



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Introduction

Jonge, C.C. de; Hunter, R.L.

Citation

Jonge, C. C. de, & Hunter, R. L. (2018). Introduction. In *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Augustan Rome: rhetoric, criticism and historiography* (pp. 1-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
doi:10.1017/9781108647632

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3295816>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Introduction

Casper C. de Jonge and Richard Hunter

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: A Greek Historian and Rhetorician in Rome

Dionysius, son of Alexander, was born in Halicarnassus, before 55 BC.¹ He came to Rome in 30/29 BC, ‘at the very time that Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war’.² Having settled in the capital of the Roman world, he learnt Latin, developed an extensive network of colleagues, students and patrons, and wrote several Greek treatises on rhetoric and literary criticism. In 8/7 BC he published the first part of his monumental history of early Rome.³ He probably lived on in Rome well beyond that date, while he was working on the remaining part of the *Roman Antiquities*, the complete edition of which was to be published in twenty books, covering the history of Rome down to the year 264 BC. The first eleven books plus some excerpts have been preserved. We do not know when and where Dionysius died.

Apart from the *Roman Antiquities*, ten of his works have survived, the chronological order of which can be partly established.⁴ The early essays are *On Imitation* (which partially survives in fragments and an epitome) and the first part of his *On the Ancient Orators*, including the treatises *On Lysias*, *On Isocrates* and *On Isaeus*. The works of the middle period are *On Demosthenes*, *On Composition* (or *On the Arrangement of Words*), the *Letter to Pompeius* and the *First Letter to Ammaeus*. The later essays are *On Thucydides* along with its appendix, the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, and

¹ See Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.6.4: Licinius Crassus led his army against the Parthians ‘in my time’ (κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἡλικίαν); cf. Hidber 1996, 2; Fromentin 1998, xiii.

² *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2: ‘in the middle of the 187th Olympiad’. ³ *Ant. Rom.* 1.3.4 and 7.70.2.

⁴ On the relative order of the rhetorical-critical works, see Bonner 1939, 25–38; Aujac 1978, 22–8; De Jonge 2008, 20–3.

On Dinarchus. Nothing survives of the treatises *On Figures* and *On Political Philosophy*.⁵

The extensive oeuvre of Dionysius of Halicarnassus is characterized by a dual tension between cultures and between genres. These two themes determine the agenda of this volume, which seeks to understand Dionysius as a writer positioned between Greece and Rome and between rhetoric and historiography. More specifically, the current volume examines how Dionysius' rhetorical and critical works are connected and intertwined with his history of early Rome, and the complex ways in which both components of this dual project – rhetorical criticism and historiography – fit into the social, intellectual, literary, cultural and political world of Rome under Augustus.

Rhetoric and Historiography

One of the most striking aspects of modern scholarship on Dionysius is its division, with a few exceptions, into two separate halves. Although it is often rightly asserted that Dionysius' rhetoric and historiography are really inseparable, it is still largely true that one group of scholars work on the *Roman Antiquities* and another group on the rhetorical-critical works. More problematic is the fact that specialists focusing on one genre have not always taken (the scholarship on) the other genre sufficiently into account.⁶ One important aim of this volume is to bridge the gap between the two genres (and between the two groups of scholars), by interpreting Dionysius' rhetorical criticism and historiography as two closely connected components of one overarching intellectual and educational project.

Readers of the twenty-first century might be surprised by the fact that one ancient author devoted his life to both rhetoric and historiography, as these disciplines are nowadays sometimes thought to be hardly compatible. But ancient authors and readers were well aware that the two genres are naturally related, as any historical text inevitably starts from invention (selection of material), disposition and style, which are the basic tools of

⁵ *On Political Philosophy*: Dion Hal. *Thuc.* 2.3. Cf. Aujac 1991, 46 n. 2. *On Figures*: Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.89. We may doubt that Dionysius ever wrote the treatise *On the Selection of Words*, which he hoped to present as a sequel to *On Composition* (see *Comp.* 1.10). The *Ars Rhetorica* attributed to Dionysius is not his work.

