



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 FOUR

IMAGINATION, TECHNIQUE AND JUDGMENT

REFERENCES TO *PERI HYPSOUS* IN FRANCISCUS

JUNIUS' *DE PICTURA VETERUM*¹

4.1 Introduction

In the seventeenth-century reception of Longinus' treatise the *De pictura veterum* of Franciscus Junius F.F. (1591-1677) constitutes a compelling case. First published in Latin in 1637, the work was translated by the author into English (*The painting of the Ancients*, 1638), and Dutch (*De Schilder-konst der Oude*, 1641).² In the *De pictura veterum* (DPV) Franciscus Junius discusses the nature (book I), development (book II) and basic principles (book III) of the visual arts, by bringing together a wealth of citations from a variety of sources.³ Since extensive discussions of the visual arts are relatively scarce in ancient literature, Junius also draws heavily on ancient poetics and rhetorical works. The *De pictura veterum* includes material from sources

¹ Parts of this chapter (especially from sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.6) have been published as W.L. Jansen, 'Translations of Longinus' sublime terminology in Franciscus Junius' *De pictura veterum*', in: M.-C. Heck (ed.), *Des mots pour la théorie, des mots pour la pratique. Lexicographie artistique: formes, usages et enjeux dans l'Europe moderne* (Montpellier: PULM, 2018), 387-400.

² *De pictura veterum libri tres* (Amsterdam: J. Blaeu, 1637); *The painting of the ancients, in three bookes: declaring by historicall observations and examples, the beginning, progresse, and consummation of that most noble art, and how those ancient artificers attained to their still so much admired excellencie* (London: R. Hodgkinsonne, 1638); *De Schilder-konst der Oude, begrepen in drie boecken* (Middelburg: Z. Roman, 1641).

³ See C. Nativel, 'Franciscus Junius et le *De pictura veterum*', *XVIIe siècle* 35 (1983), 7-30 for a concise discussion of the contents of the *De pictura veterum*.

that contain technical discussions or descriptions of artworks, such as Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*, Vitruvius' *De architectura*, and the *Eikones* of Philostratus the Elder and the Younger, but also extensively builds on the rhetorical theories of Quintilian and Cicero – which in fact constitute the lion's share of citations in the *De pictura veterum* – as well as the *Poetics* of Aristotle and Horace's *Ars Poetica*.⁴

Longinus' treatise is mentioned quite frequently throughout the *De pictura veterum*, and with about thirty explicit references *Peri hypsous* constitutes an substantial part of Junius' argument.⁵ The role of *Peri hypsous* in Junius' theory of the visual arts has received quite some attention in modern scholarship, most importantly in the work of Colette Nativel. Her edition of the first book of the *De pictura veterum*, as well as several articles on Junius' readings of Longinus in the *De pictura veterum*, have already demonstrated the significance of *Peri hypsous* for various aspects of Junius' argument.⁶ Nativel has for instance shown that Junius

⁴ See for instance K. Aldrich, P. Fehl and R. Fehl (eds.), *Franciscus Junius, The Literature of Classical Art: The Painting of the Ancients (De pictura veterum) and a Lexicon of Artists and their Works (Catalogus Architectorum...)*, 2 Vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), lxiv; Nativel (1983) and C. Nativel 'Peinture, rhétorique et philosophie: la lecture de Cicéron dans le *De pictura veterum* de Franciscus Junius', *Revue des Etudes latines* 70 (1992b), 245-261 on the role of Cicero in the *De pictura veterum*. See C. Nativel, 'Quelques sources antiques du *De Pictura Veterum* de Franciscus Junius', *De zeventiende eeuw* 5 (1989), 33-49; C. Nativel, 'Partes orationis et partes pingendi: rhétorique antique et peinture au XVIIe siècle dans le *De Pictura Veterum* de Franciscus Junius', in: Dalzell, A., Fantazzi, C., and Schoeck, R.J. (eds.), *Acta conventus neo-latini Torontonensis. Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1991a), 529-538 and C. Nativel, 'Rhétorique, poétique, théorie de l'art au XVIIe siècle: Marino et Junius', *Rhetorica* 9.4 (1991b), 341-369 on several rhetorical sources of the *De pictura veterum*. See also C. Nativel, 'Neo-Latin and the Plastic Arts in Northern Europe', in: P. Ford, J. Bloemendal and C.E. Fantazzi, *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 559-572 and Nativel (2016), 263-265.

⁵ See appendix 3 for an overview of all references to *Peri hypsous* in the *De pictura veterum*.

⁶ A. Ellenius, *De arte pingendi: Latin Art Literature in Seventeenth-Century Sweden and its International Background* (Uppsala/Stockholm: Lychnos-Bibliotek, 1960), 76-78 points out that Junius is probably the first to apply Longinus' ideas to the visual arts. Nativel's article *Le Traité "Du Sublime" et la pensée esthétique anglaise de Junius à Reynolds* (1994) discusses the influence of *Peri hypsous* in Reynolds through Junius' work. Nativel discusses several references and allusions to *Peri hypsous* in her edition of the first book of the *De pictura veterum* (Nativel, 1996). J. Dundas, *Sidney and Junius on Poetry and Painting: From the Margins to the Center* (Cranbury: University of Delaware Press, 2007), 227-233 comments on the role of Longinus' idea of *phantasia* in the *De pictura veterum*. Nativel's article 'Lectures to *Traité du sublime* par Franciscus Junius F.F. (2016) gives a rather comprehensive view of Junius' involvement with *Peri hypsous* in the *De pictura veterum*. Thijs Weststeijn comments on the role of

especially draws on Longinus' ideas about *phantasia* ('imagination') and *ingenium* ('natural talent', 'genius').⁷ Other scholars have recently analysed the influence, through Junius, of Longinus' ideas on sublime experience in seventeenth-century art.⁸ In the present chapter I will give a comprehensive analysis of the references to *Peri hypsous* in Junius' *De pictura veterum* and shed light of aspects of Junius' appropriation of Longinus that have not yet been studied extensively. By examining the appropriation of *Peri hypsous* throughout the *De pictura veterum*, I aim to shed light on three functions that Longinus' treatise fulfills in Junius' work. Junius did not only build on Longinus' ideas about *phantasia* and *ingenium*, but also creatively adapted metaphorical passages from Longinus' treatise to his reconstruction of the ancient views on the visual arts, and repeatedly referred to *Peri hypsous* as a source on the intricacies of critical judgment. In short, we could say that Junius appropriates *Peri hypsous* to describe psychological, technical and critical aspects of the visual arts.⁹ With this chapter I aim to provide an illuminating case study of the seventeenth-century reception of Longinus, and to add to our understanding of the ways in which *Peri hypsous* was used and appropriated by its early modern readers.

I have chosen to largely follow the structure of Junius' argument in presenting my analysis of the role of *Peri hypsous* in the *De pictura veterum*. This approach enables us to follow Junius' train of thought in using *Peri hypsous*, to examine the relationship between *Peri hypsous* and Junius' other sources, and to understand what meaning and interpretation Junius attached to the treatise. I will moreover

Longinus in the *De pictura veterum* in *Art and Antiquity in the Netherlands and Britain: The Vernacular Arcadia of Franciscus Junius (1591–1677)* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), and his article 'The Sublime and the "Beholder's Share": Junius, Rubens, Rembrandt' (2016).

⁷ See for instance Nativel (1994), and Nativel (2016).

⁸ See especially the articles of Caroline van Eck, Johanna Sheers Seidenstein and Hanneke Grootenboer in vol. 8.2 of the *Journal of Historians of Netherlandish Art* (2016), as well as the introduction 'The Sublime and Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Art' by Stijn Bussels and Bram van Oostveldt in the same issue, on the influence of Longinus via Junius. E. de la Fuente Pedersen, 'The Sketch and the Unfinished – Franciscus Junius and the Young Rembrandt', in: L. Bøgh Rønberg *et al.* (ed.), *Rembrandt? The Master and his Workshop* (Copenhagen: Statens Museum For Kunst, 2006), 150-166, discusses the place of rhetorical sources (especially Quintilian) in Junius' discussion of grace, and relates this to Rembrandt's early paintings.

⁹ I have borrowed the term 'psychological' for these aspects of the *De pictura veterum* from Nativel (2016), 165.

also relate Junius' reading of Longinus to seventeenth-century interpretations and applications of *Peri hypsous*, and analyse Junius' translation of Longinus' terminology into Latin, English and Dutch. After a brief introduction of Franciscus Junius and the genesis of the *De pictura veterum* (section 4.2), I will systematically analyse Junius' references to *Peri hypsous*, and relate them to the three functions that Longinus' treatise fulfills in the *De pictura veterum*: the psychological, technical and critical aspect of the visual arts. In Section 4.3 I will discuss Junius' Junius' appropriation of Longinus' ideas about *phantasia* in Book I. Section 4.4 will examine how Junius used *Peri hypsous* in the context of his discussion of the development of the visual arts in antiquity in the second book of the *De pictura veterum*. Sections 4-5-4.7 will focus on Book III of the *De pictura veterum*. In section 4.5 I will discuss Junius' creative adaptations of metaphors from *Peri hypsous*. In section 4.6 I will examine Junius' references to Longinus' treatise in the context of his discussion of 'magnificence' in art (DPV 3.1.15), and analyse the terminology of sublimity in the English and Dutch translations of this part of the *De pictura veterum*. Section 4.7 will be concerned with the role of Longinus' treatise in Junius' discussion of grace and judgment (DPV 3.6 and 3.7).

4.2 Junius, *De pictura veterum* and Longinus

Franciscus Junius the Younger was born in 1591 in Heidelberg.¹⁰ Upon his father's acceptance of the chair of theology at Leiden University in 1592, the family moved to Leiden. Junius was educated at the Latin School in Dordrecht and tutored by Gerardus Joannes Vossius, rector of the Latin School, especially after Junius' father had died in 1602.¹¹ From 1608 Junius studied at the university of Leiden, and immersed himself in a wide variety of subjects, among which classical philology and philosophy, as well as mathematics, oriental languages, biblical exegesis and

¹⁰ A biographical account of Junius' younger years is provided by Rademaker (1998). See also the introductions in Aldrich, Fehl, and Fehl (1991), xxvi-xlix, and Nativel (1996), 25-86. Franciscus Junius the Younger is identified with the addition *Francisci Filius* (F.F.) to distinguish him from his father, Franciscus Junius the Elder (1545-1602) and his nephew, Franciscus Junius F.N. (*Francisci Nepos*, died in 1678).

¹¹ Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xxix-xxx; Rademaker (1998), 4-7; Nativel (1996), 33-35.

theology.¹² After his studies, Junius became a minister in the small town of Hillegersberg in 1617.¹³ Junius' ecclesiastical career however was short-lived: as a result of the conflict between Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, which came to a boiling point with the Synod of Dordt in 1619, Junius, who refused to take sides in the debate, was suspended from his office.¹⁴ He left the Netherlands and moved to England, where he became librarian to Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel.¹⁵ Commissioned by the Earl, Junius set out to compile a catalogue of artists and artworks known from antiquity.¹⁶ In preparation of this catalogue, Junius collected ancient ideas about the visual arts. The catalogue was published posthumously in 1694, together with a second edition of the *De pictura veterum*, by Johannes Graevius in 1694, as the *Catalogus [...] artificum et operum* (catalogue of artists and works), while the 'introduction' to the catalogue, which had become a rather comprehensive overview of ancient art theory, was published in 1637 as the *De pictura veterum*.¹⁷

The *De pictura veterum* belongs to a long early modern tradition of art theory, such as Leon Battista Alberti's *Della pittura* (1435) and its Latin version *De pictura* (1439-41), *De re aedificatoria* (1454) and *De statua* (1462); Pomponius Gauricus' *De sculptura* (1504); Giorgio Vasari's *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architettori* (1568; *The Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*); Giovanni Lomazzo's *Trattato dell'arte della pittura, scoltura et architettura* (1584); Karel van Mander's *Schilder-boeck* (1604); as well as Julius Caesar Bulengerus' *De pictura*,

¹² Rademaker (1998), 8-9; Nativel (1996), 35.

¹³ Rademaker (1998), 12-15.

¹⁴ Junius was accused of siding with the Remonstrants, who had turned away from certain aspects of Calvinist doctrine. On the conflict between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, see Israel (1995), 450-477. On Junius' entanglement in the dispute, see Rademaker (1998), 14-15 and Nativel (1996), 36-38.

¹⁵ See Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xxxi-xxxvii and Nativel (1996), 42-56.

¹⁶ Junius commenced his project as early as 1628, as is witnessed by a letter to Gerardus Joannes Vossius. See Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xxxviii and Nativel (1996), 87-88.

¹⁷ The books were published in 1694 with the full title *De pictura veterum libri tres, tot in locis emendati, et tam multis accessionibus aucti, ut plane novi possint videri; Catalogus, adhuc ineditus, architectorum, mechanicorum, sed præcipue pictorum, statuariorum, cælatorum, tornatorum, aliorumque artificum, & operum quæ fecerunt, secundum seriem litterarum digestus* (Rotterdam: R. Leers, 1694). See C. Nativel, 'A Plea for Franciscus Junius as an Art Theorician', in: R.H. Bremmer (ed.), *Franciscus Junius F. F. and his circle* (Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998), 19-33.

plastice, statuaria libri duo (1627).¹⁸ Junius' method of reconstructing a history of ancient art by compiling citations from various ancient texts, as well as his heavy reliance on rhetorical sources, moreover indicate a close affinity with (especially Neo-Latin) rhetorical works of his time, such as Gerardus Joannes Vossius' *Commentarii Rhetorici* (first ed. 1606).¹⁹ The *De pictura veterum* was quite widely known in the seventeenth century, and influenced other art theoreticians, such as Roger de Piles, Roland Fréart de Chambray, Giovanni Pietro Bellori, Samuel van Hoogstraten and Gerard de Lairese.²⁰ Junius appears to be the first to use *Peri hypsous* outside the domain of literature and to apply its ideas to the visual arts.²¹

In Junius' time Longinus' treatise was available in the Netherlands.²² In his intellectual network the presence of several copies of Longinus' treatise is attested: both Gerardus Joannes Vossius and Franciscus Gomarus, who tutored Junius in his Dordrecht and Leiden years, for instance owned copies of the text.²³ In England

¹⁸ Nativel (2014), 564-566.

¹⁹ Junius incorporated observations from Vossius' *Commentarii*, for instance in DPV 1.4.6 (see section 4.3.3). Junius' discussion of the vocabulary of magnificence (DPV 3.1.15), resembles Vossius' discussion of this terminology in the *Commentarii* (see section 4.6.2). Vossius in turn used parts of the *De pictura veterum* in his essay *De Graphice*, in his work *De Quatuor Artibus Popularibus: de Philologia, Et Scientiis Mathematicis* (Amsterdam: J. Blaeu, 1650). See Nativel (2014), 566-568.

²⁰ Weststeijn (2015), 329-357 presents a chronological overview of references to Junius' *De pictura veterum* (and its English and Dutch versions) in letters, manuscripts and printed books between the 1630s and 1809. See C. Nativel, 'Rubens, Franciscus Junius, Roger de Piles', in: Chr. Mouchel, and C. Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, République des arts, Mélanges offerts au Professeur Marc Fumaroli, de l'Académie Française* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2008), 561-579 and C. Nativel, 'Ut pictura poesis: Junius et Roger de Piles', *Dix-septième siècle* 245/4 (2009), 593-608 on Junius' influence on De Piles, and C. Nativel, 'Quelques apports du *De pictura veterum libri tres* de Franciscus Junius à la théorie de l'art en France', *Revue d'esthétique* 31/32 (1997), 119-131 on Junius' reception in French art theory. See T. Weststeijn, *The Visible World. Samuel van Hoogstraten's Art Theory and the Legitimation of Painting in the Dutch Golden Age* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008), 17-21 and *passim* on Van Hoogstraten's indebtedness to Junius. Ellenius (1960), 92-96 and Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), lxiv-lxxx discuss the reception of the *De pictura veterum* and the relation with contemporary art.

²¹ See C. Nativel 'La comparaison entre la peinture et la poesie dans le *De Pictura Veterum* (I, 4) de Franciscus Junius 1589-1677', *Word and Image* 4 (1988), 323-330 and Nativel (2009) on the relationship between poetry and painting in the *De pictura veterum*. See Nativel (2014) on the place of the *De pictura veterum* in the tradition of early modern art treatises.

²² See section 1.5 on the dissemination of *Peri hypsous* in the Dutch Republic.

²³ The auction catalogue of Franciscus Gomarus lists the Portus edition of 1569. The handwritten *Catalogus Librorum* of Gerardus Joannes Vossius lists the edition of De Petra (1612), while the Leiden

Longinus' treatise circulated as well.²⁴ In 1636 Gerard Langbaine published an edition of *Peri hypsous*, which was based on the 1612 edition of Gabriele de Petra, indicating that this edition was also available in England.²⁵ Letters moreover indicate that Junius had contact with Gerard Langbaine.²⁶

Throughout the *De pictura veterum* Junius builds on the idea that painting and poetry or oratory are sister arts, and he freely adapts poetical and rhetorical theories to describe the visual arts.²⁷ We can discern three ways in which Junius applies passages from Longinus' treatise to the visual arts. Firstly, Junius uses elements of Longinus' theory that pertain to general aesthetic principles, and hence are valid for literature and the visual arts alike, such as imagination, artistic judgment, magnificence. Secondly, Junius adjusts passages by replacing words pertaining to 'literature' or 'text' with words pertaining to 'painting' or 'visual art'.²⁸ Thirdly, Junius turns visual metaphors from Longinus' treatise (passages in which Longinus for instance compares text to architecture or the human body), into actual technical precepts. Because of the scarcity of ancient sources on the visual arts, Junius uses these metaphors as actual evidence for the ancients' aesthetic views.²⁹ Most of Junius' references to *Peri hypsous* are explicit, in which case the reference consists of a Greek citation with Latin translation and a

University Library preserves a Portus edition that is annotated by Gerardus Joannes Vossius (Leiden, UB: 756 F 11).

²⁴ Nativel (2016), 267-268.

²⁵ See section 1.3.3 for a discussion of the editions of De Petra and Langbaine. The citations from *Peri hypsous* correspond to the text of De Petra. See Nativel (2016), 266n.13.

²⁶ Junius' preserved correspondence contains letters exchanged with Langbaine (in the 1650s) and several other English scholars. A part of Junius' correspondence with Langbaine however has not been preserved. See S. van Romburgh (ed.), *'For my worthy friend Mr Franciscus Junius': An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591–1677)* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 10 and 15, and Nativel (2016), 268.

²⁷ Junius describes this method in DPV 1.4. For a discussion of the connection between rhetoric and painting, see Nativel (1991a), and Nativel, 'Ut pictura poesis: Junius et Roger de Piles', *Dix-septième siècle*, 245/4 (2009), 593-608.

²⁸ An example of this is found in DPV 1.4.6, where Junius, citing *Peri hypsous* 15.8, substituted the word ῥητορικὴ ('oratory') with ζωγραφικὴ ('painting'). See also section 4.3.3.

²⁹ In DPV 3.2.4 and 3.9.20 Junius quotes Longinus' statement that "tumours in bodies are bad" (*Peri hypsous* 3.4), which is used metaphorically by Longinus, but which is turned into an artistic precept by Junius. See section 4.5.

specification of the paragraph in *Peri hypsous*.³⁰ Latin translations (as well as Latin citations) in the *De pictura veterum* are usually printed in italics to distinguish them from Junius' own words.³¹ Sometimes however Junius paraphrases his sources without explicitly referencing them, in which case the citation or paraphrase is printed in roman and cannot easily be distinguished from Junius' argument. This applies only to only a few references to *Peri hypsous*.³²

Longinus' treatise features prominently in Junius' discussion of *phantasia* in the first book of the *De pictura veterum* (especially DPV 1.2.1, 1.3.11 and 1.4.6), and in Junius' discussion of 'magnificence' and 'grace' in the third book of the *De pictura veterum* (DPV 3.1.15 and DPV 3.6-7). The references in DPV 2.11.7 and DPV 3.2-5 however also merit our attention, as these respectively provide a revealing insight in Junius' use of Longinus' treatise in matters of creativity and artistic judgment, as well as Junius' method of creatively adapting metaphorical passages from literary sources.

Junius is not only the first to apply Longinus' theory to the visual arts, but also the first to translate parts of *Peri hypsous* into English and Dutch.³³ The Latin version of his work could rely on the available Latin translations of the treatise.³⁴ A full English translation of *Peri hypsous* however did not appear before 1652, while a

³⁰ See also Nativel (2016), 265-266 on Junius' method of citing.

³¹ In the passages cited in my chapter I have maintained Junius' typographical distinction between Latin citations and translations (in italics) and Junius' own words (in roman).

³² An example is Junius' reference to Longinus' analysis of Euripides' *Phaethon* (*Peri hypsous* 15.4) in DPV 1.4.6. See below section 4.3.3. See Appendix 3 for an overview of all references to *Peri hypsous* in the *De pictura veterum*.

³³ See Spencer (1957), Nativel (1994), 721, 726-730, and Nativel (2016), 265-268 on Junius' introduction of Longinus into English criticism.

³⁴ Several Latin translations of Longinus' treatise had already appeared in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century; see Weinberg (1950), 145-151 for an overview. Nativel (1996), 96-97 notes that some of the translations of Greek citations were made by Junius' nephews Gerardus Vossius jr. and Isaac Vossius. Junius probably revised his translations for the second edition of the *De pictura veterum*. In this chapter I will present the Latin translations as they appeared in the edition of 1637, and indicate any differences with the 1694 edition, which, in the case of Longinus, are largely stylistic and do not mark significant interpretative changes.

Dutch translation of the treatise was published only in 1719.³⁵ Junius' *De pictura veterum* together with its vernacular translations thus presents Longinus' terminology in four different languages: Greek, Latin, English and Dutch. *The painting of the Ancients* (1638) and *De Schilder-konst der Oude* (1641) were meant to make the collected materials accessible to a wider audience that was not versed in Latin.³⁶ In these vernacular editions, which are slightly abbreviated versions of the first Latin edition, complex terminological or philological digressions are sometimes left out or shortened. They do however contain some additional explanations and paraphrases.³⁷ In the case of Longinus, the Latin edition usually presents a Greek citation with a Latin translation, whereas the vernacular versions only give a translation and sometimes present paraphrases rather than full quotes from the treatise.³⁸ The Latin versions include 32 explicit references to *Peri hypsous*, while the vernacular versions of the book include only about twenty references to Longinus' treatise.³⁹

³⁵ J. Hall, *Peri Hypsous, or Dionysius Longinus of the Height of Eloquence* (London: R. Daniel, 1652) and P. Le Clercq, *D. Longinus, Verhandelning over de Verhevenheit en Deftigheid des Styls* (Amsterdam: gedrukt voor de Compagny, 1719).

³⁶ This aim is put forward in Junius' preface to his English translation and in Jan de Brune de Jonge's preface to the Dutch edition. The English version of the *De pictura veterum* was made at the request of Lady Arundel. See also Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xxxix-xl, and Nativel (1996), 100. Thijs Weststeijn sees Junius' translation activities as part of broader attempts to emancipate the Dutch language; see Weststeijn (2015), 19-20. The Dutch edition was reissued twice, as *Schilder-boeck behelsende de schilder-konst der oude, begrepen in dry boecken. Nu wederom met een bequaem register vermeerderd* (Middelburg: Z. Roman, 1659) and *Begin, heerlijcke voortganch, en grootdadigh vermogen der wijdberoemde schilder-konst der antycken* (Middelburg: W. Goeree, 1675).

