



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Longinus, On the Sublime 12.4-5: Demosthenes and Cicero

Jonge, C.C. de; Nijk, A.A.

Citation

Jonge, C. C. de, & Nijk, A. A. (2019). Longinus, On the Sublime 12.4-5: Demosthenes and Cicero. *Mnemosyne*, 72(5), 766-790.
doi:10.1163/1568525X-12342532

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3249955>

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

Longinus, *On the Sublime* 12.4-5: Demosthenes and Cicero

Casper C. de Jonge

Leiden University, Classics Department

c.c.de.jonge@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Arjan A. Nijk

VU University, Classics Department

a.a.nijk@vu.nl

Received November 2017 | Accepted July 2018

Abstract

This article discusses the critical comparison (σύγκρισις) of the styles of Demosthenes and Cicero in Longinus, *On the Sublime* 12.4-5. Many readers have claimed that Longinus here presents Demosthenes and Cicero as two different models of the sublime. A detailed analysis of the passage, however, reveals that while the two are both credited with grandeur (μέγεθος), they are in fact not treated on a par with respect to sublimity (ὑψος). While the style of Demosthenes is described with keywords of Longinus' conception of the sublime (ὑψος), Cicero's style is consistently associated with the quality of diffusion (χύσις), which is closely associated with amplification (αὔξησις). Longinus' discussion of Cicero may have pleased the Roman readers in his audience, as he is presented as a canonical author of 'great' literature. We argue, however, that in the end, Longinus reserves the status of sublimity for his heroes of classical Greece.

Keywords

the sublime – Demosthenes – Cicero – Greek and Roman literary criticism

1 Introduction

One of the most remarkable passages in the Greek treatise *On the Sublime* (Περὶ ὕψους) is the critical comparison (σύγκρισις) of the styles of Demosthenes and Cicero (12.4-5). Discussions of Roman authors are extremely rare in Greek literary criticism, and scholars have observed that the appearance of Cicero in this Greek critical treatise suggests a Roman context.¹ The name of the addressee points in the same direction: he is a certain Postumius Terentianus (1.1), possibly a Roman patron or pupil of the author.² The author himself, whom we will call Longinus, illustrates his ideas on sublimity with numerous quotations from Greek authors of the archaic and classical period, with a special focus on Homer, Plato and Demosthenes.³ By including Cicero in this purely Greek context, Longinus seems to pay tribute to the most famous Roman orator, who must have been well known to his addressee and wider audience.⁴

But does Longinus present Cicero as a model of sublimity? A number of modern scholars take it for granted that he does. Donald Russell, for example, has claimed that Longinus presents Cicero as “a genuine example of

1 Kennedy 1972, 371: “... the cultural environment is definitely Roman, for Cicero is discussed and of course Caecilius worked in Rome.” Caecilius of Caleacte (active in the Augustan Period) is Longinus’ opponent. He wrote a treatise *On the Sublime* and (possibly in a different work) drew a comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero (see Plu. *Dem.* 3 = Caecilius of Caleacte fr. 153 Ofenloch = T6 Woerther). For the fragments of Caecilius, see Ofenloch 1907, Augello 2006 and Woerther 2015. On Longinus and Caecilius and their models of the sublime, see Innes 2002. De Jonge 2018 examines the comparisons of Demosthenes and Cicero in Caecilius, Plutarch, Longinus and Quintilian.

2 Terentianus seems to be a young man (ὦ νεανία, 15.1). His identity remains unknown: see Rhys Roberts 1899, 18-23, Russell 1964, 59 and Mazzucchi 2010, 131-133 on Longinus 1.1. In 12.5 (see below), Longinus uses the second person plural pronoun (ὤμεις) to address Terentianus and a wider Roman audience, in contrast with ‘us Greeks’ (ἡμῖν, 12.4, cf. ὁ ἡμέτερος said of Demosthenes). For the meaning behind this polarizing strategy see Whitmarsh 2001, 68-71; cf. below, n. 45 and 46.—In a highly speculative paper, Zabulis 1998 attempts to establish a connection between Cicero and Longinus, arguing that Terentianus might be related to Cicero’s first wife Terentia. Thanks to Terentianus, Longinus is supposed to have had access to Cicero’s Greek prose, which was only known within the circle of his relatives. Zabulis 1998, 151-154 also suggests that the political views of the ‘philosopher’ in Longinus 44.1 are similar to the ideas that Cicero presents in *De officiis*. These identifications must be rejected as utterly uncertain.

3 On date and authorship of Περὶ ὕψους, see Heath 1999, who reattributes the work to Cassius Longinus (third century AD), and Mazzucchi 2010, xxix-xxxvii, who argues that the work belongs to a writer (Dionysius Longinus) of the Augustan age.

4 Apart from Cicero, one non-Greek author is discussed in the treatise: the ‘lawgiver of the Jews’ with his famous words on God’s creation of light and earth (9.9).

a 'sublime' writer, though in a different way from Demosthenes".⁵ More recently, John Dugan has argued that Longinus "finds the sublime in not only Demosthenes and Cicero, but Homer and Sappho".⁶ There can be no doubt about Demosthenes, Homer and Sappho, but does Cicero indeed belong in this list of Longinus' sublime authors?⁷ We will challenge this assumption through a close reading of the comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero within its wider context.⁸ While we cannot make a definitive statement as to whether Longinus considered Cicero capable of producing sublime oratory, we argue that an unreservedly positive answer to this question fails to appreciate the ambiguous nature of the comparison.

In the first place, Cicero is nowhere explicitly associated with the concept of the sublime. While Demosthenes' sublimity is constantly reaffirmed, either through the use of the word ὑψος and its cognates, or through other terms central to Longinus' conception of the sublime, such keywords are conspicuously absent in the discussion of Cicero.⁹ Second, in the wider context of the

5 Russell *apud* Bowersock 1979, 76 (discussion).

6 Dugan 2007, 13. See also Dugan 2005, 316: "That Cicero is the sole Roman writer to merit mention within *On Sublimity* suggests that Cicero achieved a level of sublimity such that Longinus could not omit Cicero from a work devoted to the subject."

7 See further Innes 2002, 277-8; Heath 2012, 19; Porter 2016, 278-280 (see below, n.9, n.15). Innes argues that Longinus 12.4-5 corrects the views of Caecilius of Caleacte, who had also presented a σύγκρισις of the two orators (see above, n. 1): "As an Atticist sympathiser Caecilius will have done less than justice to Cicero, an alleged Asianist. Longinus can admire both [sc. Demosthenes and Cicero] since he does not restrict the sublime to the model of the Demosthenic thunderbolt with its combination of emotional vigour and a leaner denser style, but includes also the more expansive style of Cicero's spreading fire and Plato's broad ocean." Caecilius' discussion of Cicero has not survived, but even if it is true that Longinus did more justice to Cicero than Caecilius, that does not imply that he regards Cicero's spreading fire as sublime.

8 The current article is exclusively concerned with Longinus' presentation of Cicero. Hence we will not make any claims about the actual role of the sublime in Cicero's rhetorical theory or oratorical practice. Dugan 2005 discusses the sublimity of Cicero's oratory. Porter 2001 finds a tradition of the sublime in the euphonic views of Cicero, Philodemus, and the Hellenistic *kritikoi*. Chalkomatas 2007, 36-40, who focuses on Cicero's poetic theory, argues that Cicero and Longinus used the same source, because they have a similar concept of 'intensity'. The parallels that Chalkomatas adduces, however, are of a very general nature: the fact that both Cicero and Longinus are interested in great thoughts and pathos does not prove that they are drawing on the same source.

9 Porter 2016, 278-280 argues that grandeur and intensity are "two sides of the same coin, virtually synonyms of sublimity.... While it might be fair to ask whether Cicero is intense or grand in chapter 12 of *On the Sublime* quoted above, the answer is that he seems to be a great deal of both, perhaps a few shades less intense than he is grand." We agree that grandeur and the sublime are closely associated in *On the Sublime*, but we do not agree that they are treated as synonymous. See section 2a with n. 15. Longinus consciously avoids the word ὑψος in his discussion of Cicero.

discussion of ‘amplification’ (αὐξήσις; 11-13.1), the main point of the comparison is to clarify the distinction between an expansive style, as represented by Cicero (and Plato), and Demosthenic, abrupt sublimity (ὑψος ἀπότομον). As Longinus’ terminology and definitions reveal, these styles are distinct means to attain grandeur (μέγεθος) and should not be conflated.¹⁰ Finally, the whole tenor of the passage suggests the Greek orator’s superiority over his Roman emulator.¹¹ Even if Longinus does not deny Cicero sublime status, we hope our argument makes it clear that the mere fact that Cicero is mentioned in the treatise is not enough to warrant his sublime status. In our view, this easy assumption overlooks the central points of the comparison.