⁶ Important exceptions include Goudriaan 1989; Gabba 1991; Fox 1993; Wiater 2011a (esp. 120–225). For the idea that the historical and rhetorical works are closely connected and inseparable, see, e.g., Gabba 1991, 4; De Jonge 2008, 19; Wiater 2011a, 123.

rhetoric.⁷ The historian constructs the past, just as the rhetorician carefully shapes the narration in a forensic speech. The very close connection in antiquity between rhetoric and historiography has even been suggested to anticipate – in one sense – the theories of the historian Hayden White. In his influential *Metahistory* (1973), White pointed out that historical writing mirrors literary writing, since both genres rely on narrative, which implies selecting, omitting and structuring material: the historian constructs a version of the past and moulds it into a coherent story.⁸ Such an understanding of historical writing sits well with Dionysius' criticism of Herodotus and Thucydides, but also with his own practice in the *Roman Antiquities*.

This volume will suggest various ways in which Dionysius' two fields of interest are related and intertwined. From a general perspective one could distinguish three levels where Dionysius' rhetorical-critical works are connected with his *Roman Antiquities*. One level is that of theory and practice.⁹ Dionysius' choices in writing his own history of Rome can be understood as reflecting the theories in his rhetorical-critical works. Three of his essays are obviously of essential importance here: the *Letter to Pompeius*, which contains an extensive comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides; the treatise *On Thucydides*, a critical discussion of the content and style of Thucydides' *Histories*; and the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, an analysis of Thucydides' often obscure language.¹⁰ In the *Letter to Pompeius*, Dionysius explains how historians should proceed when choosing their topic, determining the beginning and end of the narrative, selecting the events, arranging the material and adopting the right attitude towards the events described (*Pomp.* 3.2–15). All such theoretical instructions can be compared with Dionysius' own practice as a historian.¹¹ Several authors in this volume indeed demonstrate that Dionysius' literary criticism helps us to

⁷ On rhetoric and historiography, see esp. the seminal work of Woodman 1988, who focuses on Cicero and Latin historians. Fox and Livingstone 2010 discuss Greek rhetoric and historiography.

⁸ White 1973. On Dionysius and Hayden White, see Wiater 2011a, 123–6, 160–1. He rightly warns (p. 123), however, that Dionysius should not be called a 'Hayden White of antiquity'. On White, see also Fox in this volume.

⁹ Schwartz 1903, 936 summarizes the *Roman Antiquities* as 'ein genauer Commentar zu seinen theoretischen Ausführungen über Historiographie'. For Schwartz, however, this is purely negative: the *Roman Antiquities* confirm that Dionysius did not understand anything of ancient historiography ('dass D. von dem, was die antike Historiographie wollte und konnte, auch nicht die ersten Elemente begriffen hat').

¹⁰ For Dionysius' theory of historiography in the rhetorical works, see Halbfas 1910, Pavano 1936, Grube 1950, Sacks 1983, De Jonge 2017. See further Pavano 1958, Pritchett 1975, Aujac 1991, Hunter in this volume on *Thuc.*; Aujac 1992; Fornaro 1997; Wiater 2011a, 132–54 on *Pomp.*; Aujac 1992, De Jonge 2011 on *Amm.* 2.

¹¹ Such comparisons have been presented by Halbfas 1910; Heath 1989, 71–89; Wiater 2011a, 132–54.

understand specific passages of the *Roman Antiquities*, but also the other way around – that his own history of Rome casts light on his criticism of Herodotus and Thucydides.

A second level at which rhetoric and historiography come together is that of ‘imitation’ (μίμησις), the central concept that may be said to encapsulate the intentions of all of Dionysius’ works.¹² In the *Roman Antiquities*, Dionysius aims not only to inform his readers about the obscure origins of Rome, but also to provide models of imitation:

(. . .) Rome from the very beginning, immediately after its founding, produced infinite examples of virtue in men whose superiors, whether for piety or for justice or for life-long self-control or for warlike valor, no city, either Greek or barbarian, has ever produced. (*Ant. Rom.* 1.5.3)¹³

The moral conduct of the early Romans should instruct and inspire the (Roman) readers of the *Roman Antiquities*:

And again, both the present and future descendants of those godlike men will choose, not the pleasantest and easiest of lives, but rather the noblest and most ambitious, when they consider that all who are sprung from an illustrious origin ought to set a high value on themselves and indulge in no pursuit unworthy of their ancestors (μηδὲν ἀνάξιον ἐπιτηδεύειν τῶν προγόνων). (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.4)

For Dionysius it is an essential function of historiography to provide inspiring models for the present and the future – *exempla*, as the Romans would say. In the *Letter to Pompeius* he argues that Herodotus did and Thucydides did not understand this central purpose of historical writing: Herodotus’ Greeks accomplished ‘wonderful deeds’, whereas Thucydides describes a war that was ‘neither glorious nor fortunate’ and should have been forgotten altogether (*Pomp.* 3.2–4).

