blame him for his omissions. But since you have now asked me in my turn to prepare some notes on the sublime for your own sake, let us then see whether my

a Caecilius of Caleacte in Sicily was a noted rhetorician and historian, contemporary with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and said to have been a Jew. See E. Ofenloch, Caecilii Fragmenta (1907) for a full (but uncritical) collection of material.
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σθαι χάριν, φέρε, εἰ τι δὴ δοκοῦμεν ἀνδράσι πολιτικοῖς τεθεωρηκέναι χρήσιμον ἐπισκεψομεθα. αὐτὸς δ᾿ ἦμιν, ἔταϊρε, τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους, ὡς πέφυκας καὶ καθήκει, συνεπικρινεῖς ἀληθέστατα· εὖ γὰρ δὴ ὁ ἀποφηνάμενος, τί θεοὶς ὡμοιον ἔχομεν, “ἐνεργεσίαν” εἶπας “καὶ ἀλήθειαν.” γράφων δὲ πρὸς σέ, φίλτατε, τὸν παιδείας ἐπιστήμονα, σχεδὸν ἀπῆλλαγμα καὶ τοῦ διὰ πλειώνων προϋποτίθεσθαι, ὡς ἀκρότης καὶ ἐξοχή τις λόγων ἐστὶ τὰ ύψη, καὶ ποιητῶν τε οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ συγγραφέων οὐκ ἀλλοθεν ἢ ἐνθένδε ποθὲν ἐπρώτευσαν καὶ ταῖς ἑαυτῶν περιέβαλον εὐκλείαις τὸν αἰώνα. οὐ γὰρ εἰς πειθώ τοὺς ἄκρωμένους ἀλλ᾿ εἰς ἐκκατασω ἀγεὶ τὰ ύπερφυα· πάντη δὲ γε σὺν ἐκπλήξει τοῦ πιθανοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸς χάριν ἀεὶ κρατεῖ τὸ θαυμάσιον, εἰγὲ τὸ μὲν πιθανὸν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ἐφ᾿ ἦμιν, ταῦτα δὲ δυναστείαν καὶ βίαν ἀμαχον προσφέροντα παντὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ἄκρωμενον καθίσταται· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς εὐρέσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων τάξιν καὶ οἰκονομίαν οὐκ εξ ἐνὸς οὐδ᾿ ἐκ δυνῆν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου τῶν λόγων ύψους μόλις ἐκφαινομένην ὁρῶμεν, ύψος δὲ ποι καρίως ἐξενεχθὲν τὰ τε πράγματα δίκην σκηττοῦ πάντα διεφόρησεν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ρήτορος εὐθὺς ἀθρόοι ἐνε- δείξατο δύναμιν. ταῦτα γὰρ οἴμαι καὶ τὰ παρα-

1 δὲ Faber, perhaps rightly.
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observations have any value for public speakers; and you yourself, my friend, will, I am sure, do what duty and your heart alike dictate and give me the benefit of your unbiased judgement in detail. For he spoke well who, in answer to the question, “What have we in common with the gods?” said “Beneficence and Truth.”

Further, writing for a man of such education as yourself, dear friend, I almost feel freed from the need of a lengthy preface showing how the Sublime consists in a consummate excellence and distinction of language, and that this alone gave to the greatest poets and prose writers their preeminence and clothed them with immortal fame. For the effect of genius is not to persuade the audience but rather to transport them out of themselves. Invariably what inspires wonder, with its power of amazing us, always prevails over what is merely convincing and pleasing. For our persuasions are usually under our own control, while these things exercise an irresistible power and mastery, and get the better of every listener.

Again, experience in invention and the due disposal and marshalling of facts do not show themselves in one or two touches but emerge gradually from the whole tissue of the composition, while, on the other hand, a well-timed flash of sublimity shatters everything like a bolt of lightning and reveals the full

---

a This saying is attributed to Pythagoras (Aelian, VH 12.59) but also to Aristotle and Demosthenes and others (see Gnomologium Vaticanum, p. 25 Sternbach).
b A listener is also a reader; ancient literary criticism often favours the vocabulary of listening and speaking over that of reading and writing, because the literature was thought of as primarily oral, and the sense of speeches and poems as auditory experiences was never lost.
πλήσια, Τερεντιανέ ἡδιστε, κἂν αὐτὸς ἐκ πεῖρας ύψηγήσαιο.

2. Ἄμων δ’ ἐκεῖνο διαπορητέον ἐν ἀρχῇ, εἰ ἐστιν ὑψος τις ἡ πάθους1 τέχνη, ἐπεὶ τινὲς ὅλως οἷονται διηπαθήθοι τοὺς τὰ τοιαύτα ἄγοντας εἰς τεχνικὰ παραγγέλματα. γεννᾶται γάρ, φησί, τὰ μεγαλοφυὴ καὶ οὐ διδακτὰ παραγίνεται, καὶ μία τέχνη πρὸς αὐτὰ τὸ πεφυκέναι: χείρω τε τὰ φυσικὰ ἔργα, ὡς οἶονται, καὶ τῷ παντὶ δειλότερα καθίσταται ταῖς τεχνολογίαις κατασκευευόμενα. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔλεγχθη-σεθαί τοῦθ’ ἐτέρως ἔχον φημὶ, εἰ επισκέψαιτό τις ὅτι ἡ φύσις, ὡσπερ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς καὶ δυνημένοις αὐτόνομοι, οὕτως οὐκ εἰκαίον τι κάκ παντὶς ἀμέθοδον εἶναι φιλεῖ: καὶ ὅτι αὕτη μὲν πρώτον τι καὶ ἀρχέτυπον γενέσεως στοιχείον ἐπὶ πάντων ὑφέστηκεν, τὰς δὲ ποσότητας καὶ τῶν ἐφ’ ἐκάστου καρδίν ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπλανεστάτην ἀσκησία τε καὶ χρήσιν ἱκανῇ πορίσαι2 καὶ συνενεγκείν ἡ μέθοδος· καὶ ὡς ἐπικυνδυνότερα αὐτᾶ ἐφ’ αὐτῶν δίχα ἐπιστήμης ἀστήρικτα καὶ ἀνερμάτωτα ἐαθέντα τὰ μεγάλα, ἐπὶ μόνη τῇ φορᾷ καὶ ἀμαθεί τόλμῃ λεπό-μενα· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ωσ κέντρον πολλάκις, οὕτω δὲ καὶ χαλινοῦ· οπερ γὰρ ὁ Δημοσθένης ἔπι τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποφαίνεται βίον, μέγιστον μὲν εἶναι τῶν ἁγαθῶν τὸ εὐτυχεῖν, δεύτερον δὲ καὶ οὐκ

1 πάθους is an old conjecture, presupposed by the translation of G. da Falgano (1575) and found in many later editions: P has βάθους.

2 πορίσαι P marg., for παρορίσαι.
power of the speaker at a single stroke. But, as I say, my
dear Terentianus, these and other such hints you with
your experience could supply yourself.

2. We must begin now by raising the question
whether there is an art of sublimity or emotion,\textsuperscript{a} for some
think those are wholly at fault who try to bring such mat-
ters under systematic rules. Genius, it is said, is born and
does not come of teaching, and the only art for producing
it is nature. Works of natural genius, so people think, are
spoiled and utterly demeaned by being reduced to the dry
bones of rule and precept. For my part I hold that the
opposite may be proved, if we consider that while in mat-
ters of elevation and emotion Nature for the most part
knows no law, yet it is not the way of Nature to work at
random and wholly without system. In all production
Nature is the first and primary element; but all matters of
degree, of the happy moment in each case, and again of
the safest rules of practice and use, are adequately pro-
vided and contributed by system. We must remember
also that mere grandeur runs the greatest risk if left to
itself without the stay and ballast of scientific method and
abandoned to the impetus of uninstructed temerity. For
genius needs the curb as often as the spur. Speaking of
the common life of men Demosthenes\textsuperscript{b} declares that the
greatest of all blessings is good fortune, and that next

\textsuperscript{a} This translates the emendation \textit{pathous} for the manuscript
reading \textit{bathous}, which has been interpreted as "profundity" or
"bathos."

\textsuperscript{b} \textit{Oration} 23.113.
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ἐλαττον τὸ εὖ βουλεύεσθαι, ὅπερ οἰς ἂν μὴ παρῇ συναναίρει πάντως καὶ θάτερον, τούτ’ ἂν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων εἴπομεν, ὡς ἡ μὲν φύσις τῆς τῆς εὐνυχίας τάξιν ἐπέχει, ἡ τέχνη δὲ τῆς τῆς εὐβουλίας· τὸ δὲ κυριώτατον, οὗτοι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι τινὰ τῶν ἐν λόγοις ἐπὶ μόνη τῇ φύσει οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἡμᾶς ἢ παρὰ τῆς τέχνης ἐκμαθεῖν δεἰ· εἰ ταῦθ’, ὡς ἐφην, ἐπιλογίσατο καθ’ ἑαυτὸν οὐ τοῖς χρηστομάθουσιν ἐπιτιμῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἔτι, μοι δοκῶ, περιττὴν καὶ ἄχρηστον τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἥγησατο θεωρίαν.

3. . . . καὶ καμίνων σχῶσι μάκιστον σέλας.

εἰ γάρ τιν’ ἐστιοῦχον ὁφομαι μόνον,
μίαν παρείρας πλεκτάνην χειμάρρον,
στέγην πυρώσω καὶ κατανθρακώσομαίν’
νῦν δ’ οὐ κέκραγά πω τὸ γενναίον μέλος.

οὗ τραγικά ἔτι ταῦτα, ἄλλα παρατράγῳδα, αἱ πλεκτάναι καὶ τὸ πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἔξωμεν καὶ τὸ τῶν Βορέαν αὐλητὴν ποιεῖν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἔξης· τεθόλω-
ται γὰρ τῇ φράσει καὶ τεθορυβηται ταῖς φαντασίαις μᾶλλον ἡ δεδείνωται, κἂν ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν πρὸς ἀγάς ἀνασκόπης, ἐκ τοῦ φοβεροῦ κατ’ ὦλγον ὑπο-
νοστεῖ πρὸς τὸ εὐκαταφρόνητον. ὁποῦ δ’ ἐν τραγῳ-
δία, πράγματι ὄγκηρῳ φύσει καὶ ἐπιδεχομένῳ στόμ-
φον, ὄμως τὸ παρὰ μέλος οἴδειν ἀσύγγυνωστον, 2
σχολῆ γ’ ἂν οἴμαι λόγους ἀληθινοῖς ἀρμόσειεν.

1 At this point, two pages of P have been lost; two of the later manuscripts (A and B) preserve the passage φύσις . . . θεωρίαν.
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comes good judgement, which is indeed quite as important, since the lack of it often completely cancels the advantage of the former. We may apply this to literature and say that Nature fills the place of good fortune, Art that of good judgement. And above all we must remember this: the very fact that in literature some effects come of natural genius alone can only be learned from art. If then, as I said, whose who censure students of this subject would lay these considerations to heart, they would not, I fancy, be any longer inclined to consider the investigation of our present topic superfluous and useless.

[Two pages of the manuscript are missing here.]

3. . . . and they check the chimney's towering blaze.
   For if I see one hearthholder alone,
   I'll weave one torrent coronal of flame
   And fire his homestead to a heap of ash.
   But not yet have I blown the noble strain.a

All this has lost the tone of tragedy: it is pseudo-tragic—the "coronals" and "spewing to heaven" and making Boreas a piper and all the rest of it. The phrasing is turbid, while the images make for confusion rather than forcefulness. Examine each in the light of day and it gradually sinks from the terrible to the ridiculous. Now seeing that in tragedy, which is essentially a majestic matter and admits of bombast, misplaced tumidity is none the less unpardonable, it is even less likely to suit real

a Probably from Aeschylus' *Orithyia* (fr. 281 Radt). The speaker is Boreas.
ταύτη καὶ τὰ τοῦ Δεοντίνου Γοργίου γελάται γράφοντος "Ξέρζης ὁ τῶν Περσῶν Ζεύς," καὶ "γύτες ἐμιψοχοί τάφοι," καὶ τινα τῶν Καλλισθένους ὄντα ὦνὶ πόλη ἄλλα μετέωρα, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὰ Κλειτάρχου φλούδης γὰρ ἀνήρ καὶ φυσῶν κατὰ τὸν Σωφοκλέα "μικροὶς μὲν αὐλίσκοισι, φορβειὰς δὲ ἄτερ" τὰ γε μὴν Ἀμφικράτους τουαῦτα καὶ Ἰησίου καὶ Μάτριδος πολλαχοῦ γὰρ ἐνθουσίαν ἐαυτοὺς δοκοῦντες οὔτα βακχεύουσιν ἄλλα παίζουσιν.

3 ὁλος δ᾿ ἔοικεν εἶναι τὸ οἴδειν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα δυσφυλακτότατον. φύσει γὰρ ἄπαντες οἱ μεγέθους ἐφιέμενοι, φεύγοντες ἀσθενείας καὶ ἔσχροτητος κατάγνωσι, οὐκ οἶδ᾿ ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῦθ᾿ ὑποφέρονται, πειθόμενοι τῷ "μεγάλων ἀπολισθαίνειν ὃμως εὐγενεῖς ἀμάρτημα." κακοὶ δὲ ὅγκοι καὶ ἔπὶ σωμάτων καὶ λόγων οἱ χαῦνοι καὶ ἀναλήθεις καὶ μήποτε περιστάντες ἡμᾶς εἰς τοῦναντίον οὐδὲν γάρ, φασί, ἔσχροτερον ὑδραπτικοῦ.

4 Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν οἴδοι̣ν ὑπεραίρειν βούλεται τὰ ὑψη, τὸ δὲ μειρακίωδες ἀντικρος ὑπεναντίον τοῖς μεγέθεσιν ταπεινῶν γὰρ ἐξ ὅλου καὶ μικρόψοιν καὶ τῷ ὄντι κακον ἀγεννεστατον. τί ποτ᾿ οὖν τὸ μειρακιῶδές ἐστιν; ἡ δὴ λόγον ὡς σχολαστικῇ νόησις, ὑπὸ περιεργίας λήγουσα εἰς ψυχρότητα; ὀλισθαίνουσι δ᾿...

---

a Gorgias fr. B 5a Diels-Kranz (Fragmente der Vorsokratiker).

b Nephew of Aristotle and historian of Alexander.
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speeches. Thus it is that people laugh at Gorgias of Leon- 
tini for calling Xerxes "the Persian Zeus," and vultures 
"living sepulchres";\textsuperscript{a} also at certain phrases of Callis-
thenes\textsuperscript{b} which are not sublime but highfalutin, and still 
more at some of Clitarchus's\textsuperscript{c} efforts, an affected crea-
ture, blowing, as Sophocles says, "on scrannel pipes, yet 
wasting all his wind."\textsuperscript{d} You find the same sort of thing in 
Amphicrates too, and in Hegesias and Matris.\textsuperscript{e} For often 
when they think themselves inspired, their supposed 
ecstasy is merely childish folly. Speaking generally, 
tumidity seems one of the hardest faults to guard against. 
For all who aim at grandeur, in trying to avoid the charge 
of being feeble and arid, fall somehow into this fault, pin-
ning their faith to the maxim that "to miss a high aim is to 
fail without shame." Tumours are bad things whether in 
books or bodies, those empty inflations, void of sincerity, 
as likely as not producing the opposite to the effect 
intended. For, as they say, "there's naught so dry as 
dropsy."

But, while tumidity seeks to outdo the sublime, pueri-
ity is the exact opposite of grandeur; utterly abject, mean 
spirited, and in fact the most ignoble of faults. What then 
is puerility? Is it not obviously an idea born in the class-
room, whose overelaboration ends in frigid failure? Writ-

\textsuperscript{d} Cicero (\textit{Ad Atticum} 2.16.2) quotes a different version of this 
passage (= fr. 768 Radt), and Longinus perhaps adapts it to his 
own purpose.

\textsuperscript{e} These Hellenistic writers were all despised by classicizing 
critics of the Augustan and later periods. Amphicrates fled from 
Athens to Seleucia in 86 B.C. Hegesias of Magnesia dates from 
the third century B.C. Matris of Thebes wrote hymns and enco-
mia. For Hegesias' style, see E. Norden, \textit{Antike Kunstprosa} 
134ff.
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εῖς τούτο τὸ γένος ὅρεγόμενοι μὲν τοῦ περιττοῦ καὶ πεποιημένον καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ Ἡδεοῦς, ἑξοκέλλοντες 1
dὲ εἰς τὸ ῥωπικὸν καὶ κακόζηλον. τοῦτω παράκειται 
τρίτον τι κακίας εἶδος ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς, ὡπερ ὁ 
Θεόδωρος παρῄνεσθαιν ἐκάλει. ἔστι δὲ πάθος ἀκαί-
ρον καὶ κενὸν ἐνθα μὴ δεῖ πάθους, ἡ ἀμετρον ἐνθα 
μετρίον δεῖ. πολλὰ γὰρ ὡσπερ ἐκ μέθης τυνὲς εἰς τὰ 
μηκέτι τοῦ πράγματος, ἵδια <δ’> 2 ἐαντῶν καὶ σχο-
λικὰ παραθέρουται πάθη, εἶτα πρὸς οὐδὲν πεπονθό-
tας ἀκροατὰς ἁγγειονοῦσιν εἰκότως, ἑξεστηκότες 
πρὸς οὐκ ἑξεστηκότας. πλὴν περὶ μὲν τῶν παθητι-
κῶν ἄλλος ἢμῖν ἀπόκειται τόπος.

4. Θατέρου δὲ ὡν ἐξομεν, λέγω δὲ τοῦ ψυχοῦ, 
πλήρης ὁ Τίμαιος, ἀνήρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἰκανὸς καὶ 
πρὸς λόγων ἐνίοτε μέγεθος οὐκ ἄφορος, πολύστωρ,
ἐπινοητικός, πλὴν ἀλλοτρίων μὲν ἑλεγκτικῶτατος 
ἀμαρτημάτων, ἀνεπαίθητος δὲ ἱδίων, ὑπὸ δὲ ἔρω-
tος τοῦ ξένας νοῆσεις ἀεὶ κινεῖν πολλάκις ἐκτίπτων 
eis to παιδαριωδέστατον. παραθήσομαι δὲ τάυνδρος 
ἐν ἧ δύο, ἐπειδὴ τὰ πλείω προέλαβεν ὁ Κακίλιος. 
ἐπανῶν Ἁλέξανδρον τὸν μέγαν ὁδὸ τὴν Ἀσίαν 

1 ἑξοκέλλοντες Wilamowitz, for ἑποκέλλοντες.
2 <δ’> add. Faber.

a Probably a rhetorician from Gadara, one of whose pupils 
was the emperor Tiberius, and who taught that, so long as the 
argumentation of a case was sound, the orator need not hold
ers fall into this fault through trying to be uncommon and exquisite, and above all to please, and founder instead upon the rock of cheap affectation. Closely allied to this is a third kind of fault peculiar to emotional passages, what Theodorus\textsuperscript{a} used to call the pseudo-bacchanalian. This is emotion misplaced and pointless where none is needed, or unrestrained where restraint is required. For writers often behave as if they were drunk and give way to outbursts of emotion which the subject no longer warrants, but which are private to themselves and consequently tedious, so that to an audience which feels none of it their behaviour looks unseemly. And naturally so, for while they are in ecstasy, the audience is not. However we have reserved another place in which to treat of emotional subjects.\textsuperscript{b}

4. The second fault of which we spoke above is Frigidity, of which there are many examples in Timaeus, in other respects a capable writer and sometimes not at all badly endowed for greatness of style, learned, and full of ideas. Yet while keenly critical of others' faults, he is blind and deaf to his own, and his insatiable passion for starting strange conceits often lands him in the most puerile effects. I will quote only one or two examples from Timaeus,\textsuperscript{c} as Caecilius has forestalled me with most of them. In his eulogy of Alexander the Great he speaks

\textsuperscript{b} If this refers to the present treatise, and not to a separate work (see Introd.), it must be to a passage now lost.

\textsuperscript{c} A Sicilian historian (from Tauromenium), who died c. 260 B.C.; he is adversely criticized by Polybius for inaccuracy and bad taste.
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"όλην" φησίν "ἐν ἐλάττοσιν ἐτεσίν"1 παρέλαβεν ἢ ὁσιός τὸν ὑπέρ τοῦ πρὸς Πέρσας πολέμου πανηγυρικὸν λόγον Ἰσοκράτους ἐγραψεν." θαυμαστὴ γε τοῦ Μακεδόνος ἢ πρὸς τὸν σοφιστὴν σύγκρισις· δῆλον γάρ, ὦ Τίμαιε, ὡς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι διὰ τοῦτο πολὺ τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους κατ’ ἀνδρεῖαν ἐλεύποντο, ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν τριάκοντα2 ἐτεσί Μεσσήνην παρέλαβον, ὁ δὲ τὸν πανηγυρικὸν ἐν μόνοις δέκα συνετά· ξατο. τοῖς δὲ Ἀθηναίοις ἀλούσων περὶ Σικελίαν τίνα τρόπον ἐπιφωνεῖ; ὦτι "εἰς τὸν Ἐρμην ἀσεβήσαντες καὶ περικόψαντες αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀγάλματα, διὰ τούτ’ ἐδώκαν δίκην οὐχ ἦκιστα δι’ ἕνα ἀνδρα, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρανομήθεντος διὰ πατέρων ἢν, Ἐρμοκράτη τὸν "Ερμωνος," ὥστε θαυμάζεων με, Τερεντιανὲ ἦδιστε, πῶς οὐ καὶ εἰς Διονύσιον γράφει τὸν τυράννον· "ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰς τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα δυσσεβῆς ἐγένετο, διὰ τούτ’ αὐτὸν Δίων καὶ Ἡρακλείδης τῆς τυραννίδος ἀφείλοντο.” <καὶ>3 τί δεὶ περὶ Τιμαιοῦ λέγειν, ὅπου γε καὶ οἱ ἠρως ἔκεινοι, Ξενοφώντα λέγω καὶ Πλάτωνα, καίτουγε ἐκ τῆς Σωκράτους ὅντες παλαίστρας, ὡμοί διὰ τὰ οὕτως μικροχαρῆ ποτὲ ἑαυτῶν ἐπιλαμβάνονται; ὁ μὲν γε ἐν τῇ Λακεδαιμονίῳ γράφει πολιτεία: "ἐκεῖνω δοῦν,4 ἤττον μὲν ἄν

1 add. Spengel.
2 εἴκοσι Faber.
3 <καὶ> added by early editors.
4 P has μὲν before γοῦν, but this is incorrect Greek, and is not in our text of Xenophon (Resp. Laced. 3.5).
of "one who subdued the whole of Asia in fewer years than Isocrates took to write his Panegyric urging war on Persia."\(^a\) Surely this is an odd comparison of the Macedonian to the sophist, for it is obvious, friend Timaeus, that on this showing Isocrates was a far better man than the Spartans, since they spent thirty years in subduing Messene,\(^b\) while he composed his Panegyric in no more than ten! Again, take his final comment on the Athenian prisoners in Sicily: "Having committed sacrilege against Hermes and mutilated his statues they were therefore punished, mainly owing to the action of a single man, who was kin on his father's side to the injured deity, Hermocrates the son of Hermon."\(^c\) This makes me wonder, my dear Terentianus, why he does not write of the tyrant Dionysius that "Having shown impiety towards Zeus and Heracles, he was therefore deprived of his tyranny by Dion and Heracleides."\(^d\) But why speak of Timaeus when those very demi-gods, Xenophon and Plato, for all their training in the school of Socrates, yet sometimes forgot themselves in their fondness for such cheap effects? In his Constitution of Sparta Xenophon says, "Certainly you would hear as little speech from these

\(^a\) Isocrates is said to have spent the decade c. 390–380 B.C. working over this famous speech.

\(^b\) The Spartan war of conquest in the eighth century B.C. is usually said to have taken 20 years, but there were later conflicts also. It is unsafe to emend Longinus' figure.

\(^c\) See Plutarch, Nicias 1.

\(^d\) The conceit depends on the fact that the oblique cases of Zeus are Dia, Dios, Dii, so that a pun similar to that on Hermes/Hermocrates is produced.
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ϕωνήν ἀκούσας ἢ τῶν λιθίνων, ἦττον δὲ ἄν ὁμματα στρέψαις ἢ τῶν χαλκῶν, αἰδημονεστέρους δὲ ἄν αὐτοὺς ἡγήσαι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων." Ἀμφικράτει καὶ οὐ Ξενοφώντι ἔτρεπε τάς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν κόρας λέγειν παρθένους αἰδημόνας: οἶνον δὲ Ἡράκλεις τὸ τὰς ἀπάντων ἔξης κόρας αἰσχυνηλᾶς εἶναι πεπείσθαι, ὡς φασίν οὕδενὶ οὕτως ἐνσημαίνεσθαι τὴν τινων ἀναιδειὰν ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. ἰταμὸν "οἴνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ’ ἔχων" φησίν. ¹ ο μέντοι Τίμαιος, ὡς φωρίων τινὸς ἐφαπτόμενος, οὐδὲ τούτο Ξενοφώντι τὸ ψυχρὸν κατέλιτεν. φησὶ γοῦν ἔπι τοῦ Ἀγαθοκλέους κατὰ ² τὸ τὴν ἀνεψιὰν ἐτέρῳ δεδουμένην ἐκ τῶν ἀνακαλυπτηρίων ἀρτάσαντα ἀπελθεῖν, "ὁ τίς ἄν ἐποίησεν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κόρας, μὴ πόρνας ἔχων;" τί δὲ ὁ τῶλλα θείος Πλάτων; τὰς δέλτους θέλων εἰπεῖν "γράψαντες" φησίν "ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς θήσοντις κυπαριστίνας μνήματα" καὶ πάλιν "περὶ δὲ τειχῶν, ὁ Μέγιλλε, ἐγὼ ἐλεφθεροῦμην ἄν τῇ Σπάρτῃ τὸ καθένερω ἐὰν ἐν τῇ γῇ κατακείμενα τὰ τείχη καὶ μὴ ἐπανύπτασθαι." καὶ τὸ Ἡροδότειον οὐ πόρρω, τὸ

¹ Kayser deleted ἰταμὸν . . . φησίν. The introduction of the Homeric parallel is very abrupt.
² κατὰ Reiske, for καὶ.
Spartans as from marble statues, and could as easily catch
the eye of a bronze figure; indeed you might well think
them as modest as the maidens in their eyes.”a It would
have better suited Amphicrates than Xenophon to speak
of the pupils in our eyes as modest maidens. And fancy
believing that every single man of them had modest
pupils, when they say that people show their immodesty
in nothing so much as their eyes! Why, a violent man is
called “Heavy with wine, with the eyes of a dog.”b How-
ever, Timaeus, laying hands as it were on stolen goods,
could not leave even this frigid conceit to Xenophon. For
example, speaking of Agathocles when he carried off his
cousin from the unveiling ceremonyc although she had
been given in marriage to another, he says, “Who could
have done such a thing, had he not harlots instead of
maidens in his eyes?” And what of the otherwise divine
Plato? “They will inscribe and store in the temples,” he
says, “cypress memorials,” meaning wooden tablets: and
again, “As for walls, Megillus, I would consent with
Sparta to let the walls lie slumbering on the ground and
never rise again.”d Herodotus’ phrase for fair women

a The manuscript tradition of Xenophon, Resp. Lac. 3.5 has
“maidens in their chambers” (τῶν ἐν τοῖς θαλάμοις παρθένων),
but Stobaeus (Flor. CXLIV.2.23 Hense) has the same reading as
Longinus, which involves a pun on the two meanings of κόρη,
“girl,” and “pupil of the eye” (pupula)—a sense presumably
derived from the fact that, if you look into someone’s pupil
closely, you see a doll-like image of yourself. b Achilles to
Agamemnon, Iliad 1.225. c I.e. on the third day after the
marriage, when the bride first appeared unveiled. Agathocles
ruled Syracuse, 317–287 B.C.; this story is not mentioned
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φάναι τὰς καλὰς γυναῖκας "ἀλγηδόνας ὁφθαλμῶν." καίτουγε ἔχει τινὰ παραμυθίαν, οἱ γὰρ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ταυτὶ λέγοντες εἰσιν ὁι βάρβαροι καὶ ἐν μέθη, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἐκ τοιούτων προσώπων διὰ μικροψυχίαν καλὸν ἄσχημονεὶν πρὸς τὸν αἰῶνα.

5. Ἄπαντα μέντοι τὰ οὕτως ἄσεμνα διὰ μίαν ἐμφύτευται τοῖς λόγοις αἰτίαν, διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς νοῆσεις καινόστολουν, περὶ δὲ δὴ μάλιστα κορυβαντιῶσιν οἱ νῦν. ἀφ᾽ ὧν γὰρ ἤμιν τάγαθά, σχεδὸν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν τούτων καὶ τὰ κακὰ γεννᾶσθαι φιλεῖ. ὅθεν ἐπίφορον εἰς συνταγμάτων κατόρθωσιν τὰ τε κάλλη τῆς ἐρμηνευέας καὶ τὰ ὑψη καὶ πρὸς τούτοις αἱ ἤδοναι, καὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα, καθάπερ τῆς ἐπιτυχίας, οὕτως ἀρχαὶ καὶ ὑποθέσεις καὶ τῶν ἑαυτῶν καθίστανται. τοιοῦτον πως καὶ αἱ μεταβολαὶ¹ καὶ ὑπερβολαὶ καὶ τὰ πληθυντικὰ· δεῖξομεν δ᾽ ἐν τοῖς ἑπετα τὸν κίνδυνον, ὅν ἔχειν ἐσίκασιν. διόπερ ἀναγκαῖον ἤδη διαπορείων καὶ ὑποτίθεσθαι, δι᾽ ὅτου τρόπου τὰς ἀνακεκραμένας κακίας τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς ἐκφεύγειν δυνάμεθα.

6. Ἐστι δέ, ὁ φίλος, εἰ τινὰ περιπουησάμεθ᾽ ἐν πρώτοις καθαρὰν τοῦ κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν ύψους ἐπιστήμην καὶ ἑπίκρισιν. καϊτοὶ τὸ πράγμα δύσληπτον· ἢ γὰρ τῶν λόγων κρίσις πολλῆς ἐστι ψεῦδος τελευταῖον ἐπιγένεται· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ᾽, ως εἰπεῖν ἐν παραγγελματί, ἐντεύθεν πολεμῆς ἵσως τὴν διάγνωσιν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἄδυνατον πορίζεσθαι.

¹ μεταφοραὶ Wilamowitz
is not much better: "torments for eyes" he calls them.\textsuperscript{a} Yet he has some excuse, for in Herodotus this is said by the barbarians, who are, moreover, in their cups. Yet even in the mouths of such characters as these it is not right to display the triviality of one's mind before an audience of all the ages.

5. However, all these lapses from dignity in literature spring from the same cause, namely that passion for novelty of thought which is the particular craze of the present day. For our virtues and vices spring from much the same sources. And so while beauty of style, sublimity, yes, and charm too, all contribute to successful composition, yet these same things are the source and groundwork no less of failure than of success. And we must say the same, I suppose, about variety of construction, hyperbole, and the use of plurals for singulars. We will show later\textsuperscript{b} the danger which they seem to us to involve. We are thus bound at this stage to raise and propose the answer to the question how we can avoid the faults that go so closely with the elevated style.

6. And this, my friend, is the way: first of all to obtain a clear knowledge and appreciation of what is really sublime. But this is not an easy thing to grasp: judgement in literature is the ultimate fruit of ripe experience. However, if I must speak of precept, it is perhaps not impossible that a true discernment in such matters may be derived from some such considerations as the following.

\textsuperscript{a} Herodotus 5.18, in an amusing account of the way the Macedonians entertained the Persian invaders of Greece.
\textsuperscript{b} In chapters 23 and 38.
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7. Εἰδέναι χρή, φίλτατε, διότι, καθάπερ καὶ τῷ κοινῷ βίῳ οὐδὲν ὑπάρχει μέγα, οὐ τὸ καταφρονεῖν ἐστιν μέγα, οἷον πλοῦτοι τιμαὶ δόξαι τυραννίδες καὶ ὁσα δὴ ἄλλα ἔχει πολὺ τὸ ἐξωθεὶν προστραγῳδούμε-νον οὐδ’ ἂν τῷ γε φρονίμῳ δόξειν ἀγαθὰ ὑπερβάλ-λοντα, ὥν αὐτῷ τὸ περιφρονεῖν ἀγαθὸν οὐ μέ-τριον—θαυμάζουσι γοῦν τῶν ἔχοντων αὐτὰ μᾶλλον τοὺς δυναμένους ἔχειν καὶ διὰ μεγαλοφυχίαν ὑπερ-ορῶντας—τῆδε ποι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διηρμένων ἐν πού-μασι καὶ λόγους ἐπισκεπτέον, μὴ τινα μεγέθους φαντασίαν ἔχοι τοιαύτην ἢ πολὺ πρόσκειται τὸ εἰκῆ προσαναπλαττόμενον, ἀναπτυττόμενα δὲ ἄλλως εὐρύσκοιτο χαῦνα, ὅν τοῦ θαυμάζειν τὸ περιφρονεῖν

2 εὐγενέστερον. φύσει γάρ πως ὑπὸ τάληθος ψυχῆς ἐπαιρεταὶ τε ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ γαϊρόν τι παρά-

3 στήμα λαμβάνουσα πληροῦται χαρᾶς καὶ μεγα-

лаυχίας, ὡς αὐτῆ γεννήσασα ὑπὲρ ἦκουσεν. ὅταν οὖν ὑπ’ ἀνδρὸς ἐμφρόνοι καὶ ἐμπείρον λόγων πολ-

λάκις ἀκούόμενον τι πρὸς μεγαλοφροσύνην τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ συνδιατιθῆ μηδ’ ἐγκαταλείπῃ τῆ διανοία πλείον τοῦ λεγομένου τὸ ἀναθεωρούμενον, πίπτῃ δ’, ἂν αὐτὸ3 συνεχές ἐπισκοπῆς, εἰς ἀπαύξησιν, οὐκ ἂν ἔτ’ ἀληθὲς ψυχος εἴη μέχρι μόνης τῆς ἀκοῆς σφιξό-

μενον. τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι μέγα, οὐ πολλὴ μὲν ἡ ἀναθεώρησις, δύσκολος δέ, μᾶλλον δ’ ἀδύνατος ἡ κατεξανάστασις, ἱσχυρὰ δὲ ἡ μνήμη καὶ δυσεξάλει-

1 οὐδ’. Reiske, for οὐκ.
7. We must realize, dear friend, that as in our everyday life nothing is really great which it is a mark of greatness to despise, I mean, for instance, wealth, position, reputation, sovereignty, and all the other things which possess a very grand exterior, nor would a wise man think things supremely good, contempt for which is itself eminently good—certainly men feel less admiration for those who have these things than for those who could have them but are big enough to slight them—well, so it is with the lofty style in poetry and prose. We must consider whether some of these passages have merely some such outward show of grandeur with a rich layer of casual accretions, and whether, if all this is peeled off, they may not turn out to be empty bombast which it is more noble to despise than to admire. For the true sublime naturally elevates us: uplifted with a sense of proud exaltation, we are filled with joy and pride, as if we had ourselves produced the very thing we heard. If, then, a man of sense, well-versed in literature, after hearing a passage several times finds that it does not affect him with a sense of sublimity, and does not leave behind in his mind more food for thought than the words at first suggest, but rather that on consideration it sinks into the bathetic, then it cannot really be the true sublime, if its effect does not outlast the moment of utterance. For what is truly great bears repeated consideration; it is difficult, nay, impossible, to resist its effect; and the memory of it is stubborn and

\footnote{\textit{παράστημα} Manutius, for \textit{ἀνάστημα}.}
\footnote{\textit{ἀν αὐτὸ} Pearce, for \textit{ἀνευ τὸ}.}
πτος. ὅλως δὲ καλὰ νόμιζε ὑψη καὶ ἀληθινὰ τὰ διὰ παντὸς ἀρέσκοντα καὶ πᾶσιν. ὅταν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπὸ διαφόροις ἐπιτηδευμάτων βίων ζήλων ἥλικιῶν λόγων ἐν τῷ καὶ ταύτῳ ἁμα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπασιν δοκῆ, τὸθ’ ἦ ἡ ἀσυμφάων ὡς κρίσις καὶ συγκατά-
θεσις τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ θαυμαζόμενῳ πίστιν ἑσχυράν λαμ-
βάνει καὶ ἀναμφίλεκτον.
8. Ἐπεὶ δὲ πέντε, ὡς ἃν ἐξύπο τις, πηγαί τινές εἰσιν ἢ τῆς ψηφιγραφίας γονιμώταται, προὔποκεμε-
νῆς ὀσπερ ἑδάφους τινὸς κοινοῦ ταῖς πέντε ταύταις ἰδέαις τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν δυνάμεως, ἢς ὅλως χωρὶς 
οὐδέν, πρῶτον μὲν καὶ κράτιστον τὸ περὶ τὰς νοη-
σεις ἀδρεπῆβολον, ὡς κἀν τοῖς περὶ Ξενοφώντος 
ὁρισάμεθα: δεύτερον δὲ τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσια-
στικὸν πάθος: ἀλλ’ ἂν μὲν δύο αὕτως τοῦ ύψους κατὰ 
τὸ πλέον αὐθίγενείς συνστάσεις, αἱ λοιπαὶ δ’ ἦδη καὶ 
διὰ τέχνης, ἢ τε ποιά τῶν σχημάτων πλά-
σις—διομᾶ δέ ποι ταῦτα, τὰ μὲν νοησέως, θάτερα 
δὲ λέξεως—ἐπὶ δὲ τούτως ἡ γενναία φράσις, ἢς 
μέρη πάλιν οὐσιμᾶτων τε ἐκλογὴ καὶ ἡ τροπική καὶ 
πεποιημένη λέξεις: πέμπτη δὲ μεγέθους αὐτία καὶ 
συγκλείουσα τὰ πρὸ ἑαυτῆς ἀπαντᾷ, ἢ ἐν ἄξιόματι 
καὶ διάροις σύνθεσις: φέρε δὴ τὰ ἐμπεριεχόμενα 
καθ’ ἑκάστην ἰδέαν τούτων ἐπισκεψέμεθα, τοσοῦτοι 
προεπόντες, ὅτι τῶν πέντε μορίων ὁ Καλκίλιος ἐστιν

1 χρόνων Richards, τρόπων Morus.
indelible. To speak generally, you should consider that to be beautifully and truly sublime which pleases all people at all times. For when men who differ in their pursuits, their lives, their tastes, their ages, their languages, all agree together in holding one and the same view about the same writings, then the unanimous verdict, as it were, of such discordant judges makes our faith in the admired passage strong and indisputable.

8. There are, one may say, some five most productive sources of the sublime in literature, the common groundwork, as it were, of all five being competence in speaking, without which nothing can be done. The first and most powerful is the power of grand conceptions—I have defined this in my book on Xenophon—and the second is the inspiration of vehement emotion. These two constituents of the sublime are for the most part congenital. But the other three come partly from art, namely the proper construction of figures—these being of course of two kinds, figures of thought and figures of speech—and, over and above these, nobility of language, which again may be resolved into choice of words and the use of metaphor and elaborated diction. The fifth cause of grandeur, which gives form to all those already mentioned, is dignified and elevated word-arrangement. Let us then consider all that is involved under each of these heads, merely prefacing this, that Caecilius has omitted

---

a Text unsure: the suggested emendations mean "dates" or "manners."

b This book is lost.
2 ἀ παρέλιπεν, ὦς καὶ ὁ πάθος ἀμέλει. ἀλλ’ εἰ μὲν ὦς ἐν τῷ ταῦτ’ ἄμφω, τὸ τε ὄψος καὶ τὸ παθητικόν, καὶ ἐδοξεῖν αὐτῷ πάντῃ συνυπάρχει τὰ ἄλληλοι καὶ συμπεφυκέναι, διαμαρτάνει· καὶ γὰρ πάθῃ τινα διεγεύτηται, καθάπερ οἴκτοι λύπαι φόβοι, καὶ ἐμπαλὼν πολλὰ ὄψη δίχα πάθους, ὡς πρὸς μυρίοις ἄλλοις καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς Ἀλώδας τῷ ποιήτῃ παρατετολμημένα·

"Ὅσον ἐπ’ Ὑλύμπου μέμασαν θέμεν· αὐτάρ ἐπ’ "Ὅση
Πῆλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἵν’ οὐρανὸς ἄμβατος ἐη·
καὶ τὸ τούτοις ἔτι μεῖζον ἐπιφερόμενον
καὶ νῦ κεν ἔξετέλεσαν.

3 παρά γε μὴν τοῖς ῥήτοροι τὰ ἐγκώμια καὶ τὰ πομπικὰ καὶ ἐπιδεικτικά τὸν μὲν ὄγκον καὶ τὸ ὑψηλὸν ἐξ ἀπαντὸς περιέχει, πάθους δὲ χρείεται κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον οθεν ἥκιστα τῶν ῥητόρων οἱ περιπαθεῖς ἐγκωμιστικοὶ ἢ ἐμπαλών οἱ ἐπανεικτικοὶ περιπαθεῖς. εἰ δ’ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἐξ ὅλου μὴ ἐνόμισεν ἦδ’ 1 Καικίλιος τὸ ἐμπαθῆς "εἰς" 2 τὰ ὑψη ποτὲ συντελεῖν καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ οὐχ ἤγιστατο μνήμης ἄξιον, πάνυ διηπάτηται θαρρῶν γὰρ ἀφορισαίμην ἄν, ὡς μεγαλῆγορον, ὡσπερ ὕπο μανίας τινὸς καὶ πνεῦματος ἐνθουσιαστικῶς ἐπιπνέον 3 καὶ οἰονεῖ φοιβάξεν τοὺς λόγους.

9. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ τὴν κρατίστῃν μοῖραν ἐπι-

1 ἦδ’ add. Manutius. 2 add. Faber.
some of these five classes, one obvious omission being that of emotion. Now if he thought that sublimity and emotion were the same thing, and that one always essentially involved the other, he is wrong. For one can find emotions that are mean and devoid of sublimity, for instance feelings of pity, grief, and fear. On the other hand, many sublime passages are quite without emotion. Examples are countless: take for instance the poet’s daring lies about the Aoadae:

Ossa then up on Olympus they strove to set, then upon Ossa
Pelion, ashiver with leaves, to build them a ladder to Heaven;

and the still greater exaggeration that follows,

And they would have done it as well.

Then again in the orators their eulogies and ceremonial speeches and show pieces always include touches of dignity and sublimity, yet are usually void of emotion. The result is that emotional orators excel least in eulogy, while panegyrists equally lack emotional power. If, on the other hand, it never entered Caecilius’ head that emotion sometimes contributes towards sublimity, and he therefore omitted it as undeserving of mention, then great indeed is his mistake. I would confidently lay it down that nothing makes so much for grandeur as genuine emotion in the right place. It inspires the words as it were with a fine frenzy and fills them with divine spirit.

9. Now, since the first, I mean natural, greatness plays

\[a \text{ Odyssey 11.315.}\]

\[3 \text{ Morus, for } \epsilon\kappa\pi\nu\epsilon\omicron.\]
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έχει τῶν ἄλλων τὸ πρῶτον, λέγω δὲ τὸ μεγαλοφυές, χρή κανταύθα, καὶ εἰ δωρητόν τὸ πράγμα μᾶλλον ἢ κτητόν, ὅμως καθ' ὅσον οἶον τε τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνατρέψειν πρὸς τὰ μεγέθη καὶ ὅσπερ ἐγκύμονας ἀεὶ ποιεῖν γενναῖον παραστήματος. τίνα, φήσεις, τρόπον; γέγραφά που καὶ ἐτέρωθι τὸ τοιοῦτον ύψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα. οὖθεν καὶ φωνῆς δίχα θαυμάζεται ποτε ψιλῆ καθ' ἔαντὴν ἐννοια δι' αὐτὸ τὸ μεγάλόφρον, ὡς ἡ τοῦ Αἴαντος ἐν Νεκυίᾳ σιωπὴ μέγα καὶ παντὸς ψηλότερον λόγου. πρῶτον οὖν τὸ ἐξ οὗ γίνεται προοπτοίθεσθαι πάντως ἀναγκαίον, ὡς ἔχειν δὲ τὸν ἀληθῆ ρήτορα μὴ ταπεινὸν φρόνημα καὶ ἀγεννές. οὔδὲ γὰρ οἰόν τε μικρὰ καὶ δυσλοπρεπῆ φρονοῦντας καὶ ἐπιτηδεύοντας παρ’ ὅλον τὸν βίον θαυμαστοῦντι καὶ τοῦ παντὸς αἰώνος ἐξενεγκείν ἄξιον μεγάλων δὲ οἱ λάγοι τούτων κατὰ τὸ ἐκός ὄν ἄν ἐμβριθεῖς ὅσον αἱ ἐννοιαι. ταύτη καὶ εἰς τοὺς μάλιστα φρονηματίας ἐμπίπτει τὰ ὑπερφυαὶ. ὃ γὰρ τῷ Παρμενίων φήσαντι "ἐγὼ μὲν ἡρκέσθῃν . . . "

... τὸ ἐπ’ οὐρανὸν ἀπὸ γῆς διάστημα· καὶ τοῦτ’ ἄν εἴποι τις οὐ μᾶλλον τῆς Ἑρίδος ἢ Ὀμήρου

1 P lost a whole quaternion (8 pages) after ἀδρεπηβόλον (above, 8.1); but the two outer pages are preserved in copies made when the damage was less; these however fail us at this point. P resumes at ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὀλεσσον (9.10).

*a Odyssey 11.543–67. Ajax, summoned from Hades, refuses*
a greater part than all the others, here too, even if it is rather a gift than an acquired quality, we should still do our utmost to train our minds into sympathy with what is noble and, as it were, impregnate them again and again with lofty thoughts. "How?" you will ask. Well, elsewhere I have written something like this, "Sublimity is the echo of a noble mind." And so even without being spoken the bare idea often of itself wins admiration for its inherent grandeur. How grand, for instance, is the silence of Ajax in the Summoning of the Ghosts,\(^a\) more sublime than any speech! In the first place, then, it is absolutely necessary to state whence greatness comes, and to show that the thought of the genuine orator must be neither small nor ignoble. For it is impossible that those whose thoughts and habits all their lives long are petty and servile should produce anything wonderful, worthy of immortal life. No, a grand style is the natural product of those whose ideas are weighty. This is why splendid remarks come particularly to men of high spirit. Alexander's answer to Parmenio when he said "For my part I had been content . . ."\(^b\)

\[Six\ pages\ are\ lost\ here.\]

... the distance between earth and heaven. One might say too that this measured the stature not of Strife to speak to Odysseus, because he is still angry at the award of Achilles' armour to Odysseus rather than to himself.

\(^{b}\) The story (told in most of the historians of Alexander: see e.g. Plutarch, *Alexander* 29), and perhaps derived from Callisthenes, is that Darius offered Alexander territory and one of his daughters in marriage; Parmenio said "If I were Alexander, I should have accepted," and Alexander replied "If I were Parmenio, so should I."
LONGINUS

5 μέτρον. ὃ ἀνόμοιον γε τὸ Ἡσιόδειον ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀχλύος, εἶς Ἡσιόδου καὶ τὴν Ἀσπίδα θετέον,

τῆς ἐκ μὲν ρυνῶν μύξαι βέον·

οὐ γὰρ δεινὸν ἐποίησε τὸ εἴδωλον, ἀλλὰ μυστητὸν. ὦ δὲ πῶς μεγεθύνει τὰ δαιμόνια;

ὁσον δ’ ἡροειδὴς ἄνὴρ ίδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,

ἡμενὸς ἐν σκοπή, λεύσσων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον,

τόσον ἐπιθρόσκουσι θεῶν ύψηλες ἱπποι.

τὴν ὀρμήν αὐτῶν κοσμικῆ διαστήματι καταμετρεῖ.

τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ μεγέθους ἐπιφθέγγει οὗτος, ὅτι ἂν δίς ἐξής ὁφορμήσωσιν οἱ τῶν θεῶν ἱπποί, οὐκέθ’ εὐρήσουσιν ἐν κόσμῳ τόπον;

6 ὑπερφυνα καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς θεομαχίας φαντάσματα:

ἀμφὶ δὲ σάλπιγξ ἐν μέγας οὐρανὸς οὐλυμπός
tε.

ἐδδειασεν δ’ ὑπενερθεν ἀναξ ἐνέρων Ἀιδώνεις,

deiσας δ’ ἐκ θρόνου ἄλτο καὶ ίαχε, μή οἱ

ἐπειτα

---

a Evidently Iliad 4.442:

Small is the crest that she rears at the first, but behold her thereafter

Planting her head in the skies, while she treads with her feet on the earth.
so much as of Homer. Quite unlike this is Hesiod's description of Gloom, if indeed we are right in adding the Shield to the list of Hesiod's works:

Mucus from her nostrils was running.

He has made the image not terrible, but repulsive. But see how Homer magnifies the powers of heaven:

Far as a man can see with his eyes in the shadowy distance,
Keeping his watch on a hilltop, agaze o'er the wine-dark ocean,
So far leap at a bound the high-neighing horses of heaven.

He uses a cosmic interval to measure their stride. So supreme is the grandeur of this, one might well say that if the horses of heaven take two consecutive strides there will then be no place found for them in the world. Marvelous too is the imaginative picture of his Battle of the Gods:

Blared round about like a trumpet the firmament vast and Olympus;
Shuddering down in the depths, the king of the dead, Aïdoneus,

\[b\] Shield of Heracles 267. Aristophanes of Byzantium was among the ancient scholars who regarded the Shield as perhaps not Hesiod's, but Apollonius and others took it to be genuine.
\[c\] Iliad 5.770–2.
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gayen anarphiqieie Pospeladaw onosichthow, oikia de thnitoi kai athanatous fanei, smerdalé euréveta, tâ te stungéousi theoi per.

ēpiblépeis, étaiârâ, òsw anarphiqunménâs men ev kathrnon yhâs, aitou de gyminuménon tarpâroun, ana-tropîn de ôlou kai diástaou toû kosmou lâmbâ-nitous, pánthâ amâ, ouranous âdèhs, tâ thnita tâ athâ-nata, amâ tî tîte sympotoméi kai syngkundumei
mâchi; allâ taûta foberâ men, plhâ allês, eî mh katei allhgoriâs lâmbânoito, pantâpasiq anâea kai ou sfozounta tî prêpon. "Ompros gar moi dokêi pararidoûn tróauma theoun stásseis timorías dâkruna deisîa páthi pámphirot tóous men epi tów 'Iliakôn anthrôpous idson epi tî dynamei theous peihekènai, tóus theous de anthrôpous. allâ ëmîn men dunedoumousa ápokeitai lymên kakôn o thânatos, tów theów d' ou tîn fúson, allâ tîn ântuxian èpoin-8 sev aiînion. polû de tów peri tîn theomâxian amêîn tâ òsa âxranthôn tî kai mega tî daumônou ws alhthês kai akratôn paristhson, oda (palloloih de prô ëmîn ò toûpos èxeirigastai) tâ epi tów Pospeladôwn:

trême de ourea makrâ kai ñlîh
kai korufai Trôwôn te sôlis kai ñses 'Axaîôn

a A conflation of Iliad 21.388 and 20.61–5.
b A proverbial image, cf. (e.g.) [Plutarch] Consolation to Apollonius 10, Epictetus 4.10.27, Seneca, Agamemnon 592 (with R. J. Tarrant’s note).
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Sprang from his throne with a shuddering cry, for fear the earthshaker, Poseidon,
Might soon splinter asunder the earth, and his mansions lie open,
Clear to the eyes of immortals and mortals alike all uncovered,
Grim and dreary and dank, which the very gods see with abhorrence.

You see, friend, how the earth is split to its foundations, hell itself laid bare, the whole universe sundered and turned upside down; and meanwhile everything, heaven and hell, mortal and immortal alike, shares in the conflict and danger of that battle. Terrible as these passages are, they are utterly irreligious and breach the canons of propriety unless one takes them allegorically. I feel indeed that in recording as he does the wounding of the gods, their quarrels, vengeance, tears, imprisonment, and all their manifold passions Homer has done his best to make the men in the Iliad gods and the gods men. Yet, if we mortals are unhappy, death is the "harbour from our troubles," whereas Homer has given the gods not only immortal natures but immortal sorrows. The Battle of the Gods, however, is far surpassed by those passages which represent the divine nature as truly uncontaminated, majestic, and pure. Take, for instance, the lines about Poseidon, though they have been treated fully enough by others before us:

Trembled the woods, and trembled the long-lying ranges
Yes, and the peaks and the city of Troy and the ships of Achaia
LONGINUS
ποσιών ὑπ’ ἄθανάτους Ποσειδάωνος ἴόντος.
βὴ δ’ ἔλααν ἐπὶ κύματ’, ἀταλλε δὲ κῆτε’ ὑπ’
αὐτοῦ
πάντοθεν ἕκ κενθμῶν, οὐδ’ ἡγνοῖσθεν ἀνακτα·
γηθοσύνη δὲ θάλασσα διώστατο, τοὶ δὲ
πέτοντο.

9 ταύτη καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν
ἄνηρ, ἔπειδη τὴν τοῦ θείου δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἂξιαν
ἐξώρησε καξέφηνεν, ευθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράφας
τῶν νόμων “ἐίπεν ὁ θεὸς,” φησὶ· τί; “γενέσθω φῶς,
καὶ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γη, καὶ ἐγένετο.”

10 Οὐκ ὀχληρὸς ἂν ἴσως, ἐταύρη, δόξαμι, ἐν ἐτί τοῦ
πονητοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παραθέμενος τοῦ
μαθεῖν χάριν, ὡς εἰς τὰ ἡρωϊκὰ μεγέθη συνεμβαί-
νειν ἐθίζει. ἀχλὺς ἄφνω καὶ νῦς ἄπορος αὐτῶ τῆν
τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπέχει μάχην· ἐνθα δὴ ὁ Ἁἰας ἀμηκα-
νὼν

“Ζεῦ πάτερ,” φησίν, “ἀλλὰ σὺ ῥῦσαι ὑπ’
ἡέρος οἶας Ἀχαιῶν,
ποίησον δ᾽ αἰθρην, δὸς δ᾽ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
ιδέσθαιν·
ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὀλέσσον.”

a Another conflation: Iliad 13.18, 20.60, 13.19, 27–9. In view
of Longinus’ comment, the passage was perhaps put together
by earlier critics, and is not simply a confused quotation from
memory.

b This loose quotation of Genesis 1.3–9 has often been sus-
pected of being an interpolation, and indeed the argument runs
on without it perfectly well. But there is no reason why Longinus
ON THE SUBLIME

Under the feet immortal and the oncoming march
of Poseidon.
He set him to drive o'er the swell of the sea, and
the whales at his coming
Capering leapt from the deep and greeted the
voice of their master.
Then the sea parted her waves for joy, and they
flew on the journey.a

Soo, too, the lawgiver of the Jews, no ordinary man, hav-
ing formed a worthy conception of divine power and
given expression to it, writes at the very beginning of
his Laws: "God said"—what? 'let there be light,' and
there was light, 'Let there be earth,' and there was
earth."b

Perhaps you will not think me boring, my friend, if I
insert here another passage from the poet, one that treats
of human affairs, to show you his habit of entering into
the sublimity of his heroic theme. Darkness and helpless
night suddenly descend upon his Greek army. At his wits'
end Ajax cries:

Zeus Father, rescue from out of the mist the sons of
Achaia,
Brighten the heaven with sunshine, grant us the
sight of our eyes.
Just so it be in daylight, destroy us. c

should not have known it; and the tradition that Caecilius may
have been a Jew suggests a possible source. The syntax of the
sentence is controversial; see now Mazzucchi, pp. 172–4. For
the considerable influence of the passage in the eighteenth cen-
tury, see esp. Boileau, Réflexions sur le Sublime X, and Robert
Louth's Oxford lectures De sacra poesi Hebraeorum (1753).

Iliad 17.645–7.
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ἔστων ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ πάθος Αἴαντος, οὗ γὰρ ζῆν εὐχεταὶ (ἡν γὰρ τὸ άττημα τοῦ ἠρως ταπείνωτερον), ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐν ἀπράκτῳ σκότει τὴν ἀνδρείαν εἰς οὐδὲν γενναίον εἴχε διαθέσθαι, διὰ ταύτ' ἀγανακτῶν ὡς πρὸς τὴν μάχην ἀργεῖ, φῶς ὡς τάχιστα αὐτεῖτα, ὡς πάντως τῆς ἀρετῆς εὐρήσων ἐντάφιον ἄξιον, κάν αὐτῷ Ζεὺς ἀντιτάτηται. ἀλλὰ γὰρ Ὄμηρος μὲν ἐνθάδε οὐρίος συνεμπνεύτω τοῖς ἀγώσων καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι αὐτὸς πέπονθεν ἤ

μαίνεται, ὡς ὁτ' Ἀρης ἐγχέσπαλος ἢ ὅλον πῦρ

οὐρεσι μαίνεται, βαθές ἐν τάρφεσιν ὕλης,

ἀφλουσμὸς δὲ περὶ στόμα γίγνεται.

δείκνυσι δ' ὁμως διὰ τῆς Ὄδυσσείας (καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα πολλῶν ἔνεκα προσεπιθεωρητέον), ὡτι μεγάλης φύσεως υποφερομένης ἦδη ἰδιόν ἔστων ἐν γήρᾳ τὸ φιλόμυθον. δὴ λοι γὰρ ἐκ πολλῶν τε ἄλλων συντε-θεικὼς ταυτὴν δευτέραν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, ἀτὰρ δὴ κὰκ τοῦ λείψανα τῶν Ἰλιάκῶν παθημάτων διὰ τῆς Ὅδυσσείας ὡς ἐπεισοδία τινα 1 προσεπισφέρεσι καὶ νὴ Δί' ἐκ τοῦ τὰς ὀλοφύρσεις καὶ τοὺς οὐκτους ὡς πάλαι πον προεγνωμένους 2 τοῖς ἠρωσιν ἐνταύθα προσαποδίδοναι· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλ' ἢ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἐπί- ιστους ἔστων ἢ Ὅδυσσεια·

1 The manuscripts here add τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου, but these words spoil the sense, and are perhaps a gloss on τῶν Ἰλιάκων παθημάτων.

192
These are the true feelings of an Ajax. He does not plead for his life: such a prayer would demean the hero: but since the disabling darkness robbed his courage of all noble use, therefore, distressed to be idle in battle, he prays for light on the instant, hoping thus at the worst to find a burial worthy of his courage, even though Zeus be ranged against him. Here indeed the battle is blown along by the force of Homer's writing, and he himself

Stormily raves, as the spear-wielding War-god, or
Fire, the destroyer,
Stormily raves on the hills in the deep-lying thick-ets of woodland;
Fringed are his lips with the foam-froth.\(^a\)

Yet throughout the *Odyssey*, which for many reasons we must not exclude from our consideration, Homer shows that, as genius ebbs, it is the love of storytelling that characterizes old age. There are indeed many indications that he composed this tale after the *Iliad*; for example, throughout the *Odyssey* he introduces as episodes remnants of the adventures at Ilium; yes, and does he not in this poem render to his heroes their meed of lamentation as if it were something long known? In fact the *Odyssey* is simply an epilogue to the *Iliad*:

\(^a\) *Iliad* 15.605.

\(^2\) \(\pi\rho\omega\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\mu\'\nu\omega\) Reiske (i.e. it is the heroes, not the lamentations, which are "long known").
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ἔνθα μὲν Αἴας κεῖται ἀρήιος, ἔνθα δὲ
Ἄχιλλεύς,
ἔνθα δὲ Πάτροκλος, θεόφιν μήστωρ
ἀτάλαντος,
ἔνθα δὲ ἐμὸς φίλος νίός.

13 ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας, οἴμαι, τῆς μὲν Ἰλιάδος
gραφομένης ἐν ἀκμῇ πνεύματος ὄλον τὸ σωμάτιον
dramatikūn ὑπεστήσατο καὶ ἐναγώνων, τῆς δὲ
Οδυσσείας τὸ πλέον δυνηματικῶν, ὡπέρ ἵδιον
γήρως. ὅθεν ἐν τῇ Ὁδυσσεία παρεκάσαι τις ἀν
cata dhūmēnu tōn Ὄμηρον ἡλίῳ, οὐ δίχα τῆς σφω-
drōtētos parameine tō mégebos. οὐ γὰρ ἐτὶ τοῖς
Ἰλιακοῖς ἑκείνους ποιήμασιν ἵσον ἐνταῦθα σώζει τὸν
tόν τόν, οὐδὲ ἐξωμαλωμένα τὰ ὑψη καὶ ἱζήματα
μηδάμοι λαμβάνοντα, οὐδὲ τὴν πρόχυσιν ὁμοίων
τῶν ἐπαλλήλων παθῶν, οὐδὲ τὸ ἀγχίστροφόν καὶ
πολιτικὸν καὶ ταῖς ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας φαντασίαις
kata pepukwomēnōn, ἀλλ’ οἵον ὑποχωροῦντος εἰς ἐαυ-
tōn Ὁκεάνῳ καὶ περὶ τὰ ἱδία μέτρα ἡμερομεμένου1
to loipōn faínontai tou megebos ἀμπώτιδες κάν
tōis muvōdēsi kai ἀπίστους πλάνος. λέγων δὲ ταῦτ’
oük epitelēsthmai tōn en tē Ὁδυσσεία χειμώνων kai
tōn perī tōn Kúklwta kai tīn oυν ἄλλων, ἀλλά
gήραs diηγοῦμαι, gήρas δ’ ὀμωs Ὄμηρον’ πλῆν ἐn

1 So John Price (a seventeenth-century scholar, professor at
Pisa: quoted by Toup) for P’s ἔρημουμένον (“made desolate”).
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ON THE SUBLIME 9

There then Ajax lies, great warrior; there lies Achilles;
There, too, Patroclus lies, the peer of the gods in counsel;
There, too, my own dear son.\(^a\)

It was, I imagine, for the same reason that, writing the \textit{Iliad} in the heyday of his genius he made the whole piece lively with dramatic action, whereas in the \textit{Odyssey} narrative predominates, the characteristic of old age. So in the \textit{Odyssey} one may liken Homer to the setting sun; the grandeur remains without the intensity. For no longer does he preserve the sustained energy of the great \textit{Iliad} lays, the consistent sublimity which never sinks into flatness, the flood of moving incidents in quick succession, the versatile rapidity and actuality, dense with images drawn from real life. It is rather as though the Ocean had retreated into itself and lay quiet within its own confines. Henceforth we see the ebbing tide of Homer’s greatness, as he wanders in the realm of the fabulous and incredible. In saying this I have not forgotten the storms in the \textit{Odyssey} and such incidents as that of the Cyclops—I am describing old age, but the old age of a Homer—yet the

\(^{a}\textit{Odyssey} 3.109–11.\) Both opinions about the order of \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} were held in antiquity: Seneca (\textit{De brevitate vitae} 13) regards it as a typical example of the useless questions raised by literary scholars.

Other possibilities include Toup’s \textit{ηπειρουμένον} (“becoming dry land”) and, e.g., \textit{ηρέμα κεχυμένον} (“quietly flowing”).
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ἀπασι τούτοις ἔξῆς τοῦ πρακτικοῦ κρατεῖ τὸ μυθικόν.

Παρεξέβην δ’ εἰς ταῦθ’, ὡς ἐφη, ἵνα δείξαμι ός εἰς λήρου ἐνίοτε ρᾶςτυν κατὰ τὴν ἀπακμήν τὰ μεγαλοφυὴ παρατρέπεται, οἶα τὰ περὶ τὸν ἄσκον καὶ τοὺς ἐκ Κύρκης συνομορφομένους, οὐς ὁ Ζωίλος ἐφη χοιρίδια κλαίοντα, καὶ τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πελειάδων ός νεοσσὸν παρατρεφόμενον Δία καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ναναγίου δέχ' ἡμέρας ἁσιτον τὰ τε περὶ τὴν μνηστηροφονίαν ἀπίθανα. τί γὰρ ἄν ἄλλο φήσαμεν ταύτα ἢ τῷ ὑπὶ τοῦ Δίως ἐνύψια;

15 Δευτέρου δὲ εἶνεκα προσιστορεῖσθω τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ὀδυσσειαν, ὡπως ἤ σοι γνώριμον, ως ἡ ἀπακμή τοῦ πάθους ἐν τοῖς μεγάλοις συγγραφεύσι καὶ ποιηταῖς εἰς ἡθος ἐκλύεται. τοιαῦτα γὰρ ποιὰ τὰ περὶ τὴν τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἡθικῶς αὐτῷ βιολογούμενα οἰκίαι, οἰονεὶ κοιμωδία τις ἐστὶν ἡθολογομένη.

10. Φέρε νῦν, εἰ τι καὶ ἄτερον ἔχομεν ύψηλοὺς ποιεῖν τοὺς λόγους δυνάμενον, ἐπισκεψόμεθα. οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ πᾶσι τοῖς πράγμασι φύσει συνεδρεύει τινὰ μόρια ταῖς ὑλαῖς συνυπάρχοντα, εἰ ἀνάγκης γένοιτ’ ἄν ἡμῖν ύψους αἴτιον τὸ τῶν ἐμφερομένων²

1 Manutius, for P’s ἀκμήν.
2 So Toll for P’s ἐκφερομένων.

a Aeolus imprisoned the winds in a wineskin: Odyssey 10.19–22.
fact is that in every one of these passages the mythical element predominates over the real.

I have been led into this digression to show you, as I said, that great genius with the decline of vigour often lapses very easily into nonsense—there is the story of the wineskin\(^{a}\) and the men whom Circe turned into swine\(^{b}\)—Zoilus called them “porkers in tears”—there is the nurturing of Zeus like a nestling by the doves,\(^{c}\) Odysseus’ ten days without food on the wrecked ship,\(^{d}\) and the incredible story of the suitors’ slaying.\(^{e}\) Can one call these things anything but veritable dreams of Zeus?\(^{f}\)

There is another justification for our considering the *Odyssey* as well as the *Iliad*. I wanted you to realize how, in great writers and poets, declining emotional power passes into character portrayals. For instance, his character sketches of the daily life in Odysseus’ household constitute a sort of comedy of character.

10. Well, then, let us see whether we can find anything else that can make style `sublime. Since with all things there are associated certain elements, inherent in their substance, it follows of necessity that we shall find

\[^{a}\] *Odyssey* 10.237. Zoilus of Amphipolis—nicknamed *Homeromastix*, Scourge of Homer—was a fourth-century sophist and moralist who criticized improbable and inappropriate features in the epic.

\[^{b}\] *Odyssey* 12.62.

\[^{c}\] *Odyssey* 12.447.

\[^{d}\] *Odyssey* 22.

\[^{e}\] An obscure phrase, probably suggesting that, Homer being Zeus of poets (cf. Quintilian 10.1.46), he sometimes dozes and dreams (*bonus dormitat Homerus*, Horace, *Ars Poetica* 359).
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ἐκλέγειν ἂεὶ τὰ καυρωτάτα καὶ ταῦτα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα ἐπισυνθέσει καθάπερ ἐν τῷ σώμα ποιεῖν δύνασθαι. ὁ¹ μὲν γὰρ τῇ ἐκλογῇ τῶν ἀκροτήτων τῶν λημμάτων, ὁ¹ δὲ τῇ πυκνώσει τῶν ἐκλελεγμένων προσάγεται. οἶον ἡ Σαπφῶ τὰ συμβαίνοντα ταῦτα ἐρωτικαῖς μανίας παθήματα ἐκ τῶν παρεπομένων καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς ἐκάστοτε λαμβάνει. ποῦ δὲ τὴν ἁρετὴν ἀποδείκνυται; ὅτε τὰ ἄκρα αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπερτεταμένα δεινὴ καὶ ἐκλέξαι καὶ εἰς ἄλληλα συνδῆσαι.

2

φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἱσος θέουσιν ἐμμεν' ὄνηρ, ὅτις ἐνάντιος τοι ἰζάνει καὶ πλάστων ἄδυν φωνεί-σας ὑπακούει καὶ γελαίσας ἱμερόν, τὸ μ' ἢ μᾶν καρδίαν ἐν οὐσίασιν ἐπτόασιν. ὥσ γὰρ ἐσ> σ', ἵδω βρόχε' ὡς με φώνας οὐδὲν ἐτ' εἰκειτ'. ἀλλὰ κὰμ μὲν γλώσσα ἔαγε ήπτον δ' αὐτίκα χρῆ πῦρ ὑποδερόμακεν ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδὲν ὀρημμ', ἐπιρρόμ-βεισι δ' ἄκοναν'. ἀ δὲ μ' ἱδρως² κακχέεται, τρόμος δὲ παϊσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας ἐμμν'. τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω πι δελεύς φαίνομ' <ἐμαντά>. 

ἀλλὰ πάν τόλματον, ἐπεὶ † καὶ πένητα†³
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one factor of sublimity in a consistently happy choice of these constituent elements, and in the power of combining them together as it were into an organic whole. The first procedure attracts the reader by the selection of ideas, the second by the density of those selected. Sappho, for instance, never fails to take the emotions incident to the passion of love from its attendant symptoms and from real life. And wherein does she show her excellence? In the skill with which she selects and combines the most striking and intense of those symptoms.

I think him God's peer that sits near you face to face, and listens to your sweet speech and lovely laughter.

It's this that makes my heart flutter in my breast. If I see you but for a little, my voice comes no more and my tongue is broken.

At once a delicate flame runs through my limbs; I see nothing with my eyes, and my ears thunder.

The sweat pours down: shivers grip me all over. I am grown paler than grass, and seem to myself to be very near to death.

But all must be endured, since . . .

\footnote{Sappho fr. 31, in D. A. Campbell (ed.), \textit{Greek Lyric I} (Loeb Classical Library).}

\footnote{1 So Pearce for P's ó in both places.}

\footnote{2 P has \textit{ψυχρως} after \textit{ἰδρως} (so accented).}

\footnote{3 We have not sought to reproduce P's text here in detail.}
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3 οὐ θαυμάζεις, ὡς, ὦπ<ὁ τὸ>1 αὐτὸ τὴν ψυχήν τὸ σῶμα τὰς ἁκοὰς τὴν γλῶσσαν τὰς ὦψεις τὴν χρόαν, πάνθ᾽ ὡς ἄλλοτρια διοιχόμενα ἐπιζητεῖ καὶ καθ᾽ ὑπεναντιώσεις ἀμα ψύχει κἀyetαι, ἀλογιστεῖ φρο-νεῖ [ἡ γὰρ φοβεῖται ἡ παρ᾽ ὄλιγον τέθνηκεν]2 ὡν μὴ ἐν τὶ περὶ αὕτην πάθος φαύνηται, παθὼν δὲ σύν-οδος. πάντα μὲν τοιαῦτα γίνεται περὶ τοὺς ἐρώτας, ἡ λήψις δ᾽ ὡς ἐφή τῶν ἀκρων καὶ ἡ εἰς ταύτο συναίρεσις ἀπειργάσατο τὴν ἔξωχήν. ὄντερ οἴμαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χειμῶνων τρόπων ὁ ποιητής ἐκλαμβάνει τῶν παρακοκουθοῦντων τὰ χαλεπώτατα. ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὰ Ἀρμάσπεια ποιήσας ἐκεῖνα οἶεται δεινά·

θαῦμ᾽ ἡμῖν καὶ τούτῳ μέγα φρεσῶν ἡμετέρησων. ἀνδρεῖς ὡδωρ ναίουσιν ἁπὸ χθονὸς ἐν πελάγεσιν· δύστημοι τινὲς εἰσιν, ἔχουσι γὰρ ἐργα πονηρά, ὁμματ᾽ ἐν ἄστροισι, ψυχῆν δ᾽ ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἔχουσιν. ἡ που πολλὰ θεοῦσι φίλας ἀνά χεῖρας ἔχουσε ἔχουσιν εὑρέται σπλάγχνουσι κακῶς ἀναβαλλομένουσι.

4 παντὶ οἴμαι δῆλον, ὦς πλέον ἄνθος ἔχει τὰ λεγόμενα ἡ δέος. ὁ δὲ Ὄμηρος πῶς; ἐν γὰρ ἀπὸ πολλῶν

1 Toll: P has ὦ π´ αὐτὸ.
2 [ἡ ... τέθνηκεν] ("she is either afraid or at the point of death") deleted by Weiske. Fyfe conjectured ἡ γὰρ φοιβάται ἡ ... τέθνηκεν ("she who is at the point of death is surely beside herself").

200
Is it not wonderful how she summons at the same time, soul, body, hearing, tongue, sight, skin, all as though they had wandered off apart from herself? She feels contradictory sensations, freezes, burns, raves, reasons, so that she displays not a single emotion, but a whole congeries of emotions. Lovers show all such symptoms, but what gives supreme merit to her art is, as I said, the skill with which she takes up the most striking and combines them into a single whole. It is, I fancy, much in the same way that the poet in describing storms picks out the most alarming circumstances. The author of the Arimaspeia, to be sure, thinks these lines awe-inspiring:

Here is another thing also that fills us with feelings of wonder,
Men that dwell on the water, away from the earth,
on the ocean.
Sorrowful wretches they are, and theirs is a grievous employment:
Fixing their eyes on the stars, their lives they entrust to the waters.
Often, I think, to the gods they lift up their hands and they pray;
Ever their innermost parts are terribly tossed to and fro.

Anyone can see, I fancy, that this is more elegant than awe-inspiring. But how does Homer do it? Let us take

\footnote{Aristeas of Proconnesus (see J. D. P. Bolton, \textit{Aristeas of Proconnesus}, Oxford 1962, 8–15) wrote an epic description of the peoples of the far North: Herodotus (4.27) interprets \textit{Arimaspi} as derived from Scythian words meaning one-eyed. This passage is fr. 1 Kinkel, fr. 7 Bolton, fr. 11 Bernabé.}
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λεγέσθω:

ἐν δὲ ἔπεσ’, ὡς ὅτε κῦμα θοῇ ἐν νηὶ πέσησι 
λάβρον ὑπαὶ νεφέων ἀνεμοτρεφές, ἢ δὲ τε 
πάσα 
ἄχνη ὑπεκρύφθη, ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτης 
ἰστιώ ἐμβρέμεται, τρομεούσι δὲ τε φρένα 
ναῦται 
δειδιώτες· τυθὸν γὰρ ὑπὲκ θανάτωι φέρονται.

6 ἐπεχείρησεν καὶ ὁ Ἀρατὸς τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο μετενεγ- 
κεῖν.

ὁλίγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον αἰὶ ἔρυκεν:

πλὴν μικρὸν αὐτὸ καὶ γλαφυρὸν ἔποίησεν ἀντὶ 
φοβεροῦ· ἔτι δὲ παρώρισε τὸν κίνδυνον εἰπὼν 
“ξύλον αἰὶ ἔρυκεν.” οὐκοῦν ἀπείργηεν. δὲ τοῦ 
ποιήσας οὐκ eis ἀπαξ παρορίζει τὸ δεινὸν, ἄλλα 
τοὺς ἀεὶ καὶ 
μονονοχίν κατὰ πᾶν κῦμα πολλάκις ἀπολλυμένους 
εἰκονογραφεῖ. καὶ μὴν τὰς προθέσεις ἀσυνώτους 
οὔσας συναναγκάσας παρὰ φύσιν καὶ εἰς ἀλλήλας 
συμβιασάμενος [ὑπὲκ θανάτωι] τῷ μὲν συνεμ- 
πίπτοντι πάθει τὸ ἔπος ὁμοίως ἐβασάνισεν, τῇ δὲ 
τοῦ ἔπους συνθλύσει τὸ πάθος ἄκρως ἀπεπλάσατο

1 Manutius: P has ἀπείργηεν.
2 οὐκοῦν ἀπείργηε (omitted by Robortello) may be a gloss on ἔρυκεν (so Ruhnken, Mazzucchi).
3 [ὑπὲκ θανάτωι] deleted by “G.S.A.” (1811).
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one example of many:

He fell on the host as a wave of the sea on a hurry-

ing vessel,

Rising up under the clouds, a boisterous son of the

storm-wind.

The good ship is lost in the shroud of the foam, and

the breath of the tempest

Terribly roars in the sails; and in their heart trem-

ble the sailors,

By the breadth of a hand swept out from under the

jaws of destruction.\(^a\)

Aratus, too, tried to adapt this same idea:

Only the tiniest plank now bars them from bitter

destruction.\(^b\)

But he has demeaned the idea and made it pretty instead

of awe-inspiring. Moreover, he dismisses the danger

when he says, “The plank bars them from destruction.”

Why then, it keeps it off. Homer, on the other hand,

instead of dismissing the danger once and for all, depicts

the sailors as being all the time, again and again, with

every wave on the very brink of death. Moreover, by for-

cing into an abnormal union prepositions not usually

compounded\(^c\) he has tortured his language into confor-

mity with the impending disaster, magnificently figured

the disaster by the compression of his language, and

\(^a\) Iliad 15.624–8.

\(^b\) Aratus, Phaenomena 299.

\(^c\) I.e. \(\nu\pi\epsilon\kappa\) is a compound of \(\nu\pi\omicron\omicron\) (‘under’) and \(\epsilon\kappa\) (‘from’).
καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἐνετύπωσεν τῇ λέξει τοῦ κυνήγου τὸ ἰδίωμα "ὑπὲκ θανάτου φέρονται." οὐκ ἄλλως ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυαγίου, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ προσαγγελίᾳ ὁ Δημοσθένης: "ἐσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἥν" φησίν. ἄλλα τὰς ἐξοχὰς όσ <ἀν>¹ εἶποι τις ἀριστίνδην ἐκκαθήραντες ἐπισυνέθηκαν, οὐδὲν φλοώδες ἢ ἀσέμνον ἢ σχολικόν ἐγκατατάττοντες διὰ μέσου. λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον, ὡσανεὶ ψυγματὰ ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποίοντα <εἰς>² μεγέθη συνοικοδομούμενα. τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα.

11. Σύνεδρος ἐστὶ ταῖς προεκκειμέναις ἀρετῆ καὶ ἢν καλούσιν αὐξήσιν, ὅταν δεχομένων τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἀγώνων κατὰ περίδους ἀρχὰς τε πολλὰς καὶ ἀναπαύλας ἐτέρα ἐτέρους ἐπεισκυκλούμενα μεγέθη συνεχῶς ἐπεισάγηται κατὰ ἐπίτασιν.⁴ τούτῳ δὲ εἶτε διὰ τοπηγορίαν, εἶτε δεῖνωσιν, ἡ πραγμάτων ἢ κατασκευῶν ἐπίρρωσιν, εἶτ' ἐποικοδομίαν ἐργῶν ἢ παθῶν (μυρίαι γὰρ ἰδέα τῶν αὐξήσεων) γίνοιτο, χρὴ γινώσκειν ὅμως τῶν ρήτωρα, ὡς οὐδὲν ἂν τούτων καθ' αὐτὸ συνταίη χωρὶς ὕψους τέλειον, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἐν οἴκτοις ἁρὰ νὴ Δία ἢ ἐν εὐτελισμοῖς, τῶν δ' 

¹ <ἀν> add. Ruhnken.
² <εἰς> add. Roberts.
³ συνοικοδομούμενα K marg., Manutius: P has συνοικονομούμενα.
⁴ ἐπίτασιν Wilamowitz, for ἐπίβασιν.
⁵ ἐποικοδομίαν K marg., Portus: P has ἐποικονομίαν.
almost stamped on the diction the precise form of the danger—"swept out from under the jaws of destruction." Comparable to this is the passage of Archilochus about the shipwreck\(^a\) and the description of the arrival of the news in Demosthenes. "Now it was evening," etc.\(^b\) What they have done is to clean up, as it were, the very best of the main points, and to fit them together, allowing nothing affected or undignified or pedantic to intervene. These things ruin the whole, by introducing, as it were, gaps and crevices into masses which are built together, walled in by their mutual relationships.

11. Closely allied to the merits set out above is what is called amplification. Whenever the subject matter and the issues admit of several fresh starts and halting-places from section to section, then one great phrase after another is wheeled into place with increasing force. This may be done either by the development of a commonplace, or by exaggeration, or by laying stress on facts or arguments, or by careful build-up of actions or feelings. There are indeed countless kinds of amplification. Still the speaker must recognize that none of these methods can achieve its goal on its own, without sublimity. One may indeed very well make an exception where the effect required is one of commiseration or depreciation, but in

\(^a\) Archilochus frr. 105–6 West.

\(^b\) \textit{De corona} 169: "Now it was evening, and there came one with a message for the \textit{prytaneis}, that Elatea had fallen"; there follows a vivid description of the ensuing panic at Athens. Elatea fell to Philip late in 339.
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άλλων αὐξητικῶν ὅτου περ ἂν τὸ ψηλὸν ἀφέλης, ὡς ψυχήν ἐξαιρήσεις σώματος· εὐθὺς γὰρ ἀτονεῖ καὶ κενοῦται τὸ ἔμπρακτον αὐτῶν μὴ τοὺς ύψεσι συν-επιρρωποῦμεν. ἢ μέντοι διαφέρει τοῦ ἀρτίως εἰρη-μένου τὰ νῦν παραγγελλόμενα (περιγραφὴ γὰρ τῆς ἢν ἐκείνο τῶν ἄκρων λημμάτων καὶ εἰς ἐνότητα σύν-ταξις) καὶ τίνι καθόλου τῶν αὐξήσεων παραλλάττει τὰ υψη, τῆς σαφήνειας αὐτῆς ἐνεκα συντόμως διορι-στέον.

12. Ὅ μὲν οὖν τῶν τεχνογράφων ὄρος ἐμοῦ γ’ οὐκ ἀρεστός. αὐξησίς ἐστὶ, φασί, λόγος μέγεθος περι-τιθείς τοῖς ύποκειμένοις· δύναται γὰρ ἀμέλει καὶ ύψους καὶ πάθους καὶ τρόπων έννοι κοινὸς οὕτως ὄρος, ἐπειδὴ κάκεινα τῷ λόγῳ περιτίθησι ποιῶν τι μέγεθος. ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνει ταῦτα ἀλλήλων παραλ-λάττειν, ἢ κεῖται τὸ μὲν ύψος ἐν διάρματι, ἢ δ’ αὐξη-σίς καὶ ἐν πλήθει· δι’ ὃ κεῖνο μὲν κἀν νοῆματι ἐνὶ πολλάκις, ἢ δὲ πάντως μετὰ ποσότητος καὶ περιον-σίας τινὸς ύφισταται. καὶ ἐστιν ἢ αὐξησίς, ὡς τύπω περιλαβεῖν, συμπλήρωσις ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐμφερομένων τοῖς πράγμασι μορίων καὶ τόπων, ἴσχυροποιῆσα τῇ ἐπιμονῇ τὸ κατεσκευασμένον, ταύτῃ τῆς πίστεως διεστῶσα, ὅτι ἢ μὲν τὸ χτεσύμε-νον ἀποδείκνυσιν>¹...