In what follows, we will first place the comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero in its wider context (section 2). Here we critically examine three assumptions that seem to have led to the idea that Longinus presents Cicero as a sublime author. Then we turn to the comparison itself and argue that Demosthenes is consistently associated with the sublime (ὑψος), but Cicero with amplification (αὐξήσις) (section 3). We will also try to show how Longinus imitates the styles of Demosthenes and Cicero, at least as he perceives them, in his discussion of the two orators.¹² In section 4 we compare Longinus’ discussion of Cicero with Cicero’s characterization of his own style, and with Quintilian’s presentation of Cicero. It seems significant that Longinus—unlike his Roman colleagues—does not make mention of Cicero’s famous power to evoke pity. Finally we will discuss the broader implications of Longinus’ discussion of Cicero with respect to his Roman readership and his program of the sublime (section 5).

2 The Context

After a comparative discussion (σύγκρισις) of Demosthenes and presumably Plato (12.3; there is a lacuna before this paragraph), Longinus introduces Cicero:

10 Russell 1964, 111 on Longinus 12.4: “ὑψος is here a means to μέγεθος, and is contrasted with a quality connected with αὐξήσις (πλῆθος or χύσις).”

11 In her appendix “Cicero in den Augen des Longinus”, Neuberger-Donath 1987, 111-118 argues that Longinus is critical of Cicero. Her analysis of Longinus 12.4-5, which contains some valuable corrections of traditional readings of the passage, has not received the attention that it deserves. Arieti and Crossett 1985, 76 note that “the comparison is subtly derogatory of Cicero”. Longinus’ description of Cicero is not necessarily critical in itself (although the term καταντλήσαι, 12.5, does sound uncomplimentary, see the discussion below); rather, the opposition between Demosthenes as master of the sublime and Cicero as master of amplification, when read in the context of the entire work, makes it clear that for Longinus Demosthenes is to be regarded as the superior orator.

12 Cf. Arieti and Crossett 1985, 76.

οὐ κατ' ἄλλα δέ τινα ἢ ταῦτα, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, φίλτατε Τερεντιανέ, (λέγω δέ, <εἰ> καὶ ἡμῖν ὥς Ἑλλήσιν ἐφεῖται τι γινώσκειν) καὶ ὁ Κικέρων τοῦ Δημοσθένους ἐν τοῖς μεγέθεσι παραλλάττει. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ὕψει τὸ πλεον ἀποτόμῳ, ὁ δὲ Κικέρων ἐν χύσει.¹³

It seems to me that it is exactly in this respect, most dear Terentianus, (that is, if it is allowed that we too, as Greeks, offer an opinion), that Cicero differs from Demosthenes in his grand effects [lit. 'greatnesses']. Demosthenes displays his grandeur mostly in abrupt sublimity, Cicero in diffusion.¹⁴

The first thing to note is that Longinus does not explicitly attribute sublimity (ὕψος) to Cicero's rhetoric, but 'grandeur' (μέγεθος) and 'diffusion' (χύσις). Many scholars, however, have assumed that these words, together with the wider context, imply that Cicero attains sublimity. It seems that this interpretation is based on three assumptions. First, that the terms μέγεθος and ὕψος are interchangeable, or at least so closely related in this treatise that the former implies the latter. Second, that the specific qualification of Demosthenic sublimity as 'abrupt' (ἀπότομος) implies that Cicero represents another type of sublimity, consisting in amplification (αὔξησις). Third, that the equation of Cicero with Plato in respect of their relationship to Demosthenes (note οὐ κατ' ἄλλα δέ τινα ἢ ταῦτα), together with the fact that Plato is a model of the sublime for Longinus, must mean that Cicero was too.

In this section we will argue that these assumptions are false. The core of our argument will consist of an appreciation of the relationship between the concepts ὕψος, μέγεθος, and αὔξησις in *On the Sublime*.

2.1 μέγεθος and ὕψος

Close examination of the use of the terms μέγεθος and ὕψος throughout the work reveals that they are not synonymous, despite claims to the contrary.¹⁵

13 12.4. The text is that of Russell 1964.

14 Translations of passages from *On the Sublime* combine phrases from the Loeb edition (Fyfe, rev. Russell 1995) and Russell's translation in Russell and Winterbottom 1972. Translations of Quintilian are based on Russell 2001; for translations of Cicero's *Orator* we have used Hubbell 1939; Cicero's *De oratore* is cited from May and Wisse 2001. In some cases we have adapted the original translations.

15 Most recently Porter 2016, 277–280. Porter uses 'the sublime' as a general category that includes grandeur, forcefulness and *hupsos* ('intensity'). He argues (p. 279) that 'grandeur and intensity are equated under the rubric of sublimity from the first pages of *On the Sublime*. There, Longinus mentions *hupsos* and *megethos* as if they were one (1.1)." This is not correct. In 1.1, Longinus states that he and his addressee studied Caecilius' *On the*

Broadly speaking, μέγεθος denotes the general quality of 'greatness' which all writers must aspire to, and this can be achieved through different means; ὕψος on the other hand refers to a more specific and mostly local quality that is most centrally characterized by the effect of transporting the audience out of themselves (cf. ἔκστασις and ἑκπληξις, 1.4).

This distinction comes to the fore in a number of passages. The clearest evidence is found in 12.1, where Longinus puts ὕψος next to amplification (αὐξήσις), emotion (πάθος), and tropes (τρόποι) as one of the means to invest a discourse with μέγεθος. Apparently, μέγεθος comes in different forms, and ὕψος is one of the ways to attain it. The terms are also differentiated in the comparison of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (9.13). In the *Odyssey*, Homer may be likened to a setting sun: the μέγεθος ('grandeur') remains, but the vehemence (σφοδρότης) is gone, as are the consistent intensity (τόνος), the never-resting sublimity (ὕψος), and the continuous flow of emotion (πάθος). The quality that μέγεθος denotes, then, is a rather general one that may apply to the *Odyssey* as a whole, even when it is stripped of (most of) the *Iliadic* sublimity. Again, in 40.2 Longinus refers to some poets 'who are not by nature sublime, perhaps even without grandeur' (οὐκ ὄντες ὑψηλοὶ φύσει, μήποτε δὲ καὶ ἀμεγέθεις). The lack of grandeur is presented as a more general defect than the incapacity to achieve the specific effect of sublimity.¹⁶

While different, the concepts of μέγεθος and ὕψος are closely related, and this is probably the reason why they sometimes seem interchangeable. Although μέγεθος can exist without ὕψος, the latter always involves the former. The general quality of μέγεθος is what a writer in principle aspires to, and ὕψος is a way to invest a discourse with this quality.¹⁷ But ὕψος is not simply a means, but the best means to achieve μέγεθος: Longinus says in 1.3 that ὕψος is the quality by which the 'greatest' (μέγιστοι) writers gained their immortal fame. Conversely,

Sublime (περί ὕψους) and points out that Caecilius demonstrated the nature of the sublime (τὸ ὑψηλόν) without showing how we may develop our natures to some degree of grandeur (μέγεθος). This suggests that grandeur is a quality of individuals (orators, writers, poets) that helps them to achieve the effect of the sublime (ὕψος). Longinus does not say that grandeur and the sublime (Porter's 'intensity') are one.

16 Fyfe (rev. Russell) 1995 translates 'who are not by nature sublime, perhaps even the very opposite', apparently assuming that ὕψος and μέγεθος mean the same thing, and that the new point of ἀμεγέθεις lies in the ἀ-component (they are the *opposite*). In 34.4, however, where Longinus talks about Hyperides, ἀμεγέθης clearly means 'lacking grandeur' (and it is translated as such by Fyfe). Better is Russell 1964: 'who are not by nature sublime and may indeed have an incapacity for greatness'.

