

XII. A Greek Professorial Circle at Rome

G. P. GOOLD

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

To establish beyond a shadow of doubt the date and authorship of the tractates *On the Sublime* and *On Style* is a task which has long defied—and in all probability will continue to defy—the best endeavors of scholarship. But the seeker after truth is a detective, not a magistrate; and like a detective, he will often feel satisfied that he has solved a case, though fully aware that the evidence is highly circumstantial and will not convince all of the jury. Of such a nature is the present inquiry. Nevertheless, the matter has been recently brought into court and argued at length by two eminent advocates;¹ and rightly so, since keeping an open mind is a poor excuse for remaining in the dark. Yet in the dark I fear they will have us stay, for neither has mentioned the solution which falls least short of certainty and throws most light on what was before obscure. The following plea is therefore tendered on behalf of a Greek professorial circle at Rome—*indocti discant, et ament meminisse periti*—before the tribunal of the learned retires to consider its verdict.

I. LONGINUS *On the Sublime*

Could we but penetrate the veil of the unknown, we should expect to find that once in some ancient sequestered library there existed a composite manuscript containing in a collection of rhetorical writings² a work by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and a work by Cassius Longinus; between these works with no indication of its authorship lay the tractate *On the Sublime*; when the manuscript was recopied, the scribe, being uncertain whether the tractate belonged to the author of the preceding or to the

¹ Eduard Norden† “Das Genesiszitat in der Schrift vom Erhabenen,” *Abh. der berl. Ak., Kl. f. Sprachen*, etc., 1954 (Berlin 1959) Nr. 1. G. M. A. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style* (Toronto 1961) 39–56.

² I visualize a manuscript similar to the Codex Parisinus 1741, which contains Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*; Dionysius' *De compositione verborum* and other opuscula; Demetrius' *De elocutione*; and several works of minor rhetoricians.

author of the succeeding work, described it as ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ Η ΛΟΓΓΙΝΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ. These are the words used to describe *The Sublime* in the table of contents given on the first leaf of the Codex Parisinus 2036, the archetype of the other manuscripts. That the tractate is not the creation of either author will follow as a corollary of the case to be presented. It is a truth long since recognized, for only by convention does the world call the author Longinus.³ I shall be consistently observing this convention, having no need hereafter to call upon the minister of Zenobia; whenever I speak of Longinus, I shall be referring to the author of *The Sublime*.

The first sentence of the work voices the author's dissatisfaction with the Περὶ ὕψους of Caecilius of Calacte, a Hellenized Jew who taught rhetoric at Rome under Augustus. Now there is nothing whatever in Longinus which must refer to a post-Augustan date; and if the matter rested there, one might reasonably surmise that Longinus' treatise was written as a counterblast to Caecilius' and shortly afterwards. Confirmation is provided by the occurrence in the poet Manilius of phrases which owe their inspiration to Longinus. It was Robinson Ellis⁴ who first drew attention to the arresting similarity of:

1. *De subl.* 13.3 f. (trans. Roberts): "Was Herodotus alone a devoted imitator of Homer? No, Stesichorus even before his time, and Archilochus, and above all Plato, who from the great Homeric source drew to himself innumerable tributary streams. . . . This proceeding is not plagiarism."

Man. 2.8 ff., 58: "All posterity has for its verse drawn on the rich waters of Homer's utterance, and has dared to

³ M. J. Boyd, however, in *CQ* 7, n.s. (1957) 39–46, whilst assigning *The Sublime* to the early principate, contends that the author's name was Longinus and that the tractate was the 21st book of the *Philological Discourses* (a work attributed by all other scholars to the third-century Cassius Longinus). Boyd's argument is based on one passage in John of Sicily and one passage (of clearly identical origin) in another medieval commentator on Hermogenes' *De ideis*. The weaknesses (in my opinion fatal) of Boyd's argumentation are: (1) the references to *The Sublime* could have been derived from Cod. Par. 2036 or its immediate source (so Rhys Roberts, *op. cit.* [below, note 16] 5 f.); and (2) Boyd's admission (*loc. cit.* 43, ¶2, *ad fin.*) that John of Sicily has elsewhere mistakenly attributed *The Sublime* to "the famous Cassius Longinus."

⁴ *CR* 13 (1899) 294.

channel his river into its slender streams . . . No plagiarism but an original work shall arise."

The thought does not occur earlier, and since Manilius is decorating his prooemium with rhetorical wallpaper not quite harmonizing with the astrological furniture, it looks as if he is borrowing from Longinus. The likelihood of this is much intensified by other parallels which Winfried Bühler⁵ has lately discovered and discussed without thought of and thus without prejudice about the significance which I attach to them.

2. *De subl.* 4.2 (quoting Timaeus): "Alexander who gained possession of the whole of Asia in fewer years than it took Isocrates to write his panegyric urging war against the Persians."

Man. 3.22 f.: "I shall not speak of Alexander's feats, to praise which would need more time than he took to perform them."

3. *De subl.* 19.1: "The words issue forth without connecting links and are poured out as it were, almost outstripping the speaker himself."

Man. 5.222: "When they speak, their words will outstrip them."

4. *De subl.* 35.3: "Wherefore not even the entire universe suffices for the thought and contemplation within the reach of the human mind, but our imaginations often pass beyond the bounds of space."

Man. 4.159: "They will discover paths to the skies, and after completely mapping out the heavens with numbers and measures, their genius then will pass beyond the orbits of the stars."

⁵ *Hermes* 87 (1959) 475-94. I take this opportunity of deferring to Bühler's explanation of Man. 5.222 *loquentis* as accusative; my reference to the passage in *Phoenix* 13 (1959) 110, last line but one, is therefore to be deleted.

The aggregate force of the similarities, all the more striking in that the two writers are handling themes poles apart, precludes the possibility of coincidence. Bühler's last two examples suggest why Manilius is often so difficult: he is rendering into Latin verse clever ideas which do not fit his context so well as that from which they were taken.

Had a work of the brilliance of *The Sublime* been widely disseminated, we might have expected to encounter some reference to it somewhere in our ancient sources. It is extraordinary that Manilius, another almost unknown writer, alone of extant classical authors seems to have read it. I suggest therefore that *On the Sublime* was never published outside of a narrow circle; that Manilius was a personal friend or close acquaintance of Longinus; and that Manilius' echoes of Longinus are due to a reading of the autograph and indicate that Longinus' work was written not long before. Since Book 2 of Manilius was written hardly more than a year before A.D. 14,⁶ it follows that Longinus' treatise was written late in the Augustan age; A.D. 12 will serve as a convenient approximation.

