THE AESTHETICS OF RHETORIC IN *ON THE SUBLIME* OF LONGINUS

PhD in rhetoric, Assoc. Professor, United International College of Hong Kong Baptist University and Beijing Normal University, China.

Books: *Conceptions of Criticism Cross-Cultural, Interdisciplinary, and Historical Studies of Structures of a Concept of Values*, 2008; *Beauty and Esthetics. Meanings of an Idea and Concept of the Senses. An Introduction to an Esthetic Communication Concept Facing the Perspectives Of Its Theory, History, and Cultural Traditions of the Beautiful*, 2008; „*Words Made Out of Dreams*". *An Anthology of Dreams in English Literature with an Introduction On Readings of Dreams in Non-interpretative Ways*, 2007; *Eine Leipziger Edition der Sammlung von Herrn von Hoffmannswaldau und andrer Deutschen außerlesener und bißher ungedruckter Gedichte von Benjamin Neukirch aus dem Jahre 1697: mit einer Einleitung zur Editionsgeschichte*, 2003; *Kritik. Historische Begriffe der Sprache und Literatur einer Wissenschaft und Kunst in Dokumenten aus der Antike und späten Neuzeit bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, 2002; *Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729-1812). Bibliographic zu Leben und Werk. Heidelberg: Palatina Verlag*, 2002; etc.

Fee-Alexandra HAASE

The Aesthetics of Rhetoric in *On the Sublime* of Longinus

Abstract. This article localizes the treatise *On the Sublime* in the Hellenistic culture of the 3rd century. It is by some scholars attributed to Cassius Longinus, while others reject this attribution and cultural context completely. We argue that *On the Sublime* is by Longinus written and a document that is both a piece of evidence for the cultural change of a decline in the practice of rhetoric and also exemplifies the transformation and subordination of rhetoric to newly emerging concepts in the Hellenistic culture of Late Antiquity. We interpret the changing rhetorical culture its author observes as a state of rhetoric at the end of the movement of the Second Sophistic. The historical frame and the name of the author of the treatise, Longinus, is documented by the *Suda* and other sources. *On the Sublime* itself puts rhetorical devices into a new framework exceeding the limits of traditional treatises called *rhetorike techne*. 'The sublime' is present in nature, in god, in humans, and in artifices like writings of rhetoricians, philosophers, poets, and historians. With this contextualization as a universal principle, the sublime, previously used as a criterion of style and thinking, is by Longinus established as a universal concept.

Keywords: Aesthetics, ancient Greek rhetoric, Second Sophistic, criticism, literature, sublimity.

Estetica retoricii în *Despre sublim* de Longinus

Rezumat. Acest articol încadrează tratatul „Despre sublim" în cultura elenistică a secolului al III-lea. Este atribuit de unii cercetători lui Cassius Longinus, în timp ce alții resping complet această atribuire și contextul cultural. Susținem că „Despre sublim" este scris de Longinus; tratatul este atât o dovadă a schimbării culturale în urma unui declin în practica retoricii, cât și un exemplu de transformare și subordonare a retoricii unor concepte nou apărute în cultura elenistică a Antichității târzii. Interpretăm cultura retorică în schimbare pe care o observă autorul ei ca pe o stare a retoricii la sfârșitul mișcării celei de-a doua Sofistici. Cadrul istoric și numele autorului tratatului, Longinus, este documentat de *Suda* și de alte surse. Însuși lucrarea *Despre sublim* plasează dispozitivele retorice într-un nou cadru care depășește limitele tratatelor tradiționale, numit „rhetorike techne". „Sublimul" este prezent în natură, în Dumnezeu, în oameni și în artificii precum scrierile retoricilor, filosofilor, poeților și istoricilor. Odată cu această contextualizare ca principiu universal, sublimul, folosit anterior ca un criteriu de stil și de gândire, este stabilit de Longinus ca un concept universal.

Cuvinte-cheie: Estetică, retorica Greciei antice, a doua Sofistică, critică, literatură, sublim.

1. Conditions of the Text Transmission and Editions of *On The Sublime*

1.1. Longinus as Rhetorician, the Concept of the Sublime in *On the Sublime*, and the Theory of Rhetoric. Plotinus granted Longinus legitimacy as a literary critic, but not as a philosopher. His contributions to rhetoric that have been recorded, never resulted in an appreciation as a theorist of rhetoric. To challenge this state is the background of the desideratum of our work. The passages of *On the Sublime* that we present here on rhetoric add to a by standard title known *Art of Rhetoric* and a speech for Odaenathus that Longinus wrote as stated in the respective entry of *Brill's New Pauly* [1]. None of these works that reflect the theory of rhetoric are mentioned in his entry in *Suda* [2]. The fact that Longinus taught rhetoric we know from his teaching to the scholar Porphyry as stated in the *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia* [3, p. 1]. Vielberg discusses Longinus in the context of the topos of the 'decline of rhetoric' [4, p. 471-486]. The commonly used title of the famous treatise of Longinus was in the course of its transmission history given to it. There is no doubt that this treatise deals with the overarching concept of the 'sublime', but the author uses several expressions for it. In the ancient Greek literature the words 'ὕψος' is used across all kinds of literature ranging from philosophers like Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle, to historians like Herodotus, Thucydides, the poets Euripides and Aeschylus, and continued to be used by Theophrastus, encyclopedists like Apollodorus, and emerging Christian writers. Porter [5, p. 178-282, 283-381] treated 'the sublime' before Longinus in rhetoric and criticism from in two sections from Caecilius to Demetrius and from Theophrastus to Homer and calls this specific use of the concept the 'Longinian sublime' [5, p. 57-177].

On the Sublime was edited in various print and online editions [6, 7, 8, 9,]. In *On the Sublime* the word 'ὕψος' usually occurs in the text as a singular form. Also 'τὸ ὑψηλὸν' is used for 'the sublimity' as a form derived from the adjective 'ὑψηλός' (high, lofty. Other derivations are the verb 'ὑψηχέω' ('sound high', 9.5.) and the

adjectives 'ὑψηλοφανής' ('appearing sublime', (24.1.)), and 'ὑψηλοποιός' ('producing loftiness', (28.1.), (32.6.)). The verb 'ὑψόω' for 'lift high', in this context for the production of an elevated style occurs one time in 'ὕψωσαν' (14.1.). A derivation is the noun 'ὑψηγορία' for 'lofty expression' ((8.1.), (14.1.), (34.4.)). Another word Longin employs for the 'loftiness' of style is 'ὄγκος'. Longinus considers that for the words 'sublime' ('ὕψος') and 'deep' ('βάθος') the same meaning exists. *Chapter 2* opens with the question if there is any technique or art of the 'sublime' ('ὕψος') or the 'deep' ('βάθος') ('εἰ ἔστιν ὕψους τις ἢ βάθους τέχνη'). Longinus criticizes Caecilius for saying that 'the sublime' ('τό ὕψος') and 'the pathetic' ('τὸ παθητικόν') are the same (8.2.) and that 'the empathic' (τὸ ἐμπαθὲς') does not emerge from 'the sublime' (τὸ ἐμπαθὲς ἐς τὰ ὕψη) (8.4.) The word 'μέγεθος' occurs in several chapters. In the expression 'λόγων μέγεθος' (4.1.) it is used for the 'greatness of words'. Plato in his *Laws* warns to respect the 'height and greatness of the matter ('τῆς οὐσίας ὕψος τε καὶ μέγεθος', 5.741b) [10]. In *On the Universe* (Περὶ Κόσμου, 391a), a work with Pseudo-Aristotelian authorship that Mansfeld dates not earlier than the late 1st century BCE due to its title, it is used with the defined article in the expression 'τὸ ὕψος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος' [11, p. 400]. In *On the Sublime* words like 'the sublime' ('τό ὕψος') represent abstract qualities that are treated by Longin as a matter of its own. Substantivized adjectives are a grammatical feature that refers to what is treated by Longinus, a qualitative concept for judgment. Already Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the *Suda* mentioned as a rhetor and an expert on literature in general who lived under Emperor Augustus as an ancestor of the Atticist of the time of Emperor Hadrian ("ῥήτωρ, καὶ παντοίως λόγιος: γέγονε δὲ ἐπὶ Καίσαρος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, πρόγονος τοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ γεγονότος Ἀττικιστοῦ") [12]. Describing the overarching power of the composition, Dionysius of Halicarnassus in *Περί Συνθέσεως Ονομάτων* (chapter IV. 92.) makes a distinction between the 'thoughts' ('τὰ νοήματα') and the words ('τὰ ὀνόματα') and compares Athena in Homer with