17 Cf. the phrase οἱ μεγέθους ἐφιέμενοι ('those aspiring to grandeur') in 3.3.

the way to achieve ὕψος is to develop μέγεθος of mind and character: 'sublimity is the echo of a noble mind' (ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα, 9.2).¹⁸

As the two concepts are so closely intertwined it seems understandable that the distinction between them is not always clear. Sublimity (ὕψος) is the topic of the treatise, so when μέγεθος is mentioned, it is in many cases produced by sublimity. There are indeed contexts where the terms are used in close vicinity as near synonyms.¹⁹ In such cases, the reader may understand 'greatness (attained through sublimity)'. But greatness may also be produced by other means than sublimity. When μέγεθος is used by itself, we should be careful not to interpret it immediately as ὕψος—especially when an explicit distinction is made between different kinds of μέγεθος, which is what we find in the beginning of the comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero.

2.2 ὕψος and αὔξησις

Demosthenes' sublimity is qualified as 'abrupt' by Longinus. Does this imply that there are other types of sublimity, and that Cicero is a representative of such another type? The first conclusion is correct; we will indeed see that Longinus allows for sublimity in a more extended context than just a single stroke. But the second conclusion is slippery. That a contrast is made between 'abrupt sublimity' and 'expansiveness' does not imply that 'expansiveness' is a type of sublimity. As an analogy, suppose we were to call one of two American senators a 'liberal democrat', and label the other a 'republican'. The specification 'liberal' implies that there are other types of democrat, but it would obviously be wrong to conclude that a republican is another type of democrat. So, *prima facie*, what Longinus is concerned with is the distinction between two styles, the one intense and sublime, the other expansive; what they have in common is grandeur, but not necessarily anything else.

18 Cf. 1.1, where Longinus criticizes Caecilius for not having shown by what means ὕψος can be attained. As it is, he 'apparently thought it unnecessary to deal with the means by which we may be enabled to develop our natures to some degree of grandeur (μέγεθος): — Ajax' silence in *Odyssey* 11.543-67 is characterized as both 'grand' (μέγας) and 'more sublime than any speech' (παντὸς ὑψηλότερον λόγου). The variation may well have a point: the first qualification of Ajax' silence connotes the nobility of his character, while the second compares its 'literary' effect to that of actual words.

19 A striking example is found in 8.1, where Longinus discusses the five sources of 'sublime writing' (ὕψηγορία). The first two are separated from the rest and explicitly marked as sources of the sublime (ὕψος); when Longinus gets to the fifth source, composition (σύνθεσις), he calls it the πέμπτη μεγέθους αἰτία ('fifth source of grandeur'). Still, there may be a reason for this switch. Longinus turns from the innovative (the first two sources) to the familiar: the other three sources are called the product of τέχνη ('art') and are more traditional concepts in rhetorical theory.

But if Longinus does allow for other types of sublimity, is it then perhaps possible that the Ciceronian, amplificatory style also qualifies? This has been suggested by Malcolm Heath: “In a short piece like Sappho’s lyric, the local context [in which sublimity rests] may be the whole composition; we will also be shown how sublimity can be achieved through techniques of accumulation in a relatively extended local context (11-13).”²⁰ This refers to the passage on amplification (αὔξισις). Further on Heath elaborates on the relation between αὔξισις and ὕψος: “To make amplification sublime requires not something *other* than amplification, but a quality *of* the amplification that raises its level in the same way that sustained emotional intensity secures the sublime effect of selection and combination [in Sappho’s case].”²¹

In our view, these observations are correct as far as Sappho is concerned, but not with respect to αὔξισις. In 10.1 Longinus explicitly says that the selection (ἐκλογή) and combination (ἐπισύνθεσις) of constituent elements ‘produce sublimity’ (ὕψους αἴτιον; cf. ὑψηλούς in the same passage). This is what Sappho did so skillfully in her famous poem (fr. 31 Voigt): selecting and combining the most striking and intense (τὰ ἄκρα ... καὶ ὑπερτεταμένα) symptoms of being in love. In the discussion of αὔξισις, things are different. Longinus defines it in the following way:²²

Σύνεδρός ἐστι ταῖς προεκκειμέναις ἀρετῇ καὶ ἦν καλοῦσιν αὔξισιν, ὅταν δεχομένων τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἀγώνων κατὰ περιόδους ἀρχάς τε πολλὰς καὶ ἀναπαύλας ἕτερα ἐτέροις ἐπεισκυκλούμενα μεγέθη συνεχῶς ἐπείσῃται κατ’ ἐπίτασιν.

Closely allied to the merits set out above is the quality called ‘amplification’. This is found when the subject matter and the issues admit of many starts and pauses from section to section, and the author wheels in one great phrase after another, with increasing force.

We see that αὔξισις essentially involves μέγεθος in its constituent parts (‘great phrases’), but ὕψος is not mentioned in the definition. Significantly, Longinus goes on to emphasize that αὔξισις needs to be ‘reinforced’ (συνεπιρρωννύμενον, 11.2) by ὕψος. Without it, the effect ‘loses its tension and becomes empty’ (ἀτονεῖ καὶ κενοῦται, 11.2). In the case of Sappho, it is the selection and combination of intense elements that is as a whole sublime; in the case of αὔξισις, on the other

20 Heath 2012, 12.

21 Heath 2012, 18.

22 11.1.

hand, sublimity is treated as something external. In our view, Longinus' comments here contradict the idea put forward by Heath that amplification itself is a way to achieve sublimity. Rather, sublimity needs to be brought in to prevent the amplification from getting stale. Perhaps Longinus' idea of amplification reinforced by sublimity can be understood as some sort of 'sublime amplification', but sublimity as such is here presented as a separate element that should be added to the amplification.

How should we imagine this? We understand Longinus as suggesting that some of the constituent parts of the amplification should be sublime. A hint to this is found in 43.3, where he criticizes a passage of αὔξῃσις by Theopompus. 'He descends from the sublime to the trivial, where he needs rather to make the amplification go in the other direction' (ἐκ τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων εἰς τὰ ταπεινότερα ἀποδιδράσκει, δέον ποιήσασθαι τὴν αὔξῃσιν ἔμπαλιν). This suggests that the right placement of sublime elements within the whole is what makes amplification successful.

2.3 *Cicero and Plato*

In 12.4 Longinus says that Cicero differs from Demosthenes 'in exactly the same way' (οὐ κατ' ἄλλα δέ τινα ἢ ταῦτα) as Plato does. In 13.1, when Longinus returns to Plato, he re-establishes the link between Plato and Cicero with the following remark:

“Οτι μέντοι ὁ Πλάτων (ἐπάνειμι γάρ) τοιούτῳ τινὶ χεῦματι ἀψοφητὶ ῥέων οὐδὲν ἦττον μεγεθύνεται, ἀνεγνῶκώς τὰ ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ τὸν τύπον οὐκ ἀγνοεῖς.

However, to return to Plato, though the stream of his words flows as noiselessly as oil, he none the less attains grandeur. You have read the *Republic* and you know the sort of thing.

That Longinus puts Cicero on a par with the sublime Plato here might in the first instance seem to imply that he regards Cicero as a sublime author as well. But again, we must pay close attention to the point of comparison. Longinus is still concerned here with the distinction between Demosthenic grandeur, achieved through abrupt sublimity, and grandeur based on amplification. As we have just argued, this is not a contrast between two types of sublimity. There can be no question that, for Longinus, Plato is a sublime author (see below); but in this context, Longinus' point is that Plato and Cicero share an expansive style that sets them apart from Demosthenes. This tells us little about Cicero's capacity for sublimity.

Here the following observation is significant. While Longinus readily uses words of the ὕψος-group elsewhere when discussing Plato (e.g. 14.1), he sticks to the μέγας-group in this context (μεγεθύνεται, 13.1; μέγεθος, 12.3).²³ We think this is not a coincidence. If we look at Longinus' discussions of Platonic passages throughout the work it becomes clear that there is something behind the terminological variation. Elsewhere, Longinus focuses mainly on *local* effects. In 28.2, he discusses the use of periphrasis in the *Menexenus* (periphrasis is ὑψηλοποιόν, see 28.1): Plato calls death 'a destined journey' (εἰμαρμένην πορείαν) and the state funeral 'a sort of public escort' (προπομπήν τινα δημοσίαν). In 23.4 he praises Plato's use of the plural *pro singulari* (not explicitly tied to ὕψος but mentioned in close connection with polyptoton, which is sublime: 23.1). When Plato slips, the faults are local too (4.6, 29.1, 32.7). In 32.5 Longinus does discuss an extended passage, but even here the focus is on the accumulation of local effects. What Longinus praises is the continuous use of tropes (τρόποι), connected to μέγεθος in 32.6 (note μεγάλη) but mentioned in the same breath as metaphors, a device called ὑψηλοποιόν.