³⁷ See also Nativel (1996), 100-106. The Latin version contains four more chapters in book three (DPV 3.8-3.11), which are concerned with beauty, ugliness, and the material to be used for statues. See Nativel (1983), 30. See Weststeijn (2015), 103-107 for a comparison of the Latin, English and Dutch versions of the *De pictura veterum*, and 358-368 for a schematic overview of the major differences between the English and Dutch versions.

³⁸ Colette Nativel has established that Junius' citations from *Peri hypsous* are congruent with the Greek text of De Petra's 1612 edition. Some of the Greek passages in the DPV were translated by Gerardus Joannes Vossius' sons (nephews of Junius), Gerardus jr. and Isaac. See Nativel (1996), 96-97 and Nativel (2016), 269n.30.

³⁹ Nativel (2016), 265n.8 notes six references to Longinus in the *Schilder-konst der Oude*, but this number is actually higher and equals the number of references in the English translation. See Appendix 3 for an overview of all citations from *Peri hypsous* in the Latin, English and Dutch versions of the *De pictura veterum*.

The English and Dutch versions in turn also differ from one another. The Dutch version of Junius' book contains additional explanations and paraphrases of quotations that are also found in the Latin edition, but which had been omitted from the English version. This indicates that Junius perused his collected materials again when preparing his Dutch edition, rather than simply translating the English version of his book.⁴⁰ Junius' endeavours to find appropriate translations for Longinus' vocabulary reveal how the Greek rhetorician's concept of 'the sublime' posed a terminological as well as interpretative challenge to early seventeenth century readers. This will be discussed in more detail in section 4.6.2.

Throughout this chapter I will refer to the 1637 Latin edition of *De pictura veterum* (DPV) unless stated otherwise.⁴¹ The English and Dutch editions will be referred to as *On the Painting of the Ancients* (TPA) and *Schilder-konst der Oude* (SDKO) respectively. References to any particular part of Junius' work usually indicate the book, chapter and section number (e.g. DPV 1.1.1), or book and chapter number only (e.g. DPV 1.1).⁴² Junius refers to individual chapters of *Peri hypsous* with the chapter numbers in the edition of De Petra. I have kept the original numbering in my transcriptions, and added the chapter numbers according to modern edition of *Peri hypsous* between brackets (e.g. §4 [5]).

4.3 Imitation and the human imagination (DPV 1)

Before Franciscus Junius, Longinus' ideas on *phantasia* had already been discussed and used by two Italian scholars: Francesco Patrizi (1529-1597) and Lorenzo Giacomini (1552-1598). Patrizi related Longinus' concept of *phantasia* to the idea of

⁴⁰ See also Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xl.

⁴¹ I will present the Greek citations as printed in the *De pictura veterum*. I have provided the passages that I discuss in this chapter with an English translation of my own, or with Junius' English translation of 1638 (in which case this is indicated). The edition of 1694 reproduces the edition of 1637, with the insertion of some new citations, as well as chapter summaries. See Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xv. The Latin translations have been slightly updated by Junius, which, in the case of Longinus does not lead to significant interpretative changes. See also Nativel (2016), 269n.30.

⁴² The section numbers in the Latin editions and the English and Dutch translations run almost completely parallel. In the case of incongruencies between the section numbers of the passages cited in this chapter I have indicated this. See also Appendix 3 for an overview of the sections in which *Peri hypsous* is cited or paraphrased.

meraviglia in his *Della poetica* (1586).⁴³ Lorenzo Giacomini refers to Longinus in his *Discorso del furor poetico* (1587), which presents imagination as one of the most important elements in the creation of poetry.⁴⁴ Junius' approach (not only in the case of *phantasia* Longinus, but in his work in general) is remarkable because of its application of concepts from rhetorical and poetical theory to the visual arts. The visual aspects of Longinus' discussion of *phantasia* moreover provided a particularly suitable basis for Junius' discussion of imagination.

4.3.1 Observation and visualisation (DPV 1.1 and 1.2)

The first book of the *De pictura veterum* is dedicated to the 'beginning' (*initium*) of the visual arts, which Junius locates in human nature itself. Central to Junius' argument in the first book are the human inclination to imitate nature (*ingenitum mortalibus omnia imitandi studium*), and power of imagination (*imaginativa facultas*).⁴⁵ *Peri hypsous* is adduced several times in the first book of the *De pictura veterum*, especially in Junius' discussion of 'imagination' (*phantasia*).

In section 1.1.1 of the *De pictura veterum*, Junius describes how the human mind is naturally inclined to contemplate and study nature, to measure the earth, count stars, and to be amazed by thunderstorms and lightning bolts.⁴⁶ Junius constructs his argument from a variety of sources, citing or paraphrasing their contents, and sometimes, but not always, providing a reference.⁴⁷ Paraphrasing Seneca the Elder and Longinus, Junius states that:

⁴³ See C. Vasoli, 'Schede patriziane sul *De sublime*', in G. Casertano (ed.), *Il sublime. Contributi per la storia di un'idea* (1983), 161-174.

⁴⁴ Giacomini's references to Longinus are not made in the context of his discussion of *phantasia*, but his ideas on this topic do resemble Longinus' argument. See Refini (2012), 37-43.

⁴⁵ DPV (1637) *argumentum libri primi*, p. 1. Nativel's commentary (1996, 413-596) gives an extensive discussion of the contents of Book I of the *De pictura veterum*.

⁴⁶ The lightning bolts as mentioned by Junius in DPV (1637) 1.1.1 (p. 1) belong to a paraphrase of Seneca's *Naturales Quaestiones* 1, *praefatio* 14-15, but they also echo Longinus' comparison of the sublime to a lightning bolt in *Peri hypsous* 1.4 and 12.4.

⁴⁷ The annotated text in Nativel (1996) gives an extensive overview of all sources cited and paraphrased by Junius in Book I.

Curiosus naturae speculator singula rimatur, omnia haec ad se pertinere iudicat⁴⁸; imo scit se in amplissimum hoc theatrum spectatorem praeconemque tantorum operum introductum.⁴⁹

The inquisitive observator of nature examines every single detail, thinks that everything is relevant to him; yes indeed he knows that he was brought to this magnificent theatre as the spectator and herald of such great works.

Junius refers to *Peri hypsous* 35.2, in which Longinus explains why some authors have always aimed for the highest achievements in literature.⁵⁰

πρὸς πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι ἡ φύσις οὐ ταπεινὸν ἡμᾶς ζῶον οὐδ' ἀγεννὲς τέλει κρινε τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' ὥς εἰς μεγάλην τινὰ πανήγυριν εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ἐπάγουσα, θεατάς τινας τῶν ἄθλων αὐτῆς ἐσομένους καὶ φιλοτιμοτάτους ἀγωνιστάς (...).⁵¹

This above all, that Nature has judged man a creature of no mean or ignoble quality, but, as if she were inviting us to some great gathering, she has called us into life, into the whole universe, there to be spectators of her games and eager competitors (...).

This passage from Longinus' treatise is a fitting addition to Junius' explanation why humans have a natural tendency to observe nature.⁵² In its original context, the passage serves as an analogy to explain why eminent writers of the past have always striven for greatness in their works. In the *De pictura veterum*, the metaphor of humans witnessing nature's spectacles however acquires a more literal

⁴⁸ Seneca, *Naturales Quaestiones* 1, *praefat.* 12-13.

⁴⁹ *DPV* (1637) 1.1.1, p. 1-2.

⁵⁰ The passage from *Peri hypsous* 35.2 is not cited but paraphrased. Junius identifies the passage with a reference at the end of section 1.1.1.

⁵¹ *Peri hypsous* 35.2.

⁵² The idea of humans as observers of the universe is a common theme in ancient philosophy. In *DPV* Junius has brought together and paraphrased several passages that deal with this theme. See Nativel (1996), 417-426.

meaning, as Junius applies it to the human capacities of (visual) imagination and imitation.⁵³ Junius' use of this passage is typical of his method in the *De pictura veterum*. Junius illustrates different aspects of the visual arts by interweaving passages from a wide array of sources, which are often adapted from their original (literary) context to fit Junius' discussion of the visual arts.

In the first book Junius pays a great deal of attention to the notion of *phantasia*, or the capacity to form mental images. In *DPV* 1.2 Junius distinguishes between two types of imitation. The first is called *eikastikos* ('copying') and represents objects true to nature; the second is called *phantastikos* ('based on imagination'), and creates images from the mental visualisation of things that are not visible to the human eye.⁵⁴ Regarding the second type of imitation (*DPV* 1.2.1), Junius asserts that "the power of this kind of imitation lies in 'visualisation' (*phantasia*), or in the capacity of imagination, which some call 'image productions' (*eidolopoia*)."⁵⁵ Junius here refers to the definition of *phantasia* in *Peri hypsous* 15.1, in which Longinus uses the concept to analyse very vivid passages, where an author himself 'sees' the events in his mind's eye and brings them vividly before the eyes of his audience.⁵⁶

⁵³ Nativel (2016), 269 observes that Junius' argument in *De pictura veterum* 1.1.1 closely resembles another passage from *Peri hypsous* (35.2-3): ... ἄμαχον ἔρωτα ἐνέφυσεν ἡμῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς παντὸς ἀεὶ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς δαιμονιωτέρου ("... and she therefore from the first breathed into our hearts an unconquerable passion for whatever is great and more divine than ourselves").

⁵⁴ *DPV* 1.2.1, p. 8. See Nativel (1996), 455-465 on Junius' definition of *phantasia* in *DPV* 1.2.1. Nativel has noted that Junius' definition of this second type of imitation (*phantastikos*) is based on a creative reading of Plato's *Sophist*. On this interpretation see especially C. Nativel, 'Le triomphe de l'Idée de la peinture: la *phantasia* chez Junius et Bellori', in: Heck, M.-C., et al., *Théorie des arts et création artistique dans l'Europe du Nord du XVIe au début du XVIIIe siècle (acts of an international colloquium, Lille 2000)* (Lille: Édition du Conseil Scientifique de l'Université Charles- de-Gaulle-de Lille 3, 2002), 219-231: 221-224.

⁵⁵ *DPV* 1.2.1, p. 8. *Atque hujus imitationis tota vis in phantasia, sive in facultate imaginative, quam nonnulli εἰδωλοποιῖαν dicunt, consistit.* Junius references Longinus with a marginal note. See G. Watson, *Phantasia in Classical Thought* (Galway: Galway University Press, 1988), 66-68 for a discussion of Longinus' notion of *phantasia* against its Stoic background.

⁵⁶ *Peri hypsous* 15.1. Ὅγκου καὶ μεγαληγορίας καὶ ἀγῶνος ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὦ νεανία, καὶ αἱ φαντασίαι παρασκευαστικώταται· οὕτω γοῦν <ἡμεῖς>, εἰδωλοποιῖας <δ'> αὐτὰς ἐνιοὶ λέγουσι· [...] ἥδη δ' ἐπὶ τούτων κεκράτηκε τοῦνομα ὅταν ἂν λέγεις ὑπ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ πάθους βλέπειν δοκῆς καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν τιθῆς τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. ("Weight, grandeur, and urgency in writing are very largely produced, dear young friend, by the use of 'visualizations' (*phantasiai*). That at least is what I call them; other call them 'image productions'. [...] The word has now come to be predominantly used of passages where,

Longinus' discussion of *phantasia* in *Peri hypsous* 15 is used more extensively in *DPV* 1.3.11 and especially *DPV* 1.4.6, as I will discuss in sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3.

4.3.2 Tradition and innovation (*DPV* 1.3)

In the third chapter of his first book, Junius discusses how visual art started as simple representation of physical objects, and how artists gradually improved it through constant imitation and emulation of their predecessors.⁵⁷ Successful emulation of previous artists, Junius argues, lies in an artist's ability to be innovative, which is engendered by *phantasia* (*DPV* 1.3.9). In following their imagination and striving for artistic innovation artists must dare to take risks (*DPV* 1.3.10).⁵⁸ *DPV* 1.3.11 marks a *caveat*, as Junius, using a combination of several passages from *Peri hypsous* and Seneca's *Controversiae*, argues that artists must observe some restraint as well:

Fraenis tamen hic indigebunt artifices⁵⁹ πολὺ τὸ διάπυρον καὶ θυμικῶς
ἐκφλεγόμενον ἔχοντες.⁶⁰ Neque enim leve periculum erit⁶¹, ne modum

inspired by strong emotion, you seem to see what you describe and bring it vividly before the eyes of your audience.”).

⁵⁷ *DPV* 1.3.1-8. See Nativel (1996), 485-506.

⁵⁸ See Nativel (1996), 507.

⁵⁹ *Peri hypsous* 2.2: δεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὡς κέντρον πολλάκις οὕτω δὲ καὶ χαλινοῦ (“For genius needs the curb as often as the spur”).

⁶⁰ *Peri hypsous* 12.3: ὅθεν, οἶμαι, κατὰ λόγον ὁ μὲν ῥήτωρ ἄτε παθητικώτερος πολὺ τὸ διάπυρον ἔχει καὶ θυμικῶς ἐκφλεγόμενον, ὁ δὲ, καθεστὼς ἐν ὄγκῳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σεμνότητι, οὐκ ἔψυκται μὲν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ οὕτως ἐπέστραπται (“I should say then that in point of style the orator [Demosthenes], being more emotional, has abundant warmth and passionate glow, whereas Plato, steady in his majestic and stately dignity, is less intense, though of course by no means frigid.”).

⁶¹ *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 χορὴ 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

teneant ardentissima copiosissimaque praestantium artificum ingenia, inescata fallaci promptissime subeuntium imaginum illecebra. Περί το καινόςπουδον μάλιστα κορυβαντιῶσιν οἱ νῦν· ἀφ' ὧν γὰρ ἡμῖν τὰγαθὰ, σχεδὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν τούτων καὶ τὰ κακὰ γίγνεσθαι φιλεῖ.⁶² *Ob novitatis studium ii, qui nunc sunt, maxime insaniunt.*⁶³ *A quibus enim ipsa bona nobis, ferme ab iis ipsis, quae mala sunt, ortum suum habere solent.* Dionys. Longinus Περί ὕψους, §4 [5]. Videas itaque aridos ac jejunos artifices fidelius fere, quod proposuerant, premere. Nihil enim eos sollicitat, nulla novae Inventionis dulcedo alicunde subrepat.⁶⁴

Yet artificers “who have abundant warmth and passionate glow”, will also need some restraint. For it is a great danger that the most ardent and gifted talents of eminent artificers have no moderation, enticed by the deceptive charm of images entering their mind’s eye. “People nowadays are quite crazy about being innovative; in fact, our virtues and vices spring from much the same sources.” Dionysius Longinus, *Peri hypsous* §4 [5]. Conversely, one can see how dry and faint artificers firmly hold on their proposed layout. For nothing stirs them, no charm of a new idea comes over them from anywhere.⁶⁵

spells danger”). See also Nativel (1996), 508 for the identification of *Peri hypsous* 33.2 as the subtext of DPV (1637) 1.3.11.

⁶² *Peri hypsous* 5: Ἄπαντα μέντοι τὰ οὕτως ἄσεμνα διὰ μίαν ἐμφύεται τοῖς λόγοις αἰτίαν, διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόςπουδον, περὶ ὃ δὴ μάλιστα κορυβαντιῶσιν οἱ νῦν. (“However, all these lapses from dignity in literature spring from the same cause, namely that passion for novelty of thought which is the particular craze of the present day”).

⁶³ The 1694 translation replaces *ob* with *circa* (DPV, 1694, 1.3.11, p. 20).

⁶⁴ DPV (1637) 1.3.11, p. 22. Seneca, *Controversiae* 2.1.24: *Et illi tamen qui sibi abstinentiam conviciorum imperaverant non bene praestiterunt; aliquos sententiae dulcedo subrepsit, cui non potuerunt obsistere. Aridi declamatores fidelius quos proposuerunt colores tuentur: nihil enim illos sollicitat, nullum schema, nulla sententia* (“Yet even those declaimers who committed themselves to abstaining from abuse did not keep to their promises very well; some were lured on by the delights of epigram, and could not resist. It is the dry declaimers who keep more faithfully to the colours they have laid down. There is nothing to bother them, no figure, no epigram”) (translation: Winterbottom, 1974).

⁶⁵ That is, they simply carry out their artistic plans from beginning to end without being open to new ideas. (Seneca, *Controversiae* 2.1.24).

Junius refers to *Peri hypsous* 5, but also uses passages from *Peri hypsous* 2.2 (*fraenis tamen hic indigebunt artifices*), and 12.3 (πολὺ τὸ διάπυρον καὶ θυμικῶς ἐκφλεγόμενον ἔχοντες), and hints on the intrinsic risks of striving for sublimity that Longinus' describes in *Peri hypsous* 33.2 (*neque enim leve periculum erit...*). In the edition of 1694, which includes short summaries of each section, the summary of DPV 1.3.11 includes a Latin paraphrase of *Peri hypsous* 33.2, as noted by Colette Nativel, corroborating that this chapter of *Peri hypsous* has indeed been an important subtext of Junius' argument in DPV 1.3.11.⁶⁶

These passages from *Peri hypsous*, together with a reference to Seneca's *Controversiae*, illustrate the fine line between the dangers of unbridled imagination and the dullness of sticking to a pre-existing plan. Junius' reference to *Peri hypsous* 3-5 (Longinus' critique of stylistic vices) and 33 (the defence of the flawed genius) corresponds to a broader interest in these two passages of Longinus' treatise in Junius' time.⁶⁷ Especially the combination of these passages in early modern scholarship merits our attention. In Daniel Heinsius' *De tragoediae constitutione* (1611) for instance, the combined reference to *Peri hypsous* 3-5 and 33 serves to explain which metaphors in ancient literature should be imitated, and which ones should be avoided.⁶⁸ In the *De pictura veterum* these two passages illustrate the proper amount of freedom or restraint to be exercised in matters of imagination

⁶⁶ DPV 1.3 (1694), p. 13, summary of §11. *Unde frequenter usu venit, ut in hac arte minus offendant angusti jejunique pectoris homines, quam quos largae laetiorisque naturae hilaritas vocat ad majora: quandoquidem hos fidentior animus periculis obiiicit, illos vero nimia sui diffidentia deducit in tutum* ("Therefore it often occurs that those with a faint and anxious heart seem to blunder less than those who are called to greater things by the geniality of their grand and cheerful nature: this is because the latter are thrown into danger by their confident mind, while the others are compelled to seek safety by their extreme lack of confidence." Cf. *Peri hypsous* 33.2 (cited above in note 61). See Nativel (2016), 273.

⁶⁷ *Peri hypsous* 3-5 is for instance used by Daniel Heinsius in his *Prolegomena* on Hesiod (1603), *De tragoediae constitutione* (1611), and *Aristarchus Sacer* (1627), by Isaac Casaubon in his commentary to Persius' *Satires* (1605), Nicolas Caussin in his *Eloquentia Sacra* (1619), Gerardus Joannes Vossius in his *De Historicis Graecis* (1623), and by Goulu in his *Lettres de Phyllarque à Ariste* (1627-1628). References to *Peri hypsous* 33 appear in Heinsius' *Prolegomena* (1603) and *De tragoediae constitutione* (1611), Casaubon's edition of Persius (1605), Petrus Cunaeus' *De Respublica Hebraeorum* (1617), and Leone Allacci's *De erroribus magnorum virorum in dicendo* (1635). See also Chapter Two.

⁶⁸ See section 2.8 for a discussion of this passage in Heinsius' *De tragoediae constitutione*. In the *Prolegomena* on Hesiod Heinsius combines these passages to not only condemn excess, but to reject figures of speech entirely, in favour of undefiled simplicity (see section 2.7).

and invention. Both Heinsius and Junius thus play on the dual character of Longinus' argument in *Peri hypsous*: whereas *Peri hypsous* 3-5 advises to avoid certain stylistic vices, *Peri hypsous* 33 in turn rejects the avoidance of faults. When taken together however this paradoxical combination actually sums up one of the central issues of *Peri hypsous*: the ability to walk the line between excess and dullness.⁶⁹ The reference to *Peri hypsous* 2.2, in which Longinus argues that natural talent and learned skill should complement each other, supports this point. In *DPV* 1.3.11 Junius applies this idea to the balance between accurate representation and innovative imagination. In *DPV* 1.4.6 Junius moreover makes a similar argument about the balance between verisimilitude and imaginative licence, in his discussion of the differences between painting and poetry.⁷⁰

4.3.3 Phantasia in poetry and painting (*DPV* 1.4)

In *DPV* 1.4 Junius reflects on the relationship between the visual arts and poetry. As part of this comparison, Junius discusses how both arts are advanced through imagination (*DPV* 1.4.6.), with a selection of passages from Longinus' discussion of *phantasia* (*Peri hypsous* 15). Even though Longinus and Junius focus on different media, their idea of *phantasia* is constructed along similar lines. Both in literature and the visual arts the artist needs to imagine the events described in order to present them vividly, either in text or in painting, either before an audience or before spectators.⁷¹

In *DPV* 1.4.6 Junius discusses the painter's imagination, by contrasting it to the imagination of poets, much like Longinus contrasts the *phantasia* of poets and orators in *Peri hypsous* 15. When describing how poets are sometimes enthralled by the vividness of their own 'phantasies', as if they are swept away by enthusiasm or prophetic fury, Junius for instance refers to Ovid's description of Phaethon's fall in the *Metamorphoses*, and to Longinus' discussion of the same events in Euripides'

⁶⁹ See Chapter Two for an extensive discussion of this theme.

⁷⁰ Junius' use of Longinus in *DPV* 1.3.11 also ties in with other references to Longinus in the *De pictura veterum*. Junius also refers to *Peri hypsous* 33 in relation to judgment in 2.11.7 (see section 4.4.2). Junius' use of Longinus in relation to 'invention' moreover foreshadows the discussion of invention in *DPV* 3.1, which makes extensive use of *Peri hypsous* (see section 4.6.1).

⁷¹ See also A. Sheppard, *The Poetics of Phantasia. Imagination in Ancient Aesthetics* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 19-46 on *phantasia* as 'visualisation' and as a means of producing vividness in ancient thought.

lost tragedy *Phaethon*.⁷² Referring to Ovid, but actually paraphrasing Longinus, Junius explains that the passage is so vivid that it seems as if the author himself has witnessed the events.

Ovidius certe, ut unum uberrimi Poetae exemplum pro omnibus sit, cum describit improvidum iuvenem Solis equis per aethera hac illac raptatum, an non videtur tibi una cum ipso Phaethonte praesens quasi conscedisse currum, et volucrum equorum indomito ardore abreptus in medio quoque discrimine versatus esse? Nunquam enim vel minimam tam multiplicitis confusionis umbram imaginando assequi potuisset, nisi temerarium aurigam ab ipsis carceribus animo prosecutus, et ancipiti periculo veluti immixtus, in tanto tamen turbine singula exitiabilis ausi momenta, ut deprehenderat oculis, enotasset.⁷³

Surely when Ovid, – so that one passage of this rich poet may serve as an example for all cases – describes how that careless young man was swept back and forth through the skies by the horses of the Sun-god, does it not seem to you as if he is standing next to Phaethon himself, like he has mounted the chariot, and, carried away by the unrestrained ardour of the flying horses, is present in the middle of the catastrophe? For never could he have obtained the slightest shadow of such great confusion through imagination, had he not followed the heedless charioteer from the very beginning, and, like being immersed in hazardous peril, recorded in such great turmoil the single moments of his fatal attempt.

