

## **ARCHITECTURE, RHETORIC AND THE SUBLIME**

Architecture and rhetoric have a special relationship. In his general theory of aesthetics the eighteenth-century philosopher Charles Batteux differentiated between the mechanical arts, serving utility, and the fine arts, including poetry and painting, which served pleasure; the distinction between utility and pleasure goes back to Horace's *Ars Poetica*.<sup>1</sup> But he also added a third category, of arts that served both utility and pleasure, in which he placed just two: rhetoric and architecture. Whereas the mechanical arts were invented for need alone and fine arts were invented to cause delight, architecture and rhetoric owed their origins to necessity and, once they had learned to invest themselves with allurements, were set beside the fine arts. After architecture changed the caves which it had first hollowed out as functional houses into pleasant and comfortable homes, it earned a position among the arts which it had not held before. Likewise, rhetoric, or 'eloquence', developed from a basic need to communicate into an art on the level of poetry, perfected by good taste. Both arts achieved functional goals by pleasing their audience. But while poetry and sculpture were judged on beauty not truth, so architecture and rhetoric were censured if they appeared to be designed to please, because ornament was considered a fault. Service, not spectacle, was required. Only when they were asked to celebrate grandeur were they permitted to be "raised a few steps".<sup>2</sup>

This conception of the arts was no uniquely 'modern' system, as Paul Oskar Kristeller maintained some sixty years ago in an article which continues to be controversial.<sup>3</sup> In antiquity too architecture and rhetoric were parallel activities, and their combination of utility and pleasure was not just incidental, but integrally related. Aristotle, on the one hand, presented the art of rhetoric as aiming at utility;<sup>4</sup> and, on the other hand, considered that in building city walls consideration should be given to what was appropriate to the city in beauty

(kosmos) as well as military needs (chreiai).<sup>5</sup> The contemporary planning of Priene in Ionia by the architect Pytheos can be seen to reflect both principles with its regular street-grid, ordered and secure fortifications, and mathematically proportioned temple of Athena Polias.<sup>6</sup> The parallel extended into the Roman world. Vitruvius knew the written works of Pytheos and his temple at Priene, and, even if scholars have argued over the degree of influence he exerted on him, it is likely that his famous prescription that architects should take account of utility and beauty (as well as practical considerations of stability) rested on the principles of either Pytheos himself or later architects under his influence such as Hermogenes.<sup>7</sup> In rhetoric too, Cicero argued, “those things which contain the greatest utility have either the most dignity or often also the most attractiveness”.<sup>8</sup> Vitruvius’ placement of venustas directly after utilitas may reflect his view that the former sprang from the latter: beautiful buildings were functional ones. But he might equally have borrowed this order from Cicero’s most famous rhetorical treatise, the De Oratore, in which it was clearly stated that “a certain suavitas and lepos should follow utilitas and close by necessitas”.<sup>9</sup> In this work which he not only knew, but even claimed to rely on,<sup>10</sup> he must have approved of the directly preceding passage on the Capitoline temple, the dignity of whose pediment followed on from its practical utility, a connection so close that, Cicero added, even were it built in a rainless climate where the protective function of the colonnade was redundant, it would seem to have no dignity without this feature. The good orator should, therefore, blend utility and beauty together.<sup>11</sup> Architecture and rhetoric, it was believed, formed a bond, working in harmony to produce civilisation. “Never,” Quintilian argued, “would founders of cities have brought it about that the restless multitude would form communities unless they had been moved by a learned voice.”<sup>12</sup>

In view of the very similar ideals of the two disciplines it should not be surprising that a widespread homology is found between the language of architecture and the language of rhetoric. Basic architectural metaphors have helped to articulate human thought from ancient

Egypt to the present day because “the processes of design and construction and the experience of using buildings relate to basic mental operations and basic psychological needs”.<sup>13</sup> These metaphors are built into rhetorical criticism that centred on the nature of rhetoric as an expression of ideas: it was almost as natural to speak of “building up a work” in rhetoric as in architecture.<sup>14</sup> Cicero talks of “piling up” words to form a “structure”, and, for Quintilian, words are like the structural elements of a building.<sup>15</sup> Among grammarians of late antiquity this metaphorical usage was taken for granted.<sup>16</sup> But still the metaphor continued to be used in more developed form to give religious projects authority. Thus Gregory the Great wrote: “First we lay the foundation in history; then by following a symbolical sense we erect an intellectual edifice to be a stronghold of faith; and lastly by the grace of moral instruction we as it were paint the fabric in fair colours”.<sup>17</sup> Such language reappeared on a wide scale in the eighteenth century.<sup>18</sup> For Immanuel Kant, “the Critique of Pure Reason must sketch the whole plan architectonically, that is, from principles, with a full guarantee for the validity and stability of all the parts which enter into the building”.<sup>19</sup>

We can only imagine how the architect Vitruvius would have read those passages in the De Oratore that were loaded with such imagery. The metaphor was particularly explicit where Cicero compares the opening (exordium) of a speech to the entrance to a house:

“Every beginning should contain either the significance (significatio) of the matter being brought, or an approach to the case and communitio, or some ornament and dignity; but, like the vestibules and approaches to houses and temples, it should set out the beginnings of the cases in proportion to the subject; so in small, infrequent cases it is often more convenient to begin with the matter itself; but when a beginning is needed, which will usually be the case, sentences can be drawn either from the defendant or from the plaintiff or from the subject or from those in front of whom the case is being held”.<sup>20</sup>

Here, as throughout his treatise, Cicero, like Vitruvius, is guided by the notion of decorum.<sup>21</sup>

But one wonders how far the architectural metaphor was mere window dressing, the random invention of the orator, or, rather, influenced by contemporary architectural tastes. In 55 B.C.E., when Cicero's treatise was published, the dedication of the sensational Theatre of Pompey could hardly have been ignored: the Temple of Venus Victrix at the top of its cavea took the form, we now know, of a temple with transverse cella whose projecting pronaos stood out above the theatre audience with particular prominence (Figs. 1a-b).<sup>22</sup> But the metaphor held a more important truth about temples in general and houses. Architecture, like speeches, should be internally consistent and should avoid pretension and not give false expectations. Sir John Soane, who underlined this passage in his copy of William Guthrie's translation of Cicero's De Oratore,<sup>23</sup> later elaborated on it with a further comparison:

"The front of a building is like the prologue of a play, it prepares us for what we are to expect. If the outside promises more than we find in the inside, we are disappointed. The plot opens itself in the first act and is carried on through the remainder, through all the mazes of character, convenience of arrangement, elegance and propriety of ornament, and lastly produces a complete whole in distribution, decoration and construction."<sup>24</sup>

Some support for the idea that ancient rhetorical theorists were aware of their architectural surroundings and the ideas of contemporary architects is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, where the basic metaphor of rhetorical structure is elaborated as an indication of literary style. Here the science of literary composition is described as serving three particular functions (ἐργα): first, "to see what joined with what will obtain a beautiful and pleasant combination"; second, "to assess how each of the parts to be joined with one another

should be shaped to make the joining (ἁρμονία) appear better”; and, third, “to judge if any adjustment (μετασκευή) is needed in the materials received, I mean subtraction, addition or alteration and to effect such changes in a manner proper to their future purpose”.<sup>25</sup> Dionysius’ language (ἁρμοζόμενον, ἁρμόττεσθαι, σχηματισθὲν, and ἁρμονία) already suggests not only a comparison with architecture, but even an awareness of its basic mathematical concepts; and he develops the analogy by explaining his meaning “by using resemblances with the demiurgic arts which everyone knows, house-construction, shipbuilding and the like”:

“When a builder (οἰκοδόμος) has supplied himself with the materials (τὴν ὕλην) from which he intends to construct the house – stones, timber, tiles, and everything else – he proceeds 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 (ἁρμόσαι) with what other stone, timber and brick; next, how each of the materials that are being so joined should be fitted ...; thirdly, if anything fits badly (δύσεδρόν ἐστιν), how that piece can be pared down and trimmed and made to fit well ...Now I say that those who are going to put the parts of speech together effectively should proceed in a similar way.”<sup>26</sup>

Later in the same book, this metaphor for general practice is carried forward into more precise considerations of literary style. Dionysius defines the rhetorical concept of “austere harmony” by means of an image so clearly architectural that it does not need to be explicitly identified: “words must be set in place (ἐρείδεσθαι), both solidly and distanced from one another; they should be separated by perceptible intervals (ἀισθητοῖς χρόνοις)”.<sup>27</sup> This unstated image of a temple colonnade shows an awareness of the importance of measured

intercolumniations in late Hellenistic architectural theory and thus establishes a link between the aesthetics of oratory and the aesthetics of architecture.<sup>28</sup>

The reason that the simple metaphor of process became a basis for stylistic equivalence was that architecture, like rhetoric, was an art of communication.<sup>29</sup> It was natural to seek to match the two. The principle of decor demanded that the rhetorical style of speeches should suit the architectural context where they were delivered, temples demanding the grandest style of all.

“Demosthenes could sometimes speak with restraint (summisce), but Lysias perhaps could not achieve grandeur (elate). Yet, if people think that, with an army stationed in the Forum and in all the temples around it, it was appropriate to speak in defence of Milo as if we had been speaking in a private case before a single judge, they measure the power of eloquence by their own estimate of their own ability, and not by the nature of the case.”<sup>30</sup>

This was not simply a matter of the orator’s personal security. The very terms he uses to denote styles of speaking applied equally to architecture. Festus, following the Augustan grammarian Verrius Flaccus, wrote that Marius’ temple of Honour and Virtue was “lower (summissiorem) than other temples”; by contrast, a building that was elatus was raised to a considerable height.<sup>31</sup>

Cicero regarded memory, the fifth part of oratory, as its “foundation, like that of buildings”.<sup>32</sup> Elsewhere he wrote that adherence to the truth and avoidance of partiality and malice are “foundations known to all, but the construction (exaedificatio) is built on the material (res) and words (verba)”.<sup>33</sup> Rhetoricians distinguished between what you say (res) and how you say it (verba). The res was the material for devising arguments (Greek heuresis or Latin inventio), the verba for stylistic verbal expression (lexis or elocutio).<sup>34</sup> It was a

distinction of which Vitruvius was himself aware, adopting rhetorical formulas and topoi in such measure in his treatise that he must have been one of those predecessors to whom Palladius referred as “emulating orators in arts and eloquence”.<sup>35</sup> But Cicero’s architectural metaphor suggests that architecture and rhetoric were similar representational processes, which obscures the lack of equivalence between the two arts. In architecture meaning is expressed through structure and ornament, which are analogous to oratorical verba, but there is no exact equivalent of res, the message or argument of a speech. Nonetheless, Vitruvius highlighted that architecture consisted of the signifier and the signified.<sup>36</sup> The latter was still the res, the buildings themselves, but in the case of architecture the signifier was “the proof unfolded by the methodologies of scientific studies” (demonstratio rationibus doctrinarum explicata). In other respects Vitruvius’ definition corresponds almost exactly to Quintilian’s definition of rhetoric a century later: “all speech consists either of the things signified or of those that signify, the matter and the words (rebus et verbis)”.<sup>37</sup> In other words, in both rhetoric and architecture there is a system of expression, the signifier, and a material result, the signified. In each case, the theoretical system – Vitruvian rationatio or rhetorical theory – is established a posteriori on the basis of the result, speech or building, which shows that language in action.<sup>38</sup> However, while it follows for rhetoric that its aim was to deliver a message, which was achieved through words, this is not Vitruvius’ meaning for architecture, but rather that a building is itself the message, which is explained through scientific theory. In short, buildings demonstrate, but they do not argue. Because of their lack of semantic precision buildings cannot be representational structures like other communicative arts, but nonetheless have a semiotic potential to communicate ideas and values. Architecture, like language, is potentially infinitely expressive.<sup>39</sup>

The analogy between architecture and rhetoric was not only because of the communicative and semiotic nature of buildings, but also in terms of structure and

composition. The classical architecture drawn by Vitruvius from earlier masters such as Pytheos, Hermogenes of Priene and their successors and inherited by Roman architects from late classical and Hellenistic practice gave architects a set of rules for the combination and arrangement of parts like linguistic syntax. The widespread reference to a ‘language of architecture’, defined by a ‘grammar of ornament’, was adopted by the Renaissance humanists and followed in later classicism. In a more developed form of what has been called the “linguistic analogy” in architecture, the early eighteenth-century architect Germain Boffrand in his *Livre d’Architecture* (1745) highlighted the expressive purpose of buildings, compared the orders of architecture to poetical genres, and claimed that “the profiles of mouldings, and the other members that compose a building, are in architecture what words are in a discourse”.<sup>40</sup> Such contentions would be challenged by those who see architecture and language as generically different. Twenty years later, G. E. Lessing signalled to apologists for the ancient doctrine of *ut pictura poesis*, that architecture, like painting, is a spatial art, consisting of forms displayed and experienced in space, whereas rhetoric, like poetry, is a temporal one, concerned with events represented or narrated in time or with bodily forms enumerated in sequence and experienced in time through listening or reading.<sup>41</sup> Yet such a distinction is not a generic one, but a question of degree. By Lessing’s own account it is possible, albeit with greater effort, to experience literary arts in a spatial manner and visual arts temporally; thus both works of art and architecture and works of literature can be called “structures in space-time”.<sup>42</sup> It follows from this that Lessing’s space-time distinction is no barrier to interpreting rhetoric and architecture analogously. However, although Umberto Eco asserts that “architectural language is an authentic linguistic system obeying the same rules that govern the articulation of natural languages”,<sup>43</sup> the relation between linguistic rules and architectural systems of ordering is questionable. The stages of development of a critical vocabulary to describe and evaluate buildings and its relationship to the terminology of literary criticism are uncertain. As Pierre



Gros has rightly warned, there is a danger in carrying further the significance of verbal incidences which appear to be purely metaphorical.<sup>44</sup>

In so far as it represents the way in which architects conceptualised, organised and structured their design, the application of the rhetorical metaphor in architecture may be regarded as significant. There were not many who believed, as Soane did later, that architecture shared all five components of rhetoric – invention, disposition, elocution, memory, and action<sup>45</sup> – but the rhetorical model for at least the first two categories helped to organise thoughts on architectural design. That does not mean that all rhetorical language applied to architecture was always important in the conception of buildings, especially when used by writers outside the design process. As Lise Bek has shown, the rhetorical concept of antithesis shaped descriptions of architecture in Vitruvius, Seneca and Pliny; but that does not necessarily imply anything further about the impact of rhetoric on design.<sup>46</sup> Applying rhetorical vocabulary to the description of art is not without parallel. In a well-known study Michael Baxandall has drawn attention to the “classical habit of metaphorical interchange between the critical terminology of literary and art criticism”.<sup>47</sup> Writing of the Humanist evaluation of painting and sculpture, he notes that the Latin rhetorical language of critics such as Leon Battista Alberti or Leonardo Bruni predisposed them to think about visual art in terms of rhetorical concepts that were essentially unrelated to visual experience, applying de-familiarising labels like decor, copia and varietas to perceptual realities. Descriptions of architecture thus become not so much accounts of the buildings themselves as descriptions of thinking about buildings.