the composition that can make the thoughts at one time look 'formless' ('ἄμορφα'), 'beggarly' ('πτωχά'), and 'low' ('ταπεινά') and at another time 'sublime' ('ὑψηλὰ'), 'rich' ('πλούσια'), and 'beautiful' ('καλά'). Regarding rhythm of poetry Dionysius states that what consists of long syllables ('ὁ δ' ἐξ ἁπασῶν μακρῶν') is 'sublime' ('ὑψηλός'), 'dignified' ('ἀξιωματικός'), and 'with a powerful stride' ('διαβεβηκώς') (17.172.). *In Chapter XVIII* Dionysius praises Thukydides as 'sublime' ('ὑψηλός') and ('καλλιεπής') ('elegant in diction') (XVIII.180.) and 'the sublime style of expression' ('ἡ ὑψηλὴ φράσις') of Demosthenes (XVIII.180.) [13].

As a teacher of rhetoric in Rome Quintilianus employs the concept of 'the sublime' in the Latin expression 'sublimitas' and the quality of being sublime ('sublimis') in several places of his *Institutio Oratoria.* While 'sublimitas' is used for the physical appearance of the orator Trachalus ('corporis sublimitas', 12.5.5.) in the basic meaning of the word, Quintilianus applied the word also as a category of the style in the expression 'sublimitas heroici carminis' (1.8.5.) as a way to educate children in the appreciation of poetry. In *Book 10* Quintilianus quotes the orator Theophrastus who recommends orators to study poetic works for the 'spirit of things' ('in rebus spiritus'), the 'sublimity of words' ('in verbis sublimitas'), 'any movement of the emotions' ('in adfectibus motus omnis'), and the 'ornament of persons' ('in personis decor') (10.1.27.). Quintilianus says the 'sublimity' ('sublimitas'), the 'grandeur' ('magnificentia'), 'splendor' ('nitor'), and 'authority' ('auctoritas') evokes the crashing sound of applause. ("sublimitas profecto et magnificentia et nitor et auctoritas expressit illum fragorem". (8.3.3.)) Treating metaphors, Quintilianus mentions that effects of 'sublimity' ('sublimitas') are produced by a 'metaphor' ('translatio'). Quintilianus discusses Aeschylus' sublime style of tragedies (10.1.66.) who was sublime, dignified, and grandiloquent up to faultiness ("sublimis et gravis et grandilocus saepe usque ad vitium"). Quintilianus not only uses the term 'sublimitas' for the appearance of the orator Tracalus

(12.5.5.), but also also 'sublimis' for his speeches (10.1.119.). Quintilianus uses the expression 'sublime spirit' ('sublimus spiritus', 10.5.4.) for the 'speech' ('oratio'). [14, 15]. Plinius the Younger expresses in one of his letters to Erucius (1.16.4.) that not only in the speeches of an orator sublimitas exists, but also in the narration of the 'historical account' ('historia') as 'sublimitas narrandi'. [16]. In Egypt Valerius Harpocration of Alexandra of the 2nd century AD in his *Lexicon in Decem Oratores Atticos* (epsilon lemma 145) uses the word 'sublime' ('ὕψος') in a reference to Ammonius Saccas who used it for the description of a hearth that has no height. *Suda* calls him a rhetor (ῥήτωρ) from Alexandria who wrote a *Lexicon of the Ten Orators* (Λέξεις τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων) and a *Collection of Fine Passages* (Ἀνθηρῶν συναγωγή) [17]. Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists* (1.9.1.) compares the sophist Gorgias in regard of the additions he brought to the 'art of the sophists' ('ἡ τῶν σοφιστῶν τέχνη') to Aeschylus' improvements of the poetic genre tragedy like giving the actors a 'high platform' ('ὀκρίβας ὑψηλός') [18].

1.2. The Authorship and Date of *On The Sublime*

The Research Discussion about the Localization of Longinus and his Authorship. Heath identifies the author of the treatise as Cassius Longinus, a rhetorician, literary scholar, and philosopher of the third century AD [19, p. 11]. The treatise was preserved in a fragment by the fifth-century neo-Platonist Proclus that probably used a lost commentary of Longinus's pupil Porphyry as its source. Older research about the date of the writing is made by Häußler [20, p. 141-163]. In 2001 Männlein-Robert made an interpretation of the life and works of Longinus based on extant fragments [21]. Michel Patillon and Luc Brisson published and translated extant fragments dating him in the 3rd century CE [6]. Kennedy noticed that in the best manuscript the names Dionysius and Longus are mentioned [22, p. 134]. Renaissance scholars and early modern scholars identified the author as Cassius

Longinus who wrote a partially preserved *Art of Rhetoric*. Modern scholars reject the attribution to Cassius Longinus assuming that an unknown author of the first or second century wrote it. Arthur-Montagne follows this older localization of this treatise in the first century CE [23, p. 327]. Arthur-Montagne compares its *Chapter 44* to other rhetorical treatises that refer to the corruption of eloquence like Quintilianus in his *Institutio Oratoria* (12.10.73.) [23, p. 334]. Deckard showed the continuity of the theory of the sublime from Longinus to Kant [24, p. 84-86].

Text-Intrinsic Aspect for the Date of the Writing *On the Sublime*. The most recent orator Longinus mentions is Cicero, the only writer in Latin. The last chapter, *Chapter 44*, breaks with the form of discussing with ancient examples the elements of 'the sublime' replacing it with a dialogue of Longinus and an unnamed philosopher about 'the sublime' in contemporary rhetoric and the judgment about contemporary works. Upon being asked by the philosopher if the decline of genius among the contemporary masses of trained orators depends of the lack of challenging democracy, Longinus answers generally that the judgment about contemporary issues is a hard task. The philosopher thinks that the liberty of democracy in the past eloquence could grow. Longinus in the contemporary age of corruption and egoistic indifference considers it to be better to be a servant than to be free (44.10.). Longinus considers any judgment hard about contemporary issues. The 'decline of eloquence' can be considered a topos among critics who dwelt on ancient examples. Longinus tends to change the cause from politics to major ethic deficiencies of the human soul. In his *Lives of the Sophists* Philostratus applied the concept of the Second Sophistic to the rhetoric practiced in the time from 60 to 230 CE. The contrasting opposition between the classical sophists like Gorgias and this movement suggests that Longinus flourished in the late phase of the Second Sophistic. In the *Lives of the Sophists* the last mentioned sophist is Apsines of Gadara whom Philostratus calls a friend [18]. In *Suda* Apsines is a sophist in Athens under the emperor Max-

imianus, and was awarded consular ornamenta [25]. Here Heath corrects that instead of Maximian (286-310) Maximinus (235-238) must be meant. So Apsines was a contemporary of Fronto, an uncle of Longinus.