In this analysis Junius translates a passage from *Peri hypsous* 15.4 (*an non videtur tibi...*; “does it not seem to you...”, etc), in which Longinus cites from and

⁷² *Peri hypsous* 15.4. Ov. *Met.* 2.150-328. Eur. *Phaethon*, fr. 779 (Nauck).

⁷³ DPV (1637) 1.4.6, p. 36; *Peri hypsous* 15.4: “[...] ἐκεῖσ’ ἔλα, τῇδε στρέφ’ ἄρμα, τῇδε.” ἄρ’ οὐκ ἂν εἴποις, ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ γράφοντος συνεπιβαίνει τοῦ ἄρματος καὶ συγκινδυνεύουσα τοῖς ἵπποις συνεπτέρωται; οὐ γὰρ ἂν, εἰ μὴ τοῖς οὐρανίοις ἐκείνοις ἔργοις ἰσοδρομοῦσα ἐφέρετο, τοιαυτ’ ἂν ποτε ἐφαντάσθῃ. (“Now, drive on there, now this way wheel your car, this way.’ Would you not say that the writer’s soul is aboard the car, and takes wing to share the horses’ peril? Never could it have visualized such things, had it not run beside those heavenly bodies”).

comments on Euripides' *Phaethon*. This passage in Longinus' treatise drew the attention of other early modern scholars as well. Janus Rutgersius discussed the fragment of Euripides in his *Variae Lectiones* (1619), while Heinsius used the passage to illustrate the risks of sublime writing in his *De tragoediae constitutione* (1611).⁷⁴ The title page of Gerard Langbaine's edition of Longinus included Phaethon's fall, as a reference to the passage *Peri hypsous*, as well as an illustration of sublime hazard.⁷⁵ For Longinus, Heinsius, Langbaine, as well as Junius, the story of Phaethon embodies the ultimate attempt at sublimity, as it illustrates the moment in which the line of sublimity is crossed and leads to failure, while it also constitutes a compelling example of sublime vividness in writing.⁷⁶

The creation of vividness through visualisation of and mental 'presence' at the events described is moreover not only relevant to poets, but to painters as well, as Junius explains in the same section (*DPV* 1.4.6), while twice alluding to Longinus' definition of *phantasia* as the visualisation of events "as if seeing them before one's eyes" (*coram quasi; quasi praesentes*) (*Peri hypsous* 15.1).⁷⁷ Junius however also emphasises the differences between *phantasia* in painting and poetry.

⁷⁴ Rutgersius (1618), 46-49. Heinsius, *De tragoediae constitutione* (1611), ch. 16 (Duprat, 2001, 310).

⁷⁵ G. Langbaine, *Dionysii Longini rhetoris praestantissimi liber De grandi loquentia sive sublimi dicendi genere* (1636, 2nd ed. 1638), title page. See fig. 2 in section 1.3.3 for the title page and a discussion of its contents. The imagery on Langbaine's title page contains several references to Longinus' treatise (See also Chapter One, section 3.3). The references to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (though not to book 2) on the title page of Langbaine's edition moreover align with Junius' association of Longinus and Ovid in the *De pictura veterum*. Langbaine's edition of Longinus and Junius' *De pictura veterum* were published within one year.

⁷⁶ On Phaethon's flight as a foil for the poet's attempts at sublimity, see Porter (2016), 157-159 and 344-345. See also Bussels (2016), 884-889 for a discussion of Vondel's *Phaethon* in relation to the *De pictura veterum*.

⁷⁷ *DPV* (1637) 1.4.6, p. 36: *Etiam Pictor pari modo omnia haec, atque his maiora quoque, coram quasi contuetur, non aliud interim foetae mentis levamentum inveniens, quam ut profundae imaginationis obvia sibi lineamenta proprio partu in tabulam egerat atque transfundat. Liqueat ergo quod is tantum Artifex, qui res de quibus acturus est, quasi praesentes contuetur, efficax esse possit, et naturae rerum, quas sibi proponit, haud dissimilis* ("The painter likewise sees all these events, and greater things as well, as if they appear before his eyes, finding no other relief for his productive mind, than to place and transfer with a swift delivery of his boundless imagination those lines on the panel that have appeared to him. It is therefore clear that only the artificer who reports the events that he is describing as if they appear before his mind's eye, can be powerful, and stay true to the nature of the things that he imagined").

Hoc tantum curent hic Artifices, ne plus quam par est hac in parte sibi indulgeant. Πολλαχοῦ γὰρ ἐνθουσιᾶν ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντες, οὐ βακχεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ παίζουσι.⁷⁸ *Saepissime cum videantur sibi divino correpti et incitati furore, non bacchantur, sed nugantur pueriliter.*⁷⁹ Praesertim cum Poeticae phantasiae finis sit ἔκπληξις, Pictoriae vero ἐνάργεια.⁸⁰ Καὶ τα μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ποιητικαῖς, ut loquitur idem Longinus, μυθικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν ὑπερέκπτωσιν, καὶ πάντῃ τὸ πιστὸν ὑπεραίρουσαν· τῆς δὲ ζωγραφικῆς φαντασίας κάλλιστον αἰεὶ τὸ ἔμπρακτον καὶ τὸ ἐνάληθες.⁸¹ *Quae apud Poetas reperiuntur, fabulosiores continent et modum omne fidemque superantes casus.*⁸² *At vero in pictoria phantasia praestantissimum semper actionis possibilitas est, et insita veritas.*

In this regard Artificers should be careful not to indulge in this more than what is appropriate. “For often when they think themselves inspired, their supposed ecstasy is merely childish folly.” Especially since the aim of poetic imagination is “astonishment”, while the aim of visual art is “vividness”. “And these examples from poetry show an exaggeration which belongs to fable and far exceeds the limits of credibility, whereas the perfect effect of visualisation in painting is always one of reality and truth.”

⁷⁸ *Peri hypsous* 3.2.

⁷⁹ The 1694 translation replaces *saepissime* with *frequenter enim* (DPV 1694, 1.4.6, p. 33).

⁸⁰ *Peri hypsous* 15.2: ὡς δ’ ἑτερόν τι ἢ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία βούλεται καὶ ἕτερον ἢ παρὰ ποιηταῖς οὐκ ἂν λάθοι σε, οὐδ’ ὅτι τῆς μὲν ἐν ποιήσει τέλος ἐστὶν ἔκπληξις, τῆς δ’ ἐν λόγοις ἐνάργεια, ἀμφοτέρω δ’ ὁμῶς τό τε <παθητικόν> ἐπιζητοῦσι καὶ τὸ συγκεκινημένον (“That *phantasia* means one thing in oratory and another in poetry you will yourself detect, and also that the object of the poetical form of it is to enthrall, and that of the prose form to present things vividly, though both indeed aim at the emotional and the excited.”). A note in the margin of the *De pictura veterum* translates the terms ἔκπληξις and ἐνάργεια as *admiratio* and *evidentia*.

⁸¹ *Peri hypsous* 15.8: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς μυθικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν ὑπερέκπτωσιν, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ πάντῃ τὸ πιστὸν ὑπεραίρουσαν, τῆς δὲ ῥητορικῆς φαντασίας κάλλιστον αἰεὶ τὸ ἔμπρακτον καὶ ἐνάληθες (“However, as I said, these examples from poetry show an exaggeration which belongs to fable and far exceeds the limits of credibility, whereas the most perfect effect of visualization in oratory is always one of reality and truth”).

⁸² The 1694 translation replaces *quae* with *quaeque* (DPV 1694, 1.4.6, p. 33).

Junius builds his argument on a very creative adaptation of passages from *Peri hypsous* 3.2, 15.2 and 15.8. In *Peri hypsous* 15.2 Longinus explains the difference between poetry and oratory, saying that “the object of the poetical form is to enthrall, and that of the prose form to present things vividly.”⁸³ Instead of translating the word λόγοι (‘words’, ‘oratory’), Junius writes *Pictoria* (‘painting’). In the same manner Junius replaced the word ῥητορικὴ (‘oratory’) with ζωγραφικὴ (‘painting’) in the passage quoted from 15.8.⁸⁴ By simply altering Longinus’ text (without signalling it) and thus sketching the differences between painting and oratory, Junius essentially indicates the limits of pictorial imagination, which is bound by verisimilitude more than poetry is. Junius’ argument also contains a warning against too much imaginative licence, which is based on a passage from *Peri hypsous* 3.2. This particular passage from *Peri hypsous* is especially applicable not only because of the admonition it entails, but also because it occurs in the context of a discussion of excessive metaphors. In *Peri hypsous* 3.1 Longinus criticises a passage for its misplaced tumidity: “the phrasing is turbid, while the images (*phantasiai*) make for confusion rather than forcefulness.”⁸⁵ The visual aspect of the extravagant imagery as described by Longinus is very relevant to Junius’ argument, and may be one of the reasons why he referred to this particular section from *Peri hypsous* in his discussion of *phantasia*

⁸³ *Peri hypsous* 15.2: ὅτι τῆς μὲν ἐν ποιήσει τέλος ἐστὶν ἐκπληξίς, τῆς δ’ ἐν λόγοις ἐνάργεια. See C. Nativel, ‘La théorie de l’*enargeia* dans le *De pictura ueterum* de Franciscus Junius: sources antiques et développements modernes’, *Prospect (Sorbonne Nouvelle sér.)* 1 (1992c), 73-85 on Junius’ discussion of *enargeia* in the *De pictura ueterum*.

⁸⁴ This modification is also present in the English and Dutch paraphrases of Longinus 15.2. *TPA* (1638) 1.4.6, p. 63 (the italics are Junius’): “(...) but make with *Dionysius Longinus* some difference between the Imaginations of Poets that doe intend onely an *astonished admiration*, and of Painters that have no other end but *Perspicuitie*.” *SKDO* (1641) 1.4.6, p. 50: “(...) onderscheydt maeckende tusschen de verbeeldens kracht die de Poeten gaende maeckt, en de andere die de Schilders te werckt stelt. De Poetische fantasie en heeft anders gheen ooghenmerck, als een *onsinnigheydt der verwonderinghe* te verwecken: de Konstenaars daer en teghen sijn maer alleen op de *uytdruckelickheydt* uyt.” A similar modification is moreover made in *DPV* 3.1.15, where Junius substitutes the word λόγων with ἔργων in *Peri hypsous* 14.2.

⁸⁵ *Peri hypsous* 3.1: τεθόλωται γὰρ τῇ φράσει καὶ τεθορύβηται ταῖς φαντασίαις μᾶλλον ἢ δεδείνωται [...].

in painting.⁸⁶ The recurrent emphasis on poetic fury (*furor poeticus*) in Junius' argument in *DPV* 1.4.6 moreover ties in with Longinus' mentioning of 'enthusiasm' in *Peri hypsous* 3.2 as well as *Peri hypsous* 15.1⁸⁷

Junius' argument in this section (*DPV* 1.4.6) is quite similar to his point in *DPV* 1.3.11, which also advocates a balance between restraint and freedom of the artificer's imagination.⁸⁸ In *DPV* 1.3.11 Junius argued that imagination sometimes needs restraint (*fraenis tamen hic indigebunt artifices*; cf. *Peri hypsous* 2.2), and pointed at the risks of uncontrolled imagination (*neque enim leve periculum erit...*; cf. *Peri hypsous* 33.2), while referring to Longinus' criticism of 'strive for novelty' (καινοσπουδία; *Peri hypsous* 5). In *DPV* 1.4.6, Junius illustrates the unrestrained imagination of the poet with the story of Phaethon, whose chariot runs out of control as if no one is holding the reins (*tanquam nullo fraena tenente*).⁸⁹ Phaethon's fatal ride moreover could only be described by a poet who imagined the events as if he were immersed in danger himself (*ancipiti periculo veluti immixtus*; *Peri hypsous* 15.4). Junius however also states that artificers should not indulge in more freedom of imagination than appropriate, and warns that this often leads to childishness (*Peri hypsous* 3). Both in *DPV* 1.3.11 and 1.4.6, Junius uses passages from *Peri*

⁸⁶ This also applies to Junius' citation of *Peri hypsous* 5, in *DPV* 1.3.11, which also originates from a discussion of extravagant (visual) metaphors (esp. *Peri hypsous* 4).

⁸⁷ *Peri hypsous* 3.2: ἐνθουσιᾶν; *Peri hypsous* 15.1: ἤδη δ' ἐπὶ τούτων κεκράτηκε τοῦνομα ὅταν ἂ λέγεις ὑπ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ πάθους βλέπειν δοκῇ καὶ ὑπ' ὧν τιθῇ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ("The word has now come to be used predominantly of passages where, inspired by strong emotion, you seem to see what you describe and bring it vividly before the eyes of your audience"). See Nativel (1996), 543 for the identification of this passage. The example of Phaethon in *DPV* 1.4.6 also illustrates the notion of *furor poeticus*. See Nativel (2016), 270.

⁸⁸ The underlying connection between these two passages (*DPV* 1.3.11 and 1.4.6) becomes visible in the 1694 edition of the *De pictura veterum*. In the margin of *DPV* 1.3.12 (which continues the argument in 1.3.11) appears the following note: *Artifices ingenio suo plus quam par est indulgentes, pessime consulunt arti* ("Artificers who indulge in their *ingenium* more than appropriate fail to consider the factor of 'art'"). This note is almost identical to Junius' remark in 1.4.6 that "artificers should be careful not to indulge in this more than what is appropriate" (*Hoc tantum curret hic Artifices, ne plus quam par est hac in parte sibi indulgeant*).

⁸⁹ *DPV* 1.4.6, p. 36.

hypsous to construct an argument around the danger involved with artistic imagination, the vices it could lead to, and the need for (moderate) restraint.⁹⁰

In the remainder of *DPV* 1.4.6 Junius emphasises that in both painting and oratory imagination provides great examples of subject matter that should be imitated. Imagination moreover benefits from the daily observation of actual images, so that in the process of imitation the ideas come almost automatically.⁹¹ It is for that reason, Junius asserts, that “Longinus made *enargeia*, or vividness the aim of *phantasia*”.⁹² Junius continues his argument with a citation of *Peri hypsous* 15.9.

Atque hinc etiam liquet, cur Dionys. Longinus phantasiae finem faciat ἐνάργειαν, sive evidentiam; cur itidem tantam tribuat phantasiae potentiam, ut affirmare ibidem non vereatur, orationem ejus, qui vim hanc imaginativam usu assiduo roboraverit, οὐ μόνον πείθειν τὴν ἀκροατὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δουλοῦσθαι, *non allicere modo, sed etiam subigere auditorem*.⁹³

And therefore it is clear why Longinus made *enargeia*, or vividness the aim of *phantasia*, and why he likewise attributes such great power to imagination that he is not reluctant to proclaim in the same place that the words of someone who has strengthened his imaginative force by constant practice “not only convince the audience, but overpower them as well.”

⁹⁰ This argument moreover bears great similarity to Heinsius’ discussion of artistic licence in the *De tragoediae constitutione*, which builds on the same passages from *Peri hypsous*. The *De tragoediae constitutione* was published for the first time in Leiden in 1611, when Junius studied in Leiden as well. It is not unlikely that Junius would have known this discussion from Heinsius’ *DTC*.

⁹¹ *DPV* 1.4.6, p. 37.

⁹² *DPV* 1.4.6, p. 37: Atque hinc etiam liquet, cur Dionys. Longinus phantasiae finem faciat ἐνάργειαν, sive evidentiam. Junius here again refers to *Peri hypsous* 15.2.

⁹³ *Peri hypsous* 15.9: τί οὖν ἡ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία δύναται; πολλὰ μὲν ἴσως καὶ ἄλλα τοῖς λόγοις ἐναγώνια καὶ ἐμπαθῇ προσεισφέρειν, κατακιναμένη μέντοι ταῖς πραγματικαῖς ἐπιχειρήσεσιν οὐ πείθει τὸν ἀκροατὴν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δουλοῦται (“What then is the use of visualization in oratory? It may be said generally to introduce a great deal of excitement and emotion into one’s speeches, but when combined with factual arguments it not only convinces the audience, it positively masters them”).

Junius however not only builds on the text of Longinus, but in fact borrowed this paraphrase of *Peri hypsous* 15.2 and 15.9 from Gerardus Joannes Vossius' *Commentarii Rhetorici* (3rd ed. 1630). In his discussion of the 'subject matter belonging to the grand style' (*sententiae magnifici characteris*), Vossius emphasises that one should accustom one's mind to grand ideas, since sublimity in writing originates in greatness of thought.⁹⁴ Imagination (*phantasia*) in turn enables a writer to express events vividly and convincingly.⁹⁵

Atque hinc liquet, cur Longinus φαντασίας finem ἐνάργειαν^a esse dicat; cur item tantam vim phantasiae adscribat, ut dicat orationem ejus, qui phantasia omnia, quae rebus insunt, conceperit, non modo πείθειν τὴν ἀκροατὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δουλοῦσθαι^b.⁹⁶

^a evidentiam sermonis.

^b persuadere auditori, sed etiam ad servilem quandam demissionem eum dejicere.⁹⁷

And therefore it is clear why Longinus says that the aim of "imagination" is "vividness"^a; as well as why he ascribes such great power to imagination

⁹⁴ Vossius (1630), II, 447: *Inprimis autem operaepretium fuerit monuisse, quod et Longinus scribit, debere nos animum adsuescere ad concipiendas res magnas. Oritur enim orationis sublimitas ex animi magnitudine* ("It is first of all worthwhile to give the following advice (which Longinus himself also writes), that we should accustom our mind to conceiving great things. For sublimity in writing originates from greatness of mind"). Vossius here paraphrases *Peri hypsous* 9.1-2: Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τὴν κρατίστην μοῖραν ἐπέχει τῶν ἄλλων τὸ πρῶτον, λέγω δὲ τὸ μεγαλοφύες, χρὴ κἀνταῦθα, καὶ εἰ δωρητὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα μᾶλλον ἢ κτητὸν, ὅμως καθ' ὅσον οἶόν τε τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνατρέφειν πρὸς τὰ μεγέθη καὶ ὥσπερ ἐγκύμονας αἰεὶ ποιεῖν γενναίου παραστήματος. [...] ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα ("Now, since the first, I mean natural, greatness plays a greater part than all the others, here too, even if it is rather a gift than an acquired quality, we should still do our utmost to train our minds into sympathy with what is noble and, as it were, impregnate them again and again with lofty thoughts. [...] Sublimity is the echo of a noble mind").

⁹⁵ Vossius (1630), II, 447: *Quare debet Orator, quid et de Poëta dictum velim, esse εὐφαντασίωτος. Nam φαντασία est ea vis, qua absentia consideramus tanquam praesentia* ("That is why the orator – and I would apply this to poets as well – should be gifted with a vivid imagination"). Vossius here refers to Quint. *Inst. Or.* 6.2.29-30, a passage that Junius also references, together with *Peri hypsous* 15.1, in his definition of *phantasia* in *DPV* 1.2.1 (p. 9), Gabriele De Petra likewise connects these two passages of Longinus and Quintilian in the notes to his text of *Peri hypsous* (De Petra, 1612, 78).

⁹⁶ Vossius (1630), II, 447-8.

⁹⁷ In the margin Vossius gives Latin translation of the Greek terms and phrases.

that he asserts that the words of someone, who conceives all things that are relevant to the subject, with imagination, not only “convince the audience, but overpower them as well”.^b

^a clearness of writing.

^b to persuade the audience, but also to bring him under a certain servile submission.

Junius’ indebtedness to Gerardus Joannes Vossius is not entirely coincidental.⁹⁸ Vossius was Junius’ tutor, and was involved with the publication process of the *De pictura veterum*.⁹⁹ Vossius’ *Commentarii rhetorici*, and Junius’ *De pictura veterum* moreover have a similar structure: both present an extensive discussion of a certain topic (‘rhetoric’, ‘visual art’), by thematically assembling Greek and Latin sources. In this particular section of *De pictura veterum* (1.4), which has the *Ut pictura poesis*-theme as its main topic, a connection with a contemporary rhetorical source is moreover not surprising.¹⁰⁰

Junius’ recurrent discussion of ‘imagination’ in the first book of the *De pictura veterum* quite extensively uses Longinus’ ideas on *phantasia* in *Peri hypsous* 15. Junius’ discussion of *phantasia* in DPV 1.2 effectively commences with Longinus’ definition of *phantasia* in *Peri hypsous* 15.1. In DPV 1.4.6 Junius constructs an argument about the differences between *phantasia* in poetry and painting by creatively adapting Longinus’ statements about the aims and effects of *phantasia* in *Peri hypsous* 15.2, 15.8 and 15.9. Longinus’ treatment of the story of Phaethon moreover serves to illustrate *phantasia* as the ability to create mental visualisations that are so vivid that both author and audience believe to have been witness to the events described (*Peri hypsous* 15.1, 15.4; *De pictura veterum* 1.4.6). Junius’ discussion of *phantasia* in the first book of the *De pictura veterum* is more than a

⁹⁸ Junius borrowed this passage from Vossius, but must also have consulted the Greek text of *Peri hypsous*, since his citation of Longinus includes the Greek words οὐ μόνον (‘not only’), which had been omitted from the citation and translated into Latin (*non modo*) in Vossius’ *Commentarii Rhetorici*.

⁹⁹ Nativel (1998), 19-26.

¹⁰⁰ Vossius’ essay *De Graphice*, part of *De Quatuor Artibus Popularibus: de Philologia, Et Scientiis Mathematicis* (1650), is in turn indebted to the *De pictura veterum*. See Nativel (2014), 566-568. C. Nativel, ‘La Théorie de l’imitation au XVII^e siècle en rhétorique et en peinture’, *Dix-Septième Siècle* 175 (1992a), 157-167 moreover analyses Vossius’ and Junius’ theories of imitation (in the *De pictura veterum* and Vossius’ *De imitatione*, 1647) and argues that Vossius’ approach is more traditional, while Junius’ approach is more modern in its emphasis on enthusiasm and inspiration.

simple concatenation of ancient citations dealing with the various aspects of imagination. In the case of Longinus, the selection of passages is not limited to Longinus' discussion of *phantasia*. Rather, by including other passages from *Peri hypsous*, Junius involves some of the larger themes of *Peri hypsous* as well, such as the risks associated with producing great art, and the balance between freedom and restraint.¹⁰¹

4.4 The historical development of the visual arts (DPV 2)

The second book of the *De pictura veterum* is concerned with the historical development of the visual arts, as well as the various factors that played a role in these developments. In Book II Junius for instance discusses the transmission of knowledge, the importance of adapting the education to the student's natural inclination, the proper place of the artist in society, and the process of finishing an artwork.¹⁰²

4.4.1 Success and decline (DPV 2.1 and 2.9)

In tracing the earliest history of the visual arts, Junius in DPV 2.1.3 observes that Nature itself is a prolific creator of artworks, as can for instance be seen in the beauty of flowers, the feathers of peacocks or the spots of leopards.¹⁰³ Junius underlines this observation by adducing Longinus' remark that "nature succeeds only when it she conceals latent art".¹⁰⁴ When sketching the later development of the visual arts, Junius also discusses societal aspects of artistic production, and observes that art flourished while artists were still valued in society, and endeavoured to achieve fame by producing great artworks (DPV 2.9.1-5). As love of money however grew stronger than the love of art, the arts gradually decayed,

¹⁰¹ These themes moreover also underlie the combined references to *Peri hypsous* in DPV 2.11.7. See section and 4.4.2.

¹⁰² See Nativel (1983) 17-20 for a discussion of the contents of book two of the *De pictura veterum*.

¹⁰³ DPV (1637) 2.1.3, p. 54.

