TWO FRAGMENTS OF 'LONGINUS' IN PHOTIUS

My subject is two fragments of rhetorical commentary that appear both in an anonymous manuscript collection of quotations 'From Longinus' and (without attribution) in Photius' *Bibliotheca*. My purpose is to clarify some observations that have been made on them by modern scholars and thus offer a correction or two. The collection of separate quotations labelled ἐκ τῶν Λογγίνου in Laurentianus 24, Plut. 58, was given its title by a later hand different from that of the writer of the original.[1] The grounds for that mistaken heading were that the name 'Longinus' appears in the second of the fragments. Aristotle and Theophrastus, however, are cited in other quotations, and most are anonymous, with as yet no particular resemblance found to wording in other rhetorical literature. Each begins with the word ὅτι. All are general remarks on subjects such as rhetorical tropes, style, and different types of speeches. They are, in effect, scholia without a text.

Numbers 3 and 14 of this collection appear almost verbatim in Photius' *Bibliotheca* at 259.485b21–7 and 262.488b25–7, where they are embedded in the stylistic commentary with which Photius prefaced the lives of Antiphon and Lysias. Leaving aside the larger and interesting question of Photius' use of sources,[2] we can observe with E. Ofenloch that the text in the *Bibliotheca* corresponding to the first of these two Laurentian fragments occurs in a passage of critical commentary specifically attributed to Caecilius of Caleacte.[3] Codex 259 is a life of Antiphon, which begins with the same general remarks as the original *Moralia* text, but then continues with a report of Caecilius' judgement on Antiphon's use of figures:[4]

ὁ μέντοι Σικελιώτης Καικίλιος μὴ κεχρῆσθαί φησι τὸν ῥήτορα τοῖς κατὰ διάνοιαν σχήμασιν, ἀλλὰ κατευθὺ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπλάστους τὰς νοήσεις ἐκφέρεσθαι, τροπὴν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πανούργου καὶ ἀνάλλαξιν οὔτε ζητῆσαι τὸν ἄνδρα οὔτε χρήσασθαι, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν νοημάτων καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς αὐτῶν ἀκολοσίας ἄγειν τὸν ἀκροατὴν πρὸς τὸ βούλημα.

But Caecilius of Caleacte says that the orator did not use figures of thought, but instead presented his thoughts directly and naturally, and that he neither sought nor employed clever turns or inversions, but instead by means of the thoughts themseves and their natural sequence he drew his hearer in the direction he desired.

and continues (Photius 485b21–7):

οἱ γὰρ πάλαι ῥήτορες ἱκανὸν αὐτοῖς ἐνόμιζον εὑρεῖν τε τὰ ἐνθυμήματα καὶ τῇ φράσει περιττῶς ἀπαγγεῖλαι. ἐσπούδαζον γὰρ τὸ ὅλον περὶ τὴν λέξιν καὶ τὸν ταύτης κόσμον, πρῶτον μὲν ὅπως εἴη σημαντικὴ καὶ εὐπρεπής, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἐναρμόνιος ἡ τούτων σύνθεσις.

For the ancient orators considered it sufficient to discover demonstrations and to express them with a diction striking and remarkable. They gave attention overall to their expression and its ornament, first in order that it be clear and well presented, and secondly that the combination of these qualities also be harmonious.

---

[1] Copied by Bandini for Ruhnken: see C. Spengel, ed., *Rhetores Graeci* (Leipzig, 1853), p. xxiii. The fragments are most recently published by A. O. Prickard, *Libellus de Sublimitate Dionysio Longino fere Adscriptus* (Oxford, 1906).

[2] His codices 259–68 form one version of 'The Lives of the Ten Orators'. The other, once attributed to Plutarch, is part of the *Moralia*. On the relationship between the two, and on Photius' sources for the critical material contained in the *Bibliotheca*, see W. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington, DC, 1980), pp. 37–51, and R. Smith, 'Photius on the Ten Orators', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 33 (1992). I offered an analytical review of the scholarship on this subject in R. McComb, *The Tradition of the 'Lives of the Ten Orators' in Plutarch and Photius* (Diss., University of North Carolina, 1991).