In Vitruvius’ architectural treatise the use of rhetorical language strengthens the relationship between architecture and rhetoric. This can in part be attributed to Vitruvius’s well-recognised effort to elevate the literary profile of architecture by using rhetorical and philosophical language.<sup>48</sup> Rhetorical training is not explicitly included by Vitruvius among the skills needed by the architect, although “letters” (litterae) are mentioned first among such skills

so that the architect “can make memory more secure with the help of commentarii”. His frequent recourse to the commentarius in his work seems to recall the practice of orators in preparing notes for a speech, sometimes intended themselves for publication.<sup>49</sup> Yet rhetoric offered the author not just a literary system of presentation, but also, and more significantly, a conceptual and theoretical framework. Vitruvius singled out Cicero’s De oratore not only as a model for the endurance of a literary work and a basis for future debates on rhetoric with its author, then deceased, but also as one of several works to which he owed dependence in writing his own, “applying their notions and recommendations”.<sup>50</sup>

Of the six concepts of which Vitruvius claims architecture consists three terms in particular indicate the rhetorical basis of his treatise: ordinatio; dispositio; and distributio.<sup>51</sup> All three terms are also considered in rhetorical theory to be part of the orator’s repertoire (officium oratoris). In later rhetorical theory ordinatio was thought to consist of “two parts, quality of structure and quantity of words”.<sup>52</sup> This formulation corresponds so closely to the wording of Vitruvius that one might even suspect that the later rhetoricians had been influenced by his architectural treatise. Although Vitruvius fuses the notion with aesthetic ideas, above all symmetry, the combination with dispositio might have seemed tautological to Quintilian who later reproached writers “looking for some novelty” for differentiating between dispositio and ordo.<sup>53</sup> Yet, as has been observed, the two terms reflected the subtle distinction between arranging arguments and distributing them according to their importance.<sup>54</sup> Cicero does not mention ordinatio, but in his account of arrangement (collocatio) he presents a similar concept, clothed in elaborate architectural language that resembles the later understanding of ordinatio as the arrangement of pieces in a mosaic.<sup>55</sup>

“It belongs to arrangement to assemble (componere) and build (struere) words so as not to have either a harsh (asper) juxtaposition of words or a gap between them, but it is somehow joined

together (coagmentatus) and smooth; on which a charming joke was made, in the person of my father-in-law [Q. Mucius Scaevola, father-in-law of the speaker L. Crassus], by the man who was capable of making it in the most elegant way possible, Lucilius:

‘How charmingly assembled are those tourneurs de phrase! Like all those little tesserae in pavement art and inlaid mosaic like little worms (vermiculato).’<sup>56</sup>

While the orator Cicero chooses an architectural image to define the arrangement of words in periodic style, as pieces in a mosaic laid out with artistic virtuosity and with smooth joins and no jarring gaps, the architect Vitruvius selects a rhetorical term to meet the need for organic unity in planning a building through the commensurability of the parts with each other and with the whole.<sup>57</sup> Vitruvius, however, associates collocatio with the second of his terms dispositio, already established as one of the five main divisions of rhetorical theory, which he defines as “the fitting placement of material and the elegant effect of the work”; the formulation expresses the ability of a completed building to achieve both utility, defined by decor (Cicero’s decorum) and beauty.<sup>58</sup> Dispositio indicated the arrangement of parts into an overall organic unity. Vitruvius’ use of the third term, distributio, seems almost gratuitous, applying what was a specific designation of rhetorical procedure in the sense of a “thrifty mixing” of resources and site.<sup>59</sup> Using the two terms together, however, reinforced how the architect, like the orator, was guided by the essential principles of utility and decor.<sup>60</sup> In practice, distributio was closely linked with dispositio and occurred “when buildings were disposed according to the use of the patres familiae, the financial means, and the dignity of eloquence”.<sup>61</sup> The last phrase is usually glossed as referring to the prestige or power of the patrons, but this mistranslation does not take account of the tricolon of which the phrase is the culmination, referring to the three factors in the architect’s mind when allocating architectural space: purpose; budget; and rhetoric. In other words, buildings did not just serve a social purpose or use up resource. They also ‘spoke’.

All together, Vitruvius' three terms, ordinatio, dispositio and distributio, contributed finely differentiated aspects of his essential argument that a building should be unified through the harmony of its parts, an argument that was not just structural, but aesthetic.<sup>62</sup> The rhetorical metaphor carried a deeper significance, explaining how architecture worked as a language.<sup>63</sup> Although the words themselves are drawn from extraneous rhetorical theory, they help to shape thinking about architecture and develop new modes of design. The other three terms presented by Vitruvius as the elements of architecture, eurythmia, symmetria and decor, which had particular aesthetic significance, referring to the resulting design of a building rather than the design process of the builder, are also widely used in rhetorical theory.<sup>64</sup> It is well known that decor and utilitas had aesthetic implications throughout the book, as well as being general guiding principles to frame the work.<sup>65</sup> As Pierre Gros has shown, the rhetorical conceptualisation of aesthetics in Vitruvius' treatise both is deep-rooted, being a continuation of design concepts promoted by Hermogenes in the late third century B.C.E. in particular but also already visible in architecture of the fourth century B.C.E., and continued to influence the form and composition of surviving buildings of the Roman imperial period.<sup>66</sup> Also influential on Vitruvius' own ideas are the terms eurythmia and symmetria, which had both been, and continued to be, used in rhetoric, applied above all to periodic sentence structure in oratory for the balancing of words and phrases. Eurythmia is a complex and shadowy term, whose associations with, and probably origins in, the arts of music and dance informed both rhetorical usage and architectural taste.<sup>67</sup> Symmetria may have originated in connection with the work of artists at the end of the fifth century B.C.E.; from that context it will have been borrowed by Plato to denote a system of proportional harmony arising from mathematical procedures based on quantities reducible to a common measure.<sup>68</sup>

The deployment of such rhetorical terms to frame aesthetic ideas is nowhere clearer than in the one building of Vitruvius which he describes in detail, his basilica at Fanum, used as a

particular instance of the basilica genus to illustrate how it could achieve both dignitas and venustas. Vitruvius demonstrates its “proportions and symmetries (proportiones et symmetriae)” by detailing its dimensions: the central hall 60 by 120 feet; the 20 foot module for the width of the surrounding module and the wall pilasters; the columns in 1:10 ratio of diameter to height. Considerations of decor are evident both in the placing of the pronaos of the aedes Augusti opposite the Temple of Jupiter and in the curve of its hemicycle adjusted “so that those before the magistrates would not obstruct those doing business in the basilica”. The arrangement (conlocatio) of the roof beams corresponds to the two main functional and aesthetic elements of the basilica so that the beams support one ridge extending over the basilica and a second one extending from the middle to above the shrine. This dispositio with two gabled forms on the exterior and a high ceiling offers the venusta species which Vitruvius cherishes. The distributio of the plutei (parapets) and the upper columns not only reduces the costs and relieves the design of labour-intensive trouble (operosam molestiam), but also through the giant order adds “magnificence to the expenditure and authority to the building”.<sup>69</sup>

In addition to these notions identified by Vitruvius as the elements of architecture, other rhetorical concepts informed architectural ideas. The older austere style of rhetoric defined architecturally by Dionysius, which formed the basis of later rhetorical concepts of ‘harshness’ (Greek trachutes or Latin asperitas), helped to structure Vitruvius’ own observations on asperitas intercolumniorum.<sup>70</sup> Yet for Vitruvius such “harshness” was a positive quality associated with the extra depth of the Ionic style of the late Hellenistic age, above all the creations of Hermogenes. At the Temple of Artemis Leukophryene in Magnesia the zones in shadow – like pauses in a speech – separate the white marble supports of the colonnade, maintaining around them the impression of depth from which arises that of relief. A link is thus established between the aesthetics of oratory and those of architecture.<sup>71</sup> The concept involves three complementary ideas: the rhythmic animation of the columns; the alternation

of solids and voids; and the resulting visual contrasts of light and shadow. Vitruvius used the term as a Latin equivalent of the Greek *τόνος*, which in a rhetorical context consists of rhythm, vigour and tension and had already been used of a colonnade in the fourth century B.C.E.<sup>72</sup> By contrast he dismisses the affected grandeur of *tumor*, which referred to both high-flown language and protuberant architecture. The pycnostyle manner of temple colonnades widely adopted in the new Augustan temple programme is said to produce a “swollen and unattractive appearance” (*tumidam et invenustam speciem*).<sup>73</sup>

One influential concept which is absent from Vitruvius is *concinnitas*, “prettiness”. The words *cinnus*, *concinnus*, and *concinnare* are metaphors from the sphere of cookery with the sense of “composing from different ingredients”. They penetrated into the language of rhetoric without altogether losing their original meaning: *concinnitas* is associated with oratorical rhythm, verbal symmetry, and the phonetic effects of *compositio* as a part of *elocutio*; the word designates a harmony, a balance between the constituent parts of an oratorical period or a clausula.<sup>74</sup> The concept of *concinnitas* is therefore common in writings on rhetoric, where it refers to that neat and closely crafted style produced by the skilful and elegant combination of words and phrases. It is striking, therefore, that Cicero also applies this leading term of rhetorical theory to the stucco decoration of the colonnade at his brother Quintus’ villa at Laterium.<sup>75</sup> Yet, if it might therefore be considered simply a borrowing from the orator’s rhetorical language, it also makes clear sense in an architectural context as the neat and finely crafted elaboration of materials in fine art. As in rhetoric, so in an architectural context it fits naturally with *venustas* as a quality that gives a building an attractive allure. The “pretty” or “elegant” stucco decoration, on which the “dignity” of the portico is felt to rest, makes a rhetorical and aesthetic contrast with the severe architecture of the vault, which it no doubt also adorned, as in contemporary architecture from Pompeii, to offer a more attractive surface appearance.<sup>76</sup>

\* \* \*

By the time, therefore, that the treatise Peri Hupsous ('On the Sublime') appeared in the later first century C.E. there was already a well-established tradition of interpreting rhetoric and architecture in similar ways and, as part of that, a common vocabulary.<sup>77</sup> But the work is of particular interest here because it provides the most extensive and consistent instance in antiquity of the homology of language between architecture and rhetoric. Although it is ostensibly concerned with rhetorical style, not art or architecture, the abundance of architectural imagery in the text reinforces the idea of the Sublime as something 'built up' to a height. The treatise is thus situated at the boundary between architecture and rhetoric. While the work explicitly concerns oratory and poetry, the intensely visual imagery and extended range of architectural metaphors suggest a concern as much with buildings as with words. The various constituent features that its author presents as characteristic of the Sublime can be applied to architecture as well as to rhetoric. Although he claims to refer to the impact of spoken language on the 'hearer' (akroates), it is the 'viewer' that he is really addressing. He is concerned with the direction of this 'viewer's' gaze towards the 'architectural' structure of rhetoric and, above all, with the emotional response that this gaze generates. This is clear at once from his initial reference to an earlier treatise on the Sublime by 'Caecilius':

Τὸ μὲν τοῦ Καικιλίου συγγραμμάτων, ὃ περὶ ὕψους συνετάξατο,  
ἀνασκοπούμενοις ἡμῖν ὡς οἶσθα κοινῇ, Ποστούμιε Τερεντιανὲ φίλτατε,  
ταπεινότερον ἐφάνη τῆς ὅλης ὑποθέσεως ...

"When we examined together Caecilius's treatise on the Sublime, it appeared, as you know, my

dear Postumius Terentianus, lower than the whole subject matter...” (1.1)

A visual contrast is right away established. The verb for “examined” here, anaskopoumenois, implies ‘looking upwards’ towards the Sublime, only to find that Caecilius’s work is situated down below (tapeinoteron), almost a lowly ruin. This sets the pattern for a series of elements of the Sublime with architectural meaning. They can conveniently be listed here.

**1. Height (ἄκρότης) and ‘eminence’ (ἐξοχή).** The first feature of the Sublime, so obvious that ‘Longinus’ feels it needs no further explanation to his Roman addressee who is “expert in paideia”, is “a certain distinction and excellence in expression”, which provides writers with renown and immortality.<sup>78</sup>

**2. Ecstasy.** Almost immediately, a second feature is mentioned, which is related not to the form of the Sublime, but to its effect. It transports the reader in ekstasis and does so by its skill in invention, its ordered arrangement, and its power.<sup>79</sup>

This image is visual, an intense flash of lightning. By contrast, the next characteristics of the sublime mentioned seem very literary. Yet they still have application to buildings.