¹ The completion of the word is due to Manutius.
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all other forms of amplification to remove the touch of sublimity is like taking soul from body. For their practical effect instantly loses its vigour and substance if it is not reinforced by the strength of the sublime. But what is the difference between this topic of advice and what we discussed just now, namely the delimitation and unifying arrangement of vital points? What in general is the distinction between instances of amplification and those of sublimity? I must define these matters briefly in order to make my position clear.

12. The definition given by writers on the art of rhetoric does not satisfy me. Amplification, they say, is language which invests the subject with grandeur.\(^a\) Now that definition could obviously serve just as well for the sublime, the emotional, and the metaphorical style, since these also invest the language with some quality of grandeur. But in my view they are each distinct. Sublimity lies in elevation, amplification rather in amount; and so you often find sublimity in a single idea, whereas amplification always goes with quantity and a certain degree of redundancy. To give a rough definition, amplification consists in accumulating all the aspects and topics inherent in the subject and thus strengthening the argument by dwelling upon it. Therein it differs from proof, which demonstrates the required point...

\[\text{[Two pages are lost here.]}\]

\(^a\) Aristotle (\textit{Rhetoric} 1.9.1368a27) makes the point that amplification is most appropriate to epideictic speeches, because the facts are already admitted, and what remains as the speaker's task is to add grandeur and beauty.
... πλουσιώτατα, καθάπερ τι πέλαγος, είς ἀναπεπταμένον κέχυται πολλαχή μέγεθος. οthal oίμαι κατὰ λόγον ὃ μὲν ῥήτωρ ἀτε παθητικότερος πολὺ τὸ διάπυρον ἔχει καὶ θυμικὸς ἔκφλεγόμενον, ὃ δὲ καθεστῶς ἐν ὄγκῳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σεμνότητι οὖν ἐψυκται μὲν, ἀλλ' οὐχ οὕτως ἐπέστραπται. 1 οὗ κατ' ἄλλα δὲ τυα ἦ ταῦτα, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, φίλτατε Τερεντιανε, (λέγω δὲ, <ei> 2 καὶ ἦμιν ὡς Ἐλλησιν ἐφείται τι γυνώσκειν) καὶ ὁ Κικέρων τοῦ Δημοσθένους ἐν τοῖς μεγέθεσι παραλλάττει. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ὑψεῖ τὸ πλέον ἀποτόμῳ, ὃ δὲ Κικέρων ἐν χύσει καὶ ὁ μὲν ἠμέτερος διὰ τὸ μετὰ βίας ἐκαστα ἐτὶ δὲ τάχους ρόμης δεινότητος οἶον καίειν τε ἀμα καὶ διαρπάζειν σκηπρῶ τινα παρεικάζουν ἂν ἢ κεραυνῷ ὃ δὲ Κικέρων ὡς ἀμφιλαφής τις ἐμπρησμὸς οἶμαι πάντη νέμεται καὶ ἀνειλεῖται, πολὺ ἔχων καὶ ἐπίμονον ἀεὶ τὸ καίον καὶ διακληρονομοῦμενον ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοις ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἀνατρεφόμενον. ἄλλα ταῦτα μὲν ύμεῖς ἂν ἀμένον ἐπικρίνοιτε, καιρὸς δὲ τοῦ Δημοσθένουκ μὲν ύψους καὶ ὑπερτεταμένον ἐν τε ταῖς δεινώσετι καὶ τοῖς σφοδροῖς πάθεσι καὶ ἐνθα δεὶ τοῦ ἀκροατήν τὸ σύνολον ἐκπλήξαι, τῆς δὲ χύσεως ὃπον χρὴ καταντήσαι τοπηγορίας τε γὰρ καὶ ἐπιλόγους κατὰ τὸ πλέον καὶ παρεκβάσει καὶ τοῖς φραστικοῖς ἀπασί καὶ ἐπιδεικτικοῖς, ἢστορίας τε καὶ φυσιολογίας, καὶ οὐκ ὀλίγοις ἄλλοις μέρεσιν ἀρμόδιος.

13. Ὄτι μὲντοι ὁ Πλάτων (ἐπάνευμι γάρ) τοιοῦτο
... very rich indeed: like a sea, often flooding a vast expanse of grandeur. I should say then that in point of style the orator, being more emotional, has abundant warmth and passionate glow, whereas Plato, steady in his majestic and stately dignity, is less intense, though of course by no means frigid. It is in the very same respect—so I feel, my dear Terentianus, if indeed we Greeks may be allowed an opinion—that Cicero differs from Demosthenes in his grand effects. Demosthenes' strength is usually in rugged sublimity, Cicero's in diffusion. Our countryman with his violence, yes, and his speed, his force, his terrific power of rhetoric, burns, as it were, and scatters everything before him, and may therefore be compared to a flash of lightning or a thunderbolt. Cicero seems to me like a widespread conflagration, rolling along and devouring all around it: his is a strong and steady fire, its flames duly distributed, now here, now there, and fed by fresh supplies of fuel. You Romans, of course, can form a better judgement on this question, but clearly the opportunity for Demosthenes' sublimity and nervous force comes in his intensity and violent emotion, and in passages where it is necessary to amaze the audience; whereas diffuseness is in place when you need to overwhelm them with a flood of rhetoric. The latter then mostly suits the treatment of a commonplace, a peroration, a digression, and all descriptive and epideictic passages, as well as historical and scientific contexts, and many other types of writing.

13. However, to return to Plato, though the stream of

1 Bentley conjectured ἀπαστράπτει, "flashes like lightning."
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tων χεύματι ἀψοφητὶ δέων οὐδὲν ἦττον μεγεθύνεται, ἀνεγνωκὼς τὰ ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ τὸν τύπον οὐκ ἀγνοεῖς. "οἱ ἀρά φρονήσεως," φησί, "καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀπευροῦ εὔωχίας δὲ καὶ τοῖς τουούτοις ἀεὶ συνώντες κάτω ὡς ἑοικε φέρονται καὶ ταύτη πλανῶνται διὰ βίου, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ἄληθὲς ἄνω οὔτ' ἀνέβλεψαν πώποτε οὔτ' ἀνηνέχθησαν οὐδὲ βεβαίον τε καὶ καθαρὰς ἱδονῆς ἐγεύσαντο, ἀλλὰ βοσκημάτων δίκην κάτω ἀεὶ βλέποντες καὶ κεκυφότες εἰς γῆν καὶ εἰς τραπέζας βόσκονται χορταζόμενοι καὶ ὄχευντες, καὶ ἕνεκα τῆς τούτων πλεονεξίας λακτίζοντες καὶ κυρίττουντες ἀλλήλους σιδηροῖς κέρασι καὶ ὀπλαῖς ἀποκτυνύοντες διὰ ἀπληστίαν."

2 Ἐνδείκνυται δ' ἦμῖν οὗτος ἄνηρ, εἰ βουλοῖμεθα μὴ κατολιγωρεῖν, ὡς καὶ ἄλλη τις παρὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ὁδὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλὰ τείνει. ποίᾳ δὲ καὶ τίς αὐτή; τῶν ἐμπροσθεν μεγάλων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν μίμησις τε καὶ ζήλωσις. καὶ γε τούτον, φίλτατε, ἀπρίξ ἔχομεθα τοῦ σκοποῦ πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄλλοι ἔργα τοῖς θεοφοροῦνται πνεύματι τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπον, ὡς καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν λόγον ἔχει τρίποδι πλησιάζουσαν, ἐνθα ῥήγμα ἐστι γῆς ἀναπνέουν ὡς φασίν ἄτμον ἔνθεον, αὐτόθεν ἐγκύμωνα τῆς δαιμονίου καθισταμένην δυνάμεως παραντικα χρησμωδεῖν κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν οὕτως ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μεγαλοφυίας εἰς τὰς

1 ἀναπνέου Manutius for ἀναπνεῖν P.

a Theaetetus 144B.
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his words flows as noiselessly as oil, he none the less attains sublimity. You have read the Republic and you know the sort of thing. “Those who have then no experience,” he says, “of wisdom or of goodness, living always amid banquets and other such festivities, are seemingly borne downwards and there they wander all their lives. They have never yet raised their eyes to the truth, never been carried upwards, never tasted true, abiding pleasure. They are like so many cattle; stooping downwards, with their eyes always bent on the earth and on their dinner tables, they feed and fatten and breed, and so greedy are they for these enjoyments that they kick and butt with hooves and horns of iron and kill each other for insatiate desire.”

Here is an author who shows us, if we will condescend to see, that there is another road, besides those we have mentioned, which leads to sublimity. What and what manner of road is this? Zealus imitation of the great prose writers and poets of the past. That is the aim, dear friend; let us hold to it with all our might. For many are carried away by the inspiration of another, just as the story runs that the Pythian priestess on approaching the tripod where there is, they say, a rift in the earth, exhaling divine vapour, thereby becomes impregnated with the divine power and is at once inspired to utter oracles; so, too, from the natural genius of those old writers there

\[\text{\textsuperscript{b} Republic 9.586A, with some changes and omissions.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{c} The theory that the prophetic power of Delphi was due to such an intoxicating vapour or pneuma was widely held in antiquity, but the geology of Delphi lends it no support and no “rift in the earth” has been identified.}\]
LONGINUS

τῶν ζηλοῦντων ἐκείνους ψυχὰς ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερῶν στο-
μίων ἀπόρροιαὶ τινὲς φέρονται, ὡφ ὅν ἐπιπνέομενοι
καὶ οἱ μὴ λίαν φοιβαστικοὶ τῷ ἔτερῳ συνενθου-
σίωσι μεγέθει. μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὀμηρικῶτατος
ἐγένετο; Στρησίχορος ἐτὶ πρότερον ὃ τε Ἀρχίλοχος,
πάντων δὲ τούτων μᾶλιστα ὁ Πλάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ
Ὀμηρικοῦ κείνου νάματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὡσας
παρατροπὰς ἀποχετευσάμενος. καὶ ἵσως ἢμῖν ἀπο-
δείξεων ἔδει, εἰ μὴ τὰ ἔπ᾽ ἐδούς καὶ οἱ περὶ Ἄμμώ-
νιον ἐκλέξαντες ἀνέγραφαν. ἔστων δ᾽ οὐ κλόττῃ τὸ
πράγμα, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἢθῶν ¹ ἢ ² πλασμάτων ἢ
δημουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις. καὶ οὐδὲ ἄν ἐπακμά-
σαι ³ μοι δοκεῖ τηλικαύτα τινα τοῖς τῆς φιλοσοφίας
δόγμασι καὶ εἰς ποιητικὰς ὑλὰς πολλάχοις συνεμβή-
ναι καὶ φράσεις, εἰ μὴ περὶ πρωτείων ἔν Δία παντὶ
θυμῷ πρὸς Ὀμηρον, ὡς ἀνταγωνιστὴς νέος πρὸς
ἡδη τεθαμμαζόμενον, ἵσως μὲν φιλονεικότερον καὶ
οἶνοι διαδρατιζόμενος, οὐκ ἄνωφελῶς δ᾽ ὁμως διη-
ρυστέντο. ἂγαθὴ γὰρ κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐρις
ἡδε βροτοῖς. καὶ τῷ ὄντι καλὸς οὐτός καὶ ἀξιον-
κότατος εὐκλείας ἁγῶν τε καὶ στέφανος, ἐν ὃ καὶ τὸ
ἡττᾶσθαι τῶν προγενεστέρων οὐκ ἄδοξον.

¹ εἰδῶν Toll. ἢ Jahn: ἢ P: ἢ Fyfe.
³ ἐπανθίσαι Bühler.

a Stesichorus' lyrics were largely epic in theme and language, while Archilochus' vigorous iambics had been compared with Homer by earlier critics (Heraclides Ponticus wrote on “Homer and Archilochus,” but the contents of the book are not known).
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flows into the hearts of their admirers as it were an emanation from those holy mouths. Inspired by this, even those who are not easily moved to prophecy share the enthusiasm of these others' grandeur. Was Herodotus alone Homeric in the highest degree? No, there was Stesichorus at a still earlier date and Archilochus too, and above all others Plato, who drew off for his own use ten thousand runnels from the great Homeric spring. We might need to give instances, had not people like Ammonius drawn up a collection. Such borrowing is no theft; it is rather like the reproduction of good character by sculptures or other works of art. So many of these qualities would never have flourished among Plato's philosophic tenets, nor would he have entered so often into the subjects and language of poetry, had he not striven, with heart and soul, to contest the prize with Homer, like a young antagonist with one who had already won his spurs, perhaps in too keen emulation, longing as it were to break a lance, and yet always to good purpose; for, as Hesiod says, "Good is this strife for mankind." Fair indeed is the crown, and the fight for fame well worthy the winning, where even to be worsted by our forerunners is not without glory.

Ancient critics saw resemblances between Plato and Homer in grandeur, character-drawing, and psychological theory. It is curious that the third-century Longinus (F15 Prickard) actually says: "Plato is the first who best transferred Homeric grandeur (δύναστα) into prose." Cf. Introduction.

A pupil of Aristarchus, who wrote on Plato's debt to Homer.

Or (reading ἦ for ἦ): "an impression taken from good characters, sculptures, or other works of art."

Hesiod, Works and Days 24.
LONGINUS

14. Οὔκοιν καὶ ἡμᾶς, ἡμίκ’ ἀν διαπονόμεν ὑψηλομορίας τι καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνης δεόμενοι, καλὸν ἀναπλάττεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς, πῶς ἂν εἰ τύχου ταῦτα τοῦθ’ Ὁμήρος εἶπεν, πῶς δ’ ἂν Πλάτων ἢ Δημοσθένης ὑψωσαν ἢ ἐν ἱστορίᾳ Θουκυδίδης. προσπίπτοντα γὰρ ἡμῖν κατὰ ξῆλον ἐκεῖνα τὰ πρόσωπα καὶ οἶον διαπρέποντα τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνοίσει πῶς πρὸς τὰ ἀνειδωλοποιοῦμενα μέτρα· ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον, εἰ κάκειν τῇ διανοίᾳ προσυπογράφομεν, πῶς ἂν τόδε τι ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ λεγόμενον παρὼν Ὁμήρος ἦκονσεν ἢ Δημοσθένης, ἢ πῶς ἂν ἐπὶ τούτῳ διετέθησαν; τῷ γὰρ ὄντι μέγα τὸ ἀγώνισμα, τοιοῦτον ὑποτίθεσθαι τῶν ἰδίων λόγων δικαστήριον καὶ θέατρον καὶ ἐν τηλικοῦτος ἦρωσι κριταῖς τε καὶ μάρτυριν ὑπέχειν τῶν γραφομένων εὐθύνας πεπαῖχθαι. ¹ πλέον δὲ τοῦτων παρορμητικῶν, εἰ προστιθεῖσα πῶς ἂν ἐμοῦ ταύτα γράφαντος ὁ μετ’ ἐμὲ πᾶς ἀκούσεις αἰῶν; εἰ δὲ τις αὐτόθεν φοβοῦτο, μὴ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου καὶ χρόνου φθέγξατο τὶ ὑπερήμερον, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ συλλαμβανόμενα ὑπὸ τῆς τούτου ψυχῆς ἀτελῆ καὶ τυφλὰ ὀσπερ ἀμβλουόσθαι, πρὸς τὸν τῆς υπεροφημίας ὅλως μὴ τελεσφοροῦμενα χρόνον.

15. Ὅγκοι καὶ μεγαληγορίας καὶ ἀγώνος ἐπὶ τούτως, ὃ νεανία, καὶ αἱ φαντασίαι παρασκευαστικῶταται· οὕτω γοῦν ἢμεῖς ² εἰδωλοποιᾶς ³ αὐτάς ἐνιοῦ λέγουσι. καλείται μὲν γὰρ κοινὸς φαντασία πᾶν τὸ ὁπωσοῦ ἐννόημα γεννητικὸν λόγου παριστάμενον, ἢδη δ’ ἐπὶ τούτων κεκράτηκεν τοῦ-

214
14. We too, then, when we are working at some passage that demands sublimity of thought and expression, should do well to form in our hearts the question, "How might Homer have said this same thing, how would Plato or Demosthenes or (in history) Thucydides have made it sublime?" Emulation will bring those great characters before our eyes, and their shining presence will lead our thoughts to the ideal standards of perfection. Still more will this be so, if we also try to imagine to ourselves: "How would Homer or Demosthenes, had either been present, have listened to this passage of mine? How would that passage have affected them?" Great indeed is the ordeal, if we suppose such a jury and audience as this to listen to our own utterances and make believe that we are submitting our work to the scrutiny of such heroes as witnesses and judges. Even more stimulating would it be to add, "If I write this, how would all posterity receive it?" But if a man shrinks at the very thought of saying anything that is going to outlast his own life and time, then must all the conceptions of that man's mind be like some blind, half-formed embryo, all too abortive for the life of posthumous fame.

15. Weight, grandeur, and urgency in writing are very largely produced, dear young friend, by the use of "visualizations" (phantasiat). That at least is what I call them; others call them "image productions." For the term phantasia is applied in general to an idea which enters the mind from any source and engenders speech, but the word has now come to be used predominantly of

---

1 πεπείσθαι Reiske.
2,3 These changes are by Russell (1964).
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νομα, ὅταν ἄ λέγεις ὑπ’ ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ πάθους βλέπειν δοκής καὶ ὑπ’ ὅψιν τιθῆς τοὺς ἀκούοντιν.

2 ὡς δ’ ἐτερόν τι ἡ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία βούλεται καὶ ἐτερον ἡ παρὰ ποιηταῖς, οὐκ ἂν λάθοι σε, οὐδ’ ὅτι τῆς μὲν ἐν ποιήσει τέλος ἔστιν ἐκπλήξεις, τῆς δ’ ἐν λόγωι ἐνάργεια, ἀμφότεραι δ’ ὤμωs τὸ τε <παθητικὸν> ἐπιζητοῦσι καὶ τὸ συγκεκωμένον.

ἀ μήτερ, ἴκετεύω σε, μὴ ’πισείε μοι τὰς αἴματισποὺς καὶ δρακοντώδεις κόρας· αὕται γάρ, αὕται πλησίον θρώσκουσί μου.

καὶ

οὐμοι, κτανεῖ με’ ποὶ φύγω;

ἔνταδ’ ὁ ποιητὴς αὐτὸς 2 ἐδεῖν Ἐρυνάς, ὁ δὲ ἔφαντάσθη μικρὸν δεῖν θεάσασθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡνάγκασεν. ἔστι μὲν οὖν φιλοπονώτατος ὁ Εὐριπίδης δύο ταυτί πάθη, μανίας τε καὶ ἔρωτας, ἔκτραγω- δῆσαι, καὶ τούτως ὡς οὐκ οἶδ’ εἴ τισιν ἔτεροις ἐπιτυχέστατος, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαίς ἐπιτί- θεσθαι φαντασίαις οὐκ ἄτολμος. ἦκιστά γε τοῦ μεγαλοφυῆς ὁν ὀμως τὴν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ φύσιν ἐν πολλοῖς γενέσθαι τραγικὴν προσηνάγκασεν καὶ παρ’ ἐκαστα ἐπὶ τῶν μεγεθῶν, ὡς ὁ ποιητής,

1 add. Kayser.
2 Manutius added <οὐκ>: “the poet did not see Furies.”

a Euripides, Orestes 255–7, from the classic scene in which
passages where, inspired by strong emotion, you seem to see what you describe and bring it vividly before the eyes of your audience. That phantasia means one thing in oratory and another in poetry you will yourself detect, and also that the object of the poetical form of it is to enthral, and that of the prose form to present things vividly, though both indeed aim at the emotional and the excited.

Mother, I beg you, do not drive against me
These snake-like women with blood-reddened eyes.
See there! See there! They leap upon me close.\(^a\)

And

Ah, she will slay me, whither shall I flee?\(^b\)

In these passages the poet himself saw Furies and compelled the audience almost to see what he had visualized. Now Euripides makes his greatest efforts in presenting these two emotions, madness and love, in tragic guise, and succeeds more brilliantly with these emotions than, I think, with any others; not that he lacks enterprise to attack other forms of visualization as well. While his natural genius is certainly not sublime, yet in many places he forces it into the tragic mould and invariably in his grand passages, as the poet says,

Orestes has a madman’s vision of Clytemnestra sending the Erinyes against him.

\(^b\) Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 291: a herdsman describes to Iphigenia the mad behaviour and words of the man he has seen on the beach, who turns out to be Orestes, who is experiencing the same delusion of attack by the Erinyes avenging his mother.
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οὖρή δὲ πλευράς τε καὶ ἴσχίον ἀμφοτέρωθεν
μαστίεται, ἐὰν δ' αὐτὸν ἐποτρύνει μαχέσασθαι.

4 τῷ γονὸν Φαέθοντι παραδιδοὺς τὰς ἱμίας ὁ Ἡλιος
ἐλα δὲ μήτε Διβυκὸν αἰθέρ' εἰσβαλόν·
κράσῳ γὰρ ὑγρὰν οὐκ ἔχων ἀψίδα σην
καίων ἕν διήσει . . .

φησίν, εἴθ' ἔξης

Ἅει δ' ἐφ' ἐπτὰ Πλειάδων ἔχων δρόμον.
τοσαῦτ' ἀκούσας παῖς ἐμαρφεῖν ἡμίας·
kρούσας δὲ πλευρὰ πτεροφόρων ὀχημάτων
μεθῆκεν, αἱ δ' ἐπταυτ' ἐπ' αἰθέρος πτύχας.
πατήρ δ' ὁπισθε νῶτα σειρίον βεβῶς
ἔππενε παίδα νουθετῶν· ἐκεῖο' ἔλα,
tῆδε στρέφ' ἁρμα, τῆδε.

ἄρ' οὐκ ἀν εἶποις, ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ γράφοντος συν-
επιβαίνει τοῦ ἁρματος καὶ συγκυριδυνεύουσα τοῖς
ἔπποις συνεπτέρωται; οὐ γὰρ ἂν, εἰ μή τοῖς οὐρανί-
οις ἐκείνοις ἔργοις ἰσοδρομοῦσα ἐφέρετο, τοιαῦτ' ἂν
ποτε ἑφαντάση. ὦμοια καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς Κασσάνδρας
αὐτῷ

1 Richards, for P's κάτω.
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His tail at his ribs and his flanks now lashes on this, now on that side, Ever he spurs himself on to share in the joys of the battle.a

For instance, when Helios hands over the reins to Phaethon:b

“And do not drive into the Libyan sky. Its torrid air with no damp humour tempered Will burn your wheel and melt it.”

And he goes on,

“But toward the seven Pleiads hold your course.” This heard, young Phaethon caught up the reins, Slashed at the flanks of his wing-wafted team, And launched them flying to the cloudy vales. Behind, his sire, astride the Dog-star’s back, Rode, schooling thus his son. “Now, drive on there, Now this way wheel your car, this way.”

Would you not say that the writer’s soul is aboard the car, and takes wing to share the horses’ peril? Never could it have visualized such things, had it not run beside those heavenly bodies. You find the same sort of thing in his Cassandra’s speech:

a Iliad 20.170, describing a wounded lion. 
b The following passages are from Euripides’ Phaethon (fr. 779 Nauck2, see J. Diggle, Euripides’ Phaethon, Cambridge 1970, lines 168–77). They come from a messenger’s speech relating Phaethon’s fatal ride in the Sun god’s chariot.
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άλλ’ ὁ φίλιπποι Τρώες.

5 τοῦ δ’ Αἰσχύλου φαντασίαις ἐπιτολμῶντος ἡρώικω-
tάταις, ὁσπερ καὶ <οἰ> Ἔπτα ἐπὶ Θήβας παρ’
ἀυτῷ

ἀνδρες (φησίν) ἐπτὰ θούριοι λοχαγέται,
tαυροσφαγοῦντες εἰς μελάνδετον σάκος
καὶ θιγγάνοντες χερσὶ ταυρείου φόνον
"Αρη τ’, Ἐννὼ καὶ φιλαίματον Φόβου
ὄρκωμότησαν

tὸν ἰδιὸν αὐτῶν2 πρὸς ἀλλήλους δίχα οἶκτον συν-
ομνύμενοι θάνατον, ἐνίστε μέντοι ἀκατεργάστους καὶ
οἰόνει ποκοεδείς τὰς ἐννοίας καὶ ἀμαλάκτους φέρον-
tος, ὡμος ἐαυτὸν ὁ Εὐριπίδης κάκεινος ύπὸ φιλοτι-
μίας τοῖς κυνδύνοις προσβιβάζει. καὶ παρὰ μὲν
Αἰσχύλῳ παραδόξως τὰ τοῦ Δυκούργου βασίλεια
κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ Διονύσου θεοφορεῖται,

ἐνθουσιὰ δὴ δῶμα, βακχεύει στέγη:

ὁ δ’ Εὐριπίδης τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦθ’ ἔτερως ἐφηδύνας ἔξε-
φώνησε,

πᾶν δὲ συνεβάκχευ’ ὀρος.

1 add. Morus; K marg. has ὁσπερ οἱ.
2 Faber: P has αὐτῶν.

a Euripides fr. 935 Nauck. This may come from the Alexandros, and may have to do with Cassandra’s warning against the
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O you horse-loving Trojans

And whereas when Aeschylus ventures upon heroic imaginings, he is like his own “Seven against Thebes,” where

Seven resistless captains o’er a shield
Black-bound with hide have slit a bullock’s throat,
And dipped their fingers in the bullock’s blood,
Swearing a mighty oath by War and Havoc
And Panic, bloodshed’s lover —

and all pledge themselves to each other to die “apart from pity,” and though he sometimes introduces unworked ideas, all woolly, as it were, and tangled, Euripides’ competitiveness leads him also to embark on the same perilous path. Aeschylus uses a startling phrase of Lycurgus’s palace, magically possessed at the appearance of Dionysus,

The palace is possessed, the roof turns bacchanal.

Euripides expressed the same idea differently, softening it down,

And all the mountain
Turned bacchanal with them.

Trojan Horse; if so, “horse-loving” is an apt taunt. Presumably Longinus means us to recall more of the speech than these opening words. \(^b\) *Seven against Thebes* 42–6: “apart from pity” comes from the same passage (51). \(^c\) Aeschylus fr. 58 Radt, from the *Lycurgeia*, the trilogy dealing with Lycurgus’ resistance to the cult of Dionysus in Thrace, a parallel theme to that of Euripides’ *Bacchae*, where Pentheus of Thebes vainly resists the god. \(^d\) Euripides, *Bacchae* 726.
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7 ἀκρως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ θυνδικοντος Οἰδί- 
που καὶ ἐαυτὸν μετὰ διωσμεῖας τινὸς θάπτοντος 
πεφάντασται, καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόπλου τῶν Ἑλλήνων 
ἐπὶ τάχιλλεως προφαινομένου τοῖς ἀναγομένοις 
ὑπὲρ τοῦ τάφου, ἢν οὐκ οἶδ’ εἰ τις ὄψην ἐναργέστε- 
ρον εἰδωλοποίησε Σιμωνίδου. πάντα δὲ ἀμήχανον 
παρατίθεσθαι. οὔ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ποιη-
ταῖς μυθικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν ὑπερέκπτωσιν, ὡς ἔφη,
καὶ πάντῃ τὸ πιστόν ὑπεραίρουσαν, τῆς δὲ ῥητορι-
κῆς φαντασίας κάλλιστον ἂν τὸ ἐμπρακτὸν καὶ ἐνά-
ληθε. δεινοὶ δὲ καὶ ἐκφυλοι αἰ παραβάσεις, ἦνικ’ 
ἀν ὢν ποιητικὸν τοῦ λόγου καὶ μυθώδες τὸ πλάσμα 
καὶ εἰς πάν προσεκτιπτον¹ τὸ ἄδινατον, ὡς ἡμῆ 
Δία καὶ οἱ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐνευοί ῥήτορες, καθάπερ οἱ 
τραγῳδοὶ, βλέπουσιν Ἐρυννά καὶ οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο 
μαθεῖν ὅπερ γενναίοι δύνανται, ὅτι ὁ λέγων Ὁρέστης 
μέθες: μ’ οὖσα τῶν ἐμῶν Ἐρυννά 
μέσον μ’ ὅχμαξεις, ὡς βάλης ἐς τάρταρον 
φαντάζεται ταῦθ’ ὅτι μαίνεται.

8 

9 
Τὴν η ῥητορικῆ φαντασία δύναται, πολλὰ μὲν ἰσως καὶ ἀλλα τοῖς λόγοις ἐναγώνια καὶ ἐμπαθὴ 
προσεισφέρειν, κατακιριναμένη μέντοι ταῖς πραγμα-
τικαῖς ἐπιχειρήσεων οὐ πείθει τοὺς ἀκροατὴν μόνον 
ἀλλὰ καὶ δουλοῦται. "καὶ μὴν εἰ τις," φησίν, 
"αὐτικα δὴ μάλα κρανγῆς ἄκουσες πρὸ τῶν δικα-

¹ So Morus, for προσεκτιπτον

a Oedipus at Colonus 1586–1666.
Sophocles too describes with superb visualization the
dying Oedipus conducting his own burial amid strange
portents in the sky;\(^b\) and Achilles at the departure of the
Greeks, when he appears above his tomb to those
embarking,\(^b\) a scene which nobody perhaps has depicted
so vividly as Simonides.\(^c\) But to give all the instances
would be endless. However, as I said, these examples
from poetry show an exaggeration which belongs to fable
and far exceeds the limits of credibility, whereas the most
perfect effect of visualization in oratory is always one of
reality and truth. Transgressions of this rule have a
strange, outlandish air, when the texture of the speech is
poetical and fabulous and deviates into all sorts of impos-
sibilities. For instance, our wonderful modern orators—
god help us!—are like so many tragedians in seeing
Furies, and the fine fellows cannot even understand that
when Orestes says,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Let go! Of my own Furies you are one} \\
\text{And grip my waist to cast me down to Hell,}\quad \text{d}
\end{align*}
\]

he only imagines that, because he is mad.

What then is the use of visualization in oratory? It
may be said generally to introduce a great deal of excite-
ment and emotion into one’s speeches, but when com-
bined with factual arguments it not only convinces the
audience, it positively masters them. Take Demosthenes:
“And yet, suppose that at this very moment we were to
hear an uproar in front of the law courts and someone

\(^b\) In Polyxena, fr. 523 Radt.
\(^c\) D. A. Campbell (ed.), Greek Lyric III (Loeb Classical
Library) Simonides fr. 557 (= fr. 52 Page).
\(^d\) Euryripides, Orestes 264–5.
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στηρίων, εἴτ' εἴποι τις, ώς ἀνέωκται τὸ δεσμωτήριον, οἱ δὲ δεσμώται φεύγουσιν, οὕτεις οὕτως οὔτε γέρων οὔτε νέος διάγωρός ἐστιν, ὅσον υἱὸς ὄψησθε καθ᾿ ὅσον δύναται· εἴ δὲ δὴ τις εἴποι παρελθών, ὡς ὁ τούτους ἀφεῖς οὐτός ἐστιν, οὔδε λόγον τυχῶν παραντίκ’ ἂν ἀπόλοιτο.” ὡς νὴ Δία καὶ ὁ Ἑπερείδης κατηγο- ροῦμεν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς δούλους μετὰ τὴν ἤτταν ἑλευ- θέρους ἐπιλέγον μερικότερον, “τοῦτο τὸ ψῆφισμα,” εἶπεν, “οὐχ ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐγγέγραψεν ἀλλ’ ἡ ἐν Χαρωνεία μάχη.” ἀμα γὰρ τῷ πραγματικῶς ἐπιχειρεῖν ὁ ῥήτωρ πεφάντα- σται, διὸ καὶ τὸν τοῦ πείθεν ὄρον ὑπερβέβηκεν τῷ λήμματι. φύσει δὲ πῶς ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀπασίν ἀεὶ τοῦ κρείττονος ἀκούομεν, οἶδαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποδεικτικοῦ περιελκόμεθα εἰς τὸ κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐκπληκτικόν, ὥς τὸ πραγματικὸν ἐγκρύφτηκεν περιλαμμόμενον. καὶ τοῦτ’ ὅπικος αἰτικῶς πάσχομεν· δυνεῖ γὰρ συνταττο- μένων υφ’ ἐν ἀεὶ τὸ κρείττον εἰς ἑαυτὸ τὴν θατέρου δύναμιν περισσά." 

12 Τοσαῦτα περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς νοήσεις ψηλῶν καὶ ὑπὸ μεγαλοφροσύνης ἡ φαντασίας ἑργεινωμένων ἀρκεῖσι. 

16. Αὐτὸθι μέντοι καὶ ὁ περὶ σχημάτων ἐφεξῆς τέτακται τόπος· καὶ γὰρ ταύτ’, ἄν ὦν δὲι σκευάζῃ τρόπον, ὡς ἔφη, οὐκ ἂν ἡ τυχοῦσα μεγέθους εἰς μερίς. οὐ μὴν ἄλλ’ ἐπεὶ τὸ πάντα διακριβῶν πολὺ ἐργον ἐν τῷ παρόντι, μᾶλλον δ’ ἀπειρόμενον,

1 add. Manutius: ἡ διὰ Vahlen.
2 Bühler, for πολὺ ἐργον.
were to tell us, 'The prison has been broken open and the prisoners are escaping,' there is no man, old or young, so unheeding that he would not run to give all the assistance in his power. But suppose someone were to come and actually tell us that this was the man who set them free, he would be killed on the moment without a hearing.'\(^a\) And then, to be sure, there is Hyperides on his trial, when he had moved the enfranchisement of the slaves after the Athenian reverse. "It was not the speaker that framed this measure, but the battle of Chaeronea."\(^b\) There, besides developing his factual argument the orator has visualized the event and consequently his conception far exceeds the limits of mere persuasion. In all such cases the stronger element seems naturally to catch our ears, so that our attention is drawn from the reasoning to the enthralling effect of the imagination, and the reality is concealed in a halo of brilliance. And this effect on us is natural enough; set two forces side by side and the stronger always absorbs the virtues of the other.

This must suffice for our treatment of sublimity in ideas, as produced by nobility of mind or imitation or visualization.\(^c\)

16. The topic of figures comes next, for these too, if rightly handled, may be, as I said,\(^d\) an important element in the sublime. However, since it would be a long, and indeed an interminable task to treat them all in detail

\(^a\) Demosthenes, Oration 24.208. \(^b\) After Philip's victory at Chaeronea (338 B.C.), Hyperides proposed the enfranchisement of slaves, and defended this panic measure, it is said, in these terms: see Rutilius Lupus 1.19, [Plutarch] Lives of the Ten Orators, 849A. \(^c\) This summary is puzzling: it omits the contents of chap. 10. \(^d\) In chap. 8.
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όλιγα τῶν ὁσα μεγαληγορίας ἀποτελεστικά τοῦ πιστώσασθαι τὸ προκείμενον ἔνεκα καὶ ἰδί διέξιμεν. 2 ἀπόδειξιν ὁ Δημοσθένης ύπερ τῶν πεπολυτευμένων εἰσφέρει. τίς δ’ ἦν ἡ κατὰ φύσιν χρήσις αὐτῆς; "οὐχ ἦμάρτετε, ὦ τῶν ύπερ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευ-θερίας ἀγώνα ἀράμενου· ἔχετε δὲ οἰκεία τούτων παραδείγματα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἡμαρτον οὐδ’ ὁ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι οὐδ’ ὁ ἐν Πλαταιαῖς.” ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ καθάπερ ἐμπνευσθεὶς ἐξαίφνης ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ οἰονεὶ φοβόληπτος γενόμενος τῶν τῶν ἀριστέων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὄρκον ἔξεφωνησεν “οὐκ ἔστιν ὁποῖς ἦμάρ-τετε, μὰ τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι προκινδυνεύσαντας,” φαίνεται δι’ ἐνὸς τοῦ ὀμοτικοῦ σχῆματος, ὁπερ ἐνθάδε ἀποστροφὴν ἐγὼ καλῶ, τοὺς μὲν προγόνους ἀποθεώσας, ὅτι δὲὶ τοὺς οὕτως ἀποθανόντας ὡς θεοὺς ὁμώνυμοι παριστάνων, τοῖς δὲ κρίνοντι τὸ τῶν ἐκεῖ προκινδυνεύσαντων ἐντιθεὶς φρόνημα, τὴν δὲ τῆς ἀποδείξεως φύσιν μεθεστάκως εἰς ὑπερβάλλον ύψος καὶ πάθος καὶ ἕνων καὶ ὑπερφυών ὄρκων ἀξιοπιστίαν, καὶ ἀμα παιῶν οὐκαὶ ἀλεξιφάρ-μακον εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἄκουόντων καθεῖς λόγον, ὥς κοφιξομένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγκωμίων μηδὲν ἐλαττον τῇ μάχῃ τῇ πρὸς Φίλιππον ἢ ἐπ’ τοῖς κατὰ Μαρα-θῶνα καὶ Σαλαμίνα γνησιοῖς παρίστασθαι φρο- νεῖν· οἰς πάσι τοὺς ἀκροατὰς διὰ τοῦ σχήματισμοῦ συναρπάσας ψχετο. καίτοι παρὰ τῷ Εὐπόλιδι τοῦ ὄρκου τὸ σπέρμα φασίν εὐρήσθαι.
at this point, we will by way of confirmation of our thesis merely run through a few of those which make for grandeur. Demosthenes is producing an argument in defence of his political career. What was the natural way to treat it? "You were not wrong, you who undertook that struggle for the freedom of Greece, and you have proof of this at home, for neither were the men at Marathon misguided nor those at Salamis nor those at Plataea."a But when in a sudden moment of inspiration, as if possessed by the divine, he utters his great oath by the champions of Greece, "It cannot be that you were wrong; no, by those who risked their lives at Marathon," then you feel that by employing the single figure of adjuration—which I here call apostrophe—he has deified the ancestors by suggesting that one should swear by men who met such a death, as if they were gods; he has filled his judges with the spirit of those who risked their lives there; he has transformed a demonstrative argument into a passage of transcendent sublimity and emotion, giving it the power of conviction that lies in so strange and startling an oath; and at the same time his words have administered to his hearers a healing medicine, with the result that, relieved by his eulogy, they come to feel as proud of the war with Philip as of their victories at Marathon and Salamis. In all this he is enabled to carry the audience away with him by the use of the figure. True, the germ of the oath is said to have been found in Eupolis:

a _De corona_ 208. The passage was much admired in antiquity (Quintil. 9.2.62; 12.10.24; Hermogenes, _De ideis_ p. 267 Rabe), and Longinus' discussion was highly praised by Dr. Johnson (_Life of Dryden_ p. 299, World's Classics edition).
LONGINUS

οὐ γὰρ μᾶ τὴν Μαραθώνι τὴν ἐμὴν μάχην χαίρων τις αὐτῶν τούμον ἀλγυνεῖ κέαρ.

ἔστι δ' οὖν τὸ ὄπωσον των ὁμόσαι μέγα, τὸ δὲ ποῦ καὶ πῶς καὶ ἐφ' ὄλν καίρων καὶ τίνος ἕνεκα. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ μὲν οὐδέν ἐστ' ἐὰν μὴ ὄρκος, καὶ πρὸς εὐτυχοῦντας ἔτι καὶ οὐ δεομένοις παρηγορίας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. ἔτι δ' οὐχὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀπαθανατίσας ὁ ποιητής ὀμοσεν, ἕνα τῆς ἐκέινων ἀρετῆς τοὺς ἄκοινους ἐντέκη λόγον ἄξιον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν προκινδυνεύσαντων ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρυχον ἀπεπλανήθη, τὴν μάχην. παρὰ δὲ τῷ Δημοσθένει πεπραγμάτευται πρὸς ἰητημένους ὁ ὄρκος, ὡς μὴ Χαιρώνειαν ἐτ' Ἀθηναίοις ἀτύχημα φαίνεσθαι, καὶ ταύτων, ὡς ἐφήν, ἀμα ἀπόδειξίς ἐστὶ τοῦ μηδὲν ἡμαρτηκέναι, παράδειγμα, ὄρκων πίστις, ἐγκύμιον, προτροπῆ. καπειδήπερ ὑπήντα τῷ ῥήτορι "λέγεις ἦτταν πολιτευόμενος, εἰτα νίκας ὀμνύεις;" διὰ ταῦθ' ἐξῆς κανονίζει καὶ δι' ἀσφαλείας ἁγει καὶ ὄνόματα, διδάσκων ὅτι καὶ βακχεύμασι νήθεν ἀναγκαίον. "τοὺς προκινδυνεύσαντας," φησί, "Μαραθώνι καὶ τοὺς Σαλαμῖνι καὶ ἕτ' Ἀρτεμίσιω ναυμαχήσαντας καὶ τοὺς ἐν Πλαταιαὶ παραταξαμένους." οὐδαμοὶ "υπήγαντας" εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ πάντη τὸ τοῦ τέλους διακέκλοφεν ὄνομα, ἐπιειδήπερ ἦν εὐτυχές καὶ τοῖς κατὰ Χαιρώνειαν ὑπεναντίοιν. διόπερ καὶ τὸν ἀκροατὴν φθάνων εὐθὺς ὑποφέρει: "οὐς ἀπαντας

1 ὄρκων deleted by Kayser.
2 καὶ <κατ'> Mazzucchi.
ON THE SUBLIME 16

No, by the fight I fought at Marathon,
No one of them shall vex me and go free.\(^a\)

But the mere swearing of an oath is not sublime: we must consider the place, the manner, the circumstances, the motive. In Eupolis there is nothing but an oath, and that addressed to Athens, when still in prosperity and needing no consolation. Moreover, the poet’s oath does not immortalize the men so as to beget in the audience a true opinion of their worth, but instead he wanders from those who risked their lives to an inanimate object, namely the fight. In Demosthenes the oath is carefully designed to suit the feelings of defeated men, so that the Athenians should no longer regard Chaeronea as a disaster; and it is, as I said, at the same time a proof that no mistake has been made, an example, a sworn confirmation, an encomium, and an exhortation. The orator was faced with the objection, “You are speaking of a reverse due to your policy and then you go swearing by victories,” and therefore in the sequel he measures his every word and keeps on the safe side, inculcating the lesson that “in the wildest rite” you must stay sober.\(^b\) “Those who risked their lives,” he says, “at Marathon and those who fought on shipboard at Salamis and Artemisium and those who stood in the line at Plataea”—never “those who won the victory.” Throughout he cunningly avoids naming the result, because it was a happy one, and the opposite of what happened at Chaeronea. So before his hearers can raise the objection he promptly adds, “To all of these the

\(^a\) From the Demes (fr. 106 Kassel-Austin).
\(^b\) A reminiscence of Euripides, Bacchae 317.
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ἐθαψε δημοσίᾳ" φησίν Ἡ πόλις, Δισχίνη, οὐχὶ τοὺς κατορθώσαντας μόνους.

17. Ὅπως ἂξιον ἐπὶ τούτῳ τοῦ τόπου παραλιπεῖν ἐν τι τῶν ἡμῖν τεθεωρημένων, φίλτατε, ἐσταί δὲ πάνυ σύντομον, ὅτι φύσει πως συμμαχεῖ τε τῷ ὑψεῖ τὰ σχήματα καὶ πάλιν ἀντισυμμαχεῖται θαυμαστῶς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ. πὴ δὲ καὶ πῶς; ἐγὼ φράσω. ὑποτόν ἔστιν ἰδίως τὸ διὰ σχημάτων πανουργεῖν καὶ προσβάλλων ὑπόνοιαν ἐνέδρας ἐπιβουλῆς παράλογισμοῦ, καὶ ταῦθ’ ὅταν ἡ πρὸς κρίτην κύριον ὁ λόγος, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τυράννους βασιλέας ἧγεμόνας ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς ἀγανακτεῖ γὰρ εὐθὺς, εἴ ὅσ παῖς ἄφρων ὕπο τεχνίτου ῥήτορος σχηματιῶς καταστοφίζεται, καὶ εἰς καταφρόνησιν έαυτοῦ λαμβάνων τὸν παράλογισμὸν ἐνίοτε μὲν ἀποθηριοῦται τὸ σύνολον, κἂν ἐπικρατήσῃ δὲ τοῦ θυμοῦ, πρὸς τὴν πειθώ τῶν λόγων πάντως ἀντιδιατίθεται. διότερ καὶ τότε ἀριστον δοκεῖ τὸ σχῆμα, ὅταν αὐτὸ τούτῳ διαλανθάγη ὅτι σχῆμα ἔστων. τὸ τοῖνος ὑφος καὶ πάθος τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ σχηματίζειν ὑπονοίας ἀλέξημα καὶ θαυμαστῆ τις ἐπικουρία καθίσταται, καὶ πῶς περιλαμβάνει ἡ τοῦ πανουργεῖν τέχνη τοῖς κάλλεσι καὶ μεγέθεσι τὸ λυποῦν δέδυκεν καὶ πᾶσαν ὑποψίαν ἐκπέφευγεν. ἵκανον δὲ τεκμήριον τὸ προειρημένον "μὰ τοὺς ἐν Μαραθώνι." τίνι γὰρ ἐνταῦθ’ ὁ ῥήτωρ ἀπέκρυψε τὸ σχῆμα; δῆλον ὅτι τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῷ. σχεδὸν γὰρ ὡσπέρ καὶ τὰμπρα φέγγη ἐναφανίζεται τῷ ἥλιῳ περιαγωγοῦμενα, οὔτω τὰ τῆς ῥητορικῆς σοφίσματα
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country gave a public funeral, Aeschines, not only to those who were successful."

17. While on this topic I must not omit to mention a view of my own, dear friend, which I will state, however, quite concisely. Figures seem to be natural allies of the sublime and to draw in turn marvellous reinforcement from the alliance. Where and how? I will tell you. There is an inevitable suspicion attaching to the sophisticated use of figures. It gives a suggestion of treachery, craft, fallacy, especially when your speech is addressed to a judge with absolute authority, or still more to a despot, a king, or a ruler in high place. He is promptly indignant that he is being treated like a silly child and outwitted by the figures of a skilled speaker. Construing the fallacy as a personal affront, he sometimes turns downright savage; and even if he controls his feelings, he becomes conditioned against being persuaded by the speech. So we find that a figure is always most effective when it conceals the very fact of its being a figure. Sublimity and emotional intensity are a wonderfully helpful antidote against the suspicion that accompanies the use of figures. The artfulness of the trick is no longer obvious in its brilliant setting of beauty and grandeur, and thus avoids all suspicion. A sufficient instance is that mentioned above, "By those at Marathon." In that case how did the orator conceal the figure? By its very brilliance, of course. Much in the same way that dimmer lights vanish in the surrounding radiance of the sun, so an all-embracing atmosphere of grandeur obscures the rhetorical devices. We see some-

\footnote{\textit{περιλαμφθείων} ᾨ Bury for \textit{παραλαμφθείων} P.}
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3 ἐξαμανυρὶ περιχυθὲν πάντοθεν τὸ μέγεθος. οὐ πόρρω δ’ ἵσως τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ζωγραφίας τι συμβαίνει: ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κεμένων ἐπιπέδου παραλλήλων ἐν χρόμασι τῆς σκιὰς τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός, ὀμοὶ προοπταύτι τε τὸ φῶς ταῖς ὀψείς καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐξοχον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγγυτέρω παρὰ πολὺ φαινεται. οὐκοῦν καὶ τῶν λόγων τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰ ὑψη, ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐγγυτέρω κείμενα, διά τε φυσικὴν τινα συγγένειαν καὶ διὰ λαμπρότητα ἀεὶ τῶν σχημάτων προεμφανίζεται καὶ τὴν τέχνην αὐτῶν ἀποσκιάζει καὶ οἴον ἐν κατακαλύψει τηρεῖ.

18. Τί δ’ ἐκεῖνα φῶμεν, τὰς πεύσεις τε καὶ ἔρωτήσεις; ἄρα οὐκ αὐταῖς ταῖς τῶν σχημάτων εἰδοποιίας παρὰ πολὺ ἐμπρακτότερα καὶ σοβαρότερα συνυπει τὰ λεγόμενα; "ἡ βούλεσθε, εἰπέ μοι, περιώντες ἀλλήλων πυνθάνεσθαι: λέγεται τι καίνων; τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο κανόνερον ἡ Μακεδών ἀνήρ καταπολεμῶν τὴν Ἑλλάδα; τέθυηκε Φίλιππος; οὐ μὰ Δί’ ἀλλ’ ἴσθενε. τί δ’ ὑμῖν διαφέρει; καὶ γὰρ ἂν οὕτως τι πάθη, ταχέως ύμεῖς ἔτερον Φίλιππον ποιήσετε." καὶ πάλιν "πλέωμεν ἐπὶ Μακεδονίαν," φησί. "ποῖ δὴ προσορμούμεθα; ἦρητο τις. εὐρήσει τὰ σαθρὰ τῶν Φίλιππον πραγμάτων αὐτῶς ὁ πόλεμος." ἦν δὲ ἀπλῶς ῥήθην τὸ πράγμα τῷ παντὶ καταδεστερον, νυνὶ δὲ τὸ ἐνθοῦν καὶ ὄξυρροπον τῆς πεύσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἕαυτὸν ὡς πρὸς ἔτερον ἀνθυπαντάν οὐ μόνον ύψηλότερον ἐποίησε τῷ σχῆματισμῷ τὸ ῥηθὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ πιστότερον. ἄγει γὰρ τὰ παθητικὰ τότε μᾶλλον, ὅταν αὐτὰ φαίνηται μὴ
thing of the same kind in painting. Though the highlights and shadows lie side by side in the same plane, yet the highlights spring to the eye and seem not only to stand out but to be actually much nearer. So it is in writing. What is sublime and moving lies nearer to our hearts, and thus, partly from a natural affinity, partly from brilliance of effect, it always strikes the eye long before the figures, thus throwing their art into the shade and keeping it hid as it were under a bushel.

18. Now what are we to say of our next subject, the figures of inquiry and interrogation? Is it not just the specific character of these figures which gives the language much greater realism, vigour and tension? “Tell me, my friend, do you all want to go round asking each other ‘Is there any news?’a For what stranger news could there be than this of a Macedonian conquering Greece? ‘Is Philip dead?’ ‘No, not dead but ill.’ What difference does it make to you? Whatever happens to him, you will soon manufacture another Philip for yourselves.” Or again: “Let us sail to Macedon. Someone asks me, ‘Where on earth shall we land?’ Why, the mere course of the war will find out the weak spots in Philip’s situation.” Here a bare statement would have been utterly inadequate. As it is, the inspiration and quick play of the question and answer, and his way of confronting his own words as if they were someone else’s, make the passage, through his use of the figure, not only loftier but also more convincing. For emotion is always more telling when it seems not to be

a This and the following passage are loose quotations from the First Philippic (Demosthenes, Oration 4.10 and 44).
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ἐπιτηδεύειν αὑτὸς ὁ λέγων ἄλλα γεννᾶν ὁ καιρός, ἢ
d’ ἐρώτησις ἢ εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπόκρισις μιμεῖται τοῦ
pάθους τὸ ἔπικαιρον. σχεδὸν γὰρ ὡς οἱ ύφ’ ἐτέρων
erωτώμενοι παροξυνθέντες ἐκ τοῦ παραχρῆμα πρὸς
tὸ λειχθὲν ἐναγωγίας καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας
ἀνθυπαντώσιν, οὕτως τὸ σχῆμα τῆς πεύκεως καὶ
ἀποκρίσεως εἰς τὸ δοκεῖν ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἐσκεμμένων
ἐξ ύπογύνου κεκυνήσθαι τε καὶ λέγεσθαι τὸν ἀκροα-
tὴν ἀπάγον καὶ παραλογίζεται. ἔτι τούνν (ἐν γάρ
τι τῶν ψηφιλοτάτων τὸ Ἱροδότειον πεπίστευται) εἰ
οὕτως ἢ . . . 1

19. . . . <ἀσύμη>πλοκα2 ἐκπίπτει καὶ οἰονεὶ προ-
χείται τὰ λεγόμενα, ὀλίγον δεῖν φθάνοντα καὶ αὐτόν
tὸν λέγοντα. “καὶ συμβαλόντες,” φησιν ὁ Ἑυνοφῶν,
“τὰς ἀσπίδας ἐωθοῦντο ἐμάχοντο ἀπέκτεινον ἀπέ-
θυνασκόν.” καὶ τὰ τοῦ Εὐρυλόχου

ἡλθομεν, ὡς ἐκέλευς, ἀνὰ Δρυμά, φαίδημ’
Ὁδυσσεῦ.

εἶδομεν ἐν βῆσοσθι τετυγμένα δώματα καλά.

τὰ γὰρ ἀλλήλων διακεκομμένα καὶ οὐδὲν ἦσον
κατεσπευσμένα φέρει τῆς ἁγιωτίας ἐμφάσιν ἁμα καὶ
ἐμποδιζόμοις τι καὶ συνδικοκόστης.3 τοιαῦθ’ ὁ ποιη-

1 Perhaps ἢ<γραψε>, if Longinus was about to compare Herodotus' actual use of the figure with the ineffective alternative of doing without it. Cf. chap. 21.
2 So K marg., Manutius.
3 So Faber for P’s συνδικοκόστης.
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premeditated by the speaker but to be born of the moment; and this way of questioning and answering one's self counterfeits spontaneous emotion. People who are cross-questioned by others in the heat of the moment reply to the point forcibly and with utter candour; and in much the same way the figure of question and answer actually misleads the audience, by encouraging it to suppose that each carefully premeditated argument has been aroused in the mind and put into words on the spur of the moment. Moreover—for this passage of Herodotus has always been reckoned one of the most sublime—if in this way...

[Two pages are missing here.]

19. ... the phrases tumble out unconnected in a sort of spate, almost too quick for the speaker himself. "And locking their shields," says Xenophon, "they pushed, fought, slew, fell."c And take the words of Eurylochus,

We came, as you told us to come, through the oak-coppice, shining Odysseus.
Built in the glades we beheld habitations of wonderful beauty.d

The phrases being disconnected, and yet none the less rapid, give the idea of an agitation which both checks the utterance and at the same time drives it on. This is the

a The passage of Herodotus cannot be identified, but may be 7.21, which has notable rhetorical questions.
b The subject is now asyndeton, i.e. the omission of conjunctions.
c Xenophon, Hellenica 4.3.19 (= Agesilaus 2.12).
d Odyssey 10.251–2.
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tῆς ἐξήνεγκε διὰ τῶν ἀσυνδέτων.

20. “Ακρος δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ ταύτῳ σύνοδος τῶν σχημάτων ἔσωθε κυνεῖν, ὅταν δύο ἡ τρία οἶον κατὰ συμμορίαν ἀνακινάμενα ἀλλήλοις ἐρανίζῃ τὴν ἱσχύν τὴν πειθῶ τὸ κάλλος, ὅποια καὶ τὰ ἔστι τὸν Μειδίαν, ταῖς ἀναφοραῖς ὀμοῦ καὶ τῇ διατυπώσει συναναπεπλεγμένα τὰ ἀσύνδετα. “πολλὰ γὰρ ἂν ποιήσειεν ὁ τύπτων, δῶν ὁ παθὼν ἐναὶ οὐδ' ἂν ἀπαγγέλαι δύναιτο ἑτέρῳ, τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ.”
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effect the poet has achieved by his use of asyndeton.

20. The combination of several figures often has an exceptionally powerful effect, when two or three combined cooperate, as it were, to contribute force, conviction, beauty. Thus, for instance, in the speech against Midias the asyndeta are interwoven with the figures of repetition and vivid presentation.¹ “For the aggressor may do many injuries, some of which the victim could not even describe to anyone else—by his manner, his look, his voice.” Then to prevent the speech coming to a halt by running over the same ground—for immobility expresses inertia, while emotion, being a violent movement of the soul, demands disorder—he leaps at once into further asyndeta and anaphoras. “By his manner, his looks, his voice, when he strikes with insult, when he strikes like an enemy, when he strikes with his knuckles, when he strikes you like a slave.” Here the orator does just the same as the aggressor, he belabours the minds of the jury with blow after blow. Then at this point he proceeds to make another onslaught, like a tornado. “When it’s with his knuckles, when it’s a slap on the face,” he says, “this rouses, this maddens a man who is not accustomed to insult. Nobody could convey the horror of it simply by reporting it.” Thus all the time he preserves the essence of his repetitions and asyndeta through continual variation, so that his very order is disordered and equally his disorder involves a certain element of order.

¹ Demosthenes, Oration 21.72 (with some variations from our text).
21. Φέρε οὖν, πρόσθες τοὺς συνδέσμους, εἰ θέλοις, ὡς ποιοῦσιν οἱ Ἰσοκράτειοι “καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ τούτο χρή παραλληθεῖν, ὡς πολλὰ ἂν ποιήσειν ὁ τύπτων, πρῶτον μὲν τῷ σχήματι, εἶτα δὲ τῷ βλέμματι, εἶτά γε μὴν αὐτὴ τῇ φωνῇ,” καὶ εἶσῃ κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς οὕτως παραγράφων, ὡς τοῦ πάθους τὸ συνδεδιωγμένον καὶ ἀποτραχυνόμενον, ἐὰν τοῖς συνδέσμοις ἐξομαλίσης εἰς λειτύτη τα, ἀκεντρών τε προσπίπτει καὶ εὐθὺς ἐσβιβάσται. ὥσπερ γὰρ εἰ τις συνδήσεις τῶν θεότων τὰ σώματα τὴν φορὰν αὐτῶν ἀφήρηται, οὕτως καὶ τὸ πάθος ὑπὸ τῶν συνδέσμων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προσθηκῶν ἐμποδιζόμενον ἀγανακτεῖ τὴν γὰρ ἐλευθερίαν ἀπολλύει 1 τοῦ δρόμου καὶ τὸ ὃς ἀπ’ ὀργάνου τινὸς ἀφίεσθαι.

22. Τῆς δὲ αὐτῆς ἱδέας καὶ τὰ ὑπερβατὰ θετέον. ἐστιν δὲ λέξεων ἡ νοησεων ἐκ τοῦ κατ’ ἀκολουθίαν κεκινημένη τάξις καὶ οἷον εἰς χαρακτήρ ἐναγωγίου πάθους ἀληθεστατος. ὥς γὰρ οἱ τῷ ὄντε ὀργιζόμενοι ἡ φοβούμενοι ἡ ἀγανακτοῦντες ἡ ὑπὸ ζηλοτυπίας ἡ ὑπὸ ἄλλου τινὸς (πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἀναρίθμητα πάθη καὶ οὐδ’ ἂν εἰπεῖν τις ὁπόσα δύνατο) ἐκάστοτε παραπίπτοντες ἀλλα προθέμενον πολλάκις ἐπ’ ἄλλα μεταπηδῶσι, μέσα τινὰ παρεμβαλλόντες ἀλόγως, εἰτ’ αὖθις ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἀνακυκλοῦντες καὶ πάντη πρὸς τῆς ἀγωνίας, ὡς ὑπ’ ἀστάτου πνεύματος, τῇ δὲ κάκεισε ἀγχιστρόφως ἀντισπώμενοι τὰς λέξεις τᾶς

1 So Finck for P’s ἀπολλύει.
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21. Now insert the connecting particles, if you care to do so, in the style of Isocrates\textsuperscript{a} and his school. “And yet one must not overlook this too, that the aggressor may do much, first by his manner, then by his looks, and then again by his mere voice.” If you thus paraphrase it sentence by sentence you will see that if the rush and ruggedness of the emotion is levelled and smoothed out by the use of connecting particles,\textsuperscript{b} it loses its sting and its fire is quickly put out. For just as you deprive runners of their speed if you bind them up, emotion equally resents being hampered by connecting particles and other appendages. It loses its freedom of motion and the sense of being, as it were, catapulted out.

22. In the same category we must place hyperbaton. This figure consists in arranging words and thoughts out of the natural sequence, and is, as it were, the truest mark of vehement emotion. Just as people who are really angry or frightened or indignant, or are carried away by jealousy or some other feeling—there are countless emotions, no one can say how many—often put forward one point and then spring off to another with various illogical interpolations, and then wheel round again to their original position, while, under the stress of their excitement, like a ship before a veering wind, they lay their words and

\textsuperscript{a} Isocrates was the principal proponent and model of the periodic style which articulates every clause carefully and avoids hiatus.

\textsuperscript{b} The word for “conjunction” or “connecting particle,” \textit{sundesmos}, literally means “bond.”
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νοήσεις τὴν ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἴρμου παντοίως πρὸς μυρίας τροπὰς ἐναλλάττουσι τάξιν, οὕτω παρὰ τοῖς ἀρίστοις συγγραφεῖσι διὰ τῶν ὑπερβατῶν ἡ μυμήσεις ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἔργα φέρεται. τότε γὰρ ἡ τέχνη τέλειος, ἢ μὲν ἡ φύσις εἶναι δοκῆ, ἢ δ’ αὖ φύσις ἐπιτυχῆς, ὅταν λανθάνουσαν περιέχῃ τὴν τέχνην. ὥσπερ λέγει ὁ Φωκαῖος Διονύσιος παρὰ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα, ἀνδρὸς Ἰωνῆς, εἶναι ἐλευθέρους ἡ δοῦλοι καὶ τοῦτος ὡς δραπέτησιν. ὅν δὲν ύμεῖς ἡν μὲν βούλησθε ταλαιπωρίας ἐνδέχεσθαι, παραχρήμα μὲν πόνος ὑμῖν, οἷοί τε δὲ ἔστησε ὑπερβαλέσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους." ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἦν τὸ κατὰ τάξιν ὁ ἀνδρὸς Ἰωνῆς, νῦν καιρὸς ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πόνους ἐπιδέχεσθαι. ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα." ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν ἂνδρος Ἰωνῆς ὑπερεβίβασεν προεισέβαλεν οὖν εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου, ὡς μηδ’ ἀρχὴν φθάνων πρὸς τὸ ἐφεστῶς δεός προσάγορεύωσι τοὺς ἀκούοντας. ἔστη δὲ τὴν τῶν νυκτῶν ἀπέστρεψε τάξιν πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ φήσαι ὅτι αὐτοῖς δεῖ πονεῖν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ παρακελεύεται) ἐμπροσθεν ἀποδίδωσι τὴν αἰτίαν δι’ ἧν πωνεῖν δεῖ, ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς φήσας ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα," ὥς μὴ δοκεῖν ἐσκεμμένα λέγειν ἄλλ᾽ ἦναγκασμένα. ἐτὶ δὲ μάλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης καὶ τὰ φύσει πάντως ἡρωμένα καὶ ἀδιανέμηστα ὑμοὶ τὰς ὑπερβάσεσιν ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων ἁγεῖν δεινότατος. ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης οὐχ οὕτως μὲν αὐθάδης ὥσπερ οὕτος,
thoughts first on one tack then another, and keep altering the natural order of sequence into innumerable variations—so, too, in the best prose writers the use of hyperbata allows imitation to approach the effects of nature. For art is only perfect when it looks like nature and Nature succeeds only when she conceals latent art. Take the speech of Dionysius the Phocaean, in Herodotus.¹

“Our fortunes stand upon a razor’s edge, men of Ionia, whether we be free men or slaves, aye, and runaway slaves. Now, therefore if you are willing to endure hardship, at the moment there is toil for you, but you will be able to overcome your enemies.” Here the natural order was, “O men of Ionia, now is the time for you to endure toil, for our fortunes stand upon a razor’s edge.” He has transposed “men of Ionia” and started at once with his fears, as though the terror was so immediate that he could not even address the audience first. He has, moreover, inverted the order of ideas. Before saying that they must toil—for that is the point of his exhortation—he first gives the reason why they must toil, by saying, “Our fortunes stand upon a razor’s edge.” The result is that his words do not seem premeditated but rather wrung from him. Thucydides is even more a master in the use of hyperbata to separate ideas which are naturally one and indivisible. Demosthenes, though not indeed so wilful as Thucydides,

¹ Herodotus 6.11.

¹ γὰρ Spengel.
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πάντων δ' ἐν τῷ γένει τούτῳ κατακορέστατος καὶ πολύ τὸ ἀγωνιστικὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὑπερβιβάζειν καὶ ἔτι νη
Δία τὸ ἐξ ὑπογύνων λέγειν συνεμφαίνων καὶ πρὸς τούτοις εἰς τὸν κίνδυνον τῶν μακρῶν ὑπερβατῶν
tοὺς ἀκούοντας συνεπισπώμενοι· πολλάκις γὰρ τὸν
νοῦν ὃν ἀρμῆσεν εἰπεῖν ἀνακρεμάσας καὶ μεταξὺ
πῶς ἐις ἀλλόφυλον καὶ ἀπεικονίαν τάξιν ἀλλ' ἐπ'
ἀλλοις διὰ μέσου καὶ ἐξωθέν ποθεῖν ἐπεισκυκλών ἐις
φόβον ἐμβαλὼν τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὡς ἐπὶ παντελεῖ τοὺς
λόγους διαπτώσει καὶ συναποκινδυνεύειν ὑπ' ἀγωνίας
τῷ λέγοντι συναναγκάσας, ἐκτὰ παραλόγως διὰ
μακρόν τὸ πάλαι ξητούμενον εὐκαίρως ἐπὶ τέλει ποὺ
προσαποδοὺς, αὐτῷ τῷ κατὰ τὰς ὑπερβάσεις παρα-
βόλῳ καὶ ἀκροσφαλεῖ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐκπλήττει.

23. Τά γε μὴν πολύπτωτα λεγόμενα, ἀθροισμοὶ
cαὶ μεταβολαί καὶ κλίμακες, πάνυ ἀγωνιστικά, ὡς
οἶσθα, κόσμου τε καὶ παντὸς ὕψους καὶ πάθους συν-
erγά. τὶ δὲ αἰ τῶν πτώσεων χρόνων προσώπων
ἀριθμῶν γενῶν ἐναλλάξεις, πῶς ποτε καταποκίλ-
λουσί καὶ ἐπεγείρουσί τὰ ἔρμηνευτικά; φημὶ δὲ τῶν
cατὰ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς οὐ μόνα ταῦτα κοσμεῖν, ὅποσα
tοὺς τύπους ἐνικᾶ ὀντα τῇ δυνάμει κατὰ τὴν ἀναθεό-
ρησιν πληθυντικά εὐρίσκεται:

αὐτίκα (φησί) λαὸς ἀπείρων

θύμνον ὡς.

2 θύμνον Vahlen for P’s θύμνον.

1 So Wilamowitz, for P’s μεταξὺ ὡς.
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is the most lavish of all in this kind of use and not only employs hyperbata to give a great effect of vehemence, and indeed of improvisation, but also drags his audience along with him to share the perils of these long hyperbata. For he often suspends the sense which he has begun to express, and in the interval manages to bring forward one extraneous idea after another in a strange and unlikely order, making the audience terrified of a total collapse of the sentence, and compelling them from sheer excitement to share the speaker’s risk; then unexpectedly, after a great interval, the long-lost phrase turns up pat at the end, so that he astounds them all the more by the very recklessness and audacity of the transpositions. But there are so many examples that I must stay my hand.

23. Again, accumulation, variation, and climax, the so-called “polyptota,” are, as you know, very powerful, and contribute to ornament and to sublimity and emotion of all kinds. And consider, too, what variety and liveliness is lent to the exposition by changes of case, tense, person, number, or gender. In the category of number, for example, not only are those uses ornamental where the singular in form is found on consideration to signify a plural—take the lines:

And straightway a numberless people
Scatter the length of the beaches and thunder, “the Tunny, the Tunny!”

The source of this quotation is not known. If the text here printed is right, the reference is to tunny-fishing, when the approach of a shoal is watched for and eagerly announced to the fishermen.
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ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνα μᾶλλον παρατηρήσεως άξια, ὅτι ἐσθ’ ὅπων προσπίπτει τὰ πληθυντικὰ μεγαλορρημονέ-στερα καὶ αὐτῷ δοξοκοπούντα τῷ ὀχλῷ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ.

3 τοιαύτα παρὰ τῶν Σοφοκλεῖ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ Οἰδίπου:

ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι,
ἐφύσαθ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ φυτεύσαντες πάλιν
ἀνέιτε ταύτῳ ύπέρμα καπεδείξατε
πατέρας ἀδελφοὺς παῖδας, αἱμ’ ἐμφύλιον,
νῦμφας γυναῖκας μητέρας τε χῶποσα
αὐσχιστ’ ἐν ἀνθρώπωσιν ἔργα γίγνεται.

πάντα γὰρ ταύτα ἐν ὁνομά ἐστιν, Οἰδίπουσ, ἐπὶ δὲ θατέρου Ἰοκάστη, ἀλλ’ ὅμως χυθεῖς εἰς τὰ πληθυντικὰ ὁ ἀριθμὸς συνεπλήθυσε καὶ τὰς ἀτυχίας· καὶ ὡς ἐκεῖνα πεπλεόνασται,

ἐξῆλθον ἞κτορές τε καὶ Σαρπηδόνες.

4 καὶ τὸ Πλατωνικὸν, ὦ καὶ ἐτέρωθι παρετεθείμεθα, ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. “οὐ γὰρ Πέλοπες οὐδὲ Κάδμοι οὐδ’ Ἀχγυπτοὶ τε καὶ Δαναοὶ οὐδ’ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ φύσει βάρβαροι συνοικοῦσιν ἡμῖν, ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ Ἐλληνες, οὐ μεξοβάρβαροι οἰκοῦμεν” καὶ τὰ ἔξής. φύσει γὰρ ἐξακούεται τὰ πράγματα κομπώδεστερα ἀγεληθῶν οὕτως τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπισυντιθεμένων. οὐ μέντοι δὲι ποιεῖν αὐτὸ ἐπ’ ἄλλων εἶ μὴ ἐφ’ ὅν δέχεται τὰ ὑποκείμενα1 αὐξήσειν ἡ πληθὺν ἡ ύπερβολὴν ἡ πάθος,

1 υποκείμενα Petra for υπερκείμενα.
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—but it is still more worthy of notice that plurals sometimes make a grander impression, courting favour by the sense of multitude given by the grammatical number. This is the case with Sophocles’ lines about Oedipus:

Curse on the marriages
That gave us birth and having given birth
Flung forth the selfsame seed again and showed
Fathers and sons and brothers all blood-kin,
And brides and wives and mothers, all the shame
Of all the foulest deeds that men have done.\(^a\)

These all mean one person, Oedipus, and on the other side Jocasta, but the expansion into the plural serves to make the misfortunes plural as well. There is the same sense of multiplication in “Forth came Hectors and Sarpedons too,”\(^b\) and in the passage of Plato about the Athenians, which we have also quoted elsewhere: “For no Pelopes nor Cadmuses nor Aegyptuses and Danauses nor any other hordes of born barbarians share our home, but we are pure Greeks here, no semi-barbarians,”\(^c\) and so on. The facts naturally sound more imposing from the accumulation of names in groups. This device should not, however, be employed except where the subject invites

\(^{a}Oedipus\ Tyrannus\ 1403–8.
\(^{b}\) Source unknown: see Kannicht-Snell, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta II (Adespota 1 fr. 289).
\(^{c}\) Plato, Menexenus 245D. “Elsewhere” presumably refers to another book.
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ἐν τι τούτων ἢ τὰ πλείονα, ἐπεί τοι τὸ πανταχοῦ κόσωνας ἔξηφθαι λίαν σοφιστικῶν.

24. Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τούναντίον τὰ ἐκ τῶν πληθυντικῶν εἴς τὰ ένικά ἐπισυναγόμενα ἐνίοτε ψηλοφανέστατα. "ἐπειθ' ἢ Πελοπόννησος ἁπάσα διεστήκει" φησὶ. "καὶ δὴ Φρυνίχῳ δράμα Μιλήτου ἄλωσιν διδάξαντι εἰς δάκρυα ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον."¹ τὸ ἐκ τῶν δημημένων εἰς τὰ ήνωμένα ἐπισυναρτεῖ τὸν ἀριθμὸν σωματεοιδέστερον. αὐτῖον δ' ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν τοῦ κόσμου ταῦτον οἶμαι· ὅπου τε γὰρ ένικὰ ὑπάρχει τὰ όνόματα, τὸ πολλὰ ποιεῖν αὐτὰ παρὰ δόξαν ἐμπαθοῦς, ὅπου τε πληθυντικά, τὸ εἰς ἐν τι εὐθανοὺς συγκορυφοῦν τὰ πλείονα διὰ τὴν εἰς τούναντίον μεταμόρφωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν τῷ παραλόγῳ.


26. Ἐναγώνιος δ' ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ τῶν προσώπων ἀντιμετάθεσις καὶ πολλάκις ἐν μέσοις τοῖς κινδύνοις ποιοῦσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν δοκεῖν στρέφεσθαι.

¹ ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον Toll for ἔπεσον οἱ θεώμενοι.
amplification or redundancy or exaggeration or emotion, either one or more of these. To have bells hung all over you is the mark of a sophist.

24. Yet again, the converse of this, the contraction of plurals to singulars, sometimes gives a great effect of sublimity. "Moreover, the whole Peloponnese was split," says Demosthenes.\textsuperscript{a} Again, "when Phrynichus produced his Capture of Miletus the theatre burst into tears."\textsuperscript{b} To compress the number of separate individuals into a unified whole gives more sense of solidity. The ornamental effect in both is due to the same cause. Where the words are singular, to make them unexpectedly plural suggests emotion: where they are plural and you combine a number of things into a well-sounding singular, then this opposite change of the facts gives an effect of surprise.

25. Again, if you introduce events in past time as happening at the present moment, the passage will be transformed from a narrative into a vivid actuality. "Someone has fallen," says Xenophon, "under Cyrus’ horse and, as he is trodden under foot, is striking the horse’s belly with his dagger. The horse, rearing, throws Cyrus, and he falls."\textsuperscript{c} Thucydides uses such effects very often.

26. Change of person gives an equally powerful effect, and often makes the audience feel themselves set in the thick of the danger.

\textsuperscript{a} De corona (Oration 18) 18.
\textsuperscript{b} Herodotus 6.21.
\textsuperscript{c} Xenophon, Cyropaedia 7.1.37.
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φαίης κ’ ἀκμήτας καὶ ἀτειρέας
ἄντεσθ’ ἐν πολέμῳ ὡς ἐσθυμένως ἐμάχοντο.
καὶ ὁ Ἀρατὸς

μη κείνω ἐνι μηνὶ περικλύζουν θαλάσσῃ.

2 ὅδε πον καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδοτος. “ἀπὸ δὲ Ἑλεφαντίνης
πόλεως ἄνω πλεύσει, καὶ ἐπειτὰ ἀφίξῃ ἐς πεδίον
λείων. διεξέλθων δὲ τούτῳ τὸ χωρίον αὖθις εἰς ἔτερον
πλοίου ἐμβας πλεύσει δυ’ ἡμέρας, ἐπειτὰ ἡξεὶς ἐς
πόλιν μεγάλην, ἢ ὅνομα Μερόη.” ὅρας, ὁ ἔταιρε, ὡς
παραλαβὼν σου τὴν ψυχήν διά τῶν τῶν τόπων ἀγεὶ τὴν
ἀκοήν ὅψιν ποιῶν; πάντα δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸς αὐτὰ
ἀπερειδόμενα τὰ πρόσωπα ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἑστησι τὸν
3 ἀκροατήν τῶν ἑνεργουμένων. καὶ ὅταν ὅς οὐ πρὸς
ἀπαντᾶς ἅλλ’ ὡς πρὸς μόνον τινὰ λαλῆς,

Τυδείδην δ’ οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροις μετείη,
ἐμπαθέστερόν τε αὐτὸν ἁμα καὶ προσεκτικότερον
καὶ ἄγωνος ἐμπλεων ἀποτελέσεις, ταῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν
προσφωνησεσιν ἐξεγειρόμενον.

27. Ἔτι γε μὴν ἔσθ’ ὅτε περὶ προσώπου διηγού-
μενος ὁ συγγραφέως ἐξαίφνης παρενεχθεῖς εἰς τὸ
αὐτοπρόσωπον ἀντιμεθίσταται, καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον
eίδος ἐκβολή τις πάθους.

a Iliad 15.697–8.
b Aratus, Phaenomena 287.
ON THE SUBLIME 26–27

... You would say that unworn and
with temper undaunted
Each met the other in war, so headlong the rush of
their battle.a

And Aratus' line:

In that month may you never be found where the
sea surges round you.b

Herodotus does much the same: "You will sail up from
the city of Elephantine and there come to a smooth plain.
And when you have passed through that place you will
board again another ship and sail two days and then you
will come to a great city, the name of which is Meroe."c
Do you see, friend, how he takes you along with him
through the country and turns hearing into sight? All
such passages with a direct personal address put the
hearer in the presence of the action itself. By appearing
to address not the whole audience but a single individ-
ual—

Of Tydeus' son you could not have known with
which of the hosts he was fighting—d

you will move him more and make him more attentive
and full of active interest, because he is roused by the
appeals to him in person.

27. Again sometimes a writer, while speaking about a
person suddenly turns and changes into the person him-
self. A figure of this kind is a sort of outbreak of emotion:

c Herodotus 2.29.
d Iliad 5.85.
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"Εκτωρ δὲ Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν ἄυσας νησίων ἐπισσεύσθαι, ἦν δὲ ἐναρά βροτόντα· ὅν δ’ ἂν ἔγων ἀπανεῦθε νεῶν ἐθέλοντα νοήσω, αὐτοῦ οἱ θάνατον μητίσομαι.

οὐκοῦν τὴν μὲν διήγησιν ἄτε πρέπουσαν ὁ ποιητὴς προσήγηεν ἑαυτῷ, τὴν δὲ ἀπότομον ἀπειλήν τῷ θυμῷ τοῦ ἄγερμονος ἐξαπίνης οὐδὲν προδηλώσας περιέθηκεν ἐφύχετο γάρ, εἰ παρενετίθει ἔλεγχεν δὲ τοῖς τινα καὶ τοῖς ὁ "Εκτωρ," νυνὶ δὲ ἐφθάκεν ἄφνω τὸν μεταβαίνοντα ἡ τοῦ λόγου μετάβασις. διὸ καὶ ἡ πρόσχρησις τοῦ σχῆματος τότε, ἡμίκ’ ἂν ὄξυς ὁ καιρὸς ὅν διαμέλλει τῷ γράφοντι μὴ διδῷ ἄλλ’ εὐθὺς ἐπαναγκάζει μεταβαίνει ἐκ προσώπων εἰς πρόσωπα· ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἐκαταίῳ. "Κηνξ δὲ ταῦτα δεινὰ ποιοῦμενος αὐτίκα ἐκέλευε τοὺς Κῃνοκλείδας ἐπιγόνους ἐκχωρεῖν οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖν δυνατὸς εἰμὶ ἀρήγειν. ως μὴ ἂν αὐτοὶ τε ἀπολέσθηκαν κάμε τρώσετε, ἐς ἄλλον τινα δὴμον ἀποίχεσθε." ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δημοσθένης κατ’ ἄλλον τινα τρόπον ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀριστογείτονος ἐμπαθεῖς τὸ πολυπρόσωπον καὶ ἀγχίστροφον παρέστακεν. "καὶ οὐδέσ ὑμῶν χολῆν,” φησίν, "οὐδ’ ὀργήν ἔχων εὑρεθήσεται ἐφ’ ὁδὲ οὐ βδελυρὸς οὔτος καὶ ἀναιδὴς βιάζεται, ὡς, ὁ μιαρῶτατα ἀπάντων, κεκλευμένης σοι τῆς παρρησίας οὐ κιγκλίσων οὐδέθθα, ἁ καὶ παρανοίεσεν ἂν τις …” ἐν ἀτελεί τῷ νῷ ταχὺ διαλλάξας καὶ μόνον

1 πρόσχρησις Manutius for πρόχρησις P.
Hector lifted his voice and cried afar to the Trojans
To rush back now to the galleys and leave the
blood-spattered booty.
Whomsoever I see of his own will afar from the
galleys,
Death for him there will I plan.\(^a\)

There the poet has assigned the narrative to himself as his
proper share, and then suddenly without any warning
attached the abrupt threat to the angry champion. To
insert “Hector said so and so” would have been frigid. As
it is, the change of construction has suddenly run ahead of
the change of speaker. So this figure is useful, when a
sudden crisis will not let the writer wait, and forces him to
change at once from one character to another. There is
an instance in Hecataeus: “Ceyx took this ill and immedi-
ately bade the descendants be gone. For I cannot help
you. So to prevent perishing yourselves and hurting me,
away with you to some other people.”\(^b\) By a somewhat
different method Demosthenes in the *Aristogeiton* has
used variety of person to suggest rapid shifts of emotion.
“And will none of you,” he says, “be found to feel anger
and indignation at the violence of this shameless rascal,
who—oh you most accursed of villains, who are cut off
from free speech not by gates and doors which one might
very well open . . .”\(^c\) Leaving his sense incomplete he has

\(^a\) *Iliad* 15.346–9.

\(^b\) Hecataeus fr. 30 (*FGrHist* 1). By descendants, Hecataeus
means the descendants of Heracles, as the intrusive gloss indi-
cates: Ceyx, king of Trachis, is unable to help them, and so sends
them away. See Diodorus Siculus 4.57.2.

\(^c\) [Demosthenes] *Or*. 25.27–8.
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οὐ μίαν λέξιν διὰ τὸν θυμὸν εἰς δύο διαστάσας πρόσωπα "ὦς, ὃ μιαρώτατε" εἶτα πρὸς τὸν Ἀριστο-γείτονα τὸν λόγον ἀποστρέψας καὶ ἀπολιπεῖν δοκῶν, ὅμως διὰ τοῦ πάθους πολὺ πλέον ἐπέστρεψεν. Οὐκ ἄλλως ἡ Πηνελόπη.

κῆρυξ, τίπτε δὲ σε πρόεσαν μνηστήρες ἄγανοι; εἰπὲμεναι δυνωῆσιν Ὅδυσσῆος θείου ἔργων παύσασθαι, σφίσι δ' αὐτοῖς δαίτα πένεσθαι; μὴ μνηστεύσαντες, μὴ' ἄλλοθ' ῥυμλήσαντες, ὕστατα καὶ πῦματα νῦν ἐνθάδε δειπνήσειαν, οὗ θάμ' ἀγειρόμενοι βίοτον κατακείρετε πολλόν, . . . οὐδὲ τι πατρῶν ὑμετέρων τῶν πρόσθεν ἀκούετε, παῖδες ἐόντες, οἷος Ὅδυσσεὺς ἔσκε.