[3] E. Ofenloch, *Caecilii Calactini Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907).

[4] The text is R. Henry's *Photius: Bibliotheca*, vol. 8 (Paris, 1977). The translation is my own.

Photius then makes an overt quotation, the only certain verbatim quotation of Caecilius that we have.

The parallel to 485b21–7, Fragment 3 'ἐκ τῶν Λογγίνου', reads:

Ὅτι τροπὴ ἐκ τοῦ πανούργου καὶ ἐξάλλαξις οὐδεμία ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τοῦ νοῦ σχήματα ὀψέ ποτε εἰς τοὺς δικανικοὺς λόγους παρεισῆλθεν. ἡ πλείων γὰρ αὐτοῖς σπουδὴ περὶ τὴν λέξιν καὶ τὸν ταύτης κόσμον ἦν καὶ τὴν συνθήκην καὶ ἁρμονίαν.

Fragment 3 is clearly quotation or paraphrase directly or indirectly from Caecilius. Ofenloch included in his *Caecilii Fragmenta* (1907) both the *Bibliotheca* passage and the Laurentian's Fragment 3, labelling it 'from an epitome of "Longinus"'. R. Ballheimer (1877), whom Henry frequently cites in his recent edition of Photius, had in fact already remarked on the appearance of both Fragments 3 and 14 in Photius, and he rightly declared that Fragment 3 was almost certainly not from 'Longinus' and identified it as Caecilius.[5] Henry's note to Photius' text, however, says nothing of this, and he thus leaves readers unaware of the correspondence between this passage and the quotation.

Number 14 of the Laurentian collection 'From Longinus' appears in codex 262 of the *Bibliotheca*, the life of Lysias. The speech *Against Diogeiton* is being praised for its purity and clarity:

(Photius 488b25–7) ἔστι μὲν ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγοις αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἠθικός, γίνεται δὲ κατὰ διάνοιαν ὁ ἠθικός, ὅταν χρηστὴν ἔχῃ προαίρεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω ῥέπουσαν.

('From Longinus' number 14) Ὅτι ἠθικός λόγος γίνεται κατὰ διάνοιαν, ὅταν χρηστὴν ἔχῃ προαίρεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω ῥέπουσαν.

The fragment is almost identical with the text of Photius.

Henry notes, '488b25–489a13 proviendrait de Cécilius, avec quelques lignes de Longin',[6] and he cites the number under which Ofenloch included this passage in his collection of the *Fragmenta* of Caecilius and where he also included the Laurentian Fragment 14 and called it 'from an epitome of "Longinus"'. So Henry's 'few lines of Longinus' are not 'Longinus'. This is in itself a small point, but it is one that may be misleading in larger considerations. The only 'Longinus' in the *Bibliotheca* is in the life of Demosthenes at 492a27ff., where it is part of an assembly of comments which Photius seems to have drawn from material accompanying the speeches in the manuscript he read.[7] Anyone who takes Fragment 14 for material from 'Longinus' will confuse the already complex question of Photius' sources for the lives of the Ten Orators.

In the process of hypothesizing the sources for Photius and for Ps.-Plutarch's *Lives of the Ten Orators*, Ballheimer and Ofenloch far overestimated the influence of Caecilius in the treatise.[8] Their attribution to Caecilius of Fragment 14 is, I believe,

---

[5] *De Photi vitis decem oratorum* (Diss., Bonn, 1877), p. 34. Comparing the (largely biographical) text shared by the two versions, he erroneously posited an older source common to Ps.-Plutarch and Photius. The critical commentary given in Photius but not the *Moralia* he believed to have originated with Caecilius (but see McComb, 67–85).

[6] McComb, p. 51.

[7] Longinus' opinion on the proem of *Against Leptines* – which is not to be found in any surviving Longinus – is reported briefly. The short note here that identifies Longinus is one of many similar identifications Photius offered throughout the *Bibliotheca*. Of these, 14 include the word ἤκμαζε, for example of Appian (57.17a13), Themistius (74.52a13), Pamphila (175.119b38), and Theopompus (176.120b30).