In his discussion of the *Republic* passage in 13.1, by contrast, Longinus shows no concern for the stylistics of the constituent parts. What he admires is that Plato manages to retain grandeur in spite of (note οὐδὲν ἤττον) flowing like a noiseless stream. The passage, in which the people are described 'who have no experience of wisdom and goodness', indeed shows Plato 'steady in his majestic and stately dignity' (καθεστώς ἐν ὄγκῳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σεμνότητι) as he was characterized in 12.3.

2.4 Summary

In this section we have argued that the context of the σύγκρισις does not warrant the conclusion that Longinus regarded Cicero as a model of the sublime. Cicero has 'great' moments, but greatness is not the same as sublimity. Longinus does admit of sublimity consisting in 'selection and combination' but in the case of amplification he suggests that sublimity is external to it. Finally, Cicero and the sublime Plato are compared with respect to their greatness in the use of amplification, which again does not mean that Cicero is sublime as well.

23 He does use the word ὑψηλά in 13.2, but this is the start of a new topic.—Fyfe and Russell 1995 actually translate μεγαθύνεται (13.1) as 'attains sublimity'. In his commentary Russell 1964 remarks: "[T]his is presumably not μέγεθος in its widest sense—ποιόν τι μέγεθος 12.1—but simply ὕψος." We prefer to take the terminological variation seriously. (Russell's 1972 translation of the passage retains the word 'grandeur'.)

If an argument for Cicero's sublime status is to be made based on Longinus' considerations here, it should go something like this. Amplification is 'empty' without sublimity being brought in (cf. 11.2); Cicero is able to use amplification to grandiose effect; therefore Cicero attains sublimity. That is fair enough, perhaps; still, the point remains only implicit, and Longinus' consistent avoidance of 'sublime' terminology when discussing Cicero suggests that this is simply not the point of the comparison. Longinus' main concern throughout paragraphs 12-13.1 is the distinction between ὕψος and αὔξησις. Note how the verb παραλλάττει, 'differs', in 12.4 (Demosthenes versus Cicero) echoes the same expression in 11.3 (ὕψος versus αὔξησις). Longinus' motivation for bringing in Cicero seems to be, on the one hand, to further illustrate this distinction, and, as we will argue in the next section, to assert the superiority of the Demosthenic model—implicitly, perhaps, but clearly enough.

3 Opposing Paradigms: Demosthenes and Cicero

Longinus characterizes the styles of the two orators as follows:

ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ὕψει τὸ πλεόν ἀποτόμῳ, ὁ δὲ Κικέρων ἐν χύσει, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἡμέτερος διὰ τὸ μετὰ βίας ἕκαστα, ἔτι δὲ τάχους ῥώμης δεινότητος, οἷον καίειν τε ἅμα καὶ διαρπάζειν σκηπτῷ τινι παρεικάζοιτ' ἂν ἢ κεραυνῷ, ὁ δὲ Κικέρων ὡς ἀμφιλαφῆς τις ἐμπρησμός, οἶμαι, πάντῃ νέμεται καὶ ἀνειλεῖται, πολὺ ἔχων καὶ ἐπίμονον αἰεὶ τὸ καῖον καὶ διακληρονομούμενον ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοίως ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἀνατρεφόμενον.²⁴

Demosthenes displays his grandeur mostly in abrupt sublimity, Cicero in diffusion. Our countryman, because with his violence, yes, and his speed, force, impressiveness, he burns, as it were, and scatters everything at the same time, can be likened to a thunderbolt or a flash of lighting; Cicero, on the other hand, I think, is like a spreading conflagration: rolling everywhere and devouring everything, with the fire always rich and lasting and renewed in various forms from time to time and repeatedly fed with fresh fuel.

24 12.4.

Longinus' description of Demosthenes here vividly echoes keywords of his concept of sublimity as described throughout the work.²⁵ The link of the quality of abruptness (ἀπότομος) with sublimity is established in two other passages of *On the Sublime*. (1) In 39.4, Longinus discusses a Demosthenic thought (νόημα) that is particularly sublime (ὑψηλόν). He rewrites the passage (*On the Crown* 188) in order to show that Demosthenes chose exactly the right word order and the proper number of syllables so as to achieve a perfect composition. If we add one syllable to the original formulation (by writing ὥσπερ instead of ὡσπερ), Longinus argues, 'the abrupt sublimity' (τὸ ὕψος τὸ ἀπότομον) will immediately be ruined. (2) In 27.1, Longinus discusses a passage from the *Iliad* (15.346-349) where he believes Homer switches, without warning, from indirect to direct speech: the effect is that the reader is not prepared for the sudden outburst of Hector, whose threat becomes ἀπότομος ('abrupt'). If the poet had said 'Hector said so and so', the result would have been frigid. In both 39.4 (on Demosthenes) and 27.1 (on Homer), Longinus' use of the term ἀπότομος points to the abrupt character of the sublime, which appears in one surprising moment.

The noun βία ('violence') occurs in Longinus' definition of ὕψος (1.4), which, he says, brings 'irresistible mastery and force' (δυναστείαν καὶ βίαν ἄμαχον). The word τάχος is found again in 34.4, where Longinus lists speed among the qualities that separate the sublime Demosthenes from the unexciting Hyperides. Both speed and abruptness (τάχος and ἀποτομία), qualities of Demosthenes' sublimity, are related to Longinus' belief that ὕψος can be found 'even in one single idea' (κἀν νοήματι ἐνί, 12.1).

Apart from violence, speed and force, Demosthenes also possesses δεινότης ('impressiveness'). This is an important characteristic of sublime writers in *On the Sublime*.²⁶ The pre-eminent models of the sublime in this treatise are Homer, Demosthenes and Plato (36.2), and Longinus adds Thucydides for historiography (14.1, where the four are mentioned in one breath).²⁷ Significantly, Demosthenes shares his impressiveness with his sublime colleagues: Plato is δεινός in his use of figures, although sometimes without due measure (29.1); Thucydides is said to be δεινότατος ('most impressive') in the use of hyperbaton (22.3); the δεινότης of Demosthenes himself (a traditional topic in the ancient

25 See Porter 2016, 51-54 on "logical and thematic markers of the sublime", including "sudden or extreme, often violent, motions or changes", "uncontainable forces", and "natural ... phenomena".

26 See Porter 2016, 246-282 on δεινότης, especially in Demetrius, *On Style*.

27 See Innes 2002, 261.

criticism of this orator) is pointed out again in 34.4.²⁸ We may add that Sappho is δεινὴ in selecting and combining the most striking elements of the effects of love, which results in a sublime poem (10.1).

The close connection between the word δεινός and the concept of sublimity is also obvious in the final chapter of *On the Sublime*. Longinus introduces a philosopher, who asks why really sublime talents (ὕψηλαί ... φύσεις, 44.1) are no longer or only rarely produced. He then offers the hypothesis that οἱ περὶ λόγους δεινοί ('those who are impressive in speeches', 44.2) flourished and died together with democracy (δημοκρατία), by which he must mean the democracy of classical Athens. This passage not only confirms that for Longinus δεινός / δεινότης is closely connected with sublimity, but also poses the question whether Cicero should be considered an exception to the rule that 'sublime talents' have died with classical democracy. We will return to this point in the conclusion.²⁹

Demosthenes is said to be like a thunderbolt (σκηπτός, κεραυνός, 12.4): this is a key metaphor for the sublime in the treatise. In his general definition of the sublime, Longinus (1.4) states that a touch of ὕψος at the right moment 'shatters (διεφόρησε) everything like a thunderbolt (δίκην σκηπτοῦ)'. In 12.4, the verbs καίειν and διαρπάζειν together convey the idea of sudden, violent destruction. The word διαρπάζειν may also be connected with συναρπάσας in 16.2, where Demosthenes is said to have 'carried away' the audience by his successful use of metaphor. In 34.4, the metaphor of the thunderbolt is again explicitly linked to Demosthenes, who is said to 'out-thunder' (καταβροντᾷ) the orators of all ages. It is even harder to face his repeated outbursts of emotion than to keep your eyes open during a flash of lightning (κεραυνός). The comparison between Demosthenes and a thunderbolt was a familiar one: Cicero himself had already referred to 'those Demosthenic thunderbolts' (*fulmina illa, Orat.* 234).