28. Καὶ μέντοι περίφρασις ὡς οὐχ ὑψηλοποιοῖν, οὐδὲς ἂν οἶμαι διιστάσειν. ὡς γὰρ ἐν μουσικῇ διὰ τῶν παραφώνων καλομένων ὁ κύριος φθόγγος ἠδίων ἀποτελεῖται, οὕτως ἡ περίφρασις πολλάκις συμβαθήγεται τῇ κυριολογίᾳ καὶ εἰς κόσμον ἐπὶ πολὺ συνηχεῖ, καὶ μάλιστ', ἂν μὴ ἐχὴ φυσοῦδές τι καὶ ἄμοισον ἄλλ' ἕδεως κεκραμένον. ἰκάνος δὲ τοῦτο τεκμηριώσαι καὶ Πλάτων κατὰ τὴν εἰσβολὴν

1 So Weiske, for τὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀριστογείτονα λόγον. Editors have also proposed a lacuna before ἀπολιπεῖν, supplying.
made a sudden change and in his indignation almost a
split a single phrase between two persons—"who—oh
you most accursed"—and thus, while swinging his speech
round on to Aristogeitont and appearing to abandon the
jury, he has yet by means of the emotion made his appeal
to them much more intense. Penelope does the same:

Herald, oh why have they sent you hither, those
high-born suitors?
Is it to tell the hand-maidens that serve in the
house of Odysseus
Now to desist from their tasks and make ready a
feast for the suitors?
Would that they never had wooed me nor ever met
here in our halls,
Would they might make in my house their last and
latest of banquets,
You that meet often together and utterly ravage our
substance!

... Nor yet from your fathers
Heard you ever at home long ago in the days of
your childhood
What manner of man was Odysseus.\(^a\)

28. That periphrasis can contribute to the sublime, no
one, I fancy, would question. Just as in music what we call
accompaniment enhances the beauty of the melody, so
periphrasis often chimes in with the literal expression and
gives it a far richer note, especially if it is not bombastic or
tasteless but agreeably blended. A sufficient proof of this

\(^a\) Odyssey 4.681–9.

e.g., \(<\text{τούς κρυτὰς}>\). The translation assumes this sense. See
Bühler (1964), 130.
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tou ἐπιταφίου: "ἐργῳ μὲν ύμιν οἶδ' ἔχουσι τὰ προσήκοντα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς, ὃν τυχόντες πορεύονται τὴν εἴμαρμένην πορείαν, προπεμφθέντες κοινῆ μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἔκαστος ὑπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων." οὐκοῦν τὸν θάνατον εἶπεν εἴμαρμένην πορείαν, τὸ δὲ τετυχήκεναι τῶν νομιζόμενων προπομπῆς τινα δημοσίαν ὑπὸ τῆς πατρίδος. ἄρα δὴ τούτως μετρίως ὠγκωσε τὴν νόησιν, ἦ φυλήν λαβὼν τὴν λέξιν ἐμελοποίησε καθάπερ ἄρμον τινὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς περιφράσεως περιχείμανος εὐμέλειαν; καὶ Ἐνοφῶν "πόνον δὲ τοῦ ζην ἡδεσ ἡγεμόνα νομίζετε, κάλλιστον δὲ πάντων καὶ πολεμικῶτατον κτῆμα εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς συγκεκόμασθε: ἐπαινούμενοι γὰρ μάλλον ἡ τοῖς ἄλλοις πάσι χαίρετε" ἀντὶ τοῦ "πονεῖν θέλετε" "πόνον ἡγεμόνα τοῦ ζην ἡδεσ ποιεῖσθε" εἴποτα καὶ ταλλ' ὀμοίως ἐπεκτείνας μεγάλην τινὰ ἐννοιαν τῷ ἐπαίνῳ προσπεριφρόσυτα. καὶ τὸ ἀμύμητον ἐκεῖνο τοῦ Ἡρωδότου: "τῶν δὲ Σκυθέων τοὺς συλήσασιν τὸ ἱερὸν ἐνέβαλεν ἡ θεὸς θήλειαν νοῦνσον."

29. Ἐπίκηρων μέντοι τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἡ περιφρασίς, τῶν ἄλλων πλέον, εἰ μὴ σὺν μέτρῳ1 τινὲς λαμβάνοντο: εὐθὺς γὰρ ἀβλεμές προσπίπτει, κοιφολογίας τε ὁξύν καὶ παχύτητος.2 οἶδεν καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα (δεινὸς γὰρ ἀεὶ περί σχῆμα κάν τισιν ἀκαίρως) ἐν τοῖς

1 σὺν μέτρῳ Morus for συμμέτρως.
2 παχύτητος Manutius, for παχύτατον.

254
is the opening of Plato's Funeral Oration: "First then in
deeds we have given them their due reward, and, this
won, they travel now their destined journey, escorted all
in common by their country and each man severally by his
kinsmen."a Here he calls death a destined journey and
their enjoyment of due rites a sort of public escort by
their country. Is it a trivial dignity that he thus gives to
the thought, or has he rather taken the literal expression
and made it musical, wrapping it, as it were, in the tuneful
harmonies of his periphrasis? Again Xenophon says, "You
hold that hard work is a guide to the pleasures of life and
you have stored in your hearts the noblest and most war-
rior-like of all treasures. For nothing pleases you so much
as praise."b By saying "You make hard work a guide to liv-
ing with pleasure" instead of "You are willing to work
hard," and by similarly expanding the rest of his sentence,
he has invested the eulogy with a further grand idea.
Then there is that inimitable phrase in Herodotus: "Upon
those Scythians that sacked her temple the goddess sent a
female malady."c

29. However it is a risky business, periphrasis, more
so than any of the other figures, unless used with a due
sense of proportion. For it soon falls flat, smacking of
triviality and grossness. So that critics have even made
fun of Plato—always so clever at a figure, sometimes

a Plato, *Menexenus* 236D.
b Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.5.12.
c Herodotus 1.105.4.
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Νόμοις λέγοντα "ώς οὔτε ἀργυροῦν δεῖ πλούτον οὔτε χρυσοῦν ἐν πόλει ἱδρυμένον ἐὰν οἰκεῖν" διαχλενά-ζουσιν, ως εἰ πρόβατα, φησίν, ἐκώλυε κεκτήσθαι, δῆλον ὅτι προβάτειον ἂν καὶ βόειον πλούτον ἔλεγεν.

2 Ἄλλα γὰρ ἄλις ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὰ υψηλὰ τῶν σχη-μάτων χρῆσεws ἐκ παρενθήκης τοσαύτα πεφιλολο-γησθαι, Τερεντιανὲ φίλτατε: πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα παθητικωτέρους καὶ συγκεκριμένους ἀποτελεῖ τοὺς λόγους: πάθος δὲ ψυχὸς μετέχει τοσοῦτον, ὅπως ἦπερ ἡδονής.

30. Ἐπειδὴ μέντοι ἡ τοῦ λόγου νόησις ἡ τε φρά-σις τὰ πλεῖω δι᾽ ἐκατέρω διέπτυκται, ἵθι δὴ, [ἀν]¹ τοῦ φραστικοῦ μέρους εἰ² τινὰ λοιπὰ ἔτι, προσεπι-θεασώμεθα. ὅτι μὲν τοῖς ἡ τῶν κυρίων καὶ μεγα-λοπρεπῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογὴ θαυμαστῶς ἀγιει καὶ κατακηλεὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ ὡς πᾶσι τοῖς ῥήτοροι καὶ συγγραφέως κατ᾽ ἀκρον ἐπιτήδευμα, μέγεθος ἄμα κάλλος εὐπίνειαν βάρος ἱσχὺν κράτος ἔτι δὲ γάνωσιν τινὰ τοῖς λόγοις ὡσπερ ἀγάλμασι καλλίστοις δι᾽ αὐτῆς ἐπαινεῖν παρασκευάζουσα καὶ οἴονει ψυχὴν τινὰ τοῖς πράγμασι φωνητικὴν ἐντιθέεσα, μὴ καὶ περιττὸν ἢ πρὸς εἴδοτας διεξείναι. φῶς γὰρ τῷ

2 ὅτι ἰδιον τοῦ νοῦ τὰ καλὰ ὀνόματα. ὁ μέντοι γε ὅγκος αὐτῶν ὡς πάντῃ χρειώδης, ἐπεὶ τοῖς μικρῷς πραγματίως περιτιθέναι μεγάλα καὶ σεμνὰ ὀνόματα ταῦταν ἂν φαύνοιτο, ὡς εἰ τις τραγικὸν προσωπεῖον

unseasonably so—for saying in his *Laws* “that we should not let silvern treasure nor golden settle and make a home in a city.”\(^a\) Had he been forbidding people to possess sheep, says the critic, he would clearly have said “ovine and bovine treasure.”

But, my dear Terentianus, this digression must suffice for our discussion of the use of figures as factors in the sublime. They all serve to lend emotion and excitement to the style. But emotion is as much an element of the sublime, as characterization is of charm.\(^b\)

30. Now, since thought and diction are generally closely involved with each other we must further consider whether there are any elements of diction still left untouched. It is probably superfluous to explain at length to someone who knows, how the choice of the right word and the fine word has a marvellously moving and seductive effect upon an audience and how all orators and prose writers make this their supreme object. For this of itself gives to the style at once grandeur, beauty, old-world charm, weight, force, strength, and a sort of lustre, like the bloom on the surface of the most beautiful bronzes, and endows the facts as it were with a living voice. Truly, beautiful words are the very light of thought. However, their majesty is not for common use, since to attach great and stately words to trivial things would be

\(^a\) Plato, *Laws* 7.801B
\(^b\) Cf. the comparison between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, above 9.11–15.

---

\(^2\) Spengel reads ἐ̂, retaining ἄν.
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μέγα παιδί περιθείη νηπίω. πλήν ἐν μὲν ποιήσει καὶ ἵ...¹


¹ ἰστορία (Toll) must be the word that is broken off.
² Perhaps τὸ τάνακρεοντος (Russell 1964); but it is possible that οὔκετι is not part of the quotation, and that the writer means that Anacreon’s phrase (by contrast with something just mentioned, and lost to us) is not admirable.
³ <πῶλον> supplied by Bergk.
⁴ So Vahlen; καὶ τὸν ἐπῆνετον Ρ.
like fastening a great tragic mask on a little child. However in poetry and history...

[Four pages are lost here.]

31. . . . is most nourishing and productive; so, too, with Anacreon’s “No more care I for the Thracian filly.”a In the same way the novel phrase used by Theopompus is commendable; it seems to me extremely expressive because of the analogy, though Caecilius for some reason finds fault with it. “Philip,” he says, “had a wonderful faculty of stomaching things.”b Thus a common expression sometimes proves far more vivid than elegant language. Being taken from our common life it is immediately recognized, and what is familiar is thereby the more convincing. Applied to one whose greedy ambition makes him glad to endure with patience what is shameful and sordid, “stomaching things” forms a very vivid phrase. It is much the same with Herodotus’ phrases: “In his madness,” he says, “Cleomenes cut his own flesh into strips with a dagger, until he made mincemeat of himself and perished,” and “Pythes went on fighting in the ship until he was chopped to pieces.”c These come perilously near to vulgarity, but are not vulgar because they are so expressive.

a Anacreon, fr. eleg. 5 (D. A. Campbell, Greek Lyric II p. 148).
b Theopompus fr. 262 (FGrHist 115 F 262).
c Herodotus 6.75, 7.181.
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32. Περὶ δὲ πλήθους [καὶ]¹ μεταφορῶν ὁ μὲν Καυκίλιος ἔοικε συγκατατίθεσθαι τοῖς δύο ἢ τὸ πλείστον τρεῖς ἐπὶ ταύτων νομοθετούσι τάττεσθαι: ὁ γὰρ Δημοσθένης ὁρὸς καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἡ τῆς χρείας δὲ καιρός, ἐνθα τὰ πάθη χειμάρρου δίκην ἔλαινεται, καὶ τὴν πολυπλήθειαν αὐτῶν ὡς ἀναγκαίαν ἐνταῦθα συνεφέλκεται. “Αὐθρωποί,” φησί “μιαροὶ καὶ κόλακες, ἥκρωτηρισμένοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκαστῶν πατρίδας, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν προσπελκότες πρότερον Φιλίππων, νυνὶ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρω, τῇ γαστρί μετροῦντες καὶ τοῖς αὐξόστοις τὴν εὐδαμονίαν, τὴν δ’ ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὸ μηδένα ἐχειν δεσπότην, ὃ τοῖς πρότερον “Ελλησσιν ὁροὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡσαν καὶ κανόνες, ἀνατερφότες.” ἐνταῦθα τῷ πλήθει τῶν τροπικῶν ὁ κατὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ἐπιπροσθεὶ τοῦ ῥήτορος θυμός. διόπερ ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ ὁ Θεόφραστος μειλίγματά φασί τινα τῶν θρασειῶν εἶναι ταῦτα μεταφορῶν, τὸ “ὁσπερεῖ” φάναι καὶ “οἰονεῖ” καὶ “εἰ χρῇ τοῦτοι εἰπεῖν τῶν τρόπον” καὶ “εἰ δεῖ παρακινδυνευτικότερον λέξαι.” ἡ γὰρ ὑποτίμησις, φασίν, ἵσται τὰ τολμηρά· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ταύτα μὲν ἀποδέχομαι, ὡμοσ δὲ πλήθους καὶ τόλμης μεταφορῶν, ὅπερ ἐφην κατι² τῶν σχημάτων, τὰ εὐκαιρὰ καὶ σφοδρὰ πάθη καὶ τὸ γενναίον ὑψος εἰναι φημι ἢδια τινα ἀλεξιφάρμακα, ὅτι τῷ ροθίῳ τῆς φορᾶς ταντὶ

¹ καὶ deleted by Robortelli.
² κατὶ Pearce for κάπειτα.
32. As to the proper number of metaphors, Caecilius
seems on the side of those who rule that not more than
two or at the most three may be used together. Demos-
thenes assuredly is the canon in these matters too. And
the occasion for their use is when emotion sweeps on like
a flood and carries the multitude of metaphors along as an
inevitable consequence. "Men," he says, "of evil life, flatter-
ers, who have each foully mutilated their own country
and toasted away their liberty first to Philip and now to
Alexander, men who measure happiness by their bellies
and their basest appetites, and have overthrown that lib-
erty and freedom from despotism which to Greeks of
older days was the canon and standard of all that was
good."\(^a\) Here it is the orator's indignation against the
traitors which screens the multitude of metaphors.
Accordingly, Aristotle and Theophrastus say that bold
metaphors are softened by inserting "as if" or "as it were"
or "if one may say so" or "if one may risk the expression."\(^b\)
The apology, they tell us, mitigates the audacity of the
language. I accept this, but at the same time, as I said in
speaking of figures, the proper antidote for a multitude of
daring metaphors is strong and timely emotion and gen-
uine sublimity. These by their nature sweep everything

\(^a\) De corona (= Or. 18) 296.

\(^b\) See Aristotle fr. 131 Rose, with Rhet. 3.7.1408b2, Cicero,
De oratore 3.165, Theophrastus fr. 690 Fortenbaugh.
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πέφυκεν ἀπαντὰ τάλλα παρασύρειν καὶ πρωθεῖν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἧς ἀναγκαῖα πάντως εἰσπράττεσθαι τὰ παράβολα, καὶ οὐκ ἐὰν τὸν ἀκροατήν σχολάζειν περὶ τὸν πλήθους ἔλεγχον διὰ τὸ συνεθυνοῦσιν τῷ λέγοντι.

5 Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐν γε ταῖς τοπηγορίαις καὶ διαγραφαῖς οὐκ ἄλλο τι οὕτως κατασκημαντικὸν ὡς οἱ συνεχεῖς καὶ ἐπάλληλοι τρόποι. δι’ ὅν καὶ παρὰ Ξενοφῶντι ἡ τάνθρωπινον σκήνους ἀνατομὴ πομπικῶς καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἀναξωγραφεῖται θείως παρὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι. τὴν μὲν κεφαλήν αὐτοῦ φησιν ἀκρόπολιν, ἵσθιμον δὲ μέσον διωκδομήσθαι μεταξὺ τοῦ στήθους τῶν αὐχένα, σφουνδύλους τε ὑπεστηρίχθαι φησιν οἶνον στρόφιγγας καὶ τὴν μὲν ἠδονὴν ἀνυθρώπους εἶναι κακῶν1 δέλεαρ, γλῶσσαν δὲ γεύσεως δοκίμου ἀνάμμα δὲ τῶν φλεβῶν τὴν καρδίαν καὶ πηγὴν τοῦ περιφερομένου σφοδρῶς αἴματος, εἰς τὴν δορυφορικὴν οὐκήσων κατατεταγμένην τὰς δὲ διαδρομὰς τῶν πόρων ὁνομάζει στενωποὺς. "τῇ δὲ πηδήσει τῆς καρδίας ἐν τῇ τῶν δεινῶν προσδοκία καὶ τῇ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐπεγέρσει, ἐπειδὴ διάπυρος ἤν, ἐπικουρίαν μηχανώμενοι," φησί, "τὴν τοῦ πλεύσμονος ἰδέαν ἐνεφύτευσαν, μαλακὴν καὶ ἀναίμου καὶ σήραγγας ἐντὸς ἔχουσαν ὀποῖον μάλαγμα, ἵν' ὁ θυμὸς ὁπότ' ἐν αὐτῇ ζέσῃ, πηδώσα νεανίκη αἰς ὑπείκον μὴ λυμαίνειται." καὶ τὴν μὲν τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν οὐκήσων προσείπευν ὡς γυναικωνίτιν, τὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ δὲ ἄσπερ ἀνδρωνίτιν· τὸν γε μὴν σπλήνα τῶν ἐντὸς μαγείον,
along in the forward surge of their current, or rather they positively demand bold imagery as essential to their effect, and do not give the hearer time to examine how many metaphors there are, because he shares the excitement of the speaker.

Moreover in the treatment of a commonplace and in descriptions there is nothing so expressive as a sustained series of metaphors. It is thus that in Xenophon\textsuperscript{a} the anatomy of the human tabernacle is magnificently depicted, and still more divinely in Plato.\textsuperscript{b} The head he calls the citadel of the body, the neck is an isthmus built between the head and chest, and the vertebrae, he says, are planted beneath like hinges; pleasure is evil's bait for man, and the tongue is the touchstone of taste. The heart is a knot of veins and the source whence the blood runs vigorously round, and it has its station in the guardhouse of the body. The passageways of the body he calls alleys, and "for the leaping of the heart in the expectation of danger or the arising of wrath, since this was due to fire, the gods devised a support by implanting the lungs, making them a sort of buffer, soft and bloodless and full of pores inside, so that when anger boiled up in the heart it might throb against a yielding surface and suffer no damage." The seat of the desires he compares to the women's apartments and the seat of anger to the men's. The spleen

\textsuperscript{a} Xenophon, \textit{Memorabilia} 1.4.5.

\textsuperscript{b} Plato, \textit{Timaeus} 65C–85E, quoted selectively and with considerable freedom; see Russell (1964) pp. 153–5.

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{kakōν} K marg., Manutius (cf. Cicero \textit{de Senectute} 44, \textit{escam malorum}): \textit{kakōν} P.
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"ὅθεν πληρούμενος τῶν ἀποκαθαιρομένων μέγας καὶ ὑπολογός αὐξέται."

"μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα σαρξὶ πάντα,"

φησὶ, "κατεσκίασαν, προβολὴν τῶν ἐξώθην τὴν σάρκα, οἶον τὰ πυλῆματα, προβλέμενοι."

νομήν δὲ σαρκῶν ἔφη τὸ αἷμα: "τῆς δὲ τροφῆς ἑνεκά," φησὶ, "δωχεῖτενσαν τὸ σῶμα, τέμνοντες ὠσπερ ἐν κῆποις ὁχετοῖς, ὃς ἐκ τινὸς νάματος ἐπιώντος, ἀραιοῦ ὄντος αὐλώνος τοῦ σώματος, τὰ τῶν φλεβῶν ῥέοι νάματα." ήνίκα δὲ ἡ τελευτὴ παραστῆ, λυσθαί φησι τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς οἰνεὶ νεὼς πεῖσματα, μεθενθαί τε αὐτὴν ἐλευθέραν. ταῦτα καὶ τὰ παραπλῆσια μυρί ἄττα ἐστὶν ἔξης· ἀπόχρη δὲ τὰ δεδηλωμένα, ὅσα μεγάλαι τε φύσιν εἰσὶν αἱ τροπικαί, καὶ ὡς υψηλοποιῶν αἱ μεταφοραί, καὶ ὅτι οἱ παθητικοὶ καὶ φραστικοὶ κατὰ τὸ πλέοστον αὐταῖς χαίρομαι τόποι. ὅτι μέντοι καὶ ἡ χρήσις τῶν τρόπων, ὧσπερ τάλλα πάντα καλὰ ἐν λόγοις, προαγώγων ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἁμετρον, δήλον ἢδη, καὶ ἐγὼ μὴ λέγω. ἐπὶ γὰρ τούτοις καὶ τῶν Πλάτωνα οὖν ἴκιστα διασύνομοι, πολλάκις ὧσπερ ὑπὸ βακχείας των τῶν λόγων εἰς ἀκράτους καὶ ἀπτηνείς μεταφορας καὶ εἰς ἀληθεομικόν στόμφον ἐκφερόμενων. "οὺ γὰρ ράδιον ἐπινοεῖν," φησίν, "ὅτι πόλων εἶναι <δεῖ> δίκην κρατήρος κεκερασμένην, οὐ μαυνόμενος μὲν οἶνος ἐγκεκυμένος ζεῖ, κολαζόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ νήφοντος ἐτέρου θεοῦ καλὴν κοινωνίαν λαβῶν ἀγαθὸν πόμα καὶ μέτριον ἀπεργάζεται." νήφουτα

1 πυλῆματα Toup for πηθῆματα.
again is the towel for the entrails, “with whose off-scourings it is filled and becomes swollen and fetid.” “After this,” he goes on, “they shrouded the whole in a covering of flesh, like felt, to shield it from the outer world.” Blood he calls the fodder of the flesh, and adds, “For purposes of nutriment they irrigated the body, cutting channels as one does in a garden, and thus, the body being a conduit full of passages, the streams in the veins were able to flow as it were from a running stream.” And when the end comes, the soul, he says, is loosed like a ship from its moorings and set free. These and thousands of similar metaphors occur throughout. Those we have pointed out suffice to show that figurative writing\textsuperscript{a} has a natural grandeur and that metaphors make for sublimity: also that emotional and descriptive passages are most glad of them. However, it is obvious without my stating it, that the use of metaphor, like all the other beauties of style, always tempts writers to excess. Indeed it is for these passages in particular that critics pull Plato to pieces, on the ground that he is often carried away by a sort of Bacchic possession in his writing into harsh and intemperate metaphor and allegorical bombast. “It is by no means easy to see,” he says, “that a city needs mixing like a wine bowl, where the mad wine seethes as it is poured in, but is chastened by another and a sober god and finding good company makes an excellent and temperate drink.”\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a} This translation understands λέξεως with τροπικαί.

\textsuperscript{b} Plato, \textit{Laws} 6.773C.

\textsuperscript{2} add. K marg., Manutius.
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γάρ, φασί, θεοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ λέγειν, κόλασιν δὲ τὴν κράσιν, ποιητοῦ τινος τῷ ὄντι οὐχὶ ἴνθος ἔστι.

8 Τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐλαττώμασιν ἐπιχειρῶν ὦμως αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ Καικίλιος ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Δυσίαν συγγράμμασιν ἀπεθάρρησεν τῷ παντὶ Δυσίαν ἁμείνῳ Πλάτωνος ἀποφήμασθαι, δυσὶ πάθεσι χρησάμενος ἀκρότοις· φιλῶν γὰρ τὸν Δυσίαν ὡς οὐδ’ αὐτὸς αὐτόν, ὦμως μᾶλλον μισεῖ τῷ παντὶ Πλάτωνα ἢ Δυσίαν φιλεῖ. πλὴν οὕτος μὲν ὑπὸ φιλονεικίας οὐδὲ τὰ θέματα ὁμολογούμενα, καθάπερ ἡμή. ὡς γὰρ ἀναμάρτητον καὶ καθαρὸν τὸν ῥήτορα προφέρει πολλαχῇ διημαρτημένου τοῦ Πλάτωνος· τὸ δ’ ἢν ἄρα οὐχὶ τοιοῦτον, οὐδὲ ὀλίγου δεῖ.

33. Φέρε δὴ, λάβωμεν τῷ ὄντι καθαρὸν τινα συγγραφέα καὶ ἀνέγκλητον. ἂρ’ οὐκ ἄξιόν ἐστι διαπορήσαι περὶ αὐτοῦ, τούτοις καθολικῶς, πότερον ποτε κρείττον ἐν ποιήμασι καὶ λόγοις μέγεθος ἐν ἐνύοις διημαρτημένοις1 ἢ τὸ σύμμετρον μὲν ἐν τοῖς κατορθώμασιν ύγιές δὲ πάντη καὶ ἀδιάπτωτον; καὶ ἔτι νὴ Δία, πότερον ποτε αἱ πλείους ἄρεται τὸ πρωτεῖον ἐν λόγοις ἢ αἱ μείζους δικαίως ἀν φέροιτο; ἢς αἱ ἐν παντὶ ἀκρίβεις κύνδυνοι μικρότητος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεγεθεσιν, ὦσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἄγαν πλούτοις, εἰναι τι χρή

1 διημαρτημένον K marg., Manutius: διημαρτημένοις P.
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To call water "a sober god" and mixing "chastisement," say the critics, is the language of a poet who is far from sober.

Caecilius too, in attacking like defects, has actually had the face to declare in his book on Lysias that Lysias is altogether superior to Plato. Here he has given way to two confused emotions: for though he loves Lysias even better than himself, yet his hatred for Plato altogether outweighs his love for Lysias. However he is moved by a spirit of contentiousness and even his premises are not agreed, as he supposed. For he prefers his orator on the ground that he is immaculate\(^a\) and never makes a mistake, whereas Plato is full of mistakes. But the truth, we find, is different, very different indeed.

33. Suppose we illustrate this by taking some altogether immaculate and unimpeachable writer, must we not in this very connection raise the general question: Which is the better in poetry and in prose, grandeur flawed in some respects, or moderate achievement accompanied by perfect soundness and impeccability? And again: is the first place in literature rightly due to the largest number of excellences or to the excellences that are greatest in themselves? These inquiries are proper to a treatise on the sublime and on every ground demand decision. Now I am well aware that the greatest natures are least immaculate. Perfect precision runs the risk of triviality, whereas in great writing as in great wealth there

\(^a\) Katharos, i.e. "pure," in language, possessing one of the basic stylistic virtues.
καὶ παρολιγωρούμενον· μήποτε δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἦ, τὸ τάς μὲν ταπεινὰς καὶ μέσας φύσεως διὰ τὸ μηδαμὴ παρακαταλυέναι μηδὲ ἐφίεσθαι τῶν ἀκρῶν ἀναμαρτήτους ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ ἀσφαλε-στέρας διαμένειν, τὰ δὲ μεγάλα ἐπισφαλῆ δι’ αὐτὸ γίνεσθαι τὸ μέγεθος. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἄγνοϊ τὸ δεύτερον, ὅτι φύσει πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἀπὸ τοῦ χείρουν αἰὲ μᾶλλον ἐπιγνωσκεται καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀμαρτημάτων ἀνεξάλειπτος ἡ μνήμη παραμένει, τῶν καλῶν δὲ ταχέως ἀπορρεῖ. παρατεθεμένος δ’ οὐκ ὀλίγα καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτήματα καὶ Ὁμήρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσοι μέγιστοι, καὶ ἡκιστα τοῖς πταίσμασιν ἄρεσκόμενοι, ὃμως δὲ οὐχ ἀμαρτήματα μᾶλλον αὐτὰ ἐκούσια καλῶν ἢ παροράματα δι’ ἀμέλειαν εἰκῆ που καὶ ἔστω ἔτυχεν ὑπὸ μεγαλοφυίας ἀνεπιστάτως παρεννηγμένα, οὐδὲν ἤττον οἶμαι τὰς μείζονας ἀρετὰς, ἐι καὶ μὴ ἐν πᾶσι διομαλίζονε, τὴν τοῦ πρωτείου ψήφον μᾶλλον αἰὲ φέρεσθαι, κἂν εἰ μὴ δι’ ἐνὸς ἐτέρου, τῆς μεγαλοφροσύνης αὐτῆς ἐνεκα· ἐπεί-τοιγε καὶ ἀπτωτός ὁ Ἐπολλώνιος ἐν τοῖς Ἄργοναύταις ποιητῆς καὶ τοῖς βουκολικοῖς πλὴν ὀλίγων τῶν ἔξωθεν ὁ Θεόκριτος ἐπιτυχέστατος· ἀρ’ οὖν Ὁμήρος ἀν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἐπολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι; τί δὲ; Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῇ Ἡριγόνῃ (διὰ πάντων γὰρ ἀμώμητον τὸ ποιημάτιον) Ἀρχιλόχου πολλα καὶ ἀνυικονόμητα παρασύροντος, κάκεινης τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ

1 ἀρετᾶς Petra, for aitias.
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must needs be something overlooked. Perhaps it is inevitable that humble, mediocre natures, because they never run any risks and never aid at the heights, should remain to a large extent safe from error, while in great natures their very greatness spells danger. Not indeed that I am ignorant of the second point, that whatever men do is always inevitably regarded from the worst side: faults make an ineradicable impression, but beauties soon slip from our memory. I have myself cited a good many faults in Homer\textsuperscript{a} and the other greatest authors, and though these slips certainly offend my taste, yet I prefer to call them not wilful mistakes but careless oversights, let in casually almost and at random by the heedlessness of genius. In spite, then, of these faults I still think that the greatest excellences, even if they are not sustained throughout at the same level, should always be voted the first place, if for nothing else, for the greatness of mind they reveal. Apollonius, for instance, is an impeccable poet in the \textit{Argonautica}, and Theocritus—except in a few extraneous matters\textsuperscript{b}—is supremely successful in his pastorals. Yet would you not rather be Homer than Apollonius? And what of Eratosthenes in his \textit{Erigone}\textsuperscript{c}? Wholly blameless as the little poem is, do you therefore think him a greater poet than Archilochus with all his disorganized flood and those outbursts of divine inspiration, which are

\textsuperscript{a} Presumably in other works. \textsuperscript{b} This refers either to the parts of Theocritus which are not pastoral or (more probably) to slips of factual detail noted by grammarians.

\textsuperscript{c} A learned elegiac poem by the astronomer-poet (third century B.C.), in which was related the Attic myth of the death of Icarius and the suicide by hanging of his daughter Erigone, the principal characters being all translated into stars. See J. U. Powell, \textit{Collectanea Alexandrina} 64ff.
LONGINUS

daimonion pneumatos ἂν ὑπὸ νόμον τάξαι δύσκολον, ἀρα δὴ μείζων ποιητής; τί δέ; ἐν μέλεσι μᾶλλον ἂν εἶναι Βακχυλίδης ἐλθοῦ η Πίνδαρος καὶ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ Ἰων ὁ Χίος ἢ Δία Σοφοκλῆς; ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν ἀδιά-
πτωτοί καὶ ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντη κεκαλλυγραφημέ-
νου, ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὅτε μὲν οἶον
πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, σβέννυνται δ’ ἀλόγως
πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀτυχέστατα. ἦ οὔδεις ἂν εὗ
φρονῶν ἐνὸς δράματος, τοῦ Όιδίποδος, εἰς ταῦτα
συνθεῖς τὰ Ἰωνος <ἀπαντα> ἀντιτιμήσατο ἐξῆς.
34. Εἰ δ’ ἄρθιμφ, μὴ τῷ μεγέθει κρίνοιτο τὰ
catorchômeata, οὕτως ἂν καὶ Ἐπερείδης τῷ παντὶ
προέχοι Δημοσθένους. ἔστων γὰρ αὐτοῦ πολυφωνό-
ters καὶ πλείον ἁρετὰς ἔχων, καὶ σχέδουν ὑπακρασ
ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς ὁ πένταλθος, ὡστε τῶν μὲν πρωτείων ἐν
ἀπασι τῶν ἄλλων ἁγωνιστῶν λείπεσθαι, πρωτεύειν
dae τῶν ἰδιωτῶν. ὁ μὲν γε Ἐπερείδης πρὸς τῷ πάντα
ἐξω γε τῆς συνθέσεως μμείσθαι τὰ Δημοσθένεια
κατορθώματα καὶ τὰς Δυσικάκας ἐκ περιττῶν περιε-
ληφεν ἁρετὰς τε καὶ χάριτας καὶ γὰρ λαλεῖ μετὰ
ἀφελείας, ἐνθα χρῆ, καὶ οὐ πάντα ἐξῆς [καὶ] 2
μονο-
tόνως, ὡς ὁ Δημοσθένεις λέγεται, τὸ τε ἡθικὸν ἔχει
μετὰ γλυκύτητος ἦδυν ἐφηδυνόμενον ἀφατοῖ
tε περὶ αὐτῶν ἔσων ἁστεῖςμοί, μοκτῆρ πολυτικῶτα-
tos, εὐγένεια, τὸ κατὰ τὰς εἰρονείας εὐπάλαιστρον,

1 add. Toup.
2 del. Schurz fleisch.
3 del. Weiske: ἦ Δία Richards.
so troublesome to bring under any rule? In lyrics, again, would you choose to be Bacchylides rather than Pindar, or in tragedy Ion of Chios\(^a\) rather than Sophocles? In both pairs the first named is impeccable and a master of elegance in the smooth style, while Pindar and Sophocles sometimes seem to fire the whole landscape as they sweep across it, though often their fire is unaccountably quenched and they fall miserably flat. The truth is rather that no one in his senses would give the single tragedy of _Oedipus_ for all the works of Ion together.

34. If achievements were to be judged by the number of excellences and not by their greatness, Hyperides would then be altogether superior to Demosthenes. He has greater variety of voice and his excellences are more numerous. He may almost be said to come a good second in every competition, like the winner of the Pentathlon.\(^b\) In each contest he loses to the professional champion, but comes first of the amateurs. Besides reproducing all the virtues of Demosthenes, except his skill in word arrangement, Hyperides has embraced all the excellences and graces of Lysias. He talks plainly, where necessary, does not speak always in the same tone, as Demosthenes is said to do, and has the power of characterization, seasoned moreover by simplicity and charm. Then he has an untold store of polished wit, urbane sarcasm, well-bred

\(^a\) Ion of Chios (mid-fifth century B.C.) was better known for his prose works ("Memoirs" and "Visits of Famous Men"), but a number of his tragedies were known in Hellenistic times (TGF i pp. 95ff; A. von Blumenthal, _Ion von Chios_ (1939)).

\(^b\) The best result in all five contests taken together—jumping, running, discus, javelin, wrestling—would doubtless be achieved by an athlete who was not an outstanding performer in any one.
LONGINUS

σκόμματα οὐκ ἀμοῦσα οὐδ’ ἁνάγωγα, κατὰ τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἐκείνους ἄλας¹ ἐπικείμενα, διασωρμός τε ἐπιδέξιος καὶ πολὺ τὸ κωμικὸν καὶ μετὰ παιδιάς εὐστόχου κέντρον, ἀμύμητον δὲ ἐίπειν τὸ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἐπαφρόδιτον οἴκτισασθαί τε προσφυέστατος, ἔτι δὲ μυθολογῆσαι κεχυμένως² καὶ ἐν ύγρῷ πνεύματι διεξοδεῦσαι τι³ εὐκαμπής ἀκρως, ὡσπερ ἀμέλει τὰ μὲν περὶ τὴν Δητὼ ποιητικῶτερα, τὸν δ’ ἐπιτάφιον ἐπιδεικτικὸς, ὡς οὐκ οἶδ’ εἰ τις ἄλλος, διέθετο. ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης ἀνθρωποίητος ἀδιάχυτος, ἢκιστα ύγρος ἢ ἐπιδεικτικός, ἀπάντων ἓξης τῶν προειρημένων κατὰ τὸ πλέον ἀμοῦρος, ἐνθα μὲν γελοῖος εἶναι βιάζεται καὶ ἀστεῖος, οὐ γέλωτα κινεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ καταγελάται, ὅταν δὲ ἐγγύζειν θέλῃ τῷ ἐπίχαρι εἶναι, τότε πλέον ἀφιστάται. τὸ γέ τοι περὶ Φρύνης ἢ Ἀθηνογένους λογίδιον ἐπιχειρήσας γράφειν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἃν ὑπερείδην συνέστησεν. ἀλλ’ ἐπειδήπερ, οἴμαι, τὰ μὲν θατέρου καλά, καὶ εἰ πολλὰ ὀμως ἀμεγέθη, καρδίᾳ νήφοντος ἀργὰ καὶ

¹ ἄλας Tucker for ἄλλα.
² κεχυμένως Blass, for κεχυμένος.
³ τι Bücheler, for ἔτι.

---

a Hyperides’ lost Deliacus (frr. 67–75 Kenyon; the date is about 343 B.C.) upheld the Athenian claim to the presidency of the temple at Delos, where Leto gave birth to Apollo and Artemis.

b The Funeral Oration (Oration 6) 322 B.C., on those who fell in the Lamian War, is extant on a papyrus first published in 1858.
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elegance, supple turns of irony, jests neither tasteless nor ill-bred, well-dressed with wit like the Attic masters, clever satire, plenty of pointed ridicule and well-directed fun, and in all this a quite indescribable charm. Nature endowed him fully with the power of evoking pity and also with a superb flexibility in narrating myths copiously, and pursuing a theme with fluency. His story of Leto,\textsuperscript{a} for instance, is in a more poetical vein, while his Funeral Oration\textsuperscript{b} is as good a piece of epideictic composition as anyone could produce. Demosthenes, on the other hand, has no gift of characterization or of fluency, is far from facile, and no epideictic orator. In fact he has no part in any one of the qualities we have just mentioned. When he is forced into attempting a jest or a witty passage, he rather raises the laugh against himself; and when he tries to approximate charm, he is farther from it than ever. If he had tried to write the little speech on Phryne\textsuperscript{c} or Athenogenes,\textsuperscript{d} he would have been an even better advertisement for Hyperides. But nevertheless I feel that the beauties of Hyperides, many as they are, yet lack grandeur; “inert in the heart of a sober man,”\textsuperscript{e} they

\textsuperscript{c} Hyperides’ defence of the courtesan Phryne (frr. 171–80 Kenyon) is lost, but was famous for the peroration, in which Phryne’s charms were displayed to the court (Athenaeus 13.590E).

\textsuperscript{d} Against Athenogenes (Oration 3, a large part of which survives in a papyrus published in 1892) concerns a contract for the purchase of slaves; it is lively and full of character, but the case is a complicated one.

\textsuperscript{e} Proverbial and perhaps a verse quotation.
LONGINUS

tòn ákroatḗn ἦρεμεῖν ἐώντα (οὐδεὶς γοῦν Ἰππείδην ἀναγινώσκων φοβεῖται), ὁ δὲ ἐνθεῖν ἐλὼν τοῦ μεγαλοφυσιστάτου καὶ ἐπὶ ἁκρον ἄρετὰς συντετελεσμένας, ψηφηγορίας τόνων, ἐμψυχα πάθη, περιουσίαν ἁγχίνου ιαν τάχος, ἐνθα δὴ καίριον, 1 τὴν ἀπασίν ἀπρόσιτον δεινοτητα καὶ δύναμιν, ἐπειδή ταῦτα, φημί, ὡς θεόπεμπτα τίνα 2 δωρήματα (οὐ γὰρ εἰπεῖν θεμιτὸν ἀνθρώπων) ἄθροια ἐσ ἑαυτὸν ἐστισαν, διὰ τούτο οἷς ἔχει καλοῖς ἀπαντασ αἰὲ νικὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν οὐκ ἔχει καὶ ὠσπερεὶ καταβροντῇ καὶ καταφέγγει τοὺς ἀπ’ αἰῶνοι ῥήτορας καὶ θάττων ἂν τὶς κεραυνοὶς φερομένοις ἀντανοίξαι τὰ ὁμματα δύνατο ἡ ἀντοφθαλμήσαι τοῖς ἐπαλλήλοις ἐκείνου πάθεσι τε.

35. Ἐπὶ μέντοι τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ ἄλλη τῆς ἐστών, ὡς ἔφην, διαφόρα. οὐ γὰρ μεγέθει τῶν ἄρετῶν ἄλλα καὶ τῷ πλήθει πολὺ λειπόμενος αὐτοῦ Λυσίας ὁμως 3 πλεῖον ἕτε τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι περιττεύει ἡ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς λείπεται. τί ποτ’ οὐν εἶδον οἱ ἱσόθεοι ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τοῖς μεγίστων ἐπορεξάμενοι τῆς συγγραφῆς, τῆς δ’ ἐν ἀπασίν ἀκριβείας ὑπερφρονησάντες; πρὸς πολλοὺς ἄλλοις ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι ἡ φύσις οὐ ταπεινῶν ἡμᾶς ζῶον οὐδ’ ἁγεννής ἐκρινε 4 τὸν ἀνθρωπόν, ἀλλ’ ὡς εἰς μεγάλην τινὰ πανήγυριν εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμου ἑπάγουσα θεατὰς τίνας τῶν

1 καίριον Richards for κύριον; εἰθ’, ὁ δὴ κύριον Rohde.
2 τίνα Manutius for δεινά.
3 ὁμως Toup for ὁ μὲν.
4 ἔκτισε Seager.
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do not trouble the peace of the audience. No one feels frightened while reading Hyperides. But Demosthenes no sooner "takes up the tale"\textsuperscript{a} than he shows the merits of great genius in their most consummate form, sublime intensity, living emotion, redundancy, readiness, speed—where speed is in season—and his own unapproachable vehemence and power: concentrating in himself all these heaven-sent gifts—it would be impious to call them human—he thus uses the beauties he possesses to win a victory over all others that even compensates for his weaknesses, and out-thunders, as it were, and outshines orators of every age. You could sooner open your eyes to the descent of a thunderbolt than face his repeated outbursts of emotion without blinking.

35. There is, as I said,\textsuperscript{b} a further point of difference as compared with Plato. Lysias is far inferior to him both in the greatness and number of his excellences; yet the abundance of his faults is still greater than his deficiency in excellences. What then was the vision of those demigods who aimed only at what is greatest in writing and scorned detailed accuracy? This above all: that Nature has judged man\textsuperscript{c} a creature of no mean or ignoble quality, but, as if she were inviting us to some great gathering, she has called us into life, into the whole universe, there to be spectators of her games and eager competi-

\textsuperscript{a} A Homeric phrase (\textit{Odyssey} 8.500).
\textsuperscript{b} In chap. 32.
\textsuperscript{c} If this reading is right, Nature "admits" men as spectators and competitors in the games of life: but Seager's conjecture—"created"—may well be right.
LONGINUS

ἂθλων¹ αὐτῆς ἐσομένους καὶ φιλοτιμοτάτους ἀγωνιωστάς, εὐθὺς ἁμαχον ἔρωτα ἐνέφυψεν ἥμων ταῖς ψυχαῖς παντὸς ἀεὶ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ὡς πρὸς ἥμᾶς δαμομοιωτέρου. διόπερ τῇ θεωρίᾳ καὶ διανοίᾳ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπιβολής οὐδ’ ὁ σύμπασι κόσμος ἄρκει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τοῦ περιέχοντος πολλάκις ὄρους ἐκβαίνουσιν αἱ ἑπίνοιαι· καὶ εἰ τις περιβλέψας εἴν τὸν πόλεον ὡς πλέον ἔχει τὸ περιττὸν ἐν πᾶσι καὶ μέγα καὶ καλὸν, ταχέως εἰσεῖται πρὸς ἅ γεγονα-μεν. ἐνθεν φυσικὸς πως ἀγόμενοι μᾶ Δί’ οὐ τὰ μικρὰ ρέθθα χαμάζομεν, εἰ καὶ διανῦῃ καὶ χρήσιμα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Νείλον καὶ Ἐστρον ἦ Ρήνον, πολὺ δ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὸν Ὦκεανόν, οὔτε γε τὸ υφ’ ἡμῶν τοντὶ φλογόν ἀνακαιόμενον, ἐπεὶ καθαρὸν σφίζει τὸ φέγγος, ἐκτελεστὸμεθα τῶν οὐρανίων μᾶλλον, καίτοι πολλάκις ἐπισκοτομέων, οὔτε τῶν τῆς Δίτης κρατήρων ἄξιοθαυμαστότερον νομίζομεν, ἦς αἱ ἀνα-χοαι πέτρουσ τε ἐκ βυθοῦ καὶ ὅλους ὄχθους ἀναφέ-ρουσι καὶ ποταμοῦς ἐνώπιο τοῦ γηγενοῦς² ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτομάτου³ προχέουσιν πυρός. ἀλλ’ ἔπὶ τῶν τοιοῦτων ἀπάντων ἐκεῖν’ ἀν ἐποιομεν, ὡς εὐπόριστον μὲν ἀνθρώποις τὸ χρείαζες ἦ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον, χαμαστὸν δ’ ὡμοὶ ἀεὶ τὸ παράδοξον.

36. Οὐκοιν ἔπι γε τῶν ἐν λόγοις μεγαλοφυῶν, ἐφ’ ὃν οὐκέτ’ ἔξω τῆς χρείας καὶ ὄφελείας πίπτει τὸ μέγεθος, προσήκει συνθεωρεῖν αὐτόθεν, ὅτι τοῦ ἀνα-μαρτήτου πολὺ ἀφεστώτες οἱ τηλικοῦτοι ὡμοὶ παντός⁴ εἰσιν ἐπάνω τοῦ ἑθητοῦ· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τούς
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tors; and she therefore from the first breathed into our hearts an unconquerable passion for whatever is great and more divine than ourselves. Thus the whole universe is not enough to satisfy the speculative intelligence of human thought; our ideas often pass beyond the limits that confine us. Look at life from all sides and see how in all things the extraordinary, the great, the beautiful stand supreme, and you will soon realize what we were born for. So it is by some natural instinct that we admire, not the small streams, clear and useful as they are, but the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and above all the Ocean. The little fire we kindle for ourselves keeps clear and steady, yet we do not therefore regard it with more amazement than the fires of Heaven, which are often darkened, or think it more wonderful than the craters of Etna in eruption, hurling up rocks and whole hills from their depths and sometimes shooting forth rivers of that earthborn, spontaneous fire. But on all such matters I would only say this, that what is useful or necessary is easily obtained by man; it is always the unusual which wins our wonder.

36. In dealing, then, with writers of genius, whose grandeur is of a kind that comes within the limits of use and profit, we must at the outset observe that, while they are far from unerring, yet they are above all mortal range.

---

1 ἄθλων Reiske for ὀλων.
2 γηγενώς Markland, for γένως.
3 αὐτομάτου Haupt, for αὐτοῦ μόνου.
4 παντός Pearce, for πάντες.
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χρωμένους ἀνθρώπους ἐλέγχει, τὸ δ’ ύψος ἐγγὺς ἀἱρεῖ μεγαλοφροσύνης θεοῦ. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀπταμένον οὐ ψέγεται, τὸ μέγα δὲ καὶ θαυμάζεται. τί χρή πρὸς τούτους ἔτι λέγειν ὡς ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔκαστος ἀπαντᾷ τὰ σφάλματα ἐνὶ ἐξωνέαται πολλάκις ψεύς καὶ κατορθώματι, καὶ τὸ κυρώτατον, ὡς, εἰ τις ἕκλεξα τὰ Ὀμήρου, τὰ Δημοσθένους, τὰ Πλάτωνος, τῶν ἄλλων ὡσοὶ δὴ μέγιστοι, παραπτώματα πάντα ὁμόσε συναθροίσειν, ἐλάχιστον ἂν τι, μᾶλλον δ’ οὐδὲ πολλοστημορίων ἂν εὐρεθεί τῶν ἐκείνων τοῖς ἠρωσὶ πάντῃ κατορθούμενων. διὰ ταῦθ’ ὁ πᾶς αὐτοῖς αἰών καὶ βίος, οὐ δυνάμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ φθόνου παρανοίας ἀλώναι, φέρων ἀπέδωκεν τὰ νυκτήρια καὶ ἄχρι νῦν ἀναφαίρετα φυλάττει καὶ ἔοικε τηρήσειν.

ἐστ’ ἂν ὑδωρ τε ῥέῃ καὶ δένδρα μακρὰ
tεθήλη.

3 πρὸς μέντοι γε τῶν γράφοντα, ὡς οἱ κολοσσοὶ οἱ ἡμαρτημένοι οὐ κρείττων ἢ οἱ Πολυκλέιτον δορυφόροι, παράκειται πρὸς πολλοὶς εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἐπὶ μὲν τέχνης θαυμάζεται τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν φυσικῶν ἐργῶν τὸ μέγεθος, φύσει δὲ λογικῶν ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς· κατὶ μὲν ἀνδριάντων ζητεῖται τὸ ὀμοῖον ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ λόγου τὸ ὑπεραίρον, ὡς ἔφην,

1 τις K marg., Manutius for γε.

a Quoted in Plato (Phaedrus 264C) as part of an epitaph said
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Other qualities prove their possessors men, sublimity lifts them near the mighty mind of God. Correctness escapes censure: greatness earns admiration as well. We need hardly add that each of these great men again and again redeems all his mistakes by a single touch of sublimity and true excellence; and, what is finally decisive, if we were to pick out all the faults in Homer, Demosthenes, Plato, and all the other greatest authors and put them together, we should find them a tiny part, not the smallest fraction, of the true successes to be found everywhere in the work of these heroes. That is why the judgement of all ages, which no jealousy can convict of mental incompetence, has awarded them the crown of victory, guards it as their irremovable possession, and is likely to preserve it,

So long as the rivers run and the tall trees flourish and grow.\(^a\)

As to the statement that the faulty Colossus\(^b\) is no better than the Doryphorus of Polyclitus,\(^c\) there are many obvious answers to that. For one thing, we admire accuracy in art, grandeur in nature; and it is Nature that has given man the power of using words. Also we expect a statue to resemble a man, but in literature, as I said before, we to have been written for Midas. See Anthologia Palatina 7.153.

\(^b\) Perhaps the Colossus of Rhodes, damaged in an earthquake when it had stood for sixty years; but more probably any colossal statue: cf. Strabo 1.1.23, who speaks of kolossoi in which the total effect is all-important, and the accuracy of the detail insignificant.

\(^c\) The statue of the boy with a lance by Polyclitus of Argos was regarded as a model of beautiful proportions (Pliny, Natural History 34.55).
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4 τὰ ἀνθρώπινα. προσήκει δ’ ὁμως (ἀνακάμπτει γὰρ) ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡμῶν τοῦ υπομνήματος ἡ παραίνεσις ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τέχνης ἐστὶ κατόρθωμα, τὸ δ’ ἐν ύπεροχῇ πλὴν οὐχ ὁμότιμον μεγαλοφυίας, βοήθημα τῇ φύσει πάντη πορίζοντο σθαι τὴν τέχνην ἢ γὰρ ἀλληλουχία τούτων ἱστορήματος γένουτ’ ἀν τὸ τέλειον. τοσαῦτα ἦν ἀναγκαῖον ὑπὸ τῶν προτεθέντων ἐπικρίναι σκεμμάτων χαρέτω ό ἐκαστὸς οίς ἦδεται.

37. Ταῖς δὲ μεταφοραῖς γειτνιῶσιν (ἐπανιτέ γάρ) αἱ παραβολαὶ καὶ εἰκόνες, ἐκεῖνη μόνον παραλαττοῦνται . . .

38. <καταγελα>στοὶ καὶ αἱ τοιαῦται “εἰ μὴ τῶν ἐγκέφαλον ἐν ταῖς πτέρναις καταπεπταμένοι φορεῖτε.” διόπερ εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸ μέχρι ποῦ παρορμητέον ἐκαστὸν τὸ γὰρ ἐνίοτε περαιτέρω προεκπόντισεν τεινόμενα ταῖς τοιαῦτα υπερβολὴν καὶ τὰς τοιαύτα υπερβολὴν τεινόμενα χαλάται, ἢσθ’ ὅτε δὲ καὶ εἰς υπεντιώσεις ἀντιπεριβαλλοῦσιν. ὁ γοῦν Ἰσοκράτης οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως παιδὸς πράγμα ἐπαθεῖν διὰ τὴν τοῦ πάντων αὐξητικῶς ἐθέλειν λέγειν φιλοτιμίαν. ἔστι μὲν ὡς ἐντολὴς αὐτῶ τοῦ πανηγυρικοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἡ Ἀθηναίων πόλις, ταῖς εἰς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας εὐρηγεσίαις υπερβάλλει τὴν Δακεδαμίνων, ὁ δ’ εὖθυς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ ταῦτα τίθησιν. “ἐπειδή” οἱ λόγοι τοσαῦτην ἔχουσι δύναμιν, ὡσθ’ οἶδ’ τ’ ἔστει καὶ τὰ μεγάλα ταπεινά ποιήσαι καὶ τοῖς μικροῖς περιθείναι μέγεθος καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ νῦν ἐπίπειν καὶ περὶ τῶν νεωτῶν γεγυμεμένων 280.
look for something greater than human. However (this device reverts to something with which we began our treatise), since impeccable correctness is, generally speaking, due to art, and the height of excellence, even if erratic, to genius, it is proper that art should always assist nature. Their cooperation may well result in perfection. This much had to be said to decide the questions before.

But everyone is welcome to his own taste.

37. Closely akin to metaphors (to return to them) are comparisons and similes. The only difference is . . .

[Two pages are lost here.]

38. . . . Laughable\(^a\) also are such things as “If you do not carry your brains trodden down in your heels.”\(^b\) One must know, then, where to draw the line in each case. The hyperbole is sometimes ruined by overshooting the mark. Overdo the strain and the thing sags, and often produces the opposite effect to that intended. For instance, Isocrates fell into unaccountable puerility through his ambition to amplify everything. The theme of his Panegyric is that Athens surpasses Sparta in her benefits to Greece. But at the very outset he puts this: Moreover words have such power that they can make great things humble and endue small things with greatness, give a new guise to what is old, and describe recent

---

\(^a\) This assumes Reiske’s supplement.
\(^b\) [Demosthenes] Oration 7.45.

1 Reiske.
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ἀρχαῖῳς διελθεῖν”—οὐκοῦν, φησί τις, Ἰσόκρατες, οidepress y δέλλεις καὶ τὰ περὶ Δακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀθη-ναίων ἐναλλάττειν; σχεδὸν γὰρ τὸ τῶν λόγων ἐγκα-μον ἀπιστίας τῆς καθ’ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀκούοντι παράγ-γελμα καὶ προοίμιον ἐξέθηκεν. μὴποτ’ οὖν ἀρισταὶ τῶν ὑπερβολῶν, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σχημάτων προείπο-μεν, αἱ αὐτὸ τοῦτο διαλανθάνουσα ὦτι εἰσὶν ὑπερ-βολαί. γίνεται δὲ τὸ τοιόνδε, ἐπειδὰν ὑπὸ ἐκπαθείας μεγέθις τινὶ συνεκφωνῶνται περιστάσεως, ὦπερ ὁ Θουκυδίδης ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ φθειρομένων ποιεῖ. “οἴ τε γὰρ Συρακοῦσιοι,” φησίν, “ἐπικαταβάντες τοὺς ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ μάλιστα ἔσφαλον, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εὔθυς διέφθαρτο, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν ἦσσον ἐπίνετο ὦμοι τῷ πηλῷ ἡματωμένον καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἔτι ἦν περιμά-χητος.” αἷμα καὶ πηλὸν πινόμενα ὀμοὶ εἶναι περι-μάχητα ἔτι ποιεῖ πιστῶν ἡ τοῦ πάθους ὑπεροχὴ καὶ περίστασις. καὶ τὸ Ἡροδότειον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Θερμο-πύλαις ὄμοιον. “ἐν τούτῳ” φησίν ἂλεξομένους μαχαίρησιν, ὥσις αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐτύγχανον περιοῦσα, καὶ χερσὶ καὶ στόμασι κατέχωσαν οἱ βάρβαροι <βάλλοντες>¹.” ἐνταῦθ’, οἷον ἔστι τὸ καὶ στόμασι μάχεσθαι πρὸς ὀπλισμένους καὶ ὅποιόν τι τὸ κατα-κεκώσθαι βέλεσιν, ἔρεις, πλῆρ ὀμοῖος ἔχει πίστιν· οὔ γὰρ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐνεκα τῆς ὑπερβολῆς παραλαμ-βάνεσθαι δοκεῖ, ἡ ὑπερβολὴ δ’ εὐλόγως γεννᾶσθαι πρὸς τοῦ πράγματος. ἐστὶ γὰρ, ὡς οὖ διαλείπω λέγων, παντὸς τολμήματος λεκτικοῦ λύσις καὶ παν-

¹ Add. Manutius, from Herodotus.
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events in the style of long ago”\(^a\)—“Why, Isocrates,” one may say, “do you intend by this means to reverse the positions of the Spartans and the Athenians?” For his praise of the power of words has all but issued a prefatory warning to the audience that he himself is not to be believed. Perhaps then, as we said above of figures,\(^b\) the best hyperbole is the one which conceals the very fact of its being a hyperbole. And this happens when it is uttered under stress of emotion to suit the circumstances of a great crisis. This is what Thucydides does in speaking of those who were killed in Sicily. “For the Syracusans went down and began to slaughter chiefly those in the river. The water was immediately tainted but none the less they kept on drinking it, foul though it was with mud and gore, and most of them were still ready to fight for it.”\(^c\) That a drink of mud and gore should yet still be worth fighting for is made credible only by the height of the emotion which the circumstances arouse. It is the same with Herodotus’ description of those who fought at Thermopylae. “On this spot,” he says, “while they defended themselves with daggers, such as still had daggers left, and with hands and teeth, the barbarians buried them under a shower of missiles.”\(^d\) Here you may well ask what is meant by actually “fighting with teeth” against armed men or being “buried” with missiles; yet it carries credence in the same way, because Herodotus does not seem to have introduced the incident to justify the hyperbole, but the hyperbole for the sake of the incident. As I am never tired of saying, to atone for a daring phrase the universal

\(^a\) Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 8.
\(^b\) See chap. 17.
\(^c\) Thucydides 7.84.
\(^d\) Herodotus 7.225.
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άκειά τις τὰ ἔγγυς ἐκστάσεως ἔργα καὶ πάθη. ὅθεν καὶ τὰ κωμικὰ καίτοιγ’ εἰς ἀπιστίαν ἐκπέπτοντα πιθανὰ διὰ τὸ γελοῖον.

ἀγρὸν

ἐσχ’ ἐλάττω γῆν ἔχοντ’ ἐπιστολῆς

<Δακωνικῆς>1

6 καὶ γὰρ ὁ γέλως πάθος ἐν ἡδονῇ. οἱ δ’ ὑπερβολαὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τούλαττον, ἐπειδῆ κοινὸν ἀμφότερον ἡ ἐπίτασις καὶ πῶς ὁ διασυρμός ταπεινώτητός ἐστιν αὔξησις.

39. Ἡ πέμπτη μοιρα τῶν συντελουσῶν εἰς τὸ ύψος, ὅν γε ἐν ἀρχῇ προούθεμεθα, ἐθ’ ἡμῖν λείπεται, κράτιστε, ἣν δὲ τῶν λόγων αὕτη ποιὰ σύνθεσις. ὑπὲρ ἡς ἐν δυσῶν ἀποχρώντως ἀποδεδωκότες συν-τάγμασιν, ὅσα γε τῆς θεωρίας ἢν ἡμῖν ἐφικτά, τοσοῦτον εὖ ἀνάγκης προσθείμεν ἄν εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπόθεσιν, ὥσιν μόνον ἐστὶ πειθοῦς καὶ ἡδονῆς ἢ ἀρμονία φυσικὸν ἀνθρώπου ἄλλα καὶ μεγαληγορίας καὶ πάθους θαναμαστόν τι ὄργανον.

2 οὐ γὰρ αὐλὸς μὲν ἐντίθησιν τινα πάθη τοῖς ἀκρωμένοις καὶ οἶδον ἑκφρονας καὶ κορυβαντιασμοῦ ἐπήρεις ἀποτελεῖ, καὶ βάσιν ἐνδούς τινα ῥυθμοῦ πρὸς ταῦτην ἀναγκάζει3 βαίνει ἐν ῥυθμῷ καὶ συνεξομοιο-ουσθαὶ τῷ μέλει τὸν ἀκροατὴν, κἂν ἀμονοσὸς ἢ παντάπασι, καὶ νὴ Δία φθόγγοι κιθάρας, οὐδὲν ἀπλῶς

1 Add. Portus (1569).
specific is found in actions and feelings that almost make one beside oneself. Thus, too, comic expressions, even if they result in the incredible, yet sound convincing because they are laughable:

His field was shorter than a Spartan letter.\textsuperscript{a}

Laughter indeed is an emotion based on pleasure. Hyperbole may tend to belittle as well as to magnify: the common element in both is a strain on the facts. In a sense too vilification is an amplification of the low and trivial.

39. Of those factors of sublimity which we specified at the beginning,\textsuperscript{b} the fifth one still remains, good friend—this was the arrangement of the words themselves in a certain order. On this question I have in two books given a sufficient account of such conclusions as I could reach, and for our present purpose I need only add this, that men find in melody not only a natural instrument of persuasion and pleasure, but also a marvellous instrument of grandeur and emotion. The flute, for instance, induces certain emotions in those who hear it. It seems to carry them away and fill them with divine frenzy. It sets a particular rhythmic movement and forces them to move in rhythm. The hearer has to conform to the tune, though he may be utterly unmusical. Why, the very tones of the

\textsuperscript{a} The brevity of Spartan messages was proverbial. The line is perhaps from comedy (cf. fr. adesp. 417–19 Kock).

\textsuperscript{b} In chap. 8.

\textsuperscript{2} Russell (1964), for η διὰ.

\textsuperscript{3} ἀναγκάζει Manutius, for ἀναγκάσει.
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σημαίνοντες, ταῖς τῶν ἥχων μεταβολαίς καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους κράσει καὶ μίξει τῆς συμφωνίας 3 θαυμαστῶν ἐπάγουσι πολλάκις, ὡς ἐπίστασαι, θέλγητρον (καίτοι ταύτα εἴδωλα καὶ μιμήματα νόθα ἐστὶ πειθοῦς, ὡνὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως, ὡς ἔφη, ἐνεργήματα γνήσια), οὐκ οἰόμεθα δὲ ἀρα τὴν σύνθεσιν, ἀρμονίαν τινὰ οὖσαν λόγων ἀνθρώποις ἐμφύτων καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς, οὐχὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς μόνης ἐφαπτομένων, ποικίλας κινοῦσαν ἱδέας ὀνομάτων νοήσεων πραγμάτων κάλλους εὐμελείας, πάντων ἡμῖν ἐντρόφων καὶ συγγενῶν, καὶ ἀμα τῇ μίξει καὶ πολυμορφία τῶν ἑαυτῆς φθόγγων τὸ παρεστῶς τῷ λέγοντι πάθος εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πέλας παρεσ- ἀγούσαν καὶ εἰς μετονοίαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἀεὶ παθιστάσαν, τῇ τε τῶν λέξεων ἑποικοδομήσει τὰ μεγέθη συναρμόζονται, δι’ αὐτῶν τούτων κηλεῖν2 τε ὡμοῦ καὶ πρὸς ὁγκὸν τε καὶ ἀξιώμα καὶ ψος καὶ πάν ὦ ἐν αὐτῇ3 περιλαμβάνει καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκάστοτε συνδιατιθέναι, παντοῖς ἡμῖν τῆς διανοίας ἐπικρα- τοῦσαν; ἀλλ’ εἰ καὶ μανία τὸ περὶ τῶν ὀντῶς ὀμολογουμένων διαπορεῖ (ἀποχρώσα γὰρ ἡ πεῖρα πίστει), ὑπηλόν γέ που δοκεῖ4 νόημα καὶ ἐστὶ τῷ ὄντι θαυμάσιον, ὁ τῷ ψηφίσματι ὁ Δημοσθένης ἐπι- φέρει “τούτῳ τὸ ψήφυσμα τῶν τότε τῇ πόλει περι- στάντα κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὁσπέρ νέφος,” ἀλλ’ αὐτῆς τῆς διανοίας οὐκ ἐλαττον τῇ ἀρμονίᾳ πεφώνηται. ὅλον τε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν δακτυλικῶν εἰρηταί ῥυθμῶν, εὐγενεστατοί δ’ ὀντοί καὶ μεγεθοποιοί, διὸ
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harp, themselves meaningless, by the variety of their sounds and by their combination and harmonious blending often exercise, as you know, a marvellous spell. (Yet these are only a bastard counterfeit of persuasion, not, as I said above, a genuine activity of human nature.) Must we not think, then, that composition, which is a kind of melody in words—words which are part of man’s nature and reach not his ears only but his very soul—stirring as it does myriad ideas of words, thoughts, things, beauty, musical charm, all of which are born and bred in us, and by the blending of its own manifold tones, bringing into the hearts of the bystanders the speaker’s actual emotion so that all who hear him share in it, and by piling phrase on phrase builds up one majestic whole—must we not think, I say, that by these very means it casts a spell on us and always turns our thoughts towards what is majestic and dignified and sublime and all else that it embraces, winning a complete mastery over our minds? Now it may indeed seem lunacy to raise any question on matters of such agreement, since experience is a sufficient test, yet surely the idea which Demosthenes applies to his decree strikes one as sublime and truly marvellous: “This decree made the peril at that time encompassing the country pass away like as a cloud.”a But its effect is due no less to the harmony than to the thought. Its delivery rests wholly on the dactyls, which are the noblest of rhythms and

---

a *De corona* 188.

1 K marg., Pearce, for κρούσει.
2 κηλεῖν K marg., Manutius, for καλεῖν.
3 αὐτὴ Toll, for αὐτῆ.
4 ποὺ δοκεῖ Reiske, for τοῦ δοκεῖν.
καὶ τὸ ἡρῴον ὃν ἱσμεν κάλλιστον μέτρον συνιστάσθε. [τὸ τε]¹ ἐπείτοιγε ἐκ τῆς ἕνδας αὐτὸ χώρας μετάθες ὅποι δὴ ἐθέλεις "τούτῳ τὸ ψήφισμα ὠσπερ νέφος ἔποίησε τὸν τότε κύκλου παρελθεῖν," ἢ νὴ Δία μίαν ἀπόκοψον συλλαβῆν μόνον ἴππος Ἐποίησε παρελθεῖν ὡς νέφος," καὶ έσθη, πόσον ἡ ἄρμονία τῷ ύψει συνηχεῖ, αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ ὁσπερ νέφος ἐπὶ μακρὸν τοῦ πρῶτον ὑμὸν βέβηκε, τέτρασι καταμετρουμένον² Χρόνοις ἐξαιρεθεῖσθαι δὲ τῆς μιᾶς συλλαβῆς ὡς νέφος εὐθὺς ἀκρωτηριαίες τῇ συνηκοπῇ τὸ μέγεθος, ὡς ἐμπαλιν, ἐὰν ἐπεκτείνῃς "παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὁσπερεῖ ³ νέφος," τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνει, οὕτω τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ἐπὶ προσπιέτει, ὅτι τῷ μῆκει τῶν ἀκρῶν χρόνων συνεκλύεται καὶ διαχαλάται τῷ ύψῳ τὸ ἀπότομον.

40. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς μάλιστα μεγέθηποιεῖ τὰ λεγόμενα, καθάπερ τὰ σώματα ἡ τῶν μελῶν ἐπισυνθέσεις, ὃν ἐν μὲν οὐδὲν τιμηθέν ἄφ’ ἔτερον καθ’ ἕαυτο ἄξιόλογον ἔχει, πάντα δὲ μετ’ ἄλληλων ἐκπληροῦ τέλειον σύστημα: οὕτως τὰ μεγάλα σκεδασθέντα μὲν ἀπ’ ἄλληλων ἄλλοσ’ ἄλλη ἁμα ἕαυτος εὐνυχαφορεῖ καὶ τὸ ύψος, σωματοποιούμενα δὲ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ ἐπὶ δεσμῷ τῆς ἄρμονίας περικλεόμενα, αὐτῷ τῷ κύκλῳ φωνήσαν γίνεται καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις ἔρα-νός ἐστι πλήθος τὰ μεγέθη. ἄλλα μὴν ὃτι γε πολ-

¹ Manutius omitted τὸ τε; Pearce and others propose a lacuna to follow it, e.g. τὸ τε <τελευταίον κόμμα θαυμαστῶς συντετακταῖ> Mazzucchi.
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make for grandeur—and that is why the most beautiful of all known metres, the heroic, is composed of dactyls. Change the position of the phrase\textsuperscript{a} to any place you like—
τῶτο τὸ ψῆφισμα ὁσπέρ νέφος ἔποιησε τὸν τότε κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν—or simply cut off a single syllable—ἔποιησε παρελθεῖν ὡς νέφος—and you will realize how truly the harmony chimes in with the sublimity. Indeed the actual phrase ὁσπέρ νέφος rests on its long first rhythmical element, equivalent to four beats. Cut out the one syllable—ὡς νέφος—and the curtailment at once mutilates the grandeur. So again if you lengthen it—παρελθεῖν ἔποιησεν ὁσπερεὶ νέφος—the meaning is the same, but it does not strike the same upon the ear, because the sheer sublimity is broken up and loosened by the breaking up of the longs in the final syllables.\textsuperscript{b}

40. Nothing is of greater service in giving grandeur to what is said than the organization of the various members. It is the same with the human body. None of the members has any value by itself apart from the others, yet one with another they all constitute a perfect system. Similarly if these effects of grandeur are separated, the sublimity is scattered with them: but if they are united into a single whole and embraced by the bonds of rhythm, then they gain a living voice just by being merely rounded into a period. In a period, one might say, the grandeur

\textsuperscript{a} I.e. the words ὁσπέρ νέφος.

\textsuperscript{b} I.e. both the proposed changes involve losing the effect of ὁσπερ as two longs.

\textsuperscript{2} καταμετρομένον Toll for καταμετρούμενον.

\textsuperscript{3} ὁσπερεὶ K marg. for ὁσπερ.
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λοὶ καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν οὐκ ὄντες ύψηλοι
φύσει, μήποτε δὲ καὶ ἀμεγέθεις, ὦμως κοινοὶ καὶ
dημώδεσι τοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπαγομένους
περιττῶν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ συγχρώμενοι, διὰ μόνον τοῦ
συνθείναι καὶ ἀρμόσαι ταῦτα δεόντως ὄγκου καὶ
dιάστημα καὶ τὸ μῆ ῥατεινοὶ δοκεῖν εἶναι περιβά-
λοντο, καθάπερ ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Φίλιστος, Ἀρι-
στοφάνης ἐν τισίν, ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις Ἑυρυπίδης,
3 ἰκανῶς ἡμῶν δεδηλώτατα. μετὰ γέ τοι τὴν τεκνοκτο-
νίαιν Ἡρακλῆς φησι

gέμω κακῶν δὴ κούκετ’ ἔσθ’ ὅποι τεθῇ.

σφόδρα δημώδες τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀλλὰ γέγονεν ύψη-
λὸν τῇ πλάσει ἀναλογοῦν· εἰ δ’ ἄλλως ἀυτὸ συναρ-
μόσεις, φανήσεται σοι, διότι τῆς συνθέσεως ποιητῆς
4 ὁ Ἑυρυπίδης μᾶλλον ἔστων ἦ τοῦ νοῦ. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς
συνρομένης ύπὸ τοῦ ταύρου Δίρκης,

εἰ δὲ ποι τῦχοι
πέριξ ἐλίξας, εἴλκε <πάνθ’> 2 ὦμοῦ λαβὼν
γυναῖκα πέτραν δρῦν μεταλάσσων ἄει,

ἔστι μὲν γενναίου καὶ τῷ λήμμα, ἁδρότερον δὲ
γέγονε τῷ τῆν ἀρμονίαν μὴ κατεσπεύσθαι μηδ’ ὦν
ἐν ἀποκυλίσματι φέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ στηριγμοῦς τε

1 δεόντως von Armim for δ’ ὦμως; but it may be best to make
a lacuna after δ’ (Mazzucchi).
2 Add. Bergk.
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comes from the multitude of contributors. We have indeed abundantly shown\(^a\) that many writers both in prose and poetry, who are not by nature sublime, perhaps even the very opposite, while using for the most part current vulgar words, which suggests nothing out of the common, yet by the mere arrangement and fitting together of these properly have achieved dignity and distinction and a reputation for grandeur; Philistus,\(^b\) for instance, among many others, Aristophanes occasionally, Euripides almost always. After the slaughter of his children Heracles says:

I am loaded with woes and have no room for more.\(^c\)

The phrase is exceedingly ordinary, yet becomes sublime by being apt to the situation. If you put the passage together in any other way, you will realize that Euripides is a poet of word arrangement more than of ideas. Speaking of Dirce being torn apart by the bull, he says,

And if perchance it happened
To twist itself around, it dragged them all,
Woman and rock and oak, and juggled with them.\(^d\)

The idea itself is a fine one, but it gains additional force from the fact that the rhythm is not hurried along or, as it

\(^{a}\) Presumably in the (lost) work in two books referred to at 39.1.
\(^{b}\) Sicilian historian of the fourth century, imitator of Thucydides: *FGrHist* 556.
\(^{c}\) Euripides, *Hercules Furens* 1245.
\(^{d}\) From *Antiope* (fr. 221 Nauck\(^2\)): Amphion and Zethus, having discovered that Antiope was their mother, inflict on the cruel queen Dirce the punishment she had intended for Antiope.
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ἐχεῖν πρὸς ἄλλα τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ ἐξερεύσματα τῶν χρόνων πρὸς ἕδραίον διαβεβηκότα μέγεθος.

41. Μικροποιοῦν τ᾽ οὐδὲν οὖτως ἐν τοῖς ψηλοῖς ως ρυθμὸς κεκλασμένος λόγων καὶ σεσοβημένος, ὀχὶ δὴ πυρρίχιοι καὶ τροχαίοι καὶ διχόρευοι, τέλεον εἰς ὀρχηστικῶν συνεκπάπτοντες. εὑθὺς γὰρ πάντα φαίνεται τὰ κατάρρυθμα κομψά καὶ μικροχαρῆ

2 καὶ ἀπαθέστατα διὰ τῆς ὁμοειδείας ἐπιπολάζοντα· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων τὸ χείριστον ὅτι, ὦσπερ τὰ φθάρμα τοὺς ἀκροτάτα ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος ἀφέλκει καὶ ἐφ᾽ αὐτὰ βιάζεται, οὖτως καὶ τὰ κατερρυθμισμένα τῶν λεγομένων οὐ τὸ τοῦ λόγου πάθος ἐνδίδωσι τοῖς ἀκούοντι, τὸ δὲ τοῦ ρυθμοῦ, ὡς ἐνιότε προειδότας τὰς ὁφειλομένας καταληξείς αὐτοὺς ὑποκρούει τοῖς λέγοντι καὶ ἂθάνοντας ὡς ἐν χορῷ τοις προαποδιδόναι τὴν βάσιν. ὁμοίως δὲ ἀμεγέθη καὶ τὰ λίαν συγκείμενα καὶ εἰς μικρὰ καὶ βραχυσύλλαβα συγκεκομμένα καὶ ὡσανεὶ γόμφοις τισῶν ἐπαλλήλους κατ᾽ ἐγκοπάς καὶ σκληρότητας ἐπισυνιδεθεμένα.

42. Ἔτι γε μὴν ψιφοὺς μεσωτικὸν καὶ ἡ ἄγαν τῆς φράσεως συγκοπῆ· πηροὶ γὰρ τὸ μέγεθος, ὅταν εἰς λίαν συνάγηται βραχύ· ἀκούσθω δὲ νῦν μὴ τὰ [οὐ] δεόντως συνεστραμμένα, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἀντικρυς μικρὰ καὶ κατακεκερματισμένα· συγκοπῆ μὲν γὰρ 2 κολούει τὸν νοῦν, συντομία δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ εὐθὺ. δήλον δ᾽ ὡς

2 Manutius omitted οὐ.
were, running on rollers, but the words prop one another up and are separated by intervals, so that they stand firm and give the impression of stable grandeur.\(^a\)

41. Nothing damages an elevated passage so much as effeminate and agitated rhythm, pyrrhics (\(\bullet \circ \circ \)), for instance, and trochees (\(\circ \circ \) or \(\circ \circ \circ \)), and dichorees (\(\circ \circ \circ \)), which fall into a regular dance rhythm. For all over-rhythmical passages at once become merely pretty and cheap, recurring monotonously without producing the slightest emotional effect. Moreover, the worst of it is that, just as songs divert the attention of the audience from the action and forcibly claim it for themselves, so, too, over-rhythmical prose gives the audience the effect not of the words but of the rhythm. Thus they sometimes foresee the due ending themselves and keep time with their feet, anticipating the speaker and setting the step as if it were a dance. Equally deficient in grandeur are those passages which are too close-packed and concise, broken up into tiny fragments and short syllables. They give the impression of being bolted together, as it were, at frequent intervals with rough and uneven joins.

42. Extreme conciseness of expression also tends to diminish sublimity. The grandeur is mutilated by being too closely compressed. You must understand here not proper compression, but sentences which are, in absolute terms, small and fragmented. For extreme conciseness cripples the sense: true brevity goes straight to the point.

\(^a\)The point is that combinations of consonants delay the smooth running of the words: note especially *perix helixas* and *petran drun* in the passage just quoted.
43. Δευτέρα δ' αἰσχύναι τὰ μεγέθη καὶ ἡ μικρότης τῶν ὅνομάτων. παρὰ γοῦν τῷ Ἡροδότῳ κατὰ μὲν τὰ λήμματα δαιμονίως ὁ χειμῶν πέφρασται, τινὰ δὲ νη 
Δία περιέχει τῆς ὑλῆς ἀδοξότερα; καὶ τούτο μὲν ἵσως „ζεσάσης δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης,” ὡς τὸ „ζεσάσης” 
pολὺ τὸ ὑψός περισσαῖα διὰ τὸ κακόστομον ἄλλ' Ἴ
‟ο ἀνεμος‟ φησίν ἐκοπίασεν, καὶ „τοὺς περὶ τὸ 
νανάγιον δρασσομένους ἐξεδέχετο τέλος ἁχαρί." 
ἀσεμνον γὰρ τὸ κοπιάσαι ἰδωτικον <ὁν,> 3 
2 
ἀχάριστον τηλικοῦτον πάθους ἀνοίκειον. ὄμοιως 
καὶ ὁ Θεόπομπος ὑπερφυὼς σκευάσας τὴν τοῦ Πέρ
σου κατάβασιν ἐπ' Αὐγουστίου ὅνομαίοις τυσὶ τὰ ὅλα 
διέβαλεν. „ποία γὰρ πόλις ἡ ποίον ἔθνος τῶν κατὰ 
τὴν „Ἀσίαν οὐκ ἐπρεσβεύετο πρὸς βασιλέα; τί δὲ 
τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς γεννωμένων ἡ τῶν κατὰ τέχνην ἐπι
τελουμένων καλῶν ἡ τιμίων οὐκ ἐκομίσθη δώρον ὡς 
αὐτόν; οὐ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ πολυτελεῖς στρωμναὶ καὶ 
χλανίδες, τὰ μὲν ἀλουργὴ, τὰ δὲ ποικιλτά, τὰ δὲ 
λευκά, πολλὰ δὲ σκηνάὶ χρυσάι κατεσκευασμέναι 
πᾶσι τοῖς χρησίμοις, πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ ἕως τίδες καὶ 
κλίναι πολυτελεῖς; ἔτι δὲ καὶ κοῖλος ἄργυρος καὶ 
χρυσὸς ἀπειργασμένοι καὶ ἐκπώματα καὶ κρατήρες,

1 παρ' ἀκαιρον Pearce, for γὰρ ἀκαιρον.
2 ἀναχαλώμενα Toup, for ἀνακαλούμενα.
3 <ὁν> add. Wilamowitz.
ON THE SUBLIME 42–43

It is plain that the opposite holds of fully extended expressions; what is relaxed by unseasonable length is dead.

