

LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

DIONYSIUS OF  
HALICARNASSUS

CRITICAL ESSAYS  
II



*Translated by*  
STEPHEN USHER

*Complete list of Loeb titles can be  
found at the end of each volume*

---

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS migrated to Rome in 30 B.C., where he lived until his death some time after 8 B.C., writing his *Roman Antiquities* in twenty books and teaching the art of rhetoric and literary composition to a small group of upper-class Romans. His purpose, both in his own work and in his teaching, was to re-establish the classical Attic standards of purity, invention and taste in order to reassert the primacy of Greek as the literary language of the Mediterranean world. The essays in the present volume display the full range of Dionysius' critical expertise. In the treatise *On Literary Composition*, his finest and most original work, discussion of the effects produced by the arrangement of words involves minute analysis of phonetics and metre in addition to more general aspects of literary aesthetics such as the difference between poetry and prose, and a tripartite classification of the types of arrangement. The other four essays are on a less ambitious scale. The *Dinarchus* is primarily a study of authenticity in which Dionysius attempts to identify the genuine speeches of the latest Attic orator from the list of those ascribed to him by the librarians. The three literary letters are all concerned with possible models. In the *Letter to Pompeius*, Dionysius gives his reasons for criticizing Plato on stylistic, and also moral grounds, and appends critiques of Herodotus, whom he

*Continued on back flap*

# THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

FOUNDED BY JAMES LOEB, LL.D.

EDITED BY

G. P. GOOLD, PH.D.

FORMER EDITORS

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.      † E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

† W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.      † L. A. POST, L.H.D.

E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

THE CRITICAL ESSAYS

II

DIONYSIUS  
OF  
HALICARNASSUS

THE CRITICAL ESSAYS  
IN TWO VOLUMES

II

WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION BY  
STEPHEN USHER, M.A., Ph.D.

*Senior Lecturer in Classics,  
Royal Holloway College,  
University of London*



CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON  
WILLIAM HEINEMANN LTD

MCMLXXXV



© *The President and Fellows of Harvard College 1985*

**American ISBN 0-674-99513-9**

**British ISBN 0 434 99466 9**

*Printed in Great Britain*

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO VOL. II: THE TEXT . . . . .	vii
ON LITERARY COMPOSITION—INTRODUCTION . . . . .	3
ON LITERARY COMPOSITION . . . . .	14
DINARCHUS—INTRODUCTION . . . . .	246
DINARCHUS . . . . .	250
FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS—INTRODUCTION . . . . .	303
FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS . . . . .	306
LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS—INTRODUCTION . . . . .	349
LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS . . . . .	352
SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS—INTRODUCTION . . . . .	402
SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS . . . . .	404
INDEX . . . . .	437

## INTRODUCTION <sup>1</sup>

### THE TEXT

To the list <sup>2</sup> of early editors of Dionysius given in Volume I should be added J. Upton (1702) (whose text is based on that of Sylburg [1586]), G. H. Schaeffer (1808) and F. Goeller (1815). Hermann Usener's Teubner text (the second volume—published posthumously 1904, revised 1929, reprinted 1965—devoted to Dionysius' critical essays) has been justly admired. It was largely adopted by W. Rhys Roberts in the famous edition (1910) with translation and commentary, copious introductory notes and glossary, which is the last and finest of his four editions of the Greek critics, following those of Longinus (1899 and 1907), Dionysius, *The Three Literary Letters* (1901) and Demetrius (1902).

#### *On Literary Composition*

The text of the essay *On Literary Composition* is preserved in the following manuscripts:

F	Florentinus Laurentianus LIX 15	(12th Century)
P	Parisiensis 1741	(10th or 11th Century)
M	Venetus Marcianus 508	(15th Century)

<sup>1</sup> See also Introduction to Vol. I (pp. vii–xxxiii).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I, p. xxviii.

## INTRODUCTION

- V Parisiensis (Vergetii) 1798 (16th Century)  
E Epitome  
R Rhetor Graecus (*Ad Hermogenis περὶ ἰδεῶν*)  
a Editio Alda Manutia (editio princeps, 1502–8)  
s Editio Roberti Stephani (Paris 1547)

The work of more than one hand, P is the oldest and most authoritative manuscript of Dionysius' critical essays, but unfortunately contains only the essay *On Literary Composition*, the so-called *Art of Rhetoric* and the *Second Letter to Ammaeus* among a collection of rhetorical works covering over five centuries and including Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Demetrius' treatise *On Style*, as well as several minor handbooks of the Second Sophistic period. Many subsequent manuscripts were copied from it (see Usener-Radermacher Vol. I, pp. vi–vii), but it is itself so well-preserved that they are rarely needed to supplement it. The fact that M contains the same works as P may suggest that it, too, is derived from P; and in practice it proves inadvisable to prefer M when it differs from P and is unsupported by F or V. Vergetius, the Cretan calligrapher who copied V, appears to have relied mainly on the tradition preserved in P, and his manuscript was the one on which the edition of Robert Stephen (Paris 1547) was based.

Ranking second after P in both antiquity and authority, F contains in abundance the two extremes of paleographical aberration: many solecisms and absurd readings, but also some variants which could not have arisen from misreading, but appear to be intelligent emendations by a scribe who understood what he was copying. F appears to be the main source of the text of the Epitome, but the



## THE TEXT

P-tradition was probably used to correct obvious faults. It is an early compilation, and deserves careful attention. The text of Ch. 14 quoted by the scholiast to Hermogenes *περὶ ἰδεῶν* I. 6 also appears to be derived from the F-tradition. It seems quite likely that we are unfortunate in the particular codex in which this tradition has been preserved, and that the manuscript from which F is derived was of equal authority to P. Neither M nor V is uniformly dependent upon P, so that the two traditions appear to have survived side by side. Examples of superior readings in F supported by M and V are, however, rare.

It has therefore seemed better to follow the practice of Roberts and of editors before Usener in giving somewhat greater weight to the P- than to the F-tradition, especially when the former is supported by M and V, since these may provide valuable links with other sources of equal status that are now lost.

### *Dinarchus*

F is the sole manuscript in which this treatise has survived, and the text breaks off before the end. In addition to giving many impossible forms, wrong spelling and accentuation, and confusion of proper with common names, it contains a number of lacunae which cannot with any degree of confidence be restored. The imagination of editors has been exercised, often to good effect (e.g. *φυγῆς τῶν καταλυσάντων* Sylburg: *αὐτῆς τῶν καλεσάντων* F), with the result that the text of this treatise contains a higher proportion of their emendations than that of any other in the corpus.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the most recent recension see G. Marengi: *Dionysio De Dinarcho* (1970).

## INTRODUCTION

*First Letter to Ammaeus*  
and  
*Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*

These letters are derived from a different group of manuscripts:

M	Ambrosianus D119	(15th Century)
O	Ottobonianus gr. 365	(16th Century)
Pal.	Palatinus gr. LVIII	(15th Century)
B	Parisiensis 1742	(15th–16th Century)

None of these has the authority of the earlier manuscripts. M, though written in a clear hand, contains a number of lacunae and spelling errors. O is derived from it, and provides few independent readings that are probably not errors of copying. Pal. is well-preserved, but contains many careless mistakes, some of which suggest that it was taken down from unclear dictation (e.g. *ῥητορίας* Pal.: *ῥητορείας ceteri*). B contains the same treatises in the same order as M except for the absence of the *Thucydides*, and is divided into two distinct parts, the second being in a markedly inferior hand to the first. The first part contains the *Letter to Pompeius*, the second the *First Letter to Ammaeus*. In neither letter, however, does its independent testimony carry any weight.

Three further manuscripts were collated by Usener and Radermacher for the text of the *Letter to Pompeius*:

E	Estensis Mutinensis gr. 68	(15th–16th Century)
V	Venetus Marcianus append. cl. X cod. 34	(15th Century)
P	Palatinus 58 nunc Vaticanus	(15th Century)

## THE TEXT

The order of the essays in all three manuscripts is the same, except that in E and V the *Thucydides* is last, and in P it is first. Moreover, there is close correspondence among the three manuscripts, but their consensus does not always inspire confidence, and editors and commentators have found much to emend in both letters. Full use has also had to be made of the main texts of Aristotle, Demosthenes, Herodotus and other authors quoted.

### *Second Letter to Ammaeus*

Parisiensis 1741 contains this letter, so that its text is more firmly established than those of the other two letters. The other three manuscripts are derived from it:

G Guelferbytanus XIV	(16th Century)
C Laurentianus LX 18	(15th Century)
D Parisiensis suppl. 256	(14th Century)

These provide a number of corrections to the older manuscript, some of which look like scribes' emendations.

## SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Editions:*

- G. Aujac: *Denys d'Halicarnasse. Opuscles rhétoriques I-III* (Ass. G. Budé). Paris, 1978-81.
- G. Marengi: *Dionysio De Dinarcho* (Class. greci e latini, testi e commenti). Florence, 1970.

### *Other works:*

- W. S. Allen: *Accent and Rhythm*. Cambridge, 1973.
- W. S. Allen: *Vox Graeca* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, 1975.
- G. Aujac: "Recherches sur la tradition du *Περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων* de Denys d'Halicarnasse", *Rev. d'Hist. des Textes* 4 (1975) 1-44.
- G. Aujac: "Michel Psellos et Denys d'Halicarnasse, le traité sur la composition des éléments du langage", *Rev. des Ét. Byzantines* 33 (1975) 257-75.
- K. Barwick: *Probleme der stoische Sprachlehre und Rhetorik*. Berlin, 1937.
- E. Baudat: *Étude sur Denys d'Halicarnasse et le traité de la disposition des mots*. Paris, 1879.
- J. Carson: "Greek Accent and the Rational", *J.H.S.* 89 (1969) 24-38.
- P. Costil: *L'esthétique littéraire de Denys d'Halicarnasse*. Paris, 1949.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- U. Galli: "L'opera retorica di Dionigi da Alicarnasso", *Studi ital. di filologia class.* 19 (1912) 237-73.
- Th. Gelzer: "Klassizismus, Attizismus und Asianismus", Fondation Hardt, *Entretiens* 25 (Geneva, 1979) 1-55.
- A. Hurst: "Un critique grec dans la Rome d'Auguste", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 30 (1982) 839-65.
- G. Kennedy: *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.-A.D. 300*. Princeton, 1972.
- M. Lebel: "Évolution de la doctrine de Denys d'Halicarnasse du De Lysia aux De Compositione Verborum et De Demosthene II", *Cahiers des Ét. Anc.* 2 (1973) 79-188.
- J. F. Lockwood: "'Hθικῆ λέξις and Dinarchus", *C.Q.* 23 (1929) 180-5.
- K. Pohl: *Die Lehre von den drei Wortfügungsarten*. Diss. Tübingen, 1968.
- W. K. Pritchett: *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Thucydides*. Berkeley, 1975.
- L. E. Rossi: *Metrica e critica stilistica. Il termine 'ciclico' e l'ἀγωγή. Studi di metrica classica II*. Rome, ed. del Ateneo, 1963.
- D. A. Russell: *Criticism in Antiquity*. London, 1981.
- K. S. Sacks: "Historiography in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus", *Athenaeum* 61 (1983) 67-87.
- D. M. Schenkeveld: "Theories of Evaluation in the Rhetorical Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus", *Mus. Philol. Londiniense* 1 (1975) 93-107.
- D. M. Schenkeveld: "Linguistic Theories in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus", *Glotta* 61 (1983) 67-94.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- G. Shoemaker: "Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Dinarchus", *Gr., Rom. and Byz. St.* 12 (1971) 393-409.
- M. Untersteiner: "Dionisio d'Alicarnasso, fondatore della critica pseudepigrafica", *Anales di filol. clas.* 7 (1959) 72-93.
- W. Warren: "The Structure of Dionysii Halicarnasensis Epistula II Ad Ammaeum", *A.J.P.* 20 (1899) 316-9.

**ON**  
**LITERARY COMPOSITION**





## INTRODUCTION

By a happy chance, the three most important extant post-Aristotelian treatises on literary technique and criticism are more or less complementary to one another. In the greatest of them, the treatise *On the Sublime*, an unidentifiable critic<sup>1</sup> of rare perception describes the characteristics of inspired writing. But even in the greatest writers passages of inspired sublimity, by which the reader is taken out of himself and transported to a higher plane of emotional experience, are rare; and the process of their creation defies minute analysis. Although the critic describes various features which may be present in a sublime passage, the reader is left with the overwhelming impression that such writing is possible only for someone of high intelligence writing with genuine conviction on a subject of vital interest to his sensitive reader. Thus the emphasis is upon observation and appreciation rather than imitation, and there is no suggestion that contemporary writers might hope to emulate those of the classical past in any real sense. There are admittedly several injunctions to would-be orators,<sup>2</sup> but the treatise must have seemed discouraging to all but

<sup>1</sup> See the discussion in Russell's edition (Oxford 1964), pp. xxii-xxx.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. 11. 1; 14. 2.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the gifted, or the most pretentious of these. To the student of literature without creative ambitions, however, it is a unique gallery-cum-guide of the high-points of classical verse and prose.

At the other end of the critical spectrum is the treatise *On Style* (Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας) by Demetrius.<sup>1</sup> It is firmly embedded in the sophistic tradition of the early practical handbooks of rhetoric, and discusses individually the devices of the four "characters" of style, "grand", "polished", "plain" and "forceful". To Demetrius "grandeur" (τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές), like the other "characters", may be achieved by a clearly describable set of devices available to any writer of average ability. The idea of the working of a superior genius behind great literature is not paramount: examples from the great classical writers are used not to show the unattainability of their standards but to illustrate rules and principles, which are spelled out in practical and physical terms—specific rhythms, periods of defined length, figures of speech, metaphors, and other devices which, if accorded proper study and application, can be imitated with complete success.

Dionysius' treatise *On Literary Composition* lies somewhere between these two extremes in spirit and purpose. Whereas Demetrius might have been expected to regard his treatise on its own as providing the student with adequate equipment for a literary career, Dionysius urged his pupils to devote most of their time to the study of the best authors, observing their strong points and imitating them in their own compositions. On the other hand, as a

<sup>1</sup> On author and date, see Grube, *A Greek Critic, Demetrius On Style* (Toronto 1961), pp. 39–56 and the two appendices.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

practical teacher whose pupils aspired to fame as historians and orators, Dionysius dealt in terms of the attainable as well as the purely aesthetic and theoretical. Hence he not only furnishes us with many long passages, but analyses them in minute detail, demonstrating in practice how the effect in question has been obtained, while at the same time allowing us to enjoy observing the sustained mastery of style that distinguishes a great author. Instead of sublimity, Dionysius searches for propriety, the right kind of style for the subject.<sup>1</sup> The author of the treatise *On the Sublime* succeeds in showing the many forms which his subject takes, but it must by its very nature be limited to climactic moments. Dionysius is interested in these moments from an aesthetic point of view, but they form only a part of his scheme, and it is gratifying that an author so perfectly suited to the task has written so brilliantly on a subject which is central to the study of style but which Dionysius was unable to treat more fully.

The breadth, taste, erudition, technical mastery and enthusiasm which Dionysius displays in this, his finest work, should not be allowed to obscure the limits initially laid down by the title. The word *σύνθεσις* means literally "putting-together", and may hence be rendered in English by "composition" only if a purely technical sense of that word is understood. Dionysius says explicitly that "choice of words" is another subject which he will discuss in a separate treatise.<sup>2</sup> To justify this order of priorities, he quotes a passage from Homer and a passage from Herodotus,<sup>3</sup> both of which he observes to be written in

<sup>1</sup> *De Compositione Verborum* 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* 3.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the simplest language, and yet to possess great charm, which the two authors have achieved through graceful composition. Still on the level of general criticism without minute analysis, he changes the order of words in some lines of Homer and other poets and notes how inferior the new lines are to the original ones.<sup>1</sup> Then, as a final general observation before examining the subject in detail, he emphasises that Greek is governed by no fixed rules of word order based upon the parts of speech, so that the judgment and taste of the author must be the more assiduously cultivated and refined.<sup>2</sup> His task is a formidable one, and Dionysius' pedagogical skill is worth observing. He introduces his readers to the subject with a number of examples, not analysing them in detail and yet establishing confidence in the mastery of the classical authors who are to be his models throughout the treatise.

The main analysis of the art of composition begins in Chapter 6. The three aims of composition are defined as follows: (1) to observe which combinations are naturally likely to produce a beautiful and attractive united effect; (2) to judge how each of the parts which are to be fitted together should be shaped so as to improve the harmonious appearance of the whole; (3) to judge whether any modification is required in the material used, i.e. any subtraction, addition or alteration. Initial choice of words is excluded: the illustrations with which the chapter concludes all contain either changes of order or alterations of inflection—different cases, genders, numbers, persons, tenses or voice. This exclusion of the choice of words is one of the main weaknesses of

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* 5.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the treatise, since it is an integral part of the process of composition. Somewhat disappointing too is the discussion in Ch. 7 of the "fitting-together" (ἀρμογή) of clauses or cola and in Ch. 8 of their "formation" or "shaping" (σχηματισμός). Either or both of these chapters might have been expected to contain some discussion of antithesis and periodic structure, but in neither are these considered. Little is added to this superficial discussion in Ch. 9, where examples are given of amplication and abbreviation for stylistic effect.

Having examined the nature and effect of composition in a form unhappily restricted by self-imposed terms of reference, Dionysius turns to the more rewarding study of the mechanics of composition, after first defining its aims. These are (Ch. 10) attractiveness (ἡδονή) and beauty (τὸ καλόν). These two aims correspond with the two extreme kinds of arrangement described in Ch. 22, the austere arrangement, which is said to have beauty arising from its patina of antiquity, and in Ch. 23, the polished arrangement, an example of which is described as having "charm" (χάρις), which is related to ἡδονή in Ch. 11. The contrasting sets of qualities based on these two aims form the polar extremes of the subsequent discussion after the contrast has been described in detail, and in reverse order, in Chs. 12 and 13. But Ch. 11 also contains passing reference to the melody of spoken language, and to the part played by accentuation in determining it. Though of relatively minor importance in Dionysius' discussion, this passage is a basic piece of evidence for all modern theories of Greek accentuation.<sup>1</sup> The other elements of diction

<sup>1</sup> See Allen, *Vox Graeca*, pp. 106-19.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

mentioned in Ch. 11 are considered separately in subsequent chapters: rhythm in Chs. 17 and 18, variety in Ch. 19 and appropriateness in Ch. 20. Before considering the elements of diction, however, Dionysius examines the elements of language itself, the letters and the syllables. His precise descriptions of the configurations of the mouth which produce the different sounds is unique in Greek literature and of fundamental importance for the study of classical Greek pronunciation. The influence of earlier grammatical theory<sup>1</sup> is to be discerned in the attempt to establish a natural relationship between sound and sense, and even moral quality, which results, for example, in the postulation of a hierarchy of vowel sounds, the noblest being  $\bar{a}$  and the meanest  $\epsilon$ . Here as elsewhere the absence of any proper consideration of words as units having meaning in themselves, which a writer must use if he is to express himself as he wishes, regardless of how they sound to the conditioned ear, imposes certain limits on the practical value of Dionysius' precepts. Nevertheless these provide some useful generalisations about the effects of the different letter-sounds. We may agree, for example, that the plosive consonants  $\kappa\tau\pi$  and the fricative  $\sigma$  will *tend* to produce a harsh effect when used in close series, while the liquids  $\lambda\mu\nu$  will *tend* to produce a smooth sound when so used. Again, it must also be borne in mind that Dionysius is himself the product of a long tradition of rhetorical training under which the elements of style had been analysed to the smallest detail and related to different supposed effects. The dependence of the doctrine of "three styles" upon this classification of the ele-

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, p. 91.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

ments of speech is obvious, as is its usefulness to a teacher as a system through which he can provide his pupils with cut-and-dried formulae for successful writing.

“ No word can be judged as to whether it is good or bad, correct or incorrect, beautiful or ugly, or anything else that matters to a writer, in isolation ”.<sup>1</sup> In Ch. 16 Dionysius shows, with some of his finest illustrations, how Homer skilfully combines words which he has chosen for their cumulative effect, in accordance with the phonetic rules which he has laid down in Chs. 14 and 15.

As with sounds, so with rhythms. In Chs. 17 and 18 we read of noble and ignoble rhythms, and the influence of earlier writers is seen by the correspondence of Dionysius' judgments with theirs. In fact a comparison of the views of Demetrius, the author of the treatise *On the Sublime*, Dionysius, and the earliest source of critical opinion on rhythm, Aristotle, shows a clear consensus which was probably derived from a tradition of even greater antiquity. The scansion of passages of prose in Ch. 18, however, is the first of its kind that we have, and seems to owe less to the Aristotelian tradition, in which attention was concentrated on the ends of clauses and sentences (the *clausula*, for which the paeon was recommended, a foot not favoured by Dionysius), than to the tradition preserved by Cicero, whereby the presence of rhythm throughout a sentence was advocated.<sup>2</sup> This latter tradition may indeed have been of recent origin, since Dionysius' attempts to apply it lack his customary certainty of touch.

<sup>1</sup> I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *Orator* 59. 199.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Variety, the subject of Ch. 19, had also been treated many times before. The most important point that Dionysius makes in this chapter is that the greater freedom enjoyed by the prose writer than by the poet imposes upon him the obligation to vary his rhythms, the lengths of his clauses and the order and sound of his words. The school of Isocrates, and to a lesser extent the master himself, are mentioned as prime offenders in this respect.

Dionysius' treatment of propriety in Ch. 20 supplements his treatment of it in the *Lysias* (Ch. 9). In that essay, though saying that Lysias had adapted his style satisfactorily to the speaker, the audience and the subject, he is concerned mainly with the generic characterisation of the speaker. In the present chapter attention is concentrated on the presentation of the subject in a style which can do it justice. The two chapters should be read side by side: they reflect the requirements of practical oratory on the one hand and of literary composition on the other. (Aristotle (*Rhetoric* iii. 7) covers all three aspects of propriety.) But there is nothing in any of the other critical essays to compare, for literary perception and the convincing application of principles already laid down, with the brilliant analysis of the famous lines in which Homer describes the labours of Sisyphus. Here is Dionysian criticism at its best.

The three types of composition discussed in Chs. 21 to 24 do not correspond with the Grand, Middle and Plain Styles, which appear for the first time in the *Ad Herennium*,<sup>1</sup> and are found in the early chapters

<sup>1</sup> iv. 8-10. See Caplan's notes on pp. 252-69 of his Loeb edition.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

of the *Demosthenes*. In the present essay and in Chs. 37 to 41 of the *Demosthenes* the middle type of composition is a mean between two extremes, and these extremes correspond not to the Grand and the Plain styles, but to the Grand and the Middle styles, with the same authors used to furnish illustration. A preference for a dichotomy of styles is found in Cicero,<sup>1</sup> but his division is into Grand and Plain; and of course he is discussing style in general, and not composition. Dionysius' division in the present treatise and in the later chapters of the *Demosthenes* appears to be an innovation. It is not difficult to see how he came to invent it. In Ch. 21 he says that the elements of composition can be combined in so many different ways that it is impossible to make a rigid classification. All that can be done is to identify groups of extreme characteristics. But the whole process of composition involves artistry and contrivance: in the analogy which he introduces, in his favourite manner, from painting, painters are said to "mix their pigments together in a variety of shades", and there is no reference to simple colouring or plain drawing. There is no place here for the unembellished artlessness of a plain style, because Dionysius is searching for an ideal style in which all the devices which he has described are used with balanced skill and propriety. Hence the culmination of this section of the treatise in the "tempered" or "blended" type of composition. It is only in Ch. 22, on the austere type of composition, that Dionysius gives as good an analysis as in Ch. 20, noting examples of hiatus and the clashing of rough con-

<sup>1</sup> *Brutus* 201-2. See A. E. Douglas *ad loc.*, on pp. 145-6 of his edition (Oxford 1966).

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

sonants. The polished type, discussed and illustrated in Ch. 23, is of course distinguished by the absence of most of the features found in the austere type. Yet even when allowance is made for this, Dionysius' treatment of it is less thorough. But Ch. 24, in which the ideal, blended type is under consideration, is disappointingly short and contains no illustrative passages. One senses Dionysius' impatience to draw to a close.

The two concluding chapters are concerned with defining, as far as possible, the differences between prose and verse, and with showing how the one may be made to resemble the other. Inasmuch as the discussion centres upon rhythm, these chapters add little to what Dionysius (and Aristotle and Cicero before him) had said earlier on the subject. Again, the reference in Ch. 25 to the great pains taken in composition by Isocrates, Plato and Demosthenes, made in justification of his own method of minute analysis, would probably not have struck his readers as very original. It would not be unkind to Dionysius to say that the greatest value of these last two chapters lies in the several fragments of lost verse which they preserve, and in particular Simonides' exquisite *Danae*.

No work of ancient literary criticism provides a more penetrating insight into the practical mechanics of stylistic analysis than Dionysius' treatise *On Literary Composition*. In spite of its self-imposed limitations, its inconsistencies and ambiguities, it cannot be read without enriching the experience and sharpening the critical perception of anyone with a feeling for the power of the written or spoken word.



## ΠΕΡΙ ΣΥΝΘΕΣΕΩΣ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΩΝ

1 'Δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο δίδωμι',  
καθάπερ ἢ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ φησὶν Ἑλένη ξενίζουσα  
τὸν Τηλέμαχον, πρώτην ἡμέραν ἄγοντι ταυτηνὴν  
γενέθλιον, ἀφ' οὗ παραγέγονας εἰς ἀνδρὸς ἡλικίαν,  
ἡδίστην καὶ τιμιωτάτην ἐορτῶν ἐμοί· πλὴν οὔτε  
χειρῶν δημιουργήματα πέμπω σοι τῶν ἐμῶν, ὡς  
ἐκείνη φησὶ διδοῦσα τῷ μεираκίῳ τὸν πέπλον, οὔτ'  
ἐς γάμου μόνον ὥραν, καὶ γαμετῆς<sup>1</sup> χάριν εὔθετον,  
ἀλλὰ ποίημα μὲν καὶ γέννημα παιδείας καὶ ψυχῆς  
τῆς ἐμῆς, κτήμα δὲ σοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ χρήμα πρὸς  
ἀπάσας τὰς ἐν τῷ βίῳ χρείας ὅποσαι γίνονται διὰ  
λόγων ὠφέλιμον, ἀναγκαιότατον ἀπάντων χρη-  
μάτων, εἴ τι καὶ γὰρ τυγχάνω τῶν δεόντων φρονῶν,  
ἅπασιν μὲν ὁμοίως τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τοὺς πολιτικούς  
λόγους, ἐν ἧ ποτ' ἂν ἡλικία τε καὶ ἔξει τυγχά-  
νωσιν ὄντες· μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς μεираκίοις τε καὶ  
νεωστὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ἀπτομένοις ὑμῖν, ὧ Ῥούφε  
Μετίλιε<sup>2</sup> πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ καὶ μοὶ τιμιωτάτου φίλων.

<sup>1</sup> codd.: γαμετῆ Sauppe, Usener.

<sup>2</sup> FP: μελίτιε EMV.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Odyssey* 15. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey* 15. 126.

<sup>3</sup> With its examples of *paronomasia* (δημιουργήματα . . . ποίημα . . . γέννημα . . . κτήματα . . . χρήματα) and etymological figure (γάμου . . . γαμετῆς), this opening sentence has a decidedly



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

“ I too, dear child, have here a gift for thee ”, as Helen says in Homer when she is giving Telemachus a parting gift.<sup>1</sup> You are celebrating your first birthday since reaching man’s estate, and of all festive events this is the one which I enjoy and prize most highly. However, I am sending you not the work of my own hands (as Helen says when she gives the robe to the young man <sup>2</sup>), nor what is suited only to the season of marriage and to please a bride, but the product and the offspring of my learning and my mind, which will at the same time be a possession and a useful aid in all the business of life that is transacted through speech <sup>3</sup>: the most necessary of all aids to all alike who practise civil oratory, if I have any idea of what is required, whatever their age and disposition may happen to be; but particularly necessary to young men who are just beginning to take up the study, like yourself, Rufus Metilius, whose father is my most esteemed friend.<sup>4</sup> 1

epideictic flavour reminiscent of Gorgias. This, together with the concluding sentence of the treatise, and in spite of the dedication to Rufus Metilius, suggests that Dionysius attached especial importance to this treatise and intended it for a wide literary public.

<sup>4</sup> The name Metilius is to be preferred to Melitius. See Bonner, *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, p. 2, note 4.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

διττῆς γὰρ οὔσης ἀσκήσεως περὶ πάντας ὡς εἶπεῖν τοὺς λόγους, τῆς περὶ τὰ νοήματα καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα, ὧν ἡ μὲν τοῦ πραγματικοῦ τόπου μᾶλλον ἐφάπτεσθαι δόξειεν ἄν, ἡ δὲ τοῦ λεκτικοῦ, καὶ πάντων ὅσοι τοῦ λέγειν εὖ στοχάζονται περὶ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς θεωρίας τοῦ λόγου ταύτας σπουδαζόντων ἐξ ἴσου, ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν ἐν τούτοις φρόνησιν ἄγουσα ἡμᾶς ἐπιστήμη βραδεῖά ἐστι καὶ χαλεπὴ νέοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀδύνατος εἰς ἀγενεῖων καὶ μειρακίων πεσεῖν ἡλικίαν· ἀκμαζούσης γὰρ ἤδη συνέσεώς ἐστι καὶ πολιαῖς κατηρτυμένης ἡλικίας ἡ τούτων κατάληψις οἰκειότερα, πολλῇ μὲν ἱστορία λόγων τε καὶ ἔργων, πολλῇ δὲ πείρα καὶ συμφορᾷ παθῶν οἰκείων τε καὶ ἀλλοτρίων συναυξομένη· τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς λέξεις φιλόκαλον καὶ ταῖς νεαραῖς πέφυκε συνανθεῖν ἡλικίαις. ἐπτόηται γὰρ ἅπασα νέου ψυχῇ περὶ τὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας ὠραϊσμόν, ἀλόγους τινὰς καὶ ὥσπερ ἐνθουσιώδεις ἐπὶ τοῦτο λαμβάνουσα τὰς ὀρμάς· οἷς πολλῆς πάνυ καὶ ἔμφρονος δεῖ τῆς πρώτης ἐπιστάσεώς τε καὶ ἀγωγῆς, εἰ μέλλουσι μὴ πᾶν ὅ τι κεν ἐπ' ἀκαιρίμαν γλῶσσαν ἔπος ἔλθῃ<sup>1</sup> λέγειν μηδ' εἰκῆ συνθήσειν τὰ προστυχόντα ἀλλήλοις, ἀλλ' ἐκλογῇ τε χρήσεσθαι καθαρῶν ἅμα καὶ γενναίων ὀνομάτων καὶ συνθέσει ταῦτα κοσμήσειν μεμιγμένον ἐχούση τῷ σεμνῷ τὸ ἡδύ. εἰς δὲ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ὃ δεῖ πρῶτον νέοις

---

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius employs this dichotomy in his treatment of Thucydides and Demosthenes (his essay on subject-matter in Demosthenes being lost); and in his comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides and critiques of Xenophon, Philistus and Theopompus in the *Letter to Pompeius*.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

In virtually all kinds of discourse two things require study: the ideas and the words.<sup>1</sup> We may regard the first of these as concerned chiefly with subject-matter, and the latter with expression; and all those who aim to become good orators pay close attention to both these aspects of discourse equally. But the knowledge which guides us towards the selection and judicious management of our material is attained slowly and with difficulty by the young: indeed, it cannot be acquired by beardless boys. Understanding of these things belongs rather to a mature intelligence and to an age disciplined by grey hairs—an age whose powers are constantly being augmented by examination of discourses and of actions,<sup>2</sup> and by many experiences of its own and of sharing in the fortunes of others. But the love of fine literature flowers no less naturally in the days of youth than in later life, for all young minds are excited by fresh beauty of expression,<sup>3</sup> and are attracted towards it by feelings which are instinctive and akin to inspiration. Hence young people need, at the beginning, much prudent supervision and guidance, if they are not to utter “. . . whatever word has sprung to an ill-timed tongue”,<sup>4</sup> nor to put together at random any chance combinations, but to select words which are both pure and refined and to arrange them in a combination which unites grace and dignity. So it is to supply this latter faculty, the first to which the young should apply themselves, that “. . . for the sake of

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps alluding to Dionysius' preoccupation with historical research.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. they feel an affinity for it, being themselves *ὁπαῖοι*.

<sup>4</sup> Bergk, Frag. Adespota 85.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀσκεῖσθαι, 'συμβάλλομαί σοι μέλος εἰς ἔρωτα' τὴν περὶ τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν ὀνομάτων πραγματείαν ὀλίγοις μὲν ἐπὶ νοῦν ἐλθοῦσαν, ὅσοι τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητορικὰς ἢ διαλεκτικὰς συνέγραψαν τέχνας, οὐδενὶ δ' ἀκριβῶς οὐδ' ἀποχρώντως μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος ἐξειργασμένην, ὡς ἐγὼ πείθομαι. εἰ δ' ἐγγένηταί μοι σχολή, καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἑτέραν ἐξοίσω σοι γραφήν, ἵνα τὸν λεκτικὸν τόπον τελείως ἐξειργασμένον ἔχῃς. ἐκείνην μὲν οὖν τὴν πραγματείαν εἰς νέωτα πάλιν ὥραις ταῖς αὐταῖς προσδέχου θεῶν ἡμᾶς φυλαττόντων ἀσινεῖς τε καὶ ἀνόσους, εἰ δὴ ποτε ἡμῖν ἄρα τούτου πέπρωται βεβαίως τυχεῖν· νυνὶ δὲ ἦν τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐπὶ νοῦν ἤγαγέ μοι πραγματείαν δέχου.

κεφάλαια δ' αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἃ πρόκειται μοι δεῖξαι ταῦτα, τίς τε ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς συνθέσεως φύσις καὶ τίνα ἰσχὺν ἔχει, καὶ τίνων στοχάζεται καὶ πῶς αὐτῶν τυγχάνει, καὶ τίνες αἱ γενικώταται αὐτῆς εἰσι διαφοραὶ καὶ τίς ἐκάστης χαρακτήρ καὶ ποίαν κρατίστην αὐτῶν εἶναι πείθομαι, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις, τί ποτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ποιητικὸν ἐκείνο καὶ εὐγλωσσον καὶ μελιχρὸν ἐν ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, ὃ πέφυκε τῇ συνθέσει τῆς πεζῆς λέξεως παρακολουθεῖν, ποιητικῆς τε κατασκευῆς τὸν ἀποίητον ἐκμιμούμενης λόγον καὶ σφόδρα ἐν τῇ μιμήσει κατορθούσης

---

<sup>1</sup> Philoxenus of Cythera, Frag. 833 (Page).

<sup>2</sup> No work by any other critic has survived to refute this claim. Cf. a similar claim for his rhetorical works, Vol. I, p. 13.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

love I offer you a song",<sup>1</sup> in the form of this work on literary composition. It is a subject which has occurred to only a few of those ancient writers who have composed handbooks of rhetoric or dialectic, and not one, to the best of my belief, has carried out a detailed, or even an adequate study of it up to the present day.<sup>2</sup> If I am granted the time, I shall produce another book for you, on the choice of words, in order that you may have a complete treatment of the subject of style.<sup>3</sup> You may expect that work next year at the same time, if the gods continue to preserve us from injury and disease, and it is actually my certain destiny to reach that goal. But now accept the work which my guiding genius<sup>4</sup> has inspired in my mind.

The main headings under which I propose to treat this subject are the following: what the nature of composition is, and what is its special effect; what its special aims are, and how it achieves them; what are its principal varieties, what is the peculiar character of each of these, and which of them I believe to be the most effective; and in addition what is that poetical quality, which falls so pleasantly from the tongue and is so sweet to the ear, and is the natural companion to composition in prose; and in what consists the effectiveness of that poetical artistry which closely imitates uncontrived speech and succeeds admirably

<sup>3</sup> Choice of words and their composition were the two subdivisions of the treatment of style in the scheme of Theophrastus. Dionysius' treatise on choice of words, if it was written, has not survived.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 58, *sub fin.* (Vol. I, p. 455), where *δαίμόνιον* means "god". Here Dionysius is assuming a Socratic mantle.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

εὖ τί τὸ κράτος καὶ διὰ ποίας ἂν ἐπιτηδεύσεως ἐγγένοιτο ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν. τοιαυτὶ μὲν δὴ τινὰ ἐστὶν ὡς τύπῳ περιλαβεῖν ὑπὲρ ὧν μέλλω λέγειν. ἄρχεται δὲ ἐνθὲνδ' ἡ πραγματεία.

2 ἡ σύνθεσις ἔστι μὲν, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὸ δηλοῖ τοῦ νομα, ποιά τις θέσις παρ' ἄλληλα τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων, ἃ δὴ καὶ στοιχεῖά τινες τῆς λέξεως καλοῦσιν. ταῦτα δὲ Θεοδέκτης μὲν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ οἱ κατ' ἐκείνους φιλοσοφήσαντες τοὺς χρόνους ἄχρι τριῶν προήγαγον, ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα καὶ συνδέσμους πρῶτα μέρη τῆς λέξεως ποιοῦντες. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τούτους γενόμενοι, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ Στωικῆς αἵρέσεως ἡγεμόνες, ἕως τεττάρων προὔβιβασαν, χωρίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν συνδέσμων τὰ ἄρθρα. εἶθ' οἱ μεταγενέστεροι τὰ προσηγορικὰ διελόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνοματικῶν πέντε ἀπεφήναντο τὰ πρῶτα μέρη. ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀντονομασίας ἀποζεύξαντες ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἕκτον στοιχεῖον τοῦτ' ἐποίησαν. οἱ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐπιρρήματα διελόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τὰς προθέσεις ἀπὸ τῶν συνδέσμων καὶ τὰς μετοχὰς ἀπὸ τῶν προσηγορικῶν, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς προσαγαγόντες τομὰς πολλὰ τὰ πρῶτα μόρια τῆς λέξεως ἐποίησαν· ὑπὲρ ὧν οὐ μικρὸς ἂν εἴη λόγος. πλὴν ἢ γε τῶν πρώτων εἴτε τριῶν ἢ τεττάρων εἶθ' ὅσων δὴ ποτε ὄντων μερῶν πλοκὴ καὶ παράθεσις τὰ λεγόμενα ποιεῖ κῶλα, ἔπειθ' ἡ τούτων ἀρμονία τὰς καλουμένας συμπληροῖ περι-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

in its purpose; and by what method of application each of these two results may be obtained. Such, in general outline, are the questions with which I intend to deal, and my treatise begins at this point.

Composition is, as the name itself indicates, a certain process of arranging the parts of speech, or the elements of diction, as some call them. These were restricted to three only in number by Theodectes and Aristotle and the philosophers of their day, who made nouns, verbs and conjunctions the primary parts of speech.<sup>1</sup> Their successors, and in particular the leaders of the Stoic school, raised the number to four, separating the articles from the conjunctions. Subsequent grammarians distinguished appellatives from the other substantives,<sup>2</sup> and represented the primary parts as five. Others detached the pronouns from the nouns, and thus introduced a sixth element. Yet others divided the adverbs from the verbs, the prepositions from the conjunctions and the participles from the appellatives; while others introduced still further divisions and so made the primary parts of speech many in number. The subject could be discussed at considerable length, but it is enough to say that the combination or juxtaposition of these primary parts, whether there be three, four or any number of them, forms what are called clauses. Next, the joining together of these clauses constitutes what are called

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 48, *sub init.* (Vol. I, p. 421).

<sup>2</sup> Dionysius Thrax (2nd century B.C.), an Alexandrine grammarian, distinguished eight parts of speech, but regarded *προσηγορία* as a subdivision of *ὄνομα* (Uhlig's Teubner edition, pp. 23, 34).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

όδους, αὐται δὲ τὸν σύμπαντα τελειοῦσι λόγον. ἔστι δὴ τῆς συνθέσεως ἔργα τὰ τε ὀνόματα οἰκείως θεῖναι παρ' ἄλληλα καὶ τοῖς κώλοις ἀποδοῦναι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀρμονίαν καὶ ταῖς περιόδοις διαλαβεῖν εὖ τὸν λόγον.

δευτέρα δ' οὔσα μοῖρα τῶν περὶ τὸν λεκτικὸν τόπον θεωρημάτων κατὰ γοῦν τὴν τάξιν (ἡγεῖται γὰρ ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογή καὶ προϋφίσταται ταύτης κατὰ φύσιν) ἡδονὴν καὶ πειθὸν καὶ κράτος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις οὐκ ὀλίγῳ κρείττον' ἐκείνης ἔχει. καὶ μηδεὶς ἡγήσεται παράδοξον, εἰ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ὄντων θεωρημάτων περὶ τὴν ἐκλογήν, ὑπὲρ ὧν πολὺς ἐγένετο φιλοσόφοις τε καὶ πολιτικοῖς ἀνδράσι λόγος, ἡ σύνθεσις δευτέραν ἔχουσα χώραν τῇ τάξει καὶ λόγων οὐδὲ πολλοῦ δεῖ τῶν ἴσων ἐκείνη τυχοῦσα τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει καὶ δύναμιν ὥστε περιεῖναι πάντων τῶν ἐκείνης ἔργων καὶ κρατεῖν, ἐνθυμούμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν, ὅσαι διαφόρους ὕλας λαμβάνουσαι συμφορητὸν ἐκ τούτων ποιοῦσι τὸ τέλος, ὡς οἰκοδομική τε καὶ τεκτονική καὶ ποικιλτική καὶ ὅσαι ταύταις εἰσὶν ὁμοιογενεῖς, αἱ συνθετικαὶ δυνάμεις τῇ μὲν τάξει δεύτεραι τῶν ἐκλεκτικῶν εἰσι, τῇ δὲ δυνάμει πρότεραι· ὥστ' εἰ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ αὐτὸ συμβέβηκεν, οὐκ ἄτοπον ἡγητέον. οὐδὲν δὲ κωλύει καὶ πίστει παρασχεῖν τοῦ προκει-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 9. 5-8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* 3. 43. 171-2.

<sup>3</sup> From the early sophists, especially Protagoras and Prodicus, onwards. It is a recurrent subject in the third book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, being closely bound up with the concepts



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the "periods",<sup>1</sup> and these make up the complete discourse. The functions of composition are to arrange words in a proper relationship to one another, to fit clauses together properly, and to divide the whole discourse suitably into periods.<sup>2</sup>

Although, in proper order at least, the arrangement of words falls into second place when the subject of style is under consideration, since the selection of words naturally takes precedence and is assumed to have been made, yet for the achievement of pleasing, persuasive and powerful effects in discourse it is far more potent than the other. And no one should think it strange that, whereas the choice of words has been the subject of many serious investigations,<sup>3</sup> which have caused much discussion among philosophers and men of state, composition, though it holds second place in order, and has been the subject of far less discussion than the other, yet possesses so much importance and potency that it surpasses and outweighs all the other's achievements. It must be remembered that, in the case of all other arts which take a variety of materials and make from them a composite product—arts like building, carpentry, embroidery, and any others of the same kind—the potentialities of composition are second in logical order to those of selection, but are prior in potency. Hence it should not be thought strange that the same should be the case with regard to discourse. But there is no reason why we should not furnish proofs of this proposition, so that we may not be

of purity and clarity which were central to both Greek and Roman stylistic theory (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 2. 1; 5. 1; *Ad Herennium* 4. 12. 17; Cicero, *Brutus* 72. 252-3).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

μένου, μή τι δόξωμεν ἔξ ἐτοίμου λαμβάνειν τῶν ἀμφισβήτησιν ἔχόντων λόγων.

3 ἔστι τοίνυν πᾶσα λέξις ἧ σημαίνομεν τὰς νοήσεις ἢ μὲν ἔμμετρος, ἢ δὲ ἄμετρος· ὧν ἑκατέρα καλῆς μὲν ἁρμονίας τυχοῦσα καλὸν οἶα τ' ἔστι ποιεῖν καὶ τὸ μέτρον καὶ τὸν λόγον, ἀνεπιστάτως δὲ καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν ῥιπτομένη<sup>1</sup> προσαπόλλυσι καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ χρήσιμον. πολλοὶ γοῦν καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ συγγραφεῖς φιλόσοφοί τε καὶ ῥήτορες λέξεις πάνυ καλὰς καὶ πρεπούσας τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἐκλέξαντες ἐπιμελῶς, ἁρμονίαν δὲ αὐταῖς ἀποδόντες εἰκαίαν τινὰ καὶ ἄμουσον οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἀπέλαυσαν ἐκείνου τοῦ πόνου. ἕτεροι δ' εὐκαταφρόνητα καὶ ταπεινὰ λαβόντες ὀνόματα, συνθέντες δ' αὐτὰ ἠδέως καὶ περιττῶς πολλὴν τὴν ἀφροδίτην τῷ λόγῳ περιέθησαν. καὶ σχεδὸν ἀνάλογόν τι πεπονθέναι δόξειεν ἂν ἢ σύνθεσις πρὸς τὴν ἐκλογήν, ὃ πάσχει τὰ ὀνόματα πρὸς τὰ νοήματα. ὥσπερ γὰρ οὐδὲν ὄφελος διανοίας ἔστι χρηστῆς, εἰ μὴ τις αὐτῇ κόσμον ἀποδώσει καλῆς ὀνομασίας, οὔτω κἀνταῦθα οὐδὲν ἔστι προὔργου λέξιν εὐρεῖν καθαρὰν καὶ καλλιρήμονα, εἰ μὴ καὶ κόσμον αὐτῇ τις ἁρμονίας τὸν προσήκοντα περιθήσει.

ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξω φάσιν ἀναπόδεικτον λέγειν, ἔξ ὧν ἐπείσθην κρεῖττον εἶναι καὶ τελειότερον ἄσκημα τῆς ἐκλογῆς τὴν σύνθεσιν, ἔργῳ πειράσομαι δεικνύναι, ἐμμέτρων τε καὶ πεζῶν λόγων ἀπαρχὰς ὀλίγας προχειρισάμενος. λαμβανέσθω δὲ ποιητῶν μὲν Ὅμηρος, συγγραφέων δὲ Ἡρόδοτος· ἀπόχρη γὰρ ἐκ τούτων καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰκάσαι.

<sup>1</sup> PMVE: ῥιπτουμένη Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

thought to accept without hesitation any argument of questionable validity.

Every utterance, then, by which we express our thoughts is either in metre or not in metre. Either kind is capable, if accompanied by beautiful arrangement, of conferring beauty upon either verse or prose; but if speech is thrown off carelessly and at random, it destroys the value of the thought in the process. At any rate many poets and prose-writers, both philosophers and orators, have carefully chosen expressions which are very beautiful and suited to their subject-matter, but have reaped no benefit from their efforts because they have given them a haphazard and unmusical arrangement; whereas others have taken humble words which might easily be despised, and by arranging them in a pleasing and striking manner, have succeeded in investing their discourse with great beauty. It may well be thought that composition bears the same relation to selection as words do to ideas: for just as fine thought is of no use unless one invests it with beautiful language,<sup>1</sup> so here too it is pointless to devise pure and elegant expression unless one adorns it with the proper arrangement. 3

But in order to avoid appearing to assert what I cannot prove, I shall try to give a practical demonstration of the reasons which have convinced me that composition is a more important and effectual object of study than is the mere selection of words. I shall begin by examining a few passages of verse and prose. From the poets let us take Homer, and from the prose-writers Herodotus: these will provide an adequate notion of the rest.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 18 (Vol. I, pp. 304–7).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔστι δὴ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ μὲν ὁ παρὰ τῷ συβώτῃ καταγόμενος Ὀδυσσεὺς περὶ τὴν ἐωθινήν ὥραν ἀκρατίζεσθαι μέλλων, ὡς τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἔθος ἦν· ἔπειτα ὁ Τηλέμαχος αὐτοῖς ἐπιφαινόμενος ἐκ τῆς εἰς Πελοπόννησον ἀποδημίας· πραγμάτι' ἅττα βιωτικὰ ἠρμηνευμένα ὑπέρευ. ποῦ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἀρετή, τὰ ποιήματα δηλώσει παρατεθέντα αὐτά·

τὼ δ' αὖτ' ἐν κλισίῃς Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ δῖος ὑφορβὸς ἐντύνοντ' ἄριστον ἅμ' ἠοῖ κειαμένῳ πῦρ ἔκπεμψάν τε νομῆας ἅμ' ἀγρομένοισι σύεσσι.

Τηλέμαχον δὲ περισσαινὸν κύνες ὑλακόμωροι οὐδ' ὕλαον προσιόντα. νόησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς σαίνοντάς τε κύνας, ὑπὸ δὲ <sup>1</sup> κτύπος ἦλθε ποδοῖν· αἴψα δ' ἄρ' Εὐμαιὸν προσεφώνεεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα· <sup>2</sup>

Εὐμαι', ἦ μάλα τίς τοι ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' ἑταῖρος ἢ καὶ γνώριμος ἄλλος, ἐπεὶ κύνες οὐχ ὑλάουσιν, ἀλλὰ περισσαίνουσι· ποδῶν δ' ὑπὸ δουῖπον ἀκούω.

οὐπω πᾶν εἴρητο ἔπος, ὅτε οἱ φίλος υἱὸς ἔστη ἐνὶ προθύροισι. ταφῶν δ' ἀνόρουσε συβώτης·

ἐκ δ' ἄρα οἱ χειρῶν πέσεν ἄγγεα, τοῖς ἐπονείτο κινρὰς αἴθοπα οἶνον. ὁ δ' ἀντίος ἔδραμ' ἀνακτος· κύσσε δέ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλὰ

<sup>1</sup> ὑπὸ δὲ codd.: περὶ τε Homer.

<sup>2</sup> πρ. ἐ. ἐ. codd: ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα Homer.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Now in Homer we find Odysseus staying in the swineherd's hut and about to have his breakfast around dawn, as the ancients used to do. Then Telemachus appears before them, returning from his visit to the Peloponnese. Though these are minor happenings of everyday life, they are superlatively well portrayed. But in what does the excellence of expression consist? I shall quote the lines, and they will demonstrate it themselves <sup>1</sup>:

Now in the hut Odysseus and the worthy  
swineherd stirred  
At dawn's first light the warming fire, and made  
the morning meal.  
Already with the pasturing swine the herdsmen  
forth had gone  
When, drawing near, Telemachus was met by  
fawning hounds,  
Their senseless barking stilled. Odysseus heard  
their whining note  
And the approaching steps, and straightway to  
Eumaeus spoke near:  
"Eumaeus, 'tis some friend of yours, familiar  
here, that comes:  
His steps I hear, but from the fawning hounds  
no barking din."  
Unfinished was his speech when at the door his  
dear son stood.  
The swineherd in amazement rose, and, slipping  
from his grasp,  
The bowls he mixed of sparkling wine fell  
tumbling to the ground,  
His labour lost, to run and greet his prince, to  
kiss his head

<sup>1</sup> *Odyssey* 16. 1-16.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

χειράς τ' ἀμφοτέρας· θαλερόν δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε δάκρυ. ταῦθ' ὅτι μὲν ἐπάγεται καὶ κηλεῖ τὰς ἀκοὰς ποιημάτων τε τῶν πάνυ ἡδίστων οὐδενὸς ἤττω μοῖραν ἔχει, πάντες ἂν εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι μαρτυρήσειαν. ποῦ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ πειθὼ καὶ διὰ τί τοιαῦτά ἐστι, πότερον διὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἢ διὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν; οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴποι διὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν, ὡς ἐγὼ πείθομαι· διὰ γὰρ τῶν εὐτελεστάτων καὶ ταπεινοτάτων ὀνομάτων πέπλεκται πᾶσα ἡ λέξις, οἷς ἂν καὶ γεωργὸς καὶ θαλαττουργὸς καὶ χειροτέχνης καὶ πᾶς ὁ μηδεμίαν ὥραν τοῦ λέγειν εὖ ποιούμενος ἐξ ἐτοίμου λαβὼν ἐχρήσατο. λυθέντος γοῦν τοῦ μέτρου φαῦλα φανήσεται τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄζηλα· οὔτε γὰρ μεταφοραὶ τινες ἐνεῖσιν εὐγενεῖς· οὔτε ὑπαλλαγαὶ οὔτε καταχρήσεις οὔτ' ἄλλη τροπικὴ διάλεκτος οὐδεμία, οὐδὲ δὴ γλῶτται πολλαί<sup>1</sup> τινες οὐδὲ ξένα ἢ πεποιημένα ὀνόματα. τί οὖν λείπεται μὴ οὐχὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ κάλλους τῆς ἐρμηνείας αἰτιᾶσθαι; τοιαῦτα δ' ἐστὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ μυρία, ὡς εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι πάντες ἴσασιν· ἐμοὶ δ' ὑπομνήσεως ἔνεκα λέγοντι ἀρκεῖ ταῦτα μόνον εἰρῆσθαι.

φέρει δὴ μεταβῶμεν ἤδη καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πεζὴν διάλεκτον καὶ σκοπῶμεν, εἰ κάκείνη τοῦτο συμβέβηκε τὸ πάθος, ὥστε παρὰ μικρὰ καὶ φαῦλα πράγματά τε καὶ ὀνόματα συνταχθέντα καλῶς μεγάλας ἡδονὰς γίνεσθαι καὶ χάριτας. ἔστι δὲ παρὰ τῷ

<sup>1</sup> codd.: παλαιαί Usener.

<sup>1</sup> General and particular: *hypallage* was a word used in Cicero's time to describe any form of name-transference, but he says (*Orator* 27. 93) that grammarians preferred the term

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

And both his hands and handsome eyes; and  
coursing tears fell down.

I am sure everyone would testify that these lines allure and enchant the ear, and rank second to no poetry whatsoever, even the most attractive of all. But where does their power to persuade us lie, and what causes them to be what they are? Is it the selection of words, or the composition? No one will say "selection", I am sure: for the whole passage is woven together from the most commonplace, humble words, such as might have come readily to the tongue of a farmer, seaman or artisan, or anyone else who takes no trouble to speak well. Indeed, if the metre is broken up, these very same lines will appear ordinary and unworthy of admiration: for there are no noble metaphors in them, nor instances of *hypallage* or *catachresis*,<sup>1</sup> nor any other form of figurative language; nor again many recondite, strange or newly-coined words. What alternative, therefore, is left but to attribute the beauty of the style to the composition<sup>2</sup>? There are countless passages of this kind in the poet, as I am sure everyone is aware. It is enough for me to quote this single passage as a reminder.

Let us now pass on to the language of prose, and consider whether the same principle holds good of it too—that actions and words which are trifling and ordinary, when well arranged, become invested with great charm. For example, there is in Herodotus a

*metonymy*. So Quintilian 9. 6. 23. The Aristotelian word was *μεταφορά* (*Rhetoric* 3. 10. 7, *Poetics* 21). *Catachresis* is a particular kind of name-transference, being properly applied to imprecise, strained or unnatural usages (Tryphon in *Rhetores Graeci* (Spengel III, p. 182); *Ad Herennium* 4. 33; Cicero, *Orator* 27. 94; Quintilian 8. 6. 34).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *On the Sublime* 40. 2-3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Ἡροδότῳ βασιλεύς τις Λυδῶν, ὃν ἐκεῖνος Κανδαύλην <καλεῖ, Μυρσίλον δὲ> <sup>1</sup> καλεῖσθαι φησιν ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὸς ἑρῶν, ἔπειτα ἀξιῶν τινα τῶν ἐταίρων αὐτοῦ γυμνὴν τὴν ἄνθρωπον ἰδεῖν, ὃ δὲ ἀπομαχόμενος μὴ ἀναγκασθῆναι, ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθεν, ὑπομένων τε καὶ θεώμενος αὐτήν—πρᾶγμα οὐχ ὅτι σεμνὸν ἢ καλλιλογεῖσθαι ἐπιτήδειον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδικὸν καὶ ἐπικίνδυνον καὶ τοῦ αἰσχροῦ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ καλοῦ ἐγγυτέρω· ἀλλ' εἴρηται σφόδρα δεξιῶς, καὶ κρεῖττον γέγονεν ἀκουσθῆναι λεγόμενον ἢ ὀφθῆναι γινόμενον. ἵνα δὲ μὴ τις ὑπολάβῃ τὴν διάλεκτον εἶναι τῆς ἡδονῆς αἰτίαν τῇ λέξει, μεταθεῖς αὐτῆς τὸν χαρακτήρα εἰς τὴν Ἀτθίδα γλῶτταν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο περιεργασάμενος οὕτως ἐξοίσω τὸν διάλογον.

Ἐγὼ γάρ σε δοκῶ πείθεσθαι μοι λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ εἶδους τῆς γυναικός· ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποις ὄντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν· ποίει ὅπως ἐκείνην θεάσῃ γυμνὴν. ὃ δ' ἀναβοήσας εἶπε· Δέσποτα, τίνα λόγον λέγεις οὐχ ὑγιᾶ, κελεύων με δέσποιναν τὴν ἐμὴν θεάσασθαι γυμνὴν; ἅμα δὲ χιτῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυμνῇ. πάλαι δὲ τὰ καλὰ ἀνθρώποις ἐξεύρηται, ἐξ ὧν μανθάνειν δεῖ· ἐν οἷς ἐν τῷ τούτῳ ἐστίν, ὄραν τινα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. ἐγὼ δὲ πείθομαι ἐκείνην εἶναι πασῶν γυναικῶν καλλίστην, καὶ σοῦ δέομαι μὴ δεῖσθαι ἀνόμων. ὃ μὲν δὴ λέγων ταῦτα ἀπεμάχετο <sup>2</sup> . . ., ὃ δ' ἠμείβετο τοῖσδε· Θάρσει, Ἐγὼ γάρ σε δοκῶ πείθεσθαι μοι λέγοντι

<sup>1</sup> Sylburg.

<sup>2</sup> add. ἀρρωδέων μὴ τί οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν γένηται κακόν Herodotus.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

certain king of the Lydians whom he calls Candaules, adding that he was called Myrsilus by the Greeks. Candaules was infatuated with his wife, and insisted on one of his friends seeing the poor woman naked. The friend resisted the pressure that was put upon him, but on failing to dissuade the king submitted and saw the queen. The incident was not only undignified and unsuitable for artistic embellishment, but also insignificant and hazardous, and closer to ugliness than to beauty. But the story has been told with great dexterity, and has made the incident better to hear described than to see done. So that no one may imagine that the passage owes its attractiveness to the dialect, I will change its characteristic forms into Attic, and without any further manipulation of the language will give the conversation as it stands <sup>1</sup>:

“ ‘ I do not think that you believe me, Gyges, when I speak about the beauty of my wife: for it happens that men trust their ears less readily than their eyes. Arrange, therefore, to see her naked.’ But he protested, saying, ‘ My lord, what is this unwholesome suggestion you are making, bidding me to look upon my queen naked? For when a woman casts off her clothes she casts off her modesty as well. Long ago men established good principles, from which we should learn, and one of these is that a man should keep his eyes upon his own. For my own part, I accept that she is the fairest of all women, and beg you not to require me to do anything that is unlawful.’ He said this in an attempt to ward the other off . . . But Candaules replied: ‘ Be of good cheer, Gyges, and do

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus 1. 8–10. See *Demosthenes* 41 (Vol. I, p. 398 and note).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ μὴ φοβοῦ μήτ' ἐμέ, ὡς πειρώμενόν σου λέγω λόγον τόνδε, μήτε γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμήν, μή τί σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς γένηται βλάβος. ἀρχὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ μηχανήσομαι οὕτως, ὥστε μηδὲ μαθεῖν αὐτὴν ὀφθείσαν ὑπὸ σοῦ. ἀγαγὼν γάρ σε εἰς τὸ οἶκημα, ἐν ᾧ κοιμώμεθα, ὅπισθε τῆς ἀνοιγομένης θύρας στήσω· μετὰ δὲ ἐμὲ εἰσελθόντα παρέσται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἐμὴ εἰς κοίτην. κείται δ' ἐγγὺς τῆς εἰσόδου θρόνος· ἐπὶ τοῦτον τῶν ἱματίων καθ' ἐν ἕκαστον ἐκδύσα θήσει, καὶ καθ' ἡσυχίαν πολλὴν παρέσται σοι θεάσασθαι. ὅταν δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου πορεύηται ἐπὶ τὴν εὐνὴν κατὰ νώτου τε αὐτῆς γένη, σοὶ μελέτω τὸ ἐντεῦθεν, ὅπως μὴ σε ὄψεται ἀπιόντα διὰ θυρῶν. ὁ μὲν δὴ ὡς οὐκ ἐδύνατο διαφυγεῖν, ἔτοιμος ἦν [ποιεῖν ταῦτα].<sup>1</sup>

οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τις οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ ἡ σεμνότης τῶν ὀνομάτων εὐμορφον πεποίηκε τὴν φράσιν· ἀνεπιτήδευτα γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνέκλεκτα, οἷα ἡ φύσις τέθηκεν σύμβολα τοῖς πράγμασιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἤρμοττεν ἴσως κρείττοσι χρήσασθαι ἑτέροις. ἀνάγκη δὲ δή που, ὅταν τοῖς κυριωτάτοις τε καὶ προσεχεστάτοις ὀνόμασιν ἐκφέρηται, τὰ νοήματα μηδὲν σεμνότερ' εἶναι, ἢ οἷά ἐστιν <ἐκεῖνα>.<sup>2</sup> ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ σεμνὸν οὐδὲ περιττόν, ὁ βουλόμενος εἴσεται μεταθεῖς οὐδὲν ὅ τι μὴ τὴν ἀρμονίαν. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ τούτῳ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τοιαῦτά ἐστιν, ἐξ ὧν ἂν τις τεκμήραιτο, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ κάλλει τῶν ὀνομάτων ἢ πειθῶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἦν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ συζυγίᾳ. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἱκανὰ ταῦτα.

<sup>1</sup> om. Herodotus.

<sup>2</sup> Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

not be afraid that I am doing this to test you, or that any harm will come to you from my wife. For in the first place, I shall arrange matters so that she shall not even know that she has been seen by you. I shall bring you into the room where we sleep and place you behind the door as it stands open; and after I have entered, my wife will enter too and come to bed. Now near the entrance there is a chair: on it she will place her garments one by one as she undresses, so you will have ample leisure to look at her. But as she goes from the chair to the bed with her back to you, take care next that she does not see you as you go away through the door.' Gyges, seeing that he could not escape, consented."

Here again, no one can say that it is the dignity and grandeur of the words that has given the style its pleasing form. These have not been carefully contrived and selected, but are the labels fixed to things by nature: indeed, perhaps it would not have been fitting to use other more striking words. It must necessarily be the case, in fact, that whenever ideas are expressed in the most authentic and appropriate language, no word should be grander than the nature of the ideas. That there is no grand or striking word in the present passage, anyone who wishes may discover by changing nothing but the arrangement. There are many passages like this in this author, as in Homer, from which one may conclude that the appealing quality of his style is derived, after all, not from the beauty of the words but from their combination. That is sufficient on this subject.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

4 ἵνα δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον αἰσθηταί τις, ὅσῃν ἔχει ῥώμην ἢ συνθετικὴ δύναμις ἔν τε ποιήμασι καὶ λόγοις, λήψομαί τινας εὖ ἔχειν δοκούσας λέξεις, ὧν τὰς ἁρμονίας μεταθεῖς ἄλλοῖα φαίνεσθαι ποιήσω καὶ τὰ μέτρα καὶ τοὺς λόγους. λαμβανέσθω δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν ταῦτα·

ἀλλ' ἔχεν ὥστε τάλαντα γυνὴ χερνήτις ἀληθής,  
ἣ τε σταθμὸν ἔχουσα καὶ εἴριον ἀμφὶς ἀνέλκει  
ισάζουσ', ἵνα παισὶν ἀεικέα μισθὸν ἄροιτο.

τοῦτο τὸ μέτρον ἠρωδὸν ἐστὶν ἐξάπουν τέλειον, κατὰ δάκτυλον πόδα βαινόμενον. ἐγὼ δὴ τῶν ὀνομάτων τούτων μετακινήσας τὴν σύνθεσιν τοὺς αὐτοὺς στίχους ἀντὶ μὲν ἐξαμέτρων ποιήσω τετραμέτρους, ἀντὶ δὲ ἠρωϊκῶν προσοδιακοὺς τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον·

ἀλλ' ἔχεν ὥστε γυνὴ χερνήτις τάλαντ' ἀληθής,  
ἣ τις εἴριον ἀμφὶ καὶ σταθμὸν ἔχουσ' ἀνέλκει  
ισάζουσ', ἵν' ἀεικέα παισὶν ἄροιτο μισθόν.

τοιαῦτά ἐστι τὰ πριάπεια, ὑπὸ τινων δ' ἰθυφάλλια λεγόμενα ταυτί·

οὐ βέβηλος, ὧ τελέται τοῦ νέου Διονύσου . . .

καγὼ δ' ἐξ εὐεργεσίας ὠργιασμένος ἦκω.

ἄλλους πάλιν λαβὼν στίχους Ὀμηρικούς, οὔτε προσθεῖς αὐτοῖς οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀφελών, τὴν δὲ σύνθεσιν ἀλλάξας μόνον ἕτερον ἀποδώσω γένος τὸ

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 12. 433–5.

<sup>2</sup> The term *prosodiac* was applied to a variety of metres used in processional song and lyric verse, based on the dactyl (–υυ) or the choriamb (–υυ–). The scheme is thus close to that of the dactylic (heroic) hexameter.

<sup>3</sup> A free iambic or trochaic metre used in ribald verse. These lines are ascribed to Euphorion of Chersonese by Hephaestion, *De Metris* 1. 16.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

In order that the reader may perceive much more clearly the great influence which the power of composition possesses both in poetry and in prose, I shall take a number of passages which are considered to be fine, and make their metres and word-order appear different in character merely by altering their arrangement. First let us take these lines from the Homeric poems <sup>1</sup>:

Firmly they stayed like the scales in the hands  
of a labouring woman

Carefully holding the balancing arm and weighing  
the wool

Poising it level, to earn for her children a  
beggarly pittance.

This metre is the full heroic hexameter, the basic foot of which is the dactyl. I shall change the order of the words and turn the same lines into tetrameters instead of hexameters, and into prosodiacs <sup>2</sup> instead of heroics, thus:

They stayed firmly like the scales in the  
labouring woman's hands

As she carefully held the balancing arm aloft and  
weighed the wool,

Level-poised, that her children might a beggarly  
pittance receive.

Such are the following Priapean or, as some call them, ithyphallic <sup>3</sup> lines:

I am no outsider, ye disciples of young  
Dionysus . . .

Like yourselves an initiate too, by his favour I  
come here.

Taking again other lines of Homer, and neither adding nor removing anything, but simply varying the order, I shall produce another kind of verse, the

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τετράμετρον καλούμενον Ἴωνικόν·

ὥς ὁ πρόσθ' ἵππων καὶ δίφρου κέϊτο τανυσθείς,  
βεβρυχώς, κόνιος δεδραγμένος αίματοέσσης.

ὥς ὁ πρόσθ' ἵππων καὶ δίφρου κέϊτο τανυσθείς,  
αίματοέσσης κόνιος δεδραγμένος, βεβρυχώς.

τοιαῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ Σωτάδεια ταυτί·

ἔνθ' οἱ μὲν ἐπ' ἄκραισι πυραῖς νέκυες ἔκειντο  
γῆς ἐπὶ ξένης, ὀρφανὰ τείχεα προλιπόντες  
Ἑλλάδος ἱερῆς καὶ μυχὸν ἐστίης πατρώης,  
ἦβην τ' ἐρατὴν καὶ καλὸν ἡλίου πρόσωπον.

ἐδυνάμην δ' ἂν ἔτι πολλὰς ἰδέας μέτρων καὶ  
διαφόρους εἰς τὸν ἠρωϊκὸν ἐμπιπτούσας στίχον  
ἐπιδεικνύναι, τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὀλίγου δεῖν  
πᾶσι συμβεβηκὸς μέτροις τε καὶ ῥυθμοῖς ἀποφαί-  
νειν, ὥστε τῆς μὲν ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς  
αὐτῆς μενούσης, τῆς δὲ συνθέσεως μόνης μεταπε-  
σοῦσης τά τε μέτρα μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι καὶ συμ-  
μεταπίπτειν αὐτοῖς τὰ σχήματα, τὰ χρώματα, τὰ  
ἦθη, τὰ πάθη, τὴν ὅλην τῶν ποιημάτων ἀξίωσιν·  
ἀλλ' ἀναγκασθήσομαι πλειόνων ἄψασθαι θεω-  
ρημάτων, ὧν ἔνια ὀλίγοις πάνυ ἐστὶ γνώριμα.  
ἐπὶ πολλῶν δ' ἴσως καὶ οὐχ ἦκιστα ἐπὶ τῶν  
τοιούτων καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι τὰ Εὐριπίδεια ταῦτα

---

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 13. 392-3. The Ionic foot was  $\cup \cup - -$  (*a minore*) or  $- - \cup \cup$  (*a maiore*).

<sup>2</sup> Sotades was a Hellenistic poet of the third century B.C., whose verse was considered to be effeminate. It appears to have been based on the Ionic foot. See Demetrius, *On Style* 189, and Roberts' note *ad loc.*, p. 244.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Ionic tetrameter <sup>1</sup>:

So there outstretched was he lying, his steeds and  
his chariot before,

Groaning, convulsively clutching the dust that  
was red with his gore.

So there outstretched was he lying, his steeds  
and his chariot before,

At the dust that was red with his gore clutching  
convulsively, groaning.

Such are the following Sotadean lines <sup>2</sup>:

There upon the summit of the burning pyres  
their corpses lay

In an alien land, the widowed walls forsaken  
far away,

Walls of sacred Hellas; and the hearths upon  
the homeland shore,

Winsome youth, the sun's fair face—forsaken all  
for evermore!

I could illustrate many further different types of metre, all falling under the category of the heroic line, and showing that the same thing is true of almost all the other metres and rhythms—that when the choice of words remains unchanged and only the arrangement is altered, the rhythm and the metre is changed, and with it the structure, the complexion, the character, the feeling and the general effectiveness of the lines.<sup>3</sup> But in doing so I should find it necessary to indulge in quite a number of speculations, some of which will be familiar to very few. To many speculations, perhaps, and particularly to such as these, the following lines of Euripides may be

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Quintilian 9. 4. 14–15.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔπενεγκεῖν·

μή μοι

λεπτῶν θίγγανε μύθων, ψυχῆ·

τί περισσὰ φρονεῖς; εἰ μὴ μέλλεις

σεμνύνεσθαι παρ' ὁμοίοις.

ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔάσειν μοι δοκῶ κατὰ τὸ παρόν. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἡ πεζὴ λέξις τὸ αὐτὸ δύναται παθεῖν τῇ ἐμμέτρῳ μενόντων μὲν τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλαττομένης δὲ τῆς συνθέσεως, πάρεστι τῷ βουλομένῳ σκοπεῖν. λήψομαι δ' ἐκ τῆς Ἡροδότου λέξεως τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἱστορίας, ἐπειδὴ καὶ γνώριμός ἐστι τοῖς πολλοῖς, μεταθεῖς τὸν χαρακτήρα τῆς διαλεκτοῦ μόνον. Ἐκροῖσος ἦν Λυδὸς μὲν γένος, παῖς δ' Ἀλυάττου, τύραννος δ' ἔθνῶν τῶν ἐντὸς Ἄλυσος ποταμοῦ· ὃς ῥέων ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας μεταξὺ Σύρων τε καὶ Παφλαγόνων ἐξίησι πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον εἰς τὸν Εὐξεῖνον καλούμενον πόντον· μετατίθημι τῆς λέξεως ταύτης τὴν ἀρμονίαν, καὶ γενήσεται μοι οὐκέτι ὑπαγωγικὸν τὸ πλάσμα οὐδ' ἱστορικόν, ἀλλ' ὀρθὸν μᾶλλον καὶ ἐναγώνιον· Ἐκροῖσος ἦν υἱὸς μὲν Ἀλυάττου, γένος δὲ Λυδός, τύραννος δὲ τῶν ἐντὸς Ἄλυσος ποταμοῦ ἔθνῶν· ὃς ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ῥέων μεταξὺ Σύρων καὶ Παφλαγόνων εἰς τὸν Εὐξεῖνον καλούμενον πόντον ἐκδίδωσι πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον· οὗτος ὁ χαρακτήρ οὐ πολὺ ἀπέχει ἀνδόξειεν τῶν Θουκυδίδου τούτων· Ἐπίδαμνός ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾷ εἰσπλέοντι τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον· προσοικοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν Ταυλάντιοι βάρβαροι, Ἴλ-



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

aptly applied <sup>1</sup>:

Meddle not, my soul, with subtleties:

Why complicate your thoughts, unless you hope  
To lord it o'er your peers?

I am therefore inclined to leave this matter for the present. But anyone who wishes may observe that the diction of prose can be affected in the same way as that of verse when the words are retained but their order changed.<sup>2</sup> I shall take from the text of Herodotus the opening of his *History*, since it is familiar to most people, simply altering the characteristic forms of the dialect.<sup>3</sup> "Croesus was a Lydian by birth and the son of Alyattes. He was king of the nations on this side of the river Halys, which flows from the south between Syria and Paphlagonia and discharges itself into the sea to the north, which is called the Euxine." I alter the arrangement of the words in this passage, and I shall find that the manner of writing is no longer leisurely and historical, but direct rather, and forensic: "Croesus was the son of Alyattes, and by birth a Lydian. He was king, on this side of the Halys, over nations; which river from the south flowing between Syria and Paphlagonia runs into the sea which is called the Euxine and issues towards the north." This style would not seem to differ greatly from that of Thucydides in the words <sup>4</sup>: "Epidamnus is a city on the right as you sail into the Ionian gulf; its immediate neighbours are barbarians, the Taulantii,

<sup>1</sup> Frag. 924 Nauck.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Orator* 70. 232.

<sup>3</sup> 1. 6.

<sup>4</sup> 1. 24. 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

λυρικὸν ἔθνος.' πάλιν δὲ ἀλλάξας τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν  
 ἑτέραν αὐτῇ μορφήν ἀποδώσω τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον·  
 'Ἄλυάττου μὲν υἱὸς ἦν Κροῖσος, γένος δὲ Λυδός,  
 τῶν δ' ἐντὸς Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ τύραννος ἔθνῶν· ὃς  
 ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ῥέων Σύρων τε καὶ Παφλαγόνων  
 μεταξὺ πρὸς βορέαν ἐξίησιν ἄνεμον εἰς τὸν καλού-  
 μενον πόντον Εὐξείνον.' Ἠγησιακὸν τὸ σχῆμα  
 τοῦτο τῆς συνθέσεως, μικρόκομψον, ἀγεννές, μαλ-  
 θακόν· τούτων γάρ τῶν λήρων ἱερεὺς ἐκεῖνος ἀνήρ  
 τοιαῦτα γράφων· 'Ἐξ ἀγαθῆς ἑορτῆς ἀγαθὴν  
 ἄγομεν ἄλλην.' 'Ἀπὸ Μαγνησίας εἰμὶ τῆς  
 μεγάλης Σιφυλεύς.' 'Οὐ γὰρ μικρὰν εἰς Θηβαίων  
 ὕδωρ ἔπτυσεν ὁ Διόνυσος· ἠδὲ μὲν γὰρ ἐστι, ποιεῖ  
 δὲ μαίνεσθαι.'

ἄλις ἔστω παραδειγμάτων. ἱκανῶς γὰρ οἶομαι  
 πεποιηκέναι φανερόν ὃ προὔκειτό μοι, ὅτι μείζονα  
 ἰσχὺν ἔχει τῆς ἐκλογῆς ἢ σύνθεσις. καί μοι δοκεῖ  
 τις οὐκ ἂν ἀμαρτεῖν εἰκάσας αὐτὴν τῇ Ὀμηρικῇ  
 Ἀθηνᾷ· ἐκείνη τε γὰρ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῆα τὸν αὐτὸν  
 ὄντα ἄλλοτε ἄλλοῖον ἐποίει φαίνεσθαι, τοτὲ μὲν  
 μικρὸν καὶ ῥυσὸν καὶ αἰσchrὸν

πτωχῶ λευγαλέω ἐναλίγκιον ἠδὲ γέροντι,  
 τοτὲ δὲ τῇ αὐτῇ ῥάβδῳ πάλιν ἐφαισαμένη  
 μείζονά τ' εἰσιδέειν καὶ πάσσονα θῆκεν ιδέσθαι,  
 καὶ δὲ κάρητος

οὔλας ἦκε κόμας ὑακινθίνῳ ἄνθει ὁμοίας.  
 αὕτη τε τὰ αὐτὰ λαμβάνουσα ὀνόματα τοτὲ μὲν

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

an Illyrian race." I shall alter the same passage once more and give a new form to it as follows. "Alyattes' son was Croesus, by birth a Lydian. King over all nations was he, on this side of the river Halys; which river from the south flowing between Syria and Paphlagonia discharges itself to the north, into the Euxine-called sea." This precious, degenerate, effeminate way of arranging words resembles that of Hegesias.<sup>1</sup> That writer was the high-priest of this kind of humbug, and wrote passages like: "After a goodly festival another goodly one we celebrate." "From Magnesia am I, the mighty land, a Sipylean." "It was not a small drop that into Theban waters Dionysus spewed: sweet it is indeed, but it makes men mad."

Enough of examples. I think I have sufficiently illustrated my point that composition is more important than choice of words. In fact, it seems to me that one would not be wrong to compare composition to Athene in Homer: for she used to make the same Odysseus appear in different forms at different times—at one time small, wrinkled and ugly, "resembling a pitiful, aged beggar",<sup>2</sup> and at another time, by another touch of the same wand, "she rendered him taller to see, and broader; and she made his wavy hair to fall over his shoulders like the hyacinth flower."<sup>3</sup> So also does composition take the same words, and make the ideas that they

<sup>1</sup> For Dionysius and Cicero (*Orator* 69. 230) the archetype of Asiatic degeneracy. See Vol. I, pp. x-xi. Flourished c. 250 B.C. and wrote a *History of Alexander*. See also p. 141, n. 2 and p. 148, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey* 16. 273, 17. 202, 24. 157.

<sup>3</sup> *Odyssey* 6. 230-1, 23. 157-8; cf. 8. 20, 24. 369.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἄμορφα καὶ ταπεινὰ καὶ πτωχὰ ποιεῖ φαίνεσθαι τὰ νοήματα, τοτὲ δ' ὑψηλὰ καὶ πλούσια [καὶ ἄδρὰ] <sup>1</sup> καὶ καλά. καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν σχεδὸν ᾧ μάλιστα διαλλάττει ποιητῆς τε ποιητοῦ καὶ ῥήτωρ ῥήτορος, τὸ συντιθέναι δεξιῶς τὰ ὀνόματα. τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἀρχαίοις ὀλίγου δεῖν πᾶσι πολλὴ ἐπιτήδευσις ἦν αὐτοῦ, παρ' ὃ καὶ καλά ἐστὶν αὐτῶν τὰ τε μέτρα καὶ τὰ μέλη καὶ οἱ λόγοι· τοῖς δὲ μεταγενεστέροις οὐκέτι πλὴν ὀλίγων· χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον παντάπασιν ἡμελήθη καὶ οὐδεὶς ᾧετο δεῖν ἀναγκαῖον αὐτὸ εἶναι οὐδὲ συμβάλλεσθαί τι τῷ κάλλει τῶν λόγων· τοιγάρτοι τοιαύτας συντάξεις κατέλιπον οἷας οὐδεὶς ὑπομένει μέχρι κορωνίδος διελθεῖν, Φύλαρχον λέγω καὶ Δοῦριν καὶ Πολύβιον καὶ Ψάωνα καὶ τὸν Καλλατιανὸν Δημήτριον Ἰερώνυμόν τε καὶ Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἡρακλείδην καὶ Ἡγησιάνακτα καὶ ἄλλους μυρίους· ὧν ἀπάντων εἰ τὰ ὀνόματα βουλοίμην λέγειν, ἔπιλείψει με ὁ τῆς ἡμέρας χρόνος. καὶ τί δεῖ τούτους θαυμάζειν, ὅπου γε καὶ οἱ φιλοσοφίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι καὶ τὰς διαλεκτικὰς ἐκφέροντες τέχνας οὕτως εἰσὶν ἄθλιοι περὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ᾧστε αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν; ἀπόχρη

<sup>1</sup> del. Sadée.

---

<sup>1</sup> All Hellenistic historians. See Introduction, Vol. I, pp. ix-x. The two most important in the list are probably Hieronymus of Cardia, and, of course, Polybius. Duris of Samos

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

convey appear misshapen, beggarly and mean, and at other times sublime, rich and beautiful. And this is, after all, what makes the difference between one poet or orator and another—the dexterity with which they arranged their words. Almost all the ancient writers made a special study of it, with the result that their metres, their lyrics and their prose are works of beauty. But among their successors, with few exceptions, this was no longer so. Then, in later times, it was totally neglected, and no one regarded it as essential, or even thought that it contributed anything to the beauty of discourse. Consequently they have left behind them compilations such as no one can bear to read to the final flourish of the pen: I refer to such men as Phylarchus, Duris, Polybius, Psaon, Demetrius of Callatis, Hieronymus, Antigonus, Heraclides, Hegesianax and countless others.<sup>1</sup> The space of a whole day “will not be sufficient for me”<sup>2</sup> to recite the names of all of them, if I should wish to do so. But why should we be surprised at these, when even those who claim to be philosophers and publish handbooks on logic are so inept in the arrangement of their words that I shrink even from mentioning their names? It is

(c. 340–260 B.C.) had a reputation in later antiquity for writing “tragic history”, and Phylarchus of Athens, who belonged to the next generation, was criticised by Polybius for sensationalism (2. 56–63).

<sup>2</sup> Demosthenes, *De Corona* 296.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

δὲ τεκμηρίῳ χρήσασθαι τοῦ λόγου Χρυσίππῳ τῷ Στωϊκῷ (περαιτέρω γὰρ οὐκ ἂν προβαίην).<sup>1</sup> τούτου γὰρ οὐτ' ἄμεινον οὐδείς τὰς διαλεκτικὰς τέχνας ἠκρίβωσεν οὔτε ἄρμονία χεῖρονι συνταχθέντας ἐξήνευκε λόγους τῶν γούν ὀνόματος καὶ δόξης ἀξιωθέντων. καίτοι σπουδάζεσθαι γέ τινες προσποιήθησαν αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ὄν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τέχνας γέ τινας ἔγραψαν ὑπὲρ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων· ἀλλὰ πολὺ τι πάντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπεπλάγχθησαν καὶ οὐδ' ὄναρ εἶδον, τί ποτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ποιῶν ἠδεῖαν καὶ καλὴν τὴν σύνθεσιν. ἐγὼ γ' οὖν ὅτ' ἔγνω συντάττεσθαι ταύτην τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, ἐζήτουν εἴ τι τοῖς πρότερον εἴρηται περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς φιλοσόφοις, εἰδὼς τοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ μικρὰν φροντίδα τοῦ λεκτικοῦ τόπου ποιουμένους· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὰληθῆ μαρτυρεῖν. οὐδαμῆ δ' οὐδὲν εἰρημένον ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ὄρων τῶν γούν ὀνόματος ἠξιωμένων οὔτε μείζον οὐτ' ἔλαττον εἰς ἣν ἐγὼ προήρημαι πραγματεῖαν, ἃς δὲ Χρυσίππος καταλέλοιπε συντάξεις διττὰς ἐπιγραφὴν ἐχούσας 'περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν' οὐ ῥητορικὴν θεωρίαν ἐχούσας ἀλλὰ διαλεκτικὴν, ὡς ἴσασιν οἱ τὰς βύβλους ἀνεγνωκότες, ὑπὲρ ἀξιωμάτων συντάξεως ἀληθῶν τε καὶ ψευδῶν καὶ δυνατῶν καὶ ἀδυνάτων ἐνδεχομένων τε καὶ μεταπιπτόντων καὶ ἀμφιβόλων καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν τοιουτοτρόπων, οὐδεμίαν οὐτ' ὠφέλειαν οὔτε χρεῖαν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς λόγοις συμβαλλομένας εἰς γούν ἠδονὴν καὶ κάλλος

<sup>1</sup> codd.: προβαίεν Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

sufficient to point to Chrysippus the Stoic<sup>1</sup> as proof of my statement, for beyond that I refuse to go. Of writers who have been judged worthy of renown or distinction, none has written treatises on logic with more precision, and none has published discourses which are worse specimens of composition. And yet some of those writers claimed to make a serious study of this department also, as being indispensable to good writing, and even wrote some handbooks on the classification of the parts of speech. But they all strayed far from the truth, and never even dreamt what it is that makes composition attractive and beautiful.<sup>2</sup> For my part, when I decided to write a treatise on this subject, I tried to discover whether my predecessors had said anything about it, especially the philosophers from the Stoa, since I knew that these men paid considerable attention to the subject of language: one must give them their due. But nowhere did I see any contribution, great or small, to the subject of my choice, by any author of repute. As for the two treatises which Chrysippus has left us, entitled *On the Classification of the Parts of Speech*, they contain, as those who have read the books are aware, not a rhetorical but a logical investigation: they deal with the grouping of propositions, true or false, possible and impossible, admissible and variable, ambiguous, and so forth. These contribute nothing helpful or useful to civil oratory, at least as far as the attractiveness and beauty of style are concerned; and these qualities

<sup>1</sup> He succeeded Cleanthes in 232 B.C. as head of the Stoa.

<sup>2</sup> On the limits of Stoic interest in style, see Cicero, *De Oratore* 2. 38. 159–61; *Brutus* 31. 117–9; Diogenes Laertius 7. 59.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

έρμηνείας, ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι τὴν σύνθεσιν· ταύτης μὲν τῆς πραγματείας ἀπέστην, ἐσκόπουν δ' αὐτὸς ἐπ' ἑμαυτοῦ γενόμενος, εἴ τινα δυναίμην εὐρεῖν φυσικὴν ἀφορμὴν, ἐπειδὴ παντὸς πράγματος καὶ πάσης ζητήσεως αὕτη δοκεῖ κρατίστη εἶναι ἀρχή. ἀψάμενος δέ τινων θεωρημάτων καὶ δόξας ὁδῶ μοι τὸ πρᾶγμα χωρεῖν ὡς ἔμαθον ἐτέρωσέ ποι ταύτην ἄγουσαν ἐμὲ τὴν ὁδόν, οὐχ ὅποι προυθέμην <sup>1</sup> καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἐλθεῖν, ἀπέστην. κωλύσει δ' οὐδὲν ἴσως κακείνης ἄψασθαι τῆς θεωρίας καὶ τὰς αἰτίας εἰπεῖν δι' ἃς ἐξέλιπον αὐτήν, ἵνα μὴ με δόξη τις ἀγνοία παρελθεῖν αὐτήν ἀλλὰ προαιρέσει.

5 ἔδόκει δὴ μοι τῇ φύσει μάλιστα ἡμᾶς ἐπομένους οὕτω δεῖν ἀρμόττειν τὰ μόρια τοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἐκείνη βούλεται. αὐτίκα τὰ ὀνόματα πρότερα ἡξιούν τάττειν τῶν ῥημάτων (τὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν οὐσίαν δηλοῦν, τὰ δὲ τὸ συμβεβηκός, πρότερον δ' εἶναι τῇ φύσει τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν συμβεβηκότων), ὡς τὰ Ὀμηρικὰ ἔχει ταυτί·

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα πολύτροπον  
καὶ

μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά  
καὶ

ἡέλιος δ' ἀνόρουσε λιπῶν

<sup>1</sup> PMV: πρ[ου]θέμην ὀπορευοίμην F: ἐπορευοίμην Usener.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

should be the aim of composition. I therefore abandoned this enquiry and, asserting my independence, proceeded to consider whether I could find some natural starting-point, since nature is believed to be the best basis of every operation and every enquiry. Applying myself to certain speculations, I was beginning to think that my operation was making some progress, when I realised that my path was leading me somewhere quite different, and not in the direction I had prescribed for myself, and in which I felt I had to proceed; and so I gave up. I suppose there will be no objection if I touch upon that enquiry also, and state the reasons which caused me to abandon it, so that I may avoid the suspicion of having passed it by through ignorance and not from choice.

Well, it seemed to me that we should follow nature 5  
as much as possible,<sup>1</sup> and to fit together the parts  
of speech as she demands. For example, I thought I  
should place nouns before verbs (since the former  
indicate the substance, and the latter the accident,  
and in the nature of things the substance is prior to  
its accidents). Thus Homer has these lines<sup>2</sup>:

A man—his story tell, O Muse, a man of many  
wiles  
and<sup>3</sup>

Wrath, O goddess, sing  
and<sup>4</sup>

The sun arose, abandoning

<sup>1</sup> A procedure of which a Stoic theorist would have approved.

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey* 1. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Iliad* 1. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Odyssey* 3. 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τούτοις· ἡγεῖται μὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τὰ ὀνόματα, ἔπεται δὲ τὰ ῥήματα. πιθανὸς ὁ λογος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθὴς ἔδοξεν εἶναί μοι. ἕτερα γοῦν παράσχοι τις ἂν παραδείγματα παρὰ τῷ αὐτῷ ποιητῇ κείμενα ἐναντίως συντεταγμένα ἢ ταῦτα συντέτακται, καλὰ δὲ οὐχ ἦττον καὶ πιθανά. τίνα οὖν <sup>1</sup> ἐστὶ ταῦτα·

κλυθὶ μεν αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος Ἄτρυτώνη  
καὶ

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχου-  
σαι . . .

μνήσαι πατρὸς σείο, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ.  
ἐν γὰρ τούτοις ἡγεῖται μὲν τὰ ῥήματα, ὑποτέτακται  
δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἂν αἰτιάσαιτο τὴν  
σύνταξιν ταύτην ὡς ἀηδῆ.

ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἄμεινον ἔδόκουν εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα  
προτάπτειν τῶν ἐπιρρημάτων, ἐπειδὴ πρότερόν  
ἐστὶ τῇ φύσει τὸ ποιοῦν ἢ πάσχον τῶν συνεδρευόν-  
των αὐτοῖς, τρόπου λέγω καὶ τόπου καὶ χρόνου καὶ  
τῶν παραπλησίων, ἃ δὴ καλοῦμεν ἐπιρρήματα,  
παραδείγμασι χρώμενος τούτοις·

τύπτε δ' ἐπιστροφάδην, τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ'  
ἀεικῆς . . .

ἤριπε δ' ἐξοπίσω, ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσεν . . .  
ἐκλίνθη δ' ἐτέρωσε, δέπας δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε χειρός.  
ἐν ἅπασι γὰρ δὴ τούτοις ὕστερα τέτακται [ἅμα] <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> τίνα οὖν codd.: οἰά τινα Usener.

<sup>2</sup> del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 5. 115.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad* 2. 484.

<sup>3</sup> *Iliad* 24. 486.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

and others like them, in which the nouns lead and the verbs follow. The theory is persuasive, but I decided that it was not valid. At any rate, one could furnish other examples from the same poet in which the arrangement is the opposite of this, and yet these lines are no less beautiful and convincing. What are these examples <sup>1</sup>?

Pray hear my words, untiring child of aegis-bearing  
Zeus

and <sup>2</sup>

O tell me now, ye Muses, who in halls Olympian  
dwell

and <sup>3</sup>

Recall to mind your sire, Achilles, godlike hero bold.  
In these lines the verbs lead the way, and the nouns follow in the second rank; yet no one could criticise their arrangement as unpleasant.

Again, I thought it was better to place verbs in front of adverbs, since that which acts or is acted upon is prior to those auxiliaries indicating manner, place, time and the like, which we call adverbs. I relied on the following examples <sup>4</sup>:

He struck them down on every side: their  
ghastly groan arose . . .

She staggered, backward-reeling, and gasped her  
life away . . . <sup>5</sup>

Recoiling, he fell sideways and the cup fell from  
his grasp. <sup>6</sup>

In all these cases the adverbs are placed after the

<sup>4</sup> *Iliad* 21. 20.

<sup>5</sup> *Iliad* 22. 467.

<sup>6</sup> *Odyssey* 22. 17.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῶν ῥημάτων τὰ ἐπιρρήματα. καὶ τοῦτο πιθανὸν μὲν ὡς τὸ πρῶτον, οὐκ ἀληθές δὲ ὡς οὐδ' ἐκεῖνο. τάδε γὰρ δὴ παρὰ τῷ αὐτῷ ποιητῇ ἐναντίως εἴρηται·

βοτρυδὸν δὲ πέτονται ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσι . . .  
σήμερον ἄνδρα φάοσδε μογοστόκος Εἰλείθια  
ἐκφανεῖ.

ἄρ' οὖν τι χεῖρω γέγονε τὰ ποιήματα ὑποταχθέντων τοῖς ἐπιρρήμασι τῶν ῥημάτων; οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴποι.

ἔτι καὶ τόδε ὥμην δεῖν μὴ παρέργως φυλάττειν, ὅπως τὰ πρότερα τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ τῇ τάξει πρότερα λαμβάνηται· οἷά ἐστι ταῦτα·

αὐ ἔρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν καὶ

λίγξε βιός, νευρὴ δὲ μέγ' ἴαχεν, ἄλτο δ' οἰστός καὶ

σφαῖραν ἔπειτ' ἔρριψε μετ' ἀμφίπολον βασιλεία·  
ἀμφιπόλου μὲν ἄμαρτε, βαθείη δ' ἔμβαλε δίνη.  
νὴ Δία, φαίη τις ἄν, εἴ γε μὴ καὶ ἄλλα ἦν πολλὰ οὐχ οὕτω συντεταγμένα ποιήματα οὐδὲν ἦττον ἢ ταῦτα καλά·

πλήξε δ' <sup>1</sup> ἀνασχόμενος σχίζῃ δρυός, ἦν λίπε κείων,  
πρότερον γὰρ δὴ που τὸ ἐπανατεῖναι ἐστι τοῦ πλήξαι. καὶ ἔτι

<sup>1</sup> F: πλήξεν PMV: κόψε δ' Homer.

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 2. 89.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad* 19. 103-4.

<sup>3</sup> *Iliad* 1. 459.

<sup>4</sup> *Iliad* 4. 125.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

verbs. This principle, like the others, is attractive; but it is equally unsound. For here are passages in the same poet expressed in the opposite way <sup>1</sup>:

Together ranged in clusters fly above the  
flowers of spring . . .

Today shall Eileithyia, Queen of Travail, bring to  
light

A hero.<sup>2</sup>

Well, are the lines at all inferior because the verbs are placed after the adverbs? No one would say so.

Yet again, I thought that I should never relax my efforts to see that things which were prior in time should also be taken prior in order, as in the following cases <sup>3</sup>:

They drew back first the victims' necks, then cut  
their throats and flayed their hides  
and <sup>4</sup>

The bow-frame thwacked, the string twanged  
loud, the arrow-shaft leaped forth  
and <sup>5</sup>

The princess threw the ball thereafter for a maid  
to catch:

It missed the maid, but found instead the  
swirling water's depths.

"Certainly," someone might say, "if only there were not many other lines not arranged in this order, and yet no less fine than these, like <sup>6</sup>

He struck, his arm upraising, with an oak-block  
left uncut.

Surely the arms must be raised *before* the blow is struck? And again <sup>7</sup>:

<sup>5</sup> *Odyssey* 6. 115-6.

<sup>6</sup> *Odyssey* 14. 425.

<sup>7</sup> *Odyssey* 3. 449-50.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἤλασεν ἄγχι στάς, πέλεκυς δ' ἀπέκοψε τένοντας  
αὐχενίους,

πρῶτον γὰρ δὴ που προσῆκεν τῷ μέλλοντι τὸν  
πέλεκυν ἐμβάλλειν εἰς τοὺς τένοντας τοῦ ταύρου τὸ  
στῆναι αὐτοῦ πλησίον.

ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἠξίου τὰ μὲν ὀνοματικὰ προτάτ-  
τειν τῶν ἐπιθέτων, τὰ δὲ προσηγορικὰ τῶν ὀνομα-  
τικῶν, τὰς δ' ἀντονομασίας τῶν προσηγορικῶν, ἔν-  
τε τοῖς ῥήμασι φυλάττειν, ἵνα τὰ ὀρθὰ τῶν ἐγκλι-  
ομένων ἠγῆται καὶ τὰ παρεμφατικά τῶν ἀπαρεμ-  
φάτων, καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα πολλά. πάντα δὲ  
ταῦτα διεσάλευεν ἡ πείρα καὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἄξια  
ἀπέφαινε. τοτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τούτων ἐγίνετο καὶ  
τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς ἠδεῖα ἢ σύνθεσις καὶ καλή, τοτὲ  
δ' ἐκ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων ἄλλ' ἐναντίων. διὰ  
ταύτας μὲν δὴ τὰς αἰτίας τῆς τοιαύτης θεωρίας  
ἀπέστην. ἐμνήσθη δ' αὐτῶν καὶ νῦν οὐχ ὡς  
σπουδῆς ἀξίων, καὶ τὰς διαλεκτικὰς παρεθέμην  
τέχνας οὐχ ὡς ἀναγκαίας, ἀλλ' ἵνα μηδεὶς δοκῶν  
ἔχειν τι αὐτὰς χρήσιμον εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν θεωρίαν  
περὶ πολλοῦ ποιῆται εἰδέναι, θηρευθεὶς ταῖς ἐπιγρα-  
φαῖς τῶν πραγματειῶν ὁμοιότητά τινα ἐχούσαις  
καὶ τῇ δόξῃ τῶν συνταξαμένων αὐτάς.

ἐπάνειμι δὴ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπόθεσιν ἀφ' ἧς  
εἰς ταῦτ' ἐξέβην, ὅτι πολλὴ πρόνοια τοῖς ἀρχαίοις  
ἦν καὶ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι φιλοσόφοις τε  
καὶ ῥήτορσι τῆς ἰδέας ταύτης, καὶ οὔτε τὰ ὀνόματα  
τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὔτε τὰ κῶλα τοῖς κώλοις οὔτε τὰς

---

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless certain general rules hold, the most important being that the subject usually precedes the verb, especially in

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

He drove the axe in, standing near, and the axe  
through the tendons clove,  
Of the neck.

Surely someone who was about to drive the axe into the bull's sinews should have taken up his stand near it first."

And still further, I thought it right to put my nouns before my adjectives, common before proper nouns, and pronouns before common nouns; and with verbs, to take care that the indicative should precede the other moods, and finite verbs infinitives, and so on. But experience upset all these assumptions and showed them to be completely worthless. Sometimes the composition was rendered pleasing and beautiful by these and similar arrangements, but at other times not by these but by the opposite sort. So for these reasons I abandoned such theories.<sup>1</sup> I have recalled these thoughts at the present time not because they deserve serious attention; and I have introduced these handbooks on logic not because they are essential reading, but in order to dissuade anyone from supposing that they contain anything useful for the present enquiry, and hence regarding it as important to know about them, because he has been captivated by the titles of their works, which have some affinity with the subject, and by the reputation of their authors.

I shall now return to my initial proposition, from which I digressed into these topics. It was that the ancient poets, historians, philosophers and orators gave much forethought to this branch of study. They considered that neither words, nor clauses, nor

main clauses. See Roberts' edition of this treatise, pp. 14-26, for a full discussion.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

περιόδους ἀλλήλαις εἰκῆ συνάπτειν ὦντο δεῖν, τέχνη δέ τις ἦν παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ θεωρήματα οἷς χρώμενοι συνετίθεσαν εὖ. τίνα δ' ἦν τὰ θεωρήματα ταῦτα, ἐγὼ πειράσομαι διδάσκειν, ὡς ἂν οἴός τε ᾧ, ὅσα μοι δύναμις ἐγένετο συνεξευρεῖν, οὐχ ἅπαντα λέγων ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ ἀναγκαιότατα.

6 δοκεῖ μοι τῆς συνθετικῆς ἐπιστήμης τρία ἔργα εἶναι· ἐν μὲν ἰδεῖν, τί μετὰ τίνος ἀρμοττόμενον<sup>1</sup> πέφυκε καλὴν καὶ ἡδεῖαν λήψεσθαι συζυγίαν· ἕτερον δὲ γνῶναι τῶν ἀρμόττεσθαι μελλόντων πρὸς ἀλληλα πῶς ἂν ἕκαστον σχηματισθὲν κρείττονα ποιήσῃ φαίνεσθαι τὴν ἀρμονίαν· τρίτον δ' εἴ τι δεῖται μετασκευῆς τῶν λαμβανομένων, ἀφαιρέσεως λέγω καὶ προσθήκης καὶ ἀλλοιώσεως, γνῶναί τε καὶ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν χρείαν οἰκείως ἐξεργάσασθαι. ὅ τι δὲ τούτων ἕκαστον δύναται, σαφέστερον ἐρῶ χρησάμενος εἰκόσι τῶν δημιουργικῶν τεχνῶν τισιν ἄς ἅπαντες ἴσασιν, οἰκοδομικῆ λέγω καὶ ναυπηγικῆ καὶ ταῖς παραπλησίαις· ὅ τε γὰρ οἰκοδόμος ὅταν πορίσῃται τὴν ὕλην ἐξ ἧς μέλλει κατασκευάζειν τὴν οἰκίαν, λίθους καὶ ξύλα καὶ κέραμον καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα, συντίθησιν ἐκ τούτων ἤδη τὸ ἔργον τρία ταῦτα πραγματευόμενος, ποίω δεῖ λίθω τε καὶ ξύλω καὶ πλίνθω ποῖον ἀρμόσαι λίθον ἢ ξύλον ἢ πλίνθον, ἔπειτα πῶς τῶν ἀρμοζομένων ἕκαστον καὶ ἐπὶ ποίας πλευρᾶς ἐδράσαι, καὶ τρίτον, εἴ τι δύσεδρόν ἐστιν, ἀποκροῦσαι καὶ περικόψαι καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο εὐέδρον ποιῆσαι· ὅ τε ναυπηγὸς τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα πραγματεύεται. τὰ

<sup>1</sup> PMV: ἀρμοζόμενον EF, Usener.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

periods should be put together at random, but they had a definite system of rules which they practised, and so composed well. What these principles were I shall try to explain to the best of my ability, stating not all, but only the most essential which I, along with others, have found it possible to discover.

I consider that the science of composition has three functions. The first is to observe which combinations are naturally likely to produce a beautiful and attractive united effect. The second is to judge how each of the parts which are to be fitted together should be shaped so as to improve the harmonious appearance of the whole. The third is to judge whether any modification is required in the material used—I mean subtraction, addition or alteration—and to carry out such changes with a proper view to their future purpose. The effect of each of these processes I shall explain more clearly by means of analogies drawn from the productive arts which are familiar to all—house-building, ship-building and the like. When a builder has supplied himself with the materials from which he intends to construct the house—stones, timber, tiling and all the rest—he proceeds at once to put together the building from these, paying close attention to the following three questions: what stone, timber and brick is to be fitted together with what other stone, timber and brick; next how each of the materials that are being so joined should be fitted, and on which of its sides; thirdly, if anything fits badly, how that very piece can be pared down and trimmed and made to fit well. And the shipwright gives his attention to

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

δὴ παραπλήσιά φημι δεῖν καὶ τοὺς μέλλοντας εὖ συνθήσειν τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια, πρῶτον μὲν σκοπεῖν, ποῖον ὄνομα ἢ ῥῆμα ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τι μορίων ποίῳ συνταχθὲν ἐπιτηδεῖως ἔσται κείμενον καὶ πῶς οὐκ<sup>1</sup> ἄμεινον (οὐ γὰρ δὴ πάντα γε μετὰ πάντων τιθέμενα πέφυκεν ὁμοίως διατιθέναι τὰς ἀκοάς). ἔπειτα διακρίνειν, πῶς σχηματισθὲν τοῦνομα ἢ τὸ ῥῆμα ἢ τῶν ἄλλων ὃ τι δὴ ποτε χαριέστερον ἰδρυθήσεται καὶ πρὸς τὰ ὑποκείμενα πρεπωδέστερον. λέγω δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὀνομάτων, πότερον ἐνικῶς ἢ πληθυντικῶς λαμβανόμενα κρείττω λήψεται συζυγίαν, καὶ πότερον κατὰ τὴν ὀρθὴν ἐκφερόμενα πτῶσιν ἢ κατὰ τῶν πλαγίων τινά, καὶ εἴ τινα πέφυκεν ἐξ ἀρρενικῶν γίνεσθαι θηλυκὰ ἢ ἐκ θηλυκῶν ἀρρενικὰ ἢ οὐδέτερα ἐκ τούτων, πῶς ἂν ἄμεινον σχηματισθεῖη, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ῥημάτων, πότερα κρείττω ἔσται λαμβανόμενα,<sup>2</sup> τὰ ὀρθὰ ἢ τὰ ὑπτια, καὶ κατὰ ποίας ἐγκλίσεις ἐκφερόμενα, ἃς δὴ τινες πτώσεις ῥηματικὰς καλοῦσι, κρατίστην ἔδραν λήψεται, καὶ ποίας παρεμφαίνοντα διαφορὰς χρόνων καὶ εἴ τινα τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἄλλα παρακολουθεῖν πέφυκε (τὰ δ' αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ λόγου μερῶν φυλακτέον, ἵνα μὴ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον λέγω). ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις τὰ ληφθέντα διακρίνειν, εἴ τι δεῖται μετασκευῆς ὄνομα ἢ ῥῆμα, πῶς ἂν ἐναρμονιώτερόν τε καὶ εὐεδρότερον γένοιτο. τοῦτο τὸ στοιχεῖον ἐν μὲν ποιητικῇ δαψιλέστερόν ἐστιν, ἐν δὲ λόγοις πεζοῖς σπανιώτερον. πλὴν γίνεται γε καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἐφ' ὅσον ἂν ἐγγωρῇ. ὃ τε γὰρ λέγων εἰς

<sup>1</sup> codd.: εὖ ἢ Usener.