28 On Demosthenes' δεινότης, see e.g. Demetrius, *Eloc.* 240-304 on the forceful style, with many examples from Demosthenes. Lombardo 2003 argues that Demetrius' concept of δεινότης shows affinities with the sublime, particularly with Edmund Burke's understanding of the sublime as 'delightful horror'. Wooten 1989 discusses the analysis of Demosthenes' style in Dionysius and Hermogenes.

29 Russell 1989, 309 believes that the word δημοκρατία in Longinus 44 refers to the Roman Republic; the parallel with the debate on the decline of eloquence in Tacitus' *Dialogus* is one of his main arguments for dating the treatise *On the Sublime* in the first century AD. In our view, however, Longinus' use of the word δημοκρατία refers not to the Roman Republic, but rather to classical Athens. Heath 1999, 53-54 rightly points out that "[a]part from the brief (and cautious) discussion of Cicero, [Longinus] is interested exclusively in Greek eloquence.... Indeed, it was a commonplace in late ancient histories of rhetoric to date the decline of rhetoric to the Macedonian domination." Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Orat. Vett.*) also dates the decline of eloquence to the period after Alexander.

Violence, speed, force, impressiveness and thunderbolts: Longinus obviously describes Demosthenes' style in words and metaphors that are closely associated with the sublime. In the description of Cicero, by contrast, such keywords are conspicuously absent. As for *χύσις* ('shedding', 'diffusion', 'flood'), Russell 1964, 111 notes that this metaphor is "extremely common in both Greek and Latin literary criticism". In Longinus, the most relevant parallel is the 'stream' (*χεῦμα*) of Plato, as we have discussed above.³⁰ Demosthenes however is typically *ἀδιάχυτος* ('not diffuse', 34.3).³¹ Like Demosthenes, Cicero 'burns' (the verb *καίειν* is used in connection with both authors), but the description of the Roman's fire evokes *αὔξεις*, not *ὑψος*. It is 'widespread' (*ἀμφιλαφής*,³² *πάντη*), 'large' (*πολύ*), 'steady' or 'persistent' (*ἐπίμονον*), 'renewed in various forms as time goes on, and repeatedly refueled' (*διακληρονομούμενον ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοίως ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἀνατρεφόμενον*).³³

This description takes up the treatment of *αὔξεις* in 11.1, which we discussed above, and in 12.1-2. In the latter passage it is made clear that *quantity* is essential to amplification (*πλήθος, ποσότης, περιουσία*, 12.1): *αὔξεις* consists in accumulating all the aspects and topics inherent in the subject (12.2). Longinus' description of Cicero's style illustrates the points made in these earlier discussions. Cicero's fire leaves no place untouched (cf. *πάντη*), that is, his discourse covers all the rhetorically available ground. The fire is also *ἐπίμονον*

30 It is also interesting that we find that Hyperides, who is far from sublime, is a master of narrating *κεχυμένως* ('copiously', 34.2; the adverb is an emendation by Blass for *κεχυμένος*, mss). On the other hand, *πρόχυσις* is used to characterize the sublime *Iliad* (9.13); but there it specifically refers to a 'flood of emotions' (*πάθη*). This Homeric 'flood' sounds more like Demosthenes than Cicero. A safe conclusion is that *χύσις* itself is not sublime, just as *αὔξεις*, by itself, is not (11-12.2).

31 Cf. Neuberger-Donath 1987, 118 n. 3.

32 Longinus' use of the word here seems quite felicitous, as it can be used both for natural phenomena and for the rhetorical inventiveness of the encomiast. Herodotus' use of the word for natural phenomena in 4.28.3 (lightning) and 4.50.3 (snow) may be compared with Longinus' employing it to refer to a fire. Two authors use the term to express (rhetorical or poetic) inventiveness. Pi. O. 9.82 expresses the hope that he will 'find the right words and fittingly drive forward in the chariot of the muses' (*εἶην εὐρεσιεπὴς ἀναγείσθαι πρόσφορος ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρῳ*), and gain 'ample power' (*ἀμφιλαφὴς δύναμις*; translations from Race 1997). The word's potential for describing rhetorical *copia* is exploited in pseudo-Dionysius, *Rh.* 3.5 (p. 269, 8 ed. Usener-Radermacher), where the word is used of a birthday speech: if all topics have been covered, the *λόγος* is *ἀμφιλαφής*. Note that such speeches belong to the epideictic genre, which is linked to Cicero's style in Longinus 12.5. It may also be noted that Plato uses the term once (*Phdr.* 230b), of a tree, which is also called *ὑψηλός* ('high'). This is remarkable, but it would be far-fetched to infer that Longinus is alluding to that passage to make a connection between rhetorical copiousness and sublimity.

33 The translation of these words is borrowed from Russell 1964, 111. The meaning of *διακληρονομούμενον* is not entirely certain.

(‘lasting’); in 12.2 the term ἐπιμονή is used to make the point that amplification can strengthen the argument by dwelling upon it (cf. also συνεχῶς ‘continuously’ in 11.1). The idea of ‘many starts’ (ἀρχαὶ πολλαί) from 11.1 is echoed here in the fire being renewed and repeatedly fed (διακληρονομούμενον and κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἀνατρεφόμενον, 12.4). In both passages the process keeps going with unceasing energy: ἕτερα ἐτέροις (‘one phrase after another’, 11.1) is paralleled by ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλοίως (‘now in this form, then in that’, 12.4).

In his comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero (12.4–5), Longinus characterizes the different styles of the two orators not only by describing, but also by imitating them.³⁴ When describing Demosthenes’ style, he uses what seems to be a typically Demosthenic form of αὔξησις: the asyndetic tricolon τάχους ῥώμης δεινότητος. In his discussion of this figure, Aristotle points out that a connective particle (σύνδεσμος) creates unity in plurality, whereas the absence of such particles divides a unity into discrete pieces.³⁵ He gives the example ἦλθον, διελέχθην, ἰκέτευσά (‘I came, I conversed, I begged’), which, he says, ‘has an amplificatory effect’ (ἔχει αὔξησιν). Longinus also devotes quite some attention to the topic of asyndeton (19–21). Particularly interesting is an example from Demosthenes’ *Against Midias* (Longinus 20–21 on D. 21.72). In this discussion (20.1) Longinus himself uses an asyndetic tricolon, τὴν ἰσχὺν τὴν πειθῶ τὸ κάλλος (‘force, conviction, beauty’), while the passage from Demosthenes that he is examining contains another one: τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ (‘his manner, his look, his voice’). Subsequently, Longinus (21) shows that inserting connectives (σύνδεσμοι) in the passage of Demosthenes completely ruins ‘the rush and ruggedness of the emotion’ (τοῦ πάθους τὸ συνδεδιωγμένον καὶ ἀποτραχυνόμενον). The use of many connectives is said to be in the style of Isocrates. It seems, then, that Longinus’ formulation τάχους ῥώμης δεινότητος (12.4) is a mimetic attempt at Demosthenic sublimity.

More daring and innovative is the way in which Longinus seems to imitate Cicero’s style—that is, his perception of Cicero’s style—in Greek. While he is explaining that Cicero’s rhetorical fire is constantly refreshed, Longinus keeps the fire of his own sentence going with fresh adjectives and participles with similar meanings: πολὺ ... καὶ ἐπίμονον ... καὶ διακληρονομούμενον ... καὶ ... ἀνατρεφόμενον. In Ciceronian style, Longinus himself is now, one might say, ‘strengthening the argument by dwelling on it’ (12.2).

Next, Longinus defines the right moment for Demosthenic and Ciceronian greatness respectively:

34 Arieti and Crossett 1985, 76 observe that Longinus imitates first Demosthenes, then Cicero.

35 Arist. *Rh.* 1413b32–5.

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὑμεῖς ἂν ἄμεινον ἐπικρίνοιτε, καιρὸς δὲ τοῦ Δημοσθενικοῦ μὲν ὕψους καὶ ὑπερτεταμένου ἔν τε ταῖς δεινώσεσι καὶ τοῖς σφοδροῖς πάθεσι καὶ ἔνθα δεῖ τὸν ἀκροατὴν τὸ σύνολον ἐκπλήξαι, τῆς δὲ χύσεως ὅπου χρὴ καταντλήσαι· τοπηγορίας τε γὰρ καὶ ἐπιλόγοις κατὰ τὸ πλεόν καὶ παρεκβάσει καὶ τοῖς φραστικοῖς ἅπασι καὶ ἐπιδεικτικοῖς, ἱστορίαις τε καὶ φυσιολογίαις, καὶ οὐκ ὀλίγοις ἄλλοις μέρεσιν ἀρμόδιος.³⁶

You Romans, of course, can form a better judgment on this question. But let me say that the right place for Demosthenic, high-strained sublimity is in passages of great impact, passages of vehement emotion and in general where it is necessary to strike the audience with amazement, where-as a flood may be used where it is necessary to deluge them. The latter is appropriate in the treatment of a commonplace, epilogues, digressions, all descriptive and epideictic passages, historical and scientific contexts, and many other types of writing.