**3. Avoidance of swelling.** In the search for “elevation”, it is very hard to avoid “tumidity” (τὸ οἰδεῖν), but “bad are those swellings, in bodies and in words, which are inflated and unreal, and threaten us with the reverse of our aim”.<sup>80</sup> This is close to Vitruvius’ criticism of the



“swollen appearance” of ‘pycnostyle’ temples.<sup>81</sup> It is characterised by a desire to go beyond the Sublime, like its opposite, puerility, which, in trying to impress, results only in triviality. A third fault, *parenthyrsos*, is criticised as the adoption of empty or immoderate passion where moderation is needed.<sup>82</sup> All three are called “undignified things” (*asemna*), which “arise for one reason, a pursuit of novelty, about which people today go wild.”<sup>83</sup>

Beauties of expression are the “elements and foundation” of success or failure in achieving sublimity. In architecture, such “elements and foundations” – the components of classical form: pediments, capitals, columns, and bases – are equally abused by “improper fashions” for novelty (*nunc iniquis moribus inprobantur*), in the illusionistic, painted *aediculae* of the Third Pompeian Style which pretend to be temples but lack volumetric form. Vitruvius complains that “fluted reeds are built instead of columns, ... volutes instead of pediments, candelabra supporting flowers”.<sup>84</sup>

**4. Reached by an arduous ascent.** The way to the sublime in rhetoric is declared to be arduous, its steps littered with defects, and good judgement of style is considered “the last and crowning fruit of long experience”.<sup>85</sup> A similar conceit is expressed in Vitruvius’s opening chapter about “the great discipline of architecture”, “embellished and overflowing with many, various spheres of learning”: “I do not consider that men can properly be called architects just like that, unless they have first climbed these steps of disciplines from their early childhood, fed on the knowledge of several varieties of arts and letters, and then finally reached, at the summit, the supreme temple of architecture.”<sup>86</sup>

**5. Attainability of the Sublime.** The Sublime is said to arise from five sources, deriving from

both art and nature. Beneath these ideai, “like a common foundation (edaphous)”, is the power of speaking. The natural sources are, first, the power of forming great conceptions, or literally “aiming for bulk” (ἀδρεπήβολον), and, second, violent and inspired passion. The sources derived from art are the “moulding of figures”, the choice of words, and “dignified and elevated composition”.<sup>87</sup> “We must raise up our souls towards great things and make them, as it were, pregnant with noble inspiration. ... “Sublimity is the echo of a great soul (ὑψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα) ... The true orator must not have a low (tapeinon) or ignoble thought. For it is not possible that men with small ideas fitting for slaves prevailing throughout their lives should produce anything that is admirable and worthy of immortality.”<sup>88</sup> By the same token Vitruvius’ rescue from poverty (inopia) is the premise for his architectural writings and accomplishments.<sup>89</sup>

**6. Cosmic dimensions.** The Sublime is measured by a cosmic distance.<sup>90</sup> True grandeur comes only from the appearance of cosmic dimensions. In literature the image is Homer’s, of horses stepping beyond the edges of the earth in two bounds; in architecture, Vitruvius characterises the act of looking at a tall building in similar, ‘cosmic’ terms, in a passage on the Ionic entablature: “The higher the eye’s view climbs, the less easily it cuts through the thickness of the air; so it passes through the space of the height, is stripped of its power, and reports back to the senses an uncertain size of the basic measure.”<sup>91</sup> The taller the building, then, the less sure one is of its true size.

**7. Unity.** True grandeur has a consistency and no gaps. The supposed inferiority of the Odyssey to the Iliad is expressed architecturally: it lacks “levelled heights and the absence of subsidence” (οὐδ’ ἐξωμαλισμένα τὰ ὕψη καὶ ἰζήματα μηδαμοῦ λαμβάνοντα).<sup>92</sup> Archilochus and

Demosthenes “massed together their outstanding points, inserting in the midst nothing frivolous, mean, or trivial. For these faults undermine the whole, as if creating chinks or gaps in great works built up together and fortified by the relation to each other”.<sup>93</sup>

**8. Amplification.** Amplification (auxesis) occurs when “elevated expressions follow, one after the other, in an unbroken succession and in an ascending order”, and its vigour “loses its intensity and substance when not buttressed by the Sublime”.<sup>94</sup> It is defined as an “abundance of details” (plethos) which invests the subject with grandeur.<sup>95</sup>

Height, ecstatic effect, avoidance of tumidity and crazy novelties, the result of a hard ascent and natural and artistic qualities, the suggestion of cosmic distance, uninterrupted grandeur, and amplification: all these features apply equally, or more easily, to buildings as to words. But the next characteristics of the sublime style in rhetoric come even closer to built monuments.

**9. Monumentality.** To achieve the Sublime, one must emulate great prototypes. Longinus’s model writers are like monuments. Demosthenes and Cicero are two great towers, the former consisting “in mostly sheer height” (ἐν ὕψει τὸ πλεόν ἀποτόμῳ), the latter “in accumulation” (ἐν χύσει).<sup>96</sup> But the great monument is Plato, “set down in bulk and magnificent stateliness (καθεστῶς ἐν ὄγκῳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σεμνότητι)”.<sup>97</sup> One purple passage of Plato’s that second-century writers favoured as a model of such semnities, or literary dignity, was the famous image from the Phaedrus referring to the physical transmission of beauty into a lover’s soul when he sees his beloved.<sup>98</sup> They used it to emphasise the profound eroticism of the experience of “unspeakable and immortal” aesthetic

beauty, through which one might come closer to the sublime beauty of the cosmos.<sup>99</sup> It is this passage that Lucian echoes in his rhetorical exercise On the Hall, where the interaction of an educated person with the building is analysed in similar terms, its beauty transmitted through perception: “for something beautiful virtually flows through the eyes into the soul, then adorning the soul in its own manner it releases the words”.<sup>100</sup> Emulation of a model is “like taking an impression from beautiful forms or figures or other works of art”.<sup>101</sup>

**10. Response.** Related to this is the next feature of the Sublime: its would-be creators should consider how the great writers of the past, like Homer or Demosthenes, would have responded “if they had been there, or how would they have been affected. The competition is truly great, to imagine such a law-court or theatre for our own words.”<sup>102</sup>

Considering the built environment of a speech invites a harmony between architecture and rhetoric. As Lucian writes of his “hall”, a great building needs a Homer to do it justice with praise.<sup>103</sup> But, more importantly, the creator of the Sublime needs to anticipate future responses: “there is an even greater encouragement if you also ask, ‘How would every age after me react to what I have written?’ If a man is afraid to voice anything that goes beyond one’s own life and time, the conceptions of his mind must necessarily be incomplete, blind, and, as it were, born prematurely, since they are not at all brought to perfection for the era of future fame.”<sup>104</sup>

**11. The exhilaration of materials.** Images “possess” the hearer. Both orators and poets “seek to stir the passions and the emotions”.<sup>105</sup> If this seems at first distanced from architecture, “Longinus” metaphors again bring buildings back to the foreground: “Sometimes Aeschylus introduces ideas that are rough-hewn, unpolished, and harsh ... the palace of Lycurgus at the coming of Dionysus is strangely represented as possessed – ‘A frenzy thrills the hall; the

roofs are bacchant with ecstasy’.”<sup>106</sup>

Oratorical imagery can “instil vehemence and passion into spoken words; when it is combined with argumentative passages it not only persuades the hearer but actually makes him its slave”.<sup>107</sup> In monumental architecture, this is dangerous: in Lucian’s Hall the viewer is “persuaded” into “servitude”: “I came into this building to make a speech, as if I had been attracted by a jungx or the beauty of a siren.”<sup>108</sup> But “it overawes (ekplettei) and terrifies” the speaker, “confuses his thoughts and makes him more pathetic because he reckons that it is the most shameful thing of all that his words are shown up in a place of such excellent form to be less fine”; “his eyes take control, demand attention and do not let him get on with his speech”.<sup>109</sup>

**12. The brightness of figures.** “By some kind of natural law figures bring assistance to the Sublime, and on their part are in turn assisted by it in a wonderful manner. They produce an excess of light and splendour.” The visual metaphor is again developed. “By what means has the orator here concealed the figure? Clearly: by that very light. For just as all dim lustres disappear when surrounded by the blaze of the sun, so the tricks of rhetoric are utterly obscured by the grandeur permeating everywhere around them.”<sup>110</sup> Again Lucian’s Hall provides the best comparison: “the ceiling of the hall, or rather its head, fair of face by itself, has been adorned with gold, to the same effect as the sky at night when thoroughly lit up by the stars at intervals, and blooming here and there with the flowers of their fire. If it were all fire, it would not be beautiful, but terrifying. ... When the setting sun hits it and mixes with the gold, they make a common lightning and shine in redoubled, reddish splendour.”<sup>111</sup>

**13. Rustication.** Sometimes the Sublime is reached by lack of connection. In literature this is achieved by asyndeta or connecting particles. Such a feature may seem to stretch the limits of

a comparison with architecture. But again the architectural metaphor is prominent: “if you level the roughness of passion with connecting joins to become smooth, it falls down stingless and its fire is immediately put out”.<sup>112</sup> There is something sublime then in using blocks unworked and unbonded, a kind of literary ‘rustication’, just as Quintilian likens literary composition to a “structure of unfinished stones” or “rough stone blocks” and Apuleius would later compare his own rhetorical style to a rapid and haphazard piling up of unworked stones in a wall without any attempt at achieving evenness, regularity or alignment.<sup>113</sup>

**14. Art and nature.** Here the literary technique of reversals in thought matters less to our author than its implications: “among the best writers it is by means of hyberbaton that imitation approaches the effects of nature. Art is perfect when it seems to be nature, and nature hits the mark when she contains art hidden within her.”<sup>114</sup> The complementary and mutually substitutive roles of art and nature, techne and phusis, are commonplace in great building projects from Polycrates to Trajan, through Hellenistic monarchs, down to Ruskin, who argued that the design of the Scott monument should be a harmony between art and nature: “the utmost finish of art is not inappropriate in scenes of nature”.<sup>115</sup>

So far, then, we have seen that the accumulated features attributed to the sublime style in rhetoric are inherently visual and in some cases make almost better sense applied to architecture than to words. The remaining characteristics of the Sublime, if not so obviously architectural, also have application to buildings.

**15. Variety.** In linguistic terms, polypotota, changes of case, tense, person, number, or gender, can diversify and enliven an exposition.<sup>116</sup> A similar poikilia can be found in buildings, in the range of forms and materials on Roman façades: orders of different sizes; column shafts with

straight or twisted flutes; pediments triangular and segmental; and, above all, marbles of different colours and origins.<sup>117</sup> The statues of eastern prisoners in coloured Phrygian or Numidian marble mirrors the poikilia which Greeks observed in Persian dress.<sup>118</sup> As with clothing, so in architecture slabs and columns of these materials were selected to add poikilia to a building.<sup>119</sup>

**16. Mass.** The literary effect of using plural for singular is that the subject seems “more like one body”.<sup>120</sup> The architectural meaning of this is plain from a later observation by John Ruskin: “a building, in order to show its magnitude, must be seen all at once ... it must have one visible bounding line from top to bottom, and from end to end”.<sup>121</sup>

**17. Visualisation: ‘to make the hearer see’.** “Do you observe, my friend, how [Herodotus] leads you in imagination through the region [up to the great city of Meroe (Histories 2.29)] and makes you see what you hear? All such cases supported (ἀπεργειδόμενα) on the persons themselves place the hearer on the very scene of action.”<sup>122</sup> The implication of this principle for architectural description is self-evident; but the use of an architectural metaphor in making the point reiterates how buildings do this too, engaging viewers directly.

**18. Rhythm.** Periphrasis adds musical rhythm.<sup>123</sup> Again, as Plato, starting with unadorned diction, made it musical and shed over it the melodious rhythm which comes from periphrasis, so architects start with unadorned materials, make them musical, to produce rhythm: in this they are followers of Amphion, whose musical rhythms on the lyre inspired the assembling of masonry to build Thebes.<sup>124</sup> From the Pythagorean tradition up to Goethe and beyond, architecture and music have been considered analogous; the subject is too vast to be dealt with here.<sup>125</sup>

**19. Perfection.** In literature the qualities of grandeur and beauty, elegance and dignity, power and force, and even polished refinement arise above all from diction, “the choice of authoritative and magnificent words (ἡ τῶν κυρίων καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογή)” which “leads and casts a spell on the audience” and allows these qualities to “blossom” and “breathes into dead things a kind of living voice”.<sup>126</sup>: “Longinus” points to the analogy of beautiful statues, whose refinement is literally polished; but his language applies equally to architecture, none more so than the monumental buildings of the Athenian Acropolis, “always in bloom ... as if they had an evergreen breath and ageless life suffused within them”.<sup>127</sup>.

**20. Hyperbole.** Exaggeration helps to create an impression of hupsos.<sup>128</sup> But it also helps us to judge what is monumental in architecture. A well-known instance is Pausanias on the ‘Cyclopaean’ masonry of the walls at Tiryns:

“The wall, which is the only part of the ruins still standing, is a work of the Cyclopes made of unwrought stones, each stone being so big that a pair of mules could not move the smallest from its place to the slightest degree. Long ago small stones were so inserted that each of them binds the large blocks firmly together.”<sup>129</sup>

Great architecture needs ‘a Homer to do it justice with praise’,<sup>130</sup> so indeed this image can be traced, through Virgil, to Homer himself: ....; at the dramatic culmination of the Aeneid, as Aeneas closes in on Turnus, Turnus raises a stone lifted that could not be lifted by twelve men today – as he holds it, he wavers and is hit by Aeneas’s spear, harder than stones from a siege engine or a thunderbolt. The continuity between Homer’s and Virgil’s language



suggests that Aeneas is the victim, as much as Turnus. The stone has been called “a figure of history that never had a discrete present and is as much a continuous past as a continuous present”; it is thus an image of the ‘Sublime’.<sup>131</sup> Or, in other words, it possesses all the properties of the ‘monumental’.

“Longinus”, however, stresses that “one should know where to set the limit; since an occasional overshooting of the mark ruins the hyperbole, and such expressions, if strained too much, lose their tension and sometimes swing round and produce the opposite effect”.<sup>132</sup> As Ruskin noted of the statue of San Carlo Borromeo above Lago Maggiore, such hyperbolic conception of monumental scale in architecture causes alienation.<sup>133</sup>

**21. Arrangement.** Finally, sublime harmony is achieved through the arrangement of words. The conception follows the notions of dispositio and ordinatio that we have seen in Cicero and Vitruvius. Again the architectural imagery is particularly prominent: a writer “assembles manifold shapes of words, thoughts, deeds, beauty, melody, ... and by the building of phrase upon phrase raises a sublime and harmonious structure”.<sup>134</sup> The whole matters more than the details, presenting a perfect composite of parts. Writers who are “not naturally elevated or are even lacking in greatness nonetheless, simply by joining and fitting together ordinary words that have nothing outstanding in themselves, achieve bulk and distance and the appearance of not being low”. So lines from Euripides show how “a popular expression is made high in proportion to the structure” or how “a noble idea becomes more bulky by the harmony not being hurried or carried on a roller, but the words act as buttresses for each other and in the intervals have support for well-grounded greatness”.<sup>135</sup>

When the text of “Longinus”, On the Sublime reappeared in translation in the seventeenth century, it made an impression not just in the literary world. It also affected

architecture. The intensely visual and architectural language of the treatise and the emphasis of the impact of rhetoric on the viewer, the idea of composition as a union of conflicting opposites, and the overall sublime aesthetic all became ingredients in the design and appreciation of architecture. This shift in visual culture was the result not of Boileau's 1674 translation, which was to have such a major impact in the following century on literary and philosophical ideas, but of lesser-known English versions starting with John Hall's translation of 1652. Instead of the classical values of harmony, simplicity and clarity emanating from Vitruvius, "Longinus, and in his wake Vanbrugh, Hawksmoor and Wren, appreciated the intricate, the difficult, the dark and the awful".<sup>136</sup> Instead of focusing on the architectural object itself, the treatise encouraged its architectural readers to consider the impact of buildings on their viewers.