[8] Ofenloch's aim was to be inclusive; he famously met and overshot his goal. Ballheimer attributed the bulk of the *Lives of the Ten Orators* to Caecilius. See Appendix.

correct; but since their criteria for identifying Caecilius as a source are at best overly broad, it should be said that Fragment 14 may be attributed to Caecilius on very good grounds. The Photian passage which duplicates it (488b25–7) is strikingly similar to Caecilius' writing on Antiphon which is quoted in codes 259. Certain passages in Photius' version of the lives of Lysias, Demosthenes, and Antiphon are very similar to each other in both language and content. These passages are:

(1) Antiphon 485b14–40: on Antiphon's use of figures of thought, τὰ σχήματα κατὰ διάνοιαν (= Ofenloch Fr. 103).

(2) Lysias 488b25–489a9: Lysias' speeches are ἠθικοί, making an appeal from good character; how this is successfully done via (figures of) thought; *Against Diogeiton*, the speech's narration, διήγησις, amplification, αὔξησις, purity and clarity of subject and language, its harmony and ornament (= Ofenloch Fr. 109).[9]

(3) Lysias 489a14–34: the speech *On the Olive Stump* is Lysias', witness its topics, arguments, proem, epilogue, its proof by demonstration rather than argument, its precision, the natural quality of its antitheses.

(4) Lysias 489b3–13: Lysias' skill at auxesis (= Ofenloch Fr. 110). Photius adds at the end of this passage: Καικίλιος δὲ ἁμαρτάνει..., and contradicts the opinion just reported.

(5) Demosthenes 491a40–491b7: the speeches *Against Meidias* and *Against Aeschines* contain conflicting elements that make them seem unfinished.

(6) Demosthenes 491b12–17: *Against Aeschines* seems unfinished in the quality and arrangement of its replies to the accusation (= Ofenloch Fr. 143).

(7) Demosthenes 491b18–22: ...but *Against Mnesiptolemus* by Lysias sustains its emotional appeal, τὸ παθητικόν, throughout (= Ofenloch Fr. 143).

(8) Demosthenes 491b23–8: *On the False Embassy* seems unfinished because the antitheses following the peroration are disorganized and disjointed.

(9) Demosthenes 491b29–492a5: *For Satyrus* is by Demosthenes, witness its oblique cases, continuity of periods, and vigour, excellence in choice of words and composition, compression and ornament in use of figures, cross-questioning, hypostrophe and asyndeton. A comparison of Lysias, Demosthenes, and Isocrates' period lengths (= Ofenloch Fr. 144).

These stand out sharply from the rest of the material in Photius' codices on the orators, which can be generally divided into (1) the main body of each codex, the biography of an orator taken from the Ps.-Plutarch life, (2) smaller critical notes, in length and content similar to scholia and marginal notes, e.g. (264.490a35) ὁ δὲ Δηλιακὸς ἐπιγραφόμενος οὐκ ἔστιν Αἰσχίνου, or (490b41–491a2) ...ὧν οἱ δημόσιοι μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ ἄριστον κατασκευάσθαι τοῖς πλείοσι κρίνονται, (3) quotations in the Demosthenes codex of Libanius' *Hypotheses*,[10] (4) comments, some of a general nature and some specifically critical, that Photius appears to have written himself, and finally (5) the passages listed above, all similar to the language at the beginning of the life of Antiphon which is there identified as Caecilius'.

Photius himself comments on the fact that varying ability of critics gives rise to differing opinions (260.487a29–35); and he notes that panegyric speeches by different orators can resemble one another because of the similar subject matter at hand (260.487b35–40); he complains of how a critic's labelling of spurious speeches affects their survival (262.488a34–489b2). These general remarks tend to be written in a complex, rhetorically crafted style similar to Photius' elaborately worded proem to the *Bibliotheca*. The more specifically critical remarks are typical of his criticisms

---

[9] Ofenloch included the last sentence of this passage, a summary statement that does not resemble the vocabulary or style of what precedes it, but does resemble Photius' language in his stylistic criticisms: with respect to vocabulary: ἁπλῶς (73 occurrences in Photius' critical writings in the *Bibliotheca*), τε γὰρ καί, rare in classical Attic (but used by Photius 13 times), ἄξιος with an infinitive 3 times), and κατά with the accusative to describe an aspect of style (11 times); these together with the pattern of elements strung together in simple conjunction are characteristic of Photius' descriptions of literary style (McComb, p. 109).