Our sole knowledge of Manilius outside his poem comes from Pliny the Elder, who in a passage (*NH* 35.199) confused in at least one respect⁷ and apprehensible only as through a glass darkly tells us that Manilius the astrological writer came to Rome as a slave from Antioch. Though technically impeccable, his Latin is distinctly bizarre, causing Bentley⁸ to suspect that he was a foreigner, perhaps of Asiatic origin. It is easy to believe that Greek was his native tongue; on his own admission he is using Greek star-manuals, and he also reveals a direct and extensive knowledge of Greek literature from Homer to his own contemporaries. I rather think that both as a slave and after

⁶ The dates of Books 1 and 2 of Manilius are fixed within narrow limits by the mention of Varus' defeat (A.D. 9) in 1.899 and the allusions to Augustus as the reigning emperor (1.385, 922 f.; 2.508 ff.). If Man. 1.329 is, as I suspect, derived from Ovid, *Tr.* 4.1.17 f. (published about A.D. 12), the limits will be narrowed still more. The mention of Manilius in Pliny makes it certain (as against Housman, *Man.* 1 [London 1903] page lxxii) that the *Astronomica* was indeed published; confirmation of which is found in the fact that Germanicus, the author of the *Aetna*, Juvenal, and Firmicus Maternus all show acquaintance with his work. The further facts, that Firmicus knows only Book 5, and that Book 4 alludes to Tiberius as the reigning emperor, signify that publication was by instalments, possibly a book a year.

⁷ See Otto Skutsch's discussion in *RE* 18 (1959) cols. 1920 f., and note.

⁸ Manilius (London 1739) page x.

manumission he was attached to a Pompeian house. Pompey, not Julius Caesar, is *orbis domitor* (1.793); of Pompey's war against the pirates we hear at 1.921 and again, but never a word about the conquest of Gaul or the reform of the calendar; Pharsalus (no names of vanquisher or vanquished) is no victory, but a civil disaster (1.910 f.); and in 4.50 ff. Pompey, not Julius, is compared with Alexander.⁹

There is reason to suppose that Longinus, who I have suggested was a close acquaintance of Manilius, was also the dependent of a Pompeian house. At any rate I endorse the assertion of G. C. Richards¹⁰ that his name was Gnaeus Pompeius Geminus. This person is known to us as having written to the leading professor of Greek literature at Rome, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, objecting that the latter's criticisms of Plato were out of all proportion to his laudation of Demosthenes. From the extant reply of Dionysius, the *Epistola ad Pompeium*,¹¹ we learn that Caecilius of Calacte was a professional associate of Dionysius (§ 3, 777 R). Since therefore Caecilius was contemporary with and known to Dionysius; and since Caecilius was contemporary with and known to Longinus, we naturally expect Dionysius and Longinus—two contemporary teachers of Greek literature at Rome—to be known to each other. We shall not be surprised, indeed we may expect, to find Longinus' real name mentioned somewhere in Dionysius' numerous works. No small significance, then, attaches to the fact that the two extracts of Pompeius' letter quoted by Dionysius agree exactly with sentiments expressed in *The Sublime*.

Richards compares

A. *De subl.* 36.1: "It is fitting to observe at once that, though writers of this magnitude are far removed from faultlessness, they none the less all rise above what is

⁹ With less probability R. B. Steele (*AJP* 52 [1931] 167) detects in the Pompeian references "a studied attempt not to dim the brilliancy of Julius' successor by introducing the deeds of the 'foremost man of all the world,'" and L. Alfonsi (*Latomus* [1947] 345–51) a stock theme of the rhetorical schools.

¹⁰ *CQ* 32 (1938) 133 f. The possibility had been twice casually mentioned by W. Rhys Roberts, (1) *CR* 14 (1900) 440a, and (2) Dion. Hal., *The Three Literary Letters* (Cambridge 1901) 38.

¹¹ Dionysius' letter is addressed to Gnaeus Pompeius; but in § 2 (765 R) the cognomen is given as Geminus, and this seems to be authenticated beyond impeachment by the convincing conjecture of Wilamowitz in §1 (757 R) σοί, Γεμῖνε φίλτατε (σοί γε, ἡμῶν φίλτατε ms.).

mortal; that all other qualities prove their possessors to be men, but sublimity raises them near the majesty of God; and that, while immunity from errors relieves from censure, it is grandeur that excites admiration. What need to add thereto that each of these supreme authors often redeems all his failures by a single sublime and happy touch, and (most important of all) that if one were to pick out and mass together the blunders of Homer, Demosthenes, Plato, and all the rest of the greatest writers, they would be found to be a very small part, nay an infinitesimal fraction, of the triumphs which those heroes achieve on every hand?"

and

- B. *Ep. ad Pomp.* 2, 765 R (trans. Roberts), quoting Pompeius: "In other forms of expression there may well occur something which deserves mingled praise and blame. But in embellishment whatever is not success is utter failure. So that, in my opinion, these men should be judged not by their few most hazardous attempts but by their many successes"; and then, again quoting Pompeius: "Although I could defend all, or at any rate most, of these passages, I do not venture to gainsay you. But this one thing I strongly affirm, that it is not possible to succeed greatly in any way without such daring and recklessness as must needs fail now and then."

It appears then that Pompeius, like Longinus, is a Greek teacher of letters at Rome; like Longinus, he is a contemporary of Dionysius; like Longinus, he knows Caecilius; like Longinus, he has connection with a Pompeian house; like Longinus, he does not regard Plato as a stylist inferior to Demosthenes; like Longinus, he holds views about the nature of great writing not elsewhere encountered in antiquity. Finally, Pompeius and Longinus, belonging to the same age and circle, show no awareness of each other, for neither does Longinus mention Pompeius nor Pompeius (or Dionysius) Longinus. Reason cries out aloud that the author

of *The Sublime* and Gnaeus Pompeius Geminus are one and the same person.

The beckoning ghost of Eduard Norden invites our steps along a different path. Censored during his lifetime and suppressed for thirteen years after it, his disquisition¹² is the most elaborate attempt in recent years to settle the question of date. Norden contends that the unnamed philosopher whom Longinus quotes in chapter 44 utters language and sentiments so resembling those of Philo Judaeus that (*Proposition 1*) we should identify him with Philo himself. Philo visited Rome in A.D. 40 as the leader of the Alexandrian embassy to Gaius and returned early in the following year; it was during this visit that Longinus must have met him (for Norden is satisfied that the treatise was written at Rome); therefore (*Proposition 2*) the treatise is to be dated shortly after A.D. 40.