Our localization of Longinus in the 3rd century CE places him at the verge of the Second Sophistic and Third Sophistic, a modern concept for movement for rhetorical writings between the 3rd and 6th century. It is in modern research assumed that the Second Sophistic ended in 250 CE as Fowler and Quiroga-Puertas stated [25, p. 1-14]. Prophyrius, a student of Longinus, as we learn from his *Suda* entry wrote *15 Speeches against Christians* (Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγους ιε#), a treatise or speech *Against Aristides* and a commentary on Minucian's *Art of Rhetoric* (Εἰς τὴν Μινουκιανοῦ τέχνην) [26]. Eusebius as a Christian representative of the Third Sophistic who rejected philosophy except Plato polemized against Prophyrius as a pagan philosopher in an Aristotelian tradition as Karamanolis showed [27, p. 185]. In *On the Sect of Plato and Aristotle being One* (Περὶ τοῦ μίαν εἶναι τὴν Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους αἵρεσιν) Prophyrius obviously aimed to show the unity among ancient philosophers.

Cassius Longinus as Author and his Relation to Rhetoric. Kleve discussed the question if Longinus is actually a rhetorician [28, p. 71-74]. Heath pointed out as evidence for Longinus' rhetorical teaching an *Art of Rhetoric* extant as a substantial fragment and an epitome (F48, F49) [29, p. 141]. They recently published by Michel Patillon und Luc Brisson [6]. O'Gorman argued that in the history of the theory of rhetoric *On the Sublime* "marks an important moment": Rhetoric "is presented therein as an autonomous, sublime object" that is freed "from the project of legitimation" [30, p. 71].

The attribution of the work to Longinus is based on a gloss of a 10th-century copy manuscript (*Parisinus Graecus 2036*) that records as authors a Longinus or Dionysius. In other words: Already at that time the name of the author was not identified. Doubts about the authorship under the name Longinus have

emerged, attributions to persons named Dionysius or other persons that match certain criteria are common ground in the discussion about this work. In the century the in Paris preserved manuscript was written, the name Longinus (Λογγῖνος) occurs in the *Suda* as the headword of an entry [2]. Longinus here listed works cover the fields of history, Homeric poetry, but also nature from interdisciplinary perspectives as well as two works on Attic diction in the Greek texts listed as Ἀττικῶν λέξεων ἐκδόσεις β#. The word 'ἐκδόσις' means literally 'edition'. Two editions of 'Attic diction' is one of the works. *Suda*'s Longinus flourished in the 3rd century CE under the Emperor Aurelian who executed him for having conspired with Queen Zenobia the Palmyrene Empire. The information about Longinus in the *Suda* can be traced to the *Historia Augusta* (2.30.1.-3.), an account written about emperors of the 2nd and 3rd century CE, and in Zosimus' *New History* (1.56.).

On the Sublime gives us some insight into the industrious scholarly practice of Longinus. In *Chapter* 8 Longinus mentions that he wrote a work on Xenophon (8.1.), in *Chapter 39* (39.1.) that he has published two books that deal with the topic of the 'arrangement of words' ('τῶν λόγων σύνθεσις'), and in the last chapter Longinus announces that will write another book about the subjects of the passions (44.8.). The Longinus mentioned in the biographical entry of *Suda* has similar written works about language matters, even though the compiler of *Suda* calls him only a philosopher (φιλόσοφος), a teacher of the philosopher Porphyrus (διδάσκαλος Πορφυρίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου), a polymath (πολυμαθὴς) and a critic (κριτικὸς) without the specification of the field of his criticism. About the orator Fronto of Emesa *Suda* states that Longinus the Critic was the son of his sister and his heir [31]. Quintilianus mentions that 'grammar' ('grammatice') has extended as a field of teaching by help of historians and critics ('historicorum criticorumque viribus') as the 'theory of correct speech' ('rationem recte loquendi') now present in every science of the highest arts ('omnium maximarum artium scientiam', (2.1.4.)). As for his own time,

Longinus employs the word 'judge' ('κριτής') in *On the Sublime* in the last chapter *Chapter 44*, when he argues that the contemporary time with its corruption of even a 'judge' ('κριτής') and bribery and lack of pathos hardly brings any person able to judge about literature as in times of liberty of democracy. Allen [32, p. 51-64] and Lambertz [33, p. 953-954] discussed the noble and educated young man of Rome. We learn from the last chapter of *On the Sublime* that Longinus and the philosopher he met have a discussion about the decline of contemporary rhetoric. Longinus uses the form of a dialectic discourse. If the meeting of last chapter is authentic, he also reveals himself here as a person versed in dialectic practiced among philosophers like in the professional description as a philosopher in *Suda*. *Suda* mentions a Porphyrius who lived in the time of Emperor Aurelian and was also a student of the critic Longinus ("ἦν δὲ καὶ Λογγίνου τοῦ κριτικοῦ ἀκροασάμενος").

Rhetorical References of the Work:

The Treatise of Caecilius on 'the Sublime' as Subject of Criticism. Roberts discussed the person Caecilius of Calacte [34: 302–312]. Innes contrasted the models of 'the sublime' of Longinus and Caecilius [35: 259-284]. Throughout the text, Longinus refers to a work of a certain Caecilius who treated the same topic, namely 'the sublime', as Longinus mentions in Chapter 1. In the following chapters Longinus often refers to Caecilius' writing and his judgment about authors. Longinus mentions that Caecilius omitted some of the five divisions of 'the sublime' like pathos (8.1.). Longinus criticizes Caecilius for considering Lysias who was a logographer and of the ten Attic orators in his writings about Lysias ('ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Λυσίου συγγράμμασιν') above Plato (32.8.). The work about 'the sublime' written by Caecilius Longinus mentions as a work he would like to discuss with the addressee of this writing. Occasionally Caecilius is criticized for the lack to unfold the concept of 'the sublime' to the extend Longinus does now (8.1.) or his wrong judgment about particular writers like mentioning in his essay *On the Beauties of Lysias* that this poet is bet-

ter than Plato (32.8.). In *Suda* a rhetor named Caecilius of Callatis is mentioned who lived as a rhetor of Jewish faith in the first century CE under Caesar Augustus and Hadrian, a period too long to be reasonable. Among his numerous books was a *Comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero* (*Σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος*), a *Comparison of Demosthenes and Aeschines* (*Σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Αἰσχίνου*), and *On Demosthenes* (*Περὶ Δημοσθένους*) [36].

While Longinus in his *On the Sublime* mentions that Caecilius praised Lysias, we find in the entry in *Suda* about Caecilius among the books listed a book *On the Stylistic Character of the Ten Orators* (*Περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων*) that probably also discussed Lysias. Another interesting fact is that the technique of comparing two orators with each other in works like *Comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero* and *Comparison of Demosthenes and Aeschines* is a technique of criticism also Longinus employs in his *On the Sublime*, even though it aims to demonstrate 'the sublime'. Jonge shows concerning the religious aspects of 'the sublime' both in the work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a contemporary colleague of Caecilius in the Augustan Age, and Longinus' treatise [37, p. 271-300]. Except for Caecilius no reference to an author contributing to the theory of rhetoric exist. The rhetoricians mentioned Longinus only discusses in their function as orators.

2. The Implementation of the Theory of Rhetoric in the Text of *On the Sublime*

2.1. The Structure of the Text of *On the Sublime* and Text Sequences on Rhetoric. Not a complete work is preserved in the text of *On the Sublime.* Some chapters lack relevant amounts of six text sequences. The chapters 1 to 8 can be considered as a prologue, chapters 9 to 43 deal with the sources of 'the sublime' as introduced by Longinus in *Chapter 8*, and *Chapter 44* is an epilogue. The structure of the text of *On the Sublime* to a certain degree follows the five sources that Longinus proposes (8.1.) sublime thought, pathos. figures of thought and figures of speech, suitable expression by a proper

choice of words and ornaments of diction, and majesty and elevation of the composition.

