



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Appropriating Peri hypsous : interpretations and creative adaptations of Longinus' Treatise On the Sublime in Early Modern Dutch Scholarship
Jansen, W.L.

Citation

Jansen, W. L. (2019, April 17). *Appropriating Peri hypsous : interpretations and creative adaptations of Longinus' Treatise On the Sublime in Early Modern Dutch Scholarship*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/71553>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/71553>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/71553> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Jansen, W.L.

Title: Appropriating Peri hypsous : interpretations and creative adaptations of Longinus' Treatise On the Sublime in Early Modern Dutch Scholarship

Issue Date: 2019-04-17

CHAPTER TWO

DEFENDING THE POET

THE RECEPTION OF *PERI HYP SOUS* IN DANIEL HEINSIUS' *PROLEGOMENA* ON HESIOD¹

2.1 Introduction

In Chapter One I have shown that late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century scholarship showed a particular interest in Longinus' treatise for its preservation of several fragments of ancient Greek writers, rather than the argument of the treatise itself. A notable and early exception is Daniel Heinsius' incorporation of Longinus' ideas in the *Prolegomena* to his edition of Hesiod (1603). In the *Prolegomena* Heinsius builds on Longinus' ideas about innate talent and (artistic) freedom (*Peri hypsous* 33-36 and 44) as well as Longinus' discussion of stylistic faults (*Peri hypsous* 3-5). Heinsius uses Longinus' arguments to make the point that Hesiod's poetry is marked by an inborn and genuine simplicity, and to defend Hesiod from critics who disapproved of Hesiod's unpolished style. In doing so, as I will argue in this chapter, Heinsius employs the Longinian sublime as a quality of literature that subverts traditional rules of rhetoric and literary style. This subversive interpretation of Longinus' treatise is usually attributed to Nicolas

¹ An earlier version of this chapter was published in *Lias. Journal of Early Modern Intellectual Culture and its Sources*: W.L. Jansen, 'Defending the Poet. The Reception of *On the Sublime* in Daniel Heinsius' *Prolegomena* on Hesiod', *Lias. Journal of Early Modern Intellectual Culture and its Sources* 43.2 (2016), 199-223. Some of the background on the seventeenth-century reception of *Peri hypsous* (as described in the article) is now covered in my Introduction. Section 2.8 of this chapter is a new addition.

Boileau, who is said to be the first to ‘recognise the true potential’ of Longinus’ treatise.² The case of Daniel Heinsius however makes it clear that this kind of reading was possible well before Boileau presented his definition of the Longinian sublime in 1674.³

In my Introduction I have argued that the relationship between Longinus’ ideas and the early modern interpretations of Longinus’ treatise is not uncontroversial. It has often been said or tacitly assumed that Nicolas Boileau is (among) the first to read *Peri hypsous* in its ‘proper’ sense. Boileau’s interpretation is moreover seen as the culmination of a chronological development, which consists of a shift from a predominantly rhetorical interpretation of *Peri hypsous* to the definition of the Longinian sublime as a phenomenon that is opposed to rhetorical rules and precepts. In this chapter I will argue firstly that both interpretations of *Peri hypsous* are to some extent warranted by the treatise itself, and secondly that it is not only the chronological development that dictates which reading of *Peri hypsous* was possible at a given point in time. Instead I propose to take another factor into account: the purpose that a particular early modern scholar had in mind when reading, interpreting, and incorporating Longinus’ ideas. As I will show, Daniel Heinsius was driven by a particular motive (the defence of Hesiod) when using *Peri hypsous* in his *Prolegomena* to his edition of Hesiod, which resulted in a rather creative adaptation of some of Longinus’ arguments.

This chapter will first examine the balance between art and nature – or genius and rules – in *Peri hypsous* (section 2.2). After a brief introduction of Daniel Heinsius, his intellectual network, as well as his acquaintance with *Peri hypsous* (section 2.3), I will discuss the backdrop against which Heinsius’ argument in the *Prolegomena* took shape: Julius Caesar Scaliger’s criticism of archaic poetry (section 2.4). Heinsius’ appropriation of Longinus’ terminology and ideas will be discussed in three sections, which cover the opposition between grammarians and poets (section 2.5), the defence of the faulty genius and the pernicious effects of rules and

² See for instance Dietmar Till: “The potential of *Peri hypsous* to break [the norms of the three canons of style] was not discovered until the end of the 17th century” (Till, 2012, 55). See my Introduction for a discussion of the modern understanding of the influence of Boileau on the interpretation of *Peri hypsous*.

³ Fumaroli (1986) has argued that Longinus’ treatise was already read in an anti-rhetorical way before 1674, but provides no examples in which a rejection of rhetoric is *explicitly* connected to *Peri hypsous*.

precepts (section 2.6), and the role of simplicity (section 2.7). In the final section of this chapter (section 2.8) I will contextualise Heinsius' use of Longinus by discussing similar appropriations of *Peri hypsous* in the first half of the seventeenth century.

2.2 Art, nature and criticism in *Peri hypsous*

"Can 'the sublime' be taught or learned?", Longinus asks in the introductory sections of his treatise (*Peri hypsous* 2.1). Some have argued, Longinus says, that great things do not spring from teaching, but come naturally, and that works produced by natural talent are spoiled if they are reduced to technical instructions (*Peri hypsous* 2.1). Longinus however objects that nature too operates according to certain laws, and that natural ability (φύσις) sometimes needs the moderation of art (τέχνη) (*Peri hypsous* 2.2). Presenting an instructive treatise on sublimity, Longinus must convince his readers that the sublime consists – at least partly – of teachable elements, and that sublimity is also advanced by art or skill.⁴ In his introduction, Longinus therefore insists on the cooperation of talent and skill, a synergy that also underlies Longinus' definition of five sources of the sublime in *Peri hypsous* 8.1. According to Longinus, two of these sources spring from the writer's natural talent ('greatness of thought' and 'emotion'), whereas the other three ('figures of speech', 'diction', and 'word arrangement') belong to the domain of skill.⁵ The larger part of the treatise (chapters 9-32 and 37-43) is dedicated to the

⁴ Longinus' insistence on the cooperation between art and nature for instance resembles the discussion of this topic by Quintilian (*Institutiones Oratoriae* 2.19), who asserts that teaching (*doctrina*) may enhance the qualities already present in nature (*natura*). See also Porter (2016), 60-83 on the paradoxical relation between art and nature in *Peri hypsous*.

⁵ Longinus presents his five sources of the sublime in *Peri hypsous* 8.1: Ἐπεὶ δὲ πέντε, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, πηγαὶ τινὲς εἰσὶν αἱ τῆς ὑψηγορίας γονιμώταται, (...) πρῶτον μὲν καὶ κράτιστον τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις ἀδρεπήβολον, (...)· δεύτερον δὲ τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος· ἀλλ' αἱ μὲν δύο αὗται τοῦ ὕψους κατὰ τὸ πλεον αὐθιγενεῖς συστάσεις, αἱ λοιπαὶ δ' ἤδη καὶ διὰ τέχνης, ἢ τε ποιὰ τῶν σχημάτων πλάσις (δισσὰ δὲ που ταῦτα, τὰ μὲν νοήσεως, θάτερα δὲ λέξεως), ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις ἡ γενναία φράσις, ἥς μέρη πάλιν ὀνομάτων τε ἐκλογὴ καὶ ἡ τροπικὴ καὶ πεποιημένη λέξις· πέμπτη δὲ μεγέθους αἰτία καὶ συγκλείουσα τὰ πρὸ αὐτῆς ἅπαντα, ἢ ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρχει συνθεσις· ("There are, one may say, some five most productive sources of the sublime in literature (...). The first and most powerful is the power of grand conceptions (...) and the second is the inspiration of vehement emotion. These two constituents of the sublime are for the most part congenital. But the other

discussion of these five sources.⁶ In chapters 33-36 of *Peri hypsous*, Longinus however breaks up his discussion of ‘diction’ (one of the technical sources of the sublime) and raises the question which kind of writer should be preferred: one who is sublime but makes mistakes, or one who is faultless, but remains mediocre. The immediate occasion for this discussion is the disapproval of Plato’s lavish use of metaphors by critics who ruled that no more than three metaphors should be used in one sentence.⁷ According to Longinus the critic Caecilius of Caleacte likewise condemned Plato and preferred the orator Lysias.⁸ In reaction to this judgment, Longinus argues that a writer’s excellence should be measured according to the greatness rather than the flawlessness of his works.⁹ Longinus thus asserts that, despite their shortcomings, Plato’s writings eventually outshine

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 those already mentioned, is dignified and elevated word-arrangement”).

⁶ The second source, ‘emotion’ is however not discussed systematically. On the place of ‘emotion’ in *Peri hypsous*, see Innes (1995a) and Innes (1995b). See also section II of my Introduction.

⁷ *Peri hypsous* 32.1: Περί δὲ πλήθους [καὶ] μεταφορῶν ὁ μὲν Καϊκίλιος ἔοικε συγκατατίθεσθαι τοῖς δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς ἐπὶ ταύτῳ νομοθετοῦσι τάττεσθαι (“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”); and *Peri hypsous* 32.7: ἐπὶ γὰρ τούτοις καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα οὐχ ἥκιστα διασύρουσι, πολλάκις ὥσπερ ὑπὸ βακχείας τινὸς τῶν λόγων εἰς ἀκράτους καὶ ἀπηνεῖς μεταφορὰς καὶ εἰς ἀλληγορικὸν στόμφον ἐκφερόμενον (“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”).

⁸ In his introductory remarks, Longinus presents *Peri hypsous* as a response to a (now lost) work by Caecilius of Caleacte on sublimity, who – according to Longinus – had discussed the subject inadequately. That Caecilius’ ideas are an important starting point for Longinus in his treatment of the sublime in literature has been discussed by Russell (1981), Innes (2002), and Porter (2016), 183-195.

⁹ *Peri hypsous* 33.1-5. In chapter 34 Longinus stresses that the quality of literary virtues is more important than their quantity. Thus while Hyperides may surpass Demosthenes in the amount of merits in writing, he is in turn surpassed by Demosthenes – despite the latter’s shortcomings – in forcefulness (34.1-4). Chapter 35 explains that great authors have despised accuracy in writing due to the natural inclination of the human spirit towards the contemplation of greatness in nature (35.1-5).

the flawless speeches of Lysias.¹⁰ In order to refute Caecilius, Longinus paints a contrast between ‘immensely great natures’, whose greatness causes them to make faults, and ‘humble and mediocre natures’ who avoid mistakes and never attain sublimity.¹¹ Longinus thus categorises Caecilius’ criticism of Plato and the adherence to technical precepts (such as the one dictating the appropriate number of metaphors in one sentence) as the opposite of sublimity.

The discussion in sections 33.1-36.3 has been labelled a ‘digression’, because of its deviation from the main argument of the treatise.¹² This is further marked by the fact that Longinus concludes the passage by pointing out that natural greatness and art should cooperate nonetheless (36.4).¹³ With this remark, Longinus rehabilitates the balance between talent and skill as proposed in the opening chapters of the treatise, in order to resume the discussion of the two remaining ‘technical’ sources of the sublime: diction (continued in *Peri hypsous* 37, 38, and 43) and word arrangement (*Peri hypsous* 39-42).¹⁴ While the aim of *Peri hypsous* as a

¹⁰ *Peri hypsous* 32.8 and 35.1. See also Russell (1981), Innes (2002), and C.C. de Jonge, ‘Longinus 36.3: the faulty colossus and Plato’s *Phaedrus*’, *Trends in Classics* 5 (2013), 318-340 on the comparison between Plato and Lysias in *Peri hypsous*.

¹¹ *Peri hypsous* 33.2.

¹² The passage is sometimes referred to by the title *Regel und Genie* (‘rule and genius’). The title ‘Regel und Genie’ was given to this section by the German classicist Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in his anthology of noteworthy Greek texts: U. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechisches Lesebuch 2 Vols.* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1904), II, 377-382.

¹³ *Peri hypsous* 36.4: ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τέχνης ἐστὶ κατόρθωμα, τὸ δ’ ἐν ὑπεροχῇ, πλὴν οὐχ ὁμότονον, μεγαλοφυΐας, βοήθημα τῇ φύσει πάντη πορίζεσθαι τὴν τέχνην· ἡ γὰρ ἀλληλουχία τούτων ἴσως γένοιτ’ ἂν τὸ τέλειον (“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”).

¹⁴ The oldest extant commentary to Longinus’ treatise, written by Franciscus Portus presumably around 1581, calls Longinus’ remark in 36.4 a ‘correction’: προσήκει δ’ ὁμῶς] *Correctio*, καὶ λύσις τοῦ ἀντιπ[ίπτοντος]. *Quid igitur Longine? Excludis artem a natura dicentis et scribentis? Non excludo, inquit. Ratio: quia conjuncta arte cum natura opus fit absolutum et perfectum. Confirmatio: nam si natura labatur interdum, ars corrigit et facit melius, in quo illa peccavit* (“A correction, and solution of the objection. What then, Longinus? Do you exclude art from the nature of a speaker or writer? I do not exclude it, he says. Reason: because when art is combined with nature a work becomes absolute and perfect. Confirmation: for if nature sometimes makes a mistake, art corrects it and improves that in which she has sinned”). The text of the commentary is cited from Pearce (1733), 344.

didactic treatise dictates cooperation between natural talent and learned skill, the digression in chapters 33-36.3 subverts this balanced view.