Some of the specific strategies of rhetorical invention suggested in the ancient rhetorical treatise as means to produce 'the sublime' clearly resonated with architects. As Sophie Ploeg has shown, aspects of "Longinus'" rhetorical sublime can be seen in Hawksmoor's London churches: the distinctive use of rustication in the upper storeys of the façade of St Mary Woolnoth and the outsized keystones of St George-in-the-East and St George Bloomsbury echo the demand for the unity of discordant elements and the deliberate use of the abrupt; the cultivation of projections and recesses create dramatic contrasts between light and shadow; the avoidance of "gaps and crevices" in structural masses are reflected in the abrupt transitions in the façade of St Alphege in Greenwich (Fig. 2); and Hawksmoor's use of orthogonal projections showing buildings as touched by the rays of the sun and resultant patterns of light and shadow show his obsessive concern with the visual impact of his works.<sup>137</sup> It seems no exaggeration to claim that "Longinus" offered architects and patrons of the early eighteenth century a new way of thinking about architectural design and its perception. A few decades later the earlier principles of Horace's *Ars Poetica* provided

a similar stimulus to Boffrand, whose Livre d'Architecture included a systematic architectural commentary in French and Latin on Horace's text. In one part he provides an architectural illustration of failed poetic efforts to reach sublimity:

We are deceived by an appearance of correctness. I labour to be brief, and I become obscure. One who tries to polish a work finds all its strength gone; in the effort to make it sublime, he succeeds only in making it turgid. He who fears to rise too high is left crawling on the ground; or, craving variety, he depicts dolphins in trees and wild boar in the sea.

Aim at a work with a grave character; it turns massive and ponderous. Aim at lightness; the result is arid and mean. Set out to build a church that will inspire respect, and you find that it is so dark inside that no one can read; seek to avoid that defect, and it turns into a light-filled salon, a lantern or a banqueting hall.<sup>138</sup>

If this rhetorical notion could have so great an impact at such linguistic and historical remove, what might its effect have been on its contemporaries? The precise date of the treatise on the Sublime is unknown and has been the subject of great debate and widely divergent opinions ranging from the early first century to the mid third.<sup>139</sup> The concept is already familiar in a Jewish context in Philo's reference to the prophet Moses' inspired "power of sublime speech" (hupsegoros dunamis) and the "sublime speech" (hupsegoria) of Jehovah.<sup>140</sup> The polemic with the Jewish critic and historian Caecilius of Calacte, who was probably the Caecilius addressed as philtate by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the latter years of Augustus' reign, suggests that the work attributed to Longinus was composed not long after that. Yet the author's reference to the "hackneyed" (thruloumenon) discussion of the absence of great literature in the modern age, which is treated at length in Tacitus' Dialogus, has led some to believe that the work was written in the same literary climate of the late first

century C.E.<sup>141</sup> The Dialogus was probably not published until 100, but it must have undergone several revisions before that, and its principal theme could have been current in the 80s. Nothing is known of the addressee of On the Sublime, Postumius Terentianus. But if this is the same man as the Roman commander of a military detachment in Syene in Upper Egypt in 85/6, the author's choice of a passage from Herodotus' account of a journey from nearby Elephantine to Meroe would have special point, to attract the attention either of one who had just returned from that area or of a young man about to be posted to the region.<sup>142</sup> Circumstantial evidence therefore points to a date for the treatise in the late Flavian period.

At this time "Longinus'" visual metaphors had particular relevance, when many of the orators who confronted this or similar texts not only excelled in verbal performance, but were also builders aiming at architectural display. To Philostratus their literary and architectural projects appeared analogous. Thus, in the case of the famous orator Nicetes of Smyrna, his construction of an approach road from the Ephesian gates to Smyrna was said to be surpassed only by the 'more splendid' (lamproteros) metaphorical 'pathways' that he built for Knowledge.<sup>143</sup> The quality of lamprotes, 'brightness' or 'splendour', marks both the verbal and the architectural displays of these sophists, and in neither case could it be called a remote metaphor. When mixed, according to Plato, with the colour "red" (erythros), it produced the range of colours across the spectrum.<sup>144</sup> Architecturally, it enabled that illumination which was perceived as the most striking quality of buildings, varying in intensity at different times of day. Produced by luminous materials such as gold or crystalline white marble or purple dyes, this "brilliance" found its most intense manifestation in direct sunlight and had a spiritual quality, as the movement of light was considered to manifest the presence of divine powers.<sup>145</sup> In the field of rhetoric it would become considered by rhetoricians as among the most important components of grandeur.<sup>146</sup>

None of this was lost on Nicetes' pupil, Pliny the younger. Writing to Tacitus in the late

90s C.E. (Letter 1.20), he distinguishes a full rhetorical style (amplificatio) in very similar terms to the definition of auxesis in Peri tou Hupsous, as marked by ‘abundance’ (copia) and ‘force’ (vis). He prefers expansiveness (magnitudo), manifested by boldness (audacia) and sublimity (sublimitas), to economy (brevitas). As in the Greek text, support for this attitude is found in the visual arts:

“You see how with sculpture, statuary, painting, human form and the form of many animals, even trees, so long as they are noble, nothing makes them more commendable than grandeur (amplitudo). The same goes for speeches; scale (magnitudo) adds a certain beauty and authority even to the very scrolls.”<sup>147</sup>

The letter starts out as a response to the view of “a certain learned and experienced man, who derives pleasure from nothing in forensic oratory so much as brevity”. This man’s admiration of Lysias and Pliny’s rejoinder with Demosthenes and Cicero reminds the reader of the polemic between “Longinus” and Caecilius. Indeed, elsewhere in the letter Pliny comes very close to both the rhetorical theory and the visual language of “Longinus”. His quotation from a Greek comic poet of how Pericles “flashed lightning, thundered and confounded Greece” provides the perfect demonstration of “Longinus” view that “sublimity brought out at the right moment scatters all facts before it like a thunderbolt and at once displays the full power of the orator”.<sup>148</sup> Pliny continues in an embellishment of the Greek treatise: “It is not the speech that is pruned back or chopped up, but that which is expansive, grandiose, and sublime which thunders, flashes lightning, and throws everything into tumult and confusion”.<sup>149</sup>

Pliny comes even closer to the views expressed by “Longinus” in his Letter 9.26 to Lupercus, which can be seen as forming a thematic pair with 1.20.<sup>150</sup> Orators, he writes, should “be excited and worked up, even to boiling point and often to the precipice; for a sheer drop

usually lies next to high and elevated places”. Good speakers should take risks. He admits that he is responding to his correspondent’s disapproval as tumida of what he calls sublimia, a criticism which recalls the Greek treatise, but to which architects were equally prone.<sup>151</sup> “Anyone can see what stands out above the crowd,” he replies; “but it takes a sharp mind to discriminate between the immoderate and the grand or between the elevated and the disproportionate.” It is not hard to see how such fine distinctions bedevilled the architecture of the age: what made Domitian’s Palace over the top (enorme) and extravagant (immodicum), but the projects of Trajan grand and elevated.<sup>152</sup> Both letters seem intended to provoke recipients who were inclined to disagree. Just as Letter 9.26 starts by referring elliptically to “a certain orator of our generation”, but soon addresses its comments directly to the addressee Lupercus, so in 1.20 Pliny makes it clear that Tacitus dissents from his own view and, through the witty ending and contrasting verbosity of his own letter, implies that Tacitus himself adhered to the value of brevitas.<sup>153</sup> The differences between the aesthetics of the two men have in the past encouraged readers to doubt their closeness, but it is now more common to imagine them “sitting together in Pliny’s villa, cheerfully sipping their Falernian wine, swapping clichés about life and morals,” and, one might add, debating the aesthetics of literature and buildings.<sup>154</sup>

The impact of “Longinus” on Pliny’s establishment of architectural description as almost a self-standing genre is evident from his two extensive letters on his villas, where he takes “Longinus” principle of ‘visualisation’ (no. 17, above) to a self-conscious art, making the reader see what he hears as he tries “to put the whole villa before your eyes”.<sup>155</sup> A little over a decade later, the impact of the aesthetic of the Sublime on Pliny’s views on public architecture can be seen in his correspondence as imperial legate in Bithynia-Pontus:<sup>156</sup> a bath built over a ruined house at Prusa demanded by “the dignity of the city and the splendour of your age” was not just a physical enlargement, but a rhetorical “amplification” of the city

(amplietur); the gymnasium at Nicaea looked “more free-flowing” and had “more poetic rhythm” than its predecessor on the site, though there was a danger that the expenditure on the project would lack utility because what had been built so far was scattered (incompositum) and irregular (sparsum).<sup>157</sup> In his criticism of architecture Pliny makes the very same appeal as “Longinus” to amplification and a unified body, free from gaps and crevices. Yet the relationship between vehicle and tenor is reversed. While the Peri Hupsous uses architectural imagery to define a rhetorical point, Pliny characterises architecture by rhetorical language. His remarks on the new Trajanic project at Nicomedia appeal to the same aesthetics of the Sublime. The old temple of Magna Mater in the old agora of the city was overshadowed by the buildings of the new forum rising beside it.<sup>158</sup>

A similar rhetoric had been voiced at Prusa only a few years earlier by Dio (‘Chrysostom’) Cocceianus.<sup>159</sup> His stoa was attacked for “digging up the city” and “creating a desert”, and a second project was opposed because of the demolition of “monuments and sacred buildings”.<sup>160</sup> His defence recalls the opening contrasts of On the Sublime: the buildings to be demolished were “ugly and laughable ruins” (αἰσχρὰ καὶ καταγέλαστα ἐρείπια), “much lower (ταπεινότερα) than sheep pens”, not classical “monuments of ancient prosperity” (ὑπομνήματα τῆς παλαιᾶς εὐδαιμονίας).<sup>161</sup> He proposed that tall buildings were “worthy of a great city instead of mean, low ones”.<sup>162</sup> If the theory that Dio himself was the author of the treatise on the Sublime remains speculation, there is no doubt that he was part of the same literary circle and was aware of similar texts and ideas.<sup>163</sup> Comparable aesthetic considerations led Plutarch, with perhaps some thought of Domitian’s Palace in his own day, to see the position of Valerius Publicola’s house on the Velia in Rome, “overhanging the Forum”, as “rather tragic in manner”: “it looked down on everything from a height and was hard to access, so that when he came down from up there the spectacle

(σχῆμα) was a lofty one (μετέωρον), and the pomp (ὄγκον) of his procession regal.<sup>164</sup> Even in the western empire the tendency to view architecture rhetorically is discernible. In Tacitus's account of public building in Roman Britain the easy shift in thought from a yearning for eloquence to the construction of public buildings suggests a union of architecture and rhetoric, albeit with the historian's disapproval:

“[S]o that people dispersed and uncivilised and thus ready for war might grow used to peace and leisure through pleasures, [Agricola] encouraged them privately and assisted them publicly to build temples, fora, and houses, by praising those quick to respond and chiding the lethargic: ... he would train leaders' sons in liberal arts and prefer British talents to Gallic passions, so that those who recently used to reject the Roman tongue began to yearn for eloquence. After that even our dress was an honour and the toga was common, and gradually there was a regression to the attractions of vices: porticoes; baths; and elegant dinner parties. And among the ignorant this was called civilisation (humanitas), though it was a part of subjection.”<sup>165</sup>

The motivations of architectural patrons reflect the attitudes towards literary production advocated by “Longinus”. The combination of grand conceptions and fervent passions encouraged the ambitious architectural projects of builders, exceeding even the megalophrosune advocated by Aristotle and hinting rather at Vitruvius's appeal to Augustus's divina ... mens et numen. It was that “grandeur of enterprise and majesty” which Plutarch saw in imperial buildings.<sup>166</sup> In his own project, the Great Gateway or Pylaea at Thermopylae, he realised the emulation of great models of the past urged by ‘Longinus’: “like other plants taking root beside healthy ones, so the Grand Gateway too shares the vigour with the buildings at Delphi and feeds with them off the abundance coming from this place in taking



shape and form and receiving the adornment of temples and assemblies and waters such as it had never received in the last thousand years”.<sup>167</sup> The critic’s appeal to the future age, rather than the present, is echoed in Pliny’s description to Trajan of a canal scheme at Nicomedia as “a work worthy of your eternity no less than your renown which will have beauty and utility in equal measure” and in later pronouncements on civic architecture.<sup>168</sup>

One building project which dominated these years and overshadowed all considerations of the rhetoric of architecture was Trajan’s Forum and Markets in Rome. Initiated around 106 and dedicated in 112, it was probably the first major public building project to be undertaken in Rome after the publication of the *Peri Hupsous*.<sup>169</sup> So, just as in eighteenth-century London, it is here and in the works of architecture of the ensuing years that the impact of the visual and architectural imagery of ‘Longinus’ should be sought. But first it needs to be placed in the context of recent architectural developments.