The second proposition obviously conflicts with the case I have put forward above; survival for either means a fight to the death. Let me grant for the moment (what I shall deny hereafter) that Philo *was* Longinus' philosophical friend. Could their meeting have taken place about A.D. 12? Certainly. A visit by Longinus to Alexandria is just as likely as Philo's to Rome. That Norden did not discuss the possibility seems chiefly due to the fact that the best scholars of his day in Germany had settled on A.D. 40 as a tentative approximation for the date of *The Sublime*. Yet by specifying this in one place as "um 40" and in another as "etwa 20–50 n.Chr.," Wilamowitz¹³ reveals that a range of several decades was considered possible. It is a weakness of Norden's case that no argument not involving Philo is advanced to narrow the dating of *The Sublime* to A.D. 40 or any range of years excluding A.D. 12. Only one datable fact do we know about Philo's life. In the exordium of the *Legatio ad Gaium* he tells us himself that he is an old man, whose hair is grey through length of years. On this evidence—it is all we have—his dates have been given as ca.30 B.C. –ca. A.D. 45.¹⁴ In A.D. 12 he had turned forty. If Longinus had accompanied one of his Roman wards or patrons to Egypt at this period, he could have heard Philo in his prime; and the calm, if

¹² *Op cit.* (above, note 1).

¹³ *Griech. Lit. in Kultur d. Gegenwart* (Berlin 1908) 223; and *Griech. Lesebuch* 1 (Berlin 1903) 378.

¹⁴ Piero Treves in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford 1949) 684a. Even if with Leisegang (*RE* 20 [1941] col. 1) we lower the date of Philo's birth by ten years, he would still have turned thirty by A.D. 12.

melancholy, views which the Jewish philosopher expressed on the occasion of their alleged meeting are more easily reconciled with the earlier than with the later date, when he was carrying the combined burdens of old age and anxious responsibility. On his visit to Rome in A.D. 40 Philo needed the aid and sympathy of all who claimed the title of friend. If in that year Longinus' contribution to a conversation with the patriarch had opened, as it opens in 44.6, with the remark "it is only too easy for men to find fault with their lot," I venture to think that the sequel would have been unsuitable for inclusion in his essay on literary criticism. Longinus goes on to mention his doubts about the philosopher's suggestion that "it is the peace of the world which corrupts great natures." In other words, so far as the two debaters are concerned, the world is at peace. Such a view cannot be imputed to Philo in A.D. 40. Chapter 44 gives the impression of complete detachment from public life, and this does not agree with the circumstances required by Norden's date. Since this date is not required by his first proposition or by any consideration which I have failed to mention, I shall consider it refuted and no longer imperiling the theories of Ellis and Richards which I have made my own.

Is the philosophical friend Philo? Norden points to the following parallels:

1. *De subl.* 44.1: "Really sublime and transcendent natures are no longer born, save quite exceptionally (πλήν εἰ μὴ τι σπάνιον)."

Phil. *Quod omn. prob. lib. sit.*, 62-72: "Men of surpassing excellence . . . This minority, though rare (εἰ καὶ σπάνιον), is not non-existent."

De mut. nom. 34: "But that kind is rare (σπάνιον) and hardly found, yet it is not impossible that such should be (πλήν οὐκ ἀδύνατον γενέσθαι)."

2. *De subl.* 44.3: "We seem to be learners from childhood of a just slavery, being all but cradled (μόνον οὐκ ἐνέσπαρ-γανωμένοι) in its customs and practices."

Phil. *De ebr.* 198: "I am not surprised that the multitude, ignominiously enslaved to customs and laws however

introduced, and forced from the very cradle (ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔτι σπαργάνων) to knuckle under . . . [should be incapable of thinking for themselves]."

The second parallel, which had been noted and debated before,¹⁵ is too close to be without significance; it extends to linguistic embellishment. When therefore Norden discovered that several more of the philosophical friend's ideas found expression somewhere or other in Philo's collected works, his cry of "Eureka" was eminently understandable.

Yet there were signs to arouse suspicion. The philosophical friend's ideas are not merely echoed in one or two isolated passages of Philo's works; they are reflected throughout the whole corpus. It is almost too good to be true. Moreover, in considering the famous citation of *Genesis* in 9.9, Norden says, of a comparison with *De opif. mundi* 1 ff., 131, "*Die Übereinstimmung geht hier derart ins einzelne*" and points out that the unusual active sense which *χωρέω* bears in Longinus ("grasp, comprehend") it bears again in *Quod deus immut.* 77 and *De spec. leg.* 1.44. But stop! This argument leads to the identification of Longinus, not his friend, with Philo.

Whoever stops here must soon perceive that the linguistic resemblances to Philo are not limited to the philosophical friend's thirty-two lines in Longinus: the list of words shared by Longinus and Philo¹⁶ extends throughout the whole work. We discover on investigation that the use of *χωρέω* is to be found in St. Paul;¹⁷ that the *Genesis* citation is paralleled by the surprisingly close wording at the very beginning of Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae*; and that when Philo speaks of *σπάργανα* at *De ebr.* 51 and elsewhere, he confesses with a *ὡς ἔπος εἰπείν* that he is using a cliché. That there is a noticeable concentration in chapter 44 is simply accounted for. Elsewhere Longinus is lecturing from his professorial podium; here, however, he takes off his gown and converses on more intimate terms with his pupil. To conclude: if Philo is to be credited with any portion of *The Sublime*, he must get the lot. Which is absurd.

The inference to be drawn from the significantly "Philonic"

¹⁵ By Ruhnken in Toup's Longinus (1778), Bernays (1876), and Kaibel (*Hermes* 34 [1899] 130, note 1).

¹⁶ W. Rhys Roberts, Longinus *On the Sublime*,² (Cambridge 1907) 192 f.

¹⁷ 2 *Ep. Cor.* 7.2, *χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς*, "Make room for us in your hearts."

language in Longinus was pointedly stated by W. B. Sedgwick:¹⁸ "He writes long periods, which he cannot manage; he uses abstract nouns in profusion, but in an un-Greek way; he uses extraordinary and unusual words and metaphors; he employs unskilfully typical Greek constructions (e.g. articular infinitive, article with neut. adj.). One notices all this in reading; but if we ask, 'Where have I seen all this before?', there is only one answer—in Philo, Justin, Clemens Alex., Origen, Eusebius, products of Alexandrian Judaism." And this answer extends of course to the similarity of outlook on such matters as liberty and slavery, character and environment.

This outlook was common to Hellenized Jews. Alexandria was the strongest Judaic centre in the whole Dispersion. Over a period of centuries necessary day-to-day business had by imposing the Greek language on Alexandrian Jewry sapped the vitality of their national tongue. Hebrew was forgotten. Already by the middle of the third century B.C. large portions of the Scriptures were rendered into the *koiné* for the guidance of the unilingual. The ensuing period witnessed the growth of a novel exegesis which by an enterprising employment of allegory and symbolism sought and found in the sacred writings interpretations compatible with the spirit of Greek philosophy. This movement, which has its counterpart in the history of Christianity, found in Plato that supreme secular authority which the Catholic Church was in a much later age to recognize in Aristotle. If this Graeco-Judaic movement is known to us largely through the work of Philo, we should remember that he is its mouthpiece and not its instigator. In Longinus we have one who has been brought up under its influence, for Longinus is in some sense a Jew. So was Caecilius of Calacte, and so possibly Theodorus of Gadara. A Jewish community had existed in Rome since the days of Antiochus the Great, and Josephus¹⁹ records that in 4 B.C. eight thousand of its members went out to welcome a delegation from Palestine.