A unique text feature of the treatise is an introduction part that is followed by the essential breakdown of the sources of 'the sublime' that are in the following text sections relatively unbalanced treated in the order Longinus mentions in *Chapter 8*. The following chapters contain a relatively short section that treats 'the sublime' of the mind. A lack of a section that treats the passions exclusively is obviously missing despite Longinus' mention of passion as one of the five sources. (At the end of *Chapter 44* (44.8.) Longinus mentions that he will not treat the subject of the passions since this is the topic of a coming book.) But passions are discussed throughout the writing. The complete formal change of the exemplification of 'the sublime' with texts from classical authors to the last chapter with its topic, the decadence of the contemporary time of Longinus, in *Chapter 44* in a discourse of a philosopher with Longinus distinguishes from the main part.

The implemented sections of rhetoric select rhetorical devices for the particular function of the production of 'the sublime'. Aspects of the traditional rhetoric like appeal by pathos, terms for the style, and single rhetorical devices have been discussed in recent research of *On the Sublime.* Innes [38, p. 323-333] treated Longinus' sublimity and its pathos in contrast to low emotions. Billault treated the figures of speech as a theoretical part of rhetoric and applied rhetoric [39, p. 301-314] and the names of style [40, p. 221-232]. Staden [41, p. 359-380] and Caglieri [42, p. 155-179] treated the metaphor in the conception of 'the sublime' of Longinus. Recently, Worman drew attention to the metaphor as a device of spaces [43].

2.2. Formal Aspects of the Implementation of Rhetoric in the Text of *On the Sublime.* Many aspects of *On the Sublime* like the format of a dedicated instructional treatise, the commentary of a theoretical work, the distinction of general rhetorical principles and rhetorical devices, the collection and comparison of established exempla are typical elements of the

kind of treatise called *Art of Rhetoric.* In *Chapter 1* Longinus addresses the reader of his writing, Terentian, as the critic of the now following treatise that emerged from his criticism of a treatise about the sublime written by Caecilius. At the end of the *Chapter 1* Longinus rephrases the canons of rhetoric (invention, disposition,

καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς εὑρέσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων τάξιν καὶ οἰκονομίαν οὐκ ἐξ ἑνὸς οὐδ ἐκ δυεῖν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου τῶν λόγων ὕφους μόλις ἐκφαινομένην ὁρῶμεν, ὕψος δέ που καιρίως ἐξενεχθὲν τά τε πράγματα δίκην σκηπτοῦ πάντα διεφόρησεν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ῥήτορος εὐθὺς ἀθρόαν ἐνεδείξατο δύναμιν.

In *Chapter 2* Longinus introduces the question if an 'art of the sublime or the bathos' ('ὕψους τις ἢ βάθους τέχνη') exists at all. 'The natural works' ('τὰ φυσικὰ ἔργα', (2.1.)), contrasted with artifices based on technique, should not be affected by 'technologies' ('τεχνολογίαι'). While from the opposition of 'nature' ('φύσις') and 'art' ('τέχνη') the opinion exists that only the genius as a result of 'nature' ('φύσις') is able to produce 'the sublime', Longinus also with reference to a saying of Demosthenes takes the option of a genius that uses art into account. In the following chapters Longinus demonstrates that ancient writers produced faults. While the beginning of *Chapter 3* is missing, the following examples indicate that it is about the 'fault' ('κακία') and different kind of faults that result in faulty language of the classical authors Gorgias of Leontini, Callisthenes, Cleitarchus, Amphicrates, Hegesias, and Matris. In *Chapter 4* Longinus mentions the fault of 'frigidity' ('ψυχρός'). In *Chapter 5* Longinus traces all 'faults' ('κακίαι') of language use to the 'root' ('αἰτία') of wanting something new. The next three chapters are an outline of his own work. *Chapter 6* shortly states that it is a hard task to develop a definite theory and criterion of the true Sublime (6.1.). In *Chapter 7* the effects of 'the sublime' on the human, the uplifting of the 'soul' ('ψυχὴ'), of the reader is described. The effect is as follows (7.2.) the emotion of joy and pride. *Chapter 8* lists the five sources of 'the sublime' (8.1.). In *Chapter*

elocution, and performance without a reference to memory) in one short sentence mentioning that these are tools for the developments of 'the sublime of the words' ('ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου τῶν λόγων ὕφους', (1.4.)). 'The sublime' is right in time like expected of the speech of the orator:

Skill in invention, lucid arrangement and disposition of facts, are appreciated not by one passage, or by two, but gradually manifest themselves in the general structure of a work; but a sublime thought, if happily timed, illumines an entire subject with the vividness of a lightning-flash, and exhibits the whole power of the orator in a moment of time.

(Tr. H. L. Havell)

9 is stated that 'the sublime' in writings derives 'from the most high-spirited' ('εἰς τοὺς μάλιστα φρονηματίας', (9.4.)).

In chapters 10 to 29 the use of figures of thought and figures of words for sublimity is treated. Chapters 10 to 14 discuss general rhetorical techniques in order to reach 'the sublime'. In *Chapter 10* Longinus mentions the principle of describing particular aspects with the power to make them one whole body ('ἕν τι σῶμα ποιεῖν δύνασθαι', (10.1.)). *Chapter 11* and *Chapter 12* treat 'amplification' ('αὔξησίς'). *Chapter 13* treats 'imitation' ('μίμησίς', (14.2.)) by emulation as an alternative means to reach 'the sublime' by exceeding established authors of prose and poetic literature. *Chapter 14* treats the possibility of an imaginative criticism of one's work by ancient authorities. In the following chapters different figures of thought and words are presented. In *Chapter 15* Longinus discusses images called 'the fantasies' ('αἱ φαντασίαι'). Longinus calls the particular use of fantastic images in rhetoric 'the rhetorical fantastic image' ('ἡ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία') in order to distinguish it from the fantastic image of a poet (15.2.). Different kinds of the 'rhetorical figure' ('σχῆμα', (16.1.)) are discussed in the sections from *Chapter 16* to *Chapter 29.* At the end of *Chapter 29* Longinus announces the end of the section about the 'use of figures ('ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὰ ὑψηλὰ τῶν σχημάτων χρήσεως').

Chapters 30 to 38 treat word choice, meta-

phors, and other rhetorical devices. The chapters 30 to 38 treat the word choice for 'the sublime' under lexical and rhetorical aspects, but also digressions treat 'the sublime' in nature and in the divine and the relation of art and nature. *Chapter 30* exemplifies the principle that the 'light of the thought are the beautiful words' ('φῶς γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἴδιον τοῦ νοῦ τὰ καλὰ ὀνόματα'). Also in *Chapter 31* the choice of words is discussed. Metaphors are treated in the whole *Chapter 32* (32.1.) to *Chapter 38* (32.8.). Longinus treats in *Chapter 33 and Chapter 34* the relation between 'the sublime' and faults. In *Chapter 35* Longinus continues his discussion of Caecilius' judgment about Lysias and Plato. (35.1.), but changes from the topic from literature to a discussion of an extended relation of 'the sublime' to god and nature. In *Chapter 36* Longinus analyzes 'the sublime' in nature and its relation to the divine, and obtaining perfection with the combination of 'art' ('τέχνη') and 'nature' ('φύσις'). *Chapter 37* that only survived in a few lines obviously continued with decorum, since it mentions metaphors, comparisons, and similes (37.1.). *Chapter 38* contains the advice that figures like the hyperbole should appear in the disguise of 'the sublime' after showing bad examples of figurative language use. The chapters 39 to 43 treat the composition with majesty and elevation. In *Chapter 39* Longinus begins to unfold what he calls the fifth source, the arrangement of words ('ἡ διὰ τῶν λόγων αὐτὴ ποιὰ σύνθεσις', (39.1.)). *Chapter 44 is an* epilogue in the form of a discourse about the judgment of contemporary literature. In *Chapter 44* the form and theme change. The philosopher introduces the topic of the current decline of contemporary speeches ('τοσαύτη λόγων κοσμική τις ἐπέχει τὸν βίον ἀφορία') (44.1.). 'Indifference' ('ῥαθυμία') is for Longinus the source of apathy that characterizes the contemporary state (44.11.) and as a way to deal with is Longinus recommends to focus on the passions ('τὰ πάθη'). What makes the treatise unique and distinguishable from a technical treatise of rhetoric called *Art of Rhetoric* is the extended focus onto the apathy of the contemporary time as antithesis to the ancient sublim-ity last chapter and the emphasis of the theme, 'the sublime' across rhetoric, philosophy, poetry, history, the fine arts and nature. Elements of the theory of rhetoric are subordinated under this all-embracing principle that now ranks as more than a criterium of style as an omniscent matter of existence in the spiritual sphere and in the world.