¹⁰⁴ DPV (1637) 2.1.3, p. 54: τότε ἡ φύσις [ἐπι]τυχῆς ὅταν λανθάνουσιν περιέχῃ τὴν τέχνην. *Tunc natura successu est felix, quando latentem continet & tegit artem*. The other half of this remark from *Peri hypsous* 22.1 is cited by Junius in DPV 3.4.7 (see section 4.5).

until the great masters had vanished altogether (DPV 2.9.6).¹⁰⁵ In this context Junius quotes Petronius' discussion of the decay of painting in his time (*Satyricon* 88), and refers to several sources that discuss the decline of eloquence, among which *Peri hypsous* 44.¹⁰⁶ A common factor in each of these texts is the observation that greed could be a cause for societal regression, and with it the decay of arts and literature.¹⁰⁷

4.4.2 Boldness and care (DPV 2.11)

Junius defines 'boldness' (*audacia*) as the next step in the development of the visual arts.¹⁰⁸ While the development of the visual arts was first spurred on by the esteem of magistrates and peoples, it was later encouraged by the boldness of the artificer's spirit, which may result in high aims and an ambition to strive for great things (DPV 2.10). Junius complements his emphasis on boldness with some pedagogical advice on the diligent care that is also needed in the creation of a work of art (DPV 2.11). As part of his discussion of this diligent workmanship, Junius however balances his argument with a warning against *too much* self-criticism in the artistic process (DPV 2.11.7):

¹⁰⁵ DPV (1637) 2.9.6, 109: Duravit artificibus generosus verae laudis amor, quam diu regibus populisque artium reverentia mansit. At postquam pecuniae amor eam ex animis hominum ejecit, defecerunt et ipsi artifices. ("The noble love for sincere praise remained in the artists, while they were still held in esteem by kings and peoples. But after the love of money drove her out of the minds of mankind, the artists themselves disappeared.")

¹⁰⁶ Junius gives a full citation of the passage from Petronius' *Satyricon*, and refers (without quoting them) to four other sources (Theocritus, *Idyll* 16, Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 14, Longinus, Seneca, *Controversiae* 1.1, and *Peri hypsous* 44). This can be explained from the fact that Petronius is actually discussing the visual arts, while Theocritus, Pliny, Longinus and Seneca respectively pertain to encomiastic poetry, didactic poetry, declamations, and literary excellence. The reference to Seneca's *Controversiae* is only present in the Latin editions (1637, 1694) of the *De pictura veterum*.

¹⁰⁷ The discussion of the decay of the arts in 2.9.6 ties in with Junius' dedicatory epistle in the 1637 edition of the *De pictura veterum*, which is addressed to King Charles I, and which heralds the King as protector of the arts.

¹⁰⁸ DPV (1637) 2.10.1, p. 111: Evecta supra humanam fidem ars est successu, inquit Plin. xxxiv,7, mox et audacia. Junius argues this on the basis of Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 34.17. Junius explains that *successus* ('success') should be understood as the esteem that art enjoyed from kings and peoples, which spurred on the development of art in earlier times, and which was later replaced by *audacia* ('boldness').

Abunde nunc de iis egimus, quorum festinatio temeritatis crimine laborat: restat ut attingamus etiam eos, quorum nimia cura tarditatis notam subit.¹⁰⁹ Neque enim a praecipiti temerariae festinationis cursu candidatos artis eo inhibui, ut aliquosque iam progressos ad infelicem calumniandi se poenam rursus alligarem. Nam quomodo quaeso tantae arti tandem aliquando sufficient, qui singulis partibus eius insenescent?¹¹⁰ Finem hunc spectabit artifex; ut videatur optimum argumentum optime expressisse¹¹¹: et abunde pinxit bene, qui materiae satisfacit.¹¹²

We have now spoken sufficiently about those people, whose haste suffers the verdict of rashness: it remains that we now also discuss those, whose

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or.* 12.9.14: *Nunc, quia varium fere propositum agentium fuit et quorundam cura tarditatis, quorundam facilitas temeritatis crimine laboravit, quem credam fore in hoc oratoris modum tradere non alienum videtur.* ("Advocates have had different approaches: the carefulness of some has exposed them to the charge of slowness, and the facility of others to that of haste. It seems relevant therefore that I should say what I think will be the right balance in this regard") (Translations of Quintilian's *Institutiones Oratoriae* are from Russell, 2002).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.3.10-11: *Neque enim rursus eos qui robur aliquod in stilo fecerint ad infelicem calumniandi se poenam alligandos puto. Nam quo modo sufficere officiis civilibus possit qui singulis actionum partibus insenescat?* ("On the other hand, I do not think that those who have acquired some strength in writing ought to be tied down to the fruitless punishment of picking holes in their own work. How can a man do his public duty if he lets old age creep on him while he worries about individual parts of his speeches?").

¹¹¹ Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or.* 12.9.6: *Verborum quidem dilectus, gravitas sententiarum, figurarum elegantia aut non sunt aut apparent: sed vel propter hoc ipsum ostentanda non sunt, quod apparent, ac, si unum sit ex duobus eligendum, causa potius laudetur quam patronus. Finem tamen hunc praestabit orator, ut videatur optimam causam optime egisse.* ("Choice of words, profundity of reflections (sententiae), and elegance of Figures do not exist if they are not visible. But the very fact that they are so visible itself means that they do not have to be put on show, and, if a choice between the two were necessary, it would be better for the Cause to be praised than the advocate. The orator's achievement, however, will be to have pleaded a very good Cause very well").

¹¹² Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or.* 12.9.7: *Nec illo fastidio laborabit orator non agendi causas minores, tamquam infra eum sint aut detractura sit opinioni minus liberalis materia. Nam et suscipiendi ratio iustissima est officium, et optandum etiam ut amici quam minimas lites habeant, et abunde dixit bene quisquis rei satisfacit.* ("Nor should the orator be so fastidious as to decline less important Causes, as though they were beneath him, or as if a less grand subject would detract from his reputation. After all, the best justification for taking up a case is obligation, and one must also pray that one's friends' law suits are as little threatening as possible; moreover, anyone who does justice to his subject has spoken more than satisfactorily").

excessive carefulness bears the mark of dullness. For not have I held the apprentices of art away from the heedless course of audacious haste, so that I may in turn condemn those who have already made some progress to the unhappy punishment of extreme self-criticism. For how, I ask you, can they ever succeed in such great art, if they grow old in practicing its individual elements? An artificer should keep this aim in mind; to have expressed the best argument in the best way: and he who has paid sufficient attention to his subject, has painted more than well enough.

After his discussion of the diligence and care necessary for creating a successful artwork and warnings against artistic heedlessness Junius' now balances his advice with a cautious note. Junius constructs his argument by combining passages from Lucian, Longinus, Cicero and Quintilian:

Maximamque in eo semper curam ponit, ne curam fassus incidat in κακοζηλίαν ὑπερβαινόντων τὸ μέτρον τῆς μιμήσεως καὶ πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἐπιτεινόντων. *Malam affectationem imitationis modum transgredientium, et aequo vehementius eam intendentium.*¹¹³ Lucianus de Saltatione. Neve nimia contra se calumnia verum sanguinem perdat. Quintil. X.I. Etenim in augustissimis accuratae artis operibus, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἄγαν πλούτοις, εἶναι τι χρὴ καὶ παρολιγωρούμενον¹¹⁴, *quemadmodum in maximis divitiis appetendis, necesse est aliquid ferme neglegi.*¹¹⁵ Dionys. Longinus περὶ ὕψους §29 [33.2]. Negligentia quaedam appareat¹¹⁶, et habebit Pictura

¹¹³ Lucianus, *De saltatione* 82: Γίνεται δέ, ὥσπερ ἐν λόγοις, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐν ὀρχήσει ἢ πρὸς τῶν πολλῶν λεγομένη κακοζηλία ὑπερβαινόντων τὸ μέτρον τῆς μιμήσεως καὶ πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἐπιτεινόντων. ("As in literature, so too in dancing what is generally called "bad taste" comes in when they exceed the due limit of mimicry and put forth greater effort than they should") (translation: Harmon, 1936).

¹¹⁴ *Peri hypsous* 33.2: see above note 61.

¹¹⁵ The 1694 translation replaces *maximis* with *nimiis* (DPV 1694, 2.11.7, p. 128).

¹¹⁶ Cicero, *Orator* 78: "[...] *quaedam etiam negligentia est diligens.*" ("[...] There is such a thing even as a careful negligence").

quandam ex illa vitii similitudine gratiam; ut in cibis interim acor ipse iucundus est.¹¹⁷

He [the experienced artificer] is moreover always very careful not to display his carefulness and to fall into “affectation, which belongs to those transgressing the proper measure of imitation and to those stretching beyond what is reasonable”. He should moreover “not ruin his true strength by too much self-criticism.” For in the most elevated works of elaborate art, “as in great wealth, it is inevitable that something is altogether overlooked”. A certain negligence appears, and the painting will have a certain grace arising from that similarity to the vice; just like in food sourness is sometimes pleasant itself.

In this passage Junius uses Longinus’ argument that it is natural that a great writer, because of greatness itself, occasionally makes mistakes (*Peri hypsous* 33.2). Junius describes the result of these mistakes (*gratia*; ‘grace’) with a combination of passages from Cicero’s *Orator* and Quintilian’s *Institutiones Oratoriae*. The word *neglegi* (‘to be neglected’) in Junius’ translation of *Peri hypsous* 33.2 connects the passage to Cicero’s remark on *neglegentia* (‘negligence’). By interweaving these passages Junius aims to formulate the perfect balance between boldness and carefulness, which guards artists from excessive self-criticism, as well as unbridled rashness. In Junius’ argument in *DPV* 2.11.7, *κακοζηλία* (‘false affectation’) paradoxically appears as the result of two opposite faults. On the one hand, Junius presents it as a result of too much care (... *curam fassus incidat in κακοζηλίαν*; “displaying his care the artist falls into false affectation”). On the other hand it may also result from a lack of care, or the failure to observe the limits of propriety, which is defined (in Lucian’s words) as a transgression of “the proper measure of imitation” and of “what is reasonable”. Junius makes this paradox explicit in his statement that “an experienced artist is always *careful* not to display his *care*” (*semper curam ponit, ne curam fassus...*).

¹¹⁷ *DPV* (1637) 2.11.7, p. 120. Quintilian, *Institutiones Oratoriae* 9.3.27: “Haec schemata (...) habent quandam ex illa vitii similitudine gratiam, ut in cibis interim acor ipse iucundus est.” (“These Figures [...] acquire some charm from their resemblance to faults, just as bitterness in food is sometimes agreeable in itself”).

In *DPV* 2.11.7 Junius essentially describes the critical judgment that an artist needs in order to balance boldness and carefulness, in a way that recalls his argument on the fine line between dullness and excess in his discussion of *phantasia* in the first book of the *De pictura veterum* (*DPV* 1.3.11 and 1.4.6).¹¹⁸ In each of these passages an element of danger is present: in *DPV* 1.3.11 Junius describes how great minds are at risk of being enticed by their imagination; in *DPV* 1.4.6 the unbridled imagination of poets is exemplified by the fatal ride of Phaethon; in *DPV* 2.11.7 Junius presents his argument on ‘care’ as a safeguard against the ‘heedless course of audacious haste’. In all three of these passages Junius describes how failure inevitably leads to a certain vice, be it ‘fondness for novelty’ (*DPV* 1.3.11), ‘tumidity’ (*DPV* 1.4.6), or ‘false affectation’ (*DPV* 2.11.7). *Peri hypsous* provides an important basis for Junius’s arguments in each of these passages. Excerpts from Longinus’ discussion of stylistic faults (*Peri hypsous* 3-5) serve to illustrate the vices that artists may incur (*DPV* 1.3.11 and 1.4.6), while the dangers associated with artistic production are described with references to *Peri hypsous* 33 (*DPV* 1.3.11 and 12.11.7) and *Peri hypsous* 15 (*DPV* 1.4.6).¹¹⁹ In each of these passages Junius describes the balancing act of good taste, which oscillates between boldness and carefulness, between freedom and self-criticism, between innovation and tradition. The result of this judgment, of knowing when to ‘overlook something’, is *gratia* (‘grace’). In section 4.7 I will discuss the role of *Peri hypsous* in Junius’ discussion of grace and judgment in *DPV* 3.6 and 3.7.

¹¹⁸ See sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3.

¹¹⁹ In *DPV* 2.11.7 Junius does not refer to a passage from *Peri hypsous* 3-5, but instead quotes Lucian on *κακοζηλία*, a vice that is however also discussed in *Peri hypsous* 3.4: ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν οἶδουν ὑπεραίρειν βούλεται τὰ ὕψη, τὸ δὲ μειρακιῶδες ἄντικρυς ὑπεναντίον τοῖς μεγέθεσι· ταπεινὸν γὰρ ἐξ ὅλου καὶ μικρόψυχον καὶ τῷ ὄντι κακὸν ἀγεννέστατον. τί ποτ’ οὖν τὸ μειρακιῶδες ἐστίν; ἢ δῆλον ὡς σχολαστικῇ νόησιν, ὑπὸ περιεργασίας λήγουσα εἰς ψυχρότητα; ὀλισθαίνουσι δ’ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ γένος ὀρεγόμενοι μὲν τοῦ περιττοῦ καὶ πεπονημένου καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ ἡδέος, ἐξοκέλλοντες δὲ εἰς τὸ ῥωπικὸν καὶ κακόζηλον. (“But, while tumidity seeks to outdo the sublime, puerility is the exact opposite of grandeur; utterly abject, mean spirited, and in fact the most ignoble of faults. What then is puerility? Is it not obviously an idea born in the classroom, whose overelaboration ends in frigid failure? 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”).

4.5 From visual metaphor to technical precept (DPV 3.2-5)

Throughout the *De pictura veterum* Junius uses elements from ancient rhetoric and poetics for his construction of a theory of the visual arts in Antiquity. In the case of *Peri hypsous* we have so far seen that several of Longinus' remarks on *phantasia* have been made applicable to the visual arts through the replacement of words pertaining to discourse (λόγος, ῥητορική) by words indicating visual art (*pictoria*, ζωγραφική) (DPV 1.4.6).¹²⁰ Quite often Junius however also draws on general principles that are equally applicable to literature and visual arts, such as methods for invention, emulation of predecessors, or artistic licence (DPV 2.11.7). An important element of Junius' method is the fact that ancient rhetoricians and literary critics often employed visual metaphors in their works. Ancient theoretical treatises on oratory and literature for instance comment on 'clarity' or 'obscurity' of language, use architectural terms to describe a text, or compare texts to artworks or the human body.¹²¹ Longinus too compares discourse for instance to sculpting, architecture and painting several times in *Peri hypsous*.¹²² In the *De pictura veterum* (Book III in particular) Junius turns several of Longinus' visual analogies into concrete artistic rules by removing their metaphorical dimension.

The third book of *De pictura veterum* deals with the five main principles of the creation of an artwork:

Observabantur itaque ab antiquioribus in Pictura quinque haec capita: **Inventio** sive Historia; **Proportio** sive Symmetria; **Color**, et in eo Lux et Umbra, Candor et Tenebrae; **Motus**, et in eo Actio et Passio; **Collocatio** denique sive Oeconomica totius operis dispositio.¹²³

¹²⁰ For a discussion of this particular passage (DPV 1.4.6), see section 4.3.3.

¹²¹ L. van Hook, *The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism* (Diss. University of Chicago, 1905) presents an overview of metaphors in ancient literary criticism. C.B. Menuez, 'Longinus on the Equivalence of the Arts', *The Classical Journal* 36 (1941), 346-353 discusses metaphors in Longinus' treatise. See also J.I. Porter, *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece: Matter, Sensation, and Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 355-357 and S. Butler and A. Purves (eds.), *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses* (Durham: Acumen, 2013).

¹²² Besides metaphors from the visual arts Longinus also draws on analogies with dancing and music. See Menuez (1941).

¹²³ DPV 3 (1637), *argumentum libri tertii*, p. 130.

And so the ancients observed in painting these five principles: **invention**, or the events depicted; **proportion**, or symmetry; **colour**, including light and shade, brightness and darkness; **motion**, including action and passion; and finally **collocation**, or the proper arrangement of the entire artwork.¹²⁴

These five principles seem to be inspired by the canons of oratory (*inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, and *pronuntiatio*) as they appear for instance in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*¹²⁵, Cicero's *De Inventione*¹²⁶, and Quintilian's *Institutiones Oratoriae*¹²⁷, as well as the principles of architecture in Vitruvius' *De architectura*.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ The bold typeface in the Latin citation and English translation is mine.

¹²⁵ *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.2.3: *Oportet igitur esse in oratore inventionem, dispositionem, elocutionem, memoriam, pronuntiationem. Inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium quae causam probabilem reddant. Dispositio est ordo et distributio rerum, quae demonstrat quid quibus locis sit collocandum. Elocutio est idoneorum verborum et sententiarum ad inventionem adcommodatio. Memoria est firma animi rerum et verborum et dispositionis perceptio. Pronuntiatio est vocis, vultus, gestus moderatio cum venustate* ("The speaker, then, should possess the faculties of Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory, and Delivery. Invention is the devising of matter, true or plausible, that would make the case convincing. Arrangement is the ordering and distribution of the matter, making clear the place to which each thing is to be assigned. Style is the adaptation of suitable words and sentences to the matter devised. Memory is the firm retention in the mind of the matter, words, and arrangement. Delivery is the graceful regulation of voice, countenance, and gesture") (Translation: Caplan, 1954).

¹²⁶ Cic. *Inv.* 1.9: *Partes autem eae quas plerique dixerunt, inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, pronuntiatio. Inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium quae causam probabilem reddant; dispositio est rerum inventarum in ordinem distributio; elocutio est idoneorum verborum ad inventionem accommodatio; memoria est firma animi rerum ac verborum perceptio; pronuntiatio est ex rerum et verborum dignitate vocis et corporis moderatio.* ("Parts of it, as most authorities have stated, are Invention, Arrangement, Expression, Memory, Delivery. Invention is the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one's cause plausible. Arrangement is the distribution of arguments thus discovered in the proper order. Expression is the fitting of the proper language to the invented matter. Memory is the firm mental grasp of matter and words. Delivery is the control of voice and body in a manner suitable to the dignity of the subject matter and the style") (Translation: Hubbell, 1949).

¹²⁷ Quint. *Inst. Or.* 3.3.1: *Omnis autem orandi ratio, ut plurimi maxime auctores tradiderunt, quinque partibus constat: inventione dispositione elocutione memoria pronuntiatione sive actione (utroque enim modo dicitur)* ("The system of oratory, as a whole, according to most authorities, and the best of them, consists of five parts: Invention, Disposition, Elocution, Memory, and Delivery or Performance (both terms are in use)").

¹²⁸ Vitruvius, *De architectura* 1.2.1: *Architectura autem constat ex ordinatione, quae graece τάξις dicitur, et ex dispositione, hanc autem Graeci διάθεσιν vocitant, et eurythmia et symmetria et decore et distributione, quae*

One could align Junius' principle of *inventio* with Cicero's principle of *inventio*, and Junius' principle of *proportio/symmetria* with Vitruvius' *eurythmia* and *symmetria*. Junius' principle of *collocatio/dispositio* could be linked to Cicero's *dispositio* as well as Vitruvius' *dispositio*.¹²⁹ One might also compare Junius' five principles to Longinus' five sources of the sublime, in which case Junius' *inventio* and *motus* could be aligned with Longinus' sources 'greatness of thought' and 'emotion', while Junius' *color*, *proportio* and *collocatio* could be compared respectively with Longinus' 'figures of speech', 'diction' and 'word arrangement'.¹³⁰ The resemblance between Junius' five elements and the elements in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as well as the works of Cicero, Quintilian, Vitruvius and Longinus points towards a general principle of ancient literary or artistic theory and is characteristic for Junius' synthetic method. With a combination of oratorical and architectural elements, Junius is able to cover the 'narrative' or 'scenic', as well as the graphic aspects of the visual arts. While *inventio* is concerned with the subject matter of an artwork, the other four principles pertain to artistic technique and execution. Junius dedicates a chapter to each of his five elements (DPV 3.1-5). To these five principles Junius adds the additional factor of 'grace' (*gratia*, DPV 3.6). I will discuss 'invention' (especially Junius' section on 'magnificence', which draws extensively on *Peri hypsous*) in section 4.6, and grace in section 4.7. The present section will shed light on Junius' adaptation of Longinus' metaphors in DPV 3.2-5.

In his discussion of 'proportion' (DPV 3.2), which pertains to the proportions in the picture as a whole, as well as of the individual figures depicted, Junius includes a strategically abbreviated version of Longinus' comparison between successful verbal composition and the human body:

graece οἰκονομία dicitur ("Architecture depends on order (in Greek *taxis*), arrangement (in Greek *diathesis*), proportion, symmetry, Propriety, and economy (in Greek *oikonomia*)") (Translation: Granger, 1931).

¹²⁹ See also Nativel (1983), 20 on the five principles of painting in Book III of the *De pictura veterum*.

¹³⁰ This alignment is supported by the fact that Junius extensively quotes *Peri hypsous* 9, on 'greatness of thought' in his chapter on *inventio* (DPV 3.1). The words *motus* and *πάθος* both essentially mean 'passion', while *color* or *χρῶμα* are sometimes used to denote 'character of style'. Both Junius and Longinus moreover define *collocatio/ σύνθεσις* as a principle that forges together the elements of the entire work.

τῶν γὰρ μελῶν ἐν μὲν οὐδενὶ τμηθὲν ἀφ’ ἑτέρου καθ’ ἑαυτὸ τι ἀξιόλογον ἔχει, πάντα δὲ μετ’ ἀλλήλων ἐκπληροῖ τέλειον σύστημα, σωματοποιούμενα τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ ἔτι τῷ δεσμῷ τῆς ἁρμονίας περικλειόμενα. *Membrorum unum amputatum ab altero per se ipsum nihil quidem retinet laudabile: sed alia cum aliis conjuncta omnia simul totius corporis compagem constituent, & justam ipsi magnitudinem afferent.*¹³¹

If one of the members is cut off from another it has nothing remarkable by itself, but all together they constitute a perfectly coherent whole, when they are organised through unity and moreover surrounded by the bond of harmony.¹³²

Longinus compares the unity of a text (through the proper application of rhythmic elements) to the unity of a body (σῶμα, *corpus*).¹³³ The original passage however is longer than Junius’ citation, as it includes more references to the textual aspects of Longinus’ point. Junius also leaves out the introduction of the metaphor (καθάπερ τὰ σώματα...; “just like in the human body...”), thereby implying that the statements are an actual description of the right proportions of the human body, instead of an illustrative simile.¹³⁴

¹³¹ DPV (1637) 3.2.3, p. 156.

¹³² Junius’ Latin translation is slightly different from the Greek, as it reads: “If one of the members is cut off from another it has nothing remarkable by itself, but all together constitute the structure of a complete body, and convey upon themselves the proper kind of greatness.” The reference to *magnitudo* (‘greatness’) in the Latin translation (which is not present in the Greek passage that Junius cited) is probably derived from Longinus’ mentioning of the words μέγεθος (‘greatness’) and μεγεθοποιέω (‘to invest with grandeur’) in *Peri hypsous* 40.1 in the immediate context of the passage that Junius cited.

¹³³ The earliest surviving use of the metaphor ‘text as body’ is provided by Plato in the *Phaedrus* (264b-d). See M. Heath, *Unity in Greek Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 17-20.