43. The use of trivial words also has a terribly debasing effect on a grand passage. The storm in Herodotus, for instance, is, as far as the ideas go, wonderfully described, but it includes certain things which are beneath the dignity of the subject. One might instance perhaps “the sea seething”:\(^a\) the word seething is so cacophonous that it takes off a great deal of the sublimity. But he does worse. “The wind,” he says, “flagged,” and “For those who were clinging to the wreck there awaited an unpleasant end.”\(^b\) “Flagged” is too colloquial a word to be dignified, and “unpleasant” ill befits so terrible a disaster. Similarly Theopompos,\(^c\) after fitting out the Persian king’s descent into Egypt in the most marvellous manner, discredited the whole description by the use of some paltry words. “For what city or what people of those in Asia did not send envoys to the king? What was there of beauty or of value whether born of the earth or perfected by art that was not brought as an offering to him? Were there not many costly coverlets and cloaks, some purple, some embroidered, some white; many pavilions of gold furnished with all things needful, many robes of state and costly couches? Then, moreover, there was plate of beaten silver and wrought gold, cups, and

\(^a\) Herodotus 7.188.
\(^b\) Herodotus 7.191, 8.13.
\(^c\) Fr. 263a \((FGrHist)\): the passage is quoted by Athenaeus (2.67F), but somewhat differently. It refers to the expedition of Artaxerxes Ochus against Egypt in the middle of the fourth century (cf. Diod. Sic. 16.44ff).
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ὅν τούς μὲν λιθοκολλήτους, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἀκριβῶς καὶ πολυτελῶς εἶδες ἄν ἐκπεπονημένους. πρὸς δὲ τούτους ἀναρίθμητοι μὲν ὄπλων μυριάδες τῶν μὲν Ἑλληνικών, τῶν δὲ βαρβαρικῶν, ὑπερβάλλοντα δὲ τὸ πλῆθος ὑποζύγια καὶ πρὸς κατακοπὴν ἱερεία συνευρέτα, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν ἄρτυμάτων μέδιμνοι, πολλοὶ δὲ θύλακοι καὶ σάκκοι καὶ χύτραι βυβλίων1 καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων χρησίμων τοσαῦτα δὲ κρέα τεταρτι- χευμένα παντοδαπῶν ἱερείων, ὡς σωροὺς αὐτῶν γενέσθαι τηλικούτους, ὡστε τοὺς προσώπως πόρ- ρωθεν ὑπολαμβάνειν ὄχθους εἶναι καὶ λόφους ἀντω- 
θομένους.” ἐκ τῶν ψηλοτέρων εἰς τὰ ταπεινότερα ἀποδιδράσκει, δέον ποιήσασθαι τὴν αὐξησιν ἐμπα- λιν: ἀλλὰ τῇ θαυμαστῇ τῆς ὅλης παρασκευής ἀγγε- 
λία παραμίξας τοὺς θυλάκους καὶ τὰ ἄρτυματα καὶ 
τὰ σακκία μαγειρείου, τινὰ φαντασίαν ἐποίησεν. ὃσπερ γὰρ ἐὰν τις ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν προκοσμη- 
mάτων μεταξὺ τῶν χρυσίων καὶ λιθοκολλήτων κρα- 
τήρων καὶ ἄργυρον κοίλου σκηνῶν τε ὀλοχρύσων καὶ 
ἐκπωμάτων φέρων μέσα ἔθηκεν θυλάκια καὶ 
σακκία ἀπρεπῶς ἂν ἂν τῇ προσόψει τὸ ἐργον, οὕτω 
καὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τὰ τοιαῦτα ὑνόματα αἴσχη καὶ 
οἴονει στίγματα καθίσταται παρὰ καρυῶν ἐγκατα-

tattómea. παρέκειτο δ’ ὡς ὀλοσχερῶς ἐπελθεῖν καὶ 
οὐς ὀχθοὺς λέγει συμβεβλῆσθαι καὶ περὶ τῆς ἄλλης 
παρασκευῆς οὕτως ἀλλάξας εἰπεῖν καμήλους καὶ 
πλῆθος ὑποζυγίων φορταγωγούντων πάντα τὰ πρὸς 
τρυφῆν καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν τραπεζῶν χορηγῆματα, ἦ

296
bowls, some of which you might have seen studded with jewels and others embellished by some other means both cunning and costly. Besides these there were countless myriads of weapons, some Greek, some barbarian; baggage animals beyond number, and victims fatted for slaughter; many bushels of spice, and many bags and sacks and pots of papyrus and of all other things needful; and such a store of salted meat of every kind that it lay in heaps so large that those who approached from a distance took them for mounds and hills confronting them.” He descends from the sublime to the trivial, where he needs rather a crescendo. As it is, by introducing bags and spices and sacks in the middle of his wonderful description of the whole equipage he has almost given the effect of a cook shop. Suppose that in all this show itself someone had brought bags and sacks and set them in the middle of the gold and jewelled bowls, the beaten silver, the pavilions of solid gold and the drinking cups—that would have presented an unseemly sight. In the same way the untimely introduction of such words as these disfigures the style, and puts a brand on it, as it were. He might have given a comprehensive description both of what he calls the heaped-up mounds and of the rest of the equipage by altering his description thus: “camels and a multitude of baggage animals laden with all that serves the luxury and pleasure of the table”; or he might

a Or onions, if we accept Toup’s conjecture.

---

1 Athenaeus (2.67f) has πολλοί δὲ σάκκοι καὶ θύλακοι βιβλίων; P has πολλοί δ' οἱ θύλακοι καὶ σάκκοι καὶ χάρται βυβλίων. Toup proposed χύτραι βολβών, “jars of onions,” and the reference below to μαγειρείον perhaps supports this.
σωροὺς ὄνομάσαι παντοίων σπερμάτων καὶ τῶν ἀπερ διαφέρει πρὸς ὁψοποιάς καὶ ἡδυπαθείας, ἢ ἐπερ πάντως ἐβουλεῖτο αὐτὰ καὶ ῥητῶς ἁθεῖναι, καὶ ὅσα τραπεζοκόμων εἴπειν καὶ ὁψοποιῶν ἡδύσματα.

οὗ γὰρ δεῖ καταντᾶν ἐν τοῖς ὑψίσεις εἰς τὰ ῥυπαρὰ καὶ ἐξυβρισμένα, ἀν μὴ σφόδρα ὑπὸ τινὸς ἀνάγκης συνδιωκώμεθα, ἀλλὰ τῶν πραγμάτων πρέποι ἀν καὶ τὰς φωνὰς ἔχειν ἄξιας καὶ μμείσθαι τὴν δημογραφήσασαν φύσιν τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν, ὅτις ἐν ἡμῖν τὰ μέρη τὰ ἀπόρρητα οὐκ ἐθηκεν ἐν προσώπῳ οὐδὲ τὰ τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκον περιηθήματα, ἀπεκρύψατο δὲ ὡς ἐνήν καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ξενοφῶντα τοὺς τούτων ὅτι πορρωτάτω ὀχετοὺς ἀπέστρεψεν, οὐδαμὴ κατασχύνασα τὸ τοῦ ὅλου ζῷου κάλλος. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔτει' εἴδους ἐπείγει τὰ μικροποια διαριθμεῖν προϋποδεδευμένων γὰρ τῶν ὅσα εὐγενεῖς καὶ ψηλοὺς ἔργαζεται τοὺς λόγους, δῆλον ὡς τὰ ἐναντία τούτων ταπεινοὺς ποιήσει κατὰ τὸ πλείστον καὶ ἀσχήμονας.

44. Ἐκεῖνο μέντοι λοιπὸν ἕνεκα τῆς στῆς χρηστομαθείας οὐκ ὁκνήσομεν ἐπιπροσθεῖναι <καί> ὅπερ σαφῆς, Τερεντιανὲ φιλτάτη, ὅπερ ἐζήτησε τις τῶν φιλοσοφῶν πρὸς <ἐμὲ> ἐναγχὸς, "θαυμά μ' ἔχει," λέγων, "ὡς ἀμέλει καὶ ἐτέρους πολλοὺς, τῶς ποτὲ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον αἰώνα πιθαναὶ μὲν ἐπὶ ἀκρον καὶ πολιτικά, δριμεῖα τε καὶ ἐντρεχεῖς καὶ μάλιστα πρὸς ἡδονᾶς λόγων εὐφοροι, ψηλαῖ δὲ λίαν καὶ

1 So Richards for αὐτάρκη ὑπὸς P; perhaps αὐτὰ ἀκριβῶς (cf. ταῦτα ἀκριβῆ ὑπὸς, Mazzucchi).
have called them “heaps of every kind of grain and of all known aids to cookery and good living”; or, if he must at all hazards be explicit, “all the dainties known to caterers and cooks.” One ought not in elevated passages to descend to what is sordid and contemptible, except under the severe pressure of necessity, but the proper course is to suit the words to the dignity of the subject and thus imitate Nature, the artist that created man. Nature did not place in full view our dishonourable parts nor the drains that purge our whole frame, but as far as possible concealed them and, as Xenophon says,\(^a\) thrust their channels into the furthest background, for fear of spoiling the beauty of the whole creature. There is, however, no immediate need for enumerating and classifying the factors of mean style in detail. As we have already laid down all the qualities that make our utterance noble and sublime, it obviously follows that the opposite of these will generally make it trivial and ungainly.

44. One problem now remains for solution, my dear Terentianus, and knowing your love of learning I will not hesitate to append it—a problem which a certain philosopher recently put to me. “It surprises me,” he said, “as it doubtless surprises many others too, how it is that in this age of ours we find natures that are supremely persuasive and suited for public life, shrewd and versatile and especially rich in literary charm, yet really sublime and tran-

\(^a\) Memorabilia 1.4.6.
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υπερμεγέθεις, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τι σπάνιον, οὐκέτι γεννώνται φύσεις. τοσαύτη λόγων κοσμική τις ἐπέχει τὸν
2 βίον ἀφορία. ἢ νὴ Δί’, ἔφη “πιστευτέον ἐκεῖνο τῷ θρυλουμένῳ, ὡς ἡ δημοκρατία τῶν μεγάλων ἀγαθῆς
τιθνός, ἢ μόνη σχεδὸν καὶ συνηκμασάν οἱ περὶ λόγους δεινοί καὶ συναπέθανον; θρέψαι τε γάρ,
φασίν, ἵκανὴ τὰ φρονήματα τῶν μεγαλοφρόνων ἡ ἐλευθερία καὶ ἐπετλίσαι καὶ ἁμα διεγείρειν1 τὸ πρό-
θυμον τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔριδος καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ πρωτεία φιλοτιμίας. ἔτι γε μὴν διὰ τὰ προκείμενα
ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις ἔπαθλα ἐκάστοτε τὰ ψυχικά προ-
τερήματα τῶν ῥητόρων μελετῶμεν ἀκονᾶται καὶ
οἶον ἐκτρίβεται καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς
ἐλεύθερα συνεκλάμπει. οἱ δὲ νῦν ἐοίκαμεν” ἔφη
“παιδομαθεῖς εἶναι δουλείας δικαίας, τοῖς αὐτοῖς
ἐθεσὶ καὶ ἐπιτηθεύμασιν ἐξ ἀπαλῶν ἔτι φρονημάτων
μόνων οὐκ ἐνεσπαργανωμένοι καὶ ἀγενοστοι καλλί-
στον καὶ γονιμωτάτου λόγων νάματος, τὴν ἐλευθε-
ρίαια” ἔφη “λέγω, διόπερ οὐδὲν ὅτι μὴ κόλακες ἐκ-
4 βαίνομεν μεγαλοφυῆς.” διὰ τοῦτο τὰς ἁλλὰς
ἐξεις καὶ εἰς οἰκέτας πίπτειν ἐφασκεν, δούλουν δὲ μη-
δένα γίνεσθαι ῥήτορα· εἴθισ γὰρ ἀναζεῖν2 τὸ ἀπαρ-
ρησίαστον καὶ οἶον ἐμφροινὸν ὑπὸ συνηθείας ἀεὶ
κεκονυλισμένον “ἡμών γὰρ τ’ ἄρετῆς” κατὰ τὸν
5 “Ομηρον ἀποαίνται δούλιον ἱμαρ.” “ὡσπερ οὖν,
εἴ γε” φησὶ “τοῦτο πιστὸν ἔστιν <ὁ>3 ἀκοῦω, τὰ

1 Morus, for διελθείν.
2 ἀναζεῖν Weiske, for ἀναζεῖ.
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scendent natures are no longer, or only very rarely, now produced. Such is the universal dearth of literature that besets our times. Are we really to believe the hackneyed view that democracy is the kindly nurse of genius and that—speaking generally—the great men of letters flourished only with democracy and perished with it? Freedom, they say, has the power to foster noble minds and to fill them with high hopes, and at the same time to rouse our spirit of mutual rivalry and eager competition for the foremost place. Moreover, thanks to the prizes which a republic offers, an orator's intellectual gifts are whetted by practice, burnished, so to speak, by friction, and share, as is only natural, the light of freedom which illuminates the state. But in these days we seem to be schooled from childhood in an equitable slavery, swaddled, I might say, from the tender infancy of our minds in the same servile ways and practices. We never drink from the fairest and most fertile source of eloquence, which is freedom, and therefore we turn out to be nothing but flatterers on a grand scale.” This is the reason, he alleged, that, while all other faculties are granted even to slaves, no slave ever becomes an orator. According to him, the inability to speak freely, and the sense of being as it were in prison, immediately assert themselves, the product of the repeated beating of habit. As Homer says: “Surely half of our manhood is robbed by the day of enslavement.”

\[^{a}\] Odyssey 17.322.

\[^{3}\] <δ> add. Pearce.
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γλωττόκομα, ἐν οἷς οἱ πυγμαῖοι, καλούμενοι δὲ νάνοι, τρέφονται, οὐ μόνον κωλύει τῶν ἐγκεκλεσμένων τὰς αὐξήσεις ἀλλὰ καὶ συναραιοὶ διὰ τὸν περικείμενον τοῖς σώμασι δεσμῶν, οὕτως ἀπάσαν δουλείαν, κἂν ἢ δικαιοτάτη, ψυχῆς γλωττόκομον καὶ κούνον ἂν τις ἀποφήναιτο δεσμωτήριον." ἔγὼ μέντοι γε ὑπολαβών "ῥάδιον," ἔφην "ὁ βελτιστε, καὶ ᾧν ἀνθρώπων τὸ καταμέμφεσθαι τὰ ἀεὶ παρόντα· ὅρα δὲ μὴ ποτε οὐχ ἢ τῆς οἰκουμένης εἰρήνη διαφθείρει τὰς μεγάλας φύσεις, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ κατέχων ἥμων τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπεριόριστος οὐτοσί πόλεμος, καὶ νὴ Δία πρὸς τοῦτο τὰ φρουροῦντα τὸν νῦν βίον καὶ κατ’ ἀκρας ἀγοντα καὶ φέροντα ταυτὶ πάθη. ἡ γὰρ φιλοχρηματία, πρὸς ἴν ἀπαντει ἀπλῆστος ἡδη νοσοὺμεν, καὶ ἡ φιληδονία δουλαγωγοῦσι, μᾶλλον δὲ, ὥσ ἂν εἴποι τις, καταβυθίζουσιν αὐτάνδρους ἡδῆ τῶν βίους. φιλαργυρία μὲν <γὰρ> νόσημα μικροποίων, φιληδονία δ’ ἀγεννέστατον. οὐ δὴ ἔχω λογιζόμενος εὐρέιν, ὡς οἶν το πλοῦτον ἄριστον ἔκτιμήσαντας, τὸ δ’ ἀληθέστερον εἴπειν, ἐκθειάσαντας, τὰ συμφυγὴ τούτῳ κακὰ εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς ἥμων ἐπεισιόντα μὴ παραδέχεσθαι. ἀκολουθεῖ γὰρ τῷ ἀμέτρῳ πλοῦτῳ καὶ ἀκολάστῳ συννημμένη καὶ ἱσα, φασί, βαῖνονσα πολυτέλεια, καὶ ἀμα ἀνοίγοντο ἐκεῖνον τῶν πόλεων καὶ οἰκῶν τὰς εἰσόδους εὐθὺς ἐμβαῖνει καὶ συνοικίζεται. χρονίσαντα δὲ ταύτα ἐν τοῖς βίοις

1 συναραιοί Schmidt for συνάροι.
cages in which they keep the pygmies or dwarfs, as they are called, stunt the growth of their prisoners, but enfeeble them by the bonds applied to their bodies, on the same principle all slavery, however equitable, might well be described as a cage for the soul, a common prison.” However I took him up and said, “It is easy, my good friend, and it is characteristic of human nature always to find fault with things as they are at the moment. But consider. Perhaps it is not the world’s peace that corrupts great natures but much rather this endless warfare which besets our hearts, yes, and these passions that garrison our lives in present days and make utter havoc of them. It is the love of money, that insatiable sickness from which we all now suffer, and the love of pleasure, that enslave us, or rather one might say, sink our ship of life with all hands; for love of gold is a withering sickness, and love of pleasure utterly ignoble. Indeed, I cannot discover on consideration how, if we value boundless wealth, or to speak more truly, make a god of it, we can possibly keep our minds safe from the intrusion of the evils that accompany it. In close company with vast and unconscionable Wealth there follows, ‘step for step,’ as they say, a Extravagance: and no sooner has the one opened the gates of cities or houses, than the other comes and makes a home there too. And when they have spent some time in our

---


2 ὑπολαβῶν Bühler, for ὑπολαμβάνω.
3 <γὰρ> add. Spengel.
4 εὖθυς Mathews, for εἰς ἄσ. 
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νεοττοποιεῖται κατὰ τοὺς σοφοὺς καὶ ταχέως γενόμενα περὶ τεκνοποιῶν ἀλαζόνειάν τε γεννώσι καὶ τοὺς καὶ τρυφήν, ού νόθα ἐαυτῶν γεννήματα ἄλλα καὶ πάνυ γνήσια. ἔαν δὲ καὶ τούτους τις τοῦ πλουτοῦ τοὺς ἐκγόνους εἰς ἡλικίαν ἐλθεῖν εάσῃ, ταχέως δεσπότας, ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐντόκτονωσι ἀπαραιτήτους, ύβριν καὶ παρανομίαν καὶ ἀναισχυντίαν. ταῦτα γὰρ οὖτωσ ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι καὶ μηκέτι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναβλέπειν μηδ’ ύστεροφημίας τελεσιουργεῖσθαι κατ’ ὀλίγον τὴν τῶν βίων διαφθοράν, φθίνειν δὲ καὶ καταμαραίνεσθαι τὰ ψυχικὰ μεγέθη καὶ ἂξιλα γίνεσθαι, ἡνίκα τὰ θυελλὰ ἐαυτῶν μέρη καὶ ἀνόητα ἐκ-θαυμάζουειν, παρέντες αὐξεῖν τὰθάνατα. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ κρίσει μὲν τις δεκασθεῖς οὐκ ἂν ἐτί τῶν δικαίων καὶ καλῶν ἔλευθεροι καὶ ὑγιῆ ἂν κριτῆς γένοιτο (ἀνάγκη γὰρ τῷ δωροδόκῳ τὰ οἰκεῖα μὲν φαίνεσθαι καλὰ καὶ δίκαια), ὅποιον δὲ ἡμῶν ἐκάστου τοὺς ὠλους ἡδὴ βίους δεκασμοῖ βραβεύουσι καὶ ἀλλοτρίων θήραι θανάτων καὶ ἐνέδρας διαθηκῶν, τὸ δ’ ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς κερδαίνειν ὕψωμεθα τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκατοσ πρὸς τῆς <φιλοχρηματίας> ἑνδραποδισμένου, ἀρα δὴ ἐν τῇ τοσαύτῃ λοιμικῇ τοῦ βίου διαφθορᾷ δοκοῦ-μεν ἐτὶ ἐλεύθερόν τινα κριτήν τῶν μεγάλων ἡ δη-κόντων πρὸς τῶν αἰώνα καθέκαστον ἀπολελεύφθαι καὶ μὴ καταρχαίρεσιάζεσθαι πρὸς τῆς τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐπιθυμίας; ἀλλὰ μῆποτε τοιοῦτοι, οἷοι περ

1 μηδ’ ύστεροφημίας Reiske, for μηδ’ ἔτερα φήμης.
lives, philosophers tell us, they build a nest there\(^a\) and promptly set about begetting children; these are Swagger and Conceit and Luxury, no bastards but their trueborn issue. And if these offspring of wealth are allowed to grow to maturity, they soon breed in our hearts inexorable tyrants, Insolence and Disorder and Shamelessness. This must inevitably happen, and men no longer then look upwards nor take any further thought for future fame. Little by little the ruin of their lives is completed in the cycle of such vices, their greatness of soul wastes away and dies and is no longer something to strive for, since they value that part of them which is mortal and foolish, and neglect the development of their immortal part. A man who has been bribed for his verdict can no longer give an unbiased and sound judgement on what is just and fair (for the corrupt judge inevitably regards his own interest as fair and just). So, seeing that the whole life of each one of us is now governed wholly by bribery and by hunting after other people’s deaths and laying traps for legacies, and we have sold our souls for profit at any price, slaves that we all are to our greed, can we then expect in such pestilential ruin of our lives that there is left a single free and unbribed judge of the things that are great and last to all eternity? Are we not all corrupted by our passion for gain? Nay, for such as we are perhaps it is better

\(^a\) Cf. Plato, *Republic* 9.573C.

\(^2\) καὶ ἀνόητα Toup, for καπανητα.

\(^3\) Spengel, with reason, suspected a lacuna here: the sense of the missing words would be “but other people’s interests improper.”

\(^4\) Φιλοχρησμιας add. Toll.

\(^5\) καθεκαστον Toll, for καθέκαστον
LONGINUS

ἔσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἄμεινον ἀρχεσθαι ἢ ἐλευθέρος εἶναι· ἐπείτου γε ἄφθεισαι τὸ σύνολον, ὡς ἔ εἰρκτής ἄφετοι, κατὰ τῶν πλησίων αἱ πλεονεξίαι κἀν ἐπικλύσειεν1 τοῖς κακοῖς τὴν οἰκουμένην. ὂλως δὲ δάπανον2 ἐφην εἶναι τῶν νῦν γεννωμένων φύσεων τὴν ῥαθυμίαν, ἢ πλὴν ὀλίγων πάντως ἐγκαταβιούμεν, οὐκ ἄλλως πονοῦντες ἢ ἀναλαμβάνοντες εἰ μὴ ἐπαίνου καὶ ἴδονῆς ἑνεκα, ἀλλὰ μὴ τῆς ζῆλου καὶ τιμῆς ἀξίας ποτὲ ὕφελείας.” “κρατιστον εἰκή ταῦτ’ ἔαν,” ἐπὶ δὲ τὰ συνεχή χωρεῖν ἢν δὲ ταύτα τὰ πάθη, περὶ ὤν ἐν ἴδιω προηγουμένως ὑπεσχόμεθα γράψεων ὑπομνήματι, ἀτε3 τὴν τε τοῦ ἄλλου λόγου καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὑψους μοῦραν ἐπεχόντων, ὡς ἡμῖν. . . .4

1 ἐπικλύσειαν Markland, for ἐπικαύσειαν
2 δάπανον Toll, for δαπανῶν
3 ἀτε Mazzucchi for ὦ
4 The next few words can only be guessed; perhaps εἰρητα, κρατίστην . . .
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to have a master than to be free. Were it given complete liberty, like released prisoners, as it were, to prey on our neighbours, greed would swamp the world in a deluge of evils. In fact,” I said, “what wastes the talents of the present generation is the idleness in which all but a few of us pass our lives, only exerting ourselves or showing any enterprise for the sake of getting praise or pleasure out of it, never from the honourable and admirable motive of doing good to the world.” “It’s best to let this be”\textsuperscript{a} and pass on to the next question, which is that of the Emotions, a topic on which I previously undertook to write a separate treatise, for they seem to me to form part of the general subject of literature and especially of sublimity ...

[The rest is lost.]

\textsuperscript{a} Euripides, \textit{Electra} 379.
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INTRODUCTION

*On Style* may well be the earliest post-Aristotelian treatise on literary theory to survive complete; and even if it is not, it is an important early source on an exceptionally wide range of topics. In contrast to the more stimulating but idiosyncratic Aristotle’s *Poetics* and Longinus’ *On the Sublime*, it is not likely to be highly innovative,¹ but that in itself makes *On Style* a particularly useful introduction and guide to our understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of classical literary criticism.

The author gives us our most extensive surviving account of the theory of styles, a particularly popular framework for critical analysis and judgment, and he does so in a complex theory of four styles for which we have no exact parallel. He also gives succinct, clear, and usually perceptive accounts of standard topics such as sentence theory and metaphor, and shows a more personal interest

---

**Note.** I thank Donald Russell and Rudolf Kassel for their benevolent and helpful comments on this introduction and the text respectively.

¹ See §179, where Demetrius is “forced” to be original because no one else has treated the subject before; he also fails to integrate some of his disparate sources, especially in the elegant style. His strength is in analysis of individual topics and examples.
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in less usual topics, such as the letter, music, and acting, and in less usual authors, such as Sophron, Ctesias, and Demades. Theory is consistently illustrated with typically brief and well-chosen examples, and in contrast to many of our other sources, particularly in Latin, there is no bias towards oratory.

Date and authorship

The author of On Style is conventionally called Demetrius. The most famous critic by this name is Demetrius of Phaleron (ca. 360–280 B.C.), the student of Aristotle who governed Athens 317–307 B.C. and wrote on a number of literary and rhetorical subjects, and On Style is mistakenly attributed to him in the superscription of the tenth-century manuscript P. But this attribution is a later addition, as we can see from the simpler version in the subscription of the same manuscript, “Demetrius On Style” (Δημητρίου περὶ ἐρμηνείας). This will be the original text. Demetrius is also the form in the few earlier references to name the author of On Style. The eventual

2 The fragments are edited by F. Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles vol. 4 [Basel 1968]).

3 Δημητρίου Φαληρέως περὶ ἐρμηνείας, ὁ ἐστὶ περὶ φράσεως (so also N and H; on the manuscripts see below). Manuscript attributions are in any case unreliable, as we can see from P’s misattribution of Aristotle’s Rhetoric to Dionysius and the similar problem of “Longinus”.

4 Probably first in the fourth to fifth centuries in Syrianus, In Hermog. comm. 1.99–100 Rabe; then in the sixth century by Ammonius’ commentary on Aristotle’s De Interpretatione (Comm. in Arist. Graeca 4.5), p. 4 Busse, and Phoebammon,
identification of a Demetrius with the most famous critic by that name was probably inevitable (and may well have ensured the work's survival), but it has no authority, and seems in any case inconsistent with the way in which Demetrius of Phaleron is cited in § 289. We cannot even be sure that the author was called Demetrius; if so, it was a common name, and no identification with any specific Demetrius is possible.

The date of the work is equally uncertain, and controversy continues. For much of this century scholars favoured a date in the first century A.D. (especially Roberts and Radermacher), but more recently scholars have argued for an earlier date; so ca. 270 B.C. (Grube), second century B.C. (Morpurgo Tagliabue), late second or early first century B.C. (Chiron), and a reworking in the first century A.D. of contents reflecting the second or early first century B.C. (Schenkeveld). I would agree with this growing consensus that the contents at least do not preclude and may best reflect the second century B.C. Firm evidence is, however, hard to find since we have no complete texts and only fragmentary knowledge of literary and rhetorical theory between Aristotle and authors of the first century B.C., a period including Theophrastus' *On Style* (περὶ λέξεως) and the development of the theories of styles, tropes, and figures which we see in the

Proleg. Syll. 377 Rabe. More frequently authorship is vaguely ascribed to "the ancients". Grube 53–54 suggests that the report of Demetrius of Phaleron's criticism of the long periods of Isocrates' followers in Philodemus, *Rhet.* 1.198 Sudhaus = F 169 Wehrli refers to *On Style* § 303, but Isocrates is not mentioned there, and we have similar contexts in other surviving fragments of Demetrius of Phaleron (cf. F 161–68 Wehrli).
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works of Cicero and his contemporaries. Textbooks are also prone to conservatism, so that early material may not prove early date, and “updating” revisions may produce isolated later references which prove nothing about the rest of the work.

The latest known persons to be named in On Style are roughly of the first half of the third century B.C.: Praxiphanes, Sotades, Demetrius of Phaleron, and Clitarchus (§§ 57, 189, 289, and 304), and the references to Demetrius and Sotades both suggest a date after their deaths. Grube stresses the number of quotations from authors of the fourth and early third century B.C., but we may compare two other texts with an unusual range, the Antistatticist and Rutilius Lupus. Equally striking, and to be

5 Particularly Ad Herennium IV (probably 86–82 B.C.), and Cicero, especially De Oratore (54 B.C.) and Orator (46 B.C.).

6 A possible example: § 38 ὁντερ νῦν λόγιον ὅνηματενεν. On λόγιος see note 22.

7 But likely to be somewhat later are Archedemus and Artemon (§§ 34–35, 223), both perhaps second century B.C.; see Chiron, p. xxxiii and J. M. Rist, “Demetrius the Stylist and Artemon the Compiler,” Phoenix 18 (1964) 2–8. Reference to the Augustan critic Theodorus of Gadara, in § 237, is very doubtful, and the context suggests a historian, not a critic. Chronological deductions in general depend also on whether Demetrius cited contemporaries, as Aristotle did, or followed the usual later practice of citing earlier authors.

8 Text of the former in Anecdota Graeca 1.77–116 Bekker (Berlin 1814) and of the latter in Rhetores Latini Minores 3–21 Halm (Leipzig 1863), also ed. E. Brooks (Leiden 1970); Rutilius based his treatise on figures of speech on the Greek critic Gorgias the Younger, who lived in the late first century B.C. and early first century A.D.
INTRODUCTION

explained by Demetrius’ Peripatetic sympathies, is the focus on examples from the circles of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.⁹

The claim in § 179 to be the first to discuss elegant composition, γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις, implies ignorance of the treatment of this topic in Dionysius, De Comp. Verb. 23, written some time after 30 B.C. This fits the absence of other standard later material. In particular, there is no mention of a three-style theory in the defence of four styles against those who allow only two (§§ 36–37);¹⁰ and Demosthenes is virtually restricted to the forceful style in contrast to his later preeminence as the master of all styles, a position generally acknowledged by the time of Cicero (e.g. De Or. 3.199; cf. e.g. DH. Dem. 8). This partly results from Demetrius’ recognition of independent grand and forceful styles and the parallel virtual restriction of political oratory to the forceful style, but even there Demosthenes is given no special praise comparable to that of Thucydides for the grand style, the “divine” Sappho for charm, and Aristotle for the letter (§§ 40, 127, and 230).

Perhaps most tantalising of all is the question of Demetrius’ relationship to Aristotle and the early Peripatos. Is it exceptionally close, does it have implications for the


¹⁰ See further below. But conversely the silence about four styles in Cicero, Dionysius, and others proves nothing, since they also ignore the (different) four-style theory mentioned in Philodemus, Rhet. 1.165 Sudhaus.
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date, and did Demetrius know Aristotle's writings directly, or through intermediaries? A Peripatetic debt is to some extent inevitable, since the early Peripatos, especially Aristotle and Theophrastus, was exceptionally influential in the development of critical theory;\(^{11}\) but it is striking that the only critics named in On Style are either Peripatetics (Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Praxiphanes), or appear in contexts closely linked to Aristotle (Archedemus and Artemon). It seems also a sign of special admiration that the Peripatetics head the authors praised for elegance (§181), while Aristotle himself is supreme at letter-writing (§230), and, if the text is sound, heads the authors illustrating comic charm (§126). Yet the reference to the Peripatetics also suggests that Demetrius was not himself one, and could look back on the early Peripatos as an identifiable group with a shared elegance of style (cf. Cic. Orator 127).

Aristotle's influence is particularly strong in the discussion of the clause and period (§§ 1–35), prose rhythm (§§ 38–43), metaphor (§§ 78ff), frigidity (§ 116, where the text of the Rhetoric even allows us to fill a lacuna), and clarity (§§ 191ff, including the distinction between writing and oral delivery). But it is not clear that Demetrius had read Aristotle. None of the four apparently direct quotations (§§ 11, 34, 38, 116) is verbally exact, and though the usual practice of quotation from memory and adaptation to the new context may explain the discrepancies, it is troubling that the quotation in §38 distorts Ar. Rhet. 1408b32ff in a way that implies later theory on the
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grandeur of the paean (cf. Cic. Orator 197, a contrast of the iamb of the plain style with the grander paean, “paean autem in amplioribus”).

Demetrius has been accused of a fundamental misunderstanding of Aristotle’s theory of the period (§§ 10ff), but this depends on a doubtful and controversial interpretation of Aristotle. More plausibly, Demetrius may confuse a detail (see on § 12, a confusion of terminology), but he rightly interprets Aristotle,\(^\text{12}\) while also following later theory. There is agreement on the fundamental point, that a period is a unit of thought, a structured whole where thought and form end together. The differences are that Aristotle confined the period to one or two clauses (a restriction Demetrius explicitly rejects in § 34), and favoured periods with antithesis and/or assonance, typically illustrated from Isocrates. Demetrius first defines and illustrates the period in accordance with post-Aristotelian theory (§ 10),\(^\text{13}\) with focus on the ending and an example which is from Demosthenes and shows con-


\(^{13}\) E.g. Hermogenes 178 Rabe, “A period is an independent (αὐτοτελές) shaping of a whole thought in verbal form, succinctly brought to a conclusion (συντόμως ἀπηρτισμένον), and succinct hyperbata in it shape periods well.”
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spicuous hyperbaton. Only then does he bring in Aristo-
tle (§ 11). Aristotelian influence is then seen particularly
in periods with parallelism of structure (§§ 22ff), in some
of the terminology (e.g. § 12 κατεστραμμένη) and in the
inclusion of the one-clause period (§ 17). 14 Yet other
vocabulary is post-Aristotelian (e.g. ἀπηρτισμένος, κύ-
κλος, περιαγώγη), as is the upper limit of four clauses,
and the three types of period (§§ 16 and 19–21). 15 So too
“enthyememe” in §§ 30–33 has the Aristotelian meaning,
but some of the terminology is later, as is the possible
confusion with the epiphoneme in § 109 (we may com-
pare Quint. 8.5.11, where the enthyememe may be used
for decorative purpose, added “epiphonematis modo”).
Demetrius also gives strong personal endorsement in § 15
to a moderate use of periods, a formulation which sug-
gests the Peripatetic mean but is not in Aristotle.

This combination of material from Aristotle modified
by later theory is typical. In §§ 78ff, for example, the the-
ory of metaphor 16 shows strong Aristotelian influence,

14 A type unimportant in later theory, but cf. Quint. 9.4.124,
with the same criteria of length and rounding, “simplex, cum
sensus unus longiore ambitu circumdicitur.” See also Hermo-
genpes in the next note.

15 In itself a triad found only here, but compare the looser
style of philosophy and the distinction of periods for history and
rhetoric in Cic. Orator 62ff. For the number of clauses, cf. Her-
mogentes 180 Rabe, “There are single-clause periods; there are
also two-clause and three-clause periods, formed from <two or>
three clauses, and a four-clause period formed from four clauses;
and a clause is a thought brought to a conclusion.” Cic. Orator
221 and Quint. 9.4.125 allow more than four.

16 For a more detailed analysis see Schenkeveld, Ch. IV;
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but adds material which is found elsewhere in later theory, especially on the simile and dead metaphors; and metaphor from adding a privative adjective (§ 85) is unimportant in later theory and so likely to reflect a special interest in Aristotle, who provides the example: yet Demetrius adds the author’s name, Theognis. In similar minor modifications Aristotle provides the theory and some but not all the examples in §§ 22ff and 116.

Some of these adaptations may derive from Theophrastus, for example the grandeur of the paean (cf. § 41). There are four explicit references to him (§§ 41, 114, 173, and 222). He is also the likely source for the analysis of wit and charm in the elegant style, and he or other early Peripatetics for the interest in delivery, and the recurrent sequences of topics analysed under diction and composition.\(^{17}\)

The theory of figures and tropes in On Style is less developed than that found in Ad Herennium and in Cicero, who dismissively assumes a familiarity with endless lists of figures (De Or. 3.200). Some specifically Stoic influence is likely here, perhaps especially in the figures in the forceful style, the only style in which Demetrius distinguishes figures of speech and thought, §§ 263ff).\(^{18}\)

---


\(^{18}\) See Schenkeveld, Chs. V and VI. Given the Stoic praise of
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The Stoics also influence his theory of neologism, the vocabulary for some terms of grammar in §§ 60, 201, and 214, and possibly the use of ἄστεῖος = "good" in § 114 and μεταφορὰ πλεονάζουσα, the definition of the simile in § 80.\(^{19}\) Archedemus (§ 34) may well be the Stoic Archedemus, and Chrysippus (280–207 B.C.) may be the source of the proverbs in § 172. But these Stoic traces are superficial or in language theory, an area where the Stoics influenced all later theory. What we have, then, in *On Style* is a work showing unusually strong and evident Peripatetic influence, but an influence often adapted and supplemented to fit standard later theory. As we shall see, it is also set into a very different conceptual framework of four styles.

Finally, there is linguistic evidence, an uncertain guide since we know too little about standard, educated Hellenistic prose, in particular the beginnings of linguistic Atticism, the conscious imitation of classical Attic Greek. But in terms of our current state of knowledge such Atticism is less likely as early as the second century B.C.; yet some signs of it are to be seen in Demetrius, as in


\(^{19}\) On grammar see Schenkeveld, p. 137 (but Peripatetic interest in connectives is seen in Theophr. F 683 Fortenbaugh and Praxiphanes, quoted in § 55). For ἄστεῖος, cf. e.g. SVF iii.674 (Chrysippus), and for the definition of the simile, cf. ὀρμή πλεονάζουσα, the Stoic definition of emotion, e.g. SVF iii.130.
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the use of the dual for forms other than δύο and ἄμφις, and the preposition ἄμφι in §288. Vocabularly, however, is in general not decisive, since many forms which used to be thought "late" have been found to have early instances or comparable forms (see the valuable lists in Grube, Appendix I; Schenkeveld, p. 145, n. 1). The most interesting are the few terms specifically said to be recent usages, λόγιος of grandeur in §38, and the group κακόξηλος, κακοξηλία, and (§239) ἔροκακοξηλία. The last is attested only here, and it is tempting to relate it to the "novum genus cacozeliae" which a hostile contemporary attributes to Virgil (Donatus, Vit. Virg. 44), a new affectation said to be neither swollen nor arid but produced from ordinary words and so less obvious. There may then be a few points of language to suggest a date of composition as late as the early first century B.C.

20 Particularly striking in Demetrius are the examples in §§36 (two verbs) and 235 (genitives); see Chiron, p. xiii, Schenkeveld, p. 140. Aristotle has only one dual involving a verb, Polybius has none, and seems the last to use the genitive dual. Later use of the dual was a choice artificial revival, to our knowledge first in the second half of the first century B.C. There are two examples of τῶ χείρε in the scholarly Parthenius, verbs and genitives seem to occur first in Dionysius, and verbal forms are rare even in Atticist authors.

21 See Schenkeveld, p. 144. It has disappeared already from Aristotle, Parthenius has one example, Dionysius about thirty.

22 See E. Orth, Logios, Leipzig, 1926; Grube, p. 150. It is first securely used meaning "eloquent" in Philo, and linked with grandeur perhaps first in the period of Plutarch, e.g. Mor. 350c. But see also note 6.
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Structure

The overall structure of *On Style* is clear and methodical, a preliminary account of sentence theory (§§ 1–35), followed by analysis of four styles: the grand, elegant, plain, and forceful (§§ 36–304). In the absence of any formal introduction or conclusion, these may seem two independent accounts, but there are links and cross references (e.g. §§ 6 and 121, §§ 7–9 and 241–42), and the first, a useful preliminary to a topic common to all the styles in the second part, is too long to fit within any one style: contrast, for example, the inclusion of general remarks on prose rhythm, metaphor, and neologism on their first occurrence within the grand style (§§ 38 and 78ff), clarity and vividness within the plain style (§§ 191 and 209ff), and forms of open and oblique rebuke in the forceful style (§§ 287ff).

Clauses and periods are analysed in an orderly textbook progression of topics (§§ 1–35).\(^{23}\) The unusually detailed account of the clause (§§ 1–9) moves from origin and definition to appropriate use of long and short clauses, while the period is analysed under definition, origin and history, length, and subtypes, with remarks interspersed on use. Finally, there are two appendices, reverting to definition (§§ 34–35), just as additional topics tend to follow the main analysis in the individual styles.

After a preliminary defence of the four-style theory, Demetrius analyses each of the four styles in turn. Each ends with a brief discussion of its faulty counterpart, the
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frigid, affected, arid, and unpleasant, and, with the partial exception of the elegant style, each is analysed under the same three aspects of diction, composition, and content.24 This basic structure is seen at its simplest in the brief accounts of the faulty styles, in the grand style, and, if we remove the digressions, the plain style (§§ 190–91 and 204–8). In the forceful style the three headings are covered in §§ 240–76, but then comes a ragbag of extras: further figures of speech, Demades, forms of rebuke, and disapproval of hiatus. The elegant style is more complicated and in part confused by the immediate subdivision of two types of charm, the gracefully poetic and the wittily comic (§§ 128–31), and—an intrusion from traditional accounts of wit—analysis under two headings of style and content (§§ 132–62, cf. Cic. De Or. 2.248). Ἀξείς, normally diction, now includes some topics of arrangement (and then in §§ 142–45 is confusingly restricted to single words). At this point the main discussion seems concluded, since appendices follow on the differences between charm and laughter, appropriate and inappropriate use of gibes (§§ 163–72), and on Theophrastus’ definition of beautiful words and musical theory (§§ 173–78).25 But then we find elegant arrangement, γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις (§§ 179–85), as if Demetrius had noticed a gap and wished to complete his usual structure of three aspects.

24 The three headings are traditional, and all appear in the context of the styles in Ad Herennium 4.8.11 and Cic. Orator 20. Further use of traditional material appears in the recurrent series of items found under diction and arrangement, where at least the opening items show Peripatetic influence (see note 17).

25 This amplifies the reference to beautiful words in § 164, a good example of how appendices would often be footnotes in modern texts.
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This final section apologises for originality, and reintroduces the generic term for the style, γλαφυρός, which with one exception (§ 138) had been ousted by χάρις and cognates. Taken together with the other structural peculiarities, it confirms that Demetrius adopted and modified an account of χάρις because he had no detailed model for his elegant style.

The four styles

The early history of the theory of styles, χαρακτήρες, is obscure and controversial, particularly the contribution of Theophrastus, but the fundamental criterion is propriety, τὸ πρέπον: certain subjects fit certain styles, and violation of this is normally a fault (e.g. § 120). A division into two styles, grand and plain, is found already in Aristophanes’ Frogs, where Euripides is accused of using an unsuitably plain style, though “great ideas and thoughts must father equally great words” (1058–59, ἀνάγκη μεγάλων γνωμῶν καὶ διανοιῶν ἵσα καὶ τὰ ρήματα τίκτευν). This match of content and form is why the theory of styles regularly gives content an integral place, as in Cicero, Orator 100, an example of a three-style theory, the standard number in the Roman period: “the true orator can express humble subjects in a plain style, elevated subjects in a weighty style, and intermediate subjects in a middle style.” The emphasis is however on style, and Demetrius’ discussion of suitable subject matter is always brief. Since the choice of style depends on appropriate context, all the styles are equally valid, and though he rather scorns the plain style (§ 207), Demetrius expresses no preference (nor does Ad Herennium 4.8.11ff; contrast
the supremacy of the grand style for the orator in Cic. Orator 97).

The analysis of styles has two functions: to evaluate existing writers and to instruct the future writer. Both are normally present, though one may predominate. Demetrius is primarily prescriptive (he uses many imperatives and futures), whereas, for example, Dionysius’ Demosthenes is analytic. Individual authors may also be classified under a specific style, as Demetrius may implicitly classify Thucydides under the grand style, while other authors such as Homer and Plato will control and mix more than one style (§ 37; compare Demosthenes’ mastery of all three styles in Cic. Orator 26). But these two functions are difficult to disentangle when past authors are analysed to provide models for the present. Demetrius’ formulation of four styles is in itself unusual, but its nature and use are not essentially different from the formulations of other critics.26

We can distinguish various strands in the development of the styles found in Demetrius. The theory of two styles, grand and plain, remained influential (e.g. Cic. Brutus 201), and as he almost admits in §§ 36–37, this is where Demetrius derives his four styles, by subdividing grand into grand and forceful, and plain into plain and elegant. He ignores the three-style theory, first securely attested in Ad Herennium 4.8.11ff and Cicero, De Or. 3.177, 199, 210–12 (cf. Orator 20ff), and it concerns us here only because this silence is very curious if it was known to Theophrastus.27 Probably, however, Theo-

26 Contrast the view of Schenkeveld, Ch. III.
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phrastus recognised only one good style (or diction), a mean between excessive plainness and elaboration, while defining this mean with vocabulary which was later associated with a specifically grand style. This at any rate fits the few surviving fragments: he recognised three types of diction, recommending as a mean the type blended from the other two, he discussed grandeur in diction, τὸ μέγα καὶ σεμνὸν καὶ περιττόν (DH. Dem. 3 and Isoc. 3 = F 685 and 691 Fortenbaugh), and he defined frigidity as what exceeds (τὸ ύπερβάλλον) the appropriate form of expression (§ 114), a definition suggesting a single fault of excess. If so, Theophrastus developed what was in essence already in Aristotle, who advised appropriate diction, neither low nor too elaborate, and illustrated excess diction under τὸ ψυχρόν (Rhet. 1404b3–4 and 1405b35ff).

Another strand in the Demetrian styles is the theory of qualities or virtues (ἀρέται). To simplify yet another controversial issue,28 Aristotle’s one good style or diction, a single virtue blending clarity and distinction, was turned by Theophrastus into a list of four necessary virtues, purity, clarity, propriety, and pleasing stylistic elabora-


28 See previous note; add D. A. Russell, Criticism in Antiquity, London 1981, Ch. IX; S. F. Bonner, The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cambridge 1939; and on the later and more elaborate theory of Hermogenes, Περὶ ἰδεῶν, C. Wooten, Hermogenes on Types of Style, Chapel Hill 1987 (with translation). This theory of qualities also influenced Longinus’ concept of the sublime.
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tion, "ornatum illud suave et affluens" (Cic. Orator 79). But later critics added to the list and already by the time of Cicero and Dionysius (who notes in Thuc. 22 that others had elaborated the theory before him), it is divided into necessary and additional virtues. The latter no longer allow a single pack of simultaneously required qualities, and an author may be strong in one and weak in another. Distinctions between styles and qualities now become inevitably blurred, since any style, for example the grand style, is speech shaped to embody a specific quality, for example grandeur, and Demetrius, like other later critics, moves freely between vocabulary of styles and qualities (e.g. § 240, "forcefulness . . . like all the previous styles"). But the list of qualities also provides our closest parallel for the stylistic categories which Demetrius distinguishes as separate styles, since for Dionysius the additional virtues form three groups, grandeur, force, and charm (cf. DH. Imit. 3, Thuc. 22, Ad Pomp. 3). The plain style can then be seen to use only the necessary virtues, while the grand, forceful, and elegant styles show the qualities of grandeur, force, and charm.

The grand style is appropriate for great battles and big natural phenomena (§ 75), and the examples show a preference for epic and history, Homer and Thucydides, figures such as Ajax (e.g. § 48) and set pieces of historical narrative and description, such as the plague at Athens, the river Achelous, and the sea battle at Pylos (§§ 39, 45–46, and 65); this is very much Cicero’s view of history as literature, “et narratur ornate et regio saepe aut pugna describitur” (Orator 66). Oratory is absent, save for an
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atypical descriptive passage from Antiphon (§ 53) and a metaphor from Demosthenes (§ 80), which is cited more aptly in § 272 for its force. Oratorical grandeur will often mix force and grandeur, and it would seem that Demetrius prefers to concentrate on what is basic to the style. This at least would explain why emotion is in general almost excluded. Allegory (§§ 99–102) evokes awe and τὸ φοβερόν, but this aspect,\(^{30}\) usually prominent in theories of grandeur, is not developed, probably because of the overlap with the forceful style where the same examples reappear (§§ 241–43).

The elegant style has a much less satisfactory unity, as is clear from the initial division into two types, dignified charm and comic gibes. Homer’s simile of Artemis and Lysias’ toothless hag seem to have little in common (§ 128–29). These are, however, the two extremes, where charm edges into the grand and forceful styles respectively, and in practice Demetrius moves the main focus to a more unified area, the elegant wit of a Sappho or Xenophon. As we have seen, Demetrius probably lacked any better source and tried to modify an account of wit, χάρις. Thus this section has its own unity and perceptive comments, and shares a common tradition with Cicero and Quintilian.\(^{31}\) But though χάρις means both charm

\(^{30}\) In §§ 57–58 particles are said to evoke emotion as well as grandeur: this is a digression, and emotion is distinct from grandeur.

\(^{31}\) Cf. Cic. De Or. 2.216–90, Quint. 6.3. The common source is probably Theophrastus. Cf. E. Arndt, De ridiculi doctrina rhetorica, Bonn 1904, M. A. Grant, The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable in the Greek Rhetoricians and Cicero, Madison, 1924, and especially the commentary on Cicero’s De
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and wit, and both concepts are part of ἡδονή, the pleasurable, in contrast to grandeur and force, they do not always coincide, and it is charm, not wit, that is suggested by the subject matter recommended in §§ 132–33, gardens of the nymphs, wedding songs, love, birds, and spring.

Within Demetrius the elegant style has closest links with the plain style (note how “small” birds and flowers contrast great battles in § 76), and classification of it as part of the plain style, its probable origin (cf. § 36), may be compared to Cicero, Orator 20, where the plain style has two subdivisions, the first deliberately like ordinary speech (cf. Demetrius § 207), but the second “more elegant and witty, even given a brightness and modest ornamentation.” Yet when exemplified by the smoothly euphonious Isocratean type of sentences, elegance may also both be in polar contrast to forcefulness (§§ 258, 300–301) and combine with grandeur (§ 29). Since Demetrius is struggling to express this style, parallels in other authors are hard to find, but we find a more unified concept of charm in the later quality of sweetness, γλυκύτης, with its beautiful landscapes and themes of love (Hermogenes 330–39 Rabe), and the importance of charm as an independent element of style is already clear in the first century B.C. from its place in the theory of qualities and from the varying attempts to add it to the theory of styles, as part of the middle style (Cic. Orator


32 As in the theory of qualities. Compare Longinus 34.3, where Demosthenes lacks both charm and wit.
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69), or as an independent style, γλαφυρότης (Philodemus, *Rhét.* 1.165 Sudhaus).

The account of the plain style is brief and traditional: simple subjects, diction, and arrangement. To judge from the few examples, it fits private speeches and domestic scenes (as in Lysias) and Socratic dialogues, and we can compare the similar range of subjects which the plain style illustrates in Dionysius, *Demosthenes* 2 and *Ad Herennium* 4.10.14 (an incident in a bathhouse, a forensic narrative, with dialogue), and Ps.Plutarch, *Vit. Hom.* 72 (the domestic scene of Hector and his son in *Hom. Il.* 6.466ff). Since he has little to say, Demetrius adds more general discussions of clarity, vividness, and persuasiveness. He is here adapting the virtues of narrative (these were traditionally clarity, brevity, and persuasiveness, but some added vividness, Quint. 4.2.63–64), and much is standard later theory: compare on clarity e.g. Cic. *De Or.* 3.49 and Quint. 8.2; on vividness Quint. 8.3.61–71; and on persuasiveness Quint. 4.2.52–60. Demetrius also has the same two types of vividness which Quintilian recognises, the use of every detail and good circumstantial detail ("tota rerum imago," "etiam ex accidentibus"), but originality is seen in the examples, where quick allusion to familiar passages of Homer is followed by a more detailed excursus on the much less usual figure of the historian Ctesias (§§ 212–16), including a powerful analysis of the dramatic tension as a mother is told of her son's death.

Demetrius concludes the plain style with an example of a mixed style, the combination of charm and simplicity suited to the letter. This is our earliest extant analysis of letter-writing, and perceptively explores the differences between the letter and dialogue and letters to friends and
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kings, emphasising the importance of character in the letter of friendship, since the letter mirrors the writer’s soul. In terms of classical prose theory this is a rare extension beyond the usual limits of history, philosophy, and oratory.  

The forceful style fits the expression of strong emotion, particularly anger and invective, and the main source of examples is oratory, especially Demosthenes and, in an appendix, Demades (§§282–86). Appendices continue the focus on accusation but dilute the unity of the style by including milder forms of oblique and even tactful censure. In the three-style theory such force falls under the grand style, and in Ad Herennium 4.8.12 it is an invective passage which illustrates the grand style. But independent concepts of force and grandeur were recognised in the theory of qualities (see above), and forcefulness already interested the early Peripatetics, particularly the distinction between a smooth, unemotional epideictic style and a more vigorous forensic style of oral delivery: note the λέξεις ἀγωνιστική in Ar. Rhet. 1413b3ff, the recognition of Demosthenes’ boldness (Dem. Phal. F 163 Wehrli), and Isocrates’ lack of such vigour (Hieronymus F 52 Wehrli).

The faulty styles: each style has a neighbouring faulty

33 But much was probably traditional, if we compare the brief remarks in e.g. Cic. Ad Fam. 2.4.1, Quint. 9.4.19, Theon, RG 2.115. See H. Koskenniemi, Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr., Helsinki 1956; K. Thraede, Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik, Munich 1970.

34 But not the softer emotions of pity and lament, cf. §28, and Russell (ed. 1964) on Longinus 8.2.
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counterpart. This is a familiar theory, e.g. Ad Herennium 4.10.15–11.16 and Longinus 3–5. Yet despite their traditional nature, Demetrius' faulty styles are not entirely convincing. The affected and unpleasant styles seem an agglomerate of points derived from their correct styles, and though the frigid and arid styles have more unity, they complement each other rather than their corresponding correct style. The arid style is a great theme given trivial language, the frigid style a trivial theme given rich language (§§ 114, 119, and 237). The arid style is also not a fault of excess like the other faults—we should expect something like the excessively plain style of the bathhouse quarrel in Ad Herennium 4.10.16. It is then an attractive deduction that there were originally faults for only the grand and plain styles, and that the nature of the arid style in Demetrius reflects an earlier stage when good style was a Peripatetic mean located between faults of excess and deficiency (ὑπερβολή and ἐλλευψις), frigidity and aridity.\(^\text{35}\)

Text and manuscripts

The text is based on Parisinus gr. 1741 (P), a manuscript of the tenth century which is of great importance for other texts, including Aristotle's Poetics.\(^\text{36}\) Corrections in

\(^{35}\) Compare Aristotle's ethical theory of μεγαλουχία as a mean between χαννότης and μικρουχία (Eth. Nic. 1125a17–18), and see Russell (ed. 1964) on Longinus 3.4. Use of the term ψυχρός may itself suggest Peripatetic influence since the usual term is the swollen, τὸ ὀίδον, "tumidus," "sufflatus."
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a later hand (P²) seem to show in at least some cases access to a second (lost) manuscript. There are a further forty-four manuscripts, some of them fragmentary, but virtually all derive from P, and where the reading in P is not followed, the apparatus criticus reports significant differences.

For the very beginning, §§ 1–3 μέν, two manuscripts of the fourteenth century, Matritensis 4684 (H) and Neapolitanus II E 2 (N), give some readings independent of P. Closely resembling P is Marcianus gr. 508 (M), of ca. 1330–1380. Chiron argues that it is independent of P and cites its readings fully in his apparatus criticus. M offers various linguistically more “correct” readings (e.g. ἀποκατέστησεν and ἀνέμυησεν in §§ 196 and 298 eliminate the only two examples in P of the double augment), and it includes some more accurate and fuller versions of passages quoted (e.g. §§ 4, 21, 61, 199, and 250). Most strikingly, it adds one extra lengthy quotation, but, quite independently of the question of the relationship of M to P, this addition seems to derive from a scribal marginal annotation (see note on § 53). In various places M seems to aim to improve the faulty text in P (not always successfully, e.g. § 287 διαπλεύσαντας <ίδειν>), and I suspect M is ultimately an idiosyncratic descendant of P.

37 Radermacher, pp. vff.
38 Chiron, p. cviii.
40 This is also the view of H. Gärtner and R. Kassel (private correspondence). For M as a copy of P for the text of Dionysius
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quent to the corrections in P² (examples of readings shared with P²: §§ 28, 66, 89, 122, 194, 229, 237, 288, and 291). In the *apparatus criticus* I give some of the more interesting readings, and I also give it precedence for readings accepted in the text but conjectured previously by various scholars. Collations of other manuscripts might well produce further conjectures or reattributions. ⁴¹

There is also a thirteenth-century medieval Latin translation (Lat.) published by Wall in 1937. ⁴² It is often more of a paraphrase, and it omits many passages, in particular the less usual material (especially all mention of the fourth style, since it conflicted with the medieval tradition of a theory of three styles; much of the discussion of wit; and poetic examples). It is close to P, but has a few “better” readings which may suggest independence (e.g. § 194).

Finally, in the indirect tradition, ⁴³ there are some sub-

---


⁴¹ H. Gärtner gives a few examples in “Demetriana Varia,” *Hermes* 118 (1990) 213–36. See especially p. 214, n. 6 (on conjectures wrongly attributed to Victorius); p. 216, n. 12 for Vaticanus gr. 1904, of the early fifteenth century and the oldest known descendant of P; and p. 221, n. 29 for Dresdensis Da 4, of the earlier fifteenth century.
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stantial quotations in the commentaries on Hermogenes by Gregory of Corinth (Greg.), Byzantine scholar of ca. 1070–1156. No excerpt is verbally exact, some are paraphrases, but their common archetype seems a close but independent relative of P.

SYNOPSIS

1–35: Sentence Structure
1–9: clause (kόlon)
  1–3: definition of clause
  4–8: length and use of clause
  9: definition of short clause or phrase (komma)
10–35: period and combinations of clauses
  10–11: definition of period
  12–15: periodic and unperiodic; origin and use
  16–18: length of period: number of clauses
  19–21: types of period: historical, dialogue, rhetorical
  22–29: periods with symmetrical clauses
    22–24: antithesis
    25–26: assonance
    27–29: their use
  31–33: period and enthyemene: the difference
  34–35: definition of clause in Aristotle and Archede-

mus

36–304: The Four Styles, χαρακτῆρες
Each is analysed under subject, diction and composi-
tion (πράγματα, λέξις, σύνθεσις), each with its
neighbouring faulty style.
36–37: introductory: the grand, elegant, plain, and
forceful styles
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38–127: the grand style, μεγαλοπρεπής
38–74: composition: series I
  38–43: rhythm
  44: length of clauses
  45–47: period
  48–49: cacophony
  50–52: word order
  53–58: connectives and particles
  59–67: figures
  68–74: hiatus
75–76: subjects: battles; earth and heaven
77–102: diction
  77: introduction
  78–90: metaphor and simile
  91–93: compounds
  94–98: neologisms: onomatopoeia and derivatives
  99–102: allegory
103–5: composition: series II
  103: brevity and repetition
  104: oblique construction
  105: cacophony
106–11: the epiphoneme (appendix I)
112–13: poetic words in prose (appendix II)
114–27: the frigid style, ψυχρός
  114: definition
  115: subjects
  116: diction
  117–18: composition
  119–23: propriety
  124–27: appendix on hyperbole
128–89: the elegant style, γλαφυρός
  128–35: introductory: the types of charm
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128–31: two types
132–35: two sources
136: introduction to the two sources (τοποι) of charm
137–55: diction/style
  137–41: composition: brevity, word order, figures
  142–45: single words: metaphor, compounds,
  idiosyncratic words and neologisms
  146–55: comparison, change of direction, allegory,
  the unexpected, assonance, innuendo
156–62: subjects: proverb, fable, groundless fear, com-
  parison, and hyperbole
163–72: comparison of laughter and charm
173–78: beautiful words
  176–78: digression on types of word in musical theory
179–85: elegant composition: rhythm, length of
  clauses, cacophony
186–89: the affected style, κακόζηλος
  subjects, diction, composition

190–239: the plain style, ἴσχυρος
  190: subjects
  191: diction: no metaphor, compounds or neologisms
192–203: clarity
204–8: composition
209–20: vividness
221–22: persuasiveness
223–35: the letter style (a mixed style): difference from
  dialogue, character of writer, brief and unperiodic
  composition, subjects, addressee
236–39: the arid style, ξηρός
  subjects, diction, composition; mixture of the arid
  and affected
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240–304: the forceful style, ἔνυσ
240: subjects
241–71: composition
241–52: series I: length of clauses, period,
cacophony, word order, frequency of period
253–58: series II: brevity, cacophony
259–62: digression on forceful wit of the Cynics
263–71: figures (series I): of speech, of thought
272–76: diction
272–74: metaphor and simile
275–76: compounds and matching words
277–301: appendices
277–81: figures (series II)
282–86: forceful wit of Demades
287–95: innuendo
296–98: styles of Aristippus, Xenophon, and
Socrates
299–301: composition: hiatus
302–4: the unpleasant style, ἀχροῦσ
subjects, composition, diction; link with frigid
style
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<table>
<thead>
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<th>Author</th>
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<tbody>
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<td>Sauppe</td>
<td><em>Oratorum Atticorum Fragmenta</em>, ed. H. Sauppe, Turici 1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVF</td>
<td><em>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</em>, ed. J. von Arnim, Leipzig 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGF</td>
<td><em>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</em>, ed. A. Nauck, 2d ed., Leipzig 1889</td>
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<td>Wehrli</td>
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</table>
ΠΕΡΙ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ
ΠΕΡΙ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ

(1) "Ωσπερ ἡ ποίησις διαιρεῖται τοῖς μέτροις, οἷον ἡμιμέτροις ἢ ἐξαμέτροις ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τὴν λογικὴν διαιρεῖ καὶ διακρίνει τὰ καλούμενα κῶλα, καθάπερ ἀναπαύοντα τὸν λέγοντά τε καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα¹ αὐτά, καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς ὀροίς ὀρίζοντα τὸν λόγον, ἐπεὶ τοι μακρὸς ἂν εἶναι καὶ ἄπειρος καὶ ἀτεχνώς πνίγων τὸν λέγοντα. (2) βουλευταὶ μέντοι διάνοιαν ἀπαρτίζεων τὰ κῶλα ταῦτα, ποτὲ μὲν ὀλην διάνοιαν, οἷον² ὡς Ἐκαταίως φησιν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς ἱστορίας, "Ἕκαταίος Μιλήσιος ὁδε μυθεῖται. συνείληπται γὰρ διάνοια τῷ κῶλῳ ὅλῳ ὅλη, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συγκαταλήγουσιν. ἔνιοτε μέντοι τὸ κῶλον ὀλην³ μὲν οὐ συμπεραιῶ τὰ διάνοιαν, μέρος δὲ ὅλης ὅλων ὡς γὰρ τῆς χειρὸς οὕσης ὅλου τοῦς μέρη αὐτῆς ὅλα ὅλης⁴ ἐστίν, οἷον δάκτυλον⁵ καὶ πῆχυς⁶ (ἰδίαν γὰρ περιγραφήν ἔχει τούτων τῶν

¹ λέγοντά τε καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα Finckh: λόγον τά τε καταλεγόμενα PNH.
² οἷον om. NH.
³ ὀλην P: ὅλου NH (totum Lat.).
⁴ ὅλης Hr.c.: ὅλη PNHac.
⁵ δάκτυλον PN (digiti Lat.): δάκτυλος H.
ON STYLE

(1) Just as poetry is organised by metres (such as half-lines,\textsuperscript{a} hexameters, and the like), so too prose\textsuperscript{b} is organised and divided by what are called clauses. Clauses give a sort of rest to both the speaker and what is actually being said; and they mark out its boundaries at frequent points, since it would otherwise continue at length without limit and simply run the speaker out of breath. (2) But the proper function of such clauses is to conclude a thought. Sometimes a clause is a complete thought, for example Hecataeus at the beginning of his History: “Hecataeus of Miletus speaks as follows.”\textsuperscript{c} Here a complete clause coincides with a complete thought and both end together. Sometimes, however, the clause marks off not a complete thought, but a complete part of one. For just as the arm\textsuperscript{d} is a whole, yet has parts such as fingers and forearm which are themselves each a whole, since

\textsuperscript{a} For half-lines cf. § 180, and see note on § 5 where a half-hexameter illustrates short metres.
\textsuperscript{b} More literally “prose expression,” implying formal prose. Elsewhere “style” most often translates ἐρμηνεία.
\textsuperscript{c} FGrHist 264 Hecataeus, F 1A (cf. § 12).
\textsuperscript{d} Since κόλον or clause is literally a limb of the body (cf. Latin membrum), comparisons from the body are common.

\textsuperscript{6} πήχυς H: πήχεις PN (cubiti Lat.).
Demetrius

μερών ἐκαστον, καὶ ἵδια μέρη), οὔτω καὶ διάνοιας1 τινὸς οὐσίς οὐσίς μεγάλης ἐμπεριλομβάνουτ' ἂν μέρη τινὰ αὐτῆς ὅλοκληρα ὀντα καὶ αὐτά. (3) ὀσπερ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς Ἀναβάσεως τῆς2 Ξενοφόντος τὸ τοιοῦτον, "Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος" μέχρι τοῦ "νεώτερος δὲ Κύρος," συντελεσμένη πάσα διάνοια ἐστιν' τὰ δ' ἐν αὐτῇ κόλα δύο μέρη μὲν αὐτῆς ἐκάτερον ἐστι, διάνοια δὲ ἐν ἐκατέρω πληροῦται τις,3 ίδιον ἤχουσα πέρας, οὗν "Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίνονται παῖδες."4 ἔχει γὰρ τινὰ ὅλοκληρίαν ἡ διάνοια αὐτὴ καθ' αὐτήν, ὃτι ἐγένοντο Δαρείῳ καὶ Παρυσάτιδι παῖδες. καὶ5 ὁσαύτως τὸ ἔτερον κόλων, ὃτι "πρεσβύτερος μὲν6 Ἀρταξέρξης, νεώτερος δὲ Κύρος." ὡστε τὸ μὲν κόλων, ὃς φημί, διάνοιαν περεξεῖ τινὰ πάντη πάντως, ἢτοι ὅλην ἡ μέρος ὅλης ὅλου.

(4) Δεὶ δὲ οὔτε πάνυ μακρὰ ποιεῖν τὰ κόλα, ἔπει τοι γίνεται ἀμετρος ἡ σύνθεσις ἡ δυσπαρακολούθητος· οὔδὲ γὰρ ἡ ποιητικὴ ὑπὲρ ἐξαμετρον ἂλθεν, εἰ μή ποι ἐν ὅλοις· γελοίον γὰρ τὸ μέτρον ἀμετρον εἶναι, καὶ καταλήγουντος τοῦ μέτρου ἐπιλελήσθαι ἡμᾶς πότε ἡρξατο. οὔτε δὴ7 τὸ μῆκος τῶν κόλων πρέπον τοῖς λόγοις διὰ τῆς ἁμετρίαν, οὔτε ἡ μικρότης, ἐπεί τοι γίνοιτ' ἂν ἡ λεγομένη ἕχρα σύνθεσις, οἶον η τοιάδε "ὁ βίος βραχύς, ἡ τέχνη μακρά, ὁ

ON STYLE 2–4

each of these has its own shape and indeed its own parts,\textsuperscript{a} so too a complete thought, when it is extensive, may subsume within it parts which are themselves whole, (3) as at the beginning of Xenophon's *Anabasis* in the words “Darius and Parysatis” down to “the younger Cyrus.”\textsuperscript{b} This is a fully completed thought, yet it contains two clauses, each is a part of it, and in each part a thought is completed within its own limits. Take the words “Darius and Parysatis had sons”: the thought that Darius and Parysatis had sons has its own completeness. In the same way the second clause has the complete thought, “the elder was Artaxerxes, the younger Cyrus.” So a clause will, I maintain, in all cases and circumstances form a thought, either a complete one or a complete part of a whole one.

(4) You should not produce very long clauses; otherwise the composition has no limits\textsuperscript{c} and is hard to follow. Even poetry only rarely goes beyond the length of the hexameter, since it would be absurd if metre had no limits, and by the end of the line we had forgotten when it began. But if long clauses are out of place in prose because they have no limit, so too are brief clauses, since their use would produce what is called arid composition, as in the words “life is short, art long, opportunity

\textsuperscript{a} I.e. sub-parts, such as fingernails, cf. Quint. 7.10.7. Clauses may similarly contain sub-clauses or phrases, as in the bipartite second clause of the Xenophon example in § 3.

\textsuperscript{b} Xen. *Anab.* 1.1 (cf. § 19).

\textsuperscript{c} The Greek is more pointed, since *metron*/metre means also limit or measure.
καιρὸς ὃς ὐς.

1 κατακεκομμένη γὰρ ἐοίκεν ἡ σύνθεσις καὶ κεκερματισμένη, καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος διὰ τὸ μικρὰ σύμπαντα ἐχεῖν. (5) γίνεται μὲν οὖν ποτε καὶ μακρὸν κόλου καιρὸς, οἶον ἐν τοῖς μεγέθεσιν, ός ὁ Πλάτων φησί, "τὸ γὰρ δὴ πάν τόδε τοτὲ μὲν2 αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς πορευόμενον συμποδηγεῖ3 καὶ συγκυκλεῖ." σχεδὸν γὰρ τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ κόλου συνεξήρται καὶ ὁ λόγος. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ <τὸ>4 ἔξεκμετρσ εἰρήν τε ὑνομάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ μήκους καὶ πρέπον ἤρωσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἀν τὴν Ὁμήρου Ἰλιάδα πρεπόντως τις γράψεις5 τοῖς Ἀρχιλόχου βραχέσιν, οἶον "ἀχινημένη σκυτάλη" καὶ "τὶς σᾶς παρήερε φρένας," οὐδὲ τοῖς Ἀνακρέοντος, <ὡς>6 τὸ "φέρ' ὑδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον, ὁ παϊ"· μεθύοντος γὰρ ὁ ρυθμὸς ἀτεχνῶς γέρουντος, οὐ μαχομένον ἤρως.

(6) Μακρὸν μὲν δὴ κόλου καιρὸς γίνοιτ' ἀν ποτε διὰ ταῦτα· γίνοιτο δ' ἀν ποτε καὶ βραχέος, οἶον ἂτι μικρὸν τι ήμῶν λεγόντων, ός ὁ Ἐνοφών φησίν, ὦτι ἀφίκοντο οἱ Ἑλληνες ἐπὶ τὸν Τηλεβόαν ποταμόν· "οὔτος δὲ ἦν μέγας μὲν οὖ, καλὸς δὲ." τῇ γὰρ

---

1 ὡ δὲ πείρα σφαλερή add. M (cf. § 238).
2 τοτὲ μὲν codd. Plat.: τὸ μὲν P.
3 πορεύομενον συμποδηγεῖ codd. Plat.: πορεύομενος ποδηγεῖ P.
4 τὸ add. Radermacher.
5 γράψεις Victorius: scriberet Lat.: γράψει ἐν P.
6 ὡς add. Roberts.
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fleeting.” According to the composition here seems chopped up and minced fine, and it fails to impress because all its parts are minute. (5) Occasionally, however, a long clause is appropriate, for example in elevated passages, such as Plato’s sentence, “Sometimes God himself helps to escort and revolve this whole universe on its circling way.” The elevation of the language virtually corresponds to the size of the clause. That is why the hexameter is called heroic, because its length suits heroes. Homer’s Iliad could not be suitably written in the brief lines of Archilochus, for example “staff of grief” or “who stole away your mind?” nor in those of Anacreon, for example “bring water, bring wine, boy.” That is plainly the rhythm for a drunk old man, not for a hero in battle.

(6) Sometimes, then, a long clause may be appropriate for the reasons given, at other times a short one, for instance when our subject is small, as in Xenophon’s account of the Greeks’ arrival at the river Teleboas, “this river was not large, it was beautiful however.”

---

a Hippocr. Aphorism. 1.1. In § 238 the quotation continues with a further clause, which appears here in M but not P.

b Pl. Pol. 269c. c See on § 42.

d Archil. 185.2 West. The staff is the Spartan staff used for messages in cipher, and the phrase became proverbial for a message of grief, e.g. Plu. Mor. 152e (cf. Paroem. Gr. ii.323). It is half a hexameter, and the other two examples are dimeters: short clauses or phrases are similarly like half-lines and less than a trimeter (§§ 1, 205).

e Archil. 172.2 West.

f PMG 396 Anacreon 51.1.

g Xen. Anab. 4.4.3 καλὸς µέν, µέγας δ' οὖ. Here and in § 121 Demetrius misquotes, but retains the abruptness.
DEMETRIUS

μικρότητη καὶ ἀποκοπῆ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ συνανεφάνη καὶ ἡ μικρότης τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ χάρις· εἰ δὲ οὕτως ἐκ-
tείνας αὐτὸ ἐίπεν, "οὕτως δὲ μεγέθει μὲν ἢν ἐλάττων
τῶν πολλῶν, κάλλει δὲ ὑπερεβάλλετο πάντας," τοῦ
πρέποντος ἀπετύγχανεν ἅν, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ λεγόμε-
νος ψυχρός· ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχρότητος μὲν ὑστερον
λεκτέον.

(7) Τῶν δὲ μικρῶν κόλων καὶ δεινότητι χρήσις
ἐστι· δεινότερον γὰρ τὸ ἐν ὁλίγῳ πολὺ ἐμφαινόμενον
καὶ σφοδρότερον, διὸ καὶ οἱ Δάκωνες βραχυλόγοι
ὑπὸ δεινότητος· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐπιτάσσειν σύντομον καὶ
βραχύ, καὶ πᾶς δεσπότης δούλῳ μονοσύλλαβος, τὸ
dὲ ἱκετεύειν μακρὸν καὶ τὸ ὀδύρεσθαι. <καὶ γὰρ>¹ αἱ
Λιται καθ’ Ὀμηρον καὶ χωλαὶ καὶ ῥυσαὶ ὑπὸ βρα-
dυπτήτως, τοιυτέστων ὑπὸ μακρολογίας, καὶ οἱ γερον-
tεσ μακρολόγου διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν. (8) παράδειγμα
dὲ βραχείας συνθέσεως τὸ "Δακεδαμώνιοι Φιλίππω-
Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ." πολὺ γὰρ δεινότερον φαίνε-

¹ καὶ γὰρ addidi (καὶ iam Richards).

---

a In §§ 114–27.
b §§ 241–42 repeat the same advice and the example in § 8.
For Spartan brevity cf. e.g. Hdt. 3.46.
c Strongly iambic, perhaps from comedy (Adesp. 538 Kock).
Later citation as a proverb derives from Demetrius (Paroem. Gr.
ii.606).
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broken rhythm brings into relief both the smallness of the river and its charm. If Xenophon had expanded the idea to say, "this river was in size inferior to most rivers, but in beauty it surpassed them all," he would have failed in propriety, and would have become what is called the frigid writer—but frigidity is to be discussed later.a

(7) Short clauses should also be used in forceful passages, b for there is a greater force and vehemence when a lot of meaning is packed into a few words. So it is because of this forcefulness that the Spartans are brief in speech. Commands too are always terse and brief, and every master is monosyllabic to his slave, c but supplication and lament are lengthy. For the Prayers in Homer d are represented as wrinkled and lame in allusion to their slowness—that is, their length in speech. Old men too speak at length, because they are weak. (8) Take this instance of brevity in composition, "The Spartans to Philip: Dionysius in Corinth." e These brief words have a

\[ \text{d Hom. II. 9.502–3:} \]
\[ \text{kai gar te Litoi eisi Diwos koýrai megálou,} \]
\[ \text{cholai te ñuai te parapálypeion t' ophthalýmō.} \]

Allegorical interpretation of the Prayers refers elsewhere to the physical appearance of suppliants, not their speech, e.g. Ps. Heraclitus, Hom. Alleg. 37. The sequence of examples suggests that Demetrius intends the aged Phoenix, whose long supplicant speech in Iliad 9 includes the Prayers passage.

\[ \text{e Cf. §§ 102, 241. It is a stock tag (e.g. Plu. Mor. 511e). The} \]
\[ \text{tyrant Dionysius was expelled in 344 B.C., and his retirement into} \]
\[ \text{private life in Corinth attracted apocryphal detail, such as the} \]
\[ \text{version in § 241 that poverty forced him to become a schoolmaster, cf. Ovid, Ex Pont. 4.3.39–40 (for an alternative motive, the} \]
\[ \text{wish to rule, see e.g. Cic. Ad Att. ix.9).} \]
ται ῥηθὲν οὕτω βραχέως, ἧ εἰπερ αὐτὸ μακρῶς ἐκτείναντες εἶπον, ὅτι ὁ Διονύσιος ποτε μέγας ὁν τύραννος ὡσπερ σὺ ὃμως νῦν ἰδιωτεύων οἰκεὶ Κόρινθον. οὐ γὰρ ἐτι διὰ πολλῶν ῥηθὲν ἐπιπλήξει ἐώκει ἀλλὰ διηγήματι, καὶ μᾶλλον τινι διδάσκοντι, οὐκ ἐκφοβοῦντι. οὕτως ἐκτεινόμενον ἐκλύεται τοῦ λόγου τη ἑθμίκων καὶ σφοδρῶν. ῥωσπερ <γαρ>1 τὰ θηρία συναίνεσαντα ἐαυτὰ μάχεται, τοιαύτῃ τις ἄν εἰς συνετρόφη καὶ λόγου καθάπερ ἔσπειραμένου πρὸς δεινότητα. (9) ἦ δὲ τοιαύτῃ βραχύτης κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν κόμμα ὄνομάζεται. ὀρίζονται δ’ αὐτὸ ὃδε, κόμμα ἐστὶν τὸ κόλον ἔλαττον, ὀδὸν τὸ προειρημένον, τὸ [τε]2 “Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ,” καὶ τὸ “γνώθι σεαυτόν,” καὶ τὸ “ἐπον θεῷ,” τὰ τῶν σοφῶν. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἀποφθεγματικὸν ἡ βραχύτης καὶ γνωμολογικὸν, καὶ σοφότερον τὸ ἐν ὅλῳ πολλὴν διάνοιαν ἦθροίζονται, καθάπερ εὖ τοῖς σπέρμασιν δένδρων ὅλων δυνάμεις, εἰ δ’ ἐκτείνοιτο τις τὴν γνώμην ἐν μακροῖς, διδασκαλία γίνεται τις καὶ ῥητορεία ἀντὶ γνώμης.

(10) Τῶν μέντοι κόλων καὶ κομμάτων τοιούτων συντεθεμένων πρὸς ἄλληλα συνιστάνται αἱ περίοδοι ὄνομαζόμεναι. ἔστιν γὰρ ἡ περίοδος σύστημα ἐκ κόλων ἢ κομμάτων εὐκαταστρόφωσ πρὸς τὴν διάνοια τὴν ὑποκειμένην ἀπηρτισμένου, ὁδὸν “μάλιστα

1 γαρ add. Markland.
2 τε del. Hahne.
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much more forceful impact than if the Spartans had expanded the sentence at great length to say “Although once a mighty tyrant like yourself, Dionysius now lives in Corinth as an ordinary citizen.” This lengthened version no longer seems a rebuke but a piece of narrative, and it suggests a wish to instruct rather than intimidate. With this expansion the passion and vehemence of the words are dissipated, and just as a wild beast gathers itself together for an attack, speech should similarly gather itself together as if in a coil to increase its force. (9) Such brevity in composition is called a phrase.\textsuperscript{a} A phrase is generally defined as “what is less than a clause,” for example the words already quoted, “Dionysius in Corinth,” and the sayings of the sages, “know yourself” and “follow God.”\textsuperscript{b} For brevity characterises proverbs and maxims; and the compression of a lot of meaning into a small space shows more skill, just as seeds contain the potential for whole trees. Expand a maxim at great length and it becomes a piece of instruction or rhetoric.

(10) From the combination of such clauses and phrases are formed what are called periods. The period is a combination of clauses and phrases arranged to conclude the underlying thought with a well-turned ending. For example: “Chiefly because I thought it was in the

\textsuperscript{a} Literally a cut segment or chip (cf. Latin \emph{incisum}), the \emph{komma} or phrase is a short clause, independent, as here, or part of a complex (§ 10). On its length see note on § 5.

\textsuperscript{b} Cf. e.g. Cic. \emph{De Fin.} 3.73, Paroem. Gr. ii.19 and 40.
DEMETRIUS

μὲν εἶνεκα τοῦ νομίζεων συμφέρειν τῇ πόλει λελύ-σθαι τὸν νόμον, εἶτα καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς εἶνεκα τοῦ Χαβρίου, ὡμολόγησα τοῦτος, ὡς ἂν οἴος τε ἃ, συν-ερεῖν”. αὕτη γὰρ ἡ περίοδος ἑκ τριῶν κώλων οὖσα καμπήν τε τινα καὶ συτροφήν ἔχει κατὰ τὸ τέλος.

(11) Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ὀρίζεται τῇ περίοδον οὕτως, "περίοδός ἐστι λέξις ἄρχῇν ἔχουσα καὶ τελευτήν,” μάλα καλῶς καὶ πρεπόντως ὁρισάμενος· εὔθυς γὰρ ὁ τὴν περίοδον λέγων ἐμφαίνει, ὥστε ἢ ὅρκταί ποθὲν καὶ ἀποτελευτήσει ποι καὶ ἑπείγεται εἰς τι τέλος, ὥσπερ οἱ δρομεῖς ἀφεθέντες· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνων συνεμφαίνε- ται τῇ ἄρχῃ τοῦ δρόμου τὸ τέλος. ἐνθὲν καὶ περί-οδος ὁμομάσθη, ἀπεικασθεῖσα ταῖς ὀδοῖς ταῖς κυκλοειδέσι καὶ περιωδεμέναις. καὶ καθόλου οὐδὲν ἡ περίοδος ἐστι πλὴν ποιὰ σύνθεσις. εἰ γοῦν λυθεῖται αὐτὴς τὸ περιωδεμένου καὶ μετασυνθεθεῖ, τὰ μὲν πράγματα μένει τὰ αὐτὰ, περίοδος δὲ οὐκ ἔσται, οἷον εἰ τὴν προειρήμενην τίς τοῦ Δημοσθένους περί-οδον ἀναστρέφας ἐποίη ὃδε πως, “συνερῶ τούτους, ὦ ἄνδρες 'Ἀθηναῖοι' φίλοις γάρ μοइ ἔστων ὁ νῦς Χαβρίου, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τούτους ἡ πόλις, ἣ συνει-πεῖν με δίκαιον ἔστων.” οὔ γὰρ ἐτι οὐδαμοῦ ἡ περί-οδος εὐρίσκεται.

1 ἀποτελευτήσει ποι καὶ Η. Stephanus: ἀποτελευτήσαι ποιεῖ καὶ Ρ.
2 καὶ καθόλου Radermacher: καθόλου Ρ.
interest of the state for the law to be repealed, but also for
the sake of Chabrias’ boy, I have agreed to speak to the
best of my ability in their support.”\footnote{Dem. Lept. 1 (cf. §§ 11, 20, 245).}
This three-clause period has a sort of backward bend and compactness at
the end.\footnote{Ar. Rhet. 1409a35–b1.} Aristotle gives this definition of the period,
“a period is a portion of speech that has a beginning and
an end.”\footnote{Demetrias intends the diaulos, the two-lap race where the
runner ran back along the same or parallel track to the starting
point. The period is literally a path which goes round (cf. Latin
ambitus, circuitus), and so at its end returns us to its beginning,
just as the period bends back on itself by hyperbaton or the com-
pletion of some pattern such as antithesis. } His definition is excellent and apt.
For the very use of the word “period” implies that it has had a begin-
ning at one point, will end at another, and is speeding
towards a definite goal, like runners sprinting from the
starting place. For at the very beginning of their race the
end of the course is already before their eyes.\footnote{Cf. § 10.}
Hence the
name “period,” an image drawn from paths which go
round and are in a circle. In general terms, a period is
nothing more nor less than a particular arrangement of
words. If its circular form should be destroyed and the
arrangement changed, the subject matter remains the
same, but there will be no period. Suppose, for example,
you were to invert the period I have quoted from Demo-
thenes to say something like this, “I will speak in their
support, men of Athens. For Chabrias’ son is dear to me,
and much more so is the state, whose cause it is right for
me to support.”\footnote{No longer is there any trace of the
period.} No longer is there any trace of the
period.