This discrepancy can be understood from the fact that *Peri hypsous* serves various functions. Besides a didactic aim, Longinus' treatise also serves an apologetic, accusatorial, as well as an encomiastic function, according to Donald Russell, who uses this division to explain why *Peri hypsous* only partly follows the scheme as laid out in section 8.1 of the treatise.¹⁵ Building on Russell's observations, I suggest that Longinus' opinion that nature and art should cooperate belongs to the didactic function of *Peri hypsous*, whereas the digression in 33.1-36.3 fulfils the other three objectives of the treatise: to defend Plato, to refute Caecilius, and to demonstrate the sublimity of great writers (such as Plato, Homer and Demosthenes).

Peri hypsous is sometimes seen as a treatise that exclusively celebrates genius and divine inspiration and altogether rejects the means of rhetoric.¹⁶ A substantial part of the treatise however corresponds to general principles of ancient rhetorical theory: it discusses the stylistic means (figures, diction and word arrangement) that are appropriate for creating sublimity, and advocates a balance between natural talent and technical skill.¹⁷ Readers of *Peri hypsous* may therefore find in the treatise arguments for the cooperation of natural talent and rhetorical skill, as well as a subversion of the same notion. Categorisations of the treatise as a discussion of the highest of the *genera dicendi*, as well as a rejection of stylistic norms are both to some extent legitimised.¹⁸

One might moreover say that the ambiguity that underlies the argument of *Peri hypsous* touches upon one of its central elements: the ability to form a critical judgment about literature.¹⁹ On the part of the author as well as the critic, a proper

¹⁵ Russell (1981), 74.

¹⁶ Porter (2016), 9-10 discusses the tendency in modern scholarship to describe the Longinian sublime in these terms.

¹⁷ See Porter (2016), 83-93 for a discussion of *Peri hypsous* against the background of ancient rhetorical theory.

¹⁸ Cf. James Porter's discussion of art and nature in *Peri hypsous* and the relation of *Peri hypsous* to ancient theories of rhetoric: Porter (2016), 20-83 and 83-93.

¹⁹ See for instance Hunter (2009), 128-168 and Porter (2016), 183-184 on the aspects of polemic and judgment in *Peri hypsous*.

literary judgment results from the observance of a basic set of rules, as much as from intuition in determining when certain stylistic boundaries may be crossed. Longinus for instance makes it clear that in some contexts the excessive use of metaphors is excusable, or even essential for the effect of a certain passage.²⁰ Elsewhere Longinus however criticises extravagant metaphors.²¹ This method not only allows the critic to form a careful judgment about a certain passage or author, but also to refute the literary opinions of other critics. *Peri hypsous* is a treatise on sublimity in writing and literary judgment as much as a critical reaction to Caecilius' ideas about literature. Besides ideas about genius or stylistic precepts, *Peri hypsous* also provides its early modern readers with a set of tools to validate or invalidate the literary judgments of other critics.

2.3 Daniel Heinsius and *Peri hypsous*

Daniel Heinsius spent formative years of his education among the most eminent Dutch scholars of his time. Heinsius was born in Ghent in 1580 as the son of Flemish Protestants.²² In 1583 the Heinsius family fled the Calvinist Republic of Ghent (which was to surrender to Spanish rule only one year later) and sought refuge in the Northern Netherlands. Daniel Heinsius was educated at the Latin School in Vlissingen. In 1596 Heinsius was sent to Franeker University to study law. Heinsius' interests however developed differently. When his father sent him to Leiden in 1598 in the hope that he would take more interest in his legal studies, Heinsius only developed an even greater passion for poetry and literature, and in 1600 he was officially enrolled as a student of letters.²³ During these years Heinsius came into contact with several eminent scholars of his time. From 1600 onwards

²⁰ Such as in the case of Plato's lengthy metaphoric description of the human body in the *Timaeus* (65C-85E), which Longinus praises in *Peri hypsous* 32.5-6.

²¹ Especially in *Peri hypsous* 3-5.

²² This biography of Daniel Heinsius is based on J.H. Meter, *The Literary Theories of Daniel Heinsius: A Study of the Development and Background of his Views on Literary Theory and Criticism During the Period from 1602 to 1612* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1984) and A. Duprat, 'Daniel Heinsius (1583-1655)', in: C. Nativel (ed.), *Centuriae latinae: cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat* (Geneve: Librairie Droz, 1997), 417-425.

²³ Meter (1984), 11-12.

Heinsius actively corresponded with Isaac Casaubon, while he was tutored in Leiden by Bonaventura Vulcanius and Josephus Justus Scaliger. Scaliger stimulated Heinsius in developing his skills in critical textual interpretation: already in 1600 and 1601 Heinsius made two editions of classical texts.²⁴ During his student years Heinsius also dedicated himself to writing poetry, under the supervision of Janus Dousa. In 1603 (the same year in which the *Prolegomena on Hesiod* were published) Heinsius was appointed extraordinary professor of poetry at Leiden University.

In the same period, Heinsius had already become familiar with Longinus' treatise. In his *De tragoediae constitutione*, which was published for the first time in 1611, Heinsius remarked that "every poet of tragedy should learn Longinus' treatise by heart".²⁵ The auction catalogue of Heinsius' private library reveals that Heinsius possessed at least two different editions of Longinus' text upon his death in 1655.²⁶ It is also worth noting that the aforementioned scholars who played a role in Heinsius' student and early career years (Scaliger, Vulcanius, Dousa and Casaubon) also owned copies of Longinus' text.²⁷ Heinsius therefore had ample opportunity to learn about *Peri hypsous* in the first decade of the seventeenth century.

Heinsius extensively uses Longinus' ideas in the introductory essay to his edition of Hesiod (1603). This edition contains the Greek text and a Latin translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the *Shield*, the *Theogony*, and the Hesiodic fragments, as well as commentaries on Hesiod's writings of Proclus (412-485 AD), Johannes Tzetzes (c. 1110-1185 AD) and Manuel Moschopoulos (13th-14th century).

²⁴ Silius Italicus' *Punica* and *Crepundia Siliiana*, respectively.

²⁵ D. Heinsius, *Danielis Heinsii De tragoediae constitutione liber: in quo inter caetera, tota de hac Aristotelis sententia dilucide explicatur* (Leiden, J. Balduinus, 1611), ch. XVI. See also section 2.8 of this chapter.

²⁶ The catalogue lists the edition of Manuzio (1555) and Portus (1569). See *Catalogus Variorum & Exquisitissimorum Librorum, Nobilissimi Doctissimique Viri Danielis Heinsii, D. Marci Equitis, &c. Quorum Auctio habebitur in aedibus Petri Leffen, Bibliopolae sub Signo Phoenicis, Die Martis 14. Martii, & seqq. Anno 1656* (Leiden: P. Leffen, 1656), 116-117.

²⁷ As I have shown in Chapter One, copies of *Peri hypsous* were circulating in the academic circles of Leiden at least from the beginning of the seventeenth century. Book sales catalogues from the first decade of the seventeenth century reveal that Scaliger, Vulcanius and Dousa all owned the 1569 Genevan edition of Franciscus Portus. Casaubon's annotated copy of *Peri hypsous* is preserved in the British Library: LBL 1088.m.2.

Heinsius' introduction, fully titled *In Hesiodum Prolegomena; in quibus poëtae character a Grammaticorum calumnijs vindicatur* ("Preface on Hesiod; in which the character of the poet is freed from the scorn of the grammarians"), is a polemical essay in which the author rebukes the criticism of earlier commentators on Hesiod and sets out his views on poetics.²⁸ The text of the *Prolegomena* can be divided roughly into three sections, followed by a conclusion.²⁹ In the first section, Heinsius addresses the development of the ancient poetic tradition, and argues that the simplicity of the earliest poets (Homer and Hesiod) should not be measured against Vergilian standards. In the second section, Heinsius discusses (the authenticity of) the Hesiodic corpus, and addresses the question whether Hesiod should be called a rhapsode or not. In the third (and longest) section of the *Prolegomena* Heinsius discusses the style of Hesiod's poetry, and develops an argument that is centred on the contrast between *ars* and *ingenium*, to the end of defending Hesiod's simple style.

Longinus' ideas play a crucial role in Heinsius' argument, especially in the first and third section of the *Prolegomena*. Heinsius' indebtedness to *Peri hypsous* has been discussed by Jan Hendrik Meter (1984), Irene Polke (1999), Korbinian Golla (2008) and Volkhard Wels (2013). Meter has pointed out that the *Prolegomena* react to the views of Julius Caesar Scaliger (not named in the *Prolegomena*), and Johannes Tzetzes (who is mentioned explicitly by Heinsius).³⁰ Meter also showed how Heinsius' argument builds on "the dichotomy of a) archaic and later poetic art, b) between Greek and Roman poets, and c) between *ingenium* and *ars*."³¹ Polke discussed Heinsius' *Prolegomena* in the context of her study of eighteenth-century judgments about Hellenistic poetry.³² Polke and Meter both discussed the central role of *Peri hypsous* 33-36 (the defence of the flawed genius) in the *Prolegomena*.³³

²⁸ A discussion of the contents of the *Prolegomena* can be found in Meter (1984), 74-86.

²⁹ The divisions of the text proposed by me are as follows: 1. *Nihil ex antiqua [...]* ($\alpha 1^r$) – [...] *Graecis vulgata sunt* ($\alpha 2^r$). 2. *Sed ad Hesiodum [...]* – [...] *characteribus distinguendum curavimus* ($\alpha 2^r$ – $\alpha 3^v$). 3. *Stylus caeterum [...]* – [...] *Caecum eum appellant* ($\alpha 3^v$ – $\beta 2^r$). Conclusion: *Sed de his [...]* ($\beta 2^r$) – [...] *disputamus, audire posses* ($\beta 2^v$).

³⁰ Meter (1984), 79-84.

³¹ Meter (1984), 75.

³² I. Polke, *Selbstreflexion in Spiegel des Anderen. Eine Wirkungsgeschichtliche Studie zum Hellenismusbild Heynes und Herders* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1999), 103-110.

³³ Meter (1984), 75-79; Polke (1999), 106-109.

Golla discussed Heinsius' emphasis on 'simplicity' in relation to Heinsius' epigrams on Hesiod.³⁴ Wels argues that the *Prolegomena* show that Heinsius was an advocate of the (obsolete) idea of *prisca sapientia* ('primordial wisdom').³⁵ The following discussion adds to these observations in the sense that it clarifies the factors that occasioned the incorporation of *Peri hypsous* in Heinsius' arguments, while elucidating its implications for our understanding of the reception of Longinus' treatise in the early seventeenth century.

2.4 Julius Caesar Scaliger on Vergil versus Homer (and Hesiod)

In order to understand the structure of Heinsius' argument, and to grasp why Longinus' treatise was so fit for Heinsius' purposes, we must consider a debate that took place in the sixteenth century and which centred on the comparison between the poetry of Homer and Vergil.³⁶ The comparison between these two authors goes back to classical antiquity. Quintilian for example stated that Homer had a 'heavenly and immortal nature', while Vergil exhibited more 'care and diligence'.³⁷ The observation that Homer's poetry excels in nature (*natura*), while Vergil's poetry excels in art (*ars*), led to divergent conclusions in the early modern comparisons of Homer and Vergil.³⁸ Some argued that Homer was the better poet, because of the power and purity of his poetic invention, while Vergil was a mere

³⁴ K. Golla, 'Daniel Heinsius' Epigramme auf Hesiod', in: E. Lefèvre and E. Schäfer (eds.), *Daniel Heinsius. Klassischer Philologe und Poet* (Tübingen: Narr, 2008), 31-55: 31-39.

³⁵ V. Wels, 'Contempt for Commentators. Transformation of the Commentary Tradition in Daniel Heinsius' *Constitutio tragoediae*,' in K.A.E. Enenkel and H.J.M. Nellen (eds.), *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1400-1700)* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2013), 325-346.

³⁶ Discussions of the comparison between Homer and Vergil in early modern scholarship can be found in A. Wlosok, 'Zur Geltung und Beurteilung Vergils und Homers in Spätantike und früher Neuzeit', in: E. Heck and E. Schmidt (eds.), *Res humanae – res divinae: Kleine Schriften/Antonie Wlosok* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1990), 476-498, and G. Vogt-Spira, 'Ars oder Ingenium? Homer und Vergil als literarische Paradigmata', *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 35 (1994), 9-31.

³⁷ Quintilian, *Institutiones Oratoriae* 10.1.86. On the importance of Quintilian's remarks for later judgments of Homer and Vergil, see Wlosok (1990), 480-483.