The idea of μίμησις is also central to the rhetorical works. Dionysius scrutinizes the writings of ancient poets, orators and historians, whose best qualities he feels should be carefully studied by his students. The concept of imitation was of such importance to Dionysius that he published a separate work on μίμησις, its aims, methods and techniques, as well as the literary models to be imitated and emulated. Unfortunately, his work *On Imitation* is largely lost, but apart from a few fragments and an epitome, we also have a long passage of the work

¹² See Delcourt 2005, 43–7; De Jonge 2008, 19–20. On the role of mimesis in Greek imperial literature, see esp. Whitmarsh 2001, 46–57.

¹³ Translations of the *Roman Antiquities* in this introduction are borrowed or adapted from Cary 1937–1950.

that Dionysius cites in the *Letter to Pompeius*.¹⁴ Even if we did not have these precious remains, the importance of μίμησις to both sides of Dionysius' project would still be abundantly clear, as it is such a dominant theme in all of his works. In the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, often seen as a 'manifesto of classicism', Dionysius emphatically presents the rhetorical culture of classical Athens as the model of rhetorical and literary writing in Rome under Augustus.¹⁵ The Attic Muse, which had been driven away by an Asian harlot after the death of Alexander the Great, had recently been restored thanks to Rome and 'its leaders' (δυναστεύοντες); as a result, Dionysius claims, many historical, political and philosophical treatises are published in his own time by 'both Romans and Greeks' (καὶ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησιν, *Orat. Vett.* 3.2). After a period of decline, which Dionysius associates with 'Asian' influence and which modern readers in the wake of Gustav Droysen label the 'Hellenistic period', Rome becomes the new Athens, resulting in a revival of Attic eloquence.¹⁶ This revival is grounded, of course, in the concept of μίμησις, the creative and eclectic imitation and emulation of classical Greek models, not only of oratory, but also of morality and lifestyle, as becomes clear from Dionysius' programmatic questions:¹⁷

Who are the most important of the ancient orators and historians? What manner of life and style of writing did they adopt? Which characteristic of each of them should we take over, or which should we avoid? (*Orat. Vett.* 4.2)

The formulation of these questions, juxtaposing lifestyle and writing style, suggests a third level at which the genres of rhetoric and historiography are connected. One important ideal underlying all of Dionysius' works is that of moral education and civilization, closely connected with Isocratean παιδεία.¹⁸ Readers of the *Roman Antiquities* will become better citizens if they look carefully at the early Romans; readers of the rhetorical works, like the young student Metilius Rufus, the addressee of *On Composition*, are likewise trained to become good citizens, who are both verbally and

¹⁴ For *On Imitation*, see the editions by Aujac 1992 and Battisti 1997; see also Hunter 2009. On the citation of *Imit.* in *Pomp.* 3, see Weaire 2002.

¹⁵ On the preface to *Orat. Vett.*, see Hidber 1996, who labels this text 'das klassizistische Manifest'. See also De Jonge 2014a.

¹⁶ On Augustan Rome as the revival of classical Athens, see Hidber 1996, 75–81.

¹⁷ See Hidber 1996, 56–75. Translations of the critical essays in this introduction are adapted from Usher 1974–1985.

¹⁸ On this important theme, see Goudriaan 1989; Hidber 1996, 44–75.

morally ready to play an active part in Roman society. In his treatise *On Isocrates*, Dionysius poses a series of rhetorical questions, which eloquently bring out the moral connotations of his program:

Who could fail to become a patriotic supporter of democracy and a student of civic virtue after reading Isocrates' *Panegyricus*? (...) What greater exhortation could there be, for individuals singly and collectively for whole communities, than the discourse *On the Peace*? (...) Who would not become a more responsible citizen after reading the *Areopagiticus* (...)? (*Isoc.* 5.1, 7.1, 8.1)

Throughout his works, Dionysius is a patient and passionate teacher, whose lessons are not only concerned with rhetorical theory, literary criticism and the history of Rome, but also with virtue, civic life and human civilization. His program of moral education, as we will see, in many ways resonates with the concerns of Rome at the end of the first century BC.