Again, Longinus' terminology marks Demosthenes' style explicitly as a model of sublimity (ὕψος). The word ὑπερτεταμένον ('high-strained') echoes ὑπερτεταμένα in Longinus' discussion of sublime Sappho, who selects and combines 'the most striking and intense' symptoms of love (ἄκρα ... καὶ ὑπερτεταμένα, 10.1).³⁷ The noun τόνος (intensity), which comes from the same root, is characteristic not only of Demosthenic ὕψος (34.4), but also of the sublime *Iliad* (9.13). The Demosthenic style is said to be at home in passages of 'great impact' (ταῖς δεινώσεσι) and in passages of 'vehement emotion' (τοῖς σφοδροῖς πάθεσι). The importance of δεινός for Longinus' concept of sublimity has been discussed above. The concepts of ὕψος and πάθος are also frequently linked in this work (despite Longinus' comment in 8.2-3 that ὕψος can be achieved without πάθος). Most notably, σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος ('vehement and inspiring emotion') is presented as the second of the five sources of sublimity (8.1; cf. 29.2). Note also that σφοδρότης is one of the terms used to characterize the sublime *Iliad* as opposed to the *Odyssey*, 'the ebbing tide of Homer's greatness' (9.13).

Demosthenes' style is especially useful when we need to strike the audience with amazement (ἐκπλήξαι, 12.5). This is precisely the effect of the sublime as described by Longinus. At the beginning of his treatise (1.4), Longinus presents sublimity as 'what inspires wonder, with its power of amazing us' (σὺν ἐκπλήξει! ... τὸ θαυμάσιον). In his famous digression on natural grandeur, he observes that

³⁶ 12.5.

³⁷ The connection between Sappho and ὕψος is secured by 10.1 (ὕψηλούς ... λόγους). With ὑπερτεταμένον (10.1 and 12.5) one may also compare τοιαῦτα ὑπερτείνόμενα (38.1).

we are more 'struck' (ἐκπληττόμεθα) by the heavenly fires and the eruptions of the Etna than by a small fire kindled by ourselves.³⁸ In other words, the impact of Demosthenes' style is the impact of the sublime. Though there may be different routes to this goal (Demosthenic thunderbolts, Sapphonic selection and combination), this is the effect the author must achieve in order to be called 'sublime'.

The effect of the style represented by Cicero, by contrast, is 'to deluge' the audience. The 'water' metaphor is continued, but the choice for the particular word καταντλήσαι is remarkable. It is used two times in Classical Greek to refer to rhetoric (Pl. *R.* 344d; Ar. *V.* 483) and in both cases its connotations are clearly pejorative.³⁹ It is unlikely that the echo of Plato (where Socrates uses the term to mock the sophist Thrasymachus) is accidental, given Longinus' deep immersion in Platonic writings (and note that he mentions the *Republic* in 13.1). Seen in this light, Longinus' use of the term may be a subtle way of hinting at the inferior status of Ciceronian rhetoric.

Just as in 12.4, it seems that Longinus shows us what he is talking about when discussing the styles of the orators. The right place for Demosthenes' style is described in a forceful tricolon that hits us with blows of increasing intensity: first the bare noun δεινώσει, then πάθει modified by σφοδροῖς, and finally a full clause describing the paradigmatic effect of the sublime (ἐκπλήξει). Then, having dropped the word καταντλήσαι ('to deluge'), Longinus himself appears to deluge the reader with a long enumeration of various genres with which Cicero's style is compatible.

To conclude, Longinus' main concern in this passage is to contrast not two types of sublimity but two types of grandeur: abrupt sublimity (Demosthenes) and expansiveness (Cicero). The second style is appropriate in certain pre-defined genres, while Demosthenes is the model to emulate when the true effect of the sublime needs to be achieved: to strike the audience with amazement (ἐκπλήξει).

Some might object that the picture of Cicero as a rolling fire devouring everything in its path is striking enough to suggest sublimity. Cicero would certainly seem to be more powerful than that other foil for Demosthenes: the immaculate but unexciting Hyperides (34), whose good qualities are devoid of grandeur (34.4). But this does not put Cicero on a par with Demosthenes, who, indeed, is said to 'out-thunder, as it were, and outshine the orators of every age' (ὥσπερὶ καταβροντᾷ καὶ καταφέγγει τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ῥήτορας, 34.4). In the sphere

38 Another term that describes the effect of the sublime is ἐκστασις ('displacement': 1.4, 38.5).

39 Cf. Arieti and Crossett 1985, 76.

of natural phenomena, Cicero's fire is more dangerous than the 'little fire we kindle' (τὸ ὕφ' ἡμῶν τουτὶ φλογίον ἀνακαίόμενον, 35.4)—but does it quite amount to the spontaneous and uncontrollable violence of the eruptions of the Etna? We would suggest that Longinus chose a metaphor for Cicero that suggests grandeur, but lacks the rapturous violence that is associated with the effect of the sublime.

In our final section we will consider the wider implications of Longinus' presentation of Cicero with respect to his Roman readership and his program of the sublime. But first we will turn to another matter that is important for understanding Longinus' evaluation of Cicero. This is Longinus' reticence on Cicero's capacity for evoking pity.

4 Longinus, Cicero, Quintilian, and Ciceronian Pathos

It is interesting to compare Longinus' discussion (12.4-5) with the descriptions of Cicero's style in Cicero himself and Quintilian. John Dugan has presented a useful analysis of the parallels and similarities between the three accounts.⁴⁰ We will focus on one aspect in which Longinus differs from his Roman colleagues, namely his silence about πάθος ('emotion', 'pathos') in his discussion of Cicero.

Longinus' presentation of Cicero as a master of amplification (αὔξησις, *amplificatio*) seems to accord with Cicero's own views. In *De orat.* 3.104, Cicero calls *amplificatio* 'the highest excellence of eloquence' (*summa laus eloquentiae*); in 3.105 *amplificatio* used to stir the feelings of the listeners is called 'the unique excellence of the orator, the one that is most his own' (*una laus oratoris propria maxime*). Similar praise of *amplificatio* is given in *Orat.* 125; and in 126, Cicero states that it should be 'spread equally throughout the whole of the speech' (*aequaliter toto corpore orationis fusa*), which suggests that this is characteristic of his own speeches as well. Cicero also seems to agree with Longinus about the specific moments when the technique is particularly strong: in *loci communes* ('commonplaces', see *De orat.* 3.106, and especially *Orat.* 126; cf. Longinus 12.5: τοπηγορίαί) and in perorations (*Orat.* 127; cf. Longinus 12.5: ἐπίλογοι). Cicero points out that it is to be used 'in the midst of arguments' (*inter media argumenta*, *Orat.* 127); Longinus (12.2) also notes the power of αὔξησις to strengthen an argument (τὸ κατεσκευασμένον).

40 Dugan 2005, 327-332.

Quintilian's σύγκρισις of Demosthenes and Cicero (10.1.105-8) largely agrees with that of Longinus in important aspects.⁴¹ Demosthenes is 'more concentrated' (*densior*), Cicero's style is 'richer' (*copiosior*); the one has shorter periods (*concludit adstrictius*), the other longer ones (*latius*); 'one always fights with the sword point (*acumine*), the other strikes repeatedly and puts his weight behind the blow (*frequenter et pondere*)'. The overall result is quite similar to Longinus' picture of Demosthenes striking quickly as a thunderbolt and Cicero spreading everywhere while repeatedly refueling his fire.