<sup>2</sup> EPMV: λαβόμενα ἔσται F: λαμβανόμενα ἔσται Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

these same points. Now I say that those who are going to put the parts of speech together effectively should proceed in a similar way. They should consider first in what combinations with one another nouns, verbs or other parts of speech will be suitably placed, and how not so well—for it is surely not natural that every possible arrangement should affect the ear in the same way. Then they should decide the form in which the noun or verb, or whatever else it may be, will occupy its position more elegantly and will fit more appropriately into its context: I mean, with regard to nouns, whether they will afford a better combination if used in the singular or the plural; whether they should be put in the nominative or in one of the oblique cases; or, in words which admit both a masculine and a feminine form, or a neuter as an alternative to both, which would give the better effect, and so on in all cases. With regard to verbs, which form it will be better to adopt, the active or the passive, and in what moods (or verbal cases, as some call them) they should be expressed in order to occupy the best position, and also what differences of tense should be indicated; and so with all the other natural properties of verbs. These same provisions must be made with regard to the other parts of speech also; but I need not go into details. Next, it must be decided, if any of the selected nouns or verbs requires modification, how it may be fitted in more harmoniously and to better effect. This principle may be applied more lavishly in poetry than in prose; but it is applied in prose also as much as possible. The speaker who says εἶς

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τουτονὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα<sup>1</sup> προστέθεικέ<sup>1</sup> τι τῇ ἀντωνυμίᾳ γράμμα τῆς συνθέσεως στοχαζόμενος· ἄρτιον γὰρ ἦν 'εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἀγῶνα' εἰπεῖν· καὶ πάλιν ὁ λέγων 'κατιδὼν Νεοπτόλεμον τὸν ὑποκριτὴν' τῇ προθέσει παρηύξηκεν τοῦνομα, τὸ γὰρ ἰδὼν ἀπέχρη· καὶ ὁ γράφων 'μήτ' ἰδίας ἔχθρας<sup>2</sup> μηδεμιᾶς ἔνεχ' ἦκειν' ταῖς συναλοιφαῖς ἠλάττωκε τὰ μόρια τοῦ λόγου κάποκέκρουκέ τινα τῶν γραμμάτων· καὶ ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐποίησεν 'ἐποίησε' λέγων χωρὶς τοῦ ν̄ καὶ 'ἔγραψε' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔγραψεν λέγων καὶ 'ἀφαιρήσομαι' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀφαιρεθήσομαι καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὃ τ' 'ἔχωροφίλησε' λέγων τὸ ἐφιλοχώρησε καὶ 'λελύσεται' τὸ λυθήσεται καὶ τὰ τοιουτότροπα μετασκευάζει τὰς λέξεις, ἵν' αὐτῷ γένοιτο ἀρμοσθῆναι καλλίους καὶ ἐπιτηδειότεραι.

7 μία μὲν δὴ θεωρία τῆς συνθετικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἢ περὶ αὐτὰ τὰ πρῶτα μόρια καὶ στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως ἦδε· ἑτέρα δέ, ὡσπερ καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἔφην, ἢ περὶ τὰ καλούμενα κῶλα, ποικιλωτέρας τε δεομένην πραγματείας καὶ μείζονος, ὑπὲρ ἧς αὐτίκα δὴ πειράσομαι λέγειν ὡς ἔχω γνώμης. καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα ἀρμόσαι πρὸς ἄλληλα δεῖ ὡστ' οἰκεία φαίνεσθαι καὶ

<sup>1</sup> codd.: προστέθεικέ Usener.

<sup>2</sup> add. ἐμέ Demosthenes.

<sup>1</sup> Demosthenes, *De Corona* 1.

<sup>2</sup> Not for *smoothness* of composition, however, but for emphasis.

<sup>3</sup> Demosthenes, *On the Peace* 6. The fact that *κατιδὼν* and *ιδὼν* appear to mean the same to Dionysius need not lead us to assume that they meant the same to Demosthenes.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

τουτονὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα <sup>1</sup> (“ to the trial here ”) has added a letter to the pronoun with an eye to composition.<sup>2</sup> εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἀγῶνα would have conveyed the required meaning adequately. Again, when the speaker says κατιδὼν Νεοπτόλεμον τὸν ὑποκριτὴν <sup>3</sup> (“ catching sight of Neoptolemus the actor ”), he has merely lengthened the word by the addition of a pre-verb, since ἰδὼν alone would have been sufficient. And the writer of μήτ’ ἰδίας ἔχθρας μηδεμίας ἔνεχ’ ἦκειν <sup>4</sup> (“ to have come to court for no reason of private enmity ”), has shortened some of the parts of speech by the elisions and cut off some of the letters. And the author who says ἐποίησε instead of ἐποίησεν, dropping the ν,<sup>5</sup> and ἔγραψε in place of ἔγραψεν, and ἀφαιρήσομαι in place of ἀφαιρεθήσομαι, and all such cases, and who says ἐχωροφίλησε for ἐφιλοχώρησε and λελύσεται for λυθήσεται, and things of that sort—that author is altering the forms of his words in order to fit them together more beautifully and to better purpose.

This, then, is one aspect of the science of com- 7  
position, the one which is concerned with the primary parts and elements of speech. The other, as I said at the beginning,<sup>6</sup> is concerned with what are called “ clauses ”, and this requires fuller and more elaborate treatment. I shall try to state my views on this subject forthwith.<sup>7</sup> The clauses must be joined to one another so as to present an appearance

<sup>4</sup> Demosthenes, *Against Aristocrates* 1.

<sup>5</sup> In *Demosthenes* 38 Dionysius says that this ν was introduced by musical and metrical writers in order to eliminate hiatus.

<sup>6</sup> See Ch. 2, pp. 20–23.

<sup>7</sup> Demetrius, *On Style* 1–35 gives the most detailed ancient account of clausal and periodic structure. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 9. 5–9; Cicero, *Orator* 63, 66.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

φίλα καὶ σχηματίσαι ὡς ἂν ἐνδέχῃται κράτιστα προσκατασκευάσαι<sup>1</sup> τε, εἴ πού τι δέοι, μειώσει καὶ πλεονασμῶ καὶ εἰ δὴ τιν' ἄλλην μετασκευὴν δέχεται τὰ κῶλα· τούτων δ' ἕκαστον ἢ πείρα αὐτὴ διδάσκει· πολλάκις γὰρ τουτὶ τὸ κῶλον τούτου μὲν προτεθὲν ἢ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τεθὲν εὐστομίαν τινὰ ἐμφαίνει καὶ σεμνότητα, ἑτέραν δέ τινα συζυγίαν λαβὸν ἄχαρι φαίνεται καὶ ἄσεμνον. ὁ δὲ λέγω, σαφέστερον ἔσται, εἴ τις αὐτὸ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος ἴδοι. ἔστι δὴ τις παρὰ τῷ Θουκυδίδῃ λέξις ἐν τῇ Πλαταιέων δημηγορίᾳ πάνυ χαριέντως συγκειμένη καὶ μεστὴ πάθους ἦδε· 'ὕμεις τε ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἢ μόνῃ ἐλπίς, δέδιμεν μὴ οὐ βέβαιοι ἦτε.' φέρε δὴ τις λύσας τὴν συζυγίαν ταύτην μεθαρμοσάτω τὰ κῶλα οὕτως· 'ὕμεις τε, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, δέδιμεν μὴ οὐ βέβαιοι ἦτε, ἢ μόνῃ ἐλπίς.' ἄρ' ἔτι μένει τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἡρμοσμένων τῶν κῶλων ἢ αὐτὴ χάρις ἢ τὸ αὐτὸ πάθος; οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴποι. τί δ' εἰ τὴν Δημοσθένους λέξιν ταύτην 'τὸ λαβεῖν οὖν τὰ διδόμενα ὁμολογῶν ἔννομον εἶναι, τὸ χάριν τούτων ἀποδοῦναι παρανόμων γράφη';<sup>2</sup> λύσας τις καὶ μεταθεὶς τὰ κῶλα τουτονὶ τὸν τρόπον ἐξενέγκαι· 'ὁμολογῶν οὖν ἔννομον εἶναι τὸ λαβεῖν τὰ διδόμενα, παρανόμων γράφη τὸ τούτων χάριν ἀποδοῦναι', ἄρ' ὁμοίως ἔσται δικανικὴ καὶ στρογγύλη; ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶομαι.

<sup>1</sup> προκατασκευάσαι E Usener.

<sup>2</sup> F: γράφη· εἰ PMV: γράφει Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

of affinity and attachment; they must be given the best form of which they are capable, and they must be further adapted, if necessary, by abbreviation, expansion and by any other change of form which clauses admit; experience itself being the guide to each of these adjustments. It will often happen that one clause, when placed before another or after it produces a certain euphonious and dignified effect, while a different combination produces an effect lacking in both charm and dignity. My meaning will be clearer if illustrated by an example. Now there is a passage of Thucydides in the speech of the Plataeans, a very felicitously composed sentence, full of feeling, which is as follows <sup>1</sup>: "And we fear, men of Sparta, lest you, our only hope, may fail in resolution." Now let this arrangement be disturbed and the clauses be redispersed as follows: "And we fear, men of Sparta, lest you may fail in resolution, that are our only hope." When the clauses are arranged in this way, does the same charm still remain, or the same feeling? No one would say so. Again, with this passage of Demosthenes <sup>2</sup>: "The acceptance of the offerings, then, you admit as legal, but the rendering of thanks for them you indict as an illegal proposal." If the order is disturbed and the clauses interchanged, and the sentence rendered thus: "Admitting therefore that the acceptance of the offerings is legal, you indict as illegal the rendering of thanks for them", will the sentence be an equally terse piece of pleading? I, at any rate, do not think so.

<sup>1</sup> 3. 57. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *De Corona* 119.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

8 ἡ μὲν δὴ περὶ τὴν ἀρμογὴν τῶν κώλων θεωρία τοιαύτη, ἡ δὲ περὶ τὸν σχηματισμὸν ποδαπή; οὐκ ἔστιν εἷς τρόπος τῆς ἐκφορᾶς ἀπάντων τῶν νοημάτων, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὡς ἀποφαινόμενοι λέγομεν, τὰ δ' ὡς πυνθανόμενοι, τὰ δ' ὡς εὐχόμενοι, τὰ δ' ὡς ἐπιτάττοντες, τὰ δ' ὡς διαποροῦντες, τὰ δ' ὡς ὑποτιθέμενοι, τὰ δὲ ἄλλως πως σχηματίζοντες, οἷς ἀκολουθῶς καὶ τὴν λέξιν πειρώμεθα σχηματίζειν. πολλοὶ δὲ δὴ που σχηματισμοὶ καὶ τῆς λέξεώς εἰσιν ὥσπερ καὶ τῆς διανοίας, οὓς οὐχ οἷόν τε κεφαλαιωδῶς περιλαβεῖν, ἴσως δὲ καὶ ἄπειροι· περὶ ὧν καὶ πολὺς ὁ λόγος καὶ βαθεῖα ἡ θεωρία. οὐ δὴ τὸ αὐτὸ δύναται ποιεῖν τὸ αὐτὸ κῶλον οὕτω σχηματισθὲν ἢ οὕτως. ἐρῶ δὲ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος· εἰ τοῦτον ἐξήνεγκε τὸν τρόπον ὁ Δημοσθένης τὴν λέξιν ταύτην 'ταῦτ' εἶπας ἔγραψα, γράψας δ' ἐπρέσβευσα, πρεσβεύσας δ' ἔπεισα Θεβαίους', ἂρ' οὕτως ἂν συνέκειτο χαριέντως, ὡς νῦν σύγκειται; 'οὐκ εἶπον μὲν ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔγραψα δέ· οὐδ' ἔγραψα μὲν, οὐκ ἐπρέσβευσα δέ· οὐδ' ἐπρέσβευσα μὲν, οὐκ ἔπεισα δὲ Θεβαίους'. πολὺς δ' ἂν εἶη μοι λόγος, εἰ περὶ πάντων βουλοίμην λέγειν τῶν σχηματισμῶν

---

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the internal structure of individual clauses.

<sup>2</sup> These forms of expression correspond with the *moods*: indicative, interrogative, optative, imperative and subjunctive. The division is perhaps to be traced to Protagoras (Quintilian 3. 4. 9; Diogenes Laertius 9. 53).



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Such, then is the theory governing the fitting of clauses together. What principles govern the form in which they are cast<sup>1</sup>? There is no one means of expressing all our thoughts: we utter them sometimes in the form of a statement, at others as a question, at others as a prayer, at others as an order, at others as a dilemma, at others as a supposition,<sup>2</sup> and sometimes in other forms; and we try to shape the diction accordingly. Diction, too, is cast in many forms, as is thought; and it is impossible to comprehend them all in summary form<sup>3</sup>—indeed, they are probably infinite in number. To describe these would demand a long discussion and deep study. But obviously the same clause cannot have the same effect in one form as it has in another. I shall illustrate this by an example. If Demosthenes had phrased the following passage in this way: “Having spoken thus, I moved a resolution; and having moved a resolution, I went on the embassy; and having gone on the embassy, I convinced the Thebans”, would the sentence have been composed with the same elegance as in the form in which it was actually written<sup>4</sup>: “I did not speak thus, and then fail to move a resolution; I did not move a resolution, and then fail to go on the embassy; I did not go on the embassy, and then fail to convince the Thebans.” I should need to write at length if I wanted to describe

<sup>3</sup> Yet many rhetoricians attempted to do so. It is significant that Dionysius does not refer to any treatise of his own on the subject of figures, though Quintilian includes him in a list of critics who wrote *περὶ σχημάτων*.

<sup>4</sup> Demosthenes, *De Corona* 179. The sentence is quoted by the rhetoricians as an example of *climax* (*Ad Herennium* 4. 25; Demetrius, *On Style* 270; Quintilian 6. 3. 70).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οσους τὰ κῶλα ἐπιδέχεται. ἀπόχρη δὲ εἰσαγωγῆς ἔνεκα τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθαι.

9 ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι γε καὶ μετασκευὰς δέχεται τῶν κῶλων ἔνια τοτὲ μὲν προσθήκας λαμβάνοντα οὐκ ἀναγκαίως ὡς πρὸς τὸν νοῦν, τοτὲ δὲ ἀφαιρέσεις ἀτελῆ ποιούσας τὴν διάνοιαν, ἃς οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ἔνεκα ποιούσι ποιηταί τε καὶ συγγραφεῖς ἢ τῆς ἁρμονίας, ἵν' ἡδεῖα καὶ καλὴ γένηται, πάνυ ὀλίγου δεῖν οἶομαι λόγου. τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαι τήνδε μὲν τὴν λέξιν ἣν ὁ Δημοσθένης εἶρηκε προσθήκη πλεονάζειν οὐκ ἀναγκαίως τῆς ἁρμονίας ἔνεκα; ὁ γὰρ οἷς ἂν ἐγὼ ληφθείην, ταῦτα πράττων καὶ κατασκευαζόμενος, οὗτος ἐμοὶ πολεμεῖ, κἂν μήπω βάλλῃ μηδὲ τοξεύῃ.' ἐνταῦθα γὰρ οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου χάριν πρόσκειται τὸ τοξεύειν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸ τελευταῖον κῶλον τὸ 'κἂν μήπω βάλλῃ' βραχύτερον <sup>1</sup> τοῦ δέοντος ὃν καὶ οὐχ ἡδὺ ἀκουσθῆναι τῇ προσθήκῃ ταύτῃ γένηται χαριέστερον. καὶ ἔτι τὴν Πλατωνικὴν ἐκείνην περίοδον, ἣν ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ ὁ ἀνὴρ γράφει, τίς οὐκ ἂν φαίη παραπληρώματι λέξεως οὐκ ἀναγκαίως προσηρανίσθαι; 'ἔργων γὰρ εὖ πραχθέντων λόγῳ καλῶς ῥηθέντι μνήμη καὶ κόσμος γίνεται τοῖς πράξασι παρὰ τῶν ἀκουσάντων.' ἐνταυθοῖ γὰρ τὸ 'παρὰ τῶν ἀκουσ-

<sup>1</sup> V: βραχυτέρα P: τραχύτερον ceteri, mavult Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Demosthenes, *Philippic* 3. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Roberts, note *ad loc.*, rightly points out that the "addi-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

all the forms of presentation that clauses admit. That is all it is necessary to say by way of introduction.

However, I think I need only a few words to show 9 that some clauses admit changes which sometimes take the form of additions not required by the sense, and at other times curtailments which render the sense incomplete; and that both poets and prose authors introduce these variations for no other purpose than for melodiousness, so as to make the arrangement pleasant and beautiful. Who would not admit that this sentence of Demosthenes contains an accretion which is not necessary, but which is added in order to improve its melodious quality<sup>1</sup>: “ He who contrives and prepares means whereby I may be caught is at war with me, though he is not yet firing missiles and arrows at me ”? Here the reference to “ arrows ” is added not out of necessity, but in order that the last clause, “ though he is not yet firing missiles at me ”, being shorter than it ought to be and not pleasing to the ear, may be made more elegant by this addition.<sup>2</sup> Again, who would deny that the famous period which Plato writes in the Funeral Speech has been furnished with extra material which is not necessary to the sense: “ When deeds have been nobly done, then through speech finely uttered there comes honour and remembrance to the doers from the hearers.”<sup>3</sup> Here the words “ from the

tion ” of *μηδε τοξεύη* ensures that the sentence ends in a cretic followed by a spondee instead of two spondees, each

forming a word (*μήπω βάλλη*), which would give a more rigid effect. The *varia lectio βραχύτερον* (“ more abrupt ”) is perhaps to be preferred to the vaguer *τραχύτερον* (“ rougher ”).

<sup>3</sup> *Menexenus* 236E. Cf. *Demosthenes* 26.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

άντων' πρὸς οὐδέν ἀναγκαῖον λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸ τελευταῖον κῶλον τὸ 'τοῖς πράξασι' πάρισόν τε καὶ ἐφάμιλλον τοῖς πρὸ αὐτοῦ γένηται. τί δὲ δὴ τὸ παρ' Αἰσχίνῃ λεγόμενον τουτί 'ἐπὶ σαυτὸν καλεῖς, ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους καλεῖς, ἐπὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καλεῖς', τρίκωλον ἐν τοῖς πάνυ ἐπαινούμενον, οὐχὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἰδέας ἔχεται; ὁ γὰρ οἶόν τε ἦν ἐνὶ κῶλῳ περιληφθῆναι τόνδε τὸν τρόπον 'ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καλεῖς', τοῦτο εἰς τρία διήρηται, τῆς αὐτῆς λέξεως οὐ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου ἔνεκα, τοῦ δὲ ἠδίῳ ποιῆσαι τὴν ἀρμονίαν πολλάκις τεθείσης [καὶ προσέτι πάθος τῷ λόγῳ].<sup>1</sup>

τῆς μὲν δὴ προσθέσεως ἢ γίνεται τοῖς κῶλοις οὗτος ὁ τρόπος· τῆς ἀφαιρέσεως δὲ τίς; ὅταν τῶν ἀναγκαίων τι λέγεσθαι λυπεῖν μέλλῃ καὶ διοχλεῖν τὴν ἀκρόασιν, ἀφαιρεθὲν δὲ χαριεστέραν ποιῆ τὴν ἀρμονίαν· οἶά ἐστιν ἐν μὲν τοῖς μέτροις τὰ Σοφόκλεια ταυτί·

μύω τε καὶ δέδορκα κάξανίσταμαι

πλέον φυλάσσων αὐτὸς ἢ φυλάσσομαι·

ἐνταυθοῖ γὰρ ὁ δεύτερος στίχος ἐκ δυεῖν σύγκειται κῶλων οὐχ ὄλων· τελεία γὰρ ἂν ἡ λέξις ἦν οὕτως ἐξενεχθεῖσα 'πλείον φυλάσσων αὐτὸς ἐτέρους ἢ φυλασσόμενος ὑφ' ἐτέρων', τὸ δὲ μέτρον ἠδίκητο καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἔσχεν ἦν νῦν ἔχει χάριν. ἐν δὲ τοῖς πεζοῖς λόγοις τὰ τοιαῦτα· 'ἐγὼ δ' ὅτι μὲν τινῶν

<sup>1</sup> del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> 3. 202. Cf. Demetrius, *On Style* 268.

<sup>2</sup> Frag. 706 Nauck.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

hearers ” are spoken not because the sense requires them, but they are added in order that the last clause, “ to the doers ”, may balance and match in length what has preceded it. Consider also these words of Aeschines<sup>1</sup>: “. . . you summon him against yourself; you summon him against the laws; you summon him against the democracy.” Does not this much-admired sentence of three clauses adhere to the same form? Material which could have been combined in one clause, in this way: “. . . you summon him against yourself and the laws and the democracy ”, has been divided among three clauses, the same word being repeated not from necessity but in order to make the rhythm more agreeable [and further to add feeling to the discourse].

That is the way, then, by which clauses may be expanded. How do they come to be reduced? When something which is necessary to the sense is likely to cause offence or annoyance to the ear, and its removal adds charm to the rhythm. This is the case with the following lines of Sophocles<sup>2</sup>:

I close my eyes, I open them, I rise,

Myself the warder rather than the ward.

Here the second line is composed of two incomplete clauses. The expression would have been complete if it had run thus: “ myself warding others rather than being warded by others ”. But violence would have been done to the metre, and the line would not have acquired the charm which it now has. In prose there are such examples as<sup>3</sup> “ The fact that it is a

<sup>3</sup> Demosthenes, *Against Leptines* 2. This form of feigned omission was classified as a figure of thought and called *paraleipsis*, *eironeia*, *occultatio* and *praeteritio*. (See *Ad Herennium* 4. 37 and S. Usher in *A.J.P.* 1965, pp. 175-6.)

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

κατηγοροῦντα πάντας ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τὴν ἀτέλειαν τῶν ἀδίκων ἐστίν, ἑάσω.' μεμείωται γὰρ κἀνταῦθα τῶν πρώτων δυεῖν κώλων ἑκάτερον· αὐτοτελῆ δ' ἂν ἦν, εἴ τις αὐτὰ οὕτως ἐξήνεγκεν· ἕγὼ δ' ὅτι μὲν τινῶν κατηγοροῦντα ὡς οὐκ ἐπιτηδείων ἔχειν τὴν ἀτέλειαν πάντας ἀφαιρεῖσθαι καὶ τοὺς δικαίως αὐτῆς τυχόντας τῶν ἀδίκων ἐστίν, ἑάσω.' ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐδόκει τῷ Δημοσθένει πλείονα ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν τῆς ἀκριβείας τῶν κώλων ἢ τῆς εὐρυθμίας.

τὰ δ' αὐτὰ εἰρήσθω μοι καὶ περὶ τῶν καλουμένων περιόδων· καὶ γὰρ ταύτας χρὴ τὰς τε προηγουμένας καὶ τὰς ἐπομένας οἰκείως συναρμόττειν, ὅταν ἐν περιόδοις προσήκη τὸν λόγον ἐκφέρειν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ πανταχῆ γε τὸ ἐμπερίοδον χρήσιμον. καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ θεώρημα τῆς συνθετικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἴδιον, πότε δεῖ χρῆσθαι περιόδοις καὶ μέχρι πόσου καὶ πότε μή.

- 10 διωρισμένων δὴ μοι τούτων ἀκόλουθον ἂν εἴη λέγειν, τίνα ἐστὶν ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι τὸν βουλόμενον συντιθέναι τὴν λέξιν εὖ καὶ διὰ τίνων θεωρημάτων τυγχάνοι τις ἂν ὧν βούλεται. δοκεῖ δέ μοι δύο ταῦτ' εἶναι <τὰ> <sup>1</sup> γενικώτατα, ὧν ἐφίεσθαι δεῖ τοὺς συντιθέντας μέτρα τε καὶ λόγους, ἢ τε ἡδονὴ καὶ τὸ καλόν· ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ ἐπιζητεῖ ταῦτα ἢ ἀκοή, ὅμοιον τι πάσχουσα τῇ ὁράσει· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνη πλάσματα καὶ γραφὰς καὶ γλυφὰς καὶ

<sup>1</sup> Sauppe.

<sup>1</sup> It is therefore very strange that Dionysius does not examine the subject more closely. Contrast Demetrius' full treatment, 10–35, 303.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

case of injustice when a person, in accusing certain parties, tries to deprive all of exemption, I shall pass over." Here, too, each of the first two clauses is shortened. They would each have been complete in themselves if they had been expressed thus: "I shall let pass the fact that it is a case of injustice that, when someone is accusing certain individuals of being unfit for exemption, that privilege should be withheld from everyone, even those who receive it by right." But it was not Demosthenes' policy to pay more attention to the precision of his clauses than to the beauty of their rhythm.

I intend what I have said to apply also to what are called "periods". For, when it is appropriate to deliver one's speech in periods, these must precede or follow one another in a closely harmonious sequence. Of course, the periodic style should not be used everywhere: and this very question—when periods should be used and to what extent, and when not—is one of particular relevance to the science of composition.<sup>1</sup>

Now that these distinctions have been made, my 10 next task will be to say what should be the objectives of the writer who wishes to compose well, and what principles he must follow in order to attain his goal. It seems to me that the two most important effects which those who write both poetry and prose should aim at are attractiveness and beauty.<sup>2</sup> The ear craves for both of these, being affected in much the same way as the eye: for the latter, when it views moulded figures, pictures, carvings, or any other

<sup>2</sup> Applied to creative work in general in *Demosthenes* 47. See note *ad loc.*, Vol. I, p. 419.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ὅσα δημιουργήματα χειρῶν ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὀρώσα ὅταν εὐρίσκη τό τε ἡδὺ ἐνὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ καλόν, ἀρκεῖται καὶ οὐδὲν ἔτι ποθεῖ. καὶ μὴ παράδοξον ἡγήσηται τις, εἰ δύο ποιῶ τέλη καὶ χωρίζω τὸ καλὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς, μηδ' ἄτοπον εἶναι νομίση, εἰ τινα ἡγοῦμαι λέξιν ἡδέως μὲν συγκεῖσθαι, μὴ καλῶς δέ, ἢ καλῶς μὲν, οὐ μὴν καὶ ἡδέως· φέρει γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια τὸ τοιοῦτον καὶ οὐδὲν ἀξιῶ καινόν· ἢ γέ τοι Θουκυδίδου λέξις καὶ Ἀντιφῶντος τοῦ Ῥαμνουσίου καλῶς μὲν σύγκειται νῆ Δία, εἰ πέρ τινες καὶ ἄλλαι, καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις αὐτὰς ἔχοι μέμψασθαι κατὰ τοῦτο, οὐ μὴν ἡδέως γε πάνυ· ἢ δέ γε τοῦ Κνιδίου συγγραφέως Κτησίου καὶ ἢ τοῦ Σωκρατικοῦ Ξενοφῶντος ἡδέως μὲν ὡς ἐνὶ μάλιστα, οὐ μὴν καλῶς γ' ἐφ' ὅσον ἔδει· λέγω δὲ κοινότερον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καθάπαξ, ἐπεὶ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνοις ἤρμοσταί τινα ἡδέως καὶ παρὰ τούτοις καλῶς. ἢ δὲ Ἡροδότου σύνθεσις ἀμφότερα ταῦτα ἔχει, καὶ γὰρ ἡδεΐά ἐστι καὶ καλή.

- 11 ἐξ ὧν δ' οἶμαι γενήσεσθαι λέξιν ἡδεΐαν καὶ καλήν, τέτταρά ἐστι ταῦτα τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ τὰ κράτιστα, μέλος καὶ ῥυθμὸς καὶ μεταβολὴ καὶ τὸ παρακολουθοῦν τοῖς τρισὶ τούτοις πρέπον. τάττω δὲ ὑπὸ μὲν τὴν ἡδονὴν τὴν τε ὄραν καὶ τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν εὐστομίαν καὶ τὴν γλυκύτητα καὶ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I, pp. 228-9.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. they excite admiration rather than aesthetic pleasure.

<sup>3</sup> Expatriate Greek historian and doctor, who lived at the court of the Persian king Artaxerxes and wrote a history of



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

human artefacts, and finds both attractiveness and beauty in them, is satisfied and desires nothing more. And no one should think it surprising that I should postulate two objects of style, and distinguish between beauty and attractiveness, or think it odd that I should consider a certain passage attractively composed, but not beautifully, or beautifully and yet not attractively. Actual experience shows this: I am making no novel claim. The writings of Thucydides and of Antiphon of Rhamnus<sup>1</sup> are most certainly as beautifully composed as any, and could not possibly be criticised from that point of view; but they are not particularly attractive.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the style of the historian Ctesias of Cnidus<sup>3</sup> and that of Xenophon the Socratic<sup>4</sup> are in the highest possible degree attractive, but not as beautiful as they should have been. I mean this as a general criticism, but not without exception: for there are instances of attractive arrangement in the former, and of beautiful arrangement in the latter. But the composition of Herodotus has both these qualities: it is both attractive and beautiful.<sup>5</sup>

Of the ingredients from which an attractive and 11 beautiful style may be constituted, there are four which are the most important and effective—melody, rhythm, variety, and appropriateness accompanying the use of these three.<sup>6</sup> Under attractiveness I list freshness, charm, euphony, sweetness, persuasive-

that country in twenty-three books.

<sup>4</sup> So described also by Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1. 52 and elsewhere. For a fuller critique see *Letter to Pompeius* 4.

<sup>5</sup> Dionysius greatly admired Herodotus, who was his fellow-citizen. See *Thucydides* 5, *Demosthenes* 41, *Letter to Pompeius* 3.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 47.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πιθανὸν καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὑπὸ δὲ τὸ καλὸν τήν τε μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ τὸ βάρος καὶ τὴν σεμνολογίαν καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὸν πίνον καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια. ταυτὶ γάρ μοι δοκεῖ κυριώτατα εἶναι καὶ ὡσπερ κεφάλαια τῶν ἄλλων ἐν ἑκατέρῳ. ὧν μὲν οὖν στοχάζονται πάντες οἱ σπουδῆ γράφοντες μέτρον ἢ μέλος ἢ τὴν λεγομένην πεζὴν λέξιν, ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τι παρὰ ταῦθ' ἕτερον· οἱ δὲ πρωτεύσαντες ἐν ἑκατέρῳ<sup>1</sup> τινὶ τούτων καὶ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις πολλοὶ τε καὶ ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες· παραδείγματα δὲ αὐτῶν ἑκάστον φέρειν ἐν τῷ παρόντι οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ, ἵνα μὴ περὶ ταῦτα κατατρίψω τὸν λόγον· καὶ ἅμα εἴ τι λεχθῆναι περὶ τινος αὐτῶν καθήκει καὶ δεήσει που μαρτυριῶν, ἕτερος αὐτοῖς ἔσται καιρὸς ἐπιτηδειότερος, ὅταν τοὺς χαρακτήρας τῶν ἀρμονιῶν ὑπογράψω. νῦν δὲ ταῦτ' εἰρήσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν ἀπόχρη. ἐπάνειμι δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς διαιρέσεις, ἃς ἐποησάμην τῆς θ' ἡδείας συνθέσεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς, ἵνα μοι καὶ καθ' ὁδόν, ὡς φασι, χωρῆ ὁ λόγος.

ἔφην δὴ τὴν ἀκοὴν ἠδεσθαι πρώτοις μὲν τοῖς μέλεσιν, ἔπειτα τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς, τρίτον ταῖς μεταβολαῖς, ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἅπασιν τῷ πρέποντι. ὅτι δὲ ἀληθῆ λέγω, τὴν πείραν αὐτὴν παρέξομαι μάρτυρα, ἣν οὐχ οἶόν τε διαβάλλειν τοῖς κοινοῖς πάθεσιν ὁμολογουμένην· τίς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς οὐχ ὑπὸ μὲν

<sup>1</sup> F, PMV: ἐτέρῳ Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

ness and all such qualities; and under beauty impressiveness, solemnity, seriousness, dignity, mellowness and qualities like them. These seem to me the most important, heading the list, so to speak, in either case. These are the qualities aimed at by all serious writers of poetry, both spoken and sung, and by writers of what is called "prose",<sup>1</sup> and I doubt whether there are any others. There are many excellent authors who have been outstanding in one or in both of these qualities. It is not practicable at present to give examples from the writings of each, for this would render my discourse tedious; while if something should require to be said about one of them and some evidence is needed, I shall have a more suitable opportunity to introduce them when I come to outline the different styles of literary composition. But for the present what I have said of them is sufficient. I will now return to the division which I made of composition into "attractive" and "beautiful", in order that my discourse may "keep on its path", as they say.

Well, I said that the ear took pleasure first of all in melody, then in rhythm, thirdly in variety, and finally in the appropriateness with which all these qualities are used.<sup>2</sup> As witness to the truth of my statement I shall adduce experience, which cannot be refuted because it conforms to the general feelings of mankind.<sup>3</sup> For who is there that is not stirred and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plato, *Sophistes* 237A.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 47.

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle writes in similar terms on the value of εἰκός argument in *Rhetoric* 1. 15. 17.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ταύτης τῆς μελωδίας ἄγεται καὶ γοητεύεται, ὑφ' ἑτέρας δέ τινος οὐδέν πάσχει τοιοῦτον, καὶ ὑπὸ μὲν τούτων τῶν ῥυθμῶν οἰκειοῦται, ὑπὸ δὲ τούτων διοχλεῖται; ἤδη δ' ἔγωγε καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολυανθρωποτάτοις θεάτροις, ἃ συμπληροῖ παντοδαπὸς καὶ ἄμουσος ὄχλος, ἔδοξα καταμαθεῖν, ὡς φυσικὴ τις ἀπάντων ἐστὶν ἡμῶν οἰκειότης πρὸς ἐμμέλειάν τε καὶ εὐρυθμίαν, κιθαριστήν τε ἀγαθὸν σφόδρα εὐδοκιμοῦντα ἰδὼν θορυβηθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, ὅτι μίαν χορδὴν ἀσύμφωνον ἔκρουσε καὶ διέφθειρεν τὸ μέλος, καὶ αὐλητὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας ἔξεως χρώμενον τοῖς ὄργανοις τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντα, ὅτι σομφὸν ἐμπνεύσας ἢ μὴ πιέσας τὸ στόμα θρυλιγμὸν ἢ τὴν καλουμένην ἐκμέλειαν ἠῦλησε. καίτοι γ' εἴ τις κελεύσειε τὸν ἰδιώτην τούτων τι ὧν ἐνεκάλει τοῖς τεχνίταις ὡς ἡμαρτημένων, αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι λαβόντα τὰ ὄργανα, οὐκ ἂν δύναίτο. τί δὴ ποτε; ὅτι τοῦτο μὲν ἐπιστήμης ἐστίν, ἧς οὐ πάντες μετειλήφαμεν, ἐκεῖνο δὲ πάθος ὃ πᾶσιν ἀπέδωκεν ἡ φύσις. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ῥυθμῶν γινόμενον ἐθεασάμην, ἅμα πάντας ἀγανακτοῦντας καὶ δυσारेστουμένους, ὅτε τις ἢ κροῦσιν ἢ κίνησιν ἢ μορφήν ἐν ἀσυμμέτροις ποιήσαιτο χρόνοις καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς ἀφανίσειεν.

καὶ οὐχὶ τὰ μὲν ἐμμελῆ καὶ εὐρυθμα ἡδονῆς

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* 3. 50. 196. The aural sensitivity of ancient, and especially Greek, audiences was a well-known hazard both to musical performers and to actors. See Aristophanes, *Frogs* 304.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

bewitched by one melody, but has no such feeling on hearing another, and feels at home with this rhythm, while that one fills him with irritation? Before now I have thought I perceived, even in the most popular theatres, filled with a crowd of men of all kinds and of little culture, how all of us feel naturally at home with tuneful melody and good rhythm. I have seen an able and very renowned harpist booed by the public because he struck a single false note and so spoiled the melody.<sup>1</sup> I have also seen a reed-pipe player who handled his instrument with supreme skill suffering the same fate because he blew thickly, or through not tightening his embouchure produced a discordant sound or what is called a "broken note" as he played.<sup>2</sup> And yet if anyone told the unskilled listener to take up the instrument himself and play any of the passages whose performance by professionals he was criticising, he would be unable to do so. Why ever is this? Because the latter is a matter of technical knowledge, which we do not all share, while the former is a matter of feeling, which nature has conferred upon all men. I have observed the same thing occurring in the case of rhythms: everyone with one voice expresses annoyance and displeasure when a performer strikes an instrument, takes a step or makes a gesture out of time, and so destroys the rhythm.

Again, it is not the case that, whereas good melody

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Dionysius is here referring to the effect known as "overblowing", which in the clarinet, the nearest modern equivalent of the ancient *aulos*, produces, in addition to the note fingered, a note a twelfth above.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀγωγὰ ἐστὶ καὶ πάντες ὑπ' αὐτῶν κηλούμεθα, αἱ μεταβολαὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ πρέπον οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν αὐτὴν ὄραν καὶ χάριν οὐδ' ὑπὸ πάντων ὁμοίως διακούονται· ἀλλὰ κακεῖνα πάνυ κηλεῖ πάντας ἡμᾶς κατορθούμενα καὶ εἰς πολλὴν ὄχλησιν ἄγει διαμαρτανόμενα· τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν; τεκμαίρομαι δέ, ὅτι καὶ τῆς ὀργανικῆς μούσης καὶ τῆς ἐν ᾠδῇ καὶ τῆς ἐν ὀρχήσει χάριτος <μὲν><sup>1</sup> ἐν ἅπασι διευστοχούσης, μεταβολὰς δὲ μὴ ποιησαμένης εὐκαίρους ἢ τοῦ πρέποντος ἀποπλανηθείσης βαρὺς μὲν ὁ κόρος, ἀηδὲς δὲ τὸ μὴ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἀρμόττον φαίνεται. καὶ οὐκ ἀλλοτρία κέχρημαι τοῦ πράγματος εἰκόνι. μουσικὴ γάρ τις ἦν καὶ ἡ τῶν πολιτικῶν λόγων ἐπιστήμη τῷ ποσῷ διαλλάττουσα τῆς ἐν ᾠδῇ καὶ ὀργάνοις, οὐχὶ τῷ ποιῷ· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταύτῃ καὶ μέλος ἔχουσιν αἱ λέξεις καὶ ῥυθμὸν καὶ μεταβολὴν καὶ πρέπον, ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης ἡ ἀκοὴ τέρπεται μὲν τοῖς μέλεσιν, ἄγεται δὲ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς, ἀσπάζεται δὲ τὰς μεταβολὰς, ποθεῖ δ' ἐπὶ πάντων τὸ οἰκεῖον, ἡ δὲ διαλλαγὴ κατὰ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον.

διαλέκτου μὲν οὖν μέλος ἐνὶ μετρεῖται διαστήματι τῷ λεγομένῳ διὰ πέντε ὡς ἔγγιστα, καὶ οὔτε ἐπιτείνεται πέρα τῶν τριῶν τόνων καὶ ἡμιτονίου ἐπὶ τὸ ὄξυ οὔτ' ἀνίεται τοῦ χωρίου τούτου πλέον ἐπὶ τὸ βαρὺ. οὐ μὲν ἅπασα λέξις ἢ καθ' ἐν μόριον λόγου ταττομένη ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς λέγεται τάσεως, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ὀξείας, ἡ δ' ἐπὶ τῆς

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

and rhythm are conducive to pleasure, and we are all enchanted by them, variety and appropriateness have less freshness and charm, and a less universal effect on their hearers. No, these too completely enchant all of us when they are achieved, just as failure to achieve them causes us great annoyance. Who would not admit this? To prove the point, I refer to the case of instrumental music, whether it accompanies song or dancing: if it achieves charm in everything it aims to do, but fails to introduce variety at the right time or strays from propriety, we feel the weight of satiety and have an unpleasant impression of disharmony with the subject. And the illustration I have used is not irrelevant: for the science of civil oratory is, after all, a kind of musical science, differing from vocal and instrumental music in degree, not in kind.<sup>1</sup> In oratory, as in music, the phrases possess melody, rhythm, variety and appropriateness; so that here too the ear delights in the melodies, is stirred by the rhythms, welcomes the variations, and all the time desires what is appropriate to the occasion. The distinction is simply one of degree.

Now the melody of spoken language is measured by a single interval, which is very close to that which is called a *fifth*. When the voice rises towards the acute, it does not rise more than three tones and a semitone; and when it falls towards the grave, it does not fall from this position by more than this interval. However, the whole utterance during one word is not delivered at the same pitch throughout, but one part of it is at the acute pitch, another is at

<sup>1</sup> See Aristoxenus, *Harmonics* 1. 3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

βαρείας, ἢ δ' ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν. τῶν δὲ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς τάσεις ἔχουσῶν αἱ μὲν κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν συνεφθαρμένον ἔχουσι τῷ ὀξεῖ τὸ βαρὺ, ἃς δὴ περισπωμένας καλοῦμεν· αἱ δὲ ἐν ἑτέρα τε καὶ ἑτέρα χωρὶς ἑκάτερον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν οἰκείαν φυλάττον φύσιν. καὶ ταῖς μὲν δισυλλάβοις οὐδὲν τὸ διὰ μέσου χωρίον βαρύτητός τε καὶ ὀξύτητος· ταῖς δὲ πολυσυλλάβοις, ἡλίκαί ποτ' ἂν ᾧσιν, ἢ τὸν ὀξὺν τόνον ἔχουσα μία ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς ἄλλαις βαρείαις ἔνεστιν. ἢ δὲ ὀργανικὴ τε καὶ ὠδικὴ μουσα διαστήμασί τε χρῆται πλείοσιν, οὐ τῷ διὰ πέντε μόνον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ διὰ πασῶν ἀρξαμένη καὶ τὸ διὰ πέντε μελωδεῖ καὶ τὸ διὰ τεττάρων καὶ <τὸ διὰ τριῶν καὶ τὸν> <sup>1</sup> τόνον καὶ τὸ ἡμιτόνιον, ὡς δέ τινες οἴονται, καὶ τὴν δίοσιν αἰσθητῶς· τὰς τε λέξεις τοῖς μέλεσιν

<sup>1</sup> Radermacher.

---

<sup>1</sup> This passage deals with (a) the range, and (b) the variation in the pitch of the spoken language of classical Greece, as governed by the system of accentuation introduced by the scholars of Alexandria. With regard to range, the meaning of the phrase *τοῦ χωρίου τούτου* is crucial. Roberts takes it with *πλέον*, and translates "than this interval", but this meaning of *χωρίον* is unparalleled, and unlikely since *διάστημα* has been used in this sense in the same sentence. I take *πλέον* absolutely, "more", and understand "than this interval" from the context. In Dionysius (e.g. *Demosthenes* 34) *χωρίον* means "place", "position" or "passage". The passage will then mean that a voice which has risen by the interval of a fifth required by the acute accent will *return* to the lower



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the grave, another is at both. Of the words which have both pitches, some have the grave fused with the acute on the same syllable, and we call these "circumflexed"; others have them falling on separate syllables, and each retains its own quality. Now in words of two syllables there is no interval intermediate between low and high pitch; while in polysyllabic words, however long, only one syllable carries the acute accent among the many others in low pitch.<sup>1</sup> But music, both instrumental and vocal, uses a considerable number of intervals, not the fifth only. Beginning with the whole octave, it also uses in its melodies the fourth, the third, the tone, the semitone, and even the quarter-tone quite distinguishably, according to some. Music requires that the words should be subordinate to the melody,

pitch, and so remain within the range of the fifth. If this translation is correct, the argument of J. Carson (*J.H.S.* 1969, pp. 34-7) in favour of a range of a fifth on either side of a given central pitch, giving a potential range of an octave, cannot be sustained on the evidence of this passage. But Dionysius here provides clear evidence for the theory of "contonation" propounded by Allen (*Vox Graeca* pp. 113-4) and supported by Carson. The fall of tone after an acute, unlike the rise that accompanies it, is not abrupt but gradual, giving rise to the variation of pitch (b) here described by Dionysius. But since the pitch must return to the low level at the end of the word (hence the substitution of grave for acute on final syllables), the pitch after an acute accent on a polysyllabic word can descend more gradually than on a word of only two syllables, assuming in both cases that the acute falls as far back from the end as the laws of accentuation permit (i.e. to the antepenultimate syllable). In the case of a word having a grave on its final syllable, one may perhaps assume a slight rise preceding the final fall of pitch.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ὑποτάττειν ἀξιοῖ καὶ οὐ τὰ μέλη ταῖς λέξεσιν, ὡς ἐξ ἄλλων τε πολλῶν δῆλον καὶ μάλιστα ἐκ τῶν Εὐριπίδου μελῶν, ἃ πεποίηκεν τὴν Ἡλέκτραν λέγουσαν ἐν Ὁρέστη πρὸς τὸν χορόν·

σῖγα σῖγα, λευκὸν ἴχνος ἀρβύλης

τίθετε,<sup>1</sup> μὴ κτυπεῖτ'·

ἀποπρὸ βᾶτ' <sup>2</sup> ἐκεῖσ', ἀποπρὸ μοι κοίτας.

ἐν γὰρ δὴ τούτοις τὸ 'σῖγα σῖγα λευκὸν' ἐφ' ἐνὸς φθόγγου μελωδεῖται, καίτοι τῶν τριῶν λέξεων ἐκάστη βαρείας τε τάσεις ἔχει καὶ ὀξείας. καὶ τὸ 'ἀρβύλης' τῇ μέσῃ συλλαβῇ τὴν τρίτην ὁμότονον ἔχει, ἀμμηχάνου ὄντος ἐν ὄνομα δύο λαβεῖν ὀξείας. καὶ τοῦ 'τίθετε' <sup>3</sup> βαρυτέρα μὲν ἢ πρώτη γίνεται, δύο δ' αἰ μετ' αὐτὴν ὀξύτονοί τε καὶ ὁμόφωνοι. τοῦ τε 'κτυπεῖτε' ὁ περισπασμὸς ἠφάνισται· μιᾷ γὰρ αἰ δύο συλλαβαὶ λέγονται τάσει. καὶ τὸ 'ἀποπρὸ βᾶτε' οὐ λαμβάνει τὴν τῆς μέσης συλλαβῆς προσωδίαν ὀξεῖαν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν τετάρτην συλλαβὴν μεταβέβηκεν ἢ τάσις ἢ τῆς τρίτης.

τὸ δ' αὐτὸ γίνεται καὶ περὶ τοὺς ῥυθμούς. ἢ μὲν γὰρ πεζῇ λέξις οὐδενὸς οὔτε ὀνόματος οὔτε ῥήματος βιάζεται τοὺς χρόνους οὐδὲ μετατίθησιν, ἀλλ' οἷας παρείληφεν τῇ φύσει τὰς συλλαβὰς τὰς τε μακρὰς καὶ τὰς βραχεῖας, τοιαύτας φυλάττει· ἢ δὲ μουσικὴ τε καὶ ῥυθμικὴ μεταβάλλουσιν αὐτὰς μειοῦσαι καὶ παραύξουσαι, ὥστε πολλάκις εἰς τὰναντία μεταχωρεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ταῖς συλλαβαῖς

<sup>1</sup> Euripides: τιθεῖτε FEMV.

<sup>2</sup> Usener: ἀπο προβᾶτ' PM: ἀπο πρόβατ' FEa.

<sup>3</sup> Euripides: τίθεται FP: τιθεῖτε EMV.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

and not the melody to the words. Many lines of verse illustrate this, but none better than the lyric which Euripides makes Electra address to the Chorus in the *Orestes*:

Be silent! Silent! Let the sandal's tread  
Be light, no jarring sound.

Depart ye hence afar, and from his bed withdraw. In these lines the words *σίγα σίγα λευκόν* are sung on one note; and yet each of the three words has both low and high pitch. And the word *ἀρβύλης* has its third syllable sung in the same pitch as its middle syllable, although it is impossible for a single word to carry two acute accents.<sup>1</sup> The first syllable of *τίθετε* is sung in a low pitch, while the two that follow are sung on the same high note. The circumflex accent on *κτυπεῖτε* has been eliminated, for the two syllables are uttered at the same pitch. And the phrase *ἀποπρὸ βᾶτε* does not receive the acute accent on the middle syllable, but the pitch of the third syllable has been transferred to the fourth.<sup>2</sup>

The same thing happens with regard to rhythm. For the diction of prose does not violate or even alter the quantities in any noun or verb, but keeps the syllables long or short as it has received them by nature. However, the arts of music and rhythm change them by shortening or lengthening them, so that they often pass into their opposites: the time-length is not regulated by the quantity of the

<sup>1</sup> Except when a proparoxytone word is followed by an *enclitic*, e.g. *ἄνθρωπός τις*. But two acutes may not fall on successive syllables, and this is perhaps what Dionysius means.

<sup>2</sup> Given this kind of freedom in lyric, it is possible that accent values were rendered by means of stress instead of pitch, where this served the requirements of the metre.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀπευθύνουσι τοὺς χρόνους, ἀλλὰ τοῖς χρόνοις τὰς συλλαβάς.

δεδειγμένης δὴ <sup>1</sup> τῆς διαφορᾶς ἣ διαφέρει μουσική λογικῆς λοιπὸν ἂν εἴη κακείνα λέγειν, ὅτι τὸ μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μέλος, λέγω δὲ οὐ τῆς ὠδικῆς ἀλλὰ τῆς ψιλῆς, εἰάν ἡδέως διατιθῆ τὴν ἀκοήν, εὐμελές λέγοιτ' ἂν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐμμελές· ἡ δ' ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν μορίων συμμετρία σώζουσα τὸ μελικὸν σχῆμα εὐρυθμος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔνρυθμος· πῆ δὲ διαφέρει ταῦτα ἀλλήλων, κατὰ τὸν οἰκεῖον καιρὸν ἐρῶ. νυνὶ δὲ τὰκόλουθ' ἀποδοῦναι πειράσομαι, πῶς ἂν γένοιτο λέξις πολιτικὴ παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν σύνθεσιν ἠδύνουσα τὴν ἀκρόασιν κατὰ τε τὰ μέλη τῶν φθόγγων καὶ κατὰ τὰς συμμετρίας τῶν ῥυθμῶν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ποικιλίας τῶν μεταβολῶν καὶ κατὰ τὸ πρέπον τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις, ἐπειδὴ ταῦθ' ὑπεθέμην τὰ κεφάλαια.

12 οὐχ ἅπαντα πέφυκε τὰ μέρη τῆς λέξεως ὁμοίως διατιθέναι τὴν ἀκοήν, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὴν ὄρατικὴν αἴσθησιν τὰ ὄρατὰ πάντα οὐδὲ τὴν γευστικὴν τὰ γευστὰ οὐδὲ τὰς ἄλλας αἰσθήσεις τὰ κινουῦντα ἐκάστην· ἀλλὰ καὶ γλυκαίνουσιν αὐτὴν τινες ἦχοι καὶ πικραίνουσι, καὶ τραχύνουσι καὶ λεαίνουσι, καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα πάθη ποιούσι περὶ αὐτὴν. αἰτία δὲ ἣ τε τῶν γραμμάτων φύσις ἐξ ᾧν ἡ φωνὴ συνέστηκεν, πολλὰς καὶ διαφόρους ἔχουσα δυνάμεις, καὶ ἣ τῶν συλλαβῶν πλοκὴ παντοδαπῶς σχηματιζομένη.

<sup>1</sup> PMV: om. F: del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius is here referring especially to the metrical devices of correption, synizesis, and perhaps syncopation. (See Raven, *Greek Metre*, pp. 24, 37-9.)

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

syllables, but the quantity of the syllables by the time-length.<sup>1</sup>

Now that the difference between music and speech has been shown, a few remaining points may be made. If the intonation of the voice—not in song but in ordinary conversation—has a pleasant effect upon the ear, it will be called “song-like” rather than “singing”. So too the measured arrangement of the words according to their quantity, when it preserves the lyrical form, is rhythmical rather than in rhythm.<sup>2</sup> I shall speak at the proper time of the precise nature of this distinction. For the present I shall pass on to the next question, and try to show how a style of civil oratory can be acquired which can please the ear simply by its composition, through the melodiousness of its sound, its measured rhythmical arrangement, its elaborate variety, and its appropriateness to the subject, since these are the topics which I have laid down for myself.

It is not in the nature of the constituents of a 12 sentence that they should all affect the ear in the same way, any more than all visible objects make a similar impression on the visual sense, objects tasted on the sense of taste, or any other stimuli upon the sense to which they correspond. On the contrary, different sounds make different impressions upon it, some conveying sweetness, others bitterness, some roughness, others smoothness. The cause of this is the nature of the letters of which spoken language is composed and the many different effects this can produce, and the great variety of ways in which the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 8. 1–3; *Demosthenes* 50 (Vol. I, p. 431).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τοιαύτην δὴ δύναμιν ἔχόντων τῶν τῆς λέξεως μορίων ἐπειδὴ μεταθεῖναι τὴν ἐκάστου φύσιν οὐχ οἶόν τε, λείπεται τὸ τῇ μίξει καὶ κράσει καὶ παραθέσει συγκρῦψαι τὴν παρακολουθοῦσαν αὐτῶν τισιν ἀτοπίαν, τραχέσι λεία μίσγοντα καὶ σκληροῖς μαλακὰ καὶ κακοφώνοις εὐφωνα καὶ δυσεκφόροις εὐπρόφορα καὶ βραχέσι μακρά, καὶ τᾶλλα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον εὐκαίρως συντιθέντα καὶ μήτ' ὀλιγοσύλλαβα πολλὰ ἐξῆς λαμβάνοντα (κόπτεται γὰρ ἡ ἀκρόασις) μήτε πολυσύλλαβα πλείω τῶν ἱκανῶν, μηδὲ δὴ ὁμοιότονα παρ' ὁμοιοτόνοις μηδ' ὁμοιόχρονα παρ' ὁμοιοχρονοῖς. χρῆ δὲ καὶ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνοματικῶν ταχὺ μεταλαμβάνειν (μηκνόμεναι γὰρ ἔξω τοῦ μετρίου πάνυ προσίστανται ταῖς ἀκοαῖς) καὶ τὴν ὁμοιότητα διαλύειν συνεχῶς ὀνομάτων τε τῶν ἐξῆς τιθεμένων πολλῶν καὶ ῥημάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν τὸν κόρον φυλαττομένους, σχήμασί τε μὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀεὶ μένειν ἀλλὰ θαμινὰ μεταβάλλειν καὶ τρόπους μὴ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπεισφέρειν, ἀλλὰ ποικίλλειν, μηδὲ δὴ ἄρχεσθαι πολλάκις ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν μηδὲ λήγειν εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ ὑπερτείνοντας τὸν ἐκατέρου καιρόν.

καὶ μηδεὶς οἰηθῆ με καθάπαξ ταῦτα παραγγέλλειν ὡς ἡδονῆς αἷτια διὰ παντὸς ἐσόμενα ἢ τοῦναντίον <sup>1</sup> ὀχλήσεως· οὐχ οὕτως ἀνόητός εἰμι· οἶδα γὰρ ἐξ

<sup>1</sup> PMV: τᾶναντία FE Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Quintilian 9. 4. 91.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

individual syllables can be put together. Now since the individual words have this power, and since it is impossible to change the peculiar nature of any one of them, all we can do is to conceal the offending qualities which some of them inevitably have by means of mixture,<sup>1</sup> fusion and juxtaposition—by mixing smooth with rough, soft with hard, strident with melodious, easy to pronounce with hard to pronounce, and long with short; and generally with carefully-timed combinations of the same kind, avoiding both the successive use of many short-syllabled words (for this jars upon the ear), and an excessive number of polysyllabic words, and also the monotony caused by the juxtaposition of words carrying the same accent or having the same time-length. Again we must vary at frequent intervals the cases of substantives (for if they remain the same for too long they greatly oppress the ear); and, to guard against satiety, we must constantly try to break the monotony that arises when many nouns, verbs or other parts of speech are placed in close succession. We must not always keep to the same figures of speech, but change them often: we must not reintroduce the same metaphors, but vary them<sup>2</sup>; and we must not often begin or end with the same words to a degree that exceeds the bounds of good taste in each case.

Now no one should think that I am proclaiming these as universal laws which will invariably produce pleasure when obeyed and annoyance when ignored. I am not so foolish as to make this claim, for I know

<sup>2</sup> Dionysius here discusses variation of individual words; in Ch. 19 he discusses mainly clausal variation.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀμφοῖν γινομένην πολλάκις ἡδονήν, τοτὲ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ὁμοιογενῶν, τοτὲ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀνομοιογενῶν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάντων οἶομαι δεῖν τὸν καιρὸν ὄραν.<sup>1</sup> οὗτος γὰρ ἡδονῆς καὶ ἀηδίας κράτιστον μέτρον. καιροῦ δὲ οὔτε ῥήτωρ οὐδείς οὔτε φιλόσοφος εἰς τόδε χρόνου<sup>2</sup> τέχνην ὤρισεν, οὐδ' ὅσπερ πρῶτος ἐπεχείρησε περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφειν Γοργίας ὁ Λεοντίνος οὐδὲν ὅ τι καὶ λόγου ἄξιον ἔγραψεν· οὐδ' ἔχει φύσιν τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰς καθολικὴν καὶ ἔντεχνόν τινα περίληψιν πεσεῖν, οὐδ' ὅλως ἐπιστήμη θηρατός ἐστιν ὁ καιρὸς ἀλλὰ δόξη. ταύτην δ' οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πολλῶν καὶ πολλάκις γυμνάσαντες ἄμεινον τῶν ἄλλων εὐρίσκουσιν αὐτόν, οἱ δ' ἀγύμναστον ἀφέντες σπανιώτερον καὶ ὡσπερ ἀπὸ τύχης.

ἵνα δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἶπω, ταῦτ' οἶομαι χρῆναι φυλάττειν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τὸν μέλλοντα διαθήσειν τὴν ἀκοὴν ἡδέως· ἢ τὰ εὐμελῆ καὶ εὐρυθμα καὶ εὐφωνα ὀνόματα, ὑφ' ὧν γλυκαίνεται τε καὶ ἐκμαλάττεται καὶ τὸ ὅλον οἰκείως διατίθεται ἢ αἴσθησις, ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις συναρμόττειν, ἢ τὰ μὴ τοιαύτην ἔχοντα φύσιν ἐγκαταπλέκειν τε καὶ συνυ-

<sup>1</sup> codd.: θηρᾶν Usener.

<sup>2</sup> τόδε χρόνου FMV: τὸ λέγειν P: τόδε γε Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> καιρός began its rhetorical career as a theme of deliberative oratory, e.g. in Isocrates, *Letter to Demonicus* 41; *Panegyricus* 161; Thucydides 2. 43. 2; 6. 9; Demosthenes, *Olynthiac* 1. 24. In later rhetorical theory it is closely linked with propriety (τὸ πρέπον): see Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 7. 8 and Cope's note *ad loc.* and Quintilian 11. 1. 1; and it may have been used in the sense of "the proper time" in a literary context by the early



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

that pleasure often arises from both sources, from similarity at one time, and from dissimilarity at another. However, I think we must in every case keep good taste in view,<sup>1</sup> for this is the best measure of what is pleasurable and what is not. But on the subject of good taste no rhetorician or philosopher has produced a definitive treatise up to the present time. Even the first man who set his hand to writing about it, Gorgias of Leontini, succeeded in writing nothing that was worth mentioning.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the nature of the subject is not such that it can be covered by an all-embracing, technical method of treatment, nor can good taste in general be pursued successfully by science, but only by judgment. Those who have trained this faculty by applying it frequently to many cases are more successful in their quest for good taste than others, while those who leave the faculty unexercised succeed comparatively seldom, and as it were by good luck.

And now to consider the rest of the subject. The writer who is intending to leave a pleasant impression upon the ear should, I think, see that he observes the following rules in his composition. Either he should link to one another words which are melodious, rhythmical and euphonious, by which our sense of hearing is affected with a feeling of sweetness and utter softness, and is completely won over; or he should intertwine and interweave those which have no such natural effect with those which can so

rhetoricians. See Plato, *Phaedrus* 272A; and for τὸ πρέπον used in this sense see *Demosthenes* 49.

<sup>2</sup> Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* A, p. 3, lines 23–4 Kayser, preserves another tradition linking Gorgias and καιρός, but concerning his pretensions as an extempore speaker.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

φαίνειν τοῖς δυναμένοις αὐτὴν γοητεύειν, ὥστε ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνων χάριτος ἐπισκοτεῖσθαι τὴν τούτων ἀηδίαν· οἷόν τι ποιούσιν οἱ φρόνιμοι στρατηλάται κατὰ τὰς συντάξεις τῶν στρατευμάτων· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνοι ἐπικρύπτουσι τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς τὰ ἀσθενῆ, καὶ γίνεται αὐτοῖς οὐδὲν τῆς δυνάμεως ἄχρηστον. διαναπαύειν δὲ τὴν ταυτότητά φημι δεῖν μεταβολὰς εὐκαίρους εἰσφέροντα· καὶ γὰρ ἡ μεταβολὴ παντὸς ἔργου χρῆμα ἡδύ. τελευταῖον δὲ ὁ δὴ καὶ πάντων κράτιστον, οἰκείαν ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις καὶ πρέπουσαν ἀρμονίαν. δυσωπεῖσθαι δ' οὐδὲν οἶομαι δεῖν οὔτε ὄνομα οὔτε ῥῆμα, ὅ τι καὶ τέτριπται, μὴ σὺν αἰσχύνῃ λέγεσθαι μέλλον· οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτω ταπεινὸν ἢ ῥυπαρὸν <sup>1</sup> ἢ μιαρὸν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ δυσχέρειαν ἔχον ἔσεσθαι φημι λόγου μόριον, ὧ σημαίνεται τι σῶμα ἢ πρᾶγμα, ὃ μηδεμίαν ἔξει χώραν ἐπιτηδεῖαν ἐν λόγοις. παρακελεύομαι δὲ τῇ συνθέσει πιστεύοντας ἀνδρείως πάνυ καὶ τεταρρηκότως αὐτὰ ἐκφέρειν Ὀμήρω τε παραδείγματι χρώμενος, παρ' ὧ καὶ τὰ εὐτελέστατα κείται τῶν ὀνομάτων, καὶ Δημοσθένει καὶ Ἡροδότῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὧν ὀλίγον ὕστερον μνησθήσομαι καθ' ὅ τι ἂν ἀρμόττη περὶ ἐκάστου. ταῦτά μοι περὶ τῆς

<sup>1</sup> ῥυπαρὸν ἢ μιαρὸν PV: ῥυπαρὸν EF Usener: μιαρὸν M.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

bewitch the ear that the unattractiveness of the one is overshadowed by the charm of the other. This is something like what clever tacticians do when they are marshalling their armies: they mask the weak parts with the strong, and so no part of their force proves useless. Thus I say that we should relieve monotony by the tasteful introduction of variation, since variety is a source of pleasure in everything we do.<sup>1</sup> Lastly, and what is in fact most important of all, the subject-matter should be arranged in a manner which is natural to it and appropriate. I do not think that we should be shy of using any noun or verb, however hackneyed, unless it is likely to cause offence: for I venture to say that no part of speech which signifies a person or a thing will prove to be so mean, squalid, unwholesome or otherwise disagreeable as to have no fitting place in discourse. My advice is that we should trust to the effect of the composition and utter those words in a completely manly and confident style, following the example of Homer, in whose poetry the most paltry words are to be found, and of Demosthenes and Herodotus and others, whom I shall mention a little later on,<sup>2</sup> as far as is fitting in each case. So much for my account of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 46-7, *Letter to Pompeius* 3; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 7. 14. 8, quoting Euripides, *Orestes* 234: μεταβολή πάντων γλυκύ. On variety as an essential ingredient of style, see Isocrates, *Euagoras* 9, *Against the Sophists* 16, *Antidosis* 47, *Philippus* 27; *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 22; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1. 11. 20; 3. 12. 3; *Ad Herennium* 4. 13. 18; Cicero, *De Oratore* 2. 41. 77; 3. 25. 96-100, 50. 192; *Orator* 57. 195. Dionysius extends the principle of variety to history (*Ant. Rom.* 1. 8), as Polybius (29. 12. 2) and Diodorus (20. 2. 1) had done.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 19 *sub fin.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἡδεΐας εἰρήσθω συνθέσεως, ὀλίγα μὲν ἀπὸ πολλῶν θεωρημάτων, ἱκανὰ δὲ ὡς κεφάλαια εἶναι.

13 εἶέν. καλὴ δ' ἄρμονία πῶς γένοιτ' ἂν εἴ τις ἔροιτό με καὶ ἐκ ποίων θεωρημάτων, οὐκ ἄλλως πως νῆ Δία φαίην ἂν οὐδ' ἐξ ἄλλων τινῶν ἢ ἐξ ὧν περ ἡ ἡδεΐα· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ ποιητικὰ ἀμφοῖν, μέλος εὐγενές, ῥυθμὸς ἀξιωματικός, μεταβολὴ μεγαλοπρεπῆς, τὸ πᾶσι τούτοις παρακολοθοῦν πρέπον. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡδεΐά τις γίνεται λέξις, οὕτω καὶ<sup>1</sup> γενναία τις ἄρα, καὶ ῥυθμὸς ὥσπερ γλαφυρός τις, οὕτω καὶ σεμνός τις ἕτερος, καὶ τὸ μεταβάλλειν ὥσπερ χάριν ἔχει, οὕτω καὶ τόνον· τὸ δὲ δὴ πρέπον εἰ μὴ τοῦ καλοῦ πλείστον ἔξει μέρος, σχολῆ γ' ἂν ἄλλου τινός. ἐξ ἀπάντων δὴ φημι τούτων ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι δεῖν τὸ καλὸν ἐν ἄρμονία λέξεως ἐξ ὧν περ καὶ τὸ ἡδύ. αἰτία δὲ κἀνταῦθα ἢ τε τῶν γραμμάτων φύσις καὶ ἡ τῶν συλλαβῶν δύναμις, ἐξ ὧν πλέκεται τὰ ὀνόματα· ὑπὲρ ὧν καιρὸς ἂν εἴη λέγειν, ὥσπερ ὑπεσχόμην.

14 ἀρχαὶ μὲν οὖν εἰσι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φωνῆς καὶ ἐνάρθρου μηκέτι δεχόμεναι διαίρεσιν, ἃς<sup>2</sup> καλοῦμεν στοιχεῖα καὶ γράμματα· γράμματα μὲν ὅτι γραμ-

<sup>1</sup> καὶ PMV: om. F, Usener.

<sup>2</sup> codd.: ἃ R Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 46-7.

<sup>2</sup> Underlying the following discussion is the theory, which probably originated with the Sophists of the fifth century, and was later adopted by the Stoic grammarians, that the letters or elements of speech bore a natural relationship, through the words formed from them, to the objects which

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

attractiveness of style—a brief one considering the large field of study which it covers, but enough to include the main topics.

Very well. But if anyone were to ask me by what 13 means and in accordance with what principles literary arrangement may be made beautiful, I should say, “By no other means, to be sure, and in accordance with no other principles than those which make it attractive, since the same elements produce both noble melody, dignified rhythm, impressive variation, and the appropriateness which accompanies all these.”<sup>1</sup> For just as there is to be found one style that is pleasant, so there is another that is noble; and as there is one rhythm that is polished, so there is another that is stately; and as variety produces charm, so it also produces intensity; and as for appropriateness, if it is not going to be the main source of beauty, it will scarcely be the source of anything else. Thus I maintain that beauty in literary arrangement must be pursued by the aid of all those elements that constitute attractiveness. Here as before, the cause resides in the nature of the letters and in the phonetic effect of the syllables, which are the raw material from which the fabric of the words is woven. The time may now have come for me to speak about these matters, as I promised to do.<sup>2</sup>

Now in the articulate speech of human beings 14 there are prime units admitting no further division, which we call “elements” and “letters”: “letters” (*γράμματα*), because they are signified by certain

those words described; and that hence letters might be thought to possess innately pleasant or unpleasant characteristics through such associations. Plato examines this theory in the *Cratylus* 424A ff.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

μαῖς τισι σημαίνεται, στοιχεῖα δὲ ὅτι πᾶσα φωνὴ τὴν γένεσιν ἐκ τούτων λαμβάνει πρώτων καὶ τὴν διάλυσιν εἰς ταῦτα ποιεῖται τελευταῖα. τῶν δὲ στοιχείων τε καὶ γραμμάτων οὐ μία πάντων φύσις, διαφορὰ δὲ αὐτῶν πρώτη μὲν, ὡς Ἀριστόξενος ὁ μουσικὸς ἀποφαίνεται, καθ' ἣν τὰ μὲν φωνὰς ἀποτελεῖ, τὰ δὲ ψόφους· φωνὰς μὲν τὰ λεγόμενα φωνήεντα, ψόφους δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα. δευτέρα δὲ καθ' ἣν τῶν μὴ φωνηέντων ἃ μὲν καθ' ἑαυτὰ ψόφους ὁποίους δὴ τινὰς ἀποτελεῖν πέφυκε, ῥοῖζον ἢ σιγμὸν ἢ μυγμὸν ἢ τοιούτων τινῶν ἄλλων ἤχων δηλωτικούς· ἃ δ' ἐστὶν ἀπάσης ἄμοιρα φωνῆς καὶ ψόφου καὶ οὐχ οἷά τε ἠχεῖσθαι καθ' ἑαυτά· διὸ δὲ ταῦτα μὲν ἄφωνα τινὲς ἐκάλεσαν, θάτερα δὲ ἡμίφωνα. οἱ δὲ τριχῆ νείμαντες τὰς πρώτας τε καὶ στοιχειώδεις τῆς φωνῆς δυνάμεις φωνήεντα μὲν ἐκάλεσαν, ὅσα καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ φωνεῖται καὶ μεθ' ἑτέρων καὶ ἔστιν αὐτοτελῆ· ἡμίφωνα δ' ὅσα μετὰ μὲν φωνηέντων αὐτὰ ἑαυτῶν κρεῖττον ἐκφέρεται, καθ' ἑαυτὰ δὲ χεῖρον καὶ οὐκ αὐτοτελῶς· ἄφωνα δ' ὅσα οὔτε τὰς τελείας οὔτε τὰς ἡμιτελεῖς φωνὰς ἔχει καθ' ἑαυτά, μεθ' ἑτέρων δ' ἐκφωνεῖται.

ἀριθμὸς δὲ αὐτῶν ὅστις ἐστίν, οὐ ῥάδιον εἰπεῖν ἀκριβῶς, ἐπεὶ πολλὴν παρέσχε καὶ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica* 6 (p. 9 Uhlig).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 20; Plato, *Theaetetus* 202E–203C.

<sup>3</sup> Of Tarentum. See *Demosthenes* 48. Cf. Aristotle, *De Anima* 2. 8.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

lines (*γραμμαί*),<sup>1</sup> and “elements”, because every vocal sound originates in these in the first place,<sup>2</sup> and is ultimately resolved into them. The elements and letters are not all of the same nature. The first of the differences between them, as the musical theorist Aristoxenus<sup>3</sup> indicates, is that some represent vocal sounds, and others noises: the former being those which are called “vowels”,<sup>4</sup> the latter being all the other letters. A second difference is that some of the non-vowels by their own nature produce some kind of sound—a whirring, a hissing, a murmur, or suggestions of other sounds of these kinds<sup>5</sup>; while others are devoid of any voice or sound and cannot be sounded by themselves. Consequently some theorists have called the latter “voiceless” and the others “semi-voiced”. Those who divide the primary and elementary powers of the voice into three give the name “vowels” to all the letters which can be made to produce sound on their own or together with others, and are self-sufficient; “semivowels” to all which are pronounced more effectively in combination with vowels, worse and imperfectly on their own; “voiceless”<sup>6</sup> to all which have no sound on their own, whether perfect or imperfect, but are pronounced in combination with others.

It is not easy to say precisely what the number of these letters is, for the subject has caused our pre-

<sup>4</sup> The seven referred to below (p. 95, n. 2) correspond with those in Plato, *Theaetetus* 203B. Cf. *Cratylus* 424C; Aristotle, *Historia Animalium* 4. 9. 1.

<sup>5</sup> This intermediate class of semivowels was recognised by the earliest known grammarian, the Egyptian Theuth, according to Plato, *Philebus* 18B.

<sup>6</sup> Or “mute”.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀπορίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ᾤθησαν εἶναι τριακαίδεκα τὰ πάντα τῆς φωνῆς στοιχεῖα, κατεσκευάσθαι δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐκ τούτων· οἱ δὲ καὶ τῶν εἰκοσιτεσσάρων οἷς χρώμεθα νῦν πλείω. ἡ μὲν οὖν ὑπὲρ τούτων θεωρία γραμματικῆς τε καὶ μετρικῆς, εἰ δὲ βούλεται τις, καὶ φιλοσοφίας οἰκειότερα· ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπόχρη μήτ' ἐλάττους τῶν κδ μήτε πλείους ὑποθεμένοις εἶναι τὰς τῆς φωνῆς ἀρχὰς τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτοῖς λέγειν, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τῶν φωνηέντων ποιησαμένοις.

ἔστι δὴ ταῦτα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ζ', δύο μὲν βραχέα τό τε ε̄ καὶ τὸ ο̄, δύο δὲ μακρὰ τό τε ἦ καὶ τὸ ω̄, τρία δὲ δίχρονα τό τε ā καὶ τὸ ī καὶ τὸ ū, καὶ γὰρ ἐκτείνεται ταῦτα καὶ συστέλλεται· καὶ αὐτὰ οἱ μὲν δίχρονα, ὥσπερ ἔφην, οἱ δὲ μεταπτωτικὰ καλοῦσιν. φωνεῖται δὲ ταῦτα πάντα παρὰ τῆς ἀρτηρίας συνηχούσης τῷ πνεύματι καὶ τοῦ στόματος ἀπλῶς σχηματισθέντος τῆς τε γλώττης οὐδὲν πραγματευομένης ἀλλ' ἡρεμούσης. πλὴν τὰ μὲν μακρὰ καὶ τῶν διχρόνων ἃ μακρῶς λέγεται τεταμένον λαμβάνει καὶ διηνεκῆ τὸν αὐλὸν τοῦ πνεύματος, τὰ δὲ βραχέα ἢ βραχέως λεγόμενα ἐξ ἀποκοπῆς τε καὶ μιᾷ πληγῇ πνεύματος καὶ τῆς ἀρτηρίας ἐπὶ βραχὺ κινηθείσης ἐκφέρεται. τούτων δὴ κράτιστα μὲν ἔστι καὶ φωνὴν ἡδίστην ἀποτελεῖ τά τε μακρὰ καὶ τῶν διχρόνων ὅσα μηκύνεται κατὰ τὴν ἐκφοράν, ὅτι πολὺν ἠχεῖται χρόνον καὶ τὸν τοῦ πνεύματος

<sup>1</sup> So Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica* 6 (p. 9 Uhlig).

<sup>2</sup> See note 4, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> For a rather different account of the part played by the tongue, see W. S. Allen, *Vox Graeca*, p. 3. A. J. Ellis, in his



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

decessors much perplexity. Some have thought that there are only thirteen "elements" of speech altogether and that the other letters are formed from these; while others have thought that there are more even than the twenty-four which we employ today. Now the discussion of these matters belongs more properly to grammar and prosody, or even, if you like, to philosophy. It is enough for us to assume that there are neither more nor less than twenty-four elements of sound,<sup>1</sup> and to describe the properties of each, beginning with the vowels.

These are seven in number<sup>2</sup>: two are short,  $\epsilon$  and  $o$ ; two long,  $\eta$  and  $\omega$ ; and three common,  $a$ ,  $\iota$ , and  $υ$ . These latter can be pronounced either long or short, and some call them "common", as I have done, others "variable". All these sounds are produced from the windpipe, which resounds to the breath, while the mouth is formed in a simple shape, the tongue not being busy but remaining at rest.<sup>3</sup> But the long vowels, and those common vowels that are pronounced long, take an extended and continuous column of breath, while the short vowels and those which are pronounced short are uttered abruptly, with one burst of breath and only a brief movement of the windpipe. Now the most powerful of these, and those which produce the most attractive sound, are the long vowels, and those common ones which are lengthened in utterance, and this is because they are sounded for a long time, and do not arrest the strong

book *English, Dionysian and Hellenic Pronunciation of Greek*, goes some way towards reconciling the two points of view by observing that *οὐδὲν πραγματευομένης* may mean that the tongue "does not move about, though it directs the breath."

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὐκ ἀποκόπτει τόνον· χείρω δὲ τὰ βραχέα ἢ βραχέως λεγόμενα, ὅτι μικρόφωνά τε ἐστὶ καὶ σπαδονίζει<sup>1</sup> τὸν ἦχον. αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν μακρῶν πάλιν εὐφωνότατον μὲν τὸ  $\bar{a}$ , ὅταν ἐκτείνηται· λέγεται γὰρ ἀνοιγομένου τε τοῦ στόματος ἐπὶ πλείστον καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ἄνω φερομένου πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν. δεύτερον δὲ τὸ  $\eta$ , διότι κάτω τε περὶ τὴν βάσιν τῆς γλώττης ἐρείδει τὸν ἦχον ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄνω, καὶ μετρίως ἀνοιγομένου τοῦ στόματος. τρίτον δὲ τὸ  $\bar{\omega}$ · στρογγυλίζεται γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ στόμα καὶ περιστέλλεται τὰ χεῖλη τὴν τε πληγὴν τὸ πνεῦμα περὶ τὸ ἀκροστόμιον ποιεῖται. ἔτι δ' ἦττον τούτου τὸ  $\bar{u}$ · περὶ γὰρ αὐτὰ τὰ χεῖλη συστολῆς γινομένης ἀξιολόγου πνίγεται καὶ στενὸς ἐκπίπτει ὁ ἦχος. ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων τὸ  $\bar{i}$ · περὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας τε γὰρ ἢ κρούσις τοῦ πνεύματος γίνεται μικρὸν ἀνοιγομένου τοῦ στόματος καὶ οὐκ ἐπιλαμπρυνόντων τῶν χειλῶν τὸν ἦχον. τῶν δὲ βραχέων οὐδέτερον μὲν εὐμορφον, ἦττον δὲ δυσειδὲς τοῦ  $\bar{e}$  τὸ  $\bar{o}$ · διίστησι γὰρ τὸ στόμα κρεῖττον θατέρου καὶ τὴν πληγὴν λαμβάνει περὶ τὴν ἀρτηρίαν μᾶλλον.

φωνηέντων μὲν οὖν γραμμάτων αὕτη φύσις· ἡμιφώνων δὲ τοιάδε· ὀκτὼ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὄντων αὐτῶν πέντε μὲν ἐστὶν ἀπλᾶ τό τε  $\bar{\lambda}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\mu}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\nu}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\rho}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\sigma}$ · διπλᾶ δὲ τρία τό τε  $\bar{\xi}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\xi}$  καὶ

<sup>1</sup> PMVs: σπανίζει REF Usener.

<sup>1</sup> The danger of applying such rigid aesthetic values to letters is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

flow of the breath. The short vowels, or those which are pronounced short, are inferior, because they lack volume and restrict the sound. Again, of the long vowels, the one with the best sound is *a*, when lengthened,<sup>1</sup> for it is pronounced with the mouth open to the fullest extent and the breath forced upwards to the palate.<sup>2</sup> Second comes *η*, because it presses the sound down around the base of the tongue and not upwards, and the mouth is only moderately open.<sup>3</sup> In the third place is *ω*, for in pronouncing it the mouth is rounded, the lips are contracted and the breath makes its impact on the edge of the lips.<sup>4</sup> Still lower on the scale is *υ*, for here, since a considerable contraction takes place around the lips themselves, the sound is choked and comes out thin.<sup>5</sup> Last of all comes *ι*: with this the impact of the breath is on the teeth, while the mouth is slightly open and the lips do not amplify the sound.<sup>6</sup> Of the short vowels neither is beautiful, but *ο* is less ugly than *ε*: for the former causes the mouth to open wider than the latter, and receives the impact more in the region of the windpipe.

Such, then, is the nature of the vowels. The semivowels are as follows. They are eight in number, five being simple, *λ*, *μ*, *ν*, *ρ*, *ς* and *σ*, and three double, *ζ*, *ξ*, and *ψ*. They are called double either

vowels. For example, *a* is used in tragedy to depict pain (e.g. in Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 732, 739).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* pp. 59–60; Dionysius Thrax, p. 10 Uhlig.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* pp. 66–7; Dionysius Thrax, *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* pp. 71–5; Dionysius Thrax, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* pp. 62–6; Dionysius Thrax, *ibid.*; Aristophanes, *Plutus* 895 and Rogers's note *ad loc.*

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* pp. 61–2; Dionysius Thrax, *ibid.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τὸ ψ̄. διπλᾶ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτὰ ἦτοι διὰ τὸ σύνθετα εἶναι τὸ μὲν ξ̄ διαὶ τοῦ σ̄ καὶ δ̄, τὸ δὲ ξ̄ διαὶ τοῦ κ̄ καὶ σ̄, τὸ δὲ ψ̄ διαὶ τοῦ π̄ καὶ σ̄ συνεφθαρμένων ἀλλήλοις ἰδίαν φωνὴν λαμβάνοντα, ἢ διαὶ τὸ χῶραν ἐπέχειν δυεῖν γραμμάτων ἐν ταῖς συλλαβαῖς παραλαμβανόμενον ἕκαστον. τούτων δὴ κρείττω μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ διπλᾶ τῶν ἀπλῶν, ἐπειδὴ μείζονά ἐστὶ τῶν ἐτέρων καὶ μᾶλλον ἐγγίζειν δοκεῖ τοῖς τελείοις· ἦττω δὲ τὰ ἀπλᾶ διὰ τὸ εἰς βραχυτέρους τόπους συνάγεσθαι τὸν ἦχον. φωνεῖται δ' αὐτῶν ἕκαστον τοιόνδε τινὰ τρόπον· τὸ μὲν λ̄ τῆς γλώττης πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἰσταμένης καὶ τῆς ἀρτηρίας συνηχούσης· τὸ δὲ μ̄ τοῦ μὲν στόματος τοῖς χείλεσι πιεσθέντος, τοῦ δὲ πνεύματος διὰ τῶν ῥωθῶνων μεριζομένου· τὸ δὲ ν̄ τῆς γλώττης τὴν φορὰν τοῦ πνεύματος ἀποκλειούσης καὶ μεταφερούσης ἐπὶ τοὺς ῥωθῶνας τὸν ἦχον· τὸ δὲ ρ̄ τῆς γλώττης ἄκρας ἀπορριπιζούσης τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐγγὺς τῶν ὀδόντων ἀνισταμένης· τὸ δὲ σ̄ τῆς μὲν γλώττης προσαναγομένης <sup>1</sup> ἄνω πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὄλης, τοῦ δὲ πνεύματος διὰ μέσον αὐτῶν <sup>2</sup> φερόμενου καὶ περὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας λεπτὸν καὶ στενὸν

<sup>1</sup> PVs: προσαγομένης R Usener: προαγομένης EF.

<sup>2</sup> F: μέσων αὐτῶν R Usener: μέσου αὐτοῦ EPVs: μέσου (ων sscr) αὐτοῦ M.

<sup>1</sup> Not *ds*, and hence the reverse of the English *z*.

<sup>2</sup> Thus rendering them metrically long.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

because they are composite, receiving their individual sound through the amalgamation of  $\sigma$  and  $\delta$  into  $\zeta$ ,<sup>1</sup> of  $\kappa$  and  $\sigma$  into  $\xi$ , and of  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  into  $\psi$ ; or because they each occupy the space of two letters in the syllables where they occur.<sup>2</sup> Of these semivowels the double are superior to the simple because they are ampler than the others and seem nearer to perfect letters.<sup>3</sup> The simpler letters are inferior because their sounds are confined within a narrower compass. They are severally pronounced somewhat in the following manner:  $\lambda$  by the tongue rising to the palate and by the windpipe letting out a sound at the same time;<sup>4</sup>  $\mu$  by the mouth being pressed tightly shut by the lips, while the breath is divided and passed through the nostrils<sup>5</sup>;  $\nu$  by the tongue interrupting the passage of the breath and diverting the sound towards the nostrils<sup>6</sup>;  $\rho$  by the tip of the tongue releasing the breath in puffs and rising to the palate near the teeth<sup>7</sup>; and  $\sigma$  by the entire tongue being brought up to the palate and the breath being forced between them and emitting the hissing sound lightly and thinly around the teeth.<sup>8</sup> The sound

<sup>3</sup> This judgment is difficult to reconcile with the unfavourable verdict on  $\sigma$  below. By "perfect letters" (*τέλεια γράμματα*) Dionysius seems to mean combinations of consonants closing a syllable, and so lengthening it. See Ch. 20, and Roberts's note on p. 205.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* p. 38; Dionysius Thrax, pp. 11–12, 14 Uhlig.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* p. 31; Dionysius Thrax, pp. 11, 14.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Allen, *op. cit.* p. 31; Dionysius Thrax, *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> The elemental consonant, according to Plato, *Cratylus* 426C. Cf. Allen, pp. 39–41; Dionysius Thrax, *ibid.* Demosthenes had difficulty in pronouncing it ([Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 844E; Quintilian 1. 11. 5).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Allen, pp. 43–4; Dionysius Thrax, p. 11.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐξωθοῦντος τὸ σύριγμα. τρία δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ ἡμίφωνα μικτὸν λαμβάνει τὸν ψόφον ἐξ ἑνὸς μὲν τῶν ἡμιφώνων τοῦ  $\sigma$ , τριῶν δὲ ἀφώνων τοῦ τε  $\delta$  καὶ τοῦ  $\kappa$  καὶ τοῦ  $\pi$ .

οὗτοι σχηματισμοὶ γραμμάτων ἡμιφώνων. δύναται δ' οὐχ ὁμοίως κινεῖν τὴν ἀκοὴν ἅπαντα· ἡδύνει μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴν τὸ  $\lambda$  καὶ ἔστι τῶν ἡμιφώνων γλυκύτετον, τραχύνει δὲ τὸ  $\rho$  καὶ ἔστι τῶν ὁμογενῶν γενναιότατον· μέσως δὲ πως διατίθησι τὰ διὰ τῶν ῥωθίωνων συνηχούμενα τό τε  $\mu$  καὶ τὸ  $\nu$  κερρατοειδεῖς ἀποτελοῦντα τοὺς ἤχους. ἄχαρι δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ  $\sigma$  καὶ πλεονάσαν σφόδρα λυπεῖ· θηριώδους γὰρ καὶ ἀλόγου μᾶλλον ἢ λογικῆς ἐφάπτεσθαι δοκεῖ φωνῆς ὁ συριγμός· τῶν γοῦν παλαιῶν τινες σπανίως ἐχρῶντο αὐτῷ καὶ πεφυλαγμένως, εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ ἀσίγμους ὅλας ὠδὰς ἐποίουν· δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν οἷς φησι·

πρὶν μὲν εἶρπε σχοινοτένειά τ' αἰοιδὰ διθυράμβω  
καὶ τὸ σὰν κίβδηλον ἀνθρώποις.<sup>1</sup>

τριῶν δὲ τῶν ἄλλων γραμμάτων ἃ δὴ διπλᾶ καλεῖται τὸ  $\xi$  μᾶλλον ἡδύνει τὴν ἀκοὴν τῶν ἐτέρων· τὸ μὲν γὰρ  $\xi$  διὰ τοῦ  $\kappa$  καὶ τὸ  $\psi$  διὰ τοῦ  $\pi$  τὸν συριγμὸν ἀποδίδωσι ψιλῶν ὄντων ἀμφοτέρων, τοῦτο δ' ἡσυχῇ τῷ πνεύματι δασύνεται καὶ ἔστι τῶν ὁμογε-

<sup>1</sup> ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπὸ στομάτων Athenaeus.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Demetrius, *On Style* 174.

<sup>2</sup> Because "roughness" is equated with the austere, dignified style of composition. See Ch. 22, and especially the analysis of Pindar, Frag. 75.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

assumed by the three remaining semivowels is of a mixed character, being formed from one of the semi-voiced letters,  $\sigma$ , and three voiceless letters,  $\delta$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\pi$ .

Those are the formations of the semivowels. They do not all have the same power to affect the ear.  $\lambda$  gives it pleasure, and is the sweetest of the semivowels,<sup>1</sup> while  $\rho$  has a roughening effect, and is the noblest of its class.<sup>2</sup>  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  have a sort of intermediate effect, being pronounced through the nostrils, and producing sounds similar to those of a horn.  $\sigma$  is neither charming nor pleasant and is very offensive when used to excess, for a hiss is felt to be a sound more closely associated with an irrational beast than with a rational being.<sup>3</sup> At any rate, some of the ancient writers used it sparingly and with caution, some even composing entire odes without sigmas. Pindar illustrates this in these lines<sup>4</sup>:

Before that time came in the long-drawn-out  
dithyrambic song,

and the letter *san* which sounded false to men.

Of the three other letters, which are called double,  $\zeta$  falls more pleasurably upon the ear than the others; for  $\xi$  and  $\psi$  give the hiss with  $\kappa$  and  $\pi$  respectively, both of which letters are smooth,<sup>5</sup> whereas  $\zeta$  is

<sup>3</sup> Euripides' alleged fondness for "sigmatism" was ridiculed by the comic poets, and *Medea* 476 ( $\epsilon\sigma\omega\sigma\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma'$ ,  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$  'Ελλήνων ὄσοι) is his most famous surviving example. But see Page's note *ad loc.*, warning against generalisation. Likewise, see Goodwin on Demosthenes, *De Corona* 208.

<sup>4</sup> Frag. 79a (Schroeder). Lasus of Hermione is credited with a similar feat (Athenaeus, *Deipnosophists* 10. 455C).

<sup>5</sup> Actually, as "plosives", these letters produce the bare ( $\psi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ), voiceless consonantal sound. On the voiceless plosives, see Allen, pp. 12-5.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

νῶν γενναιότατον. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν ἡμιφῶνων τοσαῦτα.

τῶν δὲ καλουμένων ἀφῶνων ἑννέα ὄντων τρία μὲν ἐστὶ ψιλὰ, τρία δὲ δασέα, τρία δὲ μεταξύ τούτων· ψιλὰ μὲν τὸ  $\bar{\kappa}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\pi}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\tau}$ , δασέα δὲ τὸ τε <sup>1</sup>  $\bar{\theta}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\phi}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\chi}$ , κοινὰ δὲ ἀμφοῖν τὸ τε <sup>1</sup>  $\bar{\beta}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\gamma}$  καὶ τὸ  $\bar{\delta}$ . φωνεῖται δὲ αὐτῶν ἕκαστον τρόπον τόνδε· τρία μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν χειλῶν ἄκρων, ὅταν τοῦ στόματος πιεσθέντος τότε προβαλλόμενον ἐκ τῆς ἀρτηρίας τὸ πνεῦμα λύσῃ τὸν δεσμὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ψιλὸν μὲν ἐστὶν αὐτῶν τὸ  $\bar{\pi}$ , δασὺ δὲ τὸ  $\bar{\phi}$ , μέσον δὲ ἀμφοῖν τὸ  $\bar{\beta}$ . τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ψιλότερον ἐστὶ, τοῦ δὲ δασύτερον. μία μὲν αὕτη συζυγία τριῶν γραμμάτων ἀφῶνων ὁμοίῳ σχήματι λεγομένων, ψιλότητι δὲ καὶ δασύτητι διαφερόντων. τρία δὲ ἄλλα λέγεται τῆς γλώττης ἄκρω τῷ στόματι προσερειδομένης κατὰ τοὺς μετεώρους ὀδόντας, ἔπειθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀπορριπιζομένης καὶ τὴν διέξοδον αὐτῷ κάτω περὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἀποδιδούσης· διαλλάττει δὲ ταῦτα δασύτητι καὶ ψιλότητι· ψιλὸν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τὸ  $\bar{\tau}$ , δασὺ δὲ τὸ  $\bar{\theta}$ , μέσον δὲ καὶ ἐπίκοινον τὸ  $\bar{\delta}$ . αὕτη δευτέρα συζυγία τριῶν γραμμάτων ἀφῶνων. τρία δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἀφῶνων λέγεται μὲν τῆς γλώττης ἀνισταμένης πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐγγὺς τοῦ φάρυγγος καὶ τῆς ἀρτηρίας ὑπηχούσης τῷ πνεύματι, οὐδὲν

<sup>1</sup> PMVs: om. RF: del. Usener.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

gently roughened by the breath and is the noblest of its class. So much for the semivowels.

Of the letters that are called "voiceless", of which there are nine, three are smooth, three rough<sup>1</sup> and three intermediate. The smooth letters are  $\kappa$ ,  $\pi$ , and  $\tau$ , the rough  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$ , and  $\chi$ <sup>2</sup>; the intermediate  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$ .<sup>3</sup> They are severally pronounced as follows: three of them,  $\pi$ ,  $\phi$  and  $\beta$ , from the edge of the lips,<sup>4</sup> when the mouth is pressed shut and the breath is projected from the windpipe and breaks through the barrier. Of these letters  $\pi$  is smooth,  $\phi$  rough and  $\beta$  intermediate between the two, being smoother than the latter and rougher than the former. This is one group of voiceless letters, all three letters being pronounced with a similar configuration <of the mouth>, but differing in smoothness and roughness. The next three are pronounced by the tongue being pressed firmly against the top of the mouth near the upper teeth,<sup>5</sup> and then being puffed away by the breath, thus providing it with its way out downwards around the teeth. These sounds differ in roughness and smoothness,  $\tau$  being the smooth one,  $\theta$  the rough one, and  $\delta$  the intermediate, sharing the qualities of both. This is the second group of three voiceless letters. The remaining three voiceless letters are pronounced with the tongue rising to the palate near the throat and the windpipe sounding in

<sup>1</sup> The metaphor, as before, is derived from the different kinds of animal skin: "hairy" and "smooth". See Dionysius Thrax, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> On the aspirated plosives, see Allen, pp. 16-23.

<sup>3</sup> On the intermediates, or voiced plosives, see Allen, pp. 16-23; Dionysius Thrax, pp. 12-3.

<sup>4</sup> Hence these are termed "labial" consonants.

<sup>5</sup> Hence these are termed "dental" consonants.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὐδὲ ταῦτα διαφέροντα τῷ σχήματι ἀλλήλων, πλὴν ὅτι τὸ μὲν  $\bar{\kappa}$  ψιλῶς λέγεται, το δὲ  $\bar{\chi}$  δασέως, τὸ δὲ  $\bar{\gamma}$  μετρίως καὶ μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν. τούτων κράτιστα μὲν ἐστὶν ὅσα τῷ πνεύματι πολλῶ λέγεται, δεύτερα δὲ <sup>1</sup> ὅσα μέσως, κάκιστα δὲ ὅσα ψιλῶς· ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ τὴν αὐτῶν δύναμιν ἔχει μόνην, τὰ δὲ δασέα καὶ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος προσθήκην, ὥστ' ἐγγύς που τελειότερα εἶναι ἐκείνων.

15 ἔκ δὴ τῶν γραμμάτων τοσοῦτων τε ὄντων καὶ δυνάμεις τοιαύτας ἔχόντων αἱ καλούμεναι γίνονται συλλαβαί. τούτων δὲ εἰσι μακραὶ μὲν ὅσαι συνεστήκασιν ἐκ τῶν φωνηέντων τῶν μακρῶν ἢ τῶν διχρόνων ὅταν μακρῶς ἐκφέρηται, καὶ ὅσαι λήγουσιν εἰς μακρὸν ἢ μακρῶς λεγόμενον γράμμα ἢ εἰς τι τῶν ἡμιφώνων τε καὶ ἀφώνων· βραχεῖαι δὲ ὅσαι συνεστήκασιν ἐκ βραχέος φωνήεντος ἢ βραχέως λαμβανομένου, καὶ ὅσαι λήγουσιν εἰς ταῦτα. μήκους δὲ καὶ βραχύτητος συλλαβῶν οὐ μία φύσις, ἀλλὰ καὶ μακρότεραί τινές εἰσι τῶν μακρῶν καὶ βραχύτεραι τῶν βραχειῶν. ἔσται δὲ τοῦτο φανερόν ἐπὶ τῶν παραδειγμάτων.

ὁμολογεῖται δὴ βραχεῖα εἶναι συλλαβή, ἣν ποιεῖ φωνῆεν γράμμα βραχὺ τὸ  $\bar{o}$ , ὡς λέγεται ὁδός. ταύτῃ τις προστεθήτω <sup>2</sup> γράμμα ἐν τῶν ἡμιφώνων

<sup>1</sup> REPMVs: δ' F Usener.

<sup>2</sup> EPV: προσθέτω F Usener: προστιθέτω M.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hence these are termed "palatal" or "velar" consonants.

<sup>2</sup> This word was used in its present sense at least as early as Aeschylus, *Seven Against Thebes* 468 (i.e. 467 B.C.).

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

response to the breath.<sup>1</sup> These, again, do not differ from one another at all in the way they are formed; but  $\kappa$  is pronounced smoothly,  $\chi$  roughly, and  $\gamma$  holds the middle position between the two. Of these the best are those which are uttered with plenty of breath; next those with a medium amount; and worst those with light breath, since they have their own force alone, whereas the rough letters have the breath in addition, so that they are in a sense nearer perfection than the others.

It is from this number of letters, with the properties described, that are formed what we call *syllables*.<sup>2</sup> Of these the ones which are made from long vowels, or from variable vowels when pronounced long, are long, as are those which end in a long letter or a letter pronounced long,<sup>3</sup> or in one of the semivowels and one of the voiceless letters.<sup>4</sup> Those which are made from a short vowel, or from one taken as short, are short. There is more than one kind of length and shortness of syllables: some are actually longer than the long and some shorter than the short. The following examples will make this point clear.

It is admitted that a syllable is short which is formed by the short vowel  $o$ , as in the word  $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$ . Let one of the semivowels,  $\rho$ , be added to this and

<sup>3</sup> "Long letters" would include the double consonants,  $\zeta$ ,  $\xi$ ,  $\psi$ . The existence in metrical practice, if not in theory, of a provision that any letter might be "pronounced long" would account for the licence that is apparent in Homeric verse, and which reflects an oral tradition. The rules of quantity were much more strictly observed in drama.

<sup>4</sup> In that order, i.e.  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\nu$  or  $\rho$  followed by a voiceless consonant (mute). Plosives followed by  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\nu$ ,  $\rho$  are short, as are  $\beta\rho$ ,  $\gamma\rho$ ,  $\delta\rho$ ,  $\phi\rho$ ,  $\chi\rho$ ,  $\theta\rho$ .

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τὸ  $\bar{\rho}$  καὶ γενέσθω Ῥόδος· μένει μὲν ἔτι βραχεῖα ἢ συλλαβή, πλὴν οὐχ ὁμοίως ἀλλ' ἔξει τινὰ παραλλαγὴν ἀκαρῆ παρὰ τὴν προτέραν. ἔτι προστεθήτω <sup>1</sup> ταύτῃ τῶν ἀφώνων γραμμάτων ἐν τὸ  $\bar{\tau}$  καὶ γενέσθω τρόπος· μείζων αὕτη τῶν προτέρων ἔσται συλλαβῶν καὶ ἔτι βραχεῖα μένει. τρίτον ἔτι γράμμα τῇ αὐτῇ συλλαβῇ προστεθήτω τὸ  $\bar{\sigma}$  καὶ γενέσθω στρόφος· τρισὶν αὕτη προσθήκαις ἀκουσταῖς μακροτέρα γενήσεται τῆς βραχυτάτης μένουσα ἔτι βραχεῖα. οὐκοῦν τέτταρες αὗται βραχείας συλλαβῆς διαφοραὶ τὴν ἄλογον αἴσθησιν ἔχουσαι τῆς παραλλαγῆς μέτρον. ὁ δ' αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς μακρᾶς. ἢ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ  $\eta$  γινομένη συλλαβὴ μακρὰ τὴν φύσιν οὔσα τεττάρων γραμμάτων προσθήκαις παραυξηθεῖσα τριῶν μὲν προταττομένων, ἐνὸς δὲ ὑποταττομένου, καθ' ἣν λέγεται σπλήν, μείζων ἂν δήπου λέγοιτο εἶναι τῆς προτέρας ἐκείνης τῆς μονογραμμάτου· μειουμένη τ' οὖν αὕθις καθ' ἐν ἑκαστον τῶν προστεθέντων γραμμάτων τὰς ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον παραλλαγὰς αἰσθητὰς ἂν ἔχοι. αἰτία δὲ τίς ἐστι τοῦ μήτε τὰς μακρὰς ἐκβαίνειν τὴν αὐτῶν φύσιν μέχρι γραμμάτων  $\bar{\epsilon}$  μηκυνομένας μήτε τὰς βραχείας εἰς ἐν ἀπὸ πολλῶν

<sup>1</sup> EPMV: προσθέτω F Usener.

<sup>1</sup> The length of a syllable for metrical purposes was determined by (1) the nature of its vowel, or (2) if the vowel was short, the number of consonants *following it*. Two such consonants, excepting the combinations listed in n. 4, p. 105, rendered a syllable long. Dionysius is here pointing out that the length of a syllable is also influenced by the consonants

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

‘Ρόδος be formed. The syllable still remains short; but not equally so, for it will show some slight difference when compared with the other. Again, let one of the voiceless letters, τ, be prefixed and let the word become τρόπος. This is longer than the former syllables, and yet it still remains short. Let still a third letter, σ, be prefixed to the same syllable and the word become στρόφος. This will become longer than the shortest syllable by three audible additional letters; and yet it still remains short.<sup>1</sup> Thus there are these four different lengths of short syllables, and they have only our instinctive feeling to measure the difference between them. The same principle applies to the long syllable. The syllable formed from η, though long by nature, yet when amplified by the addition of four letters, three in front and one at the end, as in the word σπλήν, would surely be said to be longer than that one syllable in its original form, which consisted of one letter. At any rate, if it were in turn reduced by the subtraction of one of those added letters, the stages of diminution would be perceptible. As to the reason why long syllables do not exceed their natural quantity when lengthened to five letters, nor short syllables lose their shortness

which *precede* the vowel. In practice, however, it seems likely that the effect of these consonants on the following syllable would have been felt to any perceptible degree only after syllables that had already been “closed” by one or more

consonants, e.g. in μακρὸς στρόφος the speaker would take a longer time in pronouncing the two middle syllables than their

strict metrical value of —υ, whereas μακροῦ στρόφου would take a shorter time to pronounce, though its metrical value is the same.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

γραμμαίων συστέλλομένας ἐκπίπτειν τῆς βραχύτητος, ἀλλὰ κακείνας ἐν διπλασίῳ λόγῳ θεωρεῖσθαι τῶν βραχειῶν καὶ ταύτας ἐν ἡμίσει τῶν μακρῶν, οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῷ παρόντι σκοπεῖν. ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ὅσον εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπόθεσιν ἤρμοττεν εἰρηῆσθαι, ὅτι διαλλάττει καὶ βραχεῖα συλλαβὴ βραχείας καὶ μακρὰ μακρῶς καὶ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν οὔτ' ἐν λόγοις ψιλοῖς οὔτ' ἐν ποιήμασιν ἢ μέλεσιν διὰ μέτρων ἢ ῥυθμῶν κατασκευαζομένοις πᾶσα βραχεῖα καὶ πᾶσα μακρά.