As for the philosopher mentioned in chapter 44, it was not characteristic of Longinus to pass over his name in silence; his quotations are introduced with a particularity which, by leaving

¹⁸ *AJP* 69 (1948) 198. Sedgwick's criticism of Longinus' kaleidoscopic style, a fair criticism if language were static and Periclean Attic the standard of contemporary Greek, is a grotesque misrepresentation. The prose of George Bernard Shaw would no doubt merit similar censure, if judged by the standard of Dr. Johnson.

¹⁹ *Ant. Jud.* 17.11.1; *De bell. Jud.* 2.6.1.

few of them unassigned to their authors, encourages belief that the suppression of his philosophical friend's name was designed. Possibly the discourse reported by Longinus germinated from the seed of some actual conversation; but style and sentiment so much reflect those we associate with our remarkable author that I concur with the opinion²⁰ that the philosophical friend is none other than Longinus himself.

Some will doubtless remark by way of objecting to the date A.D. 12 that this is the earliest example of the lament that loss of liberty has led to the decline of eloquence. Yet in the *Brutus* (46) Cicero had written: "In impeditis ac regum dominatione devinctis nasci cupiditas dicendi non solet," and there is no cause for surprise that a man of Longinus' insight should have seen, and intimated to those who possessed intelligence to understand, that, whilst a dictatorship may be adorned and even commended by a Vergil and a Horace, it cannot train, for it cannot permit, the great voices of freedom.

II. DEMETRIUS *On Style*

Now that G. M. A. Grube²¹ has assigned the tractate *On Style* to the early reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the orthodox opinion which puts it three hundred years later is confronted with a challenge long overdue; and in an introduction replete with learning Grube has no difficulty in exposing much argument to which scholars had clung in their unhappy incertitude as inconclusive, for example, that "broad purples" in § 108 refers to the senatorial laticlave, or as most improbable, for example, that the corrupt name in § 237 (of a writer alluding to the battle of Salamis: *Φαληρεύς Blass*) is that of the rhetorician Theodorus of Gadara. Yet the fresh interest which Grube's vigorous study will stimulate is likely to reveal the paradox that his carefully argued conclusions are less securely based than the perfunctory ones which he opposes. His position is fundamentally a cautious one, characterized by a disinclination to abandon the authorship and hence the date dubiously indicated by the chief manuscript; and his

²⁰ Sympathy struggles with sourness when Gibbon says: "Longinus was forced to enervate [his noble ideas as to liberty] not only by the term *dicaiotatê*, which he takes care to apply twice to the present despotism; but by employing the stale pretence of putting his thoughts into the mouth of a nameless philosopher." *Journal*, October 25, 1762. I owe the reference to Roberts, *op. cit.* (above, note 16) 13, note 2.

²¹ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1).

ascription of the work to about 270 B.C. is not so much a safe arrival in port as a reluctance to navigate in the darkness. But, alas, the quest for truth is always dangerous, and caution can prove as fatal as daring. *Ond' io per lo tuo me' penso e discerno / Che tu mi segui, e io sarò tua guida.*

To begin with the external evidence: the Codex Parisinus 1741, the archetype of the other manuscripts, exhibits the title *Δημητρίου Φαληρέως περὶ ἑρμηνείας ὃ ἐστὶ περὶ φράσεως* and the colophon *Δημητρίου περὶ ἑρμηνείας*. The latter preserves all that is genuine. The last four words of the title, which have all the marks of a gloss, appear to have been added by way of explanation, and to indicate that *Φαληρέως*, which word constitutes the *whole* of the evidence for the Phalerean's authorship, is a fellow impostor, possibly transferred by some sciolist from § 289. This section, in which Demetrius of Phalerum is quoted by name, all but proves that our Demetrius is not the Phalerean, for, whilst many writers ancient and modern have referred to themselves in the third person, such a practice in a teacher of style is sham modesty and would never be limited to a single instance. Moreover, Demetrius of Phalerum, an Attic orator of distinction and good enough for comparison with the best, certainly wrote in Attic. Demetrius the Stylist, if I may so call him, certainly does not. Finally, no treatise entitled *Περὶ ἑρμηνείας* is attributed to him by Diogenes Laertius in the latter's register of his works (5.5.9). The case against his authorship is conclusive.

We possess no reference to Demetrius the Stylist before the Christian era. The alleged citation in Philodemus is a mirage which vanishes at our approach. Philodemus²² declares that "long periods are awkward to deliver, a criticism Demetrius brings against those of Isocrates." Look for such a criticism in the tractate *On Style*, and you will look in vain. It is not there. Our Demetrius mentions Isocrates three times, once (12) to cite him with Gorgias and Alcidamas as an example of periodic writing, and twice (68, 299) to comment on his avoidance of hiatus. One cannot infer from our Demetrius that he disapproved of the length of Isocrates' periods, or even regarded them as "long" at all. When our Demetrius in § 303 briefly warns against "periods which are continuous and long, and make a speaker run out of breath," he does not bring this as a criticism

²² *Rhet.* 1.198.9 f., ed. Sudhaus.

against anybody; no orator is mentioned by name or implication. Only by joining together what our Demetrius has put asunder and imputing to him something which he does not expressly say has Grube²³ been able to refer Philodemus' statement to him and so claim that he ante-dates the latter, who flourished between 70 and 40 B.C. There is a simple explanation: Philodemus is not citing our Demetrius at all, but Demetrius of Phalerum, whom he has mentioned elsewhere and to whose *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς* he twice²⁴ makes explicit reference.

The one sure piece of external evidence is furnished by the fifth-century Syrianus in his prolegomena to Hermogenes' *De ideis*,²⁵ where he proffers the following opinion: "The critics who ventured to enumerate and define the various styles embarked on a futile task. For Dionysius there are three: the plain, the middle, the grand. Hipparchus adds the graphic and the florid, whilst Demetrius rejects the graphic and is satisfied with four." That Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Demetrius the Stylist are designated here is not open to doubt. Dionysius opens his appreciation of Demosthenes²⁶ with a survey of precisely the three styles mentioned by Syrianus, and later tells us that whereas other eminent Greek writers are to be regarded as representative of one or another, Demosthenes achieves excellence in all three. And Demetrius' work is distinguished from all others by precisely such a fourfold division of styles as Syrianus attributes to him, three roughly corresponding to those of Dionysius, together with a fourth, largely designed to put the overpraised Demosthenes in his place. Do I hear someone object that Syrianus implies that Demetrius' fourth style is *anthēros* and not *deinos*? And that Demetrius' "style" has a different significance from Dionysius'? He takes the words from my mouth. But Syrianus' explicit assertion that Demetrius preaches a classification of four styles, from which the graphic is excluded, is unchallengeable. As for implications, he did not intend any; an unbeliever scoffing at articles of doctrine does not pick his words with a view to elucidating the catechism. Syrianus, however, has not been called to the

²³ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 53, and 56, "highly probable."