Quintilian, however, does not consider Cicero as representing one type of style. He goes on to claim that Cicero has succeeded in reproducing 'Demosthenes' force (*vim Demosthenis*), the richness of Plato (*copia Platonis*), and the elegance of Isocrates (*iucunditatem Isocratis*)' (10.1.108). Just like Longinus, Quintilian observes that Cicero and Plato are similar in their 'richness' or 'abundance' (*copia*; cf. πλουσιώτατα in Longinus 12.3). But he also credits him with Demosthenic 'force' (*vis*, cf. 10.1.110), a quality that, according to Longinus, distinguishes Demosthenes from Cicero (note ῥώμη and βία in Longinus 12.4). Further, Quintilian (10.1.110) claims that there is no orator 'who can more deeply stir the emotions' (*movere vehementius*) than Cicero. Longinus, on the other hand, thinks that this effect is characteristic for Demosthenes' style (cf. τοῖς σφοδροῖς πάθει in Longinus 12.4). Where Quintilian states that the judges are 'swept away' (*rapi*, 10.1.110) by Cicero's violence, Longinus attributes the effect of 'scattering everything' (*διαρπάζειν*, 12.4) to Demosthenes.⁴²

Quintilian's characterization echoes the views of Cicero, who also appears to think of himself as a paradigm of 'emotional' rhetoric. He presents *pathos* repeatedly as that by which oratory truly rules (*De orat.* 2.69, 2.187, *Orat.* 128; cf. Quintilian 7.4.24). In *Orat.* 129-132, he adduces some examples from his own orations. It is striking that Longinus makes no mention whatsoever of Ciceronian πάθος.⁴³ It is Demosthenes' style that arouses emotion: when compared to Plato (for whom Cicero is a parallel), Demosthenes is called παθητικώτερος (12.3). Significantly, Longinus (8.3) states that epideictic rhetoric, to which Cicero's style is said to be adapted (12.5), is mostly devoid of πάθος. Why is Longinus silent about what Cicero himself and Quintilian see as one of Cicero's most important qualities—or rather, why does Longinus imply that Cicero lacks this quality?

41 Mazzucchi 2010, 201 also notes the similarities between the accounts of Longinus and Quintilian. For the differences between the two discussions, see De Jonge 2018.

42 There is a difference, however: according to Quintilian (10.1.110) Cicero's judge, while he is in fact swept away, seems to merely follow.

43 Dugan 2005, 328 asserts that "[b]oth [Longinus and Quintilian] describe ... Cicero's ... capacity to evince pity." We do not find such a description in Longinus.

It may be possible to explain Longinus' presentation by pointing to his views on emotions. In *On the Sublime* 8.2, he states that some emotions (πάθη) are 'devoid of sublimity and mean' (διεστῶτα ὕψους καὶ ταπεινά).⁴⁴ Examples are feelings of pity, grief and fear (οἶκτοι, λῦπαι, φόβοι). Now, according to Quintilian (10.1.107) it is *commiseratio* ('pity', οἶκτος), apart from humor, in which Cicero's oratorical abilities exceeded those of Demosthenes; and these two are 'the two most powerful elements in emotional writing' (*quae duo plurimum in adfectibus valeant*). Cicero himself devotes special attention to his *miserationes* ('evocations of pity') in *Orat.* 130-131, where he implies that he is famous for his power to evoke pity: *quid ego de miserationibus loquar?* For Cicero and Quintilian, *miseratio* seems to be the finest type of 'emotional' rhetoric. Longinus, on the other hand, considers οἶκτος a lesser emotion, which is devoid of sublimity (8.2). In other chapters of his treatise, Longinus includes more comments on pity (οἶκτος), which are also instructive. In 11.2, he points out that amplification (αὔξησις) can never be successful without sublimity (ὕψος), *except* in commiseration or deprecation (οἶκτοι and εὐτελισμοί), which implies that amplification is not sublime if it is used for οἶκτος. In 34.2, Longinus states that Hyperides, a paradigm of the non-sublime writer, has a strong natural talent for evoking pity (οἰκτίσασθαι ... προσφύεστατος), from which, again, we may gather that οἶκτος is not sublime. Finally, it is interesting that Cicero (*Orat.* 130) thinks that the ideal place for the emotional *miseratio* is in the *peroratio*; while Longinus does agree that Cicero's style is at home in the *peroratio* (ἐπιλόγοις, 12.5), he does not associate that part of the speech with strong πάθος, but with χύσις. For Cicero, on the other hand, χύσις and πάθος seem to go hand in hand.

It seems, then, that Longinus' σύγκρισις agrees only in part with the analysis of Cicero's style in the works of Cicero himself and Quintilian. On the one hand, Longinus' presentation of Cicero as a master of amplification (αὔξησις) echoes the views of Cicero himself, who regards this technique as all-important. Longinus' comments on the right places for amplification also have parallels in Cicero's views. And Longinus' analysis of the key difference between Demosthenes and Cicero is essentially in tune with Quintilian's (initial) treatment of the two orators. Both critics link Cicero and Plato with 'richness' or 'abundance'. On the other hand, Longinus differs from his Roman colleagues in one important aspect. Cicero certainly sees himself as a paradigm of pathos, and so does Quintilian, when he affirms Cicero's complete mastery of every aspect of oratory. Longinus, however, regards Demosthenes not only as the champion of πάθος and vehement rhetoric, but also as the archetypical representative of the sublime in oratory.

44 On this topic, see Innes 1995. Remarkably, fear is associated with sublimity in 10.5-6 and 34.3. This is nowhere the case with pity, however, which is our main concern here.

From a Roman perspective, we could say that Longinus is not fair to Cicero because in his discussion of Ciceronian style, he leaves out one of his most famous oratorical qualities. In Longinus' defense, on the other hand, we might say that he is actually considerate of his Roman addressee and Roman readers: the famous quality of Cicero that he ignores is in fact one that is—in his view—not sublime at all.

5 Conclusion

We have argued in this article that Longinus presents Demosthenes and Cicero as paradigmatic representatives of two styles, one consisting in abrupt sublimity, the other in expansiveness. While Demosthenes is explicitly and implicitly associated with the sublime, terminology related to this concept is consistently avoided in the case of Cicero. Moreover, Longinus is reticent about Ciceronian pathos, which according to Quintilian and Cicero himself was the strongest aspect of his oratory.

We have not tried to definitively exclude the possibility that Longinus regarded Cicero as a sublime author. But at the very least, we think we have shown that the assumption that he did should be called into question. Whatever possibilities Longinus may have left open, the main point of the comparison—the distinction between abrupt sublimity and expansiveness—does not support the interpretation that Cicero's style is sublime. Furthermore, we have shown that Longinus may have had his rhetorical reasons for including Cicero in his treatise without marking him as a sublime author—which he easily could have done if he had wanted to.

By including Cicero in his work, Longinus manages to give the most important orator of recent times a place in such a way as to satisfy his Roman addressee and other Roman readers in his audience. These Romans can be content that Cicero is included as a canonical writer of great literature. They may even get the impression that he is indeed to be counted among the truly sublime authors, for the same reasons that modern commentators have: the distinction between μέγεθος and ὕψος is easy to neglect; Demosthenic ὕψος receives a specific qualification as being 'abrupt', which may give the impression that Cicero represents another type; and Cicero is directly compared with the sublime Plato. Also, the structure of the comparison does not in itself suggest the supremacy of one of the orators over the other (here we may contrast Quintilian's comparison).

At the same time, the close association, almost identification of Demosthenes' style with the ideal of the sublime makes clear who takes the

palm. Here Longinus' strategy is implicit, as Arieti and Crossett note: "[H]e lets the accumulated impact of his own values (emotion, intensity, sublimity) operate quietly in the reader's memory; and he manages his offhand tone of self-deprecation by deferring ultimately to the critical judgment of Terentianus."⁴⁵ But elsewhere Longinus declares flat-out that Demosthenes 'out-thunders, as it were, and outshines the orators of every age' (34.4).