πρῶτον μὲν δὴ θεώρημα τοῦτο τῶν ἐν ταῖς συλλαβαῖς παθῶν, ἕτερον δὲ τοιόνδε· τῶν γραμμάτων πολλὰς ἔχόντων διαφορὰς οὐ μόνον περὶ τὰ μήκη καὶ τὰς βραχύτητας ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἤχους, ὑπὲρ ὧν ὀλίγῳ πρότερον εἶρηκα, πᾶσα ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰς ἐκ τούτων συνισταμένας συλλαβὰς ἢ διὰ τούτων πλεκομένας ἅμα τὴν τε ἰδίαν ἐκάστου σώζειν δύναμιν καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων, ἢ γίνεται διὰ τῆς κράσεώς τε καὶ παραθέσεως αὐτῶν· ἐξ ὧν μαλακαὶ τε φωναὶ γίνονται καὶ σκληραὶ καὶ λεῖαι καὶ τραχεῖαι, γλυκαίνουσαι τε τὴν ἀκοὴν καὶ πικραίνουσαι, καὶ στύφουσαι καὶ διαχέουσαι, καὶ πᾶσαν ἄλλην κατασκευάζουσαι διάθεσιν φυσικὴν· αὗται δ' εἰσὶ μυρίαὶ τὸ πλῆθος ὅσαι.

ταῦτα δὴ καταμαθόντες οἱ χαριέστατοι ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων τὰ μὲν αὐτοὶ κατασκευάζουσιν ὀνόματα συμπλέκοντες ἐπιτηδείως ἀλλήλοις, τὰ δὲ γράμματα καὶ τὰς συλλαβὰς οἰκείας οἷς ἂν βούλωνται παραστήσαι πάθεσιν ποικίλως φιλοτεχνου-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

when reduced from many letters to one, the former being still regarded as double the shorts, and the latter as half the longs—this does not need to be considered at present. It is enough to have said what is relevant to the present subject, that one short syllable may differ from another short, and one long from another long, and that not every short and every long syllable has the same quality either in prose or in poems or lyrics, whether these be metrically or rhythmically constructed.<sup>1</sup>

That, then, is the first aspect of the behaviour of syllables. The next is this: since letters have many points of difference, not only in length and shortness but in sound also—I spoke about these topics a little while ago—it must inevitably follow that the syllables, which are formed from them or woven together by means of them, preserve at the same time both the individual properties of each letter and the combined effect of all, which arises from their fusion and juxtaposition. The sounds thus formed are soft or hard, smooth or rough, sweet to the ear or harsh to it; they make us contract our mouths or relax them, and bring about every other physical condition; and these are countless in number.

The most elegant writers of poetry or prose have understood these facts well, and both arrange their words by weaving them together with deliberate care, and with elaborate artistic skill adapt the syllables and the letters to the emotions which they wish to portray. Homer does this often, as, for example,

<sup>1</sup> The doctrine of the subtle differences of length of syllables illustrated in this last paragraph is to be traced to the school of the *rhythmici*, who opposed the more simplistic teaching of the *metrici*.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

σιν, ὡς ποιεῖ πολλάκις "Ὀμηρος, ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν  
προσηνέμων αἰγιαλῶν τῇ παρεκτάσει τῶν συλλα-  
βῶν τὸν ἄπαυστον ἐκφαίνειν βουλόμενος ἦχον

ἠιόνες βοόωσιν ἐρευγομένης ἀλὸς ἕξω·

ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τετυφλωμένου Κύκλωπος τό τε τῆς  
ἀλγηδόνης μέγεθος καὶ τὴν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν βρα-  
δεῖαν ἔρευναν τῆς τοῦ σπηλαίου θύρας

Κύκλωψ δὲ στενάχων τε καὶ ὠδίνων ὀδύνησι,  
χερσὶ ψηλαφῶν·

καὶ ἄλλοθὶ που δέησιν ἐνδείξασθαι βουλόμενος  
πολλὴν καὶ κατεσπουδασμένην

οὐδ' εἴ κεν μάλα πολλὰ πάθη<sup>1</sup> ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλ-  
λων,

προπροκυλινδόμενος πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

μυρία ἔστιν εὐρεῖν παρ' αὐτῷ τοιαῦτα χρόνου μῆκος  
ἢ σώματος μέγεθος ἢ πάθους ὑπερβολὴν ἢ στάσεως  
ἡρεμίαν ἢ τῶν παραπλησίων τι δηλοῦντα παρ'  
οὐδὲν οὕτως ἕτερον ἢ τὰς τῶν συλλαβῶν κατα-  
σκευάς· καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις ἐναντίως εἰργασμένα εἰς  
βραχύτητα καὶ τάχος καὶ σπουδὴν καὶ τὰ τούτοις  
ὁμοιογενῆ, ὡς ἔχει ταυτί

ἀμβλήδην γοόωσα μετὰ δμωῆσιν ἔειπεν  
καὶ

<sup>1</sup> EF: πάθοι PMV Homer.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 17. 265. Inadequately rendered in English, the effect of restless movement is achieved in the Greek by the juxtaposition of vowels in diaeresis and the pure dactylic metre. Dionysius is mistaken as to the context. The lines describe the sea's struggle against the outflow of a great river.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

when describing a sea-shore exposed to the wind's blasts, he wants to express the ceaseless roar, and does so by the drawing-out of the syllables <sup>1</sup>:

The jutting shores resound, the foaming tide is  
held at bay.

Or again, when the Cyclops has been blinded, to express the greatness of his anguish and his hands' slow search for the door of the cavern, he says <sup>2</sup>:

The Cyclops utters groan on groan in throes of  
anguish sore

With hands slow-groping.

And when in another place he wishes to portray a long and deeply earnest prayer <sup>3</sup>:

Nor can the archer-god Apollo's passionate  
prayers avail

Though grovelling low at Father Zeus the  
aegis-bearer's feet.

Countless such lines are to be found in Homer, representing length of time, bodily size, extremity of emotion, immobility of position, or some similar effect, by nothing more than the artistic arrangement of the syllables; while other lines are wrought in the opposite way to portray brevity, speed, urgency, and the like. For example <sup>4</sup>:

Convulsively wailing to her handmaids she cried  
and <sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey* 9. 415-6. In the Greek and in the translation, anguish is expressed by a preponderance of *o*, *ω*, *υ*, and slowness by the consonants in *χερσὶ ψηλαφώων*, which lengthen the syllables in the manner described by Dionysius earlier in the chapter.

<sup>3</sup> *Iliad* 22. 220-1.

<sup>4</sup> *Iliad* 22. 476. The effect is achieved by the juxtaposition of vowel sounds.

<sup>5</sup> *Iliad* 18. 225.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἡνίοχοι δ' ἔκπληγεν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον ἀκάματον πῦρ.  
 ἐφ' ἧς μὲν γὰρ ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος δηλοῦται συγκοπή  
 καὶ τὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἄτακτον, ἐφ' ὧν δ' ἡ τῆς δια-  
 νοίας ἔκστασις καὶ τὸ τοῦ δείματος ἀπροσδόκητον·  
 ποιεῖ δὲ τούτων ἑκάτερον ἢ τῶν συλλαβῶν τε καὶ  
 γραμμάτων ἐλάττωσις.

16 καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν δὴ κατασκευάζουσιν οἱ ποιηταὶ  
 καὶ λογογράφοι πρὸς χρῆμα ὄρωντες οἰκεία καὶ  
 δηλωτικὰ τῶν ὑποκειμένων τὰ ὀνόματα, ὥσπερ  
 ἔφην· πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν λαμβά-  
 νουσιν ὡς ἐκεῖνοι κατεσκεύασαν, ὅσα μιμητικὰ  
 τῶν πραγμάτων ἐστίν· ὡς ἔχει ταυτί

ρόχθει γὰρ μέγα κῦμα ποτὶ ξερὸν ἠπείροιο.

αὐτὸς δὲ κλάγξας πέτετο πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο.

αἰγιαλῶ μεγάλῳ<sup>1</sup> βρέμεται, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε  
 πόντος.

σκέπτει δ' οἰστῶν τε ῥοῖζον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων.  
 μεγάλη δὲ τούτων ἀρχὴ καὶ διδάσκαλος ἡ φύσις ἡ  
 ποιούσα μιμητικούς καὶ θετικούς ἡμᾶς τῶν ὀνομά-  
 των, οἷς δηλοῦται τὰ πράγματα κατὰ τινὰς εὐλό-  
 γους καὶ κινητικὰς τῆς διανοίας ὁμοιότητας· ὑφ'  
 ἧς ἐδιδάχθημεν ταύρων τε μυκῆματα λέγειν καὶ

<sup>1</sup> EPM Homer: μεγάλα F Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first line appears short because *γοόωσα*, though a short word, contains four syllables; and there are four spondees in the line. The second line contains two verbal forms which, to Attic eyes, might appear "shortened": otherwise the only docked syllable is the *ε* from *δέ*.

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey* 5. 402; *Iliad* 12. 207; 2. 210; 16. 361.

<sup>3</sup> *Onomatopoeia*, the formation of words by natural association, underlay the concept of *ὀρθοέπεια* as propounded by the sophists Protagoras and Prodicus. It was also of especial

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

And scared were the charioteers beholding that  
tireless flame

In the first of these the halting of <Andromache's> breath is indicated, and her loss of control of her voice; in the second, the mental distraction <of the charioteers> and the unexpectedness of their terror. The effect in both cases is due to the reduction of the number of syllables and words.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the poets and prose authors, on their own 16 account, look to the subject they are treating and furnish it with words which suit it and illustrate it, as I said. But they also borrow many words from earlier writers, in the very form in which they fashioned them—words which imitate things, as is the case in these examples<sup>2</sup>:

With thunderous roar the mighty billow crashed  
upon the shore.

And he with yelping cry flew headlong down the  
wind's strong blast.

(The wave) Resounds upon the mighty strand, the  
ocean crashes round.

Alert, he watched for hissing arrows and for  
clattering spears.

The great source and teacher in these matters is Nature, who prompts us to imitate, and to coin words which represent things according to certain resemblances which are based on reason and appeal to our intelligence.<sup>3</sup> It is she who has taught us to speak

interest to the Stoics, who related it to their doctrine of the natural origins of words. By Dionysius' time the term *ὀνοματοποιΐα* was probably applied to the coining of words in general, a process governed by knowledge of etymology, and more particularly morphology, rather than by natural association of sounds. It may be this that causes him to introduce "reason" and "intelligence" into the discussion.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

χρεμετισμοὺς ἵππων καὶ φριμαγμοὺς τράγων πυρός τε βρόμον καὶ πάταγον ἀνέμων καὶ συριγμὸν κάλων καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις ὅμοια παμπληθῆ τὰ μὲν φωνῆς μηνύματα, τὰ δὲ μορφῆς, τὰ δὲ ἔργου, τὰ δὲ πάθους, τὰ δὲ κινήσεως, τὰ δ' ἡρεμίας, τὰ δ' ἄλλου χρήματος ὅτου δὴ· περὶ ὧν εἴρηται πολλὰ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν, τὰ κράτιστα δ' ὡς πρῶτῳ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἐτυμολογίας εἰσαγαγόντι λόγον, Πλάτωνι τῷ Σωκρατικῷ, πολλαχῆ μὲν καὶ ἄλλῃ μάλιστα δ' ἐν τῷ Κρατύλῳ.

τί δὴ τὸ κεφάλαιόν ἐστὶ μοι τούτου τοῦ λόγου; ὅτι παρὰ μὲν τὰς τῶν γραμμάτων συμπλοκὰς ἢ τῶν συλλαβῶν γίνεται δύναμις ποικίλη, παρὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν συλλαβῶν σύνθεσιν ἢ τῶν ὀνομάτων φύσις παντοδαπή, παρὰ δὲ τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀρμονίας πολύμορφος ὁ λόγος· ὥστε πολλὴ ἀνάγκη καλὴν μὲν εἶναι λέξιν ἐν ἧ καλὰ ἐστὶν ὀνόματα, κάλλους δὲ ὀνομάτων συλλαβὰς τε καὶ γράμματα καλὰ αἴτια εἶναι, ἡδεῖαν δὲ διάλεκτον ἐκ τῶν ἡδυνόντων τὴν ἀκοὴν γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὸ παραπλήσιον ὀνομάτων τε καὶ συλλαβῶν καὶ γραμμάτων, τὰς τε κατὰ μέρος ἐν τούτοις διαφορὰς, καθ' ἃς δηλοῦνται τὰ τε ἡθῆ καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ αἱ διαθέσεις καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν προσώπων καὶ τὰ συνεδρεύοντα τούτοις, ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης κατασκευῆς τῶν γραμμάτων γίνεσθαι τοιαύτας.

χρήσομαι δ' ὀλίγοις παραδείγμασι τοῦ λόγου τοῦδε τῆς σαφηνείας ἕνεκα· τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα πολλὰ

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Philebus* 18B-C, *Hippias Major* passim, *Theaetetus* 199-end.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

of the bellowing of bulls, the whinnying of horses, the bleating of goats, the roar of fire, the beating of winds, the creaking of ropes, and a host of other similar imitations of sound, shape, action, feeling, movement, stillness, and anything else whatsoever. These matters have been discussed at length by our predecessors, the most important work being that of the first writer to introduce the subject of etymology, Plato the Socratic, in his *Cratylus* especially, but in many places elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

What is the main gist of my argument? It is that the varied effect of the syllables is produced by the interweaving of letters, that the diverse nature of words is produced by the combination of syllables, and that the multiform character of a discourse is produced by the arrangement of the words. This leads us forcibly to conclude that style is beautiful when it contains beautiful words; that beauty of words is caused by beautiful syllables and letters; and that attractiveness of language is due to words, syllables and letters which please the ear by virtue of some affinity ;<sup>2</sup> and that the difference in detail between these, through which are revealed the characters, feelings, dispositions, actions and attendant qualities of the persons described, are made what they are through the original grouping of the letters.

I shall employ a few examples in order to illustrate this argument. You will find others, of which there are many, when you come to collect material on your

<sup>2</sup> Dionysius' use of *καλός* in this passage may be intended to include the use of harsh or austere words to describe violent action: the propriety of such words would please the ear no less than attractive words appropriately used.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ὄντα ἐπὶ σαυτοῦ συμβαλλόμενος εὐρήσεις. ὁ δὲ πολυφωνότατος ἀπάντων ποιητῶν Ὀμηρος, ὅταν μὲν ὦραν ὄψεως εὐμόρφου καὶ κάλλος ἡδονῆς ἐπαγωγὸν ἐπιδείξασθαι βούληται, τῶν τε φωνηέντων τοῖς κρατίστοις χρήσεται καὶ τῶν ἡμιφώνων τοῖς μαλακωτάτοις, καὶ οὐ καταπυκνώσει τοῖς ἀφώνοις τὰς συλλαβὰς οὐδὲ συγκόψει τοὺς ἤχους παρατιθεὶς ἀλλήλοις τὰ δυσέκφορα, πραεῖαν δέ τινα ποιήσει τὴν ἁρμονίαν τῶν γραμμάτων καὶ ρέουσιν ἀλύπως διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς, ὡς ἔχει ταυτὶ

ἢ δ' ἴεν ἐκ θαλάμοιο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια  
Ἄρτεμιδι ἰκέλη ἢ χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ.

Δήλω δὴποτε τοῖον Ἀπόλλωνος παρὰ βωμῶ  
φοίνικος νέον ἔρνος ἀνερχόμενον ἐνόησα.

καὶ Χλωρίν εἶδον περικαλλέα, τὴν ποτε Νηλεὺς  
γῆμεν εὖν μετὰ κάλλος, ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα.  
ὅταν δ' οἰκτρὰν ἢ φοβερὰν ἢ ἀγέρωχον ὄψιν εἰσάγη,  
τῶν τε φωνηέντων οὐ τὰ κράτιστα θήσει ἀλλὰ <τὰ  
δυσηχέστατα, καὶ> <sup>1</sup> τῶν ψοφοειδῶν ἢ ἀφώνων τὰ  
δυσεκφορώτατα λήψεται καὶ καταπυκνώσει τούτοις  
τὰς συλλαβὰς, οἷά ἐστι ταυτὶ  
σμερδαλέος δ' αὐτῆσι φάνη κεκακωμένος ἄλμη.

<sup>1</sup> Sauppe.

<sup>1</sup> *Odyssey* 17. 36–7, 19. 53–4.

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey* 6. 162–3.

<sup>3</sup> *Odyssey* 11. 281–2. Plosives and liquids are much in evidence.

<sup>4</sup> The fricatives are σ and its compounds ζ, ξ, ψ.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

own. Now when Homer, the poet with the most voices of all, wishes to portray the freshness of a comely countenance and a beauty that brings delight, you will find him using the finest of the vowels and the softest of the semivowels, and not crowding his syllables with voiceless letters, nor destroying the flow of sound by juxtaposing words which are hard to pronounce. He will make the arrangement of the letters sound gentle, and make it flow through the ear without offending it, as in the following lines <sup>1</sup>:

Penelope, queen of wisdom from her chamber  
forth had gone,  
Like Artemis or golden Aphrodite's form divine.

'Twas once at Delos that I saw hard by Apollo's  
shrine,  
A sapling palm whose youthful straightness  
matched such comely grace as thine.<sup>2</sup>

And saw I Chloris passing fair, whom Neleus wed  
of yore,  
Bestowing wedding gifts unnumbered, for her  
beauty's sake.<sup>3</sup>

But when he is introducing a scene that is pitiable, frightening or august, he will not employ the finest of the vowels, but will take <the most unpleasant-sounding and> those of the fricatives <sup>4</sup> and the voiceless consonants that are the most difficult to pronounce and crowd his syllables with these, as in these lines <sup>5</sup>:

He burst on them, a fearsome sight, all uglified  
with brine.

<sup>5</sup> *Odyssey* 6. 137. Note especially *σμερδαλέος* and *κεκακωμένος*.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῇ δ' ἐπὶ μὲν Γοργῶ βλοσυρῶπις ἐστεφάνωτο  
δεινὸν δερκομένη, περὶ δὲ Δεῖμός τε Φόβος τε.  
ποταμῶν δέ γε σύρρυσιν εἰς χωρίον ἓν καὶ πάταγον  
ὑδάτων ἀναμισγομένων ἐκμιμήσασθαι τῇ λέξει  
βουλόμενος οὐκ ἐργάσεται λείας συλλαβὰς ἀλλ'  
ἰσχυρὰς καὶ ἀντιτύπους

ὡς δ' ὅτε χεῖμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ρέοντες  
ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ.  
βιαζόμενον δέ τινα πρὸς ἐναντίον ρεῦμα ποταμοῦ  
μετὰ τῶν ὄπλων καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀντέχοντα, τὰ δ'  
ὑποφερόμενον εἰσάγων ἀνακοπὰς τε ποιήσει συλ-  
λαβῶν καὶ ἀναβολὰς χρόνων καὶ ἀντιστηριγμοὺς  
γραμμάτων

δεινὸν δ' ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆα κυκώμενον ἴστατο κῦμα,  
ᾧθι δ' ἐν σάκει πίπτων ῥόος, οὐδὲ πόδεσσιν  
εἶχε στηρίξασθαι.

ἀραττομένων δὲ περὶ πέτρας ἀνθρώπων ψόφον τε  
καὶ μόρον οἰκτρὸν ἐπιδεικνύμενος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀηδεστά-  
των τε καὶ κακοφωνοτάτων χροσιεῖ γραμμάτων  
οὐδαμῇ λεαίνων τὴν κατασκευὴν οὐδὲ ἠδύνων·

σύν τε δύω μάρψας ᾧστε σκύλακας προτὶ γαίῃ  
κόπτ'. ἐκ δ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ  
γαίαν.

πολὺ ἂν ἔργον εἶη λέγειν, εἰ πάντων παραδείγματα

---

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 11. 36-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad* 4. 452-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Iliad* 21. 240-2.

<sup>4</sup> *Odyssey* 9. 289-90.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

A Gorgon's head of baleful mien embossed the  
centre orb

With Fear and Panic ranged around her  
terrifying glare.<sup>1</sup>

When he wishes to represent in words the flowing  
together of rivers into one place and the noisy splash  
of mingling torrents, he will not render this with  
smooth syllables, but with strong and resounding  
ones <sup>2</sup>:

E'en as the winter-swollen rivers rush from hillsides  
steep,

They hurl their torrents wild into the watersmeet  
below.

And when he depicts a warrior in full armour forcing  
his way forward against the contrary current of a  
river, now holding his own, now being carried off his  
feet, he will introduce clashings of syllables, delays in  
the rhythm, and letters which hold up the flow <sup>3</sup>:

Around Achilles swirled a terrible tempestuous  
wave:

Its current dashed against his shield and swept  
away his feet

From their firm stance.

When men are being dashed against rocks, and he is  
portraying the noise and their pitiable fate, he will  
dwell on the most unpleasant and ill-sounding letters,  
nowhere attempting to make the arrangement smooth  
or attractive <sup>4</sup>:

A pair of them he snatched and dashed, like  
puppies on the ground.

Their brains flowed freely on the floor and  
incarnadined the rocks.

It would be a long task if I should set myself to

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

βουλοίμην φέρειν ὧν ἂν τις ἀπαιτήσῃε κατὰ τὸν τόπον τόνδε· ὥστε ἀρκεσθεῖς τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξῆς μεταβήσομαι.

φημὶ δὴ τὸν βουλόμενον ἐργάσασθαι λέξιν καλὴν ἐν τῷ συντιθέναι τὰς φωνάς, ὅσα καλλιλογίαν ἢ μεγαλοπρέπειαν ἢ σεμνότητα περιείληφεν ὀνόματα, εἰς ταῦτὸ συνάγειν. εἴρηται δέ τινα περὶ τούτων καὶ Θεοφράστῳ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ κοινότερον ἐν τοῖς περὶ λέξεως, ἔνθα ὀρίζει, τίνα ὀνόματα φύσει καλά· παραδείγματος ἕνεκα, ὧν συντιθεμένων καλὴν οἶεται καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆ γενήσεσθαι τὴν φράσιν, καὶ αὐθις ἕτερα μικρὰ καὶ ταπεινά, ἐξ ὧν οὔτε ποίημα χρηστὸν ἔσεσθαι φησιν οὔτε λόγον. καὶ μὰ Δία οὐκ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ ταῦτα εἴρηται τῷ ἀνδρὶ. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐγχωροίη πάντ' εἶναι τὰ μόρια τῆς λέξεως ὑφ' ὧν μέλλει δηλοῦσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα εὐφω-νά τε καὶ καλλιρήμονα, μανίας ἔργον ζητεῖν τὰ χεῖρω· εἰ δὲ ἀδύνατον εἶη τοῦτο, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ πολλῶν ἔχει, τῇ πλοκῇ καὶ μίξει καὶ παραθέσει πειρατέον ἀφανίζειν τὴν τῶν χειρόνων φύσιν, ὅπερ Ὅμηρος εἶωθεν ἐπὶ πολλῶν ποιεῖν. εἰ γάρ τις ἔροιτο ὄντιν' οὖν ἢ ποιητῶν ἢ ῥητόρων, τίνα σεμνότητα ἢ καλλιλογίαν ταῦτ' ἔχει τὰ ὀνόματα ἃ ταῖς Βοιωταῖς κεῖται πόλεσιν Ὑρία καὶ Μυκαλησσὸς καὶ Γραῖα καὶ Ἐτεωνὸς καὶ Σκῶλος καὶ Θίσβη

---

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I, pp. xii–xiv. Although earlier critics were interested in the relationship between the formation of words and natural law, this passage of Theophrastus seems to be the first in which moral or aesthetic properties are, at least by

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

produce examples of all the usages that might be required to illustrate this subject. I shall therefore content myself with what has been said and proceed to the next topic.

Now I hold that whoever wishes to create a style which is beautiful in the composition of its sounds must combine in the same work words all of which convey beauty of sound, impressiveness or dignity. Something has been said on this subject in a more general way by the philosopher Theophrastus<sup>1</sup> in his work *On Style*, where he distinguishes two classes of words—those which are naturally beautiful, which, for example, he thinks will make the expression beautiful and impressive when they are combined with one another; and those, on the other hand, which are paltry and mean, which he says will produce neither poetry nor prose that is of good quality. And, by heaven, the writer has not missed the mark in saying this. If, then, it were possible that all the parts of speech by which a certain subject was to be expressed should sound beautiful and be elegantly phrased, it would be an act of madness to look for the inferior ones. But supposing this to be impossible, as in many cases it is, we must try to cover up the natural defects of the inferior letters by interweaving, mixing and juxtaposing, and this is precisely Homer's practice in many passages. For instance, if someone were to ask any poet or rhetorician what grandeur or elegance there is in those names which have been given to the Boeotian towns Hyria, Mycalessus, Graea, Eteonus, Scolus, implication, ascribed rigidly to different classes of words according to their sound. Dionysius was profoundly influenced by this.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ Ὀγχηστὸς καὶ Εὐτρησις καὶ τὰλλ' ἐφεξῆς ὧν ὁ ποιητῆς μέμνηται, οὐδεὶς ἂν εἰπεῖν οὐδ' ἦντιν' οὖν ἔχοι· ἀλλ' οὕτως αὐτὰ καλῶς ἐκείνος συνύφαγκεν καὶ παραπληρώμασιν εὐφώνοις διείληφεν ὥστε μεγαλοπρεπέστατα φαίνεσθαι πάντων ὀνομάτων·

Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον  
 Ἄρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε,  
 οἳ θ' Ὑρίην ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐλίδα πετρήεσαν  
 Σχοῖνόν τε Σκῶλόν τε πολύκνημόν τ' Ἐτεωνόν,  
 Θέσπειαν Γραϊάν τε καὶ εὐρύχορον Μυκαλησσόν,  
 οἳ τ' ἀμφ' Ἄρμ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Εἰλέσιον καὶ Ἐρυθράς,

οἳ τ' Ἐλεῶν' εἶχον ἠδ' Ὑλην καὶ Πετεῶνα,  
 Ὠκαλέην Μεδεῶνά τ' ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον.

ἐν εἰδόσι λέγων οὐκ οἶομαι πλειόνων δεῖν παραδειγμάτων. ἅπας γάρ ἐστιν ὁ κατάλογος αὐτῶ τοιοῦτος καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα, ἐν οἷς ἀναγκασθεὶς ὀνόματα λαμβάνειν οὐ καλὰ τὴν φύσιν ἑτέροις αὐτὰ κοσμεῖ καλοῖς καὶ λύει τὴν ἐκείνων δυσχέρειαν τῆ τούτων εὐμορφία. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἄλις.

17 ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς ἔφην οὐ μικρὰν μοῖραν ἔχειν τῆς ἀξιωματικῆς καὶ μεγαλοπρεποῦς συνθέσεως, ἵνα μηδεὶς εἰκῆ με δόξῃ λέγειν ῥυθμοὺς καὶ μέτρα μουσικῆς οἰκεῖα θεωρίας εἰς οὐ ῥυθμικὴν

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 2. 494–501.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Thisbe, Onchestus, Eutresis, and the rest of the list which the poet records, no one would be able to say that they possessed any such quality at all. But Homer has so beautifully interwoven them and dispersed them among supplementary words that sound pleasant that they appear as the most impressive of all names <sup>1</sup>:

As leaders of Boeotia's host came Leitus,  
Peneleus,  
Prothoenor and Arcesilaus, Clonius to war,  
And Hyria's men, and those who dwelt by  
Aulis' craggy steeps,  
And men from Schoenus, Scolus, Eteonus'  
hill-cleft's deep,  
From Thespeia and Graea, and broad  
Mycalessus green,  
And those who lived near Harma, Eilesius,  
Erythrae,  
And those that in Eleon dwelt, in Hyle, Peteon,  
And Ocaleē and Medeon, that well-walled city  
strong.

As I am addressing men who know their Homer, I do not think that more examples are necessary. The whole of his list is of the same character, as are many other passages in which, being forced to handle words which are not naturally beautiful, he places them in a setting of beautiful ones, counteracting their ungainly effect by the shapeliness of the others. On this topic I have now said enough.

Now I have said that rhythm also plays no small <sup>17</sup> part in dignified and impressive composition. So that nobody may suppose that I am talking irrelevantly in introducing rhythm and metre, which are proper to the study of music, into my treatment of

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὐδ' ἔμμετρον εἰσάγοντα διάλεκτον, ἀποδώσω καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ τούτων λόγον. ἔχει δ' οὕτως· πᾶν ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ ἄλλο μόριον λέξεως, ὃ τι μὴ μονοσύλλαβόν ἐστιν, ἐν ῥυθμῷ τινι λέγεται· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καλῶ πόδα καὶ ῥυθμόν. δισυλλάβου μὲν οὖν λέξεως διαφοραὶ τρεῖς. ἢ γὰρ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἔσται βραχειῶν ἢ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων μακρῶν ἢ τῆς μὲν βραχείας, τῆς δὲ μακρᾶς. τοῦ δὲ τρίτου τούτου ῥυθμοῦ διττὸς ὁ τρόπος· ὁ μὲν τις ἀπὸ βραχείας ἀρχόμενος καὶ λήγων εἰς μακράν, ὁ δ' ἀπὸ μακρᾶς καὶ λήγων εἰς βραχεῖαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν βραχυσύλλαβος ἠγεμών τε καὶ πυρρίχιος καλεῖται, καὶ οὔτε μεγαλοπρεπῆς ἐστὶν οὔτε σεμνός· σχῆμα δ' αὐτοῦ τοιόνδε

λέγε δὲ σὺ κατὰ πόδα νεόχυτα μέλεα.

ὁ δ' ἀμφοτέρας τὰς συλλαβὰς μακρὰς ἔχων κεκληται μὲν σπονδειῖος, ἀξίωμα δὲ ἔχει μέγα καὶ σεμνότητα πολλήν· παράδειγμα δ' αὐτοῦ τόδε

ποιᾶν δῆθ' ὀρμάσω, ταύταν

ἢ κείναν, κείναν ἢ ταύταν;

ὁ δ' ἐκ βραχείας τε καὶ μακρᾶς συγκείμενος ἐὰν μὲν τὴν ἠγουμένην λάβῃ βραχεῖαν, ἴαμβος καλεῖται, καὶ ἔστιν οὐκ ἀγεννής· ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς μα-

---

<sup>1</sup> This statement perhaps provides an important clue to the "scansion" of prose. Since prose came into use in literature as a medium for imparting factual information, leaving verse

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

a kind of prose which is neither rhythmical nor metrical, I shall also explain their bearing on this subject. The position is this. Every noun and verb, and every other part of speech which does not consist of a single syllable only, is spoken in some sort of rhythm.<sup>1</sup> (I am here using "rhythm" and "foot" in the same sense.) A disyllabic word may take three forms. It may be made up of two shorts, or two longs, or one short and the other long. Of this third rhythm there are two forms: one beginning with a short and ending with a long, and the other beginning with a long and ending with a short. The one which is composed of two shorts is called a *hegemon* ("leader") or *pyrrhic*, and is neither impressive nor solemn.<sup>2</sup> This is how it appears<sup>3</sup>:

Pick up the newly-scattered limbs at your feet.  
The foot which has both its syllables long is called a *spondee*, and has great dignity and much solemnity. Here is an example of it<sup>4</sup>:

Whither shall I hasten now? In this direction

Or in that? In that direction or in this?

The foot which is composed of a short and a long is called an *iambus* if it has the first syllable short; and this is not ignoble. If it begins with the long

for the creative imagination of the lyric or dramatic poet, the importance of the grammatical or logical units of the sentence might be expected to find reflection in its metrical division, and feet or metra to correspond, where possible, with these grammatical units.

<sup>2</sup> Moral and aesthetic values are now applied to rhythms, as earlier to letters, syllables and words, in preparation for an examination of the three types of composition, the intermediate of which is to be adjudged the best.

<sup>3</sup> Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci, Fragmenta Adespota* 12.

<sup>4</sup> Euripides, *Hecuba* 163-4.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

κρᾶς ἄρχηται, τροχαῖος, καὶ ἔστι μαλακώτερος  
θατέρου καὶ ἀγεννέστερος· παράδειγμα δὲ τοῦ μὲν  
προτέρου τοιόνδε

ἐπεὶ σχολή<sup>1</sup> πάρεστι, παῖ Μειοιτίου.  
τοῦ δ' ἑτέρου

θυμέ, θύμ' ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε.

δισυλλάβων μὲν δὴ μορίων λέξεως διαφοραὶ τε  
καὶ ῥυθμοὶ καὶ σχήματα τοσαῦτα· τρισυλλάβων δ'  
ἕτερα πλείω τῶν εἰρημένων καὶ ποικιλωτέραν  
ἔχοντα θεωρίαν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀπασῶν βραχειῶν  
συνεστῶς, καλούμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τινων χορείος [τρίβρα-  
χυσ πούς],<sup>2</sup> οὗ παράδειγμα τοιόνδε

Βρόμιε, δορατοφόρ', ἐνυάλιε, πολεμοκέλαδε,  
ταπεινός τε καὶ ἄσεμνός ἐστι καὶ ἀγεννής, καὶ  
οὐδὲν ἂν ἐξ αὐτοῦ γένοιτο γενναῖον. ὁ δ' ἐξ ἀπα-  
σῶν μακρῶν, μολοττὸν δ' αὐτὸν οἱ μετρικοὶ καλοῦ-  
σιν, ὑψηλός τε καὶ ἀξιωματικός ἐστι καὶ διαβε-  
βηκῶς ἐπὶ πολὺ· παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτοῦ τοιόνδε

ὦ Ζηνὸς καὶ Λήδας κάλλιστοι σωτῆρες.

ὁ δ' ἐκ μακρᾶς καὶ δυεῖν βραχειῶν μέσην μὲν λα-  
βῶν τὴν μακρὰν ἀμφίβραχυσ ὠνόμασται, καὶ οὐ  
σφόδρα τῶν εὐσχημόνων<sup>3</sup> ἐστὶ ῥυθμῶν ἀλλὰ δια-  
κέκλασταί τε καὶ πολὺ τὸ θῆλυ καὶ ἀηδὲς ἔχει,

<sup>1</sup> EMV: ἐπὶ σχολῆι FP, Usener.

<sup>2</sup> del. Sauppe.

<sup>3</sup> PMV: εὐσχήμων EF Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> And yet trochaic tetrameter was the metre chosen for elevated passages in tragic drama, to contrast with the more pedestrian iambic trimeter.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragmenta Adespota* 138 Nauck (tr. Roberts).

<sup>3</sup> Archilochus, Frag. 66 Bergk.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

syllable, it is called a *trochee*. This is feebler than the other and more ignoble.<sup>1</sup> This is an example of the former<sup>2</sup>:

My leisure serves me now, Menoetius's son,  
and of the other<sup>3</sup> :

Heart of mine, O heart in turmoil with a throng  
of crushing cares!

These are all the varieties, rhythms and forms of dissyllabic words. Those of the trisyllabic words form another group, more numerous than those mentioned and requiring more complicated study. First comes the foot which consists entirely of short syllables, which some call the *choree*, of which the following is an example<sup>4</sup> :

Bromius, wielder of javelins,

Lord of the war and the battle-cry.

This is a mean foot, lacking both dignity and nobility, and nothing noble could be made out of it.<sup>5</sup> But the foot which consists entirely of long syllables, the *molossus* as the metricians call it, is elevated, dignified and long-striding. The following is an example of it<sup>6</sup> :

O glorious saviours, Zeus' and Leda's sons.

The foot which consists of a long and two shorts, with the long in the middle, has the name *amphibrach*, and has no strong claim to be included among the graceful rhythms, but is enervated and has about it much that

<sup>4</sup> Bergk, *PLG*, Frag. Adesp. 108.

<sup>5</sup> Yet accumulations of short syllables are often used to express excitement, e.g. Euripides, *Bacchae* 578–81.

<sup>6</sup> Frag. Adesp. 139 Nauck (tr. Roberts).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οἶά ἐστι ταυτί

Ἰακχε θρίαμβε, σὺ τῶνδε χοραγέ.

ὁ δὲ προλαμβάνων τὰς δύο βραχείας ἀνάπαιστος μὲν καλεῖται, σεμνότητα δ' ἔχει πολλήν· καὶ ἔνθα δεῖ μέγεθός τι περιτιθέναι τοῖς πράγμασιν ἢ πάθος, ἐπιτήδειός ἐστι παραλαμβάνεσθαι· τούτου τὸ σχῆμα τοιόνδε

βαρὺ μοι κεφαλᾶς ἐπίκρανον ἔχειν.

ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς μακρᾶς ἀρχόμενος, λήγων δὲ εἰς τὰς βραχείας δάκτυλος μὲν καλεῖται, πάνυ δ' ἐστὶ σεμνὸς καὶ εἰς τὸ κάλλος τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἀξιολογώτατος, καὶ τό γε ἥρωικὸν μέτρον ἀπὸ τούτου κοσμεῖται ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ· παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτοῦ τόδε

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασεν.  
οἱ μέντοι ρυθμικοὶ τούτου τοῦ ποδὸς τὴν μακρὰν βραχυτέραν εἶναι φασι τῆς τελείας, οὐκ ἔχοντες δ' εἰπεῖν ὅσῳ, καλοῦσιν αὐτὴν ἄλογον. ἕτερός ἐστιν ἀντίστροφον ἔχων τούτῳ ρυθμόν, ὃς ἀπὸ τῶν βραχειῶν ἀρξάμενος ἐπὶ τὴν ἄλογον τελευτᾷ· τοῦτον χωρίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἀναπαίστων κυκλικὸν καλοῦσι παράδειγμα αὐτοῦ φέροντες τοιόνδε

κέχυται πόλις ὑψίπυλος κατὰ γᾶν.

περὶ ὧν ἂν ἕτερος εἴη λόγος· πλὴν ἀμφότεροί γε τῶν πάνυ καλῶν οἱ ρυθμοί. ἐν ἔτι λείπεται τρισυλλάβων ρυθμῶν γένος, ὃ συνέστηκεν ἐκ δύο μακρῶν καὶ βραχείας, τρία δὲ ποιεῖ σχήματα· μέσης μὲν γὰρ γινομένης τῆς βραχείας, ἄκρων δὲ

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

is effeminate and ignoble, as in this example<sup>1</sup> :

Triumphant Iacchus that ledest this chorus.

The foot which begins with two shorts is called an *anapaest*, and it is a very solemn foot; and where it is necessary to invest a subject with grandeur or pathos, this is an appropriate foot to introduce. Its form may be illustrated by <sup>2</sup>:

It is heavy upon me, the coif for my hair.

The foot which begins with the long and ends with the shorts is called a *dactyl*. It is very stately and remarkably effective at producing beauty of expression. The heroic line derives its formal beauty for the most part from this. Here is an example <sup>3</sup>:

Swiftly from Ilium bore me the wind to the land  
of Ciconia.

The writers on rhythms, however, say that the long syllable in this foot is shorter than the perfect long, but not being able to say by how much, they call it "irrational". There is another foot having a rhythm which is the converse of this, starting with the short syllables and ending with the irrational. This they differentiate from the anapaest and call "cyclic", adducing the following line as an example <sup>4</sup>:

On the earth is the high-gated city laid low.

This question would require a separate discussion: but both rhythms are of a very beautiful kind.<sup>5</sup> There still remains one class of trisyllabic rhythms, which is composed of two longs and a short and takes three forms. When the short is in the middle and

<sup>1</sup> Frag. Adesp. 140 Nauck (tr. Roberts).

<sup>2</sup> Euripides, *Hippolytus* 201.

<sup>3</sup> Homer, *Odyssey* 9. 39. On the nobility of the dactyl, see Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 8. 4, *Poetics* 23; *On the Sublime* 39. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Bergk, *PLG*, Frag. Adesp. 111 (tr. Roberts).

<sup>5</sup> On the rhythmic, see p. 109, n. 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῶν μακρῶν κρητικός τε λέγεται καὶ ἔστιν οὐκ ἀγεννής. ὑπόδειγμα δὲ αὐτοῦ τοιοῦτον

οἱ δ' ἐπείγοντο πλωταῖς ἀπήναισι χαλκεμβόλοις.  
ἂν δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν αἱ δύο μακραὶ κατάσχωσιν, τὴν δὲ  
τελευτὴν ἢ βραχεῖα, οἷά ἐστι ταυτί

σοὶ Φοῖβε Μοῦσαί σύμβωμοι,  
ἀνδρῶδες πάνυ ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα καὶ εἰς σεμνολογίαν  
ἐπιτήδειον. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ συμβήσεται κἂν ἢ βραχεῖα  
προτεθῆ τῶν μακρῶν· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ ρυθμὸς  
ἀξίωμα ἔχει καὶ μέγεθος· παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτοῦ  
τόδε

τίν' ἀκτάν, τίν' ὕλαν δράμω; ποῖ πορευθῶ;  
τούτοις ἀμφοτέροις ὀνόματα κείται τοῖς ποσὶν  
ὑπὸ τῶν μετρικῶν βακχεῖος μὲν τῷ προτέρῳ,  
θατέρῳ δὲ ὑποβάκχειος. οὗτοι δώδεκα ρυθμοὶ τε  
καὶ πόδες εἰσὶν οἱ πρῶτοι καταμετροῦντες ἅπασαν  
ἔμμετρόν τε καὶ ἄμετρον λέξιν, ἐξ ὧν γίνονται  
στίχοι τε καὶ κῶλα· οἱ γὰρ ἄλλοι πόδες καὶ  
ρυθμοὶ πάντες ἐκ τούτων εἰσὶ σύνθετοι. ἀπλοῦς  
δὲ ρυθμὸς ἢ πούς οὔτ' ἐλάττων ἔσται δύο συλ-  
λαβῶν οὔτε μείζων τριῶν. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων  
οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ τὰ πλείω λέγειν.

- 18 ὧν δ' ἔνεκα νῦν ὑπήχθη ταῦτα προειπεῖν (οὐ  
γὰρ δὴ τὴν ἄλλως γέ μοι προὔκειτο μετρικῶν καὶ  
ρυθμικῶν ἄπτεσθαι θεωρημάτων, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀν-  
αγκαίου ἔνεκα), ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ὅτι διὰ μὲν τῶν γεν-  
ναίων καὶ ἀξιοματικῶν καὶ μέγεθος ἐχόντων  
ρυθμῶν ἀξιοματικὴ γίνεται σύνθεσις καὶ γενναία  
καὶ μεγαλοπρεπής, διὰ δὲ τῶν ἀγεννῶν τε καὶ

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the longs are at both ends, it is called a *cretic*, and it is not an ignoble rhythm. A specimen of it is <sup>1</sup>:

On they sped, borne on sea-wains with prows  
brazen-beaked.

But if the two long syllables occupy the beginning, and the short one the end, as in the line <sup>2</sup>

Phoebus, to thee and the Muses worshipped  
with thee,

the form assumed is a very virile one, and appropriate for solemn language. The effect will be the same even if the short is placed before the longs; for this foot too has dignity and grandeur. Here is an example of it <sup>3</sup>:

To what shore, to what grove shall I flee for  
refuge?

The names assigned to these two feet by the metrists are, respectively, *bacchius* and *hypobacchius*. These are the twelve basic rhythms and feet which measure all language, metrical and unmetrical, and from them are formed lines and clauses. All other feet and rhythms are combinations of these. A simple rhythm or foot will consist of not less than two syllables and not more than three. I do not know what more needs to be said on these matters.

The reason why I have been led to make these 18 introductory statements (for it was certainly no part of my intention to touch upon the subject of metre and rhythm, except in so far as it was necessary to do so) is this, that it is rhythms which are noble and dignified, and possess majesty, that make composition dignified, noble and impressive, whereas it somehow

<sup>1</sup> Bergk, *PLG*, Frag. Adesp. 117 (tr. Roberts).

<sup>2</sup> Bergk, *PLG*, Frag. Adesp. 110 (tr. Roberts).

<sup>3</sup> Bergk, *PLG*, Frag. Adesp. 116.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ταπεινῶν ἀμεγέθης τις καὶ ἄσεμνος, ἐάν τε καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἕκαστοι τούτων λαμβάνωνται τῶν ῥυθμῶν, ἐάν τε ἀλλήλοις κατὰ τὰς ὁμοζυγίας συμπλέκωνται. [δῆλον.]<sup>1</sup> εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔσται δύναμις ἐξ ἀπάντων κρατίστων ῥυθμῶν συνθεῖναι τὴν λέξιν, ἔχοι ἂν ἡμῖν κατ' εὐχὴν· εἰ δ' ἀναγκαῖον εἴη μίσγειν τοῖς κρείττοσι τοὺς χείρονας, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν γίνεται (τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα κεῖται τοῖς πράγμασιν ὡς ἔτυχεν), οἰκονομεῖν αὐτὰ χρὴ φιλοτέχνως καὶ διακλέπτειν τῇ χάριτι τῆς συνθέσεως τὴν ἀνάγκην ἄλλως τε καὶ πολλὴν τὴν ἄδειαν ἔχοντας· οὐ γὰρ ἀπελαύνεται ῥυθμὸς οὐδεὶς ἐκ τῆς ἀμέτρου λέξεως, ὥσπερ ἐκ τῆς ἐμμέτρου.

μαρτύρια δὲ ὧν εἴρηκα παραθεῖναι λοιπόν, ἵνα μοι καὶ πίστιν ὁ λόγος λάβῃ. ἔσται δ' ὀλίγα περὶ πολλῶν. φέρε δὴ, τίς οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν ἀξιωματικῶς τε συγκεῖσθαι καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς τὴν Θουκυδίδου λέξιν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ ταύτην· 'Οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε ἤδη εἰρηκότων ἐπαινοῦσι τὸν προσθέντα τῷ νόμῳ τὸν λόγον τόνδε, ὡς καλὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις ἀγορεύεσθαι αὐτόν.' τί οὖν ἔστιν ὁ πεποίηκε ταύτην μεγαλοπρεπῆ τὴν σύνθεσιν; τὸ ἐκ τοιούτων συγκεῖσθαι ῥυθμῶν τὰ κῶλα. τρεῖς μὲν γὰρ οἱ τοῦ πρώτου

<sup>1</sup> om. Ps: del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 8 opposes the use of recognisably regular rhythm in prose, but favours the paean (υ υ υ – or – υ υ υ) for clausulae. Cicero warns against allowing the heroic feet (dactyls, anapaests and spondees) to proceed beyond two or a little more in prose (*De Oratore* 3. 47. 182). Dionysius appears to advocate a much freer use of rhythm. His list of twelve rhythms or feet includes some, like the cretic and the

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

lacks both majesty and gravity when ignoble or mean rhythms are used, whether they are taken individually by themselves or are woven together according to their natural relationships. Now if it proves possible for us to compose in a style which consists entirely of the finest rhythms, our ideal may be realised; but if it should be necessary to mix the worse with the better, as happens in many cases (for names have been assigned to things in a haphazard way), we must manage our subject-matter artistically and disguise the constraint under which we are working by the elegance of our composition; and we can cultivate this elegance the more effectively because here we have great freedom, since no rhythm is excluded from non-metrical language, as some are from metrical language.<sup>1</sup>

It remains for me to produce proofs of my statements, in order that my argument may carry conviction. The subject has many facets, but a few proofs will be sufficient. Now surely no one would disagree that the following passage in the Funeral Speech of Thucydides is composed in a dignified and impressive manner<sup>2</sup>: "Most of those who have spoken here before me have commended the man who made this speech a statutory event, on the ground that it is right for it to be made over those who are brought home for burial from wars." What has made the composition here so impressive? The nature of the rhythms from which the clauses are composed:

bacchius, which poets used only in lyric verse; and his examples show rhythmic patterns extending over lengths exceeding those of lines of verse. The analyses here offered may well be original and revolutionary.

<sup>2</sup> 2. 35. 1. It has been impossible to preserve the Greek rhythm in the English translation.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

προηγούμενοι κώλου σπονδεῖοι πόδες εἰσίν, ὁ δὲ τέταρτος ἀνάπαιστος, ὁ δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον αὔθις σπονδεῖος, ἔπειτα κρητικός, ἅπαντες ἀξιωματικοί. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κῶλον διὰ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ σεμνόν· τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς τουτί 'ἐπαινοῦσι τὸν προσθέντα τῷ νόμῳ τὸν λόγον τόνδε' δύο μὲν ὑποβακχείους ἔχει τοὺς πρῶτους πόδας, κρητικὸν δὲ τὸν τρίτον, εἴτ' αὔθις ὑποβακχείους δύο καὶ συλλαβὴν ὑφ' ἧς τελειοῦται τὸ κῶλον· ὥστ' εἰκότως σεμνόν ἐστι καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν εὐγενεστάτων τε καὶ καλλίστων ῥυθμῶν συγκείμενον. τὸ δὲ δὴ τρίτον κῶλον ὡς καλὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις ἀγορεύεσθαι αὐτόν' ἄρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ κρητικοῦ ποδός, δεύτερον δὲ λαμβάνει τὸν ἀνάπαιστον καὶ τρίτον σπονδεῖον καὶ τέταρτον αὔθις ἀνάπαιστον, εἶτα δύο τοὺς ἐξῆς δακτύλους, καὶ σπονδεῖους δύο τοὺς τελευταίους, εἶτα κατάληξιν. εὐγενὲς δὴ καὶ τοῦτο διὰ τοὺς πόδας γέγονεν. τὰ πλείστα δ' ἐστὶ παρὰ Θουκυδίδη τοιαῦτα, μᾶλλον δὲ ὀλίγα τὰ μὴ οὕτως ἔχοντα, ὥστ' εἰκότως ὑψηλὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ καλλιπετῆς ὡς εὐγενεῖς ἐπάγων ῥυθμούς.

τὴν δὲ δὴ Πλατωνικὴν λέξιν ταυτηνὶ τίνι ποτὲ ἄλλω κοσμηθεῖσαν οὕτως ἀξιωματικὴν εἶναι φαίη

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius appears to scan thus:

οἱ μὲν | πολλοὶ | τῶν ἐν | θάδε ἦ | δη εἰ | ρηκότων

<sup>2</sup> ἐπαινοῦ | σι τὸν προσ | θέντα τῷ | νόμῳ τὸν | λόγον τόν | δε

<sup>3</sup> ὡς καλὸν | ἐπὶ τοῖς | ἐκ τῶν | πολέμων | θαπτομέ | νοις ἀγο |

ρεύεσ | θαι αὐ | τόν. The apparent lengthening of the final



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

for the three feet which introduce the first clause are spondees, the fourth is an anapaest, the next a spondee again, then a cretic<sup>1</sup>—all dignified rhythms. The next clause, “have commended the man who made this speech a statutory event”, has two hypobacchii as its first feet, a cretic as its third, then two hypobacchii again, and a syllable to complete the clause<sup>2</sup>; so that this clause too is naturally stately, since it is formed from the noblest and most beautiful rhythms. The third clause, “on the ground that it is right for it to be made over those who are brought home for burial from the wars”, begins with the cretic foot, has an anapaest second, a spondee third, the fourth an anapaest again, then two successive dactyls, and lastly two spondees followed by the catalectic syllable.<sup>3</sup> So this clause too has been made noble by its rhythmic structure. Most of the passages in Thucydides are of this character; or rather, there are few that are not, so that it is natural that he is thought lofty and eloquent, since he employs noble rhythms.

Now take the following passage of Plato.<sup>4</sup> To what stylistic device could one attribute its dignity and its

syllable of *καλόν* accords with the licence found in Homeric verse, but would not normally be allowed in Attic drama. Alternatively, following the theory proposed in note 1, p. 125, there is a break in the clausal structure at *καλόν*, and hence perhaps a pause which lengthens the last syllable. *Catalexis* is the metrical term for the suppression of a syllable, resulting in an incomplete foot, at the end of a line or period.

<sup>4</sup> *Menexenus* 236D. Also quoted, with a similar judgment, in *Demosthenes* 24 and *On the Sublime* 28, where it is praised as an example of *periphrasis*. See Russell's note *ad loc.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τις ἂν καὶ καλήν, εἰ μὴ τῷ συγκεῖσθαι διὰ τῶν καλλίστων τε καὶ ἀξιολογωτάτων ῥυθμῶν; ἔστι γὰρ δὴ τῶν πάνυ φανερῶν καὶ περιβοήτων, ἧ κέχρηται ὁ ἀνὴρ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἐπιταφίου ἀρχήν· ἔργω μὲν ἡμῖν οἶδε ἔχουσιν τὰ προσήκοντα σφίσι αὐτοῖς· ὧν τυχόντες πορεύονται τὴν εἰμαρμένην πορείαν.<sup>1</sup> ἐν τούτοις δύο μὲν ἔστιν ἃ συμπληροῖ τὴν περίοδον κῶλα, ῥυθμοὶ δὲ οἱ ταῦτα διαλαμβάνοντες οἶδε· βακχεῖος μὲν ὁ πρῶτος· οὐ γὰρ δὴ γε ὡς ἱαμβικὸν ἀξιῶσαιμ' ἂν ἔγωγε τὸ κῶλον τουτὶ ῥυθμίζειν ἐνθυμούμενος ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιτροχάλους καὶ ταχεῖς ἀλλ' ἀναβεβλημένους καὶ βραδεῖς τοῖς οἰκτιζομένοις προσῆκεν ἀποδίδοσθαι τοὺς χρόνους· σπονδεῖος δ' ὁ δεύτερος· ὁ δ' ἐξῆς δάκτυλος διαιρουμένης τῆς συναλοιφῆς· εἶθ' ὁ μετὰ τούτον σπονδεῖος· ὁ δ' ἐξῆς μᾶλλον κρητικὸς ἢ ἀνάπαιστος· ἔπειθ', ὡς ἐμὴ δόξα, σπονδεῖος· ὁ δὲ τελευταῖος ὑποβάκχειος, εἰ δὲ βούλεται τις, ἀνάπαιστος· εἶτα κατάληξις. τούτων τῶν ῥυθμῶν οὐδεὶς ταπεινὸς οὐδὲ ἀγεννής. τοῦ δὲ ἐξῆς κῶλου τουδὶ ἔστιν ὧν τυχόντες πορεύονται τὴν εἰμαρμένην πορείαν<sup>1</sup> δύο μὲν εἰσιν οἱ πρῶτοι πόδες κρητικοί, σπονδεῖοι δὲ οἱ μετὰ τούτους δύο· μεθ' οὓς αὖθις κρητικὸς, ἔπειτα τελευταῖος ὑποβάκχειος. ἀνάγκη δὴ τὸν ἐξ ἀπάντων συγκείμενον καλῶν ῥυθμῶν καλὸν εἶναι λόγον. μυρία τοιαῦτ' ἔστιν εὐρεῖν καὶ παρὰ

<sup>1</sup> Possibly a *vaticinatio post eventum*, acceptable only if Plato acknowledged the aesthetic values of the different feet laid down by Dionysius. No contemporary evidence survives to suggest that he did.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

beauty other than the fact that it is composed out of the most beautiful and striking rhythms? The passage is one of the best-known and renowned. It is the one with which he begins his Funeral Speech: "These men already have from us their due in deed; and having received it they are going their appointed way." Here the period is made up of two clauses, and the rhythmic feet into which they are divided are as follows: the first is a bacchius, for I should certainly not think it right to scan this clause as in iambic metre, considering that not running, swift movements, but slow and measured times are appropriate as a tribute to those for whom we mourn.<sup>1</sup> The second is a spondee, the next a dactyl (the hiatus being preserved), then a spondee. The next I should call a cretic rather than an anapaest, and after that, in my opinion, a spondee. The last foot is a hypobacchius or, if you like, an anapaest; then the catalectic syllable.<sup>2</sup> Of these rhythms none is mean or ignoble. In the next clause, "and having received it they are going their appointed way", the first two feet are both cretics, and they are followed by two spondees. After these comes another cretic, then finally a hypobacchius.<sup>3</sup> It is inevitable that a passage composed entirely from beautiful rhythms must be beautiful as a whole; and there are countless such passages to be found in

$\begin{array}{ccccccc|cccc|cccc|cccc|cc|cc|cc}
- & - & \cup & & - & - & & - & \cup & \cup & & - & - & & \cup & & \cup & - & | & - & \cup & & \cup & \cup \\
^2 & \acute{\epsilon}ργω & μὲν & & ἡμῖν & & & οἶδε & ἔ & & & χουσιν & & & τὰ & προσηκοντα & & & σφίσιν & & & & & & \\
- & | & - & 
\end{array}$

*αὐτοῖς*. The lengthening of *τὰ* confirms the uncertainty of final syllables suggested in note 3, p. 135.

$\begin{array}{cccc|cccc|cccc|cccc|cc|cc}
- & \cup & - & & - & \cup & - & & - & - & & - & - & & - & \cup & - & & \cup & - & - & & & & & \\
^3 & ὦν & τυχόν & \\
\end{array}$

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Πλάτωνι. ὁ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἐμμέλειάν τε καὶ εὐρυθμίαν συνιδεῖν δαιμονιώτατος, καὶ εἶ γε δεινὸς ἦν οὕτως ἐκλέξαι τὰ ὀνόματα ὡς συνθεῖναι περιττός, καὶ νύ κεν ἢ παρέλασσε τὸν Δημοσθένη κάλλους ἐρμηνείας ἕνεκεν, ἢ ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν. νῦν δὲ περὶ μὲν τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἔστιν ὅτε διαμαρτάνει, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν οἷς ἂν τὴν ὑψηλὴν καὶ περιττὴν καὶ ἐγκατάσκευον διώκη φράσιν, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐτέρωθί μοι δηλοῦται σαφέστερον. συντίθησι δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ ἡδέως καὶ καλῶς νῆ Δία, καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις αὐτὸν ἔχοι κατὰ τοῦτο μέμψασθαι τὸ μέρος.

ἐνὸς ἔτι παραθήσομαι λέξιν, ᾧ τὰ ἀριστεία τῆς ἐν λόγοις δεινότητος ἀποδίδωμι. ὅρος γὰρ δὴ τίς ἐστιν ἐκλογῆς τε ὀνομάτων καὶ κάλλους συνθέσεως ὁ Δημοσθένης. ἐν δὲ τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου λόγῳ τρία μὲν ἐστὶν ἃ τὴν πρώτην περίοδον συμπληροῖ κῶλα, οἱ δὲ ταῦτα καταμετροῦντες οἶδε εἰσὶν ῥυθμοί· 'πρῶτον μὲν, ᾧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις'. ἄρχει δὲ τοῦ κώλου βακχεῖος ῥυθμός, ἔπειθ' ἔπεται σπονδεῖος, εἶτ' ἀνάπαιστός τε καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ἕτερος σπονδεῖος, εἶθ' ἐξῆς κρητικοὶ τρεῖς, σπονδεῖος δ' ὁ τελευταῖος. τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου κώλου τοῦδε ὄσην εὐνοϊαν ἔχων ἐγὼ διατελῶ τῇ τε πόλει καὶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν' πρῶτος μὲν ὑποβάκχειός ἐστι πούς, εἶτα βακχεῖος, εἰ δὲ βούλεται τις, δάκτυλος· εἶτα κρητικός· μεθ' οὓς εἰσι δύο σύνθετοι πόδες οἱ καλούμενοι παιᾶνες· οἷς ἔπεται μολοττὸς ἢ βακχεῖος, ἐγχωρεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρως αὐτὸν διαιρεῖν· τελευταῖος δὲ σπονδεῖος. τοῦ δὲ τρίτου κώλου τοῦδε ἄτοσαύ-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Plato, as in Thucydides, for this author has a quite supernatural gift for observing at once true melody and fine rhythm, and if he had only been as clever in his choice of words as he is outstanding in his ability to combine them, he "would even have surpassed" Demosthenes in beauty of expression, or "would have left the issue in doubt."<sup>1</sup> As it is, he is sometimes quite at fault in his choice of words, and especially when he is aiming at a lofty, grandiose, elaborate style. My views on this subject I set out more explicitly elsewhere. But, by heaven, he does arrange his words both attractively and beautifully; and in this respect no one could find fault with him.

I shall quote a passage from one further author, the one to whom I assign the first prize for oratorical brilliance. Demosthenes, in fact, is a sort of standard for both choice of words and beauty of composition. For example, in the speech *On the Crown*, the first period is made up of three clauses, and the rhythms by which they are measured are as follows: "First of all, men of Athens, I pray to all the gods and all the goddesses"—a bacchius begins this first clause; then follows a spondee; then an anapaest, and after this another spondee; then three successive cretics, and a spondee as the last foot. In the second clause, "that as much good will as I have continuously shown towards the city and all of you", a hypobacchius comes first; then a bacchius or, if you like, a dactyl; then a cretic; after which there are two composite feet called a *paean*. Next follows a *molossus* or a bacchius, for it can be scanned either way. The last foot is a spondee. The third clause,

<sup>1</sup> Homer, *Iliad* 23. 382.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

την ὑπάρξαι μοι παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς τουτονὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἄρχουσι μὲν ὑποβάκχειοι δύο, ἔπεται δὲ κρητικός, ᾧ συνῆπται σπονδεῖος· εἶτ' αὖθις βακχεῖος ἢ κρητικός, καὶ τελευταῖος πάλιν κρητικός, εἶτα κατάληξις. τί οὖν ἐκώλυε καλὴν ἁρμονίαν εἶναι λέξεως, ἐν ἧ μῆτε πυρρίχιός ἐστι πούς μῆτε ἰαμβικός μῆτε ἀμφίβραχυς μῆτε τῶν χορείων ἢ τροχαίων μηδεῖς; καὶ οὐ λέγω τοῦτο, ὅτι τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων ἕκαστος οὐ κέχρηται ποτε καὶ τοῖς ἀγεννεστέροις ῥυθμοῖς (κέχρηται γάρ), ἀλλ' εὖ συγκεκρύφασιν αὐτοὺς καὶ συνυφάγκασι διαλαβόντες τοῖς κρείττοσι τοὺς χείρονας.

οἷς δὲ μὴ ἐγένετο πρόνοια τούτου τοῦ μέρους, οἱ μὲν ταπεινάς, οἱ δὲ κατακεκλασμένας, οἱ δ' ἄλλην τινὰ αἰσχύνην καὶ ἀμορφίαν ἐξήνεγκαν τὰς γραφάς. ὧν ἐστι πρῶτός τε καὶ μέσος καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ Μάγνης [ὁ σοφιστῆς]<sup>1</sup> Ἡγησίας· ὑπὲρ οὗ μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς ἅπαντας οὐκ οἶδα τί χρὴ λέγειν, πότερα τοσαύτη περὶ αὐτὸν ἀναισθησία καὶ παχύτης ἦν ὥστε μὴ συνορᾶν, οἵτινές εἰσιν ἀγεννεῖς ἢ εὐγενεῖς ῥυθμοί, ἢ τοσαύτη θεοβλάβεια καὶ διαφθορὰ τῶν φρενῶν ὥστ' εἰδότα τοὺς κρείττους ἔπειτα αἰρεῖσθαι τοὺς χείρονας, ὃ

<sup>1</sup> F: σοφιστῆς PMV: del. Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> πρῶτον μὲν | , ᾧ ἄν | δρες Ἄθη | ναῖοι, | τοῖς θεοῖς | εὐχομαι  
 πᾶσι καὶ | πάσαις | , ὄσσην εὖ | νοιαν ἔχων ἐγώ | διατελώ  
 τῇ τε πολει | καὶ πᾶσιν | ὑμῖν | , τοσαύτην | ὑπάρξαι

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

“ may be accorded to me in full measure by you in this present trial ”, begins with two hypobacchii; next comes a cretic, followed by a spondee; then again another bacchius or a cretic; and then another cretic followed by the catalectic syllable.<sup>1</sup> So what was there to prevent the arrangement from being beautiful in a passage which contains no pyrrhic foot, nor any iambus, amphibrach, choree or trochee? Now I do not say that none of these authors ever uses the more ignoble rhythms also; for they do. But they have concealed them well, dispersing them and interweaving the inferior ones with the better.

Those authors who have not paid attention to this part of their craft have produced writings which are either mean or diffuse, or have some other deformity or disfigurement. The first, middlemost and last in this is that sophist from Magnesia, Hegesias.<sup>2</sup> Concerning him, by Zeus and all the other gods, I do not know what I should say. Was he so insensitive and dense that he could not envisage which the ignoble or the noble rhythms are? Or was he so bedevilled and mentally deranged that he still chose the worse, though he knew the better? I am inclined to believe

$$\begin{array}{cccc|cccc|cccc|cccc|c} \text{—} & \text{∪} & \text{—} & & \text{—} & \text{—} & & \text{—} & \text{∪} & \text{∪} & & \text{—} & \text{∪} & \text{—} & & \text{∪} \\ \text{μοι} & \text{παρ}' & \text{ύ} & | & \text{μῶν} & \text{εἰς} & | & \text{τουτονι} & & & & | & \text{τὸν} & \text{ἀγῶ} & & | & \text{να.} \end{array}$$

Apparent irregularities are: the lengthenings *εὔνοιαν*, *τουτονι*, and *τὸν*, and, as a possible lengthening, *πᾶσιν*, and the short ening of *πόλει*.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, p. 41. His chief faults as exhibited here and in Ch. 4 appear to be jerky, monotonous rhythms and affected word-order. See Roberts, p. 52–5.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ μᾶλλον πείθομαι· ἀγνοίας μὲν γάρ ἐστι καὶ τὸ κατορθοῦν πολλαχῆ, προνοίας δὲ τὸ μηδέποτε. ἐν γοῦν ταῖς τοσαύταις γραφαῖς, αἷς καταλέλοιπεν ὁ ἀνὴρ, μίαν οὐκ ἂν εὔροι τις σελίδα συγκειμένην εὐτυχῶς. ἔοικεν δὴ ταῦτα ὑπολαβεῖν ἐκείνων κρείττω καὶ μετὰ σπουδῆς αὐτὰ ποιεῖν, εἰς ἃ δι' ἀνάγκην ἐμπεσὼν ἂν τις ἐν λόγῳ σχεδίῳ δι' αἰσχύνης θεῖτο φρόνημα ἔχων ἀνὴρ. θήσω δὲ καὶ τούτου λέξιν ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας, ἵνα σοι γένηται δῆλον ἐκ τῆς ἀντιπαραθέσεως, ὅσῃ μὲν ἀξίωσιν ἔχει τὸ εὐγενὲς ἐν ρύθμοις, ὅσῃ δ' αἰσχύνην τὸ ἀγεννές. ἔστιν δ' ὃ λαμβάνει πρᾶγμα ὁ σοφιστῆς τοιόνδε. Ἀλέξανδρος πολιορκῶν Γάζαν χωρίον τι τῆς Συρίας πάνυ ἐχυρὸν τραυματίας τε γίνεται κατὰ τὴν προσβολὴν καὶ τὸ χωρίον αἰρεῖ χρόνῳ. φερόμενος δ' ὑπ' ὀργῆς τοὺς τ' ἐγκαταληφθέντας ἀποσφάττει πάντας, ἐπιτρέψας τοῖς Μακεδόσι τὸν ἐντυχόντα κτείνειν, καὶ τὸν ἡγεμόνα αὐτῶν αἰχμάλωτον λαβῶν, ἄνδρα ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ τύχῃς καὶ εἵδους, ἐξ ἄρματείου δίφρου δῆσαι κελεύσας ζῶντα καὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἐλαύνειν ἀνὰ κράτος ἐν τῇ πάντων ὄψει διαφθείρει. τούτων οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν δεινότερα πάθη οὐδ' ὄψει φοβερώτερα. πῶς δὴ ταῦτα ἡρμήνευκεν ὁ σοφιστῆς, ἄξιον ἰδεῖν, πότερα σεμνῶς καὶ ὑψηλῶς ἢ ταπεινῶς καὶ καταγελάστως.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἔχων τὸ σύνταγμα προηγείτο.

---

<sup>1</sup> See accounts of this episode in Curtius Rufus 4. 6. 7 ff. and Arrian 2. 25. 4 ff.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the latter: for it is a characteristic of ignorance that it often lands on its feet: wilfulness never does. At any rate, in the large volume of writing which the man has left behind him, you could not find a single page that has been felicitously composed. Indeed, he seems to have supposed that his way of writing is superior to that of his predecessors, and to have practised it with enthusiasm; yet any man of sense who fell into such errors under the stress of impromptu speech would feel ashamed. But I shall quote from him also, taking a passage from his history, in order to make clear to you by means of the comparison the dignity conveyed by nobility of rhythm, and the paltry effect of that which is ignoble. The subject which the sophist is treating is as follows. Alexander, when besieging Gaza, a strongly fortified position in Syria, is wounded during the assault and captures the place after some time.<sup>1</sup> Carried away by anger, he massacres all the surviving inhabitants, allowing his Macedonians to kill anyone they should meet; and having captured their commander, a man who was highly honoured for his position and his appearance, he gives orders that he should be bound alive to a war-chariot and that the horses should be driven at full speed before the eyes of all; and he kills him in this way. No one could have a story of more terrible suffering to tell, or one containing more visual horror. Has our sophist portrayed this scene in a dignified and elevated manner, or in a mean and ridiculous one? It is worth while to see<sup>2</sup>:

“ The king advanced, leading his division. Some

<sup>2</sup> Frag. Gr. Hist. IIB 142 F3 Jacoby, p. 808.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καί πως ἐβεβούλευτο τῶν πολεμίων τοῖς ἀρίστοις, ἀπαντᾶν ἐπιόντι· τοῦτο γὰρ ἔγνωστο, κρατήσασιν ἑνὸς συνεκβαλεῖν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐλπίς αὕτη συνέδραμεν εἰς τόλμαν, ὥστ' Ἀλέξανδρον μηδέποτε κινδυνεῦσαι πρότερον οὕτως. ἀνὴρ γὰρ τῶν πολεμίων εἰς γόνατα συγκαμφθεὶς ἔδοξεν τοῦτ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῆς ἰκετείας ἔνεκα πράξαι. προσέμενος δ' ἐγγὺς μικρὸν ἐκνεύει τὸ ξίφος ἐνέγκαντος ἐπὶ τὰ πτερύγια τοῦ θώρακος, ὥστε γενέσθαι τὴν πληγὴν οὐ καιριωτάτην. ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν αὐτὸς ἀπώλεσεν κατὰ κεφαλῆς τύπτων τῇ μαχαίρᾳ, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ὀργῇ πρόσφατος ἐπίμπρα. οὕτως ἄρα ἐκάστου τὸν ἔλεον ἐξέστησεν ἢ τοῦ τολμήματος ἀπόνοια τῶν μὲν ἰδόντων, τῶν δ' ἀκουσάντων, ὥστ' ἑξακισχιλίους ὑπὸ τὴν σάλπιγγα ἐκείνην τῶν βαρβάρων κατακοπήναι. τὸν μέντοι Βαῖτιν αὐτὸν ἀνήγαγον ζῶντα Λεόνατος καὶ Φιλωτᾶς. ἰδὼν δὲ πολύσαρκον καὶ μέγαν καὶ βλοσυρωπὸν (μέλας γὰρ ἦν καὶ τὸ χρῶμα), μισήσας ἐφ' οἷς ἐβεβούλευτο καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἐκέλευσεν διὰ τῶν ποδῶν χαλκοῦν ψάλιον διεΐραντας ἔλκειν κύκλῳ γυμνόν. πιλούμενος δὲ κακοῖς περὶ πολλὰς τραχύτητας ἔκραζεν. αὐτὸ δ' ἦν, ὃ λέγω, τὸ συνάγον ἀνθρώπους. ἐπέτεινε μὲν γὰρ ὁ πόνος, βάρβαρον δ' ἐβόα, δεσπότην καθικετεύων· γελᾶν δὲ ὁ σολοικισμὸς ἐποίει. τὸ δὲ στέαρ καὶ τὸ κύτος τῆς σαρκὸς ἀνέφαινε Βαβυλώνιον ζῶον ἕτερον ἀδρόν. ὁ μὲν

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

plan had been formed by the enemy commanders to meet him as he approached; for they had come to the conclusion that, if they overcame this one man, they would rout his host at the same time. This hope led them on to daring, so that never before had Alexander been in danger to such a degree. One of the enemy fell on his knees, and Alexander thought he had done so in order to ask for mercy. Having allowed him to approach, he narrowly avoided the thrust of a sword which the man carried under the flaps of his corslet, so that the blow was not mortal. Alexander himself despatched the man with a blow on the head with his sabre, but the king's followers were inflamed with spontaneous anger. In fact, so completely did the man's insane daring banish pity from the minds of everyone who saw or heard of it, that six thousand barbarians were cut down at the trumpet signal which followed. Baetis himself, however, was brought before the king alive by Leonatus and Philotas. And Alexander, seeing that he was corpulent and tall and savage-looking (for he was black in colour too), was seized with loathing for his appearance as well as for his designs against his life, and ordered that a bronze ring be drawn through his feet and that he should be dragged round, naked. Pounded with the pain of passing over many rough pieces of ground, he set up a scream. And it was just this detail which I mention that brought people together. The pain racked him, and he kept on yelling like a barbarian, begging Alexander for mercy and addressing him as 'Lord'; and his peculiar language made them laugh. His fat and swelling flesh suggested another creature, a Babylonian beast of ample proportions. So the troops made sport of

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὖν ὄχλος ἐνέπαιζε, στρατιωτικὴν ὕβριν ὑβρίζων  
εἶδεχθῆ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ σκαιὸν ἐχθρόν.<sup>1</sup>

ἄρά γε ὅμοια ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τοῖς Ὀμηρικοῖς ἐκεί-  
νοις, ἐν οἷς Ἀχιλλεύς ἐστιν αἰκιζόμενος Ἐκτορα  
μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν; καίτοι τό γε πάθος ἐκείνο  
ἔλαττον· εἰς ἀναίσθητον γὰρ σῶμα ἢ ὕβρις· ἀλλ'  
ὅμως ἄξιόν ἐστιν ἰδεῖν, ὅσω διενήνοχεν ὁ ποιητῆς  
τοῦ σοφιστοῦ·

ἦ ῥα, καὶ Ἐκτορα δῖον ἀεικέα μῆδετο ἔργα·  
ἀμφοτέρων μετόπισθε ποδῶν τέτρηγε τένοντε  
ἐς σφυρὸν ἐκ πτέρνης, βοέους δ' ἐξῆπτεν ἱμάντας,  
ἐκ δίφροιο δ' ἔδησε· κάρη δ' ἔλκεσθαι ἔασεν.  
ἐς δίφρον δ' ἀναβὰς ἀνά τε κλυτὰ τεύχε' αἶρας  
μάστιξεν δ' ἐλάαν· τῷ δ' οὐκ ἄκοντε πετέσθην.  
τοῦ δ' ἦν ἐλκομένοιο κονίσσαλος· ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται  
κυνάνεια πίμπλαντο, κάρη δ' ἅπαν ἐν κονίησι  
κεῖτο πάρος χαρίεν· τότε δὲ Ζεὺς δυσμενέεσσι  
δῶκεν ἀεικίσσασθαι ἐῆ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

ὡς τοῦ μὲν κεκόνιτο κάρη ἅπαν· ἡ δὲ νυ μήτηρ  
τίλε κόμην, ἀπὸ δὲ λιπαρὴν ἔρριψε καλύπτρην  
τηλόσε· κώκυσεν δὲ μάλα μέγα παῖδ' ἐσιδοῦσα.  
ᾧμωξεν δ' ἐλεεινὰ πατὴρ φίλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ  
κωκυτῷ τ' εἶχοντο καὶ οἰμωγῇ κατὰ ἄστν.  
τῷ δὲ μάλιστ' ἄρ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον, ὡς εἰ ἅπασα

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 22. 395–411.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

him, mocking with the coarse mockery of the camp an enemy who was hateful in appearance and clumsy in his manner.”

I ask you, does this description resemble those lines of Homer, in which Achilles is made to outrage Hector after his death? And yet the suffering in this case is less, for the outrage is being wrought upon a corpse that has no feeling. Nevertheless it is worth noting the great superiority of the poet over the sophist <sup>1</sup>:

He spoke, and then devised for goodly Hector  
treatment vile,  
For from behind each foot he cut right through  
the sinews twain,  
From ankle-joint to heel; and thongs of ox-hide  
passed he through  
And bound them to his chariot, while the head  
trailed in the dust.  
Decked gloriously in his panoply he took his  
stand aloft  
Upon the chariot, and lashed his steeds to  
willing flight.  
Then from the trailing corpse there rose a cloud  
of dust on high.  
His dark locks billowed out on every side, his  
head, once fair,  
Lay wholly in the dust. 'Twas then that Zeus  
unto his foes  
Abandoned there the warrior-hero, in his  
native land,  
For cruel abuse. And at the sight his mother  
rent her hair,  
And cast afar her glistening veil, with wailing  
cry distraught.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

"Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ' ἄκρης.  
οὕτως εὐγενές σῶμα καὶ δεινὰ πάθη λέγεσθαι προσ-  
ῆκεν ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν φρόνημα καὶ νοῦν ἐχόντων. ὡς  
δὲ ὁ Μάγνης εἶρηκεν, ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἢ κατεαγόντων  
ἀνθρώπων λέγοιτ' ἂν καὶ οὐδὲ τούτων μετὰ σπου-  
δῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χλευασμῶ καὶ καταγέλῳτι. τί οὖν  
αἴτιον ἦν ἐκείνων μὲν τῶν ποιημάτων τῆς εὐγε-  
νείας, τούτων δὲ τῶν φλυαρημάτων τῆς ταπεινό-  
τητος· ἢ τῶν ῥυθμῶν διαφορὰ πάντων μάλιστα,  
καὶ εἰ μὴ μόνη. ἐν ἐκείνοις μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς  
ἄσεμνος στίχος ἢ ἀδόκιμος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐδεμία  
περίοδος ἥτις οὐ λυπήσει.

εἰρηκῶς δὴ καὶ περὶ τῶν ῥυθμῶν ὄσσην δύναμιν  
ἔχουσιν, ἐπὶ τὰ λειπόμενα μεταβήσομαι.

19 ἦν δέ μοι τρίτον θεώρημα τῶν ποιούντων καλὴν  
ἀρμονίαν ἢ μεταβολή. λέγω δὲ οὐ τὴν ἐκ τῶν  
κρειττόνων ἐπὶ τὰ χεῖρω (πάνυ γὰρ εὐήθες) οὐδέ  
γε τὴν ἐκ τῶν χειρόνων ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττω, ἀλλὰ τὴν  
ἐν τοῖς ὁμοειδέσι ποικιλίαν. κόρον γὰρ ἔχει καὶ  
τὰ καλὰ πάντα, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἡδέα, ὄντα ἐν τῇ  
ταυτότητι· ποικιλλόμενα δὲ ταῖς μεταβολαῖς ἀεὶ  
καινὰ μένει. τοῖς μὲν οὖν τὰ μέτρα καὶ τὰ μέλη  
γράφουσιν οὐχ ἅπαντα ἕξεστι μεταβάλλειν ἢ οὐχ

<sup>1</sup> The distinguishing characteristics of the passage of Hege-  
sias are the brevity of its clauses, a certain indifference to weight  
in the choice of rhythms, and a relative lack of antithesis.  
In addition to the dichorees (— υ — υ) to which Dionysius  
objects (cf. *On the Sublime* 41; Cicero, *Orator* 68. 212), there  
are several examples of hexameter endings (— υ υ — σ). There  
are also some bold metaphors, a characteristic of poetry  
adopted by early prose writers: Hegesias would have appreci-  
ated the comparison with Herodotus in Ch. 4 if it had been  
favourable.

<sup>2</sup> See note 1, p. 89.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

His father, too, in pitiable voice his fate  
bewailed;  
And all the townsfolk joined together in a wild  
lament.

It was for all as if, from topmost tower to  
humble ground,  
The whole of beetling Ilium in flame and smoke  
was wreathed.

This is the way in which a noble body and terrible sufferings should be described by men of sensibility and intelligence. But the manner of description used by the Magnesian could be adopted only by women or emasculated men, and not seriously even by them, but in a spirit of mockery or ridicule. What, then, is the cause of the nobility of these lines, and of the miserable inadequacy of the other drivel? The main cause, if not the only one, is the difference in the rhythms.<sup>1</sup> In the passage of Homer there is not a single undignified or undistinguished line, whereas in that from Hegesias not a single sentence will fail to give offence.

Now that I have described how important rhythms are, I shall pass on to the topics that remain.

The third factor of beautiful arrangement that I 19 said required examination is variation.<sup>2</sup> I do not mean the change from the better to the worse (for that would be utterly silly), nor yet that from the worse to the better, but variety among things that are similar in quality. For it is always possible to have too much of even beautiful things, as of things sweet to taste, when they retain their sameness. But when they are varied by changes they continue in their freshness indefinitely. Now writers of spoken verse and lyric cannot change all their metres;

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἅπασιν οὐδ' ἐφ' ὅσον βούλονται. αὐτίκα τοῖς μὲν ἐποποιοῖς μέτρον οὐκ ἔξεστι μεταβάλλειν, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη πάντας εἶναι τοὺς στίχους ἑξαμέτρους· οὐδέ γε ῥυθμόν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπὸ μακρᾶς ἀρχομένοις συλλαβῆς χρήσονται καὶ οὐδὲ τούτοις ἅπασιν. τοῖς δὲ τὰ μέλη γράφουσιν τὸ μὲν τῶν στροφῶν τε καὶ ἀντιστροφῶν οὐχ οἷόν τε ἀλλάξαι μέλος, ἀλλ' ἐάν τ' ἐναρμονίους ἐάν τε χρωματικὰς ἐάν τε διατόνους ὑποθῶνται μελωδίας, ἐν πάσαις δεῖ ταῖς στροφαῖς καὶ ἀντιστρόφοις τὰς αὐτὰς ἀγωγὰς φυλάττειν· οὐδέ γε τοὺς περιέχοντας ὅλας τὰς στροφὰς ῥυθμοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀντιστρόφους, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ τούτους τοὺς αὐτοὺς διαμένειν· περὶ δὲ τὰς καλουμένας ἐπωδοὺς ἀμφοτέρα κινεῖν ταῦτα ἔξεστι τό τε μέλος καὶ τὸν ῥυθμόν. τὰ δὲ κῶλα ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκε περίοδος ἐπὶ πολλῆς ἐξουσίας δέδοται [αὐτοῖς]<sup>1</sup> ποικίλως διαιρεῖν ἄλλοτε ἄλλα μεγέθη καὶ σχήματα αὐτοῖς περιτιθέντας, ἕως ἂν ἀπαρτίσωσι τὴν στροφὴν· ἔπειτα πάλιν δεῖ τὰ αὐτὰ μέτρα καὶ κῶλα ποιεῖν. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀρχαῖοι μελοποιοί, λέγω δὲ Ἀλκαῖόν τε καὶ Σαπφώ, μικρὰς ἐποιοῦντο στροφάς, ὥστ' ἐν ὀλίγοις τοῖς κῶλοις οὐ πολλὰς εἰσῆγον μεταβολάς, ἐπωδοῖς τε πάνυ ἐχρῶντο ὀλίγοις· οἱ δὲ περὶ Στησίχορον τε καὶ Πίνδαρον μείζους ἐργασάμενοι τὰς περιόδους εἰς πολλὰ μέτρα καὶ κῶλα διένειμαν αὐτὰς οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ἢ τῆς μεταβολῆς ἔρωτι. οἱ δὲ γε διθυραμβοποιοὶ καὶ τοὺς τρόπους μετέβαλλον Δωρίους τε καὶ Φρυγίους καὶ Λυδίους ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ

<sup>1</sup> del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Dactyls, spondees and, in the sixth foot only, the trochee.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. I, p. 323 note.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

or rather, not all can employ change, and none as much as he wishes. For example, epic poets cannot alter their metre, for all lines are bound to be hexameters; nor even the rhythm, but they must use those feet which begin with a long syllable, and not even all of these.<sup>1</sup> The writers of lyric cannot vary the melodies of strophe and antistrophe, but whether they accompany them with enharmonic,<sup>2</sup> chromatic or diatonic melodies, in all the strophes and antistrophes the same sequences must be observed. Nor again must the rhythms governing entire strophes and antistrophes be varied, but these too must remain the same. But in what are called *epodes*<sup>3</sup> both the melody and the rhythm may be changed: writers of these are also allowed great freedom in varying the clauses from which each period is formed by dividing them into different lengths at different times, and investing them with different forms until the strophe is completed; but after that the same metres and clauses must be repeated [sc. in the antistrophe]. Now the ancient lyric poets—I refer to Alcaeus and Sappho—made their strophes short, and consequently did not introduce many variations into their clauses, which were few in number, while they employed very few epodes. Stesichorus and Pindar and their followers made their periods longer, and divided them into many measures and clauses, for no other reason than love of variation. The dithyrambic poets actually used to change the modes also, composing in the Dorian, Phrygian and Lydian

<sup>3</sup> The epode was a coda or tailpiece occurring after the last antistrophe of a choral ode. It was structurally, and often metrically, independent of the corresponding stanzas, the strophes and antistrophes, which preceded it.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἄσματι ποιούντες, καὶ τὰς μελωδίας ἐξήλλαττον τότε μὲν ἑναρμονίους ποιούντες, τότε δὲ χρωματικὰς, τότε δὲ διατόνους, καὶ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς κατὰ πολλὴν ἄδειαν ἐνεξουσιάζοντες διετέλουν, οἳ γε δὴ κατὰ Φιλόξενον καὶ Τιμόθεον καὶ Τελεστήν, ἐπεὶ παρά γε τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τεταγμένος ἦν καὶ ὁ διθύραμβος.

ἡ δὲ πεζὴ λέξις ἅπασαν ἐλευθερίαν ἔχει καὶ ἄδειαν<sup>1</sup> ποικίλλειν ταῖς μεταβολαῖς τὴν σύνθεσιν, ὅπως βούλεται. καὶ ἔστι λέξις κρατίστη πασῶν, ἣτις ἂν ἔχη πλείστας ἀναπαύλας τε καὶ μεταβολὰς ἑναρμονίους, ὅταν τουτὶ μὲν ἐν περιόδῳ λέγηται, τουτὶ δ' ἔξω περιόδου καὶ ἦδε μὲν ἡ περίοδος ἐκ πλειόνων πλέκηται κώλων, ἦδε δ' ἐξ ἐλαττόνων, αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν κώλων τὸ μὲν βραχύτερον ἦ, τὸ δὲ μακρότερον καὶ τὸ μὲν αὐτουργότερον, [τὸ δὲ βραδύτερον],<sup>2</sup> τὸ δὲ ἀκριβέστερον, ῥυθμοὶ τε ἄλλοτε ἄλλοι καὶ σχήματα παντοῖα καὶ τάσεις φωνῆς αἱ καλούμεναι προσωδίαί διάφοροι κλέπτουσαι τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τὸν κόρον. ἔχει δὲ τινα χάριν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ τὸ οὕτω συγκείμενον ὥστε μὴ συγκεῖσθαι δοκεῖν. καὶ οὐ πολλῶν δεῖν οἶμαι λόγων εἰς τουτὶ τὸ μέρος· ὅτι γὰρ ἠδιστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον ἐν λόγοις μεταβολή, πάντας εἰδέναι πείθομαι. παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτῆς ποιούμεναι πᾶσαν μὲν τὴν Ἡροδότου λέξιν, πᾶσαν δὲ τὴν Πλάτωνος, πᾶσαν δὲ τὴν Δημοσθένους· ἀμήχανον γὰρ εὐρεῖν τούτων ἑτέρους ἐπεισοδίοις τε

<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἄδειαν del. Usener.

<sup>2</sup> om. F: del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> See R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Mode in Ancient Greek Music* (1936).

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

modes in the same song<sup>1</sup>; and they varied the melodies, making them now enharmonic, now chromatic, now diatonic; and in the rhythms they continually assumed great licence—I mean men like Philoxenus, Timotheus and Telestes<sup>2</sup>—when one considers the strict rules to which the dithyramb had been subject at the hands of the earlier poets.

Prose enjoys complete freedom and licence to vary composition by whatever changes it pleases. The finest style of all is that which contains the greatest amount of relief from monotony and change of structure, when one thing is said in a period, another outside it; when one period is composed of a larger number of clauses, another of a smaller number; when among clauses themselves one is short, another long, one more crudely wrought, another with more refinement; when the rhythms take now one form, now another, and the figures are of all kinds, and the pitches of the voice, which are called “accents”, are different, subtly avoiding satiety by their variation. There is considerable charm in devices of this kind, and the further characteristic that a work so composed does not seem to be artificially composed at all. I do not think that many words are needed on this part of my subject. I believe everyone knows that, in discourse, variation is a most attractive and beautiful quality. I take as examples of it all the writings of Herodotus, all those of Plato, and all those of Demosthenes. It is impossible to find other writers who have used more digres-

<sup>2</sup> Philoxenus of Cythera (436/5–380/79 B.C.) lived at the court of Dionysius I of Syracuse. Timotheus of Miletus, his contemporary, shows the freedom of his style in an extant fragment of his *Persians*. Telestes, a Sicilian from Selinus, won a victory at Athens in 402/1 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πλείοσι καὶ ποικιλίαις εὐκαιροτέραις καὶ σχήμασι πολυειδεστέροις χρησαμένους· λέγω δὲ τὸν μὲν ὡς ἐν ἱστορίας σχήματι, τὸν δ' ὡς ἐν διαλόγων χάριτι, τὸν δ' ὡς ἐν λόγων ἐναγωνίων χρεία. ἀλλ' οὐχ ἢ γε Ἴσοκράτους καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου γνωρίμων αἴρεσις ὁμοία ταύταις ἦν, ἀλλὰ καίπερ ἠδέως καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς πολλὰ συνθέντες οἱ ἄνδρες οὗτοι περὶ τὰς μεταβολὰς καὶ τὴν ποικιλίαν οὐ πάνυ εὐτυχοῦσιν· ἀλλ' ἔστι παρ' αὐτοῖς εἷς περιόδου κύκλος τις, ὁμοειδῆς σχημάτων τάξις, φυλακὴ συμπλοκῆς φωνηέντων ἢ αὐτῆ, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα κόπτοντα τὴν ἀκρόασιν. οὐ δὴ ἀποδέχομαι τὴν αἴρεσιν ἐκείνην κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος. καὶ αὐτῷ μὲν ἴσως τῷ Ἴσοκράτει πολλαὶ χάριτες ἐπήνθουν ἀλλὰ ταύτην ἐπικρύπτουσαι τὴν ἀμορφίαν, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνων ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων τῶν ἄλλων κατορθωμάτων περιφανέστερον γίνεται τοῦτο τὸ ἀμάρτημα.

20 εἷς ἔτι<sup>1</sup> καταλείπεται μοι λόγος ὁ περὶ τοῦ πρέποντος. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις χρήμασι ἅπασι παρεῖναι δεῖ τὸ πρέπον, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο ἔργον ἀτυχεῖ τούτου τοῦ μέρους, καὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦ παντός, τοῦ κρατίστου γε ἀτυχεῖ. περὶ μὲν οὖν ὅλης τῆς ἰδέας ταύτης οὐχ οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς ἀνασκοπεῖν· βαθεῖα γάρ τις αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλῶν δεομένη λόγων ἢ θεωρία. ὅσα δὲ εἰς τοῦτο συντείνει τὸ μέρος ὑπὲρ οὗ τυγχάνω ποιούμενος τὸν λόγον, εἰ μὴ καὶ πάντα μηδὲ τὰ πλείστα, ὅσα γε οὖν ἐγχωρεῖ, λεγέσθω.

ὁμολογουμένου δὴ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὅτι πρέπον ἐστὶ

<sup>1</sup> εἷς ἔτι PMV: ἔτι τις F Usener: ἔτι E.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

sions, more timely variations, or more figures of different kinds, the first in the framework of historical narrative, the second in that of elegant dialogue, the third in the practical application of forensic oratory. But the method chosen by Isocrates and his followers was quite different. They composed much that is attractive and impressive, but they are anything but felicitous in their use of change and variation. Their style is based on a single periodic cycle, a monotonous order of figures, a uniform care in the blending of vowels, and many such devices which weary the ear.<sup>1</sup> On these counts I certainly do not approve of the style chosen by that school. Now the style of Isocrates himself was no doubt graced by many charms, which helped to conceal this blemish; but among his successors, through the deficiency of compensating virtues, this fault becomes more conspicuous.

One subject still remains for me to discuss: that of 20 appropriateness. All the other adornments must be accompanied by appropriateness.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, if any other function in a speech fails to meet this requirement, it fails to attain the most important end, even if it is not wholly unsuccessful. This is not the proper time to examine this question as a whole: it is a profound study and requires a great deal of discussion. But let me say what is relevant to the part of the subject which I happen to be writing about; not a complete account, or even one which covers most of the subject, but at all events as much as circumstances permit.

It is generally agreed that appropriateness is that

<sup>1</sup> See *Isocrates* 12-14, *Demosthenes* 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 7. 1; Cicero, *Orator* 21. 70.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τὸ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἀρμόττον προσώποις τε καὶ πράγμασιν, ὥσπερ ἐκλογή τῶν ὀνομάτων εἴη τις ἂν ἢ μὲν πρέπουσα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἢ δὲ ἀπρεπής, οὕτω δὴ πού καὶ σύνθεσις. παράδειγμα δὲ τούτου χρὴ λαμβάνειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὃ δὲ λέγω, τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· οὐχ ὁμοίᾳ συνθέσει χρώμεθα ὀργιζόμενοι καὶ χαίροντες, οὐδὲ ὀλοφυρόμενοι καὶ φοβούμενοι, οὐδ' ἐν ἄλλῳ τινὶ πάθει ἢ κακῶ ὄντες, ὥσπερ ὅταν ἐνθυμώμεθα μηδὲν ὅλως ἡμᾶς ταραττεῖν μηδὲ παραλυπεῖν. δείγματος ἕνεκα ταῦτ' εἴρηκα ὀλίγα περὶ πολλῶν.<sup>1</sup> μυρία ἄλλα ἐστὶν ὅσα τις ἂν εἰπεῖν ἔχοι τὰς ἰδέας ἀπάσας ἐκλογίζεσθαι βουλόμενος τοῦ πρέποντος· ἐν δὲ ὃ προχειρότατον ἔχω καὶ κοινότατον εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, τοῦτ' ἐρῶ. οἱ αὐτοὶ ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ καταστάσει τῆς ψυχῆς ὄντες ὅταν ἀπαγγέλλωσι πράγματα οἷς ἂν παραγενόμενοι τύχωσιν, οὐχ ὁμοίᾳ χρῶνται συνθέσει περὶ πάντων ἀλλὰ μιμητικοὶ γίνονται τῶν ἀπαγγελλομένων καὶ ἐν τῷ συντιθέναι τὰ ὀνόματα, οὐδὲν ἐπιτηδεύοντες ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀγόμενοι. ταῦτα δὴ παρατηροῦντα δεῖ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιητὴν καὶ ῥήτορα μιμητικὸν εἶναι τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὲρ ὧν ἂν τοὺς λόγους ἐκφέρῃ, μὴ μόνον κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν. ὃ ποιεῖν εἴωθεν ὁ δαιμονιώτατος Ὅμηρος καίπερ μέτρον ἔχων ἐν ὧς καὶ ῥυθμοὺς ὀλίγους, ἀλλ' ὅμως αἰεὶ τι καινουργῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ φιλοτεχνῶν, ὥστε μηδὲν ἡμῖν διαφέρειν γινόμενα τὰ πράγματα ἢ λεγόμενα ὄραν. ἐρῶ δὲ ὀλίγα, οἷς

<sup>1</sup> δείγματος . . . πολλῶν del. Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

treatment which is fitting for the actors and the actions concerned. Just as the choice of words may be either appropriate or inappropriate to the subject-matter, so surely may the composition be. I might appropriately draw an example of this from real life. I allude to the fact that we do not put our words together in the same way when angry as when glad, nor when lamenting as when afraid, nor when under the stress of any other emotion as when we are aware that there is nothing at all to agitate or annoy us. I have said these few words on a large subject merely for the sake of illustration; for one could make an endless speech if one wished to catalogue all the forms of appropriateness. But I have one very obvious and general comment to make on the subject. Even when the same men in the same state of mind report events at which they have actually been present, they do not use a similar style of composition to describe them all, but even use their word-order to represent what they are reporting, not deliberately, but acting in response to a natural impulse. Bearing this principle in mind, the good poet or orator should be ready to imitate the things which he is describing in words, not only in the choice of the words but also in the composition. This is what Homer, that most inspired poet, usually does, although he is working with only one metre and a few rhythms.<sup>1</sup> But within these limits he is always producing novel effects and working in artistic refinements, so that we see the events as clearly when they are described to us as if they were actually happening.<sup>2</sup> I shall quote a few

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Lysias* 7; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 11. 1-3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἂν τις δύναίτο παραδείγμασι χρῆσθαι πολλῶν. ἀπαγγέλλων δὴ πρὸς τοὺς Φαίακας Ὀδυσσεὺς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πλάνην καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄδου κατάβασιν εἰπὼν τὰς ὄψεις τῶν ἐκεῖ κακῶν ἀποδίδωσιν. ἐν δὴ τούτοις καὶ τὰ περὶ Σίσυφον διηγεῖται πάθη, ᾧ φασι τοὺς καταχθονίους θεοὺς ὄρον πεποιῆσθαι τῆς τῶν δεινῶν ἀπαλλαγῆς, ὅταν ὑπὲρ ὄχθου τινὸς ἀνακυλίση πέτρον· τοῦτο δὲ ἀμήχανον εἶναι καταπίπτοντος ὅταν εἰς ἄκρον ἔλθῃ πάλιν τοῦ πέτρου. πῶς οὖν δηλώσει ταῦτα μιμητικῶς κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἄξιον ἰδεῖν·

καὶ μὴν Σίσυφον εἰσεῖδον κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα,  
 λᾶαν βαστάζοντα πελώριον ἀμφοτέρησιν·

ἦτοι ὃ μὲν σκηριπτόμενος χερσίν τε ποσίν τε  
 λᾶαν ἄνω ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον·

ἐνταῦθα ἡ σύνθεσις ἐστὶν ἡ δηλοῦσα τῶν γινομένων ἕκαστον, τὸ βάρος τοῦ πέτρου, τὴν ἐπίπονον ἐκ τῆς γῆς κίνησιν, τὸν διερειδόμενον τοῖς κώλοις, τὸν ἀναβαίνοντα πρὸς τὸν ὄχθον, τὴν μόλις ἀνωθουμένην πέτραν· οὐδεὶς ἂν ἄλλως εἴποι. καὶ παρὰ τί γέγονε τούτων ἕκαστον; οὐ μὰ Δί' εἰκῆ γε οὐδ' ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου. πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τοῖς δυοῖσιν στίχοις οἷς ἀνακυλίει τὴν πέτραν, ἔξω δυεῖν ῥημάτων τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς λέξεως μόρια πάντ' ἐστὶν ἦτοι δισύλλαβα ἢ μονοσύλλαβα· ἔπειτα τῷ ἡμίσει πλείους εἰσὶν αἱ μακραὶ συλλαβαὶ τῶν βραχειῶν ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τῶν στίχων· ἔπειτα πᾶσαι διαβεβήκασιν αἱ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀρμονίαι διαβάσεις εὐμεγέθεις καὶ δι-

<sup>1</sup> Homer, *Odyssey* 11. 593-6. The same lines are discussed by Demetrius, *On Style* 72. Cf. *Iliad* 7. 268-70.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

from the many examples that could be taken as typical. When Odysseus is recounting to the Phaeacians the story of his wanderings and his descent to Hades, he vividly portrays the miseries of that place. Among them he describes the torments of Sisyphus, for whom they say the gods made it a condition of his release from his terrible sufferings that he should roll a stone over a certain hill, which is an impossible task because the stone falls down again as it reaches the top. Now how is he going to portray this imitatively by the actual verbal composition? It is worthwhile to see<sup>1</sup>:

And Sisyphus I saw there under his great yoke  
of pain,

With both his arms hard-straining an enormous  
rock to move.

Buttressing that boulder with his legs and both  
his hands,

He heaved towards the summit of the hill.

Here it is the composition that illustrates each of the details—the weight of the stone, the labour of moving it from the level ground, the strain on the man's limbs supporting it, his gradual ascent to the top of the hill, the difficulty of pushing the rock upwards. No one would deny the effects produced. And by what means is each achieved? Certainly not by accident or spontaneously. Firstly, in the two lines in which Sisyphus rolls up the rock, except for two verbs all the remaining words in the passage are either disyllables or monosyllables. Next, the long syllables are half as numerous again as the short ones in each of the two lines.<sup>2</sup> Then, all the words are so spaced as to advance in ample

<sup>2</sup> Actually 8:7, 9:6, 8:7, 5:6 in the four lines.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

εστήκασι πάνυ αἰσθητῶς, ἢ τῶν φωνηέντων γραμμάτων συγκρουομένων ἢ τῶν ἡμιφώνων τε καὶ ἀφώνων συναπτομένων· ῥυθμοῖς τε δακτύλοις καὶ σπονδείοις τοῖς μηκίστοις καὶ πλείστην ἔχουσι διάβασιν ἅπαντα σύγκειται. τί δὴ ποτ' οὖν τούτων ἕκαστον δύναται; αἱ μὲν μονοσύλλαβοί τε καὶ δισύλλαβοι λέξεις πολλοὺς τοὺς μεταξὺ χρόνους ἀλλήλων ἀπολείπουσαι τὸ χρόνιον ἐμιμήσαντο τοῦ ἔργου· αἱ δὲ μακραὶ συλλαβαὶ στηριγμοὺς τινὰς ἔχουσαι καὶ ἐγκαθίσματα τὴν ἀντιτυπίαν καὶ τὸ βαρὺ καὶ τὸ μόλις· τὸ δὲ μεταξὺ τῶν ὀνομάτων ψῦγμα καὶ ἢ τῶν τραχυνόντων γραμμάτων παράθεσις τὰ διαλείμματα τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ τὰς ἐποχὰς καὶ τὸ τοῦ μόχθου μέγεθος· οἱ ῥυθμοὶ δ' ἐν μήκει θεωρούμενοι τὴν ἕκτασιν τῶν μελῶν καὶ τὸν διελκυσμὸν τοῦ κυλίοντος καὶ τὴν τοῦ πέτρου ἔρεισιν. καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα οὐ φύσεώς ἐστιν αὐτοματιζούσης ἔργα ἀλλὰ τέχνης μιμήσασθαι πειρωμένης τὰ γινόμενα, τὰ τούτοις ἐξῆς λεγόμενα δηλοῖ. τὴν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς κορυφῆς ἐπιστρέφουσαν πάλιν καὶ κατακυλιομένην πέτραν οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν ἡρμήνευκε τρόπον, ἀλλ' ἐπιταχύνας τε καὶ συστρέψας τὴν σύνθεσιν· προειπὼν γὰρ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ σχήματι

ἀλλ' ὅτε μέλλοι

ἄκρον ὑπερβαλέειν

ἐπιτίθησι τοῦτο

τότ' ἐπιστρέψασκε κραταίς·

---

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius finds more stylistic devices illustrating the

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

measures, and the gaps between them are distinctly perceptible, either because of the coincidence of vowels or the juxtaposition of semivowels or voiceless letters; and the dactylic and spondaic rhythms are the longest possible and take the longest stride. Now what is the effect of each of these details? The monosyllabic and disyllabic words, leaving many intervals between each other, portray the long duration of the action; while the long syllables, which have a holding, delaying quality, portray the resistance, the weight and the difficulty. The drawing-in of breath between the words and the juxtaposition of rough letters indicate the pauses in his efforts, the delays and the hugeness of his labour; and the rhythms, when considered in respect of their length, portray the straining of his limbs, his dragging effort as he rolls his burden, and the pushing upwards of the stone.<sup>1</sup> And these effects are not the work of Nature improvising, but of art trying to represent events. This is shown by the words that follow: for he has described the return of the rock from the hill-top and its rolling downwards in a different way, composing with greater speed and conciseness. Having first said, in the same style as before,<sup>2</sup>

But ere he passed

The highest point,  
he follows this with <sup>3</sup>

the stone's momentum turned  
it in its track

difficulty of Sisyphus' labour than Demetrius (72-3) does. He is the only critic to note the delay caused by the juxtaposition of numbers of consonants.