³⁸ Wlosok (1990), 476-480.

imitator. Others however stated that Vergil surpassed Homer, because he had refined Homer's primitive art.³⁹

An important voice in this debate is Julius Caesar Scaliger, Heinsius' implicit opponent in the *Prolegomena*.⁴⁰ In the *Poetices Libri septem* (first edition in 1561), Scaliger argued that Roman poetry is far superior to its Greek precursor, and assigned Vergil a position of superiority among the classical poets.⁴¹ Scaliger envisioned the history of poetry as a cyclical process, in which progression and decline alternate.⁴² In the first book of the *Poetices* (titled 'Historicus') Scaliger presents three stages in the development of Greek poetry. Of the pristine and uncultivated first stage only the name of Apollo, the inventor of poetry, remains.⁴³ To the second and most venerable phase belong the mythical poets Orpheus, Musaeus and Linus.⁴⁴ Homer is the founder of the third – decadent – stage, to which Hesiod also belongs.⁴⁵ In the sixth book of the *Poetices* (the 'Hypercriticus') Scaliger discusses the history of Latin poetry, which he divides into five subsequent periods. After the first and second phase, the 'infancy' (*infantia*) and 'adolescence' (*adolescentia*), comes the third and most powerful period, which flourishes (*viget*) with Terence, Catullus, Tibullus and Horace, but which shines most brightly (*luculenter splendet*) with Vergil. The fourth stage is a period of decline, and the development of poetry eventually comes to a staggering halt with the poetry of late antiquity. After a long period of standstill, the poetry of Petrarch

³⁹ See Wlosok (1990), 488-493, Vogt-Spira (1994), 9-31, and D. Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 124-142 for an overview.

⁴⁰ Meter (1984), 79-83. Meter has pointed out that Heinsius in the *Prolegomena* reverses the arguments of J.C. Scaliger in the *Poetices*. When Heinsius was writing his *Prolegomena*, Scaliger's *Poetices* was one of the most famous examples of comparative literary criticism.

⁴¹ S. Rolfes, *Die lateinische Poetik des Marco Girolamo Vida und ihre Rezeption bei Julius Caesar Scaliger* (München: Saur Verlag, 2001), 169-186.

⁴² See M. Bizer, 'The Genealogy of Poetry According to Ronsard and Julius Caesar Scaliger', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 43 (1994), 304-318, for a discussion of Scaliger's periodisation of poetry in the *Poetices*.

⁴³ J.C. Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem* (Geneva: P. de Saint-André, 1594), 11: *Vetus illud priscum, rude, incultum: et sui tantum suspicionem sine nominis memoria reliquit nisi in eo tanquam principem, Apollinem censeamus.*

⁴⁴ Scaliger (1594), 11: *Alterum illud venerandum, a quo primum Theologia et Mysteria. Inter quos Orpheus, Musaeus, Linus: Olympum quoque inter vetustos Plato nominat.*

⁴⁵ Scaliger (1594), 11: *Tertij seculi Homerus author et parens: Hesiodus quoque et alii.*

then marks the beginning of a new adolescence of poetry (*nova adolescentia*).⁴⁶ In the *Poetics* Scaliger thus assigns Homer (and Hesiod) to a period of decline, while Vergil is presented as the pinnacle of ancient poetry.

The judgment about the relative merits of Homer and Vergil, which is implicitly present in Scaliger's periodisation of poetry, is made explicit in the fifth book of the *Poetics* (titled 'Criticus'), in which Scaliger argues that a critical evaluation of poetry is necessary in order to define which poets are most worthy of imitation. Scaliger unequivocally deems Vergil to be a better example for imitation than Homer.⁴⁷ His judgment starts from the observation that poetry consists of subject matter and form (*res et verba*).⁴⁸ While Homer's talent (*ingenium*) is very great, his artistic skill (*ars*) seems to be 'found' rather than 'cultivated'.⁴⁹ Julius Caesar Scaliger thus presents Homer as a primitive and uncultivated poet who excels in 'nature', while Vergil is a master of both nature *and* art.⁵⁰ Vergil has taken the rough poetics of Homer to the highest level of perfection and thus corrected his predecessor, 'like a schoolmaster'.⁵¹ Hesiod is compared to Vergil in an even more unfavourable way: Scaliger explicitly leaves Hesiod out of the discussion in book five of the *Poetics*, as Hesiod's entire oeuvre is easily surpassed by any verse from Vergil's *Georgics*.⁵² Scaliger develops the antithesis of simplicity and refinement

⁴⁶ Scaliger (1594), 764-5: *Unde perargentum primum, deinde per aes ad hoc usque ferrum, quo nunc cum miserrime transigimus, deducti sumus, vitae vero nostrae curriculum longe alia dimensione ab infantia inchoatum, stataque aetate perfectum, declinat eo usque dum rursus exolescatur, at ipsam poesim multo diversa metimur ratione. Namque rudimenta quaedam primi illius exortus agnoscimus: flexumque aetatis tanquam per adolescentiam, a Livio atque Ennio, per Accium, Naevium, Plautum ad consummatum florensque transmissum robur, quod in Terentio, Catullo, Tibullo, Horatio viget, in Virgilio etiam luculenter splendit, a quo, ad Martialem, Juvenalem, Silium, Statium devertens, paulatim efflorescit. Tum autem quarto veluti decurso spatio, haesit in senii vestigiis cum Sereno, Sidonio, Severino, Ausonio.*

⁴⁷ G. Vogt-Spira (1990), 'Über Homer und Vergil', *Modern Language Notes* 105 (1990), 409-431: 409-412; Rolfes (2001), 169-86.

⁴⁸ Scaliger (1594), 538: *Duo igitur cum sint quibus constat poesis, res et verba, de rebus primum videamus.*

⁴⁹ Scaliger (1594), 538: *Homeri ingenium maximum, ars eiusmodi, ut eam potius invenisse quam excoluisse videatur.*

⁵⁰ Scaliger (1594), 538: *Quare neque mirandum est, si in eo naturae idea quaedam, non ars exstare dicatur.*

⁵¹ Scaliger (1594), 538: *Virgilius vero artem ab eo rudem acceptam lectoris naturae studii atque iudicio ad summum extulit fastigium perfectionis. And 598: [...] a natura proposita Homero argumenta, quasi dictata discipulo emendat Virgilius tanquam magister.*

⁵² Scaliger (1594), 627: *Omisso Hesiodo, cuius universa opera ne cum uno quidem versu Georgicôn sunt comparanda [...].*

even further by bringing Musaeus into the comparison. Scaliger qualifies the verses of Musaeus as neat (*castigatus*) and without nonchalance (*licentia*), as well as compliant with metrical rules.⁵³ Even though Musaeus' works predate those of Homer (according to Scaliger), they are much more polished and refined.⁵⁴

Scaliger's ideas about the history of poetry and the relative merits of Homer and Vergil constitute an important starting point for Heinsius' argument, even though the critic is not mentioned by name.⁵⁵ In the opening section of the *Prolegomena*, Heinsius addresses the matter of periodisation, and argues that the simplicity of ancient Greek poetry has withered after Homer and Hesiod.⁵⁶ Whereas Scaliger presented the history of poetry as a cyclical process, Heinsius puts forward the idea of a gradual decline of poetry, which enables him to place Homer and Hesiod at the top of the poetic tradition.⁵⁷ Vergil and the other Roman poets are assigned a secondary position. Their poetry may surely be appreciated for its elegance, Heinsius argues, as long as it is clear that they are the students, not the teachers of those who actually taught them.⁵⁸ The poetry of Homer and Hesiod on the other hand is marked by an "undiminished norm of language, inborn and genuine simplicity of diction, a pure, balanced fabric of speech, which shines because of its own virtue, and which is unadorned by foreign ornaments of things

⁵³ Scaliger (1594), 540: *In quibus nullam vides licentiam, omnia castigata. Nam et rarissimum admittit hiatum et lectis utitur verbis et versus claudit bisyllabis trisyllabisve maxima ex parte.*

⁵⁴ Scaliger confuses the mythical poet Musaeus with the fifth-century composer of the poem *Hero and Leander*. See G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Julius Caesar Scaliger. Poetices Libri Septem. Sieben Bücher über die Dichtkunst, Band IV: Buch 5* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1998), 50-51.

⁵⁵ Meter suggests that Heinsius' close relationship with the elder Scaliger's son, Josephus Justus Scaliger, may have been reason for Heinsius to suppress Scaliger's name, see Meter (1984), 79-84. Even if Scaliger is not Heinsius' direct opponent, his *Poetics* constitute an important representative of the ideas that Heinsius aims to refute.

⁵⁶ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', α1^r: *Nihil ex antiqua Graecorum simplicitate iniuria temporum, crudelissima magnorum ingeniorum noverca, nobis reliquum fecit; praeterquam Hesiodi pauca, et Homeri non ita multa.*

⁵⁷ Meter (1984), 77; Wels (2013), 332-334.

⁵⁸ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', α2^r: *Habeant sane venustates suas illi Romuli nepotes, dummodo ne se patres eorum profiteantur, quorum filii sunt, nec eos doceant, a quibus didicerunt.* This is a direct reaction to Scaliger's remark that Vergil corrected Homer 'like a schoolmaster' (Scaliger, 1594, 598).

or words.”⁵⁹ Hesiod’s simplicity moreover has not been given its due appreciation, because of the perverse tendency to measure Greek authors according to Roman standards.⁶⁰ Just like Scaliger, Heinsius picks up the idea that the works of Homer (and Hesiod) are ‘natural’, while Vergil’s writings are ‘refined’. Since Scaliger had used this basic assumption to argue for the superiority of Vergil over Homer, one of Heinsius’ most important objectives in the *Prolegomena* is to turn this observation on the archaic Greek poets into something positive again.

As it so happens, Longinus’ treatise *Peri hypsous* provides a set of arguments fit for Heinsius’ purpose. The treatise exhibits a great fondness for archaic poetry, and presents Homer as a prime example for imitation.⁶¹ It also describes a gradual decay of literature and the disappearance of the truly great and elevated minds of earlier times (*Peri hypsous* 44).⁶² Most importantly, as we have seen, it rejects stylistic overelaboration (*Peri hypsous* 3-5), and places the erratic outbursts of genius above flawless perfection (*Peri hypsous* 33-36). Moreover, Heinsius and Longinus had a very similar purpose: to defend their favourite authors from criticism. There are however also some significant differences between the arguments of Longinus and Heinsius. The poetry of Hesiod does not belong to Longinus’ examples of the sublime. In fact, the only occasion on which Longinus discusses Hesiod, the verdict is negative. In *Peri hypsous* 9.5 Longinus adduces a passage from Hesiod’s *Shield of Herakles* (Ἀσπίς Ἡρακλέους) as a counterexample

⁵⁹ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascreai opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, α1^r: *In Homero vero et Hesiodo illibata illa sermonis norma, dictionum nativa genuina simplicitas, purum, aequale, et virtute sua elucens orationis filum, nullis aliunde ascitiis rerum verborumque ornamentis adumbratum, aeternam posteritati aemulandi affectandique occasionem, scribendique materiam reliquit.*

⁶⁰ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascreai opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, α1^r: *Nec me fallit tamen, quam fastidiosa haec Hesiodi praesertim simplicitas arrogantibus aliquot et delicatulis hominibus esse soleat, qui cum de poetice bene iudicare videntur, de lingua et idiomate pessime sentiunt. Eo enim deventum est, ut ad amussim Romanarum, si diis placet, elegantiarum Graeci exigantur.*

⁶¹ *Peri hypsous* 13.3: μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὀμηρικώτατος ἐγένετο; Στησίχορος ἔτι πρότερον ὃ τε Ἀρχίλοχος, πάντων δὲ τούτων μάλιστα ὁ Πλάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ κείνου νάματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὅσας παρατροπὰς ἀποχετευσάμενος (“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”). Homer is also Longinus’ prime example of ‘greatness of thought’ (*Peri hypsous* 9), and features prominently in the digression on the ‘flawed genius’ (*Peri hypsous* 33-36).

⁶² *Peri hypsous* 44.

of sublimity: “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”.⁶³ Longinus’ treatise is moreover concerned with sublimity, not simplicity. As we will see, Heinsius is not bothered by these differences, as he selects those elements from *Peri hypsous* that support his defence of Hesiod, and creatively adapts them to bolster his own argument.