Greece and Rome

Dionysius' works bear witness to the complex dialogue between Greek and Roman identities at the end of the first century BC.¹⁹ This is a second main theme of this volume. The subject of Greek identity in the Roman Empire has been at the heart of recent research on the Second Sophistic (very roughly 50–250 AD): authors such as Plutarch, Dio of Prusa, Lucian and Philostratus show a very wide range of diverse attitudes towards Hellenic and Roman identity, depending on such factors as location (within the Empire), genre (history, rhetoric, biography, novel, etc.) and literary context.²⁰ Authors of Greek texts may emphasize continuity between the glorious Greek past and their own time, but they may also applaud the transformation of the world affected by the Roman Empire and the new opportunities that it offers to them. There was not one Greek identity: literary texts adopt a variety of strategies by which identities are constructed and re-constructed in differing and dynamic ways. A similar variety of perspectives on Greek and Roman identities was available to the Greek authors of the Augustan period (27 BC–AD 14), who witnessed the gradual emergence and early development of the Roman Empire. As a substantial

¹⁹ See esp. Luraghi 2003, Peirano 2010.

²⁰ Cf., e.g., Swain 1996, Goldhill 2001, Whitmarsh 2001. See also Whitmarsh 2013 with further bibliography. Barchiesi 2009 examines Roman responses to Greece, Whitmarsh 2009 Greek responses to Rome.

amount of Greek literature of the Augustan Age is either lost or survives in excerpts or fragments only (e.g., the works of Caecilius of Caleacte, Nicolaus of Damascus, Timagenes of Alexandria), Dionysius of Halicarnassus is – with Strabo of Amasia and Antipater of Thessalonica – our principal literary witness for Greek perspectives on Rome in the Augustan period.²¹

On the one hand, Dionysius is thoroughly Greek. He comes from Greek-speaking Asia Minor; he consistently writes in the Greek language; and he teaches about the literature of (what we call) archaic and classical Greece, from Homer to Demosthenes. He is especially interested in the styles of the Attic orators and historians, which are to be imitated and emulated by his students and readers; but he is also more generally intrigued by what he identifies as the highlights of classical Greek culture: Pindar, Plato, Polyclitus and all the great representatives of Greek poetry, music, sculpture, painting and philosophy. Furthermore, as a literary critic he self-consciously presents himself as working in the Greek tradition of learning and scholarship, represented in his works by such celebrated names as Isocrates, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Aristoxenus and Chrysippus.

On the other hand, Dionysius is very Roman. He arrived in Rome at a very significant moment in Roman history and became bilingual, after ‘learning the language of the Romans and acquiring knowledge of their writings’ (*Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2). Some of the sources of Roman history that he studied were in Greek, like those of Quintus Fabius Pictor and Lucius Cincius Alimentus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.3), but Dionysius also read the works of historians who wrote in Latin: ‘Porcius Cato, Quintus Fabius Maximus, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, the Aelii, Gellii and Calpurnii, and many others of note’ (*Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3); elsewhere, Dionysius mentions his older contemporary Varro (*Ant. Rom.* 1.14.1) and several other Roman historians.²² Furthermore, Dionysius was personally in direct contact with Romans and Greeks who lived at Rome: ‘Some information I received orally from men of the greatest learning, with whom I associated’ (οἷς εἰς ὀμιλίαν ἤλθον, *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.3).

²¹ On Greek identity in the Augustan Age, see esp. the volume edited by Schmitz and Wiater 2011a, with contributions on Dionysius by Fox 2011 and Wiater 2011b. Bowersock 1965, 122–39 and Hidber 2011, 122–3 provide overviews of Greek literature under Augustus. On Strabo, Nicolaus and Antipater, see below, pp. 11–13.

²² On Dionysius’ knowledge of Latin, see Marin 1969; Rochette 1997, 231–3; Delcourt 2005, 28–30; De Jonge 2008, 60–5; Nesselrath 2013. On Dionysius and Varro, see De Jonge forthcoming. On Dionysius’ sources in *Ant. Rom.*, see Schwartz 1903; Oakley in this volume. ‘Aelii’ (*Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3) refers to Quintus Aelius Tubero (and possibly his father): see below.