<sup>2</sup> Homer, *Odyssey* 11. 596-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* 597-8.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτίς ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδῆς.  
οὐχὶ συγκυλίζεται τῷ βάρει τῆς πέτρας ἢ τῶν  
ὀνομάτων σύνθεσις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἔφθακε τὴν τοῦ  
λίθου φορὰν τὸ τῆς ἀπαγγελίας τάχος; ἔμοιγε  
δοκεῖ. καὶ τίς ἐνταῦθα πάλιν αἰτία; καὶ γὰρ  
ταῦτ' ἦν ἄξιον ἰδεῖν· ὁ τὴν καταφορὰν δηλῶν τοῦ  
πέτρου στίχος μονοσύλλαβον μὲν οὐδεμίαν, δισυλ-  
λάβους δὲ δύο μόνας ἔχει λέξεις. τοῦτ' οὖν καὶ  
πρῶτον οὐ δίστησι τοὺς χρόνους ἀλλ' ἐπιταχύνει.  
ἔπειθ' ἑπτακαίδεκα συλλαβῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῷ στίχῳ  
δέκα μὲν εἰσι βραχεῖαι συλλαβαί, ἑπτὰ δὲ μακραὶ  
οὐδ' αὐταὶ τέλειοι· ἀνάγκη δὴ κατασπᾶσθαι καὶ  
συστέλλεσθαι τὴν φράσιν τῇ βραχύτητι τῶν συλ-  
λαβῶν ἐφελκομένην. ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις οὐδ' ὄνομα  
ἀπὸ ὀνόματος ἀξιόλογον εἴληφεν διάστασιν· οὔτε  
γὰρ φωνῆεντι φωνῆεν οὔτε ἡμιφώνῳ ἡμίφωνον ἢ  
ἄφωνον, ἃ δὴ τραχύνειν πέφυκεν καὶ διστάσαι τὰς  
ἁρμονίας, οὐδέν ἐστι παρακείμενον. οὐ δὴ γίνεται  
διάστασις αἰσθητὴ μὴ διηρημένων τῶν λέξεων,  
ἀλλὰ συνολισθαίνουσιν ἀλλήλαις καὶ συγκαταφέρον-  
ται καὶ τρόπον τινὰ μία ἐξ ἀπασῶν γίνεται διὰ τὴν  
τῶν ἁρμονιῶν ἀκρίβειαν. ὁ δὲ μάλιστα τῶν  
ἄλλων θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, ῥυθμὸς οὐδεὶς τῶν μακρῶν  
οἱ φύσιν ἔχουσιν πίπτειν εἰς μέτρον ἡρωικόν, οὔτε  
σπονδεῖος οὔτε βακχεῖος ἐγκαταμέμικται τῷ  
στίχῳ, πλὴν ἐπὶ τῆς τελευτῆς· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πάντες  
εἰσὶ δάκτυλοι, καὶ οὔτοι παραμεμιγμένας ἔχοντες  
τὰς ἀλόγους, ὥστε μὴ πολὺ διαφέρειν ἐνίους τῶν

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the only juxtaposed consonants are νδ twice, and ν is a liquid consonant.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

And downwards it hurtled, the pitiless boulder,  
rolling to the plain.

Do not the words, when thus combined, tumble downhill together with the impetus of the rock? Indeed, does not the speed of the narration outstrip the rush of the stone? I certainly think it does. And what is the reason here again? This too is worth observing. The line which describes the downward rush of the rock has no monosyllabic words, and only two disyllabic. Now to begin with, this does not break up the rhythm but quickens it. Next, of the seventeen syllables in the line ten are short and seven are long, and even these are not perfect longs. So the line has to be drawn on its downward path in a tumbling heap, propelled by the shortness of the syllables. Moreover, one letter is not separated from the next by any significant interval,<sup>1</sup> for vowel does not lie next to vowel, nor semivowel or voiceless letter next to semivowel—justapositions which have the natural effect of making connexions harsh and less close-fitting. Indeed, unless the words are deliberately forced apart, there is not perceptible division: they glide into one another and are carried along together, and they all fit together so closely that they form, in a sense, a single continuum. But the most surprising fact of all is that not one of the long feet that fall naturally into heroic metre, whether spondee or bacchius, has been incorporated in the line, except at the end. All the rest are dactyls,<sup>2</sup> and these all with their irrational syllables rapidly pronounced, so that some of the feet do not differ very much from tro-

<sup>2</sup> Readers of Virgil will recall his famous line portraying the rhythmic speed of galloping horses (*Aeneid* 8. 596):

*quadripedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τροχαίων. οὐδὲν δὴ τὸ ἀντιπράττον ἐστὶν εὐτροχον καὶ περιφερῆ καὶ καταρρέουσιν εἶναι τὴν φράσιν ἐκ τοιούτων συγκεκροτημένην ῥυθμῶν. πολλά τις ἂν ἔχοι τοιαῦτα δεῖξαι παρ' Ὀμήρω λεγόμενα· ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀποχρῆν δοκεῖ καὶ ταῦτα, ἵν' ἐγγένηται μοι καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰπεῖν.

ὧν μὲν οὖν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι τοὺς μέλλοντας ἠδεῖαν καὶ καλὴν ποιήσειν σύνθεσιν ἔν τε ποιητικῇ καὶ λόγοις ἀμέτροις, ταῦτα κατ' ἐμὴν δόξαν ἐστὶ τὰ γούν κυριώτατα καὶ κράτιστα. ὅσα δὲ οὐχ οἶά τε ἦν, ἐλάττω τε ὄντα τούτων καὶ ἀμυδρότερα καὶ διὰ πλῆθος δυσπερίληπτα μιᾷ γραφῇ, ταῦτ' ἐν ταῖς καθ' ἡμέραν γυμνασίαις προσυποθήσομαι καὶ πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ ῥητόρων μαρτυρίοις χρήσομαι. νυνὶ δὲ τὰ καταλειπόμενα ὧν ὑπεσχόμην καὶ οὐδενὸς ἦττον ἀναγκαῖα εἰρηῆσθαι, ταῦτ' ἔτι προσθεῖς τῷ λόγῳ παύσομαι \* \* \* <sup>1</sup> τίνες εἰσὶ διαφοραὶ τῆς συνθέσεως καὶ τίς ἐκάστης χαρακτήρ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, τῶν τε πρωτευσάντων ἐν αὐταῖς μνησθῆναι καὶ δείγματα ἐκάστου παρασχεῖν, ὅταν δὲ ταῦτα λάβῃ μοι τέλος, τότε κακεῖνα διευκρινῆσαι τὰ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀπορούμενα, τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ὃ ποιεῖ τὴν μὲν πεζὴν λέξιν ὁμοίαν ποιήματι φαίνεσθαι μένουσαν ἐν τῷ τοῦ λόγου σχήματι, τὴν δὲ ποιητικὴν φράσιν ἐμφερῆ τῷ πεζῷ λόγῳ φυλάττουσαν τὴν ποιητικὴν

<sup>1</sup> Hiatum indicavit Usener post Schottium, implendum verbis huiusmodi: ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἠγοῦμαι πρῶτον μὲν παραστήσαι.

<sup>1</sup> One of the few references to Dionysius' literary activities and teaching methods. The latter appear to have taken the

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

chees. So there is nothing to prevent a line fashioned from rhythms such as these from being rapid, rounded and flowing. One could cite many such passages from Homer, but I think these are sufficient, if I am to have time to discuss the other points as well.

The most essential and important aims, then, which should be kept in view by those intending to compose in an attractive and beautiful style, both in poetry and prose, are in my opinion those already mentioned. But there are others, less important and more obscure than these, which I could not mention because their numbers made them difficult to include in a single treatise; and these I shall submit to you in our daily exercises,<sup>1</sup> and shall support my case with evidence from many good poets, historians and orators. But now I shall go on to conclude this treatise, after adding the remaining points which I promised to mention, and which are quite as important as any to discuss . . . What are the different styles of composition and what is the general character of each? I shall include some reference to those who have been the best writers in them, and will furnish examples of each. When my discussion of these is complete, I must then proceed to resolve the difficulties which many feel: what makes a passage of prose seem like a poem, while still retaining the form of prose, and poetical expression resemble prose while maintaining the special nobility of poetry? For, broadly speaking,

form of discussions among a small circle of *cognoscenti*, with Dionysius as *primus inter pares*. The amount of elementary detail and quotation in his essays, however, suggests that these were intended for a more popular audience. See Vol. I, pp. xx-xxi.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

σεμνότητα· σχεδὸν γὰρ οἱ κράτιστα διαλεχθέντες ἢ ποιήσαντες ταῦτ' ἔχουσιν ἐν τῇ λέξει τὰγαθά· πειρατέον δὴ καὶ περὶ τούτων, ἃ φρονῶ, λέγειν. ἄρξομαι δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου.

- 21 ἐγὼ τῆς συνθέσεως εἰδικὰς μὲν διαφορὰς πολλὰς σφόδρα εἶναι τίθεμαι καὶ οὗτ' εἰς σύνοψιν ἐλθεῖν δυναμένας οὗτ' εἰς λογισμὸν ἀκριβῆ, οἷομαί τε ἴδιον ἡμῶν ἐκάστῳ χαρακτήρῳ ὥσπερ ὄψεως, οὕτω καὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων παρακολουθεῖν, οὐ φαύλῳ παραδείγματι χρώμενος ζωγραφία· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τὰ αὐτὰ φάρμακα λαμβάνοντες ἅπαντες οἱ τὰ ζῶα γράφοντες οὐδὲν εἰκότα ποιοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις τὰ μίγματα, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐν ποιητικῇ τε διαλέκτῳ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ πάσῃ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι χρώμενοι πάντες οὐχ ὁμοίως αὐτὰ συντίθεμεν. τὰς μέντοι γενικὰς αὐτῆς διαφορὰς ταύτας εἶναι πείθομαι μόνας τὰς τρεῖς, αἷς ὁ βουλόμενος ὀνόματα θήσεται τὰ οἰκεία, ἐπειδὴν τοὺς τε χαρακτήρας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς ἀκούσῃ. ἐγὼ μέντοι κυρίοις ὀνόμασιν οὐκ ἔχων αὐτὰς προσαγορευῆσαι ὡς ἀκατονομάστους μεταφορικοῖς ὀνόμασι καλῶ τὴν μὲν αὐστηράν, τὴν δὲ γλαφυράν [ἢ ἀνθηράν],<sup>1</sup> τὴν δὲ τρίτην εὐκρατον· ἦν ὅπως ποτὲ γίνεσθαι φαίην ἄν, ἔγωγε ἀπορῶ καὶ 'δίχα μοι νόος ἀτρέκειαν εἰπεῖν', εἴτε κατὰ στέρησιν τῶν ἄκρων ἐκατέρας εἴτε κατὰ μίξιν· οὐ γὰρ ῥάδιον εἰκάσαι τὸ σαφές. μή ποτ' οὖν κρεῖττον ἢ λέγειν, ὅτι κατὰ

<sup>1</sup> om. P: del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> *Demosthenes* 37–41. As in that essay, Dionysius is here confining himself to structure of sentences, not to style in general, which includes the selection of words and the use of



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

all the best writers of prose or poetry have these excellent qualities in their style. Well, I must endeavour to state my views on these subjects also. I shall begin with the first.

I hold the view that there are very many distinct 21 forms of composition, which can be included neither in a comprehensive view nor in a detailed reckoning. I also think that, as in personal appearance, so in literary composition, an individual character is associated with each of us; and I find not a bad illustration in painting. As in that art all painters mix their pigments together in a variety of shades, in the same way in poetry and all other literature, though we all use the same words, we do not put them together in the same manner. I believe, however, that there are only the following three generically different kinds of composition, to which anyone who likes may assign the appropriate names when he has heard their characteristics and their differences. But for my own part, since I cannot find authentic names by which to call them, because none exists, I name them by metaphorical terms—the first *austere*, the second *polished*, the third *well-blended*.<sup>1</sup> I have no idea how to describe the way in which the third is produced—“my mind is too divided to utter truth.”<sup>2</sup> I cannot say whether it is formed by removing the two extremes or by combining them, for it is not easy to find a clear solution to the problem. So perhaps it may be better to say that it is by the figures of speech. The third (*well-blended*) style is a true mean between the austere and the ornate, and not a distinct category. The plain style does not enter into this discussion, since that term is used in the classification of style in general, not of types of structure.

<sup>2</sup> Pindar, Frag. 213 Schroeder.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἄνεσίν τε καὶ ἐπίτασιν τῶν ἐσχάτων ὄρων οἱ διὰ μέσου γίνονται πολλοὶ πάνυ ὄντες· οὐ γὰρ ὡσπερ ἐν μουσικῇ τὸ ἴσον ἀπέχει τῆς νήτης καὶ τῆς ὑπάτης ἢ μέση, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἐν λόγοις ὁ μέσος χαρακτήρ ἑκατέρου τῶν ἄκρων ἴσον ἀφέστηκεν, ἀλλ' ἔστι τῶν ἐν πλάτει θεωρουμένων ὡς ἀγέλη τε καὶ σωρὸς καὶ ἄλλα πολλά. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐχ οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς ἀρμόττων τῇ θεωρίᾳ ταύτῃ· λεκτέον δ', ὡσπερ ὑπεθέμην, καὶ περὶ τῶν χαρακτήρων οὐχ ἅπανθ' ὅσ' ἂν εἰπεῖν ἔχοιμι (μακρῶν γὰρ ἂν μοι πάνυ δεήσειε λόγων), ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ φανερώτατα.

22 τῆς μὲν οὖν αὐστηρᾶς ἀρμονίας τοιόσδε ὁ χαρακτήρ· ἐρεῖδεσθαι βούλεται τὰ ὀνόματα ἀσφαλῶς καὶ στάσεις λαμβάνειν ἰσχυράς, ὡστ' ἐκ περιφανείας ἕκαστον ὄνομα ὄρασθαι, ἀπέχειν τε ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τὰ μόρια διαστάσεις ἀξιολόγους αἰσθητοῖς χρόνοις διειργόμενα· τραχείαις τε χρῆσθαι πολλαχῇ καὶ ἀντιτύποις ταῖς συμβολαῖς οὐδὲν αὐτῇ διαφέρει, οἶαι γίνονται τῶν λογάδην συντιθεμένων ἐν οἰκοδομίαις λίθων αἱ μὴ εὐγώνιοι καὶ μὴ συνεξεσμένοι βάσεις, ἀργαὶ δέ τινες καὶ αὐτοσχέδιοι· μεγάλοις τε καὶ διαβεβηκόσιν εἰς πλάτος ὀνόμασιν ὡς τὰ πολλά μηκύνεσθαι φιλεῖ· τὸ γὰρ εἰς βραχείας συλλαβὰς συνάγεσθαι πολέμιον αὐτῇ, πλὴν εἴ ποτε ἀνάγκη βιάζοιτο.

ἐν μὲν δὴ τοῖς ὀνόμασι ταῦτα πειράται διώκειν καὶ τούτων γλίσχεται· ἐν δὲ τοῖς κώλοις ταῦτά τε

---

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I, p. 245 note 2.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

relaxation and the intensification of these extremes that the very many varieties of mediant forms arise. It is not the same as in music, where the middle note is equidistant from the lowest and the highest<sup>1</sup>; the middle style in literature is not like this, standing at an equal distance from the two extremes. "Middle" here is viewed as a general term, like "herd", "heap" and many others. But this is not a fitting time to examine this particular point. I must say what I set myself to say about the various kinds of style, as of other subjects—not all that I could (for I should need a very long treatise to do that), but just the most outstanding points.

The special character of the austere style<sup>2</sup> of 22 composition is this: it requires that the words shall stand firmly on their own feet and occupy strong positions; and that the parts of the sentence shall be at considerable distances from one another, separated by perceptible intervals. It does not mind admitting harsh and dissonant collocations,<sup>3</sup> like blocks of natural stone laid together in building, with their sides not cut square or polished smooth, but remaining unworked and rough-hewn. It has a general liking for expansion by means of long words which extend over a wide space,<sup>4</sup> because restriction to short syllables is repugnant to it, except when necessity sometimes compels.

In respect of words, then, these are the effects which it strives to achieve and the principles to which

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 38–9; *Demetrius, On Style* 38–127.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Demetrius*, 48–9, 68.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. which have a high proportion of long syllables, cf. *Demetrius*, 72–3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ὁμοίως ἐπιτηδεύει καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς τοὺς ἀξιωματικούς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς, καὶ οὔτε πάρισα βούλεται τὰ κῶλα ἀλλήλοις εἶναι οὔτε παρόμοια ὄντα ἀνάγκη δουλεύοντα, ἀκόλουθα δὲ καὶ εὐγενῆ καὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ ἐλεύθερα, φύσει τ' εἰκέναι μᾶλλον αὐτὰ βούλεται ἢ τέχνη, καὶ κατὰ πάθος λέγεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ κατ' ἦθος. περιόδους δὲ συντιθέναι συναπαρτιζούσας ἑαυταῖς τὸν νοῦν τὰ πολλὰ μὲν οὐδὲ βούλεται· εἰ δέ ποτ' αὐτομάτως ἐπὶ τοῦτο κατενεχθείη, τὸ ἀνεπιτήδευτον ἐμφαίνειν θέλει καὶ ἀφελές, οὔτε προσθήκαις τισὶν ὀνομάτων, ἵνα ὁ κύκλος ἐκπληρωθῆ, μηδὲν ὠφελούσαις τὸν νοῦν χρωμένη οὔτε ὅπως αἱ βάσεις αὐτῶν γένοιτο θεατρικαὶ τινες ἢ γλαφυραὶ, σπουδῆν ἔχουσα οὐδ' ἵνα τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ λέγοντος ὧσιν αὐτάρκεις συμμετρομένη μάλα, οὐδ' ἄλλην τινὰ [πραγματείαν]<sup>1</sup> τοιαύτην ἔχουσα ἐπιτήδευσιν οὐδεμίαν. ἔτι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐστὶν ἁρμονίας καὶ ταῦτα ἴδια· ἀντίρροπός ἐστι περὶ τὰς πτώσεις, ποικίλη περὶ τοὺς σχηματισμούς, ὀλιγοσύνδεσμος, ἀναρθρος, ἐν πολλοῖς ὑπεροπτικὴ τῆς ἀκολουθίας, ἦκιστ' ἀνθηρά, μεγαλόφρων, αὐθέκαστος, ἀκόμψευτος, τὸν ἀρχαϊσμόν καὶ τὸν πίνον ἔχουσα κάλλος.

ταύτης τῆς ἁρμονίας πολλοὶ μὲν ἐγένοντο ζηλωταὶ κατὰ τε ποίησιν καὶ ἱστορίαν καὶ λόγους πολιτικούς, διαφέροντες δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἐν μὲν ἐπικῆ ποιήσει ὅ τε Κολοφώνιος Ἀντίμαχος καὶ Ἐμπε-

<sup>1</sup> del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius is apparently the only critic to recommend the avoidance of elaborate periodic structure for the grand style.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

it adheres. In its clauses it both pursues the same policy with regard to words, and cultivates dignified and impressive rhythms, and aims to make its clauses not parallel in structure or sound, nor slaves to a rigid sequence, but noble, conspicuous and free. It wishes them to suggest nature rather than art, and to portray emotion rather than moral character. As to periods, it does not, for the most part, even attempt to compose them as self-contained units in which the sense of each is complete<sup>1</sup>; and if it drifts into this accidentally, it aims to emphasize its own unstudied and simple character, neither using any additional words which contribute nothing to the sense, merely in order to complete the period, nor taking special care that the rhythmic movement should have a certain showy or polished character; and certainly not measuring their length so that it is just sufficient for the speaker's breath, nor paying attention to any other such matter. This style of composition has these further characteristics: it is flexible in its use of cases,<sup>2</sup> uses a variety of figures and few connectives, lacks articles, and often neglects grammatical sequence. It is not at all florid, but magnanimous, outspoken, unadorned: its beauty consists in its patina of antiquity.

This style of composition had many keen exponents in the fields of poetry, history and civil oratory. Conspicuous in epic poetry were Antimachus of Colophon<sup>3</sup> and Empedocles the natural philosopher,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *On the Sublime* 23-4.

<sup>3</sup> Born around 444 B.C. Editor of Homer as well as an epic poet in his own right, he wrote a *Thebais*, a poem entitled *Artemis*, and several others. Surviving fragments exhibit some of the qualities assigned by Dionysius to the austere style of composition. See also Quintilian 10. 1. 53.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

δοκλῆς ὁ φυσικός, ἐν δὲ μελοποιίᾳ Πίνδαρος, ἐν τραγωδίᾳ δ' Αἰσχύλος, ἐν ἱστορίᾳ δὲ Θουκυδίδης, ἐν δὲ πολιτικοῖς λόγοις Ἀντιφῶν. ἐνταῦθα ἢ μὲν ὑπόθεσις ἀπῆται πολλὰ παρασχέσθαι τῶν εἰρημένων ἐκάστου παραδείγματα, καὶ ἴσως οὐκ ἀηδῆς ἂν ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο πολλοῖς ὥσπερ ἄνθεσι διαποικιλλόμενος τοῖς ἔαρινοῖς· ἀλλ' ὑπέμετρον ἔμελλε φανήσεσθαι τὸ σύνταγμα καὶ σχολικὸν μᾶλλον ἢ παραγγελματικόν· οὐ μὲν δὴ οὐδ' ἀνεξέλεγκτα παραλιπεῖν τὰ ῥηθέντα ἤρμοττεν, ὡς δὴ φανερὰ καὶ οὐ δεόμενα μαρτυρίας· ἔδει δέ πως τὸ μέτριον ἀμφοῖν λαβεῖν καὶ μήτε πλεονάσαι τοῦ καιροῦ μήτ' ἐλλιπεῖν τῆς πίστεως. τοῦτο δὴ πειράσομαι ποιῆσαι δείγματα λαβὼν ὀλίγα παρὰ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν. ποιητῶν μὲν οὖν Πίνδαρος ἀρκέσει παραληφθεῖς, συγγραφέων δὲ Θουκυδίδης· κράτιστοι γὰρ οὗτοι ποιηταὶ τῆς αὐστηρᾶς ἁρμονίας. ἀρχέτω δὲ Πίνδαρος, καὶ τούτου διθύραμβός τις οὗ ἔστιν ἀρχή·

Δεῦτ' ἐν χορὸν Ὀλύμπιοι  
 ἐπὶ τε κλυτὰν πέμπετε χάριν θεοί,  
 πολύβατον οἷ τ' ἄστεος ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντα  
 ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀθάναις  
 οἰχνεῖτε πανδαίδαλόν τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν,  
 ἰοδέτων λαχεῖν στεφάνων τᾶν τ' ἔαριδρόπων  
 αἰοιδᾶν·

Διόθεν τέ με σὺν ἀγλαΐᾳ

<sup>1</sup> The practical purpose of this treatise is thus emphasised. It is a handbook for the guidance of an intending author, in which principles are illustrated by examples from successful

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

in lyric poetry Pindar, in tragedy Aeschylus, in history Thucydides, and in civil oratory Antiphon. At this point the subject would naturally call for the presentation of a number of examples of each author mentioned; and no doubt the discourse might have been rendered not unattractive by such colourful additions, like a host of spring flowers. But the work would then have probably seemed excessively long, more like a lecture course than a manual.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it would certainly not be fitting to leave our statements unsubstantiated, as though they were obvious and needed no proof. We probably ought to adopt some middle course between these two extremes, neither exceeding the proper limit nor failing to adduce persuasive argument. This, then, I shall try to do, by selecting a few examples from the most distinguished authors. From among the poets it will be enough to cite Pindar, and from prose writers Thucydides; for these are the best writers in the austere style of composition. Let Pindar begin. There is a dithyramb of his which opens thus<sup>2</sup>:

Come join our choir, Olympian Dominations,  
Send us the glory of your grace,  
O ye who hallow with your visitations  
The curious-carven place,

In holy Athens, scented with libations,  
Wide-thronged with many a face.  
Come, take your due of garlands violet-woven,  
Of songs that burst forth when the buds are cloven.

authors. The contrast with a lecture course confirms that he hopes it will reach a public outside his immediate circle. See also note 1, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Pindar, *Frag.* 75 Schroeder (tr. Roberts, slightly adapted).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἴδετε πορευθέντ' αἰοιδᾶν δεύτερον  
ἐπὶ τὸν κισσοδόταν θεόν,  
τὸν Βρόμιον ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν,  
γόνον ὑπάτων νῖν τε πατέρων μέλπομεν  
γυναικῶν τε Καδμεϊᾶν [ἔμολον].  
Ἐναργέα τελέων σάματ' οὐ λανθάνει,  
φοινικοεάνων ὀπότ' οἰχθέντος Ὠρᾶν θαλάμου  
εὐδομον ἐπάγησιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια·  
τότε βάλλεται, τότε ἐπ' ἄμβροτον χέρσον ἐραταὶ  
ἴων φόβαι ρόδα τε κόμαισι μίγνυνται  
ἀχεῖ τ' ὄμφαι μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς  
ἀχεῖ τε Σεμέλαν ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί.

ταῦθ' ὅτι μὲν ἐστὶν ἰσχυρὰ καὶ στιβαρὰ καὶ ἀξιωματικὰ καὶ πολὺ τὸ αὐστηρὸν ἔχει τραχύνει τε ἀλύπως καὶ πικραίνει μετρίως τὰς ἀκοὰς ἀναβέβληταί τε τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ διαβέβηκεν ἐπὶ πολὺ ταῖς ἀρμονίαις καὶ οὐ τὸ θεατρικὸν δὴ τοῦτο καὶ γλαφυρὸν ἐπιδείκνυται κάλλος ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀρχαϊκὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ αὐστηρὸν, ἅπαντες ἂν εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι μαρτυρήσειαν οἱ μετρίαν ἔχοντες αἴσθησιν περὶ λόγους. τίνι δὲ κατασκευασθέντα ἐπιτηδεύσει τοιαῦτα γέγονεν (οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ γε τέχνης καὶ λόγου τινός, αὐτοματι-

---

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius usually refers to his immediate circle as "connoisseurs". Here he appears to be addressing a wider audience.

<sup>2</sup> One of the two kinds of Asiatic style distinguished by Cicero was *verbis volucres atque incitatum . . . nec flumine solum orationis, sed etiam exornato et faceto genere verborum* (*Brutus* 95. 325). Dionysius uses the adjective *θεατρικός* to describe Asiatic excesses in the Introduction to his essays on the Ancient Orators (Vol. I, p. 5). But the antithesis *τοῦτο . . . ἐκεῖνον* could denote not an historical contrast, but simply



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Look on me—linked with music's heaven-sent  
beauty

Again have I drawn nigh

The Ivy-wreathed, on earth named God of  
Clamour,

Of the soul-thrilling cry.

We sing the Babe that of the Maid Cadmean  
Sprang to the Sire throned in the empyrean.

By surest tokens are his rites revealed:

Whenever of the Hours

The crimson-vested ones, the bridal chamber  
Is opened wide to all,

Then spring, led on by flowers nectar-breathing,  
O'er Earth the deathless flings

Violet and rose their love-locks interwreathing:  
The voice of song outrings

An echo to the pipes: the dance his story

Echoes, and chaplet-crowned Semele's glory.

I am sure that all readers with moderately well-developed literary sense<sup>1</sup> will attest that these lines are powerful, robust and dignified, and possess much austerity; that they are rough, though not to a painful degree, and are harsh upon the ear, but not excessively so; that their rhythms move at a slow pace, and the arrangement of their words gives a broadly expansive effect; and that they exhibit not the showy and polished elegance of our day,<sup>2</sup> but the austere beauty of the distant past. I shall attempt to show by what artistic devices these results were achieved, since it is not by spontaneous accident,

that between the two extreme styles of composition, *αὐστηρόν* and *γλαφυρόν*.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

σμῶ δὲ καὶ τύχῃ χρησάμενα τοῦτον εἴληφε τὸν χαρακτήρα), ἐγὼ πειράσομαι δεικνύναι.

τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῶ κῶλον ἐκ τεττάρων σύγκειται λέξεως μορίων, ῥήματος καὶ συνδέσμου καὶ δυεῖν προσηγορικῶν· τὸ μὲν οὖν ῥῆμα καὶ ὁ σύνδεσμος συναλοιφῇ κερασθέντα οὐκ ἀηδῆ πεποίηκε τὴν ἀρμονίαν· τὸ δὲ προσηγορικὸν τῶ συνδέσμῳ συντιθέμενον ἀποτετράχκεν ἀξιολόγως τὴν ἀρμογήν· τὸ γὰρ ἐν χορὸν καὶ ἀντίτυπον καὶ οὐκ εὐεπές, τοῦ μὲν συνδέσμου λήγοντος εἰς ἡμίφωνον στοιχείον τὸ  $\bar{\nu}$ , τοῦ δὲ προσηγορικοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν λαμβάνοντος ἀφ' ἐνὸς τῶν ἀφώνων τοῦ  $\bar{\chi}$ · ἀσύμμεκτα δὲ τῇ φύσει ταῦτα τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ ἀκόλλητα· οὐ γὰρ πέφυκε κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν τοῦ  $\bar{\chi}$  προτάττεσθαι τὸ  $\bar{\nu}$ , ὥστε οὐδὲ συλλαβῶν ὄρια γινόμενα συνάπτει τὸν ἦχον, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη σιωπὴν τινα γενέσθαι μέσην ἀμφοῖν τὴν διορίζουσαν ἑκατέρου τῶν γραμμάτων τὰς δυνάμεις· τὸ μὲν δὴ πρῶτον κῶλον οὕτω τραχύνεται τῇ συνθέσει· κῶλα δέ με δέξαι λέγειν οὐχ οἷς Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τις μετρικῶν διεκόσμησε τὰς ᾠδὰς, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡ φύσις ἀξιοῖ διαιρεῖν τὸν λόγον καὶ ῥητόρων παῖδες τὰς περιόδους διαιροῦσι.

τὸ δέ γε τούτῳ παρακείμενον κῶλον τὸ 'ἐπὶ τε κλυτὰν πέμπετε χάριν θεοῖ' διαβέβηκεν ἀπὸ τοῦ προτέρου διάβασιν ἀξιόλογον καὶ περιείληφεν ἐν αὐτῶ πολλὰς ἀρμονίας ἀντιτύπους· ἀρχεὶ μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ στοιχείον ἐν τῶν φωνηέντων τὸ  $\bar{\epsilon}$  καὶ παράκειται ἑτέρῳ φωνήεντι τῶ  $\bar{\iota}$ · εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

unaided by any degree of art and reason, that the lines have acquired their characteristic form.

The first clause consists of four parts of speech—a verb, a connective, and two appellatives. Now the verb and the connective have produced a not unpleasing combination by mingling and fusing together; but the juxtaposition of the appellative and the connective has produced a junction of considerable roughness, for the words *ἐν χορόν* are dissonant and melodious, since the connective ends with the semivowel *ν*, while the appellative begins with one of the voiceless consonants *χ*. These letters cannot by their nature be combined and united, for it is not natural for *ν* to precede *χ* in the same syllable. Hence, when they form the boundaries between successive syllables, they do not produce a continuous sound, but there is bound to be a pause between the two letters, and this keeps their sounds distinct. That, then, is how the first clause is roughened by the arrangement of its words. (You must understand me to mean by “clauses” not those into which Aristophanes<sup>1</sup> or any other metrician has divided the odes, but those into which Nature requires the discourse to be divided, and into which the rhetorical schools divide their periods.)

The next clause to this, *ἐπί τε κλυτὰν πέμπετε χάριν θεοί*, is separated from its predecessor by a considerable interval and includes within itself many dissonant collocations. It begins with one of the vowels, *ε*, and next to this is another vowel, *ι*, the letter which came at the end of the preceding clause.

<sup>1</sup> The grammarian of Byzantium, who divided poetry into cola, or stanzas, according to their metrical composition, not according to grammatical structure, as Dionysius does here.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔληγε τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ. οὐ συναλείφεται δὲ οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἀλλήλοις οὐδὲ προτάττεται κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν τὸ  $\bar{\iota}$  τοῦ  $\bar{\epsilon}$ . σιωπὴ δέ τις μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν γίνεται διερείδουσα τῶν μορίων ἑκάτερον καὶ τὴν βάσιν αὐτοῖς ἀποδιδούσα ἀσφαλῆ. ἐν δὲ τῇ κατὰ μέρος συνθέσει τοῦ κώλου τοῖς μὲν ἐπὶ τε συνδέσμοις ἀφ' ὧν ἄρχεται τὸ κῶλον, εἴτε ἄρα πρόθεσιν αὐτῶν δεῖ τὸ ἡγούμενον καλεῖν, τὸ προσηγορικὸν ἐπικείμενον μόριον τὸ κλυτὰν ἀντίτυπον πεποίηκε καὶ τραχεῖαν τὴν σύνθεσιν· κατὰ τί ποτε; ὅτι βούλεται μὲν εἶναι βραχεῖα ἢ πρώτη συλλαβὴ τοῦ κλυτὰν, μακροτέρα δ' ἐστὶ τῆς βραχείας ἐξ ἀφώνου τε καὶ ἡμιφώνου καὶ φωνήεντος συνεστῶσα. τὸ δὲ μὴ εἰλικρινῶς αὐτῆς βραχὺ καὶ ἅμα τὸ ἐν τῇ κράσει τῶν γραμμάτων δυσεκφόρητον ἀναβολὴν τε ποιεῖ καὶ ἐγκοπὴν τῆς ἀρμονίας. εἰ γοῦν τὸ  $\bar{\kappa}$  τις ἀφέλοι τῆς συλλαβῆς καὶ ποιήσειεν ἐπὶ τε λυτὰν, λυθήσεται καὶ τὸ βραδὺ καὶ τὸ τραχὺ τῆς ἀρμονίας. πάλιν τῷ κλυτὰν προσηγορικῶ τὸ πέμπετε ῥηματικὸν ἐπικείμενον οὐκ ἔχει συνωδὸν οὐδ' εὐκέραστον τὸν ἦχον, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη στηριχθῆναι τὸ  $\bar{\nu}$  καὶ πιεσθέντος ἱκανῶς τοῦ στόματος τότε ἀκουστὸν γενέσθαι τὸ  $\bar{\pi}$ . οὐ γὰρ ὑποτακτικὸν τῷ  $\bar{\nu}$  τὸ  $\bar{\pi}$ . τούτου δ' αἴτιον ὁ τοῦ στόματος σχηματισμὸς οὔτε κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον οὔτε τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ τῶν γραμμάτων ἐκφέρων ἑκάτερον· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ  $\bar{\nu}$  περὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν γίνεται ὁ ἦχος καὶ τῆς γλώττης ἄκροις τοῖς ὀδοῦσι προσανισταμένης καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τῶν ῥωθῶνων μεριζομένου, τοῦ δὲ  $\bar{\pi}$  μύσαντός τε τοῦ στόματος καὶ οὐδὲν τῆς γλώττης συνερ-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

These letters again do not combine smoothly, nor can  $\iota$  stand before  $\epsilon$  in the same syllable. There is a pause between the two letters, which holds the two elements apart and gives them a steady movement. In the detailed arrangement of the clauses the placing of the appellative word  $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  after the connective  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\epsilon$  (or perhaps the first of these should be called a *preposition*) has made the composition dissonant and harsh. Why is this, I wonder? Because the first syllable of  $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  requires to be short, but is actually longer than the ordinary short, since it is composed of a voiceless consonant, a semivowel and a vowel.<sup>1</sup> It is the fact that it is not absolutely short, together with the difficulty of pronunciation arising from the combination of the letters, that gives rise to delay and interruption of the rhythm. At any rate, if you were to remove the  $\kappa$  from the syllable and make the phrase  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\epsilon\ \lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  there would be an end to both the slowness and the roughness of the arrangement. Again, the verb  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ , following the appellative  $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , does not produce a harmonious sound or one that combines well: the  $\nu$  must be firmly pronounced, and the  $\pi$  be heard only when the lips have been quite pressed together, for  $\pi$  cannot be joined on after  $\nu$ . The reason for this is the configuration of the mouth, which does not produce the two letters at the same spot or in the same way. The sound of  $\nu$  is formed in the region of the palate, with the tongue rising towards the edges of the teeth and the breath dividing itself as it passes through the nostrils; while the sound of  $\pi$  is formed with the mouth closed, the tongue sharing

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, p. 107.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

γούσης τοῦ τε πνεύματος κατὰ τὴν ἀνοιξιν τῶν  
χειλῶν τὸν ψόφον λαμβάνοντος ἀθροῦν, ὡς καὶ πρό-  
τερον εἶρηται μοι· ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταλαμβάνειν τὸ στόμα  
σχηματισμὸν ἕτερον ἐξ ἑτέρου μήτε συγγενῆ  
μήτε παρόμοιον ἐμπεριλαμβάνεται τις χρόνος, ἐν  
ᾧ δίσταται <sup>1</sup> τὸ λεῖόν τε καὶ εὐεπὲς τῆς ἀρμονίας.  
καὶ ἅμα οὐδ' ἢ προηγουμένη τοῦ πέμπετε συλλαβὴ  
μαλακὸν ἔχει τὸν ἦχον ἀλλ' ὑποτραχύνει τὴν ἀκοὴν  
ἀρχομένη τε ἐξ ἀφώνου καὶ λήγουσα εἰς ἡμίφωνον.  
τῷ τε χάριν τὸ θεοὶ παρακείμενον ἀνακόπτει τὸν  
ἦχον καὶ ποιεῖ διερισμὸν ἀξιόλογον τῶν μορίων,  
τοῦ μὲν εἰς ἡμίφωνον λήγοντος τὸ ν̄, τοῦ δὲ  
ἀφώνου ἔχοντος ἡγούμενον τὸ θ̄· οὐδενὸς δὲ πέφυκε  
προτάττεσθαι τῶν ἀφώνων τὰ ἡμίφωνα.

τούτοις ἐπιφέρεται τρίτον κῶλον τουτί 'πολύβα-  
τον οἷ τ' ἄστεος ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς  
'Αθάναις οἰχνεῖτε'. ἐνταῦθα τῷ τε ὀμφαλὸν εἰς  
τὸ ν̄ λήγοντι τὸ θυόεντα παρακείμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ θ̄  
ἀρχόμενον ὁμοίαν ἀποδίδωσιν ἀντιτυπίαν τῇ πρό-  
τερον, καὶ τῷ θυόεντα εἰς φωνῆεν τὸ ᾱ λήγοντι  
ζευγνύμενον τὸ 'ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς' ἀπὸ φωνήεντος τοῦ  
ε̄ λαμβάνον τὴν ἀρχὴν διέσπακε τῷ μεταξὺ χρόνω  
τὸν ἦχον οὐκ ὄντι ὀλίγω. τούτοις ἐκεῖνα ἔπεται  
'πανδαίδαλόν τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν'. τραχεῖα κἀνταῦθα  
καὶ ἀντίτυπος ἢ συζυγία· ἡμιφώνω γὰρ ἀφώνου  
συνάπτεται τῷ ν̄ τὸ τ̄ καὶ διαβέβηκεν ἀξιόλογον  
διάβασιν ὁ μεταξὺ τοῦ τε προσηγορικοῦ τοῦ παν-  
δαίδαλον καὶ τῆς συναλοιφῆς τῆς συναπτομένης

<sup>1</sup> P: δι' οὗ συνίσταται FMV: σὺν ᾧ δίσταται Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

none of the work and the breath making a concentrated sound as the lips are opened, as I have said before. The process of the mouth's altering from one shape to another, that is neither akin to it nor like it, entails a lapse of time, during which the smoothness and euphony of the arrangement is interrupted.<sup>1</sup> At the same time the first syllable of *πέμπετε* does not have a soft sound either, but is rather rough on the ear, since it begins with a voiceless consonant and ends with a semivowel. *θεοί* coming next after *χάριν* cuts the sound short and creates a considerable interval between the words, the one ending with the semivowel *ν*, the other beginning with the voiceless consonant *θ*. It is unnatural for a semivowel to stand before any mute.<sup>2</sup>

Next follows this third clause: *πολύβατον οἷ τ' ἄστεος ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀθάναις οἴχνεῖτε*. Here *θυόεντα*, which begins with a *θ*, being placed next to *ὀμφαλὸν*, which ends in *ν*, produces a dissonance similar to that mentioned previously; and *ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς*, which begins with the vowel *ε*, when linked with *θυόεντα*, which ends with the vowel *α*, interrupts the voice by an interval of time which is by no means small. These words are followed by *πανδαίδαλόν τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν*. Here too the combination is rough and dissonant: for the voiceless letter *τ* is put next to the semivowel *ν*, and the time that elapses between the appellative *πανδαίδαλον* and the blended syllable which follows it is consider-

<sup>1</sup> Thus a word cannot begin with such combinations of consonants.

<sup>2</sup> Since this statement as it stands is absurd, the text must be suspected. Perhaps *κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν* must be supplied, cf. p. 176 line 14 and p. 178 lines 2-3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτῷ χρόνος· μακραὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀμφότεραι, μείζων δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγῳ τῆς μετρίας ἢ συναλείφουσα τὰ δύο συλλαβή, ἐξ ἀφώνου τε καὶ δυεῖν συνεστῶσα φωνήεντων· εἰ γοῦν τις αὐτῆς ἀφέλοι τὸ τ̄ καὶ ποιήσῃε πανδαίδαλον εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν, εἰς τὸ δίκαιον ἐλθοῦσα μέτρον εὐεπεστάτην ποιήσῃ τὴν ἀρμονίαν.

ὅμοια τούτοις ἐστὶ κακεῖνα ἰοδέτων λάχετε στεφάνων<sup>1</sup>. παράκειται γὰρ ἡμίφωνα δύο ἀλλήλοις τὸ ν̄ καὶ τὸ λ̄, φυσικὴν οὐκ ἔχοντα συζυγίαν τῷ μήτε κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς <τόπους μήτε καθ'><sup>2</sup> ὁμοίους σχηματισμοὺς τοῦ στόματος ἐκφέρεσθαι. καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις λεγόμενα μηκύνεται τε ταῖς συλλαβαῖς καὶ διέστηκε ταῖς ἀρμονίαις ἐπὶ πολὺ ἰοδέτων τῶν τ' ἐαριδρόπων· μακραὶ γὰρ καὶ δεῦρο συγκρούονται συλλαβαὶ τὸ δίκαιον ὑπεραίρουσαι μέτρον, ἢ τε λήγουσα τοῦ στεφάνων μορίου δυσι περιλαμβάνουσα ἡμιφώνοις φωνῆεν γράμμα φύσει μακρὸν καὶ ἢ συναπτομένη ταύτη τρισὶ μηκνυομένη γράμμασιν ἀφώνῳ καὶ φωνήεντι μακρῶς λεγομένῳ καὶ ἡμιφώνῳ· διερισμός τε οὖν γέγονε τοῖς μήκεσι τῶν συλλαβῶν καὶ ἀντιτυπία τῇ παραθέσει τῶν γραμμάτων, οὐκ ἔχοντος τοῦ τ̄ συνωδὸν τῷ ν̄ τὸν ἦχον, ὃ καὶ πρότερον εἶρηκα. παράκειται δὲ καὶ τῷ αἰοιδᾶν εἰς τὸ ν̄ λήγοντι ἀπὸ τοῦ δ̄ ἀρχόμενον ἀφώνου τὸ Διόθεν τε καὶ τῷ σὺν ἀγλαῖα εἰς τὸ ἰ λήγοντι τὸ ἴδετε πορευθέντ' αἰοιδᾶν ἀρχόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰ. πολλά τις ἂν εὔροι τοιαῦτα ὅλην τὴν ὁδὴν σκοπῶν.

ἵνα δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν εἰπεῖν ἐγγένηταί μοι,

<sup>1</sup> λάχετε στεφάνων PMV: λάχει F: λαχεῖν Usener.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

able, since both syllables are long, but the one which combines the two letters  $\epsilon$  and  $\nu$ , consisting as it does of a voiceless consonant and two vowels, is considerably longer than the average. Certainly if the  $\tau$  is removed from the syllable and *πανδαίδαλον εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν* is read, the syllable, assuming its proper metre, will make the composition more euphonious.

The same criticisms apply to the words *ἰοδέτων λάχετε στεφάνων* as to those above. Here two semivowels,  $\nu$  and  $\lambda$ , stand side by side, an unnatural combination, since they are not pronounced <in the same regions> or with the same configuration of the mouth. The words that follow these have their syllables lengthened and are widely spaced in their arrangement: *στεφάνων τᾶν τ' ἑαριδρόπων*. Here too there is a collision of long syllables which exceeds the proper measure—the final syllable of the word *στεφάνων*, which contains between two semivowels a vowel which is long by nature, and the syllable next to it, which is lengthened by three letters, a voiceless consonant, a vowel pronounced long, and a semivowel. Thus separation has been produced by the lengths of the syllables, and dissonance by the juxtaposition of the letters, since the sound of  $\tau$  does not harmonise with that of  $\nu$ , as I have said above. Next to *ᾠοιδᾶν*, which ends in  $\nu$ , comes *Διόθεν τε*, which begins with the voiceless letter  $\delta$ ; and next to *σὺν ἀγλαΐᾳ*, which ends in  $\iota$ , comes *ἴδετε πορευθέντ' ᾠοιδᾶν*, which begins with  $\iota$ . Anyone who examined the ode as a whole would find many examples of this kind.

But let that suffice for Pindar, so that I may have

---

<sup>2</sup> Usener.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Πινδάρου μὲν ἄλις ἔστω, Θουκυδίδου δὲ λαμβανέσθω λέξις ἢ ἐκ τοῦ προοιμίου ἤδε·

Ἐθουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθύς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων, τεκμαιρόμενος ὅτι ἀκμάζοντές τε ἦσαν ἐς αὐτὸν ἀμφότεροι παρασκευῇ τῇ πάσῃ, καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ὄρων ξυνιστάμενον πρὸς ἑκατέρους, τὸ μὲν εὐθύς, τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον. κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐγένετο καὶ μέρει τινὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς δ' εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀνθρώπων. τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα σαφῶς μὲν εὐρεῖν διὰ χρόνου πλήθος ἀδύνατα ἦν· ἐκ δὲ τεκμηρίων, ὧν ἐπὶ μακρότατον σκοποῦντί μοι πιστεῦσαι ξυμβαίνει, οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω γενέσθαι οὔτε κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους οὔτε ἐς τᾶλλα. φαίνεται γὰρ ἢ νῦν Ἑλλὰς καλουμένη οὐ πάλαι βεβαίως οἰκουμένη, ἀλλὰ μεταναστάσεις τε οὔσαι τὰ πρότερα καὶ ῥαδίως ἕκαστοι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπολείποντες βιαζόμενοι ὑπὸ τινων ἀεὶ πλειόνων. τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης οὔδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης, νεμόμενοί τε τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζῆν καὶ περιουσίαν χρημάτων οὐκ ἔχοντες οὔδὲ γῆν φυτεύοντες, ἀδηλον ὃν ὁπότε τις ἐπελθὼν καὶ ἀτειχίστων

---

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides 1. 1.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

the time to deal with what remains. Let us now take from Thucydides this passage of the Introduction <sup>1</sup>:

“Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote this history describing the war which the Peloponnesians and the Athenians waged against one another, beginning the work as soon as the war broke out because he expected that it would be great and memorable above all previous wars. He inferred this from the fact that both sides were entering upon it at the height of their military power, and from the realisation that the rest of the Greek races were ranging themselves on one side or the other at the outset, or were intending to do so before long. This was the greatest upheaval that had ever happened to Greece. It also affected a considerable part of the barbarian world, and one may even say the greatest part of mankind. Events before this time, and those even more remote, could not be clearly ascertained owing to the passage of time. But from evidence which an enquiry carried as far back as possible leads me to trust, I deduce that they were not of great importance either from a military or from any other point of view. It is evident, for example, that the country now called Hellas had no settled population in ancient times, but that in earlier times there were migrations, the several tribes readily abandoning their homes under the pressure of superior numbers of invaders at any time. For commerce did not exist, nor did men mix freely with one another on land or by sea. Each community cultivated its land only at subsistence level: they had no reserve of capital and did not plant the land with fruit-trees, since it was uncertain when an invader might come and rob them of their property, since they had no

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἄμα ὄντων ἄλλος ἀφαιρήσεται, τῆς τε καθ' ἡμέραν ἀναγκαίου τροφῆς πανταχοῦ ἂν ἡγούμενοι ἐπικρατεῖν οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο.'

αὕτη ἡ λέξις ὅτι μὲν οὐκ ἔχει λείας οὐδὲ συνεξεσμένας ἀκριβῶς τὰς ἀρμονίας οὐδ' ἔστιν εὐεπῆς καὶ μαλακὴ καὶ λεληθότως ὀλισθάνουσα διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἀλλὰ πολὺ τὸ ἀντίτυπον καὶ τραχὺ καὶ στρυφνὸν ἐμφαίνει, καὶ ὅτι πανηγυρικῆς μὲν ἢ θεατρικῆς οὐδὲ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐφάπτεται χάριτος, ἀρχαϊκὸν δέ τι καὶ αὐθαδὲς ἐπιδείκνυται κάλλος, ὡς πρὸς εἰδότας ὁμοίως τοὺς εὐπαιδευτούς ἅπαντας οὐδὲν δέομαι λέγειν ἄλλως τε καὶ αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ συγγραφέως ὁμολογήσαντος, ὅτι εἰς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἦττον ἐπιτερπῆς ἢ γραφὴ ἔστι, 'κτῆμα δ' εἰσαεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα εἰς τὸ παραντίκα ἀκούειν σύγκειται.' τίνα δ' ἔστι τὰ θεωρήματα οἷς χρησάμενος ἀνὴρ οὗτος ἀπηνῆ καὶ αὐστηρὰν πεποίηκε τὴν ἀρμονίαν; δι' ὀλίγων σημανῶ· ῥάδιον γὰρ ἔσται μικρὰ μεγάλων εἶναι δείγματα τοῖς μὴ χαλεπῶς ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ὁμοίου τε καὶ ἀκολουθίου μεταβαίνουσιν θεωρίαν.

αὐτίκα ἐν ἀρχῇ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ προσηγορικῶ τὸ ξυνέγραψε ῥῆμα ἐφαρμοττόμενον διίστησιν ἀξιολόγως τὴν ἀρμονίαν· οὐ γὰρ προτάπτεται τὸ σ τοῦ ξ κατὰ συνεκφορὰν τὴν ἐν μιᾷ συλλαβῇ γινομένην· δεῖ δὲ τοῦ σ σιωπῆ καταληφθέντος τότε ἀκουστὸν γενέσθαι τὸ ξ. τοῦτο δὲ τραχύτητα ἐργάζεται καὶ ἀντιτυπίαν τὸ πάθος. ἔπειθ' αἱ μετὰ τοῦτο γινόμεναι συγκοπαὶ τῶν ἤχων, τοῦ τε ν <καὶ τοῦ π> <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

fortifications either. They also thought that they could command the daily necessities of life anywhere, and therefore showed no reluctance to give up their land.”

I need not say, when all educated people know it as well as I, that this passage does not consist of smooth, polished and precise arrangements of words; that it is not fair- and soft-sounding, gliding imperceptibly through the ear, but exhibits many features that are discordant, rough and harsh; that it does not even begin to approach the elegance appropriate to an oration delivered at a public festival or in the theatre, but displays a sort of archaic and independent beauty of its own. Indeed, the historian acknowledges that his work is but little calculated to give pleasure to the hearer: “it is composed to be a possession for ever, not an occasional piece for a single hearing.”<sup>1</sup> I shall briefly point out to you the principles which the author has followed to produce such a rugged and austere arrangement. Those of you who have no difficulty in proceeding to the observation of similarities and consequences will find it easy to accept these small samples as illustrative of general principles.

At the very beginning the verb *ξυνέγραψε*, being appended to the appellative *Ἀθηναῖος*, makes a considerable break in the structure, since *σ* is never placed before *ξ* with a view to being pronounced with it in the same syllable: the sound of the *σ* must be arrested by a pause of silence before the *ξ* is heard, and the impression created by this is one of roughness and dissonance. Then the clashes of

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides 1. 22. 4.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ τοῦ τ̄ καὶ τοῦ π̄ καὶ τοῦ κ̄ τετράκις ἐξῆς ἀλλήλοις παρακειμένων, χαράττουσιν εὖ μάλα τὴν ἀκοὴν καὶ διασαλεύουσιν ἀξιολόγως τὰς ἀρμονίας, ὅταν φῆ 'τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων'. τούτων γὰρ τῶν μορίων τῆς λέξεως οὐθὲν ὅ τι οὐ<sup>1</sup> καταληφθῆναί τε δεῖ καὶ πιεσθῆναι πρότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ στόματος περὶ τὸ τελευταῖον γράμμα, ἵνα τὸ συναπτόμενον αὐτῷ τρανῆν καὶ καθαρὰν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ λάβη δύναμιν. ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἢ τῶν φωνηέντων παράθεσις ἢ κατὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ κώλου τοῦδε γενομένη ἐν τῷ καὶ Ἀθηναίων διακέκρουκε τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς ἀρμονίας καὶ διέστακεν πάνυ αἰσθητὸν τὸν μεταξὺ λαβοῦσα χρόνον· ἀκέραστοι γὰρ αἱ φωναὶ τοῦ τε ἰ καὶ τοῦ ᾠ καὶ ἀποκόπτουσαι τὸν ἦχον· τὸ δ' εὐεπὲς οἱ συνεχεῖς τε καὶ οἱ συλλεαινόμενοι ποιοῦσιν ἦχοι.

καὶ αὖθις ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ περιόδῳ τὸ προηγούμενον κῶλον τουτί 'ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου' μετρίως ἀρμόσας ὁ ἀνὴρ ὡς ἂν εὐφωνόν τε μάλιστα φαίνοιτο καὶ μαλακόν, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο πάλιν ἀποτραχύνει καὶ διασπᾷ τοῖς διαχαλάσμασι τῶν ἀρμονιῶν· 'καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων', τρὶς γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἐξῆς οὐ διὰ μακροῦ παράκειται φωνήεντα συγκρούσεις ἐργαζόμενα καὶ ἀνακοπὰς καὶ οὐκ ἐῶντα τὴν ἀκρόασιν ἐνὸς κώλου συνεχοῦς λαβεῖν φαντασίαν· ἢ τε περίοδος αὐτῷ λήγουσα εἰς τὸ 'τῶν προγεγενημένων' οὐκ ἔχει τὴν βάσιν εὐγραμμον καὶ περιφερῆ,

<sup>1</sup> Roberts: οὐν F: οὐχὶ EPMV: οὐ σιωπῆ Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

sound which occur after this through four successive juxtapositions, *νπ*, *ντ*, *νπ*, and *νκ*, grate upon the ear very violently and break up the rhythm of the sentence considerably, when he says *τὸν πόλεμον τὸν τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων*. Of these words there is not one that must not be arrested by the mouth with the emphasis on the last letter, in order that the letter which follows it may be pronounced clearly and purely with its own peculiar force. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of vowels which occurs at the end of this clause in the words *καὶ Ἀθηναίων* has broken and made a gap in the continuity of the structure by requiring an intervening pause which is quite perceptible, since the sounds of *ι* and *α* cannot be combined, and they cause an interruption in the voice; whereas it is continuous and smoothly blended sounds that produce an euphonious effect.

And again, in the second period the leading clause *ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου* has been fairly well arranged by the author so as to sound as attractive and smooth as possible. But in the next clause he reverts to roughness and dislocation by drawing its joints apart: *καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων*. Three times in close succession vowels are juxtaposed which cause collisions and checks, and prevent the ear from gaining the impression of one continuous clause; and the period which he ends with the words *τῶν προγεγενημένων* has no clear-cut and well-rounded closing rhythm,<sup>1</sup> but appears to have no beginning

<sup>1</sup> *βάσις* refers properly to the concluding rhythm of a period, the *clausula* or cadence. See Vol. I, p. 387, line 3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀλλ' ἀκόρυφός τις φαίνεται καὶ ἀκατάστροφος, ὥσπερ μέρος οὔσα τῆς δευτέρας ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τέλος.

τὸ δ' αὐτὸ πέπονθε καὶ ἡ τρίτη περίοδος· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνης ἀπερίγραφός ἐστι καὶ ἀνέδραστος ἢ βάσις τελευταῖον ἐχούσης μόριον 'τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον', πολλὰς ἅμα περιέχουσα καὶ αὐτῇ<sup>1</sup> φωνηέντων τε πρὸς φωνήεντα ἀντιτυπίας καὶ ἡμιφώνων πρὸς ἡμίφωνα καὶ ἄφωνα, ἄσπερ ἐργάζεται τὰ μὴ συνωδὰ τῇ φύσει τραχύτητος. ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἶπω, δώδεκά που περιόδων οὐσῶν ἄς παρεθέμην, εἴ τις αὐτὰς συμμέτρως μερίζοι πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, κώλων δὲ περιλαμβανομένων ἐν ταύταις οὐκ ἐλαττόνων ἢ τριάκοντα τὰ μὲν εὐεπῶς συγκείμενα καὶ συνεξεσμένα ταῖς ἀρμονίαις οὐκ ἂν εὖροι τις ἔξ ἢ ἐπτὰ τὰ πάντα κῶλα, φωνηέντων δὲ συμβολὰς ἐν ταῖς δώδεκα περιόδοις ὀλίγου δεῖν τριάκοντα ἡμιφώνων τε καὶ ἀφώνων ἀντιτύπων καὶ πικρῶν καὶ δυσεκφόρων παραβολὰς, ἔξ ὧν αἶ τε ἀνακοπαὶ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἐγκαθίσματα τῇ λέξει γέγονε, τοσαύτας τὸ πλῆθος ὥστε ὀλίγου δεῖν καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῆς μόριον εἶναί τι τῶν τοιούτων. πολλὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν κώλων ἀσυμμετρία πρὸς ἀλληλα καὶ ἡ τῶν περιόδων ἀνωμαλία καὶ ἡ τῶν σχημάτων καινότης καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀκολουθίας ὑπεροπτικὸν καὶ τᾶλλα ὅσα χαρακτηριστικὰ τῆς ἀκομφεύτου τε καὶ αὐστηρᾶς ἐπελογισάμην ὄντα ἀρμονίας. ἅπαντα γὰρ διεξιέναι πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν παραδειγμάτων καὶ καταδαπανᾶν εἰς ταῦτα τὸν χρόνον οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἡγοῦμαι.

<sup>1</sup> PMV: καὶ αὐτῇ περιέχουσα F Usener.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

and no conclusion, as if it were part of the second period but not its end.

The same thing has happened to the third period. There is a lack of definition and stability in its closing rhythm, since it has for its concluding phrase τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον. At the same time, it contains many clashings of vowels against vowels and of semi-vowels against semivowels and voiceless consonants—effects of roughness produced by things which are by their nature discordant. To summarise, I have adduced some twelve periods, if the breathing-space be taken as the unit of division, and these comprise no fewer than thirty clauses. Yet of these not as many as six or seven will be found to have been composed in an euphonious or structurally polished manner; whereas in those twelve periods there are almost thirty instances of hiatus between vowels, together with collocations of semivowels and voiceless consonants which are dissonant, harsh and difficult to pronounce. It is these that produce the interruptions and the many retardations in the passage; and they are so numerous that there is something of the sort in almost every single section of it. There is also a great imbalance between the clauses, great unevenness in the periods, many novel figures of speech, frequent neglect of grammatical sequence, and all the other features which I have noted as characteristic of the unadorned and austere style.<sup>1</sup> I do not think it necessary to waste time on these by going over the whole subject again with examples.

<sup>1</sup> See *Thucydides* 24, *Second Letter to Ammaeus* 3 ff.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

23 ἡ δὲ γλαφυρὰ [καὶ ἀνθηρὰ] <sup>1</sup> σύνθεσις, ἣν δευτέραν ἐπιθέμην τῇ τάξει, χαρακτῆρα τοιόνδε ἔχει· οὐ ζητεῖ καθ' ἐν ἑκάστον ὄνομα ἐκ περιφανείας ὄρασθαι οὐδὲ ἐν ἔδρα πάντα βεβηκέναι πλατεία τε καὶ ἀσφαλεῖ οὐδὲ μακροὺς τοὺς μεταξὺ αὐτῶν εἶναι χρόνους, οὐδ' ὅλως τὸ βραδὺ καὶ σταθερὸν τοῦτο φίλον αὐτῇ, ἀλλὰ κεκινῆσθαι βούλεται τὴν ὀνομασίαν καὶ φέρεσθαι θάτερα κατὰ τῶν ἐτέρων ὀνομάτων καὶ ὀχεῖσθαι τὴν ἀλληλουχίαν λαμβάνοντα βάσιν ὡσπερ τὰ ρέοντα καὶ μηδέποτε ἀτρεμοῦντα· συνηλεῖσθαι τε ἀλλήλοις ἀξιοῖ καὶ συνυφάνθαι τὰ μόρια ὡς μιᾶς λέξεως ὄψιν ἀποτελοῦντα εἰς δύναμιν. τοῦτο δὲ ποιοῦσιν αἱ τῶν ἀρμονιῶν ἀκρίβειαι χρόνον αἰσθητὸν οὐδένα τὸν μεταξὺ τῶν ὀνομάτων περιλαμβάνουσαι· εἰσὶν τε κατὰ μέρος εὐητρίοις ὑφεσιν ἢ γραφαῖς συνεφθαρμένα τὰ φωτεινὰ τοῖς σκιεροῖς ἐχούσαις. εὐφωνά τε εἶναι βούλεται πάντα τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ λεῖα καὶ μαλακὰ καὶ παρθενωπά, τραχείαις δὲ συλλαβαῖς καὶ ἀντιτύποις ἀπέχθεται· τὸ δὲ θρασὺ πᾶν καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένον δι' εὐλαβείας ἔχει.

οὐ μόνον δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐπιτηδείως συνηρμόσθαι βούλεται καὶ συνεξέσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κῶλα τοῖς κώλοις εὖ συνυφάνθαι καὶ πάντα εἰς περίοδον τελευτᾶν, ὀρίζουσα κώλου τε μῆκος, ὃ μὴ βραχύτερον ἔσται μηδὲ μείζον τοῦ μετρίου, καὶ περιόδου μέτρον, οὗ πνεῦμα τέλειον ἀνδρὸς κρατήσῃ· ἀπερίοδον δὲ λέξιν ἢ περίοδον ἀκώλιστον ἢ

<sup>1</sup> om. P: del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 40.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

The polished style of composition,<sup>1</sup> which I placed 23 second in order, has the following character. It does not intend each word to be viewed from all sides, nor that every word shall stand on a broad, firm base, nor that the intervals of time between them shall be long; nor in general is this slow, settled quality congenial to it. It requires that the words shall keep on the move, swept forward and riding along on top of one another, all sustained in their movement by mutual support, like the current of a stream that never rests. It sets out to blend together and interweave its component parts, and to make them convey as far as possible the effect of a single utterance. This result is achieved by the exact fitting together of the words, so that no perceptible interval between them is allowed. In this respect the style resembles finely-woven net, or pictures in which the lights and shadows melt into one another. It requires all its words to be melodious, smooth and soft and like a maiden's face. It shows a sort of repugnance towards rough and dissonant syllables, and careful avoidance of everything rash and hazardous.

It requires not only that its words shall be properly fitted and smoothed together, but also that the clauses should be effectively interwoven with one another and achieve their final form together as a period. It limits the length of a clause so that it shall not be immoderately short or long, and the length of a period by the capacity of a man's single breath to encompass it.<sup>2</sup> It could not bear to produce a passage without periods, a period without a number

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 9. 5.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

κῶλον ἀσύμμετρον οὐκ ἂν ὑπομείνειεν ἐργάσασθαι. χρῆται δὲ καὶ ῥυθμοῖς οὐ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς μέσοις τε καὶ βραχυτέροις· καὶ τῶν περιόδων τὰς τελευτὰς εὐρύθμους εἶναι βούλεται καὶ βεβηκυίας ὡς ἂν ἀπὸ στάθμης, τὰναντία ποιούσα ἐν ταῖς τούτων ἀρμογαῖς ἢ ταῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων· ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ συναλείφει, ταύτας δὲ διίστησι καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκ περιόπτου βούλεται φανερὰς εἶναι. σχήμασί τε οὐ τοῖς ἀρχαιοπρεπεστέροις οὐδ' ὅσοις σεμνότης τις ἢ βάρος ἢ τόνος πρόσσεστιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τρυφεροῖς τε καὶ κολακικοῖς ὡς τὰ πολλὰ χρῆσθαι φιλεῖ, ἐν οἷς πολὺ τὸ ἀπατηλὸν ἐστι καὶ θεατρικόν. ἵνα δὲ καὶ κοινότερον εἴπω, τοῦναντίον ἔχει σχῆμα τῆς προτέρας κατὰ τὰ μέγιστα καὶ κυριώτατα, ὑπὲρ ὧν οὐδὲν δέομαι πάλιν λέγειν.

ἀκόλουθον δ' ἂν εἴη καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταύτῃ πρωτεύσαντας καταριθμήσασθαι. ἐποποιῶν μὲν οὖν ἔμοιγε κάλλιστα τουτονὶ δοκεῖ τὸν χαρακτῆρα ἐξεργάσασθαι Ἡσίοδος, μελοποιῶν δὲ Σαπφῶ καὶ μετ' αὐτὴν Ἀνακρέων τε καὶ Σιμωνίδης, τραγωδοποιῶν δὲ μόνος Εὐριπίδης, συγγραφέων δὲ ἀκριβῶς μὲν οὐδεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῶν πολλῶν Ἐφορός τε καὶ Θεόπομπος, ῥητόρων δὲ Ἰσοκράτης. θήσω δὲ καὶ ταύτης παραδείγματα τῆς ἀρμονίας, ποιητῶν

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the qualities reserved by Dionysius for the Grand Style.

<sup>2</sup> From Ascra in Boeotia, the first didactic poet, 8th or 7th century B.C.

<sup>3</sup> Anacreon of Teos (6th century B.C.) wrote lyric poems on the subjects of wine, women and love; also epitaphs and com-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

of clauses, or a clause without balance. Again, the rhythms it uses are not the longest, but those of average length or somewhat shorter; and it requires its periods to proceed in steps measured, as it were, by a rule, and to have rhythmic *clausulae*. In fitting together its periods and its words it employs opposite procedures: the latter it runs together, while the former it keeps apart, wishing them to be viewed as it were from every side. As for figures, it likes for the most part to use not the most old-fashioned, nor those which have the qualities of stateliness or gravity or intensity,<sup>1</sup> but rather those which are delicate and appealing, and contain much that is beguiling and suited to public performance. To speak in a more general way: the form adopted by it is exactly opposite to that of the former style in the most important and essential points. I need not go over these points again.

We may, as our next step, give a list of those who have excelled in this style. Among the epic poets, then, the one who seems to me to have developed the type most successfully is Hesiod<sup>2</sup>; among lyric poets Sappho, and after her Anacreon and Simonides<sup>3</sup>; of tragedians, Euripides alone; of historians, none precisely, but Ephorus and Theopompus more than most,<sup>4</sup> and of the orators, Isocrates. I shall quote examples of this style, as of the first, selecting

memorative poems. Simonides of Ceos (c. 556–468 B.C.) was a lyric and elegiac poet who, like Pindar, celebrated the Olympic and other victories of princes in Greece and Sicily, and enjoyed the hospitality of their courts.

<sup>4</sup> The *Universal History* of Ephorus of Cyme was one of the most popular histories of the fourth century. See also Vol. I, p. 227 note. On Theopompus of Chios, see the *Letter to Pompeius* 6, note 1, p. 393.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

μὲν προχειρισάμενος Σαπφῶ, ῥητόρων δὲ Ἴσοκρά-  
την. ἄρξομαι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς μελοποιουῦ.

Ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ' Ἀφρόδιτα,  
παῖ Δίος δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε,  
μή μ' ἄσαισι μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα,  
πότνια, θῦμον·

ἀλλὰ τυίδ' ἔλθ', αἶ ποτα κατέρωτα  
τᾶς ἕμας αὔδως αἰοῖσα πήλυι  
ἔκλυες, πάτρος δὲ δόμον λίποισα,  
χρῦσιον ἦλθες

ἄρμ' ὑπασδεύξαισα. κάλοι δέ σ' ἄγον  
ῶκεες στρουῦθοι, περὶ γᾶς μελαίνας  
πύκνα δίννηντες πτέρ' ἀπ' ὠράνῳθε-  
ρος διὰ μέσσω.

αἶψα δ' ἐξίκοντο· τὸ δ', ὦ μάκαιρα,  
μειδιάσαισ' ἀθανάτῳ προσώπῳ  
ἦρέ', ὅττι δηῦτε πέπονθα κῶττι  
δηῦτε κάλημι,

κῶττι ἔμῳ μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι  
μαινόλα θύμῳ· τίνα δηῦτε πείθω  
μαῖσ' ἄγην ἐς σὰν φιλότατα; τίς σ', ὦ  
Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει;

καὶ γὰρ αἶ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει·  
αἶ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ', ἀλλὰ δώσει.  
αἶ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει  
κωὺκ ἐθέλοισα.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius here preserves one of the two longest of the surviving fragments of the famous 6th-century poetess from Lesbos (translation: A. S. Way, adapted).

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Sappho from among the poets and Isocrates from among the orators. I shall begin with the poetess <sup>1</sup>:

Rainbow-throned immortal one, Aphrodite,  
Child of Zeus, spell-weaver, I bow before thee—  
Harrow not my spirit with anguish, mighty  
Queen, I implore thee!

Nay, come hither, even as once thou, bending  
Down from far to hearken my cry, didst hear me,  
From thy father's palace of gold descending  
Drew near to me

Chariot-wafted: far over midnight-sleeping  
Earth, thy fair fleet sparrows, through cloudland  
riven

Wide by multitudinous wings, came sweeping  
Down from thine heaven,

Swiftly came: thou, smiling with those undying  
Lips and star-eyes, Blessed One, smiling towards  
me,

Said'st, "What ails thee?—wherefore uprose thy  
crying  
Calling me to thee?"

"Say for what boon most with a frenzied longing  
Yearns thy soul—say whom shall my persuasive  
power

Lead back to thy love Sappho—and who is  
wronging

Thee with disdain?"

"Who avoids thee soon shall be thy pursuer:  
Aye, the gift-rejecter the giver shall now be:  
Aye, the loveless now shall become the wooer,  
Scornful shalt thou be!"

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον  
ἐκ μερίμναν, ὅσα δέ μοι τέλεσαι  
θῦμος ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον, σὺ δ' αὐτα  
σύμμαχος ἔσσο.

ταύτης τῆς λέξεως ἡ εὐέπεια καὶ ἡ χάρις ἐν τῇ  
συνεχείᾳ καὶ λειότητι γέγονε τῶν ἀρμονιῶν·  
παράκειται γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ συνύ-  
φανται κατὰ τινὰς οἰκειότητος καὶ συζυγίας φυσι-  
κὰς τῶν γραμμάτων· τὰ γὰρ φωνήεντα τοῖς  
ἀφώνοις τε καὶ ἡμιφώνοις συνάπτεται μικροῦ διὰ  
πάσης τῆς ᾠδῆς, ὅσα προτάττεσθαι τε καὶ ὑποτάτ-  
τεσθαι πέφυκεν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν  
συνεκφερόμενα· ἡμιφώνων δὲ πρὸς ἡμίφωνα ἢ  
ἄφωνα <καὶ ἀφώνων><sup>1</sup> καὶ φωνηέντων πρὸς  
ἄλληλα συμπτώσεις αἱ διασαλεύουσαι τοὺς ἤχους  
ὀλίγαι πάνυ ἔνεισιν· ἐγὼ γοῦν ὅλην τὴν ᾠδὴν  
ἀνασκοπούμενος πέντε ἢ ἕξ ἴσως ἐν τοῖς τοσοῦτοις  
ὀνόμασι καὶ ῥήμασι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις μορίοις  
ἡμιφώνων τε καὶ ἀφώνων γραμμάτων συμπλοκὰς  
τῶν μὴ πεφυκότων ἀλλήλοις κεράννυσθαι καὶ οὐδὲ  
ταύτας ἐπὶ πολὺ τραχυνούσας τὴν εὐέπειαν  
εὐρίσκω, φωνηέντων δὲ παραθέσεις τὰς μὲν ἐν  
τοῖς κῶλοις αὐτοῖς γινομένας ἔτι ἐλάττους ἢ  
τοσαύτας, τὰς δὲ συναπτούσας ἀλλήλοις τὰ κῶλα  
ὀλίγῳ τινὶ τούτων πλείονας· εἰκότως δὴ γέγονεν  
εὗρους τις ἢ λέξις καὶ μαλακὴ, τῆς ἀρμονίας τῶν  
ὀνομάτων μηδὲν ἀποκυματιζούσης τὸν ἤχον.

ἔλεγον δ' ἂν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς συνθέσεως ταύτης  
ιδιώματα καὶ ἀπεδείκνυον ἐπὶ τῶν παραδειγμάτων

<sup>1</sup> ἢ . . . ἀφώνων Usener: ἢ ἄφωνα PM: καὶ ἀφώνων FE: om. V.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Once again come! Come, and my chains dissever,  
Chains of heart-ache! Passionate longings rend  
me—

Oh fulfil them! Thou in the strife be ever  
Near, to defend me.

The eloquence and charm of these verses arises from the continuity and the smoothness of the connections: the words lie close to one another and are woven together according to certain natural affinities and combinations of letters. Almost throughout the whole of the ode only those vowels are joined to voiceless consonants that are naturally placed before or after one another when pronounced together in one syllable. There are very few coincidences of semivowels or voiceless consonants, or of voiceless consonants and vowels with one another such as disturb the flow of the voice. For my own part, when I examine the whole ode throughout, I find that, in all those nouns and verbs and other parts of speech, there are only five, or perhaps six, combinations of semivowels and voiceless consonants which do not naturally blend with one another; and that even these do not impair the musical quality of the language to any great extent. As for the juxtapositions of vowels, I find those occurring within clauses to be even fewer; while those which join clauses to one another are only a little more numerous. Naturally the result of this is that the diction is smooth and easy-flowing, because the word-arrangement does nothing to ruffle the smooth waves of sound.

I should have gone on to mention the remaining peculiarities of this type of composition and shown

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τοιαῦτα ὄντα οἶα ἐγὼ φημι, εἰ μὴ μακρὸς ἔμελλεν ὁ λόγος γενήσεσθαι καὶ ταυτολογίας τινὰ παρέξειν δόξαν. ἐξέσται γὰρ σοὶ καὶ παντὶ ἄλλῳ καθ' ἐν ἕκαστον τῶν ἐξηριθμημένων ὑπ' ἐμοῦ κατὰ τὴν προέκθεσιν τοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἐπιλέγεσθαι τε καὶ σκοπεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν παραδειγμάτων κατὰ πολλὴν εὐκαιρίαν καὶ σχολήν· ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἀλλ' ἀπόχρη παραδείξαι μόνον ἀρκούντως ἂ βούλομαι τοῖς δυνησομένοις παρακολουθῆσαι.

ἐνὸς ἔτι παραθήσομαι λέξιν ἀνδρὸς εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν κατεσκευασμένου χαρακτῆρα, Ἰσοκράτους τοῦ ῥήτορος, ὃν ἐγὼ μάλιστα πάντων οἶομαι τῶν πεζῆ λέξει χρησαμένων ταύτην ἀκριβοῦν τὴν ἀρμονίαν. ἔστι δὲ ἡ λέξις ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγιτικοῦ ἦδε·

Ἐπολλοὺς ὑμῶν οἶομαι θαυμάζειν, ἦντινά ποτε γνώμην ἔχων περὶ σωτηρίας τὴν πρόσδοτον ἐποίησάμην, ὥσπερ ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐν κινδύνοις οὔσης ἢ σφαλερῶς αὐτῇ τῶν πραγμάτων καθεστῶτων, ἀλλ' οὐ πλείους μὲν τριήρεις ἢ διακοσίας κεκτημένης, εἰρήνην δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν χώραν ἀγούσης καὶ τῶν κατὰ θάλατταν ἀρχούσης, ἔτι δὲ συμμάχους ἐχούσης πολλοὺς μὲν τοὺς ἐτοίμους ἡμῖν ἦν τι δέη βοηθήσοντας, πολὺ δὲ πλείους τοὺς τὰς συντάξεις ὑποτελοῦντας καὶ τὸ προσταπτόμενον ποιοῦντας. ὦν ὑπαρχόντων ἡμᾶς μὲν ἂν τις φήσειεν εἰκὸς εἶναι θαρρεῖν ὡς πόρρω τῶν κινδύνων ὄντας, τοῖς δ' ἐχθροῖς τοῖς ἡμετέροις προσήκειν δεδιέναι καὶ βουλεύεσθαι περὶ σωτηρίας. ὑμεῖς μὲν οὖν οἶδ' ὅτι τούτῳ χρώμενοι τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς προσό-

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

that they are such as I say, citing examples, but for the fact that this would have made my treatise too long and created an impression of repetition. It will be possible for you and anyone else to find plenty of opportunity and leisure to pick out every single point which I have enumerated when setting forth the character of the style, and to examine it in the light of examples. But there is really no time for me to do this. It is sufficient for me merely to give an adequate indication of what I mean to all those who will be able to follow me.

I shall quote a passage from one more author who has based his technique upon the same style—Isoocrates the orator. I regard him as the most accomplished master among prose-writers of this style of composition. The passage is from the *Areopagiticus*, and is as follows <sup>1</sup>:

“ Many of you are wondering, I imagine, what can possibly be my purpose in coming before you to speak on the question of the state’s security, as if Athens were in danger or her affairs on an uncertain footing, when as a matter of fact she possesses more than two hundred warships, is at peace along her borders and enjoys command of the sea, and also has many allies who will readily come to her aid if the need should arise, and many more who are paying their contributions and obeying her ordinances. With these resources it might be said that we should feel confident that we are far removed from danger, while our enemies would do well to be afraid and to take thought for their own safety. Now you, I know, on the basis of this reasoning, are inclined to make light of my

<sup>1</sup> 1-5.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

δου καταφρονεῖτε καὶ πᾶσαν ἐλπίζετε τὴν Ἑλλάδα τῇ δυνάμει ταύτῃ κατασχῆσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ δι' αὐτὰ ταῦτα τυγχάνω δεδιώς. ὄρω γὰρ τῶν πόλεων τὰς ἄριστα πράττειν οἰομένας κάκιστα βουλευομένας, καὶ τὰς μάλιστα θαρρούσας εἰς πλείστον κίνδυνον καθισταμένας. αἴτιον δὲ τούτων ἐστίν, ὅτι τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν οὐδὲν αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ παραγίνεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ συντέτακται καὶ συνακολουθεῖ τοῖς μὲν πλούτοις καὶ ταῖς δυναστείαις ἄνοια καὶ μετὰ ταύτης ἀκολασία, ταῖς δὲ ἐνδείαις καὶ ταῖς ταπεινότησιν καὶ σωφροσύνη καὶ πολλὴ μετριότης. ὥστε χαλεπὸν εἶναι διαγνῶναι, ποτέραν ἂν τις εὔξαιτο <sup>1</sup> τῶν μερίδων τούτων τοῖς παισὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ καταλιπεῖν· ἴδοι γὰρ ἂν ἐκ μὲν τῆς φαυλοτέρας εἶναι δοκούσης ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὰς πράξεις ἐπιδιδούσας, ἐκ δὲ τῆς κρείττονος φαινομένης ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον εἰθισμένας μεταπίπτειν.

ταῦθ' ὅτι συνήλειπται τε καὶ συγκέχρωσται, καὶ οὐ καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον ὄνομα ἐν ἔδρα περιφανεῖ καὶ πλατεία βέβηκεν οὐδὲ μακροῖς τοῖς μεταξὺ χρόνοις διείργεται καὶ διαβέβηκεν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ἀλλ' ἐν κινήσει τε ὄντα φαίνεται καὶ φορᾶ καὶ ῥύσει συνεχεῖ πραεῖαί τε αὐτῶν εἰσι καὶ μαλακαὶ καὶ προπετεῖς αἱ συνάπτουσαι τὴν λέξιν ἁρμονίαι, τὸ ἄλογον ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ τῆς ἀκοῆς πάθος. ὅτι δ' οὐκ ἄλλα τινὰ τούτων ἐστὶν αἴτια ἢ τὰ προειρημένα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀγωγῆς ταύτης τῶν λόγων, ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν. φωνηέντων μὲν γὰρ ἀντιτυπίαν οὐκ ἂν εὔροι τις οὐδεμίαν ἐν γούν οἷς παρεθέμην ἀριθμοῖς, οἶομαι δ'

<sup>1</sup> EF: δέξαιτο PMV Isocrates.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

approach to you, and are confident that with this power you will bring all Greece under your control. But it is on these very grounds that I am afraid: for I observe that those cities which think they are in a most powerful state tend to follow the worst policies, and those which are the most confident are most often involved in danger. The reason for this is that no good or evil fortune comes to men entirely on its own, but that the wealth and power of princes are attended and followed by folly, and folly is attended by intemperance; whereas poverty and a humble state are attended by self-control and great moderation, so that it is hard to decide which of these two conditions a man would choose to bequeath to his children, since we can see that from what is thought to be the inferior condition men's fortunes generally improve, whereas from that which seems to be the better they usually change to a worse."

The ear's instinctive feeling testifies that these words have been merged and blended together; that they do not severally stand on a broad base from which they can be seen on all sides; and that they are not divided by long intervals of time and set at a distance from one another, but are manifestly in a state of motion, being borne onwards in a continuous stream, while the joins which hold the passage together are gentle, soft and flowing. And it is easy to see that there is no other reason for this than the character of this style as I have already described it: for no dissonance of vowels can be found, at least in the rhythmic clauses I have quoted, nor any, I think,

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὐδ' ἐν ὄλω τῷ λόγῳ, πλὴν εἴ τί με διαλέληθεν· ἡμιφώνων δὲ καὶ ἀφώνων ὀλίγας καὶ οὐ σφόδρα ἐκφανεῖς οὐδὲ συνεχεῖς. ταῦτά τε δὴ τῆς εὐπειίας αἴτια τῇ λέξει γέγονε καὶ ἡ τῶν κῶλων συμμετρία πρὸς ἄλληλα, τῶν τε περιόδων ὁ κύκλος ἔχων τι περιφερὲς καὶ εὐγραμμον καὶ τεταμιευμένον ἄκρως ταῖς συμμετρίαις. ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα δὲ ταῦτα οἱ σχηματισμοὶ πολὺ τὸ νεαρὸν ἔχοντες· εἰσὶ γὰρ ἀντίθετοι καὶ παρόμοιοι καὶ πάρισοι καὶ οἱ παραπλήσιοι τούτοις, ἐξ ὧν ἡ πανηγυρικὴ διάλεκτος ἀποτελεῖται. οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι δοκῶ μηκύνειν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ διεξιῶν· ἱκανῶς γὰρ εἴρηται καὶ περὶ ταύτης τῆς συνθέσεως ὅσα γε ἤρμοττεν.

- 24 ἡ δὲ τρίτη καὶ μέση τῶν εἰρημένων δυεῖν ἀρμονιῶν, ἣν εὐκρατον καλῶ σπάνει κυρίου τε καὶ κρείττονος ὀνόματος, σχῆμα μὲν ἴδιον οὐδὲν ἔχει, κεκέρασται δὲ ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνων μετρίως καὶ ἔστιν ἐκλογή τις τῶν ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ κρατίστων. αὕτη δοκεῖ μοι τὰ πρωτεῖα ἐπιτηδεῖα εἶναι φέρεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ μεσότης μὲν τίς ἐστι (μεσότης δὲ ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ βίων καὶ ἔργων καὶ τεχνῶν,<sup>1</sup> ὡς Ἀριστοτέλει τε δοκεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσοι κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν αἵρεσιν φιλοσοφοῦσιν), ὁράται δ', ὥσπερ ἔφην καὶ πρότερον, οὐ κατὰ ἀπαρτισμὸν ἀλλ' ἐν πλάτει, καὶ τὰς εἰδικὰς ἔχει διαφορὰς πολλὰς· οἷ τε χρησάμενοι αὐτῇ οὐ

<sup>1</sup> καὶ τεχνῶν om. EF: del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> The passage contains 26 such dissonances between words.

<sup>2</sup> Referred to elsewhere in less complimentary terms, e.g. in *Isocrates* 3, 13, *Demosthenes* 4, 25.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 167, note 1.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

in the whole speech, unless some case has escaped my notice. There are also few dissonances of semi-vowels and voiceless consonants, and these are not very noticeable or persistent.<sup>1</sup> It is these characteristics that are responsible for the melodious effect of the passage, and also the balance of the clauses and the rounding of the periods, which has about it something compact and well-defined and perfectly controlled in its proportions. And beyond all these features there are the figures of speech, full of youthful prolixity: antithesis, parallelism in sound, parallelism in structure, and others like these,<sup>2</sup> through which the language of ceremonial oratory is perfected. I do not think it necessary to prolong the discussion by going through the remaining points, since enough has been said to deal adequately with this form of composition.

The third kind of composition is a compromise 24 between the two mentioned.<sup>3</sup> For lack of a proper and better name I call it the *tempered*<sup>4</sup> style. It has no form peculiar to itself, but is a sort of judicious mixture of the other two styles and a selection from the most effective qualities of each. This kind seems to me to deserve to carry off first prize, since it represents a sort of mean, and virtue in life, conduct and the arts is a mean, in the view of Aristotle<sup>5</sup> and the other philosophers of his school. As I have said before, it is to be viewed not narrowly, but in a broad context; and it has many different specific forms. Those who have used it have not all studied the same

<sup>4</sup> εὐκρατον: literally "well-blended", which is perhaps to be preferred in some cases.

<sup>5</sup> Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2. 5, 1106b 8; *Politics* 3. 13, 1284b 7-13; *Eudemian Ethics* 2. 1220b 21.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τὰ αὐτὰ πάντες οὐδ' ὁμοίως ἐπετήδευσαν, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ταῦτα μᾶλλον, οἱ δ' ἐκεῖνα, ἐπέτεινάν τε καὶ ἀνήκαν ἄλλως ἄλλοι τὰ αὐτά, καὶ πάντες ἐγένοντο λόγου ἄξιοι κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἰδέας τῶν λόγων. κορυφή μὲν οὖν ἀπάντων καὶ σκοπός,

ἐξ οὗ περ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι,

δικαίως ἂν Ὀμηρος λέγοιτο. πᾶς γὰρ αὐτῷ τόπος, ὅτου τις ἂν ᾄψηται, ταῖς τε αὖστηραῖς καὶ ταῖς γλαφυραῖς ἀρμονίαις εἰς ἄκρον διαπεποίκιλται. τῶν δ' ἄλλων ὅσοι τὴν αὐτὴν μεσότητα ἐπετήδευσαν, ὕστεροι μὲν Ὀμήρου μακρῶ παρ' ἐκείνον ἐξεταζόμενοι φαίνονται ἂν, καθ' ἑαυτοὺς δὲ εἰ θεωροῖη τις αὐτούς, ἀξιοθέατοι, μελοποιῶν μὲν Στησίχορος τε καὶ Ἀλκαῖος, τραγωδοποιῶν δὲ Σοφοκλῆς, συγγραφέων δὲ Ἡρόδοτος, ῥητόρων δὲ Δημοσθένης, φιλοσόφων δὲ κατ' ἐμὴν δόξαν Δημόκριτός τε καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης· τούτων γὰρ ἑτέρους εὐρεῖν ἀμήχανον ἄμεινον κέρασαντας τοὺς λόγους. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν χαρακτήρων ταῦθ' ἱκανά. παραδείγματα γὰρ τούτων οὐκ οἶομαι δεῖν φέρειν, φανερῶν πάνυ ὄντων καὶ οὐδὲν δεομένων λόγου.

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad* 21. 196-7.

<sup>2</sup> Stesichorus was a 6th century lyric poet who wrote on epic themes in dactylic hexameter; hence the connection with Homer. Cf. *On the Sublime* 13. 3; Quintilian 10. 1. 62. Alcaeus of Mytilene, born c. 620 B.C., was perhaps the first poet who wrote on contemporary political themes, and did so in a variety of metres. Cf. Quintilian 10. 1. 63.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

aspects of it or treated them in the same way, but some have studied one set more, others another; and the same ones have been used with greater or lesser assiduity by different writers, who have nevertheless all earned a certain reputation in the various forms of literature. Now the summit on which everyone's gaze should be fixed may rightly be named as Homer,<sup>1</sup>

The source whence all the rivers flow and all the seas,

And every fountain,

for, whenever one alights upon his pages, the passage one finds is fashioned to the last detail in an elaborate mixture of austere and polished structural elements. Of the other writers who have cultivated the same mean, all will be seen to be clearly far inferior to Homer when judged by his standards, but deserving an audience when considered on their own. They include among the lyric poets Stesichorus and Alcaeus,<sup>2</sup> among tragedians Sophocles, among historians Herodotus, among orators Demosthenes, and among philosophers, in my opinion, Democritus,<sup>3</sup> Plato and Aristotle.<sup>4</sup> It is impossible to find authors who have been more successful than these in blending the style of their writings. That is sufficient on the subject of types of style. I do not think it necessary to give examples from these authors, since they are very readily available and need no illustration.

<sup>3</sup> Democritus of Abdera, c. 460–370 B.C., was the pupil of the first Atomist philosopher Leucippus, and is the chief source of that doctrine. His style was admired by Cicero (*Orator* 20. 67).

<sup>4</sup> Dionysius may be basing this estimate of Aristotle on works composed with conscious literary artistry, like the lost dialogues *Gryllus* and *Eudemus*.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

εἰ δέ τιτι δοκεῖ καὶ πόνου πολλοῦ ταῦτα καὶ πραγματείας μεγάλης ἄξια εἶναι, καὶ μάλα ὀρθῶς δοκεῖ κατὰ τὸν Δημοσθένην· ἀλλ' ἐὰν λογίσηται τοὺς ἐξακολουθοῦντας αὐτοῖς κατορθουμένοις ἐπαίνους καὶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡς γλυκὺς, εὐπαθείας ἡγήσεται τοὺς πόνους. Ἐπικουρείων δὲ χορόν, οἷς οὐδὲν μέλει τούτων, παραιτοῦμαι· τὸ γὰρ 'οὐκ ἐπιπόνου τοῦ γράφειν ὄντος', ὡς αὐτὸς Ἐπίκουρος λέγει, 'τοῖς μὴ στοχοζομένοις τοῦ πυκνὰ μεταπίπτοντος κριτηρίου' πολλῆς ἀργίας ἦν καὶ σκαιότητος ἀλεξιφάρμακον.

25 τούτων δὴ μοι τέλος ἔχόντων, ἐκεῖνά σε οἶομαι ποθεῖν ἔτι ἀκοῦσαι, πῶς γίνεται λέξις ἄμετρος ὁμοία καλῶ ποιήματι ἢ μέλει, καὶ πῶς ποίημα ἢ μέλος πεζῆ λέξει καλῆ παραπλήσιον. ἄρξομαι δὲ πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῆς ψιλῆς λέξεως, ἕνα τῶν ἀνδρῶν προχειρισάμενος ὃν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα οἶμαι τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐκμεμάχθαι φράσιν, βουλόμενος μὲν καὶ πλείους, οὐκ ἔχων δὲ χρόνον ἰκανὸν ἅπασιν. φέρε δὴ τίς οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν τοῖς κρατίστοις εἰκέναι ποιήμασί τε καὶ μέλεσι τοὺς Δημοσθένους λόγους, καὶ μάλιστα τὰς τε κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγορίας καὶ τοὺς δικανικοὺς ἀγῶνας τοὺς δημοσίους; ὧν ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀρκέσει λαβεῖν τὸ προοίμιον τουτί·

Ἐμμεῖς ὑμῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, νομίση με <sup>1</sup> μήτ' ἰδίας ἔχθρας <sup>2</sup> μηδεμιᾶς ἔνεχ' ἤκειν Ἀρι-

<sup>1</sup> om. Demosthenes.

<sup>2</sup> add. ἐμὲ Demosthenes.

<sup>1</sup> *On the Chersonese* 48.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

If anyone thinks that these matters deserve to have much effort and a great deal of attention devoted to them, his opinion, according to Demosthenes,<sup>1</sup> is decidedly correct; but if he further considers the credit which attends success in them and the sweetness of the fruit they yield, he will think the effort a pleasure. I ask for the indulgence of the Epicurean company, who have no regard for these things. The dictum that "writing presents no difficulties to those who do not aim at a constantly changing standard",<sup>2</sup> which Epicurus himself propounded, was intended as a talisman to ward off the charge of extreme sloth and stupidity.

Now that my discussion of these matters is at an 25 end, you are eager to hear next how language without metre is made to resemble a beautiful poem or lyric, and how a poem or song is made similar to beautiful prose. I shall begin with the language of prose, selecting an author who has, I think, most clearly modelled his diction on that of poetry. I should like to mention more than one author, but have not sufficient time for all. Now surely no one would deny that the speeches of Demosthenes are like the finest poems and lyrics; particularly his political speeches against Philip and his forensic speeches in public suits. It will be enough to take the following introduction from one of these<sup>3</sup>:

"Let none of you, people of Athens, suppose that I come here before you, led by a wish to indulge a

<sup>2</sup> Epicurus, Frag. 230 Usener. But Dionysius may be alluding more specifically to Philodemus, an Epicurean critic of his own time who opposed the views of the Peripatetics on style.

<sup>3</sup> Demosthenes, *Against Aristocrates* 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

στοκράτους κατηγορήσοντα τουτουί, μήτε μικρὸν ὀρῶντά τι καὶ φαῦλον ἀμάρτημα<sup>1</sup> ἐτοίμως οὕτως ἐπὶ τούτῳ προάγειν ἑμαυτὸν εἰς ἀπέχθειαν· ἀλλ' εἶπερ ἄρ' ὀρθῶς ἐγὼ λογίζομαι καὶ σκοπῶ, περὶ<sup>2</sup> τοῦ Χερρόνησον<sup>3</sup> ἔχειν ὑμᾶς ἀσφαλῶς καὶ μὴ παρακρουσθέντας ἀποστερηθῆναι πάλιν αὐτῆς, περὶ τούτου ἐστὶ μοι ἅπασα<sup>4</sup> ἡ σπουδή.'

πειρατέον δὴ καὶ περὶ τούτων λέγειν ἃ φρονῶ. μυστηρίοις μὲν οὖν ἔοικεν ἤδη ταῦτα καὶ οὐκ εἰς πολλοὺς οἰά τε ἐστὶν ἐκφέρεσθαι, ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν εἶην φορτικός, εἰ παρακαλοίην 'οἷς θέμις ἐστὶν' ἤκειν ἐπὶ τὰς τελετὰς τοῦ λόγου, 'θύρας δ' ἐπιθέσθαι' λέγοιμι ταῖς ἀκοαῖς τοὺς 'βεβήλους'. εἰς γέλωτα γὰρ ἔνιοι λαμβάνουσι τὰ σπουδαιότατα δι' ἀπειρίαν, καὶ ἴσως οὐδὲν ἄτοπον πάσχουσιν. ἃ δ' οὖν βούλομαι λέγειν, τοιάδε ἐστί.

πᾶσα λέξις ἢ δίχα μέτρου συγκειμένη ποιητικὴν μουσαν ἢ μελικὴν χάριν οὐ δύναται προσλαβεῖν κατὰ γοῦν τὴν σύνθεσιν αὐτήν· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ ἐκλογὴ τῶν ὀνομάτων μέγα τι δύναται, καὶ ἔστι τις ὀνομασία ποιητικὴ γλωττηματικῶν τε καὶ ξένων καὶ τροπικῶν καὶ πεποιημένων, οἷς ἠδύνεται ποιήσεις, εἰς κόρον ἐγκαταμιγέντων τῇ ἀμέτρῳ λέξει, ὃ ποιούσιν ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα Πλάτων· οὐ δὴ λέγω περὶ τῆς ἐκλογῆς, ἀλλ' ἀφείσθω κατὰ τὸ παρὸν ἢ περὶ ταῦτα σκέψις. περὶ τῆς

<sup>1</sup> ἀμάρτημ' Demosthenes.      <sup>2</sup> ὑπὲρ Demosthenes.

<sup>3</sup> Χερρό- Demosthenes.

<sup>4</sup> μοί ἐστιν ἅπασ' Demosthenes.

<sup>1</sup> Probably a formula used at the commencement of Orphic or other mystic rites. Cf. Horace, *Odes* 3. 1: *favete linguis*.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

personal hate of my own, to accuse the defendant Aristocrates here; or that it is because I have my eye on a minute misdemeanour of the man that now I am so keen to attack him and expose myself to his hostility. But if my calculation is indeed correct, my one aim and object is that the land in the region of Chersonese be safe in your hands and without trickery, and not again be taken from you."

Now I must try, here as before, to state my views. But this new subject is like the Mysteries: it cannot be divulged to people in large numbers. I should not, therefore, be guilty of rudeness, if I invited only "those with a sacred right" to approach the initiation rituals of style, while telling the "profane" to "close the gates of their ears".<sup>1</sup> Some people reduce the most serious subject to ridicule through their own callowness, and no doubt there is nothing unnatural in their attitude. Well, my views are as follows.

Any passage that is composed without metre is incapable of acquiring the music of spoken verse or the grace of lyric, at least through mere word-arrangement. <This qualification is necessary> because the actual choice of words can exert considerable influence, and there is a poetical vocabulary consisting of recondite, unfamiliar and figurative words, and of neologisms,<sup>2</sup> which contribute to the charm of poetry. These are sometimes infused into prose-writing, and to an excessive degree: many writers do this, and Plato in particular. But I am not speaking of the choice of words: let us set aside any examination of that subject for the present, and

<sup>2</sup> Such usages are characteristic of the Grand Style.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

συνθέσεως αὐτῆς ἔστω ἡ θεωρία τῆς ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ τετριμμένοις καὶ ἠκιστα ποιητικοῖς τὰς ποιητικὰς χάριτας ἐπιδεικνυμένης. ὅπερ οὖν ἔφην, οὐ δύναται ψιλὴ λέξις ὁμοία γενέσθαι τῇ ἐμμέτρῳ καὶ ἐμμελεῖ, ἐὰν μὴ περιέχῃ μέτρα καὶ ῥυθμούς τινας ἐγκατατεταγμένους ἀδήλως. οὐ μέντοι προσήκει γε ἔμμετρον οὐδ' ἔρρυθμον αὐτὴν εἶναι δοκεῖν (ποίημα γὰρ οὕτως ἔσται καὶ μέλος ἐκβήσεται τε ἀπλῶς τὸν αὐτῆς χαρακτήρα), ἀλλ' εὐρυθμον αὐτὴν ἀπόχρη καὶ εὐμετρον φαίνεσθαι μόνον· οὕτως γὰρ ἂν εἴη ποιητικὴ μὲν, οὐ μὴν ποίημά γε, καὶ ἐμμελὴς μὲν, οὐ μέλος δέ.

τίς δ' ἐστὶν ἡ τούτων διαφορά, πάνυ ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν. ἡ μὲν ὁμοία περιλαμβάνουσα μέτρα καὶ τεταγμένους σώζουσα ῥυθμούς καὶ κατὰ στίχον ἢ περίοδον ἢ στροφὴν διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν σχημάτων περαινομένη κἄπειτα πάλιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ῥυθμοῖς καὶ μέτροις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξῆς στίχων ἢ περιόδων ἢ στροφῶν χρωμένη καὶ τοῦτο μέχρι πολλοῦ ποιούσα ἔρρυθμός ἐστι καὶ ἔμμετρος, καὶ ὀνόματα κεῖται τῇ τοιαύτῃ λέξει μέτρον καὶ μέλος· ἡ δὲ πεπλανημένα μέτρα καὶ ἀτάκτους ῥυθμούς ἐμπεριλαμβάνουσα καὶ μήτε ἀκολουθίαν ἐμφαίνουσα αὐτῶν μήτε ὁμοζυγίαν μήτε ἀντιστροφὴν εὐρυθμος μὲν ἐστίν, ἐπειδὴ διαπεποίκιλταί τισιν ῥυθμοῖς, οὐκ ἔρρυθμος δέ, ἐπειδὴ οὐχὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ αὐτό. τοιαύτην δὴ φημι πᾶσαν εἶναι λέξιν ἄμετρον, ἥτις ἐμφαίνει τὸ ποιητικὸν καὶ μελικόν· ἥ δὲ καὶ τὸν

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

let our enquiry be concentrated on word-arrangement, which can reveal poetic grace in common words which are in constant use and are not in the least poetical. Thus, as I said before, mere prose cannot come to resemble metrical and lyrical writing unless it contains metres and rhythms that have been introduced into it unobtrusively. It is not appropriate, however, for it to appear to be *in* metre or *in* rhythm (for in that case it will be a poem and a lyric, and will absolutely abandon its proper character)<sup>1</sup>; it is enough that it should simply appear rhythmical and metrical. In this way it may be poetical, though not actually a poem, and lyrical, but without being a lyric.

It is quite easy to see the difference between these two conditions. The passage which comprises similar metres and preserves fixed rhythms throughout, and is effected by a repetition of the same patterns, line for line, period for period, or strophe for strophe, and then again uses the same rhythms and metres for the succeeding lines, periods or strophes, and does this over a considerable length, is *in* rhythm and *in* metre, and the names *verse* and *song* are applied to such writing. On the other hand, that which comprises haphazard metres and irregular rhythms, and in these shows neither continuity nor connection nor correspondence between stanzas is rhythmical, since it is variegated by rhythms of some kind; but it is not *in* rhythm, since they are not the same or in the same relation. I regard all language as having this character when it is without metre, and yet displays a poetical and lyrical quality; and it is this style of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Demosthenes* 50; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 8. 1-3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Δημοσθένη κεχρηῆσθαί φημι. καὶ ὅτι ἀληθῆ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐγὼ καινοτομῶ, λάβοι μὲν ἂν τις καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους μαρτυρίας τὴν πίστιν· εἴρηται γὰρ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ τά τε ἄλλα περὶ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πολιτικῆς ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ τῶν ῥητορικῶν τεχνῶν οἷαν αὐτὴν εἶναι προσῆκεν, καὶ δὴ καὶ περὶ τῆς εὐρυθμίας ἐξ ὧν τις τοιαύτη γένοιτο· ἐν ἣ τούς ἐπιτηδειοτάτους ὀνομάζει ῥυθμούς καὶ πῆ χρήσιμος ἕκαστος αὐτῶν καταφαίνεται, καὶ λέξεις παρατίθησιν τινὰς αἷς πειράται βεβαιοῦν τὸν λόγον. χωρὶς δὲ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους μαρτυρίας, ὅτι ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν ἐμπεριλαμβάνεσθαί τινὰς τῇ πεζῇ λέξει ῥυθμούς, εἰ μέλλοι τὸ ποιητικὸν ἐπανθήσειν αὐτῇ κάλλος, ἐκ τῆς πείρας τις αὐτῆς γνώσεται.