\footnote{Demetrias intends the diaulos, the two-lap race where the
runner ran back along the same or parallel track to the starting
point. The period is literally a path which goes round (cf. Latin
ambitus, circuitus), and so at its end returns us to its beginning,
just as the period bends back on itself by hyperbaton or the com-
pletion of some pattern such as antithesis. }
DEMETRIUS

(12) Γένεσις δ’ αὐτῆς ἤδε τῆς ἔρμηνείας ἢ μὲν ὁνομάζεtau κατεστραμμένη, οἷον ἡ κατὰ περιόδους ἔχουσα, ὡς ἡ τῶν Ἰσοκρατείων ρητορεῖων1 καὶ Γοργίου καὶ Ἀλκιδάμαντος· ὅλαι γὰρ διὰ περιόδων εἰσὶν συνεχῶν οὐδὲν τι ἐλαττοῦν ἦπερ ἡ Ὄμηρον ποίησις δι’ ἐξαμέτρων· ἡ δὲ τις διηρημένη ἐρμηνεία καλεῖται, ἡ εἰς κῶλα λειλεμένη οὐ μάλα ἀλλήλοις συνηρτημένα, ὃς ἡ Ἐκαταιῶν καὶ τὰ πλείοτα τῶν Ἡροδότου καὶ ὅλως ἡ ἄρχαία πάσα. παράδειγμα αὐτῆς, "Ἐκαταιῶν Μιλήσιους ὁδὲ μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω, ὡς μοι δοκεῖ ἄληθεά εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοίοι, ὃς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν." ὥσπερ γὰρ σεσωρουμένους ἐπ’ ἀλλήλοις τὰ κόλα ἐοικεν καὶ ἐπερρυμένους καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν σύνδεσιν οὐδ’ ἀντέρεσιν, οὐδὲ βοηθοῦντα ἀλλήλοις ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις. (13) ἐοικε γοῦν τὰ μὲν περιοδικὰ κῶλα τοῖς λίθοις τοῖς ἀντερείδουσι τὰς περιφερεῖς στέγας καὶ συνέχουσι, τὰ δὲ τῆς διαλελυμένης ἐρμηνείας διερρυμένους πλησίον λίθους μονον καὶ οὐ συγκεκιμένους. (14) διὸ καὶ περιεξεσμένων ἔχει τι ἡ ἐρμηνεία ἡ πρῶς καὶ εὐσταλές, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄρχαία ἀγάλματα, ὥν τέχνη ἔδοκεν ἡ συντολή καὶ ἰσχύνη, ἡ δὲ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐρμηνεία τοῖς Φειδίου ἔργοις ἦδη ἐοικεν ἔχουσά τι καὶ μεγα-

1 ρητορεῖων Weil: ρητῶν Π.

---

1 The source is Aristotle (see Rhet. 1409a26ff), but the term
(12) The origin of the period is as follows. There are two types of style. The first is called the compact style,\(^b\) namely that which consists of periods, as in the rhetorical displays of Isocrates, Gorgias, and Alcidamas,\(^b\) where period succeeds period no less regularly than the hexameters in Homer’s poetry. The second style is called the disjointed style, since it is divided into clauses which are not closely attached to each other, as in Hecataeus, Herodotus for the most part, and the older writers in general. Here is an example: “Hecataeus of Miletus speaks as follows. I write these things as they seem to me to be true. For the stories told by the Greeks are, as it appears to me, many and absurd.”\(^c\) Here the clauses seem thrown one on top of the other in a heap without the connections or buttressing or mutual support which we find in periods. (13) The clauses in the periodic style may in fact be compared to the stones which support and hold together the roof which encircles them, and the clauses of the disjointed style to stones which are simply thrown about near one another and not built into a structure.\(^d\) (14) So the older style has something of the sharp, clean lines of early statues,\(^e\) where the skill was thought to lie in their succinctness and spareness, and the style of those who followed is like the works of Phidias, since it already to

for the nonperiodic style, the “disjointed,” seems a confused memory of *Rhet*. 1409b32 where it refers to the nonantithetical form of period.

\(^b\) For Alcidamas, pupil of Gorgias, cf. § 116.
\(^c\) FGrHist 264 Hecataeus F 1A (cf. § 2).
\(^d\) A traditional comparison, cf. DH. CV 22.
\(^e\) For comparisons to the parallel development of style and sculpture, cf. DH. *Isoc.* 3, Quint. 12.10.7–9.
λείον καὶ ἀκριβές ἀμα. (15) δοκιμάζω γὰρ δὴ ἐγώγε μῆτε περιόδοις ὅλον τὸν λόγον συνείρεσθαι, ὡς ὁ Γοργίον, μῆτε διαλεύσθαι ὅλον, ὡς τὰ ἀρχαῖα, ἀλλὰ μεμίχθαι μᾶλλον δι’ ἀμφοτέρων οὗτο γὰρ καὶ ἐγκατάσκευος ἔσται καὶ ἀπλοῦς ἀμα, καὶ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἡδύς, καὶ οὔτε μάλα ἱδωτικὸς οὔτε μάλα σοφιστικός. τῶν δὲ¹ τὰς πυκνὰς περιόδους λεγόντων οὐδ’ αἱ κεφαλαὶ βαδίως ἐστᾶσιν, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν οἰνωμένων, οἱ τε ἀκούοντες ναυτῶσι διὰ τὸ ἀπίθανον, τοτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐκφωνοῦσι τὰ τέλη τῶν περιόδων προειδότες καὶ προαναβοῦσι.

(16) Τῶν δὲ περιόδων αἱ μικρότεραι μὲν ἐκ δυνών κῶλου συντίθενται, αἱ μέγισται δὲ ἐκ τεττάρων· τὸ δ’ ύπὲρ τέτταρα οὐκέτ’ ἂν ἐντὸς εἰς περιοδικὴς συμμετρίας. (17) γίνονται δὲ καὶ τρίκωλοι τινες· καὶ μονόκωλοι δὲ, ἄς καλοῦσιν ἀπλὰς περιόδους. ὅταν γὰρ τὸ κῶλον μῆκὸς τε ἐχ’ καὶ καμπῆν κατὰ τὸ τέλος, τότε μονόκωλος περίοδος γίνεται, καθάπερ ἡ τοιάδε, “...” Ηροδότου Ἀλικαρνασῆς ἱστορίης ἀπόθεξις ἢδε”· καὶ πάλιν, “...” ἢ γὰρ σαφῆς φράσις πολὺ φῶς παρέχεται ταῖς τῶν ἀκούοντων διανοίασι.” ὑπ’ ἀμφοῖν μέντοι συνιστάται ἡ ἀπλὴ περιόδος, καὶ ύπό τοῦ μῆκους καὶ ύπό τῆς καμπῆς τῆς περὶ τὸ τέλος, ύπὸ δὲ θατέρου οὐδὲ ποτε. (18) ἐν δὲ ταῖς συνθέτους περιόδους τὸ τελευταῖον κῶλον μακρότερον χρὴ εἶναι, καὶ ὡσπερ περιέχον καὶ περιειληφός τάλλα. οὕτω γὰρ μεγαλοπρεπὴς ἔσται καὶ σεμνὴ περιόδος,
some degree unites grandeur and finish. (15) My own personal view is that speech should neither, like that of Gorgias, consist wholly of a series of periods, nor be wholly disconnected like the older style, but should rather combine the two methods. It will then be simultaneously elaborate and simple, and draw charm from the presence of both, being neither too ordinary nor too artificial. Those who crowd periods together are as light-headed as those who are drunk, and their listeners are nauseated by the implausibility; and sometimes they even foresee and, loudly declaiming, shout out in advance the endings of the periods.

(16) The smaller periods consist of two clauses, the largest of four. Anything beyond four would transgress the boundaries for a period. (17) There are also periods of three clauses, and others of one clause, which are called simple periods. Any clause which has length and also bends back at the end forms the one-clause period, as in this example, “The History of Herodotus of Halicarnassus is here set out,”² and again “Clear expression sheds much light on the listeners’ thoughts.”³ For the simple period these are the two essentials, the length of the clause and the bending back at the end. In the absence of either there is no period. (18) In compound periods the last clause should be longer than the rest, and should as it were contain and envelop them all. This is how a period

---

¹ Hdt. 1.1 (cf. § 44).
² Author unknown. The “bend” is probably the completion of the antithesis of word and thought provided by the first and last word-groups.
³ óē Schneider: τε Π.
ΔΕΜΕΤΡΙΟΣ

εἰς σεμνὸν καὶ μακρὸν λήγουσα κῶλον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀποκεκομμένη καὶ χωλή ὀμοίᾳ. παράδειγμα δ᾿ αὐτῆς τὸ τοιοῦτον, "οὐ γὰρ τὸ εἰπεῖν καλῶς καλὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἰπόντα δρᾶσαι τὰ εἰρήμενα."

(19) Τρία δὲ γένη περιόδων ἔστιν, ἱστορικὴ, διαλογικὴ, ῥητορικὴ. ἱστορικὴ μὲν ἡ μὴτε περιηγμένη μὴτ ἀνειμένη σφόδρα, ἀλλὰ μεταξὺ ἄμφοτον, ώσ μὴτε ῥητορικὴ δόξειν καὶ ἀπίθανος διὰ τὴν περιαγωγὴν, τὸ σεμνὸν τε ἤχουσα καὶ ἱστορικόν ἐκ τῆς ἀπλότητος, οἷον ἡ τοιάδε, "Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίγνονται" μέχρι τοῦ "νεώτερος δὲ Κῦρος." ἔδραία γὰρ τινι καὶ ἁσφαλεῖ καταλήξει ἐσφεκν αὐτῆς ἡ ἀπόθεσις. (20) τῆς δὲ ῥητορικῆς περιόδου συνεστραμμένον τὸ ἔδος καὶ κυκλικὸν καὶ δεόμενον στρογγύλου στόματος καὶ χειρὸς συμπεριαγομένης τῷ ῥυθμῷ, οἷον τῆς "μάλιστα μὲν εἶνεκα τοῦ νομίζειν συμφέρειν τῇ πόλει λελύσθαι τὸν νόμον, εἶτα καὶ τοῦ παιδός εἶνεκα τοῦ Χαβρίου, ὁμολογησά τούτος, ώς ἂν οἶδο τῇ ὅ συνερεῖν." σχεδὸν γὰρ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡ περιόδος ἡ τοιάδε συνεστραμμένον τι ἔχει καὶ ἐμφαίνων ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἀπολῆξειν εἰς ἀπλοῖν τέλος. (21) διαλογικὴ δὲ ἐστὶ περιόδος ἡ ἐτὶ <μᾶλλον>¹ ἀνειμένη καὶ ἀπλουστέρα τῆς ἱστορικῆς,² καὶ μόλις ἐμφαίνουσα, ὅτι περιόδος ἐστιν, ὡσπερ ἡ τοιάδε, "κατέβην χθές εἰς [τὸν]³ Πειραιᾶ"

¹ μᾶλλον add. Goeller.
² ἱστορικῆς Victorius: ῥητορικῆς P.
will be imposing and impressive, if it ends on an imposing, long clause; otherwise it will break off abruptly and seem to limp. Here is an example: "For it is not to speak nobly that is noble, but after speaking to perform what has been spoken."a

(19) There are three kinds of period, the historical, the dialogue, and the rhetorical. The historical period should be neither too carefully rounded nor too loose, but between the two, in such a way that it is not thought rhetorical and unconvincing because of its rounding, but has the dignity and aptness for history from its simplicity, as in the period "Darius and Parysatis" down to "the younger Cyrus."b Its closing words resemble a firm and securely based ending. (20) The form of the rhetorical period is compact and circular; and it needs a well-rounded mouth and hand gestures to follow each movement of the rhythm. For example: "Chiefly because I thought it was in the interest of the state for the law to be repealed, but also for the sake of Chabrias’ boy, I have agreed to speak to the best of my ability in their support."c Almost right from the very beginning such a period has compactness, and shows that it will not stop on a simple ending. (21) The dialogue period is one which is still looser and simpler than the historical period, and scarcely shows that it is a period. For instance: "I went down yesterday to Piraeus" as far as the words "since they

---

a Author unknown.
b Xen. Anab. 1.1 (cf. § 3).
μέχρι τοῦ "ἀτε νῦν πρῶτον ἁγοντες." ἐπέρρυπται γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὰ κώλα ἐφ' ἐτέρφι ἐτερον, ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς διαλελυμένοις λόγοις, καὶ ἀποληξάντες μόλις ἀν ἐννοηθεῖμεν2 κατὰ τὸ τέλος, ὡτὶ τὸ λεγόμενον περίοδος ἦν. δει γὰρ μεταξὺ διηρημένης τε καὶ κατεστραμμένης λέξεως τὴν διαλογικὴν περίοδον γράφεσθαι, καὶ μεμιγμένην ὀμοίαν ἀμφοτέρους. περίοδων μὲν εἴδη τοσάδε.

(22) Γίνονται δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἀντικειμένων κῶλων περίοδοι, ἀντικειμένων δὲ ἦτοι τοῖς πράγμασιν, οἷον "πλέον μὲν διὰ τῆς ἤπειρον, πεζεύων,"3 δὲ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης," ἡ ἀμφοτέροις, τῆς τε λέξει καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὡσπερ ἡ αὐτὴ περίοδος ὥδε ἐχει. (23) κατὰ δὲ τὰ ὄνοματα μόνον ἀντικείμενα κώλα τοιάδε ἐστὶν, οἷον ὡς ὁ τῆς Ἑλένην παραβαλῶν τῷ Ἡρακλεί φησιν, ὡτὶ "τοῦ4 μὲν ἐπίπονον καὶ πολυκύνδυνον τὸν βίον ἐποίησεν, τῆς δὲ περίβλεπτον καὶ περιμάχητον τὴν φύσιν κατέστησεν." ἀντίκειται γὰρ καὶ ἄρθρον ἄρθρῳ, καὶ σύνδεσμος συνδέσμῳ, ὀμοία ὀμοίως, καὶ τάλλα δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, τῷ μὲν ἐποίησεν" τὸ "κατέστησεν," τῷ δὲ "ἐπίπονον" τὸ "περίβλεπτον," τῷ δὲ "πολυκύνδυνον" τὸ "περιμάχητον," καὶ ὀλος ἐν πρὸς ἐν, ὀμοίον παρ' ὀμοίον, ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις. (24) ἐστὶ δὲ κώλα, ἢ μὴ ἀντικείμενα

1 ἐτέρφ εδδ.: ἐκατέρω P.
2 ἐννοηθείμεν Spengel: ἐννοηθόμεν P.
3 πλεύσαι . . . πεζεύσαι codd. Isoc.
were now celebrating it for the first time.”\textsuperscript{a} The clauses are flung one on top of the other, as in the disjointed style, and when we reach the end we can hardly realise that the words formed a period. For the dialogue period should be a form of writing midway between the disconnected and the compact style, compounded of both and resembling both. This concludes my account of the different kinds of period.

(22) Periods are also formed from antithetical clauses. The antithesis may lie in the content, for example “sailing across the mainland and marching across the sea,”\textsuperscript{b} or it may be twofold, in content and language, as in this same period. (23) There are also clauses which have only verbal antithesis, as in the comparison drawn between Heracles and Helen, “The man’s life he created for labours and dangers, the woman’s beauty he formed for admiration and strife.”\textsuperscript{c} Here article is in antithesis to article, connective to connective, like to like, everything in parallel, “formed” to “created,” “admiration” to “labours,” and “strife” to “dangers.” There is correspondence throughout each detail, like with like. (24) There are some

\textsuperscript{a} Pl. Rep. 327a (cf. §§ 205–6): κατέβην χθές εἰς Πειραιά μετὰ Γλαυκώνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος προσευξόμενός τε τῇ θεῷ καὶ ἀμα τὴν ἕορτην βουλόμενος θεάσασθαι τίνα τρόπον πούσσουσιν ἀπε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες. The last three verbs all take the same object, returning us to the festival (all underlined).

\textsuperscript{b} Isoc. Panegyr: 89. Xerxes bridges the Hellespont and digs a canal through Mount Athos.

\textsuperscript{c} Isoc. Helen 17.

\textsuperscript{4} τοῦ scripsi, cum codd. Isoc.: τῷ P.
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ἐμφαίνει τινὰ ἀντίθεσιν διὰ τὸ τῷ σχήματι ἀντιθέτως γεγράφθαι, καθάπερ τὸ παρ’ Ἐπιχάρμῳ τῷ ποιητῷ πεπαιγμένον, ὅτι “τόκα μὲν ἐν τίνοις ἐγών ἢν, τόκα δὲ παρὰ τίνοις ἐγών.” τὸ αὐτὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐξερευνάτοι, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐναντίον ὦ δὲ τρόπος τῆς ἐρμηνείας μεμημημένοςBLEK ANTISHEV IN TINNA PLANOYTI EIOKEVN. ἀλλ’ οὕτως μὲν ᾧ ἵσως γελωτοποιῶν οὕτως ἀντέθηκεν, καὶ ἀμα σκώπτων τοὺς ὑπότζας.


1 μεμημημένος Muretus: μεμημημένος Ρ.
2 ἦτοι Lockwood: δὴ Ρ.
3 τὲ M, Thuc.: το (sic) P. 4 ταύτα P: corr. edd.
5 ἀποθανόντα Orth (cf. § 211): θανόντα P: omittitur apud Ar. Rhet. 1410a34–35.
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clauses which are not really antithetical but suggest an antithesis because of the antithetical form in which they are written, like the playful joke in the poet Epicharmus, “at one time I was among them, at another time with them.”\(^a\) The same idea is repeated, and there is no contrast. But the stylistic manner, with its imitation of an antithesis, suggests an intent to deceive. Epicharmus probably used the antithesis to raise a laugh, and also to mock the rhetoricians.

(25) There are also clauses with assonance. The assonance is either at the beginning, for example “giving gifts could win them, making pleas could move them,”\(^b\) or at the end, as in the opening passage of the Panegyric: “I have often wondered at those who convened the assemblies and instituted the athletic contests.”\(^c\) Another form of assonance is the isocolon, which is when the clauses have an equal number of syllables, as in this sentence of Thucydides: “since neither do those who are questioned disown the deed, nor do those who are concerned to know censure it.”\(^d\) This then is isocolon. (26) Homoeoteleuton is when clauses end similarly, either with the same word, as in the sentence, “you are the man who when he was alive spoke to his discredit, and now that he is dead write to his discredit,”\(^e\) or with the same syllable, as in the passage I have already quoted from Isocrates’ Panegyric.

\(^a\) Epicharmus 147 Kaibel, an unusual example, deriving from Ar. Rhet. 1410b3–5. Aristotle strongly influences both theory and examples in §§ 22–26.

\(^b\) Hom. Il. 9.526, with assonance of -rêtoi.

\(^c\) Isoc. Panegyr. 1, with assonance of -ontôn/-antôn.

\(^d\) Th. 1.5.2.

\(^e\) Author unknown (cf. § 211, Ar. Rhet. 1410a34–35).
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(27) Χρήσις δὲ τῶν τοιούτων κόλων ἐπισφαλῆς. οὔτε γὰρ δεινῶς λέγοντι ἐπιτήδεια: ἐκλύει γὰρ τὴν
dεινότητα ή περὶ αὐτὰ τερθείᾳ καὶ φροντίς. δήλου
d’ ἡμῖν τούτῳ ποιεῖ Θεόπομπος. κατηγορῶν γὰρ τῶν
Φιλίππου φίλων φησίν, „ἀνδροφόνοι δὲ τὴν φύσιν
ὀντες, ἀνδροπόρους τὸν τρόπον ἦσαν· καὶ ἐκαλοῦντο
μὲν ἔταιροι, ἦσαν δὲ ἔταιραι.” ή γὰρ ὀμοίότης ἡ
περὶ τὰ κώλα καὶ ἀντίθεσις ἐκλύει τὴν δεινότητα διὰ
tὴν κακοτεχνίαν. θυμὸς γὰρ τέχνης οὐ δεῖται, ἀλλὰ
dεὶ τρόπον τιμὰ αὐτοφυὰ εἶναι ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων
cατηγορῶν καὶ ἀπλὰ τὰ λεγόμενα. (28) οὔτε δήτα ἐν
dεινότητι χρήσιμα τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὡς ἐδείξα,1 οὔτε ἐν
πάθεσι καὶ ἠθεσὶν ἀπλοῦν γὰρ εἶναι βούλεται καὶ
ἀποίητον τὸ πάθος, ὀμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ ἡθος. ἐν γοῦν
tοῖς Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ δικαιοσύνης ὁ τὴν Ἀθη-
nαίων πόλιν ὀδυρόμενος εἰ μὲν οὔτως εἴποι ὃτι
„ποιὰν τοιαύτην πόλιν εἶλον τῶν ἐχθρῶν, οὐαν τὴν
ἰδίαν πόλιν ἀπώλεσαν,” ἐμπαθῶς ἀν εἰρηκώς εἴη καὶ
ὀδυρτικῶς· εἰ δὲ παρόμοιον αὐτὸ ποιῆσι: „ποιὰν
gὰρ πόλιν τῶν ἐχθρῶν τοιαύτην ἔλαβον, ὁποίαν τὴν
ἰδίαν ἀπέβαλον,” οὐ μὰ τὸν Δία πάθος κυνῆσαι οὐδὲ
ἐλεον, ἀλλὰ τὸν καλούμενον κλαυστιγέλωτα. τὸ γὰρ
ἐν πενθοῦσι παίζειν, κατὰ τὴν παρομίαν, τὸ τὰ τοι-
αὐτὰ ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι κακοτεχνεῖν ἔστι. (29) γίνεται
μὲντοι γε χρήσιμα ποτε, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλεσις φησίν,
„ἐγὼ ἐκ μὲν Ἀθηνῶν εἰς Στάγειρα ἠλθον διὰ

1 ὡς ἐδείξα P² in mg.: om. P¹.
(27) The use of such clauses is full of risk. They do not suit the forceful speaker, since their studied artifice dissipates the force. Theopompus proves our point in his invective against the friends of Philip when he says, "men-slayers by nature, they were men-harlots in behaviour; they were called companions but were concubines."\textsuperscript{a} The assonance and antithesis of the clauses dissipate the force by their artificiality. For anger needs no artifice; in such invectives what is said should be, in a way, spontaneous and simple. (28) Such clauses are of no use for force, as I have shown, nor yet for the expression of emotion or character. For emotion is properly simple and unforced, and the same is true of character. In Aristotle's dialogue \textit{On Justice}, for instance, a speaker weeps for the city of Athens. If he were to say, "what city had they taken from their enemies as great as their own city which they had lost,"\textsuperscript{b} he would have spoken with emotion and grief; but if he creates assonance, "what city from their enemies had they taken as great as their own city which they had forsaken," he will certainly not evoke emotion or pity, but rather the so-called "tears of laughter."\textsuperscript{c} For artificiality of this kind in emotional contexts is no better than the proverbial "fun at a funeral." (29) Assonance is however sometimes useful, as in the following passage of Aristotle: "I went from Athens to

\textsuperscript{a} FGrHist 185 Theopompus F 225(c) (cf. §§ 247, 250).
\textsuperscript{b} Ar.fr. 82 Rose.
\textsuperscript{c} Xen. \textit{Hell.} 7.2.9. Demetrius' glossing proverb is otherwise unknown.
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tòn βασιλέα τὸν μέγαν, ἐκ δὲ Σταυρείρων εἰς Ἀθῆνας διὰ τὸν χειμώνα τὸν μέγαν"· εἰ γοῦν ἀφέλοις τὸ ἐτερον "μέγαν,"¹ συναφαιρήσῃ καὶ τὴν χάριν· τῇ δὲ² μεγαληγορία συνεργοὶ ἂν³ τὰ τοιαῦτα κὼλα, ὁποῖα τῶν Γοργίου τὰ πολλὰ ἀντίθετα καὶ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους· περὶ μὲν δὴ τῶν παρομοίων ταῦτα.

(30) Διαφέρει δὲ ἐνθύμημα περιόδου τῇδε, ὅτι ἡ μὲν περίοδος σύνθεσις τῆς ἐστὶ περιγραμένη, ἀφ' ἢς καὶ ἀνόμασται, τὸ δὲ ἐνθύμημα ἐν τῷ διανοήματι ἔχει τὴν δύναμιν καὶ σύστασιν· καὶ ἔστων ἡ μὲν περίοδος κύκλος τοῦ ἐνθυμήματος, ὡσπερ καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν πραγμάτων, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα διάνοια τῆς ἦτοι ἐκ μάχης λεγομένη <ἡ>⁴ ἐν ἀκολουθίας σχῆματι.

(31) σημεῖον δὲ· εἰ γὰρ διαλύσεις τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ ἐνθυμήματος, τὴν μὲν περίοδον ἡφάνισα, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα ταῦτα μὲνει, ὅιον εἰ τις τὸ παρὰ Δημοσθένει διαλύσειν ἐνθύμημα τὸ τοιοῦτον, "ὡσπερ γὰρ εἰ τις ἐκείνων ἐάλω, σὺ τάδ' οὔκ ἂν ἔγραψα· οὕτως ἂν σὺ νῦν ἀλῆς, ἀλλος οὐ γράψει"· διαλύσειν δὲ οὕτω· "μὴ ἐπιτρέπετε τοῖς τὰ παράνομα γράφουσιν· εἰ γὰρ ἐκωλύουστο, οὔκ ἂν νῦν οὕτως ταῦτα ἔγραφεν, οὐδ' ἐτερος ἐτι γράψει τούτον νῦν ἀλόντος;" ἐνταύθα τῆς περιόδου μὲν ὁ κύκλος ἐκλειπται, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα ἐν ταῦτα μένει. (32) καὶ καθόλου δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐνθύμημα συνλογισμὸς τῆς ἐστι

¹ τὸ ἐτερον μέγα P: corr. edd. ² δὲ Solmsen: γἀρ P. ³ συνεργοὶ αὖ Goeller: συνεργοῖεν P. ⁴ ἡ add. Finckh.
Stagira because of the great king, and from Stagira to Athens because of the great storm.”a If you take away the second “great,” you will at the same time take away the charm. Such clauses may also contribute towards an imposing grandeur, like the many antitheses of Gorgias and Isocrates. This concludes my discussion of assonance.

(30) The enthymeme differs from the period. The latter is a rounded structure (hence its name in fact), the former has its meaning and constitution in the thought. The period circumscribes the enthymeme in the same way as any other subject matter, the enthymeme is a thought, expressed either controversially or in the form of a logical consequence.b (31) In proof of this, if you were to break up the verbal structure of the enthymeme, you have got rid of the period but the enthymeme remains intact. Suppose, for instance, the following enthymeme in Demosthenes were broken up: “Just as you would not have made this proposal if any of them had been convicted, so if you are convicted now, no one will make it in future.”c Let it be broken up: “Show no leniency to those who make illegal proposals; for if they were regularly checked, the defendant would not be making these proposals now, nor will anyone make them in future if he is convicted now.” Here the rounded form of the period has been destroyed, but the enthymeme remains where it was. (32) In general, the enthymeme is a rhetorical syllogism, while the

a Ar. fr. 669 Rose = 14 Plezia (cf. § 154).

b For the two types of syllogism, refutation of an opponent and demonstration of a point off agreed premisses, see Ar. Rhet. 1396b23ff. The terminology is later, e.g. Quint. 5.10.2, RG 1.285 Sp–H.
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ρήτορικός, ἡ περίοδος δὲ συνλογίζεται μὲν οὐδέν, σύγκειται δὲ μόνον· καὶ περίοδος μὲν ἐν παντὶ μέρει τοῦ λόγου τίθεμεν, οἷον ἐν τοῖς προοιμίοις, ἐνθυμήματα δὲ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ· καὶ τὸ μὲν ὡσπερ ἐπιλέγεται, τὸ ἐνθύμημα, ἡ περίοδος δὲ αὐτόθεν λέγεται· καὶ τὸ μὲν οἷον συνλογισμὸς ἐστιν ἀτελής, ἡ δὲ ὁλος τι ὁλεῖς συνλογίζεται. (33) συμβεβήκε μὲν οὐν τῷ ἐνθυμήματι καὶ περιόδῳ εἶναι, διότι περιοδικῶς σύγκειται, περίοδος δ' οὐκ ἐστιν, ὡσπερ τῷ οἰκοδομούμενῳ συμβεβηκε μὲν καὶ λευκῷ εἶναι, ἀν λευκόν ἢ, τὸ οἰκοδομούμενον δ' οὐκ ἐστι λευκόν. περι μὲν δὴ διαφορὰς ἐνθυμήματος καὶ περιόδου εἰρηταί.

(34) Τὸ δὲ κώλον Ἀριστοτέλης οὖτος ὁρίζεται, "κώλον ἐστι τὸ ἔτερον μέρος περιόδου"· εἶτα ἐπιφέρει· "γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἀπλῆ περιόδος." οὖτως ὁρισάμενος, "τὸ ἔτερον μέρος," δικώλον ἐβούλετο εἶναι τὴν περιόδου δηλονότι. ὁ δ' Ἀρχέδημος, συναλαβὼν τὸν ὄρον τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τῷ ὄρῳ, σαφέστερον καὶ τελεώτερον οὖτως ὄριστο, "κώλον ἐστιν ἦτοι ἀπλῆ περιόδος, ἡ συνθέτου περιόδου μέρος." (35) τί μὲν οὖν ἀπλῆ περιόδος, εἰρηταί· συνθέτου δὲ φήμας αὐτὸ περιόδου μέρος, οὐ δυσὶ κώλοις τὴν περιόδον ὀρίζειν ἐοικεν ἀλλὰ καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσιν ἡμεῖς δὲ μέτρον μὲν περιόδου ἐκτεθείμεθα, νῦν δὲ περὶ τῶν χαρακτήρων τῆς ἑρμηνείας λέγομεν.¹

¹ λέγομεν P: corr. edd.
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period is not a form of reasoning but purely a combination of words. Moreover, we use periods in every part of a speech, for example in introductions, but we do not use enthymemes everywhere. The enthymeme is, as it were, added to the verbal form, the period is exclusively verbal. The former is a sort of imperfect syllogism, the latter is no syllogism at all, perfect or imperfect. (33) Sometimes the enthymeme has the accidental property of periodicity, because its construction is periodic, but it is not a period, just as a building, if it is white, has the accidental property of whiteness, but a building is not by definition white. This concludes my account of the difference between the enthymeme and the period.

(34) This is Aristotle's definition of the clause, "a clause is one of the two parts of a period." He then adds, "a period may also be simple."\(^a\) The reference in his definition to "one of the two parts" makes it clear that he preferred the period to have two clauses. Archedemus combines Aristotle's definition and its supplement, and produces his own clearer and fuller definition, "a clause is either a simple period or part of a compound period."\(^b\) (35) The simple period has already been described. In saying that a clause may be part of a compound period, he seems to limit the period not to two clauses but to three or more. We have now set out the limits of the period; let us now describe the types of style.

\(^a\) Ar. *Rhet.* 1409b16–17 (but his term for simple is ἀφελής).

\(^b\) Unknown, often identified with the second-century Stoic Archedemus of Tarsus (see SVF iii. Archedemus 7) or the rhetorician Archedemus of Quint. 3.6.31–33.
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(36) Εἰσὶ δὲ τέτταρες ὁ άπλοϊ χαρακτήρες, ἴσχυος, μεγαλουππηθής, γλαφυρός, δεινός, καὶ λοιπὸν οἱ ἐκ τούτων μιγνύμενοι. μίγνυται δὲ οὐ πάς παντὶ, ἀλλὰ ὁ γλαφυρὸς μὲν καὶ τῷ ἴσχυῳ καὶ τῷ μεγαλουππηθεῖ, καὶ ὁ δεινὸς δὲ ὁμοίως ἀμφοτέρους· μόνος δὲ ὁ μεγαλουππηθὴς τῷ ἴσχυῳ οὐ μίγνυται, ἀλλὰ ὅσπερ ἀνθέστατον καὶ ἀντίκεισθον ἐναντιωτάτῳ. διὸ δὴ καὶ μόνος δύο χαρακτήρας τινες ἀξιούσιν εἶναι τούτους, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς δύο μεταξὺ τούτων, τὸν μὲν γλαφυρὸν τῷ ἴσχυῳ προσνέμοντες μᾶλλον, τῷ δὲ μεγαλουππηθεῖ τὸν δεινὸν, ὡς τοῦ γλαφυροῦ μὲν μικρότητά τινα καὶ κυμβείαιν ἔχοντος, τοῦ δεινοῦ δὲ ὄγκον καὶ μέγεθος. (37) γελοῖος δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος λόγος. ὅρωμεν γὰρ πλῆν τῶν εἰρημένων χαρακτήρων ἐναντίων πάντας μιγνυμένους πᾶσιν, οἶνον τὰ Ὀμήρου τε ἔπη καὶ τοὺς Πλάτωνος λόγους καὶ Ξενοφῶντος καὶ Ἡροδότου καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πολλὴν μὲν μεγαλουππηθεῖαν καταμεμγμένην ἔχοντας, πολλὴν δὲ δεινότητα τε καὶ χάρων, ἄστε τὸ μὲν πλῆθος τῶν χαρακτήρων τοσοῦτον ἐν ἐν όσον λεικεῖται. ἐρμηνεία δὲ ἐκάστῳ πρέπουσα γένοιτ' ἃν τοιάδε τις:

(38) Ἀρξομαι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγαλουππηθοῦς, ὡς ἐνπερ νῦν λόγιον ὀνομάζουσιν. ἐν τρισὶ δὴ τὸ μεγαλουππηθὲς, διανοία, λέξει, τῷ συγκείσθαι προσφόρως. σύνθεσις δὲ μεγαλουππηθῆς, ὡς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης, ἡ παιωνική. παίωνος δὲ εἴδη δύο, τὸ μὲν προκαταρκτικὸν, οὗ ἄρχει μὲν μακρά, λήγουσι δὲ τρεῖς βραχείαι, οἶον τὸ τοιόνδε, "ἡξεῖτο δὲ," τὸ δὲ καταληκτι-
(36) There are four simple styles, the plain, the grand, the elegant, and the forceful. In addition there are their various combinations, though not every style can combine with every other. The elegant combines with the plain and the grand, and the forceful similarly with both. Only the grand and the plain cannot combine, but the pair stand, as it were, in polar opposition and conflict. For this reason some writers maintain that only these two styles exist, and the other two are subsumed within them; and instead they assimilate the elegant to the plain, and the forceful to the grand, as though the first contained something slight and refined, the second something massive and imposing. (37) Such a theory is absurd. We can see for ourselves that, with the exception I have mentioned of the two polar opposites, any style may combine with any other. In the poetry of Homer, for example, as well as in the prose of Plato, Xenophon, Herodotus, and many other authors, considerable grandeur is combined with considerable forcefulness and charm. Consequently the number of the styles is as I have already indicated. The form of expression appropriate to each will be as follows.

(38) I shall begin with grandeur, which men today identify with true eloquence. Grandeur has three aspects, thought, diction, and composition in the appropriate way. According to Aristotle\(^a\) composition with paean is grand. There are two kinds of paean, the initial paean, beginning with a long syllable and ending with three shorts (e.g. ἑρχατό de, “it originated”\(^b\)), and the final

\(^{a}\) Cf. Ar. Rhet. 1408b32ff.  \(^{b}\) Th. 2.48.1.

\(^{1}\) ἐν Ὀικιάρως: ἐν Ὀικιάρως.
\(^{2}\) εἰρητένων Victorius: ὑπηρέτενον P.
κὸν θατέρω ἀντίστροφον, οὐ τρεῖς μὲν βραχεῖας ἄρχουσιν, λήγει δὲ μία μακρά, ὡσπερ τὸ Ἐραβία." (39) δεὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς κῶλοις τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς λόγον τὸν προκαταρκτικὸν μὲν παύωνα ἄρχειν τῶν κῶλων, τὸν καταληκτικὸν δὲ ἔπεσθαι. παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτῶν τὸ Θουκυδίδεων τόδε, ἦρξάτο δὲ τὸ κάκον ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας." τί ποτ’ οὖν Ἀριστοτέλης οὕτω διετάξατο; ὅτι δεὶ καὶ τὴν ἐμβολὴν τοῦ κῶλου καὶ ἄρχην μεγαλοπρεπὴ εὐθὺς εἶναι καὶ <τὸ> τέλος, τούτῳ δ’ ἔσται, ἐὰν ἀπὸ μακρᾶς ἄρχωμεθα καὶ εἰς μακρὰν λήγωμεν. φύσει γὰρ μεγαλείων ἡ μακρά, καὶ προλεγομένη τε πλήσις εὐθὺς καὶ ἀπολήγουσα ἐν μεγάλῳ τυφί καταλείπει τὸν ἀκοῦστα. πάντες γοῦν ἰδίως τῶν τε πρῶτων μυθοεύρεμων καὶ τῶν ύπότων, καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων κυνούμεθα, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν μεταξὺ ἐλαττῶν ὡσπερ ἐγκρυπτομένων ἡ ἑναφανιζομένων. (40) δῆλον δὲ τούτῳ ἐν τοῖς Θουκυδίδου σχεδὸν γὰρ ὅλως τὸ μεγαλοπρέπεις ἐν πάσιν αὐτῷ ποιεῖ ἡ τοῦ ρυθμοῦ μακρότης, καὶ κυδυνεύει τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ παντοδαποῦ ὄντος τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς αὐτὴ ἡ σύνθεσις μόνη ἡ μάλιστα περιποιεῖ τὸ μέγιστον.

(41) Δεὶ μέντοι λογίζεσθαι, ὅτι κἂν μὴ ἀκριβῶς δυνώμεθα τοῖς κῶλοις περιτιθέναι τοὺς παῖωνας ἐνθὲν καὶ ἐνθὲν ἀμφοτέρους, παϊδικὴν γε πάντως ποιησόμεθα τὴν σύνθεσιν, οἴον ἐκ μακρῶν ἄρχομενοι καὶ εἰς μακρὰς καταλήγοντες. τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης παραγγέλλειν ἔσχεν, ἀλλὰς δὲ τὸ διττὸν τοῦ παῖωνος τετεχνολογηκέναι ἀκριβείας ἐνεκά.
paean, the converse of the other, beginning with three
shorts and ending with one long (e.g. Arabië). (39) In the
grand style the clauses should begin with an initial paean
and be followed by a final paean, as in this passage of
Thucydides, ἑρξατο δε to kakon ex Aithiopiâs ("Ethiopia
was where the evil originated")\textsuperscript{a}. Why then did Aristotle
give this advice? It was because the opening and begin-
nning of a clause should be instantly impressive, and so
should its close; and this will result if we begin with a long
syllable and end with a long syllable. For a long syllable
has in its very nature something grand, and its use at the
beginning is immediately striking, while as a conclusion it
leaves the listener with a sense of grandeur. Certainly we
all uniquely remember and are stirred by words which
come first and last, while those in the middle have less
impact, as though they were obscured or hidden among
the others. (40) This is clearly seen in the case of Thucy-
dides, whose verbal dignity is in every instance almost
entirely due to the long syllables in his rhythms. While he
has the full range of grandeur, it is perhaps this power of
organisation which alone or chiefly secures his greatest
grandeur.

(41) We must, however, bear in mind that even if we
cannot position the two paeans with precision at either
end of each clause, we can at least make the composition
roughly paeanic, by beginning and ending with long sylla-
bles. This seems to be what Aristotle recommends,\textsuperscript{b}
and it was only to be precise that he went into technical detail

\textsuperscript{a} Th. 2.48.1; "the evil" is the plague of 430 B.C.
\textsuperscript{b} Cf. Ar. Rhet. 1408b31.

\textsuperscript{1} τὸ M: om. P.
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dióper Θεόφραστος παράδειγμα ἐκτέθειται μεγαλο-
πρεπείας τὸ τοιοῦτον κῶλον, "τῶν μὲν περὶ τὰ μηδε-
νός ἄξια φιλοσοφοῦντων" οὐ γὰρ ἐκ παίωνων ἄκρι-
βῶς, ἀλλὰ παιωνικὸν τί ἐστι. παραλάβωμεν¹ μέντοι
tὸν παίωνα εἰς τοὺς λόγους, ἐπειδὴ μικτὸς τίς ἐστι
καὶ ἀσφαλέστερος, τὸ μεγαλοπρέπει μὲν ἐκ τῆς
μακρᾶς λαμβάνων, τὸ λογικὸν δὲ ἐκ τῶν βραχείων.

(42) οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι, ὁ μὲν ἤρφος σεμνὸς καὶ οὐ λογικός,
ἀλλ’ ἡχώδης. <...>² οὐδὲ εὑρύθμος,³ ἀλλ’ ἄρνθ-
μος,⁴ ὥσπερ ὁ τοιόσοδε ἔχει,⁵ "ἡκων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν
χώραν" ἤ γὰρ πυκνότης τῶν μακρῶν ὑπερτίππει
tοῦ λογικοῦ μέτρου. (43) ὁ δὲ ἱαμβὸς εὐτελῆς καὶ τῇ
tῶν πολλῶν λέξει ὁμοιος. πολλοὶ γονὸν μέτρα ἱαμ-
βικὰ λαλοῦσιν οὐκ εἰδότες. ὁ δὲ παίων ἁμφοῖν
μέσος καὶ μέτριος, καὶ ὀποῖος συγκεκριμένος. ἡ
μὲν δὴ παιωνικὴ ἐν τοῖς μεγαλοπρεπέσι σύνθεσις
ὡδ’ ἂν πως λαμβάνοιτο.

(44) Ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ μήκη τῶν κῶλων μέγεθος,
οίον Ἰούκυδίδης Ἄθηναιος ἐξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον

¹ paralábωμεν τοι iam Victorius: paralabwōn P (la supra versum scripto).
² lacunam mihi iam statuenti prop. Kassel <ei δὲ διὰ πάντων
μακρῶν (vel μακρὰς) ἔχει,> (cf. § 117).
³ εὑρύθμος edd.: εὐρυθμός P.
⁴ ἄρνθμος Victorius: ἀνάρνθμος P.
⁵ ἔχει Radermacher: ἐκεί P.

376
on the two sorts of paean. On the same principle Theophrastus\textsuperscript{a} illustrated grandeur with the following clause,\textit{tôn men peri ta mèdenos axia philosophountôn} ("those who are philosophers about what is worthless.")\textsuperscript{b} It is not formed from paeans with any precision, yet it is roughly paenonic. Let us then adopt the paean in prose, since it is a mix of long and short, and so safer, deriving grandeur from the long syllable and suitability for prose from the shorts. (42) As for the other rhythms, the heroic is solemn and not suitable for prose. It is too sonorous, nor is it even a good rhythm but it has no rhythm \textit{<\ldots>},\textsuperscript{c} as in the following words, \textit{hêkôn hêmôn eis tên chôrân} ("arriving inside our land").\textsuperscript{d} Here the accumulation of long syllables goes beyond the limits of prose. (43) The iamb by contrast is ordinary and like normal speech. In fact, many people speak in iambics without knowing it.\textsuperscript{e} The paean is a mean between the two extremes and a sort of composite. Paenonic composition may then be used in elevated passages in this sort of way.

(44) Long clauses also produce grandeur, for example "Thucydides the Athenian wrote the history of the war

\textsuperscript{a} Theophr. F 703 Fortenbaugh.

\textsuperscript{b} Author unknown. Runs of short syllables give a paenonic effect.

\textsuperscript{c} Since \textit{hêrous} describes the heroic hexameter (§§ 5 and 204), it regularly includes the dactyl, as in e.g. Ar. \textit{Rhet.} 1408b32ff, which Demetrius closely follows. The transmitted text anomalously restricts it to the spondee, and I posit a lacuna, e.g. \textit{<"if it is wholly spondaic">}, a supplement suggested by R. Kassel.

\textsuperscript{d} Author unknown (cf. § 117).

\textsuperscript{e} Cf. Ar. \textit{Rhet.} 1408b33, \textit{Po.} 1449a24, and often later, e.g. Quint. 9.4.88.
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1 Αγραῖον Thuc.
ON STYLE 44–47

between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians”\textsuperscript{a} and “The History of Herodotus of Halicarnassus is here set out.”\textsuperscript{b} A sudden drop into silence on a short clause lessens the dignity of a passage, despite any grandeur in the underlying thought or vocabulary. (45) The use of periodic form is also impressive, as in the following passage of Thucydides: “For the river Acheleous, flowing from Mount Pindus through Dolopia and the land of the Agrianians and Amphilochians, passing inland by the city of Straus on the way into the sea near Oeniadæ, and surrounding that town with a marsh, by its floods makes a winter expedition impossible.”\textsuperscript{c} All this impressiveness has come from the periodic form, and from the fact that Thucydides hardly allows any pause to himself and the reader. (46) If you were to break the sentence up to say, “For the river Acheleous flows from Mount Pindus and makes its way into the sea near Oeniadæ; but before reaching its outlet it turns the plain of Oeniadæ into a marsh, so that the floods form a defence and protection against enemy attack in winter,” if you vary and rephrase it in this way, you will give the passage many pauses but destroy its grandeur. (47) Inns at frequent intervals make long journeys shorter, while desolate roads, even when the distances are short, give the impression of length.\textsuperscript{d} The same principle applies to clauses.

\textsuperscript{a} Th. 1.1.1.
\textsuperscript{b} Hdt. 1.1 (cf. § 17).
\textsuperscript{c} Th. 2.102.2 (cf. §§ 202, 206).
\textsuperscript{d} See on § 202.

\[^2\mu\text{è}v\ addidi\ ex\ §\ 202,\ Thuc.\]
\[^3\text{διεξεῖσ} Thuc.: \text{διεξείσι} P.\]
(48) Ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ δυσφωνία συνθέσεως ἐν πολλοῖς μέγεθος, οἶον τὸ “Δίας δ’ ὁ μέγας αἰεὶν ἔφῃ Ἑκτόρι χαλκοκορυστῆ.” ἄλλως μὲν γὰρ ἵσως δυσῆκοος ἢ τῶν γραμμάτων σύμπληξις, ὑπερβολὴ\(^1\) δ’ ἐμφαίνουσα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ἡρωοζ. λειτοθής γὰρ καὶ τὸ εὑρίσκουν οὐ πάντα ἐν μεγαλοπρέπειᾳ χώραν ἔχουσιν, εἰ μὴ ποι ἐν ὀλίγοις. καὶ ὁ Θουκυδίδης δὲ πανταχοῦ σχεδὸν φεύγει τὸ λείον καὶ ὀμαλῆς τῆς συνθέσεως, καὶ ἀεὶ μᾶλλον τι προσκρούοντι ἐοικεν, ὥσπερ οἱ τὰς τραχείας ὁδοὺς πορεύομενοι, ἐπάν λέγη, “ὅτι τὸ μὲν δὴ ἔτος, ὡς ὀμολόγητο, ἄνοσον ἐς τὰς ἄλλας ἀσθενείας ἑτύγχανεν ὡν.” ῥαῖον μὲν γὰρ καὶ ᾧδιον ὡδ’ ἀν τις εἰπεν, ὅτι “ἀνόσον ἐς τὰς ἄλλας ἀσθενείας ὡν ἑτύγχανεν,” ἀφήρητο δ’ αὐτοῦ τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν. (49) ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁνομα τραχὺ μέγεθος ἐργάζεται, οὕτω σύνθεσις. ὀνόματα δὲ τραχεὰ τὸ τε “kekraγὼς” ἀντὶ τοῦ “βοῶν,” καὶ τὸ “ῥήγνυμενον” ἀντὶ τοῦ “φερόμενον,” οἷος πᾶσι\(^2\) ὁ Θουκυδίδης χρηται, ὁμοιά λαμβάνων τὰ τε ὀνόματα τῇ συνθέσει, τοῖς τε ὀνόμασι τὴν σύνθεσιν.

(50) Τάσσειν δὲ τὰ ὄνοματα χρη τόνδε τὸν τρόπον πρῶτα μὲν τιθέναι τὰ μὴ μάλα ἑναργῆ, δεύτερα δὲ καὶ ὑστατα τὰ ἑναργέστερα. οὕτω γὰρ και τοῦ

\(^1\) ύπερβολὴ: Gale: ύπερβολὴ P.
\(^2\) οἰος πᾶσιν: Hammer: οἶον σπᾶσιν P.
(48) In many passages grandeur is produced by a series of ugly sounds, for example by the line, "mighty Ajax aimed always at bronze-helmeted Hector" (Aiâs d' ho megas aien eph' Hektori chalkokorustêi). In other respects the ugly clash of sounds is perhaps unpleasant to the ear, but by its very excess it brings out the greatness of the hero, since in the grand style smoothness and euphony find only an occasional place. Thucydides almost invariably avoids a smooth, even structure. He seems rather to be for ever stumbling, like men going along rough roads, as when he says: "this year from other diseases, by common consent, was as it happened free" (… etunchanen on). It would have been easier and more euphonious to say, "from other diseases happened to be free" (… on etunchanen). But this would have destroyed the grandeur. (49) Harsh composition creates grandeur, just as a harsh word does. Instances of harsh words are "shrieking" instead of "crying out" (kekrâgos and boôn), and "bursting out" instead of "charging" (rhêgnumenon and pheromenon). They are the sort of words Thucydides uses everywhere, matching the words to the composition and the composition to the words.

(50) Word order should be as follows: place first those that are not specially vivid, next or last the more vivid. In this way what comes first will sound vivid to us, and what

---

a Hom. Il. 16.358. The whole line is harsh, but the focus is on Ajax and § 105 specifies a clash of two sounds, so note either Aiâs and aien, with their internal hiatus, or the "irregular" lengthening of ho mmegas (see note on opphin in § 255).

b Th. 2.49.1. It ends on a monosyllable.

c He does not in fact use these particular examples.
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πρώτου ἀκονομεθα ὡς ἑναργοῦς, καὶ τοῦ μετ’ αὐτὸ ὡς ἑναργεστέρου. εἶ δὲ μὴ, δόξομεν ἐξησθενηκέναι [οἷον καταπετωκέναι ἀπὸ ἱσχυροτέρου ἐπὶ ἀσθενέσ]. ¹ (51) παράδειγμα δὲ τὸ παρὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι λεγόμενον, ὅτι “ἐπαύς ² μὲν τις μουσικὴ παρέχῃ καταυλεῖν καὶ καταχεῖν ³ διὰ τῶν ὀτῶν”. πολὺ γὰρ τὸ δεύτερον ἑναργεστέρον τοῦ προτέρου καὶ πάλιν προϊόν φησιν, “ὅταν δὲ καταχέων ⁴ μὴ ἀνὴ, ἀλλὰ κηλῆ, τὸ δὴ μετὰ τούτο ἥδη τῆκε καὶ λείβει.” τὸ γὰρ “λείβει” τοῦ “τῆκε” ἐμφατικώτερον καὶ ἐγγυτέρω ποιήματος. εἰ δὲ προεξήγησεν αὐτό, ἀσθενεστέρων ἀν τὸ “τῆκε” ἐπιφερόμενον ἐφάνη. (52) καὶ Ὀμηρὸς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Κύκλωπος ἀεὶ ἐπαυξεὶ τὴν ύπερβολήν, καὶ ἐπανίστη ἐπ’ αὐτῆς <ἐοϊκεν>, ⁵ οἶον

οὐ γὰρ ἔφεκεν

ἀνδρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ρίψι ὤληντι,

καὶ προσετὶ υψηλοῦ ὄρους καὶ ύπερφαινομένου τῶν ἄλλων ὄρων. ἀεὶ γὰρ καίτοι μεγάλα ὄντα τὰ πρότερον ἠττονα φαίνεται, μειώνον αὐτοῖς τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιφερομένων.

(53) Χρῆ δὲ καὶ τοὺς συνδέσμους μὴ μάλα ἀνταποδίδοσθαι ἀκρίβος, οἶον τῷ “μὲν” συνδέσμῳ τῶν “δὲ”. μικρόπροτετο ὡς ἡ ἀκρίβεια ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀτακτοτέρως πως χρῆσθαι, καθάπερ που ὁ ’Αντιφῶν

¹ del. Radermacher. ² ὅταν Plat. codd. ³ καταχεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς Plat. ⁴ καταχέων P: ἐπέχων Plat. ⁵ ἐοϊκεν edd.: om. P.
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follows more vivid still. Otherwise we will seem to have lost vigour.\(^a\) (51) An example is this passage from Plato, “when a man lets music play over him and flood through his ears.”\(^b\) Here the second verb is far more vivid than the first. And further on he says, “but when the flood fails to stop and enchants him, at that point he melts and liquefies.” The word “liquefies” is more striking than the word “melts,” and is closer to poetry.\(^c\) If he had reversed the order, the verb “melts,” coming later, would have appeared weaker. (52) Homer similarly, in describing the Cyclops, keeps augmenting his hyperbole and seems to climb higher and higher with it: “for he was not like men who eat bread but like a wooded summit,” and what is more, the summit of a high mountain, one towering above all the others.\(^d\) For however big they are, things which come first always seem less big when bigger things follow.

(53) Connectives\(^e\) should not correspond too precisely (e.g. men and de, “on the one hand” and “on the other hand”), since there is something trivial about exact precision. Use them with rather more freedom, as in Antiphon

\(^a\) Here the transmitted text adds “and as it were collapsed from strength into weakness.”


\(^c\) Pl. Rep. 411b (cf. §§ 183–85, from the same passage). The verb λείβει is poetic and rare in prose.

\(^d\) Hom. Od. 9.190–92, with paraphrase of the last line, ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ὦ τε φαύνεται ὁδὸν ἀπ’ ἄλλων.

\(^e\) Since it covers both, I translate σύνδεσμος as connective or particle as fits each case.
Λέγει: "ἡ <μὲν>¹ γὰρ νῆσος ἢν ἔχομεν² δὴ λή μὲν καὶ πόρρωθεν <οἴτι>³ ἐστιν ύπηλή καὶ τραχεία· καὶ τὰ μὲν χρῆσιμα καὶ ἐργάσιμα μικρὰ αὐτῆς ἐστι, τὰ δὲ ἄργα πολλὰ σμικρὰς αὐτῆς οὖσας." τριώτε γὰρ τοῖς "μὲν" συνδέσμους ἐις ὃ "δὲ" ἀνταποδίδοται.⁴ (54) πολλάκις μέντοι τεθέντες πως ἐφεξῆς συνδέσμοι καὶ τὰ μικρὰ μεγάλα ποιοῦσιν, ὡς παρ᾽ Ὄμηρῳ τοῖς Βοιωτιακῶν πόλεων τὰ ὀνόματα εὐτελῆ ὁντα καὶ μικρὰ ὄγκον τινὰ ἔχει καὶ μέγεθος διὰ τοὺς συνδέσμους ἐφεξῆς τοσοῦτος τεθέντας, οἶνον ἐν τῷ "Σχοῖνον τῇ Σκώλον τῇ, πολύκυκλῳ τῇ Ἑπεωνίν." (55) Τοῖς δὲ παραπληρωματικοῖς συνδέσμοις χρηστέοι, οὐχ ὡς προσθήκαις κεναῖς καὶ οἶον προσφύμασιν ἡ παραξύσμασιν, ὥσπερ τινὲς τῷ "δή". χρῄσται πρὸς οὐδὲν καὶ τῷ "νῦ" καὶ τῷ "†πρότερον†,"⁵ ἀλλ᾽ ἂν συμβάλλωνται τι τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ λόγου, (56) καθάπερ παρὰ Πλάτωνι, "ὦ μὲν δὴ

¹ μὲν add. Capperonierius: quidem Lat.
² ἔχομεν edd.: ἔχομεν P.
³ οἴτι add. Sauppe.
⁴ longum exemplum Platonis (Grg. 465e2–466a3) praebet M (crucibus inclusum), suspicor ex margine in textum deductum.
⁵ πρότερον P, vix recte: πρὸ Roshdestwenski.

---

a Antiph. fr. 50 Blass.
somewhere: “For on the one hand the island which we inhabit is clearly on the one hand even from a distance high and rugged; and the part of it which is on the one hand cultivated and useful is small, on the other hand the uncultivated part is large, though the island itself is small.”¹ There is only one “on the other hand” to answer the three examples of “on the one hand.”² (54) Yet an unbroken chain of connectives can often make even small things great, like the names of the Boeotian towns in Homer: they are ordinary and small, but they acquire a certain dignity and greatness from the long chain of connectives, for example “and Schoenus and Scolus and mountainous Eteonous.”³

(55) Expletive particles⁴ should not be used as superfluous extras and, as it were, excrescences or fillings, as “indeed” and “now” and “†earlier†” are sometimes aimlessly used. Use them only if they contribute to the grandeur of what is being said, (56) as in Plato, “and

³ M adds a passage, enclosed within cruces and probably an intrusion from a marginal annotation: “Another example is Plato in the Gorgias [465e–466a]: ‘Perhaps on the one hand I have done something extraordinary in not allowing you to make long speeches, while I myself have spoken at length. It is on the one hand right to excuse me; for when I was speaking briefly, you did not understand me, nor were you able to follow the reply I gave you, but you needed an explanation. So on the one hand, if I too am unable to follow your reply, deliver a long speech yourself in turn. But otherwise let me use one, for that is only fair.’”

⁴ Hom. Il. 2.497 (cf. § 257).

⁵ These were a recognised grammatical category of particles added for reasons of rhythm or style (e.g. Dion. Thrax, Ars Gramm. p. 96 Uhlig). The third example is corrupt, concealing e.g. the intensifier περ, “truly.”
DEMETRIUS

μέγας¹ ἐν οὐρανῶ Ζεὺς”· καὶ παρ’ Ὄμηρῳ, “ἀλλ’ ὃτε δὴ πόρον ἱξον ἐὑρρεῖον ποταμοῖο.” ἀρκτικὸς γὰρ τεθεὶς ὁ σύνδεσμος καὶ ἀποσπάσας² τῶν προτέρων τὰ ἔχομενα μεγαλεῖῶν τι εἰργάσατο· αἱ γὰρ πολλαὶ ἀρχαὶ σεμνότητα ἐργάζονται. εἰ δὲ ὦδε ἔηπεν, “ἀλλ’ ὃτε ἐπὶ τὸν πόρον ἀφίκοντο τοῦ ποταμοῦ,” μικρολογοῦντι ἐόκει καὶ ἔτι ὡς περὶ ἑνὸς πράγματος λέγοντι.

(57) Δαμβάνεται δὲ καὶ παθητικῶς³ πολλάκις ὁ σύνδεσμος οὕτως, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς Καλυψοῦς πρὸς τὸν Ἄνδρομακονα ἢ ἄδειον ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τοῦ ὅραμα·

Διογενὲς Λαερτίαδης πελεμήχαν Ὁδούσσευ, οὕτω δὴ οἰκύνθη φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν;

εἰ γοῦν τὸν σύνδεσμον ἐξέλους, συνεξαράθεσε καὶ τὸ πάθος. καθόλου γὰρ, ὥσπερ ὁ Πραξιφάνης φησίν, ἀντὶ μνημῶν παρελαμβάνοντο οἱ τοιοῦτοι σύνδεσμοι καὶ στεναγμῶν, ὥσπερ τὸ “αἰ αἰ,” καὶ τὸ “φεῦ,” καὶ “ἡ πολύ τι ἐστιν,”⁴ ὡς αὐτός φησὶ, τὸ “καὶ νῦ κ’ ὁδυρομένουσιν” ἔπρεψεν, ἔμφασιν τινα ἔχον οἰκτρού ὀνόματος. (58) οἱ δὲ πρὸς οὔδὲν ἀναπληροῦντες, φησὶ, τὸν σύνδεσμον ἑόκασιν τοῖς

¹ μέγας ἤγεμῶν Plat. codd.
² ἀποσπάσας Finckh: ἀποσπασθείς P.
³ παθητικῶς Greg.: παθητικοῖς P.
⁴ locus corruptissimus, e.g. ὡς γὰρ pro ὥσπερ et ὡσαύτως pro ὡς αὐτός Radermacher
indeed mighty Zeus in his heaven,”\textsuperscript{a} and in Homer, “but
when indeed they came to the ford of the fair-flowing
river.”\textsuperscript{b} Placed near the beginning and severing what fol-
lows from what precedes, the particle makes a dignified
impression. For the use of many opening words has an
imposing effect. If Homer had said, “but when they ar-
ried at the ford of the river,” he would have seemed to be
using trivial language and speaking of only one particular
event.

(57) The particle “indeed” is also frequently used to
add emotion, as in Calypso’s words to Odysseus,

“Born of Zeus, son of Laertes, Odysseus of the
many wiles,
do you indeed wish so much to go home to your
own dear land?”\textsuperscript{c}

Remove the particle, and you will simultaneously remove
the emotion. In general, as Praxiphanes says,\textsuperscript{d} such parti-
cles were used as substitutes for moans and laments, like
“ah ah” and “alas” and \textsuperscript{†}in the sort of way\textsuperscript{†}, as he himself
says, “\textit{and so now grieving}”\textsuperscript{e} was appropriate, since to
some degree it suggests a word of mourning. (58) But
those who use expletive particles aimlessly are, as Praxi-

\textsuperscript{a} Pl. \textit{Phdr.} 246e. \textsuperscript{b} Hom. \textit{Il.} 14.433, 21.1.
\textsuperscript{d} Praxiphanes 13 Wehrli.
\textsuperscript{e} The text is corrupt, but particles and interjections are pre-
sumably compared, as in § 58, and the particle \textit{νυ} (or the cluster
\textit{και νυ κε}) is said to have the same piteous effect as “ah ah” and
“alas.” For the last phrase, illustrating how \textit{και νυ κε} emphasises
a verb of mourning, cf. e.g. Hom. \textit{Il.} 23.154 “and as indeed they
mourned the sun set on them.”
DEMETRIUS

ὑποκριταίς τοῖς τὸ καὶ τὸ ἐπιλέγουσιν¹ λέγοντι, ὦν εἴ τις ὄδε λέγοι,

Καλυπτός μὲν ἦδε γαῖα Πελοπίας² χθονός, φεῦ. ἐν ἀντιπόρθμοις πεδί’ ἐχουσο’ εὐδαίμονα, αἰ, αἰ.

ὡς γὰρ παρέλεικε τὸ αἱ αἱ καὶ τὸ φεῦ ἐνθάδε, οὐτω καὶ ὁ πανταχοῦ μάτην ἐμβαλλόμενος σύνδεσμος.³

(59) Οἱ μὲν δὴ σύνδεσμοι τὴν σύνθεσιν μεγαλοπρεπῆ ποιοῦσιν, ὡς εἰρηταί, τὰ δὲ σχήματα τῆς λέξεως ἐστὶ μὲν καὶ αὐτὰ συνθέσεσι τι εἴδος. τὸ⁴ γὰρ δὴ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν δίς ἀναδιπλοῦντα⁵ ἢ ἐπαναφέροντα ἢ ἀνθυπαλλάσσοντα διαταττομένω καὶ μετασυνυπερτέντ’ ἐοικεν. διατακτέον δὲ τὰ πρόσφορα αὐτῶν χαρακτηρὶ ἐκάστῳ, ὦν τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεὶ μὲν περὶ ὧν πρόκειται, ταῦτα: (60) πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ἀνθυπαλλαγήν, ὡς Ὁμηρος, "οἵ δὲ δύο σκόπελοι ὁ μὲν οὐρανὸν εὐρύν ἰκάνει": πολὺ γὰρ οὕτω μεγαλειότερον ἑναλλαγείσης <τῆς>⁶ πτώσεως, ἣ εἴπερ οὕτως ἔφη, "τῶν δὲ δύο σκοπέλων ὁ μὲν οὐρανὸν εὑρύν": συνῆθως γὰρ ἐλέγετο. πάν δὲ τὸ σύνθεσις μικροπρεπὲς, διὸ καὶ ἀθαύμαστον.

(61) Τὸν δὲ Νιρέα, αὐτὸν τε ὄντα μικρὸν καὶ τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῦ μικρότερα, τρεῖς ναῦς καὶ ὅλιγος

¹ ἐπιλέγουσιν Nauck: ἔπος λέγοντι P  
² Πελοπίας (cf. Ar. Rhet. 1409b10): Πελοπείας P  
³ σύνδεσμος Greg.: om. P  
⁴ τὸ Dresd.: τῶν P  
⁵ ἀναδιπλοῦντα Solmsen: διπλοῦντα P  
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phanes says, like actors who add this or that exclamation without purpose, as though you were to say,

“This land of Calydon, of the land of Pelops (alas!) the facing shore, with its fertile plains (ah! ah!).”

For just as in this passage the “ah! ah!” and the “alas!” are superfluous, so is any particle which is inserted indiscriminately and without reason.

(59) Connectives then, as has been said, give grandeur to the composition. Next, figures of speech: these are themselves a form of composition, since it is practically a matter of rearrangement and redistribution when you say the same thing twice, through repetition or anaphora or antypallage. Each style must be assigned its appropriate figures, in the case of the grand style, our present concern, the following: (60) First, antypallage, as in Homer’s line, “the two rocks, one of them reaches up to the wide heaven.” With this change from the normal genitive, the line is far more imposing than if he had said, “of the two rocks one reaches up to the wide heaven.” That would have been the usual construction, but anything usual is trivial and so fails to impress.

(61) Again, take Nireus, who is personally insignificant and his contingent still more so, three ships and a few

---

\(^a\) TGF Eur. *Meleager fr.* 515. The interjections make it seem that Calydon is in the Peloponnese.

\(^b\) Anthypallage is a change of grammatical case, subdividing a plural into its parts (a type of \(διλογία\), cf. § 103).

\(^c\) Hom. *Od.* 12.73.

\(^6\) \(τῆς\) add. Kroll.
DEMETRIUS

ἀνδρας, μέγαν¹ καὶ μεγάλα ἐποίησεν καὶ πολλὰ ἀντ’ ὀλίγων, τῷ σχῆματι διπλῷ καὶ μικτῷ χρησάμενος ἐξ ἑπαναφορᾶς τε καὶ διαλύσεως. "Νιρεύς γάρ," φησι, "τρεῖς νῆς ἂγεν, Νιρέυς Ἀγλαίης νῦς, Νιρεύς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνήρ".² ἦ τε γάρ ἑπαναφορὰ τῆς λέξεως ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα τὸν Νιρέα καὶ ἡ διάλυσις πλῆθός τι ἐμφαίνει πραγμάτων, καίτοι δύο ἢ τριῶν ὄντων. (62) καὶ σχεδὸν ἀπαξ τοῦ Νιρέως ὄνομασθέντος ἐν τῷ δράματι μεμνήμεθα οὐδὲν ἤττον ἢ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, καίτοι κατ’ ἐποὺ ἐκαστὸν³ λαλουμένων σχεδόν. αἰτία δ’ ἡ τοῦ σχήματος δύναμις: εἰ δ’ οὐτως ἐἶπεν, "Νιρεύς ὁ Ἀγλαίας νῦς ἐκ Σύμης τρεῖς νῆς ἂγεν," παρασκιωπηκότι ἔφθει τοῦ Νιρέα. ὁσπερ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἐστιάσεις τὰ ὀλίγα διαταχθέντα πως πολλὰ φαίνεται, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς λόγοις. (63) πολλαχοὶ μέντοι τὸ ἐναιστῶν τῇ λύσει, ἡ συνάφεια, μεγέθους αἰτίων γίνεται μάλλον, οἴον ὅτι ἐστρατεύοντο "Ελληνες τε καὶ Κάρες καὶ Λύκιοι καὶ Πάμφυλοι καὶ Φρύγες." ἦ γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ συνδέσμου θέσις ἐμφαίνει τι ἀπειρον πλῆθος. (64) τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτο "κυρτά, φαληριώντα," τῇ ἐξαιρέσει τοῦ "καὶ" συνδέσμου μεγαλειότερον

¹ μέγαν edd.: μέγα P.
² ὑπὸ Ἡλιον Ἰλθὲν add. Greg. M.
³ ἐκαστὸν edd. ἐκάστων P.
men. But Homer has made him and it impressive, and has multiplied the small contingent by using the two combined figures of anaphora and absence of connectives. “Nireus,” he says, “brought three ships, Nireus, son of Aglaia, Nireus the most handsome man. . . .”\(^a\) The verbal anaphora of the same word, Nireus, and the absence of connectives give an impression of a huge contingent, even though it is only two or three ships. (62) Nireus is mentioned barely once in the course of the action,\(^b\) but we remember him no less than Achilles and Odysseus, the subjects of almost every line. The impact of the figure is the cause. If Homer had said, “Nireus, the son of Aglaia, brought three ships from Syme,” he might just as well have passed over Nireus in silence. Speech is like a banquet: a few dishes may be arranged to seem many. (63) In many passages, however, linking with connectives, the opposite of asyndeton, tends to increase the grandeur, for example “to the war marched, Greeks and Carians and Lycians and Pamphylians and Phrygians.”\(^c\) The use of the same connective suggests infinite numbers. (64) But in a phrase such as “high-arched, foam-crested”\(^d\) the omission of the connective “and” makes the language more impres-

\(^{a}\) Hom. \textit{Il.} 2.671ff, a traditional example, e.g. Ar. \textit{Rhet.} 1414a2–7 and Ps.Plu. \textit{Vit. Hom.} 33. The name Nireus begins three successive lines:
\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
Νιρεὺς αὖ Σύμηθεν ἄγε τρεῖς νῆας ἔσας,
Νιρεὺς Ἀγλαῖης νῦς Χαρόποιο τ’ ἀνακτος,
Νιρεὺς ὁς κάλλιστος ἄνηρ ὑπὸ Ἰλιὸν ἠλθεν.
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

\(^{b}\) For δράμα of nondramatic genres, compare the mimes of Sophron in § 156, and Plato’s \textit{Menexenus} in § 266 (in both because of the use of direct speech).

\(^{c}\) Author unknown. \(^{d}\) Hom. \textit{Il.} 13.799 (cf. § 81).
DEMETRIUS

ἀπέβη μᾶλλον, ἡ <εἴπερ>¹ εἴπεν, "κυρτά καὶ φαληρίωντα."

(65) [Τὸ]² μεγαλείον μέντοι ἐν τοῖς σχήμασιν τὸ μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μένειν πτώσεως, ὡς Θουκυδίδης, "καὶ πρῶτος ἀποβαίνων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀποβάθραν ἐλειποψύχησε τε, καὶ πεσόντος αὐτοῦ ἐς τὴν παρεξειρεσίαν . . ." πολὺ γὰρ οὕτως μεγαλειότερον, ἡ εἴπερ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πτώσεως οὕτως ἐφη, ὅτι "ἐπεσεν ἐς τὴν παρεξειρεσίαν καὶ ἀπέβαλε τὴν ἀστίδα." (66) καὶ ἀναδιπλώσις δ’ ἔποις³ εἰργάσατο μέγεθος, ὡς Ἡροδοτος⁴ "δράκοντες δὲ που," φησίν, "ἥσαν ἐν τῷ Καυκάσῳ <. . .:>⁵ μέγεθος, καὶ μέγεθος καὶ πλήθος." διὸς ῥηθεὶ τὸ "μέγεθος" ὅγκον τινὰ τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ παρέσχεν. (67) χρῆσθαι μέντοι τοῖς σχήμασι μὴ πυκνοῖς· ἀπειρόκαλον γὰρ καὶ παρεμφαίνον τινα τοῦ λόγου ἀνωμαλίαν. οἱ γοῦν ἀρχαῖοι πολλὰ σχήματα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τιθέντες συνηθέστεροι τῶν ἀσχηματίστων εἰσίν, διὰ τὸ ἐντέχνως τιθέναι.

(68) Περὶ δὲ συγκρούσεως φωνηέντων ὑπέλαβον ἄλλοι ἄλλοις. Ἰσοκράτης μὲν γὰρ ἐφυλάττετο συμπλήσσειν αὐτά, καὶ οἱ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἄλλοι δὲ τινες ὡς ἔτυχε συνέκροσαν καὶ παντάπασιν δεῖ δὲ οὔτε ἡχόδη ποιεῖν τὴν σύνθεσιν, ἀτέχνως αὐτὰ συμπλήσσοντα καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε· διασπασμῷ γὰρ τοῦ λόγου τὸ τοιοῦτον καὶ διαρρύθη ἔοικεν· οὔτε μὴν

¹ εἴπερ Radermacher: ei Greg.: om. P.
² τὸ del. Radermacher et Roberts.
³ ἀναδιπλώσις δ’ ἔποις P²: ἀναδιπλώσις δ’ ἔποις P¹.
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ON STYLE 64–68

de.endswith than if Homer had said “high-arched and foam-crested.”

(65) Grandeur in figures is also produced from variety in the use of cases, as in Thucydides, “the first to step on the gangway, he fainted, and in his falling on the oars, his shield . . .”a This is far more striking than if he had kept to the same case and said, “he fell on the oars and dropped his shield.” (66) Repetition of a word is also imposing, as in this passage of Herodotus, “there were serpents in the Caucasus, <vast> in size, yes in size and number.”b The repetition of the word “size” adds weight to the style. (67) Do not, however, crowd figures together. That is tasteless and suggests an uneven style. The early writers, it is true, use many figures in their works, but they position them so skilfully that they seem less unusual than those who avoid figures altogether.

(68) Next; hiatus, on which opinions have differed. Isocrates and his school avoided any clash of vowels, while others admitted it wholesale wherever it happened to occur. You should, however, neither make your composition too sonorous by a random and unskillful use of hiatus (for that produces a jerky and disjointed style), nor yet

---

a Th. 4.12.1. The sentence continues, ἡ ἄσπις περιμερρύη ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν, “his shield slipped off into the sea.”

b Text uncertain and perhaps a memory of Hdt. 1.203.1, ἔδω όρέων καὶ πλήθει μέγιστον καὶ μεγέθει ὑψηλότατον. But the parallel is not close, there are no snakes, and Orth, Philologische Wochenschrift 45 (1925) 778–83, attractively suggests Herodorus of Heraclea (FGrHist 31 F 63 addenda, p.*12 Jacoby).

---

4 Ἡρόδωτος P: Ἡρόδωρος Orth.
5 lacuna subest, e.g. <θαυμαστοῖ τὸ> Kroll.
DEMETRIUS

παντελῶς φυλάσσεσθαι τήν συνέχειαν τῶν γραμμάτων λειτέρα μὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἔσται ἱσωσ ἢ σύνθεσις, ἀμονστείρα δὲ καὶ κωφή ἀτεχνῶς, πολλὴν εὐφωνίαν ἀφαιρεθέωσα τὴν γινομένην ἐκ τῆς συγκρούσεως. (69) σκεπτέον δὲ πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι καὶ ἡ συνήθεια αὐτὴ συμπλήττει τὰ γράμματα τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν, καίτοι στοχαζομένη μάλιστα εὐφωνίας, οἶον ἐν τῷ Αἰακὸς καὶ χών. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ διὰ μόνων τῶν φωνητῶν συντίθησιν ὀνόματα, οἶον Αἰαίκη καὶ Εὐιως, οὐδὲν τε δυσφωνότερα τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ἱσωσ καὶ μουσικότερα. (70) τά γε μὴν ποιητικά, οἶον τὸ ἥλιος, διηρημένων καὶ συγκρούόμενοι ἐπίτηδες, εὐφωνότερον ἐστὶ τοῦ ἥλιος καὶ τὸ ὀρέων τοῦ ὀρῶν. ἔχει γὰρ τινα ἡ λύσις καὶ ἡ συγκρονισις οἶον ἔθην ἐπιγινομένην. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐν συναλιψ的真实性 2: δύσφωνα ἤν, διαρεθέκτα δὲ καὶ συγκρονοθέντα εὐφωνότερα, ὥσ τὸ "πάντα μὲν τὰ νέα καὶ καλά ἐστιν." εἰ δὲ συναλείψας εὑρίσκοι "καλ' ἐστίν," 3 δυσφωνότερον ἐσται τὸ λεγόμενον καὶ εὐτελέστερον. (71) ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμῖνοι διὰ τῶν ἐπτά φωνητῶν οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἐφεξῆς ἡχοῦστε αὐτά, καὶ ἄντι αὐλοῦ καὶ ἄντι κιθάρας τῶν γραμμάτων τούτων ὁ ἥχος ἀκούεται ὑπ' εὐφωνίας, ὥστε ὁ ἐξαιρῶν τὴν

1 τὰ ἐν Roshdestwenski: ταῦτα Ρ.
2 δύσφωνα edd., δύσφορα Ρ.
3 καλ' ἐστίν (sic) Ahrens: καλὰ ἐστὶν Ρ.
avoid hiatus altogether, since your composition will then perhaps be smoother but it will be less musical and quite flat when robbed of much of the euphony produced by hiatus. (69) Note first that ordinary usage itself aims above all at euphony, yet it has a clash of vowels within such words as Aiakos and chiôn ("snow"), and it even forms many words exclusively from vowels, e.g. Aiaiê and Euios,\(^a\) and these words are no less pleasant than any others and possibly even more musical. (70) Poetic forms\(^b\) where the resolution and hiatus are deliberate have more euphony, for example éelios for hélios ("sun") and oreôn for orôn ("mountains"), since the separate sounds produced by the hiatus add a sort of singing effect. Many other words would be harsh if the sounds were run together, but are more melodious when they are separated in hiatus, for example kala estin (at the end of the sentence "all that is young is beautiful"\(^c\)). Running the vowels together, kal' estin, will make the phrase harsher and more ordinary. (71) In Egypt when the priests sing hymns to the gods, they sing the seven vowels in succession,\(^d\) and the sound of these vowels has such euphony that men listen to it instead of the flute and the lyre. The removal here of hiatus simply removes the

\(^a\) I.e. god of the bacchant cry, euoi (Dionysus).

\(^b\) Both examples (the first recurs in § 207) show epic forms, as do those in § 73.

\(^c\) Author unknown (cf. § 207).

\(^d\) The seven vowels are a e ê i o u ô. Such vowel songs appear in Egyptian/Greek magical texts. See H. D. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, Chicago 1986, e.g. pp. 172–95.
DEMETRIUS

σύγκρουσιν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἡ μέλος ἀτεχνῶς ἔξαιρει τοῦ λόγου καὶ μοῦσαν. ἀλλὰ περὶ τούτων μὲν οὐ καίρος μηκύνευν ἵσως.

(72) Ἕν δὲ τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ χαρακτῆρι σύγκρουσις παραλαμβάνοιτʼ ἄν πρέπουσα ἦτοι διὰ μακρῶν, ὡς τὸ "λᾶν ἄνω ὀθεσκὸ

καὶ γὰρ ὁ στίχος μηκός τι ἔσχεν ἐκ τῆς συγκρουσίους, καὶ μεμίμηται τοῦ λίθου τὴν ἄναφορὰν καὶ βίαν ὅσαύτως καὶ τὸ "μὴ ἡ

ἵπτευρος εἶναι" τὸ Θουκυδίδεων. συγκρούνται καὶ διφθογγοι διφθόγγοι, "ταύτην κατάφηκαν μὲν Κερκυραίοι ὁἰκιστής δὲ ἐγένετο. . . ." (73) ποιεῖ μὲν

οὐν καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μακρὰ συγκρούσμενα μέγεθος καὶ αἱ αὐταὶ διφθογγοί. αἱ δὲ ἐκ διαφερόντων συγκρούσεις ὁμοῦ καὶ μέγεθος ποιοῦσι καὶ ποικιλίαν ἐκ τῆς

πολυχώρας, ὅ ὁν "ἡώς," ἐν δὲ τῷ "οὐ̄ν" οὐ μόνων διαφέροντα τὰ γράμματά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἦχοι οἱ μὲν δασύς, ὅ δὲ ψιλός, ὡστε πολλὰ ἀνόμοια εἶναι.

(74) καὶ ἐν ὁδαῖς δὲ τὰ μελίσματα ἐτὰ [τοῦ] ἕινος γίνεται <καὶ> 3 τοῦ αὐτοῦ μακροῦ γράμματος, οἴον ὁδῶν ἐπεμβαλλομένων ὁδαῖς, ὡστε ἡ τῶν ὁμοίων συγκρούσις μικρὸν ἐστι τὶ ὁδής μέρος καὶ μέλισμα. περὶ μὲν δὴ συγκρούσεως, καὶ ὡς γίνοιτ’ ἄν μεγαλοπρεπῆς σύνθεσις, λελέχθω τοσαῦτα.

(75) Ἕστι δὲ καὶ ἐν πράγμασι τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές,

1 τῆς οὐ P; οὐ del. Victorius.
2 ἐτὰ [τοῦ] edd.: ἀπὸ vel ἀπὸ τοῦ codd. rec.: ἀπὸ τοῦ vel fort. κατὰ P.
3 καὶ add. Gärtn.
music and harmony of the song. But perhaps this is not the time to enlarge on this subject.

(72) In the grand style the appropriate hiatus to use would be between long vowels, for example “ô” + “ô” in lân anô ôtheske (“he kept pushing the stone up”).\textsuperscript{a} The line has been lengthened by the hiatus and has reproduced the stone’s upward movement and the effort needed. Thucydides has a similar example, “ê” + “ê” in mē ëpetros einai (“not to be mainland”).\textsuperscript{b} Diphthongs too may clash with diphthongs, for example “oi” + “oi” in Kerkuraioi oikistês (“its colonists were Corcyrean, its founder was . . .”).\textsuperscript{c} (73) Hiatus then between the same long syllables and the same diphthongs creates grandeur. Yet so does hiatus between different vowels, producing variety as well as grandeur from the change of sound, for example êôs (“dawn”); and in the case of hoiên (“such”) not only are the vowels different but also the breathings, rough followed by smooth, so there is considerable variety. (74) In songs, too, a note can be prolonged on one and the same long vowel,\textsuperscript{d} a sort of song within a song, so that hiatus from similar vowels will produce a tiny part of a song, a prolonged note. But let this be enough on hiatus and the kind of composition appropriate to the grand style.

(75) Grandeur also comes from the subject, for exam-

\textsuperscript{a} Hom. \textit{Od}. 11.596. It is given detailed and sensitive analysis in DH. CV 20.

\textsuperscript{b} Th. 6.1.2.

\textsuperscript{c} Th. 1.24.2.

\textsuperscript{d} On the text and meaning (a prolonged note, not a trill), see H. Gärtnner, \textit{Hermes} 118 (1990) 214–19.
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ἀν μεγάλη καὶ διαπρεπῆς πεζομαχία ἡ ναυμαχία, ἢ περὶ οὐρανοῦ ἢ περὶ γῆς λόγος· οὗ γὰρ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀκούσων πράγματος εὕθως καὶ <τὸν>¹ λέγοντα οἶτε τι μεγάλως λέγειν, πλανῶμενος· δεῖ γὰρ οὗ τὰ λεγόμενα σκοπεῖν, ἀλλὰ πῶς λέγεται· ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα μικρῶς λέγοντα ἀπρεπές <τὶ>² ποιεῖν τῷ πράγματι. διὸ καὶ δεινοῦς τινὰς φασίν, ὡσπερ καὶ Θεόπομπον, δεινὰ οὐ δεινῶς λέγοντας.³ (76) Νικίας δ’ ὁ ζωγράφος καὶ τοῦτο εὕθως ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῆς γραφικῆς τέχνης οὐ μικρόν μέρος τὸ λαβόντα ὠλὴν εὑμεγέθη γράφειν, καὶ μὴ κατακερματίζειν τὴν τέχνην εἰς μικρά, οἷον ὁρνίθια ἢ ἀνθῆ, ἀλλ’ ἵππομαχίας καὶ ναυμαχίας, ἐνθα πολλὰ μὲν σχήματα δεῖξεν ἂν τῷ ἵππῳ τῶν μὲν θεόντων, τῶν δὲ ἀνθισταμένων ὀρθῶν, ἀλλῶν δὲ ὀκλαξίνων, πολλοὺς δ’ ἀκοντίζοντας, πολλοὺς δὲ καταπίπτοντας τῶν ἵππεων· φιλο γὰρ καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν αὐτῆς μέρος εἶναι τῆς ζωγραφικῆς τέχνης, ὡσπερ τοὺς μύθους τῶν ποιητῶν. οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστὸν, εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις [καὶ]⁴ ἐκ πραγμάτων μεγάλων⁵ μεγαλοπρέπεια γένηται.