Perhaps a generation before “Longinus”, Rome had already seen a revolution in design facilitated by the greater theoretical understanding of Roman concrete vaulting and the use of more resilient materials with the selection of lightweight stones for the *caementa*, including Vesuvian scoria and pumice, and an improved quality of mortars made from pozzolana and lime.<sup>170</sup> The Roman architects Severus and Celer had started to think more creatively in terms of mass and volume, now confident in the manipulation of the structural properties of concrete architecture. Internal space was no longer determined only by the axial lines of colonnades and rectilinear walls. The form of solids mattered less than the spaces created between them. Instead of flat and inert rooms, the architects produced a sequence of spaces embraced by vaulted forms overhead and moulded into creatively unified spatial compositions.<sup>171</sup> The Esquiline wing of Nero’s Golden House was “intended to appeal to the viewer emotionally, viscerally. Proportion does not strike the viewer as an issue that requires intellectual reflection, but lighting, dramatic views and overwhelming decoration all cry out

for attention in the delicious ways that those design features always do.” Above all, the Octagon Suite was a spectacular series of interwoven spaces that were brilliantly and ingeniously illuminated and formed a sophisticated unity. Roman concrete architecture showed its potential to appeal not to the intellect but to the emotions. After that, it “would always retain a component of emotional awe.”<sup>172</sup>

Contributing to this enlivened and emotional presentation was the emergence of what have been understandably called “baroque modes” of design.<sup>173</sup> Characteristic features are orders of mixed heights or uneven spacing, recessed or broken pediments, ressautes, S-scrolls, an alternation of triangular and segmental pediments, and straight elements linked by curvilinear features. In the House of Apollo in Pompeii a fresco of the 60s C.E. (Fig. 3) shows the three divine and astrological figures bathed in brilliant light and presented in a sophisticated columnar staging within rectilinear pavilions either side of a tholos with dynamic interweaving of projections and recesses. Similarly powerful compositions are achieved in the Nabataean Khasneh and Deir structures at Petra (Figs. 4-5), which play with light and shade by manipulating columnar orders of unequal height and shaded recesses between the broken pediment elements and the central tholos. The irregular columnar rhythm of the Deir, enhanced by ressautes and a central concave bay of the entablature suggests a flowering of baroque architecture, which may date to around the mid-first century C.E.<sup>174</sup> A hallmark of such “baroque” design is complex compositional unity often established by means of symmetrical framing schemes. The curving niche used to frame a central aedicula in a second-century design has been described as “almost rhetorical, functioning as a kind of architectural gesture presenting the aedicula to the viewer”.<sup>175</sup>

MacDonald is right to contest the characterisation of proto-baroque designs as fantasy architecture and to reject the implicit marginalisation of “an architecture of substantial purpose and meaning” which in fact contributed significantly to the distinctive texture of

Roman urbanism. But he seeks the explanation for such forms in mathematical developments and the supposed shift from geometric to arithmetic solutions.<sup>176</sup> It may be more profitable to explain this manner of presentation in terms of the vision of the patrons, not the calculation of the architects. Like the seventeenth-century style from which it derives its name, the baroque architecture of Roman antiquity aimed “at arousing astonishment, at giving the impression of grandeur, at imposing their effects immediately, even abruptly, on the spectator”.<sup>177</sup> Should one not then rather account for features such as “the compelling stress placed on a single view or axis”, the hierarchical organisation of elements of classical architectural vocabulary, and the packing of many parts “tightly into a schematic crowdedness” by the impact of the same intensely visual rhetorical conceptions which would later have similar impact on the designs of Hawksmoor in early eighteenth century England?

We know that the idea of the Sublime had been current in the half century before ‘Longinus’, and ‘Longinus’ own vision of the concept is presented in answer to alternatives offered by preceding writers, not least Caecilius.<sup>178</sup> Some buildings appear already to reflect the new rhetorical thinking; Nero’s Parthian Arch, for example, subsequently demolished, appears, like Hawksmoor’s works, to have presented an oversized keystone, and its design of all four sides proudly displayed in the new three-quarter view on coinage corresponded to his demand, inspired by a reading of Hall’s translation of ‘Longinus’, that the South and North of Castle Howard “should not be taken in completely at one glance”.<sup>179</sup> But it was in Domitian’s palace that the architect Rabirius used the confidence and methods of the architectural revolution to achieve a grandeur that could claim to be sublime. In each of the two largest halls, the Aula Regia and Cenatio Iovis on opposite sides of the vast central peristyle garden, the emperor was presented in an apse, surrounded by brilliant surfaces draped in coloured marble panels, within a baroque, sculptured architecture characterised by a profusion of decoration with ornamental column bases and highly patterned entablatures.<sup>180</sup> Martial’s

description presents a sublime aesthetic:

Clarius in toto nil videt orbe dies.

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Septenos pariter credas adsurgere montes,

Thessalicum brevior Pelion Ossa tulit;

Aethera sic intrat, nitidis ut conditus astris

Inferiore tonet nube serenus apex

Et prius arcano satietur numine Phoebi,

Nascentis Circe quam videt ora patris.

Haec, Auguste, tamen, quae vertice sidera pulsat,

Par domus est caelo, sed minor est domino.

“Nothing so brilliant sees the light of day in the entire world. You would believe the seven hills rose up together; Ossa carrying Thessalian Pelion on top was not so high. It pierces heaven, and hidden among the shining stars its peak echoes sunlit to the thunder in the cloud below ... And yet, Augustus, this palace which with its pinnacle touches the stars, though level with heaven, is less than its lord.”<sup>181</sup>

The final chapter of “Longinus” treatise seems to reflect on this political reality and its potential threat to the aesthetics of rhetorical creativity. It opens with the commonplace “that in our time there are men who have the gift of persuasion to the utmost extent, and are well fitted for public life, and are keen and ready, and particularly rich in all the charms of language, yet there no longer arise really lofty and transcendent natures unless quite exceptionally. So great and world-wide a dearth of high utterance attends our age.” (44.1)

“Can it be,” he continues, “... that we are to accept the trite explanation that democracy is the kind nursing-mother of genius, and that literary power may be said to share its rise and fall with democracy and democracy alone? For freedom, it is said, has power to feed the imaginations of the lofty-minded and inspire hope, and where it prevails there spreads abroad the eagerness of mutual rivalry and the emulous pursuit of the foremost place. 3. Moreover, owing to the prizes which are open to all under popular government, the mental excellences of the orator are continually exercised and sharpened, and as it were rubbed bright, and shine forth (as it is natural they should) with all the freedom which inspires the doings of the state.” (44.2-3)

The failure of contemporary literature to rival that of the past is thus attributed to the loss of this freedom:

“Today we seem in our boyhood to learn the lessons of a righteous servitude, being all but enswathed in its customs and observances, when our thoughts are yet young and tender, and never tasting the fairest and most productive source of eloquence (by which,’ he added, ‘I mean freedom), so that we emerge in no other guise than that of sublime flatterers. This is the reason, he maintained, why no slave ever becomes an orator, although all other faculties may belong to menials. In the slave there immediately burst out signs of fettered liberty of speech, of the dungeon as it were, of a man habituated to buffetings. “For the day of slavery,” as Homer has it, ‘takes away half our manhood (*Odyssey* 17.322)’.” (44.4-5).

Yet under the Empire such a conclusion would compromise “Longinus” idea of the achievability of the Sublime. He does not agree that this is a quality only of monuments of the distant past. “It is easy,” he says, “and peculiar to mankind, to find fault with the present.” His

explanation for the decline is not political but moral, that people are corrupted by love of money and love of pleasure:

“[I]f we value boundless wealth so highly, ... men will no longer lift up their eyes or have any further regard for fame, but the ruin of such lives will gradually reach its complete consummation and sublimities of soul fade and wither away and become contemptible, when men are lost in admiration of their own mortal parts and omit to exalt that which is immortal. In an age which is ravaged by plagues so sore, is it possible for us to imagine that there is still left an unbiased and incorruptible judge of works that are great and likely to reach posterity, or is it not rather the case that all are influenced in their decisions by the passion for gain? No, it is perhaps better for men like ourselves to be ruled than to be free, since our appetites, if let loose without restraint upon our neighbours like beasts from a cage, would set the world on fire with deeds of evil. In general, I said that the characteristic of modern natures was laziness (rhathumia), in which all except a few of us live, since our work or activity is only for praise and pleasure, never for utility that is truly worthy of honour and pride. ‘But enough of such speculation’ (Euripides, *Electra* 379),....” (44.11-12)

Despite the prevailing negative tone of this chapter, the final part of this passage offers a glimmer of hope that the Sublime can be achieved. It is not the desire for pleasure or praise, but the search for utility (opheleia) which is truly worthy of envy and honour, the same value in which Caecilius’ treatise was lacking.<sup>182</sup> The words ‘except a few’ (πλὴν ὀλίγων) suggest that there are still some people living today who can reach that height. An earlier passage throws further light on Longinus’ remarks:

“In life nothing can be considered great which it is held great to despise. For instance, riches,

honours, distinctions, sovereignties, and all other things which possess in abundance the external trappings of the stage (τὸ ἔξωθεν προστραγώδουμένον), will not seem, to a man of sense, to be supreme blessings, since the very contempt of them is reckoned good in no small degree, and in any case those who could have them, but are high-spirited enough to disdain them, are more admired than those who have them. So also in the case of sublimity in poems and prose writings, we must consider whether some supposed examples have an illusion (fantasia) of greatness, to which much is added, moulded on top to no purpose (τὸ εἰκῇ προσαναπλαττόμενον), but when opened up they are found to be merely frivolous things, to despise which is nobler than to admire. **2.** For, by nature somehow, our soul is uplifted by the true sublime and, receiving a splendid high position, is filled with joy and vaunting, as though it had itself produced what it has heard.” (7.1-2)

Although the apparent subject here is rhetoric, the intrusion again of a metaphor from architectural sculpture (προσαναπλαττόμενον) suggests that, without the promise of utility, features which offer an illusion of greatness<sup>183</sup> – costly marbles and gilding, columns, pediments, the ‘ornaments of the tragic stage’ according to Vitruvius<sup>184</sup> – do not represent the genuine sublime.

The Forum and Markets of Trajan promised to achieve that sublime grandeur not, like Domitian’s Palace, through profusion of ornament “added on top to no purpose”, but by creating a beauty that also met the goal of utility. In its formal rhetoric it mirrors the principles advocated by ‘Longinus’ and promoted at Rome through men like Pliny and Nicetes. The Forum square emulated earlier imperial fora in its formal planning with exedras, colonnades and open spaces and through its decoration and modular dimensions, but it also visibly enhanced those features through amplification (auxesis), providing an extended and

more spacious form in both plan and volume. The east end of the Forum, centred on an octastyle front with ressauts and freestanding columns to either side, showed the intricate articulation which MacDonald has called “complex compositional unity”.<sup>185</sup> The position of the colonnade was established by planimetric harmony with the restored Forum Iulium, opened the following year, in particular the front of the Venus Genetrix temple. The magnificent lattice ceiling of the Basilica Ulpia was creatively lit through the broad windows overlooking the Forum. The “rhetoric” of materials, artistic styles and architectural orders throughout the Forum complex presented rich diversity (*poikilia*). The themes enunciated through its materials and representations are precisely those elaborated in the Rome oration of Aelius Aristides of 144: the vastness of the empire; the spread of peace and prosperity; and the position of Rome herself as amalgam of global diversity.<sup>186</sup> This affinity is no accident because the whole architectural project, not just the Column, was rhetorically conceived. But there was no free rein given to architectural elaboration. There was a reaction against the lavish architectural ornament of Domitian’s Palace.

Instead, the project paid heed to “Longinus”’ message about the inclusion of utility. The most “brilliant and audacious” design belonged not to the ostentation of the Forum, but to the utilitarian Markets, with their bold shapes created out of concrete and brick.<sup>187</sup> The integration of disparate elements into a unified design centring on the hemicycle betrays a rhetorical conception informed by the aspiration to the literary sublime.<sup>188</sup> The best illustration of this for us today is in the so-called Aula Traiana (Fig. 6). The spacious volume, unbroken by horizontal or vertical divisions, offered a coherent whole and overwhelming sense of place; its transverse barrel vault, higher than any other vaults in the Markets, crowned an “unencumbered, noble space”, in which structure, lighting and proportions contributed to a harmonious whole. In just the same way ‘Longinus’ saw the Sublime as originating “in the systematic selection of the most important elements, and the power to



make these, by their mutual combination, as it were, into a single body” (τὸ τῶν ἐμφορομένων ἐκλέγειν ἀεὶ τὰ καιριώτατα καὶ ταῦτα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα ἐπισυνθέσει καθάπερ ἓν τι σῶμα ποιεῖν δύνασθαι).<sup>189</sup> At the same time, the alternation of triangular and segmental pediments in the attic storey of the hemicycle showed that baroque daring in juxtaposing “elements not normally compounded”.<sup>190</sup>

The new rhetorical ideas also had an influence in the Roman East. In the early Flavian period a new form of fountain structure had emerged which exhibited markedly baroque characteristics. The first was probably the Nymphaeum at Ephesus built under the supervision of C. Laecanius Bassus, proconsul of Asia in 78/9 C.E., at the south-west corner of the State Agora.<sup>191</sup> A large square basin facing the projected temple of the imperial cult was surrounded on three sides by a spectacular marble façade 10 m high on two sides and 16 m high on the higher, central side (Fig. 7). The façade comprised projecting and receding sections of a stage-like front marked not just by freestanding columnar orders of different scales with spirally fluted shafts in the central bay, but by three different sizes of pediment, and below that two orders of aedicules crowned by both triangular and segmental varieties.<sup>192</sup> The niches within the aedicules were filled by statues depicting a sea thiasos with river-gods, matched by a relief of Nereids on the podium.<sup>193</sup> In the following year, in 79/80, an even more ostentatious and theatrical structure was erected at Miletus and dedicated by M. Ulpius Traianus, father of the future emperor, as proconsul (Fig. 8).<sup>194</sup> Three rows of aedicules were constructed to produce a syncopated effect with each succeeding aedicule standing above the gap in the row below. It is not hard to understand these structures as in competition with each other and based on an aesthetic ideal which aimed at achieving an elevated style through the multiplication of pedimental dignity.

A generation later, around the same time as Trajan’s Forum was being undertaken in Rome, there was a reaction against the proliferation of pediments of these Flavian monuments. Two new fountain buildings were dedicated to the city goddess Trajan and the emperor Trajan

by Ti. Claudius Aristion, whom Pliny describes as a munificent man and princeps Ephesiorum.<sup>195</sup> Both fountains followed the type established by the Flavian governors, but the better-preserved and slightly later fountain on the 'Curetes Street' can be seen to have differed from the Flavian structures in its cultivated simplicity, a manner which has been described as "Trajanic austerity" (trajanische Nüchternheit).<sup>196</sup> Instead of the profusion of pediments and sculpture on the latter, the principal façade was a much more compact design consisting of just five broad bays with a composite form of capital in the lower of the two storeys and two S-shaped scrolls crowned the upper cornice (Fig. 9). Complexity and heaviness of ornamentation made way for unity of conception and refinement. At the centre of the façade an over-lifesize nude statue of the Emperor Trajan was framed by two exceptional spiral, or 'barley sugar', columns decorated in relief with vines and figures including a Pan.<sup>197</sup> As Pliny attests, Aristion was a well-educated and urbane man, the sort who could have been acquainted with the new rhetorical fashions of the Sublime. Those doctrines and their arresting visual imagery might have brought a more restrained answer to Bassus' nymphaeum of some thirty years earlier.