²⁴ *Rhet.* 1.274.4; 1.346.1, ed. Sudhaus.

²⁵ *Rhet. Gr.* 7.93, ed. Walz. Writing about A.D. 500 the Aristotelian commentator Ammonius (*Comm. Arist. Berl.* 4.996-97) also mentions Demetrius the Stylist, but furnishes no information bearing on his date.

²⁶ *De Dem.* §§. 1-7.

witness-box as a technical expert; he is subpoenaed solely as a lay witness to a point of time. His testimony, associating Demetrius with the Graeco-Roman period of literary theory, enables us to assign the tractate *On Style* to an age contemporary with or not far removed from that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who flourished at Rome in the first thirty years of the principate; since he mentions before and not after Demetrius the unknown Hipparchus whose system embraced five styles, it rather looks as if Syrianus has named the three critics in chronological order, as if, that is to say, Demetrius' work is later than Dionysius'.

No safe argument can be built on the dates of the authors quoted or mentioned by Demetrius. They cover a period from Homer to Sotades (early third-century B.C.) and permit the opinion, to which my other arguments compel me, that Demetrius regards them as "classical" authors. We encounter a similar range of authors, a similar recognition of a "classical" period, and a similar silence about the contemporary scene in other rhetorical works, in Dionysius' *De compositione verborum*, for example, which is of the Augustan period. Grube maintains that references to writers of the later fourth and early third centuries are "unusually frequent."²⁷ They have not seemed so to any other scholar. None of these writers, with the exception of Menander, is mentioned more than once, and Menander is only mentioned twice; Sappho is referred to more times than all put together. I do not count Theophrastus and his disciple Praxiphanes, whom Demetrius cites as technical authorities. Nor do I count Archedemus and Artemon, two more technical authorities cited in §§ 34 and 223 respectively. Apart from these two, all writers named by Demetrius have been identified with persons otherwise known, and this circumstance has led to the plausible conjectures that here are mentioned Archedemus of Tarsus and Artemon of Cassandria, who are generally assigned to the second half of the second century B.C. Two proverbial sayings quoted by Demetrius in § 172 are also quoted by Seneca and Diogenes Laertius, who name Chrysippus (second half of the third century B.C.) as their source; hence the plausible conjecture that Chrysippus has been used by Demetrius also as a source.²⁸ If any one of these three

²⁷ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 41, bottom.

²⁸ Seneca, *De const. sap.* 17; Diogenes Laertius 7.1,2; quoted by W. Rhys Roberts, Demetrius *On Style* (Cambridge 1902), note on 150, 15, page 241.

conjectures is true, Grube's date would be refuted at a blow. We should not assume that, because confirmation of these conjectures is precluded by our lack of knowledge, they are false and the possibility of them being true may be safely disregarded.

I digress to consider a special passage. In § 193 Demetrius remarks that a disjointed style is appropriate to the stage, and "for this reason Menander, whose style is for the most part broken, is acted, whereas Philemon is read." This statement is most readily referred to a period subsequent to the careers of those writers; when Demetrius wrote, Philemon's plays were no longer acted; and Philemon did not die till 262 B.C. But the passage is chiefly interesting for the singularity of the comparison. It was Philemon and not Menander who was preferred by contemporary theatre-goers; and it is no rash inference from Plautine *Quellenforschung* to assert that Philemon held his own on the stage for at least the rest of the century. Only with the activity of Terence is it clear that Menander has been awarded posterity's accolade. Even then Philemon was not pushed off the boards at once. Performances of his pieces took place as late as the second century of our era, when a statue commemorating him was erected at Athens. How then could Demetrius take for granted a ready acceptance of his statement? Only, I think, if he was writing long after the age of Plautus, yet at a time when Philemon was still quoted, that is, was still frequently read. The turn of the millennium is the time which would best accord with our professor's remarks; and it should be noted that Rome is a likely place, where the plays of Menander were often performed.²⁹

The evidence of language and style has been fully set forth by Roberts and Grube in their editions,³⁰ and there is no need for another tabulation. Grube, who is obliged to prove that Demetrius is not writing a prose which became current only three centuries after his death, has attempted a thorough rebuttal of all the evidence adduced by Roberts in support of a late date. Yet, even if we accept as proved the contention that Demetrius' prose *could* have been written in 270 B.C., it is highly improbable that it

²⁹ See, for example, *Anth. Pal.* 9.513; Quintilian, *IO* 11.3.91; and Cassius Dio 60.29 (Book 61, Boissevain, vol. 4, page 1), who quotes, as from the same poet, *Epitrep.* 157 and Kock, *FCG* 3, *Adesp.* 487, evidently overlooked by Koerte in the Teubner Menander, vol. 2.

³⁰ Roberts, *op. cit.* (above, note 28) 55–59; Grube, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 46–50, 133–55.

was then penned by a teacher of style. By Grube's account Demetrius was a younger contemporary of Theophrastus and Menander; his teachers had listened to Demosthenes and Aristotle; he himself aspired to become the Strunk of his age. Such a man was bound to employ an Attic pure to the point of pedantry. We do not expect in a manual on style the unproved fashions of up-to-date language; H. W. Fowler does not write like P. G. Wodehouse. We expect a syntax, diction, and discipline sanctioned as authoritative by the best usage of the preceding age, and unmarked by the novelties of the rising generation. In this regard the variegated *koiné* of Demetrius must be held to favor a date distinctly later than that maintained by Grube.

Nor should it escape notice that in his assessment of the lexicographical evidence Grube has frequent recourse to the argument of analogy. If a word in Demetrius is of a type or formation analogous to that of a word found in the classical period, there is no reason—Grube maintains—why Demetrius' word could not have been current in the classical period, even though it is not attested until much later. Accordingly, since *philophronoumai* is found in Herodotus, Xenophon, and Plato, Grube considers *philophronêsis* "natural enough"³¹ for 270 B.C., even though it is not found "again" until Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Josephus, and Plutarch. Usage, however, is not determined by analogy, but by an infinite number of usually undiscoverable factors; caprice and not reason is the final arbiter. The words *dread*, *dreadful*, *dreadfully*; *peace*, *peaceful*, *peacefully* are attested in written English by 1300. So are the words *force* and *help*; yet *forcefully* is not attested until 1774, and *helpfully* not until 1832. *Strengthful* and *sleepful* occur before 1400; their adverbs have yet to make their début; and it is not through lack of written English that these words are not found from Chaucer to Hemingway. The lesson taught by these facts is that in order to date a literary work by its vocabulary we must proceed empirically, treating each word—no matter how closely related to or modeled upon another word it may be—as a separate entity. No exception can be taken to Grube's statement³² that Demetrius's *cacophônia* ("ill-sounding-ness") is a perfectly natural formation from Aristotle's *cacophônos*. But the question is: when did this perfectly natural formation acquire an

³¹ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 152.