(77) Τὴν δὲ λέξιν ἐν τῷ χαρακτήρι τούτῳ περιττὴν εἶναι δεῖ καὶ ἐξηλλαγμένην καὶ ἀσυνήθη μᾶλλον· οὕτω γὰρ ἔξει τὸν ὄγκον, ἡ δὲ κυρία καὶ συνήθης σαφῆς μὲν ἄει, τῇ⁶ δὲ καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος. (78) πρῶτα μὲν οὖν μεταφοραῖς χρηστέοις αὐτὰ γὰρ

¹ τὸν add. edd. ² τὶ add. Goeller. ³ λέγοντας Hammer: λέγοντα P.
ple when the subject is a great and famous battle on land or sea, or when earth or heaven is the theme. For the man who listens to an impressive subject immediately supposes that the speaker too is impressive—mistakenly, for we must consider not what but how he says it, since an unimpressive treatment of an impressive topic produces inappropriateness. Hence some writers like Theopom-
pus are said to be forceful, but it is their subject, not their style that is forceful. (76) The painter Nicia\textsuperscript{a} used to maintain that no small part of the painter’s skill was the choice at the outset to paint an imposing subject, and instead of frittering away his skill on minor subjects, such as little birds or flowers, he should paint naval battles and cavalry charges where he could represent horses in many different poses, charging, or rearing up, or crouching low, and many riders hurling javelins or being thrown. He held that the theme itself was a part of the painter’s skill, just as plot was part of the poet’s. So it is no surprise that in prose similarly grandeur comes from grandeur in the subject.

(77) The diction in the grand style should be distin-
guished, distinctive and the less usual. It will then have weight, while the normal, usual words may always be clear but are in certain cases unimpressive. (78) In the first place, we should use metaphors, for they more than

\textsuperscript{a} Nicias 1825 Overbeck, an Athenian painter of the later fourth century. No cavalry battle is attested for him, but he was famed for his paintings of animals, e.g. Pliny, \textit{Nat. Hist.} 35.133.

\textsuperscript{4} καὶ del. Spengel.
\textsuperscript{5} μεγάλων M: \textit{magnis} Lat.: μεγάλη P.
\textsuperscript{6} ἀεὶ τῆ P: \textit{semper et} Lat.: λειτή Spengel.
μάλιστα καὶ ἡδονὴν συμβάλλουν τοῖς λόγοις καὶ μέγεθος, μὴ μέντοι πυκναῖς, ἐπεὶ τοι διθύραμβον ἀντὶ λόγου γράφομεν· μήτε μὴν πόρρωθεν μετενη- νεγμέναις, ἀλλ’ αὐτόθεν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὀμοίου, οἷον ἔστω ἀλλήλους στρατηγός, κυβερνήτης, ἡμίοχος· πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἀρχοντές εἰσίν. ἀσφαλῶς οὖν ἔρει καὶ ὁ τῶν στρατηγὸν κυβερνήτην λέγων τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἀνάπαλιν ὁ τῶν κυβερνήτην ἡμίοχον¹ τῆς νησοῦ. (79) οὐ πάσαι μέντοι ἀνταποδίδονται, ἀσπερνεὶς ἀν αὐτοῖς προειρημένα, ἐπεὶ τὴν ὑπόρειαν μὲν τῆς Ἰδῆς πόλα ἔξην εἰπείν τὸν ποιητήν, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πόλα ὅψκετο ὑπόρειαν εἰπείν.

(80) Ἐπάν μέντοι κινδυνώδης ἢ μεταφορά δικῆ, μεταλαμβανόμεθα εἰς εἰκασίαν· οὖτω γὰρ ἀσφαλεστέρα γίγνοντ’ ἀν. εἰκασία δ’ ἐστὶ μεταφορά πλεονάζουσα, οὖν εἰ τις <τῷ>³ ἀνάμεσα ἐν τῷ Πύθωνι τῷ ρήτορι ἑρεοτι καθ’ ύμῶν” προσθεῖς εἰπο, “ὁσπερ ἑρεοτι καθ’ ύμῶν.” οὖτω μὲν γὰρ εἰκασία γέγονεν καὶ ἀσφαλεστέρος ὁ λόγος, ἐκείνως δὲ μεταφορά καὶ κινδυνωδέστερος. διὸ καὶ Πλάτων ἔπισφαλές τι δοκεῖ ποιεῖν μεταφοραῖς μᾶλλον χρώμενος ἡ εἰκασίας, ὁ μέντοι Ξενοφῶν εἰκασίας μᾶλλον.

(81) Ἀρίστη δὲ δοκεῖ μεταφορά τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει ἢ κατὰ ἐνέργειαν καλομένη, ὅταν τὰ ἄθυγχα ἐνεργοῦντα εἰσάγηται καθάπερ ἐμψυχα, ὡς τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ βέλους.

¹ ἡμίοχον Finckh: ἀρχοντα P. ² δ’ Victorius: ἀλλ’ P. ³ τῷ add. Gale.
anything make prose attractive and impressive, but they should not be crowded together (or we write a dithyramb instead of prose), nor yet far-fetched but from the same general area and based on a true analogy. For instance, general, pilot, and charioteer are similar in ruling over something. So it will be safe to say that a general is "the city's pilot" and conversely a pilot "the ship's charioteer." a

(79) But not all metaphors are reciprocal, like the above. Homer could call the lower slope of Ida its foot b but never a man's foot his slope.

(80) When a metaphor seems bold, convert it into a simile for greater safety. A simile is an expanded metaphor. For example instead of saying "the orator Python was then a rushing torrent against you," c expand it and say "was like a rushing torrent against you." The result is a simile and a less risky form of expression, while the former was a metaphor and more dangerous. This is why Plato's use of metaphor in preference to simile is thought risky. Xenophon by contrast prefers the simile.

(81) Aristotle d thought that what is called the personifying metaphor is the best, in which the inanimate is introduced personified as animate, for example in the

---

a For "charioteer of the ship" cf. EGF 'Homerus' F19 and 20 (= Ps.Plut. Vit. Hom. 2.20, RG 3.228). The change of text from "ruler" to "charioteer" provides a traditional example of metaphor, and preserves the focus on analogical metaphor (on which cf. Ar. Po. 1457b6ff).

b Cf. Hom. Il. 2.824; 20.59 and 218. Like other later critics, e.g. RG 3.228, he rejects Aristotle's advice that metaphors should always be reciprocal (Rhet. 1407a14–15).

c Dem. De Cor. 136 (cf. § 272).

d Nowhere explicitly, but cf. Ar. Rhet. 1410b35, 1411b32ff, which includes both the examples here.
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οξυβελής καθ’ ὁμιλον ἐπιπέτεσθαι μενεαίνων,
καὶ τὸ "κυρτὰ φαληριώντα." πάντα γὰρ τὰῦτα, τὸ "φαληριώντα" καὶ τὸ "μενεαίνων," ζωτικαῖς ἐνεργείαις ἔοικεν. (82) ἕνα μέντοι σαφέστερον ἐν ταῖς μεταφοραῖς λέγεται καὶ κυριότερον ἦπερ¹ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς κυρίοις, ὥσ τὸ ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχη." οὗ γὰρ ἂν τις αὐτὸ μεταβαλὼν διὰ κυρίων οὐτ’ ἀληθέστερον εἴποι οὔτε σαφέστερον. τὸν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν δοράτων κλόνον <καὶ τὸν>² γυνόμενον τούτοις ἴρεμα ἢχον συνεχῶς φρύσοντον μάχην προσηγόρευσεν, καὶ ἀμα ἐπείληπται πῶς τῆς κατ’ ἐνέργειαν μεταφορᾶς τῆς προειρημένης, τὴν μάχην φρύσεσσιν εἰπὼν ὥσπερ ζῶον.

(83) Δεὶ μέντοι μὴ λανθάνειν, ὅτι ἐναι μεταφορὰ μικροπρέπειαν ποιοῦσι μᾶλλον ἤ μέγεθος, καίτοι τῆς μεταφορᾶς πρὸς ὅγκον λαμβανομένης, ἡς τὸ "ἀμφὶ δ’ ἔσταλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανός"· οὐρανὸν γὰρ ὅλον ἢχον τῷ ἐχρὴν προσεικάσαι ἢχοῦσθε σάλπιγγι, πλὴν εἰ μή τις ἄρα³ απολογοῖτο ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ὀμήρου λέγων, ὡς οὔτως⁴ ἢχησεν μέγας οὐρανός, ὥς ἄν ἢχησεν σαλπίξων ὅλος οὐρανός. (84) ἔτεραν οὖν ἐπινοήσωμεν μεταφορὰν μικρότητος αὐτῶν γυνομένην μᾶλλον ἤ μεγέθους· δεὶ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν μειζόνων μεταφέρειν εἰς τὰ μικρά, οὐ τὸ ἐναντίον, οἶον ὡς ὁ Ἱερόθύμνῳ φησιν, "ἐπεὶ δὲ πορευομένων ἐξεκύμηνε

¹ ἦπερ edd.: ἦπερ P. ² καὶ τὸν add. Spengel. ³ ἄρα edd.: ἄμα P. ⁴ ὡς οὔτως Greg.: ὥστις P.
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passage describing the arrow, “sharp-pointed, eager to shoot into the crowd” and in the words “high-arched, foam-crested.”a All such expressions as “foam-crested” and “eager” activate a personification. (82) Some things are, however, expressed more clearly and properly by metaphor than by the actual proper terms, for example “the battle shuddered.”b No change of phrasing to introduce the proper terms could convey the meaning with greater truth or clarity. Homer has renamed as “shuddering battle” the clash of spears and the low, continuous sound they make. In so doing he has simultaneously exploited the personifying metaphor of our earlier discussion when he represents the battle shuddering as if alive.

(83) We must, however, keep in mind that some metaphors produce triviality rather than grandeur, even though the metaphor is intended to impress, for example “all around the mighty heaven trumpeted.”c The whole heaven resounding ought not to have been compared to a resounding trumpet—unless perhaps a defence of Homer could be made that the mighty heaven resounded in the way in which the whole heaven would resound if it were trumpeting. (84) So let us consider a second example of metaphor which has a trivial rather than grand effect. Metaphors should compare the smaller to the greater, not the reverse. Xenophon, for example, says,

---

a Hom. Il. 4.126 and 13.799 (cf. § 64, illustrating asyndeton).
c Hom. Il. 21.388, a controversial metaphor, cf. Longinus 9.6, Pliny, Epist. 9.26.6. Since it may be defended, Demetrius adds a second example, which incontrovertibly trivialises.
DEMETRIUS

τι τῆς φάλαγγος." τὴν γὰρ τῆς τάξεως παρεκτροπὴν ἐκκυμαίνουσα θαλάσση εἶκασεν καὶ προσωνόμασεν. εἰ δὲ τις μεταβαλὼν εἴτε έκφαλαγγίσασαν τὴν θάλασσαν, τάχα μὲν οὐδὲ οἰκείως μετοίσει, πάντη δὲ πάντως μικροπρεπῶς.

(85) "Εννοι δὲ καὶ ἀσφαλίζονται τὰς μεταφορὰς ἐπιθέτους ἐπιφερομένους, ὅταν αὐτοῖς κινδυνώδεις δοκῶσιν, ὡς ὁ Θεόγνις παρατίθεται τῷ τόξῳ "φόρμηγγα ἄχορδον" ἐπὶ τοῦ τῷ τόξῳ βάλλοντος· ἡ μὲν γὰρ φόρμηγγες κινδυνώδεις ἐπὶ τοῦ τόξου, τῷ δὲ ἄχορδῳ ἡσφάλισται.

(86) Πάντων δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡ συνήθεια καὶ μάλιστα μεταφορῶν διδάσκαλος· μικρὸν γὰρ [σχεδόν]4 πάντα μεταφέροντα λανθάνει διὰ τὸ ἀσφαλῶς μεταφέρειν, λευκὴν τε φωνὴν λέγουσα καὶ ὄξυν ἀνθρωπον καὶ τραχὺ ὧθος καὶ μακρὸν ῥήτορα καὶ τάλλα, ὡσα οὕτω μεταφέρεται μονοσκός, ὡστε ὁμοια δοκεῖν τοῖς κυρίοις. (87) τούτον <οὖν>5 ἐγὼ καλόνα τίθεμαι τῆς ἐν λόγοις μεταφορῶν, τῆς τῆς συνήθειας τέχνην εἴτε φύσιν. οὕτω γοῦν ἐνια μετήνεγκεν ἡ συνήθεια καλῶς, ὡστε οὐδὲ κυρίων ἐτί ἐδεήθημεν, ἀλλὰ μεμένηκεν ἡ μεταφορὰ κατέχουσα τὸν τοῦ

1 τι Greg., Xen. codd.: om. P.
2 τῷ τόξῳ φόρμηγγα Nauck: τὸν τοξοφόρμηγγα P.
3 τῷ M: τῷ P.
4 σχεδον del. Roberts.
5 οὖν addidi: autem Lat.
"on the march a part of the phalanx surged out."\textsuperscript{a} He compared a swerve from the line of march to a surging of the sea, and gave it that name. But if conversely you were to say that the sea swerved from its line of march, the metaphor would possibly not even fit; in any case it would be utterly and completely trivial.

(85) When they consider their metaphors risky, some writers try to make them safe by adding epithets; for example Theognis refers to the bow as a "Lyre with tuneless strings,"\textsuperscript{b} when describing an archer in the act of shooting. The image of the bow as lyre is bold, but it is made safe by the qualification "with tuneless strings."

(86) Usage\textsuperscript{c} is our teacher everywhere, but particularly in the case of metaphors. Usage, in fact, expresses almost everything in metaphors, but they are so safe that we hardly notice them. It calls a voice pure, a man sharp, a character harsh, a speaker long, and so on. All are applied so harmoniously that they pass for the proper terms. (87) So my own rule for the use of metaphor is the art—or natural instinct—of usage. Metaphors have in some cases been so well established by usage that we no longer need the proper terms, and the metaphor has usurped the

\textsuperscript{a} Xen. \textit{Anab.} 1.8.18.
\textsuperscript{b} TrGF i. Theognis F 1; cf. Ar. \textit{Rhet.} 1413a1.
\textsuperscript{c} For appeal to usage, cf. §§ 69, 91, and 96; for its role as \textit{διδάσκαλος} or \textit{κανών}, cf. Quint. 1.6.3 \textit{loquendi magistra}, Hor. \textit{Ars Po.} 72 \textit{norma loquendi}.

§§ 86–87 discuss metaphors of ordinary speech, examples of usage so apt that we no longer try to find a proper term. Compare the necessary metaphor in Cic. \textit{De Or.} 3.155 and Quint. 8.6.6, both with similar examples, e.g. \textit{durum hominem} and \textit{gemmare vites}. 
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κυρίου τόπον, ώς “ὁ τῆς ἀμπέλου ὀφθαλμὸς” καὶ εἰ
tι ἑτερον τοιούτον. (88) σφόνδυλος μέντοι καὶ κλεῖς
τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ κτένες οὐ κατὰ μεταφορὰν
ἀνόμασται, ἀλλὰ καθ’ ὀμοιότητα διὰ τὸ ἐσικένα τὸ
μὲν κτενὶ μέρος, τὸ δὲ κλειδὶ, τὸ δὲ σφονδύλῳ.

(89) Ἐπὶ πέντε εἰκασίαι ποιῶμεν τὴν μεταφο-
ράν, ὡς προλέκεται, στοχαστέον τοῦ συντόμου, καὶ
tοῦ μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ1 ὁσπερ” προτιθέναι, ἐπεὶ τοι
ἀντ’ εἰκασίας παραβολῆ ἦσσαν ποιητική, οἴον τὸ τοῦ
Ξενοφῶντος, “ὁσπερ δὲ κύων γεγεναις ἀπρονοήτως
ἐπὶ κάπρον φέρεται,” καὶ “ὁσπερ ἰππος λυθεὶς διὰ
πεδίου γαυρτῶν καὶ ἀπολακτίζων”. ταύτα γὰρ οὐκ
εἰκασίαις ἐτί ἐοικεν, ἀλλὰ παραβολαῖς ποιητικαῖς.
(90) τὰς δὲ παραβολὰς ταύτας οὔτε ῥαδίως ἐν τοῖς
πεζοῖς λόγους τιθέναι δεῖ, οὔτε ἀνεν πλεῑστης φυλα-
kῆς. καὶ περὶ μεταφορὰς μὲν <τοσαῦτα>2 ὡς τύπῳ
eἰπεῖν.

(91) Δηπτέον δὲ καὶ σύνθετα ὀνόματα, οὐ τὰ
diθυραμβικῶς συγκείμενα, οἴον “θεοτεράτους πλά-
nας,” οὐδὲ “ἀστρων δορύπυρον στρατῶν,” ἀλλ’ ἐοι-
kότα τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς συνηθείας3 συγκειμένους· καθόλου
γὰρ ταύτην κανόνα ποιούμασ πάσης ὀνομασίας,

1 τοῦ μηδὲ τὸ P¹: μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ P² in mg.
2 τοσαῦτα add. Schneider.
3 συνηθείας Finckh: ἀληθείας P.

The eye is normal Greek for the bud of a plant or tree, e.g.
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place of the proper term, for example the eye of the vine,\(^a\) and so forth. (88) The parts of the body,\(^b\) however, which are called the "disk" (vertebra), the "key" (collarbone), and the "combs" (back of the hand) derive their names not from metaphor but from the physical resemblance.

(89) When we turn a metaphor into a simile in the way I described,\(^c\) we must aim at conciseness, and do no more than prefix "like," or else we shall have a poetic comparison instead of a simile. Take, for example, "like a gallant hound which recklessly charges a boar" (from Xenophon)\(^d\) and "like a horse let loose, kicking and proudly prancing over the plain."\(^e\) Such descriptions no longer seem similes but poetic comparisons, (90) and poetic comparisons should not be used freely in prose nor without the greatest caution. This concludes my outline on the subject of metaphor.

(91) Next, we should use compound words, but not those in dithyrambic formations, for example "god-prodigied wanderings" or "the fiery-speared army of the stars."\(^f\) They should be like those formed by usage. In general, in all word formation I regard usage as the

\(^a\) The connection of thought is unclear, but the term metaphor is now restricted to analogical metaphor (cf. § 78).

\(^b\) See § 80.

\(^c\) Xen. _Cyrop._ 1.4.21 (cf. § 274).

\(^d\) Author unknown, an imitation of a famous simile in Hom. _Il._ 6.506ff.

\(\omegaς\; δ\'\; οτε\; της\; στατος\; ἵππος,\; ἀκοστήσας\; ἐπι\; φάτνη,\)
\(δεσμον\; ἀπορρήξας\; θέιγ\; πεδίου\; κροαίνων\; . . .\)
\(κυδίων.\)

\(^f\) PMG _Adesp._ 962(a) and (b).
νομοθέταις λέγουσαν καὶ ἀρχιτέκτονας, καὶ τοιάδε πολλὰ ἔτερα ἀσφαλῶς συντιθείσαν. (92) ἔξει μέντοι τὸ σύνθετον όνομα ὅμοι καὶ ποικιλίαν τινὰ ἐκ τῆς συνθέσεως καὶ μέγεθος, καὶ ἁμα καὶ συντομίαν τινὰ. ὄνομα γὰρ τεθήσεται ἀντὶ ὅλου τοῦ λόγου, ὦν ἂν τὴν τοῦ σίτου κομιδὴν σιτοπομπίαν λέγησι· πολὺ γὰρ οὔτω μείζον. τάχα δ’ ἂν καὶ λυθέντος όνόματος εἰς λόγον ἔτερον τρόπον μείζον γένοιτο, ὦν σίτου πομπῆ ἀντὶ σιτοπομπίας. (93) όνομα δ’ ἂντ’ λόγου τίθεται, ὦν ὡς ὁ Ἐννοφῶν φησίν οτι οὐκ ἦν λαβεῖν όνον ἁγιον, εἰ μὴ οἱ ἱππέες διαστάντες θηρᾶν διαδεχόμενοι, όνόματι δηλῶν ὅτι οἱ μὲν ὁπισθεν ἐδώκον, οἱ δ’ ἀπήντων ὑπελαύνοντες πρόσω, ὥστε τὸν όνον ἐν μέσῳ ἀπολαμβάνεσθαι. φυλάττεσθαι μέντοι δὲι πολλὰ τιθέναι τὰ διπλὰ όνόματα· τούτο γὰρ ἔξεισι; λόγου πεζοῦ τὸ εἶδος.

(94) Τὰ δ’ πετοιμένα όνόματα ὑφίστονται μὲν τὰ κατὰ μίμησιν ἐκφερόμενα πάθους ἢ πράγματος, ὦν ὡς τὸ „σίζε” καὶ τὸ „λάπτοντες,” (95) ποιεῖ δὲ [μάλιστα] ὁ μεγαλοπρέπειαν διὰ τὸ ὦν ψόφους ἐσωκέναι καὶ μάλιστα τῷ ἔξειρῷ οὔ γὰρ ὄντα όνόματα λέγει ἀλλὰ τότε γινομένα, καὶ ἁμα σοφόν τι φαινεῖται όνόματος καὶνοῦ γένεσις, ὦν συνηθείας· ἔουκεν


---

**a** A rare meaning of πομπῆ, e.g. Th. 4.108.1.

**b** Xen. Anab. 1.5.2. The text is uncertain but concerns the terse effect of the compound verb, διαδεχόμενοι, “in relays.”
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arbiter, usage which speaks of “lawgivers” and “master builders,” and forms many other such safe compounds. (92) A compound word will usually, from the very fact that it is composite, have variety, grandeur, and simultaneously conciseness. One word will stand for an entire phrase. For instance, you might speak of “grain convoy” instead of “the transport of grain,” using a much more striking expression. Still, the greater impact may sometimes result from the converse process of resolving a word into a phrase, “convoy of grain,” for instance, instead of “grain convoy.” (93) An example of a word replacing a phrase is Xenophon’s sentence: “It was not possible to capture a wild ass unless the mounted men separated and hunted in relays.”b By the single word “relays” he says that some horsemen gave chase from behind, while others rode forward to meet them, so that the wild ass was caught in the middle. The use, however, of many compoundsc should be avoided, since it oversteps the limits of prose.

(94) Onomatopoeic words are defined as those which are uttered in imitation of an emotion or action, for example “hissed” and “lapping” (size and laptontes).d (95) They create grandeur by their resemblance to inarticulate sounds, and above all by their novelty. The speaker is not using existing words but words which are only then coming into existence, and at the same time the creation of a new word is thought clever, as though it were the creation

c Cf. e.g. Ar. Rhet. 1404b23. Less probably, keeping the text of the mss, translate “The doubling of double compounds . . . ,” a warning against triple compounds, cf. Ar. Po. 1457a34.

DEMETRIUS

γούν <ὁ> 1 ὄνοματουργῶν τοῖς πρῶτοι θεμένοις τὰ ὄνόματα. <...> 2

(96) Στοχαστέων <οὖν> 3 πρῶτον μὲν τοῦ σαφοῦς ἐν τῷ ποιομένῳ ὄνοματι καὶ συνήθους, ἕπειτα τῆς ὁμοιότητος πρὸς τὰ κείμενα ὄνόματα, ὡς μὴ φρυγίζειν ἢ σκυθίζειν τις δόξει μεταξύ ἐλληνικῶν τοῖς ὄνομασι. 4 (97) ποιητέοι μέντοι ἦτοι τὰ μὴ ὄνομασμένα, οἶνον τὰ τύμπανα καὶ τάλλα τῶν μαλθακῶν ὀργάνα κιναίδιας 5 εἰπὼν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης τὸν ἐλεφαντιστήν ὡς παρὰ τὰ κείμενα παρονομάζοντα αὐτόν, οἶνον ὡς τὸν σκαφῆτην τῆς ἐφή τὸν τῇν σκάφην ἐρέσσοντα, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης τὸν αὐτότην οἶνον τὸν μόνον αὐτὸν ὡντα. (98) Ξενοφῶν δὲ ἡλέλιξε” 6 φησιν “ὁ στρατός,” 7 τὴν τοῦ ἔλελεῦ ἀναβόησεν ἢν ἀνεβόα στρατὸς 8 συνεχῶς παραποιήσας ὄνόματι.

1 ὁ add. Rutherford.
2 lacunam statui, ut transeamus ad conficta et declinata, cf. etiam § 98 ὡς ἐφῆν.
3 οὖν addidi.
4 ἐλληνικῶν τοῖς ὄνομασι Lockwood: ἐλληνικῶς ὄνομασι P: ἐλληνικῶν ὄνομάτων Dresd.
5 αν κιναίδια?
6 ἡλέλιξ Victorius: ἡλλαξεν P.
7 στρατός Victorius: στρατήγος P.
8 στρατός Victorius: στρατηγός P.

a §§ 94–95 recognise only onomatopoeic neologism, §§ 97–98
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of a new usage. So the creator of new words is like those who originally created language.<...>\textsuperscript{a}

(96) The first aim in the formation of neologisms is to be clear and fit usage; the next, to follow the analogy of established words, in order to avoid the appearance of introducing Phrygian or Scythian speech in our Greek. (97) Neologisms should be either newly invented forms, as was done by the person who described the drums and other musical instruments of the effeminate priests as “lecheries,”\textsuperscript{b} or by Aristotle when he invented “elephanteer”;\textsuperscript{c} or the writer may create secondary meanings from existing words, for example when someone gave the name “boatman”\textsuperscript{d} to someone rowing a boat, and Aristotle called a man who lived alone by himself “selfish.”\textsuperscript{e} (98) Xenophon similarly says, “the army hurrah’d,”\textsuperscript{f} denoting by the derivative the shout “hurrah” which the army abruptly introduce neologism from compounds and derivatives, and in § 98 “as I said” lacks reference. I posit a lacuna, with the general sense, “There are also derivative neologisms; they are full of risk, even in poetry.” For the three types, cf. fingere, con-fingere, declinare in Varro, Ling. Lat. 5.7, a classification of the Alexandrians.

\textsuperscript{b} Author unknown.

\textsuperscript{c} Ar. Hist. Anim. 497b28.

\textsuperscript{d} Author unknown, cf. Strabo 17.1.49. The form could alternatively (though it is not attested) have the meaning “digger” (cf. σκαφεύς).

\textsuperscript{e} Ar. fr. 668 Rose (cf. §§ 144, 164). The translation attempts a similar pun on self(ish)/being by one’s self. Elsewhere αὐτίτης refers to homemade wine, i.e. wine made by one’s self.

\textsuperscript{f} Xen. Anab. 5.2.14. Here (also Anab. 1.8.18) it refers to the cry eleleu, but normally it means “to whirl around, cause to vibrate.”
DEMETRIUS

ἐπισφαλὲς μέντοι τούργον, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς ποιηταῖς. καὶ τὸ διπλοῦν μέντοι ὄνομα εἶδος ἂν εἰη πεποιημένον ὄνοματος· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ συντιθέμενον ἐκ τινῶν γέγονεν δηλονότι.

(99) Μεγαλεῖον δὲ τί ἐστι καὶ ἡ ἀληγορία, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς ἀπειλαῖς, οἶνον ὡς ὁ Διονύσιος, ότι "οἱ τέττιγες αὐτοῖς ἄσονται ἁχαμόθεν." ὡς οὖν ὡσ τῶν ἄπλώσ ἔπειν, ὅτι τεμεῖ τῇ Δοκρίδᾳ χώραν, καὶ ὀργιλότερος ἀν ἔφανη καὶ εὐπελέστερος. νῦν δὲ ὡσπερ συγκαλύμματι τοῦ λόγου τῇ ἀληγορίᾳ κέχρηται: πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ὑπονοοῦμενον φοβερότερον, καὶ ἄλλος εἰκάζει ἄλλο τὸ ὅ δὲ σαφὲς καὶ φανερόν, καταφρονεῖσθαι εἰκός, ὡσπερ τοὺς ἀποδεδυμένους.

(100) διὸ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐν ἀληγορίαις λέγεται πρὸς ἐκπληξίν καὶ φρίκην, ὡσπερ ἐν σκότῳ καὶ νυκτί. έοικε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀληγορία τῷ σκότῳ καὶ τῇ νυκτί. (102) φυλάττεσθαι μέντοι κατὶ ταύτης τὸ συνεχές, ὡς μὴ αἴνιγμα ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν γένηται, οἶνον τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς συκύας τῆς ἰατρικῆς: "ἀνδρὶ εἴδον πυρὶ χαλκῶν ἐπ᾽ ἀνέρι κολλήσαντα." καὶ οἱ Δάκωνες πολλὰ ἐν ἀληγορίαις ἔλεγον ἐκφοβοῦντες, οἶνον τὸ "Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ" πρὸς Φίλιππον, καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα οὐκ ὄλιγα.

1 ὡς Victorius: καὶ ὡς P.
2 ἄσονται edd.: ἄρονται P.
3 ἁχαμόθεν M (cf. § 243): χαμάθεν P.
4 φανερὸν Goeller: φοβερὸν P.
kept continuously shouting. The practice is, however, as I said, a full of risk even for the poets themselves. Note too that any compound is a form of neologism, for anything which is composite must, of course, derive from preexisting parts.

(99) Allegory is also impressive, particularly in threats, for example that of Dionysius, “their cicadas will sing from the ground.”b If he had said openly that he would ravage the land of Locris, he would have shown more anger but less dignity. As it is, he has shrouded his words, as it were, in allegory. What is implied always strikes more terror, since its meaning is open to different interpretations, whereas what is clear and plain is apt to be despised, like men who are stripped of their clothes.

(101) This is why the mysteries are revealed in allegories, to inspire the shuddering and awe associated with darkness and night. In fact allegory is not unlike darkness and night. (102) Here again in the case of allegory we should avoid a succession of them, or our words become a riddle, as in the description of the surgeon’s cupping glass: “I saw a man who had with fire welded bronze to a man.”c The Spartans too often spoke in allegory to evoke fear, as in the message to Philip, “Dionysius in Corinth,”d and many other similar threats.

---

a See note on § 95.

b Stesichorus according to Ar. Rhet. 1395a1–2 and 1412a22–23 (= PMG 281(b)); cf. § 243.

c Cleobulina 1.1 West; cf. Ar. Rhet. 1405b1.

d Cf. §§ 8, 241.

5 σκότῳ Victorius: αὐτῷ P.

6 Σκότῳ Victorius: αὐτῷ (sic) P.
DEMETRIUS

(103) Ἡ συντομία δὲ πὴ μὲν μεγαλοπρεπῆς, καὶ μάλιστα ἡ ἀποσιώπησις· ἐνὶ γὰρ μὴ ῥηθέντα μείζονα φαίνεται καὶ ὑπονοθέντα μᾶλλον πὴ δὲ μικροπρεπῆς. καὶ γὰρ ἐν διλογίαις γίνεται μέγεθος, οἶνον ὡς Ἐξενοφῶν, "τὰ δὲ ἅρματα ἐφέρετο," φησί, "τὰ μὲν δι’ αὐτῶν τῶν φιλίων, τὰ δὲ καὶ δι’ αὐτῶν τῶν πολεμίων." πολὺ γὰρ οὕτω μείζον, η ἐπερ ὅδ’ εἶπεν, "καὶ διὰ τῶν φιλίων καὶ διὰ τῶν πολεμίων αὐτῶν." (104) πολλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ τὸ πλάγιον μείζον τοῦ εὐθέος, οἶνον "ἡ δὲ γνώμη ἤν, ὡς εἰς τὰς τάξεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλώντων1 καὶ διακοψόντων" ἀντὶ τοῦ "διενοῦντο ἐλάσσαν καὶ διακόψαι." (105) συμβεβληται δὲ καὶ ἡ ὄμοιότης τῶν ὄνομάτων καὶ ἡ δυσφωνία ἡ φανομένη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ δύσφωνον πολλαχοῦ ὄγκορόν, ὡσπερ "Αἰας δ’ ὁ μέγας αἰεὶν ἐφ’ Ἐκτορὶ. πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον τὸν Αἰαντα μέγαν ἔνεβηνεν ἡ τῶν δύο σύμπληξις τῆς ἔπταβοείου ἀσπίδος.

(106) Τὸ δὲ ἐπιφώνημα καλοῦμενον ὀρίζοντα μὲν ἄν τις λέξει ἐπικοσμοῦσαν, ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπέστατον ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, τῆς γὰρ λέξεως ἡ μὲν ὑπηρετεί, ἡ δὲ ἐπικοσμεῖ. ὑπηρετεῖ μὲν ἡ τοιάδε, οὐαν τὰν ὑάκινθον ἐν οὐρεσί ποιμένες ἀνδρεῖς ποσσὶ καταστείβουσιν,

ἐπικοσμεῖ δὲ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τὸ "χαμαι δὲ τε πόρ-

1 ἐλώντων Xen. codd.: ἐλθόντων P.

a Xen. Anab. 1.8.20. Compare anthypallage in § 60.
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(103) In certain cases conciseness, and especially apop.
siopesis, produce grandeur, since some things seem more
significant when they are not openly expressed but only
implied. In other cases, however, triviality is the result.
In fact, grandeur may result from repeating words, as in
Xenophon, "The chariots rushed on, some of them right
through the ranks of their friends, some right through the
ranks of their enemies."\textsuperscript{a} This wording is far more striking
than if he had said, "right through the ranks of both
friends and enemies alike." (104) Often too an indirect
construction is more impressive than the direct, for ex-
ample "the intention was that of charging the ranks of the
Greeks and cutting their way through,"\textsuperscript{b} rather than "they
intended to charge and cut their way through." (105) The
assonance of the words and a conspicuous lack of
euphony have also contributed to its impact. For
cacophony is often impressive, as in the words, "mighty
Ajax aimed always at Hector,"\textsuperscript{c} where the clash of the two
sounds brings out the greatness of Ajax more vividly than
his famous shield with its seven layers of oxhide.

(106) What is called the epiphoneme may be defined
as additional decorative detail. It is the most imposing
kind of verbal grandeur. Language can be functional; it
can also be decorative. It is functional in a passage like
this, "as the hyacinth in the mountains is by shepherds
trampled underfoot," but what comes next adds decora-

\textsuperscript{b} Xen. \textit{Anab.} 1.8.10. Indirect construction is at least primarily
the use of subordinate participial constructions, cf. § 198.
The example (so § 105) also illustrates assonance (from the end-
ing, \textit{-on/-ontôn/-ontôn}, cf. § 25) and clashing sounds (includ-
ing hiatus of long syllables, cf. § 72).

\textsuperscript{c} Hom. \textit{Il.} 16.358 (cf. § 48).
DEMETRIUS

φυρον ἄνθος". ἐπενήμερται γὰρ τοῦτο τοῖς προεξενηπεγμένοις1 κόσμος σαφῶς καὶ κάλλος. (107) μεστὴ δὲ τούτων καὶ ἡ Ὀμήρου ποιήσις, οἶον ἐκ καπνοῦ κατέθηκε, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τούτων ἔφεκε, οἷς τὸ πάρος Τροίηνδε κιὸν κατέλειπεν ὦντες.

πρὸς δὲ ἔτι καὶ τόδε μεῖζον ἐπὶ φρεσὶν ἐμβαλε δαίμων,

μήπως οἰνωθέντες, ἔριν στήσαντες ἐν ψυμῖν,

ἀλλήλους τρώσαντε.

εἶτα ἐπιφώνει, "αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος." (108) καὶ καθόλου τὸ ἐπιφώνημα τοῖς τῶν πλουσίων έουκεν ἐπιδείγμασιν, γείσους λέγω καὶ τριγλύφους καὶ πορφύρας πλατείας· οἶον γὰρ τι καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦ ἐν λόγοις πλουτὸν σημειών ἔστων.

(109) Δόξειεν δ' ἄν καὶ τὸ ἐνθύμημα ἐπιφωνήματος εἶδός τι εἶναι, οὐκ ὅν μέν (οὔ γὰρ κόσμον ἐνεκεν, ἀλλὰ ἀποδείξεως παραλαμβάνεται), πλὴν ἐπιλεγόμενον γε ἐπιφωνηματικῶς. (110) ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἡ γνώμη ἐπιφωνομένων τινὶ έουκεν ἐπὶ προετρήμενοι, ἀλλ' οὖν' αὕτη ἐπιφωνήμα ἔστι· καὶ γὰρ προλέγεται πολλάκις, λαμβάνει μέντοι χώραν ποτὲ ἐπιφωνήματος. (111) τὸ δὲ, "νήπιος οὔδ' ἄρ' ἐμελλε κακᾶς ὑπὸ κήρας ἀλύζειν," οὔν' αὐτὸ ἐπιφώνημα ἄν

1 προεξενηπεγμένοις Lockwood: προετρήμενοις P.

a Sappho 105(c) L–P.
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tive detail, "and on the ground the purple flower. . . ."a For this addition to the preceding lines clearly adds de
oration and beauty. (107) Homer’s poetry is full of exam
les, for example

“I have put the weapons away, out of the smoke,
since they no longer look
like those which Odysseus left behind earlier when
he went to Troy.
Moreover a god has put this yet greater fear in my
heart,
that you may become drunk, start up a quarrel
and wound each other.”

Then he adds the detail, “for iron of itself draws men to
fight.”b (108) In general, the epiphoneme resembles the
things which only the rich display—cornices, triglyphs,
and broad bands of purple.c For it is in itself a sort of rich
ness in speech.

(109) The enthymeme might be thought to be a kind
of epiphoneme. But it is not, since it is used for proof, not
decoration—though admittedly it may come last in the
manner of an epiphoneme. (110) Similarly a maxim
resembles in some ways a detail added to a previous state
ment, but it in its turn is not an epiphoneme, since it
often comes first and only sometimes takes the final posi
tion of an epiphoneme. (111) Again, take the line “the
fool! he was not going to escape hard fate”.d that would

b Hom. Od. 16.288–94 = 19.7–13 (with omissions).
c In juxtaposition to cornices and triglyphs, the broad bands
of purple will be an architectural feature, such as bands of paint
on metopes or walls. Less probably, it is purple cloth, as in the
“purple patch” of Hor. Ars Po. 15–16.
DEMETRIUS

εὖν οὖ γὰρ ἐπιλέγεται οὐδὲ ἐπίκοσμεῖ, οὐδ’ ὅλως ἐπιφωνήματι ἔουεν ἀλλὰ προσφωνήματι ἡ ἐπικερ- τομήματι.

(112) Τὸ δὲ ποιητικὸν ἐν λόγοις ὁτι μὲν μεγαλο- πρεπές, καὶ τυφλῶ δῆλον φαινι, πλὴν οἱ μὲν γυμνῆ πάντω χρώνται τῇ μιμήσει τῶν ποιητῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ μιμήσει ἀλλὰ μεταβῆσει, καθάπερ Ἡρόδωτος. (113) Θουκυδίδης μὲντοι κἂν λάβῃ παρὰ ποιητῶν τι, ἰδίως αὐτῶ χρώμενος ἰδιον τὸ ληφθὲν ποιεῖ, οἴον ο μὲν ποιητὴς ἐπὶ τῆς Κρήτης ἔφη,

Κρήτη της γα’ ἐστι ¹ μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ, καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυτος.

ὁ μὲν δὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγέθους ἐχρῆσατο τῷ “περίρρυ- τος,” ὁ δὲ Θουκυδίδης ὁμονοεῖν τοὺς Σικελιώτας καλὸν οἴεται εἶναι, γης οὔτας μιὰς καὶ περιρρύτουν, καὶ ταῦτα² πάντα εἰπὼν, γην τε ἀντὶ νήσου καὶ περιρρύτουν ὁσαύτως, ὅμως ἔτερα λέγειν δοκεῖ, διὸτι ὅν χόν πρὸς μέγεθος ἀλλὰ πρὸς ὁμονοιαν αὐτῶς ἐχρῆσατο. περὶ μὲν δὴ μεγαλοπρεπείας τοσαύτα.

(114) Ἡσσερ δὲ παράκειται φαύλα τινα ἀστείους τιαίν, οἴον θάρρει μὲν τὸ θράσος, ἡ δ’ αὐχύνη τῇ αἴδῃ, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῖς χαρακτήρων παράκειται διημαρτημένοι τινές. πρῶ- ¹ γα’ ἐστι codd. Hom.: γ’ ἐστι Ῥ.
² ταῦτα Ῥ.
not be an epiphoneme either. For it is not a later addition, nor is it decorative, nor is it in any way like an epiphoneme, but rather an exclamatory address or a rebuke.

(112) Poetic vocabulary in prose adds grandeur, as, in the words of the proverb, even a blind man can see.\(^a\) Still, some writers imitate the poets quite crudely, or rather, they do not imitate but plagiarise them, as Herodotus has done. (113) Contrast Thucydides. Even if he borrows vocabulary from a poet, he uses it in his own way and makes it his own property. Homer, for instance, says of Crete: “There is a land of Crete, in the midst of the wine-dark sea, beautiful, fertile, wave-surrounded.”\(^b\) Now Homer used the word “wave-surrounded” to be impressive. Thucydides, for his part, thinks it right that the Sicilians should act in unity, as they belong to one single “wave-surrounded land.”\(^c\) He uses the same words as Homer, “land” instead of “island” and “wave-surrounded,” yet he seems to be saying something different. The reason is that he uses the words not to impress but to recommend unity. This concludes my account of the grand style.

(114) But just as in the sphere of ethics certain bad qualities lie close to certain good ones (rashness, for example, next to bravery, and shame to modest respect), so too the types of style have neighbouring faulty styles.

\(^a\) Cf. § 239, Paroem. Gr. ii.156.
\(^b\) Hom. Od. 19.172–73.
\(^c\) Th. 4.64.3 (the speaker is Hermocrates of Syracuse) τὸ δὲ ξύμπαν γείτονας ὄντας καὶ ἕνωκοις μίας χώρας καὶ περιρρύτου καὶ ὀνόμα ἐν κεκλημένος Σικελλώτας. The use of περίρρυτος in Hdt. 4.42.2 and 4.45.1 may make the general reference to Herodotus in § 112 more pointed.
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ta de peri tou gemeiwontos to megalooprephe lexe-
men. onoma mên ouv autw phvkrôw, orizetai de to
phvkrôn Theôfrastos ouwos, phvkrôn esti to uper-
baallon twn oikeias apaggelian, ouw "apvndakwotos
ou trapexouontai kûliex," antî tou upymenous épí tra-
pexh kûliex ou tithetai. to gar prâguma smkrôn ou
ou déxetai oukou tosoûton lexeos.

(115) Gînetai mëntoi kai to phvkrôn ev trosin,
ôsper kai to megalooprepeis. ëi gar ev dianoia,
katháper épî tou Kûklopos lîsthoboloûntos tîn naôv
bou Ódussewêv efh tîs, "feromênou tou lîthou akês
ènemounto ev autw." èk gar touti uperbeblêmênou tê
thia diasvdoias kai aduvatou ëi phvkrôthsh. (116) ev
dê lexei ò 'Aristotelês phesì gînesothai tetraçhôs,
<...>1 òws
'Alkidâmâs "ûgrou ídrôta". ëi ev suneðetai, òtan
diathramaßoî swnetéh ëi dîplwos tou õnômatos,
òs tou "ërhmoplaços" efh tîs, kai ei2 ti allou ouwos
upereugou. gînetai de kai ev metaforâ tou phvkrôn,
"trémontâ kaiôhra tá prâgmata.3" tetaçhôs mên
ouv kata tîn lezîw ouwos an gînyno. (117) sînthe-
sis de phvkrâ ëi ùph evrûthmos,4 allá ârûthmos ouwa
kai diâ pântov makran5 êchousa, ôsper ëi toiaðè,

1 lacunam stat. Victorius.
2 ei add. edd.
3 prâgmata Victorius (cf. Ar. Rhet. 1406b9): grammata P.
4 evrûthmos Finckh: érrûthmos (sic) P.
5 makran Schneider: makron P.
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ON STYLE 114–117

We will discuss first the faulty style which is adjacent to the grand style. Its name is the frigid style, and frigidity is defined by Theophrastus\(^a\) as “that which exceeds its appropriate form of expression,” for example “an unbased cup is not tabled,” instead of “a cup without a base is not put on a table.”\(^b\) The trivial subject does not allow such magniloquence.

(115) Frigidity, like grandeur, has three aspects. It may be in the thought, as in one writer’s description of the Cyclops throwing a rock at Odysseus’ ship, “as the rock was rushing along, goats were browsing on it.”\(^c\) This is frigid because the thought is exaggerated and impossible. (116) In diction, Aristotle\(^d\) lists four types, <...>, for example Alcidamas’ “moist sweat”;\(^e\) from compounds, when the words are compounded in a dithyrambic manner, for example “desert-wandering”\(^f\) in one writer, and any other similarly pompous expressions; and from metaphors, for example “the situation was trembling and pale.”\(^g\) These then are the four types of frigidity in diction. (117) Composition is frigid when it lacks good rhythm, or has no rhythm when it has exclusively long syl-

\(^a\) Theophr. F 686 Fortenbaugh.
\(^b\) TrGF iv. Soph. Triptolemus F 611.
\(^c\) Author unknown, a grotesque elaboration on Hom. Od. 9.481 ἰθεὶς ἵππος πῶς κρομπήν ὀρεος μεγάλοιον.
\(^d\) Cf. Ar. Rhet. 1405b34ff for the four types of frigid diction: compounds, glosses, epithets, and metaphors. Aristotle helps us to fill the lacuna in our text, which will have covered glosses and introduced epithets. \(^e\) Alcidamas, fr. 15 Sauppe, the first example of frigid epithet in Ar. Rhet. 1406a21.
\(^f\) Author unknown, not one of Aristotle’s examples.
\(^g\) Gorgias B16 D–K; cf. Ar. Rhet. 1406b8–10 χλωρὰ καὶ ἀναιμα τὰ πράγματα.
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"ἠκον ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν, πάσης ἡμῶν ὀρθῆς οὐσίας." οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔχει λογικὸν οὐδὲ ἀσφαλὲς διὰ τὴν συνέχειαν τῶν μακρῶν συλλαβῶν. (118) ψυχρὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ μέτρα τιθέναι συνεχῆ, καθάπερ τινές, καὶ μὴ κλεπτόμενα ὑπὸ τῆς συνεχείας: ποίημα γὰρ ἀκαίρων ψυχρῶν, ὄσπερ καὶ τὸ ὕπερμετρον. (119) καὶ καθόλου ὁποῖον τί ἔστιν ἡ ἀλαζονεία, τοιοῦτον καὶ ἡ ψυχρότης: ὃ τε γὰρ ἀλαζῶν τὰ μὴ προσόντα αὐτῷ αὐχεῖ ὡμός ὡς προσόντα, ὃ τε μικρῶς πράγμασιν περιβάλλων ὅγκον καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν μικρῶι ἀλαζονευμένῳ ἐστεκεν. καὶ ὁποῖον τι τὸ ἐν τῇ παρομοίᾳ κοσμούμενον ὑπερων, τοιοῦτον τί ἔστι καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ ἐξηρμένου ἐν μικρῶι πράγμασιν.

(120) Καίτοι τινές φασὶ δεῖν τὰ μικρὰ μεγάλως λέγειν, καὶ σημεῖον τοῦτο ἡγοῦνται ὑπερβαλλούσης δυνάμεως. ἐγὼ δὲ Πολυκράτει μὲν τῷ ῥήτορι συγκροτοῦ ἐγκωμιάζοντι <...>¹ ώς Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐν ἀντιθέτοις καὶ μεταφοραῖς καὶ πάσι τοῖς ἐγκωμιαστικοῖς τρόποις: ἐπαιζέν γὰρ, οὐκ ἐσπούδαζεν, καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς γραφῆς ὁ ὅγκος παίγνιον ἔστι. παίζεν μὲν δὴ ἐξέστω, ως φημί, τὸ δὲ πρέπειν ἐν παντὶ πράγματι φυλακτέον, τούτ’ ἐστι προσφόρως ἐρμηνευστέον, τὰ μὲν μικρὰ μικρῶς, τὰ μεγάλα δὲ μεγά-

¹ lacunam stat. Victorius, e.g. Θερσίτην Maass.

ⁿ Author unknown (cf. §42); the second phrase lacks a subject, e.g. “city.”
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lables, for example “arriving inside our land, since it now is all stirred up” (hêkôn hêmôn eis tên chôrân, pâsês hêmôn orthês ousês).\(^a\) Owing to the unbroken succession of long syllables, this sentence is quite unlike good prose and finds no safe footing. (118) It is also frigid to introduce, as some do, continuous metrical phrases, since their continuity makes them obtrude. A line of verse in prose is out of place, and as frigid as too many syllables to the line in verse.\(^b\) (119) In general, there is a sort of analogy between boastfulness and frigidity. The boaster pretends that qualities belong to him even if they do not, while the writer who adds pomp to trifles is himself like the man who boasts about trifles. The use of a heightened style on a trivial subject recalls the proverbial “ornamented pestle.”\(^c\)

(120) There are, however, people who hold that we should use grand language on slight themes, and regard it as a sign of exceptional skill. For my own part, I excuse the rhetorician Polycrates\(^d\) who eulogised <...> like an Agamemnon with antithesis, metaphor, and every artifice of eulogy. He was being playful and not in earnest; the very inflation of his writing is part of the play. So play, as I say, is legitimate, but otherwise preserve propriety, whatever the subject; or in other words, use the relevant style,

\(^a\) Or alternatively “as metre which is too regular.”
\(^b\) Paroem. Gr. i.459.
\(^c\) Polycrates, Art. Scr. B.xxi.11; he specialised in paradoxical encomia of villains and trifles such as pots, pebbles, and mice. In the lacuna add a name such as Busiris, the wicked king who was the subject of his most famous encomium, or the ugly Thersites (cf. § 163). For an extant παίγνιον see Gorgias’ Helen (cf. Hel. 21 Ἐλένης μὲν ἐγκόμιον, ἔμον δὲ παίγνιον).
λως, (121) καθάπερ Ξενοφόν έπι τοῦ Τηλεβόα ποταμοῦ μικροῦ ὄντος καὶ καλοῦ φησιν, "οὗτος δὲ ποταμός ἦν μέγας μὲν οὐ, καλὸς δέ." τῇ γὰρ βραχύτητι τῆς συνθέσεως καὶ τῇ ἀπολήξει τῇ εἰς τὸ "δὲ" μόνον οὐκ ἐπεδείξει ἡμῖν μικρὸν ποταμόν. ἔτερος δὲ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ὄμοιον τῷ Τηλεβόᾳ ποταμῶν\textsuperscript{1} ἔφη, ὡς "ἀπὸ τῶν Λαυρικῶν ὅρεων ὀρμώμενος ἐκδιδοὶ ἐς θάλασσαν," καθάπερ τὸν Νείλον ἐρμηνεύων κατακρημνιζόμενον ἢ τὸν "Ἰστρον ἐμβάλλοντα. πάντα οὖν τὰ τουαύτα ψυχρότης καλεῖται. (122) γίνεται μέντοι τὰ μικρὰ μεγάλα ἐτερον τρόπον, οὐ διὰ τοῦ ἀπρεποῦς ἀλλ᾽ ἐνίοτε ὑπ᾽ ἀνάγκης οἶνον ὅταν μικρὰ κατορθώσαντα τινα στρατηγόν ἐξαίρειν βουλώμεθα ὡς μεγάλα κατωρθωκότα, \textsuperscript{2}<ἡ> οἶνον ὃτι ἔφορος ἐν Δακεδαίμονι τὸν περιέργος καὶ οὐκ ἐπιχωρίως σφαιρίζαντα ἐμαστάγωσεν τοῦτο\textsuperscript{3} γὰρ αὐτὸθεν μικρῷ ἀκουσθήναι ὅτι ἐπιτραγῳδοῦμεν, ὡς οἱ τὰ μικρὰ πονηρὰ ἐθη ἐὼντες ὁδὸν τοῖς μείζονι πονηροῖς ἄνοιγνοσιν, καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῖς μικροῖς παρανομήμασιν χρῆ κολάζων μᾶλλον, οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις. καὶ τὴν παρομίαιν ἐποίσομεν,\textsuperscript{4} "ἀρχὴ δὲ τοὺς ἡμίσιν παινός," ὡς ἑοικυῖαν τοῦτο τῷ σμικρῷ κακῷ, ἢ καὶ ὃτι οὐδὲν κακὸν μικρὸν ἔστιν. (123) οὕτως μὲν δὴ ἐξέστω καὶ τὸ μικρὸν κατορθωμα ἐξαίρειν μέγα,

\textsuperscript{1} ποταμῶν Schneider: flumen Lat.: ποταμῷ P.
\textsuperscript{2} ἢ add. Roberts. \textsuperscript{3} τοῦτω edd.: τουτώ P.
\textsuperscript{4} ἐποίσομεν Hemsterhuys: ἐποίσαμεν P.
\textsuperscript{5} τοῦτο τῷ P:\ τούτῳ P\textsuperscript{1}. \textsuperscript{6} ἢ P\textsuperscript{2}, om. P\textsuperscript{1}.
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slight for slight themes, grand for grand themes, (121) just as Xenophon does when he describes the small and beautiful river Teleboas, “this was not a large river; it was beautiful, however.”\(^a\) Through the conciseness of the construction and the final position of “however” he makes us all but see a small river. Contrast another writer who describes a river similar to the Teleboas, saying that it “rushed from the hills of Laurium and disgorged itself into the sea,”\(^b\) as though he were writing about the cataracts of the Nile or the mouth of the Danube. All such language is called frigid. (122) Minor themes, however, may be magnified in another way, a way which is not inappropriate and sometimes necessary, for instance when we wish to praise a general for some small victory as though he had actually won a major victory; or the ephor in Sparta who scourged a man who played ball with extravagant gestures and not in the local manner. The offence in itself sounds trivial, so we wax eloquent on its gravity, pointing out that men who permit minor bad habits open the way to more serious ones, and that we ought to punish minor offences against the law rather than major ones; and we will introduce the proverb, “work begun is half-done,”\(^c\) arguing that it fits this minor offence, or even that no offence is minor. (123) In this way, then, we may legitimately magnify a small success,

\(^{a}\) Xen. Anab. 4.4.3, cf. § 6.
\(^{b}\) Author unknown.
DEMETRIUS

όυ μὴν ὡστε ἄπρεπὲς τι ποιεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ μέγα κατασμικρύνεται χρησίμως πολλάκις, οὕτως ἃν καὶ τὸ μικρὸν ἐξαιρεῖτο.

(124) Μάλιστα δὲ ἡ ύπερβολὴ ψυχρότατον πάντων. τριττὴ δὲ ἐστιν· ἡ γὰρ καθ’ ὁμοίωτητα ἐκ-φέρεται, ὡς τὸ “θέειν δ’ ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοίοι,” ἡ καθ’ ύπεροχὴν, ὡς τὸ “λευκότεροι χίωνος,” ἡ κατὰ τὸ ἀδύνατον, ὡς τὸ “οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη.” (125) πάσα μὲν οὖν ύπερβολὴ ἀδύνατός ἐστιν· οὔτε γὰρ ἂν χίωνος λευκότερον γένοιτο, οὔτ’ ἂν ἀνέμῳ θέειν ὁμοίοι. αὐτὴ μέντοι [ἤτοι]¹ ἡ ύπερβολὴ ἡ εἰρημένη ἐξαιρέτως ὁνομάζεται ἀδύνατος. διὸ δὴ καὶ μάλιστα ψυχρὰ δοκεῖ πάσα ύπερβολὴ, διότι ἀδυνάτῳ ἔοικεν.

(126) διὰ τοῦτο δὲ μάλιστα καὶ οἱ κωμῳδοποιοὶ χρώνται αὐτῇ, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου ἐφέλκονται τὸ γελοῖον, ὦσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν Περσῶν τῆς ἀπληστίας ύπερβαλλόμενος τις ἐφη, ὅτι “πεδία ἐξέχεξον ὅλα,” καὶ ὅτι “βοῦς ἐν ταῖς γνάθοις ἐφέρον.” (127) τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐἴδους ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ “φαλακρότερος εὐδίας” καὶ τὸ “κολοκύνητης ύγιέστερος.” τὸ δὲ “χρυσῶ χρυσο-τέρα” τὸ Σαπφικὸν ἐν ύπερβολῇ λέγεται καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ ἀδυνάτως, πλὴν αὐτῶ γε τῷ ἀδυνάτῳ χάριν ἔχει, οὐ ψυχρότητα. δ’ ἡ καὶ μάλιστα θαυμάστειν ἂν τις Σαφφοῦς τῆς θείας, ὅτι φύσει κυνδυνώδει πράγματι καὶ δυσκατορθωτο ἐχρήσατο ἐπιχαρίτως. καὶ περὶ μὲν ψυχρότητος καὶ ύπερβολῆς τοσαῦτα.

¹ ἤτοι del. edd.
but without doing anything unsuitable. Just as major themes can often be usefully depreciated, so can minor themes be magnified.

(124) The most frigid of all devices is hyperbole, which is of three kinds. It is expressed either in the form of a likeness, for example “like the winds in speed”; or of superiority, for example “whiter than snow”; a or of impossibility, for example “with her head she reached the sky.” b

(125) Admittedly every hyperbole is an impossibility. There could be nothing “whiter than snow,” nothing “like the winds in speed.” But this last kind is especially called impossible. And so the reason why every hyperbole seems particularly frigid is that it suggests something impossible. (126) This is also the chief reason why the comic poets use it, since out of the impossible they create laughter, for example when someone said hyperbolically of the voracity of the Persians that “they excreted entire plains” c and that “they carried oxen in their jaws.” d

(127) Of the same type are the expressions “bolder than a cloudless sky” and “healthier than a pumpkin.” e Sappho’s phrase, “more golden than gold” f is also in form a hyperbole and impossible, but by its very impossibility it is charming, not frigid. Indeed, it is a most marvellous achievement of the divine Sappho that she handled an intrinsically risky and intractable device to create charm. This concludes my account of frigidity and hyperbole.

a Hom. II. 10.437 (of horses). bHom. II. 4.443 (of Strife).

c Author unknown; cf. Arist. Acharnians 82 κἀχεξεὶν ὀκτὼ μῆνας ἐπὶ χρυσῶν ὄρων. dAuthor unknown, a proverb (Paroem. Gr. ii. 749). In § 161 it describes a Thracian.

e Sophron 108 and 34 Kaibel (cf. § 162).

f Sappho 156 L–P (cf. § 162 for a longer citation).
DEMETRIUS

Νῦν δὲ περὶ τοῦ γλαφυροῦ χαρακτῆρος λέξομεν.  
(128) <δ́ς> χαριεντισμός ἐστὶ καὶ λόγος ἰλαρός. 
τῶν δὲ χαρίτων αἱ μὲν εἰσὶ μείζονες καὶ σεμνότεραι, 
αἱ τῶν ποιητῶν, αἱ δὲ εὐτελεῖς μᾶλλον καὶ κωμικῶτεραι, 
σκόμμασιν ἐσκηνοῦσι, οἴον αἰ Ἀριστοτέλους 
χάριτες καὶ Σώφρονος καὶ Λυσίαν ἃ γὰρ "ᾧ ῥᾷν 
ἀν τις ἀριθμήσειν τοὺς ὁδόντας ἢ τοὺς δακτύλους, 
τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς πρεσβύτητος, καὶ τὸ "霅ς ἀξίων ἢ 
λαβεῖν πληγάς, τοσαῦτας εἰληφεῖν δραχμάς," οἱ 
τοιούτου ἀστείσμοι οὐδὲν διαφέρουσιν σκωμμάτων, 
οὐδὲ πόρρω γελωτοποιῶς εἰσί. (129) τὸ δὲ 

tῇ δὲ θ’ ἀμα Νύμφαι 
παίζουσι γέγηθε δὲ το φρένα Δητῶι 
καὶ 

ῥεῖν δ’ ἀργιγνώτη πέλεται καλαί δὲ το πᾶσαι 
[kαϊ][3] αὐτάι εἰσιν αἱ λεγόμεναι σεμναὶ χάριτες καὶ 
μεγάλαι. (130) χρήται δὲ αὐταῖς "Ὀμηρος καὶ πρὸς 
δείνωσιν ἐνίοτε καὶ ἐμφασιν, καὶ παίζων φοβερῶτε 
ρός ἐστι, πρῶτος τε εὐρηκέναι δοκεῖ φοβερᾶς χάρι 
τας, ὡσπερ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄχαριτωτάτου προσώπου, τὸ 
ἐπὶ τοῦ Κύκλωπος, τὸ [οὖν][4] "Οὐτων ἐγὼ 
πῦματων ἔδομαι, τοὺς δὲ λουποὺς πρῶτους," τὸ 
τοῦ Κύκλωπος

1 <δ́ς> χαριεντισμός ἐστι καὶ λόγος ἰλαρός Kassel: καὶ om. P: ὁ γλαφυρὸς λόγος χαριεντισμός καὶ ἰλαρός λόγος in mg. P. 2 δὲ om. P. 
3 καὶ del. Schneider.
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ON STYLE 127–130

We will next discuss the elegant style, (128) which is speech with charm and a graceful lightness. Some kinds of charm, those of the poets, are more imposing and dignified, others are more ordinary, closer to comedy and resembling gibes, like those of Aristotle, a Sophron, and Lysias. Such witticisms as “whose teeth could be counted sooner than her fingers” (of an old woman) and “he has taken as many coins as he has deserved beatings” b are exactly like gibes, and come close to buffoonery. (129) Contrast the lines, “At her side the nymphs play, and Leto rejoices in her heart” and “she easily outshone them all, yet all were beautiful.” c This is the charm that can be called imposing and dignified. (130) Charm is also used by Homer sometimes to make a scene more forceful and intense. His very jesting adds to the terror, and he seems to have been the first to invent the grim joke, as in the passage describing that least charming of figures, the Cyclops: “No-man I will eat last, the rest before him” d—the Cyclops’ gift of hospitality. No other detail

a A surprising choice for comic wit (§ 164 is also suspect), and Aristophanes has been proposed.

b Lys. fr. 1 (cf. § 262) and 93 Thalheim.

c Hom. Od. 6.105ff (of Artemis).

d Hom. Od. 9.369–70 (cf. §§ 152, 262),

Oδτυν ἐγὼ πῦματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷς ἔτάρουσιν,

τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους πρόσθεν, τὸ δὲ τοι ξεινήμου ἔσται.

4 οὖν P, om. edd.: fort. delenda sunt verba omnia τὸ ἐπὶ . . .

τὸ οὖν Roberts.
DEMETRIUS

ξένιουν ού γὰρ οὕτως αὐτὸν ἐνέφημεν δεινὸν ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅταν δύο δειπνῆ ἐταΐρους, οὔδ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ θυρεοῦ ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ῥοπάλου, ὡς ἐκ τοῦτον τοῦ ἀστείσμου. (131) χρήται δὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ εἴδει καὶ Ξενοφῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς δεινότητας εἰσάγει ἐκ χαρίτων, οἰον ἐπὶ τής ἐνόπλου ὀρχηστρίδος, "ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παφλαγόνου εἰ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτοῖς συνεπολέμουν, ἐφεξάν αὐταὶ γὰρ καὶ ἔτρεψαν τὸν βασιλέα." διττὴ γὰρ ἐμφαίνεται ἡ δεινότης ἐκ τῆς χάριτος, ἢ μὲν ὅτι οὐ γυναῖκες αὐτοῖς ἐιπτοῦ ἄλλ’ Ἀμαζόνες, ἢ δὲ κατὰ βασιλέως, εἰ οὕτως ἦν ἀσθενῆς ὡς ὑπὸ γυναικῶν φυγεῖν. (132) τὰ μὲν οὖν εἶδη τῶν χαρίτων τοσάδε καὶ τοιάδε.

Εἰςιν δὲ αἱ μὲν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι χάριτες, οἰον νυμφαίοι κήποι, ὑμέναιοι, ἔρωτες, ὅλη ἡ Σαπφοῦς ποίησις. τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα, κἂν ὑπὸ Ἰππόνακτος λέγηται, ἡ χαρίεντα ἐστὶ, καὶ αὐτὸ ἰλαρὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀν ὑμέναιον ἄδοι ὀργιζόμενος, οὐδὲ τῶν ἔρωτα Ἐρμοῦ ποιήσειν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ ἡ γίγαντα, οὐδὲ τὸ γελάν κλαίειν. (133) ὥστε ἢ μὲν τὸν ἐν πράγμασι χάρις ἐστὶ, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἡ λέξις ποιεῖ ἐπιχαριτώτερα, οἰον

ὡς δ’ ὦ τε Πανδαρέου κούρη, χλωρῆς ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀείδησιν, ἔαρος νέον ἴσταμένοιο.

1 λέγεται Ρ: λέγηται edd.
2 ἄδοι Schneider: ἄδει Ρ.
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ON STYLE 130–133

reveals so clearly the grimness of the monster—not his eating two of Odysseus' companions for supper, nor his door made from a rock, nor his club—as this piece of wit. (131) Xenophon is also familiar with this type, and he too uses charm to grim effect, as in the passage describing the dancing girl in armour: "A Greek was asked by the Paphlagonian whether their women accompanied them to war. 'Yes,' he replied, 'in fact they were the ones who routed the king.'"a This witticism is tellingly forceful in two ways, the implication that it was not mere women but Amazons who accompanied them, and the implied insult to the king that he was so feeble that he was put to flight by women. (132) This, then, is the number and variety of the forms of charm.

The charm may lie in the subject matter, such as gardens of the nymphs, marriage songs, loves, or the poetry of Sappho generally. Such themes, even in the mouth of a Hipponax,b have charm, and the subject has its own graceful lightness. No one could sing a marriage song in frenzied anger, nor could style change Love into a Fury or a Giant, or laughter into tears. (133) There is, then, charm in the theme itself, but sometimes diction can give an added charm, as in the lines:

"Just as Pandareus' daughter, the pale nightingale, sings beautifully at the beginning of spring."c

---


3 ποιήσειεν Hammer: ποιήσει ἐν P.
4 πράγμασι Victorius: πράγματι P.
5 Πανδαρέου codd. Hom: Πανδαρέη P.
DEMETRIUS

ἐνταῦθα γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἀγδῶν χάριεν ὀρνίθιον, καὶ τὸ ἔαρ φύσει χάριεν, πολὺ δὲ ἐπικεκόσμηται τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ, καὶ ἐστὶ χαριέστερα τῷ τε "χλωρηθῆς" καὶ τῷ Ἀνδαρέου κοῦρῃ εἰπεῖν ἐπὶ ὀρνιθὼς, ἀπερ τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἴδια ἦστι.

(134) Πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὰ μὲν πράγματα ἀπερτῆ ἦστι φύσει καὶ στυγνά, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ λέγοντος γίνεται ἰλαρά. τούτῳ δὲ παρὰ Ἐνοφὼντι δοκεῖ πρώτῳ εὐρησθαι λαβῶν γὰρ ἀγέλαστον πρόσωπον καὶ στυγνόν, τῶν Ἀγαλαϊτάδων, τῶν Πέρσην, γέλωτα εἴρεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ χαριέντα, ὦτὶ "ῥόμον ἦστι πῦρ ἐκτρύψας ἀπὸ σοῦ ἡ γέλωτα." (135) αὕτη δὲ ἦστι καὶ ἡ δυνατωτάτη χάρις, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τῷ λέγοντι. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πράγμα καὶ φύσει στυγνὸν ἦν καὶ πολέμιον χάριτι [ὁσπερ καὶ Ἀγαλαϊτάδας], ὅ δὲ ὅσπερ ἐνδείκνυται ὦτὶ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων παῖζεσ ἦστιν, ὅσπερεὶ καὶ ὑπὸ θερμοῦ ψύχεσθαι, θερμαίνεσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ψυχρῶν.

(136) Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ ἐκδη τῶν χαρίτων δέδεικται, τύνα ἦστι καὶ ἐν τίσιν, νῦν καὶ τοὺς τόπους παραδείξομεν, ἃ τι ὧν αἱ χάριτες. ἦσαν δὲ ἥμιν αἱ μὲν ἐν τῇ λέξει, αἱ δὲ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν. παραδείξομεν οὖν καὶ τοὺς τόπους καθ' ἐκάτερα· πρώτους δὲ τοὺς τῆς λέξεως.

(137) Εὐθὺς οὖν πρώτη ἦστι χάρις ἡ ἐκ συντομίας, ὅταν τὸ αὐτὸ μηκυνόμενον ἄχαρι γένηται, ὑπὸ καὶ τῷ τὲ Finckh: τὸ τὲ καὶ τῷ P.

1 τῷ τὲ . . . καὶ τῷ Finckh: τῷ τὲ . . . καὶ τὸ P.
2 Πανδαρέης P.
ON STYLE 133-137

This passage refers to the nightingale, which is a delightful little bird, and to spring, which is of its nature a delightful season of the year, but the style has made it much more beautiful, and the whole has added charm from "pale" and the personification of the bird as Pandareus' daughter. Both these touches are the poet's own.

(134) Often subjects which are naturally unattractive and sombre acquire a lighter tone from the writer's skill. This secret seems to have been discovered first by Xenophon, who took the gloomy and sombre figure of the Persian Aglaitadas and exploited him for a charming joke, "it would be easier to strike fire from you than laughter."\(^a\)

(135) This is, indeed, the most effective kind of charm, and one which most depends on the writer. The subject was in itself sombre and hostile to charm,\(^b\) but the writer virtually gives a demonstration that even with such unpromising material jokes are possible, just as cold can heat and heat can cool.

(136) Now that we have set out the varieties of charm and where it is found, we will next list its sources. As we have already said, it lies partly in the style and partly in the subject. So we will list the sources under both categories, beginning with those from style.

(137) The very first source of charm is brevity, when a thought which would lose its charm if it were expanded is

---

\(^a\) Xen. Cyrop. 2.2.15.
\(^b\) The Greek text adds "as Aglaitadas certainly was."

---

\(^3\) ρᾶον codd. Xen.: ράδιον P.
\(^4\) del. Schenkeveld.
\(^5\) παραδείξομεν Gale: παραδείξομαι P.
DEMETRIUS

dè tâxous xârime, ò̂sper parâ Ξevoφônti, "tò ònvto toûtvò̂ ounone métestî tîs 'Ellâdos, êpêi ègô avtôn eîdôn òsperêî Ïvدوn Âìmôôterà tà òvta tétrnìmpê

novò̂ 2 kai eîxé̂n oûtvos." tò gôr épîleogômenon tò "eîxé̂n oûtvos" ùpò tîs svntomîas tîn xârîn poîneî, eî
dè èmèkûnîth dià plèîônîn, ôtî "èlegeve tànta àlêthê, 
sâfâwôs gôr ètètrûpêto," dièghyma àn òîlon ègêneî 
àntî xâritos. (138) poleâkis dè kai dûo frâçetâ di' 
èvôs prôs tò xârime, ôîôv èpî tîs 'Amaçônôs kâthe-

doûsîs èfê tîs, ôtî "tò tôxoç ènîtêamênov èkêuî, 
kai ô farètrâ plîrêsh, tô gêrrovo èpî tê këfàlê-
tôvôs dè òòôsîras ûv lûónîta." èn gôr toûtv kai ô

vômos èîrêtaî ò perî tòv òòôsîtêrîs, kai ôtî òîk
èlûse tòv òòôsîtêrà, tà dûo pràgmata dià mîas

èrmîneias. kai apô tîs svntomîas taûtîs glaîfuvô

tî ësîta.

(139) Dêûteros dè tôpös èsîn àpô tês tâçwos. 
tô gôr dêitô prôtîn men teîâv ô mésoûn âçarî 
gîne-
tavî. èpî dè tôv talvûs xârîvî, ôîôv òs òì Þevoφôvn 

fhîsvn èpî tôv Kûrov, "dîdôshî dê avêtî kai dôra,

îppîn kai stolôn kai strepîtîn, kai têv xôrân

mêkêtî ârpàçèsthî.â.

èn gôr tô tôuîs tô mënu telên-
tâlîn èsîtê tô tôv xârîn poîôn tô "têv xôrân

mêkêtî ârpàçèsthî" dià tô ëvên tôv dôroûk kai têv

îdîôtêsh. aitîos dê ô tôpös tês xâritos. eî 

gôvîn prôtîn ètâxhê, âçarîtôteron ònî, ôîôv ôtî "dîdôshin

1 toûtv M: istius Lat.: toûto P.
given charm by a quick mention, as in Xenophon: “This man has really nothing Greek about him, for he has (and I saw it myself) both his ears pierced like a Lydian; and so he had.”\textsuperscript{a} The ending, “and so he had,” has charm from its brevity, but if it had been expanded at greater length, “what he said was true, since he had evidently had them pierced,” it would have become a bald piece of narrative instead of a flash of charm. (138) Often too the conflation of two ideas in one sentence gives a delightful effect. A writer once said of a sleeping Amazon: “Her bow lay strung, her quiver full, her shield by her head; but they never loosen their belts.”\textsuperscript{b} In one and the same phrase the general custom about their belts is indicated, and so is the fact that she had not loosened her belt—two things at once. There is a touch of elegance in this brevity.

(139) The second source is word order. The very thought which would have no charm if it is put at the beginning or middle of a sentence, is often full of charm if it comes at the end, for example Xenophon on Cyrus, “He gives him gifts too—a horse, a robe, a torque, and the assurance that his country would no longer be plundered.”\textsuperscript{a} It is the last item in the sentence (“the assurance that his country would no longer be plundered”) that creates the charm, from the novel and unique nature of the gift. And the charm is due to its position. If it had been put first, it would be less attractive, for example, “He

\textsuperscript{a} Xen. \textit{Anab.} 3.1.31. \textsuperscript{b}Author unknown. The Amazon custom was to remain virgins. \textsuperscript{c} Xen. \textit{Anab.} 1.2.27.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{tētpυπημένον} codd. Xen.: \textit{perforatus} Lat.: \textit{tētpυμένον} P.
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αὐτῷ δῶρα, τὴν τε χώραν μηκέτι ἀρπάζεσθαι, καὶ ἵππον καὶ στολὴν καὶ στρεπτόν.” νῦν δὲ προειπὼν τὰ εἰθισμένα δῶρα, τελευταίον ἐπήνευκεν τὸ ξένον καὶ ἄρθρες, εξ ὧν ἀπάντων συνήκται ἡ χάρις.

(140) Αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν σχημάτων χάριτες δὴλαί εἰσιν καὶ πλείστα παρὰ Σαπφοῦ, οἶνον ἐκ τῆς ἀναδίπλωσες, ὅπου¹ νύμφη πρὸς τὴν παρθενίαν φησὶ, “παρθενία, παρθενία, ποὶ μὲ λυποῦσα οἶχη;” ἡ δὲ ἀποκρίνεται πρὸς αὐτὴν τῷ αὐτῷ σχήματι, “οὐκέτι ἥξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἥξω.” πλείων γὰρ χάρις ἐμφαίνεται, ἢ εἶπερ ἄπαξ ἐλέχθη καὶ ἀνευ τοῦ σχήματος. καίτοι ἡ ἀναδίπλωσις πρὸς δεινότητας μᾶλλον δοκεῖ εὑρήσθαι, ἡ δὲ καὶ τοῖς δεινοτάτοις καταχρῆται ἐπιχαρίτως.² (141) χαριεντίζεται δὲ ποτε καὶ εξ αναφορᾶς, όσ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑσπέρου, “’Εσπέρε, πάντα φέρεις,” φησὶ, “φέρεις οἶν,³ φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις ματέρι παιδα.” καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἡ χάρις ἑστὶν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως τῆς “φέρεις” ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀναφερομένης. (142) πολλὰς δ’ ἄν τις καὶ ἄλλας ἐκφέροι χάριτας.

Γίγνονται δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ λέξεως χάριτες, ἢ εκ μεταφορᾶς, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ τέττιγος, “πτερύγων δ’ ὑποκακχεῖ λιγυρᾶν ἀοιδάν, ὅτι ποτ’ ἄν φλόγιον ἡκαθέταν ἐπὶ-

¹ ὅπου edd.: ποῦ P.
² ἐπιχαρίτως Finckh: ἐπὶ (sic) χάριτος P.
³ οἶν Paulus Manutius: οἶνον P.

---

ᵃ Sappho 114 L–P.
ᵇ Sappho 104(a) L–P. The text has some uncertainties and
gives him gifts, the assurance that his country would no longer be plundered, a horse, a robe, and a torque.” As it is, he listed the customary gifts first, and then added last the novel and unusual gift, and all this combines to give charm.

(140) There is obvious charm from the use of figures, preeminently in Sappho, for example the use of repetition when a bride addresses her own virginity, “virginity, virginity, why have you gone and left me?” and it replies to her with the same figure, “never again shall I come to you, never again shall I come.” The idea has clearly more charm than if it had been expressed only once, without the figure. Repetition, it is true, is thought to have been invented more particularly to add force, but Sappho exploits even the most forceful features for charm. (141) Sometimes too she makes attractive use of anaphora, as in the lines on the evening star,

“All evening star, you bring everything home,
you bring the sheep, you bring the goat, you bring the child to its mother.”

Here the charm lies in the repetition in the same position of the phrase, “you bring.” (142) Many other examples of this could be cited.

Charm also comes from the use of a single word, for example from metaphor, as in the passage about the cicada,

“from under his wings he pours out a stream of piercing song, as

the second line may contrast the bride who does not return home to her mother.
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---

¹ locus corruptus, at recte καταυλεῖ· ἦ Finckh: καταυλεῖῃ P.  
² τοῦ del. Finckh.  
³ Πλούτων M² Bergk: πλούτων P.  
⁴ πυρροπτερύγων Wilamowitz (qui et personas distinxit): πρὸ πτερύγων P.  
⁵ σατυρικά Gale: σατύρια P.  
⁶ εἴδος Orth: ἔθος P.  
⁷ κόβαλος Wilamowitz: κόλακος P.

---

ᵃ Alcaeus 347 (b) L–P. The text is corrupt, the metaphor probably the attractive conjecture, καταυλεῖ, “flutes.” The
in the blazing heat of summer he flies and flutes";\(^a\)

(143) or from dithyrambic compounds, "Pluto, lord of the sable-winged"—‘that is terrible, make it red-winged.’\(^b\) Such freaks of language are best suited for comedy and satyr drama. (144) Idiosyncratic language is another source, as in Aristotle: "the more I am a solitary, the more I have become a lover of stories."\(^c\) So too are neologisms, as in the same author and passage: "the more I am a solitary and selfish, the more I have become a lover of stories." The word "solitary" is already of a rather idiosyncratic type, and "selfish" is coined from "self." (145) Many words owe their charm to their application to a particular object, for example: "this bird is a flatterer and a rogue."\(^d\) Here there is charm because the author mocked the bird as though it were a person, and applied words not usually applied to a bird. These then are the types of charm from single words.

author is likely to be Alcaeus, since like 347 (a) L–P it imitates Hesiod, Op. 582ff.

\(^b\) Author unknown, presumably comedy (Supp. Com. Adesp. 1) rather than lyric (PMG 963). The text is corrupt, but parodies tragic compounds in "-winged," and is probably a dialogue.

\(^c\) Ar. fr. 668 Rose (cf. §§ 97, 164). The surrounding context involves unusual words and uses, and μονότης is rare outside Aristotle, so ἐδωτικός should here mean "idiosyncratic." If the text of § 164 were sound (see note), the meaning must be "ordinary," as in §§ 15, 207–8, and it is an accident that we lack proof that μονότης was indeed part of ordinary speech (so D. J. Allen, Mnemosyne 27 (1971) 119–22).

\(^d\) Author unknown, cf. Ar. Hist. Anim. 597b23 (of a kind of owl) κόβαλος καὶ μυμητῆς.
(146) Ἐκ δὲ παραβολῆς, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐξέχοντος ἀνδρὸς ἡ Σαπφῶ φησι, “πέρροχος ὡς ὅτ’ ἄοιδὸς ὁ Δέσβιος ἀλλοδαποῖοιν.” ἐνταῦθα γὰρ χάριν ἐποίησεν ἡ παραβολή μᾶλλον ἡ μέγεθος, καίτοι ἐξῆν εἰπεῖν πέρροχος ὡσπερ ἡ σελήνη τῶν ἀλλων ἀστρων, ὡς ἡ ἕλιος ὁ λαμπρότερος, ἡ ὡς ἀλλὰ ἔστι θηρημικῶτερα. (147) Σώφρων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὠμοίου εἶδους φησί, “θάσαι, ὡςα φύλλα καὶ κάρφεα τοι παῖδες τοὺς ἀνδρας βαλλίζοντι, οἶον περ φαντί, φίλα, τοὺς Τρώας τὸν Λιαντα τῷ παλῳ.” καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἐπίχαρις ἡ παραβολή ἔστι, καὶ τοὺς Τρώας διαπαίζονσα ὡσπερ παῖδας.

(148) Ἔστι δὲ τις ἰδίως χάρις Σαπφική ἐκ μεταβολῆς, ὅταν τι εἰποῦσα μεταβάλληται καὶ ὡσπερ μετανοήσῃ, οἷον “ὕψοι δή,” φησί, “τὸ μέλαθρον ἀέρατε τέκτονες. γαμβρός εἰσέρχεται ἵκος Ἄρτη, ἀνδρὸς μεγάλου πολλῷ μείζων,” ὡσπερ ἐπιλαμβανομένη ἑαυτῆς, ὅτι ἀδυνάτῳ ἐχρήσατο ὑπερβολῆ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῷ Ἄρτῃ ὅς ἔστιν. (149) τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰδοὺς καὶ τὸ παρὰ Θηλεμάχῳ, ὅτι “δύο κόνες δεδέατο πρὸ τῆς αὐλῆς, καὶ δύναμαι καὶ τὰ ὠνόματα εἰπεῖν τῶν κυνῶν. ἀλλὰ τί ἂν μοι βούλοιτο τὰ ὠνόματα ταύτα;” καὶ γὰρ οὕτως μεταβαλλόμενος μεταξὺ ἡστείαστο καὶ ἀποσιγήσας τὰ ὠνόματα. (150) καὶ ἀπὸ στίχου δὲ ἀλλοτρίου γίνεται χάρις, ὡς ὁ Ἄρι-

1 ὡς Radermacher: καὶ Ρ.
2 ὕψοι edd.: νύσω Ρ.: ὕψω Radermacher.
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(146) Charm also comes from the use of comparison, as in Sappho's description of an exceptionally tall man as "preeminent, like the poet of Lesbos among strangers."a Here the comparison creates charm rather than grandeur, as would have been possible if she had said, "preeminent like the moon among the stars," or the sun, which is even brighter, or any other more poetic comparison. (147) Sophron uses the same type when he says: "See how many leaves and twigs the boys are throwing at the men—as thick as the mud, my dear, which they say the Trojans threw at Ajax."b Here again the comparison is charming, as it makes fun of the Trojans as though they were boys.