αὐτίκα ὁ κατὰ Ἀριστοκράτους λόγος οὗ καὶ μικρῷ πρότερον ἐμνήσθην ἄρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ κωμικοῦ στίχου τετραμέτρου ἐξ ἀναπαιστων ῥυθμῶν συγκειμένου, λείπεται δὲ ποδὶ τοῦ τελείου, παρ' ὃ καὶ λέληθεν· ἄμῃδεῖς ὑμῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, νομίση με· τοῦτο γὰρ εἰ προσλάβοι τὸ μέτρον πόδα ἦτοι κατ' ἀρχὰς ἢ διὰ μέσου ἢ ἐπὶ τελευτῆς, τέλειον ἔσται τετράμετρον ἀναπαιστικόν, ὃ καλοῦσιν τινες Ἀριστοφάνειον·

μῃδεῖς ὑμῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, νομίση με  
παρεῖναι,  
ἴσον δὲ τῷ

---

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 8. 4-7.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

writing that I say Demosthenes employed. That this is true, and that I am breaking no new ground in saying it, anyone may prove to himself by examining the testimony of Aristotle; for in the third book of his *Rhetoric*<sup>1</sup> the philosopher, when describing the various requirements of political oratory, has referred specifically to the good rhythm which would fulfil those requirements. In that passage he names the most suitable rhythms, indicates where each of them may be used to effect, and tries to confirm his argument by adducing some illustrative passages. But apart from the testimony of Aristotle, a writer will learn from experience that some rhythms must be included in prose writing if it is to have upon it the bloom of poetical beauty.

For example, the speech *Against Aristocrates*, to which I alluded a little earlier, begins with a comic tetrameter line set in its anapaestic rhythms, but escaping our notice because it falls short of completeness by one foot.<sup>2</sup> If this line had an additional foot either at the beginning or in the middle, or at the end, it would be a complete anapaestic tetrameter, which some call the "Aristophanic" line:

Let none of you, people of Athens, suppose that  
I come here before you  
corresponds with<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In this metre, spondees (--) could be substituted for anapaests (υ υ -) in all feet. Hence:

- -   - -	- -   υ υ -	- -   υ υ -	υ [υ -   -]
μηδεις υμων	ω ανδρες Αθη	ναϊοι, νομιση	με

The line falls short of a full anapaestic tetrameter catalectic by υ - υ.

<sup>3</sup> Aristophanes, *Clouds* 961, scanning thus:

- -   - -	- -   - -	- - - -	υ υ -   υ
λεξω τοινυν	την αρχαιαν	παιδειαν ως	διεκειτο

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

λέξω τοίνυν τὴν ἀρχαίαν παιδείαν ὡς διέκειτο.  
τάχα τις ἐρεῖ πρὸς ταῦτα, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιτηδεύσεως  
τοῦτο ἀλλ' ἐκ ταυτομάτου ἐγένετο· πολλὰ γὰρ  
αὐτοσχεδιάζει μέτρα ἢ φύσις. ἔστω τοῦτο  
ἀληθές εἶναι. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ συναπτόμενον τούτῳ  
κῶλον, εἰ διαλύσειέ τις αὐτοῦ τὴν δευτέραν συν-  
αλοιφήν ἢ πεποίηκεν αὐτὸ ἄσημον ἐπισυνάπτουσα  
τῷ τρίτῳ κῶλῳ, πεντάμετρον ἐλεγειακὸν ἔσται  
συντετελεσμένον τουτί

μήτ' ἰδίας ἔχθρας μηδεμιᾶς ἔνεκα  
ὅμοιον τούτοις

κοῦραι ἐλαφρὰ ποδῶν ἴχνι' ἀειράμεναι.  
καὶ τοῦτ' ἔτι κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ὑπολάβωμεν αὐτομα-  
τισμὸν ἄνευ γνώμης γεγονέναι. ἀλλ' ἐνὸς τοῦ  
μεταξὺ κῶλου συγκειμένου λεκτικῶς τοῦ ἦκειν  
Ἄριστοκράτους κατηγορήσοντα τουτουί' τὸ συμ-  
πλεκόμενον τούτῳ πάλιν κῶλον ἐκ δυεῖν συνέστη-  
κεν μέτρων· μήτε μικρὸν ὄρωντά τι καὶ φαῦλον  
ἀμάρτημα, ἐτοίμως οὕτως ἐπὶ τούτῳ· εἰ γὰρ τὸ  
Σαπφικόν τις ἐπιθαλάμιον τουτί

οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀτέρα πάις, ὦ γαμβρέ, τοιαύτα

〈ποτα〉<sup>1</sup>

καὶ τοῦ κωμικοῦ τετραμέτρου, λεγομένου δὲ  
Ἄριστοφανείου τουδί

ὄτ' ἐγὼ τὰ δίκαια λέγων ἦνθουν καὶ σωφροσύνη  
ἔννομιστο

τοὺς τελευταίους πόδας τρεῖς καὶ τὴν κατάληξιν

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

And now I'll describe how in earlier days our children received education.

Perhaps someone will reply to this by saying that this has happened not from design but by accident, since our natural utterance often produces verse spontaneously. Let this be accepted as true. Yet the next clause as well, if you resolve its second elision, which has concealed its identity by linking it closely with the third clause, will be a complete elegiac pentameter as follows:

Led by a wish to indulge personal hate of my own, which is similar to this <sup>1</sup>

Maidens whose feet in the dance lightly were lifted on high.

Let us suppose that this, too, has just happened spontaneously and unintentionally. But after one intervening clause composed in prose rhythm, "to accuse the defendant Aristocrates", again the clause which is attached to this consists of two metrical lines,

or because I've my eye on a minute misdemeanour of the man that now I'm so keen to attack him. For if we were to take this line from Sappho's bridal song <sup>2</sup>:

Never was there another like this maid, O my son-in-law,

and were also to take the last three feet and the catalectic foot of the following comic tetrameter, the one called "Aristophanic" <sup>3</sup>:

When of righteousness I was the popular preacher, and temperance still was in fashion,

<sup>1</sup> Callimachus, Frag. 391 Schneider.

<sup>2</sup> Sappho, Frag. 106 Bergk.

<sup>3</sup> Aristophanes, *Clouds* 962 (tr. by W. R. Roberts).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐκλαβὼν συνάψειε τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον

οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀτέρα πάις, ὦ γαμβρέ, τοιαύτα

〈ποτα〉<sup>1</sup> καὶ σωφροσύνη ἑνεόμιστο·

οὐδὲν διοίσει τοῦ ἕμῃτε μικρὸν ὄρωντά τι καὶ  
φαῦλον ἀμάρτημα, ἐτοίμως οὕτως ἐπὶ τούτῳ. τὸ  
δ' ἀκόλουθον ἴσον ἐστὶν ἰαμβικῶ τριμέτρῳ τὸν  
ἔσχατον ἀφηρημένῳ πόδα ἑμαυτὸν εἰς  
ἀπέχθειαν. τέλειον γὰρ ἔσται πόδα προσλαβὼν καὶ  
γενόμενον τοιοῦτο

προάγειν ἑμαυτὸν εἰς ἀπέχθειάν τινα.

παρίδωμεν ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα ὡς οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιτηδεύσεως  
ἀλλ' αὐτοματισμῶ γενόμενα; τί οὖν βούλεται πάλιν  
τὸ προσεχὲς τούτῳ κῶλον; ἰαμβεῖον γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ  
τοῦτο τρίμετρον ὀρθόν

ἀλλ' εἶπερ ἄρ' ὀρθῶς ἐγὼ λογίζομαι,

τοῦ ἄρα συνδέσμου μακρὰν λαμβάνοντος τὴν προ-  
τέραν συλλαβήν. καὶ τί γε δὴ διὰ μέσου παρεμπε-  
σὸν τὸ ἑκαὶ σκοπῶ, ὑφ' οὗ δὴ τὸ μέτρον ἐπισκο-  
τούμενον ἠφάνισται; τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ παραλαμβα-  
νόμενον κῶλον ἐξ ἀναπαίστων σύγκειται ῥυθμῶν  
καὶ προάγει μέχρι ποδῶν ὀκτῶ τὸ αὐτὸ σχῆμα δια-  
σῶζον

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> The iambic trimeter consisted of three *metra*, each of two iambic feet. The first syllable of each metron could be lengthened, giving a possible spondee or dactyl, rarely an anapaest:

$\begin{array}{c} \cup \cup \quad - \cup \quad - \\ \text{προάγειν ἑμαυ} \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \cup \quad - \quad \cup \quad - \\ \text{τὸν εἰς ἀπέχ} \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{c} - \quad - \quad \cup \quad - \\ \text{θειάν τινα.} \end{array}$

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

and then were to combine them thus:

Never was there another like this maid, O my  
son-in-law, when temperance still was in fashion,  
it will exactly correspond to

or because I've my eye on a minute misdemeanour  
of the man that now I'm so keen to attack him.  
The next clause is like an iambic trimeter with its  
final foot removed, "expose myself to his hostility":  
it will be complete if a foot is added and it becomes  
something like this: "expose myself to some  
hostility of his".<sup>1</sup> Shall we once more ignore these  
resemblances as if they came about not through  
design but by accident? Then what, again, is the  
significance of the next clause to this? For this too  
is a correct iambic trimeter line:

But if my calculation is indeed correct,  
if the connective *ἄρα* has its first syllable made long,<sup>2</sup>  
and if further—by your leave!—the words *καὶ σκοπῶ*  
are regarded as a mere intrusion, causing the metre  
to be obscured and to vanish from sight.<sup>3</sup> The clause  
which is placed next after this is composed of  
anapaestic feet, and extends to eight of them, while  
preserving the same form,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The "line" will then scan:

$\begin{array}{cccc|cccc|cccc} - & - & \cup & - & - & - & \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & - \\ \text{ἀλλ'} & \text{εἶπερ} & \text{ἄρ'} & & \text{ὀρθῶς} & \text{ἐγὼ} & & \text{λογίζομαι.} & & & & \end{array}$

The first syllable of *ἄρα* was sometimes scanned as long, no doubt through confusion with *ἄρα*.

<sup>3</sup> And hence meeting the requirement that prose should be rhythmical, but not in rhythm. See note 1, p. 213.

<sup>4</sup> Again the "line" is not perfectly anapaestic, having a cretic in the fourth foot:

$\begin{array}{cccc|cccc|cccc|cccc|cccc|cccc} \cup & \cup & - & | & \cup & \cup & - & | & \cup & \cup & - & | & - & \cup & - & | & - & - & | & - & - & | & \cup & \cup & - & | \\ \text{περὶ} & \text{τοῦ} & \text{Χερώνη} & & \text{σον} & \text{ἔχειν} & \text{ἀσφαλῶς} & & \text{ὑμᾶς} & \text{καὶ} & \text{μὴ} & & \text{παρακρουσ-} & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ - & - & \\ \text{θέντας.} & \end{array}$

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

περὶ τοῦ Χερώνησον ἔχειν ὑμᾶς ἀσφαλῶς καὶ μὴ  
 παρακρουσθέντας,

ὅμοιον τῷ παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ τῷδε  
 βασιλεῦ χώρας τῆς πολυβώλου  
 Κισσεῦ, πεδίων πυρὶ μαρμαίρει.

καὶ τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο πάλιν κείμενον τοῦ αὐτοῦ κώλου  
 μέρος τουτί 'ἀποστερηθῆναι πάλιν αὐτῆς' ἰαμβι-  
 κὸν τρίμετρον ἐστὶ ποδὶ καὶ ἡμίσει λειπόμενον·  
 ἐγένετο δ' ἂν τέλειον οὕτως

ἀποστερηθῆναι πάλιν αὐτῆς ἐν μέρει.

ταῦτ' ἔτι φῶμεν αὐτοσχέδια εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπιτήδευτα  
 οὕτω ποικίλα καὶ πολλὰ ὄντα; ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀξιῶ·  
 καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἐξῆς τούτοις ὅμοια εὐρεῖν ἐστὶ πολλῶν  
 καὶ παντοδαπῶν ἀνάμεσα μέτρων τε καὶ ῥυθμῶν.

ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ τοῦτον ὑπολάβῃ τις μόνον οὕτως  
 αὐτῷ κατεσκευάσθαι τὸν λόγον, ἑτέρου πάλιν  
 ἄψομαι τοῦ πάνυ ἡρμηνεῦσθαι δαιμονίως δοκοῦντος,  
 τοῦ ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος, ὃν ἐγὼ κράτιστον ἀπο-  
 φαίνομαι πάντων λόγων· ὁρῶ δὴ καὶ τούτῳ μετὰ  
 τὴν προσαγόρευσιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων εὐθέως τὸν  
 κρητικὸν ῥυθμόν, εἴτε ἄρα παιᾶνά τις αὐτὸν βού-  
 λεται καλεῖν (διοίσει γὰρ οὐδέν) τὸν ἐκ πέντε  
 συγκείμενον χρόνων οὐκ αὐτοσχεδίως μὰ Δία ἀλλ'  
 ὡς οἶόν τε μάλιστα ἐπιτετηδευμένως δι' ὅλου τοῦ  
 κώλου πλεκόμενον τούτου

τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις.

οὐ τοιοῦτος μέντοι κακείνός ἐστιν ὁ ῥυθμός

<sup>1</sup> Euripides, *Archelaus*, Frag. 229 Nauck. The dactylic substitution diminishes the resemblance:

υ υ -   - -		- υ υ   - -
βασιλεῦ χώρας		τῆς πολυβώλου
- -   υ υ -		υ υ -   - -
Κισσεῦ, πεδίων		πυρὶ μαρμαίρει.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

that the land in the region of Chersonese be safe  
in your hands and without trickery,  
which resembles this in Euripides <sup>1</sup>:

Mighty Cisseus, king of a harvest-filled land,  
The plain is alight with a fire bright.

And the part of the same clause which comes next to it,  
and once again be taken from you,  
is an iambic trimeter minus a foot and a half. It  
would have been complete written thus <sup>2</sup>:

and once again be taken from you in return.

Are we to say that these effects too are spontaneous  
and uncontrived when they are so many and various?  
I do not think we should; for it is possible to find  
similar instances in the clauses that follow these,  
replete as they are with many varieties of metres and  
rhythms.

But in case it should be supposed that this is the  
only one of his speeches that is constructed in this  
way, I shall refer to another whose style is acknow-  
ledged to be inspired; the oration *For Ctesiphon*,  
which I declare to be the finest of all speeches. I  
observe that in this speech also, straight after the  
invocation to the Athenians, the cretic rhythm, or  
the *paeon* if you wish to call it so (for it will make no  
difference), which consists of five time-units, is inter-  
laced, certainly not haphazardly but with the utmost  
care, throughout the whole clause <sup>3</sup>:

Now I pray all the gods, all the goddesses.

Is not the following rhythm of the same kind <sup>4</sup>:

$\cup - \mid \cup - \mid - - \mid \cup \cup - \mid - - \mid \cup -$   
<sup>2</sup> ἀποστέρη | θῆναι πάλιν αὐ | τῆς ἐν μέρει

A comic iambic trimeter, in which anapaests could be sub-  
stituted in all feet.

<sup>3</sup> *De Corona* 1. See the analysis in Ch. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Bergk *PLG Frag. Adesp.* 118.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Κρησίοις ἐν ῥυθμοῖς παῖδα μέλιψωμεν ;  
ἐμοὶ γοῦν δοκεῖ· ἕξω γὰρ τοῦ τελευταίου ποδὸς τά  
γε ἄλλα παντάπασιν ἴσα. ἔστω καὶ τοῦτο, εἰ  
βούλεται τις, αὐτοσχέδιον· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ συναπτόμε-  
νον τούτῳ κῶλον ἰαμβεῖόν ἐστιν ὀρθόν, συλλαβῇ  
τοῦ τελείου δέον, ἵνα δὴ κἀνταῦθα ἄσημον γένηται  
τὸ μέτρον, ἐπεὶ μιᾶς γε συλλαβῆς προστεθείσης  
τέλειον ἔσται

ὄσσην εὐνοϊαν ἔχων ἔγωγε διατελῶ.  
κᾶπειτα ὁ παιᾶν ἢ ὁ κρητικὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ πεντάχρο-  
νος ἤξει ῥυθμὸς ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς τούτοις 'τῇ πόλει καὶ  
πᾶσιν ὑμῖν τοσαύτην ὑπάρξαι μοι παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς  
τουτονὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα'. τοῦτο γὰρ ἔοικεν, ὅ τι μὴ  
κατακλωμένους ἔχει δύο πόδας ἐν ἀρχαῖς, κατὰ  
γοῦν τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τῷ παρὰ Βακχυλίδη

οὐχ ἔδρας ἔργον οὐδ' ἀμβολᾶς, ἀλλὰ χρυσαιγίδος  
Ἰτανίας

χρῆ παρ' εὐδαίδαλον ναὸν ἐλθόντας ἀβρόν τι  
δεῖξαι.

ὑφορῶμαί τινα πρὸς ταῦτα καταδρομὴν ἀνθρώ-  
πων τῆς μὲν ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ἀπείρων, τὸ δὲ  
ἀγοραῖον τῆς ῥητορικῆς μέρος ὁδοῦ τε καὶ τέχνης  
χωρὶς ἐπιτηδευόντων, πρὸς οὓς ἀναγκαῖον ἀπο-  
λογήσασθαι, μὴ δόξωμεν ἔρημον ἀφηκέσαι τὸν  
ἀγῶνα. ἐροῦσι δὲ ταῦτα· ὁ Δημοσθένης οὖν  
οὕτως ἄθλιος ἦν, ὥσθ' ὅτε γράφοι τοὺς λόγους,  
μέτρα καὶ ῥυθμοὺς ὥσπερ οἱ πλάσται παρατιθέμε-  
νος, ἐναρμόττειν ἐπειρᾶτο τούτοις τοῖς τύποις τὰ



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

Sing we now Cretan songs in the son's honour?  
It certainly seems so to me; for except in the final foot there is complete correspondence. But let us say, if you like, that this too is unpremeditated; yet the next clause after this is a correct iambic line that is incomplete by one syllable, no doubt so that here too the metre may be obscured.<sup>1</sup> The addition of one single syllable will render the line complete<sup>2</sup>:

that such goodwill as I have always cherished.  
Then, that paeon or cretic rhythm of five time-units will occur in the words which follow:

towards the state and towards all of you, should  
be mine at your hands as I face this ordeal.  
Now this, except that it has two shortened feet at the beginnings, resembles in all other respects the passage in Bacchylides<sup>3</sup>:

This is no time to sit still nor wait,  
Unto yon carven shrine let us go,  
Even gold-aegis'd Queen Pallas' shrine,  
And the rich vesture there show.

I suspect that certain persons, who have no general education but practise rhetoric on a street-corner level without method or art, will inveigh violently against these statements. I must defend myself against these for fear of appearing to let the case go by default. No doubt they will argue: "Was Demosthenes such a helpless creature, then, that when he was writing his speeches, he laid out metres and rhythms beside him as his materials, as clay-

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, p. 213 and note 3, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> The line has the number of syllables required for an iambic trimeter, but the order would need alteration.

<sup>3</sup> Bacchylides, Frag. 11 Jebb (tr. Roberts).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

κῶλα, στρέφων ἄνω καὶ κάτω τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ παραφυλάττων τὰ μήκη καὶ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὰς ἐγκλίσεις τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ πάντα τὰ συμβεβηκότα τοῖς μορίοις τοῦ λόγου πολυπραγμονῶν; ἠλίθιος μέντ' ἔειπε εἰς τοσαύτην σκευωρίαν καὶ φλυαρίαν ὁ τηλικούτος ἀνὴρ ἑαυτὸν διδούς. ταῦτα δὴ καὶ τὰ τούτοις παραπλήσια κωμωδοῦντας αὐτοὺς καὶ καταχλευάζοντας οὐ χαλεπῶς ἂν τις ἀποκρούσαιτο ταῦτα εἰπών· πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἦν, εἰ <ὁ><sup>1</sup> τοσαύτης δόξης ἠξιωμένος ἀνὴρ ὅσης οὐδεὶς τῶν πρότερον ὀνομασθέντων ἐπὶ δεινότητι λόγων, ἔργα συνταπτόμενος αἰώνια καὶ διδούς ἑαυτὸν ὑπεύθυνον τῷ πάντα βασανίζοντι φθόνῳ καὶ χρόνῳ ἐβουλήθη μηδὲν εἰκῆ μήτε πράγμα παραλαμβάνειν μήτ' ὄνομα, πολλὴν δ' ἀμφοῖν ἔχειν τούτων πρόνοιαν τῆς τε ἐν τοῖς νοήμασιν οἰκονομίας καὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας τῆς περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα, ἄλλως τε καὶ τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων οὐ γραπτοῖς ἀλλὰ γλυπτοῖς καὶ τορευτοῖς εἰκότας ἐκφερόντων λόγους, λέγω δὲ Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος τῶν σοφιστῶν· ὁ μὲν γε τὸν πανηγυρικὸν λόγον, ὡς οἱ τὸν ἐλάχιστον χρόνον γράφοντες ἀποφαίνουσιν, ἐν ἔτεσι δέκα συνετάξατο, ὁ δὲ Πλάτων τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ διαλόγους κτενίζων καὶ βοστρυχίζων καὶ πάντα τρόπον ἀναπλέκων οὐ διέλειπεν ὀγδοήκοντα γεγονῶς ἔτη· πᾶσι γὰρ δήπου τοῖς φιλολόγοις γνώριμα τὰ περὶ τῆς φιλοπονίας τάνδρὸς ἱστορούμενα τά τε ἄλλα

<sup>1</sup> Sadée.

<sup>1</sup> The Greek *paronomasia* cannot be rendered in English without sacrificing accuracy.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

modellers lay out their moulds, and tried to fit his clauses into them, adjusting the word-order this way and that, keeping a careful watch on his longs and his shorts and taking great trouble over the cases of his nouns and the moods of his verbs and everything else affecting the parts of speech? An orator of his standing would cut a poor figure if he were to involve himself with such trappings and fripperies." If they scoffed or jeered in these or similar terms, they could be refuted without difficulty by the following rejoinder: first, that there is nothing odd in the idea that a man who is considered to have earned a greater reputation than any of his predecessors who were renowned for their eloquence, when composing works of permanent importance and submitting himself to that test of everything, envy and time,<sup>1</sup> wanted to admit no subject or word at random, but to pay special attention to both management of ideas and formal beauty of language: particularly as the authors of that time were producing works which suggested not mere writing but carving and chasing—I refer to those of the masters, Isocrates and Plato. Of these the former spent ten years over the composition of his *Panegyricus*, according to the lowest recorded estimate of the time<sup>2</sup>; while Plato, even at the age of eighty, never let off combing and curling his dialogues and re-plaiting them in every way. Of course, every scholar is familiar with the stories told about Plato's industry, especially the one

<sup>2</sup> So Timaeus, quoted by the author of *On the Sublime* 4. 2. Cf. Quintilian 10. 4. 4. [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 837F gives fifteen as well as ten years.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν δέλτον, ἣν τελευτήσαντος αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν εὐρεθῆναι ποικίλως μετακειμένην τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Πολιτείας ἔχουσαν τήνδε 'Κατέβην χθὲς εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος.' τί οὖν ἦν ἄτοπον, εἰ καὶ Δημοσθένει φροντισ εὐφωνίας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας ἐγένετο καὶ τοῦ μηδὲν εἰκῆ καὶ ἀβασανίστως τιθέσθαι μήτε ὄνομα μήτε νόημα; πολὺ τε γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ προσήκειν ἀνδρὶ κατασκευάζοντι λόγους πολιτικούς μνημεῖα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως αἰώνια μηδενὸς τῶν ἐλαχίστων ὀλιγωρεῖν, ἢ ζωγράφων τε καὶ τορευτῶν παισὶν ἐν ὕλῃ φθαρτῇ χειρῶν εὐστοχίας καὶ πόνους ἀποδεικνυμένοις περὶ τὰ φλέβια καὶ τὰ πτίλα καὶ τὸν χνοῦν καὶ τὰς τοιαύτας μικρολογίας κατατρίβειν τῆς τέχνης τὴν ἀκρίβειαν. τούτοις τε δὴ τοῖς λόγοις χρώμενος δοκεῖ μοί τις ἂν οὐδὲν ἔξω τοῦ εἰκότος ἀξιούσιν καὶ ἔτι ἐκεῖνα εἰπών, ὅτι μειράκιον μὲν ὄντα καὶ νεωστὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ἀπτόμενον αὐτὸν οὐκ ἄλογον <ἦν><sup>1</sup> πάντα περισκοπεῖν, ὅσα δυνατὰ ἦν εἰς ἐπιτήδευσιν ἀνθρωπίνην πεσεῖν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡ χρόνιος ἀσκησις ἰσχὺν πολλὴν λαβοῦσα τύπους τινὰς ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ παντὸς τοῦ μελετωμένου καὶ σφραγίδας ἐνεποίησεν, ἐκ τοῦ ράστου τε καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξεως αὐτὰ ἤδη ποιεῖν. οἷόν τι γίνεται καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τέχναις, ὧν ἐνέργειά τις ἢ ποίησις τὸ τέλος· αὐτίκα οἱ κιθαρίζειν τε καὶ ψάλλειν καὶ αὐλεῖν ἄκρως εἰδότες ὅταν κρού-

<sup>1</sup> Sauppe.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Quintilian 8. 6. 64; Diogenes Laertius 3. 37; Demetrius, *On Style* 21 (this sentence quoted); Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* p. 41.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

about the writing-tablet which they say was found after his death, with the opening words of the *Republic* arranged in various orders ("I went down yesterday to the Piraeus with Glaucon the son of Ariston").<sup>1</sup> Therefore there is surely nothing odd in Demosthenes' also being concerned to secure euphony and melody, and to use no word or thought haphazardly or without scrutiny. For it appears to me far more appropriate in a man who is composing political speeches which are to be permanent memorials to his own powers, that he should not ignore even the smallest details, than it is for painters and engravers, who display their manual skills and industry upon perishable materials, to exhaust the refinements of their artistry on fine veins, young plumage, the first beard's down and minute details of a similar character.<sup>2</sup> Anyone who argued along these lines would not seem to me to make any unreasonable claims; and he might further add that when Demosthenes was still a lad, and had only recently taken up the study of rhetoric, he naturally investigated all the effects which human application to the art could attain<sup>3</sup>; but after long training had led to the acquisition of a greater mastery, and imprinted on his mind marks and impressions of all that he had studied, he henceforth produced his effects with the greatest of ease from sheer force of habit. Something similar happens in other arts whose purpose is a form of activity or production. For example, when highly-skilled players upon the lyre, the harp or the reed-pipe hear an unfamiliar tune,

<sup>2</sup> See *Demosthenes* 51 *sub fin.*

<sup>3</sup> He was trained privately by Isaeus. See [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 839F, 844C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

σεως ἀκούσωσιν ἀσυνήθους, οὐ πολλὰ πραγματευθέντες ἀπαριθμοῦσιν αὐτὴν εὐθύς ἐπὶ τῶν ὀργάνων ἅμα νοήσει· μανθάνοντες δέ γε χρόνῳ τε πολλῶ καὶ πόνῳ τὰς δυνάμεις τῶν φθόγγων ἀναλαμβάνουσιν, καὶ οὐκ εὐθύς αἱ χεῖρες αὐτῶν ἐν ἔξει τοῦ δρᾶν τὰ παραγγελόμενα ἦσαν, ὅψε δέ ποτε καὶ ὅτε ἢ πολλὴ ἄσκησις αὐταῖς εἰς φύσεως ἰσχὺν κατέστησε τὸ ἔθος, τότε τῶν ἔργων ἐγένοντο ἐπιτυχεῖς. καὶ τί δεῖ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων λέγειν; ὁ γὰρ ἅπαντες ἴσμεν, ἀπόχρη καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτῶν διακόψαι τὴν φλυαρίαν. τί δ' ἐστὶ τοῦτο; τὰ γράμματα ὅταν παιδευόμεθα, πρῶτον μὲν τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν ἐκμανθάνομεν, ἔπειτα τοὺς τύπους καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις, εἰθ' οὕτω τὰς συλλαβὰς καὶ τὰ ἐν ταύταις πάθη, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἤδη τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐταῖς, ἐκτάσεις τε λέγω καὶ συστολὰς καὶ προσωδίας καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τούτοις· ὅταν δὲ τὴν τούτων ἐπιστήμην λάβωμεν, τότε ἀρχόμεθα γράφειν τε καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν, κατὰ συλλαβὴν <μὲν><sup>1</sup> καὶ βραδέως τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπειδὰν δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἀξιόλογος προσελθὼν τύπους ἰσχυροὺς αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐμποιήσῃ, τότε ἀπὸ τοῦ ράστου δρῶμεν αὐτὰ καὶ πᾶν ὅ τι ἂν ἐπιδῶ τις βιβλίον ἀπταιστῶς<sup>2</sup> διερχόμεθα ἔξει τε καὶ τάχει ἀπίστῳ.<sup>3</sup> τοιοῦτο δὴ καὶ περὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ περὶ τὴν εὐέπειαν τῶν κώλων ὑποληπτέον γίνεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς ἀθληταῖς

<sup>1</sup> Sadée.

<sup>2</sup> codd.: ἀπταιστῶ Usener.

<sup>3</sup> ἀπίστῳ del. Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

once they have grasped it they have very little trouble in playing it through as quickly as a thought<sup>1</sup> on their instrument. They have come to learn, after much time and toil, the values of the notes, and so can reproduce them. At the beginning of their training their hands were not in a condition to do what they were told, but became capable of the work required of them some time later, after long practice had turned habit into natural accomplishment. But why consider other aspects of the subject? A fact familiar to all of us is sufficient to demolish the whole of our opponents' nonsensical argument. What is this fact? When we are taught to read, first we learn by heart the names of the letters, then their shapes and their values, then, in the same way, the syllables and their effects, and finally words and their properties, by which I mean the ways they are lengthened, shortened, and scanned; and similar functions. And when we have acquired knowledge of these things, we begin to write and read, syllable by syllable and slowly at first.<sup>2</sup> It is only when a considerable lapse of time has implanted firmly in our minds the forms of the words that we execute them with the utmost ease, and we read through any book that is given to us unfalteringly and with incredible confidence and speed. It must be assumed that something of this kind happens with accomplished professional writers when they come to deal with literary composition and the harmonious arrangement of clauses. It is not unnatural to find that those

<sup>1</sup> For the speed of thought, see Homer, *Iliad* 15. 80, *Odyssey* 7. 36. Cf. *Demosthenes* 52 (Vol. I, p. 438, lines 16, 20).

<sup>2</sup> Plato, *Protagoras* 325D.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τοῦ ἔργου. τοὺς δὲ τούτου ἀπείρους ἢ ἀτριβεῖς ἔργου ὄτουοῦν<sup>1</sup> θαυμάζειν καὶ ἀπιστεῖν, εἴ τι κεκρατημένως ὑφ' ἑτέρου γίνεται διὰ τέχνης, οὐκ ἄλογον. πρὸς μὲν οὖν τοὺς εἰωθότας χλευάζειν τὰ παραγγέλματα τῶν τεχνῶν ταῦτα εἰρήσθω.

26 περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐμμελοῦς τε καὶ ἐμμέτρου συνθέσεως τῆς ἐχούσης πολλὴν ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὴν πεζὴν λέξιν τοιαῦτά τινα λέγειν ἔχω, ὡς πρώτη μὲν ἐστὶν αἰτία κἀνταῦθα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὄνπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμέτρου ποιητικῆς ἢ τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν ἀρμογή, δευτέρα δὲ ἢ τῶν κώλων σύνθεσις, τρίτη δὲ ἢ τῶν περιόδων συμμετρία. τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει κατορθοῦν τὰ τῆς λέξεως μόρια δεῖ πολυειδῶς στρέφειν τε καὶ συναρμόττειν καὶ τὰ κῶλα ἐν διαστήμασι ποιεῖν συμμέτρως, μὴ συναπαρτίζοντα τοῖς στίχοις ἀλλὰ διατέμνοντα τὸ μέτρον, ἄνισά τε ποιεῖν αὐτὰ καὶ ἀνόμοια, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ εἰς κόμματα συνάγειν βραχύτερα κώλων, τὰς τε περιόδους μήτε ἰσομεγέθεις μήτε ὁμοιοσχήμονας τὰς γοῦν παρακειμένας ἀλλήλαις ἐργάζεσθαι· ἔγγιστα γὰρ φαίνεται λόγοις τὸ περὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς καὶ τὰ μέτρα πεπλανημένον. τοῖς μὲν οὖν τὰ ἔπη καὶ τοὺς ἰάμβους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ὁμοειδῆ μέτρα κατασκευάζουσιν οὐκ ἔξεστι πολλοῖς διαλαμβάνειν μέτροις ἢ ῥυθμοῖς τὰς ποιήσεις, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη μένειν αἰεὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχήματος·

<sup>1</sup> ἔργου ὄτουοῦν del. Usener.



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

without experience of this, or who are unfamiliar with the practice of any profession, should be surprised and incredulous when something is done with such consummate mastery by another person through artistic accomplishment. This will suffice as a reply to those who are in the habit of scoffing at the rules of rhetorical handbooks.

Concerning composition involving melody and 26 metre which bears a strong resemblance to prose, my opinions are roughly as follows. As with poetical prose, so here too the prime factor is the fitting together of the words themselves; the second, the composition of the clauses; and the third, the balanced arrangement of the periods. Now anyone who wishes to succeed in this part of the task must switch the words in the passage about and connect them with each other in many ways, and variously adjust the lengths of his clauses, not allowing them to complete their sense with the lines but breaking up the metre.<sup>1</sup> He must make the clauses unequal in length and sound, and often reduce them to phrases which are shorter than clauses; and he must render the periods—at least those which are adjacent to one another—neither equal in length nor similar in construction; for it is an irregular metrical scheme that seems to bring verse nearest to prose.<sup>2</sup> Well, those authors who compose in epic or iambic verse, or use the other regular metres, cannot diversify their poetry with a variety of metres and rhythms, but must always adhere to the same form. But the lyric

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the poet must practise *enjambement*. This is particularly the case in the choral lyric of drama. See note 1, p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* 1. 16. 70.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τοῖς δὲ μελοποιοῖς ἔξεστι πολλά μέτρα καὶ ῥυθμοὺς εἰς μίαν ἐμβαλεῖν περίοδον· ὥσθ' οἱ μὲν τὰ μονόμετρα συντιθέντες ὅταν διαλύσωσι τοὺς στίχους τοῖς κώλοις διαλαμβάνοντες ἄλλοτε ἄλλως, διαχέουσι καὶ ἀφανίζουσι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ μέτρου, καὶ ὅταν τὰς περιόδους μεγέθει τε καὶ σχήματι ποικίλας ποιῶσιν, εἰς λήθην ἐμβάλλουσιν ἡμᾶς τοῦ μέτρου· οἱ δὲ μελοποιοὶ πολυμέτρους τὰς στροφὰς ἐργαζόμενοι καὶ τῶν κώλων ἐκάστοτε πάλιν ἀνίσων τε ὄντων καὶ ἀνομοίων ἀλλήλοις ἀνομοίους τε καὶ ἀνίσους ποιούμενοι τὰς διαιρέσεις, δι' ἄμφω δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐὼντες ἡμᾶς ὁμοειδοῦς ἀντίληψιν λαβεῖν ῥυθμοῦ πολλὴν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς λόγους ὁμοιότητα κατασκευάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν, ἔνεστί τε καὶ τροπικῶν καὶ ξένων καὶ γλωττηματικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιητικῶν ὀνομάτων μενόντων ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν μηδὲν ἦττον αὐτὰ φαίνεσθαι λόγῳ παραπλήσια.

μηδεὶς δὲ ὑπολαμβάνετω με ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι κακία ποιήματος ἢ καλουμένη λογοεΐδεια δοκεῖ τις εἶναι, μηδὲ καταγιγνωσκέτω μου ταύτην τὴν ἀμαθίαν, ὡς ἄρα ἐγὼ κακίαν τινὰ ἐν ἀρεταῖς τάπτω ποιημάτων ἢ λόγων· ὡς δὲ ἀξιῶ διαιρεῖν κὰν τούτοις τὰ σπουδαῖα ἀπὸ τῶν μηδενὸς ἀξίων, ἀκούσας μαθέτω. ἐγὼ τοὺς λόγους τὸν μὲν ἰδιώτην ἐπιστάμενος ὄντα, τὸν ἀδολέσχην τοῦτον λέγω καὶ φλύαρον, τὸν δὲ πολιτικόν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πολὺ κατεσκευασμένον ἐστὶ καὶ ἔντεχνον, ὃ τι μὲν ἂν τῶν ποιημάτων ὅμοιον εὐρίσκω τῷ φλυάρῳ καὶ ἀδολέσχῃ, γέλωτος ἀξίον

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

poets can include many metres and rhythms in a single period. Thus when the writers of single-metre verse break up their lines by distributing them into clauses in various ways at different times, they destroy and eliminate the regularity of the metre; and when they vary the length and the construction of the periods, they make us forget the metre.<sup>1</sup> The lyric poets, however, compose their stanzas in many metres; and again, inasmuch as the clauses vary severally in length and sound, they make the divisions unlike in sound and length. By both these means they prevent us from recognizing any uniform rhythm, and thus produce in their lyric poems a great likeness to prose. It is, moreover, possible for the poems to retain figurative, strange, recondite and otherwise poetical words, while none the less showing a close resemblance to prose.

And let no one suppose me ignorant of the fact that the quality called "prosiness" is regarded as a kind of vice in poetry, or charge me, of all people, with the stupidity of classing a vice among the virtues of poetry or prose. Let my critic rather listen and learn how, here again, I claim to distinguish between what merits serious consideration and what is worthy of none. Prose style, as I understand it, is of two kinds, that of the ordinary man, by which I mean the current garrulous nonsense, and the language of public oratory, which is in large measure composed with artistry and skill. Whatever poetry I find

<sup>1</sup> The metre of Greek lyric is remarkable for its variety and complexity, often containing different metres in consecutive lines, though strictly observing correspondence between *strophe* and *antistrophe*. Dionysius is therefore exaggerating slightly here.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τίθεται, ὅ τι δ' ἂν τῷ κατεσκευασμένῳ καὶ ἐντέχνῳ, ζήλου καὶ σπουδῆς ἐπιτήδειον τυγχάνειν οἶομαι. εἰ μὲν οὖν διαφόρου προσηγορίας τῶν λόγων ἐκάτερος ἐτύγχανεν, ἀκόλουθον ἦν ἂν καὶ τῶν ποιημάτων ἃ τούτοις ἔοικεν διαφόροις ὀνόμασι καλεῖν ἐκάτερον· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ τε σπουδαῖος καὶ ὁ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἄξιος ὁμοίως καλεῖται λόγος, οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτάνοι τις τὰ μὲν εἰκότα τῷ καλῷ λόγῳ ποιήματα καλὰ ἡγούμενος, τὰ δὲ τῷ μοχθηρῷ πονηρὰ οὐδὲν ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ λόγου ὁμοειδείας ταραπτόμενος. κωλύσει γὰρ οὐδὲν ἢ τῆς ὀνομασίας ὁμοιότης κατὰ διαφόρων ταπτομένης πραγμάτων τὴν ἐκατέρου φύσιν ὁρᾶν.

εἰρηκῶς δὴ καὶ περὶ τούτων παραδείγματά σοι τῶν εἰρημένων ὀλίγα θεῖς αὐτοῦ κατακλείσω τὸν λόγον. ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἐπικῆς ποιήσεως ταῦτα ἀπόχρη·

αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐκ λιμένος προσέβη τρηχεῖαν ἀταρπὸν·  
ἐν μὲν δὴ τοῦτο κῶλον. ἕτερον δὲ

χῶρον ἂν' ὑλήεντα  
ἔλαττόν τε τοῦ προτέρου καὶ δίχα τέμνον τὸν στίχον.  
τρίτον δὲ τουτί

δι' ἄκριας

ἔλαττον κώλου κομμάτιον. τέταρτον δὲ  
οἶ οἶ Ἀθήνη

πέφραδε δῖον ὑφορβόν  
ἐξ ἡμιστιχίων δύο συγκείμενον καὶ τοῖς προτέροις  
οὐδὲν εἰκόσ. ἔπειτα τὸ τελευταῖον

ὁ οἶ βιότιο μάλιστα  
κῆδετο οἰκῆων οὖς κτήσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

resembling this garrulous nonsense, I regard as worthy only of ridicule, and I regard as fit for serious imitation only that which resembles the artistic and skilful kind. Now if each sort of prose were called by a different name, it would have been only consistent to call each of the corresponding sorts of poetry also by different names. But since both the excellent and the worthless are called "prose", it may not be wrong to regard as fine that poetry which resembles fine prose, and as bad that which resembles inferior prose, and not to be in any way confused by the identity of terms. The use of similar names for different things will not prevent us from discerning their true nature in either case.

Since I have come to speak on these topics, I shall conclude my discourse by giving you here a few examples to illustrate my argument. From epic poetry it will be enough to quote the following lines<sup>1</sup>:

But from the haven went he forth along the  
rugged path

Here we have one clause. The next is:

O'er woody places.

This is shorter than the other, and cuts the line in two. The third is:

and through hills

a segment still shorter than a clause. The fourth:

to where Athene fair

To him had said the loyal swineherd lived,  
consists of two half-lines, and is in no way like the former. Then the conclusion:

who, most of all the serfs

Of lord Odysseus, cared for his estate,

<sup>1</sup> Homer, *Odyssey* 14. 1-7.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀτελῆ<sup>1</sup> μὲν τὸν τρίτον ποιοῦν στίχον, τοῦ δὲ τε-  
τάρτου τῇ προσθήκῃ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἀφηρημένον.  
ἔπειτ' αὖθις

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ εὖρ' ἤμενον  
οὐ συνεκτρέχον οὐδὲ τοῦτο τῷ στίχῳ.

ἔνθα οἱ αὐλῆ

ὑψηλῆ δέδμητο  
ἄνισον καὶ τοῦτο τῷ προτέρῳ. κάπειτα ὁ ἐξῆς  
νοῦς ἀπερίοδος ἐν κώλοις τε καὶ κόμμασι λεγόμε-  
νος· ἐπιθεῖς γὰρ

περισκέπτῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ,

πάλιν ἐποίσει

καλῆ τε μεγάλη τε  
βραχύτερον κώλου κομμάτιον, εἶτα  
περίδρομος

ὄνομα καθ' ἑαυτὸ νοῦν τινα ἔχον. εἶθ' ἐξῆς τὰ  
ἄλλα τὸν αὐτὸν κατασκευάσει τρόπον· τί γὰρ δεῖ  
μηκύνειν;

ἐκ δὲ τῆς ποιήσεως τῆς ἰαμβικῆς τὰ παρ' Εὐρι-  
πίδου ταυτί

ᾠ γαῖα πατρίς ἦν Πέλοψ ὀρίζεται,  
χαῖρε,

τὸ πρῶτον ἄχρι τούτου κῶλον.

ὅς τε πέτραν Ἀρκάδων δυσχείμερον

〈Πάν〉<sup>2</sup> ἐμβατεύεις

τὸ δεύτερον μέχρι τούδε.

<sup>1</sup> codd.: ἐντελῆ Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Musgrave: hiatus indic. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Two characteristics of Homeric style, here illustrated, are the frequency of apposition, most commonly of substantival

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

which leaves the third line unfinished, while by the addition of the fourth it loses all uniformity. Then again:

He found him seated at his doorway,  
where once more the words do not run out the full  
course of the line

where his courtyard wall

Was builded tall.

Again, this line does not balance the former. Further, the order of the ideas in the sequel is unperiodic,<sup>1</sup> even though it is uttered in clauses and phrases. For, after adding

upon a sight with panoramic view,  
we shall find him adding

A great and splendid sight,  
which is a segment shorter than a clause. Then  
encirclable,

where the one word by itself carries a certain meaning. Then we find him elaborating everything that follows in the same way. Why do we need to prolong the illustration?

From iambic poetry may be taken these lines of Euripides<sup>2</sup>:

O fatherland which Pelops' rule defines,  
Hail!

That is the point to which the first clause extends.

And thou, O Pan, who haunt the stormy rocks  
Of Arcady.

That is how far the second extends.

or adjectival phrases, as "a great and splendid sight"; and of loose, concatenated clausal structure, not closely organised round a single verbal nucleus.

<sup>2</sup> Euripides, *Telephus*, Frag. 696 Nauck. The metre is iambic trimeter, the normal metre of tragic narrative and dialogue.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔνθεν εὐχομαι γένος.

τοῦτο τρίτον. τὰ μὲν πρότερα μείζονα στίχου,  
τοῦτο δὲ ἔλαττον.

Αὔγη γὰρ Ἀλέου παῖς με τῷ Τιρυνθίῳ  
τίκτει λαθραίως Ἡρακλεῖ·

μετὰ τοῦτο

ξύννοιδε ὄρος

Παρθένιον,

οὐθέτερον αὐτῶν στίχῳ συμμετρούμενον. εἴτ'  
αὖθις ἕτερον στίχου τε ἔλαττον καὶ στίχου μείζον  
ἔνθα μητέρ' ὠδίνων ἐμὴν

ἔλυσεν Εἰλείθυια

καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τούτοις παραπλήσια.

ἐκ δὲ τῆς μελικῆς τὰ Σιμωνίδεια ταῦτα· γέ-  
γραπται δὲ κατὰ διαστολὰς οὐχ ὦν Ἀριστοφάνης  
ἢ ἄλλος τις κατεσκεύασε κώλων ἄλλ' ὦν ὁ πεζὸς  
λόγος ἀπαιτεῖ. πρόσεχε δὴ τῷ μέλει καὶ ἀναγίν-  
ωσκε κατὰ διαστολὰς, καὶ εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι λήσεταιί σε ὁ  
ῥυθμὸς τῆς ὠδῆς καὶ οὐχ ἕξεις συμβαλεῖν οὔτε  
στροφὴν οὔτε ἀντίστροφον οὔτ' ἐπωδόν, ἀλλὰ  
φανήσεταιί σοι λόγος εἰς εἰρόμενος. ἔστι δὲ ἡ διὰ  
πελάγους φερομένη Δανάη τὰς ἑαυτῆς ἀποδυρομένη  
τύχας·

Ὃτε λάρνακι ἐν δαιδαλέᾳ

ἄνεμός τε ἱμῆνί πνέων

κινηθεῖσά τε λίμνα δείματι

ἔρειπεν, οὐκ ἀδιάντοισι παρειαῖς



## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

whereof I boast my birth.

That is the third. The former two are longer than a line, and the last shorter:

Me Auge, Aleus' child, in secret bore  
Unto Tirynthian Heracles.  
and afterwards

This knows

Yon hill Parthenian.

Neither of these sentences corresponds exactly to a line. Then again there is another clause that is both less than a line and longer than a line:

where from her birth-pangs mother mine,  
The midwife-goddess freed  
and similarly with the lines which follow these.

From lyric poetry we may take these lines of Simonides. They are written not according to those divisions which Aristophanes or some other metrician devised, but according to those demanded by prose. Now look at the ode and read it according to divisions: you can be sure that its rhythmical arrangement will escape you, and you will be unable to guess at any strophe, antistrophe or epode, but it will seem to you clearly to be a continuous piece of prose. The subject is Danaë, being borne across the sea and lamenting her fate<sup>1</sup>:

And when, in the carved ark lying,  
She felt it through darkness drifting  
Before the drear wind's sighing  
And the great sea-ridges lifting,  
She shuddered with terror, tear stained were her  
cheeks

<sup>1</sup> Simonides, Frag. 37 Bergk (text: Page, *PMG*, except as noted; translation: A. S. Way, adapted).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀμφί τε Περσεί βάλλε φίλαν χέρα  
 εἶπέν τε· ὦ τέκος, οἶον ἔχω πόνον·  
 σὺ δ' ἄωτείς,  
 γαλαθηνῶι δ' ἤθει κνωώσσεις  
 ἐν ἀτερπέι δούρατι χαλκεογόμφῳ  
 <τῶ> δε νυκτιλαμπεί  
 κυανέῳ τε <sup>1</sup> δνόφει σταλείς.<sup>2</sup>  
 ἄλμαν <sup>3</sup> δ' ὑπερθεν <sup>4</sup> τεᾶν κομᾶν  
 βαθείαν παριόντος  
 κύματος οὐκ ἀλέγεις οὐδ' ἀνέμου  
 φθόγγον, πορφυρέαι  
 κείμενος ἐν χλανίδι πρόσωπον καλόν.  
 εἰ δέ τοι δεινὸν τό γε δεινὸν ἦν,  
 καί κεν ἐμῶν ῥημάτων  
 λεπτὸν ὑπείχες οὔσας.  
 κέλομαι δ', εὔδε βρέφοις,  
 εὐδέτω δὲ πόντος, εὐδέτω δ' ἄμετρον κακόν.  
 μεταβουλία δέ τις φανείη,  
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἐκ σέο·  
 ὅττι δὲ θαρσαλέον ἔπος εὔχομαι  
 ἢ νόσφι δίκας,  
 σύγγνωθί μοι.

τοιαῦτά ἐστι τὰ ὅμοια τοῖς καλοῖς λόγοις μέτρα  
 καὶ μέλη, διὰ ταύτας γινόμενα τὰς αἰτίας ἃς προ-  
 εἶπά σοι.

τοῦθ' ἔξεις δῶρον ἡμέτερον, ὦ Ῥοῦφε, 'πολλῶν  
 ἀντάξιον ἄλλων', εἰ βουληθείης ἐν ταῖς χερσί τε

<sup>1</sup> om. Page.

<sup>2</sup> Bergk: ταδ' εἰς PMV: ταθείς Schneidewin, Page.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

And she folded her arms round Perseus sleeping;  
And "Oh my baby," she moaned, "for my lot  
Of anguish!—but thou, thou carest not:  
For down sleep's flood is thy child-soul sweeping,  
Though planks brass-welded on every side  
Make a darkness, even had the day not died  
When they launched thee forth on the evening  
tide.

And the surf-crests fly o'er thy tresses fair  
As the waves roll past—thou dost not care:  
Neither carest thou for the wind's shrill cry,  
As lapped in my crimson cloak thou dost lie  
On my breast, little face so fair—so fair!  
And were these sights, these sounds of fear  
Fearsome to thee, that dainty ear  
Would hearken my words—nay, nay, my dear,  
Hear them not thou! Sleep, little baby, sleep;  
And slumber thou, O unrestful deep!  
Sleep, measureless wrongs; let the past suffice:  
And oh, may a new day's dawn arise  
On thy counsels, Zeus! O change them now!  
But if aught be presumptuous in this my prayer,  
If aught, O Father, of sin be there,  
Forgive it Thou."

Such are the verses and lyrics which resemble fine prose, and the causes of the resemblances are those I have explained to you.

Make this gift of mine your own, then, Rufus. You will find it "the match of many others in worth",<sup>1</sup> if only you will keep it in your hands

<sup>1</sup> Homer, *Iliad* 11. 514.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bergk: ἀυλεαν PV: ἀυλαίαν M: ἄχραν Page.

<sup>4</sup> codd.: ὑπερθε Page.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτὸ συνεχῶς ὥσπερ τι καὶ ἄλλο τῶν πάνυ χρησίμων ἔχειν καὶ συνασκεῖν αὐτὸν ταῖς καθ' ἡμέραν γυμνασίαις. οὐ γὰρ αὐτάρκη τὰ παραγγέλματα τῶν τεχνῶν ἐστὶ δεινοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς ποιῆσαι τοὺς βουλομένους γε δίχα μελέτης τε καὶ γυμνασίας· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πονεῖν καὶ κακοπαθεῖν βουλομένοις κεῖται ἢ σπουδαῖα<sup>1</sup> εἶναι τὰ παραγγέλματα καὶ λόγου ἄξια ἢ φαῦλα καὶ ἄχρηστα.

<sup>1</sup> ἢ σπουδαῖα MV: σπουδαῖαν P: σπουδαῖ' ἂν Usener.

## ON LITERARY COMPOSITION

constantly like any other really valuable thing, and exercise yourself in its lessons daily. No rules in the handbooks are capable in themselves of making brilliant performers out of those who intend to dispense with practice and exercise.<sup>1</sup> It lies in the power only of those who are willing to undergo labour and hardship to decide whether such rules are worthless and useless, or worthy of serious consideration.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Isocrates, *Antidosis* 191; Cicero, *De Officiis* 1. 18. 60.



## DINARCHUS

## INTRODUCTION

Dionysius was concerned incidentally with problems of ascription and chronology throughout his career as a literary critic. In the early *Lysias* he shows how, in the absence of internal chronological or other evidence, a developed literary taste could be called into service as the final judge of authorship. In the later *Letter to Pompeius* he conducts a dual biographical enquiry, in a rather more partisan spirit, concerning Aristotle and Demosthenes. He and his friend Caecilius of Caleacte,<sup>1</sup> before recommending specific speeches for their pupils to study as models of Attic purity, had first to establish as positively as possible that these were the genuine work of Attic orators. The only previous systematic attempts at ascription had been made by the librarians of Alexandria and Pergamum. The former, notably Callimachus and Aristophanes of Byzantium, were learned and objective, but probably overworked, and were responsible for some patently absurd ascriptions, like that to Demosthenes of the speech *Against Theocrines*, which contains uncomplimentary references to that orator. It is possible that there

<sup>1</sup> See Blass, *Die griechische Beredsamkeit* (Berlin 1865) pp. 208, 211, 218–21; W. Rhys Roberts in *A.J.P.* 18 (1897), pp. 302–12; K. Barwick, *Probleme der Stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik* (Berlin 1959) pp. 105–9.



## DINARCHUS

were some more discriminating critics with a greater interest in Atticism at Pergamum, but they do not appear to have greatly altered the general situation of confused identity and ascription which Dionysius, Caecilius and other visitors to libraries and booksellers found in the first century B.C. These two men carried out extensive surgery on the catalogues of speeches assigned to the Attic orators by Callimachus,<sup>2</sup> Aristophanes and other unnamed librarians. But the only surviving work of either that deals primarily and systematically with ascription is the essay on Dinarchus.

The reason for the need of such an essay may be the subject himself. Dinarchus was, after Andocides, the least esteemed of the Attic orators. He was "neither an inventor nor a perfecter",<sup>3</sup> but remained permanently in the shadow of his model, Demosthenes.<sup>4</sup> Obviously little attention had been paid to him in the past, and it is possible that the Alexandrine and Pergamene librarians used his low reputation to save themselves the trouble of too much research when confronted with speeches of inferior quality, especially when these could be assigned approximately to the last quarter of the fourth century and bore certain Demosthenic traits. For this reason the transmitted *Corpus Dinarcheum* may well have contained a higher proportion of spurious intrusions than those of most other orators. Other critics had not thought that Dinarchus was of sufficient merit to deserve protection from continued confusion of identity; but Dionysius, while not

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. I, p. 185, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Dinarchus* I *sub init.*

<sup>4</sup> *Dinarchus* 8.

## DINARCHUS

recommending him as a model, allowed the orator some skill and acknowledged his popularity, and therefore undertook to catalogue those speeches which might with some confidence be read as examples of Dinarchus' art. He was also concerned to purify the *Corpus Demosthenicum*, into which a number of speeches more likely to have been by Dinarchus had found their way.

The neglect of Dinarchus by earlier biographers made it necessary for Dionysius to reconstruct the main events of his life. These he obtained from two sources: the orator himself and the local Athenian historian, Philochorus. The resultant outline of the main events of Dinarchus' life provides a chronological framework for the acceptance or rejection of the speeches assigned to him by the librarians. But speeches do not always contain chronological clues, and in these cases the literary critic must take over from the literary historian. Dinarchus' style is difficult to describe because of its chimerical character—now like Lysias, now like Hyperides, now like Demosthenes. The only way to isolate Dinarchus is to observe whether the style under examination contains the essential individual character of one of these orators, and if it does not, to allow it to remain assigned to Dinarchus. The dangers of such a method are obvious, but would presumably be diminished in speeches containing passages in all three styles, since these would suggest an orator of some skill writing after the death of Demosthenes and Hyperides.

When Dionysius comes to examine the speeches themselves, dividing them into four groups (genuine public, spurious public, genuine private, spurious private), in the case of the public spurious speeches

## DINARCHUS

he adopts the same order of treatment as he has outlined in the previous chapters, i.e. speeches rejected by chronological evidence, followed by those rejected by stylistic criteria. The essay breaks off abruptly in the middle of the chapter (13) on spurious private speeches, all of which have been rejected on grounds of chronology. It is therefore possible that some, at least, of the speeches which complete this list are rejected on grounds of style. Dionysius is by no means as derogatory towards Dinarchus as are some critics: in spite of his denial that Dinarchus has much individuality, five of the speeches rejected on stylistic grounds are adjudged in various ways to be unworthy of Dinarchus.

## ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕΙΝΑΡΧΟΥ

1 Περὶ Δεινάρχου τοῦ ῥήτορος οὐδὲν εἰρηκῶς ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραφεῖσιν διὰ τὸ μήτε εὐρετὴν ἰδίου γεγονέναι χαρακτῆρος τὸν ἄνδρα, ὥσπερ τὸν Λυσίαν καὶ τὸν Ἴσοκράτην καὶ τὸν Ἴσαῖον, μήτε τῶν εὐρημένων ἑτέροις τελειωτῆν, ὥσπερ τὸν Δημοσθένη καὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην καὶ <τὸν> <sup>1</sup> Ὑπερείδην ἡμεῖς κρίνομεν, ὁρῶν δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα παρὰ πολλοῖς ἠξιωμένον ὀνόματος ἐπὶ δεινότητι λόγων καὶ ἀπολελοιπότα δημοσίου τε καὶ ἰδίου λόγους οὔτε ὀλίγους οὔτ' εὐκαταφρονήτους, ἠγησάμην δεῖν μὴ παραλιπεῖν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν καὶ διορίσαι τοὺς τε γνησίους καὶ ψευδεῖς λόγους πάντων ἢ τῶν γε πλείστων ἀναγκαιότερον οἶμαι τοῖς μὴ ἐκ περιζώματος ἀσκοῦσι ῥητορικῆν. ἅμα δ' ἐώρων <sup>2</sup> οὐδὲν ἀκριβὲς οὔτε Καλλίμαχον οὔτε τοὺς ἐκ Περγάμου γραμματικούς περὶ αὐτοῦ γράψαντας, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἐξετάσαι περὶ αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀκριβεστέρων ἡμαρτηκότητας, ὡς μὴ μόνον ἐψεῦσθαι πολλὰ ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγους τοὺς οὐδὲν μὲν αὐτῷ προσήκοντας ὡς Δεινάρχου

<sup>1</sup> Westermann.    <sup>2</sup> Usher: δὲ ὁρῶν F: θεωρῶν Radermacher.

<sup>1</sup> See *Introduction* 4 (Vol. I, p. 13).

<sup>2</sup> Poet and librarian at Alexandria during the third century

## DINARCHUS

I said nothing about the orator Dinarchus in my 1  
writings on the ancient orators because he was neither  
the inventor of an individual style, as were Lysias,  
Isocrates and Isaeus, nor the perfecter of styles  
which others had invented, as I judge Demosthenes,  
Aeschines and Hyperides to have been.<sup>1</sup> But I  
observe that many have thought that this man also  
deserves renown for the brilliance of his oratory; I  
observe too that he left both public and private  
speeches which are inconsiderable neither in number  
nor in quality. Therefore I have decided that he  
should not be passed over, but that for serious students  
of rhetoric, who do not wish merely to don the  
trappings of the art, it is imperative, or at any rate a  
matter of high priority, to examine his life and style  
and to distinguish between his genuine and spurious  
speeches. At the same time, however, I saw that  
neither Callimachus<sup>2</sup> nor the grammarians from Per-  
gamum had written any detailed study of him, and  
that through this failure to examine him in greater  
detail they had committed errors which have resulted  
not only in many falsifications but also in the ascrip-  
tion to Dinarchus of many speeches which are not his

B.C., died c. 240 B.C. In addition to his extensive literary  
activities, especially as a poet, his work involved him in prob-  
lems of ascription and identification.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τούτῳ προστίθεσθαι, τοὺς δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφέντας ἐτέρων εἶναι λέγειν· ἀλλὰ Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης, ὃς ἔδοξε γενέσθαι πολυῖστωρ, ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν ὁμωνύμων πραγματείᾳ λέγων καὶ περὶ τούτου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ὑπόληψιν παρασχών, ὡς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέξων τι ἀκριβές, διεψεύσθη τῆς δόξης. οὐθὲν δὲ κωλύει καὶ τὰς λέξεις παραθέσθαι τοῦ ἀνδρός. ἔστι δὲ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφέντα τάδε·

Ἐπειδὴ δ' ἐνετύχομεν τέτταρσιν· ὧν ἔστιν ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ῥητόρων τῶν Ἀττικῶν, ὁ δὲ τὰς περὶ Κρήτην συναγήοχε μυθολογίας, ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος μὲν ἀμφοῖν τούτων, Δήλιος δὲ τὸ γένος, πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος, τοῦτο δὲ πράγματα, τέταρτος δὲ ὁ περὶ Ὀμήρου λόγον συντεθεικώς. ἐθέλω δὲ πρὸς μέρος περὶ ἐκάστου διελθεῖν, καὶ πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ῥήτορος. ἔστι τοίνυν οὗτος κατὰ γε τὴν ἐμὴν δόξαν οὐδὲν ἀπολείπων τῆς Ἰπερείδου χάριτος, ὥστ' εἰπεῖν· καὶ νύ κεν ἦ παρέλασεν. ἐνθύμημα γὰρ φέρει πειστικὸν καὶ σχῆμα παντοδαπὸν, πιθανότητός γε μὴν οὕτως εὖ ἦκει, ὥστε παριστάνειν τοῖς ἀκούουσι, μὴ ἄλλως γεγονέναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει. καὶ νομίσειεν ἂν τις εὐήθεις εἶναι τοὺς ὑπολαβόντας τὸν λόγον τὸν κατὰ Δημοσθένους εἶναι τούτου· πολὺ γὰρ ἀπέχει τοῦ χαρακτήρος. ἀλλ' ὅμως τοσοῦτον σκότους ἐπιπεπόλακεν, ὥστε τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους

<sup>1</sup> See Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, pp. 16–22.

<sup>2</sup> Rhetorician and polymath, contemporary of Cicero and

## DINARCHUS

at all, and to others of speeches which were written by him.<sup>1</sup> Even Demetrius of Magnesia,<sup>2</sup> who had a reputation for great learning, referring to this orator in his work *On Namesakes*, and giving a critique in which he thought he was going to say something special about him, was completely deceived in his expectation. There is no reason why I should not quote the scholar's words:

“ We have come across four Dinarchuses: one is one of the Attic Orators; one has collected the myths about Crete; another, earlier than either of these and a Delian by birth, has written both epic poetry and history; while the fourth is the man who composed a treatise on Homer.<sup>3</sup> I propose to describe each in turn, beginning with the orator. Now, in my opinion at any rate, this orator is in no way inferior to Hyperides in charm, so that one could say “ he might even have surpassed him ”<sup>4</sup>; for his argumentation<sup>5</sup> carries conviction and he uses a variety of figures. Indeed, he is so accomplished in the art of persuasion that he can implant in his audience's mind a conviction that the action took place exactly as he himself describes it.<sup>6</sup> Now those who suppose that the speech against Demosthenes is by him might be thought silly, for its style is very different from his. And yet so much obscurity has prevailed about his

friend of Atticus, and one of the chief biographical sources of Diogenes Laertius. See *Ad Atticum* 4. 11. 2; 8. 11. 7, 12. 6; 9. 9. 2; Diogenes Laertius 1. 38, 79, 112, 113 etc.

<sup>3</sup> Of these, apart from the orator, only the Delian Dinarchus seems to have been generally known in later antiquity. See Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* 18. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Homer, *Iliad* 23. 382.

<sup>5</sup> See note 2, p. 267.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Lysias* 7 (Vol. I, p. 33).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτοῦ λόγους σχεδὸν που ὑπὲρ ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ὄντας <πάντας> <sup>1</sup> ἀγνοεῖν συμβέβηκε, τὸν δὲ μὴ γραφέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μόνον ἐκείνου νομίζεσθαι. ἢ δὲ λέξις ἐστὶ τοῦ Δεινάρχου κυρίως ἠθική, πάθος κινούσα, σχεδὸν τῇ πικρία μόνον καὶ τῷ τόνῳ τοῦ Δημοσθενικοῦ χαρακτῆρος λειπομένη, τοῦ δὲ πιθανοῦ καὶ κυρίου μηδὲν ἐνδέουσα.'

2 ἐκ τούτων οὐδὲν ἔστιν οὔτε ἀκριβὲς ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀληθὲς εὐρεῖν· οὔτε γὰρ γένος τάνδρος οὔτε χρόνους, καθ' οὓς ἦν, οὔτε τόπον, ἐν ᾧ διέτριψε, δεδήλωκεν, ὀνόματα δὲ μόνον κοινὰ καὶ περιτρέχοντα ἐσπούδασε καὶ πλήθος λόγων εἶπεν οὐδενὶ τῶν . . .<sup>2</sup> σύμφωνον. ἔδει δὲ τούναντίον. ἂ οὖν ἐγὼ αὐτὸς δι' ἐμαυτοῦ κατελαβόμην, ταῦτ' ἐστίν·

Δείναρχος ὁ ῥήτωρ υἱὸς μὲν ἦν Σωστράτου, Κορίνθιος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἀφικόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας, καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἦνθουν αἱ τε τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ ῥητόρων διατριβαί, Θεοφράστῳ τε συνεγένετο καὶ Δημητρίῳ τῷ Φαληρεῖ. εὐφυῆς δὲ περὶ τοὺς πολιτικούς λόγους γενόμενος ἀκμαζόντων ἔτι τῶν περὶ Δημοσθένην ἤρξατο λόγους γράφειν καὶ προῆει κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς δόξαν. μάλιστα δὲ ἤκμασε μετὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτήν, Δημοσθένους μὲν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων φυγαῖς αἰδίους καὶ θανάτοις

<sup>1</sup> Radermacher.

<sup>2</sup> Hiatus forsitan ὑπ' ἄλλων γραφέντων supplendus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Lysias* 8 (Vol. I, p. 33).



## DINARCHUS

work that as a result, while the rest of his output, numbering something in excess of 160 speeches, is totally unknown, this speech, which he did not write, is regarded as his only work. Dinarchus' diction portrays moral character in standard language <sup>1</sup> and is capable of arousing emotion. In general, it falls short of Demosthenes' style only in pungency and intensity, and is in no way deficient in persuasiveness and natural expression."

There is nothing precise or even informative to be gathered from this: he has disclosed neither the orator's family, nor the time in which he lived, nor the place. He has devoted his energies merely to using common words enjoying current vogue,<sup>2</sup> and to making a lot of statements which do not agree <with the judgment of others>. He should have done the opposite. So this is what I have gathered through my own research: 2

The orator Dinarchus was the son of Sostratus, and a Corinthian by birth. He came to Athens at the time when the philosophical schools were in their heyday, and attended the classes of Theophrastus <sup>3</sup> and Demetrius of Phalerum.<sup>4</sup> Having revealed a natural talent for political oratory, he began to write speeches when Demosthenes and his party were still at the height of their power, and gradually acquired a reputation. His finest period was after the death of Alexander,<sup>5</sup> when Demosthenes and the other orators had been sentenced to permanent exile or

<sup>2</sup> Standard critical vocabulary does not seem to have changed in the generation that separated Demetrius from Dionysius.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. I, pp. xii-xiv.

<sup>4</sup> See Vol. I, p. viii.

<sup>5</sup> 323 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

περιπεσόντων, οὐδενὸς δ' ὑπολειπομένου μετ' αὐτοὺς ἀνδρὸς ἀξίου λόγου. καὶ διατετέλεκεν ἑτῶν πεντεκαίδεκα χρόνον λόγους συγγράφων τοῖς βουλομένοις, ἕως Κάσσανδρος τὴν πόλιν κατέσχευεν. ἐπὶ δὲ Ἀναξικράτους ἄρχοντος, ἐφ' οὗ κατέλυσαν τὴν ἐν τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ φρουρὰν ὑπὸ Κασσάνδρου κατασταθεῖσαν οἱ περὶ Ἀντίγονον καὶ Δημήτριον <τοὺς><sup>1</sup> βασιλεῖς, αἰτίαν ἔχων ἅμα τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις Ἀθηναίων καίτοι ξένος αὐτὸς ὢν καταλύσαι τὸν δῆμον, ὁρῶν ἠρεθισμένους τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ μάλιστα τῷ πλουτεῖν ἑαυτὸν ὑφορωμένους, μὴ διὰ τοῦτο πάθῃ τι δεινόν, εἰσελθεῖν μὲν εἰς δικαστήριον οὐχ ὑπέμεινε, ἐξελθὼν δὲ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἔλθων εἰς Χαλκίδα τὴν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ, τὸν ἀπ' Ἀναξικράτους χρόνον ἕως Φιλίππου πεντεκαίδεκαετῆ γενόμενον ἐκεῖ διέτριψεν, εἴ τις αὐτῷ γένοιτο διὰ Θεοφράστου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων κάθοδος, περιμένων.

- 3 συγχωρήσαντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως μετὰ <τῶν><sup>1</sup> ἄλλων φυγάδων κακείνῳ κατελθεῖν, ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ παρ' ἐνὶ τῶν φίλων Προξένῳ καταχθεῖς <τὸ><sup>1</sup> χρυσίον ἀπολλύει γηραιὸς ὢν ἤδη καὶ τὰς ὄψεις ἀσθενής. ὀλιγώρως δ' ἔχοντας τοῦ Προξένου πρὸς τὴν ζήτησιν, δίκην ἔλαχεν αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν χρημάτων αὐτὸς οὐδεπώποτε πρότερον εἰς δικαστήριον παρελθὼν. οὗτος μὲν ὁ βίος τῶνδρός. ἀποδείκνυται δ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἕκ τε τῶν ἱστοριῶν τῶν Φιλοχόρου καὶ ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς περὶ

<sup>1</sup> Radermacher.

<sup>1</sup> Demosthenes and Hyperides died in 322 B.C., Lycurgus in 324 B.C.

## DINARCHUS

death,<sup>1</sup> and no other orator worthy of note was left to succeed them. He spent fifteen years, during which Cassander gained control over the city,<sup>2</sup> writing speeches for those who wanted them. But during the archonship of Anaxicrates,<sup>3</sup> when the kings Antigonos and Demetrius<sup>4</sup> and their followers removed the garrison which had been installed in Munychia by Cassander, he was accused, along with some of the most illustrious Athenians, of subverting the democracy. Seeing that the Athenians were incensed, and that in particular they were suspicious of his growing wealth, in order to avoid suffering some dire penalty for this he did not await trial, but left the city and came to Chalcis in Euboea, and there spent the fifteen years from the archonship of Anaxicrates to that of Philippus<sup>5</sup> waiting to see whether he would be recalled through the good offices of Theophrastus and his other friends.

When the king had agreed that he should return 3 along with the other exiles, he came back to Athens and went to live in the house of one of his friends, Proxenus. There, now an old man with failing eyesight, he lost his money. When Proxenus neglected to conduct a proper search for it, he filed a suit against him and appeared in court in person, having never done so before. Such was the orator's life. Each detail is to be found in the history of Philochorus and in the account which he himself in-

<sup>2</sup> 317 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> 307/6 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> Demetrius Poliorcetes, son of Antigonos I here mentioned, the Macedonian heirs to Alexander's European kingdom; the third Demetrius referred to in this essay. See note 2, page 253 and note 4, p. 255.

<sup>5</sup> 307/6-292/1 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτοῦ ξυνέγραφεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ κατὰ Προξένου, ὃς εἴρηται μὲν μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν, προσκειμένην δὲ ἔχει τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην· 'Δείναρχος Σωστράτου Κορίνθιος Προξένω, ᾧ σύνειμι, βλάβης ταλάντων δύο. ἔβλαψέ με Πρόξενος, ὑποδεξάμενος εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἐν ἀγρῷ, ὅτε πεφευγὼς Ἀθήνηθεν κατήειν ἐκ Χαλκίδος, χρυσίου μὲν στατῆρας ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ διακοσίους καὶ πέντε, οὓς ἐκόμισα ἐκ Χαλκίδος εἰδότος Προξένου καὶ εἰσηλθὼν ἔχων εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, ἀργυρώματα δὲ οὐκ ἔλαττον εἴκοσι μνῶν ἄξια, ἐπιβουλεύσας τούτοις.' οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ εὐθὺς μὲν ἐν ἀρχῇ περὶ τοῦ μηδεμίαν δίκην πρότερον εἰσελθεῖν δεδήλωκεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς [πρότερον]<sup>1</sup> μετὰ ταῦτα πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τὴν βλάβην τὴν γενομένην αὐτῷ διὰ Προξένου δεδήλωκεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐξῆς περὶ τε τῆς φυγῆς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διεξέρχεται πάντων, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φανερά τὰ προειρημένα, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις, ὅτι ξένος διέμεινε καὶ γέρων ἤδη ὧν εἶπε τὸν λόγον, ἐξ ὧν ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τῆς δίκης εἴρηκε.

ταῦτα μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Δείναρχος περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς ἱστορίαις περὶ τε τῆς φυγῆς τῶν καταλυσάντων τὸν δῆμον καὶ περὶ τῆς καθόδου πάλιν οὕτως λέγει· 'Τοῦ γὰρ Ἀναξικράτους ἄρχοντος εὐθὺς μὲν ἢ τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλις ἐάλω· ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ <βασιλεὺς><sup>2</sup> κατελθὼν ἐκ τῶν Μεγάρων κατεσκευάζετο τὰ πρὸς τὴν Μουνυχίαν καὶ τὰ τεῖχη κατασκάψας ἀπέδωκε τῷ δήμῳ.

<sup>1</sup> del. Radermacher.

<sup>2</sup> Radermacher.

## DINARCHUS

corporated in his speech against Proxenus, which was delivered after his exile and has this indictment attached to it: "I, Dinarchus, son of Sostratus, a Corinthian, claim damages from Proxenus, with whom I am lodging, to the sum of two talents. Proxenus inflicted this damage upon me after receiving into his house in the country 285 gold staters which I brought when I returned from Chalcis after a period of exile from Athens. He knew that I had brought this money, and that I had it with me when I entered his house. I also had silver plate worth not less than 20 minae. He planned to misappropriate this property." Further to this, at the very beginning of the speech itself he has disclosed that he has not appeared in any lawsuit before, and then, as the first point in his introductory section, he has disclosed the damage he has sustained as a result of Proxenus' actions, and in the next passage gives details of his exile and of all the other facts from which the clear account given above is derived. In addition to this, the fact that he remained an alien and was already advanced in age when he made the speech is evident from what he has said at the end of the speech.

These are the facts which Dinarchus personally tells us about himself. Philochorus, writing in his *Attic History* about the exile of the men who overthrew the democracy and their return, gives the following additional information<sup>1</sup>: "At the beginning of the archonship of Anaxicrates the city of the Megareans was captured; and King Demetrius, on returning from Megara, began his military preparations against Munychia and, having razed its walls to the ground, restored it to the democratic govern-

<sup>1</sup> Frag. Gr. Hist. 328 F66 (Jacoby III i, pp. 340-5).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ὑστερον δὲ εἰσηγγέλθησαν πολλοὶ <τῶν><sup>1</sup> πολιτῶν, ἐν οἷς καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς. τῶν δ' εἰσαγγελθέντων οὓς μὲν οὐχ ὑπομείναντας τὴν κρίσιν ἐθανάτωσαν τῇ ψήφῳ, οὓς δ' ὑπακούσαντας ἀπέλυσαν.<sup>2</sup> ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τῆς ὀγδόης. ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐνάτῃ φησί· 'Τοῦ δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ τουδὶ διελθόντος, ἑτέρου δ' εἰσιόντος, ἐν ἀκροπόλει σημεῖον ἐγένετο τοιοῦτον· κύων εἰς τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος νεῶν εἰσελθοῦσα καὶ δῦσα εἰς τὸ Πανδρόσειον, ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀναβᾶσα τοῦ Ἐρκείου Διὸς τὸν ὑπὸ τῇ ἐλαίᾳ κατέκειτο. πάτριον δ' ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, κύνα μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν. περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ χρόνον καὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἡλίου τ' ἐξέχοντος καὶ οὕσης αἰθρίας ἀστὴρ ἐπὶ τινα χρόνον ἐγένετο ἐκφανής. ἡμεῖς δ' ἐρωτηθέντες ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ σημείου καὶ τοῦ φαντάσματος, εἰς ὃ φέρει, φυγάδων κάθοδον ἔφαμεν προσημαίνειν ἀμφότερα καὶ ταύτην οὐκ ἐκ μεταβολῆς πραγμάτων ἐσομένην, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ καθεστῶσῃ πολιτείᾳ· καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεσθῆναι συνέβη.'

- 4 προειρημένων δὴ τούτων ἐν ἔτι λείπεται καὶ ἀναγκαιότατον, τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ διορίσαι, ἵνα καὶ περὶ τῶν λόγων τῶν τε γνησίων αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ σαφές τι ἔχωμεν λέγειν. τίθεμεν δὴ αὐτὸν ἑβδομηκοστὸν ἔχοντα ἔτος ἀπὸ τῆς φυγῆς κατεληλυθέναι, ὡς καὶ αὐτός φησι, γέροντα αὐτὸν ἀποκαλῶν· ἀφ' οὗ

<sup>1</sup> Krüger.

<sup>1</sup> Frag. Gr. Hist. 328 F67 (Jacoby III i, pp. 345-6).

<sup>2</sup> A practical recognition of canine habits translated into a

## DINARCHUS

ment. But later many of the citizens were impeached, and Demetrius of Phalerum was one of these. And of the men impeached, those who did not await the verdict of a trial they condemned to death by decree, but those who submitted they set free." This is from the eighth book. In the ninth book he says <sup>1</sup>: "When this year had ended and the next was beginning this portent occurred on the Acropolis: a bitch came into the temple of Athene Polias, entered the Pandrosion, climbed up on to the altar of Zeus Herceius beneath the olive tree, and lay down. It is an ancestral custom of the Athenians that no dog is allowed to go up to the Acropolis.<sup>2</sup> And also around the same time, during daylight when the sun was out and the air was clear, a star was plainly visible for a time in the sky.<sup>3</sup> And we, on being questioned as to the meaning of the portent and the apparition, said that both foretold a return of exiles, and that this would happen not as a result of revolution but under the existing government; and it came about that this interpretation was fulfilled."

After these prefatory remarks there still remains 4  
one very necessary task, to determine his life-span, in order to be able to say something definite on the matter of which speeches are genuinely his and which are not. Now we assume that he returned from exile at the age of seventy, as he himself says when he calls himself an old man; since it is from this age onwards

taboo. For a parallel, see Frazer, *The Golden Bough* x, p. 4 (a dog may not enter the house of an Ibo priest).

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps a unique record: the appearance of stars by day is accompanied by overcast skies in Ammianus Marcellinus 20. 3. 1. Cf. Julius Capito, *Pertinax* 14. 3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

χρόνου καὶ καλεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ταύτῃ μάλιστα εἰώθαμεν. ὑποκειμένων δὲ τούτων ὀλοσχερεῖ λογισμῶ (τὸ γὰρ ἀκριβὲς οὐκ ἔχομεν) εἴη ἂν κατὰ Νικόφημον ἄρχοντα γεγονώς. εἰ δέ τις ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἢ νεώτερον τῶν εἰρημένων χρόνων αὐτὸν εἶναι φήσει, πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν ὑγιὲς λέγειν καὶ λόγους αὐτῷ πολλοὺς ἀφελεῖται, μᾶλλον δὲ πάντας πλὴν πέντε ἢ ἕξ, τῶν μὲν πρεσβύτερον αὐτόν, τῶν δὲ νεώτερον εἶναι λέγων. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄρξασθαι λέγοντες αὐτὸν λόγους συγγράφειν ἀπὸ τοῦ πέμπτου ἢ ἕκτου πρὸς τῷ εἰκοστῷ ἔτους οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοιμεν, ἄλλως τε καὶ τῶν περὶ Δημοσθένη τότε ἀκμαζόντων. ἕκτος δὲ καὶ εἰκοστός ἐστιν ἀπὸ Νικοφήμου Πυθόδημος. ὥσθ' ὅσους εὐρίσκομεν πρεσβυτέρους τούτου τοῦ ἄρχοντος [τοὺς φερομένους εἰς αὐτὸν λόγους]<sup>1</sup> εἴ τις γνησίους θήσεται, ἀπιστοίημεν ἂν εἰκότως· ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπ' Ἀναξικράτους ἕως Φιλίππου τετελεσμένους ἀγῶνας ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ψευδέσιν ἀναγράφοιμεν ἂν· οὐ γὰρ εἰς Χαλκίδα ἂν τινες ἔπλεον λόγων χάριν ἢ ἰδίων ἢ δημοσίων· οὐ γὰρ τέλεον ἠπόρουσιν οὕτω λόγων.

- 5 ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ χρόνος τάνδρος ὡς οἶόν τε ἀκριβέστατα εὔρηται, πρὸς ὃν καὶ τῶν λόγων τοὺς τε γνησίους καὶ μὴ διακρινούμεν, καιρὸς ἤδη καὶ περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος αὐτοῦ λέγειν. ἔστι δὲ δυσόριστον. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτε κοινὸν οὔτ' ἴδιον ἔσχεν οὔτ' ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις οὔτ' ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀγῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς

<sup>1</sup> del. Radermacher.



## DINARCHUS

that we most commonly call men at this time of life old.<sup>1</sup> If we base our calculations upon this general approximation (for we have no other precise information), he would have been born during the archonship of Nicophemus.<sup>2</sup> If anyone says that he was born earlier or later than the date stated he will, in addition to adopting an unsound argument, also be depriving him of many of his speeches, or rather all except five or six; for he will be saying that he was too old to have written some and too young to have written others. What is more, we should not be wrong if we were to say that he began to write speeches at the age of twenty-five or twenty-six, especially since Demosthenes and his party were at the height of their power at that time. Pythodemus is the twenty-sixth archon after Nicophemus.<sup>3</sup> Therefore if anyone assumes as genuine any speeches that we find to be earlier than the year of this archon, we may reasonably disbelieve him; and again we might similarly include in the list of spurious speeches those completed between the archonships of Anaxicrates and Philippus<sup>4</sup>: for nobody would have sailed to Chalcis for speeches, either public or private: they were not so completely at a loss for speeches.

Now that we have established the orator's life-time 5  
as accurately as possible for use as a criterion to distinguish which of his speeches are genuine and which are not, it is time to turn to his style. It is difficult to define, for he possessed no quality common to all his oratory, or any individual characteristic, either in his private or in his public speeches, but in

<sup>1</sup> So Pseudo-Plutarch in his catalogue of *Longaevi*.

<sup>2</sup> 361/0 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> 336/5 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> 307 to 291 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Λυσίου παραπλήσιος ἔστιν ὅπου γίνεται καὶ τοῖς Ὑπερείδου καὶ τοῖς Δημοσθένους λόγοις. καὶ τούτων πολλὰ ἂν τις ἔχοι παραδείγματα ἐκθέσθαι. τοῦ μὲν Λυσιακοῦ χαρακτήηρος ἔν τε τῷ περὶ Μνησικλέους λόγῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λυσικράτους ὑπὲρ Νικομάχου καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις πολλοῖς. τοῦ δ' Ὑπεριδείου ταῖς τε οἰκονομίαις ἀκριβεστέρου καὶ ταῖς κατασκευαῖς γενναιοτέρου πως ὄντος τῶν Λυσιακῶν ἐν πλείοσι μὲν ἢ τριάκοντα Δεινάρχου λόγοις παραδείγματα εὔρεῖν ἔστιν, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ἀγάθωνος διαμαρτυρίας. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Δημοσθενικοῦ χαρακτήηρος, ὃν μάλιστα ἐμιμήσατο, πολὺ πλείω δύναιτ' ἂν τις εἰπεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Πολυεύκτου. προοιμιάζεται γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐκείνῳ, καὶ δι' ὅλου τοῦ λόγου παραπλήσιος μεμένηκε.

6 πῶς οὖν ἂν τις δυνηθείη τοὺς γνησίους αὐτῷ γνωρίζειν λόγους; πρῶτον μὲν εἰ ἐπίσταιτο τοὺς τῶν ἄλλων χαρακτήηρας, ἔπειτα τοὺς μὲν Λυσίου παραπλησίους λόγους τούτῳ προσφέρει, τοὺς δ' Ὑπερείδου δόξαντας εἶναί τισι Δεινάρχου λέγοι μακρὰ ταῖς ἐπιγραφαῖς τῶν βυβλίων χαίρειν εἰπών, τοὺς δὲ τῷ Δημοσθενικῷ χαρακτήηρι προσεληλυθότας ὡς οἶόν τε τούτου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διαβεβαιοῖτο εἶναι. ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων, οὓς μεμίμηται, μεγίστη γνῶσις ἢ ὁμοεῖδεια τῶν λόγων. αὐτίκα ὁ μὲν Λυσίας ἔν τε τοῖς ἰδίῳις καὶ τοῖς δημοσίῳις ἀγῶσιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ὁμολογούμενός

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Ch. 7 below. Hyperides' all-round qualities, and in particular his *acumen*, won him high esteem among the

## DINARCHUS

some places he shows a close resemblance to Lysias, in others to Hyperides, and in others to Demosthenes. One could furnish many examples to illustrate this. Examples of the Lysianic style are to be found in the speech about Mnesicles, the speech for Nicomachus against Lysicrates, and many others; of the Hyperidean, which is more precise in its arrangement and somehow nobler in its artistry than that of Lysias,<sup>1</sup> examples are to be found in more than thirty of Dinarchus' speeches, and not least in the demurrer on behalf of Agathon. And again, one could mention many more examples of the Demosthenic style, which he imitated most of all, particularly in the speech against Polyeuctus: for he models his introduction on Demosthenes, and continues to resemble him closely throughout the speech.

How, then, would one be able to recognise those speeches which are genuinely his? Firstly, if he knew the styles of the other orators, and then ascribed to our orator those speeches which are like those of Lysias, and said that those which are thought by some to be by Hyperides are by Dinarchus, paying no attention whatsoever to the titles on the scrolls; and if he affirmed as strongly as possible that those speeches which approximate to the Demosthenic style are by our author. For in the case of the other orators whom he imitates, the most effective means of recognition is the uniformity of their speeches. For example, Lysias shows self-consist-

critics. See *On the Sublime* 34, Cicero, *De Oratore* 3. 28, *Orator* 110, [Dionysius], *De Imitatione* B 5 (U-R II p. 213), Quintilian 10. 1. 77, Dio Chrysostom 18. 11, Hermogenes, *Περὶ ιδέων* β 11 (Spengel II p. 411).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔστιν . . .<sup>1</sup> εἰς δὲ τὸν λεκτικὸν τόπον κατὰ τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων σαφήνειαν καὶ σύνθεσιν αὐτοφυῆ μὲν καὶ λείαν εἶναι δοκοῦσαν, παντὸς δὲ λόγου κατὰ τὴν ἡδονὴν διαφέρουσιν. ὁ δ' Ὑπερείδης κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἠττάται Λυσίου, κατὰ δὲ τὸν πραγματικὸν τόπον διαφέρει. διηγείται δὲ πολλαχῶς, ποτὲ μὲν κατὰ φύσιν ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν πορευόμενος. πιστοῦται <τε><sup>2</sup> οὐ κατ' ἐνθύμημα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' ἐπιχείρημα πλατύνων. ὁ δὲ τούτους τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας ὑπερβαλλόμενος Δημοσθένης, ἅπαντα μιμησάμενος καὶ πάντων τὰ κάλλιστα ἐκλεξάμενος, δῆλος μὲν καὶ τῆ φωνῆ μόνον, δῆλος δὲ καὶ τῷ καθ' ἓνα ἕκαστον λόγον πρέποντι, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ <τῆ><sup>3</sup> συνθέσει καὶ τῷ τῶν σχηματισμῶν ἀγκύλω καὶ τῆ οἰκονομίᾳ καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τὸ μέγιστον τῆ δεινότητι. ὁ δὲ Δεινάρχος οὔτε ὅμοιος ἐν ἅπασιν ἔστιν οὔτ' ἰδίου τινὸς εὐρετής, δι' οὗ γινώσεται τις αὐτὸν ἀκριβῶς, ἢ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· πολὺ γὰρ ἐμφαίνει μιμήσεις τε καὶ αὐτῶν ὡς πρὸς τῶν λόγων τὰρχέτυπον διαφορὰν, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους.

7 ἔστωσαν δὴ τινες ἐπιγραφόμενοι λόγοι ὡς ὄντες Δεινάρχου, πολλὴν ἔχοντες πρὸς τὰ Λυσιακὰ ὁμοιότητα. τούτων ὁ βουλόμενος ποιείσθαι τὴν διάγνωσιν πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ἰδιότητα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκείνου

<sup>1</sup> Lacunam indic. Radermacher.

<sup>2</sup> Radermacher.

<sup>3</sup> Reiske.

## DINARCHUS

ency in both his private and his public speeches . . . and in respect of diction, the lucidity of his language, the apparent naturalness and smoothness of his composition, which, however is pleasing beyond all description.<sup>1</sup> Hyperides, on the other hand, is inferior to Lysias in his choice of words, but superior in his treatment of subject-matter. He composes his narrative in a variety of ways, proceeding sometimes according to the natural order of events, at other times from the end to the beginning. In his proofs he not only uses the enthymeme, but also expatiates by means of the epichireme.<sup>2</sup> But Demosthenes, who surpasses these and all others, having adopted all these devices and selected the best features of all writers, was obviously superior for his expression alone; obviously also for the individual appropriateness of each of his speeches; and not only for that, but also for his composition, the complexity of his figures of speech, his arrangement, his emotional power, and, most of all, his brilliance. But Dinarchus is neither uniform in all his speeches nor the inventor of an individual style by which one can recognise him with accuracy, except in this way; he displays many examples of imitation and of difference from the original models of the speeches themselves, as is the case with the pupils of Isocrates and Isocrates himself.

Now let it be supposed that certain speeches have Dinarchus' name inscribed upon them, and are very similar to the Lysianic speeches. Anyone who wishes to decide between the two authors should

<sup>1</sup> See *Lysias* 4, 10.

<sup>2</sup> For the difference between the enthymeme and the epichireme, see note on *Isaeus* 16 in Vol. I, pp. 212-13.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

θεωρείτω, ἔπειτ' εἰ μὲν ἀρετὴν τε καὶ χάριν τοῖς λόγοις ἐπανθοῦσαν ἴδῃ καὶ τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογὴν ἐνοῦσαν καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἄψυχον εἶναι τῶν λεγομένων, θαρρῶν λεγέτω τούτους Λυσίου. εἰ δὲ μήτε <τὸ><sup>1</sup> χάριεν ὅμοιον εὐρίσκη μήτε τὸ πιθανὸν καὶ τὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀκριβὲς μήτε <τὸ><sup>2</sup> τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπτόμενον, ἐν τοῖς Δεινάρχου λόγοις αὐτοὺς εἶπω. ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Ὑπερείδου· εἰ τῆς μὲν λέξεως τὸ ἰσχυρόν, τῆς δὲ συνθέσεως τὸ ἀπλοῦν, τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων τὸ εὐκαιρον, τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς τὸ μὴ τραγικὸν μηδὲ ὀγκῶδες ἔχη (ταῦτα γὰρ μέγιστα ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἰδιά ἐστιν), Ὑπερείδου λεγέτω. εἰ δὲ ἐνδεεστερώς ἐν αὐτοῖς τούτοις ἔχη, κἂν τὰ ἄλλα πάντα μὴ φαύλως ἢ γεγραμμένα, ἐν τοῖς Δεινάρχου πάλιν ἀναγραφέτω. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ περὶ Δημοσθένους ὑπολαμβάνομεν. εἰ μὲν καὶ ἡ τῆς λέξεως μεγαλοπρέπεια καὶ ἡ τῆς συνθέσεως ἐξαλλαγὴ καὶ τὸ τῶν παθῶν ἔμψυχον καὶ τὸ διὰ πάσης κεραίας διῆκον πικρὸν καὶ νοερὸν τό τε πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ δεινότης πᾶσι παρέπηται, μηθὲν ἔτι τὸ κωλῦον ἔστω <ἐν τοῖς><sup>3</sup> Δημοσθένους αὐτοὺς ἀναγράφειν. εἰ δ' ἐλλείπη τὸ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τούτων ἄκρον ἢ τὸ διὰ πάσης ἰδέας ὅμοιον μενέτωσαν ἐν τοῖς Δειναρχείοις. ὡς δὲ καθόλου εἰπεῖν, δύο τρόπους τῆς διαφορᾶς ὡς πρὸς τὰ ἀρχαῖα μιμήσεως εὔροι τις ἄν· ὧν ὁ μὲν φυσικὸς τέ ἐστι καὶ ἐκ πολλῆς κατηχήσεως καὶ συντροφίας λαμβανόμενος, ὁ δὲ τούτῳ προσεχῆς

<sup>1</sup> Sylburg.

<sup>2</sup> Reiske.

<sup>3</sup> Reiske.

## DINARCHUS

first contemplate the individual style of that famous orator; then, if he sees that the speeches are adorned with excellence and charm, and contain his careful choice of words and no lack of animation in what is said, let him confidently assert that these are by Lysias.<sup>1</sup> But if he finds no such qualities of charm or persuasiveness or precision of language or close adherence to reality, let him leave them among the speeches of Dinarchus. The same applies to the speeches of Hyperides: if they contain his forcefulness of diction, his simplicity of composition and his effective timing in the treatment of subject-matter, and there is no melodramatic or bombastic artificiality (for these are that orator's most important characteristics), let him assert that these are by Hyperides. But if they are rather deficient in these particular qualities, even though in all other respects they are not badly written, let him assign them once more to Dinarchus. And we make the same assumption with regard to Demosthenes: if his impressiveness of diction, his originality of composition, his vivid portrayal of emotion, his pungency and keenness of mind, which shows itself in the configuration of every letter, his vitality and vehemence are constantly present, there need be no further hesitation about including them among the speeches of Demosthenes. But if the highest degree of each of these qualities is absent, or consistency of style is not maintained throughout, let them remain among the speeches of Dinarchus. Generally speaking, two different forms of imitation can be found with regard to ancient models: one is natural, and is acquired by intensive learning and familiarity;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Lysias* 11.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐκ τῶν τῆς τέχνης παραγγελμάτων. περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου τί ἂν τις καὶ λέγοι; περὶ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου τί ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν <ἦ><sup>1</sup> ὅτι πᾶσι μὲν τοῖς ἀρχετύποις αὐτοφυῆς τις ἐπιπρέπει χάρις καὶ ὦρα, τοῖς δ' ἀπὸ τούτων κατεσκευασμένοις, κἂν ἐπ' ἄκρον μιμήσεως ἔλθωσι, πρόσεστίν τι ὅμως τὸ ἐπιτετηδευμένον καὶ οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως ὑπάρχον. καὶ τούτῳ τῷ παραγγέλματι οὐ ῥήτορες μόνον ῥήτορας διακρίνουσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ζωγράφοι τὰ Ἀπελλοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνον μιμησαμένων καὶ πλάσται τὰ Πολυκλείτου καὶ γλυφεῖς τὰ Φειδίου.

8 καὶ οἱ μὲν Πλάτωνα μιμῆσθαι λέγοντες καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον καὶ ὑψηλὸν καὶ εὐχαρι καὶ καλὸν οὐ δυνάμενοι λαβεῖν, διθυραμβώδη δὲ ὀνόματα καὶ φορτικὰ εἰσφέροντες κατὰ τοῦτ' ἐλέγχονται ῥαδίως. οἱ δὲ Θουκυδίδην ζηλοῦν λέγοντες καὶ τὸ μὲν εὐτονον καὶ στερεὸν καὶ δεινὸν καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια χαλεπῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντες, τοὺς δὲ σολοικοφανεῖς σχηματισμοὺς καὶ τὸ ἀσαφὲς προχειριζόμενοι, πάνυ εὐχερῶς ἂν ἀλίσκοιντο ἐκ τούτου τοῦ παραγγέλματος. ὥς πέρ γε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ῥητόρων οἱ μὲν Ὑπερείδην μιμούμενοι, διαμαρτόντες τῆς χάριτος ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ἄλλης δυνάμεως, αὐχμηροὶ τινες ἐγένοντο, οἷοι γεγόνασι Ῥοδιακοὶ ῥήτορες οἱ περὶ Ἀρταμένην καὶ Ἀριστοκλέα καὶ Φιλάγριον καὶ Μόλωνα· οἱ δ' Ἴσοκράτην καὶ τὰ Ἴσοκράτους ἀποτυπώσασθαι θελήσαντες ὑπτιοὶ καὶ ψυχροὶ καὶ

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *De Compositione Verborum* 18, *Demosthenes* 24 *sub init.* But Dionysius is critical of the excesses here mentioned in Plato



## DINARCHUS

the other is related to it, but is acquired by following the precepts of the art. About the first, what more is there to say? And about the second, what is there to be said except that a certain spontaneous charm and freshness emanates from all the original models, whereas in the artificial copies, even if they attain the height of imitative skill, there is present nevertheless a certain element of contrivance and unnaturalness also? It is by this rule that not only orators distinguish other orators, but painters the works of Apelles and his imitators, moulders the works of Polyclitus, and sculptors the works of Phidias.

Again, those who claim to imitate Plato, and are 8  
unable to capture his pristine quality, his sublimity, his grace and beauty,<sup>1</sup> introduce inflated and vulgar language, and are easily exposed in this way. Those who claim to be emulating Thucydides, and find difficulty in assimilating his characteristic vigour, compactness and intensity,<sup>2</sup> resort instead to ungrammatical constructions and to obscurity, and can very easily be caught out by applying this rule. So it is with the orators also: the imitators of Hyperides, having failed to capture that special charm of his, and the rest of his oratorical power, tended to become arid, as have those orators who formed the Rhodian school, Artamenes, Aristocles, Philagrios, Molon and their followers.<sup>3</sup> Those who wished to model themselves on Isocrates and the Isocratean style became flat, frigid, loosely-knit and affected: these are

himself. See *Demosthenes* 5, 24–9, and the *Letter to Pompeius*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Second Letter to Ammaeus*.

<sup>3</sup> The Rhodian School was said to have been founded by Aeschines ([Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 840D). See Vol. I, p. x.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀσύστροφοι καὶ ἀναληθεῖς· οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ περὶ Τίμαιον καὶ Ψάωνα καὶ Σωσιγένην. οἱ δὲ Δημοσθένην προχειρισάμενοι καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς τὰς ἐκείνου διώκοντες τῆς μὲν προαιρέσεως ἔνεκα ἐπηνέθησαν, οὐ μὴν ἴσχυσαν τὰ κράτιστα τῶν ἐκείνου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἔργων λαβεῖν. τούτων ἄριστον ἂν τις θείη τὸν Δείναρχον γενέσθαι. λείπεται δὲ Δημοσθένους κατὰ <μὲν><sup>1</sup> τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων τῇ δεινότητι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν σύνθεσιν τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ τῇ ἐξαλλαγῇ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν εὗρεσιν τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων τῷ μὴ καινὰ καὶ παράδοξα λαμβάνειν ἀλλὰ φανερὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ κείμενα, κατὰ δὲ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῇ τάξει καὶ ταῖς ἐξεργασίαις τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων καὶ ταῖς προκατασκευαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐφόδοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τεχνικοῖς παραγγέλμασιν, ἃ περὶ ταύτην ἐστὶ τὴν ἰδέαν, μάλιστα δ' αὐτοῦ λείπεται τῇ συμμετρίᾳ καὶ τῷ καιρῷ <καὶ τῷ><sup>2</sup> πρέποντι. λέγω δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐν τῷ καθόλου τρόπῳ, ὡς μηδὲν τούτων κατορθούτος, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κοινοτέρῳ καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ. δι' αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἄγροικόν τινες Δημοσθένην ἔφασαν <αὐτὸν><sup>3</sup> εἶναι, κατὰ τὸ ἔλλιπές τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτην περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν λαβόντες· τὸ γὰρ ἄγροικον τοῦ πολιτικοῦ σώματος οὐ μορφῇ, κατασκευῇ δὲ καὶ διαθέσει τινὶ τῆς μορφῆς διήνεγκεν.

<sup>1</sup> Sylburg.

<sup>2</sup> Radermacher.

<sup>3</sup> Blass.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Timaeus was the famous Sicilian historian. See Vol. I, pp. ix, 25, 482; for a full examination of his work, T. S.

## DINARCHUS

Timaeus, Psaon, Sosigenes and their followers.<sup>1</sup> And those who chose Demosthenes and sought to acquire his qualities were praised for their choice, but did not, of course, have the ability to attain to the finest of that famous orator's accomplishments. Of these writers Dinarchus may be regarded as the best. With regard to the choice of words, he falls short of Demosthenes in brilliance; with regard to composition, in variety and originality of figures of speech; with regard to invention of arguments, in his use not of the novel and the unexpected, but of those which are obvious and in common use; with regard to arrangement, in the order and development of his arguments, in his anticipations, his insinuations<sup>2</sup> and other rhetorical formulae employed in this genre; but most of all he is inferior to Demosthenes in his sense of proportion, of occasion and of appropriateness. I do not apply these strictures absolutely, so as to say that he never succeeds in any of those departments, but in the more general sense, as being true for the most part. It is for this very reason that some have called him a "rustic Demosthenes",<sup>3</sup> deriving their opinion about him from his inferior arrangement: for the body of the rustic differs from that of the city dweller not in its essential appearance but in his clothing and deportment, which modifies that appearance in a certain way.

Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Berkeley 1958); and for a brief account, S. Usher, *The Historians of Greece and Rome*, pp. 103-4. Psaon of Plataea was another third-century historian. This Sosigenes is otherwise unknown.

<sup>2</sup> See *Isaeus* 3 (Vol. I pp. 178-9).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the equally disparaging *κρίθινον Δημοσθένην* ("small-beer Demosthenes") recorded by Hermogenes, *Περὶ ἰδέων* β 11 (Spengel II p. 413).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

9 ἃ μὲν οὖν ἐνεδέχεται περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τοῦ ἀνδρός εὐρεῖν τε καὶ γράψαι, ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆν τῶν λόγων διάγνωσιν τρέφομαι. τοῖς μὲν οὖν γνησίοις αὐτὸ τὸ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς προσέεται μόνον, τοῖς δὲ ψευδέσι τὰ τοῦ τ' ἐλέγχου καὶ τῆς αἰτίας διηκριβωμένα, δι' ἣν ἕκαστον ἀθετούμεν αὐτῶν. ἐπεὶ δ' ἀναγκαία πρὸς ταῦτα ἢ τῶν χρόνων διάγνωσις, τοὺς Ἀθήνησιν ἄρξαντας, ἀφ' οὗ Δείναρχον ὑπεθέμεθα γεγονέναι χρόνου, μέχρι τῆς δοθείσης αὐτῶ μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν καθόδου, γενομένους ἑβδομήκοντα, προθήσομεν. εἰσὶ δὲ οἶδε· Νικόφημος, Καλλιμήδης, Εὐχάριστος, Κηφισόδοτος, Ἀγαθοκλῆς, Ἐλπίνης, Καλλίστρατος, Διότιμος, Θούδημος, Ἀριστόδημος, Θεέλλος, Ἀπολλόδωρος, Καλλίμαχος, Θεόφιλος, Θεμιστοκλῆς, Ἀρχίας, Εὐβουλος, Λυκίσκος, Πυθόδοτος, Σωσιγένης, Νικόμαχος, Θεόφραστος, Λυσιμαχίδης, Χαιρώνδας,<sup>1</sup> Φρύνιχος, Πυθόδημος· ἐπὶ τούτου πρῶτον αὐτὸν εἰς δικαστήριον λόγους συγγράφειν ὑπεθέμεθα. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Εὐαίνετος, Κτησικλῆς, Νικοκράτης, Νικήτης, Ἀριστοφάνης, Ἀριστοφῶν, Κηφισοφῶν, Εὐθύκριτος, Ἠγήμων, Χρέμης, Ἀντικλῆς, <Ἠγησίας,><sup>2</sup> Κηφισόδοτος, Φιλοκλῆς· ἐπὶ τούτου τὴν

<sup>1</sup> Χαιρωνίδας F, Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Sylburg.

---

<sup>1</sup> 361/0–292/1 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> 361/0 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> 358/7 B.C. Cf. *Isaeus* 5.