¹³⁴ *Peri hypsous* 40.1: Ἐν δὲ τοῖς μάλιστα μεγεθοποιεῖ τὰ λεγόμενα, καθάπερ τὰ σώματα ἢ τῶν μελῶν ἐπισύνθεσις, ὧν ἐν μὲν οὐδὲν τμηθὲν ἀφ’ ἑτέρου καθ’ ἑαυτὸ ἀξιόλογον ἔχει, πάντα δὲ μετ’ ἀλλήλων ἐκ- πληροῖ τέλειον σύστημα, οὕτως τὰ μεγάλα σκεδασθέντα μὲν ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων ἄλλοσ’ ἄλλη ἅμα ἑαυτοῖς συνδιαφορεῖ καὶ τὸ ὕψος, σωματοποιούμενα δὲ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ ἔτι δεσμῷ τῆς ἁρμονίας περικλειόμενα αὐτῷ τῷ κύκλῳ φωνήεντα γίνεται καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις ἑρᾶνός ἐστι πλῆθους τὰ μεγέθη (“Nothing is of greater service in giving grandeur to what is said than the organization of the various members. It is the same with the human body. None if the members has any value by itself apart from the others, yet one with another they all constitute a perfect system. Similarly

Junius' discussion of proportion in *DPV* 3.2 however ties in with other metaphors that are present in *Peri hypsous* as well as in several of Junius' other sources: the analogy with music, and, on a deeper level, with arithmetics. After an introduction of the concept of proportion and the various terms the ancients used to denote it (such as *ξυμμετρία*, *ἀναλογία*, *ἁρμονία*, *congruentia*, *compositio*; *DPV* 3.2.1), Junius dwells on the comparison between painting and music, which are both based on 'proportions' and have a basis in arithmetic (*DPV* 3.2.2).¹³⁵ In the subsequent section (*DPV* 3.2.3) Junius explains how the universe itself is permeated by harmony and symmetry, which also applies to *the* human body, and explains that, just like natural bodies gain their beauty from having the right proportions, the imitation of natural bodies should likewise follow this principle.¹³⁶ Unlike many other parts of *De pictura veterum*, Junius' discussion of proportion hardly draws on the principles of poetry or oratory. Instead, Junius elucidates the importance of proportion by using analogies with music and arithmetic.

In this context Longinus' statement on the unity of the human body (*Peri hypsous* 40.1) is cited without reference to its underlying literary aspect. The musical implications of Longinus' metaphor however do resonate in the context of *DPV* 3.2.3. In *Peri hypsous* 40.1, which, in the first place, is a discussion of the rhythmical qualities of text, the word μέλος can indicate both 'member' (of a body), and 'melody' or '(phrase of a) song'.¹³⁷ The expression τέλειον σύστημα, meaning 'perfect coherence', enforces the organic metaphor that is invoked through the words μέλος and σωματοποιούμενα, and hence signifies 'the

if these effects of grandeur are separated, the sublimity is scattered with them: but if they are united into a single whole and embraced by the bonds of rhythm, then they gain a living voice just by being merely rounded into a period. In a period, one might say, the grandeur comes from the multitude of contributors").

¹³⁵ *DPV* (1637) 3.2.2, p. 154. According to Junius (following Pliny), painting borrowed the terms *tonus* ('tone' or 'colour') and *ἁρμογή* ('tuning' or 'joining') from music (*DPV* 3.2.2, 1637, p. 155).

¹³⁶ *DPV* (1637) 3.2.3, p.156: quemadmodum igitur vera naturalium corporum pulchritudo sine hac harmoniae concinnitate nulla prorsus est; ita etiam recta naturalium corporum imitatio in legitima proportionis hujus observatione potissimum consistit. ("Just as there exists no true beauty of natural bodies without that harmonic agreement, so the right imitation of natural bodies above all consists in the proper observation of this proportion").

¹³⁷ Elsewhere in *Peri hypsous* it is indeed used in the musical sense: cf. μέλος (*Peri hypsous* 3.1), and ἐμελοποίησε (*Peri hypsous* 28.2).

complete body' (as in Junius' Latin translation). In musical contexts however the expression τέλειον σύστημα is also used to denote a particular harmonic system.¹³⁸ Finally, the term ἄρμονία (literally 'joining'), can be a musical term, but can also refer to the 'joining together' of limbs in the right proportions.¹³⁹ Junius' repeated reference to 'proportion' with the word ἄρμονία as well his insistence on the relationship between music and painting reveal his musical mindset when constructing his argument on 'proportion' in *DPV* 3.2. It moreover explains Junius' incorporation in this context of *Peri hypsous* 40.1, which combines an organic and musical metaphor.¹⁴⁰

In the subsequent section of the *De pictura veterum* Junius continues his discussion of proportion by emphasising that artificers should carefully study the shape of the human body in order to depict it properly (*DPV* 3.2.4). As earlier, Junius selects passages from ancient rhetorical treatises that compare text to the human body, and takes them out of their metaphorical context. From Quintilian Junius borrows the advice that bones and sinews should also be covered by flesh, and that a human face should not be portrayed rigidly.¹⁴¹ In this context Junius also

¹³⁸ See A. Barker, *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 13-17 on the 'perfect system' in Greek musical theory.

¹³⁹ The term ἄρμονία in the sense of 'joining together' bears an architectural connotation as well. A conspicuous use of the term ἄρμονία in the context of architecture is found in Vitruvius, *De architectura* 5.4, in which the author gives an extensive summary of the ancient musical theory and terminology that an architect should know for establishing the proper measurements of a theatre.

¹⁴⁰ *DPV* (1637) 3.2.1, p. 154: *Invento argumento, proximum est, ut in eo delineando artifex justae Proportionis rationem habeat; quae Philostrato atque aliis passim ξυμμετρία, ἀναλογία, ἄρμονία vocari solent. DPV* (1637) 3.2.2, p.155: *Ἀναλογίας certe et ἄρμονίας voces videntur his artifices mutuati ab ea, quae in numeris Arithmetice et concentibus Musicis deprehenditur proportione. Neque enim aliud quid est Proportio, quam certa quaedam le numerorum, quam sequuntur artifices.*

¹⁴¹ The original passages contain statements on the proper amount of rhetorical instruction, and on the naturalness of oratory, respectively. Quint. *Inst. Or.* 1.prooem.24: *Nam plerumque nuda illae artes nimiae subtilitatis adfectione frangunt atque concidunt quidquid est in oratione generosius, et omnem sucum ingenii bibunt et ossa detegunt, quae ut esse et adstringi nervis suis debent, sic corpore operienda sunt* ("The familiar dry textbooks, with their striving for excessive subtlety, merely weaken and cripple any generous stylistic tendencies there may be, drain off all the juice of the mind, and expose the bones—which must of course be there, and be bound together by the proper sinews, but which also need to be covered by the flesh"). Quint. *Inst. Or.* 9.3.101: *Et oratio habet rectam quandam velut faciem, quae ut stupere immobili rigore non debebit, ita saepius in ea quam natura dedit specie continenda est* ("Oratory too has, as it were, its

adduces Longinus' rejection of 'tumours' in writing: *κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι ἐπὶ σωμάτων* ("tumours in bodies are bad" *Peri hypsous* 3.4).¹⁴² In *Peri hypsous* 3 Longinus discusses the vice of 'turgidness' in writing and employs a series of organic metaphors to illustrate his point. Longinus for instance defines tragedy as a 'pompous matter' (*πρᾶγμα ὀγκηρόν*; lit. 'bulky thing'), which however should not result in 'misplaced tumidity' (*τὸ παρὰ μέλος οἰδεῖν*; lit. 'to swell beyond moderation') (*Peri hypsous* 3.1).¹⁴³ In this context Longinus asserts that "tumours are bad things in bodies as well as in writing". In the *De pictura veterum* these statements are used to underline the need for properly observing the shape and proportions of the human body. Junius refers to the same passage again in his discussion of 'beauty' *DPV* 3.9.20, to illustrate that "a luscious neck does not come from a swollen skin or bulky fatness."¹⁴⁴ Even if Junius here transforms Longinus' words from a metaphorical into a literal statement, the advice runs similar, as both Junius and Longinus indicate the fine line between the type of 'swelling' that is allowed (the grandeur of tragedy; the lusciousness of the human body), and the type that is not (bombastic expressions; bulky fatness).

The third reference to Longinus' treatise in the context of Junius' discussion of 'proportion' (*DPV* 3.2) is derived from *Peri hypsous* 36.3. In *Peri hypsous* 36.3 Longinus compares writing with sculpture, and states that "we expect a statue to resemble a man, but in literature, as I said before, we look for something greater

natural face, which must of course not be fixed in motionless rigidity, but still should normally be kept looking as nature intended it").

¹⁴² *DPV* (1637) 3.2.4, p. 157: *κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι ἐπὶ σωμάτων, mali tumores in corporibus*. Cf. *Peri hypsous* 3.4: *κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι καὶ ἐπὶ σωμάτων καὶ λόγων οἱ χαῦνοι καὶ ἀναλήθεις καὶ μήποτε περιστάντες ἡμᾶς εἰς τοῦναντίον* ("Tumours are bad things whether in books or bodies, those empty inflations, void of sincerity, as likely as not producing the opposite to the effect intended").

¹⁴³ *Peri hypsous* 3.1: *ὅπου δ' ἐν τραγωδίᾳ, πρᾶγματι ὀγκηρῷ φύσει καὶ ἐπιδεχομένῳ στόμφον, ὅμως τὸ παρὰ μέλος οἰδεῖν ἀσύγνωστον, σχολῇ γ' ἂν οἶμαι λόγοις ἀληθινοῖς ἀρμόσειεν* ("Now seeing that in tragedy, which is essentially a majestic matter and admits of bombast, misplaced tumidity is nonetheless unpardonable, it is even less likely to suit real speeches").

¹⁴⁴ *DPV* (1637) 3.9.20, p. 274: *Succulentiam tamen hanc non putamus consistere in cute distenta nimiaeque pinguedinis mole gravata. κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι ἐπὶ σωμάτων, vitiosi enim sunt tumores corporis, ut supra cap. II huius libri tertii, §. 4, ex Dionysio Longino didicimus* ("Yet we think that lusciousness does not consist in a swelling of the skin, or a heavy bulk of extreme fatness. Tumours in bodies are bad, as we learned above, in chapter two, section 4 of our third book, from Longinus"). The 1694 translation replaces *corporis* with *in corporibus* (*DPV* 1694, 3.9.20, p. 257).

than human”.¹⁴⁵ Junius in turn uses the first half of this comparison to stress the importance of similitude in painting in *DPV* 3.4.7.¹⁴⁶ Just like the other references to *Peri hypsous* in *DPV* 3.2, this passage leaves out the metaphorical context from which it originates.

Junius’ discussion of ‘colour’ (*DPV* 3.3), ‘motion’ (*DPV* 3.4) and ‘arrangement’ (*DPV* 3.5), likewise draws on metaphors and comparisons from *Peri hypsous*. In *DPV* 3.3.6 (on ‘colour’) Junius adduces Longinus’ remarks on ‘highlights’ (*Peri hypsous* 17.3), which, like the sublime itself, draw the eye’s attention away from the darker parts of a painting.¹⁴⁷ In *DPV* 3.4 Junius discusses ‘motion’, or the suggested liveliness and emotions of the individuals depicted. Adducing Longinus, Junius asserts in 3.4.7 that “art is then perfect, when it seems to be nature” (*Peri hypsous* 22.1).¹⁴⁸ Junius concludes his discussion of ‘motion’ with a warning against

¹⁴⁵ *Peri hypsous* 36.3: καπὶ μὲν ἀνδριάντων ζητεῖται τὸ ὁμοιον ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ λόγου τὸ ὑπεραῖρον, ὡς ἔφην, τὰ ἀνθρώπινα (“Also we expect a statue to resemble a man, but in literature, as I said before, we look for something greater than human”).

¹⁴⁶ *DPV* (1637) 3.2.7, p. 160: ἐπὶ ἀνδριάντων ζητεῖται τὸ ὁμοιον ἀνθρώπῳ. In *statuis requiritur quod est simile hominibus*. The 1694 translation replaces *hominibus* with *hominis* (*DPV* 1694, 3.2.7, p. 165).

¹⁴⁷ *DPV* (1637) 3.3.6, p. 168: ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κειμένων ἐπιπέδου παραλλήλων ἐν χρώμασι τῆς σκιᾶς τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός, ὁμῶς προὔπαντᾶ τε τὸ φῶς ταῖς ὄψεσι καίόμενον ἔσοχον καὶ ἐγγυτέρω παρὰ πολὺ φαίνεται. *Collocatis in eodem plano lineis aequali spatio distantibus, tum umbrae, tum luminis adhibitibus coloribus, occurrit imprimis oculis nostris quod luminosum est flagrans vehementer, & propius aspectui multo magis conspicuum apparet*. Dionys. Longinus, Περὶ ὕψους, §15 [17.3]. The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: *Parallelis in eodem plano ductis, atque umbrae luminisque coloribus distinctis, in oculos nostros imprimis incurret flagrans vis luminis, propiusque oculis admota esse videbitur* (*DPV* 1694, 3.3.6, p. 171). Cf. *Peri hypsous* 17.3: οὐ πόρρω δ’ ἴσως τούτου καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ζωγραφίας τι συμβαίνει· ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κειμένων ἐπιπέδου παραλλήλων ἐν χρώμασι τῆς σκιᾶς τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός, ὁμῶς προὔπαντᾶ τε τὸ φῶς ταῖς ὄψεσι καὶ οὐ μόνον ἔσοχον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγγυτέρω παρὰ πολὺ φαίνεται. οὐκοῦν καπὶ τῶν λόγων τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰ ὕψη ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐγγυτέρω κείμενα διὰ τε φυσικὴν τινα συγγένειαν καὶ διὰ λαμπρότητα, αἰεὶ τῶν σχημάτων προεμφανίζεται καὶ τὴν τέχνην αὐτῶν ἐπισκιάζει καὶ οἷον ἐν κατακαλύψει τηρεῖ (“We see something of the same kind in painting. Though the highlights and shadows lie side by side in the same plane, yet the highlights spring to the eye and seem not only to stand out, but to be actually much nearer. So it is in writing. What is sublime and moving lies nearer to our hearts, and thus, partly from a natural affinity, partly from brilliance of effect, it always strikes the eye long before the figures, thus throwing their art into the shade and keeping it hid as it were under a bushel”).

¹⁴⁸ *DPV* (1637) 3.4.7, p. 189: Recte Longinus, Περὶ ὕψους §19 [22.1]: τότε γὰρ ἡ τέχνη τέλειος ἢνικ’ ἀν φύσις εἶναι δοκῇ. *Tunc ars est perfecta, quando natura esse videtur*. Cf. *Peri hypsous* 22.1. In the original passage Longinus states that the deliberate manipulation of the word order in a sentence can render a

‘misplaced’ emotion (DPV 3.4.8), which is derived from *Peri hypsous* 3.5.¹⁴⁹ Junius’ discussion of ‘arrangement’ (DPV 3.5.9) includes Longinus’ advice to avoid the addition of showy or undignified elements, as they break up the structure like gaps and fissures do in a building.¹⁵⁰

Throughout his discussion of the four ‘technical’ principles of painting (DPV 3.2-5) Junius creatively adapts metaphorical passages from Longinus’ treatise and turns them into technical precepts in his overview of the ancient ideas about the visual arts. In the absence of extensive theoretical treatises from antiquity on the visual arts Junius thus reconstructs a theory of the visual arts from other sources,

seemingly authentic imitation of excitement or vehement emotion. See also note 104 for Junius’ reference to *Peri hypsous* 22.1 in DPV 2.1.3.

¹⁴⁹ DPV (1637) 3.4.8, p. 189-190: ἔστι δὲ πάθος ἄκαιρον καὶ κενὸν ἔνθα μὴ δεῖ πάθους, ἢ ἄμετρον ἔνθα μετρίου δεῖ. πολλὰ γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐκ μέθης τινὲς εἰς τὰ μηκέτι τοῦ πράγματος ἴδια ἑαυτῶν καὶ σχολικὰ παραφέρονται. Est autem aliud nihil, quam intempestiva, inanis, & ubi nihil opus est affectibus, affectuum usurpatio: vel cum sine modo adhibentur, ubi moderati requiruntur. Saepe enim tanquam ab ebrietate nonnulli non jam quidem rerum proprios, sed quos à schola habent, adhibent affectus. Dionys. Longinus, Περί ὕψους, §3 [3.5]. Cf. *Peri hypsous* 3.5: “This is emotion misplaced and pointless where none is needed, or unrestrained where restraint is required. For writers often behave as if they were drunk and give way to outbursts of emotion which the subject no longer warrants, but which are private to themselves and consequently tedious.” Weststeijn (2015), 366 notes a digression in SKDO (1641) 3.4.8, p. 296 after the citation of Longinus, in which Junius criticises those artists who fail to recognise their own faults, and even take pleasure in such vices as tumidity (‘swellende opgeblaesenhed’) and fake greatness (‘een schijn groote handelinge’).

¹⁵⁰ DPV (1637) 3.5.9, p. 195: ἡ φλοιῶδες τι ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικὸν ἐγκατατάττοντες διὰ μέσου. λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον, ὥσανεὶ ψήγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦντα μεγέθη συνοικοδομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα. Aut corticeum, aut indecorum, aut Scholasticum, per medium inserentes. Totum enim haec ipsum labefactant corrumpuntque, tanquam psegmata, aut raritates, & intersitia, quae dum mutual inter se constructa affectione veniunt in constitutionem aedificii, faciunt ut in molem crescat ingentem. Dionys. Longinus, Περί ὕψους, §8 [10.7]. The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: Aut corticeum quid, aut minus grave, aut scholasticum in medio inserentes. Quandoquidem hac totum opus corrumpunt, tanquam destrigmenta quaedam aut raritates, quae dum mutua inter se affectione ad constructionem aedificii concurrunt, faciunt ut in molem ingentem excrescat (DPV 1694, 3.5.11, p. 194). Cf. *Peri hypsous* 10.7: ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐξοχάς, ὡς <ἀν> εἴποι τις, ἀριστίνδην ἐκκαθήραντες ἐπισυνέθηκαν, οὐδὲν φλοιῶδες ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικὸν ἐγκατατάττοντες διὰ μέσου. λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον, ὥσανεὶ ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦντα μεγέθη συνοικοδομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα (“What they have done is to clean up, as it were, the very best of the main points, and to fit them together, allowing nothing affected or undignified or pedantic to intervene. These things ruin the whole, by introducing, as it were, gaps and crevices into masses which are built together, walled in by their mutual relationships”).

particularly from rhetorical and literary theory. The visual metaphors that are found in these treatises not only provide insight in the author's view on (the production or effects of) oratory or poetry, but also contain knowledge on how the ancients viewed visual art. Junius interprets the metaphors in *Peri hypsous* as reflections on ancient artistic practice, and hence he uses them prominently in his discussion of the principles of the visual arts.

4.6 Magnificent invention (DPV 3.1.15)

4.6.1 The echo of a great mind

The first of the five principles that Junius discerns in the third book of the *De pictura veterum* is *inventio* ('invention'). Junius defines it as the process of imagining what to paint, or the choice of subject matter (DPV 3.1.1).¹⁵¹ As such, invention belongs to the imaginative faculty of the human mind (*phantasia*).¹⁵² For a successful invention, artists should take their own abilities into account, while also refraining from putting too much restraint on their own ideas (3.1.2-5). Invention should moreover be based on solid knowledge of optics, geometry, nature, humans and symbolism, as well as good observation (DPV 3.1.6-11). Junius identifies four elements of invention: 'truth' (ἀλήθεια), 'opportunity' (καιρός), 'discretion' (δικαιοσύνη), and 'magnificence' (σεμνότης) (DPV 3.1.12-15). Whereas *Peri hypsous* is not mentioned in any other part of Junius' discussion of invention, it plays a significant role in the section on 'magnificence' (DPV 3.1.15). Virtually all of the themes that Junius discusses in his section on magnificence are based on passages from *Peri hypsous*. Junius consecutively discusses: the terminology of magnificence; the vices that lie close to greatness (*Peri hypsous* 3.1); the universal approval of magnificent artworks (*Peri hypsous* 7.3-4); the necessity of entertaining magnificent thoughts (*Peri hypsous* 2.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4); and the attainment of magnificence through the emulation of predecessors (*Peri hypsous* 13.2, 13.4 and 14.2).

¹⁵¹ DPV (1637) 3.1.1, p. 130-131: Artificem ergo ante omnia par est sibi proponere, quid potissimum imitari velit.

¹⁵² Junius states that *inventio* should be quite easy, given the great variety of topics one could choose from, unless one is 'unimaginative' (ἀφαντασίωτος) (DPV 1637, 3.1.1, p. 131).

Magnificence, according to Junius, “provides [an artwork] with the greatest charm and authority” (*maximam arti gratiam auctoritatemque conciliat*). It should avoid artificial refinement, which bears the suspicion of anxious diligence.¹⁵³ Artists should moreover refrain from reaching beyond their abilities, lest they fall into excess:

Fit igitur interdum, ut valentioris Inventionis laudem sine dubio reportet, ac turgenti germine veluti efflorescat, sicut indomitus ager quasdam quoque laetiores herbas subinde producit; maximum tamen quod est in ipsa Inventione *periculum minus vitat, conaturque perdit*: unde evenit nonnumquam ut aliquid grande inveniat, qui semper quaerit quod nimium est. Verum et raro invenit, et caetera vitia non pensat. Quintil. II, 12.¹⁵⁴ Quae vero a tali animo proficiscuntur, τεθόλωται γὰρ τῇ φράσει καὶ τεθορύβηται ταῖς φαντασίαις μᾶλλον ἢ δεδείνωται, κἂν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐγὰς ἀνασκοπῆς, ἐκ τοῦ φοβεροῦ κατ’ ὀλίγον ὑπονοστεῖ πρὸς τὸ εὐκαταφρόνητον; *turbata et phantasiis exaestuantia potius, quam cum gravitate tractata et exaggerata videntur, etsi unumquodque istorum ad rationis radios inspicias, ex terribili ad vile contemptumque paulatim abcedit*. Dionys. Longinus, Περὶ ὕψους §2 [3.1].

Consequently it sometimes occurs that someone receives undubitable praise, and seems to prosper through his bloated productions, just like an untilled field from time to time yields some fertile crops; yet he hardly avoids the greatest danger that lies within invention itself, and undertakes hopeless attempts: as a result of which it occurs that he, who always seeks excess, at

¹⁵³ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 147: debet enim Pictura plurimum gravitatis habere, & omnino omnia in se continere, quae pertinent ad amplificandam dignitatem: splendoris tamen, festivitatis, & quaesitae concinnitudinis minimum prae se ferat; propterea quod ex his suspicio quaedam diligentiae nimis anxiae nascitur, quae artifice saepius adimit, quam addit auctoritatem.

¹⁵⁴ Quint. Inst. Or. 2.12.5: *Illud quoque alterum quod est in elocutione ipsa periculum minus vitat, conaturque perdit, unde evenit nonnumquam ut aliquid grande inveniat qui semper quaerit quod nimium est: verum id et raro provenit et cetera vitia non pensat.* (“The unskilled speaker is also less able to avoid the other danger, which is actually a matter of style: he makes desperate efforts, and hence, just because he is always looking for too much, sometimes succeeds in finding something impressive. But this is a rare piece of luck, and it does not compensate for his other faults”).

some point invents something grand. But this rarely happens, and it does not compensate his other faults. The things that spring from such a mind are turbid in phrasing, and are confused in imagery rather than forceful, and if one examines each in the light of day, it gradually sinks from the terrible to the ridiculous.