(148) There is a kind of charm from a change of direction which is peculiarly characteristic of Sappho. She will say something and then change direction, as though changing her mind, for example: "Raise high the roof of the hall, builders, for the bridegroom is coming, the equal of Ares, much taller than a tall man."c She seems to check herself, feeling that she has used an impossible hyperbole, since no one is the equal of Ares. (149) The same type appears in Telemachus: "Two hounds were leashed in front of the courtyard. I can tell you the actual names of the hounds. But why should I want to tell you their names?"d By this sudden change of direction in the middle, suppressing their names, he too is elegantly witty.

(150) Charm also comes from parody of another writer's

---

a Sappho 106 L–P.
b Sophron 32 Kaibel; cf. Hom. II. 11.358ff, where Ajax' slow retreat is like a donkey being beaten by boys.
c Sappho 111 L–P.
d Telemachus, otherwise unknown (or, but less natural Greek, an unknown author describes Telemachus, son of Odysseus).
ΔΕΜΕΤΡΙΟΣ

στοφάνης σκώπτων που τόν Δία, ὅτι οὖν κεραυνοῖ τοὺς πονηρούς, φησίν,

ἀλλὰ τὸν ἔαυτοῦ νεῶ βάλλει, καὶ Σοῦνιον ἄκρον Ἄθηνῶν.

ἀφερέ γοῦν οὐκέτι ὁ Ζεὺς κωμῳδεύοις δοκεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὁ Ὀμηρός καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ Ὀμηρικός, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου πλεῖων ἐστὶν ἡ χάρις.

(151) Ἐχονσι δε τι στωμύλον καὶ ἀλληγορίαι τινές, ὅπερ τό, "Δελφοί, παιδίον ὑμῶν ἀ κὼν φέρει." καὶ τὰ Σώφρονος δὲ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν γερόντων, "ἐνθάδε ὅν ὁ λῆγω παρ’ ὑμεῖς ὑμῶν ὁμότριχας ἔξομι-ζομαί, πλόον δοκάζων πόντιον· ἀρτέαι ὁ γὰρ ἢδη τοῖς ταλικοίσδε ταῖς ἀγκυραῖ·" ὡσ τε ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικῶν ἀλληγορεῖ, οἷον ἐπὶ ἴχθυῶν, "σωλῆνες, γλυκύκρεον κογχύλιον, χηρᾶν γυναικῶν λίχνευμα." καὶ μιμικώ-τερα τὰ τοιαύτα ἐστὶ καὶ αἰσχρά.

(152) Ἔστι δὲ τις καὶ ἡ παρὰ [τὴν] προσδοκίαν χάρις, ὥς τοῦ Κύκλωπος, ὅτι "ὑστατον ἔδομαι Οὔτων" ὅπερ προσεδόκα τοιόντο ξένιον οὔτε ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς οὔτε ὁ ἀναγνώσκων. καὶ ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐπὶ τοῦ Σωκράτους, "κηρὼν διατήξας," φησίν, "ἐκ διαβήτην λαβὼν, ἐκ τῆς παλαίστρας ὑμάς ὑφεῖ-

1 ἐνθάδε ὁν Schneider: ἐνθάδεων P.
2 πόντιον· ἀρτέαi Kaibel: πόντιον ψαλ ναι vel pontinai P.
3 λίχνευμα apud Athenaeum 86e: λίχνευματι P.
4 μιμικώτερα Victorius: μιμικώτερα P.
5 τὴν P: del. Schneider.
line, like Aristophanes’ mockery of Zeus somewhere because “he does not strike the wicked with his thunderbolts but his own very temple, and ‘Sunium, headland of Athens.’”\textsuperscript{a} It seems as though it is no longer Zeus who is being laughed at, but Homer and Homer’s line, and this fact increases the charm.

(151) Some allegories have a colloquial turn of wit, as in: “Delphians, that bitch of yours is with child”,\textsuperscript{b} and in Sophron’s passage on the old men: “Here I too wait with you, whose hair is white like mine, outside the harbour, ready for the voyage out to sea: for men of our age always have our anchors weighed”; and his allegory of women, when he speaks of fish: “tube fish, sweet-fleshed oysters, dainty meat for widows.”\textsuperscript{c} Jokes of this kind are ugly and suit only the mime.

(152) There is also a sort of charm from the unexpected, as in the Cyclops’ words, “No-man I will eat last.”\textsuperscript{d} Neither Homer nor the reader was expecting this kind of hospitality gift. Similarly Aristophanes says of Socrates, “He melted some wax first, then grabbed a pair of compasses, and from the wrestling school—he stole a

\textsuperscript{a} Arist. Clouds 401; cf. Hom. Od. 3.278 ἀλλ’ ὅτε Σούνιον ἵρν ἀφικόμεθ’, ἄκρον Ἀθηνέων.
\textsuperscript{b} Author unknown (= PLG. Adesp. pp. 742–43). Text and meaning are both uncertain.
\textsuperscript{c} Sophron 52 and 24 Kaibel. In the latter σωλήν, a pipe or tube, is a slang term for the penis as well as a type of fish.
\textsuperscript{d} Hom. Od. 9.369 (cf. §§ 130, 262).
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λετο.” (153) ἦδη μέντοι ἐκ δύο τόπων ἐνταῦθα ἐγένετο ἡ χάρις. οὐ γὰρ παρὰ προσδοκίαν μόνον ἐπηνέχθη, ἀλλὰ οὔθ’ ἦκολούθει τοῖς προτέρους· ἢ δὲ τοιαύτη ἀνακολούθει καλεῖται γρίφος, ὅσπερ ὁ παρὰ Σῶφρονι ρητορεύων Βουλίας· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀκόλουθον αὐτῷ λέγει· καὶ παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ δὲ ὁ πρόλογος τῆς Μεσσηνίας.


(155) Καὶ κατηγορίαι δὲ ἀποκεκρυμμέναι ἐνίοτε ὁμοιοῦνται χάρισιν, ὡσπερ παρὰ Ξενοφῶντι ὁ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ παρὰ τῷ Σεῦθει προσώπων τῶν συνδέησις ἐκάστῳ καὶ πείθουν δωρεῖσθαι Σεῦθει ὁ τὸ ἐχον· ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ χάριν τινὰ ἐμφαίνει, καὶ κατηγορίαι εἰς τὸν ἀποκεκρυμμέναι.

(156) Αἱ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν χάριτες τοσαῦται καὶ οἱ τόποι, ἐν δὲ τοῖς πράγμασι λαμβάνονται χάριτες ἐκ παροιμίας. φύσει γὰρ χάριν πράγμα ἐστὶ παροιμία, ὡς ὁ Σῶφρον μὲν, “Ἡπιόλης,” ἐφη, “ὁ τῶν πατέρα πνεύμων.” καὶ ἀλλαχόθι

1 αὐτῷ M: αὐτὸ P.
2 ὁ τῷ M: ὁ τῆς P.
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coat."\(^a\) (153) Here the wit came from two sources: the last words were not only added unexpectedly, they had no connection with what precedes. Such incoherence is called a puzzle; and an example is Boulias making a speech in Sophron’s mime\(^b\) (he is utterly incoherent), or the prologue of Menander’s Woman of Messenia.\(^c\)

(154) Again, assonance often produces a charming effect, as in Aristotle: “I went from Athens to Stagira because of the great king, and from Stagira to Athens because of the great storm.”\(^d\) Through the use of the same lexical ending in both clauses, he adds charm. If you remove the word “great” from the second clause, the charm also disappears.

(155) An innuendo also has an effect sometimes which resembles wit. In Xenophon, for example, Heraclides, one of Seuthes’ men, goes up to each guest and urges him to give all he can to Seuthes.\(^e\) This shows some wit, and it is an example of innuendo.

(156) These then are the varieties and sources of charm in style. Charm in content comes from the use of proverbs, since they are by their nature delightful. Sophron, for instance, speaks of “Epioles, who throttled his own father”; and somewhere else, “off one claw he

\(^a\) Arist. Clouds 149 and 179.
\(^b\) Sophron 109 Kaibel.
\(^c\) Menander fr. 268 Koerte.
\(^d\) Ar. fr. 669 Rose (cf. § 29).
\(^e\) Xen. Anab. 7.3.15ff.

\(^3\) Ἡπιόλης Kaibel: ἔπις P.
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πού φησιν, "ἐκ τοῦ ὄνυχος γὰρ τὸν λέοντα ἔγραψεν·
tορύναν ἔξεσεν· κύμινον ἔπρισεν."\(^1\) καὶ γὰρ δυσὶ
παρομίαις καὶ τρισὶν ἐπαλλήλους χρῆται, ὡς ἐπι-
πληθύνων\(^2\) αὐτῷ αἱ χάριτες· σχεδόν τε πάσας ἐκ
τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ τὰς παρομίαις ἐκλέξαι ἐστίν.
(157) καὶ μῦθος δὲ λαμβανόμενος καιρίως εὐχαρίς
ἐστιν, ἦτοι ὁ κείμενος, ὡς ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐπὶ τοῦ
ἀετοῦ φησιν, ὅτι λιμῷ θυνήσκει ἐπικάμπτων τὸ ῥάμ-
φος· πάσχει δὲ αὐτὸ, ὅτι ἀνθρωπὸς ὄν ποτε ἡδίκη-
σεν ἐξένων. ὃ μὲν οὖν τῷ κειμένῳ μύθῳ κέχρηται καὶ
κοινῷ. (158) πολλοῦς δὲ καὶ προσπλάσσομεν προσ-
φόρους καὶ οἰκείους τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὡσπερ τις περὶ
αἰλουρον λέγων, ὅτι συμφθίνει τῇ σελήνῃ [καὶ]\(^3\) ὁ
αἱλουρος καὶ συμπαχύνεται, προσέπλασεν\(^4\) ὅτι
"ἐνθεν καὶ ὁ μῦθος ἐστιν, ὡς ἡ σελήνη ἔτεκεν τὸν
αἰλουρον"· ὃς γὰρ μόνον κατ’ αὐτὴν τὴν πλάσιν
ἐσται ἡ χάρις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μῦθος ἐμφαίνει χάριν τι,
αἷλουρον ποιῶν σελήνης παίδα.

(159) Πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἕκ φόβου ἀλλασσομένου
gίνεται χάρις, ὅταν διακενής τις φοβηθῇ,\(^5\) οἶνον τὸν
ἰμάντα ὃς ὁφιν ἡ τῶν κρίβανον ὡς χάσμα τῆς γῆς,

\(^1\) ἔπρισεν Hemsterhuys: ἐσπειρεῖν P.
\(^2\) ἐπιπληθύνων M: ἐπιπληθύνωνται P.
\(^3\) del. Spengel.
\(^4\) προσέπλασεν M: πρῶς ἐπλασσεῖν P.
\(^5\) φοβηθῇ Schneider: φοβή P.

\(^a\) Sophron 68 and 110 Kaibel. The former is obscure, but
probably Epioles (or Epiales or Ephialtes), the demon of night-
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drew the lion,” “he polished even the ladle,” and “he split cummin seeds.”a He uses two or three proverbs in quick succession, to accumulate the charm, and almost all the proverbs in existence could be collected from his mimes. (157) A neatly introduced fable is also attractive, either a traditional fable, like Aristotle’s fable of the eagle: “It dies of hunger, when its beak grows more and more curved. It suffers this fate because once upon a time when it was human it wronged a guest.”b Here Aristotle has used a traditional, familiar fable. (158) But we can often also invent fables which fit closely and match the context, for example one writer on the topic of cats said that they thrive and pine in phase with the moon, and then added his own invention, “and this is the origin of the fable that the moon gave birth to the cat.”c Not only will the new fiction in itself be attractive, but the actual fable is charming in making the cat the child of the moon.

(159) Release from feard is, also often a source of charm, for example a man needlessly afraid, mistaking a strip of leather for a snake or a bread oven for a gaping hole in the ground—mistakes which are rather comic in

mare and cold fevers, chokes the sleeper, its “father” (cf. Arist. Wasps 1038–39). The first of the three proverbs, building a whole picture off a detail, is common, as is the third, an example of miserliness (Paroem. Gr. i.252 and ii.178), but the second is attested only here.


c Author unknown. There was an Egyptian story that a cat’s eyes wax and wane with the moon (Plu. Mor. 376f).

d The text here may be corrupt, but the type of joke is clear from the examples. Compare the parasite frightened by a wooden scorpion thrown into his cloak in Plu. Mor. 633b.

(163) Διαφέρουσι δὲ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ εὐχαρί πρῶτα μὲν τῇ ὑλῇ χαρίτων μὲν γὰρ ὑλὴ νυμφαίοι κήποι, ἔρωτες, ἀπερ οὐ γελάται: γέλωτος δὲ Ἡρῶς καὶ Θερσίτης. τοσοῦτον οὖν διωόσουσι, ὅσον ὁ Θερσίτης τὸν Ἡρῶτος. (164) διαφέρουσι δὲ καὶ τῇ λέει αὐτῇ. τὸ μὲν γὰρ εὐχαρί μετὰ κόσμου ἐκφέρεται καὶ δι’

1 καὶ φοβούμεθα del. Denniston, fort. recte (om. Lat.). 2 del. Spengel.

a Cf. Arist. Birds 486–87, and 490. There it is the Persian king who (rightly) wears the upright tiara, and purple is not mentioned.
themselves. (160) Comparisons too may be attractive—for instance, if you compare a cock to a Persian because it holds its crest up, or to the Persian king because of its purple plumage, or because at cockcrow we jump up as though a king had shouted, and we are afraid. (161) Charm in comedy comes especially from the use of hyperbole. Every hyperbole is impossible, for example Aristophanes on the voracity of the Persians, “they baked oxen in their ovens instead of bread,” and another writer on the Thracians, “their king Medoces would carry a whole ox in his jaws.” (162) Of the same type are expressions such as “healthier than a pumpkin,” “balder than a cloudless sky,” and Sappho’s “far more melodious than the harp, more golden than gold.” The charm in all of these comes from hyperbole.

(163) Laughter and charm are, however, different. They differ first in their material. Gardens of the nymphs and loves are material for charm (they are not humorous), Irus and Thersites are material for laughter, and the two concepts will be as different as Thersites and Love. (164) They also differ in their actual style. Charm is expressed

b This last phrase may well be a later addition (so J. D. Denniston, Classical Quarterly 23 (1929) 8).
c Arist. Acharnians 85–87

\[ \text{παρετίθει δ' ήμιν ὀλοὺς} \]

\[ \text{ἐκ κριβάνου βοῦς. (Δι.) καὶ τίς εἴδε} \]

\[ \text{βοῦς κριβανίτας;} \]

d Author unknown (cf. § 126, there of the Persians).
e Sophron 34 and 108 Kaibel (cf. § 127).
f Sappho 156 L–P (cf. § 127) and fr. Add. (a) p. 338 L–P.
g Irus, the beggar in Hom. Od. 18.1ff, and Thersites, the ugly common soldier in Il. 2.216ff.
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ονομάτων καλῶν, ἃ μάλιστα ποιεῖ τὰς χάριτας, οἷον τὸ "ποικίλλεται μὲν γαῖα πολυστέφανος" καὶ τὸ "χλωρηής ἀηδών": τὸ δὲ γελοῖον δι’ ὁ νομάτων ἔστιν εὐτελῶν καὶ κοινοτέρων· [ὦσπερ ἔχει: "ὦσον γὰρ αὐτὴς καὶ μονώτης εἰμί, φιλομυθότερος γέγονα." ]3

(165) ἐπειτὰ ἀφανιζεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἐρμηνείας, καὶ ἀντὶ γελοῖον θαῦμα γίνεται. αἱ μέντοι χάριτες εἰσὶ μετὰ ἀγαθοφροσύνης,4 τὸ δὲ ἐκφράζειν τὰ γέλια ὅμοιον ἐστὶ καὶ καλλωπίζειν πίθηκον.

(166) διὸ καὶ ἡ Σαπφῶ περὶ μὲν κάλλους ἄδουσα καλλιετής ἐστὶ καὶ ἰδεῖα, καὶ περὶ ἐρώτων δὲ καὶ ἔαρος5 καὶ περὶ ἀλκυόνος, καὶ ἀταν καλὸν ὄνομα ἐνύφανται αὐτὴς τῇ ποιήσει, τὰ δὲ καὶ αὐτῇ εἰργάσατο. (167) ἀλλως δὲ σκόπτει τὸν ἀγροίκου νυμφίον καὶ τὸν θυρωδὸν τὸν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις, εὐτελέστατα καὶ ἐν πεζοῖς ὄνομασι μάλλον ἡ ἐν ποιητικῶς, ὡστε αὐτῆς μᾶλλον ἐστὶ τὰ ποιήματα ταῦτα διαλέγεσθαι ἡ ἄδεια, οὐδ’ ἂν ἀρμόσαι πρὸς τὸν χορὸν ἡ πρὸς τὴν λύραν, εἰ μὴ τις εὐχαρη χορὸς διαλεκτικός. (168) μάλιστα δὲ διαφέρουσι καὶ ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως: οὐ γὰρ ὅμοια προαιρεῖται ὁ εὐχάριστος καὶ ὁ γελωτοποιῶν,

1 δι’ coniceli (iam καὶ δι’ Richards): καὶ Ρ.
2 fort. ὅσφι Roberts.
3 del. Hahne.
4 σωφροσύνης Ρ. κόσμου Schenkeveld: an εὐφροσύνης?
(cf. § 168).
5 ἔαρος Gale: ἀέρος Ρ.
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with decorative, beautiful words, a chief source of charm, for example “the earth is a tapestry of garlands of flowers,“\(^a\) and “the pale nightingale.“\(^b\) By contrast, laughter uses ordinary and rather prosaic words [for example “the more I am a solitary and selfish, the more I have become a lover of stories,”]\(^c\) (165) and secondly laughter is actually destroyed by a decorative style and becomes bizarre. Charm may be embellished \(\dagger\)in moderation\(\ddagger,\)\(^d\) but the formal elaboration of a humorous topic is like beautifying an ape.\(^e\) (166) This is why Sappho sings of beauty in words which are themselves beautiful and attractive, or on love or spring or the halcyon. Every beautiful word is woven into the texture of her poetry, and some she invented herself. (167) But it is in a very different tone that she mocks the clumsy bridegroom and the doorkeeper at the wedding.\(^f\) Her language is then very ordinary, in the diction of prose rather than poetry; so these poems of hers are better spoken than sung, and would not suit the accompaniment of a chorus or lyre—unless you could imagine a chorus which speaks prose. (168) But the main difference is in their purpose: the writers of charm and comedy do not share the same purpose, the one aims to give pleasure, the other to make

\(^a\) PMG Adesp. 964(a).

\(^b\) Hom. Od. 19.518 (cf. §133).

\(^c\) Ar. fr. 668 Rose (see also on §§97, 144), but neologism at least is a curious example of ordinary speech, and interpolation is more likely (so Hahne). \(^d\) Text corrupt, concealing “with elaboration” or “with resulting pleasure.”

\(^e\) Compare the proverbial “ape in purple,” which even dressed up is ugly (Paroem. Gr. i.303).

\(^f\) Cf. Sappho 110(a) L–P.
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άλλ’ ὁ μὲν εὐφραίνειν, ὁ δὲ γελασθῆναι. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπακολουθοῦντων δὲ· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ γέλως, τοῖς δὲ ἑπαυνοῦσ. (169) καὶ ἐκ τόπου. ἐνθα μὲν γὰρ γέλωτος τε χρεία¹ καὶ χαρίτων, ἐν σατύρῳ καὶ ἐν κωμῳδίαις, τραγῳδία δὲ χάριτας μὲν παραλαμβάνει ἐν πολλοῖς, ὥστε γέλως ἑχθρὸς τραγῳδίας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπινοήσειν ἄν τις τραγῳδίαν παύσουσαν, ἐπεὶ σάτυρον γράφει ἀντὶ τραγῳδίας.

(170) Χρήσονται δὲ ποτε καὶ οἱ φρόνιμοι γελοίους πρὸς τέ τοὺς καιροὺς, οίον ἐν ἔορταις καὶ ἐν συμπόσιοις, καὶ ἐν ἐπιπλήξεσιν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς τρυφεροτέρους, ὡς ὁ Τηλαύγος² θύλακος, καὶ ἡ Κράτητος ποιητική, καὶ φακῆς ἐγκώμιον ἄν ἀναγνώρισε τις ἐν τοῖς ἀσώτοις· τοιοῦτος δὲ ὡς τὸ πλέον καὶ ὁ Κυνικὸς τρόπος· τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα γελοία χρείας λαμβάνει τάξιν καὶ γνώμης. (171) ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἠθίους τις ἐμφάσις ἐκ τῶν γελοίων, [καὶ]³ ἡ παιγνίας ἡ ἀκολογίας, ὡς ὁ⁴ τοῦ οἶνον τῶν προχυθέντα ἐπισκόψας Πηλέα⁵ ἀντὶ Οἰνέως. ἡ γὰρ ἀντίθεσις ἡ περὶ τὰ ὄνοματα καὶ ἡ φροντίς ἐμφαίνει τινὰ ψυχρότητα ἠθίους καὶ ἀναγωγίαν. (172) περὶ δὲ σκωμμάτων <τὸ>⁶ μὲν

¹ τε χρεία Weil: τέχναι P.
² Τηλαύγος Casaubon: τηλαυγῆς P.
³ Delevi.
⁴ ὁ Gärtner (iam ὁ add. Goeller): καὶ P.
⁵ ἐπισκόψας von Arnim: Πηλέα Sophianus: ἐπίσχῶν τὰ σπήλαια P.
⁶ τὸ add. von Arnim.
us laugh. They differ also in their results, laughter in the one case, praise in the other. (169) They also fit different contexts. In some there is need of both laughter and charm—in comedy and satyr drama—whereas tragedy often welcomes charm, but laughter is its enemy. No one could really conceive of a tragedy of humour, or he would be writing a satyr drama rather than a tragedy.

(170) Even sensible people will indulge in laughter on such suitable occasions as feasts and drinking parties, and in reprimanding those who are too inclined to a life of luxury. Examples are Telauges' bag\(^{a}\) and Crates' poetry\(^{b}\)—and you might well read a eulogy of lentil soup to the profligate. The Cynic manner is very much like this, for such humour is a substitute for maxims and gnomic wisdom. (171) Laughter also gives some indication of character, revealing playful wit or vulgarity. Somebody once mocked the spilling of wine on the floor as “Oeneus turned into Peleus.”\(^{c}\) The punning play on the names and the laboured thought indicate a character lacking taste and upbringing. (172) In gibes too, one type is a witty

\(^{a}\) The text is uncertain, but probably refers to the Telauges of Aeschines Socraticus (=fr. 42 Dittmar; cf. § 291). The beggar's bag represents the ostentatiously ascetic life.

\(^{b}\) Crates VH 66 Giannantoni. For the mocking poetry of this Cynic philosopher cf. § 259. Since he wrote one, the praise of the humble lentil soup is also best taken as his.

\(^{c}\) Crates VB 488 Giannantoni. The text is uncertain, but the names of two heroes are used to suggest a pun on wine (oinos) turned into mud/wine-lees (pēlos).
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οἶνον ἐἰκασία τῆς ἔστιν [ἡ γὰρ ἀντίθεσις] ἐντράπελος. χρήσονται τε ταῖς τοιαύταις εἰκασίαις, ὡς "Αἰγυπτία κληματίς" <ἀποκαλούντες τὸν> ² μακρὸν καὶ μέλανα, καὶ τὸ "θαλάσσιον πρόβατον" τὸν μῶρον τὸν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. τοὺς μὲν τοιούτους χρήσονται· ἐὰν δὲ μή, φευξόμεθα τὰ σκώμματα ὁσπερ λουδορίας.

(173) Ποιεῖ δὲ εὐχαρίν τὴν ἐρμηνείαν καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα καλὰ ὄνοματα. ὁρίσατο δὲ αὐτὰ Θεόφραστος οὕτως, κάλλος ὄνοματός ἐστι τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀκοὴν ἢ πρὸς τὴν ὁμιλ σῆμεν, ἢ τῷ διανοίᾳ ἐντιμον. (174) πρὸς μὲν τὴν ὁμιλ σῆμεν ἢδέα τὰ τοιαύτα, ἢρόδοχροον, ἢ ἀνθοφόρον χλόας. ³ ὅσα γὰρ ὅραται ἡδέως, ταῦτα καὶ λεγόμενα καλὰ ἐστι. πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀκοὴν "Καλλίστρατος, ἡ Ἀννοῦν." ⁴ ἢ τέ γὰρ τῶν λάμβδα σύγκρουσις ἡχῶδες τι ἔχει, καὶ ἡ τῶν νῦ γραμμάτων. (175) καὶ ἄλως τὸ νῦ δι' εὐφωνίαν ⁵ ἐφέλκουσα οἱ Ἀττικοὶ "Δημοσθένης" λέγοντες καὶ "Σωκράτης." τῇ διανοίᾳ δὲ ἐντιμα τὰ τοιαύτα ἔστιν, οȋον τὸ "ἀρχαιο" ἀντὶ τοῦ "παλαιο" ἐντιμότερον νοὶ γὰρ ἀρχαιοί ἀνδρες ἐντιμότεροι.

(176) Παραι δὲ τοὺς μουσικοὺς λέγεται τι ὄνομα λείον, καὶ ἐτερον τὸ τραχὺ, καὶ ἄλλο εὐπαγές, καὶ ἄλλο ὄγκηρον. λείον μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ὄνομα τὸ διὰ φωνηέτων ἢ πάντων ἢ διὰ πλειόνων, οȋον Αἰας,

¹ del. Gale.
² τὸν addidi, ἀποκαλούντες post μῶρον iam Radermacher.
³ χλόας Gomperz: χρῶας P.
comparison, and writers can use comparisons like calling a tall, dark man "Egyptian clematis" and an idiot at sea "sea sheep." This is the kind they can use; otherwise we will avoid gibes as we would crude insults.

(173) Charm in style also comes from what are called beautiful words. According to the definition of Theophrastus, beauty in a word is that which gives pleasure to the ear or the eye, or has an inherent nobility of thought. (174) Pleasant to the eye are expressions such as "rose-coloured" and "flowery meadow," since images pleasant to see are also beautiful when they are spoken of; and pleasant to the ear are words like "Kallistratos" and "Annonônt", since the double "I" and the double "n" have a certain resonance. (175) In general, it is on account of the euphony that the Attic writers add an extra "n" to the accusative forms of Demosthenes and Socrates (Dêmosthenê, Sôkratê). Inherently noble in thought are words like "the men of old" which is nobler than "the ancients," since "the men of old" implies greater nobility.

(176) Musicians speak of words as smooth, rough, well-proportioned, and weighty. A smooth word is one which consists exclusively or mainly of vowels, e.g. Ajax

---

a Both are attributed to the Stoic Chrysippus (SVF i.1 and ii. Chrysippus 11).

b Theophr. F 687 Fortenbaugh, an adaptation of the definition in Ar. Rhet. 1405b17–8.

c Authors unknown.

d Probably corrupt. It occurs only here.

e I.e. the accusative ending in -ê becomes -ên.

---

4 'Annonôv P, vix recte.
5 εὐφωνίαν Gale: εὐφημίαν P.
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tραχύ δὲ οἶον βέβρωκεν καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ τραχύ ὄνομα κατὰ μύησιν ἐζευνήνεκται ἑαυτοῦ· εὐπαγεῖς δὲ ἐπαμφοτερίζον καὶ μεμιγμένον ἵσως τοῖς γράμμασιν. (177) τὸ δὲ ὄγκηρον ἐν τρισὶ, πλάτει, μήκει, πλάσματι, οἶον βροντὰ ἀντὶ τοῦ βροντῆ· καὶ γὰρ τραχύτητα ἐκ τῆς πρωτέρας συλλαβῆς ἔχει, καὶ ἐκ τῆς δευτέρας μῆκος μὲν διὰ τὴν μακράν, πλατύτητα δὲ διὰ τὸν Δωρισμόν· πλατέα λαλοῦσι γὰρ πάντα οἱ Δωριεῖς. διόπερ οὐδὲ ἐκωμόθουν δωρίζοντες, ἀλλὰ πικρῶς ἡττίκιζον· ἡ γὰρ Ἁττικὴ γλῶσσα συνεστραμμένον τι ἔχει καὶ δημοτικὸν καὶ ταῖς τοιαύταις εὐτραπελίαις πρέπον. (178) ταῦτα μὲν δὴ παρατεχνολογῆσθω 1 ἄλλως. τῶν δὲ εἰρημένων ὄνομάτων τὰ λεία μόνα ληπτέον ὡς γλαφυρὸν τι ἔχοντα.

(179) Γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐκ συνθέσεως τὸ γλαφυρὸν· ἔστι μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ράδιον περὶ τοῦ τρόπου τοῦ τοιούτου εἰπεῖν· οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν πρῶτων εἰρήται τιν wand περὶ γλαφυρᾶς συνθέσεως· κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν δὲ ὁμοιοὶ πειρατέων λέγεων. (180) τάχα γὰρ δὴ ἔσται τις ἡδονή καὶ χάρις, εἰς ἁμύκωμεν ἐκ μέτρων τὴν σύνθεσιν ἤ ὅλων ἢ ἡμίσεων· οὐ μὴν ὡστε φαίνεσθαι αὐτὰ μέτρα ἐν τῷ συνειρμῷ τῶν λόγων, ἀλλ’ εἰ διαχωριζοῦ τις καθ’ ἐν ἔκαστον καὶ διακρίνων, τότε δὴ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν αὐτὰ2 φωρᾶσθαι μέτρα ὁντα. (181) καὶ μετρειδὴ δὲ ἤ, τὴν αὐτὴν ποιήσει χάριν· λανθανόντως δὲ

1 παρατεχνολογήσθω Goeller: παρατεχνολογεῖσθω Ρ.
2 αὐτὰ Kroll: αὐτῶν Ρ.
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(Aiás). An example of a rough word is “devoured” (be-brôke)—and this particular rough word has a form designed to imitate its own meaning. A well-proportioned word is one which draws on both and is a balanced mix of rough and smooth. (177) A weighty word has three aspects, breadth, length, and emphatic pronunciation, a for example brontâ instead of brontê (“thunder”). This word has roughness from its first syllable, length from its second because of the long vowel, and breadth because of the Doric form, since the Dorians broaden all their vowels. b This is why comedies were not in Doric but in the sharp Attic dialect. For the Attic dialect has terseness, and is used by ordinary people, and so suits the wit of comedy. (178) But let us leave this theorising as rather an irrelevance. Of all the words I have listed, you should use only the smooth, since they have a certain elegance.

(179) Elegance also comes from composition. It is not easy to describe the process, and no previous writer has analysed it, but I must try to do so, to the best of my ability. (180) There will, perhaps, be a pleasing charm if we integrate metrical units into our composition, whole lines or half-lines; yet the actual metres must not obtrude in the general flow of the sentence, but only if it is divided and analysed in minute detail, then and only then should we detect that they are metres, and (181) even an approximation to metre will produce the same effect. The

a Πλάσμα is vocal inflexion, a fuller sound used by the trained speaker (cf. Quint. 1.11.6 καταπεπλασμένον).

b Cf. Theocritus 15.88 ἐκκυησεύντι πλατειάσδουσαί ἀπαντά.
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toi paradúgetai  ἢ ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης ἡδονῆς χάρις, καὶ πλείστον μὲν τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶδός ἐστι παρὰ τοῖς Περι-
patητικοῖς καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι καὶ παρὰ Ξενοφῶντι καὶ Ἡροδότῳ, τάχα δὲ καὶ παρὰ Δημοσθένει πολλα-
χοῦ. Θουκυδίδης μέντοι πέφευγε τὸ εἴδος. (182) παραδείγματα δὲ αὐτῶν λάβοι τις ἀν τοιάδε, οἶον ὡς ὁ ἰωκαίαρχος: "ἐν Ἑλέα," φησί, "τῆς Ἰταλίας προσβύτην ἡδὴ τὴν ἡλικίαν ὀντα."1 τῶν γὰρ κόλων ἀμφοτέρων αἱ ἀπολήξεις μετρείδες τι ἔχουσιν, ὡπὸ δὲ τῶν εἰρμῶν καὶ τῆς συναφείας κλέπτεται μὲν τὸ μετρικὸν, ἡδονὴ δ’ οὐκ ὀλίγῃ ἔπεστι.

(183) Πλάτων μέντοι ἐν πολλοῖς αὐτῷ τῷ ρυθμῷ γλαφυρῷ ἐστιν ἐκτεταμένω 2 πως, καὶ οὕτε έδραν ἔχουσι τις μήκος: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱσχύναι καὶ δεινῶν, τὸ δὲ μήκος μεγαλοπρεπές. ἀλλ’ οἶον ὀλίσθη φιλοτιμοῦσι 3 παντάπασιν οὕτ᾽ ἀμέτροις, οἶον ἐν τῷ περὶ μουσικῆς λόγῳ ἐπᾶν φη 4 "νῦν δὴ ἐλέγουμεν".5 (184) καὶ πάλιν, "μανυρίζων τε καὶ γεγανωμένος ὑπὸ τῆς ὕδης διατελεῖ τὸν βίον ὀλον". καὶ πάλιν, "τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, εἰ τι θυμοειδὲς εἶχεν, ὦσπερ σίδηρον ἐμάλαξεν". οὕτως μὲν γὰρ γλαφυρὸν καὶ ὕδικον σαφῶς: εἰ δ’ ἀναστρέψας εἴποις, "ἐμάλαξεν ὦσπερ σίδηρον," ἡ "διατελεῖ ὀλον τὸν βίον," ἐκχεῖς 6 τοῦ λόγου τῆς χάριν ἐν αὐτῷ

1 ὀντα edd.: ὀντι P.
2 ἐκτεταμένω Victorius: ἐκτεταμένος P.
3 οὕτ᾽ ἐμέτροις C. F. Hermann: οὕτε μέτροις P.
4 ἐπὰν φη Spengel: ἐπάμφω P.
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ON STYLE 181–184

charm of this pleasing device steals over us before we are aware, and the type is a favourite with the Peripatetics, Plato, Xenophon, and Herodotus; it is also, I think, frequent in Demosthenes, but Thucydides avoids it. (182) Dicaearchus can offer this example: “At Elea in Italy,” he says, “when already he was old in years” (en Eleà tês Italiâs, presbûtên êdê tên hêlikiân onta).\(^a\) The close of each clause has a quasi-metrical cadence, but the metre is disguised by the smooth, continuous flow. The effect is highly attractive.

(183) Now Plato’s elegance in many passages comes directly from the rhythm, which is given some length but is free from endings which have a perceptible pause and a series of long syllables. The former suits the plain and forceful styles, the latter the grand. Instead Plato’s clauses seem to glide smoothly along and to be neither altogether metrical nor unmetrical, as in the passage about music, in the words “we were saying just now,”\(^b\) (184) and again “warbling and radiant under the influence of song he passes his whole life,”\(^c\) and again “first, if he had any symptom of passion, he would like iron temper it.”\(^d\) This word order is clearly elegant and musical, but if you inverted it to say, “he would temper it like iron,” you

\(^a\) Dicaearchus 39 Wehrli. In §§ 182–85 the intended rhythmical effects are most clearly seen from the transpositions in §§ 184–85, which introduce hiatus and the clash of consonants between words and lose the runs of short vowels near the ends of clauses, thus adding ἔδρα and μῆκος.
\(^b\) Pl. Rep. 411a (cf. § 51).
\(^d\) Pl. Rep. 411b.


---

1 τῷ add. Gale.
2 ὀνομάζω Gale: ὀνομάζει P.
rob the language of its charm, which comes directly from the rhythm; for it is definitely not in the thought or the vocabulary. (185) He has integrated yet another attractive rhythm in his account of musical instruments, “it is the lyre which you are left with in the town.” a Invert the order to say, “in the town you are left with the lyre,” and you will change the melody. He adds, “and yes, in the fields the shepherds would have some pipe.” By the length of the clause and the long syllables he has very elegantly imitated the sound of a pipe, as will be clear to anyone who changes the word order of this sentence also. (186) This concludes my account of elegance which is found in composition, a difficult subject; and it also concludes my account of the elegant style, and where and how it is produced.

Just as the frigid style was adjacent to the grand style, so there is a faulty style next to the elegant style, and I call it by that broad term, the affected style. Like all the other styles, it too has three aspects. (187) It may be in the thought, for example one writer spoke of “a centaur riding himself,” b and on the theme of Alexander deliberating whether to compete in the Olympic games, another said, “Alexander, run in your mother’s name.” c (188) It may be in the words, for example “the sweet-coloured rose laughed.” d The metaphor “laughed” is thoroughly inappropriate, and not even in verse could the compound

---

a Pl. Rep. 399d.
b Author unknown.
c Author unknown. The name of Alexander’s mother was Olympias. d Author unknown.

3 γίνοντο edd.: γίνεται P.
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πούματι θείη ἄν τις ἀκριβῶς σωφρονῶν· ἤ ὡς τις ἐ毅 ὑπεν ὄτι: “λεπταῖς ὑπεσύριζε πῖτυς αὐραίς.” περὶ μὲν δὴ τὴν λέξιν οὐτως. (189) σύνθεσις δὲ <κακόζη- λος ἤ>; ἀναπαιστικὴ καὶ μάλιστα έουσκα τοῖς κεκλασμένοις καὶ ἀσέμνους μέτρους, οἷα μάλιστα τὰ Σωτάδεια4 διὰ τὸ μαλακότερον, “σκῆλας καύματι κάλυψον,” καὶ “σείων μελήνην Πηλιάδα δεξιῶν κατ’ ὁμον” ἀντὶ τοῦ “σείων Πηλιάδα μελήνην κατὰ δεξιῶν ὁμον”; ὅποια γάρ μεταμεμορφωμένη ἔοικεν ὁ στί- χος, ὡσπερ οἱ μυθεομένοι έξι ἀρρένων μεταβάλλειν εἰς θηλείας. τοσάδε μὲν καὶ περὶ κακοζηλίας.

(190) Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἴσχυοῦ χαρακτήρος ἔχομεν5 ἃν καὶ πράγματα ἴσως τινὰ μικρὰ καὶ τῶ χαρακτήρι πρόσφορα, οἰον τὸ παρὰ Δυσία, “οἰκίδιον ἐστι μοι διπλοῦν, ἵνα ἔχων τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω.” τὴν δὲ λέξιν εἶναι πάσαν χρῆ κυρίαν καὶ συνήθης μικρότερον γὰρ τὸ συνηθέστερον πᾶν,6 τὸ δὲ ἀσύνηθες καὶ μετεννηγμένον μεγαλοπρεπές. (191) καὶ μὴδὲ διπλά ὀνόματα τιθέναι: τοῦ γάρ ἐναντίον χαρακτή- ρος καὶ ταῦτα, μὴδὲ μὴν πεποιημένα, μὴδ’ ὅσα ἄλλα μεγαλοπρέπειαν ποιεῖ, μάλιστα δὲ σαφῆ χρῆ τὴν λέξιν εἶναι. τὸ δὲ σαφῆς ἐν πλείσσωι.

1 ὡς τις edd.: ὡστὶς P.
2 λεπταῖς Radermacher: δὲ γε ταῖς P.
3 κακόζηλος ἤ add. Goeller.
4 Σωτάδεια Victorius: σώματα P.
5 ἔχομεν Victorius: ἐκεῖ μὲν P.
6 πάντων in pān corr. P.
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“sweet-coloured” be used by anyone with reliable good sense. This is true also of the words, “the pine was whistling to the accompaniment of the gentle breezes.”\(^a\) This is enough on diction. (189) The composition is <affected when it is> anapaestic and like the emasculated, undignified metres, particularly the Sotadean\(^b\) because of its rather effeminate rhythm, as in “having dried in the heat, cover up” (skēlas kaumati kalypson) and “brandishing the ash spear Pelian to the right over his shoulder” (seiôn meliên Pēliadâ dexion kat’ ómon)\(^c\) instead of “brandishing the Pelian ash spear over his right shoulder” (seiôn Pēliadâ meliên kata dexion ómon).\(^d\) The line seems to have changed its whole shape, like figures in the world of fable who change from male into female. This now concludes my account of affectation.

(190) In the case of the plain style, we should perhaps keep to subjects which are themselves simple and appropriate to that style, like this passage in Lysias, “I have a small house on two floors, the one above exactly corresponding to the one below.”\(^e\) The diction throughout should be normal and familiar, since the more familiar is always simpler, while the unfamiliar and metaphorical have grandeur. (191) Do not admit compounds either (since they too belong to the opposite style), nor yet neologisms, nor any other words which create grandeur. Above all, the diction should be clear. Now clarity involves a number of factors.

\(^a\) Author unknown.
\(^b\) For the dissolute reputation of Sotadeans cf. e.g. DH. CV 4, Quint. 1.8.6.
\(^c\) Sotades 17 (meaning obscure) and 4(a) Powell.
\(^d\) Hom. II. 22.133.
\(^e\) Lys. 1.9.
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(192) Πρῶτα μὲν ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις, ἐπειτὰ ἐν τοῖς συνδεδεμένοις. τὸ δὲ ἀσύνδετον καὶ διαλελυμένον ὁλον ἁσαφὲς πάντι ἅδηλος γὰρ ἡ ἐκάστον κώλου ἀρχὴ διὰ τὴν λύσιν, ὅσπερ τὰ Ἡρακλεῖτον καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα σκοτεινὰ ποιεῖ τὸ πλεῖστον ἡ λύσις. (193) ἐναγώνιος μὲν οὖν ὕσως μᾶλλον ἡ διαλελυμένη λέξις, ἡ δ’ αὐτὴ καὶ ύποκριτικὴ καλεῖται καὶ ἐναγώνιη γαρ ὑπόκρισιν ἡ λύσις. γραφικὴ δὲ λέξις ἡ εὐανάγγελος. αὕτη δ’ ἔστιν ἡ συνηρτημένη καὶ οἷον ἡ σφαλισμένη τοῖς συνδέσμοις. διὰ τούτο δὲ καὶ Μένανδρον ὑποκρίνονται <ὄντα>¹ λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις, Φιλήμονα δὲ ἀναγινώσκοντι. (194) ὅτι δὲ ύποκριτικὸν ἡ λύσις, παράδειγμα ἐκκείσθω² τόδε, “ἐδεξάμην, ³ ἔτικτον, ἐκτρέφω, φίλε.” οὕτως γὰρ λελυμένον ἀναγκάσει καὶ τὸν μή θέλοντα ὑποκρίνεσθαι διὰ τὴν λύσιν· εἰ δὲ συνδήσας ἐὕποις, “ἐδεξάμην καὶ ἔτικτον καὶ ἐκτρέφω,” πολλὴν ἀπάθειαν τοῖς συνδέσμοις συμμβαλεῖς. ⁴ πᾶν⁵ δὲ τὸ ἀπαθῆς ἀνυπόκριτον. (195) ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θεωρήματα ύποκριτικά, οἷον καὶ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Εὐριπίδει Ἰων ὁ τῶς ἀρπάζων καὶ τῶς κύκνω ἀπειλῶν [τῷ ὀρνιθί.]⁶ ἀποτατοῦντι κατὰ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων καὶ γὰρ κυνήσεις πολλαὶ παρέχει τῷ ύποκριτή ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ τῶς δρόμος καὶ

1 σφαλισμένη Kassell.
2 ἐκκείσθω Finckh: ἐγκείσθω P.
3 ὑπεδεξάμην Kock.
4 συμμβαλεῖς Roberts: συμβαλεῖς P.
5 πᾶν Victorius: omne Lat.: πάν P² in mg., om. P¹.
ON STYLE 192–195

(192) First, it involves the use of normal words, secondly the use of connectives. Sentences which are unconnected and disjointed throughout are always unclear. For the beginning of each clause is obscured by the lack of connectives, as in the prose of Heraclitus,\(^a\) for it is mostly this lack which makes it darkly obscure. (193) The disjointed style is perhaps better for immediacy, and that same style is also called the actor's style\(^b\) since the asyndeton stimulates dramatic delivery, while the written style is easy to read, and this is the style which is linked closely together and, as it were, safely secured by connectives. This is why Menander, who mostly omits connectives, is acted, while Philemon is read.\(^c\) (194) To show that asyndeton suits an actor's delivery, let this be an example: "I conceived, I gave birth, I nurse, my dear."\(^d\) In this disjointed form the words will force anyone to be dramatic, however reluctantly—and the cause is the asyndeton. If you link it together to say, "I conceived and I gave birth and I nurse," you will by using the connectives substantially lower the emotional level, and anything unemotional is always undramatic. (195) Acting technique offers other aspects to investigate, for example the case of Ion in Euripides, who seizes his bow and threatens the swan which is fouling the sculptures with its droppings.\(^e\) The actor is given wide scope for stage movements by Ion's rush for his bow, by turning his face up to the sky

\(^a\) Cf. Ar. Rhet. 1407b13.  
\(^b\) Cf. Ar. Rhet. 1413b8ff.  
\(^c\) PCG Philemon T 22.  
\(^d\) Menander fr. 685 Koerte.  
\(^e\) Eur. Ion 161ff.

---

\(^6\) del. von Arnim.
Η πρῶς τῶν ἀέρα ἀνάβλεψις τοῦ προσώπου διαλεγομένου τῇ κύκνῳ, καὶ ἡ λοιπῇ πάσα διαμόρφωσις πρὸς τὸν ὑποκριτήν πεποιημένη. ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ ὑποκρίσεως ἢμῖν τὰ νῦν ὁ λόγος.

(196) Φευγέτω δὲ ἡ σαφῆς γραφὴ καὶ τὰς ἀμφιβολίας, σχήματι δὲ χρῆσθω τῇ ἐπαναλήψει καλουμένη. ἐπανάληψις δὲ ἔστι συνδέσμου ἐπιφορὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς διὰ μακροῦ ἐπιφερομένους λόγους, οἷον "ὁσα μὲν ἔπραξε Φιλιππος, καὶ ὁς τὴν Θράκην κατεστρέφατο, καὶ Χερσόνησον ἔδει, καὶ Βυζάντιον ἐπολιορκήσεν, καὶ Ἀμφίπολιν ὦν ἀπέδωκεν, ταῦτα μὲν παραλέψω."\(^1\) σχεδὸν γὰρ ὁ μὲν σύνδεσμος ἑπενεχθεὶς ἀνέμνησεν ἡμᾶς τῆς προθέσεως, καὶ ἀπεκατέστησεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν. (197) σαφηνείας δὲ ἑνεκεν καὶ διλογιστέου πολλάκις. ἦδιον γὰρ πῶς τὸ συντομώτερον ἡ\(^2\) σαφέστερον ὡς γὰρ οἱ παρατρέχοντες παρορῶνται ἐνίοτε, οὕτως καὶ ἡ λέξις παρακούεται διὰ τὸ τάχος.

(198) Φευγεῖν δὲ καὶ τὰς πλαγιότητας καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἁσαφές, ὀσπέρ ἡ Φιλίστου λέξις. συντομώτερον δὲ παράδειγμα πλαγίας λέξεως καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἁσαφοῦς τὸ παρὰ Ξενοφόντη, οἶον "καὶ ὅτι τριήρεις ἦκουν περιπλεόντας ἀπ' Ἰωνίας εἰς Κιλικίαν\(^3\) Τάμων ἔχοντα τὰς Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ αὐτοῦ Κύρου." τοῦτο γὰρ <ἀν>\(^4\) ἔξ εὐθείας μὲν ὁδὲ πως λέγοιτο.

\(^1\) παραλεύψω M: omittam Lat.: περιλεύψω P.
\(^2\) ἡ edd.: ὡς P.
as he speaks to the swan, and by the way in which all the other details are shaped to exploit acting skills. But acting is not our present subject.

(196) Clear writing should also avoid ambiguities and use the figure termed epanalepsis. Epanalepsis is the resumptive repetition of the same particle in the course of a long sentence, for example "On the one hand, all Philip's activities—how he conquered Thrace, seized the Chersonese, besieged Byzantium, and refused to return Amphipolis—all these, on the one hand, I shall pass over."a The repetition of the particle "on the one hand" (men) virtually reminded us of the opening and put us right back to the beginning again. (197) Clarity often demands repetition. Brevity may in a way add more pleasure than clarity. For just as men who run past us are sometimes not properly seen, so too the speed of a passage sometimes causes it not to be properly heard.

(198) Avoid also the use of dependent constructions, since this too leads to obscurity, as Philistus' style shows.b A shorter example of how the use of dependent constructions causes obscurity is this passage of Xenophon: "and that he had heard that triremes were sailing round from Ionia to Cilicia commanded by Tamus, ships belonging to the Spartans and to Cyrus himself."c This sentence could be redrafted without dependent constructions in the fol-

---

a Author unknown; cf. Dem. 11.1, also § 263.
b FGrHist 556 Philistus T 19. He was noted for his obscure style, e.g. Cic. Brutus 66.
c Xen. Anab. 1.2.21.

3 Κιλικίαν Xen.: συκελίαν P.
4 ἄν add. Spengel.
"τριήρεις προσεδοκώντο εἰς Κιλικίαν¹ πολλαὶ μὲν Λάκαναι, πολλαὶ δὲ Περσίδες, Κύρῳ ναυπηγηθεῖσαν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ τούτῳ. ἔπλεον δὲ ἀπ’ Ἰωνίας ναύαρχος δ’ αὐτάς ἐπεστάτει Τάμος Αἰγύπτιος." μακρότερον μὲν οὕτως² ἐγένετο ὄσσος, σαφέστερον δὲ. (199) καὶ ὅλως τῇ φυσικῇ³ τάξει τῶν οἰκομάτων χρηστέον, ὅς τὸ "Επίδαμνός ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾷ ἐσπλέοντι εἰς⁴ τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον". πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὁνόμασται τὸ περὶ οὖ, δεύτερον δὲ ὁ τοῦτο ἐστιν, ὅτι πόλις, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐφεξῆς. (200) γίγνοιτο μὲν οὖν ἄν καὶ τὸ ἐμπαλὼν, ὅσ τὸ "Εβύρη". οὐ γὰρ πάντῃ ταύτῃ δοκιμάζομεν τὴν τάξιν, οὐδὲ τὴν ἑτέραν ἀποδοκιμάζομεν, καθὰ⁵ ἐκχείμεθα μόνον τὸ φυσικὸν εἴδος τῆς τάξεως. (201) ἐν δὲ τοῖς δυνηθμασθεῖ ἦτοι ἀπὸ τῆς ὁρθῆς ἀρκτεόν, "Επίδαμνός ἐστι πόλις," ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτιατικῆς, ὅσ τὸ "λέγεται Επίδαμνον τὴν πόλιν." αἰ δὲ ἄλλα πτώσεις ἀσάφειαν τυν παρέξονοι καὶ βάσανον τῷ τε λέγοντι αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι.

(202) Πειράσθαι δὲ μὴ εἰς μῆκος ἐκτείνει τὰς περιαγωγὰς: "ὁ γὰρ Ἀχελῶς ρέων ἐκ Πάνδου ὄρους ἀνωθὲν μὲν παρὰ Στράτον πόλιν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν διεξεισών" ἄλλα αὐτόθεν ἀπολήγειν καὶ ἀναπαύειν

¹ Κιλικίαν Χεν.: σκελίαν Ρ.
² οὕτως Μ: ita Lat.: οὕτος Ρ.
³ φυσικῇ Victorius: φύσει καὶ Ρ.
⁴ εἰς Ρ, om. Μ, Thuc.
⁵ καθὰ Ρ suspexvum; expectes ἄλλα.
⁶ Στρατὸν πόλιν M: Stratopolim Lat.: στρατὸν πόλιν Ρ.
lowing sort of way: "Triremes were expected in Cilicia, many of them Spartan, many of them Persian and built by Cyrus for this very purpose. They were sailing from Ionia, and the commander in charge of them was the Egyptian Tamus." This version would perhaps have been longer, but it would also have been clearer. (199) In general, follow the natural word order, for example "Epidamnus is a city on your right as you sail into the Ionian gulf."a The subject is mentioned first, then what it is (it is a city), then the rest follows. (200) The order can also be reversed, for example "There is a city, Ephyra."b We do not rigidly approve the one nor condemn the other order; we are simply setting out the natural way to arrange words. (201) In narrative passages begin either with the nominative case (e.g. "Epidamnus is a city")c or with the accusatived (e.g. "It is said that the city Epidamnus . . ."). Use of the other cases will cause some obscurity and torture for the actual speaker and also the listener.

(202) Try not to make your periodic sentences too long. Take this sentence: "For the river Achealous, flowing from Mount Pindus, passing inland by the city of Stratus, runs into the sea."e Make a natural break here and give

---

a Th. 1.24.1 (cf. § 201). On theories of natural word order cf. DH. CV 5.

b Hom. Il. 6.152. Th. 1.24.1 (cf. § 199).

d The Greek construction for indirect speech after e.g. "it is said that" may have the accusative as the subject (and the infinitive as the verb).

e Th. 2.102.2 (cf. §§ 45–47, 206). The inns of § 47 have become signposts (cf. milestones, a Roman adaptation, in Quint. 4.5.22).
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tòn ākoiōnta ou̱tws: "ò γàr Ἀχελῶος μὲν ἐκ Πίνδου ὄρους, ἔξεισιν δὲ εἰς θάλασσαν." polν γàr ou̱tws ἱσαφέστερον, ὡσπερ ἀν αἱ πολλὰ σημεῖα ἔχουσαι ὁδοὶ καὶ πολλὰς ἀναπαύλας ήγεμόσι γὰρ τὰ σημεῖα έσκευεν, ὡ δὲ ἀσημείωτος καὶ μονοειδῆς, κἂν μικρὰ ᾗ, ἄδηλος δοκεῖ. (203) περὶ μὲν δὴ σαφῆνειας τοσαύτα, ὡς ὅλγα ἐκ πολλῶν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς ἰσχυρὸις αὐτῇ λόγοις χρηστέον.

(204) Φεύγειν δὲ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τούτου πρῶτον μὲν τὰ μῆκη τῶν κόλων μεγαλοπρεπὲς γὰρ πάν μῆκος, ὡσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν [ήρωικῶν]1 μέτρων τὸ ἔξαμετρον ἠρωικὸν [ὁν]2 καλεῖται ὑπὸ μεγέθους καὶ πρέπουν ἠρωσίν,3 ἡ κωμῳδία δὲ συνεσταλται εἰς τὸ τρίμετρον ἢ νέα. (205) τὰ πολλὰ οὖν κόλοις τριμέτρους χρησόμεθα καὶ ἐνίοτε κόμμασιν, ὡσπερ ὁ μὲν Πλάτων φησὶ, "κατέβην χθες εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος": πυκνῶν γὰρ αἱ ἀνάπαυλαι καὶ ἀποθέσεις. Αἰσχῦνς δὲ "ἐκαθήμεθα μὲν," φησίν, "ἐπὶ τῶν θάκων ἐν Δυκείῳ, οὖ οἱ ἂθλοθέται τῶν ἀγώνα διατιθέασιν." (206) ἔχετω δὲ καὶ ἔδραν ἀσφαλῆ τῶν κόλων τὰ τέλη καὶ βάσιν, ὡς τὰ εἰρημένα: αἱ γὰρ κατὰ τὰ τελευταία ἐκτάσεις μεγαλοπρεπεῖς, ὡς τὰ Θουκυδίδου, "Ἀχελῶος ποταμὸς ῥέων ἐκ Πίνδου ὄρους" καὶ τὰ ἔξης. (207) φευκτέον

1 ἠρωικῶν del. Spengel.
2 ὅν del. Radermacher et Roberts.
3 ἠρωσίν edd.: ἠρώων P.
the listener a rest: “For the river Achelous flows from Mount Pindus, and runs into the sea.” This version is far clearer. Sentences are like roads. Some roads have many signposts and many resting places; and the signposts are like guides. But a monotonous road without signposts seems infinite, even if it is short. (203) These are a few remarks out of the many possible on the subject of clarity, and clarity is to be used most of all in the plain style.

(204) Next, composition in this style: first, avoid long clauses, since length always has grandeur, just as in the case of metres the hexameter is called heroic because of its length and it suits heroes,\(^a\) while New Comedy is kept confined within the iambic trimeter. (205) So we shall for the most part use clauses of trimeter length\(^b\) and sometimes phrases, as in Plato, “I went down yesterday to Piraeus with Glaucon . . .”\(^c\) (here the pauses and endings come close together), and in Aeschines, “we were sitting on the benches in the Lyceum, where the stewards of the games organise the contests.”\(^d\) (206) And let the closing words of the clauses reach a secure and perceptible end,\(^e\) as in the sentences I have just quoted. Long delayed endings belong rather to the grand style, as in the sentence of Thucydides, “The river Achelous, flowing from Mount

\(^a\) Cf. § 5.

\(^b\) I.e. a length of roughly 15–16 syllables. The phrase is shorter (see note on § 5).

\(^c\) Pl. Rep. 327a (cf. § 21). The whole sentence is intended.

\(^d\) Aesch. Soc. 2 Dittmar, probably the beginning of the Alcibiades. Compare also the beginning of his Miltiades (in P. Oxy. 2889), “It happened to be the great Panathenaic festival, and we were sitting . . .”

\(^e\) Cf. § 183.
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οὖν καὶ τὰς τῶν μακρῶν στοιχείων συμπλήξεις ἐν τῷ χαρακτῆρι τούτῳ καὶ τῶν διφθόγγων· ὠγκηρῶν γὰρ πᾶσα ἐκτασίς. καὶ εἰ που βραχέα συγκροτήσει βραχέσιν, ὡς "πάντα μὲν τὰ νέα καλά ἐστιν," ἣ βραχέα μακροῖς, ὡς "ἡλιός, 1 ἡ ἀμῶς 2 γέ πως διὰ βραχέων καὶ ὅλως ἐμφαίνεται 3 εὐκαταφρόνητος ὁ τοιούτος τρόπος τῆς λέξεως καὶ ἰδιωτικός, καὶ αὐτὰ 4 ταῦτα πεποιημένοις. (208) φευγέτω δὴ καὶ τὰ σημεώδη σχήματα· πάν γὰρ τὸ παράσημον ἀσύνηθες καὶ οὐκ ἰδιωτικόν. τὴν δὲ ἐνάργειαν καὶ τὸ πιθανὸν μάλιστα ὁ χαρακτήρ ὅτος ἐπιδέεται. περὶ ἐνάργειας οὖν καὶ περὶ πιθανότητος λεκτέων.

(209) Πρῶτον δὲ περὶ ἐνάργειας· γίνεται δ' ἡ ἐνάργεια πρῶτα μὲν ἐξ ἀκριβολογίας καὶ τοῦ παραλείπειν μηδὲν μηδ' ἐκτέμνειν, ὅιον "ὡς δι' ὤτ' ἀνήρ όχετηγός" καὶ πᾶσα. αὕτη ἡ παραβολή· τὸ γὰρ ἐνάργειας ἔχει ἐκ τοῦ πάντα εἰρήσθαι τὰ συμβαίνοντα καὶ μὴ παραλείπεσθαι μηδέν. (210) καὶ ἡ ἱπποδρομία δὲ ἡ ἐπὶ Πατρόκλου, ἐν οἷς λέγει, "πνοῦ ὃν Ἰμμήλου μετάφρενω," καὶ "αἰεὶ γὰρ δίφρον ἐπιβησομένους ἐκτηνή." πάντα ταῦτα ἑναργῆ ἔστιν ἐκ

1 ἡλιός Victorius: ήλιος P.
2 ἀμῶς Finckh: ἀλλως P.
3 ἐμφαίνεται Victorius: ἐμφαίνεσθαι P.
4 καὶ αὐτὰ P: καὶ αὐτὰ Roberts.

a Th. 2.102.2 (cf. §§ 45 and 202).
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Pindus . . .”a and so on. (207) In this style we should also avoid hiatus between long vowels and diphthongs, since any lengthening is imposing. If there is any, we should have it between short vowels (e.g. *kala estin* at the end of the sentence “all that is young is beautiful"b) or between a short and a long (e.g. *êlios*, “the sun”), or at any rate shorts in some shape or form. In general, this type of style is unimpressive and ordinary, and that is the very effect it intends. (208) Conspicuous figures should also be avoided, since anything conspicuous is unfamiliar and out of the ordinary. Vividness, however, and persuasiveness will be particularly welcome in this style, so we must speak next about vividness and persuasiveness.

(209) First, vividness: it comes first from the use of precise detail and from omitting and excluding nothing, for example the whole simile beginning “as when a man draws off water in an irrigation channel.”c This comparison owes its vividness to the fact that all accompanying details are included and nothing is omitted. (210) Another example is the horse race in honour of Patroclus, in the lines where Homer describes “the hot breath on Eumelus’ back” and “for they always looked as if they were about to mount the chariot.”d The entire passage is

---

a Author unknown (cf. § 70).
b Author unknown (cf. § 70).
c Hom. *Il.* 21.257ff: “as when a man draws off water in an irrigation channel from a spring with deep black water, and he guides the flow of water along his plants and orchards, and with a spade in his hands, he throws out any obstructions from the ditch, and as the water streams forth, all the pebbles are jostled along, and flowing quickly down it gurgles in its sloping bed, and outruns the man who controls it.”
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toù μηδὲν παραλειπέσθαι τῶν τε συμβαίνόντων καὶ συμβάντων. (211) ὡστε πολλάκις καὶ ἡ διλογία ἐναργείαν ποιεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ ἀπαξ λέγειν, ὡστερ τὸ "σὺ δ’ αὐτὸν καὶ ζωντα ἔλεγες κακῶς, καὶ νῦν ἀποθανόντα γράφεις κακῶς." διὸ γὰρ κείμενον τὸ "κακῶς" ἐναργεστέραν σημαίνει τὴν βλασφημίαν.

(212) Ὁπερ δὲ τῷ Κητσία ἐγκαλοῦσιν ὡς ἀδολεσχοτέρῳ διὰ τὰς διλογίας, πολλαχῇ μὲν ἵσως ἐγκαλοῦσιν ὀρθῶς, πολλαχῇ δὲ οὐκ αἰσθάνονται τῆς ἐναργείας τοῦ ἀνδρός: τίθεται γὰρ ταύτῳ <δις>¹ διὰ τὸ πολλάκις ποιεῖν ἐμφασιν πλείονα. (213) οἱ τὰ τοιάδε, "Στρναγγαῖος² τις, ἀνὴρ Μήδος, γυναῖκα Σακίδα καταβαλὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιποῦ μάχονται γὰρ δὴ αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν Σάκαις ὡσπερ αἱ Ἀμαζόνες: θεισάμενος δὴ τὴν Σακίδα εὐπρεπῆ καὶ ὁραίαν μεθήκεν ἀποσώζεσθαι. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο σπονδῶν γενομένων, ἐρασθείς τῆς γυναικὸς ἀπετύχανεν ἐδέδοκτο μὲν αὐτῷ ἀποκαρτερεῖν γράφει δὲ πρότερον ἐπιστολὴν τῇ γυναικὶ μεμφόμενος τοιάνδε: Ἐγὼ μὲν σε ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ μὲν³ δ’ ἔμε ἔσωθης: ἔγω δὲ διὰ σὲ ἀπωλῶμην." (214) ἐνταῦθα ἑπιτιμήσειν ἄν ἰσως τις βραχυλόγος οἰόμενος εἶναι, ὅτι δις ἐτέθη πρὸς οὐδὲν τὸ "ἔσωσα" καὶ "δ’ ἔμε ἔσωθης" ταὐτὸν γὰρ σημαίνει ἀμφότερα. ἀλλ’ εἰ ἄφελοις θάτερον, συναφαίρεσεις καὶ τὴν ἐνάργειαν καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐναργείας πάθος.

¹ δις add. Gärtn. cf. δις πολλάκις in mg. P.
² Στρναγγαῖος Finckh: στρνάγλιος P.
³ μὲν P: om. P. Oxy. 2330.
vivid since no detail of what usually happens and did happen is omitted. (211) Consequently repetition is often more vivid than a single mention, e.g. “you are the man who when he was alive spoke to his discredit, and now when he is dead write to his discredit.”\(^a\) The repetition of “to his discredit” gives the insult a more vivid impact.

(212) This is relevant to the charge of garrulousness regularly brought against Ctesias\(^b\) on account of his repetitions. In many passages it is perhaps a valid charge, but in many others it is a failure to appreciate the author’s vividness. The same word is often put twice to increase the impact, as in this passage: (213) “Stryangaeus, a Persian, unhorsed a Sacian woman (for among the Sacians the women fight like Amazons); his gaze was caught by the Sacian’s youth and beauty, and he let her escape. Later, when peace was made, he fell in love with the woman but had no success. He decided to starve to death, but first he wrote her this letter of complaint: ‘I saved you, because of me you were saved, yet because of you I am dead.’”\(^c\) (214) Here perhaps anyone convinced of his own brevity might object that there is a pointless repetition in “I saved you” and “because of me you were saved,” since both mean the same. But if you take away either, you will also take away the vividness and the

\(^a\) Author unknown (cf. § 26).
\(^b\) FGrHist 684 Ctesias T 14(a).
\(^c\) F 8(a); cf. F 8(b) = P.Oxy. 2330.
καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον δὲ, τὸ “ἀπωλόμην” ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἀπόλλυμαι,” ἐναργεῖστερον αὐτῇ τῇ συντελείᾳ ἐστὶ· τὸ γὰρ δὴ γεγονός δεινότερον τοῦ μέλλοντος ἡ γνωμένου ἐτι. (215) καὶ ὅλως δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς οὕτως (ποιητὴν γὰρ αὐτὸν καλοὶ τις <ἀν>¹ εἰκότως) ἐναργεῖας δημουργός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ γραφῇ συμπάσχῃ. (216) οἶνον καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοι δὲ δεῖ τὰ γενόμενα² οὐκ εὐθὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μικρὸν, κρεμνώντα τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ ἀναγκάζοντα συναγωνιάν. τούτῳ ὁ Κησίων ἐν τῇ ἀγγελίᾳ τῇ περὶ Κύρου τεθνεώτος ποιεῖ. ἐλθὼν γὰρ ὁ ἄγγελος οὐκ εὐθὺς λέγει ὅτι ἀπέθανεν Κύρος παρὰ τὴν Παρυσάτων· τούτῳ γὰρ ἡ λεγομένη ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ἰῆσις ἐστιν· ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν ἠγγειλεν ὅτι νικᾷ, ἡ δὲ ἡσθή καὶ ἡγωνιάσεν· μετὰ δὲ τούτῳ ἑρωτᾷ, βασιλεὺς δὲ πῶς πράττει; ὁ δὲ πέφευγε φησι· καὶ ἡ ὑπολαβοῦσα. Τισσαφέρνης γὰρ αὐτὸ τούτῳ αὐτίκος· καὶ πάλιν ἐπανερωτᾶ· Κύρος δὲ ποῦ νῦν; ὁ δὲ ἄγγελος ἀμείβεται· ἐνθα χρῆ τοὺς ἁγαθοὺς ἄνδρας αὐλίζεσθαι. καὶ³ κατὰ μικρὸν καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ προϊὸν μόλις, τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον, ἀπερρήξεν αὐτῷ, μάλα ἡθικὸς καὶ ἑναργῶς τὸν τε ἄγγελον ἐμφήνας ἀκοουόντα ἄγγελοῦντα τὴν συμφοράν, καὶ τὴν μητέρα εἰς ἀγωνίαν ἐμβαλὼν καὶ τὸν ἀκούοντα.

¹ ἀν M: om. P.
² γενόμενα Greg.: γενόμενα P.
³ καὶ Lockwood: καὶ οὕτω Greg.: om. P.
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emotional impact of the vividness. Furthermore, the following words, “I am dead” instead of “I am dying,” add yet more vividness by the use of an actual past tense, since what has already happened is more forceful than what will happen or is still happening. (215) Altogether, this poet (for Ctesias may reasonably be called a poet) is an artist in vividness throughout his writings, (216) as in the next example. In the case of a disaster we should not immediately say that a disaster has happened but reveal it only gradually, keeping the reader in suspense and forcing him to share the anguish. This is what Ctesias does when the messenger reports Cyrus’ death.\(^a\) The messenger arrives but does not immediately say before Parysatis that Cyrus is dead (for that would be the proverbially blunt speech of the Scythians).\(^b\) First he reports the victory of Cyrus. Parysatis feels both joy and anguish. Then she asks, “How is the king?” He replies, “He has escaped.” She responds, “Yes, this he owes to Tissaphernes.” Again she asks a question: “Where is Cyrus now?” The messenger replies, “where the brave should camp.” Moving gradually and step by reluctant step Ctesias at last, in the traditional phrase, “broke the news,” and in a style full of characterisation and vividness he presented the messenger’s reluctance to report the disaster and stirred the mother’s anguish, which he made the reader share.

\(^a\) F 24. The king is Artaxerxes, the elder son of Parysatis (cf. § 3).
\(^b\) Cf. § 297, Paroem. Gr. ii.438.
ДЕМЕТРИЙ

(217) Γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς πράγμασι λέγειν ἐνάργεια, οἷον ὅσι εἶπ τοῦ ἀγροίκου βαδίζοντος ἐφή τις, ὅτι “πρόσωθεν ἢκουέτο1 αὐτοῦ τῶν ποδῶν ὁ κτύπος προσώπον,” ὡς οὐδὲ βαδίζοντος ἄλλ’ οἶον γε λακτίζοντος τὴν γῆν. (218) ὅπερ δὲ ὁ Πλάτων φησιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰπποκράτους, ἔρυθριάσας [ἡδὴ τῇ νυκτί2], ἦδη γὰρ ὑπέφημεν τι ἡμέρας, ὡστε3 καταφανῇ αὐτὸν γενέσθαι,” ὅτι μὲν ἐναργεστάτον ἔστι, παντὶ δὴλον· ἢ δ’ ἐνάργεια γέγονεν ἐκ τῆς φροντίδος τῆς περὶ τὸν λόγον καὶ τοῦ ἀπομνημονεύ-σαι, ὅτι νύκτωρ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσήλθεν ὁ Ἰπποκράτης.


(221) Τὸ πιθανόν δὲ ἐν δυνι, ἐν τῇ τῷ σαφέϊ καὶ συνήθει τὸ γὰρ ἀσαφῆς καὶ ἀσύνηθες ἀπίθανον;

1 ἢκουέτο Cobet: ἢκουότο P.
2 ἦδη τῇ νυκτὶ del. Schneider.
3 ὡστε Plat. codd.: εἰς τὸ P.
(217) Vividness also comes from the use of circumstantial detail, as in someone's description of a countryman walking along, "the clatter of his feet was heard from far away as he approached,"a just as if he were not just walking along but virtually stamping the ground. (218) Plato too has an example when he is describing Hippocrates: "He was blushing, for there was already a first glimmer of daylight to reveal him."b This is extremely vivid, as anybody can see, and the vividness is the result of his careful use of words and keeping in mind that it was night when Hippocrates visited Socrates.

(219) Harsh sounds are often vivid, as in "He struck them down, and out spurted their brains" (kopt', ek d' enkephalos)c and "over and over, up and down" (polla d' ananta katanta).d Homer intended the cacophony to imitate the jerkiness, and all imitation has an element of vividness. (220) Onomatopoeic formations also produce vividness, since they are coined to suggest an imitation, as in "lapping" (laptontes).e If Homer had said "drinking," he would not have imitated the sound of dogs drinking, and there would have been no vividness; and the addition "with their tongues" (glôssêisi) after "lapping" makes the passage still more vivid. This concludes my brief outline on the subject of vividness.

(221) Next, persuasiveness: it depends on two things, clarity and familiarity, since what is unclear and unfamiliar...
Λέξειν τε οὖν ὑπὲρ ηὗ περιττὴν οὔδε ύπέρογκου διωκτέου ἐν τῇ πιθανότητι, καὶ ὁσαῦτως σύνθεσιν βεβαιοῦσαν¹ καὶ μηδὲν ἠχουσαν ῥυθμοειδές. (222) ἐν τούτως τε οὖν τὸ πιθανόν, καὶ ἐν ὧν Θεόφραστος φησιν, ὅτι οὐ πάντα ἐπὶ ἀκριβείας δεὶ μακρηγορεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔνια καταλιπέω καὶ τῷ ἀκροατῇ συνιέναι καὶ λογίζεσθαι εἰς αὐτοῦ· συνεῖς γὰρ τὸ ἐλλειφθὲν ὑπὸ σοῦ οὐκ ἀκροατῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς σου γίνεται, καὶ ἁμα εὐμενέστερος. συνεδὸς γὰρ ἔαντ为空 δοκεῖ διὰ σὲ τὸν ἀφορμῆν παρεσχηκότα αὐτῷ τοῦ συνιέναι, τὸ δὲ πάντα ὡς ἀνοητῷ λέγειν καταγινώσκοντι ἐοικεῖον τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ.

(223) Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐπιστολικὸς χαρακτήρ δεῖται ἵσχυστος, καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέξομεν. Ἀρτέμων μὲν οὖν ὧν ὁ τάς Ἀριστοτέλους ἀναγράψας ἐπιστολάς φησιν, ὅτι δεὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ διάλογὸν τε γράφειν καὶ ἐπιστολάς· εἶναι γὰρ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὁνὸν τὸ ἐτερὸν μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου. (224) καὶ λέγει μὲν τι ἱσως, οὐ μὴν ἄπαν· δεὶ γὰρ ὑποκατεσκευάσθη πως μᾶλλον τοῦ διαλόγου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν· μὲν γὰρ μιμεῖται αὐτοσχεδιάζοντα, ἢ δὲ γράφεται καὶ δώρον πέμπεται τρόπον τινά. (225) τίς γοῦν οὕτως ἄν διαλεχθεῖσιν πρὸς φίλον ὅσπερ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς Αὐτίπατρον ὑπὲρ τοῦ φυγάδου γράφων τοῦ γέροντός φησιν· "εἰ δὲ πρὸς ἀπάσας οὐχεῖται γὰς³ φυγάς

¹βεβαιοῦσαν P vix recte: βεβαιαν Dahl: βεβαιαν οὖσαν Roberts.
iar is unconvincing. So to be persuasive we should aim for diction which is not elaborate or inflated, and for composition similarly which moves steadily along without formal rhythm. (222) These then are the essentials of persuasiveness, along with the advice of Theophrastus,\(^a\) that you should not elaborate on everything in punctilious detail but should omit some points for the listener to infer and work out for himself. For when he infers what you have omitted, he is not just listening to you but he becomes your witness and reacts more favourably to you. For he is made aware of his own intelligence through you, who have given him the opportunity to be intelligent. To tell your listener every detail as though he were a fool seems to judge him one.

(223) We will next discuss the style for letters, since that too should be plain. Artemon,\(^b\) the editor of Aristotle’s *Letters*, says that a letter should be written in the same manner as a dialogue; the letter, he says, is like one of the two sides to a dialogue. (224) There is perhaps some truth in what he says, but not the whole truth. The letter should be a little more formal than the dialogue, since the latter imitates improvised conversation, while the former is written and sent as a kind of gift. (225) Who would ever talk to a friend as Aristotle writes to Antipater on behalf of an old man in exile? “If he is a wanderer over

\(^a\) Theophr. F 696 Fortenbaugh.

\(^b\) Perhaps the second-century B.C. grammarian. For the letter as part of a conversation, cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* 13.18, Ovid *Ars. Amat.* 1.468 *praeens ut videare loqui*.

\(^2\) διαλέξθείη Schneider: διαλέξθη P.

\(^3\) γᾶς Valckenaer: τᾶς P.
DEMETRIUS

οὗτος, ὁστε μὴ κατάγειν, δῆλον ὡς τοῦτε γεις Ἀιδοὺ κατελθὲιν βουλομένους οὐδεὶς φθόνος.” ὁ γὰρ οὕτως διαλεγόμενος ἐπιδεικνυμένως ἔστι καὶ μᾶλλον, οὐ λαλοῦτι. (226) καὶ λύσεις συχναὶ1 ὅποιαι <..>2 οὐ πρέπουσιν ἐπιστολαίς· ἀσαφὲς γὰρ ἐν γραφῇ ἢ λύσις, καὶ τὸ μυμητικὸν οὐ γραφής οὕτως οἰκεῖον ὡς ἁγώνος, οἰον ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐυθυδῆμῳ: “τίς Ἦν, ὦ Σώκρατε, ὃ χθές ἐν Δυκεώ διελέγου; ἢ πολὺς ἃ μᾶς ὁχλος περιειστήκει.” καὶ μικρὸν προελθὼν ἐπιφέρει, “ἀλλὰ μοι ξένον τις φαίνεται εἶναι, ὃ διελέγουν τίς Ἦν;” ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη πᾶσα ἐρμηνεία καὶ μίμησις ὑποκρίτην πρέπει3 μᾶλλον, οὐ γραφομένως ἐπιστολαῖς.

(227) Πλείστον δὲ ἐχέτω τὸ ἥθικόν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ὅσπερ καὶ ὁ διάλογος· σχεδὸν γὰρ εἰκόνα ἐκαστὸς τῆς ἐαυτοῦ ψυχῆς γράφει τὴν ἐπιστολὴν. καὶ ἐστι μὲν καὶ ἔξ ἄλλου λόγου παντὸς4 ἴδειν τὸ ἡθός τοῦ γράφοντος, ἐξ οὐδενὸς δὲ οὕτως, ὡς ἐπιστολής.

(228) Τὸ δὲ μέγεθος συνεστάλθω τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ὁσπερ καὶ ἡ λέξις. αὐτὶ δὲ ἄγαν μακραί, καὶ προσέτι κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ὁγκωδέστεραι, οὐ μᾶ τὴν ἀληθειαν ἐπιστολαί γένουτο ἀν, ἀλλὰ συγγράμματα, τὸ χαίρειν ἔχοντα προσγεγραμμένον, καθάπερ τοῦ Πλάτωνος πολλαί5 καὶ ἡ Θουκυδίδου. (229) καὶ τῷ

1 συχναὶ Victorius: ἵσχναι P.
3 πρέπει Victorius: πρέποι P.
4 παντὸς Victorius: πάντως P.
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all the world, an exile with no hope of being recalled home, it is clear that we cannot blame men like him if they wish to return home, to Hades.”\textsuperscript{a} A man who talked like that would seem to be making a speech, not chatting. (226) Yet a series of abrupt sentence breaks such as \textless \ldots \textgreater \textsuperscript{b} does not suit the letter. Abruptness in writing causes obscurity, and the imitation of conversation is less appropriate to writing than to real debate. Take the \textit{Euthydemus}: “Who was it, Socrates, you were talking to yesterday in the Lyceum? There was certainly a large crowd standing round your group.” And a little further on he adds: “I think he was a stranger, the man you were talking to. Who was he?”\textsuperscript{c} All this sort of style in imitation of reality suits oral delivery better, it does not suit letters since they are written.

(227) Like the dialogue, the letter should be strong in characterisation. Everyone writes a letter in the virtual image of his own soul. In every other form of speech it is possible to see the writer’s character, but in none so clearly as in the letter.

(228) The length of a letter, no less than its range of style, should be restricted. Those that are too long, not to mention too inflated in style, are not in any true sense letters at all but treatises with the heading, “Dear Sir.” This is true of many of Plato’s letters, and that one of Thucydides.\textsuperscript{d} (229) The sentences should also be fairly

\textsuperscript{a} Ar. \textit{fr.} 665 Rose = F 8 Plezia. \textsuperscript{b} Add e.g. “suit the dialogue.” \textsuperscript{c} Pl. \textit{Euthyd.} 271a. \textsuperscript{d} An unknown later fiction, unless it is the letter of Nicias in Th. 7.11–15. Neither it nor the Plato letters begin with \textit{χαίρειν}.  

\textsuperscript{5} τοῦ Πλάτωνος πολλαί Finckh: τὰ Πλάτωνος πολλὰ P.
συντάξει 1 μέντοι λελύσθω μᾶλλον γελοῶν γὰρ περιοδεύειν, ὡσπερ οὐκ ἑπιστολήν ἄλλα δίκην γρά- 
φοντα: καὶ οὐδὲ γελοῶν μόνον ἄλλῃ οὐδὲ φιλικὸν (τὸ 
γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τὴν παρομίαιν "τὰ σῶκα σῶκα" λεγό-
μενον) ἑπιστολαίς ταῦτα ἐπιτηδεύειν. (230) εἰδέναι 
δὲ χρῆ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔρμηνεία μόνον ἄλλα καὶ πράγματα 
tυπα ἑπιστολικά ἔστων. Ἀριστοτέλης γοῦν ὅς 2 
mάλιστα ἐπιτευχέναι δοκεῖ τοῦ [αὐτοῦ 3] ἑπιστολι-
κοῦ, "τὸντο δὲ οὐ γράφω σοί," φησίν: "οὐ γὰρ ἦν 
ἑπιστολικὸν." (231) εἰ γὰρ τις ἐν ἑπιστολῇ σοφίσ-
ματα γράφοι καὶ φυσιολογίας, γράφει μὲν, οὐ μὴν 
ἑπιστολὴν γράφει. φιλοφρόνησις γὰρ τις βούλεται 
εἶναι ἡ ἑπιστολῆ σύντομος, καὶ περὶ ἄπλου πράγμα-
tος ἐκθεσις καὶ ἐν ὅνομαισιν ἄπλοις. (232) κάλλος 
mέντοι αὐτῆς αἰ τε φιλικαὶ φιλοφρονήσεις καὶ 
πυκναὶ παρομίαι ἐνοῦσαι· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον 
ἐνέστω αὐτῇ σοφόν, διότι δημοτικὸν τί ἔστων ἡ 
παρομίαι καὶ κοινὸν, ὅ δὲ γνωμολογῶν καὶ προτρε-
pὸμενος οὐ δι’ ἑπιστολῆς ἔτι λαλοῦντι ἑοίκεν, ἄλλα 
<ἀπὸ> 4 μηχανής. (233) Ἀριστοτέλης μέντοι καὶ 
ἀποδείξειν που χρῆται ἑπιστολικοὺς, οἶον διδάξαι 
βουλόμενος, ὅτι ὁμοίως χρῆ εὐεργετεῖν τὰς μεγάλας 
πόλεις καὶ τὰς μικρὰς, φησίν, "οἱ γὰρ θείοι ἐν ἀμφο-
tέραις ἵσοι, ὅστ’ ἐπεὶ αἱ χάριτες θεαί, ἵσαι ἀποκει-
σονται σοι παρ’ ἀμφοτέραις.” καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀποδει-
kύμενον αὐτῷ ἑπιστολικὸν καὶ ἡ ἀπόδειξις αὐτῆ.