## DINARCHUS

These, then, are the facts which I have been able to discover and record about the orator's style. I shall now turn to the selection of his speeches: for the genuine ones only the name inscribed in the list will be given; but for the spurious speeches precise details of our examination and our reasons for rejecting each of them will be given. And since for these purposes knowledge of dates must be established, we shall begin by listing the archons at Athens from the date we have assumed for Dinarchus' birth until the date when he was granted permission to return after his exile, a period of seventy years.<sup>1</sup> They are as follows: Nicophemus,<sup>2</sup> Callimedes, Eucharistus, Cephisodotos,<sup>3</sup> Agathocles, Elpines, Callistratus, Diotimus, Thudemus,<sup>4</sup> Aristodemus, Theëllus,<sup>5</sup> Apollodorus, Callimachus, Theophilus, Themistocles, Archias, Eubulus,<sup>6</sup> Lyciscus, Pythodotus, Sosigenes, Nicomachus, Theophrastus, Lysimachides, Chaerondas,<sup>7</sup> Phrynichus, Pythodemus. We have assumed that he wrote his first forensic speeches during the latter's archonship.<sup>8</sup> After him came Evaenetus, Ctesicles, Nicocrates, Nicetes, Aristophanes, Aristophon, Cephisophon, Euthycritus, Hegemon, Chremes, Anticles, <Hegesias>,<sup>9</sup> Cephisodorus and Philocles. During the latter's archon-

<sup>1</sup> Eudemus, according to Diodorus Siculus 16. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Thessalus, according to Diodorus Siculus 16. 40.

<sup>3</sup> One of the leading Athenian politicians of the fourth century.

<sup>4</sup> Chaeronidas in F; but Chaerondas in Demosthenes, *De Corona* 54, Aeschines, *In Ctesiphontem* 27, Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 24.

<sup>5</sup> 336/5 B.C.

<sup>6</sup> The archon for 324/3, according to Arrian (7. 28). Diodorus (17. 113) has Agesias.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

φρουράν ἐδέξαντο Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ὁ δῆμος κατελύθη. Ἄρχιππος, Νέαιχμος, Ἀπολλόδωρος, Ἄρχιππος, Δημογένης, Δημοκλείδης, Πραξίβουλος, Νικόδωρος, Θεόφραστος, Πολέμων, Σιμωνίδης, Ἱερομνήμων, Δημήτριος, Καίριμος, Ἀναξικράτης· ἐπὶ τούτου ἡ κατασταθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κασσάνδρου ὀλιγαρχία κατελύθη, καὶ οἱ εἰσαγγελθέντες ἔφυγον, ἐν οἷς καὶ Δείναρχος ἦν. Κόροιβος, Εὐξένιππος, Φερεκλῆς, Λεώστρατος, Νικοκλῆς, Κλέαρχος, Ἡγέμαχος, Εὐκτῆμων, Μνησίδημος, Ἀντιφάτης, Νικίας, Νικόστρατος, Ὀλυμπιόδωρος, Φίλιππος . . .<sup>1</sup> ἐπὶ τούτου κάθοδος ἐδόθη τοῖς τε ἄλλοις φυγάσι καὶ Δεινάρχῳ ὑπὸ βασιλέως Δημητρίου.

### Δημόσιοι λόγοι γνήσιοι

- 10 Κατὰ Πολυεύκτου βασιλεύειν λαχόντος δοκιμασία· ἑπολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ γένοιτο. Κατὰ Πολυεύκτου ἐκφυλλοφορηθέντος ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἔνδειξις· ἑπάλαι θαυμάζω ὑμῶν. Κατὰ Πολυεύκτου περὶ τοῦ γεωφανίου· ἑπερὶ μὲν αὐτῆς τῆς μηνύσεως. Περὶ τοῦ γεωφανίου ἐπίλογος· ἑβραχύν, ὦ ἄνδρες.

<sup>1</sup> Lacunam indic. Unger.

<sup>1</sup> 322/1 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Charinus, according to Diodorus (20. 37) and Seneca, *Epistles* 18. 9.

<sup>3</sup> 307/6 B.C.

## DINARCHUS

ship<sup>1</sup> the Athenians admitted the garrison and the democracy was dissolved. Next were Archippus, Neaechmus, Apollodorus, Archippus, Demogenes, Democleides, Praxibulus, Nicodorus, Theophrastus, Polemon, Simonides, Hieromnemon, Demetrius, Caerimus,<sup>2</sup> Anaxicrates. During the latter's year<sup>3</sup> the oligarchy which had been set up by Cassander was removed and those who were impeached went into exile, including Dinarchus. There followed Coroebus, Euxenippus, Pherecles, Leostratus, Nicocles, Clearchus,<sup>4</sup> Hegemachus,<sup>5</sup> Euctemon, Mnesidemus, Antiphates, Nicias, Nicostratus, Olympiodorus, Philippus. It was during the term of this archon that King Demetrius granted Dinarchus, along with the other exiles, permission to return.

### GENUINE PUBLIC SPEECHES

*Against Polyeuctus*,<sup>6</sup> examination on his seeking 10 election by lot to the office of King Archon: "May many benefits accrue . . ."

*Against Polyeuctus*, on his expulsion from the council, a criminal indictment: "I have long wondered at you . . ."

*Against Polyeuctus*, on the open-cast mine: "Concerning the denunciation itself . . ."

Concerning the open-cast mine, conclusion: "A brief word, gentlemen . . ."

<sup>1</sup> Probably to be preferred to Calliarchus (F). See Kirchoff in *Hermes* 2 (1874) p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> Dionysius is the sole source for the remaining archons. If Philippus was the archon for 292/1, one archon appears to be missing.

<sup>3</sup> Of Cydantidae, who appeared against Hyperides in the case of Euxenippus. See Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit* III 2, p. 62.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Κατὰ Πυθέου ξενίας· 'ἵκανή μὲν ἦν πρόφασις.'  
 Κατὰ Πυθέου περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἐμπόριον· 'ἐπειδὴ  
 τοῖς μὲν λέγειν τῶν ῥητόρων.' Κατὰ Τιμοκρά-  
 τους· 'ὥσπερ δίκαιόν ἐστι.' Κατὰ Λυκούργου  
 εὐθυναί· 'οἶδα, ὅτι, κἂν μηδὲν ὑμῖν.' Συνηγορία  
 Αἰσχίνῃ κατὰ Δεινίου· 'βουλοίμην ἄν, ὦ ἄνδρες.'  
 Κατὰ Φορμισίου ἀσεβείας· 'ἀρά γ' εἶ τινες.'  
 Κατὰ Καλλαίσχρου περὶ τῶν τιμῶν· 'πολλάκις,  
 ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι.' Τυρρηνικός· 'ἅπαντα συμβήσεσθαι  
 ἔτι.' Κατὰ Διονυσίου τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως·  
 'ἴσως μὲν, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι.' Καθ' Ἴμεραίου εἰσαγγελ-  
 τικός· 'οὐδένα νομίζω, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι.' Εἰσαγγε-  
 λία κατὰ Πιστίου· 'ὥσπερ καὶ ὑμῶν ἕκαστος.'  
 Κατ' Ἀγασικλέους εἰσαγγελία ξενίας· 'οὐδένα  
 πώποτε οἶμαι.' Κατὰ Θεοκρίνου ἔνδειξις· 'τοῦ  
 πατρός, ὦ ἄνδρες.' τοῦτον Καλλίμαχος ἐν τοῖς  
 Δημοσθένους φέρει. Κατὰ Στεφάνου παρανόμων·  
 'ὑπάρχει τοῦ νόμου δεδωκότος, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Κατὰ

<sup>1</sup> An adherent of Aeschines and opponent of Demosthenes. See *Isaeus* 4 and note *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> One of the most distinguished of the conservative politicians of the Demosthenic period, and one of the canon of Ten Attic Orators. His speech *Against Leocrates* survives. See Loeb *Minor Attic Orators* II.

<sup>3</sup> Praised for his public spirit by Dinarchus in the speech *Against Demosthenes* 38.

<sup>4</sup> The brother of Demetrius of Phalerum.

<sup>5</sup> Of Piraeus. Bribed the people of Halimus to enrol him in their deme, according to Harpocration. See also Hyperides, *For Euxenippus* 3.

<sup>6</sup> The ascription is by no means certain; but the speech was probably delivered before 336 B.C. (see Blass III<sup>1</sup>, pp.



## DINARCHUS

*Against Pytheas*,<sup>1</sup> on a charge of illegal citizenship: "There was sufficient reason . . ."

*Against Pytheas*, concerning the transactions in the market: "Since for some orators to speak . . ."

*Against Timocrates*: "Just as it is right . . ."

*Against Lycurgus*,<sup>2</sup> an audit: "I know that even if nothing to you . . ."

*Supporting speech for Aeschines against Dinias*: "I should wish, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Phormisius*,<sup>3</sup> on a charge of impiety: "Surely if some people . . ."

*Against Callaeschrus*, concerning the honours: "Frequently, Athenians . . ."

*The Tyrrhenian Speech*: "That everything will still turn out . . ."

*Against Dionysius*, the treasurer: "Probably, Athenians . . ."

*Against Himeraeus*,<sup>4</sup> an impeachment speech: "I do not consider that anyone, Athenians . . ."

*Against Pistias*, an impeachment: "Just as each one of you also . . ."

*Against Agasicles*,<sup>5</sup> impeachment on a charge of illegal citizenship: "I think that no one ever . . ."

*Against Theocrines*, a criminal indictment: "Of the father, gentlemen . . ." (Callimachus enters this among the speeches of Demosthenes).<sup>6</sup>

*Against Stephanus*,<sup>7</sup> for illegal proposals: "Since the law grants it, gentlemen, it is established . . ."

498-9), so that Dionysius might be expected to agree with Callimachus unless he was willing to revise his view that Dinarchus began his professional activities in that year.

<sup>7</sup> Two speeches, on charges of false witness, against a certain Stephanus are included among the speeches of Demosthenes.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Καλλισθένους εἰσαγγελία· ‘οὐκ ἄγνοῶ, <ὦ><sup>1</sup>  
 ἄνδρες.’ Διαδικασία Φαληρέων πρὸς Φοίνικας  
 ὑπὲρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος· ‘εὐχομαι,  
 νῆ τὴν Ἀθηναῖν, πρέπειν δῆ.’ Πρὸς τὴν Κηφι-  
 σοφῶντος ἀπογραφὴν· ‘πρῶτον μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες,  
 δέομαι.’ ‘Ὁ ὕστερος· ‘τὰ μὲν περὶ τὴν ὠνήν.’  
 Ἀπολογία διαμαρτυρίας πρὸς τὴν Χάρητος . . .<sup>2</sup>  
 εἰσαγγελία κατὰ Φειδιάδου γραμματέως· ‘οὐτ’  
 ἔχθρας οὐδεμιᾶς ἔνεκα.’ Κατὰ Φιλοκλέους ὑπὲρ  
 τῶν Ἀρπαλείων· ‘τί χρῆ λέγειν τὸ πρὸς τῶν.’  
 Κατὰ Ἀγνωνίδου<sup>3</sup> περὶ τῶν Ἀρπαλείων· ‘οὐκ  
 ἄδηλον.’ Κατ’ Ἀριστονίκου περὶ τῶν Ἀρπα-  
 λείων· ‘εὐτύχημα μὲν ἦν, ὦ ἄνδρες.’ Κατὰ Δημο-  
 σθένους περὶ τῶν Ἀρπαλείων· ‘ὁ μὲν δημαγωγὸς  
 ὑμῖν.’ Κατὰ Ἀριστογείτονος περὶ τῶν Ἀρπα-  
 λείων· ‘πάνθ’, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὦ ἄνδρες.’

### Ψευδεπίγραφοι δημόσιοι

- 11 Κατὰ Θεοδώρου εὐθυνητικός· ‘ἦκιστα μὲν, ὦ  
 ἄνδρες.’ πρεσβύτερός ἐστι τῆς Δεινάρχου ἡλι-  
 κίας. εἴρηται γὰρ ἐπὶ Θεοφίλου ἢ Θεμιστο-  
 κλέους ἄρχοντος μετὰ Θέελλον ἄρχοντα ἐνιαυτῶ  
 τρίτῳ <ἢ τετάρτῳ>,<sup>4</sup> ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου γίνε-

<sup>1</sup> Sauppe.

<sup>2</sup> Lacunam indic. Blass.

<sup>3</sup> Reiske: Γνωδίου F, Usener.

<sup>4</sup> Radermacher.

---

<sup>1</sup> This speech has survived almost in its entirety. See Loeb *Minor Attic Orators* II pp. 287–305.

<sup>2</sup> Hagnonides was one of those accused with Demosthenes in the Harpalus scandal, on which see E. Badian, “Harpalus”, *J.H.S.* 81 (1961) 16–43.

<sup>3</sup> This is the longest surviving speech of Dinarchus. See Loeb *Minor Attic Orators* II pp. 165–257.

## DINARCHUS

*Against Callisthenes*, an impeachment: "I am not unaware, gentlemen . . ."

*A claim suit by the Phalereans against the Phoenicians*, concerning the priesthood of Poseidon: "I pray by Athena that it should indeed be fitting . . ."

*Against the inventory of Cephisophon*: "First of all, gentlemen, I ask . . ."

The second speech: "The facts concerning the purchase . . ."

*Defence of the demurrer (obstructive plea) against the . . . of Chares*: ". . . . ."

*Against the secretary Phidiades*, an impeachment: "Neither from any enmity . . ."

*Against Philocles*,<sup>1</sup> concerning the Harpalus affair: "What ought one to say <of the treatment received> from . . ."

*Against Hagnonides*,<sup>2</sup> concerning the Harpalus affair: "It is not difficult to see . . ."

*Against Aristonicus*, concerning the Harpalus affair: "It was a piece of luck, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Demosthenes*,<sup>3</sup> concerning the Harpalus affair: "This popular leader of yours . . ."

*Against Aristogeiton*,<sup>4</sup> concerning the Harpalus affair: "Everything, as it seems, gentlemen . . ."

### SPURIOUS PUBLIC SPEECHES

*Against Theodorus*, a speech in an audit: "Least of all, gentlemen . . ." It is before Dinarchus' time; for it was delivered during the archonship of either Theophilus or Themistocles two or three years after the archonship of Theëllus,<sup>5</sup> as is clear from the speech

<sup>4</sup> The first part of this speech has survived. See Loeb *Minor Attic Orators* II pp. 261-3.

<sup>5</sup> 348-6 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ται φανερόν, οὐπω πέμπτον <καὶ δέκατον>,<sup>1</sup> ὡς ἐδείξαμεν, ἔτος ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ. Κατὰ Κηρύκων· 'εἰ μὲν ὁ πατήρ, ὦ ἄνδρες.' οὗτος ὁ ἀγὼν εἴρηται ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Εὐβούλου ἢ Λυκίσκου τοῦ μετ' Εὐβουλον, οὐπω εἰκοστ<ὸν ἔτος ἔχ>οντος<sup>2</sup> αὐτοῦ . . .<sup>3</sup> ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος περὶ τινος ἀποψηφισθέντος γέγονεν ἐπ' Ἀρχίου τοῦ μετὰ Θεμιστοκλέα. δῆλον δ' ἕκαστον τῶν εἰρημένων ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου γίνεται. Κατὰ Μοσχίωνος, ἀπογραψαμένου αὐτὸν Νικοδίκου· 'τῶν ἀποψηφισαμένων, ὦ ἄνδρες, τουτουὶ Μοσχίωνος συμβαλῶν.' καὶ οὗτος ὁ λόγος κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους τῷ προτέρῳ εἴρηται. δηλοῦται δ' ἕκ τε αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ λόγου καὶ [τὰ]<sup>4</sup> τῶν ἐξῆς. Κατὰ Μενεκλέους ἀπαγωγῆς· 'ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ τῶν νόμων καθ' οὓς.' καὶ οὗτος εἴρηται παιδὸς ὄντος ἔτι Δεινάρχου. ὁ μὲν γὰρ κρινόμενός ἐστι Μενεκλῆς ὁ τὴν ἰέρειαν Νίνον ἐλὼν, ὁ δὲ κατηγορῶν υἱὸς τῆς Νίνου. ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα πρεσβύτερα τῆς Δεινάρχου ἀκμῆς. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δημοσθένους περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος [δεδηλώκαμεν]<sup>4</sup> λόγος, ἐν ᾧ τούτων μέμνηται, κατὰ Θεέλλον ἢ Ἀπολλόδωρον ἄρχοντα τετέλεσται, ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ Δημοσθένους δεδηλώκαμεν. εἰ δ' ὡς τεθνηκότος ἤδη τοῦ Μενεκλέους ὁ Δημοσθένης

<sup>1</sup> Codex Bodleianus in marg.

<sup>2</sup> Radermacher: οὐπω εἴκοσι ὄντος F.

<sup>3</sup> Lacunam indic. Radermacher.

<sup>4</sup> del. Sylburg.

<sup>1</sup> 345–3 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> 346/5 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> 351–49 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> Dionysius presumably drew attention to the reference to the Battle of Tamynae in 16. Discussion of ascription seems

## DINARCHUS

itself. Dinarchus was then not yet fifteen years old, as we have shown.

*Against the Marshals*: "If the father, gentlemen . . ." This case was pleaded during the archonship either of Eubulus or his successor Lyciscus,<sup>1</sup> when Dinarchus was not yet twenty years old . . . For the speech was delivered in the case of a certain man who had been disfranchised during the year of Archias, who succeeded Themistocles.<sup>2</sup> Each of the facts stated is obvious from the speech itself.

*Against Moschion*, on his enrolment by Nicodemus as his son: "From those who disfranchised Moschion here I deduce, gentlemen . . ." This speech was delivered at the same time as the previous one, as is evident from the beginning of the speech and what follows.

*Against Meneclēs*, on his arrest: "Gentlemen of the jury, even of the laws by which . . ."

This too was delivered when Dinarchus was still a minor: for the defendant is the Meneclēs who secured the conviction of the priestess Ninus, and the prosecutor is the son of Ninus. These events are earlier than the prime of Dinarchus: for the speech of Demosthenes *On the Name*, in which he recalls these events, was completed during the archonship either of Theëllus or of Apollodorus,<sup>3</sup> as we have shown in our work on Demosthenes.<sup>4</sup> And if Demosthenes is referring to Meneclēs as already dead when

a more appropriate subject for a treatise on style, such as the present essay and Dionysius' extant essay on Demosthenes, than for a treatise on an author's treatment of subject-matter. This reference therefore does not establish that Dionysius actually wrote the essay which he promised at the end of the *Demosthenes*. Discussion of ascription may have preceded the truncated review of the three styles with which the essay, as we now have it, begins.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐκεῖ μέμνηται λέγων· ‘ἔωρᾶτε γὰρ πάντες αὐτὸν χρώμενον, ἕως ἕξῃ, Μενεκλεί’, παλαιὸς λόγος τίς ἐστιν. ὅτι δὲ οὗτος ὁ Μενεκλῆς, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ δεδήλωκεν ὁ κατηγορῶν. Διαδικασία Ἀθμονεῦσι περὶ τῆς μυρρίνης καὶ τῆς μίλακος· ‘εὐχομαι δὴ τῇ Δήμητρι καὶ τῇ Κόρη.’ πρεσβύτερός ἐστι τῆς Δεινάρχου ἀκμῆς. εἴρηται γὰρ ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου γίνεται δῆλον, ἐν πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσιν ἔτος τοῦ ῥήτορος ἔχοντος. οἱ μὲν οὖν <πρεσβύτεροι><sup>1</sup> τῆς ἀκμῆς αὐτοῦ φερόμενοι ψευδεπίγραφοι [εἰς αὐτὸν]<sup>2</sup> λόγοι εἰσὶν οἷδε. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν εἰς Χαλκίδα ἀναχώρησιν οἷδε· Διαδικασία τῆς ἱερείας τῆς Δήμητρος πρὸς τὸν ἱεροφάντην· ‘πολλῶν καὶ παραδόξων, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί.’ οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἤδη πεφευγὸς αὐτοῦ εἴρηται, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γίνεται φανερόν. μέμνηται γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ <ὁ λέγων><sup>3</sup> τῆς κατασχούσης ὀλιγαρχίας. Κατὰ Τιμοκράτους εἰσαγγελτικὸς δῆμος καταλύσεως· ‘ἔργα ποιεῖς.’ οὗτος καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς ἐστὶ δῆλος ψευδεπίγραφος ὢν. Κατὰ Σπουδίου· ‘καὶ ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κατηγορήσειν ὑπεσχό-

<sup>1</sup> Reiske.

<sup>2</sup> del. Radermacher.

<sup>3</sup> Radermacher.

---

<sup>1</sup> 341/40 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> See Ch. 2. The change from the oligarchy imposed by Cassander to democracy in 307 B.C., when Athens was “liberated” by Demetrius Poliorcetes, led to the 15-year exile of Dinarchus. But the use of the aorist, a tense of pure narrative, does not establish that the change from oligarchy to democracy was recent at the time of writing.

## DINARCHUS

he says " For you all observed his association with Meneclcs while Meneclcs lived ", the speech is an old one; and that this Meneclcs is the one in question the prosecutor has shown in the speech itself.

Claim suit concerning the myrtle and the smilax, *On behalf of the Athmoneis*: " I pray to Demeter and Persephone . . ." This is earlier than the prime of Dinarchus: for it was delivered during the archonship of Nicomachus,<sup>1</sup> as becomes obvious from the speech itself. Dinarchus was then twenty-one years old.

These, then, are the speeches falsely ascribed to him which were in circulation before his prime. The following were written after his withdrawal from Athens to Chalcis:

Claim-suit for the priestess of Demeter, *Against the Hierophant*: " Of many unexpected things, gentlemen of the jury . . ." This speech was delivered when he was already in exile, as is evident from the speech: for in it the speaker refers to the oligarchy as " having held power ".<sup>2</sup>

*Against Timocrates*, an impeachment for subverting the democracy: " You are perpetrating acts . . ." The very title of the speech proves it to be spurious.<sup>3</sup>

*Against Spudias*: " And in the assembly I promised to accuse . . ." This too was delivered after the

<sup>3</sup> The title shows that the speech could not have been written under the oligarchy, which began with Antipater's settlement of 322 B.C. and ended in 307 B.C. (see preceding note). Dinarchus was composing speeches before 322 B.C. It must therefore be assumed that for some reason—most likely that of age—Timocrates could not have been a defendant before 322 B.C. If, in accordance with custom, he was the grandson of the Timocrates prosecuted in 353/2 by Demosthenes, his date of birth cannot have been long before 330 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

μην.' μετὰ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας εἴρηται καὶ οὗτος ἤδη Δεινάρχου [φαίνεται]<sup>1</sup> φεύγοντος, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ μάλιστα τοῦ λόγου γίνεταί φανερόν. Διαδικασία Εὐδανέμων πρὸς Κήρυκας ὑπὲρ τοῦ κανῶς· 'οὐδαμῶς τοιαῦτα πράγματα.' καὶ οὗτος κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους εἴρηται, πεφευγὸτος ἤδη τοῦ ῥήτορος, ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ πάλιν δηλοῦται. Ἀττικός· 'πάντων ἦσαν ὁμοίως.' καὶ οὗτος εἴρηται ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς χρόνοις, ὡς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ φανερόν γίνεταί. Αἰτωλικός· 'καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες Αἰτωλοί, πρέσβεις.' οὗτος καθεστῶσης τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθήνηθεν φυγάδων εἴρηται δεομένων τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς αὐτοῖς βοηθεῖν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Κάσσανδρος αὐτοῖς ἐλευθέρους οὖσιν ἐπεχειρεῖ, ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ γίνεταί τοῦτο δῆλον. οὐκ οὐκ εἰκὸς φίλον ὄντα τὸν Δείναρχον τῶν τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν καταστησάντων τοῖς καταλύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν συναγωνίζεσθαι, οὐδ' αὐτοὺς Ἀθήνηθε λόγους καταλαμβάνειν οἷόν τ' ἐστί. Διφίλω δημηγορικός, αἰτοῦντι δωρεάς· 'διὰ τὸ μὴ ῥάδιον εἶναι.' τοῦτον ἐπέισθην ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους γεγράφθαι τὸν λόγον, ὅτι τὰς δωρεὰς ἔγραψεν αὐτῷ Δημοσθένης, ὡς Δείναρχος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δημοσθένους λόγῳ δεδήλωκε, καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλει <τοῦ><sup>2</sup> λόγου ὁ Δίφιλος Δημοσθένην παρακαλεῖ συνήγορον. ἀπίθανον δὲ οἶμαι εἶναι τὰς μὲν τιμὰς οὕτω γράφειν εὐνοοῦντα τῷ Διφίλῳ τὸν

<sup>1</sup> del. Reiske.

<sup>2</sup> Reiske.



## DINARCHUS

overthrow of the oligarchy, with Dinarchus already in exile, as is very obvious from the speech itself.

Claim suit by the Heudanemoi, *Against the Marshals*, concerning the basket: "Such matters in no way . . ." This again was delivered at about the same time, with the orator already in exile, as is once more shown by the speech itself.

*The Attic Speech*: "Of all, they were likewise . . ." This was also delivered in that period, as becomes obvious from the speech itself.

*The Aetolian Speech*: "And we ambassadors, Aetolians . . ." This was delivered after the establishment of the oligarchy, by the exiles from Athens. These were asking the Aetolians to help them, as Cassander also was attempting an attack on their position as free men,<sup>1</sup> as is clear from the speech itself. It is surely not likely that Dinarchus, a friend of those who had established the oligarchy, should collaborate with those who were trying to overthrow it, nor is it possible that they could have obtained speeches from Athens.

*For Diphilus*, a deliberative speech requesting privileges: "Because it is not easy . . ." I have become convinced that this speech was written by Demosthenes; since Demosthenes proposed the privileges on his behalf, as Dinarchus has shown in his speech *Against Demosthenes*,<sup>2</sup> and because at the end of the speech Diphilus calls upon Demosthenes to speak in his support. I think it incredible that Demosthenes should propose such honours for Diphilus out of good

<sup>1</sup> It is not clear why these exiled democrats did not seek asylum in Aetolia, which Cassander failed to conquer.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 43.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Δημοσθένην, λόγον δὲ παρὰ Δεινάρχου λαβόντα περιδεῖν. Ἐρμῖα ἐμπορίου ἐπιμελητῆ ἑπιπέρι τῶν κατηγορηθέντων ἀπολογία· ἴδέομαι ὑμῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες· ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος εὔροι τις ἂν οὐκ ὄντα τὸν λόγον Δεινάρχου (ὑδαρῆς τε γὰρ καὶ ἀσθενῆς καὶ ψυχρὸς ἐστίν), ἀλλὰ μάλλον αὐτὸν ἂν τις θείῃ Δημοκλείδου ἢ Μενεσαίχμου ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων τινός. ἀφαιροῦμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ Μενεσαίχμου λόγους ἀμφοτέρους αὐτοῦ, ὧν ὁ μὲν ἐστίν περὶ τῆς Δήλου θυσίας· ἴκετεύομεν ὑμᾶς καί· ὁ δὲ πρὸς Περικλέα καὶ Δημοκράτην, οὗ ἢ ἀρχῆ· ἴνομίζομεν, ὦ ἄνδρες· διὰ τε τὸν χαρακτῆρα (ὑδαρῆς γὰρ καὶ κεχυμένος καὶ ψυχρὸς) καὶ ὅτι ὁ λέγων αὐτοῦς, ὧν οὔτε ἄδοξος καὶ μετὰ Λυκοῦργον τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν δημοσίων χρημάτων παραλαβῶν, ἐξητασμένος δὲ πολλάκις αὐτός, ὡς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις περὶ ἀπάντων μηνύει, καὶ ἐν ἰδίῳ καὶ ἐν δημοσίῳ ἀγῶσιν οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἀδύνατος, ὥστε Δεινάρχῳ λογογράφῳ χρῆσθαι. Ἰπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἐκδοῦναι Ἄρπαλον Ἀλεξάνδρῳ οὐκ ἄξιον ἄρα θαυμάζειν· οὐδ' οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἐμφαίνει τὸν Δεινάρχου χαρακτῆρα. εἰ γὰρ κἂν μηδὲν ἄλλο, τό γ' οὖν ἠλίθιον καὶ σοφιστικὸν εὔροι τις ἂν ἐν αὐτῷ πολὺ, τὸ πλεῖστον ἀπέχον τῶν Δεινάρχου χαρακτῆρων. Δηλιακός· Ἄπόλλωνος καὶ Ῥοιοῦς τῆς Σταφύλου· οὗτος οὐ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἀλλ' ἐτέρου τινός συγγραφέως ἐστίν. δηλοῖ δ' ἐκ τοῦ τρόπου καὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἀρχαϊκὸς ὧν καὶ περι-

## DINARCHUS

will, but allow him to receive the speech from Dinarchus.

*For Hermias*, supervisor of the market, concerning the charges against him: "I beg you, gentlemen . . ." One could gather from the style that this speech is not by Dinarchus (for it is insipid, weak and frigid): one would rather ascribe it to Democles<sup>1</sup> or Menesaechmus<sup>2</sup> or some other such orator. I also deny him both the speeches for Menesaechmus, one of which is *On the Delian Sacrifice*: "We beseech you and . . ."; the other is *Against Pericles and Democrates*, and begins: "We consider, gentlemen . . ." I do so because of their style, which is insipid, diffuse and frigid, and because the speaker of these orations was quite well-known and took over the management of the public finances after Lycurgus, and was himself frequently subjected to enquiries, all of which he indicates in the speeches; and he would not have been so incompetent in both private and public speaking as to employ Dinarchus as his speech-writer.

*On the Refusal to Surrender Harpalus to Alexander*: "It is not remarkable, then . . ." This speech does not exhibit the style of Dinarchus either: one can find in it, if nothing else, much that is silly and quibbling, characteristics which are far removed from those of Dinarchus.

*The Delian Speech*: "Of Apollo and Rhoeo, daughter of Staphylus . . ." This is not the work of our orator but of some other writer. It betrays this by its manner of writing and its style: it is old-fashioned

<sup>1</sup> An opponent of Demosthenes' nephew Demochares. No speeches of his are known. See Blass, *op. cit.*, III<sup>1</sup> p. 288.

<sup>2</sup> An opponent of Lycurgus and his successor at the Athenian treasury. See Blass, *loc. cit.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τρέχων τὴν τοπικὴν Δήλου καὶ Λέρου ἱστορίαν. Κατὰ Δημοσθένους παρανόμων· 'εἰώθατε, ὦ ἄνδρες.' οὗτος ἐν τοῖς Περγαμηνοῖς πίναξι φέρεται ὡς Καλλικράτους. ἐγὼ δ', εἰ μὲν ἐκείνου ἐστίν, οὐκ οἶδα (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνέτυχον τῶν Καλλικράτους οὐδενί), ὅτι δὲ πάμπολυ τῶν Δεινάρχου λόγων ἀφέστηκεν, εὐτελής τε ὢν καὶ κενὸς καὶ οὐκ ἀπέχων ἰδιωτικῆς φλυαρίας, πείθομαι.

### Ἰδιωτικοὶ γνήσιοι

- 12 Κατὰ Προξένου βλάβης, ὃν αὐτὸς εἶπεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ· 'εἴ τίς μοι θεῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Κατὰ Κηφισοκλέους καὶ τῶν οἰκείων βλάβης· 'ἃ μὲν ἐγκαλῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Πρὸς Φανοκλέα βλάβης ἀπολογία· 'ᾧ μὲν ἐγώ, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Πρὸς Λυσικράτην ὑπὲρ Νικομάχου βλάβης· 'ἄνδρες δικασταί, ὅτι μὲν ἰδιώτης.' Συνηγορία Παρμένοντι ὑπὲρ ἀνδραπόδου βλάβης· 'καὶ παραγεγεννημένος ὕστερον, ἄνδρες δικασταί, ἔγωγε ἔγνω, ὅτι Παρμένων ἀδικεῖται.' Κατὰ Ποσειδίππου κλοπῆς· 'ἀδικηθεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Κατὰ Ἡδύλης ἀποστασίου· 'καταλιπόντος † ἐνοτίου πατρός.'<sup>1</sup> Ἀποστασίου πρὸς Ἀρχέστρατον·

<sup>1</sup> ἐνωτίον τοῦ πατρός Sauppe: ἐν Ὁα τοῦ πατρός Radermacher.

## DINARCHUS

and makes a survey of the local history of Delos and Leros.

*Against Demosthenes*, an indictment for proposing an illegal measure: "It is your custom, gentlemen . . ." In the catalogue at Pergamum this is ascribed to Callicrates. I do not know whether it is his work (for I have not even come across any of Callicrates' speeches), but I believe that it is very different indeed from the speeches of Dinarchus, for it is paltry and empty, and not unlike the prattle of an untrained speaker.

### GENUINE PRIVATE SPEECHES

*Against Proxenus*, for damages, which he delivered in 12 person on his own behalf.<sup>1</sup> "If one of the gods, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Cephisocles* and his family, for damages: "As to some of the charges I am making, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Phanocles*, a defence for damages: "I thought, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Lysicrates* on behalf of Nicomachus, for damages: "Gentlemen of the jury, that a private citizen . . ."

*For Parmenon*, a supporting speech concerning a slave, for damages: "When I arrived there later, gentlemen of the jury, I discovered for myself that Parmenon was being wronged . . ."

*Against Poseidippus*, for theft: "Having been wronged, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Hedyle*, for desertion of her patron: "The father having left . . ."

<sup>1</sup> See Ch. 2.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

'πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ γένοιτο.' Συνηγορία Ἡγελόχῳ  
 ὑπὲρ ἐπικλήρου· 'ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμῶν ἕκαστος.'  
 Ἐπικληρικὸς ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰοφῶντος θυγατρὸς·  
 'ἄνδρες δικασταί, οὐ πένης ὢν.' <Ὁ><sup>1</sup> ὕστερος·  
 'ἄμαχον γὰρ ἦν, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Διαμαρτυρία, ὡς  
 οὐδὲ εἰσὶν ἐπίδικοι <αἱ><sup>2</sup> Ἀριστοφῶντος θυγατέρες·  
 'τοῦ νόμου δεδωκότος, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Κατὰ Πεδιέως  
 κακώσεως παιδὸς ὀρφανοῦ· 'μηδεὶς ὑμῶν, ὦ  
 ἄνδρες, θαυμάση.' Διαμαρτυρία περὶ τοῦ Εὐίπ-  
 που κλήρου πρὸς Χάρητα· 'πολλάκις ἤδη ἤκουσα.'  
 Ἐπὲρ τοῦ Μνησικλέους κλήρου· 'δικαίαν, ὦ  
 <ἄνδρες>,<sup>3</sup> δέησιν.' Κατὰ Προξένου ὕβρεως·  
 'ὑβριστῆς ἐστίν, ὦ ἄνδρες.' <Ἀπολογία><sup>4</sup> πληγῶν,  
 ἔδει δ' ἐπιγεγράφθαι Ἀπολογία ὕβρεως Ἐπιχάρει  
 πρὸς Φιλωτάδην· 'τὸν θαυμαστόν, ὦ ἄνδρες.'  
 Κατὰ Κλεομέδοντος αἰκίας· 'ὅτι μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες,  
 καὶ ὁ πατὴρ Θεόδωρος δῆ.' Πρὸς Διοσκουρίδην  
 περὶ νεώς· 'δικαίως ἂν οἶμαι, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Ἐρα-  
 νικὸς πρὸς τοὺς Πατροκλέους παῖδας· 'ἃ μὲν  
 ἀδικούμενος, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Πρὸς Ἀμεινοκράτην  
 διαδικασία περὶ καρπῶν χωρίου· 'ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὦ  
 ἄνδρες, ἀνάγκη ἐστί.' Περὶ τοῦ ἵππου· 'τοῦ μὲν

<sup>1</sup> Blass.

<sup>2</sup> Reiske.

<sup>3</sup> Victorius.

<sup>4</sup> Blass.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Ch. 5.

## DINARCHUS

*Against Archestratus*, for deserting his patron: "May many benefits accrue . . ."

*For Hegelochus concerning an Heiress*, a supporting speech: "Just as each of us also . . ."

*Concerning the Daughter of Iophon*, an inheritance speech: "Gentlemen of the jury, not being poor . . ."

The second speech: "For it was impossible, gentlemen . . ."

*A demurrer*, that the daughters of Aristophon are not even subject to adjudication: "Since the law has granted, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Pedieus*, for the maltreatment of an orphan: "Let no one of you marvel, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Chares*, a demurrer concerning the estate of Euhippus: "By now I have frequently heard . . ."

*Concerning the Estate of Mnesicles*<sup>1</sup>: "A just request, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Proxenus*, for violence: "He is a violent man, gentlemen . . ."

*Defence in an action for Battery*, but the title ought to be inscribed: *For Epichares*, a defence against Philotades in an action for violence: "The remarkable fellow, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Cleomedon*, for assault: "That even his father Theodorus, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Dioscurides*, concerning a ship: "Rightly, I should think gentlemen . . ."

*Against the Children of Patrocles*, concerning a contribution: "As to some of the matters in which I am being wronged, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Ameinocrates*, a claim suit concerning the produce of a farm: "In these circumstances, gentlemen, it is necessary . . ."

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀγῶνος, ὦ ἄνδρες.’ Ὁ ὕστερος· ἔβουλόμην ἄν, ὦ ἄνδρες.’ Λυσικλείδη κατὰ Δάου ὑπὲρ ἀνδραπόδων· ἅ μὲν ἀδικούμενος, ὦ ἄνδρες.’ Παραγραφή πρὸς Βιώτην· ὅτι μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπείρως.’ Κατὰ Θεοδώρου ψευδομαρτυριῶν· νομίζομεν, ὦ ἄνδρες.’ Ἀγάθωνι συνηγορία· ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὸς εἶρηκεν Ἀγάθων.’ Ἀποστασίου ἀπολογία Αἰσχύλῳ πρὸς Ξενοφῶντα· χρήσασθαι μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες.’ Κατὰ Καλλίππου μεταλλικός· ὅτι μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες, Κάλλιππος.’ Ὑπὲρ υἰοποιήτου, ἔδει δ’ ἐπιγεγράφθαι Ὑπὲρ Θεοδώρου, ὃν ἐποιήσατο υἱὸν Ἀρχεφῶν· βουλοίμην ἄν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ὥσπερ καλὸν καὶ δίκαιον.’ Περὶ τοῦ Ἀρχεφῶντος κλήρου· καὶ δίκαιον εἶναι νομίζων.’

### Ἰδιωτικοὶ ψευδεπίγραφοι

- 13 Πρὸς Πεδιέα παραγραφή· κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦτον.’ οὗτος ὁ λόγος εἶρηται ἐπὶ Ἀριστοδήμου ἄρχοντος, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου γίνεται δῆλον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰς Σάμον ἀποσταλέντες κληροῦχοι κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν ἄρχοντα ἀπεστάλησαν, ὡς Φιλόχορος ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις λέγει. Δείναρχος δ’ οὐπω δέκατον ἔτος τηνικαῦτα εἶχε. Πρὸς Μελήσανδρον ὑπὲρ τῆς τριηραρχίας· ὥσπερ οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν.’ οὐ ἂν ὁ λόγος . . .<sup>1</sup> ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν

<sup>1</sup> Lacunam indic. Sauppe; εἴη, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν coniecit.

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Diogenes Laertius for statements about the family of Xenophon the Socratic and historian.

<sup>2</sup> 352/1 B.C.



## DINARCHUS

*Concerning the Horse:* "Of the lawsuit, gentlemen . . ."

The second speech: "I would have wished, gentlemen . . ."

*For Lysiclides* against Daus, concerning slaves: "As to some of the matters in which I am being wronged, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Biotes*, a special plea: "That even I myself without experience . . ."

*Against Theodorus*, for perjury: "We consider, gentlemen . . ."

*For Agathon*, a supporting speech: "Just as Agathon himself has said . . ."

*For Aeschylus*, a defence speech against Xenophon<sup>1</sup> in an action for deserting his patron: "To have treated, gentlemen . . ."

*Against Callippus*, concerning a mine: "That Callippus, gentlemen . . ."

*Concerning an Adoption*, but the title ought to read, *For Theodorus*, whom Archephon adopted as his son: "I would wish, gentlemen, as is fair and just . . ."

*Concerning the Estate of Archephon:* "And I, considering it just . . ."

### SPURIOUS PRIVATE SPEECHES

*Against Pedieus*, a special plea: "According to this law . . ." This speech was delivered during the archonship of Aristodemus,<sup>2</sup> as becomes clear from the speech itself. Those who were sent to colonise Samos were sent in this archon's year, as Philochorus says in his *Histories*. At this time Dinarchus was not yet ten years old.

*Against Melesander*, concerning the trierarchy: "As the laws command . . ." Who the author of this

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

λέγων ὡς ἐπὶ Μόλωνος ἄρχοντος γεγενημένου τοῦ ἀδικήματος ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον. φησὶν δὲ τῷ ὑστέρω ἔτει εἰσιέναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐπὶ Νικοφήμου ἄρχοντος, καθ' ὃν εὐρίσκεται γεγενημένος ὁ Δείναρχος. Πρὸς Βοιωτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος· 'οὐδεμιᾶ φιλοπραγμοσύνη.' εἰ καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἄλλοις οἱ Δημοσθένους ἀφαιρούμενοι τοῦτον τὸν λόγον καὶ Δεινάρχῳ προσάπτοντες ἐλέγχοιντο, τῷ χρόνῳ γ' οὖν ἐπιδειχθεῖεν ἂν ψευδόμενοι. μέμνηται γὰρ ὡς νεωστὶ εἰς Πύλας ἐξόδου γεγενημένης, ἣ δ' εἰς <Πύλας><sup>1</sup> Ἀθηναίων ἐξοδος ἐπὶ Θουδήμου ἄρχοντος ἐγένετο, ὄγδοον ἔτος Δεινάρχου ἔχοντος. Πρὸς Μαντίθειον περὶ προικός· 'πάντων ἐστὶν ἀνιαρότατον.' οὗτος ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ προτέρῳ λόγῳ καὶ πολλὰ ἔχει κατὰ <τὴν> λέξιν τοιαῦτα,<sup>2</sup> ἃ εἶη ἂν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ῥήτορος, ἔξω τῆς τῶν Δεινάρχου ἡλικίας . . .<sup>3</sup> πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ὕστερον ἠγώνισται τὸν ἀγῶνα ὁ κατήγορος, ἀλλὰ δύο ἢ τρισὶν, ὡς ἀκριβέστερον περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ <περὶ><sup>4</sup> Δημοσθένους γραφῇ δεδηλώκαμεν. Ἀθηνάδῃ συνηγορία περὶ τῆς σχεδίας πρὸς Ἀμύντιχον· 'φίλος μοι καὶ ἐπιτήδειος ὢν.' 'Ὁ ὕστερος· 'οἶμαι μὲν ὑμᾶς, ὦ ἄνδρες.' Διοπίθους ἔτι περὶ Ἑλλάσποντον τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> Sylburg.

<sup>2</sup> Sadée: κατὰ λέξιν ταῦτα F.

<sup>3</sup> Lacunam sensit Sauppe; ὄντος. οὐ γὰρ coniecit.

<sup>4</sup> Reiske.

---

<sup>1</sup> 362/1 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> The event which dates the speech is the Battle of Tamynae (350 B.C.), referred to in Ch. 16. The Athenian expedition to

## DINARCHUS

speech <might be I cannot say>, but the speaker conducts his argument as if the wrong was committed in the archonship of Molon,<sup>1</sup> and he says that he took the case to court the following year, when Nicophemus was archon, which was the year of Dinarchus' birth, according to our findings.

*Against Boeotus*, concerning the name: "In no vexatious spirit . . ." If those who want to take this speech from Demosthenes and assign it to Dinarchus were not refuted by the other evidence, they would in any case be proved wrong by the date: for he recalls as a recent event the expedition to Thermopylae<sup>2</sup>; and the Athenian expedition to Thermopylae was made during the archonship of Thudemus, when Dinarchus was eight years old.

*Against Mantitheus*,<sup>3</sup> concerning a dowry: "Most distressing of all is . . ." This comes after the previous speech, and has many stylistic features of the kind that would suggest the same orator, hence placing it outside Dinarchus' period: <for it was not> many years later that the prosecutor fought the case, but two or three, as we have demonstrated in our more detailed discussion of these speeches in our treatise on Demosthenes.<sup>4</sup>

*For Athenades*, a supporting speech against Amyntichus, concerning the raft (pontoon?): "Being a close friend of mine . . ."

The second speech: "I think that you, gentlemen . . ." The speech was delivered while the Athenian

Thermopylae (Pylae) is probably to be dated to the summer of 352 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> Closely connected with the previous speech, and often referred to by the same name.

<sup>4</sup> See note 4, p. 281.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοῦ διατρίβοντος εἴρηται ὁ λόγος, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γίνεται φανερόν. ἔστι δὲ ὁ χρόνος κατὰ Πυθόδοτον ἄρχοντα, ὡς δηλοῖ Φιλόχορος σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς . . .<sup>1</sup> ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ ἄρχοντος οὐδέπω εἰκοστὸν ἔχων ἔτος. Πρὸς Μήκυθον μεταλλικός· ἑπριάμενοι μέταλλον, ὧ ἄνδρες· ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος εἴρηται ὁ λόγος οὗτος. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ λέγων ἐπ' Εὐβούλου μὲν μισθώσασθαι τὸ μέταλλον, τρία δὲ ἔτη ἐργασάμενος, ἐκβαλλόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πλησίον ἔχοντος μέταλλα, λαχεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν δίκην κατὰ Νικόμαχον ἄρχοντα, Δεινάρχου ἐν καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος ἔχοντος. Σατύρω πρὸς Χαρίδημον ἐπιτροπῆς ἀπολογία· ἑμὴ μεγάλου κινδύνου συμβεβηκότος· καὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ Νικομάχου εἴρηται. Ἐπὶ ἀντιδόσεως <πρὸς><sup>2</sup> Μεγακλείδην· εἰ μὲν ἔδει, ὧ ἄνδρες, πρὸς τρεῖς ἢ τέτταρας· ὁ μὲν λέγων ἐστὶν Ἀφαρεύς, ἔξω δ' ἐστὶ τῶν Δεινάρχου χρόνων <ὁ λόγος>.<sup>3</sup> εἴρηται γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Τιμοθέου ζῶντος κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τὸν τῆς μετὰ Μενεσθέως στρατηγίας, ἐφ' ἧ τὰς εὐθύνas ὑποσχῶν ἐάλω. Τιμόθεος δὲ τὰς εὐθύνas ὑπέσχηκεν ἐπὶ Διοτίμου τοῦ μετὰ Καλλίστρατον, ὅτε καὶ \* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Lacunam indic. Radermacher; τὰς Ἀθίδας συγγράψασιν. εὐρίσκεται δ' ὁ ῥήτωρ coniecit.

<sup>2</sup> Sauppe.

<sup>3</sup> χρόνων ὁ λόγος Radermacher: λόγων F.

---

<sup>1</sup> 343/2 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> 341/0 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> 354/3 B.C. Dionysius surprisingly omits to mention the leading figure in this famous trial, Isocrates. Aphareus, his

## DINARCHUS

general Diopeithes was still engaged around the Hellespont, as is obvious from the speech itself. The time is during the archonship of Pythodotus,<sup>1</sup> as Philochorus shows, <and is corroborated> by the other <local Attic historians. Dinarchus has been seen> to have been not yet twenty in the time of this archon.

*Against Mecythus*, concerning a mine: "Having leased a mine, gentlemen . . ." This speech was delivered during the archonship of Nicomachus, for the speaker says that he rented the mine during the archonship of Eubulus, worked it for three years and, when the occupant of the neighbouring mine tried to eject him, filed the suit against him in the archonship of Nicomachus,<sup>2</sup> when Dinarchus was twenty-one.

*For Satyrus*, a defence speech in a guardianship suit against Charidemus: "If the danger that has befallen me were not great . . ." This too was delivered during the archonship of Nicomachus.

*Against Megacleides*, on an exchange of property: "If it were necessary, gentlemen, with regard to three or four . . ." The speaker is Aphareus, and the speech belongs outside Dinarchus' period: for it was delivered while the general Timotheus was still alive about the time of his command with Menes-theus, over which he was convicted after having his accounts audited; and Timotheus underwent his audit in the archonship of Diotimus, who succeeded Callistratus,<sup>3</sup> when also . . .

adopted son, spoke on his behalf, and Isocrates afterwards wrote the *Antidosis* as an extended *apologia pro vita sua*. See [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 839C. Perhaps a reference to Isocrates followed in the lost sequel.



**FIRST  
LETTER TO AMMAEUS**





## INTRODUCTION

This letter, like the essay on Dinarchus, is a work of literary history rather than pure criticism; but it belongs to the mainstream of Dionysius' critical writing in that it is concerned with defending the primacy of Demosthenes among orators. An unnamed Peripatetic philosopher had recently argued that Demosthenes learned his oratorical skill from the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. Statements of this kind are to be considered in the context of the unending war which had been waged between philosophers and rhetoricians since the days of Socrates and the Sophists, but it was obviously important for a practising teacher like Dionysius that they should be refuted: otherwise his circle of pupils might follow Demosthenes' supposed example and hence have no further need of his instruction. On a more serious level, any statement which exalted the rhetorical handbook, at the possible expense of training by the study of literary models, conflicted with Dionysius' own principles and teaching methods. He wanted his pupils to regard the finest classical writers, and particularly Demosthenes and the other Attic orators, as the original and only sources of literary training.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I, pp. xx-xxii.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

His refutation is not without its own rhetorical resource. After some essential biographical details he introduces his weakest evidence, cross-references in the *Rhetoric* to other works of Aristotle, which prove only that the *Rhetoric* is not one of Aristotle's earliest works. Then, using as his sources of chronology Philochorus and, according to Diels,<sup>2</sup> Apollodorus' *Life of Aristotle*, Dionysius refers to historical events mentioned in the *Rhetoric*: the Olynthian War (349 B.C.), before which Demosthenes had written four of his most famous political orations, and events of the year 339 B.C. This evidence is decisive, and Dionysius might have rested his case at this point. But he ends by trying to prove that the *Rhetoric* was written after the delivery of the *De Corona* (330 B.C.), alleging that ἡ περὶ Δημοσθένους δίκη καὶ τῶν ἀποκτεινάντων Νικάνορα refers to that speech. But no Nicanor is mentioned in the speech as we have it, and no case of homicide is connected with the lawsuit concerned.

Modern critics have generally agreed in assigning the *Rhetoric* to the second period of Aristotle's residence at Athens (335–2 B.C.). We need not thereby dismiss the possibility that Aristotle conducted researches into rhetorical theory during his first stay at Athens, and even that his general conclusions might have been known by interested persons in the city and elsewhere. But there is really little in the *Rhetoric* that can be related in any specific way to the style and rhetorical methods of

<sup>2</sup> *Rh. Mus.* 31 (1876) p. 43.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

Demosthenes; and even if there were, it cannot be proved that Aristotle, and not one of the early rhetorical writers, was the ultimate source. Thus Dionysius is not to be denied.

## ΠΡΟΣ ΑΜΜΑΙΟΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΑΙΩΙ ΤΩΙ ΦΙΛΤΑΤΩΙ  
ΠΛΕΙΣΤΑ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

1 Πολλῶν μετ' ἄλλων ξένων τε καὶ παραδόξων ἀκουσμάτων, ὧν ἐνήνοχεν ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνος, ἔν τι καὶ τοῦτο ἐφάνη μοι πρῶτως ἀκούσαντι παρὰ σοῦ, ὅτι τῶν φιλοσόφων τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου πάντα χαρίζεσθαι βουλόμενος Ἀριστοτέλει τῷ κτίσαντι ταύτην τὴν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τοῦτο ὑπέσχετο ποιῆσειν φανερόν, ὅτι Δημοσθένης τὰς ῥητορικὰς τέχνας παρ' ἐκείνου μαθὼν εἰς τοὺς ἰδίους μετήνευκε λόγους καὶ κατ' ἐκείνα κοσμούμενος τὰ παραγγέλματα πάντων ἐγένετο τῶν ῥητόρων κράτιστος. κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν οὖν ὑπελάμβανον τῶν πολλῶν τινα εἶναι τὸν ταῦτ' ἐπιχειρήσαντα λέγειν, καὶ παρήνουν σοι μὴ πᾶσι τοῖς παραδόξοις προσέχειν. ὡς δὲ καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπυθόμην, ὃν ἐγὼ καὶ τῶν ἡθῶν ἔνεκα καὶ τῶν λόγων ἀποδέχομαι, ἐθαύμασα, καὶ πολὺς ἐν ἑμαυτῷ γενόμενος ἐπιμελεστέρας ᾧμην δεῖσθαι σκέψεως τὸ πρᾶγμα, μὴ ποτε λέληθέ με τᾶληθές οὕτως ἔχον καὶ οὐδὲν εἰκῆ τῷ ἀνδρὶ εἶρηται, ἵνα ἢ τὴν δόξαν ἢν πρότερον αὐτὸς ἔσχον <ἀφείην> βεβαίως<sup>1</sup> μαθὼν ὅτι προτεροῦσι

<sup>1</sup> ἀφείην βεβαίως Usener: βεβαιωθῶ MOs: βεβαιωτῶ BP.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

DIONYSIUS TO HIS DEAR FRIEND AMMAEUS  
WARMEST GREETINGS

Our age has brought forth many strange and paradoxical pronouncements; and this statement of yours seemed to me to be one of them when I first heard it from your own lips. You said that one of the Peripatetic philosophers, wishing to show all respect to Aristotle, the founder of his school, actually undertook to demonstrate that it was from him that Demosthenes learnt the rules of rhetoric and applied them to his own speeches; and that it was by equipping himself in accordance with these rules that he became the most accomplished of all the orators. Now initially I supposed that the person who had ventured to make this statement was an ordinary layman, and I advised you not to pay attention to every paradox you heard. But when I heard his name and found him to be a man whom I respect both for his character and for his literary accomplishments, I was astounded; and after much private thought I concluded that the matter needed more diligent enquiry, in case the real truth had escaped me and the man had not spoken at random. I should then have either discarded my earlier view, on learning for certain that the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῶν Δημοσθένους λόγων αἱ Ἀριστοτέλους τέχναι, ἢ τὸν οὕτως ἐγνωκότα καὶ γράψαι γε παρεσκευασμένον, πρὶν εἰς ὄχλον ἐκδοῦναι τὸ σύνταγμα, μεταβαλεῖν πείσαιμι τὴν δόξαν.

2 οὐκ ἐλαχίστην δέ μοι καὶ σὺ παρέσχου ῥοπήν εἰς τὸ μὴ παρέργως ἐξετάσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, παρακαλῶν φανεροὺς ποιῆσαι τοὺς λόγους, οἷς ἐμαυτὸν πέπεικα Δημοσθένους ἀκμάζοντος ἤδη καὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους εἰρηκότους ἀγῶνας τότε ὑπὸ Ἀριστοτέλους τὰς ῥητορικὰς γεγράφθαι τέχνας. ἐδόκεις τέ μοι καὶ τοῦτο ὀρθῶς παραινεῖν, μὴ σημείοις μηδὲ εἰκόσι μηδ' ἄλλοτρίαις τὸ πρᾶγμα πιστώσασθαι μαρτυρίαις, ἐπειδὴ τούτων οὐδεμία τῶν πίστεων δι' ἀναγκαίων συνάγεται λημμάτων· ἀλλ' αὐτὸν Ἀριστοτέλη παρασχέσθαι διὰ τῶν ἰδίων τεχνῶν ὁμολογοῦντα τὰληθῆς οὕτως ἔχειν. τοῦτο δὴ πεποίηκα, βέλτιστε Ἀμμαῖε, τῆς τε ἀληθείας προνοούμενος, ἦν ἐπὶ παντὸς οἴομαι δεῖν πράγματος ἐξετάζεσθαι, καὶ τῆς ἀπάντων τῶν περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους ἐσπουδακώτων χάριτος· ἵνα μὴ τοῦθ' ὑπολάβωσιν, ὅτι πάντα περιείληφεν ἢ περιπατητικὴ φιλοσοφία τὰ ῥητορικὰ παραγγέλματα, καὶ οὔτε οἱ περὶ Θεόδωρον καὶ Θρασύμαχον καὶ Ἀντιφῶντα σπουδῆς ἄξιον οὐδὲν εὔρον οὔτε Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Ἀναξιμένης καὶ Ἀλκιδάμας οὔτε οἱ τούτοις συμβιώσαντες τοῖς ἀνδράσι παραγγελημάτων τεχνικῶν συγγραφεῖς καὶ ἀγωνισταὶ λόγων ῥητορικῶν, οἱ περὶ Θεοδέκτην καὶ Φιλίσκον καὶ Ἰσαῖον καὶ Κηφισόδωρον Ὑπερείδην τε καὶ Λυκοῦρ-

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

preceded the speeches of Demosthenes, or tried to persuade the person who has adopted this view and is prepared to put it in writing, to change it before publishing his treatise abroad.

However, the strongest of my motives for making a systematic investigation of the truth was supplied by yourself, urging me to publish the arguments with which I have satisfied myself that it was not until Demosthenes had already reached his prime and had delivered his most celebrated orations that the *Rhetoric* was written by Aristotle. And again, you seem to me right to urge me not to rest my case upon mere signs or probabilities<sup>1</sup> or pieces of evidence extraneous to it, since none of these forms of proof is drawn from necessary premises, but rather to call as my witness Aristotle himself and show him to confirm through his own handbooks that the truth is as I say. This I have done, my dear Ammaeus, both out of regard for the truth, which I think should be the object of every enquiry, and for the gratification of all those who make a serious study of civil oratory. I should not want them to suppose that all the precepts of rhetoric are comprehended in the Peripatetic philosophy, and that nothing important has been discovered by Theodorus, Thrasymachus, Antiphon and their associates; nor by Isocrates, Anaximenes, Alcidamas or those of their contemporaries who composed rhetorical handbooks and engaged in oratorical contests: Theodectes, Philiscus, Isaeus, Cephisodorus, Hyperides, Lycurgus, Aeschines and

<sup>1</sup> These forms of evidence are discussed by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* 3. 2. 15-16.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

γον καὶ Αἰσχίνην, οὐδ' <ἄν><sup>1</sup> αὐτὸς ὁ Δημοσθένης ὁ πάντας ὑπερβαλόμενος τοὺς τε πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ μηδὲ τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις<sup>2</sup> ὑπερβολὴν καταλιπὼν τοσοῦτος ἐγένετο τοῖς Ἰσοκράτους τε καὶ Ἰσαίου κοσμούμενος παραγγέλμασιν, εἰ μὴ τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνας ἐξέμαθεν.

3 'οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος', ὦ φίλε Ἀμμαῖε, οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν τῶν ὕστερον ἐξενεχθεισῶν οἱ Δημοσθένους λόγοι συνετάχθησαν ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑτέρας τινὰς εἰσαγωγάς· ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐν ἰδίᾳ δηλώσω γραφῇ τὰ δοκοῦντά μοι· πολὺς γὰρ ὁ περὶ αὐτῶν λόγος, ὃν οὐ καλῶς εἶχεν ἑτέρας γραφῆς ποιῆσαι πάρεργον. ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι τοῦτο πειράσομαι φανερόν ποιῆσαι, ὅτι Δημοσθένους ἀκμάζοντος ἤδη κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους εἰρηκότους ἀγῶνας τοὺς τε δικανικούς καὶ τοὺς δημηγορικούς καὶ θαυμαζομένου διὰ πάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπὶ δεινότητι λόγων τότε ὁ φιλόσοφος τὰς ῥητορικὰς ἔγραψε τέχνας. ἀνάγκη δ' ἴσως πρῶτον, ὅσα<sup>3</sup> παρέλαβον ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν ἱστοριῶν, ἃς<sup>4</sup> κατέλιπον ἡμῖν οἱ τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνδρῶν συνταξάμενοι, προειπεῖν. ποιήσομαι δὲ ἀπὸ Δημοσθένους τὴν ἀρχήν.

4 οὗτος ἐγεννήθη μὲν ἐνιαυτῷ πρότερον τῆς ἑκατοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος· ἄρχοντος δὲ Τιμοκράτους εἰς ἔτος ἦν ἐμβεβηκῶς ἑπτακαιδέκατον \* \* \*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> οὐδ' ἄν Usener: οὔτε codd.: οὐδ' Sauppe.

<sup>2</sup> Bonner: γινομένοις codd., Usener.

<sup>3</sup> codd.: ὡς Usener.

<sup>4</sup> MBPs: om. O: ἃ Usener.

<sup>5</sup> Hiatum indic. Weil.



## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

all their associates.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, even Demosthenes himself, who surpassed all his predecessors and contemporaries, and left his successors with no scope for improvement,<sup>2</sup> would not have achieved such greatness if he had equipped himself only according to the precepts of Isocrates and Isaeus, and had not thoroughly mastered the handbooks of Aristotle.

“That story is not true”,<sup>3</sup> my dear Ammaeus, nor in fact were the speeches of Demosthenes composed in accordance with the precepts of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, which was published at a later date. His speeches are indebted to other treatises, about which I shall disclose my views in another work, since the subject demands a full discussion, which could not properly be made a subordinate part of a work on another topic. So my present efforts will be devoted to demonstrating that, at the time when Aristotle wrote his *Rhetoric*, Demosthenes was already at the height of his career as a politician, and had delivered his most celebrated speeches, forensic and deliberative, and was admired throughout Greece for oratorical brilliance. But perhaps I ought first to mention the facts I have gathered from the general histories which the biographers of the two men have left us. I shall begin with Demosthenes.

This author was born the year before the hundredth Olympiad.<sup>4</sup> He had entered upon his seventeenth year in the archonship of Timocrates<sup>5</sup> . . . He

<sup>1</sup> The last seven were all pupils of Isocrates.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Lysias* 1.

<sup>3</sup> Stesichorus Frag. 26 Bergk.

<sup>4</sup> 381/0 B.C. Evidence supplied by Demosthenes himself points to the years 384 or 383. See Blass III<sup>1</sup> pp. 6–10; Sealey, *C.R.*, 1957, p. 197.

<sup>5</sup> 364/3 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

δημοσίους δὲ λόγους ἤρξατο γράφειν ἐπὶ Καλλιστράτου ἄρχοντος εἰκοστὸν καὶ πέμπτον ἔτος ἔχων. καὶ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ πρῶτος τῶν ἐν δικαστηρίῳ κατασκευασθέντων ἀγώνων ὁ κατὰ Ἀνδροτίωνος, ὃν ἔγραφε Διοδώρῳ τῷ κρίνοντι τὸ ψήφισμα παρανόμων, καὶ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἕτερος [ἐπὶ Καλλιστράτου ἄρχοντος],<sup>1</sup> ὁ περὶ τῶν ἀτελειῶν, ὃν αὐτὸς διέθετο, χαριέστατος ἀπάντων τῶν λόγων καὶ γραφικώτατος. ἐπὶ δὲ Διοτίμου τοῦ μετὰ Καλλίστρατον ἐν Ἀθηναίοις πρώτην εἶπε δημηγορίαν, ἣν ἐπιγράφουσιν οἱ τοὺς ῥητορικοὺς πίνακας συντάξαντες 'περὶ τῶν συμμοριῶν'. ἐν ἣ παρεκάλει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μὴ λύειν τὴν πρὸς βασιλέα γενομένην εἰρήνην μηδὲ προτέρους ἄρχειν τοῦ πολέμου, εἰ μὴ παρασκευάσωνται τὴν ναυτικὴν δύναμιν, ἐν ἣ πλείστην εἶχον ἰσχύν, καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς παρασκευῆς αὐτὸς ὑποτίθεται. ἐπὶ δὲ Θουδήμου τοῦ μετὰ Διοτίμον ἄρχαντος τὸν τε κατὰ Τιμοκράτους λόγον ἔγραψε Διοδώρῳ τῷ κρίνοντι παρανόμων τὸν Τιμοκράτη καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς Μεγαλοπολιτῶν βοηθείας δημηγορικὸν [ὃν]<sup>2</sup> αὐτὸς ἀπήγγειλε. μετὰ δὲ Θουδήμον ἔστιν Ἀριστόδημος ἄρχων, ἐφ' οὗ τῶν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγοριῶν ἤρξατο, καὶ λόγον ἐν τῷ δήμῳ διέθετο περὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς τοῦ ξενικοῦ στρατεύματος καὶ τῶν δέκα φυγαδικῶν τριηρῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τὸν κατὰ Ἀριστοκράτους ἔγραψε λόγον Εὐθυκλεῖ

<sup>1</sup> del. Herwerden.

<sup>2</sup> del. Weil: om. Usener.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

began writing public speeches in the archonship of Callistratus, at the age of twenty-five.<sup>1</sup> The first of his forensic orations is the speech *Against Androtion*, written for one Diodorus,<sup>2</sup> who was prosecuting Androtion for proposing an illegal measure. Another speech belonging to the same period is the one *On Exemptions*,<sup>3</sup> which he delivered himself and which is the most elegant and vividly-written of all his speeches. In the archonship of Diotimus,<sup>4</sup> who succeeded Callistratus, he delivered before the Athenians his first political speech, which the compilers of the lists of orators entitle *On the Symmories*. In this speech he urged the Athenians not to break the peace that had been made with the Persian King, nor to be the first to declare war without previously organising their naval forces, in which lay their chief strength; and he suggests the method of organisation himself. In the archonship of Thudemus,<sup>5</sup> who succeeded Diotimus, he wrote the speech *Against Timocrates* for Diodorus, who was prosecuting Timocrates for proposing an illegal measure. The speech *On Aid for the Megalopolitans* he delivered himself in the assembly. The next archon after Thudemus was Aristodemus,<sup>6</sup> and in his year of office Demosthenes began his orations against Philip, and delivered a speech before the people on the dispatch of the mercenary force and the squadron of ten swift ships to Macedonia.<sup>7</sup> At this time he also wrote the speech *Against Aristocrates*, for Euthycles, who was

<sup>1</sup> For a recent discussion of this speech, see Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, pp. 216-19.

<sup>2</sup> The speech *Against Leptines*. See Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-2.

<sup>4</sup> 354/3 B.C.

<sup>5</sup> 353/2 B.C.

<sup>6</sup> 352/1 B.C.

<sup>7</sup> *Philippic* 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῷ διώκοντι παρανόμων τὸ ψήφισμα. ἐπὶ δὲ Θεέλλου τοῦ μετὰ Ἀριστόδημον τὴν περὶ Ῥοδίων ἀπήγγειλε δημηγορίαν, ἐν ἣ πεῖθει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καταλύσαι τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐλευθερῶσαι. ἐπὶ δὲ Καλλιμάχου τοῦ τρίτου μετὰ Θεέλλον ἄρξαντος τρεῖς διέθετο δημηγορίας παρακαλῶν Ἀθηναίους βοήθειαν Ὀλυνθίοις ἀποστεῖλαι τοῖς πολεμουμένοις ὑπὸ Φιλίππου, πρῶτην μὲν ἧς ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ "Ἐπὶ πολλῶν μὲν ἰδεῖν ἂν τις ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοί μοι δοκεῖ". δευτέραν δὲ "Οὐχὶ ταῦτὰ παρίσταται μοι γινώσκειν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι". τρίτην δὲ "Ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἂν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι χρημάτων". κατὰ τοῦτον γέγραπται τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ ὁ κατὰ Μειδίου λόγος, ὃν συνετάξατο μετὰ τὴν χειροτονίαν, ἣν ὁ δῆμος αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup> κατεχειροτόνησε.

μέχρι τοῦ περὶ δώδεκα λόγων εἴρηκα<sup>2</sup> δημοσίων, ἐν οἷς εἰσι δημηγορικοὶ μὲν ἑπτὰ, δικανικοὶ δὲ πέντε, ἅπαντες <όντες><sup>3</sup> πρότεροι τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν, ὡς ἕκ τε τῶν ἱστορουμένων περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀποδείξω καὶ ἕκ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφέντων, ἐντεῦθεν ἀρξάμενος.

5 Ἀριστοτέλης υἱὸς<sup>4</sup> μὲν ἦν Νικομάχου τὸ γένος καὶ τὴν τέχνην ἀναφέροντος εἰς Μαχάονα τὸν

<sup>1</sup> codd.: αὐτῷ Usener.

<sup>2</sup> μέχρι . . . εἴρηκα] μέχρι τοῦδ' εὕρισκομένων δώδεκα λόγων ὧν εἴρηκα Usener.

<sup>3</sup> Weil: <ἐγένοντο> Usener.

<sup>4</sup> codd.: πατρὸς Herwerden, Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> On the name of this archon and of the archon for 353/2 B.C. see *Dinarchus*, notes 4 and 5, p. 275.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

prosecuting the proposer of an illegal measure. In the archonship of Theëllus,<sup>1</sup> who succeeded Aristodemus, he delivered his political oration *On the Rhodians*, in which he tried to persuade the Athenians to put an end to their oligarchic government and set the people free. Under Callimachus, the second archon after Theëllus,<sup>2</sup> he delivered three speeches to the assembly, urging the Athenians to send help to the Olynthians, on whom Philip was waging war. The first begins: "On many occasions, men of Athens, one may see . . ." <sup>3</sup>; the second begins: "Not the same thoughts, men of Athens, occur to me . . ." <sup>4</sup>; the third begins: "You would give a great deal of money, men of Athens . . ." <sup>5</sup> During the year of office of the same archon was also written the speech *Against Meidias*, which Demosthenes composed after the vote of censure passed on Meidias by the people.

Up to this point I have mentioned twelve public speeches, seven of which were delivered in the assembly and five in the courts. All of these are earlier than the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, as I shall prove both from what other writers say about the author and from what he himself has written. I begin with the former.

Aristotle was the son of Nicomachus, who traced his lineage and his profession back to Machaon, the son

<sup>2</sup> 349-8 B.C. The Greeks and Romans computed inclusively, hence τρίτον here = second.

<sup>3</sup> *Olynthiac* 2. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Olynthiac* 3. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Olynthiac* 1. 1. Dionysius is alone in adopting this order. See Blass III <sup>1</sup> pp. 315-20.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Ἄσκληπιου, μητρὸς δὲ Φαιστίδος ἀπογόνου τινὸς τῶν ἐκ Χαλκίδος τὴν ἀποικίαν ἀγαγόντων εἰς Στάγειρα· ἐγεννήθη δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐνενηκοστὴν καὶ ἐνάτην Ὀλυμπιάδα Διοτρεφούς Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντας τρισὶν ἔτεσι Δημοσθένους πρεσβύτερος. ἐπὶ δὲ Πολυζήλου ἄρχοντας τελευτήσαντος τοῦ πατρὸς ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ἔτος ἔχων εἰς Ἀθήνας ἦλθεν, καὶ συσταθεὶς Πλάτωνι χρόνον εἰκοσαετῆ διέτριψε σὺν αὐτῷ. ἀποθανόντος δὲ Πλάτωνος ἐπὶ Θεοφίλου ἄρχοντας ἀπῆρε πρὸς Ἑρμίαν τὸν Ἀταρνέως τύραννον καὶ τριετῆ χρόνον παρ' αὐτῷ διατρίψας ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἄρχοντας εἰς Μυτιλήνην ἐχωρίσθη· ἐκεῖθεν δὲ πρὸς Φίλιππον ὤχετο κατὰ Πυθόδοτον ἄρχοντα, καὶ διέτριψε χρόνον ὀκταετῆ παρ' αὐτῷ καθηγούμενος Ἀλεξάνδρου· μετὰ δὲ τὴν Φιλίππου τελευτὴν ἐπ' Εὐαινέτου ἄρχοντας ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐσχόλαζεν ἐν Λυκείῳ χρόνον ἐτῶν δώδεκα. τῷ δὲ τρισκαιδεκάτῳ, μετὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτὴν ἐπὶ Κηφισοδώρου ἄρχοντας ἀπάρας εἰς Χαλκίδα νόσῳ τελευτᾷ, τρία πρὸς τοῖς ἐξήκοντα βιώσας ἔτη.

6 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ἃ παραδεδώκασιν ἡμῖν οἱ τὸν βίον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναγράψαντες. ἃ δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ φιλόσοφος ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ γράφει, πᾶσαν ἀφαιρούμενος ἐπιχείρησιν τῶν χαρίζεσθαι βουλομένων αὐτῷ τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα, πρὸς πολλοῖς <sup>1</sup> ἄλλοις ὧν

<sup>1</sup> add. δ' Weil, Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Early in the seventh century B.C.

<sup>2</sup> 384/3 B.C. See note 3, p. 311. Could Dionysius have

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

of Asclepius. His mother, Phaestis, was descended from one of those who led the expedition from Chalcis which founded the colony at Stagira.<sup>1</sup> He was born in the ninety-ninth Olympiad, when Diotrophes was archon at Athens,<sup>2</sup> and was thus three years older than Demosthenes. In the archonship of Polyzelus,<sup>3</sup> after the death of his father, he came to Athens, being then eighteen years of age. Having been recommended to Plato as a pupil, he spent twenty years in his society. When Plato died, in the archonship of Theophilus,<sup>4</sup> he went off to the court of Hermias, the tyrant of Atarneus, and spent three years with him before returning to Mytilene in the archonship of Eubulus.<sup>5</sup> Thence he went to the court of Philip, during the archonship of Pythodotus,<sup>6</sup> and spent eight years there as tutor to Alexander. After the death of Philip, in the archonship of Evaenetus,<sup>7</sup> he returned to Athens, and taught in the Lyceum for a period of twelve years. In the thirteenth year, after the death of Alexander in the archon-year of Cephisodorus,<sup>8</sup> he set off for Chalcis, where he fell ill and died at the age of sixty-three.<sup>9</sup>

These, then, are the facts which the biographers of Aristotle have left us. What the philosopher says of himself in his own writings completely nullifies the efforts of those who wish to accord him honours to which he is not entitled. In addition to many other

confused the two dates? Probably not, since this date is well authenticated for Aristotle's birth.

<sup>3</sup> 367/6 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> 348/7 B.C.

<sup>5</sup> 345/4 B.C.

<sup>6</sup> 343/2 B.C.

<sup>7</sup> 335/4 B.C.

<sup>8</sup> 323/2 B.C.

<sup>9</sup> In 322 or 321 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὐδὲν δέομαι μεμνήσθαι κατὰ τὸ παρόν, ἃ τέθηκεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ ταύτης τῆς πραγματείας, ὡς οὐ μειράκιον ἦν, ὅτε τὰς ῥητορικὰς συνετάττετο τέχνας, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ κρατίστῃ γεγονῶς ἀκμῇ καὶ προεκδεδωκῶς ἤδη τὰς τε τοπικὰς συντάξεις καὶ τὰς ἀναλυτικὰς καὶ τὰς μεθοδικὰς, τεκμήρι' ἐστὶν ἰσχυρότατα. ἀρξάμενος γὰρ τὰς ὠφελείας ἐπιδεικνύειν, ἃς περιείληφεν ὁ ῥητορικὸς λόγος, ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· 'χρήσιμος δ' ἐστὶν ἡ ῥητορικὴ τὸ διὰ γε <sup>1</sup> φύσει εἶναι κρείττω τ' ἀληθῆ καὶ τὰ δίκαια τῶν ἐναντίων· ὥστε ἐὰν μὴ κατὰ τὸ προσῆκον αἱ κρίσεις γίνωνται, ἀνάγκη δι' αὐτὸν <sup>2</sup> ἡττᾶσθαι· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἄξιον ἐπιτιμῆσεως. ἔτι δὲ πρὸς ἐνίους, οὐδ' εἰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην ἔχοιμεν ἐπιστήμην, ῥᾶδιον ἀπ' ἐκείνης πείσαι λέγοντας· διδασκαλία <sup>3</sup> γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην λόγος, τοῦτο δὲ ἀδύνατον· ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη διὰ τῶν κοινῶν ποιεῖσθαι τὰς πίστεις καὶ τοὺς λόγους, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοπικοῖς λέγομεν περὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐντεύξεως.'

7 περὶ δὲ παραδειγμάτων <καὶ ἐνθυμημάτων> <sup>4</sup> προελόμενος λέγειν, ὅτι τὴν αὐτὴν ταῦτ' ἔχει δύναμιν ταῖς ἐπαγωγαῖς καὶ τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῦτα περὶ τῆς ἀναλυτικῆς καὶ μεθοδικῆς πραγματείας τίθησι· 'τῶν δὲ διὰ τοῦ δείκνυσθαι <sup>5</sup> <ἢ> <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MBP: τε Aristotle: δὲ O.

<sup>2</sup> Usener: αὐτὸν codd.: αὐτῶν Aristotle.

<sup>3</sup> codd.: -λίας Aristotle.

<sup>4</sup> Spengel.

<sup>5</sup> POs: δεικνύναι Aristotle: om. MB.



## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

proofs, none of which I need mention at the present time, there is the passage he has written in the First Book of the treatise under discussion. Here we have the strongest of proofs that he was no mere youth when he composed the *Rhetoric*, but was at the height of his powers, having already published the *Topics*, the *Analytics* and the *Methodics*. At the beginning of the passage in which he indicates the advantages that come within the scope of the art of rhetoric, these are the words he actually writes<sup>1</sup>: "But rhetoric is useful because truth and justice are, by their nature, stronger than their opposites; so that, if wrong verdicts are reached, a man's defeat must necessarily be due to himself; and this is deserving of censure. Further, in dealing with some juries, it is not easy, even if we possess the most exact knowledge, to carry conviction by means of it. For discourse based on knowledge is a form of instruction, and instruction cannot be here employed: we must conduct our proofs and our arguments along lines which everyone understands, as we said in the *Topics*<sup>2</sup> when we were discussing the way to address a large number of people."

In the passage where he sets out to show that 7  
"examples" and "enthymemes" are equivalent to  
"inductions" and "syllogisms", Aristotle makes  
this reference to his *Analytics* and *Methodics*<sup>3</sup>: "Of  
proofs obtained by real or apparent demonstration

<sup>1</sup> *Rhetoric* 1. 1. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhetoric* 1. 2. 8-10.

---

<sup>6</sup> s, Aristotle: om. PMBO.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

φαίνεσθαι δείκνυσθαι, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀναλυτικοῖς τὸ μὲν ἐπαγωγή ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ συλλογισμός, <τὸ δὲ φαινόμενος συλλογισμός>,<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἐνταῦθ' ὁμοίως· ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ μὲν παράδειγμα ἐπαγωγή, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα συλλογισμός, τὸ δὲ φαινόμενον φαινόμενος συλλογισμός· καλῶ γὰρ ἐνθύμημα μὲν ῥητορικὸν συλλογισμόν, παράδειγμα δὲ ἐπαγωγήν ῥητορικὴν· πάντες δὲ τὰς πίστεις ποιοῦνται διὰ τοῦ <δεικνύναι ἢ παραδείγματα λέγοντες ἢ ἐνθυμήματα, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδέν· ὥστ' εἴπερ καὶ ὅλως ἀνάγκη συλλογιζόμενον ἢ ἐπάγοντα><sup>2</sup> δεικνύναι ὅτιοῦν, δῆλον δ' ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν ἀναλυτικῶν, ἀναγκαῖον ἐκάτερον <αὐτῶν ἐκατέρω><sup>1</sup> τούτων τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι. τίς δ' ἐστὶ διαφορὰ παραδείγματος καὶ ἐνθυμήματος, φανερόν ἐκ τῶν τοπικῶν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ περὶ συλλογισμοῦ καὶ ἐπαγωγῆς εἴρηται πρότερον, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ πολλῶν καὶ ὁμοίων δείκνυσθαι ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει ἐκεῖ μὲν ἐπαγωγή ἐστὶν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ παράδειγμα· τὸ δὲ τινῶν ὄντων ἕτερόν τι διὰ ταῦτα συμβαίνειν παρὰ τὸ ταῦτ' εἶναι ἢ καθόλου ἢ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ἐκεῖ μὲν συλλογισμός, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐνθύμημα καλεῖται. φανερόν δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἐκάτερον ἔχει ἀγαθὸν τὸ εἶδος τῆς ῥητορείας· καθάπερ <γὰρ><sup>1</sup> καὶ ἐν τοῖς μεθοδικοῖς εἴρηται, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ὁμοίως ἔχει· ὅσα μὲν οὖν Ἀριστοτέλης ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ γέγραφε μαρτυρόμενος διαρρήδην, ὅτι τὰς ῥητορικὰς τέχνας συνετάξατο πρεσβύτερος ὢν ἤδη καὶ τὰς κρατίστας συντάξεις προεκδεδωκώς, ταῦτ'

<sup>1</sup> Sylburg ex Aristotele.

<sup>2</sup> s ex Aristotele.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

there are, in dialectic, induction, syllogism and apparent syllogism; similarly in rhetoric, the counterpart of induction is example; of the syllogism, the enthymeme; and of the apparent syllogism the apparent enthymeme. I call an enthymeme a 'rhetorical syllogism', and an example a 'rhetorical induction'. Now every orator makes his demonstrative proofs by using examples or enthymemes, and no other means of any kind. If, therefore, it is as a general rule necessary to use either the syllogism or induction to prove anything (and this is plain to us from the *Analytics*),<sup>1</sup> it follows of necessity that enthymeme and example are respectively identical with syllogism and induction. The difference between example and enthymeme is clear from the *Topics*, for we have already said there,<sup>2</sup> when discussing the syllogism and induction, that the formulation of a general rule from a number of similar cases is called induction in dialectic, and an example in rhetoric; while the conclusion that from certain premises something different follows because of these, and as a consequence of their being true either universally or in most cases, is called a syllogism in dialectic and an enthymeme in rhetoric. It is evident that each of these two forms of argument in rhetoric has its own advantages—for what has been said in the *Methodics*<sup>3</sup> also holds good in this case." Thus Aristotle, writing about himself, testifies explicitly that the *Rhetoric* was a product of his later years, and was composed after he had published his most important treatises. With this

<sup>1</sup> *Prior Analytics* 2. 23; *Posterior Analytics* 1. 1.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 1, 12.

<sup>3</sup> A lost treatise.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔστιν· ἐξ ὧν ὁ προειλόμην ποιῆσαι φανερόν, ὅτι προτεροῦσιν οἱ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἀγῶνες τῶν τοῦ φιλοσόφου τεχνῶν, ἱκανῶς ἀποδεδείχθαι νομίζω· εἴ γε ὁ μὲν εἰκοστὸν καὶ πέμπτον ἔτος ἔχων ἤρξατο πολιτεύεσθαι καὶ δημηγορεῖν καὶ λόγους εἰς δικαστήρια γράφειν, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους ἔτι συνῆν Πλάτωνι καὶ διέτριψεν ἕως ἑτῶν ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα οὔτε σχολῆς ἠγούμενος οὔτε ἰδίαν πεποιηκῶς αἵρεσιν.

8 εἰ δέ τις οὕτως ἔσται δύσερις ὥστε καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντιλέγειν, ὅτι μὲν ὕστερον ἐγράφησαν αἱ ῥητορικαὶ τέχναι τῶν ἀναλυτικῶν τε καὶ μεθοδικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν, ὁμολογῶν ἀληθὲς εἶναι, οὐδὲν δὲ κωλύειν λέγων ἀπάσας ταύτας κατεσκευακέναι τὸν φιλόσοφον τὰς πραγματείας ἔτι παιδευόμενον παρὰ Πλάτωνι, ψυχρὰν μὲν καὶ ἀπίθανον ἐπιχείρησιν εἰσάγων, βιαζόμενος δὲ τὸ κακουργότατον τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων ποιεῖν πιθανώτερον, ὅτι καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰκὸς γίνεται ποτε εἰκός, ἀφείς ἂν πρὸς ταῦτα λέγειν εἶχον ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτοῦ τρέψομαι τοῦ φιλοσόφου μαρτυρίας, ἃς ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ τῶν τεχνῶν τέθηκε περὶ τῆς μεταφορᾶς κατὰ λέξιν οὕτω γράφων· ἑτῶν δὲ μεταφορῶν τεττάρων οὐσῶν, εὐδοκιμοῦσι μάλιστα αἱ κατὰ ἀναλογίαν· ὡς Περικλῆς ἔφη τὴν νεότητα τὴν ἀπολομένην ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὕτως ἠφανίσθαι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὥσπερ εἴ τις τὸ

---

<sup>1</sup> See note 7, p. 317: the year 335 or 334. Confusion persists: if Aristotle's age was thirty-seven when he began

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

evidence I consider I have sufficiently proved what I set myself to make clear, that the orator's forensic speeches are earlier than the rhetorical writings of the philosopher: if, that is to say, it is conceded that Demosthenes began to engage in public life at the age of twenty-five, to address the assembly, and to write speeches for the lawcourts; at which time Aristotle was still a pupil of Plato, and he went on to be thirty-seven before becoming the head of a school or forming a philosophical sect of his own.<sup>1</sup>

But if, even in the face of these arguments, some person should be so quarrelsome as to object, saying that while he admits the truth of the statement that the *Rhetoric* was written after the *Analytics*, the *Methodics* and the *Topics*, there is no reason why Aristotle should not have composed all these treatises while still a disciple in Plato's school, such a contention is feeble and improbable, and is merely a violent attempt to make that most mischievous of paradoxes seem more credible, that even what is unlikely is likely to occur sometimes. Omitting, therefore, what I could have said in reply to this, I shall turn to evidence provided by the philosopher himself in the *Rhetoric*, where he has these words (which I quote from the text) on the subject of metaphor<sup>2</sup>: "Of the four kinds of metaphor the most highly esteemed are those based on analogy, like that in which Pericles said that when the youth of the city had been lost in the war, their disappearance was like the removal of

teaching at Athens, this dating would place his birth in the year 382 or 381, thus reviving the possibility suggested in note 2, p. 317.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhetoric* 3. 10. 7.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔαρ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐξέλοι . . .<sup>1</sup> καὶ Κηφισόδοτος σπουδάζοντας Χάρητος εὐθύνας δοῦναι τῶν περὶ τὸν Ὀλυνθιακὸν πόλεμον ἠγανάκτει φάσκων αὐτὸν εἰς πνῖγμα τὸν δῆμον ἀγαγόντα τὰς εὐθύνας πειρᾶσθαι διδόναι.'

- 9 οὕτωςι μὲν δὴ σαφῶς αὐτὸς ὁ φιλόσοφος ἀποδεικνύει μετὰ τὸν Ὀλυνθιακὸν πόλεμον γεγραμμένας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς τέχνας. οὗτος δ' ἐπὶ Καλλιμάχου γέγονεν ἄρχοντας, ὡς δηλοῖ Φιλόχορος ἐν ἕκτῃ βύβλῳ τῆς Ἀτθίδος κατὰ λέξιν οὕτω γράφων· 'Καλλίμαχος Περγασῆθεν· ἐπὶ τούτου Ὀλυνθίοις πολемуμένοις ὑπὸ Φιλίππου καὶ πρέσβεις Ἀθήναζε πέμψασιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμαχίαν τε ἐποίησαντο \* \* \*<sup>2</sup> καὶ βοήθειαν ἔπεμψαν πελταστὰς δισχιλίους, τριήρεις δὲ τριάκοντα τὰς μετὰ Χάρητος καὶ ἄς συνεπλήρωσαν ὀκτώ.' ἔπειτα διεξελθὼν ὀλίγα τὰ μεταξὺ γεγόμενα τίθησι ταυτί· 'περὶ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Χαλκιδέων τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης θλιβομένων τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ πρεσβευσαμένων Ἀθήναζε Χαρίδημον αὐτοῖς ἔπεμψαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ στρατηγόν· ὃς ἔχων ὀκτωκαίδεκα τριήρεις καὶ πελταστὰς τετρακισχιλίους, ἵππεῖς δὲ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν τε Παλλήνην καὶ τὴν Βοττιαίαν μετ' Ὀλυνθίων καὶ τὴν χώραν ἐπόρθησεν.' ἔπειθ' ὑπὲρ

<sup>1</sup> Hiatum indic. Usener ex Aristotele supplendum.

<sup>2</sup> Hiatum indic. MO.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Rhetoric* 1. 7. 34. These words are not reported by Thucydides in the Funeral Oration, but almost the same words are attributed by Herodotus to Gelo, tyrant of Gela (7. 162. 2).

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

spring from the year.<sup>1</sup> And when Chares was eager to have his conduct of the Olynthian War examined, Cephisodotus<sup>2</sup> indignantly exclaimed that he was trying to have his record examined while he had the people by the throat."

In this way the philosopher's own evidence shows clearly that he wrote the *Rhetoric* after the Olynthian War; and this war took place in the archonship of Callimachus,<sup>3</sup> as Philochorus shows in the Sixth Book of his Attic History, where his exact words are<sup>4</sup>: "Callimachus of the deme Pergase. In his year of office the Olynthians, who were being attacked by Philip, sent ambassadors to Athens, and the Athenians made an alliance with them. They sent two thousand lightly-armed troops to their aid, and thirty triremes which were serving under Chares, as well as eight others manned for the occasion." Then, after describing the few intervening events, he continues: "About the same time the Chalcidians on the Thracian seaboard were hard-pressed by the war, and sent an embassy to Athens. The Athenians sent to their aid Charidemus, their commander in the Hellespont. He brought with him eighteen triremes, four thousand lightly-armed troops and a hundred and fifty cavalry. Accompanied by the Olynthians, he advanced into Pallene and Bottiaea, and ravaged the country." Later on he writes this

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confused with Isocrates' pupil Cephisodorus (see Vol. I p. 157 and note). Chares was a general and Cephisodotus was probably the orator who defended Leptines against Demosthenes.

<sup>2</sup> 349/8 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> Frag. Gr. Hist. 328 F56 (Jacoby III i, p. 531).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῆς τρίτης συμμαχίας λέγει ταυτί· 'πάλιν δὲ τῶν Ὀλυνθίων πρέσβεις ἀποστειλάντων εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ δεομένων μὴ περιδεῖν αὐτοὺς καταπολεμηθέντας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις δυνάμεσι πέμψαι βοήθειαν μὴ ξενικὴν ἀλλ' αὐτῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἔπεμψεν αὐτοῖς ὁ δῆμος τριήρεις μὲν ἑτέρας ἑπτακαίδεκα <καὶ><sup>1</sup> τῶν πολιτῶν ὀπλίτας δισχιλίους καὶ ἱππεῖς τριακοσίους ἐν ναυσὶν ἱππηγοῖς, στρατηγὸν δὲ Χάρητα τοῦ στόλου παντός.'

10 ἀπόχρη μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα ῥηθέντα φανεράν ποιῆσαι τὴν φιλοτιμίαν τῶν ἀξιούντων τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους ἐζηλωκέναι τέχνας τὸν Δημοσθένη, ὃς ἤδη τέτταρας μὲν ἔτυχεν εἰρηκῶς δημηγορίας Φιλιππικάς, τρεῖς δὲ Ἑλληνικάς, πέντε δὲ λόγους δημοσίου εἰς δικαστήρια γεγραφῶς, οὓς οὐδεὶς ἂν ἔχοι διαβαλεῖν ὡς εὐτελεῖς τινὰς καὶ φαύλους καὶ μηδὲν ἐπιφαίνοντας τεχνικόν, ἐπειδὴ πρὸ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους συνετάχθησαν τεχνῶν. οὐ μὴν ἔγωγε μέχρι τούτου προελθὼν στήσομαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους αὐτοῦ λόγους τοὺς μάλιστ' εὐδοκιμοῦντας ἐπιδείξω τοὺς τε δημηγορικοὺς καὶ τοὺς δικανικοὺς πρότερον ἀπηγγελμένους τῆς ἐκδόσεως τούτων τῶν τεχνῶν, μάρτυρι πάλιν αὐτῷ χρώμενος Ἀριστοτέλει. μετὰ γὰρ ἄρχοντα Καλλίμαχον, ἐφ' οὗ τὰς εἰς Ὀλυνθον βοηθείας ἀπέστειλαν Ἀθηναῖοι πεισθέντες ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους, Θεόφιλος ἔστιν ἄρχων, καθ' ὃν ἐκράτησε τῆς Ὀλυνθίων πόλεως Φίλιππος. ἔπειτα Θεμιστοκλῆς, ἐφ' οὗ τὴν πέμπτην τῶν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγοριῶν

<sup>1</sup> Radermacher.



## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

on the subject of the third alliance: "The Olynthians sent a fresh embassy to the Athenians begging them not to allow them to be destroyed in the war, but to send out, in addition to the troops already there, a force consisting not of mercenaries but of Athenian citizens. The Athenian people sent them seven thousand further triremes, together with two thousand hoplites and three hundred cavalry conveyed in horse-transport ships. The whole force was composed of citizens, and was under the command of Chares."

Enough has been said to expose the exaggerated 10 claims of those who assert that Demosthenes was inspired by the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. Demosthenes had already delivered four public speeches against Philip and three on Greek affairs generally before the treatise was written. He had also written five speeches for the popular courts, which no one could impugn as slight, poor and showing no artistic merit through being composed before the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. Having progressed thus far, however, I shall not stop there, but I shall show that all his other most famous speeches, whether addressed to the people or to the law-courts, had been delivered before the publication of the *Rhetoric*; and I shall make Aristotle my witness once again. After the archonship of Callimachus,<sup>1</sup> in whose year of office the Athenians dispatched their reinforcements to Olynthus on the advice of Demosthenes, Theophilus was archon; and during his term Philip gained control of the city of the Olynthians. Next came Themistocles, in whose year Demosthenes delivered the fifth of his orations against Philip, which is con-

<sup>1</sup> 349/8 B.C.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἀπήγγειλε Δημοσθένης περὶ τῆς φυλακῆς τῶν νησιωτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ πόλεων, ἧς ἐστὶν ἀρχή· “Α μὲν ἡμεῖς ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι δεδυνήμεθα εὐρεῖν, ταῦτ’ ἐστίν.” μετὰ δὲ Θεμιστοκλέα Ἀρχίας, ἐφ’ οὗ παραινεῖ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις μὴ κωλύειν Φίλιππον τῆς Ἀμφικτυονίας μετέχειν μηδὲ ἀφορμὴν διδόναι πολέμου νεωστὶ πεποιημένους τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰρήνην· ἀρχὴ δὲ ταύτης τῆς δημηγορίας ἐστὶν ἡδε· “Ὀρῶ μὲν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ παρόντα πράγματα.” μετὰ δὲ Ἀρχίαν ἔστιν Εὐβουλος· εἶτα Λυκίσκος, ἐφ’ οὗ τὴν ἐβδόμην τῶν Φιλιππικῶν δημηγοριῶν διέθετο πρὸς τὰς ἐκ Πελοποννήσου πρεσβείας, ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιησάμενος· “Ὅταν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι λόγοι γίνωνται.” μετὰ Λυκίσκον ἔστιν ἄρχων Πυθόδοτος, ἐφ’ οὗ τὴν ὀγδόην τῶν Φιλιππικῶν δημηγοριῶν διέθετο πρὸς τοὺς Φιλίππου πρέσβεις, ἧς ἐστὶν ἀρχή· “ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅπως αἱ αἰτίαι”, καὶ τὸν κατ’ Αἰσχίνου συνετάξατο λόγον, ὅτε τὰς εὐθύνας ἐδίδου τῆς δευτέρας πρεσβείας τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄρκους· μετὰ Πυθόδοτον ἔστι Σωσιγένης, ἐφ’ οὗ τὴν ἐνάτην διελήλυθεν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγορίαν περὶ τῶν ἐν Χερρονήσῳ στρατιωτῶν, ἵνα μὴ διαλυθῇ τὸ μετὰ Διοπείθους ξενικόν, ἀρχὴν ἔχουσαν ταύτην· “Ἐδει μὲν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς λέγοντας ἅπαντας”· καὶ

<sup>1</sup> *Philippic* 1. 30.

<sup>2</sup> *On the Peace* 1.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

cerned with the protection of the islanders and the cities of the Hellespont, and begins as follows<sup>1</sup>: "This, men of Athens, is what we have been able to devise . . ." Themistocles' successor was Archias, and in his year of office Demosthenes urged the Athenians not to try to prevent Philip from joining the Amphictyonic Council, nor to give him an occasion for renewing the war, now that they had recently made peace with him. This speech begins with these words<sup>2</sup>: "I see, men of Athens, that this present crisis . . ." After Archias came Eubulus, and after him Lyciscus. It was in Lyciscus' year of office<sup>3</sup> that Demosthenes delivered the seventh of his public orations against Philip. It is a reply to the envoys from the Peloponnese, and begins in this way<sup>4</sup>: "When, men of Athens, discussions are held . . ." The archon who followed Lyciscus was Pythodotus, and in his year of office Demosthenes replied to the envoys of Philip by delivering the eighth of the Philippic orations. It begins<sup>5</sup>: "Men of Athens, it is not possible that the accusations . . ." In the same year he also composed the speech against Aeschines, when the latter was rendering an account of his part in the second embassy, which had been sent to secure a solemn agreement from Philip. The archon after Pythodotus was Sosigenes, in whose year of office he delivered the ninth oration against Philip, concerning the troops in the Chersonese, the purpose of which was to prevent the disbandment of the mercenaries commanded by Diopceithes. This is how it begins: "All speakers, men of Athens,

<sup>3</sup> 344/3 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> *Philippic* 2. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *On Halonnesus* 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἄρχοντα τὴν δεκάτην, ἐν ἣ πειράται διδάσκειν, ὅτι λύει τὴν εἰρήνην Φίλιππος καὶ πρότερος ἐκφέρει τὸν πόλεμον, ἧς ἐστὶν ἀρχή· ‘Πολλῶν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι λόγων γιγνομένων.’ μετὰ Σωσιγένην ἄρχων ἐστὶ Νικόμαχος, ἐφ’ οὗ τὴν ἐνδεκάτην δημηγορίαν διελήλυθε περὶ τοῦ λελυκέναι τὴν εἰρήνην Φίλιππον καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους πείθει Βυζαντίοις ἀποστεῖλαι βοήθειαν, ἧς ἐστὶν ἀρχή· ‘Καὶ σπουδαῖα νομίζων ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι.’ ἔπεται Νικομάχῳ Θεόφραστος ἄρχων, ἐφ’ οὗ πείθει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους γενναίως ὑπομεῖναι τὸν πόλεμον ὡς κατηγγελκός αὐτὸν ἦδη Φιλίππου· καὶ ἐστὶν αὕτη τελευταία τῶν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγοριῶν, ἀρχὴν ἔχουσα ταύτην· “Ὅτι μὲν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι Φίλιππος οὐκ ἐποίησατο τὴν εἰρήνην πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ’ ἀνεβάλετο τὸν πόλεμον.’

- 11 ὅτι δὲ καὶ τούτους ἅπαντας τοὺς λόγους οὓς κατηρίθμηται πρὸ τῆς ἐκδόσεως τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν ἀπήγγειλεν ὁ Δημοσθένης, αὐτὸν Ἀριστοτέλη παρέξομαι μαρτυροῦντα. ἀρξάμενος γὰρ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βύβλῳ τῶν τεχνῶν τοὺς τόπους ὀρίζειν, ἀφ’ ὧν τὰ ἐνθυμήματα φέρεται, καὶ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου παραλαμβάνει παρατιθεὶς αὐτῷ τὰ παραδείγματα. θήσω δὲ αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ φιλοσόφου λέξιν· ‘ἄλλος εἰς τὸν χρόνον σκοπεῖ· οἶον, ὡς ὁ<sup>1</sup> Ἰφικράτης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀρμόδιον, ὡς εἰ πρὶν ποιῆσαι ἡξίου<sup>2</sup> τῆς εἰκόνας τυχεῖν ἔαν ποιήσω,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> om. Aristotle.

<sup>2</sup> Sylburg ex Aristotele: ἡξίου MBOs, Usener: ἡξίους P.

<sup>3</sup> Sylburg ex Aristotele: ποιήση codd.: ποιήση Usener.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

ought . . .”<sup>1</sup> Under the same archon he delivered the tenth speech, in which he endeavoured to show that Philip was violating the peace and taking the lead in stirring up war. The speech begins<sup>2</sup>: “Although there is a great deal of discussion, men of Athens . . .” The next archon after Sosigenes was Nicomachus, in whose year of office he delivered the eleventh oration,<sup>3</sup> about the violation of the peace by Philip, in which he urged the Athenians to send help to the Byzantines. It begins: “Serious as I consider, men of Athens . . .” In the archonship of Theophrastus, who followed Nicomachus, Demosthenes urges the Athenians to endure the war in a courageous spirit, since Philip had already declared it. This is the last of the speeches against Philip, and it begins with these words<sup>4</sup>: “The fact that Philip did not make peace with you, men of Athens, but merely deferred the war : . . .”

To show that all the speeches I have enumerated 11 were delivered by Demosthenes before the publication of the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, I shall produce Aristotle himself as my witness. In the beginning of the passage in the Second Book of the *Rhetoric*, where he begins to define the topics from which enthymemes are derived, one of those which he introduces is that of time, and he illustrates it by examples. I shall quote his actual words<sup>5</sup>: “Another topic relates to time. Thus Iphicrates, in his speech against Harmodius, says: ‘If, before doing you this service, I had demanded this statue

<sup>1</sup> *On the Chersonese* 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Philippic* 3. 1.

<sup>3</sup> 341/0 B.C. The Fourth Philippic.

<sup>4</sup> *The Reply to the Letter of Philip* (XI in the Oxford text).

<sup>5</sup> *Rhetoric* 2. 23. 6.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔδοτε ἄν· ποιήσαντι δ' οὐ δώσετε; μὴ τοίνυν μέλλοντες μὲν ὑπισχνεῖσθε, παθόντες δὲ ἀφαιρεῖσθε. καὶ πάλιν πρὸς τὸ διὰ Θηβαίων διείναι<sup>1</sup> Φίλιππον εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, ὅτι εἰ πρὶν βοηθῆσαι <εἰς><sup>2</sup> Φωκεῖς ἡξίου, ὑπέσχοντο ἄν· ἄτοπον οὖν εἶ, διότι προεῖτο καὶ ἐπίστευσεν, μὴ διήσουσιν.'

ὁ δὲ χρόνος οὗτος, ἐν ᾧ Φίλιππος ἡξίου Θηβαίους ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν αὐτῷ δοῦναι δίοδον ὑπομιμνήσκων τῆς ἐν τῷ πρὸς Φωκεῖς πολέμῳ γενομένης βοηθείας, ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς γίνεται φανερὸς ἱστορίας. εἶχε γὰρ οὕτως· μετὰ τὴν Ὀλυνθίων ἄλωσιν ἄρχοντος Θεμιστοκλέους συνθήκαι Φιλίππῳ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐγένοντο περὶ φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας· αὐταὶ διέμειναν ἑπταετῆ χρόνον ἄχρι Νικομάχου· ἐπὶ δὲ Θεοφράστου τοῦ μετὰ Νικόμαχον ἄρξαντος ἐλύθησαν, Ἀθηναίων μὲν Φίλιππον αἰτιωμένων ἄρχειν τοῦ πολέμου, Φιλίππου δὲ Ἀθηναίοις ἐγκαλοῦντος. τὰς δὲ αἰτίας δι' ἃς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον κατέστησαν ἀδικεῖσθαι λέγοντες ἀμφοτέροι, καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐν ᾧ τὴν εἰρήνην ἔλυσαν ἀκριβῶς δηλοῖ Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ ἕκτῃ τῆς Ἀτθίδος βύβλῳ. θήσω δ' ἐξ αὐτῆς τὰ ἀναγκαιότατα· Θεόφραστος Ἀλαιεύς; ἐπὶ τούτου Φίλιππος τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀναπλεύσας Περίνθῳ προσέβαλεν, ἀποτυχῶν δ' ἐντεῦθεν Βυζάντιον ἐπολιόρκει καὶ μηχανήματα προσῆγεν.' ἔπειτα διεξελθὼν, ὅσα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις

<sup>1</sup> codd.: τὸ Θηβαίους διείναι Aristotle.

<sup>2</sup> Sauppe ex Aristotele.

<sup>1</sup> 347/6 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> 341/0 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> Frag. Gr. Hist. 328 F54 (Jacoby III i. p. 331).

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

from you on condition of my success, you would have granted it. Will you then refuse it to me when I have done it? Do not make promises when you expect something, and break them after you have received it.' And again, in an argument addressed to the Thebans to persuade them to allow Philip to pass through their territory into Attica, it might be said that if he had made the demand before he helped them against the Phocians they would have promised. It would therefore be monstrous if they refused to let him through because he had thrown away his opportunity and had trusted them."