Junius again refers to Longinus' discussion of stylistic vices (*Peri hypsous* 3-5), which is adduced several times in the *De pictura veterum*.¹⁵⁵ In this case the passages serves as a reverse definition of magnificence: it does *not* spring from always aiming for excess.

True magnificence however, as Junius argues using Longinus' words, is something that stays in our thoughts forever, and which is esteemed by people with different tastes, ages, and ways of life (the translation is taken from *The painting of the ancients*):

genuinam magnificentiae ac granditatis notam suggerit nobis Dionys. Longinus, Περί ὕψους, §5 [7.3-4].¹⁵⁶ τοῦτο γὰρ τῷ ὄντι μέγα, οὗ πολλή μὲν ἢ ἀναθεώρησις, δύσκολος δὲ μᾶλλον δ' ἀδύνατος ἢ κατεξανάστασις, ἰσχυρὰ δὲ ἢ μνήμη καὶ δυσεξάλειπτος. ὅλως δὲ καλὰ νόμιζε ὕψη καὶ ἀληθινὰ τὰ διὰ παντὸς ἀρέσκοντα καὶ πᾶσιν. ὅταν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπὸ διαφόρων ἐπιτηδευμάτων βίων ζήλων ἡλικιῶν ἔν τι καὶ ταῦτόν ἅμα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἅπασι δοκῇ, τόθ' ἢ ἐξ ἀσυμφώνων ὡς κρίσις καὶ συγκατάθεσις τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ θαυμαζομένῳ πίστιν ἰσχυρὰν λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναμφίλεκτον. *Illud vere magnum, quod subinde cogitandum considerandumque nobis occurrit, quod vix, ac ne vix quidem, animo excidere potest, sed constanti, firma, ac indelebili memoria retinetur. Denique praeclaram illam demum granditatem & veram esse ducito, quae per omnia & omnibus placeat. Quum enim in oratione aliqua qui moribus, vitae ratione institutis, studiisque & aetatibus differunt, idem simul de iisdem sentiunt omnes, tum a dissidentibus alias &*

¹⁵⁵ DPV 1.3.11, 1.4.6, 3.2.4, 3.4.8, 3.9.20. As earlier, Junius points out that artistic invention is essentially a dangerous undertaking (*maximum periculum minus vitat*).

¹⁵⁶ The 1694 translation adds *itaque* after *genuinam* (DPV 1694, 3.1.16, p. 155).

*discrepantibus veluti profectum iudicium & approbatio unanims ei, quod habetur in admiratione, fidem certam & minime dubiam acquirit.*¹⁵⁷

It is worth our labour to observe out of *Longinus* an infallible marke of true magnificence. *That is geat indeed sayth he [Longinus], which doth still returne into our thoughts, which we can hardly or rather not at all put out of our minde, but the memorie of it sticketh close in us and will not be rubbed out: esteeme that also to be a most excellent and true magnificence, which is liked always and by all men: for when all such men as differ in their studies, course of life, purposes, and ages, doe all agree in their opinion about one and the same thing, the judgement and approbation of so many diversly minded folks, must needs gain a constant and certaine estimation of the thing so much admired.*¹⁵⁸

Junius attributes this magnificence to ‘greatness of mind’, and presents it as a mental capacity that is to be attributed to innate talent rather than learned skill. In a series of references to *Peri hypsous* Junius argues that magnificent thoughts cannot be taught and are given by nature (*Peri hypsous* 2.1), that greatness is the echo of a great mind (*Peri hypsous* 9.2)¹⁵⁹, that great ideas come to elevated minds (*Peri hypsous* 9.3)¹⁶⁰, and that those who entertain servile thoughts may never attain greatness (*Peri hypsous* 9.4).¹⁶¹ In the case of the references to *Peri hypsous* 9, Junius’

¹⁵⁷ The 1694 translation removes *in oratione aliqua* (DPV 1694, 3.1.16, p. 155).

¹⁵⁸ TPA 1638, 3.1.15, p. 246.

¹⁵⁹ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 149: Quumque certum sit hanc Imaginum sublimitatem nihil aliud esse, quam ἀπήχημα quoddam μεγαλοφροσύνης, sequitur etiam animum artificis ad maxima haec se accingentis, omnem humilium ac sordidarum rerum curam deponere debere, atque iis potissimum cogitationibus vacare, unde eum non id agentem vivus quidam augustae majestatis decor furtim prosequatur (“And because it is certain that this sublimity of images is nothing else than a certain ‘echo of a noble mind’, it also follows that the mind of an artificer, who prepares himself for these great things, should lay aside any concern with lowly and ignoble matters, and above all dedicate himself to those thoughts, from which a vivid kind of elegance will stealthily accompany the artist if he does not actively aim at it”).

¹⁶⁰ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 148-149: εἰς τοὺς μάλιστα φρονηματίας ἐμπίπτει τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ. *In elati spiritus homines maxime cadunt, quae sunt grandia.* (TPA 1638, 3.1.15, p. 247: “Great minded men are most of all given to entertain stately conceits”).

¹⁶¹ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 149: recte Longinus Περί ὕψους, §.7 [9.3] οὐχ οἷόν τε μικρὰ καὶ δουλοπρεπῇ φρονοῦντας καὶ ἐπιτηδεύοντας παρ’ ὅλον τὸν βίον θαυμαστόν τι καὶ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἐξενεγκεῖν ἄξιον. *Neque enim fieri potest, ut qui parva, & quae servitorum sunt propria, obeunt per omnem*

rendition is congruent with Longinus' argument. In his reference to *Peri hypsous* 2.1 Junius however makes a crucial alteration to the passage:

"Natura quae magna sunt constant, nec ulla doctrina comparari possunt, & una ars ad illa consequenda, ita a natura comparatum esse."¹⁶²

"Magnificent thoughts come by nature, and cannot be taught, **sayth Longinus**, yea the onely art to attaine unto the same, is that Nature should fit us to high conceited and lofty things."¹⁶³

This citation is taken from section 2.1 of *Peri hypsous*, in which Longinus raises the question whether sublimity is due to natural abilities or learning. In this passage Longinus reacts to the ideas of other critics, who argued that sublimity could only spring from natural talent:

Ἡμῖν δ' ἐκεῖνο διαπορητέον ἐν ἀρχῇ, εἰ ἔστιν ὕψους τις ἢ βάθους τέχνη, ἐπεὶ τινες ὅλως οἴονται διηπατῆσθαι τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄγοντας εἰς τεχνικὰ παραγγέλματα. γεννᾶται γάρ, **φησί**, τὰ μεγαλοφυῆ καὶ οὐ διδακτὰ παραγίνεται, καὶ μία τέχνη πρὸς αὐτὰ τὸ πεφυκέναι.

We must begin now by raising the question whether there is an art of sublimity or emotion, for some think those are wholly at fault who try to bring such matters under systematic rules. Greatness, **it is said**, is born and does not come of teaching, and the only art for producing it is nature.¹⁶⁴

vitam, admiratione & dignum omni aevo quidquam edant (TPA 1638, 3.1.15, p. 248: "It is impossible that those, sayth Longinus, who busie the thoughts and studies of there whole life about vile and servile matters, should bring forth any thing that might deserve the admiration of all ages"). The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: *Fieri non potest, ut exilia quaedam ac servilia per omnem vitam cogitantes curantesque admirabile quid atque omni aevo dignum producant* (DPV 1694, 3.1.17, p. 155).

¹⁶² DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 148. The 1694 translation replaces *constant* with *proveniunt* (DPV 1694, 3.1.17, p. 155).

¹⁶³ TPA (1638) 3.1.15, p. 247.

¹⁶⁴ *Peri hypsous* 2.1.

Junius however presents this citation as if these are Longinus' own words. In his quotation of the Greek text and in his Latin translation the word φησί ('it is said', or 'so they say') is left out. In the English and Dutch versions Junius moreover translates φησί as 'sayth Longinus' and 'seght Longinus'. In the Latin version of 1637 (see above), Longinus' addition *it is said* is simply left out (in the original Greek citation as well as Junius' Latin translation).¹⁶⁵ In doing so, Junius places a larger emphasis on the importance of natural talent than the source text itself.

The remainder of Junius' section on 'magnificence' focuses on the attainment of greatness through emulation of predecessors. Since invention is first and foremost a mental process, the painter's inspiration can come from studying paintings and poetry alike.¹⁶⁶ Junius explains the process of drawing inspiration from predecessors by quoting Longinus' description of the divine inspiration of the Pythian priestess (*Peri hypsous* 13.2, 13.4)¹⁶⁷ as well as Longinus' advice that one

¹⁶⁵ TPA (1638) 3.1.15, p. 247: *Magnificent thoughts come by nature, and cannot be taught, sayth Longinus, yea, the onely art to attaine unto the same, is that Nature should fit us to high conceited and lofty things.* SKDO (1641) 3.1.15, p. 233: *Ghelijck de hooghdraeghende dinghen uyt de nature oorspronckelick voordkomen, seght Longinus, soo en konnense ons door de leeringhe niet worden inghestort; ja de eenighe Konst om tot dese grootse dapperheyd te gheraecken, bestaet voornaemelick daer in, datmen van de Nature daer toe bequaem worde gemaect.*

¹⁶⁶ Junius explains that many painters drew inspiration from poetry (DPV 1637, 3.1.15, p. 150-151).

¹⁶⁷ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 151: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίῳ θεοφοροῦνται πνεύματι τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὃν καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν λόγος ἔχει τρίποδι πλησιάζουσαν, ἔνθα ῥήγμά ἐστι γῆς ἀναπνέον, ὥς φασιν, ἀτμὸν ἔνθεον, αὐτόθεν ἐγκύμονα τῆς δαιμονίου καθισταμένην δυνάμεως παραντίκα χρησιμῶδεῖν κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν· οὕτως ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μεγαλοφυΐας εἰς τὰς τῶν ζηλούντων ἐκείνους ψυχὰς ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερῶν στομίων ἀπόρροιαί τινες φέρονται, ὅφ' ὧν ἐπιπνεόμενοι καὶ οἱ μὴ λίαν φοιβαστικοὶ τῷ ἑτέρων συνενθουσιῶσι μεγέθει. ἔστι δ' οὐ κλοπὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἡθῶν ἢ πλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις. καὶ τῷ ὄντι καλὸς οὗτος καὶ ἀξιονικότερος εὐκλείας ἀγών τε καὶ στέφανος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡττᾶσθαι τῶν προγενεστέρων οὐκ ἄδοξον. *Multi alieno seu divino spiritu affliti rapiuntur eodem prorsus modo, quo fama est Pythiam tripodi admotam corripī: ubi ut perhibent hiatus quidam est terrae vaporem inde auramque exhalans divinam: factamque Deo plenam numinis instinctu, consulentibus responsa dare & oracula reddere: sic ab illis priscorum magnis ingenii in animos imitantium ipsos, tanquam ex sacris ostiis rivi quidam feruntur a quibus affliti etiam qui suapte natura non isto Phoebeo aguntur furore, aliorum, magnitudine impulsī rapiuntur simul. Factum porro hoc non est censendum furtum, sed tanquam ab honestis & praeclaris moribus, aut figmentis efficta expressaque forma. Et revera praeclarum hoc & victoria dignissimum pro gloria certamen & proelium: quippe in quo a majoribus vinci non sit inglorium.* Cf. *Peri hypsous* 13.2, 13.4: "For many are carried away by the inspiration of another, just as the story runs that the Pythian priestess on approaching the tripod where there is, they say, a rift in the earth, exhaling divine vapour, thereby becomes impregnated with the divine power and is at once inspired to utter

should formulate the standards of perfection by envisioning the judgment of one's predecessors (*Peri hypsous* 14.2).¹⁶⁸

Notwithstanding the presence of references to other sources, especially Quintilian, Junius' discussion of magnificence in 3.1.15 reads as a summary of the early chapters of *Peri hypsous*, drawing on Longinus' discussion of the role of art and nature (*Peri hypsous* 2), the vices associated with failed sublimity (*Peri hypsous* 3), the universal nature of the sublime (*Peri hypsous* 7), the importance of greatness of thought (*Peri hypsous* 9), as well as inspiration and emulation (*Peri hypsous* 13 and 14). Longinus' ideas on sublimity thus constitute an important basis for Junius' discussion of magnificence. In my next section I will moreover shed light on the choice that Junius makes in rendering the vocabulary of sublimity in DPV 3.1.15.

4.6.2 "Gantsch treffelicke ende waerachtighe hoogh-staetelickheyd"

In the Latin version of his book, Junius starts his discussion of magnificence with an overview of several relevant Greek and Latin terms.

oracles; so, too, from the naturel genius of those old writers there flows into the hearts of their admirers as it were an emanation from those holy mouths. Inspired by this, even those who are not easily moved to prophecy share the enthusiasm of these others' grandeur. [...] Such borrowing is no theft; it is rather like the reproduction of good character by sculptures or other works of art. [...] Fair indeed is the crown, and the fight for fame well worth the winning, where even to be worsted by our forerunners is not without glory."

¹⁶⁸ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 152: sed hoc ipsum plus etiamnum habebit momenti, si praesentis ac futuri saeculi de nobis aestimationem ex eorum, quibus nos reformandos ac velut recoquendos tradidimus, iudicio pendere sentiamus: neque enim fieri potest, ut humile quid sapiat animus aeternitatem cogitans τῷ γὰρ ὄντι μέγα τὸ ἀγώνισμα, τοιοῦτον ὑποτίθεσθαι τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων δικαστήριον καὶ θέατρον, καὶ ἐν τηλικούτοις ἥρωσι κριταῖς τε καὶ μάρτυσιν ὑπέχειν τῶν γραφομένων εὐθύνας, καὶ μὴ παῖσαι. *Revera enim illud decus magnum, & quod palmarium ducendum, tale operum suorum constituere iudicium & theatrum; nec non apud tantos heroes arbitros & testes pro scriptis causam dicere, eademque illorum iudicio citra omnem jocum subjicere.* Dionys. Longinus, Περὶ ὕψους, §12 [14.2]. vide locum. The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: *Revera enim certamen est ingens tale operum suorum constituere iudicium & theatrum* (DPV 1694, 3.1.20, p. 158). Cf. *Peri hypsous* 14.2: "Great indeed is the ordeal, if we suppose such a jury and audience as this to listen to our own utterances and make believe that we are submitting our work to the scrutiny of such heroes as witnesses and judges". In this citation Junius has replaced the word λόγων with ἔργων, in order to make the passage applicable to artworks rather than text.

“Σεμνότης, sive μεγαλοπρέπεια Quintiliano lib. iv, cap. 2. dicitur **magnificentia**.¹⁶⁹ Plinio juniori lib. vi. epist. 21. & lib. ix. ep. 26 **granditas** vocatur, & maximam arti **gratiam auctoritatemque** conciliat.¹⁷⁰ debet enim Pictura plurimum **gravitatis** habere, & omnino omnia in se continere, quae pertinent ad amplificandam **dignitatem**: splendoris tamen, festivitatis, & quaesitae concinnitudinis minimum prae se ferat.”¹⁷¹

“‘Solemnity’ or ‘greatness’ is called ‘**magnificence**’ by Quintilian. It is called ‘**grandeur**’ by Pliny the Younger, and gives art its greatest **charm and distinction**. A painting should have much **gravity**, and should altogether contain in itself everything that adds to its **dignity**. It should display as little splendour, witticism and artificial beauty as possible.”

Throughout his discussion of invention in 3.1.15, Junius uses a very broad spectrum of terms denoting ‘greatness’ or ‘sublimity’, including *gravitas*, *dignitas*, *sublimitas*, *magnitudo*, *augusta majestas*, and the adjectives *excelsis*, *grandis*, *elatus*, *sublimis*. This compilation of Latin and Greek terms indicating sublimity strongly resembles the discussion of the *character grandis* (‘high style’) in the rhetorical handbooks of Junius’ time, as for instance in the *Commentarii Rhetorici* of Gerardus Joannes Vossius.¹⁷² Both Vossius and Junius include Longinus’ term ὕψος in a

¹⁶⁹ Quint. *Inst. Or.* 4.2. Σεμνότης (‘solemnity’) is the term usually associated with Hermogenes’ *On types of Style*. See for instance Wooten (1987), xiii-xiv and 19-26.

¹⁷⁰ Pliny, *Letters* 6.21 and 9.26.

¹⁷¹ DPV (1637) 3.1.15, p. 147.

¹⁷² In his discussion of the grand style in writing (*character grandis*) Vossius explains that this style is indicated with a wide range of Greek and Latin terms. Longinus’ term ὕψος is also mentioned. Vossius (1630), II, 432-433: *Character magnificus varias, cum apud Latinos, tum Graecos, appellationes sortitus est. Nam Latine alii vocant magnificum, vel magniloquum, vel altiloquum; alii magnum, vel altum, vel summum, vel sublimem; quidam etiam plenum, vel uberem. [...] Apud Graecos similiter character is vocatur μεγαλοπρεπής, quia in eo, uti in divitum aedificiis, omnia sunt exquisita, non vulgaria aut quotidiana. [...] Denique Dionysio Longino, Rhetori κριτικωτάτω, qui sub Aureliano Caesare de hoc characterе ablectum et plane aureolum reliquit libellum, appellatur ὕψος* (“The grand style is called by many names, in Latin as well as Greek. For in Latin some call it ‘magnificent’, ‘speaking eminently’, ‘speaking highly’, others call it ‘grand’, ‘high’, ‘lofty’, or ‘sublime’; some even ‘full’ or ‘copious’. [...] By the Greeks this style is similarly called ‘magnificent’, because in this style, like in palaces of the rich, everything is exquisite,

broadier discussion of ‘magnificence’, and both use a wide spectrum of different terms, from different Latin and Greek sources.¹⁷³

Junius’ English and Dutch introductions of the topic of ‘magnificence’ in *The Painting of the Ancients* (1638) and *De Schilder-konst der Oude* (1641) omit the explicit discussion of the Greek and Latin terms, but do provide a range of virtual synonyms of the word:

“**Magnificence** doth shew it selfe in a well-conceived invention, and there is added a **wonderfull great authoritie** unto the worke, when Truth, Occasion, and Disposition are duly observed in it: for as the whole Art of painting is not much worth, unlesse it be accompanied with much **gravitie** and doe containe all such kinde of things as are full of **grace and dignitie**, so must shee make but a small shew of elegancie, pleasantnesse, and too much laboured gayness.”¹⁷⁴

“Nu komen wy eyndelick tot de **Magnificentie** ofte **staetelickheyd**, die sich ghemeynlick in een welbeleyde *Inventie* laet vinden, ghemerckt het d’ *Inventie* altijd een **sonderlinghe aensienlickheyd** toebrenght, dat den Konstenaer bevonden wordt de waerheyd, d’ occasie en de discretie omsichtiglick daer in waerghenomen te hebben. Want ghelijck de gantsche Schilder-Konst niet vele om ’t lijf en heeft, ’t en sy saecke datse met een **sonderlinghe stemmigheyd** vergeselschap sijnde, d’aenschouwers door den aenghenaemen schijn van een **hoogwaerdighe bevalligheyd** beroere, soo maghse evenwel niet al te seer op d’ opghepronckte verlustinghe van een overarbeydsaeme nettigheyd steunen.”¹⁷⁵

When comparing the various terms that Junius uses in his three introductions of the topic of ‘greatness’ we can observe that *De Schilder-konst der Oude* employs

not vulgar or common. [...] Lastly, by Dionysius Longinus, a most critical rhetorician, who in the time of Caesar Aurelian wrote an excellent and truly golden booklet on this particular style, it is called ‘sublimity’”).

¹⁷³ See Nativel (1991a), on the role of rhetorical theory in the *De pictura veterum*.

¹⁷⁴ TPA (1638) 3.1.15, p. 245.

¹⁷⁵ SKDO (1641) 3.1.15, p. 232.

slightly more elaborate terms. Particularly striking is the addition of the word *sonderlingh* ('special' 'singular', 'peculiar'), which in the Dutch version adds a mysterious air to the words *aensienlickheyd* ('authority') and *stemmigheyd* ('gravity', 'solemnity').

Junius' creativity in his Dutch version of the *De pictura veterum* can also be observed in his rendering of terminology from Longinus' treatise, as for instance in the following passage (*Peri hypsous* 7.3), here quoted in Junius' English translation, with the original Greek and Junius' Latin and Dutch renderings inserted into the text:

It is worth our labour to observe out of Longinus an infallible marke of true magnificence [Gr. ἀληθὲς ὕψος; Lat. *genuinam magnificentia ac granditas*; Du. *hoogstaetelicke grootse dinghen*]. That is great indeed sayth he, which doth still returne into our thoughts, which we can hardly or rather not at all put out of our minde, but the memorie of it sticketh close in us and will not be rubbed out: esteeme that also to be a most excellent and true magnificence [Gr. καλὰ ὕψη καὶ ἀληθινὰ; Lat. *praeclarum granditatem et veram*; Du. *treffelicke ende waerachtighe hoog-staetelickheyd*], which is liked always and by all men: for when all such men as differ in their studies, course of life, purposes, and ages, doe all agree in their opinion about one and the same thing, the judgement and approbation of so many diversly minded folks, must needs gain a constant and certaine estimation of the thing so much admired.¹⁷⁶

The Latin version translates Longinus' Greek term ὕψος with (*magnificentia ac*) *granditas*.¹⁷⁷ The English version uses the word *magnificence*, in keeping with the term that Junius used in the introduction of *DPV* 3.1.15 (as discussed above). The Dutch version however introduces the terms *hoogstaetelicke grootse dinghen* and *hoog-staetelickheyd* to render the Greek word ὕψος.

The noun *hoog-staetelickheyd* and the adjective *hoogstaetelick* are compounds of *hoogh* ('high') and *staetelick* ('stately') or *staetelickheyd* ('stateliness'). These two

¹⁷⁶ TPA (1638) 3.1.15, p. 246.

¹⁷⁷ This corresponds to De Petra's Latin translation of this passage: De Petra (1612), 50.

compounds are rarely found in Dutch literature. Given the fact that Junius is probably the first one in history who translated parts of Longinus' treatise into Dutch – and thus had to invent much of his terminology – the word *hooghstaetelick* appears to be a neologism that is designed to give an accurate rendering of especially the Longinian vocabulary.¹⁷⁸ The words *hoogh-staetelickheyd* or *hooghstaetelick* occur a total of thirteen times in the Dutch version of Junius' book.¹⁷⁹ In six instances these words are used to translate terms from Longinus' treatise. Three of these cases are translations of the Greek word ὑψος. Junius also uses *hoogh-staetelick(heyd)* to translate Longinus' terms τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ ('extraordinary things') and μεγαλοφυᾶ ('greatness of nature'), and in a clarifying remark about one of Longinus' passages in 3.1.15 (*Peri hypsous* 13.2, 13.4).¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Weststeijn suggests that *hoogh-staetelickheyd* is a neologism, see T. Weststeijn, 'The Sublime and the "Beholder's Share": Junius, Rubens, Rembrandt,' *Journal of Historians of Netherlandish Art* 8:2 (2016), 21n.1. Indeed, the cognate words *hooghstaetelick* and *hoogh-staetelickheyd* do not seem to occur in any text prior to the publication of Junius' *Schilder-konst der Oude* in 1641. They do however occur in the work of Junius' nephew, Jan de Brune de Jonge (in his *Wetsteen der Vernuftten*, 1644, and *Jok en Ernst*, 1644). De Brune was responsible for the publication of Junius' Dutch translation of the *De pictura veterum* in Middelburg, and also wrote the preface to this edition. De Brune had visited Junius in England in 1638 and it seems that De Brune's own work was influenced by Junius. See J.A. Worp, 'Jan de Brune de Jonge', *Oud Holland* 8 (1890), 81-103, and P. Koning (ed.), *Jan de Brune de Jonge, Wetsteen der vernuftten* (Querido: Amsterdam, 1990), 102. The occurrence of the words *hooghstaetelick* and *hoogh-staetelickheyd* in a source that is so close to Junius' work could certainly be an indication that these words originated in Junius' and De Brune's milieu, and quite possibly that they were coined by Junius in his *De pictura veterum*.