2.5 Grammarian versus poet

After the discussion of the Hesiodic corpus in the first half of the *Prolegomena*, Heinsius moves on to the topic of Hesiod’s style. Heinsius describes the style of Hesiod’s *Works and Days* as simple (*facilis*), fluent (*lenis*) and uniform (*uniformis; constans sibi*), and “redolent of antiquity” (τᾷς ἀρχαίστατος ὁσδων), thus again emphasising its pristine aspects.⁶⁴ On this topic Heinsius however has another adversary to fight besides Scaliger: the Byzantine scholar Johannes Tzetzes, whose commentary on Hesiod’s *Works and Days* was also included in Heinsius’ edition of Hesiod.⁶⁵ In his commentary, Tzetzes not only ridiculed the commentary of his predecessor Proclus, but also criticised numerous mistakes in Hesiod’s writing.⁶⁶ Tzetzes for instance remarked how clumsy Hesiod’s versification was.⁶⁷ Heinsius in turn does not hide his indignation for Tzetzes’ criticisms: “He [Tzetzes] dares to

⁶³ *Peri hypsous* 9.5: ὃ ἀνόμοιον γε τὸ Ἡσιόδειον ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀχλύος, εἶγε Ἡσιόδου καὶ τὴν Ἀσπίδα θετέον· τῆς ἐκ μὲν ῥινῶν μύξαι ῥέον· οὐ γὰρ δεινὸν ἐποίησε τὸ εἰδωλον, ἀλλὰ μισητόν. Modern scholars no longer attribute the *Shield* to Hesiod. Longinus’ doubt about the attribution is mentioned by Johannes Meursius in his commentary on Lycophron’s *Alexandra* (1597). Heinsius discusses the matter of the attribution, but still ascribes the work to Hesiod and includes it in his edition of 1603.

⁶⁴ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, α3^v: *Stylus caeterum τῶν Ἑργῶν facilis, lenis, uniformis est, constans sibi, et revera, ut Dorice loquar, τᾷς ἀρχαίστατος ὁσδων*.

⁶⁵ Tzetzes produced many philological treatises as well as verse compositions, among which the *Chiliades* (‘Thousands’) and *Theogony* (after Hesiod). See H. Hunger, *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 Vols. (München: Beck, 1978), 59–63.

⁶⁶ See M.L. West (ed.), *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 69–70 for a brief overview of ancient and Byzantine commentaries on Hesiod’s *Works and Days*.

⁶⁷ Johannes Tzetzes, commentary on Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, in: Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 105: ἐκ δὲ τῶν τριῶν περισσῶν κε εἰ δὲ κεν ἀπόκεν, καὶ σφύραν, κεν, ἀδυναμίην πολλὴν μετρικὴν τοῦ Ἡσιόδου καταγνώσκειν ἐστὶ (‘From those three superfluous elements ‘ke’, ‘ei de ken’, ‘apoken’, and ‘sphyran ken’, one can recognise Hesiod’s incapability in the art of metrics”).

object to the free use of one syllable or another. I don't see who could be convinced by this man, who indiscriminately neglects all measures of syllable quantities as well as charm of language in his writings. That's how we know that a grammarian (*grammaticus*) is something completely different – that is, trivial, futile, wordy, and garrulous – than a supreme poet.”⁶⁸ Heinsius moreover states that Tzetzes' own writings are inferior to Hesiod's poetry, in purity and simplicity, just like a prostitute is inferior to a chaste virgin.⁶⁹

By ridiculing Tzetzes' work and portraying him as a garrulous grammarian, Heinsius seeks to invalidate his criticism of Hesiod's poetry: “I can think of no other reason why Tzetzes has such a bad opinion of Hesiod, than the fact that he is a grammarian.”⁷⁰ The characterisation is all the more pertinent, since Tzetzes *was* commonly referred to as ‘the grammarian’, especially with regard to his commentary on Hesiod's *Works and Days*.⁷¹ In Heinsius' eyes, grammarians “hunt letters like beggars are picking their lice” and proclaim a triumph, as soon as they have spotted a metrical abnormality.⁷² Heinsius finds it unacceptable that grammarians are forcing rules on the same poets from which they have formed their standards.⁷³ Heinsius' ‘grammarians’ take the place that Caecilius of Caleacte

⁶⁸ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Asdraei opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, α4^v: *Licentiam syllabae unius aut alterius obicere audeat; in eo homine ferri qui possit non video, qui et omnia promiscue quantitatum tempora, et linguae venustates in suis negligere consuevit. Quod nisi longe aliud sciremus Grammaticum esse, id est levem, futilem, verbosum, garrulum, quam summum poetam.*

⁶⁹ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Asdraei opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, α4^v: [...] *qui tanto Hesiodo puritate sermonis, et simplicitate inferiores sunt, quanto prostibula impurissima, virgine castissima.*

⁷⁰ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Asdraei opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, α4^v: *Ac de Hesiodo quidem cur male sentiat causam reperire nullam possum, quam quod Grammaticus sit [...].*

⁷¹ Hunger (1978), 59. Henischius' edition of Tzetzes' commentary to Hesiod (Basel: Oporinus, 1574) as well as another Basel edition of the commentary from 1542/44 present Tzetzes as a ‘grammaticus’, probably referring to his capacity of teacher (*grammaticus*) at the Byzantine court. See F. Hieronymus, *Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen. Katalog der frühen griechischen Drucke aus Basel in Text und Bild*, <http://www.ub.unibas.ch/cmsdata/spezialkataloge/gg/>, accessed 16 June 2016.

⁷² Heinsius, *Hesiodi Asdraei opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, β1^r: *Qui hac forte nati sunt, ut literas venentur, sicut mendici in sole pedunculos suos. Quod si alibi vel miseram literulam tempore immutatem, vel syllabam claudicantem inveniunt; satis est, Triumphum postulant [...].*

⁷³ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Asdraei opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, β1^r: *Quod vero iis negotium facessunt, eos in ordinem cogunt, iis molesti sunt, e quibus canones suos technici, e quibus compedes ingeniorum, cancellos naturae formarunt, ferri nec potest, nec debet.*

(among others) held for Longinus: as critics who discredited an author on the grounds of certain rules and precepts.⁷⁴

Heinsius' rejection of a grammatical approach to poetry also extends to the renunciation of poets who are also grammarians.⁷⁵ The poet Musaeus for instance, whose writings were praised for their precision and metrical accuracy by Scaliger, is commonly known as *grammaticus*.⁷⁶ In the *Prolegomena*, Heinsius describes Musaeus' poetry as very polished and refined, and objects to the opinion (which was held by Scaliger) that Musaeus outranked Homer.⁷⁷ Another 'grammarian' that Heinsius discusses is the Hellenistic poet Callimachus. Heinsius' starting point is Ovid's judgment of Callimachus in *Amores* 1.15. In the elegy Ovid describes Callimachus as weak in inspiration (*ingenium*), but powerful in technical skill (*ars*).⁷⁸ In the *Prolegomena* Heinsius recounts that many illustrious scholars of his time disagree with Ovid and think that Callimachus *does* possess ease of invention (*inventionum facilitas*) and a keen mind (*acumen*).⁷⁹ Heinsius however, siding with Ovid, considers Callimachus a grammarian rather than a poet and emphasises that Callimachus is not 'devoid of talent', because 'talent' is not a

⁷⁴ Recall the rule that Caecilius and other critics adhered to (*Peri hypsous* 32.1): that no more than two or three metaphors may be used in one sentence.

⁷⁵ To some extent this is also the case for Tzetzes, who commented upon Hesiod's works, but also composed a *Theogony* in emulation of Hesiod. See Hunger (1978), 59.

⁷⁶ In several manuscripts of Musaeus the author is called *grammaticus*; see C.A. Trypanis, T. Gelzer and C.H. Whitman, *Callimachus. Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Other Fragments. Musaeus. Hero and Leander* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 297.

⁷⁷ Scaliger's idea that Musaeus even antedated Homer is ardently rejected by Heinsius, see *Prolegomena* α4^r.

⁷⁸ Ovid, *Amores* 1.15.13-14: *Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe / quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet* ("The son of Battus (Callimachus) shall be sung throughout the world; although he does not excel in genius, he does excel in art").

⁷⁹ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', β1^r: *Parum videlicet plerique et hac aetate viri praestantissimi perceperunt, cur ingenium Callimacho detraxerit Naso: ita ut nonnulli litem ei intendere veriti non sint: cum neque inventionum facilitate, inquirunt, neque acumine, quantum ratio scribendi admittit, destituatur poeta ille, et quaedam apud eum talia sint ut ingeniosissimo homine non inferiora videantur*. Heinsius probably reacts to the remarks of Henri Estienne in his edition of Callimachus (*Callimachi Cyrenaei Hymni et Epigrammata*, Geneva: R. Estienne, 1577). To Ovid's assertion that Callimachus does not excel in talent, but in skill only, Estienne objected that Callimachus *does* have some talent, even if his technical skills outweigh his natural abilities. The position of Estienne in the debate about Callimachus is discussed lucidly by Polke (1999), 92-96.

category that is at all applicable to him.⁸⁰ For the same reasons Heinsius finds fault with Ovid's inclusion of Callimachus in a list of poets.⁸¹ For Heinsius the opposition between grammarian and poet is essentially one of *ars* versus *ingenium*. Just like Longinus in *Peri hypsous* 33-36 rebuked Caecilius by (temporarily) diminishing the role of art and focussing almost exclusively on natural talent as a prerequisite for the sublime, Heinsius refutes the judgment of grammarians by advancing *ingenium* or *natura* as the only criterium according to which a poet should be judged. As we will see shortly, Heinsius takes Longinus' arguments even one step further.

2.6 The faulty genius and the decay of literature

Continuing his discussion of Ovid's remarks, Heinsius argues that the difference between a grammarian and a poet is the absence or presence of *ingenium*, an argument that relies heavily on *Peri hypsous* 33 and 44.

Ingenium vocavit τὴν ὀμῆν: quo saepe peccant poëtae: grammatici ne hoc quidem possunt. Si quis itaque ex me querat, quem Graecorum poëtarum primum existimem: dicam, primum esse, qui peccavit saepissime: secundum, qui proximus esse audendo meruit. Ita & Homerus non nisi genere peccat, et Pindarus, et Archilochus et Sophocles: Eratosthenis contra Erigone sine vitio habita est. Apollonius autem et Callimachus, quod ubique artem sequantur, ne hoc quidem meruerunt, ut magnifice peccarent: itaque ἄπρωτοι, & ἀδιάπτωτοι a veteribus dicta sunt, quod errare nescirent.⁸²

⁸⁰ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', β1r: *Pro eo nos respondemus. Neque ingenio destitutum fuisse poëtam illum: neque id esse quod in eo desideramus: nisi quatenus ingenio eum destitui arbitramur, qui arte peccat.* See M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 444-449 about Callimachus' status as a grammarian.

⁸¹ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', β1r: *Summus itaque poëtarum Naso, cum de reliquis poëtis egisset, tandem Callimachum recenset, non sine praefatione mehercule: neque enim debet, qui Grammaticum poëtis adiungit.*

⁸² Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascræi opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', β1r- β1v.

With the term *talent* [Ovid] designated “the impulse”, which is the reason why poets often make mistakes; grammarians are not even capable of that. If someone were to ask me thus, which one of the Greek poets I would regard the first: I would say, that the first is the one who makes mistakes most often: and the second is the one who as a result of his courage deserves to be the next. Thus, Homer does not make mistakes, unless nobly, as do Pindar, and Archilochus, and Sophocles: Eratosthenes’ *Erigone* on the other hand is considered to be flawless. But Apollonius and Callimachus, because they follow art everywhere, are not worthy even of this, namely of making mistakes magnificently. Therefore they are called “faultless” and “impeccable” by the ancients, because they don’t know how to make mistakes.

Heinsius explains that *ingenium* is Ovid’s term for the Greek word ὁρμή. In Stoic writings the word ὁρμή commonly denotes the irrational faculty of the soul, which is distinguished from reason.⁸³ The term is found in a similar sense in Longinus’ treatise, albeit not in the modern critical editions of *Peri hypsous*. The *editio princeps* of Robortello (1554) and the edition of Portus (1569) both have a version of *Peri hypsous* 33.5 that includes the word ὁρμή in the description of Archilochus’ inspiration: “And what of Eratosthenes in his *Erigone*? Wholly blameless as the little poem is, do you therefore think him a greater poet than Archilochus with all his disorganized flood and his ‘impetus’ (ὁρμή) from the outburst of divine inspiration, which is so troublesome to bring under any rule?”⁸⁴ According to

⁸³ See e.g. Cicero, *De officiis* 1.101: *Duplex est enim vis animorum atque natura; una pars in appetitu posita est, quae est orme Graece, quae hominem huc et illuc rapit, altera in ratione, quae docet et explanat, quid faciendum fugiendumque sit* (“Now we find that the essential activity of the spirit is twofold: one force is appetite (that is, ὁρμή, in Greek), which impels (*rapit*) a man this way and that; the other is reason, which teaches and explains what should be done and what should be left undone”) (Translation: Miller, 1913). See also M. Winterbottom, ‘On impulse’, in: D.C. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric. Classical Essays for Donald Russell, on his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 313-322, on the term *impetus* in ancient literary criticism.

⁸⁴ The sentence runs perfectly well without the word ὁρμή. See for instance B. Weiske, *Dionysii Longini de sublimitate, Graece et Latine* (Leipzig: Io. Aug. Glo. Weigel, 1809), 407 and 607 for the variant readings of this passage. It is most likely that Heinsius’ consulted the edition of Portus (which has ὁρμή), as this edition circulated in his milieu.