Now the date at which Philip called upon the Thebans to grant him a passage into Attica, reminding them of his help in the Phocian War, is clear from common historical knowledge. The circumstances were as follows. In the archonship of Themistocles,<sup>1</sup> after the capture of Olynthus, Philip made a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Athenians. This agreement lasted seven years, till the year of Nicomachus' archonship.<sup>2</sup> It was broken in the archonship of Theophrastus, who succeeded Nicomachus. The Athenians blamed Philip for starting the war, while Philip accused the Athenians. The reasons why each of the two sides embarked upon the war and claimed to be the injured party, and the date when they violated the peace, are indicated precisely by Philochorus in the Sixth Book of his *Attic History*, from which I shall quote the essential facts<sup>3</sup>: "Theophrastus of the deme Halae. In his year of office Philip first sailed up and attacked Perinthus, and, failing there, went next to lay siege to Byzantium, and brought siege-engines against it." Then he describes in full the allegations which

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ὁ Φίλιππος ἐνεκάλει διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ταῦτα πάλιν κατὰ λέξιν ἐπιτίθησιν· ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀκούσας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ Δημοσθένους παρακαλέσαντος αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον καὶ <τὰ><sup>1</sup> ψηφίσματα γράψαντος ἐχειροτόνησε τὴν μὲν στήλην καθελεῖν τὴν περὶ τῆς πρὸς Φίλιππον εἰρήνης καὶ συμμαχίας σταθεῖσαν, ναῦς δὲ πληροῦν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐνεργεῖν τὰ τοῦ πολέμου·

ταῦτα γράψας κατὰ Θεόφραστον ἄρχοντα γεγονέναι, τῷ μετ' ἐκείνον ἐνιαυτῷ τὰ πραχθέντα μετὰ τὴν λύσιν τῆς εἰρήνης ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου ἄρχοντος διεξέρχεται. θήσω δὲ καὶ τούτων αὐτὰ τὰ ἀναγκαιότατα· Ἐπιμαχίδης Ἀχαρνεύς· ἐπὶ τούτου τὰ μὲν ἔργα τὰ περὶ τοὺς νεωσοίκους καὶ τὴν σκευοθήκην ἀνεβάλλοντο διὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς Φίλιππον· τὰ δὲ χρήματα ἐψηφίσαντο πάντ' εἶναι στρατιωτικὰ Δημοσθένους γράψαντος. Φιλίππου δὲ καταλαβόντος Ἐλάτειαν καὶ Κυτίνιον καὶ πρέσβεις πέμψαντος εἰς Θήβας \* \* \*<sup>2</sup> Θετταλῶν Αἰνιάνων Αἰτωλῶν Δολόπων Φθιωτῶν, Ἀθηναίων δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον πρέσβεις ἀποστειλάντων τοὺς περὶ Δημοσθένη, τούτοις συμμαχεῖν ἐψηφίσαντο· φανεροῦ δὲ γεγονότος τοῦ χρόνου, καθ' ὃν εἰσῆλθον εἰς Θήβας οἱ τε Ἀθηναίων πρέσβεις οἱ περὶ Δημοσθένη καὶ οἱ παρὰ Φιλίππου, ὅτι κατὰ Λυσιμαχίδην ἄρχοντα πίπτει, παρεσκευασμένων ἤδη τὰ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἀμφοτέρων, αὐτὸς ὁ Δημοσθένης ποιήσει φανερόν ἐν

<sup>1</sup> Weil.

<sup>2</sup> καὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ suppl. Usener: μετὰ suppl. Sauppe.



## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

Philip made against the Athenians in his letter, and adds these words, which I quote as they stand: "The people, after listening to the letter and the speech of Demosthenes exhorting them to declare war and proposing the usual measures, voted to demolish the column that had been set up to record the treaty of peace and alliance with Philip, and to man a fleet and in other respects to make active preparations for war."

After stating that these events took place in the archonship of Theophrastus, he describes in full the events of the succeeding year, when Lysimachides was archon after the breaking of the peace. Here again I shall quote only the most essential details.<sup>1</sup> "Lysimachides of the deme Acharnae. In the year of this archon the Athenians, because of the war against Philip, deferred the work on the docks and the arsenal. They resolved, on the proposal of Demosthenes, that all the money should be devoted to the campaign. But when Philip seized Elateia and Cytinium, and sent to Thebes representatives of the Thessalians, Aenianians, Aetolians, Dolopians and Phthiotians, while at the same time the Athenians had sent out an embassy headed by Demosthenes, the Thebans resolved to form an alliance with the Athenians." Now it is clear that it was during the archonship of Lysimachides, when both sides had already completed their preparations for war, that the Athenian envoys headed by Demosthenes and those sent by Philip entered Thebes. Demosthenes

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου λόγῳ, τίνες ἦσαν αἱ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβειῶν ἀμφοτέρων ἀξιώσεις· θήσω δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς λαβὼν τῆς ἐκείνου λέξεως τὰ συντείνοντα πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα· Ὅυτως διαθεῖς Φίλιππος τὰς πόλεις πρὸς ἀλλήλας διὰ τούτων, καὶ τούτοις ἐπαρθεῖς τοῖς ψηφίσμασι καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν ἦκεν ἔχων τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τὴν Ἐλάτειαν κατέλαβεν, ὡς οὐδ' ἂν εἴ τι γένοιτο, ἔτι συμπνευσάντων <sup>1</sup> ἡμῶν ἂν καὶ τῶν Θηβαίων· ἀλλὰ μὴν τὰ τότε συμβάντα διεξελθὼν, διεξελθὼν δὲ τοὺς ῥηθέντας ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ λόγους ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ὡς πρεσβευτῆς ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων εἰς Θήβας ἐπέμφθη, ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν ἐπιτίθησιν· ὡς γὰρ <sup>2</sup> ἀφικόμεθα εἰς τὰς Θήβας, κατελαμβάνομεν Φιλίππου καὶ Θετταλῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων παρόντας πρέσβεις, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἡμετέρους φίλους ἐν φόβῳ, τοὺς δ' ἐκείνου θρασεῖς· ἔπειτ' ἐπιστολὴν τινα κελεύσας ἀναγνωσθῆναι ταῦτ' ἐπιτίθησιν· Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἐποίησαντο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, προσῆγον ἐκείνους <προτέρους> <sup>3</sup> διὰ τὸ τὴν τῶν συμμάχων τάξιν ἐκείνους ἔχειν. καὶ παριόντες <sup>4</sup> ἐδημηγόρουν πολλὰ μὲν Φίλιππον ἐγκωμιάζοντες, πολλὰ δ' ὑμῖν ἐγκαλοῦντες, <sup>5</sup> πάνθ' ὅσα πώποτε ἐναντία ἐπράξατε Θηβαίους ἀναμιμνήσκοντες. τὸ δ' οὖν κεφάλαιον, ἡξίουσιν, ὧν μὲν εὖ ἵπεπόνθεσαν ὑπὸ Φιλίππου χάριν αὐτοὺς ἀποδοῦναι, ὧν δ' ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἡδίκηνται δίκην λαβεῖν, ὁποτέρως βούλονται, ἢ διέντας αὐτοὺς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἢ συνεμβάλλοντας <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Elmsley, Schaefer: συμπνευσόντων codd. Dionysii et Demosthenis, Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Demosthenes: δ' codd., Usener.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

himself, in his speech *On the Crown*, will clearly show what were the claims made by both sides. I shall quote from his actual text the relevant passages<sup>1</sup>: “ Philip, having induced this mutual feeling among the cities by these means, and being encouraged by these decrees and answers, came with his army and seized Elateia, in the belief that, whatever might happen, we and the Thebans would never again make common cause”. Furthermore, after describing in full what happened at that point, and also describing the speeches which he himself delivered in the public assembly and the circumstances under which he was sent as an ambassador to Thebes, he adds (and I quote)<sup>2</sup>: “ On our arrival at Thebes, we found ambassadors from Philip, the Thessalians and his other allies, already there, and our friends alarmed, his confident.” Then, after requesting a certain letter to be read, he adds<sup>3</sup>: “ So when the Thebans had convened the assembly, they introduced Philip’s representatives first, because they had the status of allies. And these came forward and spoke in fulsome praise of Philip and disparagement of you, recalling all the hostile acts you had ever committed against the Thebans. To sum up, they urged them to show their gratitude for the services done by Philip, and to exact from you the penalty for the injuries which you had done them by either of the two ways they preferred, by allowing Philip’s troops to pass through their land to attack

<sup>1</sup> *De Corona* 168.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* 211.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* 213.

---

<sup>3</sup> Roberts ex Demosthene: om. Usener.

<sup>4</sup> MBP: παρελθόντες Demosthenes.

<sup>5</sup> codd.: ὑμῶν κατηγοροῦντες Demosthenes.

<sup>6</sup> codd.: συνεμβalόντες s ex Demosthene.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν· εἰ δὲ κατὰ Λυσιμαχίδην μὲν ἄρχοντα τὸν μετὰ Θεόφραστον λελυμένης ἤδη τῆς εἰρήνης οἱ παρὰ Φιλίππου πρέσβεις εἰς Θήβας ἀπεστάλησαν παρακαλοῦντες αὐτοὺς μάλιστα μὲν συνεισβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, εἰ δὲ μή, δίοδον τῷ Φιλίππῳ παρασχεῖν μεμνημένους τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν περὶ τὸν Φωκικὸν πόλεμον, ταύτης δὲ μέμνηται τῆς πρεσβείας Ἀριστοτέλης, ὡς ὀλίγω πρότερον ἐπέδειξα τὰς ἐκείνου λέξεις παρασχόμενος, ἀναμφιλόγοις δῆπουθεν ἀποδέδεικται τεκμηρίοις, ὅτι πάντες οἱ Δημοσθένους ἀγῶνες οἱ πρὸ τῆς Λυσιμαχίδου ἀρχῆς ἐν ἐκκλησίαις τε καὶ δικαστηρίοις γινόμενοι πρότερον τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν \* \* \*<sup>1</sup>

- 12 ἑτέραν προσθήσω μαρτυρίαν παρὰ τοῦ φιλοσόφου λαβῶν, ἐξ ἧς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἔσται φανερόν, ὅτι μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν συμβάντα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Φίλιππον αἱ ῥητορικαὶ συνετάχθησαν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τέχνη, Δημοσθένους ἀκμάζοντος ἤδη κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ πάντας εἰρηκότους τοὺς τε δημηγορικοὺς καὶ τοὺς δικανικοὺς λόγους, ὧν ὀλίγω πρότερον ἐμνήσθην. διεξιὼν γὰρ τοὺς τόπους τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς αἰτίας τίθησι· παρέξομαι δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου λέξιν· ἄλλος παρὰ τὸ ἀναίτιον <ὡς αἴτιον>,<sup>2</sup> οἷον τῷ ἅμα ἢ μετὰ τοῦτο γεγονέναι. τὸ γὰρ μετὰ τοῦτο <ὡς διὰ τοῦτο><sup>2</sup> λαμβάνουσι, καὶ μάλιστα<sup>3</sup> ἐν ταῖς

<sup>1</sup> Hiatum indic. Usener ἐκδεδομένοι εἰσιν explendum.

<sup>2</sup> s ex Aristotele.

<sup>3</sup> οἱ add. s ex Aristotele.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

you, or by joining him in the invasion of Attica.” Now if it was during the archonship of Lysimachides, the successor of Theophrastus,<sup>1</sup> and after the peace had been broken, that the ambassadors of Philip were sent to the Thebans urging them preferably to join in invading Attica, or, failing that, to provide Philip with a way through their country in recognition of his services during the Phocian War; and if it is this embassy that Aristotle is alluding to, as I showed it to be a little earlier when I cited his actual words, then obviously we have demonstrated with incontestable evidence that all the public speeches which Demosthenes addressed to the assemblies and the law-courts before the archonship of Lysimachides are earlier than the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle.

I shall add another piece of evidence which I have 12  
obtained from the philosopher, from which it will become even more obvious that his *Rhetoric* was composed after the war which took place between Philip and the Athenians, when Demosthenes had attained the height of his political power and had delivered all the deliberative and forensic speeches which I mentioned a little while ago. In his list of the topics of enthymemes the philosopher includes that of cause. I shall quote the passage as he wrote it <sup>2</sup>: “Another topic consists in regarding what is not a cause as a cause, as, for example, when one thing happens at the same time as or after another: in this case what happens after something else is assumed to have been caused by it. This is a very common

<sup>1</sup> 339/8 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhetoric* 2. 24. 8, the only passage in the *Rhetoric* in which Demosthenes is mentioned by name.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πολιτείαις.<sup>1</sup> ὡς ὁ Δημάδης τὴν Δημοσθένους πολι-  
τείαν πάντων τῶν κακῶν αἰτίαν· μετ' ἐκεῖνο<sup>2</sup>  
γὰρ \* \* \*'.<sup>3</sup> ποίους οὖν ὁ Δημοσθένης κατε-  
σκεύασεν ἀγῶνας ταῖς Ἀριστοτελείοις τέχναις  
ὁδηγοῖς χρησάμενος, εἰ πάντες οἱ δημόσιοι λόγοι,  
δι' οὓς ἐπαινεῖται τε καὶ θαυμάζεται, πρὸ τοῦ πολέ-  
μου γεγόνασιν, ὡς πρότερον ἐπέδειξα, πλὴν ἑνὸς  
τοῦ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου; οὗτος γὰρ μόνος εἰς δικασ-  
τήριον εἰσελήλυθεν μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐπ' Ἀριστο-  
φῶντος ἄρχοντος <ὀγδόω><sup>4</sup> μὲν ἐνιαυτῷ μετὰ  
τὴν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχην, ἕκτω δὲ μετὰ τὴν Φιλίπ-  
που τελευταίην, καθ' ὃν χρόνον Ἀλέξανδρος τὴν ἐν  
Ἀρβήλοισι ἐνίκα μάχην.

εἰ δέ τις ἐρεῖ τῶν πρὸς ἅπαντα φιλονεικούντων,  
ὅτι τοῦτον ἴσως ἔγραψε τὸν λόγον ταῖς Ἀριστοτέ-  
λους ἐντετευχῶς τέχναις, τὸν κράτιστον ἀπάντων  
<τῶν> λόγων,<sup>5</sup> πολλὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ἔχων, ἵνα  
μὴ μακρότερος τοῦ δέοντος ὁ λόγος γένηται μοι,  
καὶ τοῦτον ἐπιδείξειν ὑπισχνούμαι τὸν ἀγῶνα πρὸ  
τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν ἐπιτετελεσμένον αὐτῷ  
χρησάμενος τῷ φιλοσόφῳ μάρτυρι. προθεῖς γὰρ  
τόπον ἐνθυμημάτων τὸν ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἄλληλα,  
ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· ἄλλος ἐκ τῶν πρὸς  
ἄλληλα· εἰ γὰρ θατέρῳ <ὑπάρχει τὸ καλῶς ἢ

<sup>1</sup> ὄλον add. Aristotele.

<sup>2</sup> MBOP: ἐκείνην s ex Aristotele.

<sup>3</sup> συνέβη ταῦτα suppl. Usener: συνέβη ὁ πόλεμος suppl. s ex Aristotele.

<sup>4</sup> Bentley.

<sup>5</sup> τῶν λόγων Usener: λόγον codd.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

form of argument in politics: Demades argued that Demosthenes' administration was the cause of all the city's troubles, for it was after it . . .” Now what speeches can Demosthenes have composed under the guidance of the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle if, as I have previously shown, all the public speeches that earned him praise and fame were made before the war, with the sole exception of the speech *On the Crown*? This was the one speech that came into court after the war: it was delivered during the archonship of Aristophon,<sup>1</sup> eight years after the battle of Chaeroneia, and six years after the death of Philip, at the time of Alexander's victory at the Battle of Arbela.<sup>2</sup>

Now if one of those habitual quibblers is going to suggest that perhaps Demosthenes did not write this, the best of all his speeches, before he had come across the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, I can say many things in reply to him. But in order that my discussion may not become unnecessarily long, I undertake to demonstrate, using the philosopher himself as my witness, that this oration too was completed before the publication of the *Rhetoric*. In proposing to deal with the subject of enthymemes derived from relative terms, he writes these exact words<sup>3</sup>: “Another topic is that derived from relative terms. If the terms ‘fairly’ or ‘justly’ may be applied to a man who

<sup>2</sup> The Battle of Gaugamela took place in that year; that of Arbela was fought in 331 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhetoric* 2. 23. 3. Dionysius quotes inaccurately and incompletely.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

δικαίως ποιῆσαι, θατέρω><sup>1</sup> τὸ πεπονθέναι, καὶ εἰ  
κελεῦσαι, καὶ τὸ πεποιηκέναι· οἶον ὡς ὁ τελώνης ὁ  
Διομέδων·<sup>2</sup> εἰ γὰρ μηδ' ὑμῖν αἰσχρὸν τὸ πωλεῖν,  
οὐδὲ ἡμῖν τὸ ὠνεῖσθαι. καὶ εἰ τῷ πεπονθότι <τὸ><sup>1</sup>  
καλῶς καὶ<sup>3</sup> δικαίως ὑπάρχει, τῷ πεπραγμένῳ  
ὑπάρξει καὶ τῷ ποιήσαντι ἢ ποιοῦντι. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο  
παραλογίσασθαι· οὐ γὰρ εἰ δικαίως ἔπαθεν, ἅμα  
καὶ δικαίως ὑπὸ τούτου πέπονθε. διὸ δεῖ σκοπεῖν  
χωρίς, εἰ ἄξιός ὁ παθὼν παθεῖν καὶ ὁ ποιήσας  
ποιῆσαι, εἶτα χρῆσθαι ὁποτέρως ἂν ἀρμόττη.  
ἐνίοτε γὰρ διαφωνεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ  
Ἄλκμαίῳ τῷ Θεοδέκτου . . .<sup>4</sup> καὶ οἶον ἢ περὶ  
Δημοσθένους δίκη καὶ τῶν ἀποκτεινάντων Νικά-  
νορα· τίς οὖν ἔστιν ἢ Δημοσθένους δίκη [καὶ  
τῶν ἀποκτεινάντων Νικάνορα]<sup>5</sup> περὶ ἧς ὁ φιλό-  
σοφος γέγραφεν, ἐν ἧ τὸ κυριώτατον τῆς ἀμφισ-  
βητήσεως κεφάλαιον ἦν ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς ἄλληλα τόπου;  
ἢ πρὸς Αἰσχίνην ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος τοῦ παρασχόν-  
τος Δημοσθένει τὸ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου ψήφισμα  
καὶ τὴν τῶν παρανόμων φεύγοντος γραφήν· ἐν  
ταύτῃ γὰρ τὸ ζητούμενον ἦν οὐ τὸ κοινόν, εἰ  
τιμῶν καὶ στεφάνων ἄξιός ἦν Δημοσθένης ἐπιδουῶς  
ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κτημάτων τὴν εἰς τὰ τεῖχη δαπάνην,  
ἀλλ' εἰ καθ' ὃν χρόνον ὑπεύθυνος ἦν, κωλύοντος τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> s ex Aristotele.

<sup>2</sup> add. περὶ τῶν τελωνῶν s ex Aristotele.

<sup>3</sup> codd.: ἢ Aristotle.

<sup>4</sup> Exempla ex Alcmaeone Theodecti om. Dionysius.

<sup>5</sup> del. Weil.



## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

acts, they can also be applied to the man who is affected by the action; and if they can be applied to a command, they can also be applied to its execution, as is seen in the words of the tax-gatherer Diomedon, who said, 'If it is not shameful for you to sell the taxes, it is not shameful for us to buy them.' And if the terms 'fairly' or 'justly' can be applied to the man affected by an action, they can also be applied to the action itself and the man who has acted or is acting. This argument, however, is a fallacy: for if a man has been treated justly, it does not follow that he has been treated justly by the particular agent involved. Therefore we must consider separately whether the patient has been treated rightly and whether the agent has acted rightly, and then deal with the matter in whichever of the two ways seems more appropriate; for sometimes a distinction is to be made, as in the *Alcmaeon* of Theodectes . . . Another example is the trial in which Demosthenes and those who killed Nicanor were concerned."<sup>1</sup> Now what is this trial of Demosthenes to which Aristotle refers, in which the most important point in the dispute was derived from the topic of relative terms? It is that in which he opposed Aeschines on Ctesiphon's behalf, when the latter had moved that Demosthenes be honoured, and was being accused of proposing an illegal measure: for in this trial the point at issue was not the general question of whether Demosthenes deserved honours and garlands for having provided the money for the fortifications from his own private resources, but whether he should receive these awards while he was still an official

<sup>1</sup> Nothing is known of this Nicanor, and he does not appear in the *De Corona* as we have it. See Introduction, p. 304.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

νόμου τοὺς ὑπευθύνους στεφανοῦν. τὸ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἄλληλα τοῦτ' ἔστιν, εἰ ὥσπερ τῷ δήμῳ τὸ δοῦναι, οὕτως καὶ τῷ ὑπευθύνῳ τὸ λαβεῖν τὸν στέφανον ἐξῆν. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ταύτης οἶομαι τῆς δίκης μεμνήσθαι τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη. εἰ δέ τις ἐρεῖ, ὅτι περὶ τῆς τῶν δώρων, ἣν ἐπ' Ἀντικλέους ἄρχοντος ἀπελογήσατο περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτήν, πολλῶ νεωτέρας ἔτι ποιήσει τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνας τῶν Δημοσθένους ἀγώνων.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὅτι μὲν οὐχ ὁ ῥήτωρ παρὰ τοῦ φιλοσόφου τὰς τέχνας παρέλαβεν αἷς τοὺς θαυμαστοὺς ἐκείνους κατεσκεύασε λόγους, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον τὰ Δημοσθένους καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων ἔργα παραθέμενος Ἀριστοτέλης ταύτας ἔγραψε τὰς τέχνας, ἱκανῶς ἀποδεδείχθαι νομίζω.

## FIRST LETTER TO AMMAEUS

liable to account, when the law forbade the granting of decorations to such officials. Here we have the topic of relative terms: the point is whether the official liable to account had the same right to receive, as the people had to give, the garland. Therefore I think it is to this trial that Aristotle is referring. But if anyone says that the reference is to the accusation of corruption against which Demosthenes defended himself in the archonship of Anticles,<sup>1</sup> about the time of the death of Alexander, this will make the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle later than the speeches of Demosthenes by an even greater margin.

But I think I have sufficiently proved my contention that the orator did not receive from the philosopher the rules of rhetoric which he used in the construction of those marvellous speeches of his, but that, on the contrary, Aristotle wrote his *Rhetoric* with reference to the works of Demosthenes and the other orators.

<sup>1</sup> 325/4 B.C.



**LETTER TO  
GNAEUS POMPEIUS**



## INTRODUCTION

This letter is divided into two parts. In the first two chapters Dionysius defends the criticisms he has made of Plato's style in the *Demosthenes*, and quotes Chapters 5, 6 and 7 of that work. He argues that his criticisms of Plato, unlike the philosopher's criticisms of others, arise not out of malice but naturally from the comparative method of criticism, which he defends. After quoting his earlier remarks, he points out that his strictures are confined to matters of style, and that they arise through his application of Plato's own high standards. The fact that Dionysius found it necessary to restate his views on Plato and to conclude Chapter 2 by reaffirming his belief in the superiority of Demosthenes to Plato may be compared with a similar reference to Demosthenes at the end of the *Thucydides*, whose superficial attraction to pretentious seekers after novel obscurity of style was noted by Cicero (*Orator* 9. 30-2). This was one of the difficulties which Dionysius faced in championing Demosthenes; another was the view taken by some who called themselves Atticist, that plainness and simplicity was the hallmark of that style. But the greatest of his difficulties was the fact that Demosthenes came at the end of a long line of great

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

Athenian authors, so that his debt to any or all of these might be exaggerated. (Plato himself was included by Cicero (*Orator* 4. 15) among those who influenced Demosthenes' style.)

But if Demosthenes was the author to be admired and imitated above all others, the rest of the Attic pantheon was not to be ignored. Each had a contribution to make, and not only the orators: in his lost treatise *On Imitation* Dionysius described and compared the styles of poets, philosophers and historians as well as orators for eclectic purposes, and Chapters 3 to 6 of the present letter contain quotations from this treatise. Historians only are considered, and he begins with a comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides. Herodotus is judged to be superior to Thucydides in his choice of subject. There could be no clearer indication of the intellectual weakness of the rhetorical mentality than this extraordinary statement, which has long<sup>1</sup> been the object of deserved scorn and adds nothing to Dionysius' own stature as a critic, or indeed as a historian. It provides stark illustration of the purpose of rhetorical history—to furnish examples of the noble deeds of the past in order to show how men of brave and virtuous character prevailed over the base and the ignoble. Thucydides, understood by few in antiquity, did not fit into this pattern.

Xenophon, though he had his prejudices, was a more conventional, and certainly a more accessible

<sup>1</sup> Especially, of course, on the part of the historian's admirers. Thomas Hobbes expressed his disgust in these words: "I think there was never written so much absurdity in so few lines" (Preface to his translation of Thucydides, in *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, Vol. VIII, p. xxvi).



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

historian, and enjoyed wide popularity,<sup>1</sup> especially among the Romans of Dionysius' day. In his critique Dionysius shows a similar awareness of his stylistic limitations to Cicero, finding him a worthy, if pale imitator of Herodotus, suffering the inadequacies of an exponent of the plain style—lack of intensity and emotional appeal. The next historian discussed, Philistus, is proclaimed an imitator of Thucydides, like him choosing an inferior subject, but writing in a more pedestrian style which was easier to imitate.

Theopompus, the last author discussed by Dionysius in this letter, was the archetypal Hellenistic historian (and hence of especial interest to Dionysius' pupils) in two senses: he was himself steeped in rhetoric, being a pupil of Isocrates, and was acutely conscious of the power of history to entertain, edify and educate. His moralising, censorious strain made him the most suitable of models for historians of Dionysius' own day, apart from the orators themselves, since the whole tenor of his history resembled that which then prevailed. While emphasising Theopompus' moralising qualities with characteristic hyperbole, Dionysius also stresses his devotion to research and his intellectual powers. In none of Dionysius' critical works does any author receive more fulsome praise than Theopompus in this letter. The adverse criticisms with which it concludes are brief: in style he is said to have some of his master's faults, and in subject-matter an excessive fondness for digression.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See K. Munscher, *Xenophon in der griechischer-römische Literatur*. Philologus Suppl. 1920.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Orator* 61. 207.

ΠΡΟΣ ΠΟΜΠΗΙΟΝ ΓΕΜΙΝΟΝ  
ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΓΝΑΙΩΙ ΠΟΜΠΗΙΩΙ  
ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

1 Ἐπιστολήν τινα παρὰ σοῦ κομισθεῖσαν ἔδεξάμην εὐπαίδευτόν τε καὶ πάνυ μοι κεχαρισμένην, ἐν ἣ γράφεις, ὅτι τὰς συντάξεις τὰς ἐμὰς ἐπιχορηγοῦντός σοι Ζήνωνος τοῦ κοινοῦ φίλου διαπορευόμενος καὶ πάνυ διατιθέμενος οἰκείως, ἐν αὐταῖς τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θαυμάζεις, ἐνὶ δὲ μέρει δυσχεραίνεις τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς κατακεχωρισμένων, τῇ Πλάτωνος κατηγορία. ὅτι μὲν οὖν σεβαστικῶς διάκεισαι πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα, ὀρθῶς ποιεῖς· ὅτι δὲ περὶ ἡμῶν τὰναντία ὑπέιληφας, οὐκ ὀρθῶς. εἰ γάρ τις ἄλλος ἐκπλήττεται ταῖς Πλατωνικαῖς ἐρμηνείαις, εὖ ἴσθι νῦν, καὶ γὰρ τούτων εἰς εἶμι. ὁ δὲ πέπονθα πρὸς ἅπαντας, ὅσοι τὰς αὐτῶν ἐπινοίας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν φέρουσιν ὠφέλειαν ἐπανορθοῦντες ἡμῶν βίους τε καὶ λόγους, ἐρῶ σοι, καὶ πείσω γε νῆ Δία, πιστεύων καινὸν οὐδὲν ἐρεῖν οὐδὲ παράδοξον οὐδ' ὁ μὴ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως δοκεῖ.

---

<sup>1</sup> This suggests that Pompeius Geminus was not one of

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

DIONYSIUS TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS  
GREETINGS

A scholarly letter has been brought to me from you, which I have received with great pleasure. In it you write that Zeno, a friend of both of us, has supplied you with copies of my treatises,<sup>1</sup> and that in perusing and familiarising yourself with them you find that you feel a general admiration for them, but are dissatisfied with one portion of their contents, namely the criticism of Plato.<sup>2</sup> Now you are right to feel reverence for that author, but not right in your contrary assumption about my attitude. I want to assure you here and now that, if anyone is astounded by Plato's powers of expression, I am to be numbered among these admirers.<sup>3</sup> But I will tell you what I feel about all those who direct their thoughts towards public benefaction in their desire to reform our lives and words; and indeed I intend to convince you that I have discovered nothing new or unexpected or contrary to the universally accepted view. 1

Dionysius' closer associates. This Zeno is otherwise unknown to us.

<sup>2</sup> Adverse criticism of Plato is found in *Demosthenes* 5-7, 23-30.

<sup>3</sup> Plato is quoted with admiration in *De Compositione Verborum* 18 and 25.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐγὼ οὖν νομίζω δεῖν, ὅταν μὲν ἔπαινον προέλῃται γράφειν τις πράγματος εἴτε σώματος ὁποίου γένους, τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ τὰ τυχήματα, εἴ τινα πρόσεστι, [τῷ πράγματι ἢ τῷ σώματι δεῖν]<sup>1</sup> προφέρειν· ὅταν δὲ βουλευθῆ διαγνῶναι, τί τὸ κράτιστον ἐν ὅτῳ δὴ ποτε βίῳ καὶ τί τὸ βέλτιστον τῶν ὑπὸ ταῦτὸ γένος ἔργων, τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην ἐξέτασιν προσφέρειν καὶ μηδὲν παραλείπειν τῶν προσόντων αὐτοῖς εἴτε κακῶν εἴτε ἀγαθῶν· ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια οὕτως εὐρίσκεται μάλιστα, ἧς οὐδὲν χρῆμα τιμιώτερον. τοῦτο δὴ προθέμενος ἐκεῖνο λέγω· εἰ μὲν ἔστι μοι κατὰ Πλάτωνος λόγος τις καταδρομὴν περιέχων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὡσπερ Ζωῖλῳ τῷ ῥήτορι, ἀσεβεῖν ὁμολογῶ· καὶ εἴ γε βουλευθεὶς ἐγκώμιον αὐτοῦ γράφειν ψόγους τινὰς συγκαταπλέκω τοῖς ἐπαίνοις, ἀδικεῖν φημι καὶ παρεκβαίνειν τοὺς καθεστῶτας ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐπαίνοις νόμους· οὐ γὰρ ὅτι διαβολὰς οἶομαι δεῖν γράφειν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀπολογίας· εἰ δὲ χαρακτῆρας λόγου προελόμενος σκοπεῖν καὶ τοὺς πρωτεύοντας ἐν αὐτοῖς φιλοσόφους τε καὶ ῥήτορας ἐξετάζειν τρεῖς μὲν ἐξ ἀπάντων ἐξελεξάμην τοὺς δοκοῦντας εἶναι λαμπροτάτους, Ἴσοκράτην τε καὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Δημοσθένη, ἐκ δὲ τούτων αὐτῶν πάλιν προέκρινα Δημοσθένη, οὐδὲν ὦμην οὔτε Πλάτωνα οὔτε Ἴσοκράτην ἀδικεῖν.

νὴ Δία, φῆς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔδει σε τὰ Πλάτωνος ἀμαρτήματα ἐξελέγχειν, βουλόμενον ἐπαινεῖν Δημοσθένη. ἔπειτα πῶς ἂν μοι τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην

<sup>1</sup> del. Herwerden.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

Now I think it is an author's duty, when he chooses to write a eulogy of an achievement or person of any kind, to give prominence to merits rather than to any deficiencies there may be. But whenever he wishes to distinguish what is the greatest achievement in any walk of life, and what is the best among a number of deeds of the same class, he ought to apply the most rigorous investigation and leave none of their qualities out of consideration, whether good or bad: for this is the surest way of arriving at the truth, and there is nothing more precious than this.<sup>1</sup> Now to that initial proposition I add this: if there is any writing of mine which, like the work of Zoilus the rhetorician,<sup>2</sup> contains an attack upon Plato, I plead guilty of impiety; and if, though purporting to write a eulogy of him, I insinuate a certain amount of censure into my praises, I admit that I am in the wrong and am transgressing the laws which we have established for eulogies, for I think they should not contain even defence, much less derogation, of their subject. When, on the other hand, after undertaking to examine the different literary styles and the philosophers and rhetoricians who excelled in them, I chose from all of them those who are considered to be the most brilliant—Isocrates, Plato and Demosthenes—and among these again I judged Demosthenes the best, I thought I was doing no injustice either to Plato or to Isocrates.

“Very well,” you say, “but you should not have exposed the faults of Plato when your purpose was to praise Demosthenes.” Then how could my argu-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Thucydides* 2 (Vol. I p. 464 lines 14–15) and Sophocles, *Antigone* 702.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. I, p. 229.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

βάσανον ὁ λόγος ἔλαβεν, εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἀρίστους λόγους τῶν Ἰσοκράτους τε καὶ Πλάτωνος τοῖς κρατίστοις <τῶν><sup>1</sup> Δημοσθένους ἀντιπαρέθηκα καὶ καθ' ὃ μέρος ἦττους οἱ τούτων λόγοι εἰσὶ τῶν ἐκείνου, μετὰ πάσης ἀληθείας ἐπέδειξα, οὐχ ἅπαντα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐκείνοις ἡμαρτηῆσθαι λέγων (μανίας γὰρ τοῦτό γε), ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἅπαντα ἐπίσης κατωρθῶσθαι. εἰ δὲ τοῦτ' οὐκ ἐποίουν, ἐπήνουν δὲ Δημοσθένη πάσας διεξιὼν αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀρετάς, ὡς μὲν ἀγαθὸς ὁ ῥήτωρ, ἔπεισα πάντως ἂν τοὺς ἀναγνωσομένους· ὡς δὲ καὶ κράτιστος πάντων τῶν πρωτευσάντων περὶ λόγους, οὐκ ἂν ἔπεισα μὴ παρατιθεῖς αὐτῷ τοὺς ἀρίστους· πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν καθ' αὐτὰ φαινομένων καλῶν καὶ θαυμαστῶν ἑτέροις ἀντιπαρατεθέντα κρείττοσιν ἐλάττω τῆς δόξης ἐφάνη. οὕτω γέ τοι καὶ χρυσὸς ἑτέρω χρυσῷ παρατεθεῖς κρείττων εἶτε καὶ χεῖρων εὐρίσκειται καὶ πᾶν ἄλλο χειρουργημα, καὶ ὄσων ἐνάργεια <sup>2</sup> τὸ τέλος. εἰ δὲ ἀχάριστον ὑπολήψεται τις ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς λόγοις τὴν ἐκ τῆς συγκρίσεως ἐξέτασιν καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστον ἀξιῶσει σκοπεῖν, οὐδὲν κωλύσει τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιεῖν, καὶ μήτε ποιήσιν ἀντεξετάζειν ἑτέρα ποιήσιν μήθ' ἱστορικὴν σύνταξιν ἑτέρα συντάξει μήτε πολιτείαν πολιτεία μήτε νόμον νόμῳ, μὴ στρατηγὸν στρατηγῷ, μὴ βασιλεῖ βασιλέα, μὴ βίῳ βίον, μὴ δόγματι δόγμα· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἂν τις συγχωρήσειε νοῦν ἔχων.

εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαρτυριῶν παρασχέσθαι σοι

<sup>1</sup> Herwerden.

<sup>2</sup> codd.: ἐνέργεια Bontadosus, Usener.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

ments have been subjected to the most rigorous test, if I had not compared the best discourses of Isocrates and Plato with the finest of Demosthenes, and thus shown, with complete objectivity, in what respects their discourses are inferior to his, not maintaining that those two writers were always at fault (for that would be sheer madness) but of course not saying either that they were always and uniformly successful? If I had not acted in this way, but merely praised Demosthenes and listed all his virtues, I should no doubt have convinced my readers that he was a good orator; but I should not have convinced them that he was the finest of all those who attained distinction in oratory, unless I compared him with the best of them. For many things which appear fine and admirable when considered on their own turn out to be less good than they had seemed when they are set side by side with other things that are better. Thus gold when compared with other gold is found to be superior or inferior, and this is true of all other things on which we practise manual skills, and of all activities in which the aim is to produce a vivid effect. But if it is to be assumed that comparative examination is ungracious when applied to civil oratory, and the demand is made that we should consider each orator on his own, there is nothing to stop the same restriction being introduced in other fields. Poetry will no longer be compared with poetry, nor historical treatise with historical treatise, nor constitution with constitution, nor law with law, general with general, king with king, life with life, or belief with belief. Yet no sensible man would agree with this.

But if you require also to be furnished with proofs

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πίστεις, ἐξ ὧν μᾶλλον σοι γενήσεται καταφανές, ὅτι κράτιστος ἐλέγχου τρόπος ὁ κατὰ σύγκρισιν γιγνόμενος, ἀφείς τοὺς ἄλλους αὐτῷ χρήσομαι μάρτυρι Πλάτωνι. βουλευθεὶς γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐπιδείξασθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἣν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς λόγοις, οὐκ ἠρκέσθη ταῖς ἄλλαις γραφαῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ \* \* \*<sup>1</sup> κρατίστου τῶν τότε ῥητόρων ἕτερον αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Φαίδρῳ συνετάξατο λόγον ἐρωτικὸν εἰς τὴν <αὐτὴν><sup>2</sup> ὑπόθεσιν· καὶ οὐδὲ ἄχρι τούτου προελθὼν ἐπαύσατο καταλιπὼν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναγνωσομένοις τὴν διάγνωσιν, πότερός ἐστι κρείττων λόγος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἤψατο τῶν Λυσιείων, τὰς μὲν λεκτικὰς μαρτυρῶν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἀρετάς, τῶν δὲ πραγματικῶν ἐπιλαμβανόμενος. ὁπότε οὖν Πλάτων τὸ φορτικώτατον καὶ ἐπαχθέστατον τῶν ἔργων προελόμενος, αὐτὸν ἐπαινεῖν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν λόγων, οὐδὲν ᾤετο ποιεῖν κατηγορίας ἄξιον, εἰ παρὰ τὸν ἄριστον τῶν τότε ῥητόρων τοὺς ἰδίους ἐξετάζειν ἠξίου λόγους ἐπιδεικνύμενος Λυσίαν τε ἐν οἷς ἠμάρτηκεν καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐν οἷς κατώρθωκε, τί θαυμαστὸν ἐποιοῦν ἐγὼ τοῖς Δημοσθένους λόγοις συγκρίνων τοὺς Πλάτωνος καὶ εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔχειν ᾤμην, ἐπιλογιζόμενος; ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰς ἄλλας αὐτοῦ γραφὰς παραφέρειν, ἐν αἷς κωμῶδεῖ τοὺς πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ, Παρμενίδην τε καὶ Ἴππίαν καὶ Πρωταγόραν καὶ Πρόδικον καὶ Γοργίαν καὶ Πῶλον καὶ Θεόδωρον καὶ Θρασύμαχον καὶ ἄλλους συχνούς, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> Hiatum indic. Sadée, quem Usener Λυσίου λόγον ἐρωτικὸν ἐκδεδωκότος, τοῦ explendum esse censuit.



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

from personal testimony, to make it clearer to you that the best method of assessment is the comparative, I will pass over all the rest and use Plato himself as my witness. Wishing to show off his own ability in civil oratory, he was not satisfied with his other writings, but, <in rivalry with Lysias> the most accomplished orator of the time, himself composed in the *Phaedrus* another speech on the <same> subject of Love. And even after going to such a length he did not stop and leave it to his readers to decide which speech was the better, but he actually attacked the faults of Lysias, testifying to his virtues of style, but criticising his treatment of subject-matter. Thus, when engaging in the most banal and invidious of tasks, praising his own oratorical ability, Plato did not think that he was doing anything worthy of censure in claiming that his own speeches should be examined alongside those of the best orator of the day, and in calling attention to Lysias' failings and his own successes. In these circumstances, what was there so surprising in my action when I compared the speeches of Plato with those of Demosthenes, and took account of anything that is not good in them? I refrain from bringing in those other works of his in which he makes fun of his predecessors, Parmenides,<sup>1</sup> Hippias, Protagoras, Prodicus,<sup>2</sup> Gorgias, Polus,<sup>3</sup> Theodorus,<sup>4</sup> Thrasymachus<sup>5</sup> and many others, for he

<sup>1</sup> *Sophistes* 242C ff.

<sup>2</sup> All three in *Protagoras* 314 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Gorgias* 461 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Phaedrus* 266E-267A.

<sup>5</sup> *Republic* 1. 336 ff.

---

<sup>2</sup> Herwerden.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

βελτίστου πάντα περὶ αὐτῶν γράφων ἄλλ' εἰ βούλει, καὶ ἀπὸ φιλοτιμίας· ἦν γάρ, ἦν ἐν τῇ Πλάτωνος φύσει πολλὰς ἀρετὰς ἐχούση τὸ φιλότιμον. ἐδήλωσε δὲ τοῦτο μάλιστα διὰ τῆς πρὸς Ὀμηρον ζηλοτυπίας, ὃν ἐκ τῆς κατασκευαζομένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πολιτείας ἐκβάλλει στεφανώσας καὶ μύρω χρίσας, ὡς δὴ τούτων αὐτῷ δέον ἐκβαλλομένῳ, δι' ὃν ἢ τε ἄλλη παιδεία πᾶσα παρήλθεν εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ τελευτῶσα φιλοσοφία. ἀλλὰ θῶμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου δι' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντα λέγειν [ἀληθῆ] <sup>1</sup> Πλάτωνα· τί οὖν ἄτοπον ἐποιοῦμεν <αὐτοὶ> <sup>2</sup> τοῖς ἐκείνου νόμοις χρώμενοι καὶ ἀντι-παρεξετάζειν αὐτῷ τοὺς τῶν ἐπακμασάντων λόγους βουλόμενοι;

ἔπειτ' οὐ μόνος οὐδὲ πρῶτος ἐγὼ φανήσομαι περὶ Πλάτωνος ἐπιχειρήσας τι λέγειν. οὐδ' ἄν τις ἔχοι κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο μέμψασθαί με τὸ μέρος, ὅτι τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ πλείοσιν ἢ δώδεκα γενεαῖς ἑμαυτοῦ πρεσβύτερον ἐξετάζειν \* \* \* <sup>3</sup> ἐπεβαλόμην ὡς δὴ διὰ τοῦτο δόξης τινὸς τευξόμενος. πολλοὶ γὰρ εὐρεθήσονται πρὸ ἐμοῦ τοῦτο πεπονηκότες, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνου γεγόμενοι χρόνον, οἱ δὲ λίαν ὕστερον ἐπακμάσαντες. καὶ γὰρ τὰ δόγματα διέβαλον αὐτοῦ τινες καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐμέμψαντο πρῶτον μὲν ὁ

<sup>1</sup> del. Herwerden.

<sup>2</sup> Usener.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

does not always write about these men in a completely fair spirit, but rather (if you will excuse me for saying so) in a spirit of jealousy. For there was indeed in Plato's nature, for all its virtues, a measure of jealousy. He showed this especially in his envious hostility towards Homer, whom he expels from his imaginary commonwealth, after crowning him with a garland and anointing him with myrrh,<sup>1</sup> as if Homer needed such compliments as he was being expelled, in view of the fact that it was through him that every form of culture, and finally philosophy itself, became a part of our lives.<sup>2</sup> But let us assume that Plato said all these things in a spirit of complete fairness and purely in the interest of truth: what, then, was there unnatural in our conduct when we followed his precedent and elected to compare the discourses of his successors with his own?

Furthermore, it will be seen that I am not the only, nor even the first critic who has ventured to express a view about Plato. Nor could anyone find fault with me on the particular ground that I have taken it upon myself to examine the most distinguished of the philosophers, who is my senior by more than twelve generations, in the fond hope of winning a name for myself by so doing, because many will be found to have done this before me, some of them his contemporaries, and others belonging to a much later age. For his doctrines have had their detractors and his dialogues have had their critics. The first of

<sup>1</sup> *Republic* 3. 398A.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Philodemus, *Rhetorica* Frag. XXI (Vol. II, p. 111 Sudhaus).

---

<sup>3</sup> Hiatus in M (17 litt.), E (15-16 litt.), nullus in PBs.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ μαθητῆς Ἀριστοτέλης, ἔπειτα οἱ περὶ Κηφισόδωρόν τε καὶ Θεόπομπον καὶ Ζωΐλον καὶ Ἴπποδάμαντα καὶ Δημήτριον καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί, οὐ διὰ φθόνον ἢ διὰ φιλαπεχθημοσύνην κωμωδοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξετάζοντες. τοσούτοις δὴ καὶ τηλικούτοις ἀνδράσι παραδείγμασι χρώμενος καὶ παρὰ πάντας τῷ μεγίστῳ Πλάτωνι οὐδὲν ἡγούμην τῆς φιλοσόφου ῥητορικῆς ποιεῖν ἀλλότριον ἀγαθοῦς ἀγαθοῖς ἀντεξετάζων. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς προαιρέσεως, ἣν ἔσχον ἐν τῇ συγκρίσει τῶν χαρακτήρων, ἱκανῶς ἀπολελόγημαι καὶ σοί, Γεμίνε φίλτατε.

2 λοιπὸν δ' ἐστὶ μοι καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ὧν εἶρηκα λόγων περὶ τῶνδ' ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν πραγματεία ῥητόρων εἰπεῖν. θήσω δὲ αὐταῖς λέξεσιν, ὡς ἐκεῖ γέγραφα·

“Ἡ δὲ δὴ Πλατωνικὴ διάλεκτος βούλεται μὲν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὴ μίγμα ἑκατέρου τῶν χαρακτήρων, τοῦ τε ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἰσχυροῦ, καθάπερ εἶρηται μοι πρότερον· πέφυκε δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίως πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς χαρακτήρας εὐτυχῆς. ὅταν μὲν οὖν τὴν ἰσχνὴν καὶ ἀφελῆ καὶ ἀποίητον ἐπιτηδεύῃ φράσιν, ἐκτόπως ἡδεῖά ἐστι καὶ φιλάνθρωπος. καθαρά τε <sup>1</sup> γὰρ ἀποχρώντως γίνεται καὶ διαυγῆς, ὥσπερ τὰ διαφανέστατα τῶν ναμάτων, ἀκριβῆς τε καὶ λεπτὴ παρ' ἠντινοῦν ἑτέραν τῶν τὴν αὐτὴν διάλεκτον εἰργασμένων. τὴν τε κοινότητα διώκει τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὴν σαφήνειαν ἀσκεῖ πάσης ὑπεριδοῦσα κατασκευῆς ἐπιθέτου· ὃ τε πίνος

<sup>1</sup> om. *De Dem.*

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

these was his most representative pupil, Aristotle, and people like Cephisodorus, Theopompus,<sup>1</sup> Zoilus,<sup>2</sup> Hippodamas, Demetrius,<sup>3</sup> and many others. These men made fun of him not from envy or in a vexatious spirit, but in a search for the truth. So with the example of so many great men before me, and especially that of the greatest of them, Plato, I considered that I was doing nothing alien to the spirit of philosophic rhetoric when I compared good writers with good. I therefore think I have sufficiently defended the principle which I have adopted in comparing one style with another, even to your satisfaction, my dearest friend.

It now remains for me to refer to my actual remarks on Plato in the treatise on the Attic Orators. I will quote them word for word as I wrote them in the passage <sup>4</sup>:

“ Plato’s style, too, purports to be a mixture of the grand and the plain style, as I have said before, but his nature did not render him equally effective in both styles. Thus when he expresses himself in plain, simple and unartificial language, his style is extraordinarily agreeable and pleasant; it becomes altogether pure and transparent, like the most pellucid of streams, and compares well in finely-drawn precision with that of any other writing in this style. It aims to use standard vocabulary and cultivates clarity, spurning all superfluous artifice;

<sup>1</sup> See this *Letter*, Ch. 6.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. I, p. 229.

<sup>3</sup> Demetrius of Phalerum. This Hippodamas is otherwise unknown: it is unlikely that he was the archon of that name (375/4 B.C.).

<sup>4</sup> *Demosthenes* 5–7, with some alterations.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτῇ<sup>1</sup> ὁ τῆς ἀρχαιότητος ἡρέμα<sup>2</sup> καὶ λεληθότως ἐπιτρέχει ἰλαρόν τέ τι καὶ τεθηλὸς καὶ μεστόν ὥρας ἄνθος ἀναδίδωσι, καὶ ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν εὐωδιστάτων λειμώνων αὐρά τις ἠδεῖα ἐξ αὐτῆς φέρεται, καὶ οὔτε τὸ λιγυρὸν ἔοικεν ἐμφαίνειν λάλον οὔτε τὸ κομψὸν θεατρικόν. ὅταν δ' εἰς τὴν περιττολογίαν καὶ τό καλλιπεῖν, ὃ πολλάκις εἴωθε ποιεῖν, ἄμετρον ὄρμην λάβῃ, πολλῶ χειρῶν ἑαυτῆς γίννεται· καὶ γὰρ ἀηδεστέρα<sup>3</sup> καὶ κάκιον ἑλληνίζουσα καὶ παχυτέρα φαίνεται· μελαίνει τε τὸ σαφές καὶ ζόφῳ ποιεῖ παραπλήσιον, ἔλκει τε μακρὸν ἀποτείνουσα<sup>4</sup> τὸν νοῦν, συστρέψαι<sup>5</sup> δέον ἐν ὀλίγοις ὀνόμασιν· ἐκχεῖται δ'<sup>6</sup> εἰς ἀπειροκάλους περιφράσεις, πλοῦτον ὀνομάτων ἐπιδεικνυμένη,<sup>7</sup> ὑπεριδοῦσα δὲ<sup>8</sup> τῶν κυρίων ὀνομάτων<sup>9</sup> κὰν τῇ κοινῇ χρήσει κειμένων τὰ πεποιημένα ζητεῖ καὶ ξένα καὶ ἀρχαιοπρεπῆ. μάλιστα δὲ χειμάζεται περὶ τὴν τροπικὴν φράσιν· πολλὴ μὲν γὰρ<sup>9</sup> ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις, ἄκαιρος δ' ἐν ταῖς μετωνυμίαις, σκληρὰ δὲ καὶ οὐ σώζουσα τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐν ταῖς μεταφοραῖς γίννεται, ἀλληγορίας τε περιβάλλεται μακρὰς καὶ πολλὰς οὔτε μέτρον ἔχουσας οὔτε καιρόν, σχήμασί τε ποιητικοῖς ἐσχάτην προσβάλλουσιν ἀηδίαν, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Γοργιείοις ἀκαίρως καὶ μεираκιωδῶς ἐναβρύνεται· καὶ ἄπολύς ὁ τελέτης ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις παρ' αὐτῶ, ὡς καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ

<sup>1</sup> s, *De Dem.*: om. codd., Usener.

<sup>2</sup> add. αὐτῇ codd., Usener.

<sup>3</sup> add. τῆς ἐτέρας *De Dem.*

<sup>4</sup> codd.: ἀποτείνουσα *De Dem.*

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

and it betrays its old-fashioned quality only by the almost imperceptible patina of age that gently steals over it and imparts to it a certain radiant, burgeoning bloom full of vigour. A sweet breeze emanates from it, as from the most fragrant of meadows. Its piercing clarity does not give rise to garrulity, nor its elegance to mere show. But when it launches itself unrestrainedly, as it often does, into impressive and decorated language, it does itself far less than full justice: for this style is less pleasing than the other, since it lacks its purity of dialect and its transparency of texture. It darkens what is clear and reduces it almost to obscurity. It conveys its meaning in a long-drawn-out way when concision and brevity are called for. It abandons itself to tasteless circumlocutions and an empty show of verbal exuberance and, in defiance of correct usage and standard vocabulary, seeks artificial, exotic and archaic forms of expression. It is in figurative speech that it founders decisively: it abounds in appositions, is inopportune in its metonymies and harsh and inaccurate in its metaphors. It also admits allegories whose frequency and length are governed by no considerations of measure or occasion, and revels inappropriately and in a juvenile manner in the conceits of artificial expression, and especially in the Gorgianic figures, which can arouse the utmost displeasure. Indeed, he is quite the hierophant in these matters, as Demetrius of Phalerum and several

---

<sup>5</sup> add. δὲ codd., Usener: om. *De Dem.*

<sup>6</sup> *De Dem.*: om. codd.

<sup>7</sup> add. κένον *De Dem.*

<sup>8</sup> codd.: τε *De Dem.*

<sup>9</sup> om. *De Dem.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Φαληρεὺς εἶρηκέ που καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί.<sup>1</sup> 'οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος.'

Ἔμῃ δέ με ταῦτα ἠγείσθω λέγειν ἀπάσης καταγινώσκοντα τῆς ἐγκατασκευῆς καὶ ἐξηλλαγμένης λέξεως ἣν κέχρηται Πλάτων (μὴ γὰρ οὕτω σκαιὸς γενοίμην ὥστε ταύτην τὴν δόξαν περὶ ἀνδρὸς τηλικούτου λαβεῖν), ἐπεὶ πολλὰ καὶ περὶ πολλῶν οἶδα μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας δυνάμεως ἐξενηνεγμένα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἐνδείξασθαι βουλόμενον, ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀμαρτήματα ἐν ταῖς κατασκευαῖς εἶωθεν ἀμαρτάνειν, καὶ χείρων <μέν><sup>2</sup> αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ γίνεται, ὅταν τὸ μέγα διώκη καὶ περιττὸν ἐν τῇ φράσει, μακρῶ δέ τινι ἀμείνων, ὅταν τὴν ἰσχνὴν καὶ ἀκριβῆ <καὶ><sup>2</sup> δοκοῦσαν μὲν ἀποίητον εἶναι κατεσκευασμένην δὲ ἀμωμήτῳ καὶ ἀφελεῖ κατασκευῇ διάλεκτον εἰσφέρει· ἢ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀμαρτάνει ἢ κομιδῇ βραχὺ τι καὶ οὐκ ἄξιον κατηγορίας. ἐγὼ δὲ ἠξίουں τηλικούτον ἄνδρα πεφυλάχθαι πᾶσαν ἐπιτίμησιν. ταῦτὰ γὰρ οἷ τε κατ' αὐτὸν γερόμενοι πάντες ἐπιτιμῶσιν, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα οὐδὲν δεῖ με λέγειν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῶ (τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ λαμπρότατον)· ἦσθετο γὰρ τῆς ἰδίας ἀπειροκαλίας καὶ ὄνομα ἔθετ' αὐτῇ τὸ διθύραμβον· ὃ νῦν ἂν ἠδέσθην ἐγὼ λέγειν ἀληθὲς ὄν. τοῦτο δὲ παθεῖν ἔοικεν, ὡς ἐγὼ νομίζω, τραφεῖς μὲν ἐν τοῖς Σωκρατικοῖς λόγοις<sup>3</sup> ἰσχυροτάτοις οὖσι καὶ ἀκριβεστάτοις, οὐ μείνας δ'

<sup>1</sup> add. πρότερον *De Dem.*



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

of his predecessors said; for 'the saying is not mine.'<sup>1</sup>

“ But no one should suppose that in making these criticisms I am condemning all the forms of ornate and unconventional style which Plato employs. I hope that I should not be so obtuse and insensitive<sup>2</sup> as to take this view of such a great man, for I know that he has produced many works on a variety of subjects that are great, admirable and inspired in conception. I only wish to show that he is apt to commit errors of this kind in his more elaborate passages and that he falls below his own standards when he strives to express himself in a grand and extraordinary manner, but is far better when he uses language that is plain and precise and appears natural, but really contains a certain degree of simple and unexceptionable artifice. Then he is either completely blameless or but slightly and venially at fault. But I should have expected such a great writer to have insured himself against all forms of criticism. In point of fact, contemporaries of his whose names I need not mention reproach him with this very fault; and the most striking thing is that he acknowledges it himself. He apparently notices his own tendency towards banality, and called it his 'dithyrambic' style, a term which I should have been ashamed to introduce myself at this point, apt though it is. This fault seems to me to be due to the fact that, although he was brought up on the rigorous plainness and precision of the Socratic dialogues, he did not remain

<sup>1</sup> Euripides, Frag. 488 Nauck.

<sup>2</sup> An echo of Demosthenes, *De Corona* 120.

---

<sup>2</sup> *De Dem.*: om. codd.

<sup>3</sup> E: *διαλόγοις* codd., *De Dem.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀλλὰ τῆς Γοργίου καὶ Θουκυδίδου κατασκευῆς ἐρασθεῖς· ὥστ' οὐδὲν ἔξω τοῦ εἰκότος ἔμελλεν πείσεσθαι σπάσας τινὰ καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἅμα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ὧν ἔχουσιν οἱ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων χαρακτῆρες.

ἑ παραδείγματα δὲ τῆς ἰσχνῆς καὶ τῆς ὑψηλῆς λέξεως ἐξ ἑνὸς βυβλίου τῶν πάνυ περιβοήτων παραθήσομαι, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς ἐρωτικούς ὁ Σωκράτης διατέθειται λόγους πρὸς ἕνα τῶν γνωρίμων Φαῖδρον, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν εἴληφε τὸ βυβλίον.

ἐν γὰρ τούτοις τὸ μὲν πραγματικὸν οὐδαμῆ μίμφομαι τοῦ ἀνδρός, τοῦ δὲ λεκτικῆ μορίου τὸ περὶ τὴν τροπικὴν τε καὶ διθυραμβικὴν φράσιν ἐκπίπτει, ἐν οἷς οὐ κρατεῖ τοῦ μετρίου, ἐπιτιμῶ τε οὐχ ὡς τῶν τυχόντων τῶ ἀλλ' ὡς ἀνδρὶ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐγγὺς τῆς θείας ἐληλυθότι φύσεως, ὅτι τὸν ὄγκον τῆς ποιητικῆς κατασκευῆς εἰς λόγους ἤγαγε φιλοσόφους ζηλώσας τοὺς περὶ Γοργίαν, ὥστε καὶ διθυράμβοις τινὰ ποιεῖν εἰκότα, καὶ μηδὲ ἀποκρύπτεσθαι τοῦτο τὸ ἀμάρτημα ἀλλ' ὁμολογεῖν. καὶ σύ γε αὐτός, ὦ βέλτιστε Γεμίνε, ὁμοίαν ἐμοὶ γνώμην περὶ τὰνδρὸς ἔχων φαίνῃ δι' αὐτῆς γέ τοι τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ἐν οἷς κατὰ λέξιν οὕτω γράφεις· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἑτέροις σχήμασι ῥάδιον πεσεῖν μέσον τι ἐπαίνου καὶ μέμψεως· ἐν δὲ τῇ κατασκευῇ τὸ μὴ ἐπιτευχθὲν πάντῃ ἀποτυγχάνεται. διὸ μοι δοκεῖ τούτους τοὺς ἀνδρας οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐπικινδυνωτέρων οὐδὲ ἐλασσόνων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πλείστων καὶ εὐτυχηθέντων ἐξετάζειν'. καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα πάλιν ἐπιλέγεις ταυτί· ἐγὼ δὲ καίπερ ἔχων ἀπολογῆσασθαι ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων ἢ τῶν γε πλείστων

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

constant to these, but fell in love with the artificial styles of Gorgias and Thucydides: so that it was predictable that he should absorb some of the faults of these authors' styles along with their virtues.

“ I am taking as an example of the elevated style a passage from one of his most celebrated dialogues, in which Socrates addressed his discourse on love to one of his friends, Phaedrus, from whom the dialogue takes its title.”

Nowhere in this passage do I find fault with the writer's treatment of subject-matter: only his partiality for figurative and inflated expression, in which respect he fails to maintain moderation. And I criticise him not as an ordinary man, but as a great one who has come near to the divine nature. His fault is that he has introduced the apparatus of poetical artifice into philosophical discourses, and in doing so has vied with Gorgias and his followers, so that some of his prose is like dithyrambic poetry; and he does not try to conceal this fault, but openly avows it. It is clear from your letter, my good Geminus, that you hold the same opinion as I do about the man, for these are the very words you write: “ In other forms of expression it is easy to fall half-way between praise and blame: but in ornamentation, whatever is not success is utter failure. It therefore seems to me that these men should be judged not by their few hazardous attempts but by their many successful ones.” And a little further on you add the following words: “ Although I could defend all these passages, or at least most of them, I

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οὐ τολμῶ σοι ἐναντία λέγειν· ἐν δὲ τοῦτο δισχυρίζομαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι μεγάλως ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐν οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ μὴ τοιαῦτα τολμῶντα καὶ παραβαλλόμενον, ἐν οἷς καὶ σφάλλεσθαι ἐστὶν ἀναγκαῖον.' οὐδὲν διαφερόμεθα πρὸς ἀλλήλους· σύ τε γὰρ ὁμολογεῖς ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὸν ἐπιβαλλόμενον μεγάλοις καὶ σφάλλεσθαι ποτε, ἐγὼ τέ φημι τῆς ὑψηλῆς καὶ μεγαλοπρεποῦς καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένης φράσεως ἐφιέμενον Πλάτωνα μὴ περὶ πάντα τὰ μέρη κατορθοῦν, πολλοστὴν μέντοι μοῖραν ἔχειν τῶν κατορθουμένων τὰ διαμαρτανόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ καθ' ἐν τοῦτο Πλάτωνά φημι λείπεσθαι Δημοσθένους, ὅτι παρ' ᾧ μὲν ἐκπίπτει ποτὲ τὸ ὕψος τῆς λέξεως [τῶν λόγων] <sup>1</sup> εἰς τὸ κενὸν καὶ ἀηδές, παρ' ᾧ δὲ οὐδέποτε ἢ σπανίως γε κομιδῆ. καὶ περὶ μὲν Πλάτωνος τοσαῦτα.

3 περὶ δὲ Ἡροδότου καὶ Ξενοφῶντος ἐβουλήθησ μαθεῖν, τίνα περὶ αὐτῶν ὑπόληψιν ἔχω, καὶ γράψαι με περὶ αὐτῶν ἐβουλήθησ. πεποίηκα [καὶ] <sup>2</sup> τοῦτο οἷς <πρὸς> <sup>3</sup> Δημήτριον ὑπεμνημάτισμαι περὶ μιμήσεως. τούτων ὁ μὲν πρῶτος αὐτὴν περιείληφε τὴν περὶ τῆς μιμήσεως ζήτησιν, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περὶ τοῦ τίνας ἄνδρας μιμείσθαι δεῖ ποιητάς τε καὶ φιλοσόφους, ἱστοριογράφους τε καὶ ῥήτορας, ὁ δὲ τρίτος περὶ τοῦ πῶς δεῖ μιμείσθαι μέχρι τοῦδε ἀτελής. ἐν δὴ τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ Ἡροδότου τε καὶ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Ξενοφῶντος καὶ Φιλίστου καὶ Θεοπόμπου (τούτους γὰρ ἔκρινον τοὺς ἄνδρας εἰς μίμησιν ἐπιτηδειοτάτους) τάδε γράφω·

<sup>1</sup> del. Sylburg.    <sup>2</sup> del. Usener.    <sup>3</sup> οἷς πρὸς Usener: εἰς codd.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

do not venture to contradict you: but this one point I strongly affirm, that it is not possible to achieve great success in any direction without facing and accepting risks of such a kind as must involve the possibility of failure." There is no disagreement between us: for you admit that a man who aspires to great things must sometimes fail, while I say that Plato, in aiming to achieve lofty, impressive and daring effects of expression, did not succeed in every particular, but his failures were nevertheless only a very small fraction of his successes. And I say that it is in this one respect that Plato is inferior to Demosthenes, that with him elevation of style sometimes lapses into emptiness and tedium; whereas with Demosthenes this is never, or only very rarely so. That is all I have to say about Plato.

You wished to learn my opinion of Herodotus and Xenophon, and expressed the desire that I should write about them. I have done this in the essays which I addressed to Demetrius on the subject of imitation.<sup>1</sup> The first of these contains an enquiry into the nature of imitation itself. The second discusses the question of which particular poets and philosophers, historians and orators, should be imitated. The third, in which the question of how imitation should be done, is as yet incomplete. In the second book I write as follows concerning Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Philistus and Theopompus (these being the writers whom I judged to be most suitable for imitation):

<sup>1</sup> For the surviving fragments of an epitomator's version of this work, see Usener-Radermacher (Teubner, Vol. VI) pp. 197-217.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔει δὲ δεῖ καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰπεῖν, περὶ μὲν Ἡρόδοτου καὶ Θουκυδίδου ταῦτα φρονῶ. πρῶτόν τε καὶ σχεδὸν ἀναγκαιότατον ἔργον ἀπάντων ἐστὶ τοῖς γράφουσιν πᾶσιν ἱστορίας ὑπόθεσιν ἐκλέξασθαι καλὴν καὶ κεχαρισμένην τοῖς ἀναγνωσομένοις. τοῦτο Ἡρόδοτος κρεῖττόν μοι δοκεῖ πεποιηκέναι Θουκυδίδου. ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ κοινὴν Ἑλληνικῶν τε καὶ βαρβαρικῶν πράξεων ἐξενήνοχεν ἱστορίαν, ὥς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα . . .’ καὶ ἅπερ αὐτὸς εἶρηκε. τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ προοίμιον καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἐστὶ τῆς ἱστορίας. ὁ δὲ Θουκυδίδης πόλεμον ἓνα γράφει, καὶ τοῦτον οὔτε καλὸν οὔτε εὐτυχῆ· ὃς μάλιστα μὲν ὤφειλε μὴ γενέσθαι, εἰ δὲ μή, σιωπῆ καὶ λήθη παραδοθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων ἠγνοῆσθαι. ὅτι δὲ πονηρὰν εἴληφεν ὑπόθεσιν, καὶ αὐτὸς γε τοῦτο ποιεῖ φανερόν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ· πόλεις τε γὰρ δι’ αὐτὸν ἐξερημωθῆναί φησι πολλὰς Ἑλληνίδας, τὰς μὲν ὑπὸ βαρβάρων, τὰς δ’ ὑπὸ σφῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ φυγαδείας καὶ φθόρους ἀνθρώπων ὅσους οὐπω πρότερον γενέσθαι, σεισμούς τε καὶ αὐχμούς καὶ νόσους καὶ ἄλλας πολλὰς συμφοράς. ὥστε τοὺς ἀναγνόντας τὸ προοίμιον ἠλλοτριῶσθαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, Ἑλληνικῶν μέλλοντας ἀκούειν. ὅσω δὲ κρείττων ἢ τὰ θαυμαστὰ ἔργα δηλοῦσα Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ βαρβάρων γραφὴ τῆς τὰ οἰκτρὰ καὶ δεινὰ πάθη τῶν Ἑλλήνων διαγγελούσης, τοσοῦτω

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

“ These are my opinions concerning Herodotus and Thucydides, if I must speak about them also. The first, and one might say the most necessary task for writers of any kind of history is to select a noble subject which will please their readers. Herodotus seems to me to have done this better than Thucydides. He has produced a general history of the affairs of the Greek and the barbarian world, ‘ in order that the memory of men’s actions may not be erased by the passage of time, nor the achievements . . .’,<sup>1</sup> to use his own words: for this very introduction seems to embody both the beginning and the end <sup>2</sup> of his *History*. Thucydides, however, writes of a single war, and one which was neither glorious or fortunate, but which had best never happened at all or, failing that, should have been consigned to silence and oblivion and ignored by later generations. In his Introduction he makes it clear himself that he has chosen a bad subject, for he says that many Greek cities were laid waste because of the war, partly by barbarians and partly by one another, while there were more expulsions or massacres of whole populations than ever before, and more earthquakes, droughts, plagues and other disasters of many kinds occurred than ever before.<sup>3</sup> The result of this is that readers of the Introduction feel repugnance towards the subject, for it is about the affairs of Greece that we are about to hear. The superiority of Herodotus’ judgment to that of Thucydides in his choice of subject is as great as the superiority of the story of the wonderful deeds of Greeks and barbarians to that of

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus 1. 1.

<sup>2</sup> “ End ” in the sense of “ purpose ”.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides 1. 23. 3.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

φρονιμώτερος Ἡρόδοτος Θουκυδίδου κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῆς ὑποθέσεως. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἔνεστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι δι' ἀνάγκην ἦλθεν ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν γραφὴν, ἐπιστάμενος <μὲν ὡς><sup>1</sup> ἐκεῖνα καλλίω, βουλόμενος δὲ μὴ ταῦτ' ἑτέροις γράφειν· πᾶν γὰρ τοῦναντίον ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ διασύρων τὰ παλαιὰ ἔργα κάλλιστα καὶ θαυμασιώτατα τὰ καθ' αὐτὸν ἐπιτελεσθέντα φησὶν εἶναι, καὶ φανερός ἐστι ταῦτα ἐκὼν ἐλόμενος. οὐ μὴν Ἡρόδοτός γε τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων γενομένων Ἑλλανίκου τε καὶ Χάρωνος τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν προεκδεδωκότων οὐκ ἀπετράπετο, ἀλλ' ἐπίστευσεν αὐτῷ κρεῖσσόν τι ἐξοίσειν· ὅπερ καὶ πεποίηκεν.

δεύτερόν ἐστι τῆς ἱστορικῆς πραγματείας ἔργον γνῶναι πόθεν τε ἄρξασθαι καὶ μέχρι τοῦ προελθεῖν δεῖ. φαίνεται δὴ καὶ τούτῳ Θουκυδίδου πολὺ Ἡρόδοτος φρονιμώτερος· ἄρχεται τε ἀφ' ἧς αἰτίας ἤρξαντο πρῶτον κακῶς ποιεῖν τοὺς Ἕλληνας οἱ βάρβαροι, καὶ προελθὼν εἰς τὴν <τῶν><sup>2</sup> βαρβάρων κόλασιν καὶ τιμωρίαν λήγει. ὁ δὲ Θουκυδίδης ἀρχὴν μὲν ἐποίησατο ἀφ' ἧς ἤρξατο κακῶς πράττειν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν· ὅπερ Ἕλληνα ὄντα καὶ Ἀθηναῖον οὐκ ἔδει ποιεῖν (καὶ ταῦτα οὐ τῶν ἀπερριμμένων ὄντα, ἀλλ' ὧν ἐν πρώτοις ἦγον Ἀθηναῖοι στρατηγιῶν τε καὶ [τῶν]<sup>3</sup> ἄλλων τιμῶν ἀξιοῦντες)· καὶ οὕτω γε φθονερῶς, ὥστε καὶ τῇ πόλει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ τὰς φανεράς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου περιάπτειν, ἑτέραις ἔχοντα πολλαῖς ἀφορμαῖς περιάψαι τὰς

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Herwerden.

<sup>3</sup> del. Kalinka.

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I, p. 471.

<sup>2</sup> For a similar application of the rhetorical concept of



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

the sad and terrible disasters of the Greeks. Nor can it even be said that Thucydides came to write this work through necessity, because, though knowing that the other subject was finer, he wished to avoid writing on the same theme as others. On the contrary, in his Introduction he disparages the achievements of early times in the strongest terms, and says that those of his own day were most remarkable, thus revealing that his choice of subject was voluntary. This, however, was not the course adopted by Herodotus. Although the historians who preceded him, Hellanicus and Charon,<sup>1</sup> had already published works on the same subject, he was not deterred, but trusted in his own ability to produce something better; and this is what he has done.

“ The second task required of a writer of an historical work is to decide where to begin and how far to go. In this, too, Herodotus shows far better judgment than Thucydides: he begins with the reasons why the barbarians injured the Greeks in the first place, and proceeds until he has described the punishment and the retribution which befell them: at which point he ends. But Thucydides made his beginning at the point where Greek affairs started to decline. This should not have been done by a Greek and an Athenian,<sup>2</sup> especially an Athenian who was not one of the outcasts,<sup>3</sup> but one whom his fellow citizens counted among their foremost men in appointing to commands and other offices of state. And such is his malice, that he actually attributes the overt causes of the war to his own city, though he could have attributed them to many other sources.

“ propriety ” to historical subject-matter, see *Thucydides* 37-40. <sup>3</sup> Perhaps an echo of Demosthenes, *De Corona* 48.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αἰτίας, καὶ ἄρξασθαί γε τῆς διηγήσεως μὴ ἀπὸ τῶν Κερκυραϊκῶν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν κρατίστων τῆς πατρίδος ἔργων, ἃ μετὰ τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον εὐθὺς ἔπραξεν (ὧν ὕστερον οὐκ ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ τόπῳ μνήμην ἐποιήσατο φαύλως πως καὶ ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς), διελθόντα δὲ ταῦτα μετὰ πολλῆς εὐνοίας ὡς ἄνδρα φιλόπολιν ἔπειτ' ἐπενεγκεῖν, ὅτι τούτων φθόνῳ καὶ δέει προελθόντες Λακεδαιμόνιοι προφάσεις ὑποθέντες ἑτεροίας ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον, καὶ τότε λέγειν τὰ Κερκυραϊκὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτο λέγειν ἐβούλετο. τὰ δ' ἐν τέλει πλείονος ἀμαρτίας πλήρη· καίπερ γὰρ λέγων ὅτι παντὶ τῷ πολέμῳ παρεγένετο, καὶ πάντα δηλώσειν ὑποσχόμενος, εἰς τὴν ναυμαχίαν τελευτᾶ τὴν περὶ Κυνὸς σῆμα γεγενημένην Ἀθηναίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων, ἣ συνέβη κατὰ ἔτος εἰκοστὸν καὶ δεύτερον. κρεῖττον δὲ ἦν διεξελθόντα πάντα τελευτὴν ποιήσασθαι τῆς ἱστορίας τὴν θαυμασιωτάτην καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἀκούουσι κεχαρισμένην, τὴν κάθοδον τῶν φυγάδων τῶν ἀπὸ Φυλῆς ἀφ' ὧν ἡ πόλις ἀρξαμένη τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀνεκομίσασατο.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1. 24 ff.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 89–117. See also *Thucydides* 10–12.

<sup>3</sup> *Thucydides* says this in 1. 23. 6 and 1. 88.

<sup>4</sup> The Megarian Decree is introduced by *Thucydides* only as

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

He might have begun his narrative not with the events at Corcyra,<sup>1</sup> but with his country's splendid achievements immediately after the Persian War (achievements which he mentions later at an inappropriate point and in a rather grudging and cursory way).<sup>2</sup> After he had described these events with all the good will of a patriot, he might then have added that it was through a growing feeling of envy and fear that the Lacedaemonians came to engage in the war, although they alleged motives of a different kind.<sup>3</sup> He might then have described the events at Corcyra and the decree against the Megarians,<sup>4</sup> and anything else of the kind that he wished to mention. The concluding portion of his narrative is dominated by an even more serious fault. Although he states that he was an eye-witness of the whole war,<sup>5</sup> and has promised to describe everything that occurred, yet he ends with the sea-battle which took place off Cynossema between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians in the twenty-second year of the war.<sup>6</sup> It would have been better, after describing all the events of the war, to end his history with a climax, and one that was most remarkable and especially gratifying to his audience, the return of the exiles from Phyle, which marked the beginning of the city's recovery of freedom.

a grievance mentioned by Spartan envoys in a final, and probably half-hearted, attempt to avert hostilities (1. 139. 1).

<sup>5</sup> 5. 26. 5.

<sup>6</sup> We do not know why Thucydides abandoned his intention of bringing his narrative down to the conclusion of the war, but we can be sure that the theatrical view of history here propounded by Dionysius would have had little appeal for Thucydides.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τρίτον ἐστὶν ἀνδρὸς ἱστορικοῦ <σκοπεῖν>,<sup>1</sup> τίνα τε δεῖ παραλαβεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν πράγματα καὶ τίνα παραλιπεῖν. δοκεῖ δὴ μοι κἂν τούτῳ λείπεσθαι Θουκυδίδης. συνειδὼς γὰρ Ἡρόδοτος, ὅτι πᾶσα μῆκος ἔχουσα πολὺ διήγησις ἂν μὲν ἀναπαύσεις τινὰς λαμβάνη, τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀκροωμένων ἠδέως διατίθησιν, εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μένη πραγμάτων, κἂν τὰ μάλιστα ἐπιτυγχάνηται, λυπεῖ τὴν ἀκοὴν τῷ κόρῳ, ποικίλην ἐβουλήθη ποιῆσαι τὴν γραφὴν Ὀμήρου ζηλωτῆς γενόμενος· καὶ γὰρ τὸ βυβλίον ἦν αὐτοῦ λάβωμεν, μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης συλλαβῆς ἀγάμεθα καὶ αἰεὶ τὸ πλεόν ἐπιζητοῦμεν. Θουκυδίδης δὲ πόλεμον ἕνα κατατείνας ἀπνευστὶ διεξέρχεται μάχας ἐπὶ μάχαις καὶ παρασκευὰς ἐπὶ παρασκευαῖς καὶ λόγους ἐπὶ λόγοις συντιθεῖς· ὥστε μοχθεῖν μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἀκροωμένων \* \* \*<sup>2</sup> 'κόρον δ' ἔχει' φησὶν ὁ Πίνδαρος 'καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' ἀφροδίσια'. ἤδη δ' ὁ λέγω κάκεινος ἐνεθυμήθη, ὡς ἠδὺ χρῆμα ἐν ἱστορίας γραφῇ μεταβολὴ καὶ ποικίλον, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν δύο ἢ τρισὶ τόποις ἐποίησεν, ἐπὶ τε τῆς Ὀδρυσῶν ἀρχῆς, δι' ἧς αἰτίας ἐγένετο μεγάλη, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ πόλεων.

μετὰ τοῦτο ἔργον ἐστὶν ἱστορικοῦ διελέσθαι τε καὶ τάξαι τῶν δηλουμένων ἕκαστον ἐν ᾧ δεῖ τόπῳ. πῶς οὖν ἑκάτερος διαιρεῖται καὶ τάττει τὰ λεγόμενα; Θουκυδίδης μὲν τοῖς χρόνοις ἀκολουθῶν, Ἡρόδοτος δὲ ταῖς περιοχαῖς τῶν πραγμάτων.

<sup>1</sup> Reiske.

<sup>2</sup> Hiatum indic. Reiske.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* 2. 77. 311-2, *Brutus* 93. 322.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *On the Sublime* 13. 2 and many minor rhetoricians.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

“ A third question which a historian must consider is which events he should include in his work, and which he should omit. In this respect, too, I think Thucydides is inferior. Herodotus realised that any narrative that proceeds to a great length has a pleasant effect on the minds of its hearers provided that it contains a number of pauses,<sup>1</sup> but that if it is confined to the same series of events, however successful it might otherwise be, it vexes the ear with a feeling of satiety; so he wished to give variety to his writing, thereby showing himself to be an eager admirer of Homer.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, if we take up his book we remain enthralled up to the last syllable and always look for more. Thucydides, on the other hand, hurtles breathlessly through an extended description of a single war, stringing together battle after battle, armament after armament and speech after speech. The result is that the hearer’s mind is exhausted. “ There is excess ”, as Pindar says,<sup>3</sup> “ even of honey, and the delightful flowers of love.” Even Thucydides in his day realised the truth of my contention, that change is a pleasant quality in an historical work, and gives it variety: he has had recourse to it in two or three passages, as when he is discussing the causes of the growth of the Odrysian kingdom to greatness,<sup>4</sup> and again when he is describing the cities of Sicily.<sup>5</sup>

“ The historian’s next function is to distribute the material of his account and arrange each item in its proper place. How, then, does each author distribute and arrange what he has to say? Thucydides keeps close to the chronological order, Herodotus to the divisions provided by the events themselves.

<sup>3</sup> *Nemean Odes* 7. 52.

<sup>4</sup> 2. 97.

<sup>5</sup> 6. 2-5.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

καὶ γίνεταί Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀσαφὴς καὶ δυσ-  
 παρακολούθητος· πολλῶν γὰρ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ θέρος  
 ἢ τὸν αὐτὸν χειμῶνα γιγνομένων ἐν διαφόροις ὡς  
 εἰκὸς τόποις, ἡμιτελεῖς τὰς πρώτας πράξεις κατα-  
 λιπὼν ἑτέρων ἄπτεται [τῶν κατὰ θέρος ἢ τὸν  
 αὐτὸν χειμῶνα γιγνομένων].<sup>1</sup> πλανώμεθα δὴ καθ-  
 ἄπερ εἰκός, καὶ δυσκόλως τοῖς δηλουμένοις παρ-  
 ακολουθοῦμεν ταραττομένης τῆς διανοίας. Ἡρό-  
 δοτος δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Λυδῶν βασιλείας ἀρξάμενος καὶ  
 μέχρι τῆς Κροίσου καταβὰς ἐπὶ Κῦρον εὐθέως τὸν  
 καταλύσαντα τὴν Κροίσου ἀρχὴν μεταβαίνει, Αἰγυπ-  
 τίων τε ἀρχεται διηγημάτων καὶ Σκυθικῶν καὶ  
 Λιβυκῶν, τὰ μὲν ὡς ἀκόλουθα δηλῶν, τὰ δὲ ὡς  
 ἐπιζητούμενα προσαναλαμβάνων, τὰ δ' ὡς χαριεσ-  
 τέραν ποιήσοντα τὴν διήγησιν ἐπεισάγων· διεξελ-  
 θῶν τε πράξεις Ἑλλήνων <τε><sup>2</sup> καὶ βαρβάρων  
 ἕτεσιν ὁμοῦ διακοσίοις καὶ εἴκοσι γενομένας ἐν  
 ταῖς τρισὶν ἡπείροις καὶ περιγράψας<sup>3</sup> τῆς Ξέρξου  
 φυγῆς τὴν ἱστορίαν οὐ διέσπασε τὴν διήγησιν·  
 ἀλλὰ συμβέβηκε τῷ μὲν μίαν ὑπόθεσιν λαβόντι  
 πολλὰ ποιῆσαι μέρη τὸ ἐν σῶμα, τῷ δὲ τὰς πολλὰς  
 καὶ οὐδὲν εἰοικυίας ὑποθέσεις προελομένῳ σύμφωνον  
 ἐν σῶμα πεποιηκέναι.

μίας δ' ἰδέας ἐπιμνησθήσομαι πραγματικῆς, ἣν  
 οὐδεμιᾶς τῶν εἰρημένων ἦττον ἐν ἀπάσαις ἱστο-  
 ρίαις ζητοῦμεν, τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ συγγραφέως διάθε-  
 σιν, ἣ κέχρηται πρὸς τὰ πράγματα περὶ ὧν γράφει·  
 ἡ μὲν Ἡροδότου διάθεσις ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπιεικῆς καὶ  
 τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς συνηδομένη, τοῖς δὲ κακοῖς

<sup>1</sup> del. Herwerden.      <sup>2</sup> Sadée.      <sup>3</sup> Reiske: παραγράψας  
 codd., Usener, qui hiatum post verbum indicat.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

The result is that Thucydides is obscure and hard to follow, for since naturally many events occur in different places in the course of the same summer and winter, he leaves his account of earlier events half-finished and embarks upon others.<sup>1</sup> Naturally we are bemused, and feel annoyance as we try to follow the events he is describing because our minds are confused. Herodotus, on the other hand, begins with the dominion of the Lydians and comes down to the reign of Croesus; whence he passes on straight-way to Cyrus, who destroyed the empire of Croesus. Then he begins his narrative of Egyptian, Scythian and Libyan history, relating some events as a sequel, taking up others as missing links in the story, and introducing others as likely to add charm to the narrative. Although he narrates events in Greek and barbarian history that occurred over a period of some two hundred and twenty years in the three continents, and writes up the story of Xerxes' flight to its conclusion, he does not break the continuity of the narrative. The result is that, whereas Thucydides has taken a single subject and divided the whole body into many parts, Herodotus has chosen a number of subjects which are in no way alike and has made them into one harmonious whole.

“ I shall mention one further feature of the treatment of subject-matter, one which we look for in all histories no less than for the other features which have been mentioned: I mean the historian's own attitude to the events he describes. The attitude of Herodotus is fair throughout, showing pleasure in

<sup>1</sup> See *Thucydides* 9.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

συναλγοῦσα· ἡ δὲ Θουκυδίδου [διάθεσις] <sup>1</sup> αὐθέκαστος τις καὶ πικρὰ καὶ τῇ πατρίδι τῆς φυγῆς μνησικακοῦσα. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἁμαρτήματα ἐπεξέρχεται καὶ μάλα ἀκριβῶς, τῶν δὲ κατὰ νοῦν κεχωρηκότων καθάπαξ οὐ μέμνηται, ἢ ὥσπερ ἠναγκασμένος.

καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὸν πραγματικὸν τόπον ἤττων ἐστὶν Ἡροδότου διὰ ταῦτα Θουκυδίδης· κατὰ δὲ τὸν λεκτικὸν τὰ μὲν ἤττων, τὰ δὲ κρείττων, τὰ δ' ἴσος. ἐρῶ δὲ καὶ περὶ τούτων, ὡς ὑπέιληφα.

πρώτη τῶν ἀρετῶν γένοιτ' ἄν, ἧς χωρὶς οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν περὶ τοὺς λόγους ὄφελός τι, ἢ καθαρὰ τοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα σώζουσα διάλεκτος. ταύτην ἀκριβοῦσιν ἀμφοτέρω· Ἡρόδοτός τε γὰρ τῆς Ἰάδος ἄριστος κανὼν Θουκυδίδης τε τῆς Ἀθίδος. \* \* \* <sup>2</sup> τρίτην ἔχει χώραν ἢ καλουμένη συντομία· ἐν ταύτῃ δοκεῖ προέχειν Ἡροδότου Θουκυδίδης. καίτοι λέγοι τις ἄν, ὡς μετὰ τοῦ σαφοῦς ἐξεταζόμενον ἡδὺ φαίνεται τὸ βραχύ· εἰ δὲ ἀπολείποιτο τούτου, πικρόν· ἀλλὰ μηδὲν <ἤττων> <sup>3</sup> ἔστω παρὰ τοῦτο. ἐνάργεια μετὰ ταῦτα τέτακται πρώτη μὲν τῶν ἐπιθέτων ἀρετῶν· ἱκανῶς ἐν ταύτῃ κατορθοῦσιν ἀμφοτέρω. μετὰ ταύτην συνίσταται τὴν ἀρετὴν [τῶν] <sup>4</sup> ἠθῶν τε καὶ παθῶν μίμησις· διήρηνται

<sup>1</sup> del. Herwerden.

<sup>2</sup> Hiatum indic. Sylburg, ex epitoma fortasse his verbis supplendum: τῆς σαφηνείας δὲ ἀναμφισβητήτως Ἡροδότῳ τὸ κατόρθωμα δέδοται. <sup>3</sup> Krüger. <sup>4</sup> del. Usener.

<sup>1</sup> Some qualification of this last statement may follow: otherwise Dionysius contradicts his statement in *Lysias* 2, which describes the style of Thucydides as "a model of the archaic dialect".



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

the good and distress at the bad. That of Thucydides, on the other hand, is outspoken and harsh, revealing the grudge which he felt against his native city for his exile. He recites a catalogue of her mistakes, going into them in minute detail; but when things go according to plan he either does not mention them at all, or only like a man under constraint.

“ These are the reasons why Thucydides is inferior to Herodotus with regard to subject-matter. In style he is in some respects inferior, in others superior, and in others equal. I shall state the opinions I have formed on these matters also.

“ We may regard as the supreme virtue that without which no other literary quality is of any use— language that is pure in its vocabulary and preserves the Greek idiom. Both writers meet this requirement exactly: Herodotus is the perfect model of the Ionic dialect, and Thucydides of the Attic . . .<sup>1</sup> Third<sup>2</sup> in order comes the quality called conciseness. In this Thucydides is considered to excel Herodotus. It might, however, be said that brevity appears attractive only when it is seen to be united to clarity, and that, if it fails in this, it is harsh. But let us take for granted that Thucydides is in no way inferior on this count. Next in order comes vividness as the first of the ancillary qualities: in this both are decidedly successful. After this quality comes the imitation of traits of character and of emotions.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The lost second point of comparison may have concerned vocabulary, as distinct from dialect. See *Lysias* 3; but also the epitome of the treatise *On Imitation* 2. 2 (Usener-Radermacher II p. 207, line 10, where the second point of comparison is lucidity (*σαφήνεια*), for which Herodotus is accorded the palm).

<sup>3</sup> See Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2. 12. 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τὴν ἀρετὴν ταύτην οἱ συγγραφεῖς· Θουκυδίδης μὲν γὰρ τὰ πάθη δηλῶσαι κρείττων, Ἡρόδοτος δὲ τὰ γε ἦθη παραστήσαι δεινότερος. μετὰ ταῦτα αἱ τὸ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἐκφαίνουσαι τῆς κατασκευῆς ἀρεταί· ἴσοι κὰν ταύταις οἱ συγγραφεῖς. ἔπονται ταύταις αἱ τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὸν τόνον καὶ τὰς ὁμοιοτρόπους δυνάμεις τῆς φράσεως ἀρεταὶ περιέχουσαι· κρείττων ἐν ταύταις Ἡροδότου Θουκυδίδης. ἡδονὴν δὲ καὶ πειθὴν καὶ τέρψιν καὶ τὰς ὁμοιογενεῖς ἀρετὰς εἰσφέρεται μακρῶ Θουκυδίδου κρείττονας Ἡρόδοτος. τῆς δὲ φράσεως [τῶν ὀνομάτων]<sup>1</sup> τὸ μὲν κατὰ φύσιν Ἡρόδοτος ἐξήλωκε, τὸ δὲ δεινὸν Θουκυδίδης.<sup>2</sup> πασῶν ἐν λόγοις ἀρετῶν ἡ κυριωτάτη τὸ πρέπον· ταύτην ὁ Ἡρόδοτος ἀκριβοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ Θουκυδίδης· ὁμοειδὴς γὰρ οὗτος ἐν πᾶσι, κὰν ταῖς δημηγορίαις μᾶλλον ἢ ταῖς διηγήσεσιν· ἐμοὶ μέντοι καὶ τῷ φιλτάτῳ Καικιλίῳ δοκεῖ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα αὐτοῦ μάλιστα μιμήσασθαι τε καὶ ζηλῶσαι Δημοσθένους. ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἶπω, καλαὶ μὲν αἱ ποιήσεις ἀμφοτέραι (οὐ γὰρ ἂν αἰσχυνθείην ποιήσεις αὐτὰς λέγων), διαφέρουσι δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἀλλήλων, ὅτι τὸ μὲν Ἡροδότου κάλλος ἰλαρόν ἐστι, φοβερόν δὲ τὸ Θουκυδίδου. ἀπόχρη ταῦτα εἰρῆσθαι περὶ τούτων τῶν συγγραφέων, πολλῶν καὶ ἄλλων ἐνότων λέγεσθαι, περὶ ὧν καὶ ἕτερος ἔσται καιρός.

- 4 Ξενοφῶν δὲ καὶ Φίλιστος οἱ τούτοις ἐπακμάσαντες οὔτε φύσεις ὁμοίας εἶχον οὔτε προαιρέσεις. Ξενοφῶν μὲν γὰρ Ἡροδότου ζηλωτῆς ἐγένετο κατ' ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς χαρακτῆρας, τὸν τε πραγματικὸν καὶ τὸν λεκτικόν. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὰς ὑποθέσεις

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

Here the historians divide the credit, for Thucydides is the better at portraying emotions, while Herodotus is the cleverer at representing character. Next come those qualities which display grandeur and impressiveness in composition. Here also the historians are equal. Next come those excellences whose effects include force, intensity and similar qualities. In these Thucydides is superior to Herodotus. But of those qualities which excite pleasure, and persuade and delight the reader, and produce other effects similar to these, Herodotus provides a far greater fund than Thucydides. In his choice of language Herodotus strives to attain naturalness, Thucydides brilliance. The most important of all literary qualities is propriety. Herodotus is more scrupulous about this than Thucydides, whose style is uniform in all contexts, a fault which is more evident in his speeches than in his narratives. However, my friend Caecilius shares my opinion that his enthymemes have been imitated to a high degree by Demosthenes. To be brief, the poetical compositions (as I should not be ashamed to call them) of both are beautiful. The main point of difference between them is that the beauty of Herodotus is gay, while that of Thucydides is awe-inspiring. Enough has now been said about these historians, although much more could be; but there will be another opportunity for this.

“Xenophon and Philistus, who flourished at a later time than these writers, did not resemble one another either in their nature or in the principles they adopted. Xenophon modelled himself upon Herodotus in both aspects, subject-matter and language. 4

---

<sup>1</sup> del. Reiske.

<sup>2</sup> add. *λείπει* Usener.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐξελέξατο καλὰς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς καὶ ἀνδρὶ φιλοσόφῳ προσηκούσας· τὴν τε Κύρου παιδείαν, εἰκόνα βασιλέως ἀγαθοῦ καὶ εὐδαίμονος· καὶ τὴν ἀνάβασιν τοῦ νεωτέρου Κύρου, ᾧ καὶ αὐτὸς συνανέβη, μέγιστον ἐγκώμιον ἔχουσαν τῶν συστρατευσαμένων Ἑλλήνων· καὶ τρίτην ἔτι τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν καὶ ἣν κατέλιπεν ἀτελεῖ Ἰουκιδίδης, ἐν ἣ καταλύονται τε οἱ τριάκοντα καὶ τὰ τεῖχη τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἃ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καθείλον, αὐθις ἀνίσταται. οὐ μόνον δὲ τῶν ὑποθέσεων χάριν ἄξιός ἐπαινέσθαι ζηλωτῆς Ἡροδότου γενόμενος,<sup>1</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας· ταῖς τε γὰρ ἀρχαῖς αὐτῶν ταῖς πρεπωδεστάταις κέχρηται καὶ τελευτὰς ἐκάστη τὰς ἐπιτηδειοτάτας ἀποδέδωκε, μεμέρικέν τε καλῶς καὶ τέταχεν καὶ πεποίκιλκε τὴν γραφὴν. ἠθὸς τε ἐπιδείκνυται θεοσεβὲς καὶ δίκαιον καὶ καρτερικὸν καὶ εὐπρεπές, ἀπάσαις τε συλλήβδην κεκοσμημένον ἀρεταῖς· καὶ ὁ μὲν πραγματικὸς τύπος αὐτῷ τοιοῦτος.

ὁ δὲ λεκτικὸς πῆ μὲν ὅμοιος Ἡροδότου, πῆ δὲ ἐνδεέστερος. καθαρὸς μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἱκανῶς καὶ σαφῆς <καὶ ἐναργῆς><sup>2</sup> καθάπερ ἐκεῖνος· ἐκλέγει δὲ ὀνόματα συνήθη τε καὶ προσφυῆ τοῖς

<sup>1</sup> ζηλωτῆς Ἡ. γενόμενος susp. Krüger, del. Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Usener ex epitoma.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Xenophon always enjoyed a following among men of action like Scipio Africanus, Caesar and Arrian, on balance he was regarded more as a philosopher than as a historian.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

In the first place, the historical subjects which he chose are fine and impressive and appropriate to a philosopher<sup>1</sup>: the *Education of Cyrus*, the portrait of a good and successful king; the *Expedition of the Younger Cyrus*, in which Xenophon himself accompanied the prince, contains praises of the Greek auxiliaries in the highest terms; and thirdly the *Greek History*, a continuation of Thucydides' unfinished history, in which he described the overthrow of the Thirty and the rebuilding of the Athenian walls, which had been destroyed by the Spartans.<sup>2</sup> But it is not only for his subjects, which he chose in emulation of Herodotus,<sup>3</sup> that Xenophon deserves to be praised, but also for his arrangement of his material. Everywhere he has begun at the most appropriate place, and he has concluded each episode at the most suitable point. His division is good, and so is the order and variety of his writing. The moral qualities which he shows are those of piety, justice, perseverance and affability—a character, in short, which is adorned with all the virtues. Such, then, is his manner in the treatment of subject-matter.

“ In style he is in some respects similar to Herodotus, and in others inferior. Like him, he is decidedly pure and lucid in vocabulary.<sup>4</sup> The words he chooses are familiar and correspond to the nature of the

<sup>2</sup> The seven books of the *Hellenica* cover the period 411–362 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. attempting to rival the chronological and geographical scope of Herodotus' history.

<sup>4</sup> This judgment suggests that Dionysius did not have as rigid a conception of pure Atticism as some Atticists, like Phrynichus, who detected many impurities in Xenophon's language. See also Vol. I, p. 619.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πράγμασι, καὶ συντίθησιν αὐτὰ ἡδέως πάνυ καὶ κεχαρισμένως οὐχ ἤττον Ἡροδότου. ὕψος δὲ καὶ κάλλος καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ἰδίως πλάσμα ἱστορικὸν Ἡρόδοτος ἔχει· οὐ γὰρ μόνον οὐκ ἴσχυσε τοῦτο παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποτε διεγεῖραι βουλευθῆ τὴν φράσιν, ὀλίγον ἐμπνεύσας ὥσπερ ἀπόγειος αὔρα ταχέως σβέννυται \* \* \*<sup>1</sup> μακρότερος γὰρ γίνεται τοῦ δέοντος ἐν πολλοῖς, καὶ τοῦ πρέποντος οὐχ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος ἐφάπτεται τῶν προσώπων εὐτυχῶς, ἀλλ' ἐν πολλοῖς ὀλίγωρός ἐστιν, ἂν τις ὀρθῶς σκοπῆ.

5 Φίλιστος δὲ Θουκυδίδη μᾶλλον <ἂν><sup>2</sup> δόξειεν εἰσκέσθαι καὶ κατ' ἐκείνον κοσμεῖσθαι τὸν χαρακτῆρα. οὔτε γὰρ ὑπόθεσιν εἴληφε πολυωφελῆ καὶ κοινήν, ὥσπερ Θουκυδίδης<sup>3</sup> ἀλλὰ μίαν καὶ ταύτην τοπικὴν· διήρηκε δ' αὐτὴν εἰς γραφὰς δύο, Περὶ Σικελίας μὲν τὴν προτέραν ἐπιγράφων, Περὶ Διονυσίου δὲ τὴν ὑστέραν. ἔστι δὲ μία· καὶ τοῦτο γνοίης ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τῆς Σικελικῆς. τάξιν δὲ οὐ τὴν κρατίστην ἀποδέδωκε τοῖς δηλουμένοις ἀλλὰ δυσπαρακολούθητον, χεῖρον τῆς Θουκυδίδου. καὶ πρᾶγμα ἔξωθεν οὐ βούλεται παραλαμβάνειν, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Θουκυδίδης, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁμοειδής. ἡθὸς τε κολακικὸν καὶ φιλοτύραννον ἐμφαίνει καὶ ταπεινὸν καὶ μικρολόγον. τῆς δὲ λέξεως ἦ

<sup>1</sup> Hiatum indic. Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Herwerden.

<sup>3</sup> ὥσπερ Θ. del. Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. the monstrous sentence in *Hellenica* 6. 4. 2-3.

<sup>2</sup> A fourth-century Sicilian historian. Dionysius' view of him is similar to, if a little more severe than, that of Cicero

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

subject, and he puts them together with no less marked attractiveness and charm than Herodotus. But Herodotus also possesses sublimity, beauty and impressiveness, and what is called by the special name of "the historical cast of style". Not only did Xenophon lack the power to borrow this from him, but when, on occasion, he wishes to enliven his style, like an off-shore breeze he blows for a short time, but is soon stilled. In many passages he goes on too long<sup>1</sup> and, so far from equalling Herodotus' success in the delineation of character, is found on strict examination to be often careless in this respect.

"Philistus<sup>2</sup> would appear to be more like Thucydides, and to be invested with that author's characteristics. Like Thucydides, he has taken a subject which is not of much general service and interest, but is a single one, and concerned with regional history at that. He has divided it into two works, entitling the first *On Sicily* and the second *On Dionysius*; but the subject is one, as may be seen from the conclusion of the Sicilian part. He has not presented his material in the best order, but in one which is hard to follow; and in this respect he is inferior to Thucydides. He does not try to introduce extraneous material any more than Thucydides does, but adheres to the same form of narrative; and the character that he displays is that of a fawning tyrant-lover, mean and petty. He has avoided the peculi-

(*Ad Quintum Fratrem* 2. 11. 4; *De Oratore* 2. 13. 56). The author of *On the Sublime* (40. 2) says that in spite of his limited vocabulary he succeeds in achieving dignity by his skilful composition.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Θουκυδίδης κέχρηται τὸ μὲν σημειῶδες καὶ περιέργον πέφευγεν, τὸ δὲ στρογγύλον καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ ἐνθυμηματικὸν ἐκμέμακται. τῆς μέντοι καλλιλογίας τῆς ἐκείνου καὶ <τῆς σεμνότητος καὶ><sup>1</sup> τοῦ πλούτου τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων καὶ πολὺ ὑστερεῖ. οὐ μόνον δ' ἐν τούτοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς σχηματισμούς· ἢ μὲν γὰρ πλήρης σχημάτων (καὶ οὐδὲν οἶμαι περὶ τῶν φανερῶν ἐπὶ πλεόν δεῖν λέγειν), ἢ δὲ Φιλίστου φράσις ὁμοειδῆς πᾶσα δεινῶς καὶ ἀσχημάτιστός ἐστι· καὶ πολλὰς εὗροι τις ἂν περιόδους ὁμοίως ἐφεξῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ σχηματιζόμενας, οἷον ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς δευτέρας τῶν περὶ Σικελίας· 'Συρακόσιοι δὲ παραλαβόντες Μεγαρεῖς καὶ Ἐνναίους, Καμαριναῖοι δὲ Σικελούς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους συμμάχους πλὴν Γελῶων ἀθροίσαντες, Γελῶοι δὲ Συρακοσίοις οὐκ ἔφασαν πολεμήσειν· Συρακόσιοι δὲ πυνθανόμενοι Καμαριναίους τὸν Ὑρμῖνον διαβάντας—'. ταῦτα δὲ ἀηδῆ πάνυ ὄντα ἐμοὶ φαίνεται. μικρός τε παρὰ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ἐστὶ καὶ εὐτελής, εἴαν τε πολιορκίας διηγῆται εἴαν τε οἰκισμούς, εἴαν τε ἐπαίνους εἴαν τε ψόγους διαπορεύηται. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῖς μεγέθεσι τῶν ἀνδρῶν συνεξισῶν τοὺς λόγους ἀλλὰ ψοφοδεεῖς καὶ τοὺς <κρατίστους><sup>2</sup> δημηγοροῦντας καταλείπων τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τὰς προαιρέσεις ὁμοίους ἅπαντας ποιεῖ. εὐστομίαν δὲ τινα φυσικὴν εἰσφέρεται κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν καὶ σύνεσιν ἐπιτευκτικὴν τοῦ μετρίου. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀληθινούς ἀγῶνας ἐπιτηδειότερος Θουκυδίδου.

6 Θεόπομπος δὲ Χίος ἐπιφανέστατος πάντων

<sup>1</sup> Usener ex epitoma.

<sup>2</sup> Usener.



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

arity and elaboration of Thucydides' style, and has formed his own upon its qualities of terseness, concision and systematic argument. However, he falls far indeed behind the beauty of language and the wealth of enthymemes found in Thucydides. And not only in these respects is he inferior, but also in figurative usages. The style of Thucydides is full of figures (and I do not think it necessary to enlarge upon the obvious), but the language of Philistus is terribly uniform throughout and lacking in figurative expression. One could find many successive periods of his constructed in the same way, as at the beginning of the second book of his work *On Sicily*: "The Syracusans having enlisted the aid of the Megarians and the Ennaeans, and the Camarineans having mustered the Sicels and the rest of the allies except the Geloans (the Geloans said they would not make war on the Syracusans); and the Syracusans learning that the Camarineans had crossed the Hyrminus . . ." This seems to me clearly to be a most disagreeable style. He is trivial and paltry whatever his subject may be, whether he is describing sieges or settlements, or dispensing praises or censure. He does not even make his speeches measure up to the stature of his speakers, but makes his popular orators so crowd-shy that they all alike abandon their faculties and their principles. However, he brings a certain natural grace of expression to his style and a certain intelligence which enables him to strike the mean. He is a more suitable model for actual pleadings than Thucydides.