³² *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 141.

actual as opposed to a potential existence? For we must not assume that *cacophónos* was bound to give birth to a noun. *Strengthful* did not give birth to *strengthfully*, though it had a start of two hundred years on *forceful*. Again, *cacophónos* might just as naturally have produced *calophónos*, but the word is not recorded. Since our source-material is necessarily incomplete, and particularly so for the Hellenistic period, it is not possible to draw a reliable conclusion from a single word. But when we find that not one word, but a second, and then another, and then yet more, lack attestation before Graeco-Roman times, and when we find Grube resorting on each occasion to the argument of analogy to maintain his defence of an early date, then such a defence draws upon it greater and ever greater suspicion, until finally it is no defence but a self-indictment.

Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.2.1404b) had taught that the ideal style (*lexis*) is a lucid mean, capable of embracing simplicity on the one hand and elevation on the other; and if Theophrastus preserved this teaching unchanged in his *Περὶ λέξεως*,³³ his words at any rate seem to have misled Dionysius³⁴ into thinking otherwise, and may have led ultimately to the tripartite classification of styles (Middle, flanked by Plain and Grand) first attested in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, ca. 85 B.C. At first sight the four styles of Demetrius have no relationship to this tripartite classification. The *caractères* are not for Demetrius, as they are for Dionysius, separate personalities, of which a writer may possess only one; they are rather suits of clothes in his wardrobe, each available for wear on the appropriate occasion. Yet a close look shows that, whatever his conception of them, Demetrius' styles are, in origin, of the same nature as the styles of Cicero and Dionysius. Grube³⁵ is rightly suspicious of Solmsen's³⁶ attempt to link them to the four Theophrastean virtues. To record that Demetrius' styles are *elevated, elegant, plain, forcible* and Theophrastus' virtues *correctness, lucidity, propriety, ornamentation* is refutation enough. Of Demetrius' styles the *plain* (*ischnos*) is the same as the *plain* (*litos*) of

³³ See G. L. Hendrickson, *AJP* 25 (1904) 125-46.

³⁴ Dionysius (*De Dem.* § 3) implies that Theophrastus considered Thrasyarchus a representative of the *middle* style. For the sake of clarity I do not discuss in this paper Dionysius' complete system of tripartite classification, which contains three styles of *diction* as well as three styles of *composition*.

³⁵ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 50, note 66.

³⁶ *Hermes* 66 (1931) 241-67.

Dionysius; the *elegant* (*glaphyros*), though not identical with the *middle* (*mesos*) of Dionysius, is closely connected with the *middle* of Philodemus and Cicero;³⁷ the *elevated* (*megaloprepês*) is the same as the *elevated* or *grand* (*hypsêlos*) of Dionysius. When Cicero³⁸ represents the *plain* and the *grand* as two extremes, and Demetrius (§ 36) says that the *plain* and the *elevated* stand in irreconcilable opposition and contrast, we are justified in concluding that Demetrius had after all points of contact with the orthodox Graeco-Roman school, and that Syrianus³⁹ knew what he was talking about. I have already indicated why Demetrius added a fourth style, the *forcible* (*deinos*). I think he objected, as Longinus objected, to the perpetual hosannas which were everywhere raised at the name of Demosthenes. Merely to show that the orator variously employed the three available styles would be to add color to the Dionysian dogma that the greatness of Demosthenes transcended the limitations of other Greek stylists. By associating Demosthenes with a fourth style, indeed by practically demoting him to it, our author fashioned an effective weapon against the teaching of the Dionysians. The perspicacious will notice that increasing the number of styles from three to four necessitates changing the name of the old *middle* style, for the second of four is obviously not *mesos*. It is possible that it was Hipparchus and not Demetrius who was responsible for the innovation. There are, however, obstacles in the way of placing Demetrius either before or after Dionysius. Had Demetrius' four-fold classification been propounded before the time of Dionysius, it is strange that the

³⁷ Of the *middle* style Cicero says (*Or.* 96): "Est enim quoddam etiam insigne et florens orationis genus pictum et expolitum in quo omnes verborum, omnes sententiarum illigantur lepores." This is identical with Demetrius' *glaphyros*. Similarly Quintilian (*IO* 12.10.58): "Tertium alii medium ex duobus, alii floridum (namque id *anthêron* appellant) addiderunt." The relevant sentence in Philodemus (*Rhet.* 1.165, iv 2-5, ed. Sudhaus) is unfortunately mutilated, but is restored by Radermacher as follows: πλάσμα δὲ τὸ ἀδρογραφίαν ἔχον ἢ ἰσχνότητα ἢ μ[εσότητα ἢ] γλαφυρότητα, rightly interpreted by Hubbell (*Trans. Connecticut Acad.* 23 [1920] 297-98) as "*plasma* refers to the distinction between grand and plain and middle or smooth style," since one cannot have a *middle* style of four styles. The supplement involves taking ἢ in two different senses. More probably Philodemus wrote something like μ[έσην τινα]. Radermacher justifies the restoration by quoting Proclus *ap. Phot. Bibl.* 239 (ed. Bekker [Berlin 1824] 318b, 26 f.): οὗ τοῦ πλάσματος τὸ μὲν ἐστὶν ἰσχνόν, τὸ δὲ ἀδρόν, τὸ δὲ μέσον. Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 35 [1900] 30, note 4) is not to be followed in imputing to Philodemus a fourfold classification.

³⁸ *Brutus* 201, with Hendrickson's note in the Loeb edition (1939) 172 f.; *Orator* 20.196-97.

³⁹ See above, note 25.

latter should nowhere have thought fit to criticize it. *On Style* cannot be ante-Dionysian. But it cannot be later either. § 179, wherein Demetrius states that no earlier critic had treated of "elegant word-order," strongly suggests that *On Style* was written before Dionysius' *De compositione verborum*. It seems best to regard the two men as contemporaries. In any case unprofitable wrangling over the stylistic classification of authors soon discredited this section of rhetorical teaching; in Dionysius' own lifetime Longinus abandoned it, and in the succeeding age we look in vain for further disputation. Henceforth Greek and Roman literary theorists turn to the practical field of oratory. Technical considerations prescribe for Demetrius's *On Style* a late Augustan date.