¹⁷⁹ *SKDO* (1641) 1.3.7, p. 30: 'de hooghstaetelicke grootscheydt van Nicophanes'; *SKDO* (1641) 1.4.1, p. 39: 'hooghstaetelickheydt van Euphranor'; *SKDO* (1641) 2.8.5, p. 117: 'hoogh-staetelicke vercierselen der Kercken'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.15, p. 233: 'het rechte merckteycken van hooghstaetelicke grootse dinghen'; 'gantsch treffelicke ende waerachtighe hoogh-staetelickheyd'; 'groote hoogh-staetelicke ghedachten'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.15, p. 234: 'allerley hooghstaetelicke en wonderbaerlicke bedenckingen'; 'de hooghstaetelickheyd der Inventien'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.15, p. 238: 'de hoogh-staetelickheyd der ouder schrijvers'; 'allerley hoogh-staetelicke ghedachten'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.16, p. 242: 'tot allerley hooghstaetelicke Inventien onbequaem'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.3.13, p. 276: 'de rechte hoogh-staetelickheyd'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.7.6, p. 336: 'hoogh-staetelickheyd'.

¹⁸⁰ *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.15, p. 233: 'het rechte merckteycken van hooghstaetelicke grootse dinghen'; 'gantsch treffelicke ende waerachtighe hoogh-staetelickheyd'; 'groote hoogh-staetelicke ghedachten'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.15, p. 234: 'allerley hooghstaetelicke en wonderbaerlicke bedenckingen'; 'de hooghstaetelickheyd der Inventien'; *SKDO* (1641) 3.1.15, p. 238: 'de hoogh-staetelickheyd der ouder schrijvers'; 'allerley hoogh-staetelicke ghedachten'.

In the introduction of the topic of ‘magnificence’ at the beginning of *DPV* 3.1.15, Junius used the words *magnificentie* (a loan word) and *staetelickheyd* as the Dutch equivalents for the terms σεμνότης, μεγαλοπρέπεια, *magnificentia* and *granditas* (found in the Latin version of the *De pictura veterum*) and *magnificence* (found in *The Painting of the Ancients*). When seeking a Dutch translation of Longinus’ word ὕψος in the same section, why did Junius not use *magnificentie* or *staetelickheyd* again? Apparently these words did not provide a rendering of this term that was accurate enough for Junius. The 1599 etymological dictionary of Cornelis Kiel, which is the first in its kind and contains a wealth of knowledge about the Dutch language, renders *staetigh*, *staetelick* with the Latin words *grauis*, *severus*, *constans*, *auctoritate et reverentia valens*, *magnificus*, *elatus*, and the English word *stately*.¹⁸¹ Likewise *staetigheyd* is rendered by Kiliaan as *grauitas*, *seueritas*, *constantia*, *decentia*, or *magnificentia*.¹⁸² Junius’ words *hoogh-staetelickheyd* and *hoogstaetelick* however explicitly convey an additional aspect: the metaphor of ‘height’. By combining ‘greatness’ and ‘height’ in one word, Junius has designed a term that does justice to Longinus’ complex vocabulary of sublimity in *Peri hypsous*, which in itself includes a great variety of terms indicating ‘greatness’, ‘grandeur’, ‘height’, and ‘elevation’.¹⁸³

As I have noted above in section 4.2, the Latin version of Junius’ work is the most extensive, but the Dutch version contains explanations and paraphrases that elaborate the ideas put forward in the earlier versions of his work. Junius’ relative consistence in rendering Longinus’ terminology with *hoogh-staetelick(heyd)* – the English and Latin version use a greater variety of terms – could therefore be a reflection of the maturity of his study when he completed his Dutch edition. Having examined his sources yet another time, and spurred on by the need to invent proper Dutch words for rendering Longinus’ vocabulary of sublimity – as

¹⁸¹ F. Claes (ed.), *Cornelis Kiel, Etymologicum teutonicae linguae* (Den Haag: Mouton, 1972), s.v. *staetigh*, *staetelick*.

¹⁸² Claes (1972), s.v. *staetigheyd*.

¹⁸³ See Porter (2016), 180-183. That Longinus’ term ὕψος was difficult to translate can for instance also be seen in the Latin title of the treatise in Francesco Robortello’s *editio princeps: Dionysii Longini praestantissimi liber de grandi sive de sublimi orationis genere* (Basel, 1554).

well as aided by his creative abilities in his mother tongue – Junius further developed his translations of Longinus in the Dutch version of his work.¹⁸⁴

In *DPV* 3.1.15 Junius presents his readers with a reconstruction of the ancients' views on 'magnificence', following his usual method of juxtaposing excerpts from a variety of sources. In the case of *Peri hypsous* however, Junius gives a rather comprehensive reading of some of the treatise's key themes in *DPV* 3.1.15, and in the Dutch version of his book the Longinian vocabulary of magnificence is translated several times with a specifically coined term (*hoogstaetelick*), indicating that for Junius *Peri hypsous* provided a particularly relevant contribution to his definition of magnificence in painting.

4.7 Grace and judgment (*DPV* 3.6 and 3.7)

After having described the basic principles of art (*DPV* 3.1-5), Junius discusses 'grace' (*gratia*), the overarching quality of art that ultimately makes an artwork successful (*DPV* 3.6). In the subsequent section Junius explains the proper way to judge artworks (*DPV* 3.7).¹⁸⁵ It has been argued that Junius' discussion of grace is greatly informed by Longinus' ideas about the creative genius, inspiration, and artistic licence.¹⁸⁶ In Junius' discussion of grace *Peri hypsous* is indeed adduced explicitly several times, and some of Junius' arguments seem to align with parts from *Peri hypsous*, especially Longinus' defence of the flawed genius and rejection of flawless mediocrity (*Peri hypsous* 33-36). In *DPV* 2.11.7, in which Junius briefly comments on grace as well, *Peri hypsous* 33 also plays an important role.¹⁸⁷ In his

¹⁸⁴ Junius moreover dedicated much of his life to the study of the Germanic languages, and described his Dutch translation of the *De pictura veterum* as an embellishment to his mother tongue. See Weststeijn (2015), 124 and 124-143.

¹⁸⁵ *DPV* (1637) 3.6.1, p. 197. *Quinque capita haec, quae recensuimus, ita sunt inter se connexa et indiscreta, ut, si quid ex his defuerit, frustra in caeteris laboretur. Nec possumus quolibet uno eorum esse contenti ad consummationem picturae, nisi porro ex omnibus his rite observatis eluceat certa quaedam Venustas ac Gratia, qua non singula haec, sed, ut semel dicam, pariter omnia decent* ("These five principles, which we have discussed, are mutually connected and inseparable, in such a way that, if one of these is absent, all work on the others will be in vain. Nor can we be content with just one of them for the consummation of a picture, if not, in turn, from the due observation of all these, shines a certain charm or grace, of which not only one, but all principles are equally fitting").

¹⁸⁶ Ellenius (1960), 85-86; Weststeijn (2008), 155; Sheers Seidenstein (2016), 4-5.

¹⁸⁷ See section 4.4.2.

discussion of grace (both in *DPV* 2.11.7 and 3.1.6-7) Junius however draws on material from numerous other sources, and some of his ideas do not correspond to Longinus' arguments, and rather seem to be derived from a broader ancient and early modern discussion of grace.

In chapter 3.6 Junius discusses the nature and attainment of grace, while chapter 3.7 is concerned with the proper way of judging an artwork, and recognising grace.¹⁸⁸ According to Junius, grace emanates from the proper design of the five primary aspects of art (*DPV* 3.6.1). Although it cannot be taught by rules, and is spoiled by excessive care, it nonetheless requires the cooperation of art and nature (*DPV* 3.6.2.). Grace springs from ease (*facilitas*; 3.6.3) and should above all be natural and simple, while avoiding careful diligence and affectation (*DPV* 3.6.4). A graceful artwork moreover stirs the minds of spectators, and invokes astonishment (*stupor*) and admiration (*admiratio*) (*DPV* 3.6.5). Grace moreover transcends the subtleties of artistic precepts; its effects are ruined by too much care (3.6.6). The only way of attaining grace, is to combine art with nature, and to adjust one's skill to one's natural disposition (3.6.7). Junius continues in chapter 3.7 with a discussion of judgment, which entails a comprehensive study of the artwork in its entirety, and not just its individual elements (3.7.1-2). Small mistakes should sometimes be forgiven, and criticism should not be a limiting factor for the artist (3.7.3). It is moreover important to observe an artwork under the right conditions, with the proper lighting and distance (3.7.4), and through the informed observation of the events and figures depicted (3.7.5). One should moreover not be lost in the study of every little detail, but observe the greatness and magnitude of the whole artwork (3.7.6). Observing an artwork conjures up images and memories in the minds of spectators (3.7.7), and, like the artists themselves, the spectators should have a storehouse of images in their mind (*DPV* 3.7.8), which they acquire through repeated observation of images, and which enables them to recognise grace (*DPV* 3.7.9). The facility of judging (*consuetudo oculorum*) moreover enables spectators to distinguish originals from copies, and older from newer works (*DPV* 3.7.10-11). Lastly, Junius remarks that *parerga* ('by-works'), which are often made with less accuracy than the principal work, are worth studying as well (*DPV* 3.7.12), and stresses that it is important to always

¹⁸⁸ See also Nativel (1983), 28-30 for a discussion of the contents of *DPV* 3.6 and 3.7.

study the ancients, and renew their knowledge and artworks (DPV 3.7.13). Throughout Junius' discussion of (the critical assessment) of 'grace' in DPV 3.6 and 3.7, *Peri hypsous* serves to illustrate the balance between nature and art (DPV 3.6.2) and the process of critical judgment (DPV 3.7.1 and 3.7.9).

4.7.1 Art, nature, and observation

In chapters 3.6 and 3.7 Junius adduces four different passages from *Peri hypsous*. The first appears in DPV 3.6.2, where Junius defines grace as a quality that cannot be described by rules:

"Atque haec est proculdubio Venus illa quam, ex ingenio artificis sponte sua nascentem, nullae regulae artis tradunt, quamque nulla vel morosissima praeceptorum sedulitate artifices assequi valeant."¹⁸⁹

"This is questionlesse that grace, which readily and freely proceeding out of the Artificers spirit, cannot be taught by any rules of art: no more can assiduity of importunate studies helpe us to it."¹⁹⁰

With a series of quotations from Quintilian's *Institutiones Oratoriae* and Cicero's *De Oratore*, Junius bolsters his argument that grace cannot be taught by rules, and points out that extreme carefulness leads to 'false affectation' (κακοζηλία).¹⁹¹ Junius moreover argues that grace can only arise from concealed art, but also stresses that both art and nature contribute to the attainment of grace. In this context Junius adduces Longinus' take on the cooperation of nature and art:

Etenim haec duo natura arcte adeo sunt inter se copulata ac devincta, ut separari atque intervelli salvo lepore operum non possint.¹⁹² (...) καὶ ἡ

¹⁸⁹ DPV (1637) 3.6.2, p. 199.

¹⁹⁰ TPA (1638) 3.6.2, p. 323.

¹⁹¹ DPV (1637) 3.6.2, p. 199.

¹⁹² Cf. Quint. Inst. Or. 10.7.5: *Nota sit primum dicendi via: neque enim prius contingere cursus potest quam scierimus quo sit et qua perveniendum. Nec satis est non ignorare quae sint causarum iudicialium partes, aut quaestionum ordinem recte disponere, quamquam ista sunt praecipua, sed quid quoque loco primum sit ac secundum et deinceps: quae ita sunt natura copulata ut mutari aut intervelli sine confusione non possint* ("First,

ἀλληλουχία τούτων ἴσως γένοιτ' ἂν τὸ τέλειον. *Ipsorum sane cohaerentia est ipsa pulchritudo*.¹⁹³ Dionys. Longinus, Περὶ ὕψους, §32 [36.4].¹⁹⁴

For these things are inherently so closely coupled and connected, that they cannot be separated or taken apart, if the attractiveness of the work is to be preserved. (...) Their coherence may well result in their very beauty.

Both Junius and Longinus develop the argument that extreme carefulness spoils an artwork and that grace or sublimity benefits from a certain freedom. In *Peri hypsous* this point is made in an extensive digression in the chapters 33-36, which defends the erratic outbursts of genius and rejects flawless mediocrity, thus suggesting that natural talent should not be confined by care or judged according to artistic precepts.¹⁹⁵ At the end of this digression, Longinus however balances this point by insisting on the cooperation of art and nature in *Peri hypsous* 36.3. Similarly Junius, by adducing this passage, argues that both art and nature contribute to grace, and this balances his earlier statements that grace cannot be taught by rules and arises from genius only.

In chapter 3.7 Junius explains that it can be very difficult to judge an artwork properly:

ἀμίμητον τὸ ἐν πᾶσιν ἐπαφρόδιτον¹⁹⁶, inimitabilis illa Venustas per totum opus aequabiliter interspersa atque diffusa, non nisi arguta quadam

the line to be taken must be understood. We cannot have a successful run until we know where we have to go and by what route. It is not enough to know the parts of judicial Causes, or to put the Questions in the right order, important as these things are; what we have to know is what comes first, what second, and so on, under each head, for all these points are so closely linked by nature that they cannot be changed round or separated without causing confusion.”).

¹⁹³ The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: *Mutua tamen horum cohaerentia futura forte est perfectio operum* (DPV 1694, 3.6.2, p. 199).

¹⁹⁴ DPV (1637) 3.6.2, p. 200. Cf. *Peri hypsous* 36.4: ἐπεὶ δὲ 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· ἢ 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”).

¹⁹⁵ See also my discussion of this theme in *Peri hypsous* in Chapter Two.

¹⁹⁶ *Peri hypsous* 34.2.

perspicacia deprehenditur. Nam ut gravis, ut suavis, ut erudita, ut admirabilis, ut polita, ut copiosa sit Pictura, ut affectus habeat, quantum opus sit: non est singulorum articulorum; in toto spectantur haec corpore. Recte itaque Dionysius Longinus Περί ὕψους §1 [1.4], τὴν μὲν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς εὐρέσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων τάξιν καὶ οἰκονομίαν οὐκ ἐξ ἑνὸς οὐδ' ἐκ δυεῖν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου ὕψους μάλιστα ἐκφαινομένην ὀρῶμεν.¹⁹⁷ *Cognitionem interventionis, rerumque ordinem & oeconomiam, non ex uno neque ex duobus solum, sed ex toto contextu effulgere videmus.*¹⁹⁸

This inimitable grace, equally diffused and dispersed through the whole worke, as it is not had so easily, cannot be discerned so easily. Whether a picture be copious, learned magnificent, admirable, sufficiently polished, sweet, whether the affections and passions are therein seasonably represented, cannot bee perceived in any one part; the whole worke must shew it. Dionys. Longinus speaketh well to the purpose when he sayth: We see the skil of invention, the order and disposition of things, as it sheweth itself, not in one or two parts only, but in the whole composition of the worke, and that hardly too.¹⁹⁹

Junius here combines two passages from *Peri hypsous*: Longinus' description of the charm in the works of Hyperides (*Peri hypsous* 34.2), and his argument that the basic principles of the art of speaking are visible in all elements of a textual composition (*Peri hypsous* 1.4). In illustrating his argument on exercising proper judgment, Junius has aptly chosen two passages from Longinus' treatise that pertain to judgment as well, while however using them in a way that is slightly different from their original context. In *Peri hypsous* 1.4, Longinus sketches a contrast between the basic principles of invention (εὕρησις) and disposition (τάξις), which appear in the work as a whole and not just in one or two places, and well-timed sublimity (ὕψος καιρίως ἐξενεχθέν), which manifests itself in one

¹⁹⁷ *Peri hypsous* 1.4.

¹⁹⁸ DPV (1637) 3.7.1, p. 207. The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: *Peritiam inventionis, rerumque ordinem & oeconomiam, non ex uno neque ex duobus, sed ex toto contextu vix elucentem cernimus* (DPV 1694, 3.7.1, p. 204). The word *interventionis* is corrected into *inventionis*.

¹⁹⁹ TPA (1638) 3.7.1, p. 335.

single moment.²⁰⁰ Junius chooses the first half of Longinus' remark, as it fits his earlier argument that grace may arise from the proper execution of the five principles of art (invention, proportion, colour, motion, disposition), while the part on sublimity is left out. Similarly, Junius' quotation of *Peri hypsous* 34.2 focuses on the element of charm (τὸ ἐπαφρόδιτον), which in Longinus' argument is compared unfavourably to the sublimity of Demosthenes.²⁰¹

Junius again adduces Longinus treatise in *DPV* 3.7.9, when he describes the process of sharpening one's critical judgment:

Ex hac frequentiore atque intentiore Picturarum inspectione provenit minime fallax judicandi facilitas: κρίσις illa, quae Dionysio Longino Περί ὕψους, §4 (6), dicitur πολλῆς πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγέννημα, *quam per multam experientiam consequimur*.²⁰²

²⁰⁰ *Peri hypsous* 1.4: καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς εὐρέσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων τάξιν καὶ οἰκονομίαν οὐκ ἐξ ἑνὸς οὐδ' ἐκ δυεῖν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου τῶν λόγων ὕψους μόλις ἐκφαινομένην ὁρῶμεν, ὕψος δὲ που καιρίως ἐξενεχθὲν τὰ τε πράγματα δίκην σκηπτοῦ πάντα διεφόρησε καὶ τὴν τοῦ ῥήτορος εὐθὺς ἀθρόαν ἐνεδείξατο δύναμιν ("Again, experience in invention and the due disposal and marshalling of facts do not show themselves in one or two touches but emerge gradually from the whole tissue of the composition, while, on the other hand, a well-timed flash of sublimity shatters everything like a bolt of lightning and reveals the full power of the speaker at a single stroke").

²⁰¹ *Peri hypsous* 34.2: ὁ μὲν γε Ὑπερείδης πρὸς τῷ πάντα, ἔξω γε τῆς συνθέσεως, μιμῆσθαι τὰ Δημοσθένεια κατορθώματα καὶ τὰς Λυσιακὰς ἐκ περιττοῦ περιείλφεν ἀρετὰς τε καὶ χάριτας. καὶ γὰρ λαλεῖ μετὰ ἀφελείας ἔνθα χρή, καὶ οὐ πάντα ἐξῆς [καὶ] μονοτόνως ὡς ὁ Δημοσθένης λέγει· τό τε ἠθικὸν ἔχει μετὰ γλυκύτητος [ἡδύ,] λιτῶς ἐφηδυνόμενον· ἄφατοί τε περὶ αὐτόν εἰσιν ἀστεῖσμοί, μυκτῆρ πολιτικώτατος, εὐγένεια, τὸ κατὰ τὰς εἰρωνείας εὐπάλαιστον, σκώμματα οὐκ ἄμουσα οὐδ' ἀνάγωγα, κατὰ τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἐκείνους ἄλλας ἐπικείμενα, διασυρμός τε ἐπιδέξιος καὶ πολὺ τὸ κωμικὸν <ἔχων> καὶ μετὰ παιδιᾶς εὐστόχου κέντρον, ἀμίμητον δὲ εἰπεῖν τὸ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἐπαφρόδιτον. ("Besides reproducing all the virtues of Demosthenes, except his skill in word arrangement, Hyperides has embraced all the excellences and graces of Lysias. He talks plainly, where necessary, does not speak always in the same tone, as Demosthenes is said to do, and has the power of characterization, seasoned moreover by simplicity and charm. Then he has an untold store of polished wit, urbane sarcasm, well-bred elegance, supple turns of irony, jests neither tasteless nor ill-bred, well-dressed with wit like the Attic masters, clever satire, plenty of pointed ridicule and well-directed fun, and in all this a quite indescribable charm").

²⁰² *DPV* (1637) 3.7.9, p. 216. The 1694 translation is phrased somewhat differently: *Postrema jugis experientiae superfoetatio* (*DPV* 1694, 3.7.9, p. 210).

This frequent and attentive viewing of pictures engendreth in our minde an undeceivable Facilitie of Judging, the last brood of great experience, as Dionys. Longinus calleth it.

Junius argues that one should build experience in observing artworks in order to develop the ability to judge them, just like Longinus emphasises that experience is necessary for recognising true sublimity.²⁰³

4.7.2 Mistakes and admiration

Besides these explicit references to *Peri hypsous*, some parts of Junius' discussion of grace and judgment appear to align implicitly with elements from Longinus' treatise. In *DPV* 3.6.4 Junius argues that the grace of an artwork is spoiled by too much diligence, while it is enhanced by 'ease' (*facilitas*) and 'negligence' (*neglegentia*).²⁰⁴ The argument in *DPV* 3.6.4 echoes *DPV* 2.11.7, in which Junius likewise warned against excessive carefulness and stated that negligence or small mistakes may confer grace on an artwork.²⁰⁵ Both *DPV* 3.6.4 and 2.11.7 refer to Cicero's remarks on 'negligence' in the *Orator*.²⁰⁶ The connection between these two passages is made explicit by Junius in the English and Dutch versions of his book, in which section 3.6.4 contains an explicit reference to *DPV* 2.11.7.²⁰⁷ Both *DPV* 3.6.4

²⁰³ *Peri hypsous* 6: ἔστι δέ, ὦ φίλος, εἴ τινα περιποιησάμεθ' ἐν πρώτοις καθαρὰν τοῦ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὕψους ἐπιστήμην καὶ ἐπὶ κρίσιν. καίτοι τὸ πρῶγμα δύσληπτον· ἡ γὰρ τῶν λόγων κρίσις πολλῆς ἐστι πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγένημα ("And this, my friend, is the way: first of all to obtain a clear knowledge and appreciation of what is really sublime. But this is not an easy thing to grasp: judgement in literature is the ultimate fruit of ripe experience").

²⁰⁴ *DPV* (1637) 3.6.4, p. 201: Deturpat ergo nimia cura totam emendatissimarum quoque picturarum Gratiam, quemadmodum facilitas eam auget. *DPV* (1637) 3.6.4, p. 202: Tullius quoque in Oratore, quaedam etiam negligentia est diligens, inquit (...).

²⁰⁵ See section 4.4.2.

²⁰⁶ Cicero, *Orator* 78: "[...] quaedam etiam negligentia est diligens" ("[...] There is such a thing even as a careful negligence").