Heinsius, this ‘impetus’ is what constitutes the difference between a grammarian and a poet, while it is also the phenomenon that causes poets to make mistakes. Therefore, Heinsius regards the poet who makes mistakes most often to be the best of all. The idea that faults and genius are intrinsically linked is clearly derived from *Peri hypsous* 33.⁸⁵ Longinus argues that the best writer is the one whose excellences are the greatest, rather than the one who has the greatest number of excellences, or than the writer whose works are faultless.⁸⁶ This also includes an element of danger: avoidance of risks may result in flawlessness, but may never attain the height of sublimity.⁸⁷ Heinsius however pushes his defence of the flawed genius even further than Longinus, by making the number of mistakes proportional to a poet’s success: “the more mistakes, the better.” In doing so, Heinsius turns what was regarded a flaw by critics such as Scaliger and Tzetzes into a strength. Any mistakes they have pointed out only corroborate the idea that Hesiod and Homer are poets with great *ingenium* rather than petty grammarians.

Another significant borrowing from Longinus’ treatise is found in Heinsius’ selection of exemplary authors. In section 33.4-5 of *Peri hypsous*, Longinus illustrates his preference for the flawed genius over flawless mediocrity by

⁸⁵ Also pointed out by Meter (1984), 77-78 and Polke (1999), 106-109.

⁸⁶ *Peri hypsous* 33.1: Φέρε δή, λάβωμεν τῷ ὄντι καθαρὸν τινα συγγραφέα καὶ ἀνέγκλητον. ἂρ’ οὐκ ἄξιόν ἐστι διαπορῆσαι περὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου καθολικῶς, πότερόν ποτε κρεῖττον ἐν ποιήμασι καὶ λόγοις μέγεθος ἐν ἐνίοις διημάρτημένον ἢ τὸ σύμμετρον μὲν ἐν τοῖς κατορθώμασιν ὑγιές δὲ πάντῃ καὶ ἀδιάπτωτον; καὶ ἔτι νῆ Δία πότερόν ποτε αἱ πλείους ἄρεται τὸ πρωτεῖον ἐν λόγοις ἢ αἱ μείζους δικαίως ἂν φέροιντο; (“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?”).

⁸⁷ *Peri hypsous* 33.2: ἐγὼ δ’ οἶδα μὲν ὡς αἱ ὑπερμεγέθεις φύσεις ἥκιστα καθαραὶ <τὸ> γὰρ ἐν παντὶ ἀκριβὲς κίνδυνος μικρότητος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεγέθεσιν, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἄγαν πλούτοις, εἶναι τι χρὴ καὶ παρολιγωρούμενον· μήποτε δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἦ, τὸ τὰς μὲν ταπεινὰς καὶ μέσας φύσεις διὰ τὸ μηδαμῇ παρακινδυνεύειν μηδὲ ἐφίεσθαι τῶν ἄκρων ἀναμαρτήτους ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ ἀσφαλεστέρας διαμένειν, τὰ δὲ μεγάλα ἐπισηφαλῇ δι’ αὐτὸ γίνεσθαι τὸ μέγεθος (“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 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”).

comparing a number of authors that represent one or the other side of the opposition. Both Apollonius, who is a faultless poet (ἄπτωτος ποιητής) in the *Argonautica*, and Theocritus, who is most successful in his bucolic poetry, cannot hold up against Homer. Eratosthenes' flawless poem *Erigone* is contrasted with the 'disorganised flood' of Archilochus, while Bacchylides is contrasted with Pindar and Ion with Sophocles. Longinus concludes that even though in these pairs the first ones are considered to be impeccable (ἀδιάπτωτος), the latter ones are still to be preferred.⁸⁸

Heinsius takes over Longinus' Greek terms ἄπτωτος and ἀδιάπτωτος (both meaning 'faultless' or 'impeccable') into his comparison of the flawless and faulty writers. Although Heinsius' selection of authors largely overlaps with Longinus' selection, there are some differences. In *Peri hypsous* 33.4 Longinus mentions Apollonius together with Theocritus, whereas Heinsius speaks of Apollonius and Callimachus. As we have seen, Heinsius' discussion of *ingenium* takes Ovid's *Amores* 1.15 as a starting point, and particularly Ovid's criticism of Callimachus. By excluding Theocritus and including Callimachus, Heinsius conflates both

⁸⁸ *Peri hypsous* 33.4-5: ἐπείτοιγε καὶ ἄπτωτος ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις ποιητής, κὰν τοῖς βουκολικοῖς πλὴν ὀλίγων τῶν ἔξωθεν ὁ Θεόκριτος ἐπιτυχέστατος· ἄρ' οὖν Ὅμηρος ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι; τί δέ; Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῇ Ἡριγόνῃ (διὰ πάντων γὰρ ἀμώμητον τὸ ποιημάτων) Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικονόμητα παρὰσύροντος, κἀκεῖνης τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ δαιμονίου πνεύματος ἦν ὑπὸ νόμον τάξαι δύσκολον, ἄρα δὴ μείζων ποιητής; τί δέ; ἐν μέλεσι μᾶλλον ἂν εἶναι Βακχυλίδης ἔλοιτο ἢ Πίνδαρος, καὶ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ Ἴων ὁ Χίος ἢ νῆ Δία Σοφοκλῆς; ἐπεὶ οἱ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντῃ κεκαλλιγραφημένοι, ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὅτε μὲν οἷον πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, σβέννυνται δ' ἀλόγως πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀτυχέστατα. ἢ οὐδεὶς ἂν εὖ φρονῶν ἐνός δράματος, τοῦ Οἰδίποδος, εἰς ταῦτ' οὐ συνθεῖς τὰ Ἴωνος <πάντ'> ἀντιτιμήσαιο ἑξῆς ("Apollonius, for instance, is an impeccable poet in the *Argonautica*, and Theocritus – except in a few extraneous matters – is supremely successful in his pastorals. Yet would you not rather be Homer than Apollonius? And what of Eratosthenes in his *Erigone*? 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 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 rather than Sophocles? In both pairs the first named is impeccable (ἀδιάπτωτος) 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").

accounts.⁸⁹ Heinsius' omission of the poets Ion and Bacchylides from the selection moreover results in a selection with a distinct temporal division: the archaic and classical poets Homer, Archilochus, Pindar, and Sophocles are contrasted with the Hellenistic poets (and scholars) Eratosthenes, Apollonius and Callimachus. This division corresponds to Heinsius' argument that the first, pristine poetry is better than its later derivatives.⁹⁰

Heinsius continues his defence of the flaws of genius by discussing the pernicious effects of rules and precepts:

Atqui sicut in proelio non minus laudem consequitur, qui pro patria cadit, quam qui salvus evadit; contra vero ignavissimus habetur, quem superstitem metus fecit: ita ne vitio quidem poetae dignus est Grammaticus, quem pessundat ubique putida praeceptorum observatio. Sicut arcae illae in quibus Nanos, et Pygmaeos suos reges nutriunt non modo corporum eorum incrementis obesse solent, sed et ipsa membra in arctum cogunt: tale revera animal est Grammaticus, cum maxime sibi in arte sua arridet. Poeta cum periculo audet aliquid, καὶ τολμηρόν τι χοῦμά ἐστι, καὶ αὐτῆς της Σπάρτης ἐλευθερώτερον. Itaque ut veteres dicendi magistri servum ad omnia idoneum esse dicunt, praeterquam ut Rhetor sit, ita et nos negamus Grammaticum poetam esse. Sed enimvero fleant Grammatici, nos cum Pindaro exclamemus, τὸ φυᾷ πᾶν ἐπιπρέπει.⁹¹

⁸⁹ That Heinsius was to publish a new edition of Theocritus in 1604, may also have contributed to his exclusion of the author from his account of infallible but mediocre writers. Heinsius' fondness for the Greek author Theocritus is moreover reflected by the pseudonym that Heinsius used in his collection of love emblems: Theocritus à Ganda ('from Ghent'). The Greek name 'Theocritus' can be interpreted as a translation of the Hebrew name 'Daniel' ('God is my judge'). See B. Becker-Cantarino, *Daniel Heinsius* (Boston: Twayne publishers, 1978), 57 and Wesseling (2011), 242n.60.

⁹⁰ The contrast of 'Classical vs. Hellenistic' already lurks behind Longinus' comparisons. According to Fantuzzi and Hunter "'Longinus' too treats Ion and Bacchylides as 'Hellenistic poets' *avant la lettre* [...]" (Fantuzzi and Hunter, 2004, 446). Modern scholars have wondered why Longinus did not mention Callimachus at this point, since he reacts to a distinctly 'Callimachean' ideal. We may consider Heinsius' inclusion of Callimachus in this context to be precursor of the modern interpretation of this passage. See for instance R. Hunter, *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception. Part 1: Hellenistic Poetry and its Reception* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 549-556 on this question.

⁹¹ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascraei opera quae extant* (1603), 'In Hesiodum Prolegomena', β1v.

And as if one who dies for his country in a battle would be praised no less than who escapes unharmed; on the contrary, we deem most cowardly, whom fear has made a survivor: therefore a grammarian, whom the exorbitant scrutiny of precepts spoils, is not even worthy of a poet's mistake. Just like those cages, in which kings keep their dwarves and pygmies, not only tend to damage the growth of their bodies, but they also force their very limbs in a narrow space: truly such an animal is the grammarian, especially when he praises himself in his artifice. When a poet dares something to his own risk, "it is a bold thing, and even more free than Sparta herself".⁹² Therefore, just like the ancient masters of rhetoric say that a slave is apt for everything, except for being an orator, so we too deny that a grammarian is a poet. But indeed, let the grammarians weep; and let us exclaim with Pindar: "everything stands out by nature."⁹³

Ingenium, Heinsius argues, is harmed by cautiousness, and grammarians are incapable of making mistakes because they fear to break the rules, even though they have formed these rules themselves. In order to illustrate this, Heinsius adapts the simile of the 'caged pygmies' from chapter 44 of *Peri hypsous*. In this chapter Longinus presents a dialogue between himself and an anonymous philosopher, about the decay of literature.⁹⁴ The philosopher explains the trend of

⁹² The quotation is taken from Maximus of Tyre, *Oration* 20.2: Διόπερ μοι δοκεῖ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις πάννυ τι ἐπιχωριάσαι τὰ τοῦ ἔρωτος. ὅπου γὰρ τὸ μὲν πλῆθος δουλεῦει, τὸ δὲ ἄρχον δεσπόζει, τὸ διὰ μέσου ἐνθὲνδε ἐξήρηται, τὸ ἰσηγορόν τε καὶ ἰσότιμον καὶ ξύννομον. ὁ δὲ ἔρως οὐδενὶ οὕτως πολεμεῖ ὥς ἀνάγκη καὶ δέει, καὶ ἔστιν χροῖμα γαῦρον καὶ δεινῶς ἐλεύθερον καὶ τῆς Σπάρτης αὐτῆς ἐλευθερώτερον. ("It is for this reason, I believe, that true love does not have a proper home among foreigners. Where the mass of the population is enslaved and rule is despotic, all the middle ground where equal rights to speech and status, and sociability, can flourish is removed. Love, on the other hand, has no worse enemy than compulsion and fear; it is a haughty creature and terribly independent, more so indeed even than Sparta herself") (Text: M.B. Trapp, *Maximus Tyrius. Dissertationes*, Stuttgart: Teubner, 1994; translation: M.B. Trapp, *Maximus of Tyre: The Philosophical Orations*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). Heinsius published an edition of Maximus of Tyre in 1607.

⁹³ The quotation is taken from Pindar's *Pythian Ode* 8.44-55: φυᾶ τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει ἐκ πατέρων παισὶ λῆμα. ("By nature the noble resolve from fathers shines forth in their sons") (Translation: Race, 1997).

⁹⁴ See for instance C.P. Segal, "Ὑψος and the Problem of Cultural Decline in the *De sublimitate*", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64 (1959), 121-146, J. Bause, 'Περὶ ὕψους, Kapitel 44', *Rheinisches Museum*

decadence by pointing at the current repressive regime, which poses an impediment to the development of free spirits, just like cages stunt the growth of pygmies and dwarfs.⁹⁵

Hadrianus Junius, whose work was well known to Daniel Heinsius, had already discussed Longinus' simile of the caged pygmies in his *Adagia* (1558), as well as in his *Emblemata* (1565), thereby drawing particular attention to this section of Longinus' treatise.⁹⁶ In the *Adagia*, Junius included the proverb *animae scrinium servitus*, which translates a phrase in *Peri hypsous* 44.5: ψυχῆς γλωττόκομον δουλεία ("slavery is a cage for the soul").⁹⁷ Junius paraphrases and discusses the passage at length, explaining Longinus' argument that liberty is a prerequisite for eloquence, and discussing the Greek term γλωττόκομον ('cage'; lit. 'tongue-binder').⁹⁸ In his *Emblemata* (1565) Junius connects Longinus' proverb with the adage of the nightingale that does not sing when caged, in a double distich titled *Animi scrinium servitus* ("Slavery is a box for the soul").⁹⁹ Daniel Heinsius was quite

123 (1980), 258-266, T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 66-71, and C.C. de Jonge, 'The Attic muse and the Asian harlot. Classicizing allegories in Dionysius and Longinus', in: J. Ker and C.H. Pieper (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World: Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 388-409, for a discussion of the two positions presented in *Peri hypsous* 44 and their meaning for the understanding of Longinus' treatise.