2.3. Text Sequences with Reference to Rhetoric in *On The Sublime.* Among all discussed ancient rhetoricians, philosophers, historians, and poets the name of Demosthenes is by far the most mentioned person. Orators are discussed as examples in the two main sections that treat rhetorical devices except one mentioning of Demosthenes in *Chapter 2* (2.3.) and *Chapter 39* (39.4.), the names of Amphicrates (3.2.), Gorgias of Leontini (3.2.), and Matris (3.2.) mentioned as examples for a faulty choice of words in *Chapter 3*, and Theopompus' style discussed in *Chapter 43* (43.2.).

Chapters 10 to 29: Figures of Thought and Figures of Words as Schemata. In *Chapter 10* Longinus calls it a 'law of nature' that in all 'things" ('πράγματα') 'certain parts' ('τινὰ μόρια') establish the matter ('ταῖς ὕλαις συνυπάρχοντα', (10.1.)). Sappho, the poet of the *Arimaspeia*, Homer, Archilochus, and Demosthenes are taken as examples for the vividness of the composition of selected parts (10.7.)). In *Chapter 11* and *Chapter 12* the figure of 'amplification' ('αὔξησις') is discussed. It is a 'virtue' ('ἀρετὴ', 10.1.) and can occur in many different forms, among them the 'τοπηγορία' ('discussion on a commonplace'), 'exaggeration' ('δείνωσις'), and a 'disposition of actions or of passions' ('ἐποικονομία ἔργων ἢ παθῶν', 11.2.). 'Amplification' is, according to Longinus, defined by authorities on rhetoric as a 'speech' ('λόγος') with 'grandeur' ('μέγεθος') (12.1.). Longinus contrasts the *pathos*-based style of an orator like Demosthenes with a more balancing style of the philosopher Plato (12.3.) and the orators Cicero and Demosthenes (12.3.-5.). Longinus recommends 'Shedding' ('χύσις') as a style for 'discussions of commonplaces' ('τοπηγορίαι'), 'perorations' ('ἐπιλόγοι'),

the 'digression' ('παράβασις'), a 'descriptive' ('φραστικός') and 'declamatory' ('ἐπιδεικτικός') passages, 'histories' ('ἱστορίαι) and a 'natural history' ('φυσιολογία', (12.5.). In *Chapter 13* Longinus mentions that besides the five sources of 'the sublime' also the 'imitation' ('μίμησίς') and 'emulation' ('ζήλωσις') of the greatest writers and poet ('μεγάλων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν) like in Plato's *Republic* can be used. Such an 'imitation' ('μίμησις') Longinus compares with the 'impression' ('ἀποτύπωσις') of 'beautiful forms' ('καλῶν εἰδῶν') or 'statues' ('πλασμάτων') or 'works of skilled labour' ('δημιουργημάτων') (13.4.)). Longinus mentions that Ammonius and his school already classified examples of imitators of Homer (13.3.) and that Plato must have taken Homer's poetry applying this principle to his own language.

In *Chapter 14* Longinus recommends 'to remodel the beautiful' ('καλὸν ἀναπλάττεσθαι') like Homer as a poet, Plato as a philosopher, Demosthenes as an orator, or Thucydides as a historian (14.1.) and to consider how they would have judged upon reading this work ((14.1.), (14.2.)). Another method is to consider what critics in the future might say about the work (14.3.). In *Chapter 15* Longinus states that the 'dignity' ('ὄγκος'), 'grandeur' ('μεγαληγορία'), and 'power' ('ἀγῶνος') of a style largely depend on a proper employment of the 'images' ('φαντασία') (15.1.) Its aim for the poet is the consternation ('τέλος'ἐστὶν ἔκπληξις'), while the orator aims at 'evidence in the words' ('ἐν λόγοις ἐνάργεια', 15.2.). Longinus exemplifies this for poetry with passages from Homer, Euripides, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Simonides (15.2.-8.) and for rhetoric with passages from Demosthenes and Hyperides (15.9.-10.). In *Chapter 16* Longinus shows that the 'figure of speech of adjuration' ('σχήματος τοῦ ὁμοτικοῦ') called 'apostrophe' ('ἀποστροφή') contributes to the sublimity of the speech. (16.1.) with reference to Demosthenes ((16.2.) and (16.3.)). In *Chapter 17* Longinus addresses that the use of figures can raise the 'suspicion' ('ὑποψία') of dishonesty (17.1.). Since a once discovered attempt of contempt of judgment may result in

rejection due to the discovery of contempt of the hearers, Longinus recommends using a figure in disguise (17.1.). 'The sublime' is the tool to cover the 'sophismata of rhetoric' ('σοφίσματα τῆς ῥητορικῆς', 17.2.) comparing it to the light of the sun that makes the lustre of the stars invisible (17.2.) and the illusion of light in the art of painting by different colors that produce the illusion of distance with different tones for shadow and light (17.3.). 'Pathos' ('πάθος') and 'the sublime' ('ὕψος') of the 'words' ('λόγοι') reach the 'soul' ('ψυχή') before any 'figure' ('σχῆμα') is discovered due to the 'art' ('τέχνη) (17.3.).

In *Chapter 18* the figures of 'question' ('πεῦσις') and 'interrogation' ('ἐρώτησις') are mentioned by Longinus as means of affecting the audience giving examples of the figure 'question' ('πεῦσις') and the figure 'interrogation' ('ἐρώτησις') for raising questions and answering them by the speaker himself (18.1.). The rhetorical figure 'interrogation' ('ἐρώτησις') produces by mimesis the 'opportune moment of passion' ('τοῦ πάθους τὸ ἐπίκαιρον', (18.2.)). The text passage with the example of Herodotus and the beginning of the *Chapter 19* is missing. Longinus addresses here the figures of speech of unconnected words with examples taken from Xenophon and Homer. In *Chapter 20* Longinus introduces 'change' ('μεταβολή') by a variation as a rhetorical principle (20.3.). Longinus recommends as a means of sublimity the 'combination of rhetorical figures' ('σύνοδος τῶν σχημάτων', 20.1.) that can set the audience in motion ('κινεῖν') and produce 'beauty', 'κάλλος', 20.1.). The appeal to pathos comes with 'indiscipline' ('ἀταξία', 20.2.) instead of 'order' ('τάξις'). For this combination Demosthenes is the example ((20.1.), (20.2.), (20.3.)). *Chapter 21* continues with figures of speech that structure the speech. Longinus describes that the use of a 'conjunction' ('συνδέσμος') serves as a device in the tradition of Isocrates. It replaces the 'pathos' of the *asynedeta* with a logical structure. Longinus illustrates this effect with a comparison of two runners bound together who neutralize their power (21.2.).