It is important to bear in mind that Demetrius "must have had strong Peripatetic connections," and that his attitude towards Aristotle "might be described as respect falling short of veneration." But when Grube, whose words these are,⁴⁰ suggests that the relationship between Demetrius and Aristotle is that of two critics not far removed in time,⁴¹ some remonstrance is called for. The relationship is, on the contrary, similar to that which might exist between a modern Roman Catholic theologian and Thomas Aquinas. On fundamental matters a chronological proximity might appear to be indicated, but differences of emphasis in the application of doctrine and a greater precision in technical minutiae, not to mention general linguistic discrepancies, would reveal the lapse of the centuries between them. So it is with Aristotle and Demetrius. Demetrius uses ἀπλοϊκός (Philo: ἀπλοϊκῶς, Dionysius of Halicarnassus) where Aristotle had written ἀφελής; and ἀλληγορία (Philodemus, Cicero, Longinus) where Aristotle had written τὸ μὴ ὁ φησι λέγειν. Demetrius' καταληκτικός, a term which we search for in vain in Aristotle, is unparalleled before Philodemus and the κατάληξις of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Longinus; his λεληθότως, also wanting in Aristotle, is unparalleled before the appearance of this word in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Cicero.⁴² Demetrius seemingly disputes an appraisal of Demosthenes not formulated till the time of Cicero and Dionysius, and this in a chapter which "has practically

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 56 and 37.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 38, line 7.

⁴² Grube, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 34 and 64, note on §15.

nothing that recalls Aristotle.”⁴³ “That our author’s relation to Aristotle is unique in extant critical texts”⁴⁴ is but another way of saying that the text of Demetrius the Stylist is the only literary treatise we possess written by a confirmed Peripatetic.

Now, if we search the Augustan age for a literary professor who had strong Peripatetic connections, who thoroughly knew his Aristotle, and who opposed the Dionysian idolatry of Demosthenes and taught that attention to Aristotelian precepts was more important than Demosthenic *mimêsis*, we shall sooner or later alight on a letter of Dionysius in which such a literary professor is mentioned, though unfortunately not named. He answers so closely to the description of the missing man as to warrant the conjecture that he is Demetrius himself, the author of *On Style*. I quote the passage in full in Roberts’s translation.⁴⁵

You said that a certain Peripatetic philosopher, in his desire to do all homage to Aristotle the founder of his school, undertook to demonstrate that it was from him that Demosthenes learnt the rules of rhetoric which he applied in his own speeches, and that it was through conformity to the Aristotelian precepts that he became the foremost of all orators. Now my first impression was that this bold disputant was a person of no consequence, and I advised you not to pay heed to every chance paradox. But when on hearing his name I found him to be a man whom I respect on account of his high personal qualities and his literary merits, I did not know what to think.

Notice that the words “on account of his high personal qualities (τῶν ἡθῶν ἕνεκα)” permit the possibility of personal acquaintance, and this is placed beyond doubt by the concluding words of the paragraph: “I wished therefore . . . to induce the person who has adopted this view, and is prepared to put it in writing, to change it before giving his treatise to the world.” So the Peripatetic teacher of rhetoric is accessible to Dionysius’ demurs, and has actually announced a forthcoming treatise!

At last I see land. But perhaps there are some who are unconvinced that we are making for shore? They dispute the identification and will not assent until they find Demetrius’ actual name in Dionysius’ text. Let them turn to Dion. Hal., *Ep. ad Pompeium*

⁴³ Grube, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 33.

⁴⁴ Grube, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 37.

⁴⁵ Dion. Hal., *Ep. ad Ammaeum* 1.1, Roberts (above, note 9) 52 f.

3, Roberts 104, lines 8–11: “You wished also to learn my view with regard to Herodotus and Xenophon, and you wished me to write about them. This I have done in the essays I have addressed to Demetrius⁴⁶ on the subject of imitation.” This Demetrius was a teacher of Greek literary criticism like Dionysius himself. That much is guaranteed by the context. Dionysius addressed his works either to Roman patrons (doubtless students and friends as well) like Quintus Aelius Tubero and Melitius Rufus or to professional associates like Gnaeus Pompeius Geminus, the author of *The Sublime*. With a name like Demetrius, the addressee of a treatise must have belonged to the second category. Observe that elsewhere⁴⁷ in this letter to Pompeius (or Longinus, as the world will continue to call him) Dionysius names Demetrius of Phalerum in full as Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς, whilst the professional associate is referred to quite simply as Demetrius. It follows that Longinus knew Demetrius, at least by name, and they may have enjoyed closer acquaintanceship.

Grube further urges as supporting his position: “There is no trace [in the tractate *On Style*] of the rhetorical *mimēsis* or emulation so important to Cicero, Dionysius, and Quintilian.”⁴⁸ This I should explain by asserting that Demetrius is a staunch Peripatetic whose relationship with Cicero, Dionysius, and what I may call the orthodox Roman school may be likened to that of a Roman Catholic theologian with Protestant ones. There is no reason why contemporary literary critics at Rome should have differed any less than Christian thinkers do. And no less than these did the former find themselves at variance with each other. Longinus, we saw, had ventured to disagree with Dionysius on the matter of Plato’s style; and an elaborate reply duly reached him. What more likely than that a similar disagreement drew forth the *πρὸς Δημήτριον περὶ μιμήσεως*? It would hardly be surprising if Dionysius found fault with the absence of *mimēsis* from Demetrius’ teaching, and labored to persuade his fellow-professor to include it in his syllabus. Nor, *scio quod dico*, if he herein labored in vain.

Further external evidence about the author of *On Style* does not seem to exist. Many Demetriuses find place in the vast mass of

⁴⁶ This Demetrius as the author of *On Style* was tentatively considered by W. Rhys Roberts, *CR* 14 (1900) 440b.

⁴⁷ Dion. Hal., *Ep. ad Pompeium* 2, Roberts (above, note 9) 98, line 23.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 51.

material which antiquity has bequeathed to us. One would like to know more of that Demetrius unflatteringly immortalized in the tenth satire of Horace's first book; and of the Peripatetic Demetrius (Plut. *Cat. Min.* 65, 67 ff.) who attended the Younger Cato in the extremity of his fortunes. Some, discerning in our Demetrius an "apparent familiarity with Egypt,"⁴⁹ have suspected that Alexandria rather than Rome was the place of composition; and others besides Muretus have deemed this suspicion confirmed by Diogenes Laertius, who, in his list of twenty celebrated Demetriuses, records (5.5.11) that "the eighth is the professor who resided at Alexandria, the author of rhetorical treatises." This cannot, however, be our man: whether or not Diogenes took over his biographical material from Demetrius of Magnesia (*fl.* 50 B.C.), his list seems to adhere to a general chronological sequence, and this necessitates placing Diogenes' Demetrius who lived at Alexandria and compiled rhetorical treatises in the second century B.C.