⁹⁵ *Peri hypsous* 44.4-5: διὰ τοῦτο τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἔξεις καὶ εἰς οἰκέτας πίπτειν ἔφασκε, δοῦλον δὲ μηδένα γίνεσθαι ῥήτορα. [...] ὥσπερ οὖν, εἴ γέ' φησί 'τοῦτο πιστόν ἐστιν ἀκούω, τὰ γλωττόκομα, ἐν οἷς οἱ Πυγμαῖοι καλούμενοι δὲ νᾶνοι τρέφονται, οὐ μόνον καλύει τῶν ἐγκεκλεισμένων τὰς αὐξήσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τσυνάροι διὰ τὸν περικείμενον τοῖς σώμασι δεσμόν, οὕτως ἅπασαν δουλείαν, κὰν ἡ δικαιοσύνη, ψυχῆς γλωττόκομον καὶ κοινὸν ἂν τις ἀποφῆναιτο δεσμοτήριον.' ("This is the reason, he alleged, that while all other faculties are granted even to slaves, no slave ever becomes an orator. [...] 'And so,' he adds, 'if what I hear is true that not only do the 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'").

⁹⁶ Junius, *Adagia* (1558), 800-802; *Emblemata* (1565), 62 and 146-147. On Hadrianus Junius' interest in Longinus see also section 1.4.2 and 1.5.3.

⁹⁷ See Wesseling (2011), 231-233.

⁹⁸ The term γλωττόκομον can refer to the mouthpiece of an aulos-player, but is also used to denote a 'cage' or 'casket'.

⁹⁹ Junius, *Emblemata* (1565), 62 (emblem no. 56): *Luscinia veris nuncia / mutescit inclusa caveae: / est servitus scrinium animi / linguamque vinco praepedit.* ("A nightingale, harbinger of spring, / falls silent when caught in a cage. / Slavery is a box for the soul, / it binds and obstructs the tongue."). Junius explains

familiar with Junius' emblems, as he studied them for his own collection of love emblems (*Quaeris quid sit amor?*) of 1601, and several of Heinsius' emblems are derived from Junius' collection.¹⁰⁰ Just like Junius had incorporated Longinus' simile of the caged pygmies in his *Adagia* and *Emblemata*, Heinsius exploited the passage in his *Prolegomena*.

Heinsius' phrasing *sicut arcae [...] cogunt* is an almost literal translation of the passage in *Peri hypsous* 44.5. Whereas *Peri hypsous* however presents this image to illustrate the detrimental effect of a political regime, Heinsius uses it to describe the harmful effects of strict rules on poetic production.¹⁰¹ Underlying both Longinus' and Heinsius' use of the metaphor however is the idea of an idealised past versus a later, deteriorated period. The anonymous philosopher states how truly great minds are no more to be found¹⁰², whereas Heinsius (as is clear from the opening sections of the *Prolegomena*) describes how the genuine simplicity of Hesiod and Homer has vanished. Heinsius' adaptation of Longinus' image of the 'caged genius' as well as his comparison of archaic and classical authors to later, Hellenistic authors (as I have shown above), both serve to support Heinsius' representation of the development of poetry as regressive, *contra* Scaliger, who had envisioned it as a cyclical process.

2.7 The corruption of simplicity

Perhaps the most striking adaptation of terminology and ideas from Longinus' treatise is found in Heinsius' description of simplicity as the greatest virtue of literature:

Simplicitas est quam in his veneramur, simplicitas est quam suspicimus,
simplicitas est quam omnibus dicendi figuris opponimus, καὶ ἡ καθαρότης.
Ex quo enim Sophistica illa καινοσπουδία genuinam simplicitatem invasit,

the adage in the notes on p. 146-147 of his book. See Wesseling (2011), 231-233 for a discussion of Junius' conflation of these two *adagia*.

¹⁰⁰ D. Heinsius, *Quaeris quid sit amor?* (Amsterdam: H. De Buck, 1601). See Wesseling (2011), 241-243.

¹⁰¹ The victim of these rules is the grammarian, whose *ingenium* is stunted in its development and hence cannot rise up to talent of a poet.

¹⁰² *Peri hypsous* 44.1.

secutum est in sublimi dicendi genere τὸ μειρακιῶδες, vitium ridiculum, & τὸ κορυβαντιῶδες: τὸ μικροχαρὲς denique τῶν νοήσεων, & τὸ πεποιημένον: in humili τὸ ψυχρὸν, et similia.¹⁰³

Simplicity is what we revere in these [writings], simplicity is what we admire, simplicity – and “purity” – is what we place against all figures of speech. For ever since that sophistic “strive for novelty” has attacked genuine simplicity, “puerility” has followed in the sublime style of writing, a ridiculous fault, and “a wild frenzy”: eventually “pettiness of thoughts” and “contrived expression” [have followed]: in the low [style of writing] “frigidity” is produced, and similar things.

In this passage, which follows right after Heinsius’ discussion of the grammarians’ vicious attacks on Hesiod, simplicity is contrasted with ‘figures of speech’ (*dicendi figurae*), and equated with ‘purity’ (καθαρότης). This genuine simplicity has been attacked by a ‘sophistic strive for novelty of expression’ (*sophistica illa καινοσπουδία*), which produces all kinds of vices.

The Greek terms that Heinsius uses in this passage are a rearrangement of the terminology of stylistic vices used by Longinus in chapters 3-5 of *Peri hypsous*.¹⁰⁴ In the third chapter of *Peri hypsous* Longinus discusses several types of ‘failed sublimity’, among which the faults of ‘tumidity’ and ‘puerility’. While tumidity is an overly inflated form of sublimity, ‘puerility’ (τὸ μειρακιῶδες) is its opposite: ‘mean spirited’ (μικρόψυχος), a ‘studied fabrication’ (σχολαστική νόησις), which leads to ‘frigidity’ (ψυχρότης; ‘coldness’ or ‘aridity’), and which is caused by an attempt to be ‘exquisite’ (πεποιημένος).¹⁰⁵ In *Peri hypsous* 4, Longinus discusses

¹⁰³ Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascraei opera quae extant* (1603), ‘In Hesiodum Prolegomena’, β1^ε.

¹⁰⁴ The correspondences with *Peri hypsous* 3-5 have also been suggested by Meter (1984). 77.

¹⁰⁵ *Peri hypsous* 3.4: ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν οἶδὺν ὑπεραίρειν βούλεται τὰ ὕψη, τὸ δὲ μειρακιῶδες ἀντικρὺς ὑπεναντίον τοῖς μεγέθεσι ταπεινὸν γὰρ ἐξ ὅλου καὶ μικρόψυχον καὶ τῷ ὄντι κακὸν ἀγεννέστατον. τί ποτ’ οὖν τὸ μειρακιῶδες ἐστίν; ἡ δὴλον ὡς σχολαστικὴ νόησις, ὑπὸ περιεργασίας λήγουσα εἰς ψυχρότητα; ὀλισθαίνουσι δ’ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ γένος ὀρεγόμενοι μὲν τοῦ περιττοῦ καὶ πεποιημένου καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ ἡδέος, ἐξοκέλλοντες δὲ εἰς τὸ ῥωπικόν καὶ κακόζηλον (“But, while tumidity seeks to outdo the sublime, puerility (τὸ μειρακιῶδες) is the exact opposite of grandeur; utterly abject, mean spirited (μικρόψυχος), and in fact the most ignoble of faults. What then is puerility (τὸ μειρακιῶδες)? Is it not obviously an idea born in the classroom (σχολαστικὴ νόησις), whose overelaboration ends in

examples of ‘frigidity’ (το ψυχρόν) in Timaeus, who is keen on criticising others, though he himself lacks stylistic sense.¹⁰⁶ Not only Timaeus, but also the ‘demi-gods’ Xenophon and Plato occasionally lapse into ‘fondness for cheap effects’ (τὰ μικροχαρῆ).¹⁰⁷ The fifth chapter of *Peri hypsous* marks the end of the discussion of failed sublimity and explains the common origin of all the vices described in chapters 3 and 4: that ‘passion for novelty of thought’ (τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόςπουδον), which people nowadays ‘are so crazy about’ (κορυβαντιῶσιν).¹⁰⁸

Longinus and Heinsius describe a similar process: a ‘strive for novelty’ (το καινόςπουδον or καινοσπουδία) results in stylistic vices, such as ‘puerility’ (το μειρακιῶδες) and ‘frigidity’ (το ψυχρόν). Whereas Longinus however presents these faults as failed attempts at sublimity, for Heinsius they spring from the corruption of *simplicity*. As such, Heinsius’ incorporation of Longinus’ terminology serves the greater scheme of the *Prolegomena*: to rewrite the history of the

frigid failure (ψυχρότης)? Writers fall into this fault through trying to be uncommon and exquisite (πεποιημένος), and above all to please, and founder instead upon the rock of cheap affectation”).

¹⁰⁶ *Peri hypsous* 4.1: Θατέρου δὲ ὧν εἶπομεν, λέγω δὲ τοῦ ψυχροῦ, πλήρης ὁ Τίμαιος, ἀνὴρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἱκανὸς καὶ πρὸς λόγων ἐνίστε μέγεθος οὐκ ἄφορος, πολυῖστωρ, ἐπινοητικός, πλὴν ἁλλοτριῶν μὲν ἐλεγκτικώτατος ἀμαρτημάτων ἀνεπαίσθητος δὲ ἰδίων, ὑπὸ δὲ ἔρωτος τοῦ ξένας νοήσεις ἀεὶ κινεῖν πολλάκις ἐκπίπτων εἰς τὸ παιδαριωδέστατον (“The second fault of which we spoke above is frigidity (τὸ ψυχρόν), 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 other’s 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”).

¹⁰⁷ *Peri hypsous* 4.4: <καὶ> τί δεῖ περὶ Τιμαίου λέγειν, ὅπου γε καὶ οἱ ἥρωες ἐκεῖνοι, Ξενοφῶντα λέγω καὶ Πλάτωνα, καίτοιγε ἐκ τῆς Σωκράτους ὄντες παλαίστρας, ὅμως διὰ τὰ οὕτως μικροχαρῆ ποτε ἑαυτῶν ἐπιλανθάνονται; (“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 (τὰ μικροχαρῆ)?”

¹⁰⁸ *Peri hypsous* 5: Ἀπαντα μέντοι τὰ οὕτως ἄσεμνα διὰ μίαν ἐμφύεται τοῖς λόγοις αἰτίαν, διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόςπουδον, περὶ ὃ δὴ μάλιστα κορυβαντιῶσιν οἱ νῦν· ἀφ’ ὧν γὰρ ἡμῖν τὰγαθὰ, σχεδὸν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τούτων καὶ τὰ κακὰ γεννᾶσθαι φιλεῖ. ὁθεν, ἐπεὶ φορὸν εἰς συνταγμάτων κατόρθωσιν τὰ τε κάλλη τῆς ἐρμηνείας καὶ τὰ ὕψη καὶ πρὸς τούτοις αἱ ἡδοναί, καὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα, καθάπερ τῆς ἐπιτυχίας, οὕτως ἀρχαὶ καὶ ὑποθέσεις καὶ τῶν ἐναντιῶν καθίστανται (“However, all these lapses from dignity in literature spring from the same cause, namely that passion for novelty of thought (τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόςπουδον) which people nowadays are so crazy about (κορυβαντιῶσιν). 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”).

development of poetry and to present Hesiod's (and Homer's) simplicity as the highest poetical virtue. The invasion of simplicity by 'striving for novelty' is then to be interpreted as the corruption of poetic style after Hesiod and Homer, which resulted in the artificial approach to poetry of later poets and critics (or poet-critics), such as the Hellenistic poets Callimachus, Apollonius and Eratosthenes, but also (by implication) the Homeric imitator Vergil, Scaliger's champion. Interestingly, Heinsius discerns a dual development: the corruption of simplicity by 'strive for novelty' leads to 'puerility' and other vices in the 'elevated style' (*in sublimi genere dicendi*), whereas in the 'low [style]' (*in humili [genere dicendi]*) it leads to 'frigidity'. The implication is that 'simplicity' can be a characteristic of the high style as well as the low style in writing. It appears that for Heinsius at this point 'simplicity' is not the same as the 'low style' in rhetorical theory, but rather an absence of artificial contrivances – the opposite of 'figures of speech'.¹⁰⁹

Heinsius' interpretation of Longinus' words as an outright rejection of figures of speech can be explained from a textual variant that is present in the editions of Manuzio and Portus. In *Peri hypsous* 3.4, where Longinus discusses 'puerility' (το μειρακιῶδες), Manuzio and Portus read τροπικόν ('figurative') as a correction of the nonsensical manuscript reading τὸ ῥωπικόν ('inclined'): "Writers fall into this fault through trying to be uncommon and exquisite, and above all to please, and instead drift into figurative speech (τροπικόν) and bad taste." In this context the reading τροπικόν ('figurative') would implicate that there is a direct link between 'figurative speech' and the stylistic vice of 'puerility'.¹¹⁰ In his argument, possibly motivated by a textual variant, Heinsius thus redefines simplicity from being an insult ('crude, unrefined') into a virtue that trumps stylistic devices.