In *Chapter 22* Longinus describes the fig-

ure 'hyperbaton' ('ὑπερβατόν') as a transposition of words or thoughts from their usual order ('λέξεων ἢ νοήσεων ἐκ τοῦ κατ ἀκολουθίαν κεκινημένη τάξις') and with the character of competently unconcealed energetic emotion ('χαρακτὴρ ἐναγωνίου πάθους ἀληθέστατος'). The hyperbaton is a means of the 'imitation' ('μίμησις') of the 'works of nature' ('τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἔργα') that is employed by the best writers following the principle of mimesis of 'art' ('τέχνη') and 'nature' ('φύσις') (22.1.). Examples are taken from Herodotus, Thucydides who even breaks up sentences. Breaking the usual 'order' ('τάξις'), the effect is that the audience considers the speech natural like in the example of Demosthenes (22.3.). In *Chapter 23* the figures *polyptoton* ('πολύπτωτον'), 'enumeration' ('ἀθροισμός'), 'change' as variation' ('μεταβολή'), 'climax' ('κλῖμαξ'), and the change of singular and plural are recommended as forms the contribute to the 'beauty' ('κόσμος') and grandeur ('ὕψος') with examples from Sophokles and Plato. *Chapter 24* continues with the change of plural forms to singular forms. Longinus considers their 'beauty' ('κόσμος') is in 'making all in accordance with an empathetic opinion' ('τὸ πολλὰ ποιεῖν αὐτὰ παρὰ δόξαν ἐμπαθοῦς') by the change of case numbers wth the example of Demosthenes (24.1.). Longinus calls this a 'change of the form' ('μεταμόρφωσις') of the 'things' ('πραγμάτα') against the expectations ("μεταμόρφωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν τῷ παραλόγῳ.", (24.2.)). In *Chapter 25* Longinus explains that the change of the tense from past to present involves the change from a narration ('διήγησις') to an 'energetic' ('ἐναγώνιος') speech style of the 'issue of poetic fabrication' ('πρᾶγμα ποιήσεις') that he exemplifies with Xenophon and Thucydides.

In *Chapter 26* Longinus states that the rhetorical figure 'anitimetathesis' for an interchange of persons ('ἀντιμετάθεσις τῶν προσώπων', (26.1.) puts due to the change of the perspective the reader as a spectator in the middle of the action. Examples are taken from Aratus' advice "Beware that month to tempt the surging sea" (26.1.) and Herodotus' description of a jour-

ney that directs its readers from the city of Elephantine in Egypt to the city of Meroe (26.2.). In *Chapter 27* Longinus mentions that a 'writer' ('συγγραφεὺς') can also apply an 'antimetastasis' in a change from narrative in 3rd person to a person speaking in the 1st person and return backwards to the narrative in 3rd person like Homer in the *Iliad* (27.1.), Hecataeus (27.2.), and Demosthenes (27.3.). In *Chapter 28* Longinus mentions that the rhetorical figure 'paraphrase' ('περίφρασις') contributes often to the 'proper meaning' ('κυριολογία') when something is expressed in other words (28.1.). Longinus chooses the example of Plato's *Funeral Speech*, Xenophon, and Herodotus (28.3.). In *Chapter 29* the rhetorical figure 'paraphrase' ('περίφρασις') is treated as a means of abuse by a wrong choice of replacing words like the expression 'gold nor silver wealth' in Plato's *Laws*. In *Chapter 29* Longinus ends the chapters for the relation of rhetorical figures to 'the sublime' with the statement that all devices he mentioned are for making a 'speech' ('λόγος') more 'exciting' ('συγκεκινημένος') and 'pathetic' ('παθητικωτέρος'). 'Pathos' ('πάθος') contributes to 'the sublime' like 'ethos' ('ἦθος') to 'pleasure' ('ἡδονή') ("πάθος δὲ ὕψους μετέχει τοσοῦτον, ὁπόσον ἦθος ἡδονῆς.", (29.2.)). These three ways of appeal are standard elements in classical rhetorical treatises as 'reason' ('λόγος'), 'pathos' ('πάθος'), and 'ethos' ('ἦθος').

Chapters 30 to 38: Word Choice. Metaphors and other Ornaments of Diction. Starting with *Chapter 30*, Longinus treats the 'selection of words' ('ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων'). The 'understanding of the word' ('νόησις τοῦ λόγου') and the 'speech' ('φράσις') are interwoven, (30.1.). Longinus states that 'beautiful words' ('καλὰ ὀνόματα') are the very 'light' ('φῶς') of 'mind' ('νόος') ("φῶς γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἴδιον τοῦ νοῦ τὰ καλὰ ὀνόματα.", 30.1.) Chapter 30 ends in section 2. The beginning of *Chapter 31* is lost and it starts with examples of Anacreon, Theophrastus, Theopompus, and Herodotus treating the expressions of common people, the 'idiotismos' ('ἰδιωτισμός') of the 'idiotes' ('ἰδιώτης'). In *Chapter 32* Longinus notices that the use of the 'metaphor' ('μεταφορά') depends on the 'occa-

sion' ('καιρός') and involves 'pathos' ('πάθος') with the example of Demosthenes (32.1.). Longinus recommends a serial use of metaphors for a 'discussion of a commonplace' ('τοπηγορία') and a 'descriptive passage' ('διαγραφή') (32.5.). But Longinus describes also negative effects of this trope. The 'use of tropes' ('χρῆσις τῶν τρόπων') and 'all beautiful in words' ('πάντα καλὰ ἐν λόγοις') tends to result in the excess of the figures ('προαγωγὸν ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄμετρον') (32.7.). Longinus mentions Plato for intemperate use of the violent metaphors ('ἀπηνής μεταφορὰ') and an inflated 'figurative lofty phrase' ('ἀλληγορικὸν στόμφον ἐκφερόμενον', (32.7.)). Caecilius' judgment about Lysias as superior to Plato is criticized in *Chapter 32* (32.8.).

Longinus opens *Chapter 33* with the question if a sublime style with occasional faults in prose or poetry is better than a moderate, but flawless style answering it with an analogy of humans with the 'high intellects' ('αἱ ὑπερμεγέθεις φύσεις') who not strive for perfection instead of limitations of a mind that is flawless in its thinking (33.2.). Longinus shows faults in Homer's works, while the *Argonautica* of Apollonius is considered a faultless poem (33.4.). Eratosthenes's *Erigone* is without a flaw, while Archilochus has disorderly profusion with a god-gifted genius. For lyric poetry Longinus contrasts Bacchylides with Pindar and in tragedy Sophocles with Io of Chios (33.5.). Longinus continues in *Chapter 34* with the question for oratory taking the speeches of the orators Demosthenes ((34.1.), (34.2.), (34.3.), (34.4.)), Hyperides (34.1.), and Lysias (34.2.) as examples.

Caecilius' superiority of Lysias to Plato is again rejected in *Chapter 35* (35.1.). Longinus considers nature ('φύσις') as 'diviner' ('δαιμόνια') than humans (35.2.). Observance of the nature around the human lets the human feel what sublimity is (35.4.). The sublimity of nature is not present in a little stream, but in the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and the Ocean (35.4.). In *Chapter 36* Longinus states that 'the sublime' in nature is accompanied by 'utility' ('χρεία') and 'advantage' ('ὠφελεία') (36.1.). Sublimity in writing is not free from faults, but their authors are more

than human. This is a reference to the quality of being 'divine' ('δαιμόνιος') of nature that Longinus mentioned in the previous chapter (35.2.). In *Chapter 36* Longinus writes that 'the sublime' ('τὸ δ ὕψος') allows a man to emerge to the 'greatness of the mind of the god' ('μεγαλοφροσύνης θεοῦ') (36.1.). Demosthenes serves as an example (36.2.). Longinus writes that the avoidance of an error is usually the gift of 'art' ('τέχνη'), while high excellence is the attribute of genius. 'art' ('τέχνη') and 'nature' ('φύσις') combined can lead to perfection, 'the perfect' ('τὸ τέλειον'). (36.4.) *Chapter 37* has only survived in a few lines mentioning the rhetorical figures 'metaphor' ('μεταφορά'), 'parabole' ('παραβολή'), and 'simile' ('εἰκών') (37.1.). In *Chapter 38* Longinus mentions that for the rhetorical figure 'hyperbole' ('ὑπερβολή') an overstraining can result in an opposite effect (38.1.). This effect Longinus exemplifies with Isocrates who uses rhetorical figures that make the speech childish (38.2.). Longinus recommends disguising the hyperbole like other figures (38.3.).