The Nymphaeum of Trajan was a local project, adorned, as far as we can tell from the surviving architectural ornament, by local craftsmen.<sup>198</sup> But a further development occurred a few years later when this theatre-like façade was grafted onto a public building. The year after Trajan's Forum was formally opened, its influence was already felt on the design of the library building bequeathed by the will of the consul Celsus Polemaeanus and completed under the direction of Aristion. The new rhetorical conception was complemented by formal architectural correspondences to Roman design.<sup>199</sup> The resulting building combined utility and visibility, literature and architecture. Baroque features of the Flavian nymphaeum at Miletus like the syncopated effect of the rhythms of upper and lower storeys in their alternation of niches and aediculas were included, but they were fitted into a more measured overall conception (Fig. 10). The alternation of triangular and segmental pediments crowning

the three aedicules of the upper storey and the lone ressauts at each end recall the play with classical vocabulary in the Flavian façades, but are part of a more proportionate ensemble with orders of equal size.

The building was an architectural version of the rhetoric of the Sublime. What has felicitously been termed its “visual rhetoric”<sup>200</sup> can be identified more closely: the spectacular façade represents a rhetorical exordium to the structure within, alluding to its inner content with statues of the virtues of Celsus Polemaeanus and of the benefactor himself; its notable height, deliberately raised above the upper cornice of the adjacent Arch of Mazaesus and Mithridates, provided that akrotes and exoche coveted in the opening sections of “Longinus” work; the optical device of the curvature of the upper entablature suggests a deliberate concern with the building’s visual impact, to present to best effect the hierarchical arrangement of the architectural orders, composite below Corinthian; the wide spacing between the aedicules of paired white marble columns and the dark ‘gaps’ of the doors and windows intercolumniations created a “harshness” (asperitas) of alternating fields of light and shadow offering dramatic intensity. The subtle configuration of the curvature of the upper cornice suggests a particular attention to the visual impact of the building from afar, above all when viewed down ‘Curetes Street’ from the earlier nymphaeum.<sup>201</sup> Instead of the serried ranks of statuary crowded into the aedicules of the earlier fountain buildings, statues were set at intervals, apart from the shadowy voids, to produce a balanced effect: female allegories of the virtues of Celsus within the aedicules below; portraits of Celsus on pedestals between the aedicules above. In the deep relief of the wall pilasters on either side of the women were set mythological exempla framed by the column-like Roman fascēs denoting Celsus’ consular rank. The same exempla directly indicated that the interpretation of the structure as a work of rhetoric was not merely metaphorical. The eagle on the acanthus frieze of the lower storey representing pictorially the cognomen of the building’s founder, Aquila, and its association with Roman military power invites a ready

identification between words and ornament, the verbal and the visual. The insertion of paradigms like Cupid and Psyche or Pegasus and Bellerophon match the orator's search for mythic exempla to add rhetorical colour and phantasia to his discourse: the former brings the intensity of erotic passion to the architectural design and experience; the latter is a typically allusive rebus for the building's cultural enterprise, pointing not just to the medusa heads in the tympana above, but also to the spring on the Muses' sanctuary on Mt Helicon.

Other buildings demonstrate the same rhetoric of the Sublime. Further down the street, the small street-side annexe to the Baths of Varus on the 'Curetes Street' dating from the same time and known as the 'Temple of Hadrian' sported a 'Syrian arch'. As on Hawksmoor's Christ Church, Spitalfields, the abrupt juxtaposition of arch and entablature provided an architectural illustration of "Longinus'" rhetorical device of "forcing into an abnormal union prepositions not normally compounded".<sup>202</sup> At Miletus, erected at most only a few years later, the Market Gate (Fig. 11) displayed the same contrast with earlier architecture as the Celsus library and the nymphaea of Aristion, the orders arranged in the same pattern of composite below and Corinthian above. The design is more markedly baroque with the main aedicule interrupted by a notable recession of its central part over the main gateway; the similarity to the Tomb of the Broken Pediment at Petra is striking.<sup>203</sup> But again there is an abstinence from ornamental richness and a desire for proportion; the syncopated rhythm of the aedicules is passed over for a more conventional alignment; and the unbounded richness of earlier theatrical forms makes way for a focus on the single view. Together these buildings in Asia Minor in the first two decades of the second century present a clear contrast with earlier architecture. While the architect remains sensitive to the effects of striking visual novelties, particularly the combination of dissonant elements, there is a move away from excess of ornamentation and a focus on the aesthetic unity of the work.

At Rome, hardly was the mortar dry in Trajan's Forum than work began on another

project which, perhaps more than any building at Rome, deserves the label “sublime”. This is not the first time Pantheon has been read as a rhetorical statement. The building’s spatial sequence has been seen as representing a judicial causa, a quaestio finita, in four parts: the forecourt as exordium to prepare the audience; the portico as narratio, or statement of facts; the rotunda as probatio, the argument and proof; and the Basilica of Neptune as peroratio.<sup>204</sup> But, while one may quibble over the applicability of these individual labels,<sup>205</sup> it is not even necessary to suggest such a literal correlation of rhetorical parts. When the building is considered in relation to “Longinus” Sublime, its rhetorical aspect is more understandable. Here, if anywhere, the opinion that the literary sublime is measured by a cosmic distance finds an obvious architectural manifestation. Whether or not the attic storey of twenty-eight aedicules should be seen as corresponding to the phases of the moon and the five rows of coffering as echoing the five planets, or the division in plan of the rotunda into sixteen segments as reflecting the demands of Etruscan disciplina,<sup>206</sup> there is no doubt that the conception of the building, with the temple-like front and the great oculus at the top, was based upon a desire to create grandeur. Moreover, the increasing realisation that the sumptuous and awe-inspiring rotunda that replaced Agrippa’s Pantheon may have been conceived by the architects of the Forum project, above all Apollodorus of Damascus, and executed in the years immediately following the latter’s dedication helps to situate it too within the same rhetorical framework.<sup>207</sup> Many of the features which the Trajano-Hadrianic Pantheon shares with the Forum and Markets confirm this interpretation: the ‘baroque’ mode of alternating pediments in the Markets hemicycle is repeated, yet with the variatio that the attic arcade with pilasters and alternating pediments around the hemicycle is replaced by a continuous row of pilasters and rectilinear openings with the alternating pediments transferred to the ground-floor aedicules of the rotunda (Figs. 12a-b); the highly charged design of squares and circles in the pavement matches the floor pattern of the Basilica Ulpia; and the centred arrangement of the

main apse of the Pantheon repeats the apsidal focus of the basilica. As at Ephesus, the arched lintel over the doorway shows further thinking on the means to achieve dignity through discordance. Finally, a higher portico with 50 foot granite shafts, perhaps the preferred plan of Apollodorus, would have given the façade greater elevation and sublimity.<sup>208</sup>

A major change occurred after the appearance of the treatise, and it affected not only rhetoric but architecture too. If earlier buildings had provided some of the visual inspiration for the rich architectural imagery of ‘Longinus’, the publication of the treatise and the spread of similar rhetorical ideas through men like Nicetes, Pliny, Aristion, Apollodorus and Hadrian helped to transform the potential of the ‘Roman architectural revolution’. The generation after the treatise On the Sublime saw attention to the very issues that it had advocated in rhetoric. The rhetorical invention of Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli and its creation of a field of rhetorical memory, perhaps with the aid of Dionysius of Miletus, expert in “the Chaldaean arts”, is too well-known and too complex to require detailed comment here.<sup>209</sup> I have shown elsewhere how the Mausoleum of Hadrian, which Ruskin lauded for the sublime effect produced by its broad expanse of wall surface, uninterrupted situation, unbroken bonding lines, and almost square shape, also echoed the literary sublime in its achievement of a hyperbolic scale, its combination of the ‘sheer face’ of Demosthenes with the ‘accumulation’ of Cicero and in the image of brilliance suggested by its decoration with two peacocks.<sup>210</sup> The debate between Hadrian and Apollodorus on the statuary of the Temple of Venus and Rome makes sense in the context of “Longinus”’ response to an unnamed writer’s criticism of the “faulty colossus”.<sup>211</sup> The contrast with the Doryphorus of Polyclitus suggests that the colossus meant here was Phidias’ statue of the Olympian Zeus, a wonder of the world and a touchstone of aesthetic criticism; Strabo’s judgement that the statue would hit the roof of the temple if it stood up suggests that the ‘fault’ was one of proportion.<sup>212</sup> But the repetition of Strabo’s point with reference to the new Roman temple highlights how central this rhetorically informed

discussion may have been to architectural planning in the wake of “Longinus” treatise.<sup>213</sup>

‘Longinus’ left a mark not just on architecture, but also on architectural description. What was admired was architecture which seemed to reflect the blazing light of the sublime.<sup>214</sup> Buildings were now praised for embodying those very visual principles which had themselves been modelled on architectural images. Aelius Aristides, speaking at Pergamum, describes the city’s acropolis “flashing lightning from every approach”, or, a few years later, Smyrna with its “lightning flashes of beauty, numbers and measurements of grand scale, and unities as if of a single structure”.<sup>215</sup> Similar is Cleitophon’s experience of Alexandria in Achilles Tatius’ novel: “Like a flash of lightning, the city’s beauty struck me at once and filled my eyes with pleasure. ...”<sup>216</sup> Aristides’ assessment of the temple at Cyzicus was based on rhetorical qualities: the harmonies (harmoniai) in this perfectly ordered structure (41); its grandeur (megethos); and its dignity (semnotes).<sup>217</sup>

These were the visual ideals on which the rhetorical texts of the second and third centuries laid ever greater emphasis. From the second century onwards the visual qualities increasingly emphasised by rhetorical theory as components of ‘grandeur’ (megethos) gave buildings a louder voice. In the treatise on rhetorical style ascribed to Hermogenes of Tarsus grandeur (megethos) and dignity (axioma) in speaking are said to arise from six qualities defined by both subject and manner of speaking: first, solemnity (semnotes), divine subjects voiced by broad sounds or cadences that force the speaker to open his mouth wide; second, abundance (mestotes), not defined further; third, asperity (trachytes), the use of harsh language to reproach superiors to achieve an unrhythmical, inharmonious and jarring effect; fourth, vehemence (sphodrotes), typically using single words separated by pauses to reproach inferiors; fifth, brilliance (lamprotes), produced not by adornment or a decorative arrangement to beautiful effect, but through dignified speech declaring acts “in which one can shine” directly, with confidence and without interruption, typically by means of long clauses and solemn rhythms;

and finally florescence (akme), the highest power of exposition, which is closely linked with the preceding qualities; in addition, the quality of amplification (peribole) is emphasised.<sup>218</sup>

Alongside this articulation of rhetorical method the architectural metaphors developed earlier by Cicero and Dionysius were now used in a more expressive way with speakers encouraged to think of prose style as akin to architectural form. Thus in the De Elocutione attributed to Demetrius the disconnected style of Hecataeus' preface is contrasted with the periodic style, conceived in terms of the new vaulted architecture:

“[In Hecataeus] the members (τὰ κῶλα) seem thrown upon one another in a heap without binding together (σύνδεσιν) or buttressing (ἀντέρχεισιν), and without the mutual support which we find in periods. The members in a periodic style may, at least, be compared to the stones which support and hold together vaulted roofs (τὰς περιφερεῖς στέγας); while the members of the disconnected style resemble stones which are simply flung carelessly apart and not built together into a structure. Consequently, there is something rough-hewn (περιεξεσμένον) and compact (εὐσταλές) in the older method of writing, like ancient statues, the art of which was held to consist in their contraction (συστολή) and sparseness (ἰσχνότης), while the later style is like the works of Phidias, since it already exhibits in some degree both grandeur (μεγαλεῖον) and precision (ἀκριβές).”<sup>219</sup>

Corresponding to the visuality of the text was the orality of the building. With his rhetorical training the emperor Hadrian described the construction work of fortifications on the African frontier not only in self-consciously archaic poetic diction, but also with words which made plain the rhetorical aspect of the architecture. The description of the building blocks as grandibus gravibus inaequalibus in contrast to the smooth (planus) and pliable (mollis) aspect of



the earth rampart used terms that were now well recognised in rhetorical theory to describe styles of eloquence, a flowing style with the absence of harsh syllables. They were not just “huge, heavy, unequal blocks of stone”, but, like speeches of the old school, had an authority that came from their rugged grandeur and the disconnected arrangement of words and phrases of different length. Likewise, terms like semnotes and lamprotēs or auxesis / ampli(fic)atio had become so embedded in rhetorical language that buildings praised for these qualities seemed similarly eloquent.<sup>220</sup> In Lucian’s Hall a warning is issued against those who make speeches of praise in beautiful buildings: “the content of the speech gets lost in the grandeur of the beautiful sights [and] is overshadowed ... like ... an ant placed on an elephant or a camel.” Architectural form has its own dangers. The ‘periodic’ barrel-vault threatened to yield a sonorous echo. Flat gilded ceilings threatened blazing brilliance of light.

“The speaker has to watch out that he does not get worried by his own voice when talking in such a harmonious and resonant building; the building, in fact, makes counter-shout, counter-cry, counter-assertion and, worse, hides your shout, like a trumpet drowning a flute when they play together or the sea with people shouting orders to their rowers ... megalophony dominates and obliterates any lesser noise.”<sup>221</sup>

Such depth of affinity between buildings and speeches would strike any rhetorically educated visitor to Rome or any city in the Roman East. The curvature of their forms and the resonance of their materials gave them a lasting voice. They were inscribed with texts that could be said, in a very meaningful sense, to ‘speak’ and to arouse emotions in those who listened to them.<sup>222</sup> In antiquity the assimilation between architecture and rhetoric by Batteux and Boffrand went further than they could ever have suspected; the language of architecture was more seriously considered than Eco might ever have dreamed.