2.8 The defence of the poet in context

Heinsius' adaptation of Longinus' ideas in his *Prolegomena* constitutes a remarkable and original response to *Peri hypsous* in the context of the late

¹⁰⁹ *Peri hypsous* 3.4: ὀλισθαίνουσι δ' εἰς τοῦτο τὸ γένος ὀρεγόμενοι μὲν τοῦ περιττοῦ καὶ πεποιημένου καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ ἡδέος, ἐξοκέλλοντες δὲ εἰς τὸ ῥωπικόν καὶ κακόζηλον.

¹¹⁰ Since the edition of Tollius (1694) most editions have τὸ ῥωπικόν: "Writers 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 (τὸ ῥωπικόν)". See also section 5.3.3 on this emendation in Tollius' edition.

sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century reception of the treatise. Heinsius was not, unlike many of his contemporaries, interested in the fragments preserved in the treatise, but instead used Longinus' ideas on artistic freedom and literary judgment to make a radical point about the appreciation of archaic Greek poetry. In the final section of this chapter I will contextualise Heinsius' use of Longinus' ideas by highlighting some other contexts in which these particular aspects of Longinus' treatise drew the attention of early modern scholars, especially in the first half of the seventeenth century.

A particularly relevant example is found in Daniel Heinsius' *De Tragoediae Constitutione* (1611). Heinsius reiterates his arguments from the *Prolegomena* in a slightly different form in his chapter on diction, or expression (*dictio, sive elocutio*).¹¹¹ When discussing the proper use of metaphors, Heinsius elaborates on a statement from Aristotle's *Poetics*:

Sicut autem recte ac feliciter transferre felicitis, ut praeclare dictum Philosopho, nec mediocris iudicium naturae est, ita et translationes, cui sint peculiare elocutioni, ut oportet, iudicare, non cuiusvis est. (...) Plurimum a Pindaro desumam, quaedam ejus sapienter vitem, ac praesertim quae ad dithyrambum, sive vocum compositione sive audacia translationum proxime accedunt. Ne dum gravitatem aut sublimitatem nimiam affectem, neque illam assequar, et in tumorem alibi incurram.¹¹²

But just as to hit on good and lucky metaphors is, as was very well said by the Philosopher [Aristotle], a sign of a luckily gifted, not an ordinary, nature, so properly to judge of the metaphors that are peculiar to this sort of expression does not fall to the lot of everyone. (...) I should borrow many [metaphors] from Pindar, but would be wise to avoid some of his, and especially those that (whether through combination of words or boldness of metaphors) come as close as possible to the dithyramb, lest while affecting

¹¹¹ Heinsius, *De Tragoediae constitutione* (1611), ch. 16; A. Duprat (ed.), *De constitutione tragoediae: La constitution de la tragédie, dite La poétique d'Heinsius* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2001), 292-337.

¹¹² Text: Duprat (2001), 310.

high seriousness or exceeding sublimity, I fail to attain it and fall into swelling in other respects.¹¹³

Heinsius discusses Aristotle's remark that the proper use of metaphors is a matter of natural giftedness (εὐφυΐα).¹¹⁴ His subsequent advice on the moderate use of metaphors touches upon a matter that Heinsius also addressed in the *Prolegomena*, and which is ultimately derived from *Peri hypsous*: extravagant figures of speech may result in 'swelling' (*tumor*).¹¹⁵ Heinsius then proceeds with a defence of excessive metaphors and faults in the writings of the ancient authors.¹¹⁶

A quo vitio plerunque triviales absunt animae, quales apud Graecos Eratosthenes et Ion memorantur, quorum scripta, quia extra reprehensionem, intra mediocritatis laudem stare putabantur; pulchrae autem ac excelsae vix hoc evitant, et plerunque amant, animae. Ne Homerum quidem veteres excipiunt, aut Sophoclem. Quorum utrunque generose et ut Phaetontem e coelo labi ajunt. Cum in terra caeteri subsistant.¹¹⁷

Ordinary spirits are generally free of this vice. Among the Greeks, Eratosthenes and Ion are spoken of as being of this sort – their writings were thought to earn mean praise because they deserved no censure. Beautiful

¹¹³ Translation (slightly adapted): P.R. Sellin and J. McManmon (trans.), *Heinsius, On Plot in Tragedy* (Northridge, California: State University Northridge, 1971), 121.

¹¹⁴ Aristotle, *Poetics* 1459a: διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις ποιεῖ τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ἐν τῇ λέξει ἅπαντα τὰ τοιαῦτα· ἐκεῖνος δὲ τοῦτο ἡγνόμενός ἐστιν. ἔστιν δὲ μέγα μὲν τὸ ἐκάστῳ τῶν εἰρημένων πρεπόντως χρῆσθαι, καὶ διπλοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ γλώτταις, πολὺ δὲ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν εἶναι. μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο οὐτε παρ' ἄλλου ἔστι λαβεῖν εὐφυΐας τε σημείον· ἐστὶ τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἔστιν ("Because absent from standard speech, all such expressions make an out-of-the-ordinary impression; but Aiphrades 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") (Translation: Halliwell, 1999).

¹¹⁵ See also *Peri hypsous* 3.4 and my section 2.7.

¹¹⁶ This ties in with Longinus' discussion of the excessive metaphors used by Plato (*Peri hypsous* 32), and his subsequent defence of the flawed genius in *Peri hypsous* 33.

¹¹⁷ Duprat (2001), 310 (DTC 16).

and lofty spirits, on the other hand, scarcely avoid this, and for the most part are fond of it. Indeed, the ancients make no exception of Homer or Sophocles, both of whom, they say, fall from the vault of heaven in a noble fashion like Phaethon, whereas all the rest tarry on earth.¹¹⁸

Heinsius' defence is derived from Longinus' argument that avoiding mistakes leads to mediocrity, while lofty spirits are noble in their errors, and includes two of Longinus' examples of faultless writers (Eratosthenes and Ion). This reference to *Peri hypsous* 33.4-5 corresponds to Heinsius' argument in *Prolegomena* β1^r- β1^v.¹¹⁹ In this particular passage of *DTC* Heinsius moreover compares the authors Homer and Sophocles to the mythical figure of Phaethon, whose dangerous ride in Helios' chariot becomes a metaphor for the risks associated with striving for sublimity in writing, an insight that also underlies Longinus' own discussion of Euripides' tragedy *Phaethon* in *Peri hypsous* 15.4.¹²⁰ Heinsius expands his argument with an example of a faulty, yet sublime writer: Pindar.

A quibus diversissimus, si quisquam, Pindarus, qui cum non incedat sed feratur, non offendit alibi, ut alii, sed cadit. Ut praeclare, si quis veterum, Longinus, cujus de sublimitate scriptum Tragico poetae ediscendum putem. (...) Nam et generosum spiritus immensi impetum, et sublimitatem majorem usitata, et in verbis copiam, et in sermone toto suppeditat splendorem.¹²¹

Pindar, if anyone, is very different from those [on the earth]. Since he marches with no stately gait but is borne aloft, he does not blunder elsewhere like other poets, but yet he falls, as Longinus (if any among the ancients) very well observes – whose treatise *On Sublimity* I consider necessary for the tragic poet to have by memory. (...) He affords the noble

¹¹⁸ Sellin and McManmon (1971), 121-122.

¹¹⁹ See section 2.6.

¹²⁰ Porter (2016), 344-345. In the context of the *De tragoediae constitutione* the reference to Euripides' tragedy *Phaethon* moreover gains additional relevance.

¹²¹ Duprat (2001), 310 (*DTC* 16).

vehemence of a boundless spirit, and a loftiness much greater than the ordinary, and richness in words, and magnificence in all speech.¹²²

Heinsius is inspired by Longinus' appraisal of Pindar and Sophocles as poets who "fire the whole landscape as they sweep across it, though often their fire is unaccountably quenched and they fall miserably flat" (*Peri hypsous* 33.5).¹²³ The metaphor of the sweeping fire caused by Pindar's poetic flow neatly ties in with the image of Phaethon's ride on the sun-chariot that Heinsius adduced earlier. In this passage Heinsius explicitly acknowledges his indebtedness to Longinus' argument and stresses the relevance of *Peri hypsous* for any tragedian. Heinsius' terminology resonates with Longinus' as well as his own words in the *Prolegomena*. Pindar is said to have the 'noble vehemence of a boundless spirit', echoing the importance of *impetus* to the central argument of the *Prolegomena*, as well as Heinsius' remark that Homer errs nobly (*generose peccat*).¹²⁴ The expression 'boundless spirit' may well be a rendering of Longinus' (ὑπερμεγέθεις φύσεις; 'immensely great natures') as for instance in *Peri hypsous* 33.2.¹²⁵

Heinsius' use of the word sublimity (*sublimitas*) highlights a significant difference with his line of reasoning in the *Prolegomena*, and illuminates a crucial aspect of Longinus' argument about the faulty genius. Heinsius used the same arguments from *Peri hypsous* to defend the simplicity of Hesiod's style in the *Prolegomena*, as well as to defend the extravagant metaphors of poets like Pindar in the *DTC*.¹²⁶ In both cases Heinsius' argument is a matter of literary judgment,

¹²² Sellin and McManmon (1971), 122.

¹²³ *Peri hypsous* 33.5: (...) ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὅτε μὲν οἶον πάντα ἐπιπλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, σβέννυνται δ' ἀλόγως πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀτυχέστατα. It is interesting that Heinsius here chooses Pindar rather than Sophocles for illustrating sublime diction in tragedy.

¹²⁴ See also section 2.6.

¹²⁵ Duprat (2001), 310 (*DTC* 16): *nemo enim tam ignavus est ac deses, quem non ille rapiat, inflammet, accendat, semper concitatus, ac plerunque subito, ut, cum minime id expectes, divino quodam motu, coelum non tam petat, quam transcendat*. ("There is no one so sluggish and idle that Pindar does not seize him, inflame him, kindle him; he is always vehement, and for the most part unexpectedly so, with the result that when you least expect it, he not so much reaches for heaven as (with a kind of divine impulse) transcends it") (Sellin and McManmon, 1971, 122).

¹²⁶ Another difference between Heinsius' method in the *Prolegomena* and *DTC* is the fact that in the *Prolegomena* the source of the argument (*Peri hypsous*) is not mentioned explicitly. I would suggest that this difference can be explained from the fact that Heinsius' subject in the *Prolegomena* deviates more

which takes ‘genius’ as its primary criterion and hence allows to be applied to any genre or style. The origin of the separation of the Longinian sublime from the system of the *genera dicendi* may hence be traced as far back as the first decades of the seventeenth century, in Heinsius’ *Prolegomena* and *DTC*.

Outside Heinsius’ works Longinus’ ideas on genius *versus* rules found fertile ground in the works of other early modern scholars as well. Before Heinsius’ *Prolegomena*, the apologetic elements of *Peri hypsous* had been briefly signalled by Vettori (1560) and Caselius (1569).¹²⁷ In his edition of Persius’ *Satires* (1605) Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) defends Persius in a way that is very similar to Heinsius’ defence of Hesiod. In the *Prolegomena* to his edition, Casaubon reacts to the criticism that Persius’ language is overly obscure, and defends the author by referring to Longinus’ condonation of Plato’s harsh and intemperate metaphors.¹²⁸ In the *Prolegomena* to the third book of his *De Respublica Hebraeorum* (1617), Petrus Cunaeus (1586-1638), explains that his work included some criticism of the mistakes and oversights of earlier scholars, whom he nonetheless holds in very high esteem.¹²⁹ Cunaeus pardons his predecessors by adducing Longinus’ point

from Longinus’ treatise, which does not praise Hesiod, nor discuss simplicity. In *DTC* 16 Heinsius discusses the sublimity of Homer, Sophocles and Pindar, all of which belong to Longinus’ canon. A reader of the *Prolegomena*, an essay praising the simplicity of Hesiod, would be surprised to find a reference to a treatise on sublimity, whereas a reader of the *DTC* (as Heinsius suggests), could find in *Peri hypsous* some interesting ideas to supplement his studies of the nature of tragedy.

¹²⁷ Vettori, *Commentarii in I librum Aristotelis de arte poetarum* (Florence: Giunti, 1560), 295 and Caselius (1569), c2^v-c3^r mention that Longinus stated that some passages in Homer can be defended by interpreting them allegorically (cf. *Peri hypsous* 9.7).