2.4. The Position of *On the Sublime* in the History of Rhetoric. While the writing *On the Sublime* with its application of the concept of 'the sublime' to works of so different fields as rhetoric, poetry, history, and philosophy framed the concept of literature in later modern époques, its main point of reference of the technical scholarship is rhetoric. The theory of rhetoric and discussions of Greek and Roman orators is present throughout the text of the treatise, the concept of 'the sublime' can be considered an overarching concept blending rhetoric and other disciplines. The implementation of the theory of rhetoric is in many chapters present, even though Longinus structures the main body of the text according to what he calls the five sources of 'the sublime'. The technique of 'σύγκρισις' was used by Caecilius in his *Comparison of Demosthenes and Aeschines* (*Σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Αἰσχίνου*), so its title in *Suda* [36]. This technique of the comparative juxtaposition is often practiced by Longinus, in the main part to the writers, but also in the comparison of the old

and new rhetoricians in *Chapter 44.* Longinus himself mentions 'σύγκρισις' only in one case, the comparison of Timaeus between the style of Alexander the Great with Isocrates. Longinus neither mentions his sources for the selection of the rhetorical devices he exemplifies as means of the production of 'the sublime' nor discusses rhetorical devices except in discussions of Caecilius' use of 'the sublime'.

In *Suda* various entries with writers, usually called sophists, who authored a type of treatise called *Art of Rhetoric* exist. Matthaios pointed out that *Suda* implemented as source a rhetorical lexicon apparently the source of the *Λέξεων Ῥητορικῶν* (Bekker's 5th lexicon) [44, p. 5]. Among the writers of such a treatise in the 1st century the rhetor Paulus of Tyre who lived at the time of Philo of Byblos and flourished between the 1st and the 2nd century is mentioned. For the 2nd century *Suda* records Aristocles of Messene who probably flourished in the 2nd century CE, the sophist Aristocles of Pergamum who lived under both Trajan and Hadrian in the 2nd century, Hermagoras of Temnos who lived under the emperor Marcus Aurelius in the 2nd century, and Porphyrius of Tyre who lived between 234 BCE and 305 CE and wrote a commentary on Minucian's *Art of Rhetoric.* The rhetor Leon of Alabanda who wrote an *Art of Rhetoric* flourished between the 2nd century BCE and the 2nd century CE. The rhetor Aelius Sarapion of Alexandria dates to the 2nd century CE as Heath mentions and attributes the treatise traditionally attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus to Aelius Serapion [45, p. 81]. Sophists mentioned by *Suda* in the 3rd and 4th century are the sophist Menander of Laodicea who wrote a commentary on Hermogenes' *Art of Rhetoric* during the late 3rd century CE, the sophist Gaianus of Arabia who lived as a pupil of Apsines of Gadara in the 3rd century, the sophist Minucianus, son of the sophist Nicagoras, who lived in the 3rd century CE. The sophist Aelius Harpocration who according to Dilts and Kennedy lived in the second half of the 2nd century [46, p. XII]. The sophist Metrophanes of Eucarpia who a commentary on Hermogenes' *Art of Rhetoric*

(εἰς τὴν Ἑρμογένους τέχνην ὑπόμνημα) probably during the 3rd and 4th century CE. The sophist Aphthonius who was a pupil of the sophist Libanios who flourished in the second half of the 4th century CE. The sophist Lachares of Athens who lived under the emperors Marcianus and Leon of the 5th century. Nicolaus of Myra in Lycia who was a pupil of Lachares. While it was common practice for teaching sophists and rhetors to write an *Art of Rhetoric* and other treatises that treat the theory of rhetoric, *On the Sublime* exceeds the theory of rhetoric. Longinus subjugates the teachings of rhetoric under the concept of 'the sublime'.

The 'composition' ('σύνθεσις') is the most important mean to reach it that Longinus mentions as the 5th source of 'the sublime'. Already for Dionysius of Halicarnassius in *Περί Συνθέσεως Ονομάτων* the composition plays an important role dedicating a whole treatise to it. Longinus calls the most important principle for 'the sublime' the 'σύνθεσις' ('ἡ ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρσει σύνθεσις', 8.1.). Doing so, Longinus practices what the emerging Christian writers in the following time apply to rhetoric, using its technique and terminology for their belief, even reinterpreting this knowledge with new meanings. Eusebius in his *The Ecclesiatical History* (2.18.1) describes the Hellenistic Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria as 'sublime' ('ὑψηλός') and 'elevated' ('μετέωρος' in his expositions of divine writings ('ἐν ταῖς εἰς τὰς θείας γραφὰς θεωρίαις') [47]. The opposition between pagan orators and writers and Christian public speakers and writers who adopted the rhetorical terminology and concepts under a new paradigm, a transnational Hellenism across the Mediterranean region, and a weakening Roman Empire might be considered the framework for a philosopher who experiences this as the despotism and Longinus who localizes the failure in the soul of humans now present in all contemporary public life. Augustinus, trained in pagan rhetoric and a convert to Christianity, documents the beginning of the Christian a new interpretation in *De Civitate Dei* (16.41.4.), when he defines the kind of death ('genus mortis') that brings ascension

as 'sublimitas crucis' in the description of the practice of martyrdom [48]. Church Father Johannes Chrysostomus, known as public speaker spreading the Christian Faith, in the 4th century intensively used 'ὕψος' in his writings. The orator and ecclesiastic writer Procopius in the 6th century continued with the use of the concept 'sublime' ('ὕψος'). The ecclesiastic writer Alexander, a monk from Cyprus of the 6th century, in his terms of rhetoric adapting writing *Inventio Crucis* employs the concepts of 'τὸ ὕψος' and 'τὸ βάθος' in "τὸ ὕψος καὶτὸ βάθος" (page 4021, line 25, TLG) [49].

References:

1. Elvers, Karl-Ludwig; Baltes, Matthias; Montanari, Franco; Tinnefeld, Franz. "Longinus." In: *Brill's New Pauly*. Antiquity Volumes. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. English Edition by Christine F. Salazar. Classical Tradition Volumes ed. Manfred Landfester. English Edition by Francis G. Gentry. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

2. "Λογγῖνος." Adler number: lambda,645. *Suda*. Translated by Malcolm Heath. Suda Online. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

3. "Greek Scholar Porphyry." In: *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*. 6th Edition. March 2021: 1. Ebscohost. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=134488926&site=ehost-live.

4. Vielberg, Meinolf. "Debatte um den Verfall der Beredsamkeit: Tacitus und Ps.-Longin." In: *Handbücher Rhetorik. Volume 1. Handbuch Antike Rhetorik*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2019, p. 471-486.

5. Porter, James. I. *The Sublime in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

6. Longinus. *Longin. Fragments. Art Rhetorique. Rufus. Art Rhetorique*. Edited by Michel Patillon and Luc Brisson. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001.

7. Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Edited by William Rhys Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.

8. Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Translated by H.L. Havell. London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1890.

9. Longinus. *Le Traité du Sublime*. Hodoi Elektronikai. Du Texte à l'Hypertexte. *Itinera Electronica. Bibliotheca Classica Selecta (BCS)*. Catholic University of Louvain. hodoi.fltr.ucl.ac.be/concordances/longin_du_sublime.