[10] See Henry on codex 265.

throughout the work: they are written in simpler language – short sentences and clauses simply connected – and they employ an identifiable vocabulary (much of it based on Hermogenes) to describe the overall effect of an author's style.[11]

In contrast, the nine passages I take to be drawn from Caecilius consistently offer analysis of rhetorical techniques such as convincing (as opposed to unconvincing) methods of appeal from character, general composition and period length that blend with vividness and preserve propriety, the setting forth of as opposed to the amplification of the accusation, ἡ κατηγορία. The vocabulary ranges from common rhetorical terms for periods, proofs, and arguments, discovery, arrangement, and narration to less common technical words such as ἀνάλλαξις, ἐρώτησις, παράλειψις, and ὑποστροφή.

The preface in Photius' codex on Lysias is the discussion of successful appeal from character. Like the other nine passages – compare the critique of Antiphon, above – the language is simple, clear Attic and the tone authoritative. While Antiphon avoided strained and clever turns of thought, employing the natural sequence of his points to lead the listener on, Lysias makes the appeal from character by means of the thought in his speeches:

Ἔστι μὲν ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγοις αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἠθικός, γίνεται δὲ κατὰ διάνοιαν ὁ ἠθικός, ὅταν χρηστὴν ἔχῃ προαίρεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω ῥέπουσαν. ὅθεν οὐ χρὴ ψιλῶς τὰ πραχθέντα λέγειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γνώμην συνάπτειν μεθ᾽ ἧς ἐπράττετο ἕκαστον, οἷον ἂν μὲν χαλεπὰ ἦ καὶ πρὸς φίλους ἢ ἄλλως μετρίους τὴν ἀνάγκην αἰτιᾶσθαι, ἂν δὲ ἀμείνω, τὴν προαίρεσιν. αὔτη δὲ μάλιστα πιθανὴ γίνεται, εἰ τὴν αἰτίαν προσλάβοι. τὰς μέντοι αἰτίας οὐ χρὴ τοῦ λυσιτελοῦς ἕνεκα παραλαμβάνειν· φρονίμου γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ χρηστοῦ καὶ εὐγνώμονος τὰ τοιαῦτα. χαλεπὸς δὲ ὁ τρόπος φυλάξαι· διὸ καὶ Λυσίας ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεται πολλάκις διαμαρτάνων.

He is in many of his speeches concerned with character, and this element comes in by way of the thought [expressed by the speaker] when he has an intention which is morally good and aims at producing some good. That is why one must not simply say what was done, but must include the intention with which each thing was done; for example, if the acts are troublesome and were done to friends or other respectable persons, one must attribute them to necessity, but if they are better than that, one should attribute them to deliberate choice. And this is most plausible when it includes [a statement of] the motive. Motives, however, which aim at gain one ought not to accept: for such things are the marks of a thoughtful man rather than of a good and well-intentioned one. This manner is hard to maintain, which is why even Lysias is plainly to be seen erring in it.

In conclusion, 259.485b14–40 and 488b25–489a9 are substantial examples of Caecilius' comments on Antiphon and Lysias. And Fragments 3 and 14 in the Laurentian collection ἐκ τῶν Λογγίνου are comments of Caecilius that ended up in

