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The title of these notes needs perhaps some defence. More than half a century ago Prickard wrote: “The difficulty long felt as to the combination of the Greek and Roman names Dionysius-Longinus may not be insuperable; but, when the names are those of the best-known critics of Antiquity, it is much to ask to believe that they were ever borne in real life by one man” 1). The warning remains salutary; still, Boyd has made so strong a case 2) that I think Longinus’ name may be freed from its usual prefix or inverted commas.

Π 2 πλήν ἵσως τούτων μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα οὐχ ὤτως αἰτιάσκει τῶν ἐκλεισμένων ὡς χύτης τῆς ἐπινοεῖς καὶ σπουδῆς ἔξευ ἐπικενέειν. For πλήν Lebègue has “aussi bien”, Rostagni “o”. Neither of these translations has enough of the restrictive-adversative force which is to be found in Longinus’ usage of πλήν (IV 1, IX 7, XI 2, XXXVI 4; this last is lacking in Rhys Roberts’ Index Graecitatis). The words πλήν . . . . ἐπικενέειν are a mitigating appendix, added to the criticism of Caecilius in I 1, and leading up to the sentence ἐπεὶ δ’ ἡμᾶς ἑνεκελεύοσον κ.τ.λ. which contains the contrast to the opening sentence τὸ μὲν τοῦ Κεκιλίου συγγραμματίου κ.τ.λ.

Π 2 ἡ φύσις, ὃσπερ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς καὶ διηρμένοις αὐτόνομοι, οὕτως οὐκ εἰκάσθην τι κάκις παντὸς ἀμέδιον εἶναι φιλεῖ. This striking Latinism (ut . . . . ita with adversative-restrictive meaning; XLIII 3 is a different case) should be added to the list in Rhys Roberts’ edition (p. 188).

Π 3 εἰ ταῦθ’, ὡς ἐφιν, ἐπιλογίσατο ὁ τοῖς χρηστομαθοῦσιν ἐπιτιμῶν, οὐχ ἔν ἐπὶ, μοι δοξᾶ, περίττην καὶ ἠφηστον τῇ ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων νομίσατο θεωρίαν (from the fragmentum Tollianum!). The Greek does not support Lebègue’s rendering “la théorie exposée à ce sujet”; still less Rostagni’s “teoria soll’ argomento

1) Longinus on the Sublime (Oxford 1906), p. IX.
proposto". Perhaps τῶν προσεχεῖμένων could have the meaning Lébégue and Rostagni find here. But, up to the point reached, Longinus has not yet, properly speaking, proposed a theory. He has uttered the opinion that there exists a δύσως τέχνη, that theorizing about the subject is possible and useful. If he had proposed a theory in the proper sense of the word, the words περιττὴν καὶ ἄρχηστον would not be the most appropriate for a criticism of his view. He is, however, viewing the general contention that theorizing about this subject-matter is extravagant or useless. So the usual translation, "inquiry upon the subjects before us" (Prickard’s, e.g.), will do.

III 4 κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι καὶ ἑτὶ σωμάτων καὶ λόγων οἱ χάριν καὶ ἀναλήψεις. Wilamowitz proposed καὶ ἑτὶ σωμάτων καὶ ἑτὶ λόγων. Photiades was the only one, as far as I know, who has followed him; the majority of the editors have rightly rejected this emendation. Cp. Clem. Al. Protr. I 2 ώς ἑτὶ κλάδῳ τῷ ὄργανῳ (where Reitzenstein’s ἑτὶ τῷ ὄργανῳ has not been adopted by Stählin, Butterworth and Mondésert-Plassart), Plato, Rep. 520E ώς ἑτ’ ἀναγκαίον αὐτῶν ἐκαστὸς εἰς τὸ ἄρχειν, and Kühner-Gerth, Gr. Gramm. II 1, p. 551.

V ἀπεντά μέντοι τὰ οὕτως ἄσεμα διὰ μίαν ἐμφύεται τοῖς λόγοις αἰτίαν, διὰ τῷ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόσπουδον, περὶ δὲ μάλιστα κορυφαστὶ ἦσσον οἱ νῦν- ἄρ’ ὃν γὰρ ἦμιν τάγαθα, σχεδὸν ἂπ’ αὐτῶν τούτων καὶ τὰ κακὰ γενναθαι φλει. θεῖν ἐπίφορον εἷς συνταξιμάτων κατόρθωσον τὰ τῇ κάλλι τῆς ἐρμηνείας καὶ τὰ δῆν καὶ πρὸς τούτως αὐτὸν καὶ αὐτὰ ταύτα, καθάπερ τῆς ἐπιτυχίας, οὕτως ἄρχαί καὶ ὑπόθεσεα καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων καθίσταται. Immisch thought that the μιὰ αἰτία is not τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόσπουδον, but that the αἰτία is indicated in the sentence ἄρ’ ὃν γὰρ κ.τ.λ., "die Doppelseitigkeit des Guten, die Unvermeidlichkeit der ανακεφαλαίων κακεία τοῖς ύψηλοις, wie es weiterhin heisst . . . . , das ist die μιὰ αἰτία aller ἄσεμα . . . . Die Worte zeigen nicht an, was die μιὰ αἰτία ist, sondern warum alle ἄσεμα aus einer μιὰ αἰτία ableitbar sind" 1).

Hoogland calls this far-fetched 2); he is sure that διὰ . . . .

2) J. Ph. Hoogland, Longinus over het Verhevene, vertaling met inleiding