<sup>1</sup> Batteux 1746; cf. Hor. AP 343.

<sup>2</sup> Batteux 1746, 44-8.

<sup>3</sup> For the ‘modern system of the arts’, see Kristeller 1951. Kristeller’s argument has lately been taken up by Shiner 2009, but vigorously challenged by Porter 2009 and 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Ar. Rhet. 1.6, 1362 a; Martin 1974, 171-4.

<sup>5</sup> Ar. Pol. 1331 a 10-14 (ὅπως καὶ πρὸς κόσμον ἔχη τῇ πόλει πρεπόντως καὶ πρὸς τὰς πολεμικὰς χρείας).

<sup>6</sup> von Gerkan 1924; Fehr 1980.

<sup>7</sup> Vitr. De Arch. 1.3.2.

<sup>8</sup> Cic. De or. 3.178.

<sup>9</sup> Cic. De or. 3.181; cf. Gros 1982, 680-1.

<sup>10</sup> Vitr. De Arch. 9 pr. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Cic. De or. 3.178-80.

<sup>12</sup> Quint. Inst. Or. 2.16.9.

<sup>13</sup> Onians 1992.

<sup>14</sup> Cic. De or. 1.164 ; 2.63.2 (exaedificatio).

<sup>15</sup> Cic. De or. 3.43 (componere et struere verba); Brutus 8, 33 (structura verborum); Quint. Inst. or. XXX.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. in the standard use of construere, ‘to construct’, for grammatical construction.

<sup>17</sup> Gregory the Great, Epistles 5.53a, translated by Dudden 1905, I: 193.

<sup>18</sup> Fussell 1965, 171-210.

<sup>19</sup> Kant 1781, Introduction, section vii.

<sup>20</sup> Cic. De or. 2.320-1: Omne autem principium aut rei totius, quae agetur, significationem

habere debebit aut aditum ad causam et communionem aut quoddam ornamentum et dignitatem; sed oportet, ut aedibus ac templis vestibula et aditus, sic causis principia proportionem rerum praeponere; itaque in parvis atque infrequentibus causis ab ipsa re est exordiri saepe commodius; sed cum erit utendum principio, quod plerumque erit, aut ex reo aut ex adversario aut ex re aut ex eis, apud quos agetur, sententias duci licebit.

<sup>21</sup> See, above all, Horn-Oncken 1967, 92-117, and Schlikker 1940, 96-112.

<sup>22</sup> For this reconstruction of the temple, see Monterroso Checa 2006, 48-50 and 2010, 270-89. For the rhetorical aesthetics of the pronaos in Roman temples generally, see Gros 1979, 336-8.

<sup>23</sup> Copy of Guthrie 1808, 277 in Sir John Soane Museum, London, General Library 23A.

<sup>24</sup> Sir John Soane Museum, London, Archives 1/2/52, 'Query 5th Lecture' (watermark 1808), in Watkin 1996, 188.

<sup>25</sup> Dion. Hal. De comp. verb. 6 (trans. Usher).

<sup>26</sup> A comparable description of language as consisting of elements combined like wooden parts joined by glue or a bolt is found in P.Herc. 994 col.34.5-11 = Sbordone Treatise A.

<sup>27</sup> Dion. Hal. De comp. verb. 22 (trans. Rhys Roberts, 1910, p. 210).

<sup>28</sup> Gros 1990, 116 and 1991, 76.

<sup>29</sup> This has become well accepted through the work of, especially, Tonio Hölscher.

<sup>30</sup> Cic. De opt. gen. 10; cf. Mil. 70.

<sup>31</sup> Fest. 344 M; Caes. BC 2.8.3.

<sup>32</sup> Cic. De opt. gen. 5.

<sup>33</sup> Cic. De or. 2.62-3.

<sup>34</sup> Martin, Antike Rhetorik, 216.

<sup>35</sup> Pallad. Op. agr. 1.1. For Vitruvius' rhetorical style, see Callebat 1982, 704-5; and, for the

prefaces in particular, André 1987.

<sup>36</sup> Cic. Brut. 16.65 ; De part. or. 1.3. Vitruv. De arch. 1.1.3.

<sup>37</sup> Quint. Inst. Or. 3.5.1.

<sup>38</sup> Callebat, ‘Rhétorique et architecture, 35-6.

<sup>39</sup> Crossley and Clarke 2000, esp. 4-5 and 14; cf. Van Eck 2000, esp. 81.

<sup>40</sup> Van Eck 2002, 9; cf. xxii. For the “linguistic analogy”, see Collins 1965, 173-82.

<sup>41</sup> Lessing 1766; see Mitchell 1986, 95-115.

<sup>42</sup> Mitchell 1986, 102-3.

<sup>43</sup> Eco 1969.

<sup>44</sup> Gros 1991.

<sup>45</sup> “Rhetoric like architecture has five parts ... invention, disposition, elocution, memory, delivery, or action.” Sir John Soane Museum, Architectural Library, Soane Case 161/3, Portfolio 2, and Soane’s marginal notes on his copy of Quintilian, Guthrie 1805, I: 149. See further Watkin 1996, 186-7; Van Eck 2007, 123.

<sup>46</sup> Bek 1976.

<sup>47</sup> Baxandall 1971, 00.

<sup>48</sup> Callebat 1982, especially 704-7 ; 1994, 32.

<sup>49</sup> Vitruv. De Arch. 1.1.4 (uti commentariis memoriam firmiorem efficere possit). This clause is usually translated with the sense that the architect “should strengthen his own memory by reading what has been written in the field” (I. D. Rowland (Cambridge, 1999), 22, following Claude Perrault and Auguste Choisy and, more recently, P. Ruffel and P. H. Schrijvers). However, C. Fensterbusch (1964; 5th printing, 1991), 25) and P. Fleury (Budé edn., 1990), 5) interpret it as meaning that the architect should make his own work more memorable by writing commentaries. This interpretation takes litterae as referring to literature, rather than

literacy, memoria in the sense of a memorial for posterity, rather than the architect's powers of memory, equivalent to the sense of memoria in rhetorical theory, and commentarii as works for publication, rather than notes for personal use, like the notes made by orators in preparation of their speeches. These alternative translations fit Vitruvius' usage elsewhere in his work, but conceal his dependence on rhetorical theory; Quintilian's use of the term which Fleury cites (Inst. Or. 10.7.30) is more ambiguous.

<sup>50</sup> Vit. De Arch. 9 pr. 17-18.

<sup>51</sup> Vit. De Arch. 1.2.1-2.

<sup>52</sup> [Aug.] De rhetorica 1, in Halm 1863, I: 137. The attribution of this work to St Augustine of Hippo is dubious.

<sup>53</sup> Quint. Inst. Or. 3.3.8.

<sup>54</sup> Cic. De or. 1.142; cf. Rhet. ad Her. 3.3.8. Callebat, 'Rhétorique et architecture,' 37-8.

<sup>55</sup> Ord. 1.1.2.

<sup>56</sup> Cic. De or. 3.171: Conlocationis est componere et struere verba sic, ut neve asper eorum concursus neve hiulus sit, sed quodam modo coagmentatus et levis; in quo lepide soceri mei persona lusit is, qui elegantissime id facere potuit, Lucilius:

quam lepide λέξεις compostae! ut tesserulae omnes

arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato.

<sup>57</sup> Gros 1990, xxix.

<sup>58</sup> Vit. De Arch. 1.2.2.

<sup>59</sup> Vit. De Arch. 1.2.8. Cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium 4.35.47 (distributio est cum in pluras res aut personas negotia quaedam certa dispertiuntur).

<sup>60</sup> P. Rutilius Lupus, *Schemata lexeos* 1.18, in Halm 1863, 10.31-11.1: Hoc schema [merismos] singulas res separatim disponendo et suum cuique proprium tribuendo magnam

efficere utilitatem et inlustrem consuevit.

<sup>61</sup> Vitruv. De Arch. 1.2.9 (Alter gradus erit distributionis, cum ad usum patrum familiarum et ad pecuniae copiam aut ad eloquentiae dignitatem aedificia aliter disponentur).

<sup>62</sup> Callebat, 'Rhétorique et architecture,' 37-8 adds a fourth term, compositio, used several times later in Vitruvius' treatise and equivalent to the Platonic sustasis, which also implied harmonious relations between the parts and the whole and between the parts themselves.

<sup>63</sup> Ricoeur 1978.

<sup>64</sup> For this manner of dividing the six basic terms, see R. L. Scranton, 'Vitruvius' Arts of Architecture,' Hesperia 43 (1974), 494-499. As, however, distributio is placed last, after decor, eurythmia and symmetria, in so far as Vitruvius intended a division into two groups, it seems to belong to the second group, associated with the building.

<sup>65</sup> E.g. Horn-Oncken 1967, 114; Schlikker 1940, 96-101.

<sup>66</sup> Gros 1979 and 1991.

<sup>67</sup> I have discussed eurythmia in more detail in Thomas forthcoming.

<sup>68</sup> Associated with the painter Parrhasius and the sculptor Euphranor by Pliny, HN 35.67 and 128, who is associated with Socrates by Quint. Inst. Or. 12.10.4 and Xen. Mem. 3.10.1-5; developed in Pl. Phlb. 64e ff. and Rep. 530a.

<sup>69</sup> Vitruv. De Arch. 5.1.10.

<sup>70</sup> Vitruv. De Arch. 3.3.9; cf. Dion. Hal. (above, n. 24). For later trachutes, see Martin, Antike Rhetorik, 341.

<sup>71</sup> Gros 1990, 116; 1991, 76.

<sup>72</sup> Tóvoς means literally tightening, strain, tension, or contraction, and refers to a cord, band, or sinew. Its meanings include the raising of the voice, pitch, volume, metre, key, mental or physical exertion, intensity, tension, force, tenor, or city quarter (IG 12.5.872.36, et al.).

Rhetorical uses: Plutarch, Brutus, 32; Dion. Hal. Isocrates 13; Hdt. 1.47, 62. Of a row of columns in the design of the Piraeus arsenal by Philo of Byzantium: *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1668.48 with R. Martin, ‘Note sur la charpenterie grecque d’après *IG* II<sup>3</sup> 1668, II 45 – 59,’ REG 80 (1967), 314-324; Linfert 1981.

<sup>73</sup> Vitruvius, De Arch. 3.3.11. For the Augustan preference for the pycnostyle mode, already (cf. 3.3.2) adopted in the temples of Divus Iulius in the Roman Forum and of Venus Genetrix in the Forum Iulium, see Gros 1976, XX. Other Augustan pycnostyle temples would include the Temple of Apollo Sosianus, Palatine Apollo and Mars Ultor.

<sup>74</sup> López Moreda 2000.

<sup>75</sup> Cic. Ad Q. fr. 3.1.5.

<sup>76</sup> Ling 1972

<sup>77</sup> For this now generally accepted date and its ramifications, see further below. The attribution to the tutor of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, Cassius Longinus, is, of course, pure fancy.

<sup>78</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 1.3: “In addressing you who are so expert in culture (paideia) I feel almost absolved from the necessity of premising at greater length that sublimity is a height (ἀκρότης) and excellence (ἐξοχή) of language, and from no other source than this the greatest poets and prose writers have derived their eminence and embellished time with their own renown.” (1.3)

<sup>79</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 1.4 : “The effect of elevated language upon an audience is not persuasion but ecstasy (ἔκστασις). In every way the amazing (τὸ θαυμάσιον) with its sudden shock (σὺν ἐκπλήξει) prevails over that which aims at persuasion and gratification. While persuasion is generally under our control, these things become established in front of every listener, bringing power and irresistible might. We see skill in invention, and the arrangement



(τάξις) and management of material (οἰκονομία), painstakingly emerging not from one or two features, but out of the overall sublimity of the language (ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου τῶν λόγων ὕψους); and sublimity brought out at the right moment scatters all facts before it like a thunderbolt and at once displays the full power (δύναμιν) of the orator.”.

<sup>80</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 3.3.

<sup>81</sup> Vitruvius. De Arch. 3.3.11 (above, n. 73).

<sup>82</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 3.5.

<sup>83</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 5.

<sup>84</sup> Vitruvius. De Arch. 7.5.3.

<sup>85</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 5-6.

<sup>86</sup> Vitruvius. De Arch. 1.1.11.

<sup>87</sup> [Long.] Subl. 8.1.

<sup>88</sup> [Long.] Subl. 9.2-3.

<sup>89</sup> Vitruvius. De Arch. 1 pr. 3.

<sup>90</sup> [Long.] Subl. 9.5.

<sup>91</sup> Vitruvius. De Arch. 3.5.9.

<sup>92</sup> [Long.] Subl. 9.13.

<sup>93</sup> [Long.] Subl. 10.7.

<sup>94</sup> [Long.] Subl. 11.1-2.

<sup>95</sup> [Long.] Subl. 12.1.

<sup>96</sup> [Long.] Subl. 12.4.

<sup>97</sup> [Long.] Subl. 12.3.

<sup>98</sup> Hermogenes. Id. 1.6; Trapp 1988, 152-3.

<sup>99</sup> E.g. Maximus, Dialexis 21.7-8, quoted by Trapp 1988, 162-3.

<sup>100</sup> Lucian, De domo 4.

<sup>101</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 13.4.

<sup>102</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 14.2.

<sup>103</sup> Lucian, De domo 9.

<sup>104</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 14.3.

<sup>105</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 15.2.

<sup>106</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 15.5-6.

<sup>107</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 15.9.

<sup>108</sup> Lucian, De domo 13.

<sup>109</sup> Lucian, De domo 17.

<sup>110</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 17.1-2.

<sup>111</sup> Lucian, De domo 8.

<sup>112</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 21.1.

<sup>113</sup> Quint. Inst. Or. 8.6.63, 9.4.27; Apul. De deo Socr., pr. 3; cf. Flor. 18.

<sup>114</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 22.1.

<sup>115</sup> Cook and Wedderburn 1903-12, I: 256-7. For art and nature in ancient architecture, see, for example, Fehr 1980 and Purcell 1987.

<sup>116</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 23.1-2.

<sup>117</sup> E.g. Joseph. BJ 5.1.4 (176-80) on Herod's palace in Jerusalem, noting the variety of the marbles, the size of the roof beams, the dazzling ornaments, numbers of rooms, and thousands of different shapes.