It is not possible to determine with precision the date at which our Demetrius issued his tractate. We are restricted to a rough estimate based on the activity of Dionysius, the only dates of whose life known to us are 30 B.C., when he came to Rome, and 8 B.C., when he wrote the preface to his *Antiquitates Romanae*. We have no notion how old he was on either occasion, nor when the literary treatises were written. As Longinus had corresponded with Dionysius, and *The Sublime* has been fixed at A.D. 12, the probability is that some at least of Dionysius' critical work was written later than 8 B.C. I therefore suggest that, since the contents of Demetrius' tractate are not discussed anywhere in Dionysius, but a work by Demetrius is heralded in the *First Letter to Ammaeus*, the year A.D. 1 as the approximate date of *On Style* cannot be far out.

III. GREEK PROFESSORS IN ROME

Possibly, if our information were not so scanty, we might find that men like Caecilius and the other friends of Dionysius, like Theodorus of Gadara, like the author of the *Περὶ ὕψους*, like the author of the

⁴⁹ Grube, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 52. In identifying Demetrius as a member of a Roman professorial circle, I am not to be held as rejecting the possibility that his origin and even his literary training may have been Alexandrian.

Περὶ ἑρμηνείας, and even like Manilius . . ., had this in common that they belonged to the age of Augustus . . ., and further resembled each other (in some instances) in being freedmen or sons of freedmen attached to the great Roman houses such as that of Pompey, and in having an Eastern or Jewish origin.⁵⁰

It is a pity that Rhys Roberts, to whom every student of Greek literary theory is deeply indebted, should in his search for the authors of our two tractates have later indulged in improbable hypotheses when he might without absurdity have amplified his statement above. This amplification I have now endeavored to supply, claiming that it merits priority over all other theories, for even the protestation that the author of *The Sublime* is unknown is essentially a conjecture—no less audacious than mine—that the name of the author occurs nowhere in ancient records.

The association of Dionysius, Longinus, and Demetrius enables us to appraise more accurately the aims and methods of higher education and more particularly the position of the Greek language in early imperial Rome. Their circle was not a literary, but a professorial one; they had no connection with and showed no awareness of Roman poets and Roman literature. Manilius is Romaic rather than Roman. The sole reference to Cicero (*De subl.* 12.4–5) makes of the greatest wielder of the Latin language only an illustrative footnote. The Dionysians were not mere *grammatici*. Their courses were not “Greek without tears” or even Greek courses at all; their works presume in those they taught—and these must have been Romans—a complete mastery of Greek and a wide acquaintance with the Greek classics. They were Professors of Literature, which meant Greek literature, since they had not the faintest idea that Latin—and not Greek—was to become the common tongue of Western Europe and was already pregnant with the speech of modern civilization; they were Professors of Classics, like ourselves, with their attention focused on the genius of an age long since passed; and their writings contain no direct reference to the times in which they lived. To judge from their apparent ease of movement and communication, they enjoyed the privileged life of university men, for Dionysius could send junior colleagues with offprints of his work, as it were, to Longinus and Demetrius, whilst Longinus

⁵⁰ W. Rhys Roberts, *CR* 14 (1900) 440 f.

had heard Theodorus of Gadara in Rhodes⁵¹ and had secured a copy of Caecilius' dissertation as soon as it came on the market.

Their methods of teaching literary style suffer from the misconception, exposed as such by the very language they wrote, but still prevalent two thousand years later,⁵² that classical Attic was the absolute standard for Greek; imitation of Demosthenes was in the age of Augustus a counsel, not of perfection, but of impossibility. Our Greek professors recognized of course that certain virtues of style are independent of a particular language, but this makes all the more significant their failure to consider Latin. It is very probable that Greek was much more widespread in ancient Italy than we commonly suppose; and that many in Augustan Rome, including our Greek professors, entertained hopes that Greece would take her captor captive in the matter of language.

True bilingualism in a nation (as opposed to bilingualism in marginal areas like Alsace-Lorraine) is a very rare phenomenon; man is by nature unilingual. In bilingual environments the struggle of one language against another, even within the personality of a single individual, rages unceasingly; equality may be attainable under favorable circumstances, but equilibrium never. The greater the communicative power of a language is felt to be, the less able are its speakers to feel and exploit the power of another (or, if you like, the less ready they are to learn another). Few speakers of English do not feel its communicative power to be absolute; hence the vast majority of English-speakers are unilingual; of the total number of bilingual persons to be found, for example, in Canada or South Africa or Wales, the vast majority speak as their mother tongue French or Afrikaans or Welsh. In the Augustan age Greek and not Latin probably enjoyed the greater communicative power.⁵³ It was the Romans who were eager to learn Greek from their slaves, not the slaves Latin from the Romans. Outside Italy Greek was still entrenched at Massilia and Syracuse, whilst beyond the Adriatic—with the curious exception of Dacia—Latin hardly secured any foothold, not even later

⁵¹ *De Subl.* 3.5. If Longinus did not hear Theodorus (the natural interpretation in view of the chronology involved), he must have studied Theodorus' works during the latter's lifetime. I am thus not troubled by Grube's doubts, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 41, note 46.

⁵² See above, note 18.

⁵³ Bilingualism in ancient Rome is discussed in his *Stranger at the Gate*² (Oxford 1948) 309–26 by T. J. Haarhoff.

when, surrounded by grandees of church and state, Roman emperors held court in the cities of the Eastern Empire. In Italy and in Rome itself, the Greek-speaking population, though servile, fell not far short of the Roman; most books—and most of the classics—were Greek, and yet we never hear of “Loebs” or literal translations; Strabo was writing his *Geography* in Greek, and Diodorus Siculus his *Historical Library*; commerce with abroad was conducted, medicine practised, and the sciences investigated in Greek. Small wonder that Romans generally exhibit an extraordinarily fluent knowledge of Greek; it was no school-Greek, to be compared with the school-French of English-speakers, in which eminent Romans from Gracchan to imperial times addressed Greek audiences, wrote letters—tragedies, even—or in their leisure moments conversed at dinner-parties.⁵⁴

Such is the conception of Greek entertained by Dionysius, Longinus, Demetrius, and, we may be sure, many an ancient professor besides. Greek was for them the chief language of the empire and the world, and they probably hoped that it would one day reign supreme in Rome itself. That their hopes were blighted by the march of history does not necessarily mean that their conception of Greek was unnatural or unjustified at the time. The practical fruit of their labors matured a century later in the widespread and lasting return of literary aspirants to an artificial Attic. Their real achievement, however, securely based on a tasteful appreciation and genuine love of all that was good and beautiful and effective in speech and writing, was their preservation of the living voice of Hellas. And Time’s stern, searching judgment, from which there is neither dissent nor appeal, has upheld their teaching of the classics by preserving their voice, too.

⁵⁴ It was surely in Greek that Pontius Pilate (though “eminent” is hardly *le mot juste* for him) cross-examined Jesus Christ; none of the gospels makes mention of interpreters at the trial.