¹²⁸ I. Casaubon, *In Persii Satiras liber commentarius* (Paris: A. & H. Drovart, 1605), ‘Prolegomena’, eiv; cf. *Peri hypsous* 32.7. On p. eiv^r of the *Prolegomena*, Casaubon repeats his argument and defends Persius’ obscurity by referring to Longinus’ statement that “figurative writing has a natural grandeur and that metaphors make for sublimity: also that emotional and descriptive passages are most glad of them” (*Peri hypsous* 32.6). In the commentary (p. 56-7; 111), Casaubon refers to Longinus’ discussion of stylistic vices (e.g. ‘tumidity’; *Peri hypsous* 3-5), and cites Longinus’ of literary imitation with the inspiration of the Pythian priestess (*Peri hypsous* 13.2). See P.M. Medine, ‘Isaac Casaubon’s *Prolegomena* to the *Satires* of Persius: An Introduction, Text, and Translation,’ *ELR* 6 (1976), 271-277, for a discussion of Casaubon’s *Prolegomena* to Persius.

¹²⁹ Cunaeus, *De Respublica Hebraeorum libri III* (Leiden: L. Elzevier, 1617), 358-359.

that it is sometimes necessary to make mistakes, since avoidance of faults leads to mediocrity.¹³⁰

Another striking case is the polemic exchange between Jean Goulu (1576-1629) and Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac (1597-1654). As Emma Gilby has shown, Goulu adduced *Peri hypsous* in his *Lettres de Phyllarque à Ariste* (1627-1628) in order to criticise Guez de Balzac's stylistic extravagancies.¹³¹ Much like Heinsius, Casaubon and Cunaeus, Goulu used *Peri hypsous* to make an argument about what should be

¹³⁰ Cunaeus (1617), 359-361: *Hallucinamur omnes, alij gravia, alij leviora. Nec est quisquam, qui tam bene animum suum disciplinis obfirmavit, ut nihil fugere eum possit amplius, aut fallere. Adde quod interdum vitij loco est, nusquam peccavisse. Quod de Apollonio Rhodio Dionysius Longinus pronuntiavit, cum significare vellet artem et diligentiam in eo summam fuisse, at ingenij vim negatam illi esse. Spernit anxiam curam animus, simulac illum implevit rei majestas. Miserum est ferme et jejunum, quicquid ab illis speratur, qui sese intra limitas quosdam et praescripta spatia claudunt: qui sensa sua torquent, et de singulis rebus in consilium eunt: quorum hic exitus est, ut, quum toto anno, per omnes dies, magno molimine unum librum extuderint, vitavisse potius reprehensionem, quam meruisse laudem videantur. Quare idem ille acerrimi vir judicij Longinus maximos homines ab omni aevo, cum luculentissima quaeque dicerent scriberentque, errores interdum in minimis usque adeo non effugisse ait, uti in quosdam etiam sponte delati sint. Nimis angusta res est, non errare. Quod cui contigit, is sollicite quidem cuncta ad normam exegit, sed tamen extra culpam duntaxat est. At vero, qui per generosos lapsus omnia soluto impetu pervadit, hic et hominem esse se, cadendo docet, et, quia nihil mediocre concupiscit, proximus tenenti summa est. Est aliqua laus, magnis excidisse ausubus.* ("We all make mistakes, some bigger, others smaller. And there is no one, who has strengthened his mind through studies to such an extent, that nothing could escape or deceive him. Add to this a phenomenon that sometimes takes the place of faults: to never make mistakes. This is what Dionysius Longinus said about Apollonius Rhodius, when he wanted to explain that this writer's art and diligence are excellent, while he lacks the power of natural talent. When the mind despises anxious care, the greatness of the subject matter fills it up completely. It is quite miserable and poor, whatever is expected from those, who keep between the lines and limit themselves to prescribed spaces. They twist and turn their ideas and overthink every detail: as a result it seems that they, having finished one book with immense effort after working on it every single day for a whole year, rather would escape censure than earn praise. For this reason that same sharp-witted critic Longinus explained that great men from every era, in composing and writing their most excellent works, sometimes hardly avoided mistakes, or even not at all, so that they end up making mistakes spontaneously. It is a very stifling matter, not making mistakes. Someone who is subject to this fate may execute everything according to the rules, but he is blameless only in this respect. On the other hand, who pervades everything with unimpeded vigour through noble faults, proves he is human in making mistakes, and, because he strives for nothing mediocre, is closest to the one who attains the highest glory. It is an honour to fall from a great undertaking").

¹³¹ J. Goulu, *Lettres de Phyllarque à Ariste. Où il est traité de la vraye & de la bonne Eloquence, contre la fausse & la mauvaise du Sieur de Balzac* (Paris: N. Buon, 1627 and 1628). See Gilby (2016). Goulu especially used Longinus' criticism of stylistic faults in *Peri hypsous* 3.

considered an acceptable transgression of certain norms, but instead of defending Balzac, Goulu used Longinus to demonstrate precisely where Balzac had crossed the line. Furthermore, Leone Allacci (c. 1586-1669) made Longinus' discussion of the faulty genius a central theme of his *De erroribus magnorum virorum in dicendo* (1635). In the dedication of his work, Allacci explains that he has become fascinated by the idea of a faulty sublime and faultless mediocrity.¹³² Longinus' allowance of faults is moreover adduced by Franciscus Junius in his *De pictura veterum* (1637) (as will also be discussed in chapter 4), when he explains how 'negligence' may actually enhance an artwork's charm.¹³³

In the late seventeenth century Longinus' treatise was used once more to subvert stylistic criticism and defend artistic freedom. John Dryden, for instance, adduced Longinus' arguments to defend Milton (among others) in his *Apology for Heroique Poetry and Poetic Licence* (1677).¹³⁴ Jacobus Tollius, who made the first edition of Longinus' treatise in the Low Countries, compared various ancient authors to the end of proving the superiority of certain (earlier, Greek) authors over other (later, Roman) authors in his *Animadversionum criticarum ad Longinum Gustus* (1677).¹³⁵ Nicholas Boileau defended Pindar from the criticism of Charles Perrault in his *Réflexions critiques sur quelques passages du Rhéteur Longin* (1694). Samuel Cobb referred to Longinus' defence of Homer in his *On Liberty in writing* (1707).¹³⁶ Alexander Pope moreover included Longinus' rejection of flawless mediocrity in his *Essay on Criticism* (1711).

¹³² Allacci, referring to *Peri hypsous* 33.2, calls it *quaestio de oratione sublimi, nonnumquam tamen errante, et de mediocri, quae nullas labe haberet, sed splenderet ἀναμάτητος* ("the question of the sublime style, which is nonetheless sometimes faulty, and the mediocre style, which is faultless, but shines unerring") (L. Allacci, *De erroribus magnorum virorum in dicendo*, Rome: Mascardi, 1635, p. 2). On Allacci and Longinus, see M. Fumaroli, 'Crépuscule del l'enthousiasme au XVIIe siècle', in: J.-C. Margolin (ed.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Turonensis. III^e Congrès international d'Etudes Néolatines, Tours 1976* (Paris: Vrin, 1980), 1279-1305 and Fumaroli (1986), 33-51 (esp. 39-40).

¹³³ Junius, *De Pictura Veterum* (1637), 120 (section 2.11.7). See Nativel (2016), 263-279 and Chapter Four.

¹³⁴ Dryden's apology appeared as a preface to *The State of Innocence and the Fall of Man: an Opera* (London: printed by T.N. for Henry Herringman, 1677), a stage adaptation of Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

¹³⁵ Tollius, *Animadversionum criticarum ad Longinum Gustus* (1677), published as an appendix to an edition of Cicero's *Pro Archia*. See Chapter Five for a discussion of Tollius' work on *Peri hypsous*.

¹³⁶ Cobb's *On Liberty in writing* appeared in *A Collection of Poems on Several Occasions* (London: printed for R. and J. Bonwick, 1707).

The recurring use of this particular motive from *Peri hypsous* may indicate some indebtedness of one scholar to another. In the case of Dryden, Cobb and Pope we may trace their interest in these elements of Longinus' treatise back to Boileau, whose translation of and observations on *Peri hypsous* made the treatise widely known among English critics.¹³⁷ It is unlikely that Heinsius' use of Longinus in the *Prolegomena* of 1603 exerted great influence on later interpretations of *Peri hypsous*. The treatise or its author are not mentioned explicitly, and the *Prolegomena*, as part of an edition of Hesiod's complete works, probably had a fairly limited audience. This may have been different in the case of Heinsius' *De tragoediae constitutione* (first ed. 1611), which was quite influential in seventeenth-century poetics.¹³⁸ Particularly interesting moreover are Heinsius' direct connections to Isaac Casaubon and Petrus Cunaeus, and his more indirect connections to Jean Goulu and Franciscus Junius. In the early seventeenth century Heinsius actively corresponded with Casaubon.¹³⁹ Heinsius and Cunaeus both worked in Leiden on the *Dionysiaca* of the late-antique Greek author Nonnus.¹⁴⁰ In his *Lettres de Phyllarque à Ariste* (1627-1628), which made use of *Peri hypsous*, Jean Goulu polemicised against Jean Louis Guez de Balzac, who had in turn studied under Heinsius in Leiden.¹⁴¹ Franciscus Junius F.F. moreover studied at Leiden University from 1608 onwards, while Heinsius held the chairs of poetry and Greek.¹⁴² Even if

¹³⁷ See Clark (1925) and Monk (1935).

¹³⁸ See for instance E. Kern, *The Influence of Heinsius and Vossius upon French Dramatic Theory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949) and P.R. Sellin, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden: Oxford and Leiden University Presses, 1968).

¹³⁹ Meter (1984), 23-24.

¹⁴⁰ Cunaeus' and Heinsius' observations to the *Dionysiaca* were published in *Nonni Panopolitae Dionysiaca. Petri Cunaei Animadversionum liber. Danielis Heinsii Dissertatio de Nonni Dionysiacis et ejusdem Paraphrasi. Josephi Scaligeri Coniectanea* (Hanau: C. de Marne and heirs of J. Aubry, 1610). See also W.G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek, 'Petrus Cunaeus' in: J. Bloemendal en C. Heesakkers, eds., *Bio-bibliografie van Nederlandse Humanisten. Digitale uitgave DWC/Huygens Instituut KNAW* (Den Haag 2009). www.dwc.huygensinstituut.nl.

¹⁴¹ In the 1630s Guez de Balzac however ended up in a heated literary dispute with his former teacher. See M. Somos, *Secularisation and the Leiden Circle* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 143-148.

¹⁴² See C. Nativel (ed.), *Franciscus Junius, De pictura veterum: édition du livre I* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1996), 33-38, C.S.M. Rademaker, 'Young Franciscus Junius: 1591-1621', in: R.H. Bremmer (ed.), *Franciscus Junius F. F. and his circle* (Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998), 1-18 and section 4.2 on Junius' early education.

Casaubon, Cunaeus, Goulou, and Junius do not owe their knowledge of this particular part of *Peri hypsous* directly to Heinsius, we may conclude that they were dealing with similar or common issues, to which a creative adaptation of *Peri hypsous* could provide an answer.

2.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that *Peri hypsous* allows for a ‘subversive’ as well as a more traditional, rhetorical reading. By advocating, on the basis of Longinus’ treatise, a quality of literature that cannot be measured or judged according to technical rules, and which takes ‘genius’ as one of its primary criteria, Daniel Heinsius exploited the treatise’s potential to subvert traditional norms of literary criticism, allowing for a highly subjective judgment of (ancient) literature. The same line of reasoning is moreover found in the works of numerous other seventeenth-century scholars. The fairly widespread reception of Longinus’ argument on artistic freedom and literary judgment in the first half of the seventeenth century calls for a reconsideration of the idea that a ‘subversive’ interpretation of *Peri hypsous* was possible only after Boileau had expressed his views on the nature of the Longinian sublime. Numerous scholars before 1674 exploited Longinus’ rebuttal of Caecilius’ criticism in various contexts. A common characteristic of these responses is the fact that almost all of them used Longinus’ arguments to prove a certain point about the proper way to judge literature, and to ward off criticism. Their use of *Peri hypsous* is in the first place utilitarian and opportunistic: they applied its arguments to whatever purpose they were serving at the moment, be it rebuking stylistic criticism, arguing *pro* or *contra* a particular literary judgment, or defending the right to make mistakes. In this respect it seems unnecessary to assume a strictly chronological development that culminated in Boileau’s redefinition of the Longinian sublime. The subversive aspects of *Peri hypsous* were noticed long before Boileau, and resulted from the need for an answer to the question what makes ‘great’ literature.

Heinsius connected Longinus’ theories to the idea of ‘simplicity’, even though the treatise itself does not. In order to refute Scaliger’s negative assessment of Homer and Hesiod as ‘simple’ and ‘uncultivated’, Heinsius advanced simplicity as the greatest virtue in writing in the *Prolegomena*. In Chapter Three I will shed light

on the prehistory of the *Querelle du Fiat Lux*, which also revolved around the idea of 'simplicity' in relation to Longinus' treatise, and show how the interpretation of Longinus' reference to Genesis as an example of 'sublime simplicity' was rooted in Dutch biblical scholarship: most notably in the works of Hugo Grotius and, again, of Daniel Heinsius.