²⁰⁷ The fact that this reference is absent from the first (Latin) edition, suggests that Junius, in reworking his material for the English and Dutch versions, recognised the connection and similarities between these two parts of his book and added an explanatory reference. *TPA* (1638) 3.6.4, p. 327: "A heave and difficult diligence doth then marre and quite kill the grace of the worke; whereas a light an nimble Facilitie of working addeth life to the worke: and it concerneth an Artificer very much that he should resolve to do with ease whatsoever he doth: see our second book, cap. XI, §7, where we touch this point

and 2.11.7 might be interpreted as a rejection of stylistic overelaboration and excessive carefulness and hence resonate with Longinus' defence of the flawed genius (*Peri hypsous* 33.2). In *DPV* 2.11.7 Junius explicitly referred to this part of Longinus' treatise, which makes this particular passage a subtext of *DPV* 3.6.4 as well, even if it is not cited explicitly.²⁰⁸

Junius' argument that grace produces astonishment (*stupor*) and admiration (*admiratio*) in spectators (*DPV* 3.6.5), moreover reminds of Longinus' remark in *Peri hypsous* 15.2 that the aim of poetry is ἔκπληξις, which Junius translates as *admiratio* in *DPV* 1.4.6, and explains with an additional note as *admiratio, vel consternatus attonitae admirationis stupor* ('admiration, or the perplexed astonishment of a thunderstruck admiration') in his edition of 1694.²⁰⁹ Junius' discussion of *stupor* as part of grace (*DPV* 3.6.5), which employs the same vocabulary and treats a similar topic as in *DPV* 1.4.6 (ἔκπληξις, *stupor*, *attonitus*, *admiratio*) however does not mention *Peri hypsous*, but is based on citations from other authors, such as Philostratus and Callistratus.

In his discussion of 'judgment' (*DPV* 3.7), Junius moreover insists that small mistakes should be forgiven (*DPV* 3.7.3):

Non sum ex iudiciis severissimis, qui omnia ad exactam redigam regulam:
multa donanda ingeniis puto: sed donanda vitia, non portenta sunt.²¹⁰

a little." *SKDO* (1641) 3.6.4, p. 321: "Gelijck het dan blijckelick is, dat een verdrietighlick swaermoedighe maniere van wercken d' aenghenaeme *Gratie* des wercks door een onlieffelicke hardigheyd gantsch en gaer verdooft; dat oock de wackere lichtsinnigheyd der gener die haere wercken met een meesterlicke en gantsch mannelicke kloekheyd aentasten, ghemeynlick met een vaerdighe vloeyenheyd vergheeselschap is, die 't gheheel werck met een levendighe kracht der bevalligheyd plaght te vervullen en d' aenschouwers door een soete aenlockelickheyd sonderbaerlick te bekoren; soo is het daer uyt lichtelick af te nemen dat sich den Konstenaar al met den eersten daer toe ghewennen moet, dat hy de bysondere ghedeelten sijnes wercks met sulcke stoute penceel-streken soo kluchtigh henen swiere, datmen daer in d' ervaerenheyd van een vaste en vaerdighe handelinghe verneme. Siet ons tweede Boeck, Cap. XI.7."

²⁰⁸ In 4.7.3 I will however show that there are also some significant differences between Junius' and Longinus' arguments.

²⁰⁹ *DPV* (1694), 1.4.6, p. 33.

²¹⁰ Seneca Maior, *Controversiae* 10, preface 10.

Quibusvis certe erroribus veniam denegare, humanitatem est exuere. Horat.
in Arte, *quandoque dormitat bonus Homerus*.²¹¹

I'm not one of those very rigid judges, determined to direct everything by a precise rule. I think that many concessions must be made to genius – but it is faults, not monstrosities that we must concede. Surely, to deny pardon for any kind of fault, is to lay aside one's humanity.²¹² Horace, *Ars Poetica*:
“whenever good Homer nods.”²¹³

By citing Seneca Maior and Horace, Junius constructs a plea for forgiving small mistakes that corresponds to Longinus' defence of the faulty genius (*Peri hypsous* 33-36).²¹⁴ In the case of the *Ars poetica*, the reference to 'Homer nods' (*dormitat Homerus*; referring to occasional mistakes in Homer's works) suffices to adduce Horace's discussion of which faults should or should not be forgiven.²¹⁵ Horace's argument shares similarities with Longinus' defence of the faulty genius in *Peri hypsous* 33 as well as Longinus' critical attitude towards Homer's *Odyssey* in *Peri hypsous* 9.11-15.²¹⁶ Junius' remarks in DPV 3.7.3 are moreover closely associated

²¹¹ DPV (1637) 3.7.3, p. 207-208.

²¹² Translation: Winterbottom (1974).

²¹³ Horace, *Ars Poetica* 347-359.

²¹⁴ *Peri hypsous* 33.2: see above note 61.

²¹⁵ Horace, *Ars Poetica* 347-359: *Sunt delicta tamen quibus ignovisse velimus: nam neque chorda sonum reddit, quem volt manus et mens, poscentique gravem persaepe remittit acutum; nec semper feriet quodcumque minabitur arcus. Verum ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis offender maculis, quas aut incuria fudit aut humana parum cavit natura. quid ergo est? Ut scriptor si peccat idem librarius usque, quamvis est monitus, venia caret, et citharoedus ridetur, chorda qui semper oberrat eadem: sic mihi, qui multum cessat, fit Choerilus ille, quem bis terve bonum cum risu miror; et idem indignor quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus, verum operi longo fas est obrepere somnum* (“Yet faults there are which we can gladly pardon; for the string does not always yield the sound which hand and heart intend, but when you call for a flat often returns you a sharp; nor will the bow always hit whatever mark it threatens, but when the beauties in a poem are more in number, I shall not take offence at a few blots which a careless hand has let drop, or human frailty has failed to avert. What, then, is the truth? As a copying clerk is without excuse if, however much warned, he always makes the same mistake, and a harper is laughed at who always blunders on the same string: so the poet who often defaults, becomes, methinks, another Choerilus, whose one or two good lines cause laughter and surprise; and yet I also feel aggrieved, whenever good Homer “nods,” but when a work is long, a drowsy mood may well creep over it”) (Translation: Rushton Fairclough, 1926).

²¹⁶ See for instance Russell (1964), 99 on the parallelism in Horace's and Longinus' arguments.

with his warning against excessive self-criticism (DPV 2.11.7), in which he adduced *Peri hypsous* 33 and argued that small mistakes, or negligence, may eventually produce grace.²¹⁷ Longinus' treatise is however not adduced in this particular section (DPV 3.7.3). Instead, Junius refers to the far more famous passage of Horace on Homer's mistakes.²¹⁸

In the same paragraph (DPV 3.7.3), Junius paraphrases and cites Pliny the Younger on the difficulty of distinguishing excellence from excess, or greatness from bombast:

Frequenter enim inconsulte judicantes in exquisitissimis summorum artificum operibus carpunt quaedam ut tumida, quae prudentioribus sublimia videntur; ut improba, quae sobrie judicantibus audentia sunt; ut nimia, quae rectis judiciis plena putantur. *Plurimum autem refert, reprehendenda annotes an insignia. Omnis enim advertit, quod eminet et exstat; sed acri intentione dijudicandum est, inmodicum sit an grande, altum an enorme.* Plin. junior, IX, 6.

For often those who judge inconsiderately define in the most exquisite works of the greatest artists as pompous those things, which would seem sublime to more prudent people; they call shameless, what to reasonable judges appears daring; they consider excessive, what by the right judgments is deemed copious. "But it is important to determine whether you are attacking genuine faults or only striking phrases; for, though anyone can see what stands out above the average, it needs a keen judgement to decide whether this is extravagant and disproportionate or lofty and sublime." Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 9.26.6.²¹⁹

²¹⁷ See section 4.4.2.

²¹⁸ Karel van Mander (one of Junius' predecessors), who was far less versed in ancient literature than Junius, for instance refers to Horace's 'nodding Homer' in *Het Schilder-Boeck waer in voor eerst de leerlustighe jueght den grondt der edel vry schilderconst in verscheyden deelen wort voorghedraghen* (Haarlem: P. van Wesbusch), fol. 148r: "En te segghen, dat onse Constenaers (hoe sy hun bevljten, en arbeeydt doen) zijn onderworpen ghebreken en dwalingen, also wel als ander in ander wetenschappen doen, geliick men seght, dat den goeden *Homerus* self somtijden slaperigh wort, oft in slaep valt."

²¹⁹ Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 9.26.6: *Cur haec? Quia visus es mihi in scriptis meis adnotasse quaedam ut tumida quae ego sublimia, ut improba quae ego audentia, ut nimia quae ego plena arbitrabar. Plurimum autem*

This citation from Pliny not only resembles Longinus' defence of the faulty genius (*Peri hypsous* 33-36), but also ties in with Longinus' discussion of the vices that lie close to sublimity (*Peri hypsous* 3-5).²²⁰ Both passages play an important role elsewhere in the *De pictura veterum*, such as DPV 1.3.11, 1.4.6 and 2.11.7.²²¹

4.7.3 Simplicity and the ineffable

Junius' discussion of grace and judgment in DPV 3.6 and 3.7 contains several arguments that are very similar to certain key themes in Longinus' treatise, such as the defence of the flawed genius (*Peri hypsous* 33-36), as well as Longinus' discussion of ἐκπληξίς (*Peri hypsous* 15.2), and his rejection of stylistic vices (*Peri hypsous* 3-5), topics that recur throughout the *De pictura veterum*. It is tempting to consider *Peri hypsous* as the basis for these elements in Junius' discussion of grace and judgment in DPV 3.6 and 3.7. Junius however tells his story using a variety of other sources, which contain very similar arguments. The passages in which Longinus is quoted directly in turn insist on the balance between art and nature (*Peri hypsous* 36.3; DPV 3.6.2), the importance of judging an artwork comprehensively (*Peri hypsous* 1.4 and 34.5; DPV 3.7.1), and the development of judgment through experience (*Peri hypsous* 6; DPV 3.7.9). All of these passages hardly function as the source for Junius' discussion of genius, admiration, and artistic licence in DPV 3.6 and 3.7, which Junius instead bases on excerpts from Cicero, Seneca the Elder, Horace, and Pliny the Younger.

While Longinus' treatise indeed comments on inspiration, greatness and artistic licence, Junius' discussion of grace and artistic judgment is not necessarily or

refert, reprehendenda adnotes an insignia. Omnis enim advertit, quod eminet et exstat; sed acri intentione diiudicandum est, immodicum sit an grande, altum an enorme. ("I write as I do because I had an idea that you had criticized some passages in my writings for being pompous, though I thought them splendid, and what I imagined to be a full treatment of a bold enterprise you dismissed as redundant and exaggerated. But it is important to determine whether you are attacking genuine faults or only striking phrases; for, though anyone can see what stands out above the average, it needs a keen judgement to decide whether this is extravagant and disproportionate or lofty and sublime") (Translation: Radice 1969).

²²⁰ See F. Quadlbauer, 'Die genera dicendi bis Plinius d. J.', *Wiener Studien* 71 (1958), 55-111: 108-109 for a discussion of some of the similarities between *Peri hypsous* 33-36 and Pliny's *Epistula* 9.26.

²²¹ See also sections 4.3.3 and 4.4.2.

primarily derived from *Peri hypsous*, and rather reflects contemporary debates on grace, and the nature, history and effect of the (visual) arts. Examples of this are Junius' insistence that grace shines through naturalness and simplicity, or the absence of artistic elaboration (DPV 3.6.4) and the characterisation of grace as something 'ineffable' (DPV 3.6.5-6). In DPV 3.6.4 Junius states that an artwork should not be 'impure' (*maculosus*) or 'swollen' (*turgidus*), but possess natural beauty (*naturalis pulchritudo*), as well as 'artless and unaffected simplicity' (*ἀφέλεια simplex et inaffectedata*).²²² From rejecting carefulness and its neighbouring vices, Junius here moves on towards identifying 'grace' as the very absence of stylistic contrivances, which is 'simplicity' or 'naturalness'. In DPV 3.6.5 Junius discusses the astonishment caused by grace and describes how the spectator is rendered *attonitus* and *stupefactus* ('dumbfounded', 'stunned') and captured by ἀφασία ('speechlessness'). Several citations from Callistratus' *Descriptions*, describe ancient artworks as 'ineffable'.²²³ In his introduction of the topic of 'grace' in DPV 3.6.1 Junius moreover includes the following quote from the poet Martial: "There is something more (*nescioquid plus est*) that gives lasting fame to a book", suggesting that grace is to be regarded as a certain 'I don't know what'.²²⁴

Although Longinus rejects overelaboration and stresses the importance of 'greatness of thoughts' over stylistic elements, *Peri hypsous* does not embrace

²²² DPV (1637) 3.6.4, p. 201: Grande, et, ut ita dicam, pudicum exactae consummataeque artis specimen, non est maculosum, nec turgidum, sed naturali pulchritudine exurgit, calamistrorum fucique impatiens. [...] ἀφέλεια simplex et inaffectedata, inquit idem ille Quintil. Viii,3, *habet quendam purum, qualis etiam in foeminis amatur, ornatum; et quasdam velut e tenui diligentia munditias*. Cf. Quint. Inst. Or. 8.3.87.

²²³ DPV (1637) 3.6.5, p. 205: Callistratus, *Descriptions* 2, *On the Statue of A Bacchante*: Πρόσωπόν γε μὴν ἰδόντες ὑπὸ ἀφασίας ἔστημεν. [...] καὶ ὅσα φέρει μανίας οἰστρώσα ψυχὴ τοσαῦτα πάθους διέλαμπε τεκμήρια ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης ἀρρήτῳ λόγῳ καθαθέντα ("When we saw the face we stood speechless; [...] and so strikingly there shone from it, fashioned by art in a manner not to be described, all the signs of passion which a soul goaded by madness displays"). Callistratus, *Descriptions* 5, *On the Statue of Narcissus*: Τὸ δὲ οὐδὲ λόγῳ ῥητὸν λίθος εἰς ὑγρότητα κεχαλασμένος καὶ ἐναντίον σῶμα τῇ οὐσίᾳ παρεχόμενος ("Indeed, words cannot describe how the marble softened into suppleness and provided a body at variance with its own essence") (Translation: Fairbanks 1931).

²²⁴ Martial, *Epigrams* 6.61.9-10: *nescioquid plus est, quod donat saecula chartis / victurus genium debet habere liber* ("There is something more (*nescioquid plus est*) that gives lasting fame to paper. A book that is to live must have a Genius") (Translation based on Shackleton Bailey, 1993). The same passage was later adduced by Bouhours in his explanation of the *je ne sais quoi*. See Litman (1971), 17-28 on Bouhours and the *je ne sais quoi*.

simplicity, ineffability or charm as essential features of the sublime.²²⁵ If anything, Longinus rather seems to exclude them from his theory as he portrays Hyperides (the counterpart of sublime Demosthenes) as the master of ‘charm’ (χάρις), ‘simplicity’ (ἀφέλεια), ‘sweetness’ (γλυκύτης) and ‘grace’ (τὸ ἐπαφρόδιτον).²²⁶ Junius’ association of grace with ‘ease’, ‘negligence’, ‘simplicity’ and the ‘ineffable’ rather corresponds to broader ideas about ‘grace’ in Antiquity as well as the Renaissance. Samuel Monk has argued that Junius’ discussion of grace belongs to a wider seventeenth-century discourse about ‘grace’, *sprezzatura* and the *je ne sais quoi*, discussions of which are found, for instance, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano* (1528), as well as in the works of several of Junius’ predecessors, such as Giorgio Vasari and Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo.²²⁷ Instead of an authority on ‘grace’ Longinus rather serves as the source for Junius’ ideas on the balance between boldness and care, on ‘how to judge art’. In Junius’ chapters on (the critical assessment of) grace (DPV 3.6-7) *Peri hypsous* likewise underpins Junius’ emphasis on balance in the process of *creating* as well as *judging* an artwork.²²⁸ But instead of *founding* his definition of grace on arguments from *Peri hypsous*, Junius rather *connects* some of Longinus’ ideas on critical

²²⁵ See also my Introduction and Chapters Two and Three. Porter (2016), 302n.56 observes that “ineffability is not a common attribute of sublime criticism”. See also Porter (2016), 7n.11 on Boileau’s introduction of Bouhours’ *je ne sais quoi* into the interpretation of *Peri hypsous*.

²²⁶ *Peri hypsous* 34.2, cited in note 201.

²²⁷ S.H. Monk, ‘A Grace Beyond the Reach of Art’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 5.2 (1944), 131-150: 133-136. Henry Peacham, author of *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622), a book inspired on Castiglione’s *Il cortegiano*, was a member of Arundel’s household. See Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), xxxvi. The phrase *non so che* (Italian for ‘I don’t know what’) is used by Junius’ predecessors Karel van Mander, and Giorgio Vasari. See Weststeijn (2008), 395n.198 and H. Miedema (ed.), *Karel van Mander, Den Grondt der Edel Vry Schilder-Const, Uitgegeven en van Vertaling en Commentaar Voorzien door H. Miedema*. 2 Vols. (Utrecht: Haentjens, Dekker & Gumbert, 1973), 440. See L. Viidebaum, ‘Dionysius and Lysias’ Charm’, in: R. Hunter and C.C. de Jonge (eds.), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Augustan Rome: Rhetoric, Criticism, and Historiography* (Cambridge, 2018, forthcoming) χάρις (‘grace’) as a certain inexplicable quality in ancient literary criticism, and particularly in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ work *On Lysias*. Junius quotes from Dionysius’ *On Lysias* in *De pictura veterum* 3.6 (DPV, 1637, 3.6.2, p. 200).

²²⁸ DPV (1637) 3.6.2, 3.7.1, 3.7.9.

judgment to an existing debate about grace, studied negligence, *sprezzatura* or the *je ne sais quoi*.²²⁹

The relation between Junius' discussion of grace (DPV 3.6) and Longinus' treatise is complex. Although several aspects of Junius' concept of grace resonate well with parts of *Peri hypsous* (such as the rejection of rules, a distaste for certain stylistic vices, the emphasis on astonishment), Junius builds his argument on a multitude of other sources in which these ideas are conveyed as well. Junius' emphasis on simplicity, ineffability and ease rather points towards another, well established, aesthetic tradition: that of grace, *sprezzatura*, and the *je ne sais quoi*. Instead of identifying *Peri hypsous* as the source of Junius' idea of grace, we may regard the *De pictura veterum* as an example of the association of Longinus' treatise with concepts such as grace and the *je ne sais quoi*, and its dissociation from artistic refinement and stylistic contrivances.

The *De pictura veterum* is often seen as an important mediator in the diffusion of the Longinian sublime in the seventeenth century. Notwithstanding the successful reception of the *De pictura veterum* in England, the Netherlands as well as France, its role in propagating Longinus' ideas must not be overstated. Art theoreticians that extensively drew on Junius' work, such as Roger de Piles and Samuel van Hoogstraten refer to *Peri hypsous* considerably less than the *De pictura veterum*. Moreover, although Junius' discussion of grace did play a role in seventeenth-century debates on taste and aesthetics, the kernel of Junius' ideas on grace is not formed by *Peri hypsous*. As the case of Junius' *De pictura veterum* shows, *Peri hypsous* was certainly not the primary catalyst of the seventeenth-century debates on grace and the *je ne sais quoi*, but instead was associated with and appropriated by them.

4.8 Conclusion

Junius' *De pictura veterum* presents us with a unique and multifaceted interpretation of Longinus' treatise *Peri hypsous*. It draws on a great range of citations and uses them in a variety of contexts. I have discerned three different

²²⁹ See Monk (1944), 143-144, Ellenius (1960), 84-87 and Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991), lv-lvi on Junius and seventeenth-century discussions of grace. See also Weststeijn (2008), 154-160 on Van Hoogstraten's *ik en weet niet wat* and seventeenth-century discussions of 'grace' and the *je ne sais quoi*.

functions of *Peri hypsous* in the *De pictura veterum*. The first and most prominent is Longinus' contribution to Junius' discussion of the imaginative or creative aspects of painting: *phantasia*, and magnificence (a part of *inventio*). Both in *DPV* 1.4.6 and *DPV* 3.1.15 Junius employs multiple citations from *Peri hypsous* to illustrate the painter's mental capacity to respectively form a vivid image of the events described, and to achieve greatness in choosing the right subject matter. The centrality of *Peri hypsous* in Junius' discussion of magnificence (3.1.15), is moreover underpinned by Junius' use of the new or very rare word *hoogh-staetelick* or *hoogh-staetelickheyd* (in the *Schilder-konst der Oude*), which is used predominantly in this section and especially as a translation of Longinus' terminology of sublimity. In Junius' discussion of *phantasia* and magnificence a prominent place is thus given to Longinus' ideas about greatness of thought, inspiration, in short, the psychological aspects of artistic production.²³⁰

A very different function of *Peri hypsous* is found in Junius' discussion of the technical aspects of painting (proportion, colour, motion, and collocation, *DPV* 3.2-5). Having to cope with the relative scarcity of ancient treatises on the visual arts, Junius fills the void by focusing on visual metaphors in ancient treatises on rhetoric and literary criticism. The underlying assumption of this method is the idea that visual metaphors can reveal something about ancient aesthetics. By using (among others) Longinus' comments on the proportions of the human body, architecture and painting, thus effectively reversing the *Ut pictura poesis*-theme, Junius is able to provide a reconstruction of the ancient views on artistic techniques.

The third function of *Peri hypsous* in the *De pictura veterum*, which ties in with one of the central themes of Longinus' treatise itself, is judgment (κρίσις). As we have seen, *Peri hypsous* is adduced throughout the *De pictura veterum* to illustrate the balance between boldness and care, nature and art, freedom and restraint, grace and κακοζηλία, as for instance in Junius' discussion of *phantasia* (*DPV* 1.3.11 and 1.4.6), the historical development of the visual arts (*DPV* 2.11.7), magnificence (*DPV* 3.1.15), and grace (*DPV* 3.6-7). By oscillating between these poles Junius eventually aims to demonstrate the fine line between failure and success, and to

²³⁰ See also Nativel (2016), 165 on the psychological aspects of Junius' discussion of *phantasia* and magnificence in the first and third book of the *De pictura veterum*.

sharpen the critical judgment that is necessary to discern either. Junius' emphasis on this balanced judgment also explains his frequent reference to Longinus' discussion of stylistic vices (*Peri hypsous* 3-5), which throughout the *De pictura veterum* appears as an illustration of artistic failure, bad taste, or as the counterpart of successful art.²³¹ In serving as the example of what should be avoided, these references moreover at the same time paint a picture of the paradigm of success. In the case of Longinus the aesthetic ideal is sublimity, or the right kind of grandeur; in the *De pictura veterum* it is grace, or the absence of excessive care (as is seen most clearly in DPV 2.11.7).

To an early modern reader who seeks to define grace as the absence of stylistic contrivances, Longinus' rejection of bombast, overelaboration, and false affectation (*Peri hypsous* 3-5) provides a fitting source. The prominence of Longinus' discussion of stylistic vices in the *De pictura veterum* indicates how the interpretation of *Peri hypsous* in some contexts slowly tilts from 'sublimity' towards 'grace'. A similar appropriation of Longinus' ideas is for instance found in Daniel Heinsius' *Prolegomena* on Hesiod (as I have discussed in Chapter Two), in which the pure and genuine simplicity of archaic Greek poetry is contrasted with the stylistic vices as described in *Peri hypsous* 3-5.²³² Junius' (and Heinsius') appropriation of these arguments corresponds to a broader early modern interest in these chapters of *Peri hypsous*, as exemplified not only by Junius and Heinsius, but also by several other scholars and critics.²³³ Its use as an illustration *a contrario* of the concept of grace moreover engendered Longinus' later association with concepts such as simplicity, the *je ne sais quoi*, and possibly lies at the basis of the separation of the Longinian sublime from 'the sublime style'.

²³¹ DPV (1637) 1.3.11, 1.4.6, [2.11.7], 3.1.15, 3.2.4, 3.4.8 and 3.9.20.

²³² See also Chapter Two. In DPV (1637) 2.6.1 (p. 68) and 3.6.6 (p. 206) Junius moreover mentions the (decay of the) simplicity of the earliest artists, which also plays a central role in Heinsius' *Prolegomena*.

²³³ See above section 4.3.2, as well as section 2.8.