[11] McComb, pp. 179–218. A good example of the rhetorical style of the general comments is 260.487a29–35:
διὸ καὶ πολλοῖς πολλὰς παρέσχε τῶν κριτικῶν διατριβὰς μὲν καθ᾽ ἑαυτούς, διαφωνίας δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τῶν μὲν ἐμβαθυνομένων τῇ μελέτῃ καὶ διασκέψει τοῦ λόγου, τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιπόλαιον τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιουμένων. ἔστι δ᾽ εἰπεῖν καὶ διότι τοῖς μὲν ἔνεστι φύσις εὖ ἔχουσα πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις, τοὺς δὲ ὁ ἐλαττούμενος ἐπιγινώσκει λόγος.
The alliteration, antitheses, and play of word order is typical of the ornate style Photius employs in formal, emotional, or self-conscious moments. Eleven of the words/phrases in this brief passage have a combined total of 44 parallels (McComb, pp. 183–9) in Photius' other prose works.
The more simple language in which Photius analyses style in the *Bibliotheca* (e.g. 487b26–8, τῶν δὲ λόγων αὐτοῦ τὸ εὐκρινὲς καὶ σαφὲς καὶ μεμελετημένον πᾶσι δῆλον, καὶ ὡς ἐπανθεῖ αὐτοῖς οὐ μόνον ἔμφυτον ἀλλὰ καὶ κομμωτικὸν κάλλος) is consistent throughout the 130 or so evaluations of various writers (McComb, pp. 97–103). This sentence, like the others, begins with words that set off and announce the beginning of an evaluation, τῶν δὲ λόγων, and describes qualities and effects of style rather than analysing structure or technique (McComb, p. 136).

a set of miscellaneous quotations which was labelled 'Longinus' by someone who did not know its source(s), but saw Longinus named in the second fragment. Ballheimer and Ofenloch together did not provide Henry with a clear or correct picture of Caecilius' presence in Photius' work. Ofenloch ultimately attributed both Numbers 3 and 14 to Caecilius, but not on defensible grounds. Ballheimer's notice of the presence of both fragments in Photius' text has been overlooked and forgotten, and 'Longinus'' name has, as a result, crept back into an authoritative commentary on Photius' *Bibliotheca* where it does not belong.

APPENDIX

On the grounds that Caecilius is named in the text, Ofenloch takes several passages in Photius to be Caecilius, when the name simply occurs because it is part of the original *Moralia* text where Caecilius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus are often cited at the beginning of a life as authorities on how many speeches of an orator are genuine. These citations are one-line statements that look like isolated tags of information; they provide no grounds for ascribing the surrounding *Moralia* text to Caecilius. If style and vocabulary were his criteria, Ofenloch's omissions and many of his inclusions in the *Lives of the 10 Orators* are surprising. The body of fragments drawn from Ps.-Plutarch and Photius comprise numbers 99–149, 40 pages altogether.

The quotation in Photius' life of Antiphon is the only direct one that survives; most of the fragments merely refer to or cite Caecilius. Once a very conservative rule is applied, excluding passages that merely precede or follow phrases with Caecilius' name in them and rejecting entries that seem to show his 'spirit and genius', we are left with very little. Generally, most of the traces of Caecilius – they are all brief – come from 'Longinus'' essay *On the Sublime*, Quintilian, and Tiberius' *On Figures in Demosthenes* (cf. G. Ballaira, ed., *Tiberii de Figuris Demosthenicis Libellus cum Deperditorum Operum Fragmentis* [Rome, 1968]). His opinions on particular figures of speech are reported, often followed by examples, as in Tiberius: 'Caecilius calls παρεμβολή a figure of speech and uses an example from Thucydides' (Ofenloch No. 75); and in 'Longinus', *On the Sublime* (1.1.10) where 'Longinus' complains that Caecilius' essay established the nature of the sublime by means of numerous examples but did not explain how to achieve it. Also (4.4.6–7), 'I will give only one or two examples from Timaeus, since Caecilius anticipates me in most of them'. This 'figure plus definition plus example' pattern reflects the common structure of rhetorical handbooks and perhaps Caecilius' favoured method of exposition as well.

Although he did not discuss the origin of Fragment 14 in particular, Ballheimer mentioned both Fragments 3 and 14 in the course of arguing that the critical notes in Photius which do not occur in the set of lives in the *Moralia* came from an older work on the orators by Caecilius. His argument, in addition to operating on some of the more overly mechanical methods of source criticism, severely underestimated Photius' critical ability and level of contribution (see Smith).

Meredith College   REBEKAH M. SMITH
Raleigh, North Carolina