1 καὶ τῇ συντάξει P²: τάξει P¹.
loosely structured. It is absurd to build up periods, as if you were writing not a letter but a speech for the law courts. Nor is it just absurd to be so formal in letters, it is even contrary to friendship, which demands the proverbial calling of “a spade a spade.”\(^a\) (230) We should also be aware that there are epistolary topics as well as style. Certainly Aristotle is thought to have been exceptionally successful in the genre of letters, and he comments, “I am not writing to you on this, since it is not suitable for a letter.”\(^b\) (231) If anyone should write in a letter about problems of logic or natural philosophy, he may indeed write, but he does not write a letter. A letter’s aim is to express friendship briefly, and set out a simple subject in simple terms. (232) It has its own beauty, but only in expressions of warm friendship and the inclusion of numerous proverbs. This should be its only permitted philosophy, permitted since the proverb is ordinary, popular wisdom. But the man who utters sententious maxims and exhortations seems to be no longer chatting in a letter but preaching from the pulpit.\(^c\) (233) Aristotle, however, sometimes even develops proofs, though in such a way that they suit the letter. For instance, wanting to prove that large and small cities have an equal claim on benefactors, he says: “The gods are equal in both; so, since the Graces are gods, you will find grace stored up equally in both.”\(^d\) The point being proved suits a letter, and so does

\(^a\) Paroem. Gr. ii.654, literally figs.

\(^b\) Ar. fr. 670 Rose = T 4(b), F 16 Plezia.

\(^c\) I.e. as a \textit{deus ex machina}, speaking from on high.

\(^d\) Ar. fr. 656 Rose = T 4(c), F 17 Plezia.

\(^4\) \textit{aπὸ} add. Cobet (Ruhnkenium secutus).
(234) ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ πόλεσίν ποτὲ καὶ βασιλεύσων γράφομεν, ἔστωσαν τοιαῦται [αἱ] ἐπιστολαὶ μικρὸν ἐξηρμέναι πως. στοχαστέον γὰρ καὶ τοῦ προσώπου ὁ γράφεται ἐξηρμένη μέντοι καὶ ὁ ωθεὶς σύγγραμμα εἰναι ἀντ᾽ ἐπιστολῆς, ὡσπερ αἱ Ἀριστοτέλους πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Δίωνος οἰκεῖους ἡ Πλάτωνος. (235) καθόλου δὲ μεμίχθω ἡ ἐπιστολὴ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἐκ δυοῖν χαρακτήρων τούτων, τοῦ τε χαρίεντος καὶ τοῦ ἰσχυν. καὶ περὶ ἐπιστολῆς μὲν τοσαῦτα, καὶ ἀμα περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τοῦ ἰσχυν.

(236) Παράκειται δὲ καὶ τῷ ἰσχυρῷ διημαρτημένος χαρακτήρ, ὁ ξηρὸς καλούμενος. γίνεται δὲ καὶ οὕτως ἐν τρισὶν ἐν διανοίᾳ μὲν, ὡσπερ τις ἔπι Ἐρέξου ἐφη, ὅτι "κατέβαινεν ὁ Ἐρέξης μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ." μάλα γὰρ ἐσμίκρυνε τὸ πράγμα, ἀντὶ τοῦ "μετὰ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀπάσης" εἰπεῖν [ἡ] μετὰ πάντων <τῶν> ἑαυτοῦ" φησάς. (237) περὶ δὲ τὴν λέξιν γίνεται τὸ ἔχρον, ὅταν πράγμα μέγα συμμετοιχία μονομαχή ἀπαγγέλλῃ, οἶον ὡς ὁ Γαθαρεύς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Σαλαμίνη ναυμαχίας φησί ἃ ἢν καὶ τοῦ Φαλάριδος τοῦ τυράννου ἐφη τις, "ἀπαγγέλει τούς Ἀρκαδούνοις;" ναυμαχίαν γὰρ τοσαῦτην καὶ τυράννου ὑμότητα ὁχὰς τῷ "ἀπαγγέλει Π.: ἀπαγγέλλῃ Radermacher, fort. recte.

1 αἱ del. Spengel.  2 καὶ del. Goeller.
3 ἡ P: del. edd.  4 τῶν add. edd.
5 ἀπαγγέλλῃ edd.: ἀπαγγέλει Π.: ἀπαγγέλῃ Radermacher, fort. recte.
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the proof itself. (234) Sometimes we write to cities and kings: such letters must be a little more elaborate, since we should consider the person to whom the letter is written, but it should not be so elaborate that the letter turns into a treatise, like those of Aristotle to Alexander or that of Plato to Dion’s friends.\(^a\) (235) In summary, in terms of style the letter should combine two of the styles, the elegant and the plain, and this concludes my account of the letter, and also of the plain style.

(236) Next to the plain style is its faulty counterpart, what is called the arid style, and it too has three aspects. The first is the thought, as in one writer’s account of Xerxes, “he was coming down to the coast with all his men.”\(^b\) He has greatly trivialised the event by saying “with all his men” instead of “with the whole of Asia.”

(237) In diction aridity is found when a writer narrates a great event in trivial language, for example the man of Gadara\(^c\) on the sea battle of Salamis <...>,\(^d\) or another writer on the tyrant Phalaris, “Phalaris was a bit of a nuisance to the people of Acragas.”\(^e\) So momentous a sea battle and so cruel a tyrant should not have been

---

\(^a\) Pl. *Epist.* 7.  
\(^b\) Author unknown.  
\(^c\) The “man of Gadara,” the probable text, may but need not be Theodorus of Gadara, a rhetorician of Augustan Rome.  
\(^d\) A quotation seems lost.  
\(^e\) Author unknown.

---

6 Γαδαρεὺς edd.: Γαδηρεὺς P.  
7 lacunam stat. ed. Glasg.  
8 τυράννων P\(^2\): tyranni Lat.: τυράννων P\(^1\).
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όνόματι οὐδὲ τῷ "ἡνωχλεῖ" ἐχρῆν λέγεων, ἀλλ’ είν μεγάλους καὶ πρέπουσιν τῷ ύποκειμένῳ πράγματι. (238) ἐν δὲ συνθέσει γίνεται τὸ ξηρὸν, ἦτοι ὅταν πυκνὰ ἢ τὰ κόμματα, ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς Ἀφορίσμοις ἔχειν "ὁ βίος βραχύς, ἢ δὲ τέχνη μακρά, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὠξύς, ἢ δὲ πεῖρα σφαλερα.” ἢ ὅταν ἐν μεγάλῳ πράγματι ἀποκεκομμένον ἢ τὸ κῶλον καὶ μὴ ἐκπλεων, ὡσπερ τοῖς Ἀριστείδου κατηγορῶν ὅτι οὐκ ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν ἐν Σαλαμίνι ναυμαχίαν, "ἀλλὰ αὐτόκλητος," ἔφη, [ὁτί]¹ "ἡ μὲν Δημήτηρ ἦλθεν καὶ συνεναυμάχει, Ἀριστείδης δὲ οὐ.” ἡ γὰρ ἀποκοπὴ καὶ ἀπρεπὴς καὶ ἀκαίρος. ταῖς μὲν τοιαύταις ἀποκοπαῖς ἐν ἐτέρους χρηστέουν. (239) πολλάκις μέντοι τὸ μὲν διανόημα αὐτὸ ψυχρὸν τί ἔστι, καὶ ὡς νῦν ὁνομάζομεν κακοżąλον, ἡ σύνθεσις δ’ ἀποκεκομμένη καὶ κλέπτουσα τοῦ διανοήματος τὴν ἀγήδιαν,² ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ νεκρᾶ τῇ γυναικὶ μιχθέντος ἔφη τις, ὅτι "οὐ μέγινυται αὐτῇ αὖ”.³ τὸ μὲν γὰρ διανόημα καὶ τυφλῷ δηλόν φασιν, ἡ σύνθεσις δὲ συσταλείσα κλέπτει μὲν πως τὴν ἀγήδιαν⁴ τοῦ πράγματος, ποιεῖ δὲ τὴν νῦν ὅνομα ἐχουσαν ξηροκακοζηλίαν συγκειμένην ἐκ δυοῖν κακῶν, ἐκ μὲν τῆς κακοζηλίας διὰ τὸ πράγμα, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ξηροῦ διὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν.

¹ ὅτι del. Hahne.
² ἀγήδιαν Weil: ἀδειαν P.
³ αὐτῇ αὖ M, fort. recte: αὐτῆς ἄν P: αὖ τῇ ἀνθρώπῳ Roberts.
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described by words like “a bit of” and “nuisance,” but in impressive terms appropriate to the subject. (238) In composition aridity is found when there is an unbroken series of phrases, as in the Aphorisms, “Life is short, art long, opportunity fleeting, experience deceptive,”a or when the subject is important and the clause is abruptly broken off and not completed, as in one writer’s accusation of Aristides for not coming to the battle of Salamis, “But Demeter came uninvited and fought on our side in the sea battle, but Aristides not.”b Here the abrupt ending is inappropriate and ill-timed. Such abruptness should be used in other contexts. (239) Often it is the thought itself which is frigid, or in our current terminology affected, while the composition is abrupt and tries to disguise the unpleasant nature of the thought. Someone says of a man who lay with his wife’s corpse: “he does not lie with her again” (ou mignutai autei au).c The meaning, in the words of the proverb, is clear even to the blind;d but the wording is so compact that it disguises to some extent the unpleasantness of the subject, and produces what we now term arid affectation, a combination of two faults, affectation in the subject and aridity in the composition.

a Hippocr. Aphorism. 1.1 (cf. § 4).
b Author unknown. Aristides fought at Salamis, and this fiction sounds like a piece of school declamation.
c Author unknown, text uncertain but including ugly hiatus and abrupt monosyllables.
d Cf. § 112.

4 ἀηδίαν Weil: ἀδείαν P.
(240) Καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς δεινὸτητος δὲ δῆλα ἂν εἰ ἴη λοιπὸν ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων, ὡτι καὶ αὐτὴ γένοιτ' ἂν ἐν τρισίν, ἐν οὔσπερ οἱ πρὸ αὐτῆς χαρακτῆρες καὶ γὰρ πράγματα τινα ἔξ ἐαυτῶν ἐστι δεινά, ὥστε τοὺς λέγοντας αῦτα δεινοὺς δοκεῖν, κἂν μὴ δεινῶς λέγωσιν, καθάπερ ὁ Θεόπομπος τὰς ἐν τῷ Πειραιῶι αὐλητρίας καὶ τὰ πορνεία καὶ τοὺς αὐλοῦντας καὶ ἄδοντας καὶ ὅρχουμένους, ταῦτα πάντα δεινὰ [ὀνόματα] ἄντα καίτοι ἀσθενῶς εἰπὼν δεινὸς δοκεῖ.

(241) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σύνθεσιν ὁ χαρακτήρ οὕτως γίνοιτ' ἂν πρῶτον μὲν εἰ κόμματα ἔχοι ἀντὶ κῶλων· τὸ γὰρ μήκος ἐκλύει τὴν σφοδρότητα, τὸ δὲ ἐν ὀλίγῳ πολὺ ἐμφαινόμενον δεινότερον· παράδειγμα τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων πρὸς Φίλιππον, "Διονύσιος ἐν Κορώνῃ·" ἐδὲ ἐξέτειναν αὐτό, "Διονύσιος ἐκπεσόν τῆς ἀρχῆς πτωχεύει ἐν Κορώνῃ διδάσκων γράμματα," δεήγημα σχεδὸν ἂν ἦν μᾶλλον ἀντὶ λοιδορίας. (242) κἂν τοῖς ἄλλοις δὲ φύσει ἔβραχυλόγους οἱ Δάκωνες· δεινότερον γὰρ τὸ βραχὺ καὶ ἐπιτακτικὸν, τὸ μακρυγορεῖν δὲ τῷ ἱκετεύει πρέπει καὶ αἰτεῖν. (243) διὸ καὶ τὰ σύμβολα ἔχει δεινότητας, ὡτι ἐμφερὴ ταῖς βραχυλογίαις· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ βραχέως ῥηθέντος ὑπονοήσαι τὰ πλείστα δεῖ, καθάπερ ἐκ τῶν συμβόλων· οὕτως καὶ τὸ "χαμόθεν οἱ τέττυχες ὑμᾶν ἄσονται" δεινότερον ἄλληγορικῶς ῥηθέν ἡ εἴπερ ἀπλῶς ἐρρήθη, "τὰ δένδρα ὑμῶν ἐκκοπήσεται."

1 ὀνόματα del. Schenkl.
(240) Next, forcefulness. It should be clear from what has already been said that forcefulness, like all the previous styles, has three aspects. Some subjects are forceful in themselves, so that those who speak about them are thought to be forceful, even if they do not speak forcefully. Theopompus, for instance, speaks about the flute girls in the Piraeus, the brothels, and the men playing flutes, singing and dancing; all these are forceful in themselves, and although his style is feeble, he is thought to be forceful.

(241) In composition this style would result, if, first, phrases replace clauses. Length dissipates intensity, while a lot of meaning packed into a few words is more forceful. An example is the message of the Spartans to Philip, “Dionysius in Corinth.” If they had expanded it, “Dionysius was deposed from rule and is now a poverty-stricken schoolteacher in Corinth,” the result would have been a virtual narrative rather than an insult. (242) In all circumstances the Spartans had a natural inclination towards brevity in speech. Brevity, after all, is more forceful and peremptory, while length in speech suits supplications and requests. (243) This is why expressions which symbolise something else are forceful, since they resemble brevity in speech. We are left to infer a great deal from a short statement, as in the case of symbols. For example, the saying “the cicadas will sing to you from the ground” is more forceful in this allegorical form than if it had been straightforwardly expressed, “your trees will be cut down.”

---

\[a\] FGrHist 115 Theopompus T 43, cf. § 75.
\[b\] See note on § 8.
\[c\] Cf. § 7.
\[d\] Cf. §§ 99–100.
DEMETRIUS

(244) Τάς γε μὴν περιόδους ἐσφίγχθαι μάλα δεῖ κατὰ τὸ τέλος· ἡ γὰρ περιαγωγὴ δεινῶν, ἡ δὲ λύσις ἀπλούστερον καὶ χρηστοποιεῖται σημεῖον, καθάπερ ἡ ἀρχαία πάσα ἐρμηνεία· ἀπλοῖκοι γὰρ οἱ ἄρχαιοι.2

(245) ὥστε ἐν δεινότητι φεύγειν δεῖ τὸ ἄρχαιοεῖδες καὶ τοῦ ἡθούς καὶ τοῦ ρυθμοῦ, καὶ καταφεύγειν μάλιστα ἐπὶ τὴν νῦν κατέχουσαν δεινότητα. τῶν οὖν κόλων αἱ τοιαῦτα ἀποθέσεις, ὡμολόγησα τούτοις, ὃς ἂν οἶδα τὸ ὠ, συνερεῖν, ἔχονται μάλιστα οὐ εἴρηκα ρυθμοῦ. (246) ποιεῖ δὲ τινα καὶ ἡ βία κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν δεινότητα· δεινῶν γὰρ πολλαχοῦ καὶ τὸ δύσφθογον, ὡσπερ αἱ ἀνώμαλοι ὁδοί. παράδειγμα τὸ Δημοσθενικὸν τὸ ὕμας τὸ δοῦναι ύμῶν ἐξεῖναι.

(247) Τὰ δὲ ἀντίθετα καὶ παρόμοια ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις φευκτέοιν ὅγκοιν γὰρ ποιοῦσιν, οὐ δεινότητα, πολλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ ψυχρότητα ἀντὶ δεινότητος, οἷον ὡς ὁ Θεόπομπος κατὰ τῶν ἕταρχων τῶν Φιλίππου λέγων ἔλυσεν τῇ ἀντιθέσει τὴν δεινότητα, “ἀνδροφόνοι δὲ τὴν φύσιν ὄντες,” λέγων, “ἀνδροπόροι τῶν τρόπων ἔσχαν”. τῇ γὰρ περισσοτεχνίᾳ, μᾶλλον δὲ κακοτεχνίᾳ προσέχων ὁ ἀκροατής ἔξω γίνεται θυμοῦ παντός. (248) πολλὰ μέντοι ὑπ’ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὡσπερ ἀναγκασθησόμεθα συνθέιναι στρογγύλως καὶ δεινῶς, οἵον τὸ Δημοσθενικὸν τὸ

1 κατὰ Victorius: καὶ Ρ.
2 οἱ ἄρχαιοι Μ: ἄρχαιοι Ρ.
(244) Periods should be tightly concentrated at the end. Periodic rounding is forceful, while a loose structure is more straightforward and a sign of simple innocence, like the whole early style; for the early writers were straightforward. (245) It follows that in the forceful style we must avoid old-fashioned qualities of character and rhythm, and resort to the new fashion of forcefulness. Clauses which have endings of the following kind, "I have agreed to speak to the best of my ability in their support," a keep closest to the rhythm I have mentioned. (246) Violent collocation also creates a kind of force. For in many passages harsh sounds are forceful, like rough roads, b as in Demosthenes' sentence "(he has deprived) you of the power for you to grant" (hûmâs to dounai hûmîn exêinai). c

(247) We should avoid antithesis and assonance in periods, since they add weight, not force, and the result is often frigid instead of forceful. Theopompos, for example, attacks the friends of Philip but destroys the force by his antithesis, "men-killers by nature, they were men-harlots in behaviour." d By having his attention drawn to the excessive artifice, or rather the inept artifice, the hearer loses all sense of anger. (248) We will often find ourselves compelled by the very nature of the subject matter to construct sentences which are compact and forceful, as in this example from Demosthenes: "Just as

\[ a \] Dem. Lept. 1 (cf. §§ 10–11, 20).
\[ b \] Cf. § 48.
\[ c \] Dem. Lept. 2, the end of a long period. Note hyperbaton, assonance, hiatus, and only one short syllable.
\[ d \] FGrHist 115 Theopompos T 44 and F 225(c) (cf. §§ 27, 250).
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touoûton, "ôsper gar ei tis èkeînwn èalw, sv tàd'¹ oûk án ègrafiws: ouws Ân sv nûn álûs, állos ou
gràfie:" autô gar to prâgma kai Î tâzîs autou
sympefuvkîan² safôs èschev tîn sûnthesin, kai oudê
biásâmenvos Ân tis râdziws éteros swnéthkein autô.
ën gar polloiç prâgmâsi swnítîmein, Ôsper ou tâs
catabâsies trêchontes, ûp' autôn èlkoîmeoi tîw
pragmátiswv. (249) poïthikôn de deînôtetos èstî kai
tô èpî téleî tîthênev to deînôtaton. perilaambanôme-
ven gâr en mésoû ámblûvenai, katháper to 'Antisthê-
vous, "scheidôn gâr òdunýseî anôrâptos ek frugâywn
ánavstâs:" ei gar metaswththeî tis ouws autô, "scheidôn
gâr ek frugâywn ánavstâs anôrâptos òduný-
seî,"³ kai toî tautôn eîpôn ou tautôn èti nwmôsthûse-
tai légeîn. (250) ò de àntîthesis, În èpî toû Thesopô-
pou èfên, oudê en trîs Dêmôsthenvikôs èrmôsen,
êntha phêsîn, "èttelieis, ègw de ètelôûmênhè edidaskes,⁴
egw de èfouîwn ètritagwvûsteis, ègw de òthwmynhè
èxeptites, ègw de òstyrîtton" kakotexwvûnti gâr
êoukev dia tîn àntapôdësîn, mâtallon de paîzonti,
ouk ègânaktoûnti.

(251) Prêstei de tî déînôtêsi kai tâw periôdôn ò
puknôthp, kai toî en toîs loupôs xaraktîrsw ouk
èpítîdeia ougâ: sunevxôs⁵ gâr tîthêmênh métrof èikâ-
sthêtei leugomênì èfeqêh, kai toûto deînô métrof,

¹ sv tàd' Dem. codd.: sv ð' P.
² sympefuvkîan Victorius: sympefuvkîa P.
³ òdunýseî Goeller: òdunýseîen P.
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you would not have made this proposal if any of them had been convicted, so if you are convicted now, no one will make it in future."\textsuperscript{a} This particular arrangement clearly grew naturally out of the subject itself and the order it demanded, and not even by violent dislocation could anyone have easily constructed it differently. In many topics in constructing sentences we are swept along by the subject itself, just as though we were running down a steep slope. (249) It also creates force to put the most striking part at the end, since if it is put in the middle, its point is blunted, as in this sentence of Antisthenes, "for almost a shock of pain will be caused by a man standing up out of brushwood."\textsuperscript{b} If you were to change the order, "for a man standing up out of brushwood will cause almost a shock of pain," you will be saying the same thing but will no longer be believed to be saying the same. (250) But to revert to antithesis, which I condemned in Theopompos:\textsuperscript{c} it is not suitable either in that passage of Demosthenes where he says, "you were initiating, I was initiated; you were a school teacher, I went to school; you took minor roles in the theatre, I was in the audience; you were driven off the stage, I would be hissing."\textsuperscript{d} The elaborate parallelism seems too artificial, and more like word play than honest anger.

(251) A massive series of periods fits the forceful style, though it does not suit the other styles. Put continuously, they will suggest successive lines of metre, and forceful

\textsuperscript{a} Dem. \textit{Aristocr.} 99 (cf. § 31). \textsuperscript{b} Antisthenes VA 45 Gian-nnantoni. For the advice cf. §§ 50–53. \textsuperscript{c} Cf. §§ 27, 247. \textsuperscript{d} Dem. \textit{De Cor.} 265.

\textsuperscript{4} γράμματα add. M, Dem.: om. P.
\textsuperscript{5} συνεχώς edd.: συνεχεῖ P.
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όσπερ οἱ χωλίαμβοι. (252) ἀμα μέντοι πυκναὶ ἐστω- σαν καὶ σύντομοι, λέγω δὲ δίκωλοι τινες, ἐπεὶ τοι πολύκωλοι γε ὁδοι κάλλος μᾶλλον παρέξουσιν, οὐ δεινότητα.

(253) Ὄψω δ' ἡ συντομία τῷ χαρακτηρί χρήσιμον, ὡστε καὶ ἀποσωπήσαι πολλαχοῦ δεινότερον, καθάπερ ὁ Δημοσθένης· "ἂλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν, οὐ βούλομαι δὲ δυσχερέσ oúdoν εἰπέν, οὕτος δὲ ἐκ περιονσίας κατηγορεῖ." σχεδὸν ὁ2 σωπῆσαι ἐνταῦθα δεινότερος παντὸς τοῦ εἰπόντος ἀν. (254) καὶ νὴ τοὺς θεούς σχεδὸν [ἀν3] καὶ ἡ ἀσάφεια πολλαχοῦ δεινότης ἐστί· δεινότερον γὰρ τὸ ὑπονοοῦμενον, τὸ δ' ἐξεπλωθὲν καταφρονεῖται.

(255) Ἐστι δ' ὅπῃ κακοφωνία δεινότητα ποιεῖ, καὶ μάλιστα ἐάν τὸ ὑποκείμενον πράγμα δέχηται αὐτῆς,4 ύστερ πο τῷ Ὠμηρικόν, τὸ "Τρῶες δ' ἔρριγη- σαν, ὅπως ἴδοιν αἰόλον ὦφιν"· ἢν μὲν γὰρ καὶ εὐθυ- νοτέρως εἰπόντα σώσαι τὸ μέτρον, "Τρῶες δ' ἔρρι- γησαν, ὅπως φών τὰ βοῶν εἶδον"· ἂλλ' οὔτ' ἄν ὁ λέγων δεινὸς οὕτως ἔδοξεν οὕτε ὁ5 ὄφις αὐτός. (256) τοῦτο οὖν ἐπάμευοι τῷ παραδείγματι καὶ τὰ ἀλλα προστοχασόμεθα6 τὰ ὤμοια, οἷον ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ "πάντα ἂν <ἐγραψεν" "πάντα>7 ἐγραψεν ἀν," ἀντὶ

1 γε Goeller: τε P.
2 ὁ Weil: ὦς P.
3 ἀν del. edd.
4 δέχηται αὐτῆς M: δέχ τοιαύτης P.
5 ὁ M: om. P.
6 προστοχασόμεθα Goeller: προστοχασόμεθα P.
metres at that, like the choliambic.\(^a\) (252) These massed periods should, however, be short (I suggest two clauses), since periods with many clauses will produce beauty rather than force.

(253) Brevity in fact is so useful in this style that a sudden lapse into silence often adds to the forcefulness, as in Demosthenes, “I certainly could—but I do not wish to say anything offensive, and the prosecutor has the advantage in accusing me.”\(^b\) His silence here is almost more effective than anything anyone could have said. (254) And (strange as it may seem) even obscurity is often a sort of forcefulness, since what is implied is more forceful, while what is openly stated is despised.

(255) Occasionally cacophony produces vigour, especially if the nature of the subject calls for it, as in Homer’s line, “the Trojans shuddered, when they saw the writhing serpent” (\ldots idon aiolon ophin).\(^c\) It would have been possible for him to construct the line more euphoniously, without violating the metric, “the Trojans shuddered, when they saw the serpent writhing” (\ldots ophin aiolon eidon), but then neither the speaker nor the serpent itself would have been thought forceful. (256) On this model we can attempt other similar experiments, for example by replacing “he would have written everything” (panta an egrapsen) with “everything would he have written” (panta egrapsen an), or “he was not present” (ou

\(^a\) See on § 301. \(^b\) Dem. De Cor. 3.  
\(^c\) Hom. Il. 12.208. The line scans if the first syllable of ὤφων is “irregularly” lengthened (as if opphin).

\(^7\) "πάντα ἂν edd.: πάντων P: "ἐγραψεν" πάντα add. Radermacher.
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dè toû ὃν παρεγένετο εὐχὶ'. (257) ἀπολήγοντες δὲ ποτε καὶ εἰς συνδέσμους τὸν 'δὲ' ἤ τὸν 'τε'· καίτοι παραγγέλλεται φυγεῖν τὴν ἀπόληγησιν τὴν τοιαύτην· ἀλλὰ πολλαχοὺ χρήσιμος τοιαύτη ἄν γένοιτο, οἷον ὃοκ εὐφήμησε μὲν, ἄξιον ὃντα, ἴτιμασε δὲ," καὶ¹ τὸ "Σχοινών τε Σκωλόν τε," ἀλλ’ ἐν μὲν τοῖς Ὀμηρικοῖς μέγεθος ἐποίησεν ἢ εἰς τοὺς συνδέσμους τελευτή. (258) ποιήσωε δὲ ἀν ποτε καὶ δεινότητα, εἰ τις ὃοδε εἴποι ᾧντερεψεν² δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀφροσύνης τε ὑπὸ τῆς ἀσεβείας τε ἢ ἵρα τε ἢ ἀσιά τε"· ὀλῶς γὰρ ἡ λείτους καὶ τὸ εὐόχοου γλαφυρότητος ἰδιαί, οὐ δεινότητός ἐστιν, οὗτοι δ’ οἱ χαρακτήρες ἐναντιώσατοι δοκοῦσιν.

(259) Καίτοι ἐστὶ πολλαχοὺ ἐκ παιδιάς παραμεριμνήσις δεινότης ἐμφανομένη τις, οἷον ἐν ταῖς κωμῳδίαις, καὶ πᾶς ὁ Κυνικὸς τρόπος, ὡς τὰ Κράτητος "πήρη ³ τις γαϊ’⁴ ἐστι μέσω ἐνὶ οὖνπε πόντῳ"· (260) καὶ τὸ Διογένους τὸ ἐν Ἤλυμπαία, ὅτε τοῦ ὀπλίτου δραμότος ἐπιτρέχων αὐτὸς ἐκήρυττεν ἑαυτὸν νυκὰν τὰ Ἡλυμπία πάντας ἀνθρώπους καλοκαγαθία.

¹ καὶ Radermacher: ὃς Ρ.
² ἀνέτρεψεν Weil: ἡν. ἕγραψεν Ρ.
³ πήρη Victorius: τὸ ποτήρῃ Ρ.
⁴ γαϊ’ Victorius: γαρ Ρ.

¹ The negative moves to final, emphatic position. The point of the first example is presumably that ἀν prefers a weak position.
paregeneto) with "present he was not" (paregeneto ouchi);\(^a\) (257) or by ending sometimes with a connective, "on the other hand" (de) or "too" (te), even though the normal instruction is to avoid such endings. But this sort of closure can often be useful, for example "he did not praise him on the one hand (men), though he deserved it; he insulted him, on the other hand" (de);\(^b\) or "and Schoenus and Scolus too ..." (Schoenon te Skolon te ...)\(^c\)—though in Homer's lines it is grandeur which is the result of ending with a connective. (258) But sometimes it can also produce force, as in this sort of sentence (with repeated te), "He overturned, in his folly and his impiety too, things sacred and holy too."\(^d\) In general, smoothness and euphony are characteristic of the elegant style, not the forceful, and these two styles seem to be direct opposites.

(259) Yet mixing in an element of playfulness often produces a kind of vigour, for example in comedy; and the whole Cynic manner is like this, as in the words of Crates, "There is a land of Beggarbag in the midst of the wine-dark sea";\(^e\) (260) and the story about Diogenes at Olympia, when after the race between men in armour he ran forward and personally proclaimed himself victor in

\(^a\) Author unknown.
\(^b\) Hom. Il. 2.497 (cf. § 54).
\(^c\) Author unknown.
\(^d\) Cf. § 170. Crates VH 70 Giannantoni, a parody of Homer's description of Crete (quoted in § 113). Demetrius (or a copyist) is too close to Homer: compare the correct version in Diog. Laert. 6.85, Πήρη τις πόλις ἐστι μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοιντι τύφῳ, "There is a city of Beggarbag in the midst of wine-dark delusion."
καὶ γὰρ γελάται τὸ εἰρημένον ἁμα καὶ θαυμάζεται,
καὶ ἡρέμα καὶ ύποδάκνει πως λεγόμενον. (261) καὶ
tὸ πρὸς τὸν καλὸν ῥήθην αὐτῷ: προσπαλαίων γὰρ
cαλὸ παιδὶ Διογένης διεκινήθη πως τὸ αἰδοῖον, τοῦ
de παιδὸς φοβηθέντος καὶ ἀποπηθήσαντος, “θάρ-
ρει”, ἤφη,1 “ὡ παιδίον οὐκ εἰμὶ ταύτη ὁμοιος.”
γελοίον γὰρ τὸ πρόχειρον τοῦ λόγου, δεινὴ δὲ ἡ κευ-
θομένη ἐμφασις. καὶ ὄλως, συνελόντι φράσαι, πάν
tὸ εἶδος τοῦ Κυνικοῦ λόγου σαίνοντι ἁμα ἐουκε τῷ
καὶ δάκνοντι. (262) χρήστον ταὶ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ ρήτο-
ρές ποτε, καὶ ἐχρήσταντο, Δυσίας μὲν πρὸς τὸν
ἐρώτη τῆς γραῖς λέγων, ὅτι “ἠς ῥά ζων ἢν ἀριθμῆ-
σαι τοὺς ὄντος ἡ τοὺς δακτύλους”. καὶ γὰρ δεινό-
tata ἁμα καὶ γελοιότατα ἐνέφηνεν τῆν γραῦν.
“Ομηρὸς δὲ τὸ “Οὐτιν ἐγὼ πῦματον ἐδομαί,” ὡς
προγέγραπται.
(263) Ὀς δὲ ἄν καὶ ἐκ σχημάτων γίγνοιτο δεινό-
της, λέξομεν: ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῶν τῆς διανοίας σχημά-
tων, ἐκ μὲν τῆς παραλείψεως ῥομαξομένης οὖτως:
“Ολυνθων μὲν δὴ καὶ Μεθώμην καὶ Ἀπολλωνίαν
καὶ δύο καὶ τριάκοντα πόλεις τὰς ἐπὶ Θρήκης ἐω”· ἐν
gὰρ τούτοις καὶ ἔρημῃ πάντα, ὅσα ἐβούλετο, καὶ
παραλύπειν αὐτά φησιν, ὡς δεινότερα εἶπεν ἕχων
ἔτερα. (264) καὶ ἡ προερημένη δὲ ἀποσιώπησις τοῦ
αὐτοῦ εἴδους2 ἐχομένη δεινότερον ποιήσει τὸν λόγον.

1 ἤφη Greg.: om. P: εἶπεν post παιδίον M.
2 εἴδους Orth: ἐθοὺς P.
the Olympic games over all mankind, in nobility of character.¹ This announcement raises simultaneous laughter and applause, and unobtrusively it also somehow gently bites as it is being said. (261) So do his words to the handsome youth: wrestling with a handsome youth Diogenes somehow experienced an erection, and the boy became afraid and jumped away. “Never fear, my boy,” he said, “I am not like you in that way.”² There is wit in the speed of the reply, and force in the meaning hidden below. Generally speaking, to summarise, the whole character of Cynic sayings suggests a dog that fawns as it bites. (262) Orators will also sometimes use it, as they have in the past, for example Lysias when he said to the old woman’s lover, “her teeth could be counted sooner than her fingers.”³ He revealed the old woman most forcefully in a most ridiculous light. Homer also used it, as in an example I have already quoted, “No-man I will eat last.”⁴

(263) We shall next discuss how force can result from figures. First, figures of thought, beginning with the figure given the name of paraleipsis, for example “I pass over Olynthus, Methone, Apollonia, and thirty-two cities in Thrace.”⁵ In these words Demosthenes has actually stated everything he wanted, yet he claims to pass over them, to imply that he has other more forceful points to make. (264) The figure of aposiopesis which I have already mentioned⁶ is of the same kind, and it too adds

(265) παραλαμβάνοιτο δ’ ἂν σχήμα διανοιάς πρὸς
dεινότητα <ἡ>¹ προσωποποιών καλομένη, ὦν
"δόξατε ύμιν τοὺς προγόνους ὀνειδίζειν καὶ λέγειν
tάδε τινὰ ἡ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἡ τὴν πατρίδα, λαβοῦσαν
γυναικός σχῆμα”. (266) ὁσπέρ ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ Πλάτ
τοῦ τὸ "ὡς παῖδες, ὅτι μὲν ἐστε πατέρων ἀγαθῶν
. . .”, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προσώπου λέγει ἄλλα ἐκ
tοῦ τῶν πατέρων· πολὺ γὰρ ἐνεργέστερα καὶ δεινό-
tερα φαίνεται ὑπὸ τῶν προσώπων, μᾶλλον δὲ δρά
ματα ἀτεχνῶς γίνεται.

(267) Τὰ μὲν δὴ² τῆς διανοιάς [καὶ]³ σχήματα
λαμβάνοντ’ ἂν, ὡς εἴρηται· καὶ γὰρ τοσάτα τὰ
eἰρημένα παραδείγματος ἕνεκα, τὰ δὲ τῆς λέξεως
σχήματα ποικιλώτερον ἐκλέγοντα ἐστὶ δεινότερον
ποιεῖν τὸν λόγον· ἐκ τε τῆς ἀναδιπλώσεως, ὡς
"Θῆβαι δέ, Θῆβαι, πόλεις ἀστυνεῖτων, ἐκ μέσης τῆς
Ἑλλάδος ἀνήρπασται” (διλογηθὲν γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα
dεινότητα ποιεῖ). (268) καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀναφορᾶς καλομέ
νης, ως τὸ ἑπὶ σαυτὸν καλεῖς, ἑπὶ τοὺς νόμους
καλεῖς, ὡς ² ἑπὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καλεῖς”, τὸ δὲ σχήμα
tὸ εἰρημένον τοῦτο τριπλοῦν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπαναφορά
ἐστιν, ὡς ⁵ εἴρηται, διὰ τὸ τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν ἐπαναφέ
ρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἀσύνδετον· διὰ
γὰρ συνδέσμων λέλεκται, καὶ ὀμοιοτέλευτον διὰ τὴν

¹ ἡ add. Hammer.
² δὴ Spengel: εἰδη P. ³ καὶ del. Spengel.
⁴ ἑπὶ τοὺς νόμους καλεῖς add. Aesch., M in mg., om. P.
⁵ ἑστιν, ὡς Victorius: ἵστος P.
force to what we say. (265) Another figure of thought which may be used to produce force is the figure called prosopopoeia, for example “Imagine that your ancestors are rebuking you and speak such words, or imagine Greece, or your country in the form of a woman.”a (266) This is what Plato uses in his Funeral Speech, “Children, that you are the sons of brave men . . .”b He does not speak in his own person but in that of their fathers. The personification makes the passage much more lively and forceful, or rather it really turns into a drama.

(267) The figures of thought may be used as I have described; and the instances above will serve as a sample. As for figures of speech, the more varied your choice, the more forceful their impact on what you say. Take repetition, as in “Thebes, Thebes, our neighbouring city, has been torn from the middle of Greece.”c The repetition of the name gives force. (268) Or take the figure called anaphora, as in “against yourself you summon him, against the laws you summon him, against the democracy you summon him.”d Here the figure in question is threefold. It is anaphora, as I have already said, because the same word is repeated at the beginning of each clause; it is asyndeton because it is expressed without connectives; and it is homoeoteleuton because of the recurrent end-

a Author unknown, perhaps an invented pastiche since ancestors and country give the two standard categories of animate and inanimate, e.g. Cic. Orator 85.

b Pl. Menex. 246d.

c Aesch. Ctes. 133.
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ἀπόληξιν του “καλεὶς” <τεθείσαν>¹ πολλάκις. καὶ
dεινότης ἦθροισται ἐκ τῶν τριῶν, εἰ δ’ εἴποι τις
οὕτως, “ἐπὶ σαῦτὸν”² καὶ τόσον νόμος καὶ τήν δήμο-
κρατίαν καλεὶς,” ἀμα τοῖς σχήμασιν ἐξαιρήσει καὶ
tήν δεινότητα. (269) μάλιστα δὲ πάντων ἱστέων τήν
dιάλυσιν δεινότητος ἐργάτων, οἷον “πορεύεται διὰ
tῆς ἁγορᾶς τὰς γνάθους φυσῶν, τὰς ὀφρῶσ ἐπηρ-
κῶς, ἵσα βαίνων Πυθοκλεῖ”· εἰ γὰρ συναφὴ πάντα
συνδέσμοις, πρώτερα ἔσται. (270) λαμβάνοντ’ ἂν
καὶ ἡ κλίμαξ καλομένη, ὠσπερ Δημοσθένει τὸ “οὐκ
ἐίπον μὲν ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔγραψα δέ· οὔδ’ ἔγραψα μέν,
οὐκ ἐπρέσβευσα δέ· οὔδ’ ἐπρέσβευσα μέν, οὐκ
ἐπείσα δὲ Θηβαίον.”· σχεδὸν γὰρ ἐπαναβαίνοντι ὁ
λόγος ἐνικεῖ ἐπὶ μειζόνων μεῖζονε· εἰ δὲ οὕτως εἶποι
τις ταῦτα, “ἐπάνω ἐγὼ καὶ γράφας ἐπρέσβευσά τε
καὶ ἐπείσα Θηβαῖον,” διήγημα ἐρεῖ μόνον, δεινὸν
dὲ οὔδεν. (271) καθόλου δὲ τῆς λέξεως τὰ σχήματα
cαὶ ύπόκρισιν καὶ ἁγώνα παρέχει τῷ λέγοντι,
mάλιστα τὸ διαλελυμένον [τούτ’ ἔστι δεινότητα].³
cαὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν σχημάτων ἀμφοτέρων τοσαῦτα.

(272) Δέξις δὲ λαμβανόσθω πᾶσα, ὡσ καὶ ἐν τῷ
μεγαλοπρεπεῖ χαρακτηρί, πλὴν οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ
tέλος· καὶ γὰρ μεταφέροντα ἐστὶ δεινὰ ποιεῖν, ὡς τὸ

¹ καλεὶς τεθείσαν Denniston: καλεὶσθαι P; καλεῖς iam edd.
² ἐπὶ σαῦτὸν Victorius: ἐπαυτὸν P.
³ del. Radermacher.
ing, "you summon him." Force is the cumulative result of the three figures, and if you were to write, "against yourself and the laws and the democracy you summon him," you will remove the force along with the figures. (269) But you should realise that above all other figures it is asyndeton which produces force, as in "he walks through the marketplace, puffing out his cheeks, raising his eyebrows, keeping in step with Pythocles."\(^a\) If the words were smoothed out with connectives, they will be tamer. (270) The figure called climax should also be used, as in this sentence from Demosthenes, "I did not express this opinion, and then fail to move the resolution; I did not move the resolution and then fail to serve as envoy; I did not serve as envoy and then fail to convince the Thebans."\(^b\) This sentence seems almost to be climbing higher and higher at each step, and if you were to rewrite it like this, "after I gave my opinion and moved the resolution, I served as envoy and convinced the Thebans," you will give a mere narrative of events, with nothing forceful about it. (271) In summary, figures of speech, particularly asyndeton, provide the speaker with scope for dramatic delivery and immediacy [that is to say force].\(^c\) This concludes my account of both kinds of figures.

(272) The diction to use should be entirely the same as that in the grand style, but with a different end in view. Metaphor, for example, creates force, for example

\(^a\) Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* 314.

\(^b\) Dem. *De Cor.* 179, the traditional example, e.g. Quint. 9.3.55. Literally ladder, \(\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\varepsilon\) has a narrower meaning than its derivative, "climax," since each step must be repeated.

\(^c\) The perverse word order in the Greek seems to demand deletion.
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(277) Τὸ δὲ ἐξαιρεθαὶ πως λαμβανόμενον οὐ μέγεθος ποιεῖ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ δεινότητα, ὡς τὸ “οὐ λέγειν εἰσὶ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντα δεῖ, Αἰσχύνη, ἀλλὰ

¹ εἰκασίας Μ: εἰ εἰκάσειας Ρ.
² διεβιάσατο Μ: διεβιβάσατο Ρ.
³ λαθραίως Victorius: λάθρα ὡς Ρ.
⁴ an ἐξετρύπησεν?
"Python grew bold and was a rushing torrent in full spate against you,"\textsuperscript{a} (273) and so does simile, as in Demosthenes' passage, "this decree made the danger which then threatened the city pass by like a cloud."\textsuperscript{b} (274) But detailed comparisons do not suit the forceful style because of their length, for example "as a gallant hound, ignorant of the danger, recklessly charges a boar."\textsuperscript{c} There is an element of beauty and precise detail about this sentence, whereas forcefulness needs to be short and sharp, like a close exchange of blows. (275) Compound words also give force, as usage proves in many forceful compounds such as "street-lay," "brain-crazy,"\textsuperscript{d} and the like. Many similar examples may be found in the orators. (276) Try also to use words which match their subject, for example say of a man who acted violently and ruthlessly that "he forced his way through," or of a man who acted violently in an open and reckless manner that "he slashed his way out, he hacked his way out," or of a man who acted treacherously and evasively that "he wormed his way, he gnawed his way through," or whatever words similarly match the subject.

(277) Some uses of heightening the tone produce force as well as grandeur, for example "It is not as an orator that you ought not to hold your hand out, Aeschines,

\textsuperscript{a} Dem. \textit{De Cor.} 136 (cf. § 80).
\textsuperscript{b} Dem. \textit{De Cor.} 188.
\textsuperscript{c} Xen. \textit{Cyrop.} 1.4.21 (cf. § 89).
\textsuperscript{d} Literally ground-struck (prostitute) and sideways-hit (mad). Compounds also dominate § 276, providing all but one of the examples (to be emended therefore?). Cf. § 93 for the concise power of compound verbs.
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πρεσβεύειν εἰσώ τὴν χείρα ἔχοντα.” (278) καὶ τὸ ἀλλ’ ὁ τὴν Εὐβοιαν ἐκεῖνος σφετεριζόμενος· οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέγαν ποιήσαι τὸν λόγον ἡ ἐπανάστασις, ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ τοῦ δεινὸν. γίνεται δὲ τοῦτο ἐπὰν μεταξὺ ἐξαρθέντες1 κατηγορούμεν των· ὡσπερ γὰρ Αἰσχίνου κατηγορία, τὸ δὲ Φιλίππου ἐστίν. (279) δεινὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐρωτώντα τούς ἀκούοντας ἐνια λέγειν, καὶ μὴ ἀποφανόμενον, ἀλλ’ ὁ τὴν Εὐβοιαν ἐκεῖνος σφετεριζόμενος καὶ κατασκευάζων ἐπιτειχισμα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν, πότερον ταῦτα ποιῶν ἡδίκει,2 καὶ ἔλυς τὴν εἰρήνην, ἡ οὖ; καθάπερ γὰρ εἰς ἀπορίαν ἄγει τὸν ἀκούοντα ἐξελεγχομένῳ ἐνίκητα καὶ μηδὲν ἀποκρίνασθαι ἔχοντι· εἰ δὲ ὅδε μεταβαλὼν ἔφη τις, ἡδίκει καὶ ἔλυς τὴν εἰρήνην,” σαφῶς διδάσκοντι ἐφέκει καὶ <οὐκ>3 ἐλέγχοντι. (280) ἢ δὲ καλούμενη ἐπιμονή ἐστὶ μὲν ἐρμηνεία πλείων τοῦ πράγματος, μέγιστα δὲ συμβάλοντ’ ἂν εἰς δεινότητα· παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτῆς τὸ Δημοσθένους, "νόσημα γὰρ, ὃ ἀνδρεῖς Ἀθηναίοι, δεινὸν ἐμπέπτωκε4 εἰς τὴν "Ελλάδα . . .” <. . .>5 οὐκ ἂν οὕτως ἦν δεινὸν.

(281) Τάχα δὲ κάνο6 ὁ εὐφημισμὸς καλούμενος μετέχοι τῆς δεινότητος, καὶ ὁ τὰ δύσφημα εὐφήμα

1 ἐξαρθέντες Spengel: ἐξαρεβέντες P.
2 καὶ παρεστοῦνδεi add. M, Dem.
3 οὐκ add. Victorius.
4 ἐμπέπτωκεν M: μὲν πέπτωκεν P.
5 lacunam stat. Victorius. 6 κάν Goeller: καὶ P.
but as an envoy not to hold your hand out.”a (278) And similarly: “No, he was annexing Euboea . . .”b The rise in tone is not aimed to make the style dignified, but to make it forceful. This happens when the heightening is introduced as we attack someone, just as the former passage is an attack on Aeschines, the latter on Philip. (279) It is also forceful to express some points by asking the audience questions rather than by making a statement, for example “No. he was annexing Euboea and establishing a base against Attica—and in doing this was he wronging us and breaking the peace, or was he not?”c Demosthenes forces his listener into a sort of corner, so that he seems to be cross-examined and unable to reply. If you were to redraft and substitute this version, “he was wronging us and breaking the peace,” it would seem an open statement rather than a cross-examination. (280) The figure called epimone, which is an elaboration going beyond the bare statement of fact,d can contribute very successfully to a forceful effect. Here is an example from Demosthenes. “men of Athens, a terrible disease has fallen on Greece” < . . . > the sentence would not then have had force.

(281) Perhaps some force may be found even in what is called euphemism, language which makes inauspicious

---
a Dem. De Fals. Leg. 255. Aeschines may use the hand gestures of the orator, but should not take bribes.
b Dem. De Cor. 71. c The same passage now illustrates a different point, the use of rhetorical questions.
d I.e. the same idea is variously expressed, as in the example from Dem. De Fals. Leg. 259, which continues with a list of variants on ἃυνων. This will have been clarified in the lacuna. Add e.g. “If it were cut short at this point.”
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τοιῶν καὶ τὰ ἀσεβήματα εὐσεβήματα, οἶνον ὡς ὁ τὰς Νίκας τὰς χρυσὰς χωνεύειν κελεύων καὶ καταχρήσθαι τοὺς χρῆμασιν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ὅντως εἶπεν προχείρως, ὅτι "κατακόψωμεν τὰς Νίκας εἰς τὸν πόλεμον"· δύσφημον γὰρ ἄν ὅτις καὶ λοιπο-ροῦντι έοικὸς ἢν τὰς θεὰς, ἀλλ’ εὐφημότερον, ὅτι "συγχρησόμεθα ταῖς Νίκαις εἰς τὸν πόλεμον"· οὐ γὰρ κατακόπτουντι τὰς Νίκαις ἕοικεν ὅτις ῥηθέν, ἀλλὰ συμμάχους μεταποιοῦντι.

(282) Δενά δὲ καὶ τὰ Δημάδεια, καίτοι ἵδιον καὶ ἄτοπον τρόπον ἔχειν δοκούντα, ἔστι δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ δεινύτης ἐκ τε τῶν ἐμφάσεων γινομένη, καὶ εἰ καλλιγορικὸν τινος παραλαμβανομένου, καὶ τρίτον εἰς ὑπερβολῆς. (283) οἶον ἔστι τὸ "οὐ τέθνηκεν Ἀλέξανδρος, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἅθηναιοι ὄζεν γὰρ ἣν ἡ οἰκομένη τοῦ νεκροῦ." τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὃζεν ἄντι τοῦ ἣσθάνετο καλλιγορικὸν καὶ ὑπερβολικὸν ἄμα, τὸ δὲ τὴν οἰκομένην αὐσθάνεσθαι ἐμφανίσκον τῆς δυνάμεως τῆς Ἀλέξανδρου, καὶ ἄμα δὲ τι ἐκπληκτικὸν ἢξεί τὸ λόγος ἠθρουσμένον ἐκ τῶν τριῶν· πᾶσα δὲ ἐκπληξίς δεινόν, ἔπειδη φοβερὸν. (284) τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἑίδους καὶ τὸ [ὁτι]¹ "τούτο τὸ ψήφισμα οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐγγραφα, ἀλλ’ ὁ πόλεμος τῷ Ἀλέξανδρον δόρατι γράφων," καὶ τὸ "ἐοίκε γὰρ ἡ Μακεδονικὴ δύναμις, ἀπολωλεκυίᾳ τῶν Ἀλέξανδρου, τῷ Κύκλωπι τετυ-φλωμένῳ." (285) καὶ ἄλλαχοι ποιοῦν, "πόλιν,² οὐ τὴν ἐπὶ προγόνων τὴν ναυμάχοι, ἄλλα γραῖν, σαινδάλια

¹ del. de Falco. ² πόλιν Lhardy: πάλιν P.

510
things appear auspicious and impious things appear pious. A speaker, for example, once recommended that the golden statues of Victory should be melted down and the proceeds used to finance the war: he did not say openly, “let us cut up the Victory statues for the war.” That would have been inauspicious and like an insult to the goddesses. He put it more auspiciously, “we will have the support of the Victories for the war,” a version which suggests not the cutting up of the Victories but their conversion into allies.

(282) There are also the forceful sayings of Demades, though they are thought to be of a peculiar, and even eccentric nature, and their force results from innuendo, from the use of an allegorical element, and thirdly from hyperbole. (283) This is an example: “Alexander is not dead, men of Athens; or the whole world would have smelled his corpse.” The use of “smelled” instead of “noticed” is both allegory and hyperbole; and the idea of the whole world noticing implicitly suggests Alexander’s power. Further, the words carry a shock, the cumulative result of the three sources; and what shocks is always forceful, since it inspires fear. (284) Of the same kind are the words, “I was not the one to write this decree, the war wrote it with Alexander’s spear,” and “The power of Macedon after the loss of Alexander is like the Cyclops after his blinding,” (285) and in another passage, “a city which is no longer the city of our ancestors fighting sea

---

a Author unknown, example also in Quint. 9.2.92.
b Demades fr. 53 de Falco.
c Fr. 12 de Falco.
d Fr. 15 de Falco.
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υποδεδεμένην καὶ πτισάνην ροφώσαν" τὸ μὲν γὰρ γραῖν ἀλληγοροῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄσθενῆ καὶ εὔπτηλον ἥδη, καὶ ἀμα ἐμφαίνων τὴν ἀδρανίαν αὐτῆς ὑπερβολικῶς· τὸ δὲ πτισάνην ροφώσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ́ 1 εἰν κρεανμίας τότε καὶ παιδαυτίας διάγονον ἀπολλύειν 2 τὰ στρατιωτικὰ χρήματα. (286) περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς Δημαδείου δεινότητος ἀρκεῖ τοσαῦτα, καίτοι ἔχουσις τι ἐπισφαλές καὶ οὐκ εὔμιμητον μάλα· ἐνεστὶ γὰρ τι καὶ ποιητικὸν τῷ ἐδει, εἰ γε ποιητικὸν ἢ ἀλληγορία καὶ ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἐμφάσις, ποιητικὸν δὲ μικτὸν κωμῳδίας.

(287) Τὸ δὲ καλοῦμενον ἐσχῆματισμένον ἐν λόγῳ οἱ νῦν ῥήτορες γελοῖως ποιοῦσιν καὶ μετὰ ἐμφάσεως ἀγενοῦς ἀμα καὶ οἰον ἀναμνηστικῆς, ἀληθινὸν δὲ σχῆμα ἔστι λόγου μετὰ δυοὺν τούτων λεγόμενον, εὐπρεπείας καὶ ἀσφαλείας. (288) εὐπρεπείας μὲν, οἷον ὡς Πλάτων Ἀρίστιππον καὶ Κλεόμβροτον λοιδορήσαι θελήσας. ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ὡφοαγοῦντας δεδεμένων Ὀσκράτους Ἀθηνησίμην ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, καὶ μὴ διαπλεύσοντας <πρὸς> 4 τῶν ἑταίρων καὶ διδάσκαλον, καίτοι οὐχ ὀλούς ἀπέχοντας διακοσίους σταδίους τῶν Ἀθηνῶν. ταῦτα πάντα διαρρήθην μὲν οὐκ ἐπεκελεί λοιδορία γὰρ ἢν ὁ λόγος· εὐπρεπῶς δὲ πως τούτῳ τῶν τρόπων ἐρωτηθεῖς γὰρ ὁ Φαίδων τοὺς παρόντας Σωκράτη, καὶ καταλέξας ἑκαστον. ἐπανερωτηθεῖς εἰ καὶ Ἀρίστιππος καὶ Κλεόμβροτος

1 ἐπὶ τοῦ Sauppe: ἐπεί P.
2 ἀπολλύειν Μ2: ἀπολύειν PM1.
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battles, but an old hag, wearing slippers and gulping her broth.”a Here “hag” is used allegorically to describe a weak city in terminal decline, whose impotence it also suggests implicitly and with hyperbole; and “gulping her broth” is also allegorical, describing a city then preoccupied with feasts and banquets and squandering the funds for the war. (286) This is enough on the forcefulness of Demades, a type which has an element of risk and is not very easy to imitate. There is in its nature an element of poetry, if allegory, hyperbole, and innuendo are poetic, but it is poetry with a blend of comedy.

(287) Next, what is called allusive verbal innuendo. It is used by current orators in a ridiculous way, with a vulgar and what one might call obtrusive explicitness, but genuine allusive innuendo is expressed with these two safeguards, tact and circumspection. (288) Tact is shown, for example, when Plato wants to blame Aristippus and Cleombrotus because they were feasting in Aegina when Socrates was imprisoned for many days in Athens, and they did not sail over to visit their friend and teacher, although they were less than two hundred stades from Athens.b Plato did not say all this explicitly (for that would have been an open insult) but with some tact, as follows. Phaedo is asked who were with Socrates, and he lists them one by one. Next he is asked if Aristippus and

a Fr. 18 de Falco.
b I.e. roughly twenty-five miles.

3 διαπλέωσαντας P2: διαλύσαντας P1 Greg.
4 πρός add. Gärtner.
παρήσαν, "οὖ," φησίν, "ἐν Αἰγίνῃ γὰρ ἦσαν"·
pάντα γὰρ τὰ προειρημένα ἐμφαίνεται τῷ "ἐν
Αἰγίνῃ ἦσαν"· καὶ πολὺ δεινότερος ὁ λόγος δοκεῖ
τοῦ πράγματος αὐτοῦ ἐμφαίνοντος τὸ δεινόν, σοφῶ
τοῦ λέγοντος. τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἄριστιππον
καὶ λοιδορῆσαι ἵσως ἀκινδύνου ὄντος ἐν σχήματι ὁ
Πλάτων ἐλοιδόρητον. (289) πολλάκις δὲ ἢ πρὸς
τύραννον ἢ ἄλλος βιαῖον τινα διαλεγόμενοι καὶ
ὁνειδίσαι ὀρμώντες χρήζομεν εἷς ἀνάγκης σχήματος
λόγου,1 ως Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς πρὸς Κρατερὸν
tὸν Μακεδόνα ἐπὶ χρυσῆς κλίνης καθεξόμενον
μετέωρον καὶ ἐν πορφυρᾷ χλανίδι, καὶ ὑπερηφάνως
ἀποδεχόμενος τὰς προσβείας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, σχημα-
tίσσας εἰπεν ὀνειδιστικῶς, ότι "ὑπεδεξάμεθά ποτε
προσβεύοντας ἥμεις τούσδε2 καὶ Κρατερὸν τούτον"·
ἐν γὰρ τῷ δεικτικῷ τῷ "τούτον" ἐμφαίνεται ἡ ὑπερη-
φανία τοῦ Κρατεροῦ πάσα ὀνειδισμένη ἐν σχήματι.
(290) τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἴδους ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Πλάτωνος πρὸς
Διονύσιον ψευσάμενον καὶ ἀρνησάμενον, ότι "ἐγὼ
σοι Πλάτων οὐδὲν ὁμολογήσα, σὺ μέντοι, νὴ τοὺς
θεοὺς." καὶ γὰρ ἐλήλεγκται ἐψευσμένοι, καὶ ἔχει τι
ὁ λόγος σχῆμα μεγαλεῖον ἁμα καὶ ἀσφαλές. (291)
πολλαχῇ μέντοι καὶ ἑπαμφωτερίζοντοι· τοῖς ἐσκέ-
ναι εἴ τις ἑθέλοι καὶ ψόγους εἰ καὶ ὁ ψόγους εἶναι
[θέλοι τις]3 παράδειγμα τὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύνου ἐπὶ τοῦ

1 λόγου Finckh: ὅλου P.  2 τούσδε edd.: τόνδε P.
3 locus corruptus, fort. οὐ pro ὁ Grube: θέλοι τις del.
Roberts.
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Cleombrotus were also there. "No," he replies, "they were in Aegina."a Everything that precedes leads up to the words, "they were in Aegina," and the passage seems far more forceful because the force is produced by the fact itself and not by an authorial comment. So, although he could presumably have openly insulted Aristippus and his friends without any personal risk, Plato has done so allusively. (289) But in addressing a tyrant or any other violent individual, if we wish to be censorious, we often need to be oblique out of necessity, as in the case of Demetrius of Phaleron: when the Macedonian Craterus sat high above him on a couch of gold and in a purple robe and received the Greek envoys with insolent pride, he addressed him, using innuendo to censure him, "We ourselves once welcomed these men as envoys, including this man, Craterus."b By the use of the demonstrative, "this man," all the pride of Craterus is implicitly indicated and allusively censured. (290) Under the same heading comes Plato's reply to Dionysius, who had broken a promise and then denied ever making it: "I, Plato, have not made you any promises, but you—well, heaven knows!"c Dionysius is convicted of telling lies, while the words themselves carry a dignified and circumspect innuendo. (291) People often use words with an equivocal meaning. †If you wanted to be like them and use invective which does not seem invective†,d there is an example in Aeschines' passage about Telaeuges.e Almost the whole

---

a Pl. Phaed. 59c, similarly interpreted as an attack on Aristippus in Diog. Laert. 3.36.
b Dem. Phal. 183 Wehrli.
c Cf. Pl. Epist. 7, 349b.
d Text very uncertain, but the general sense is clear.
Τηλανγοῦσ· πάσα γὰρ σχεδὸν ἢ περὶ τῶν Τηλανγή
dιήγησις ἀπορίαν παράσχοι ἂν ἐίτε θαυμασμός
ἐίτε χλευασμός ἐστι. τὸ δὲ τουοῦτον εἴδος ἀμφίβο-
λον, καίτοι εἰρωνεία óυκ ὁν, ἐχει τινὰ ὁμώς καὶ εἰρω-
νείας ἐμφασιν.

(292) Δύνατο δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἔτέρως σχηματίζειν,
oίον οὕτως· ἐπειδὴ ἄγριός ἀκούσαν οἱ δυνάσται καὶ
dυνάστιδες τὰ αὐτῶν ἀμαρτήματα, παρανοώντες
αὐτοῖς μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν ὁν ἐξ εὐθείας ἐρωῦμεν, ἀλλ’
ἐτοι ἔτέρους ψεξομεν τινὰς τὰ ὁμοία πεποικότας,
oίον πρὸς Διονύσιον τὸν τύραννον κατὰ Φαλάριδος
tῶν τυράννων ἐρωῦμεν καὶ τῆς Φαλάριδος ἀποτομίας·
ἡ ἐπανεσομεθά τινας Διονυσίω τὰ ἐναυτία πεποι-
κότας, οἴον Γέλωνα ἢ Ἰέρωνα, ὅτι πατράσιν ἐψκε-
σαν τῆς Σικελίας καὶ δίδασκαλοίς· καὶ γὰρ νοουθε-
τείται ἀκούων ἁμα καὶ οὐ λοιποῦται καὶ ἔκλοτυντεί
τῷ Γέλωνι ἐπανοομένῳ καὶ ἐπαινοῦ ὅρεγεται καὶ
οὕτος. (293) πολλὰ δὲ τοιοῦτα παρὰ τοῖς τυράννοις,
oίον Φίλιππος μὲν διὰ τὸ ἐτερόφθαλμος εἶναι ὑργί-
ζετο, εἰ τις ὁνομάσειν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ Κύκλωτα ἢ ὄφθαλ-
μον ὅλως· Ἐρμείας δ' ὁ τοῦ Ἄταρνεώς ἄρξας, καίτοι
tάλλα πράσος, ὡς λέγεται, οὐκ ἂν ἡνεχετο ῥαδίως
τῶν μαχαίρων ὁνομάζοντος ἢ τομὴν ἢ ἐκτομὴν διὰ
τὸ εὐνοῦχος εἶναι. ταῦτα δ' ἐφηκα ἐμφηναι βουλό-
μενος μάλιστα τὸ ἄθος τὸ δυναστευτικόν, ὡς
μάλιστα χρῆζον λόγου ἀσφαλοῦς, ὃς καλείται
ἐσχηματισμένος. (294) καίτοι πολλάκις καὶ οἱ δήμοι
οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ ἵσχυροι δέονται τουοῦτον εἴδους τῶν
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narrative about Telauges will leave you puzzled whether it is meant as admiration or mockery. This ambiguous way of speaking, although not irony, yet has a suggestion of irony.

(292) Innuendo may be used in yet another way, as in this case: since powerful men and women dislike hearing their own faults mentioned, we will not speak openly, if we are advising them against a fault, but we will either blame others who have acted in a similar way, for example, in addressing the tyrant Dionysius, we will attack the tyrant Phalaris and the cruelty of Phalaris: or we will praise people who have acted in the opposite way to Dionysius, and say that Gelo or Hiero, for example, are like fathers and teachers of Sicily. Dionysius is receiving advice as he listens, but he does not feel insulted; he is envious of Gelo, the subject of this praise, and wants to be praised himself. (293) Such caution is often needed in dealing with rulers. Because he had only one eye, Philip would grow angry if anyone mentioned the Cyclops in his presence or used the word “eye” at all. Hermeias, the ruler of Atarneus, was in other respects good-tempered, it is said, but he resented any mention of a knife, surgery, or amputation, because he was a eunuch. I have mentioned these points to bring out very clearly the true nature of those in power, and to show that it especially calls for that circumspection in speech which is called innuendo. (294) It is also the case, however, that great and powerful

\[\text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{1}}\text{παρασχοι} \text{\reflectbox{αν}} \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{2}}; \text{παρέχοι} \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{1}}.\]
DEMETRIUS

λόγων, ὦσπερ οἱ τύραννοι, καθάπερ ὁ Ἀθηναίων δήμος, ἄρχων τῆς Ἐλλάδος καὶ κόλακας τρέφων Κλέωνας καὶ Κλεοφὼτας. τὸ μὲν οὖν κολακεύειν αἰσχρόν, τὸ δὲ ἐπιτιμᾶν ἐπισφαλές, ἀριστον δὲ τὸ μεταξὺ, τοῦτ’ ἔστι τὸ ἐσχηματισμένον. (295) καὶ ποτε αὐτὸν τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα ἐπανέσωμεν, οὐκ ἐφ’ οἷς ἡμαρτεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ οἷς οὐχ ἡμάρτηκεν, οἷον τὸν ὀργιζόμενον, ὅτι χθές ἐπηνεῖτο πρῶος φανείς ἐπὶ τοῖς τοῦ δείνος ἁμαρτήμασιν, καὶ ὅτι κηλίωτος τοῖς πολίταις σύνεστιν ἠδέως γὰρ δὴ ἔκαστος μιμεῖται ἕαυτόν καὶ συνάψαι βούλεται ἐπαίνῳ ἐπαινῶ, μᾶλλον δ’ ἔνα ὀμαλή ἐπαίνον ποιήσαι.

(296) Καθόλου δὲ ὦσπερ τὸν αὐτὸν κηρὸν ὁ μὲν τις κύνα ἐπλασεν, ὁ δὲ βοῦν, ὁ δὲ ἱππον, οὗτω καὶ πράγμα ταύτων ὁ μὲν τις ἀποφαινόμενος καὶ κατηγορῶν φησιν, ὅτι "οἱ Ἀνθρωποὶ χρήματα μὲν ἀπολείπουσι τοῖς παισίς, ἐπιστήμην δὲ οὐ συναπολείπουσι, τὴν χρήσιμαν τοὺς ἀπολειφθεῖσιν".2 τοῦτο δὲ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου Ἀριστόππεων λέγεται ἔτερος δὲ ταύτων ὑποθετικῶς προοίμεται, καθάπερ Ἐνοφῶντος τὰ πολλά, οὐδὲν ὅτι "δεὶ γὰρ οὐ χρήματα μόνον ἀπολιπεῖν τοῖς ἔαυτοις παισίς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιστήμην τὴν χρήσιμαν αὐτοῖς". (297) τὸ δὲ ἱδίως καλοῦμεν εἶδος Σωκρατικῶν, ὁ μᾶλιστα δοκοῦσιν ἠγαφήναι Αἰσχίνης καὶ Πλάτων, μετα-

1 οἵ οἱ εδδ.: οἵ δὲ Π.
2 τοῖς ἀπολειφθεῖσιν Victorius: τοῖς συναπολειφθεῖσιν Π.

---
a Not a fragment of Aristippus (IV A 148 Giannontoni). We
democracies often need this type of speech just as much as tyrants, for example the democracy of Athens when it was ruler of Greece and the home of flatterers like Cleon and Cleophon. Flattery is shameful, open criticism is dangerous, and the best course lies in the middle, namely innuendo. (295) Sometimes we will compliment the very man who has a weakness not on the weakness but on his avoidance of it. We will compliment a bad-tempered man, for example, that he was praised yesterday for the mildness he showed when so and so was at fault, and that he is a model to his fellow citizens. Every one likes to be his own example and is eager to add praise to praise, or rather to win one uniform record of praise.

(296) In general, language is like a lump of wax, from which one man will mould a dog, another an ox, another a horse. The same subject will be treated by one person in the form of direct statement and accusation, for example “men leave property to their children, but they do not leave with it the knowledge of how to use the legacy”—this is the type used by Aristippus. Another will, as Xenophon frequently does, put the same idea in the form of a precept, for example “men ought to leave not only property to their children, but also the knowledge of how to use it.” (297) What is specifically called the Socratic manner—the type which Aechines and Plato in

have three variations in the styles of Aristippus, Xenophon, and Socrates of a passage described as open rebuke as if by a deus ex machina in Pl. Clitoph. 407b, “mankind, where are you rushing to? are you not aware of your inappropriate behaviour, devoting all your energy to making money but with no thought for how your children, to whom you will leave it, will understand how to use it justly?” See A. Carlini, Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica 96 (1968) 38–46.
DEMETRIUS

ρυθμίσειν ἀν1 τοῦτο τὸ πράγμα τὸ προειρημένον εἰς ἐρώτησιν ὑδὲ πως οἶον ὡς παϊ. πόσα σου χρήματα ἀπέλυσεν ὁ πατήρ; ἥ πολλά τυχα καὶ οὐκ εὐαριθμητα;—πολλά, ὃ Σωκρατεσ.—ἀρα οὖν καὶ ἐπιστήμην ἀπέλυσεν σοι τὴν χρησμομένην αὐτοῖς;” ἀμα γὰρ καὶ εἰς ἀπορίαν ἐβαλεν τὸν παίδα λεληθότως, καὶ ἤνεμνησεν ὅτι ἀνεπιστήμων ἐστί, καὶ παιδεύεσθαι προετρέψατο· ταῦτα πάντα ἡθικῶς καὶ ἐμμελῶς, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον τοῦτο ἀπὸ Σκῆθων. (298) εὐημέρησαν δὲ οἱ τουοῦτοι λόγοι τότε ἔξευρεθέντες τὸ πρῶτον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐξέπληξαν τῷ τε μμητικῷ2 καὶ τῷ ἑναργεὶ καὶ τῷ μετὰ μεγαλοφροσύνης νουθετικῷ. περὶ μὲν δὴ πλάσματος λόγον καὶ σχηματισμῶν ἄρκειτω ταῦτα.

(299) Ἡ δὲ λειτυχής ἡ περὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν. οὐκέχρησται μάλιστα οἱ ἀπ᾽ Ἰσοκράτους, φυλαξάμενοι τὴν σύγκρουσιν τῶν φωνηέντων γραμμάτων, οὐ μάλιστα ἐπιτηδεία ἐστὶ δεινῷ λόγῳ πολλά γὰρ [τὰ3] εκ τῆς συμπλήξεως ἄν αὐτής γένοιτο δεινότερα, οἰον “τοῦ γὰρ Φωκικοῦ συστάντος πολέμου, οὐ δι᾽ ἐμὲ, οὐ γὰρ ἐγγυε ἐποιιτεύμην πω τότε.” εἰ δὲ μεταβαλών τις καὶ συνάψας ὅδε εἰπον: “τοῦ πολέμου γὰρ οὐ δι᾽ ἐμὲ τοῦ Φωκικοῦ συστάντος· οὐ γὰρ ἐποιιτεύμην ἐγγυε πω τότε.” οὐκ ὅλιγον διεξαιρήσει τῆς δεινότητος, ἐπεὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ τὸ ἥχωδε τῆς συγκρούσεως ἱσως ἔσται δεινότερον. (300) καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀφρόνιστον αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ ὀσπερ αὐτοφυές δεινό-

1 metarvthmíseiv αν Schneider: metarvthmísetaiν P.
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particular are considered to emulate—would redraft the same idea in the form of questions, in this sort of way: "My boy, how much property did your father leave you? Was it a lot and not easily assessed?" 'It was a lot, Socrates.' 'Well now, did he also leave you the knowledge of how to use it?" Socrates unobtrusively drives the boy into a corner; he reminds him that he does not have knowledge and encourages him to find instruction. All this is done with characterisation and in perfect taste, far from the proverbial Scythian bluntness.  

(298) This type of speech was very successful at the time it was first invented, or rather it stunned everyone by the verisimilitude, the vividness, and the nobility of the ethical advice. Let this then be enough on how to mould speech, and on innuendo.

(299) Smoothness of composition (of the kind particularly used by the followers of Isocrates, who avoid any clash of vowels) is not well suited to forceful speech. In many cases the very hiatus would increase the force, for example "when the Phocian war broke out, through no fault in me, as I at that time was not yet active in public life." If you were to redraft the words more smoothly, "when through no fault in me the Phocian war broke out, as I was at that time not yet active in public life," you will remove much of the force, since in many passages perhaps the very resonance of the hiatus will be more forceful. (300) The fact is that words which are unpre-

---

---

\(^a\) Cf. § 216.

\(^b\) Dem. De Cor: 18. Note especially the jerky hiatus between the clauses, polemou, ou di’ eme, ou. On hiatus cf. §§ 68–74.

\(^2\) ωμητικῷ Gale: τωμητικῷ P.  

\(^3\) τὰ del. Spengel.
τητα παραστήσει τινά, μάλιστα ἐπὰν ὀργιζομένους ἐμφαίνωμεν αὐτούς ἡ ἡδικημένους. ἦ δὲ περὶ τὴν λειτοτητα καὶ ἀρμονίαν φροντὶς ὅπις ὀργιζομένου, ἀλλὰ παῖζοντός ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιδεικυμένου μᾶλλον. (301) καὶ ὁσπερ τὸ διαλελυμένον σχῆμα δεινότητα ποιεῖ, ὡς προλέεκται, οὕτω ποιήσει ἡ διαλελυμένη ὀλως σύνθεσις. σημειῶν δὲ καὶ τὸ Ἰππώνακτος· λοι- δορήσαι γὰρ βουλόμενος τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔθραυσεν τὸ μέτρον, καὶ ἐποίησεν χωλὸν αὐτὶ εὐθέως καὶ ἄρνθ- μον, τουτέστι δεινότητι πρέπουν καὶ λοιδορία· τὸ γὰρ ἔρρυθηκαν καὶ εὐήκοον ἐγκωμίοις ἀν πρέποιτο μᾶλλον ἡ ψόγους. τοσαύτα καὶ περὶ συγκρούσεως.

(302) Παράκειται δὲ τις καὶ τῷ δεινῷ χαρακτήρι, ώς τὸ εἰκός, δυναρτημένος καὶ αὐτός, καλεῖται δὲ ἄχαρις. γίνεται δὲ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἐπὰν τις αἰσχρὰ καὶ δύσρητα ἀναφανδὸν λέγῃ, καθάπερ ὁ τῆς Τιμάνδρας¹ κατηγορῶν ὡς πεπονυκυῖας τὴν λεκανίδα καὶ τοὺς ὀβολοὺς καὶ τὴν ψιάθον καὶ πολ- λὴν τῶν τοιαύτην δυσφημίαν κατήρασεν τοῦ δικα- στηρίου. (303) ἡ σύνθεσις δὲ φαίνεται ἄχαρις, εὰν διεσπασμένη ἐμφερῆς ἢ, καθάπερ ὁ εἰπὼν, "ὅτι οὔτωσι δ’ ἔχουν τὸ καὶ τὸ, κτείναι."² καὶ ἐπὰν τὰ κώλα μηθεμένα ἕχῃ πρὸς ἀλληλα σύνδεσιν, ἀλλ’ ὀμοια διερρηγμένους. καὶ αἱ περίοδοι δὲ αἱ συνεχεῖς καὶ μακρὰ καὶ ἀποπνίγονται τοὺς λέγοντας οὐ

¹ ὁ τῆς Τιμάνδρας edd: ὅτι ἂν τῆς Τημάνδρας Π.
² locus corruptus, οὔτωσι ἢ δ’ Π: οὔτωσι cum praecedentibus Radermacher, fort. recte.
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meditated, and somehow spontaneous, will in themselves create some vigour, especially when we show our anger or sense of injustice, whereas careful attention to smoothness and harmony signals not anger so much as a lack of seriousness or a display of rhetoric. (301) As has already been said,\(^a\) the figure of abruptness creates force. The same may be said of abrupt composition on a wider scale. Hipponax\(^b\) is a case in point. Wanting to insult his enemies, he shattered his metre, he made it limp instead of walk straight, he made the rhythm irregular, and therefore suitable for forceful insult. Regular, harmonious rhythm would be more suitable for eulogy than invective. This concludes my account of hiatus.

(302) Next to the forceful style there is, as might be expected, a corresponding faulty style. It is called the repulsive style. It occurs in the subject matter when a speaker mentions in public things that are disgusting and obscene, like the man who accused Timandra\(^c\) of being a prostitute and spewed out over the court her basin, her fees, her mat, and many similar ugly details. (303) Composition sounds repulsive if it seems disjointed, like the man who said, "+this and that being the case, to kill+",\(^d\) and when the clauses are in no way linked to one another, but are like broken fragments. Long continuous periods, too, which run the speaker out of breath cause not only a

\(^a\) Cf. § 269.

\(^b\) Hipponax turned the iambic trimeter into "limping" iambics by making the final iamb a spondee. Cf. § 251.

\(^c\) Author unknown; perhaps Hyperides in his attack on this famous prostitute (= fr. 165).

\(^d\) Author unknown, text very uncertain.
μόνον κατακορές ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀτερπές. (304) τῇ δὲ ὀνομασίᾳ ¹ πολλάκις χαρίεντα πράγματα ὁντα ἀτερπέστερα φαίνεται, καθάπερ ὁ Κλείταρχος περὶ τῆς τευθρηδόνος λέγων, ζῶον μελίσση ἑοικότος. "κατανέμεται μέν," φησί, "τὴν ὀρεινήν, εἰσίπταται δὲ εἰς τὰς κοῖλας δρῦς." ὡσπερ περὶ βοὸς ἄγριον ἣ τοῦ Ἐρυμανθίου κάπρου λέγων, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ περὶ μελίσσης τωσ, ὡστε καὶ ἄχαρι τὸν λόγον ἁμα καὶ ψυχρὸν γενέσθαι. παράκειται δὲ πως ἀλλήλοις ταῦτα ἀμφότερα. ²

¹ τῇ δὲ ὀνομασίᾳ Victorius: ἢ δὲ ὀνομασία Ρ.
² Δημητρίου περὶ ἔρμηνείας subscriptio in Ρ.
surfeit but actual aversion. (304) The choice of words often makes even subjects which are themselves charming lose their attractiveness. Clitarchus, for instance, gives this description of the wasp, an insect like a bee: “It lays waste the hillsides, and rushes into the hollow oaks.”\(^a\) It is as if he described some wild bull, or the Erymanthian boar, rather than a kind of bee. The result is that the passage is both repulsive and frigid, and in a way these two faults lie next to each other.

\(^a\) FGrHist 137 Clitarchus F 14 (cf. T 10).
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Aegeus, 61b21
Aegisthus, 53a37
Aeschylus, 49a16. Choephoroi, 55a4. (?)Mysians, 60a32.
Niobe, 56a17. Philoctetes, 58b23. (?)Phineidae, 55a10.
(?)Phorcides, 56a2.
(?)Prometheus Bound, 56a2
Agathon, 56a18, 24, 30. Antheus, 51b21
Ajax, 56a1
Alcmaeon, 53a20, 53b24. See also Astydamas
Amphiaraus, see Carcinus
Antheus, see Agathon
Antigone, see Sophocles
Ariphrades, 58b31
Aristophanes, 48a27
Astydamas, Alcmaeon, 53b33
Athens, 48a36, 48b1, 49b7

Callippides, 61b35, 62a9
Carcinus, Amphiarasus, 55a26.
Thyestes, 54b23
Centaur, see Chairemon
Chairemon, 60a2. Centaur, 47b21
Chionides, 48a34
Choephoroi, see Aeschylus

Cleobulina, 58a29
Cleophon, 48a12, 58a20
Clytemnestra, 53b23
Crates, 49b7
Creon, 54a1
Cresphontes, see Euripides
Cypria, 59b2, 4
Cyprians, see Dicaeogenes

Danaus, 52a28
Deiiad, see Nicochares
Dicaeogenes, Cyprians, 55a1
Dionysius, 48a6
Dorians, 48a30

Empedocles, 47b18, 57b13–14, 24, 58a5, 61a24
Epicharmus, 48a33
Eriphyle, 53b24
Euclides, 58b7
Euripides, 53a24, 29, 56a17, 27, 60b34. Cresphontes, 54a5.
Iphigeneia in Aulis, 54a32.
Iphigeneia in Tauris, 52b5, 54a7, 54b31, 55a18, 55b3, 14.
Medea, 53b28, 54b1, 61b20.
Philoctetes, 58b25. Trojan
Women, 59b7
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Eurypylus. see Sophocles
Glaucion, 61b1

Haemon, 54a2
Hector, 60a15, 60b26
Hegemon, 48a12
Helle, 54a8
Heracles, 51a22
Herodotus, 51b2
Hippias of Thasus, 61a22
Homer, 47b18, 48a11, 22, 26, 48b28, 34, 51a23, 54b15, 59a31, 59b12, 60a5, 19. Iliad. 48b38, 51a29, 54b2, 56a13, 56b1, 57a29, 57b11, 58a7, 58b31, 59a31, 59b3, 14, 60a15, 60b26, 61a2–33 passim. 62b3.
8. Margites. 48b30, 38.
Odyssey, 49a1, 51a24, 53a32, 54b26, 30, 55a2, 55b17, 57b10, 58b25, 29, 59b3, 15, 60a26, 35, 61b5, 62b9

Iphigenia, see Euripides
Ixion, 56a1

Little Iliad, 59b2, 5
Lyceus. see Theocritus

Magnes, 48a34
Margites, see Homer
Medea, see Euripides
Megarians, 48a31
Melanippe, see Euripides
Meleager, 53a20
Menelaus, 54a29, 61b21
Merope, 54a5
Mitys, 52a8
Mnaseus, 62a7
Myrmicus, 61b34
Mysians, see Aeschylus, Sophocles

Neoptolemus, 59b6

Nicocharis. Dei/Iad, 48a13
Niobe. see Aeschylus

Odysseus, see Homer. Odyssey
Odysseus the False Messenger, 55a13
Odysseus Wounded, see Sophocles
Oedipus, 53a11, 20. See also Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus
Orestes, 53a20, 37, 53b24. See also Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris, Orestes

Pausanias, 48a6
Peleus, see Euripides, Sophocles
Philoctetes, 59b5. See also Aeschylus, Euripides
Philoxenus, 48a15
Phineidae, see Aeschylus
Sophocles
Phorcides, see Aeschylus
Phthiotides, see Sophocles
Pindar, 61b35
Polygnotus, 48a5, 50a27
Polypheus, 55a6, 55b10
Prometheus, see Aeschylus
Protagoras, 56b15

Sack of Troy, 59b6
Scylla, see Timotheus
Sicily, 48a32, 49b7
Sinon, see Sophocles
Sisyphus, 56a22
(?)Mysians, 60a32.
(?)Odysseus Wounded, 53b34.
Oedipus Tyrannus, 52a24.
53b7, 31, 54b8, 55a18, 60a30, 62b2. (? )Peleus, 56a2
(?)Phineidae, 55a10.
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