10. Plato. *Laws*. In: *Platonis Opera*. Ed. John Burnet. Oxford: University Press, 1903. Perseus Digital Library. https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0165%3Abook%3D1%3Asection%3D624a

11. Mansfeld, Jaap. **"**Περι Κοσμου: A Note on the History of a Title.**"** *Vigiliae Christianae* 46.4, 1992, p. 391-411.

12. "Διονύσιος." Adler number: delta,1174. Tr. Malcolm Heath. *Suda*. Suda Online. Ed. David Whitehead. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

13. Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *On Literary Composition*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. London: Macmillan and Co, 1910.

14. Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius. *Institutio Oratoria*. MS Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1555. Monumenta. Ed. Max Bänziger. Seminar for Mediaeval Latin. Zurich University. http://www.monumenta.ch/latein/xanfang.php?n=46.

15. Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius. *Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by Harold Edgeworth Butler. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1920. Perseus Project of Tufts University. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2007.01.0060.

16. Epistula XVI. *Letters of Pliny the Younger*. MS Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1561. Monumenta. Edited by Max Bänziger. Seminar for Mediaeval Latin. Zurich University. http://www.monumenta.ch/latein/xanfang.php?n=46.

17. "Ἀρποκρατίων." Adler number: alpha,4014. Tr. Malcolm Heath. *Suda*. Suda Online. Ed. David Whitehead. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

18. *Philostratus and Eunapius. The Lives of the Sophists. The Lives of the Philosophers*. Translated by Wilmer Cave Wright. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1922.

19. Heath, Malcolm. "Longinus and the Ancient Sublime." In: *The Sublime from Antiquity to the Present*. Ed. Timothy M. Costelloe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 11-23.

20. Häußler, Reinhard. "Zur Datierung der Schrift vom Erhabenen." In: *Prinzipat und Kultur im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert. Wissenschaftliche Tagung der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena und der Iwane-Dshawachischwili-Universität Tbilissi 27.-30. Oktober 1992 in Jena*. Edited by Barbara Kühnert, Volker Riedel und Rismag Gordesiani. Bonn: Habelt, 1995, p. 141-163.

21. Männlein-Robert, Irmgard. *Longin. Philologe und Philosoph. Eine Interpretation der erhaltenen Zeugnisse*. Dissertation. München; Leipzig: Saur, 2001.

22. Kennedy, George Alexander. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

23. Arthur-Montagne, Jacqueline. "Symptoms of the Sublime. Longinus and the Hippocratic Method of Criticism." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 57, 2017, p. 325-355.

24. Deckard, Michael Funk. "The Theory of the Sublime from Longinus to Kant." *Journal of Aesthetics & Art Criticism* 75.1, 2017, p. 84-86.

25. "Ἀψίνης". Adler number: alpha, 4735. Tr. Malcolm Heath. *Suda.* Suda Online. Edited by David Whitehead. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

26. Fowler, Ryan C.; Quiroga-Puertas, Alberto. *Prolegomena to the Third Sophistic.* In: *Plato in the Third Sophistic*. Edited by Ryan C. Fowler. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014, p. 1-14.

27. "Πορφύριος." Adler number: pi, 2098. Translated by Malcolm Heath, *Suda.* Suda Online. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

28. Karamanolis, George. "The Platonism of Eusebius of Caesarea." In: *Plato in the Third Sophistic*. Edited by Ryan C. Fowler, Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014, p. 171-192.

29. Kleve, Knut. "Longinus - Too Good to be a Rhetorician?' *Symbolae Osloenses* 55, 1980, p. 71-74.

30. Heath, Malcolm. "Porphyry's Rhetoric." *Classical Quarterly* 53.1, 2003, p. 141-166.

31. O'Gorman, Ned. "Longinus's Sublime Rhetoric, or How Rhetoric Came into Its Own." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34.2, 2004, p. 71-89.

32. "Φρόντων." Adler number: phi, 735. Translated by Malcolm Heath, *Suda.* Suda Online. Ed. David Whitehead. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

33. Allen, Walter Jr. "The Terentianus of the Perì Hýpsous." *The American Journal of Philology* 62.1, 1941, p. 51-64.

34. Lambertz, Maximilian. "Postumius *Terentianus.*" In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. 22, 1. Edited by Georg Wissowa, 953-954. München and Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1954.

35. Roberts, W. Rhys. "Caecilius of Calacte." *American Journal of Philology* 18.3, 1897, p. 302-312.

36. Doreen C., Innes. "Longinus and Caecilius: Models of the Sublime." *Mnemosyne* 55.3, 2002, p. 259-284.

37. "Κεκίλιος". Adler number: kappa, 1165. Tr. Malcolm Heath. *Suda.* Suda Online. Ed. David Whitehead. The Stoa Consortium. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

38. Jonge, Casper C. de. "Dionysius and Longinus on the Sublime. Rhetoric and Religious Language." *American Journal of Philology* 133.2, 2012, p. 271-300.

39. Doreen C. Innes. "Longinus, Sublimity, and the Low Emotions." In: *Ethics and Rhetoric. Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-fifth Birthday.* Edited by Doreen Innes, Harry Hine and Christopher Pelling, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995, p. 323-333.

40. Billault, Alain. Théorie et Pratique des Figures dans la Traité Du Sublime." In: *Skhèma. Figura. Formes et Figures chez les Anciens. Rhétorique, Philosophie, Littérature*. Edited by Maria Silvana Celentano, Pierre Chiron, Marie-Oierre Noël, Paris: Éditions Rue d' Ulm, 2004, p. 301-314.

41. Billault, Alain. "Les Noms du Style dans le Traité Du Sublime." In: *Les Noms du Style. Dans l' Antiquité Gréco-Latine.* Ed. Pierre Chiron and Carlos Lévy, 221-232. Louvain, Paris, Walpole, MA: Éditions Peeters, 2010.

42. Staden, Heinrich von. "Metaphor and the Sublime: Longinus." In: *Desde los Poemas Homéricos hasta la Prosa Griega del Siglo IV d. C. Veintiséis Estudios Filológico*s. Edited by Juan Antonio López Férez. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 1999, p. 359-380.

43. Caglieri, C. "Le Metafore nel Sublime, Ill Discorso come Lotta." *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia. Linguistica e Tradizione Classica* 4, 2000, p. 155-179.

44. Worman, Nancy Baker. *Landscape and the Spaces of Metaphor in Ancient Literary Theory and Criticism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

45. Matthaios, Stefanos. "Suda. The Character and Dynamics of an Encyclopedic Byzantine Dictionary." In: *Η Λεξικογράφηση του Ελληνικού Πολιτισμού, Αρχαίου, Μεσαιωνικού και Νέου. Τα Σύγχρονα Εγκυκλοπαιδικά Λεξικά*. Edited by I. N. Kazazhs. Thessaloniki: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας, 2006, p. 1-43. http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/files/document/conference-2003/012MatthaiosEn.pdf.

46. Heath, Malcolm. "Pseudo-Dionysius Art of Rhetoric 8-11: Figured Speech, Declamation, and Criticism." *The American Journal of Philology* 124.1, 2003, p. 81-105.

47. Dilts, Mervin R.; Kennedy, George A. *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire. Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1997.

48. Eusebius of Caesarea. *The Ecclesiastical History.* Vol 1-2. Edited by J.E.L. Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Lawlor Oulton. London: William Heinemann; New York: Putnam; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1926-1932.

49. Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei.* MS Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek Cod. 1008. Monumenta. Ed. Max Bänziger. Seminar for Mediaeval Latin. Zurich University. http://www.monumenta.ch/latein/codex_content.php?c=94.

50. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature Project.* Directed by Maria Pantelia. University of California, Irvine. Online Edition 2019.