That Longinus reserves the qualification of sublimity for his heroes of Classical Greece—Homer, Plato, Thucydides (among others), and especially Demosthenes—ties in with the deeper ethico-political ramifications underlying his program of the sublime. These appear at the end of the work in 44, where Longinus reports a discussion between himself and 'one of the philosophers' on the cause of the decline of oratory after the fall of the democracy (which we take as the classical Athenian democracy, cf. note 29).⁴⁶ The philosopher sees the loss of individual freedom as the main cause of this decline. Longinus, however, blames the loss of moral values: it is 'love of money' (φιλοχρηματία) and 'love of pleasure' (φιληδονία) that 'enslave' (δουλαγωγούσι) men. In this passage Longinus recalls a passage in Demosthenes' speech against Aeschines *On the False Embassy*,⁴⁷ where Demosthenes says that Aeschines has betrayed Athens for his personal gain. He has become 'one of Philip's friends, who want to get rid of the people and believe the present constitution is instability, madness'.⁴⁸ It is, of course, significant that Longinus alludes to Demosthenes in this context. We may also think of 32.2, where Longinus cites a passage from the famous speech *On the Crown*. Here Demosthenes characterizes the betrayers of Greek freedom as 'men who measure happiness by their bellies and their basest appetites, and have overthrown that liberty and freedom from

45 Arieti and Crossett 1985, 76. That Greek critics should refrain from evaluating the Latin style of a Roman orator seems to be the point of Plutarch's critical remarks about Caecilius' comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero (*Dem.* 3 = Caecilius fr. 153 Ofenloch). In his *On Demosthenes*, Plutarch himself refuses to discuss Demosthenes' style. Longinus (12.4-5) repeatedly asserts that 'you' (ὑμεῖς i.e. the Romans) are better judges of Cicero; cf. Whitmarsh 2001, 68-71. Quintilian (10.1.105) is likewise aware that the comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero is a sensitive topic: 'I know, of course, what a storm of opposition I am raising' (*nec ignoro quantam mihi concitem pugnam*).

46 For the significance of this passage in light of Longinus' strategy of creating distance between Greek and Roman culture, cf. Whitmarsh 2001, 68-71; de Jonge 2014, 404-7.

47 Through the phrase ἵσα βαίνουσα 'step for step' (44.7; note φασί 'as they say'), cf. ἵσα βαίνων in D. 19.314.

48 D. 19.314: τῶν Φιλίππου ξένων καὶ φίλων εἰς οὗτος ὑμῖν ἤδη, τῶν ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ δήμου βουλομένων καὶ κλύδωνα καὶ μανίαν τὰ καθεστηκότα πράγμαθ' ἡγούμενων.

despotism which to Greeks of older days was the canon and standard of all that was good'.⁴⁹

For Demosthenes the decline of moral values caused the demise of the Athenian democracy; Longinus attributes the coincidental death of sublime oratory to the same cause. After all, 'sublimity is the echo of a noble mind' (ὑψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα, 9.2). For Longinus, Demosthenes does not just represent a rhetorical ideal; he was the last bastion of Greek freedom and its classical values, and when he ultimately lost the fight, sublime oratory died with him.⁵⁰ Thus, reading a Ciceronian sublimity into the treatise *On the Sublime* is prominently at odds not only with the text of the comparison in 12.4-5, but also with the deeper meaning of Longinus' conception of the sublime itself.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank the two anonymous referees for their helpful comments and suggestions. The research for this article was partly funded by the *Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* (NWO) through the VIDI project on 'Greek Criticism and Latin Literature. Classicism and Cultural Interaction in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome' (2014-2018) and the Spinoza prize awarded to Ineke Sluiter in 2010. We thank Ineke Sluiter for supporting this research.

Bibliography

- Arieti, J.A., and Crossett, J.M. (1985). *Longinus. On the Sublime*. New York.
- Augello, I. (2006). *Cecilio di Calatte. Frammenti di critica letteraria, retorica e storiografia*. Rome.

49 D. 18.296: τῇ γαστρὶ μετροῦντες καὶ τοῖς αἰσχίστοις τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, τὴν δ' ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὸ μηδὲνα ἔχειν δεσπότην ..., ἃ τοῖς πρότερον Ἕλλησιν ὄροι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἦσαν καὶ κανόνες, ἀνατετροφότες.

50 On the image of Athenian democracy in Hellenistic and Greek Imperial literature, see now Canevaro and Gray 2018. Many post-classical Greek writers, like Dionysius and Plutarch, draw a connection between the democracy of classical Athens and its cultural flourishing and intellectual achievements. Longinus' *On the Sublime* fits into this general approach, as he associates the sublime with the writers of the period up to Demosthenes, whom he presents as the last (and most) sublime orator.

- Bowersock, G.W. (1979). Historical Problems in Late Republican and Augustan Classicism. In: H. Flashar, ed., *Le classicisme à Rome aux iers siècles avant et après J.-C.* Vandœuvres/Geneva, pp. 57-78.
- Canevaro, M., and Gray, B., eds. (2018). *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought*. Oxford.
- Chalkomatas, D. (2007). *Ciceros Dichtungstheorie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Literaturästhetik*. Berlin.
- Dugan, J. (2005). *Making a New Man. Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford.
- Dugan, J. (2007). Modern Critical Approaches to Roman Rhetoric. In: W. Dominik and J. Hall, eds, *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Malden, MA, pp. 9-22.
- Fyfe, W.H. (rev. D.A. Russell) (1995). Longinus. On the Sublime. In: S. Halliwell, W.H. Fyfe (rev. D.A. Russell), and D. Innes, *Aristotle, Poetics. Longinus, On the Sublime. Demetrius, On Style*. Cambridge, MA, pp. 143-307.
- Heath, M. (1999). Longinus, On Sublimity. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 45, pp. 43-74.
- Heath, M. (2012). Longinus and the Ancient Sublime. In: T.M. Costelloe, ed., *The Sublime from Antiquity to the Present*. Cambridge, pp. 11-23.
- Hubbell, H.M. (1952). *Cicero. Orator*. London.
- Innes, D.C. (1995). Longinus, Sublimity and the Low Emotions. In: D.C. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling, eds., *Ethics and Rhetoric. Classical Essays for Donald Russell*. Oxford, pp. 323-333.
- Innes, D.C. (2002). Longinus and Caecilius. Models of the Sublime. *Mnemosyne* 55, pp. 259-284.
- de Jonge, C.C. (2014). The Attic Muse and the Asian Harlot. Classicizing Allegories in Dionysius and Longinus. In: J. Ker and C. Pieper, eds., *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 388-409.
- de Jonge, C.C. (2018). Demosthenes versus Cicero. Intercultural Competition in Ancient Literary Criticism. In: C. Damon and C. Pieper, eds., *Eris vs. Aemulatio. Valuing Competition in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 300-323.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1972). *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 BC-300 AD*. Princeton, NJ.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1999). *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2nd ed. Chapel Hill, NC.
- Lombardo, G. (2003). Il sublime di Demetrio. *Aevum Antiquum* 3, pp. 135-154.
- May, J.M., and Wisse, J. (2001). *Cicero, On the Ideal Orator*. New York.
- Mazzucchi, C.M. (2010). *Dionisio Longino, Del sublime. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commentario*. 2nd ed. Milan.
- Neuberger-Donath, R. (1987). *Longini De sublimitate lexicon*. Hildesheim.

- Ofenloch, E. (1907). *Caecilii Calactini fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Porter, J.I. (2001). Des sons qu'on ne peut entendre. Cicéron, les 'kritikoi' et la tradition du sublime dans la critique littéraire. In: C. Auvray-Assayas and D. Delattre, eds., *Cicéron et Philodème. La polémique en philosophie*. Paris, pp. 315-341.
- Porter, J.I. (2016). *The Sublime in Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Race, W.H. (1997). *Pindar, Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. Cambridge MA.
- Rhys Roberts, W. (1899). *Longinus, On the Sublime*. Cambridge.
- Russell, D.A. (1964). *Longinus, On the Sublime*. Oxford.
- Russell, D.A. (1989). Longinus on Sublimity. In: G.A. Kennedy, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Vol. 1: Classical Criticism*. Cambridge, pp. 306-311.
- Russell, D.A. (2001). *Quintilian, The Orator's Education*. (5 vols). Cambridge, MA.
- Russell, D.A., and Winterbottom, M. (1972). *Ancient Literary Criticism. The Principal Texts in New Translations*. Oxford.
- Usener, H., and Radermacher, L. (1904-1929). *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant, Vol. 6: Opusculorum volumen secundum*. Stuttgart/Leipzig.
- Voigt, E.-M. (1971). *Sappho et Alcaeus, Fragmenta*. Amsterdam.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.
- Woerther, F. (2015). *Caecilius de Calè-Acte, Fragments et témoignages*. Paris.
- Wooten, C.W. (1989). Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes on the Style of Demosthenes. *American Journal of Philology* 110, pp. 576-588.
- Zabulis, H. (1998). Cicerone nel trattato del Sublime. In: *Ciceroniana. Atti del X Colloquium Tullianum*, Monte Sant'Angelo, 24-27 aprile 1997. Rome, pp. 133-157.