"Theopompus of Chios was the most illustrious of 6

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

<τῶν><sup>1</sup> Ἴσοκράτους μαθητῶν γενόμενος καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν πανηγυρικούς, πολλοὺς δὲ συμβουλευτικούς συνταξάμενος λόγους ἐπιστολάς τε τὰς Χιακὰς ἐπιγραφομένας καὶ ὑποθήκας ἄλλας λόγου ἀξίας, ἱστορίαν πεπραγματευμένος ἀξίος ἐπαινέσθαι πρῶτον μὲν τῆς ὑποθέσεως τῶν ἱστοριῶν (καλαὶ γὰρ ἀμφότεραι, ἢ μὲν τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου περιέχουσα, ἢ δὲ τὰ Φιλίππῳ πεπραγμένα), ἔπειτα τῆς οἰκονομίας (ἀμφότεραι γὰρ εἰσιν εὐπαρακολούθητοι καὶ σαφεῖς), μάλιστα δὲ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τε καὶ φιλοπονίας τῆς κατὰ τὴν συγγραφὴν· δῆλος γὰρ ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἔγραψε, πλείστην μὲν παρασκευὴν εἰς ταῦτα παρεσκευασμένος, μεγίστας δὲ δαπάνας εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν τετελεκώς, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις πολλῶν μὲν αὐτόπτης γεγενημένος, πολλοῖς δ' εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἔλθων ἀνδράσι τοῖς τότε πρωτεύουσι καὶ στρατηγοῖς δημαγωγοῖς τε καὶ φιλοσόφοις διὰ τὴν συγγραφὴν· οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τινὲς πάρεργον τοῦ βίου τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐποιήσατο, ἔργον δὲ τὸ πάντων ἀναγκαιότατον. γνοίη δ' ἂν τις αὐτοῦ τὸν πόνον ἐνθυμηθεὶς τὸ πολύμορφον τῆς γραφῆς· καὶ γὰρ ἔθνῶν εἴρηκεν οἰκισμοὺς καὶ πόλεων κτίσεις ἐπελήλυθε, βασιλέων τε βίους καὶ τρόπων ἰδιώματα δεδήλωκε, καὶ εἴ τι θαυμαστὸν ἢ παράδοξον ἐκάστη γῆ καὶ θάλασσα φέρει, συμπεριείληφεν τῇ πραγματείᾳ. καὶ μηδεὶς ὑπολάβῃ ψυχαγωγίαν ταῦτ' εἶναι μόνον· οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν ὡς

<sup>1</sup> Herwerden.

<sup>1</sup> Both Cicero (*De Oratore* 2. 13. 57) and Quintilian (10. 1. 74) emphasise Theopompus' rhetorical training as a pupil of

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

the pupils of Isocrates.<sup>1</sup> He composed many ceremonial and many deliberative speeches, as well as the letters which are entitled ' Chian ', and some noteworthy hortatory treatises. As a professional historian he deserves praise on several grounds. Firstly, his historical subjects are both good, one of them comprising the closing stages of the Peloponnesian War, the other the career of Philip. Good, too, is his arrangement, being in both works lucid and easy to follow. Particularly commendable are the care and industry which mark his historical writing, for it would have been obvious, even if he had said nothing about it, that he made elaborate preparations for his task, and had gone to great expense to collect his material. Moreover, he was an eye-witness of many events, and conversed with many of the eminent men and generals of his day because of his profession as a historian, and also with popular leaders and philosophers: for he did not consider the writing of history a part-time occupation in his life, as some regard it, but as the most necessary of all his activities. How much effort he put into it can be judged from reflection on the wide variety of its subject-matter. He has related the settlements of tribes, described the foundation of cities, portrayed the lives of kings and peculiarities of custom, and has included in his work everything remarkable or extraordinary contained in every single land and sea. And nobody should suppose that this is purely for our entertainment: this is not the case, but the material contained in it is virtually all for our Isocrates. The surviving fragments of his historical works, the *Philippica* and the *Hellenica*, display a strong vein of moral censure. See Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* pp. 1-18; W. R. Roberts in *C.R.* 22 (1908) pp. 118-22.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔπος εἰπεῖν ὠφέλειαν περιέχει.

ἵνα δὲ πάντ' ἀφῶ τᾶλλα, τίς οὐχ ὁμολογήσει τοῖς ἀσκούσι τὴν φιλόσοφον ῥητορικὴν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι πολλὰ μὲν ἔθνη καὶ βαρβάρων καὶ Ἑλλήνων ἐκμαθεῖν, πολλοὺς δὲ νόμους ἀκούσαι πολιτειῶν τε σχήματα, καὶ βίους ἀνδρῶν καὶ πράξεις καὶ τέλη καὶ τύχας; τούτοις τοίνυν ἅπασαν ἀφθονίαν δέδωκεν οὐκ ἀπεσπασμένην τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλλὰ συμπαροῦσαν. πάντα <τε><sup>1</sup> δὴ ταῦτα ζηλωτὰ τοῦ συγγραφέως, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ὅσα φιλοσοφεί παρ' ὄλην τὴν <συγγραφὴν περὶ><sup>1</sup> δικαιοσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς διεξερχόμενος λόγους. τελευταῖόν ἐστι τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ καὶ χαρακτηριστώτατον, ὃ παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἐξείργασται καὶ δυνατῶς οὔτε τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οὔτε τῶν νεωτέρων· τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστι; τὸ καθ' ἑκάστην πρᾶξιν μὴ μόνον τὰ φανερά τοῖς πολλοῖς ὄραν καὶ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐξετάζειν καὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν πραξάντων αὐτὰς καὶ τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς, ἃ μὴ ῥάδια τοῖς πολλοῖς εἶδέναι, καὶ πάντα ἐκκαλύπτειν τὰ μυστήρια τῆς τε δοκούσης ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγνοουμένης κακίας. καί μοι δοκεῖ πως ὁ μυθεύμενος ἐν "Αἶδου τῶν ψυχῶν ἀπολυθεισῶν τοῦ σώματος ἐξετασμός ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ δικαστῶν οὕτως ἀκριβῆς εἶναι ὡς ὁ διὰ

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

practical benefit.

“ To set aside all other considerations, who will not admit that it is necessary for students of philosophic rhetoric to acquire a thorough knowledge of the many customs of the barbarians and the Greeks, to hear about various laws and forms of government, the lives of their men and their exploits, their deaths and their fortunes <sup>1</sup>? Well, for these students he has provided an absolute abundance of material, not divorced from the events narrated, but side by side with them. All these qualities of the historian are worthy of imitation; and the same may also be said of the philosophical comments scattered throughout the whole of his history, in which he reflects at length on justice, piety and the other virtues, and utters some fine sentiments. His final and most characteristic accomplishment is something which no other historian, either before or since, has achieved with comparable exactness or effect. And what is this quality? It is the ability, in the case of every action, not only to see and to state what is obvious to most people, but to examine even the hidden reasons for actions and the motives of their agents, and the feelings in their hearts (which most people do not find it easy to discern), and to reveal all the mysteries of apparent virtue and undetected vice. Indeed, I feel in some way that the fabled examination before the judges of the other world, which is conducted in Hades upon the souls that have been released from the body, is of the same searching kind as that which is carried out through the writings of Theopompus.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* 2. 15. 62.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τῆς Θεοπόμπου γραφῆς γιγνόμενος. διὸ καὶ βάσκανος ἔδοξεν εἶναι, προσλαμβάνων τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις τινὰ ὄνειδισμοῖς κατὰ τῶν ἐνδόξων προσώπων οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα πράγματα, ὅμοιόν τι ποιῶν τοῖς ἰατροῖς, οἳ τέμνουσι καὶ καίουσι τὰ διεφθαρμένα τοῦ σώματος ἕως βάθους τὰ καυτήρια καὶ τὰς τομὰς φέροντες, οὐδὲν τῶν ὑγαινότων καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἐχόντων στοχαζόμενοι. τοιοῦτος μὲν δὴ τις ὁ πραγματικὸς Θεοπόμπου χαρακτήρ.

ὁ δὲ λεκτικὸς Ἴσοκράτει μάλιστα ἔοικε· καθαρά τε γὰρ ἡ λέξις καὶ κοινὴ καὶ σαφής, ὑψηλὴ τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς καὶ τὸ πομπικὸν ἔχουσα πολὺ, συγκειμένη τε κατὰ τὴν μέσσην ἁρμονίαν, ἠδέως καὶ μαλακῶς ρέουσα. διαλλάττει δὲ τῆς Ἴσοκρατείου κατὰ τὴν πικρότητα καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐπ' ἐνίων, ὅταν ἐπιτρέψῃ τοῖς πάθεσι, μάλιστα δ' ὅταν ὄνειδίξῃ πόλεσιν ἢ στρατηγοῖς πονηρὰ βουλεύματα καὶ πράξεις ἀδίκους (πολὺς γὰρ ἐν τούτοις), καὶ τῆς Δημοσθένους δεινότητος οὐδὲ κατὰ μικρὸν διαφέρει, ὡς ἐξ ἄλλων πολλῶν ἂν τις ἴδοι καὶ τῶν Χιακῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἃς τῷ <συμφύτῳ><sup>1</sup> πνεύματι ἐπιτρέψας γέγραφεν. εἰ δ' ὑπερείδεν ἐν τούτοις ἐφ' οἷς μάλιστα δὴ ἐσπούδακε τῆς τε συμπλοκῆς τῶν φωνηέντων γραμμάτων καὶ τῆς κυκλικῆς εὐρυθμίας τῶν περιόδων καὶ τῆς ὁμοειδείας τῶν σχηματισμῶν, πολὺ ἀμείνων ἂν ἦν αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατὰ τὴν φράσιν.

ἔστι δὲ ἅ καὶ κατὰ τὸν πραγματικὸν τόπον ἀμαρτάνει, καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τὰς παρεμβολάς· οὔτε γὰρ ἀναγκαῖαί τινες αὐτῶν οὔτ' ἐν καιρῷ γινόμεναι, πολὺ δὲ τὸ παιδιῶδες ἐμφαίνουσαι· ἐν

## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

This gave him a reputation for malice,<sup>1</sup> because he added unnecessary details to the criticisms of famous persons that he was compelled to make; but in fact he was acting like surgeons who cut and cauterise the morbid parts of the body, operating to a certain depth, but not encroaching upon the healthy and normal parts. Such, then, is the character of Theopompus' treatment of subject-matter.

“ In style he resembles Isocrates most of all. His diction is pure, ordinary and clear; lofty, impressive and full of stateliness. The style of its composition is of the middle kind, having a pleasant and gentle flow. But it differs from that of Isocrates in pungency and energy in some passages, when he gives way to his emotions, and particularly when he reproaches cities or generals for their wicked policies and their unjust actions, as he frequently does. His intensity in such passages does not fall short of that of Demosthenes even in the slightest degree, as can be seen from many of his works, and especially the *Chian Letters*, in which he has given free play to his natural feelings. If, in these passages over which he has taken the greatest trouble, he had paid less attention to the blending of vowels, the rhythmic cadence of periods and the uniformity of constructions, he would have expressed himself far better than in fact he did.

“ He is also occasionally at fault with regard to subject-matter, and in particular with regard to insertions. Some of these are neither necessary nor opportune, but betray great childishness. Examples

---

<sup>1</sup> So Lucian, *De Historia Conscribenda* 59.

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αἷς ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ περὶ Σιληνοῦ τοῦ φανέντος ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ δράκοντος τοῦ διαναυμαχῆσαντος πρὸς τὴν τριήρη καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις οὐκ ὀλίγα ὅμοια.

οὗτοι παραληφθέντες οἱ συγγραφεῖς ἀρκέσουσι τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τὸν πολιτικὸν λόγον ἀφορμὰς ἐπιτηδείους παραδειγμάτων παρασχεῖν εἰς ἅπασαν ἰδέαν.



## LETTER TO GNAEUS POMPEIUS

of this are the story of the Silenus who appeared in Macedonia, that of the serpent which fought a battle with a trireme, and not a few others of that kind.

“ The comparison of these historians will be sufficient to provide students of civil oratory with a basic stock of suitable examples for every variety of setting.”



**SECOND  
LETTER TO AMMAEUS**

## INTRODUCTION

Following a cursory description of the main features of Thucydides' style in Chapter 24 of his essay on the historian, Dionysius says in the next chapter that he does not propose to deal with each aspect of his style separately, subjoining illustrative passages. Reading the essay, Ammaeus apparently complained of this omission, and the conscientious Dionysius remedied it with this letter. He shows no great enthusiasm for the task, however, and his reluctance is of some interest. At the end of Chapter 1 he says that the information which Ammaeus is requesting is the kind which is given in rhetorical handbooks. He considers his own criticism to be on an altogether higher aesthetic plane than such writings (see Vol. I, pp. xx-xxi); but Ammaeus could point to many passages in his other essays where he had been more generous with examples.

After quoting the offending passage in the *Thucydides*, Dionysius deals (Chapters 3 to 14) with the various ways in which Thucydides alters the form of individual words from normal usage, forming new words in one part of speech from existing words in another. Substantives in particular are formed in this way. This phenomenon is not unique to Thucydides, but is part of a process, begun before his time,

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

of enlargement and refinement of expression which accompanied the growth of both literary and technical writing in the fifth century.<sup>1</sup> Dionysius is therefore somewhat narrow-minded in describing it as a purely Thucydidean characteristic, especially as it is to be found in an orator who was widely recognised as the historian's literary forerunner—Antiphon of Rhamnus.

Chapters 15–17 are concerned with clausal structure, and the examples are well chosen to illustrate illogical sequence of argument, strained antithesis and excessive assonance.

It has been noted<sup>2</sup> that the topics treated by Dionysius in the main body of the letter do not correspond exactly with those listed in the passage quoted from the *Thucydides*. It is also clear that the text as we have it is not free from lacunae. But it would be a very bold step to postulate lost chapters dealing with topics mentioned in the quotation but not in our text. Dionysius does not say that he will deal with every topic, and even if he had it would be possible to point to other examples of promises unfulfilled.

<sup>1</sup> See Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* pp. 20–2, 28–34, 39–40.

<sup>2</sup> By Winnifred Warren in *A.J.P.* 20 (1899) pp. 316–9.

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΘΟΥΚΥΔΙΔΟΥ ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΩΝ  
ΠΡΟΣ ΑΜΜΑΙΟΝ

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΑΙΩΙ ΤΩΙ ΦΙΛΤΑΤΩΙ  
ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

1 Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑπελάμβανον ἀρκούντως δεδηλωκέναι τὸν Θουκυδίδου χαρακτήρα, τὰ μέγιστα καὶ κυριώτατα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων περὶ αὐτὸν ἰδιωμάτων ἐπεξελθών, ἐν οἷς γε δὴ μάλιστα διαφέρειν ἔδοξέν μοι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων, πρότερον μὲν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων πρὸς τὸ σὸν ὄνομα συνταχθείσιν ὑπομνηματισμοῖς, ὀλίγοις <δὲ> δη<sup>1</sup> πρόσθεν χρόνοις ἐν τῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου κατασκευασθείσῃ γραφῇ προσειπὼν τὸν Αἴλιον Τουβέρωνα, ἐν ἣ πάντα τὰ δεόμενα λόγου μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων ἀποδείξεων διεξελήλυθα κατὰ τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ δύναμιν· σοῦ δὲ ὑπολαμβάνοντος ἤττον ἠκριβῶσθαι τὰς γραφάς, ἐπειδὴ προεκθέμενος ἅπαντα τὰ συμβεβηκότα τῷ χαρακτήρι τότε τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν πίστεις παρέχομαι, ἀκριβεστέραν δὲ τὴν δήλωσιν τῶν ἰδιωμάτων τοῦ χαρακτήρος ἔσεσθαι νομίζοντος, εἰ παρὰ μίαν

<sup>1</sup> δὲ δὴ Usener: δὴ Pa: δὲ H. Stephanus.

SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS  
ON THE CHARACTERISTICS OF  
THUCYDIDES' STYLE

DIONYSIUS TO HIS DEAR FRIEND AMMAEUS  
GREETINGS

I thought I had sufficiently demonstrated the special character of Thucydides' style when I discussed in detail the most prominent and important of those peculiarities which seemed to me to distinguish him most clearly from all the orators and historians before him.<sup>1</sup> I have treated the subject, on the earlier occasion in the essays on the Ancient Orators addressed to you personally,<sup>2</sup> and a short time ago in the work I wrote on Thucydides himself, which I addressed to Aelius Tubero, and in which, to the best of my ability, I have thoroughly discussed all the necessary points, and have added suitable illustrations. But you consider that these writings are insufficiently detailed, because I do not give the proofs until I have set out all the characteristics; and you think that my description of the special qualities of his style would be more precise if I were to append to

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the *Thucydides*, passages discussing the historian's style occur in the *De Compositione Verborum* 22 and the *Letter to Pompeius* 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Demosthenes* 10.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἐκάστην τῶν προθέσεων τὰς λέξεις τοῦ συγγραφέως παρατιθείην, ὃ οἱ τὰς τέχνας καὶ τὰς εἰσαγωγὰς τῶν λόγων πραγματευόμενοι ποιούσιν, προελόμενος εἰς μηδὲν ἐλλείπειν καὶ τοῦτο πεποίηκα, τὸ διδασκαλικὸν σχῆμα λαβὼν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιδεικτικού.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> ἵνα δὲ εὐπαρακολούθητος ὁ λόγος σοι γένηται, προθεῖς κατὰ λέξιν, ὅσα περὶ τοῦ συγγραφέως τυγχάνω προειρηκώς, ἐπιτροχάδην ἀναλήψομαι τῶν προθέσεων ἐκάστην καὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις παρέξομαι, καθάπερ ἠξίους. ἔπεται δὲ τοῖς περὶ Ἡροδότου γραφεῖσιν τὰ μέλλοντα δηλοῦσθαι.

ἴσως γὰρ Θουκυδίδης τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὧν πρότερον ἐμνήσθην, καὶ συνιδῶν, ὡς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἔσχεν ἀρετὰς ἰδιὸν τι γένος χαρακτῆρος, οὔτε πεζὸν αὐτοτελῶς οὔτ' ἔμμετρον ἀπηρτισμένως, κοινὸν δέ τι καὶ μικτὸν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἐργασάμενος εἰς τὴν ἱστορικὴν πραγματείαν ἐσπούδασεν εἰσαγαγεῖν· ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τὴν τροπικὴν καὶ γλωττηματικὴν καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένην καὶ ξένην λέξιν παραλαμβάνων πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῆς κοινῆς καὶ συνήθους τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώποις, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν σχηματισμῶν, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα ἐβουλήθη διενεγκεῖν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, πλείστην εἰσενεγκάμενος πραγματείαν, τοτὲ μὲν λόγον ἐξ ὀνόματος ποιῶν, τοτὲ δὲ εἰς ὄνομα συνάγων τὸν λόγον· καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ ῥηματικὸν ὀνοματικῶς ἐκφέρων, αὐθις δὲ τοῦνομα ῥῆμα ποιῶν· καὶ αὐτῶν γε τούτων ἀναστρέφων τὰς χρήσεις, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν <προσηγορικὸν γένηται, τὸ δὲ προσηγορικὸν ὀνοματικῶς><sup>2</sup> λέ-



## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

each of my statements actual passages from the author, as is the practice of the authors of rhetorical handbooks and introductions to literary composition. Wishing, therefore, to meet every requirement, I have done this, and have followed the didactic method instead of the epideictic.

In order that the argument may be easy for you to follow, I shall begin by quoting word for word what I have said about the historian. I shall then briefly reconsider each statement, and will supply the illustrations you ask for. The passage which I am about to quote follows the remarks on Herodotus.<sup>1</sup> 2

“ Following after Herodotus and the others whom I mentioned before him, and perceiving their several qualities, Thucydides aspired to form and to introduce into the writing of history an individual kind of style which was neither absolute prose nor wholly verse, but a mixture containing elements of both. In his choice of words he preferred those which were metaphorical, obscure, archaic and outlandish to those which were common and familiar to his contemporaries. He took the greatest trouble to vary his constructions, since it was in this respect chiefly that he wished to excel his predecessors. Sometimes he makes a nominal phrase from a noun, and sometimes he condenses a phrase into a noun. Sometimes he expresses a verbal idea in a nominal form, and sometimes he changes a noun into a verb; and of the nouns themselves he inverts their normal use, so that proper nouns become common, and common nouns

---

<sup>1</sup> *Thucydides* 24–5. See notes in Vol. I, pp. 526–31.

<sup>1</sup> Πα: ἀποδεικτικοῦ alii, Usener.

<sup>2</sup> Reiske ex *De Thuc.*

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

γηται, καὶ τὰ μὲν παθητικὰ ῥήματα δραστήρια, τὰ δὲ δραστήρια παθητικά· πληθυντικῶν δὲ καὶ ἐνικῶν ἀλλάπτων τὰς φύσεις καὶ ἀντικατηγορῶν ταῦτα ἀλλήλων, θηλυκά τ' ἀρρενικοῖς καὶ ἀρρενικὰ θηλυκοῖς καὶ οὐδέτερα τούτων τισὶν συνάπτων, ἐξ ὧν ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθία πλανᾶται· τὰς δὲ <τῶν><sup>1</sup> ὀνοματικῶν ἢ μετοχικῶν πτώσεις τοτὲ μὲν πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος ἀποστρέφων, τοτὲ δὲ πρὸς τὸ <σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ> σημαινομένου.<sup>2</sup> ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνδετικοῖς καὶ τοῖς προθετικοῖς μορίοις καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς διαρθροῦσι τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων δυνάμεις ποιητοῦ τρόπον ἐνεξουσιάζων. πλείστα δ' ἂν τις εὔροι παρ' αὐτῶ τῶν σχημάτων, προσώπων τε ἀποστροφαῖς καὶ χρόνων ἐναλλαγαῖς καὶ τροπικῶν σημειώσεων μεταφοραῖς ἐξηλλαγμένα καὶ σολοικισμῶν λαμβάνοντα φαντασίας· ὅποσα τε γίνεται πράγματα ἀντὶ σωμάτων ἢ σώματα ἀντὶ πραγμάτων, καὶ ἐφ' ὧν ἐνθυμημάτων τε καὶ νοημάτων αἱ μεταξὺ παρεμπτώσεις πολλαὶ γινόμεναι διὰ μακροῦ<sup>3</sup> τὴν ἀκολουθίαν κομίζονται, τὰ τε σκολιὰ καὶ πολύπλοκα καὶ δυσεξέλικτα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ συγγενῇ τούτοις. εὔροι δ' ἂν τις οὐκ ὀλίγα καὶ τῶν θεατρικῶν σχημάτων κείμενα παρ' αὐτῶ, τὰς παρισώσεις λέγω καὶ παρομοιώσεις καὶ παρονομασίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας ὁ Λεοντῖνος καὶ οἱ περὶ Πῶλον καὶ Λικύμνιον καὶ πολλοὶ ἄλλοι τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀκμασάντων. ἐκδηλότατα δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ χαρακτηριστώτατά ἐστι τό τε πειρᾶσθαι δι' ἐλαχίστων ὀνομάτων πλείστα σημαίνειν πράγματα καὶ πολλὰ συντιθέναι νοήματα εἰς ἓν καὶ<sup>4</sup>

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

become proper nouns, and passive verbs become active and active become passive. He alters the natural uses of singular and plural, and substitutes the one for the other. He combines feminines with masculines, sometimes neuters with both, thereby violating the natural agreement of gender. He sometimes changes the case of nouns or participles from subject to object, and sometimes from object to subject. In the use of conjunctions and prepositions, and especially in the use of particles which serve to bring out the force of individual words, he allows himself full poetic licence. One can find in his work a great many constructions which, through changes of person and variation of tense and the use of obscure figurative expressions, acquire the appearance of solecisms. Again, he often substitutes things for persons and persons for things. In his enthymemes and his sentences there are often parentheses which delay the conclusion for a long time; and his style is generally tortuous, involved, and difficult to unravel, and has other similar properties. The ostentatious figures of speech are also to be found in his work in no small number—I mean those parallelisms in length and sound, word-play and antithesis, which were excessively used by Gorgias of Leontini, by Polus and Licymnius and their followers, and by many of his other contemporaries. But the most obvious of his characteristics is the effort to express as much as possible in the fewest possible words, and to combine many ideas into one,

---

<sup>1</sup> Usener ex *De Thuc.*

<sup>2</sup> CDs, *De Thuc.*: πρὸς τὸ σημαϊνόμενον Πα.

<sup>3</sup> codd.: πολλοῦ *De Thuc.*

<sup>4</sup> add. τὸ Usener.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

ἔτι προσδεχόμενον τι τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἀκούσεσθαι καταλιπεῖν, ὑφ' ὧν ἀσαφὲς γίνεται τὸ βραχύ. ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἴπω, τέσσαρα μὲν ἔστιν ὥσπερ ὄργανα τῆς Θουκυδίδου λέξεως, τὸ ποιητικὸν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τὸ πολυειδὲς τῶν σχημάτων, τὸ τραχὺ τῆς ἀρμονίας, τὸ τάχος τῆς σημασίας· χρώματα δὲ αὐτῆς τό τε στριφνὸν καὶ τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ πυκνὸν καὶ τὸ αὐστηρὸν καὶ τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ τὸ δεινὸν καὶ φοβερὸν, ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα τὸ παθητικόν. τοιοῦτοσί μὲν δὴ τίς ἔστιν ὁ Θουκυδίδης κατὰ τὸν τῆς λέξεως χαρακτῆρα, ᾧ παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους διήνεγκεν.'

3 γλωσσηματικά μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένα καὶ δυσείκαστα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἔστι τό τε ἀκραιφνές καὶ ὁ ἐπιλογισμὸς καὶ ἡ περιωπή καὶ ἡ ἀνακωχή καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις. ποιητικὰ δὲ ἢ τε κωλύμη καὶ ἡ πρέσβευσις καὶ ἡ καταβολή καὶ ἡ ἀχθηδών καὶ ἡ δικαίωσις καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια.

ἡ δ' ἐν τοῖς σχηματισμοῖς καινότης τε καὶ πολυτροπία καὶ ἡ ἐξαλλαγή τῆς συνήθους χρήσεως, ἐν ἧ μάλιστα διαφέρει αὐτὸν ἡγούμεθα τῶν ἄλλων, ἐπὶ τούτων γίνεται τῶν ἔργων φανερά·

4 ὅταν μὲν οὖν μίαν λέξιν εἴτε ὀνομαστικὴν εἴτε ῥηματικὴν ἐν πλείοσιν ὀνόμασιν ἢ ῥήμασιν ἐκφέρη περιφράζων τὴν αὐτὴν νόησιν, τοιαύτην ποιεῖ τὴν λέξιν· 'ἦν γὰρ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς βεβαιότατα δὴ φύσεως ἰσχὺν δηλώσας καὶ διαφερόντως τι ἐς αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἑτέρου ἄξιος θαυμάσαι.' καὶ μὴν ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ γέγραφεν· 'οὐδ' αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δέ

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

and to leave the listener still expecting to hear something more. These help to make his brevity obscure. I may summarise the instruments,<sup>1</sup> so to speak, of Thucydides' style as follows: there are four—artificiality of vocabulary, variety of figures, harshness of word-order, rapidity of signification. The special features that colour his style include compactness, pungency, solidity, severity, vehemence, the ability to disturb and to terrify, and above all emotional power. Such are the characteristics of style by which Thucydides is distinguished from all the rest.”

Examples of words that are recondite and archaic, and hard for ordinary people to guess at are: τὸ ἀκραιφνές, ὁ ἐπιλογισμός, ἡ περιωπή, ἡ ἀνακωχή and so forth. Examples of coined words are ἡ κωλύμη, ἡ πρέσβευσις, ἡ καταβοή, ἡ ἀχθηδών, ἡ δικαίωσις and similar forms. 3

The inventiveness and versatility which he shows in his constructions, and his departure from familiar usage, which we regard as the chief point of difference between him and all other writers, are clearly shown in the following passages:

When he conveys the meaning of a single noun or verb by means of several, expressing the same idea periphrastically, he produces this sort of phrase.<sup>2</sup> “Themistocles was a man who most convincingly displayed the strength of natural genius, and in this respect deserved particular admiration, exceeding that due to any other.” Again, in the Funeral Speech, he writes<sup>3</sup>: “nor yet on the ground of 4

<sup>1</sup> ὄργανα and χρώματα (below) are derived from the technical vocabulary of music, appositely in this context.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 138. 3.

<sup>3</sup> 2. 37. 1.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀξιώματος ἀφανεία κεκώλυται· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τὸ σημαινόμενον<sup>1</sup> . . . ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον τοιοῦτον, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου Βρασίδα τέθηκεν, ὅτε μαχόμενος περὶ Πύλον ἀπὸ τῆς νεῶς τραυματίας γενόμενος ἐξέπεσεν· ‘πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ’ φησὶν ‘εἰς τὴν παρεξαιρεσίαν ἢ ἀσπίς περιερρύη.’ βούλεται γὰρ δηλοῦν· ‘πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔξω τῆς νεῶς ἐπὶ τὰ προέχοντα μέρη τῆς εἰρεσίας’ [εἰς θάλατταν].<sup>2</sup>

5 ἐν οἷς δὲ τὰ ῥηματικὰ μόρια τῆς λέξεως ὀνοματικῶς σχηματίζει, τοιαύτην ποιεῖ τὴν φράσιν· ἔστιν δὲ αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ὁ Κορίνθιος ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ τὰδε λέγων· ‘δικαιώματα μὲν οὖν τὰδε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχομεν, παραίνεσιν δὲ καὶ ἀξίωσιν χάριτος τοιάνδε.’ τὸ γὰρ παραινεῖν καὶ ἀξιοῦν ῥήματα ὄντα ὀνοματικὰ γέγονεν παραίνεσις καὶ ἀξίωσις. ταύτης ἐστὶ τῆς ιδέας ἢ τε οὐκ ἀποτείχισις τοῦ Πλημμυρίου ἢ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ βύβλῳ <καὶ ἡ ὀλόφυρσις ἦν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ><sup>3</sup> τέθηκεν ἐν δημηγορίᾳ. τὸ γὰρ ἀποτείχισαι καὶ τὸ ὀλοφύρασθαι ῥηματικὰ ὄντα ὀνοματικῶς ἐσχημάτικεν ἀποτείχισιν καὶ ὀλόφυρσιν.

6 ὅταν δὲ ἀντιστρέψας ἑκατέρου τούτων τὴν φύσιν τὰ ὀνόματα ποιῇ ῥήματα, τοῦτον τὸν τρό-

<sup>1</sup> Pa: σύντομον alii, Usener: hiatum indic. Schenkel.

<sup>2</sup> del. Usener.

<sup>3</sup> Krüger.

---

<sup>1</sup> 4. 12. 1. For the precise meaning of *παρεξαιρεσία*, see Morrison and Williams, *Greek Oared Ships*, pp. 281–3.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

poverty is a man who has the power to confer some benefit upon the city prevented from doing so by the obscurity of his station." For in these cases the sense . . . gives the passage this character, as in his description of the Spartan Brasidas, when in the battle at Pylos he was wounded and fell overboard. He says<sup>1</sup> "He fell on to the outrigger (*παρεξειρεσία*) and his shield slipped off." What he wants to signify is that "he fell overboard on to the projecting parts of the oars."

When he casts the verbal parts of speech in the form of nouns, he expresses himself in the following way. The speaker is the Corinthian addressing the Athenians in the First Book<sup>2</sup>: "Such, then, are the pleas for justice we can make to you, together with the following exhortation and claim for gratitude." Here the verbs "we can exhort" and "we can claim" have become nouns, "exhortation" and "claim". Expressions in the same form are "the non-fortification of Plemmyrium" in the Seventh Book,<sup>3</sup> and "the lamentation" which he has put in a public speech in the First Book<sup>4</sup>: for he has given to the verbs "to fortify" and "to lament" the form of nouns, "fortification" and "lamentation".

But when he reverses the natural use of both of these parts of speech and turns nouns into verbs, he

<sup>2</sup> 1. 41. 1. The coining of new nouns originated in the second half of the fifth century B.C. in the growth of technical vocabulary stimulated by the sophistic movement. See J. Finley, "The Origins of Thucydides' Style", *H.S.C.P.* 50 (1939) pp. 35-84.

<sup>3</sup> Not in the received text of Thucydides. Perhaps a misquotation of *τὴν οὐ περιτείχισιν* in 3. 95. 2 applied to Plemmyrium (cf. *ἡ πλεμμυρίου λήψις*, 7. 24. 3).

<sup>4</sup> 1. 143. 5.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πον ἐκφέρει τὴν λέξιν, ὡς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ περὶ τῆς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου γράφει· 'τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀληθεστάτην αἰτίαν, λόγῳ δὲ ἀφανεστάτην, τοὺς Ἀθηναίους οἶομαι μεγάλους γινομένους ἀναγκάσαι εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν.' βούλεται γὰρ δηλοῦν, ὅτι μεγάλοι γιγνόμενοι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνάγκην παρέσχον τοῦ πολέμου· πεποίηκεν δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς ἀνάγκης καὶ τοῦ πολέμου ὀνοματικῶν ὄντων ῥηματικὰ τό τε ἀναγκάσαι καὶ τὸ πολεμεῖν.

7 ὅταν δὲ τῶν ῥημάτων ἀλλάττη τὰ εἶδη τῶν παθητικῶν καὶ ποιητικῶν, οὕτω σχηματίζει τὸν λόγον· 'οὔτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνο κωλύει ταῖς σπονδαῖς οὔτε τόδε·' τὸ γὰρ κωλύει ῥῆμα ἐνεργητικὸν ὑπάρχον ἀντὶ τοῦ κωλύεται παθητικοῦ ὄντος παρείληπται· ἦν δὲ τὸ σημαινόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς λέξεως τοιοῦτο· 'οὔτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνο κωλύεται ταῖς σπονδαῖς οὔτε τόδε·' καὶ ἔτι τὰ ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ λεγόμενα· 'τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις·' καὶ γὰρ <ἐν><sup>1</sup> τούτοις τὸ ἐπιμιγνύντες ἐνεργητικὸν ὑπάρχον ῥῆμα τοῦ ἐπιμιγνύμενοι παθητικοῦ ὄντος χώραν ἐπέχει.

8 ὅταν δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιητικοῦ τὸ παθητικὸν παραλαμβάνη, τοῦτον σχηματίζει τὸν τρόπον· 'ἡμῶν δὲ ὅσοι μὲν Ἀθηναίοις ἤδη ἐνηλλάγησαν·' βούλεται μὲν γὰρ δηλοῦν· 'ἡμῶν δὲ ὅσοι μὲν Ἀθηναίοις συνήλλαξαν', παρείληφεν δὲ τὸ ἐνηλλάγησαν παθητικὸν ὑπάρχον ἀντὶ ποιητικοῦ τοῦ συνήλλαξαν· καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τούτῳ· 'τοὺς δ' ἐν τῇ μεσογοίᾳ

<sup>1</sup> CDs: om. Pa.



## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

produces the following kind of expression, as he writes in the First Book concerning the cause of the war<sup>1</sup>: "Now the most genuine cause, though given least publicity, I consider to have been the fact that growing Athenian power made it necessary for them to go to war." What he is trying to signify is that growing Athenian power imposed upon them the necessity of war. But for the nouns "necessity" and "war" he has substituted the verbs "made it necessary" and "to wage war".

When he interchanges the passive and active forms of verbs, this is how he constructs his sentence<sup>2</sup>: "for neither the one hinders by the truce nor the other." The verb "hinders", which is active, is employed instead of the passive "is hindered". What the passage is intended to mean is: "for neither the one is hindered by the truce nor the other." And again, in the words of the introduction<sup>3</sup>: "for as there was no commerce, and they did not mingle freely with one another . . ." Here the verb "did not mingle", which is active, takes the place of the passive "were not mingled".

When he uses the passive instead of the active, he constructs a sentence in the following manner<sup>4</sup>: "those of us who had by this time been brought into contact with the Athenians". What he wishes to signify is "those of us who dealt with the Athenians". But he has adopted the passive form "been brought into contact with" instead of the active "dealt with". And so with the immediate sequel: "those

<sup>1</sup> 1. 23. 6.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 144. 2.

<sup>3</sup> 1. 2. 2. Also, a genitive absolute is coordinated with a nominative.

<sup>4</sup> 1. 120. 2.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

15 ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν τε καὶ νοήμασιν αἱ μεταξὺ παρεμπτώσεις πολλαὶ γινόμεναι καὶ μόλις ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος ἀφικνούμεναι, δι' ἃς ἡ φράσις δυσπαρακολούθητος γίνεται, πλείσται μὲν εἰσιν καθ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν· ἀρκέσουσι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ προοιμίου δύο ληφθεῖσαι μόναι, ἧ τε δηλοῦσα τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν ἀρχαίων τῆς Ἑλλάδος πραγμάτων καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἀποδιδούσα· τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδὲ ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης, νεμόμενοί τε τὰ αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζῆν καὶ περιουσίαν χρημάτων οὐκ ἔχοντες, οὔτε γῆν φυτεύοντες, ἄδηλον ὃν πότε τις ἐπελθὼν καὶ ἅμ' ἀτειχίστων ὄντων ἄλλος ἀφαιρήσεται· τῆς τε ἀναγκαίου τροφῆς πανταχοῦ ἂν ὁμοίως ἐπικρατήσῃν οἰόμενοι οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο' (<εἰ γὰρ τὸ οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο><sup>1</sup> προσέθηκεν τῇ πρώτῃ περιόδῳ καὶ ἐσχημάτισεν οὕτως· τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν <οὔτε κατὰ θάλασσαν>,<sup>2</sup> νεμόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζῆν οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο', φανερωτέραν ἂν ἐποίει τὴν διάνοιαν· τῇ δὲ παρεμβολῇ τῶν μεταξὺ πραγμάτων πολλῶν ὄντων ἀσαφῆ καὶ δυσπαρακολούθητον πεποίηκεν), καὶ ἡ περὶ τῆς Εὐρυσθέως στρατείας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἦδε· Εὐρυσθέως ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλειδῶν ἀποθανόντος, Ἀτρέως δὲ μητρὸς ἀδελφοῦ ὄντος αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐπιτρέψαντος Εὐρυσθέως, ὅτ' ἐστράτευε, Μυκῆνας τε καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατὰ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

<sup>2</sup> G: om. PCD: οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης Thucydides.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

In his enthymemes and periods the parentheses are 15 numerous and arrive at their conclusions with some difficulty; and this makes the meaning hard to follow. There are many of them throughout the whole of the history, but two only, taken from the Introduction, will suffice. One is the passage which shows the economic weakness of early Greece, and assigns the causes of it.<sup>1</sup> "For as there was no commerce, and they did not mingle freely with one another either by land or over the sea, and each tribe cultivated its own land only to the extent needed for subsistence, and did not have a surplus of wealth; and they did not plant the land, since it was uncertain when some invader would come and rob them, as there were no fortifications to protect them; and feeling that they could possess themselves of the bare necessities equally well anywhere, they migrated without compunction." If he had added "migrated without compunction" to the first period and had written it in this form: "for as there was no commerce, and they did not mingle freely with one another either by land or over the sea, and each tribe cultivated its own land only to the extent needed for subsistence, they migrated without compunction", he would have made the sense clearer; but by the insertion of a large number of parenthetical clauses he has made it obscure and difficult to follow. The second passage is that which refers to the invasion of Attica by Eurystheus<sup>2</sup>: "As Eurystheus was slain in Attica by the Heraclidae, and Atreus was his maternal uncle, to whom, as his kinsman, Eurystheus had entrusted his kingdom of Mycenae when he

<sup>1</sup> 1. 2. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 9. 2.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

τοιαίδε εἰσίν, ὅταν τὴν μὲν παραχὴν τάραχον καλῆ τὸ θηλυκὸν ἐκφέρων ἀρρενικῶς καὶ τὴν ὄχλησιν ὄχλον, τὴν δὲ βούλησιν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὸ βουλόμενον λέγῃ καὶ τὸ δυνάμενον· ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων τέθηκεν, ὅτε τὴν εἰς Σικελίαν ἀπέστελλον στρατιάν· οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ μὲν βουλόμενον οὐκ ἀφηρέθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀχλώδους τῆς παρασκευῆς, καὶ ἐν οἷς περὶ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν εἶρηκεν· ὥστε εἰ μὴ δυναστεία μᾶλλον ἢ ἰσονομία ἐχρῶντο τῷ ἐπιχωρίῳ οἱ Θεσσαλοί· καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα οὐδέτερον πεποίηκεν τὸ θηλυκόν· ἦν δὲ τὸ σημαινόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς λέξεως τοιόνδε· ὥστε εἰ μὴ δυναστεία μᾶλλον ἢ ἰσονομία ἐχρῶντο τῇ ἐπιχωρίῳ οἱ Θεσσαλοί·

- 11 ἐν οἷς δὲ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν προσηγοριῶν καὶ τῶν μετοχῶν καὶ <τῶν><sup>1</sup> συναπτομένων τούτοις ἄρθρων ἐξαλλάττει τοῦ συνήθους, οὕτως σχηματίζει [τῇ φράσει]·<sup>2</sup> ὡφροσύνην γὰρ λαβοῦσαι αἱ πόλεις καὶ ἄδειαν τῶν πρασσομένων ἐχώρησαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντικρυς ἐλευθερίαν, τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπούλου εὐνομίας οὐ προτιμήσαντες· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀκολούθως τῇ κοινῇ συνηθείᾳ σχηματίζοντες τὴν φράσιν τῷ τε θηλυκῷ γένει τῆς προσηγορίας τὸ θηλυκὸν ἂν ἔζευξαν μόριον, καὶ τὴν πτώσιν [τῆς μετοχῆς]<sup>2</sup> τὴν

<sup>1</sup> Herwerden.

<sup>2</sup> del. Usener.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not in the received text.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

τάραχος<sup>1</sup> for παραχή, giving a feminine word a masculine form, and likewise ὄχλος<sup>2</sup> for ὄχλησις. He says τὸ βουλόμενον<sup>3</sup> and τὸ δυνάμενον<sup>4</sup> instead of τὴν βούλησιν and τὴν δύναμιν. For instance, he writes of the Athenians when they were considering the dispatch of their expedition to Sicily<sup>5</sup>: “the Athenians were not deprived of their *wishing* by the *troublesomeness* of their preparations.” And also in his reference to the Thessalians: “so that if the Thessalians had not been under despotic rule rather than enjoying equal civil rights by the law of their country”. Here he has made the feminine neuter. What he wishes to signify is “so that if the Thessalians had not been under despotic rule rather than enjoying national equality of civic rights”.

In some cases he gives an unusual turn to the declension of proper nouns, appellatives and participles, and to the articles attached to them, forming a sentence in this way<sup>6</sup>: “for the states, having acquired a moderate constitution and security in their actions, moved towards downright independence, showing no regard for the hollow pretence of law and order offered by the Athenians.” Now those who construct their sentences in conformity with generally recognised usage would have subjoined to the noun in the feminine gender the feminine form <of the participle> and would have used the accusative

<sup>2</sup> 1. 73. 2.

<sup>3</sup> In 1. 90. 2 and 7. 49. 1, but not in the received text of the passage quoted (6. 24. 2), which has τὸ ἐπιθυμοῦν.

<sup>4</sup> Not in the received text.

<sup>5</sup> 6. 24. 2.

<sup>6</sup> 8. 64. 5. Cf. 1. 2. 2, and note 3, p. 415. Both are examples of Thucydidean μεταβολή (see Vol. I, p. 529, note 1).

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αἰτιατικὴν <ἄν><sup>1</sup> ἀντὶ τῆς γενικῆς ἔταξαν τὸν τρόπον τόνδε· ἴσως φροσύνην γὰρ λαβοῦσαι αἱ πόλεις καὶ ἄδειαν τῶν πρασσομένων ἐχώρησαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντικρυς ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπουλον εὐνομίαν οὐ προτιμήσασαι· οἱ δὲ τὰ ἀρρενικὰ τοῖς θηλυκοῖς συντάττοντες, ὥσπερ οὗτος πεποίηκεν, <καὶ><sup>2</sup> τὰς γενικὰς ἀντὶ τῶν αἰτιατικῶν πτώσεων παραλαμβάνοντες σολοικίζειν ἄν ὑφ' ἡμῶν λέγοιντο. καὶ ἔτι τὰ τοιαῦτα· ἴκαὶ μὴ τῷ πλήθει αὐτῶν καταπλαγέντες· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς δοτικῆς πτώσεως ἐσχηματίζεσθαι τὴν λέξιν ἤρμοσται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς αἰτιατικῆς· ἴκαὶ μὴ τὸ πλήθος τῶν πολεμίων καταπλαγέντες· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἴκαὶ τῆ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ὀργῇ φοβεῖσθαι λέγοιτ' ἄν τις, ἀλλὰ ἴκαὶ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ὀργήν·

- 12 ἴκαὶ δὲ παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκβεβηκυῖα τὸ κατάλληλον φράσις τοιαύτη τίς ἐστὶ· ἴκαὶ τοὶ εἰ ῥαθυμία μᾶλλον ἢ πόνων μελέτη, καὶ μὴ μετὰ νόμων τὸ πλεον ἢ τρόπων ἀνδρείας ἐθέλομεν κινδυνεύειν, περιγίνεται ἡμῖν τοῖς τε μέλλουσιν ἀλγεινοῖς μὴ προκάμνειν καὶ ἐς αὐτὰ ἐλθοῦσι μὴ ἀτολμοτέροις τῶν αἰεὶ μοχθούντων φαίνεσθαι· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸ μὲν ἐθέλομεν ῥῆμα τοῦ μέλλοντός ἐστὶ χρόνου δηλωτικόν, τὸ δὲ περιγίνεται τοῦ παρόντος. ἀκόλουθον δ' ἄν ἦν, εἰ συνέζευξεν τῷ ἐθέλομεν τὸ περιέσται \* \* \*<sup>3</sup> ἴκαὶ τοῦ τε γὰρ χωρίου τὸ δυσέμβρατον ἡμέτερον νομίζω, ὃ μενόντων μὲν ἡμῶν σύμμαχον γίνεται· ὑποχωρήσασι δὲ καίπερ

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

instead of the genitive case, as follows: *σωφροσύνην γὰρ λαβοῦσαι αἱ πόλεις καὶ ἄδειαν τῶν πρασσομένων ἔχωρησαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντικρυς ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπουλον εὐνομίαν οὐ προτιμήσασαι*. But those authors who construct masculines with feminines, as Thucydides has done, and use genitives instead of accusatives, would be said by us to be committing solecism. The following words also have this fault: “not frightened by their numbers”.<sup>1</sup> This clause should not have been constructed in the dative case but in the accusative: “not fearing the numbers of the enemy”. So, too, no one would be said to “fear through the anger of the gods” but rather “fear the anger of the gods”.

The style which neglects consistency in the tenses 12 of verbs is of the following kind<sup>2</sup>: “And yet, if we should choose to face danger in a spirit of easy indifference rather than after laborious preparation, and with a courage born of habit rather than from respect for the law, we gain the advantage of not suffering hardships when they are yet to come, while in actually confronting them we show ourselves no less courageous than those who are always toiling.” Here *ἐθέλομεν* is a verb indicating the future, while *περιγίγνεται* indicates the present. The construction would have been consistent if he had joined *περίεσται* with *ἐθέλομεν*. “I consider the inaccessibility of the spot to be in our favour, but this helps us only if we stand our ground: if we withdraw,

<sup>1</sup> 4. 10. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 2. 39. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Herwerden.

<sup>2</sup> Usener.

<sup>3</sup> Excidit transitus formula huiusmodi: τὸν τρόπον τόνδε.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

χαλεπὸν ὄν εὖπορον ἔσται.' τὸ μὲν γὰρ γίνεται τοῦ παρόντος ἐστί, τὸ δὲ ἔσται τοῦ μέλλοντος χρόνου δηλωτικόν. γέγονεν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τὰς πτώσεις σχηματισμὸς ἀκατάλληλος· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς γενικῆς πτώσεως ἐξενήνοχεν τό τε μετοχικὸν ὄνομα τὸ μενόντων καὶ <τὸ><sup>1</sup> ἀντονομαστικὸν τὸ ἡμῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς δοτικῆς τὸ ὑποχωρήσασιν· οἰκειότερον δ' ἦν καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐξενήνεχθαι πτώσιν.

13 ὅταν δὲ πρὸς τὸ σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαινομένου πράγματος τὴν ἀποστροφὴν ποιῆται ἢ πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος, οὕτως σχηματίζει τὸν λόγον· 'τῶν δὲ Συρακοσίων ὁ δῆμος ἐν πολλῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔριδι ἦσαν.' προθεῖς γὰρ ἐνικὸν ὄνομα τὸν δῆμον ἀπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τούτου τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τὸ σημαινόμενον πρᾶγμα πληθυντικὸν ὑπάρχον, τοὺς Συρακοσίους. καὶ αὖθις· 'Λεοντῖνοι γὰρ ἀπελθόντων Ἀθηναίων ἐκ Σικελίας μετὰ τὴν σύμβασιν πολίτας τε ἐπεγράψαντο πολλοὺς καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐπενόει τὴν γῆν ἀναδάσασθαι.' ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Λεοντῖνοι ἀπέστρεψεν τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τὸ ἐνικὸν ὄνομα τὸν δῆμον. \* \* \*<sup>2</sup>

14 πρόσωπα δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ τὰ πράγματα γίνεται, καθά περ ἐν τῇ Κορινθίων πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους δημηγορίᾳ γέγονεν· ἀξιώων γὰρ ὁ Κορίνθιος τοὺς προεστηκότας τῆς Πελοποννήσου φυλάττειν αὐτῆς τὸ ἀξίωμα πρὸς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, οἷον παρὰ τῶν πατέρων παρέλαβον, ταῦτα λέγει· 'πρὸς τάδε

<sup>1</sup> CDs: om. Pa.

<sup>2</sup> Lacunam indic. Krüger.



## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

the position, though difficult in itself, will be easily occupied by the enemy." Now *γίγνεται* refers to the present, but *ἔσται* indicates the future. There is also inconsistency in the construction of the cases: for he has put the participle *μενόντων* and the pronoun *ἡμῶν* in the genitive case, but *ὑποχωρήσασιν* in the dative; whereas the latter would more properly have been expressed in the same case as the two former.

When he shifts his attention from the object being 13 signified to the word that is signifying it, and *vice versa*, he uses a form of words like the following<sup>1</sup>: "The populace of the Syracusans were engaged in great strife with one another." Although he has begun with the singular noun "populace", he has changed the form of words from this to the object that is being signified, the Syracusans. And again,<sup>2</sup> "for when the Athenians left Sicily after the convention, the men of Leontini enrolled many new citizens, and the populace turned its mind to the idea of redistributing the land." From the plural "men of Leontini" he changes to the singular noun "the populace" . . .

In his *History* things are treated as persons, as in 14 the speech of the Corinthians to the Lacedaemonians. The Corinthian speaker demands of the leading men of the Peloponnese that they should maintain its prestige in the eyes of external states at the level transmitted to them by their fathers. These are his

<sup>1</sup> 6. 35. 1. *Constructio ad sensum*, whereby collective nouns in the singular are often followed by verbs in the plural.

<sup>2</sup> 5. 4. 2.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

βουλεύεσθε εὖ, καὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον πειρᾶσθε μὴ ἐλάσσον' ἐξηγεῖσθαι ἢ οἱ πατέρες ὑμῖν παρέδοσαν· τὸ γὰρ ἐξηγεῖσθαι νῦν τέθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ προάγειν ἔξω τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἡγουμένους αὐτῆς· τοῦτο δὲ τῇ χώρᾳ μὲν ἀδύνατον ἦν συμβῆναι, τῇ δὲ δόξῃ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν τοῖς περὶ αὐτὴν ὑπάρχουσιν δυνατόν, καὶ βούλεται τοῦτο δηλοῦν.

πράγματα δὲ ἀντὶ σωμάτων τὰ τοιαῦτα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γίνεται· λέγεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κορινθίων πρεσβευτοῦ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους συγκρίνοντος τά τε Ἀθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων· οἱ μὲν γε νεωτεροποιοὶ καὶ ἐπινοῆσαι ὀξεῖς καὶ ἐπιτελέσαι ἔργῳ ὃ ἂν γνῶσιν· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὰ ὑπάρχοντά τε σώζεις καὶ ἐπιγνῶναι μηδὲν καὶ ἔργῳ οὐδὲ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἐξικέσθαι· μέχρι μὲν οὖν τούτων τὸ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως σώζει τὴν ἀκολουθίαν, ὡς ἐπὶ προσώπων ἀμφοτέρων κείμενον· ἔπειτα ἀποστρέφεται κατὰ θάτερον τῶν μερῶν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἀντὶ σωμάτων πρᾶγμα γίνεται <τὸ><sup>1</sup> περὶ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, ὅταν φῆ· αὐθις δὲ οἱ μὲν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταὶ καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐέλπιδες· τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον τῆς τε δυνάμεως ἐνδεᾶ πρᾶξαι τῆς τε γνώμης μηδὲ τοῖς βεβαίοις πιστεῦσαι· τὸ γὰρ ὑμέτερον ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑμεῖς παρείληπται, πρᾶγμα ὑπάρχον ἀντὶ σώματος.

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

<sup>1</sup> 1. 71. 7. *Metonymy*: see *Ad Herennium* 4. 32. 43 ("denominatio"), Cicero, *De Oratore* 3. 42. 167; Quintilian 8. 6. 24.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

words<sup>1</sup>: "Therefore you must take good counsel, and strive to ensure that the Peloponnese you lead forth may be no less powerful than when your fathers left it in your care." He has used the expression "to lead forth" here in the sense of "to guide the Peloponnese outside as its leaders". Now this could not possibly apply to the territory, but it can apply to its reputation and its material resources; and this is what he means to indicate.

Persons are treated as things by him in the following way, in the words uttered by the same Corinthian envoy addressing the Lacedaemonians, when he compares the character of the Athenians and the Lacedaemonians<sup>2</sup>: "Now they are innovators, quick to conceive plans and realise in action what they have decided upon; but you are disposed to preserve what you have and to form no new design, and to refrain from carrying out in action even what is necessary." Now up to this point the structure preserves the natural sequence of the thought, in that the two persons form the subject. But after this, in the second clause, the expression is changed, and instead of persons a thing is used to refer to the Lacedaemonians when he says: "and again they are daring even beyond their power and adventurous beyond their better judgment, and optimistic in the face of danger; but *your way* is to undertake things which do not require your full resources, and not to trust even the sound conclusions of your judgment." Here "your way" has been submitted for "you", a thing taking the place of a person.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 70. 2.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

15 ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν τε καὶ νοήμασιν αἱ μεταξὺ παρεμπτώσεις πολλαὶ γινόμεναι καὶ μόλις ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος ἀφικνούμεναι, δι' ἃς ἡ φράσις δυσπαρακολούθητος γίνεται, πλείσται μὲν εἰσιν καθ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν· ἀρκέσουσι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ προοιμίου δύο ληφθεῖσαι μόναι, ἧ τε δηλοῦσα τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν ἀρχαίων τῆς Ἑλλάδος πραγμάτων καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἀποδιδούσα· τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδὲ ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης, νεμόμενοί τε τὰ αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζῆν καὶ περιουσίαν χρημάτων οὐκ ἔχοντες, οὔτε γῆν φυτεύοντες, ἄδηλον ὃν πότε τις ἐπελθὼν καὶ ἅμ' ἀτειχίστων ὄντων ἄλλος ἀφαιρήσεται· τῆς τε ἀναγκαίου τροφῆς πανταχοῦ ἂν ὁμοίως ἐπικρατήσῃν οἰόμενοι οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο' (<εἰ γὰρ τὸ οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο><sup>1</sup> προσέθηκεν τῇ πρώτῃ περιόδῳ καὶ ἐσχημάτισεν οὕτως· τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν <οὔτε κατὰ θάλασσαν>,<sup>2</sup> νεμόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζῆν οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀνίσταντο', φανερωτέραν ἂν ἐποίει τὴν διάνοιαν· τῇ δὲ παρεμβολῇ τῶν μεταξὺ πραγμάτων πολλῶν ὄντων ἀσαφῆ καὶ δυσπαρακολούθητον πεποίηκεν), καὶ ἡ περὶ τῆς Εὐρυσθέως στρατείας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἦδε· Εὐρυσθέως ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλειδῶν ἀποθανόντος, Ἀτρέως δὲ μητρὸς ἀδελφοῦ ὄντος αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐπιτρέψαντος Εὐρυσθέως, ὅτ' ἐστράτευε, Μυκῆνας τε καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατὰ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> Usener.

<sup>2</sup> G: om. PCD: οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης Thucydides.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

In his enthymemes and periods the parentheses are 15 numerous and arrive at their conclusions with some difficulty; and this makes the meaning hard to follow. There are many of them throughout the whole of the history, but two only, taken from the Introduction, will suffice. One is the passage which shows the economic weakness of early Greece, and assigns the causes of it.<sup>1</sup> "For as there was no commerce, and they did not mingle freely with one another either by land or over the sea, and each tribe cultivated its own land only to the extent needed for subsistence, and did not have a surplus of wealth; and they did not plant the land, since it was uncertain when some invader would come and rob them, as there were no fortifications to protect them; and feeling that they could possess themselves of the bare necessities equally well anywhere, they migrated without compunction." If he had added "migrated without compunction" to the first period and had written it in this form: "for as there was no commerce, and they did not mingle freely with one another either by land or over the sea, and each tribe cultivated its own land only to the extent needed for subsistence, they migrated without compunction", he would have made the sense clearer; but by the insertion of a large number of parenthetical clauses he has made it obscure and difficult to follow. The second passage is that which refers to the invasion of Attica by Eurystheus<sup>2</sup>: "As Eurystheus was slain in Attica by the Heraclidae, and Atreus was his maternal uncle, to whom, as his kinsman, Eurystheus had entrusted his kingdom of Mycenae when he

<sup>1</sup> 1. 2. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 9. 2.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

οἰκεῖον Ἀτρεΐ· τυγχάνειν δὲ αὐτὸν φεύγοντα τὸν πατέρα διὰ τὸν Χρυσίππου θάνατον· καὶ ὡς οὐκέτι ἀνεχώρησεν Εὐρυσθεὺς, βουλομένων καὶ τῶν Μυκηναίων φόβῳ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν, καὶ ἅμα δυνατὸν δοκοῦντα εἶναι καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τεθεραπευκότα τῶν Μυκηναίων τε καὶ ὄσων Εὐρυσθεὺς ἦρχεν τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀτρέα παραλαβεῖν.<sup>1</sup>

16 ἐν οἷς δὲ σκολιὰ καὶ πολύπλοκος καὶ δυσεξέλικτος ἢ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων κατασκευὴ γίνεται, τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἔχει παρ' αὐτῷ· κεῖται δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ ἢ λέξις· 'τὴν δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων τιμωρίαν ποθεινοτέραν αὐτῶν λαβόντες καὶ κινδύνων ἅμα τόνδε κάλλιστον νομίσαντες ἐβουλήθησαν τοὺς μὲν τιμωρεῖσθαι τῶν δ' ἐφίεσθαι, ἐλπίδι μὲν τὸ ἀφανὲς τοῦ κατορθώσειν ἐπιτρέψαντες, ἔργῳ δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἤδη ὄρωμένου σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἀξιοῦντες πεποιθέσαι· ἐν τῷ ἀμύνεσθαι παθεῖν μᾶλλον ἡγησάμενοι ἢ ἐνδόντες σώζεσθαι τὸ μὲν αἰσχροὺν τοῦ λόγου ἔφυγον, τὸ δ' ἔργον τῷ σώματι ὑπέμειναν καὶ δι' ἐλαχίστου καιροῦ τύχης ἅμα ἀκμῇ τῆς δόξης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ δέους ἀπηλλάγησαν.' τοιαῦτά ἐστι καὶ τὰ περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ· ἦν γὰρ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς βεβαιότατα δὴ φύσεως ἰσχὺν δηλώσας καὶ διαφερόντως τι ἐς αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἑτέρου ἄξιος θαυμάσαι. οἰκεία γὰρ ξυνέσει, καὶ οὔτε προμαθῶν εἰς

<sup>1</sup> 2. 37. 4. This fault has been well illustrated in the *Thucydides* 46 and 48.

<sup>2</sup> 1. 138. 3.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

went to the wars—Atreus who had been banished by his father because of the murder of Chrysippus—when Eurystheus did not return again, at the wish of the Mycenaeans themselves, through fear of the Heraclidae, and also because he was reckoned powerful and had courted the favour of the people, the kingship over the Mycenaeans passed into the hands of Atreus.”

The construction of some of his enthymemes is 16 sometimes tortuous, involved and difficult to unravel, as in this passage, which is found in the Funeral Speech<sup>1</sup>: “Conceiving vengeance upon their enemies to be more precious than these objects, and at the same time regarding danger thus incurred to be the noblest of all, they wished to pursue their revenge and abandon them, trusting the uncertainty of success to hope, but in action thinking it right to rely on themselves in respect of what was at that time before their eyes. They believed that they should rather suffer in self-defence than save themselves by giving in, and thus escaped a shameful reputation by enduring the brunt of the conflict with their bodies; and in the briefest moment of time, at the height of their fortune, they were taken away from the scene not of their fear but of their glory.” Of a similar kind to this is the historian’s portrait of Themistocles in the First Book<sup>2</sup>: “For Themistocles was a man who most convincingly displayed the strength of natural genius, and in this respect deserved particular admiration, exceeding that due to any other man; for it was by native intelligence, unaided by know-

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

αὐτὴν οὐθὲν οὐτ' ἐπιμαθῶν τῶν τε παραχρῆμα δι' ἐλαχίστης βουλῆς κράτιστος γνώμων καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἐπὶ πλείστον τοῦ γενησομένου ἄριστος εἰκαστής· καὶ ἃ μὲν μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχοι, καὶ ἐξηγήσασθαι οἷός τε· ὧν δὲ ἄπειρος εἶη, κρῖναι ἱκανῶς οὐκ ἀπήλλακτο· τό τε ἄμεινον ἢ χεῖρον ἐν τῷ ἀφανεῖ ἔτι προεώρα. καὶ τὸ ξύμπαν εἶπεῖν, φύσεως μὲν δυνάμει, μελέτης δὲ βραχύτητι κράτιστος δὴ οὗτος αὐτοσχεδιάζειν τὰ δέοντα ἐγένετο.'

- 17 οἱ δὲ μεираκιώδεις σχηματισμοὶ τῶν ἀντιθέτων τε καὶ παρομοιώσεων καὶ παρισώσεων, ἐν οἷς οἱ περὶ τὸν Γοργίαν μάλιστα ἐπλεόνασαν, ἤκιστα τῷ χαρακτήρι τούτῳ προσήκοντες, αὐστηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ τοῦ κομψοῦ πλείστον ἀφεστηκότι, τοιοῦτοί τινές εἰσι παρὰ τῷ συγγραφεῖ· 'φαίνεται γὰρ ἢ νῦν καλουμένη Ἑλλάς οὐ πάλαι βεβαίως οἰκουμένη.' καὶ ἔτι δέ· 'οἱ μὲν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί· τὸ δ' ὑμέτερον τῆς τε δυνάμεως ἐνδεᾶ πράξαι τῆς τε γνώμης μηδὲ τοῖς βεβαίοις πιστεῦσαι, τῶν δὲ δεινῶν μηδέποτε οἶεσθαι ἀπολυθήσεσθαι.' καὶ ἐν οἷς τὰς καταλαβούσας τὴν Ἑλλάδα συμφορὰς διὰ τὰς στάσεις ἐπεξέρχεται τοιάδε γράφων· 'τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀλόγιστος ἀνδρεία φιλέταιρος ἐνομίσθη· μέλλησις δὲ προμηθῆς δειλία εὐπρεπής, τὸ δὲ σῶφρον

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I, pp. 137, 253, 337.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *De Compositione Verborum* 22, p. 174.

<sup>3</sup> 1. 2. 1. Cf. *Thucydides* 24.

<sup>4</sup> 1. 70. 3.



## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

ledge acquired earlier than or after the event, that he surpassed all others; whether as a judge of present needs with the least possible time for deliberation, or as a forecaster of future events, covering the widest range of possibilities, he was supreme. And he had the ability to explain what he had in hand, while in matters of which he had no experience he was not at a loss to form a competent judgment. He could foresee the better or the worse course in a situation that was still in the obscure future. To sum up, by the force of his natural genius, even after the shortest practice for the task, this man proved himself the best at improvising what should be done."

The juvenile figures of antithesis and parallelism <sup>17</sup> in sound and structure, which Gorgias and his followers used to excess,<sup>1</sup> are very inappropriate to this style, which has an austere manner, and is far removed from preciosity.<sup>2</sup> But examples like these are found in the historian<sup>3</sup>: "For it is clear that the Greek nation of today had no secure population in former days." And again<sup>4</sup>: "They are audacious even beyond their power, and adventurous beyond their better judgment; but your way is to undertake things which do not require your full resources, and not to trust even the sound conclusions of your judgment, and to think that you will never be freed from the dangers which threaten you". And in the passage in which he describes the disasters which had overtaken Greece because of party strife, writing as follows<sup>5</sup>: "For reckless audacity came to be regarded as dedicated party-loyalty, provident hesitation as specious cowardice. Moderation was a cloak

<sup>5</sup> 3. 82. 4. Cf. *Thucydides* 29.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

πρόσχημα τοῦ ἀνάνδρου, καὶ τὸ εἰς ἅπαν ξυνετὸν ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀργόν.' πολλὰ τοιαῦτά τις ἂν εὔροι δι' ὅλης αὐτοῦ τῆς ἱστορίας λεγόμενα, ἱκανὰ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα δείγματος ἔνεκα εἰρήσθαι.

ἔχεις, ὦ φίλε Ἀμμαῖε, τὰ παρατηρήματα καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς ἐξητασμένα πραγματείας, ὡς ἐπεζήτεις.

## SECOND LETTER TO AMMAEUS

for unmanliness, ability to understand all things was considered as inability to act in anything." Many passages of this kind may be found throughout his *History*, but the foregoing are quite enough to quote by way of illustration.

You have here, my dear Ammaeus, my observations individually confirmed, as you requested, by the normal literary method.



# INDEX



# INDEX

(The numbers refer to pages)

- Achilles, 147  
 Acropolis, 261  
 Aelius Tubero, 405  
 Aeschines, 67, 251, 271, 278, 309, 343;  
     *Ag. Ctes.*, 275  
 Aeschylus, 173; *Seven*, 104  
 Agasicles, 278-9  
 Alcaeus, 151, 206  
 Alcidas, 305  
 Alexander the Great, 141-9, 255, 341,  
     345  
 Alyattes, 39  
 Ammaeus, 311, 402, 433  
 Ammianus Marcellinus, 261  
 Anacreon, 194-5  
 Anaxicrates, archonship of, 257-9, 263  
 Anaximenes, 309  
 Andocides, 247  
 Antigonus, 43, 257  
 Antimachus, 171  
 Antipater, 285  
 Antiphon of Rhamnus, 71, 173, 309,  
     403  
*antithesis*, 431  
 Apelles, 271  
 Aphareus, 298-9  
 Apollodorus, 304  
 Arbela, Battle of, 341  
 Archilochus, 127  
 archons at Athens, 361-291 B.C., 275-  
     7, 295, 297, 311, 313-33  
 Aristocles, 271  
 Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 74; *Plutus*, 97;  
     *Clouds*, 217  
 Aristotle, 207, 246, 304-11, 315-35,  
     363; *Rhet.*, viii, 9, 10, 12, 21, 22, 23,  
     29, 59, 73, 83, 86, 89, 129, 132, 155,  
     193, 213-15, 303-11, 315-45, 383;  
     *Poet.*, 29, 92, 129; *Nic. Eth.*, 89, 205;  
     *De Anima*, 92; *Hist. Anim.*, 93;  
     *Polit.*, 205; *Eud. Eth.*, 205; *Analyt.*  
     321-3; *Top.*, 317-21; *Method.*, 317-  
     21  
 Aristoxenus, 77, 92-3  
 Arrian, 142, 275, 386  
 Artamenes, 271  
 Asianism, Asiatic style, 174  
 Athene Polias, temple of, 261  
 Athenians, 415-17  
 Attic dialect, 31, 246, 383  
 Atticism, 247, 349, 387  
 Augustine, 253  
 Bacchylides, 223  
 Caecilius of Caleacte, 246, 247, 385  
 Caesar, Julius, 386  
 Callimachus, 217, 246, 247, 250-51,  
     279  
 Candaules, 31  
 Cassander, 257, 284, 287  
*catachrēsis*, 29  
 Cephisodorus, 309, 363  
 Chalcis, 257-9, 263, 317, 325  
 Chares, 325-7  
 Charidemus, 325  
 Charinus, 276  
 Charon of Lampsacus, 375  
 Chrysippus, 45  
 Cicero, M. Tullius, 9, 11, 12; *De*  
     *Oratore*, 22, 45, 74, 89, 132, 231, 265,  
     378, 389, 392, 424; *Orator*, 28-9, 39,  
     41, 59, 89, 148, 155, 265, 349-51;  
     *Brutus*, 23, 45, 174, 378; *De Div.*, 71;  
     *Ep. ad Att.*, 253; *Ep. ad Quint.*, 389  
*clausula*, 9, 189  
 Cleanthes, 45  
*climax*, 63  
*constructio ad sensum*, 423  
 Corcyra, 377  
 Corinthians, 423-5  
 Croesus, 39, 41  
 Ctesias, 70, 71  
 Curtius Rufus, 142  
 Cynossema, Battle of, 377  
 Danaë, 239-41  
 Demades, 341  
 Demetrius, member of Dionysius'  
     circle, 371  
 Demetrius of Callatis, 43  
 Demetrius of Magnesia, *On Namesakes*,  
     252-3  
 Demetrius of Phalerum, 255, 261, 278,  
     363, 365  
 Demetrius, *On Style*, vii, 4, 9, 36, 59,  
     63, 66, 68, 100, 158, 161, 169, 226  
 Demetrius Poliorcetes, 257-9, 277, 284  
 Demochares, 289  
 Democles, 289  
 Democritus, 207  
 Demosthenes, 12, 16, 69, 89, 139, 153,  
     223, 227, 246-8, 251, 253-6, 263-73,  
     280, 287, 303-17, 323-71, 385, 397,  
     405; *De Cor.*, 43, 58, 61, 63, 101,  
     139-41, 221, 275, 304, 337, 341, 367,  
     375; *Phil.*, 64, 313, 327, 329, 331;  
     *Olynth.*, 86, 311; *On the Peace*, 58,  
     *Lept.*, 67; *Androt.*, 313; *Timoc.*, 313;

## INDEX

- Demosthenes (*contd.*)  
*Aristoc.*, 59, 209-21, 313; *Chers.*, 208, 331; *On the Name*, 283; *For Megal.*, 313; *Mid.*, 315; *Rhod.*, 315  
Dinarchus, and his speeches, 246-99  
Dio Chrysostom, 265  
Diodorus Siculus, 89, 275  
Diogenes Laertius, 45, 62, 226, 253, 294  
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *passim*;  
*Thucyd.*, x, xi, 191, 349, 355, 375, 376, 381, 402-3, 405, 407-11, 417, 428, 430; *Lysias*, 16, 157, 246, 253, 267, 269, 383; *Isoc.*, 155, 204; *Isaeus*, 267, 273, 274, 278; *Demos.*, 11, 19, 21, 25, 31, 65, 69, 73, 78, 83, 86, 89, 90, 92, 155, 166, 169, 204, 213, 227, 229, 270, 271, 283, 349, 353, 363-9; *On Imitation*, 350, 383; *Ant. Rom.*, 89  
Dionysius Thrax, 21, 92, 94, 97, 99, 103  
Duris, 42, 43
- Empedocles, 171  
*enthymeme*, 267, 391, 409, 427, 429  
Ephorus, 195  
Epicurus, 209  
*etymological figure*, 14  
Eumaeus, 27  
Euphorion, 34  
Euripides, 37, 195, 367; *Orestes*, 81, 89; *Medea*, 101; *Hecuba*, 123; *Bacchae*, 127; *Hippol.*, 129; *Archelaus*, 221; *Telephus*, 237  
Eurystheus, 427-9
- Gaugamela, Battle of, 341  
Gorgias, 15, 87, 359, 369; *Gorgianic figures*, 365, 409, 431  
Greeks, 373, 375  
Gyges, 31-3
- Hagnonides, 280-81  
Harpalus, 280, 289  
Hector, 147  
Hegesianax, 43  
Hegesias, 41, 141-9  
Helen, 15  
Hellanicus, 375  
Hephaestion, 34  
Heraclides, 43  
Herennius, treatise addressed to (*Ad Herennium*), 10, 23, 29, 67, 89, 424  
Hermogenes, 265, 273
- Herodotus, 5-6, 16, 25, 31-3, 39, 71, 89, 153, 350, 371-89, 407  
Hesiod, 195  
Hieronymus, 42-3  
Himeraeus, 278-9  
Hippias, 359  
Hippodamas, 363  
Homer, 5-6, 9, 10, 15, 25, 27, 33-7, 121, 147-9, 157, 207, 236-7, 361; *Iliad*, 35, 37, 47-51, 111-13, 119, 123, 147-9, 159, 207, 229, 241, 253; *Odyssey*, 27-9, 41, 47-51, 111-13, 117-19, 129, 159-65, 229, 235-7  
Horace, *Odes*, 210  
*hypallage*, 29  
Hyperides, 248, 251-3, 256, 264-71, 309; *For Euxenippus*, 277, 278
- Ionic dialect, 383  
Iphicrates, 331-3  
Isaeus, 227, 251, 311  
Isocrates, 12, 155, 195, 197, 201-5, 225, 251, 267, 271, 298-9, 309, 311, 355, 357, 393, 397; *Paneg.*, 86, 225; *Ad Demonium*, 86; *Euag.*, 89; *Ag. Soph.*, 89; *Antid.*, 89, 299; *Phil.*, 89
- Julius Capito, 261
- kairos*, 86-7
- Lacedaemonians, *see* Spartans  
Lasus of Hermione, 101  
Leucippus, 207  
Licymnius, 401  
[Longinus], *On the Sublime*, vii, 3, 5, 9, 29, 129, 148, 170, 206, 225, 265, 378, 389  
Lucian, 397  
Lycurgus, 256, 278-9, 289, 309; *Ag. Leocr.*, 278  
Lydians, 31, 381  
Lysias, 248, 251, 265-71, 359; *For Mnesicles*, 265; *For Nicom.*, 265
- Macedonia, 399  
Machaon, son of Asclepius, 315-17  
Megarians, 377; Megarian Decree, 376  
Menesaechmus, 289  
*metabolē*, 419  
*metaphor*, 148, 365  
Metilius, Rufus, 15, 241  
*metonymy*, 29, 365, 424  
metres and rhythms, *prosodiac*, 34, 35; *ithyphallic* or *Priapean*, 35; *ionic*, 36, 37; *spondaic*, 65, 112, 135, 137,



## INDEX

- 150; *dactylic*, 35, 129, 135, 139, 150;  
*cretic*, 65, 131, 132, 135, 137, 139,  
 141; *pyrrhic*, 125; *choriambic*, 34;  
*iambic*, 34, 125, 219-21, 237-9;  
*trochaic*, 34, 126, 127, 150; *sotadean*,  
 36, 37; *anapaestic*, 127, 135, 137,  
 219; *molossus*, 127, 139; *amphibrach*,  
 127; *bacchius*, 131, 133, 137, 139,  
 141; *hypobacchius*, 131, 135, 137,  
 139, 141; *paeon*, 139; *choree*, 127;  
*dichoree*, 148  
 modes, Dorian, Phrygian and Lydian,  
 151  
 Molon, 271  
 Munychia, 259
- Nicanor, 304, 343  
 Nicophemus, archonship of, 263
- Odysseus, 27, 41, 159  
 Olynthian War, 325-7  
*onomatopoeia*, 112
- paraleipsis*, 67  
 Parmenides, 359  
*paronomasia*, 14, 224  
 Peloponnesians, 377; Peloponnesian  
 War, 393  
 Peripatetics, 307, 309  
 Persian War, 377  
 Phaestis, 317  
 Phidias, 271  
 Philagrios, 271  
 Philip II of Macedon, 209, 313-17,  
 325-39, 393  
 Philippus, archonship of, 263, 277  
 Philistus, 16, 371, 385, 389-91  
 Philochorus, 248, 259-61, 304, 325, 333  
 Philodemus, 209, 361  
 Philostratus, 87  
 Philoxenus, 18, 153  
 Phocian War, 329  
 Phormisius, 278-9  
 Phrynichus, 387  
 Phylarchus, 43  
 Phyle, 377  
 Pindar, 100-101, 151, 167, 173-83,  
 195, 379  
 Plato, 12, 139, 153, 225, 271, 317, 323,  
 349-71; *Menex.*, 65, 135-7; *Soph.*,  
 73, 359; *Phaedr.*, 87, 359, 369; *Rep.*,  
 227, 359, 361; *Crat.*, 91, 93, 115;  
*Theaet.*, 92-3, 114; *Phileb.*, 93, 114;  
*Hipp. Maj.*, 114; *Protag.*, 229, 359;  
*Gorg.*, 359  
 Plutarch, *Demos.*, 275
- Polus, 359, 409  
 Polybius, 42, 43, 89  
 Polyclitus, 271  
 Polyeuctus, 277  
 Pompeius Geminus, 352-3, 369  
 Prodicus, 112, 359  
 prose rhythm, 124-5, 219  
 Protagoras, 62, 112, 359  
 Proxenus, 257-9, 291  
 Psaon, 43, 273  
 Pytheas, 278, 279  
 Pythodemos, archonship of, 263
- Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, 29, 37, 62, 63,  
 85, 86, 99, 171, 206, 225, 226, 265,  
 392, 424
- Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 89  
 Rhodian School, 271  
 rhythms, *see* metres
- Sappho, 151, 195-9, 217  
 Scipio Africanus, 386  
 Seneca, *Ep.*, 276  
 Sicily, 379, 389, 419  
 Silenus, 399  
 Simonides, 12, 195, 239-41  
 Sisyphus, 10, 159  
 Socrates, 303  
 Sophists, 90-91, 112, 303  
 Sophocles, 67, 207, 355; *Philoctetes*,  
 97  
 Sosigenes, 273  
 Sotades, 36  
 Spartans, Lacedaemonians, 387, 423-5  
 Stagira, 317  
 Stephanus, 279  
 Stesichorus, 151, 206, 207  
 Stoics, 21, 45, 90, 113  
*strophe*, *antistrophe*, 233  
 syllables, length of, 105-15  
 Syracusans, 417
- Tamynae, Battle of, 282, 296  
 Telemachus, 15, 27  
 Telestes, 153  
 Thebans, 333  
 Themistocles, 429  
 Theodectes, 21, 343  
 Theodorus, 309, 359  
 Theophrastus, 19, 120-21, 255, 257  
 Theopompus, 16, 195, 363, 391-9  
 Thermopylae, 297  
 Thessalians, 419  
 Thrasymachus, 309, 359  
 Three Styles: Grand, 194, 211

## INDEX

- Three Types of Arrangement or Composition, 8, 10, 11, 125, 166-7; Austere, 11-12, 169-91, 194; Smooth (Polished), 12, 193-205; Intermediate (Tempered or Blended), 11, 205-31
- Thucydides, 16, 39, 61, 71, 86, 133-5, 139, 173, 185-91, 271, 350, 369, 371-91, 402-33
- Timaeus, 225, 272, 273
- Timocrates, 285
- Tryphon, 29
- Virgil, *Aeneid*, 163
- Xenophon, 16, 71, 294, 350-51, 371, 385-9; *Hellen.*, 387, 388; *Cyrop.* and *Anab.*, 387
- Xerxes, 381
- Zeno, 353
- Zeus Herceius, altar of, 261
- Zoilus, 355, 363

# THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

---

## VOLUMES ALREADY PUBLISHED

---

### *Latin Authors*

- AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. 3 Vols.  
APULEIUS: THE GOLDEN ASS (METAMORPHOSES). W. Adlington (1566). Revised by S. Gaselee.  
ST. AUGUSTINE: CITY OF GOD. 7 Vols. Vol. I. G. E. McCracken. Vols. II and VII. W. M. Green. Vol. III. D. Wiesen. Vol. IV. P. Levine. Vol. V. E. M. Sanford and W. M. Green. Vol. VI. W. C. Greene.  
ST. AUGUSTINE, CONFESSIONS OF. W. Watts (1631). 2 Vols.  
ST. AUGUSTINE, SELECT LETTERS. J. H. Baxter.  
AUSONIUS. H. G. Evelyn White. 2 Vols.  
BEDE. J. E. King. 2 Vols.  
BOETHIUS: TRACTS and DE CONSOLATIONE PHILOSOPHIAE. Rev. H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand. Revised by S. J. Tester.  
CAESAR: ALEXANDRIAN, AFRICAN and SPANISH WARS. A. G. Way.  
CAESAR: CIVIL WARS. A. G. Peskett.  
CAESAR: GALLIC WAR. H. J. Edwards.  
CATO: DE RE RUSTICA. VARRO: DE RE RUSTICA. H. B. Ash and W. D. Hooper.  
CATULLUS. F. W. Cornish. TIBULLUS. J. B. Postgate. PERVIGILIUM VENERIS. J. W. Mackail.  
CELSUS: DE MEDICINA. W. G. Spencer. 3 Vols.  
CICERO: BRUTUS and ORATOR. G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell.  
[CICERO]: AD HERENNIUM. H. Caplan.  
CICERO: DE ORATORE, etc. 2 Vols. Vol. I. DE ORATORE, Books I and II. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Vol. II. DE ORATORE, Book III. DE FATO; PARADOXA STOICORUM; DE PARTITIONE ORATORIA. H. Rackham.  
CICERO: DE FINIBUS. H. Rackham.  
CICERO: DE INVENTIONE, etc. H. M. Hubbell.  
CICERO: DE NATURA DEORUM and ACADEMICA. H. Rackham.  
CICERO: DE OFFICIIS. Walter Miller.  
CICERO: DE REPUBLICA and DE LEGIBUS. Clinton W. Keyes.

- CICERO: DE SENECTUTE, DE AMICITIA, DE DIVINATIONE.** W. A. Falconer.
- CICERO: IN CATILINAM, PRO FLACCO, PRO MURENA, PRO SULLA.** New version by C. Macdonald.
- CICERO: LETTERS TO ATTICUS.** E. O. Winstedt. 3 Vols.
- CICERO: LETTERS TO HIS FRIENDS.** W. Glynn Williams, M. Cary, M. Henderson. 4 Vols.
- CICERO: PHILIPPICS.** W. C. A. Ker.
- CICERO: PRO ARCHIA, POST REDITUM, DE DOMO, DE HARUSPICUM RESPONSIS, PRO PLANCIO.** N. H. Watts.
- CICERO: PRO CAECINA, PRO LEGE MANILIA, PRO CLUENTIO, PRO RABIRIO.** H. Grose Hodge.
- CICERO: PRO CAELIO, DE PROVINCIIS CONSULARIBUS, PRO BALBO.** R. Gardner.
- CICERO: PRO MILONE, IN PISONEM, PRO SCAURO, PRO FONTEIO, PRO RABIRIO POSTUMO, PRO MARCELLO, PRO LIGARIO, PRO REGE DEIOTARO.** N. H. Watts.
- CICERO: PRO QUINCTIO, PRO ROSCIO AMERINO, PRO ROSCIO COMOEDO, CONTRA RULLUM.** J. H. Freese.
- CICERO: PRO SESTIO, IN VATINIUM.** R. Gardner.
- CICERO: TUSCULAN DISPUTATIONS.** J. E. King.
- CICERO: VERRINE ORATIONS.** L. H. G. Greenwood. 2 Vols.
- CLAUDIAN.** M. Platnauer. 2 Vols.
- COLUMELLA: DE RE RUSTICA. DE ARBORIBUS.** H. B. Ash, E. S. Forster and E. Heffner. 3 Vols.
- CURTIUS, Q.: HISTORY OF ALEXANDER.** J. C. Rolfe. 2 Vols.
- FLORUS.** E. S. Forster.
- FRONTINUS: STRATAGEMS and AQUEDUCTS.** C. E. Bennett and M. B. McElwain.
- FRONTO: CORRESPONDENCE.** C. R. Haines. 2 Vols.
- GELLIUS.** J. C. Rolfe. 3 Vols.
- HORACE: ODES and EPODES.** C. E. Bennett.
- HORACE: SATIRES, EPISTLES, ARS POETICA.** H. R. Fairclough.
- JEROME: SELECTED LETTERS.** F. A. Wright.
- JUVENAL and PERSIUS.** G. G. Ramsay.
- LIVY.** B. O. Foster, F. G. Moore, Evan T. Sage, and A. C. Schlesinger and R. M. Geer (General Index). 14 Vols.
- LUCAN.** J. D. Duff.
- LUCRETIVS.** W. H. D. Rouse. Revised by M. F. Smith.
- MANILIUS.** G. P. Goold.
- MARTIAL.** W. C. A. Ker. 2 Vols. Revised by E. H. Warmington.
- MINOR LATIN POETS: from PUBLILIUS SYRUS to RUTILIUS NAMATIANS,** including GRATTIUS, CALPURNIUS SICULUS, NEMESIANUS, AVIANUS and others, with "Aetna" and the "Phoenix." J. Wight Duff and Arnold M. Duff. 2 Vols.

MINUCIUS FELIX. Cf. TERTULLIAN.  
 NEPOS CORNELIUS. J. C. Rolfe.  
 OVID: THE ART OF LOVE and OTHER POEMS. J. H. Mosley.  
 Revised by G. P. Goold.  
 OVID: FASTI. Sir James G. Frazer  
 OVID: FEROIDES and AMORES. Grant Showerman. Revised  
 by G. P. Goold  
 OVID: METAMORPHOSES. F. J. Miller. 2 Vols. Revised by G. P.  
 Goold.  
 OVID: TRISTIA and EX PONTO. A. L. Wheeler.  
 PERSIUS. Cf. JUVENAL.  
 PERVIGILIUM VENERIS. Cf. CATULLUS.  
 PETRONIUS. M. Heseltine. SENECA: APOCOLOCYNTOSIS.  
 W. H. D. Rouse. Revised by E. H. Warmington.  
 PHAEDRUS and BABRIUS (Greek). B. E. Perry.  
 PLAUTUS. Paul Nixon. 5 Vols.  
 PLINY: LETTERS, PANEGYRICUS. Betty Radice. 2 Vols.  
 PLINY: NATURAL HISTORY. 10 Vols. Vols. I-V and IX. H.  
 Rackham. VI.-VIII. W. H. S. Jones. X. D. E. Eichholz.  
 PROPERTIUS. H. E. Butler.  
 PRUDENTIUS. H. J. Thomson. 2 Vols.  
 QUINTILIAN. H. E. Butler. 4 Vols.  
 REMAINS OF OLD LATIN. E. H. Warmington. 4 Vols. Vol. I.  
 (ENNIUS AND CAECILIUS), Vol. II. (LIVIUS, NAEVIUS  
 PACUVIUS, ACCIUS) Vol. III. (LUCILIUS and LAWS OF XII  
 TABLES) Vol. IV. (ARCHAIC INSCRIPTIONS)  
 RES GESTAE DIVI AUGUSTI. Cf. VELLEIUS PATERCULUS.  
 SALLUST. J. C. Rolfe.  
 SCRIPTORES HISTORIAE AUGUSTAE. D. Magie. 3 Vols.  
 SENECA, THE ELDER: CONTROVERSIAE, SUASORIAE. M.  
 Winterbottom. 2 Vols.  
 SENECA: APOCOLOCYNTOSIS. Cf. PETRONIUS.  
 SENECA: EPISTULAE MORALES. R. M. Gummere. 3 Vols.  
 SENECA: MORAL ESSAYS. J. W. Basore. 3 Vols.  
 SENECA: TRAGEDIES. F. J. Miller. 2 Vols.  
 SENECA: NATURALES QUAESTIONES. T. H. Corcoran. 2 Vols.  
 SIDONIUS: POEMS and LETTERS. W. B. Anderson. 2 Vols.  
 SILIUS ITALICUS. J. D. Duff. 2 Vols.  
 STATIUS. J. H. Mozley. 2 Vols.  
 SUETONIUS. J. C. Rolfe. 2 Vols.  
 TACITUS: DIALOGUS. Sir Wm. Peterson. AGRICOLA and  
 GERMANIA. Maurice Hutton. Revised by M. Winterbottom,  
 R. M. Ogilvie, E. H. Warmington.  
 TACITUS: HISTORIES and ANNALS. C. H. Moore and J. Jackson.  
 4 Vols.

**TERENCE.** John Sargeant. 2 Vols.  
**TERTULLIAN: APOLOGIA and DE SPECTACULIS.** T. R. Glover.  
**MINUCIUS FELIX.** G. H. Rendall.  
**TIBULLUS.** Cf. CATULLUS.  
**VALERIUS FLACCUS.** J. H. Mozley.  
**VARRO: DE LINGUA LATINA.** R. G. Kent. 2 Vols.  
**VELLEIUS PATERCULUS and RES GESTAE DIVI AUGUSTI.** F. W. Shipley.  
**VIRGIL.** H. R. Fairclough. 2 Vols.  
**VITRUVIUS: DE ARCHITECTURA.** F. Granger. 2 Vols.

### ***Greek Authors***

**ACHILLES TATIUS.** S. Gaselee.  
**AELIAN: ON THE NATURE OF ANIMALS.** A. F. Scholfield. 3 Vols.  
**AENEAS TACTICUS. ASCLEPIODOTUS and ONASANDER.** The Illinois Greek Club.  
**AESCHINES.** C. D. Adams.  
**AESCHYLUS.** H. Weir Smyth. 2 Vols.  
**ALCIPHON, AELIAN, PHILOSTRATUS: LETTERS.** A. R. Benner and F. H. Fobes.  
**ANDOCIDES, ANTIPHON.** Cf. MINOR ATTIC ORATORS.  
**APOLLODORUS.** Sir James G. Frazer. 2 Vols.  
**APOLLONIUS RHODIUS.** R. C. Seaton.  
**APOSTOLIC FATHERS.** Kirsopp Lake. 2 Vols.  
**APPIAN: ROMAN HISTORY.** Horace White. 4 Vols.  
**ARATUS.** Cf. CALLIMACHUS.  
**ARISTIDES: ORATIONS.** C. A. Behr. Vol. I.  
**ARISTOPHANES.** Benjamin Bickley Rogers. 3 Vols. Verse trans.  
**ARISTOTLE: ART OF RHETORIC.** J. H. Freese.  
**ARISTOTLE: ATHENIAN CONSTITUTION, EUDEMIAN ETHICS, VICES AND VIRTUES.** H. Rackham.  
**ARISTOTLE: GENERATION OF ANIMALS.** A. L. Peck.  
**ARISTOTLE: HISTORIA ANIMALIUM.** A. L. Peck. Vols. I.-II.  
**ARISTOTLE: METAPHYSICS.** H. Tredennick. 2 Vols.  
**ARISTOTLE: METEOROLOGICA.** H. D. P. Lee.  
**ARISTOTLE: MINOR WORKS.** W. S. Hett. On Colours, On Things Heard, On Physiognomies, On Plants, On Marvellous Things Heard, Mechanical Problems, On Indivisible Lines, On Situations and Names of Winds, On Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias.  
**ARISTOTLE: NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.** H. Rackham.

- ARISTOTLE: OECONOMICA and MAGNA MORALIA. G. C. Armstrong (with METAPHYSICS, Vol. II).
- ARISTOTLE: ON THE HEAVENS. W. K. C. Guthrie.
- ARISTOTLE: ON THE SOUL, PARVA NATURALIA, ON BREATH. W. S. Hett.
- ARISTOTLE: CATEGORIES, ON INTERPRETATION, PRIOR ANALYTICS. H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick.
- ARISTOTLE: POSTERIOR ANALYTICS, TOPICS. H. Tredennick and E. S. Forster.
- ARISTOTLE: ON SOPHISTICAL REFUTATIONS.  
On Coming to be and Passing Away, On the Cosmos. E. S. Forster and D. J. Furley.
- ARISTOTLE: PARTS OF ANIMALS. A. L. Peck; MOTION AND PROGRESSION OF ANIMALS. E. S. Forster.
- ARISTOTLE: PHYSICS. Rev. P. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford. 2 Vols.
- ARISTOTLE: POETICS and LONGINUS. W. Hamilton Fyfe; DEMETRIUS ON STYLE. W. Rhys Roberts.
- ARISTOTLE: POLITICS. H. Rackham.
- ARISTOTLE: PROBLEMS. W. S. Hett. 2 Vols.
- ARISTOTLE: RHETORICA AD ALEXANDRUM (with PROBLEMS. Vol. II). H. Rackham.
- ARRIAN: HISTORY OF ALEXANDER and INDICA. Rev. E. Iliffe Robson. 2 Vols. New version P. Brunt.
- ATHENAEUS: DEIPNOSOPHISTAE. C. B. Gulick. 7 Vols.
- BABRIUS AND PHAEDRUS (Latin). B. E. Perry.
- ST. BASIL: LETTERS. R. J. Deferrari. 4 Vols.
- CALLIMACHUS: FRAGMENTS. C. A. Trypanis. MUSAEUS: HERO AND LEANDER. T. Gelzer and C. Whitman.
- CALLIMACHUS, Hymns and Epigrams, and LYCOPHRON. A. W. Mair; ARATUS. G. R. Mair.
- CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. Rev. G. W. Butterworth.
- COLLUTHUS. Cf. OPPIAN.
- DAPHNIS AND CHLOE. Thornley's Translation revised by J. M. Edmonds; and PARTHENIUS. S. Gaselee.
- DEMOSTHENES I.: OLYNTHIACS, PHILIPPICS and MINOR ORATIONS I.-XVII. AND XX. J. H. Vince.
- DEMOSTHENES II.: DE CORONA and DE FALSA LEGATIONE. C. A. Vince and J. H. Vince.
- DEMOSTHENES III.: MEIDIAS, ANDROTION, ARISTOCRATES, TIMOCRATES and ARISTOGEITON I. and II. J. H. Vince.
- DEMOSTHENES IV.-VI.: PRIVATE ORATIONS and IN NEAERAM. A. T. Murray.
- DEMOSTHENES VII.: FUNERAL SPEECH, EROTIC ESSAY, EXORDIA and LETTERS. N. W. and N. J. DeWitt.
- DIO CASSIUS: ROMAN HISTORY. E. Cary. 9 Vols.

- DIO CHRYSOSTOM. J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby. 5 Vols.
- DIODORUS SICULUS. 12 Vols. Vols. I.–VI. C. H. Oldfather. Vol. VII. C. L. Sherman. Vol. VIII. C. B. Welles. Vols. IX. and X. R. M. Geer. Vol. XI. F. Walton. Vol. XII. F. Walton. General Index. R. M. Geer.
- DIOGENES LAERTIUS. R. D. Hicks. 2 Vols. New Introduction by H. S. Long.
- DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS: ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. Spelman's translation revised by E. Cary. 7 Vols.
- DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS: CRITICAL ESSAYS. S. Usher. 2 Vols. Vol. I.
- EPICTETUS. W. A. Oldfather. 2 Vols.
- EURIPIDES. A. S. Way. 4 Vols. Verse trans.
- EUSEBIUS: ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. Kirsopp Lake and J. E. L. Oulton. 2 Vols.
- GALEN: ON THE NATURAL FACULTIES. A. J. Brock.
- GREEK ANTHOLOGY. W. R. Paton. 5 Vols.
- GREEK BUCOLIC POETS (THEOCRITUS, BION, MOSCHUS). J. M. Edmonds.
- GREEK ELEGY AND IAMBUS with the ANACREONTEA. J. M. Edmonds. 2 Vols.
- GREEK LYRIC. D. A. Campbell. 4 Vols. Vol. I.
- GREEK MATHEMATICAL WORKS. Ivor Thomas. 2 Vols.
- HERODES. Cf. THEOPHRASTUS: CHARACTERS.
- HERODIAN. C. R. Whittaker. 2 Vols.
- HERODOTUS. A. D. Godley. 4 Vols.
- HESIOD AND THE HOMERIC HYMNS. H. G. Evelyn White.
- HIPPOCRATES and the FRAGMENTS OF HERACLEITUS. W. H. S. Jones and E. T. Withington. 4 Vols.
- HOMER: ILIAD. A. T. Murray. 2 Vols.
- HOMER: ODYSSEY. A. T. Murray. 2 Vols.
- ISAEUS. E. W. Forster.
- ISOCRATES. George Norlin and LaRue Van Hook. 3 Vols.
- [ST. JOHN DAMASCENE]: BARLAAM AND IOASAPH. Rev. G. R. Woodward, Harold Mattingly and D. M. Lang.
- JOSEPHUS. 10 Vols. Vols. I.–IV. H. Thackeray. Vol. V. H. Thackeray and R. Marcus. Vols. VI.–VII. R. Marcus. Vol. VIII. R. Marcus and Allen Wikgren. Vols. IX.–X. L. H. Feldman.
- JULIAN. Wilmer Cave Wright. 3 Vols.
- LIBANIUS. A. F. Norman. 3 Vols. Vols. I.–II.
- LUCIAN. 8 Vols. Vols. I.–V. A. M. Harmon. Vol. VI. K. Kilburn. Vols. VII.–VIII. M. D. Macleod.
- LYCOPHRON. Cf. CALLIMACHUS.



- LYRA GRAECA, J. M. Edmonds. 2 Vols.  
 LYSIAS. W. R. M. Lamb.  
 MANETHO. W. G. Waddell.  
 MARCUS AURELIUS. C. R. Haines.  
 MENANDER. W. G. Arnott. 3 Vols. Vol. I.  
 MINOR ATTIC ORATORS (ANTIPHON, ANDOCIDES, LYCURGUS,  
 DEMADES, DINARCHUS, HYPERIDES). K. J. Maidment and  
 J. O. Burtt. 2 Vols.  
 MUSAEUS: HERO AND LEANDER. Cf. CALLIMACHUS.  
 NONNOS: DIONYSIACA. W. H. D. Rouse. 3 Vols.  
 OPPIAN, COLLUTHUS, TRYPHIODORUS. A. W. Mair.  
 POPYRI. NON-LITERARY SELECTIONS. A. S. Hunt and C. C.  
 Edgar. 2 Vols. LITERARY SELECTIONS (Poetry). D. L.  
 Page.  
 PARTHENIUS. Cf. DAPHNIS and CHLOE.  
 PAUSANIAS: DESCRIPTION OF GREECE. W. H. S. Jones. 4  
 Vols. and Companion Vol. arranged by R. E. Wycherley.  
 PHILO. 10 Vols. Vols. I.-V. F. H. Colson and Rev. G. H.  
 Whitaker. Vols. VI.-IX. F. H. Colson. Vol. X. F. H.  
 Colson and the Rev. J. W. Earp.  
 PHILO: two supplementary Vols. (*Translation only.*) Ralph  
 Marcus.  
 PHILOSTRATUS: THE LIFE OF APOLLONIUS OF TYANA. F. C.  
 Conybeare. 2 Vols.  
 PHILOSTRATUS: IMAGINES; CALLISTRATUS: DESCRIPTIONS. A.  
 Fairbanks.  
 PHILOSTRATUS and EUNAPIUS: LIVES OF THE SOPHISTS. Wilmer  
 Cave Wright.  
 PINDAR. Sir J. E. Sandys.  
 PLATO: CHARMIDES, ALCIBIADES, HIPPARCHUS, THE LOVERS,  
 THEAGES, MINOS and EPINOMIS. W. R. M. Lamb.  
 PLATO: CRATYLUS, PARMENIDES, GREATER HIPPIAS, LESSER  
 HIPPIAS. H. N. Fowler.  
 PLATO: EUTHYPHRO, APOLOGY, CRITO, PHAEDO, PHAEDRUS,  
 H. N. Fowler.  
 PLATO: LACHES, PROTAGORAS, MENO, EUTHYDEMUS. W. R. M.  
 Lamb.  
 PLATO: LAWS. Rev. R. G. Bury. 2 Vols.  
 PLATO: LYSIS, SYMPOSIUM, GORGIAS. W. R. M. Lamb.  
 PLATO: Republic. Paul Shorey. 2 Vols.  
 PLATO: STATESMAN, PHILEBUS. H. N. Fowler; ION. W. R. M.  
 Lamb.  
 PLATO: THEAETETUS and SOPHIST. H. N. Fowler.  
 PLATO: TIMAEUS, CRITIAS, CLITOPHO, MENEXENUS, EPISTULAE.  
 Rev. R. G. Bury.  
 PLOTINUS: A. H. Armstrong. 7 Vols. Vols. I.-V.

- PLUTARCH: MORALIA.** 16 Vols. Vols I.-V. F. C. Babbitt.  
 Vol. VI. W. C. Helmbold. Vols. VII. and XIV. P. H. De  
 Lacy and B. Einarson. Vol. VIII. P. A. Clement and H. B.  
 Hoffleit. Vol. IX. E. L. Minar, Jr., F. H. Sandbach, W. C.  
 Helmbold. Vol. X. H. N. Fowler. Vol. XI. L. Pearson  
 and F. H. Sandbach. Vol. XII. H. Cherniss and W. C.  
 Helmbold. Vol. XIII 1-2. H. Cherniss. Vol. XV. F. H.  
 Sandbach.
- PLUTARCH: THE PARALLEL LIVES.** B. Perrin. 11 Vols.
- POLYBIUS.** W. R. Paton. 6 Vols.
- PROCOPIUS.** H. B. Dewing. 7 Vols.
- PTOLEMY: TETRABIBLOS.** F. E. Robbins.
- QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS.** A. S. Way. Verse trans.
- SEXTUS EMPIRICUS.** Rev. R. G. Bury. 4 Vols.
- SOPHOCLES.** F. Storr. 2 Vols. Verse trans.
- STRABO: GEOGRAPHY.** Horace L. Jones. 8 Vols.
- THEOCRITUS.** Cf. GREEK BUCOLIC POETS.
- THEOPHRASTUS: CHARACTERS.** J. M. Edmonds. **HERODES,**  
 etc. A. D. Knox.
- THEOPHRASTUS: ENQUIRY INTO PLANTS.** Sir Arthur Hort,  
 Bart. 2 Vols.
- THEOPHRASTUS: DE CAUSIS PLANTARUM.** G. K. K. Link and  
 B. Einarson. 3 Vols. Vol. I.
- THUCYDIDES.** C. F. Smith. 4 Vols.
- TRYPHIODORUS.** Cf. OPPIAN.
- XENOPHON: CYROPAEDIA.** Walter Miller. 2 Vols.
- XENOPHON: HELLENCIA.** C. L. Brownson. 2 Vols.
- XENOPHON: ANABASIS.** C. L. Brownson.
- XENOPHON: MEMORABILIA AND OECONOMICUS.** E. C. Marchant.  
**SYMPOSIUM AND APOLOGY.** O. J. Todd.
- XENOPHON: SCRIPTA MINORA.** E. C. Marchant. **CONSTITU-**  
**TION OF THE ATHENIANS.** G. W. Bowersock.

*Continued from front flap*

greatly admired, and three other historians — Xenophon, Philistus and Theopompus. Of the two *Letters to Ammaeus*, the second may be read as an appendix to the *Thucydides*, but the first concerns literary history, and investigates the question of whether Demosthenes could have learnt his oratorical skills from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

Volume I contains the essays *On the Ancient Orators*, *Lysias*, *Isocrates*, *Isaeus*, *Demosthenes*, and *Thucydides*.

*Other Works on Rhetoric and Oratory  
in the Loeb Series*

---

ARISTOTLE

'Art of Rhetoric'

CICERO

Rhetorica ad Herennium

QUINTILIAN

TACITUS

Dialogus de Oratoribus