<sup>118</sup> Hdt. 7.61.1; Xen. Anab. 1.5.8; cf. Schneider 1986, 152-5 with sculptural examples.

<sup>119</sup> Strabo 12.8.14 (C 537) on pavonazzetto from Docimium; cf. Thomas 2007, 209.

<sup>120</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 24.1 (σωματοειδέστερον).

<sup>121</sup> Ruskin, Seven Lamps, III.6, in Works of John Ruskin, VIII, 106.

<sup>122</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 26.2.

<sup>123</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 28.1-2.

<sup>124</sup> Aristid. Or. 27.30-1; for the analogy between poetry and architecture, cf. Hor. AP 394-6.

<sup>125</sup> J.-W. von Goethe, 23 March 1829: “Ich habe unter meinen Papieren ein Blatt gefunden wo ich die Baukunst eine erstarrte Musik nenne. Und wirklich, es hat etwas; die Stimmung, die von der Baukunst ausgeht, kommt dem Effekt der Musik nahe.” Eckermann 1986, 340. I shall deal with this theme in more detail in “City-gates of southern Italy and the music of the cosmos” (forthcoming).

<sup>126</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 30.1.

<sup>127</sup> Plut. Per. 13.3.

Formatted: French (France)

<sup>128</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 38.

Formatted: French (France)

<sup>129</sup> Paus. 2.25.8; cf. 2.16.5, 7.25.6.

<sup>130</sup> Lucian, De domo 9.

<sup>131</sup> Virg. Aen. 12.896-902; cf. Il. 5.302-14, 20.283-92. Budick 2000, 62-70 (quotation at 69).

<sup>132</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 38.1.

<sup>133</sup> Cook and Wedderburn 1903-12, I: 263-4; cf. Thomas 2007, 237.

<sup>134</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 39.3.

<sup>135</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 40.1-4.

<sup>136</sup> Van Eck 2007, 121.

<sup>137</sup> Ploeg 2005 and 2006.

<sup>138</sup> Translation by David Britt. Van Eck 2002, 9, after Hor. AP 25-30. The underlined passage refers to Boffrand’s translation of Horace.

<sup>139</sup> For a summary, see Häussler 1995.

<sup>140</sup> Philo, Quis rerum divinarum heres 4; Quod deterius 79.

<sup>141</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 44.2.

<sup>142</sup> Martial 1.86.7; [Long.] De Subl. 26.2. Herrmann 1964, 80. Manutius' correction of the manuscript reading "Florentianus" is defended by Russell 1964, 59 and accepted by all modern commentators, although one should not rule out that Manutius was familiar with the Martial passage when he made his correction. The same name also appears on a later water pipe from a suburban property on the Janiculum in Rome: CIL 15.2.7373.

<sup>143</sup> Philostr. VS 511.

<sup>144</sup> Pl. Tim. 67d.

<sup>145</sup> For further discussion of lamprotes, see Thomas 2007, 219-20, and forthcoming.

<sup>146</sup> Hermogenes, De Eloc. 264-9, in Wooten 1987, 32-6.

<sup>147</sup> Pliny, Ep. 1.20.5; cf. [Long.] De Subl. 30.1.

<sup>148</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 1.4.

<sup>149</sup> Pliny, Ep. 1.20.19.

<sup>150</sup> Whitton 2012, 364.

<sup>151</sup> Pliny, Ep. 9.26.5; [Long.] In Subl. 3.4; cf. Vitruvius at n. 68, above. For Pliny's admiration of sublimitas in literature, compare Ep. 1.10.5 (Platonicam illam sublimitatem et latitudinem) and 4.20.2-3 (to Novius Maximus: opus pulchrum validum acre sublime varium elegans purum figuratum spatiosum etiam et cum magna tua laude diffusum ... Nam dolori sublimitatem et magnificentiam ingenium ... addidit).

<sup>152</sup> Pliny, Ep. 9.26.6; elsewhere (Paneg. 47.4-6) Pliny plays on the more familiar contrast of modesty and excess, rather than, as here, two types of grandeur.

<sup>153</sup> Riggsby 1995.

<sup>154</sup> Griffin 1999, 156; cf. Whitton 2012, 346-7.

<sup>155</sup> Pliny, Ep. 2.17 and 5.6. Compare esp. 5.6.44 with [Long.] In Subl. 26.2.

<sup>156</sup> Pliny's mission in Bithynia is generally dated to the years between 109 and 111: Sherwin-White 1966, 81.

<sup>157</sup> Prusa : Pliny, Ep. 10.23.2 (et dignitas civitatis et saeculi tui nitor postulat, where nitor corresponds to Greek lamprotes); 10.70.1. Nicaea: ibid. 10.39.4.

<sup>158</sup> Pliny, Ep. 10.49.1 (est multo depressior opera eo quod cum maxime surgit); cf. [Long.] In Subl. 1.1.

<sup>159</sup> Dio's stoa seems to have been near completion by 105-6: Salmeri 2000, 67.

<sup>160</sup> Dio Chrys. Or. 40.8 (λόγοι δὲ ἐγίγνοντο πολλοὶ μὲν, οὐ παρὰ πολλῶν δέ, καὶ σφόδρα ἀηδεῖς, ὥς κατασκάπτω τὴν πόλιν, ὥς ἀνάστατον πεποιήκα); a common criticism to judge from Pliny, who denounced the people of Claudopolis for "digging not building" (defodiunt plus quam aedificant, Ep. 10.39.5), or, as 'razing to the ground', cf. Hdt. 7.156; Soph. Phil. 998; Thuc. 4.109; SIG 344.7 (Teos); Plut. Publ. 10; ἀνάστατον πεποιήκα: cf. Plin. Ep. 6.16.13; Tac. Agr. 30.6.

<sup>161</sup> αἰσχρὰ καὶ καταγέλαστα ἐρείπια: cf. ILS 6043, l. 9; Plin. Ep. 10.70.1;

ταπεινότερα: cf. Plin. Ep. 10.49.1 (the old temple at Prusa, overshadowed by the new architecture).

<sup>162</sup> Dio Chrys. Or. 47.14-15. The deletion, after Emp., of the manuscript reading οὐδὲν after ὄφελος, misses the irony of these lines.

<sup>163</sup> The evidence is assembled by Herrmann 1964, esp. 80-1, making the speculative inference regarding authorship and arguing that Dio's Oration 18 was dedicated to the same Terentianus.

<sup>164</sup> Plut. Publ. 10.3 (καὶ γὰρ ὄντως ὁ Οὐαλέριος ᾧκει τραγικώτερον ὑπὲρ τὴν καλουμένην Οὐελίαν οἰκίαν ἐπικρεμαμένην τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ καθορῶσαν ἐξ ὕψους ἅπαντα, δυσπρόσοδον δὲ πελάσαι καὶ χαλεπὴν ἔξωθεν, ὥστε καταβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ τὸ σχῆμα μετέωρον εἶναι καὶ βασιλικὸν τῆς προπομπῆς τὸν ὄγκον).

<sup>165</sup> Tac. Agr. 21.

<sup>166</sup> Plut. Comp. Per. et Fab. Max. 3.7.

<sup>167</sup> Plut. De Pyth. Orac. 409a.

<sup>168</sup> Pliny, Ep. 10.41.1; compare Antoninus Pius' declaration to the Ephesians on the buildings of Vedius Antoninus as "something by which he hopes to make the city more dignified (semnoteran) for the future" IEph 1491 = Syll.<sup>3</sup> 850 = J. H. Oliver, Greek constitutions of the early Roman emperors from inscriptions and papyri (Philadelphia, 1989), no. 138 = F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1926), 423 no. 101, ll. 7-18. Translation in N. Lewis, Greek Historical Documents. The Roman Principate 27 B.C. – 285 A.D. (Toronto, 1974), 89 no.26i.

<sup>169</sup> Packer 1997, I: 4-5. This would still be the case if the tradition is believed that the project had been conceived by Domitian.

<sup>170</sup> Lancaster 2005, 51-67.

<sup>171</sup> MacDonald 1982, 41-6.

<sup>172</sup> Ball 2003, 26.

<sup>173</sup> MacDonald 1986, 221-47.

<sup>174</sup> McKenzie 1990, 46, 49-50, and 159-61.

<sup>175</sup> MacDonald 1986, 240.

<sup>176</sup> MacDonald 1986, 245-6.

<sup>177</sup> Blunt 1973, 8.

<sup>178</sup> Russell 1964, XX.

<sup>179</sup> I discuss the philosophical thinking behind Nero's Arch in Keystones (forthcoming), Chapter 2.

<sup>180</sup> Zanker 2002, 112 for the apses, 118 for the "aura of the sacred" in the Cenatio Iovis, and, for the exceptionally fine ornament, e.g. 127 fig. 15, reproducing Bianchini 1738, tab. 3.

<sup>181</sup> Mart. Epigr. 8.36.4-12.

<sup>182</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 1.1.

<sup>183</sup> Προσαναπλαττόμαι is similarly used by Philo of false images of the divine (De sacrific. Abel. Et Cain. 96; De decalog. 54) and later by Clement of Alexandria of diaphanous clothing, "moulded onto the body, growing into its shape" (Paedag. 2.10bis.107: προσαναπλάττεται σαρκικῶς ἐμφυῖσα τῷ σχήματι). Αναπλαττεῖν of sculpture: Diod. Sic. 16.33.1; Plut. De Is. et Osir. 366f.

<sup>184</sup> Vitruvius De Arch. 7.5.2; for the 'tragic' aspect of architecture, compare Plut. Publ. 10.3 (n. 150 above).

<sup>185</sup> Packer 1997, I: 85-91; Meneghini 2009, 39 pl. 1; cf. MacDonald 1986, 237.

<sup>186</sup> Galinier 2007, 192-207, esp. 194-5.

<sup>187</sup> MacDonald 1982, 79. An inscription from less than a century later, found in 1992, implies that Forum and Markets were seen as one project, even if their architecture is contrasting and they were separated by a blind barrier wall: Wilson-Jones 2000, 22.

<sup>188</sup> For the design, see still MacDonald 1982, 75-93 (quotation at p. 79).

<sup>189</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 10.1.

<sup>190</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 10.6.

<sup>191</sup> Dorl-Klingenschmid 2001, no. 24.

<sup>192</sup> Lamare 2011.

<sup>193</sup> Rathmayr 2011.

<sup>194</sup> ILS 8970 = AE 1999.1576; Alföldy 1998 ; Dorl-Klingenschmid 2001, no. 64.

<sup>195</sup> Pliny, Ep. 6.31.3. Acquitted in Trajan's court at Centumcellae, he was also sole or joint donor of the Harbour Baths.

<sup>196</sup> Strocka 1988, 295.

<sup>197</sup> Quatember 2011, 15-16 (columns), 66-7 (statue) and 76 (location of statue). For other nude statues of Trajan, see C. H. Hallett, *The Roman Nude: heroic portrait statuary 200 B.C.-A.D. 300* (Oxford, 2005), nos. 143-6.

<sup>198</sup> Quatember 2011.

<sup>199</sup> Strocka 1988 and 2003, 39, has argued for the stylistic influence of the metropolis on the building, but whether this influence took the form of the actual arrival of workmen from Rome is unclear. The prevailingly local technique of the architectural ornament makes it more likely that Roman influences were rather transmitted through the use of pattern books: see Rohmann 1998, 109; Plattner 2004, 23; and Quatember 2007, 109.

<sup>200</sup> Diana Eidson (academia.edu).

<sup>201</sup> Hüber 1999.

<sup>202</sup> Ploeg 2005; cf. [Long.] De Subl. 10.6.

<sup>203</sup> Strocka 1981; cf. McKenzie 1990, pl. 132.

<sup>204</sup> McEwen 1993, 60.

<sup>205</sup> In particular, the label exordium is much more appropriate to the portico of the building, because of the absence of any structural requirement for such an element: see Cic. De or. 2.320-1 (n. 18, above) and Gros 1979, 338.

<sup>206</sup> For these readings of the building, see Loerke 1990 and Wilson-Jones 2000, 183.



<sup>207</sup> The thesis of Heilmeyer 1975 is revived by Wilson-Jones 2000, 192-3 and gains more credence in the light of the re-evaluation of the brick-stamps and the building's subsequent dating to the final years of Trajan's reign (Hetland 2007). See now Wilson Jones 2009, esp. 82-6, and forthcoming.

<sup>208</sup> Wilson-Jones 2000, 212.

<sup>209</sup> McEwen 1994, 56.

<sup>210</sup> Cook and Weddeburn 1903-12, VIII: 103; cf. Thomas 2007, 237. For the scale, see Dio Cass., Exc. Salm. fr. 114 Müller, between books 69 and 70 (Loeb edn., ed. Cary, viii, 466-7), and, for the peacock's proverbial beauty, due particularly to its shifting of colour in the light, and its relevance to architecture, see Lucian, De domo 11.

<sup>211</sup> [Long.] In Subl. 36.3.

<sup>212</sup> Strab. 8.3.30 (C353-4). For this possible identification, see Wilamowitz 1971 and Merkelbach 1997, citing Callim. Fr. 196 Pf. for the statue's place in literary aesthetics.

<sup>213</sup> Dio Cass. 69.4.2-5; translation in Lepper and Frere 1988, 188.

<sup>214</sup> [Long.] De Subl. 1.4, 17.1-2; cf. Pliny, Ep. 1.20.19 and Lucian, De domo 8 (n. 103 above).

<sup>215</sup> Or. 23.14; 18.3; cf. 18.6.

<sup>216</sup> Ach. Tat. 5.1.6.

<sup>217</sup> Cf. Paus. 8.41.8 on the temple of Apollo at Bassae; cf. Aristid. Or. 34.30, on Smyrna. On semnotes as a divine aura, cf. Hermog. Id. 1.6, with Rutherford 1998, 00.

<sup>218</sup> Hermogenes, On Types of Style 242-71, trsl. Wooten 1987, 18-38; cf. Hagedorn 1964, 30-44; Martin 1974, 339-42.

<sup>219</sup> [Demetrius], On Style (De elocutione) 13-14.

<sup>220</sup> Maupai 2003 on connections of the term with beauty.

<sup>221</sup> Lucian, De domo 15-16.

<sup>222</sup> Chaniotis 2012.