We know the names of several members of Dionysius' intriguing network in Rome.²³ Some of them were Greek, like Demetrius, the addressee of *On Imitation* (otherwise unknown), and Caecilius of Caleacte, the famous historian and rhetorician.²⁴ Some of them were Roman, like Metilius Rufus, the student who received his *On Composition* as a birthday present. Dionysius describes the father of this young boy as his 'most esteemed friend' (*Comp.* 1.4), which may imply that he acted as his patron; an additional argument for a relationship of patronage is the fact that Dionysius includes the family of the Metilii in his list of Alban *principes* (*Ant. Rom.* 3.29.7).²⁵ In introducing Metilius Rufus to the secrets of stylistic composition, Dionysius seems to have made a useful contribution to the political career of his Roman pupil: Metilius was to become governor of the province of Achaëa, where he had ample opportunity to put his teacher's theories into practice.²⁶ Another important Roman connection was Quintus Aelius Tubero, the addressee of Dionysius' treatise *On Thucydides*. Aelius Tubero himself wrote a history of Rome (one of Dionysius' sources: see below), possibly in the Thucydidean style, but he was also a lawyer from an influential family, known to us through Cicero's *Pro Ligario* (20–9): Quintus Aelius Tubero's father was a legate in Asia; his sons were consuls in 11 and 4 BC.²⁷ Dionysius also mentions the names of Ammaeus, addressee of *On the Ancient Orators* and two letters, and Cn. Pompeius Geminus, the addressee of one letter, who was also in touch with Dionysius' friend Zeno.²⁸ We do not know whether Ammaeus and Pompeius Geminus considered themselves to be Greek or Roman. What is clear, however, is that Dionysius was well connected in Rome, not only with scholars, teachers and students, who stimulated his ideas and intellectual development, but also with influential families who seem to have supported his project.²⁹ Dionysius' Greek works have a social,

²³ On Dionysius' 'literary circle' or 'network of intellectuals' in Rome, see Roberts 1900; Wisse 1995, 78–80; Hidber 1996, 5–7; De Jonge 2008, 25–34. Applying social identity theory, Wiater 2011a, 22–9 interprets Dionysius' network of colleagues and friends as an 'elite community of classicists'.

²⁴ *Pomp.* 3.1, 3.20. For the fragments of Caecilius, see Woerther 2015.

²⁵ See Bowersock 1965, 132 n. 2.

²⁶ Bonner 1939, 2 n. 4; Bowersock 1965, 132; De Jonge in this volume. On Dionysius' strategies as the Greek teacher of a Roman student, see Weaire 2012.

²⁷ Quintus Aelius Tubero: *Thuc.* 1.1, 55.5. See also *Ant. Rom.* 1.80.1 on Aelius Tubero's history of Rome as one of Dionysius' sources. Cf. Bowersock 1965, 130; Bowersock 1979, 68–70; Fromentin 1998, xiv–xviii. Dionysius may have been familiar with Strabo (who mentions him in *Geogr.* 14.2.16) via the Tuberones.

²⁸ *Orat. Vett.* 1.1; *Amm.* 1 1.1; *Amm.* 2 1.1; *Pomp.* 1.1.

²⁹ The Tuberones were among the more prominent families in Rome, as Fromentin 1998, xiv–xv points out: 'une grande famille aristocratique qui comptait plusieurs personnages illustres et qui tenait, semble-t-il, une place de premier plan dans la Rome d'Auguste'. Cf. Bowersock 1979, 68 and

intellectual and cultural context in Rome; Dionysius himself, moreover, explicitly reflects on the complex relationship between Greece and Rome, both in his rhetorical criticism and in his historiography.

In the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, as we have just seen, Dionysius praises Rome for the cultural revolution it had achieved, and, in particular, for the restitution of the Attic Muse, who stands for a morally serious oratory and literature of high standards. According to Dionysius' manifesto, Rome and its 'leaders' (plural) shaped the political circumstances that facilitated the production of great texts, both in Greek and in Latin. Dionysius' words of praise have been interpreted either as mere flattery, or as the sincere gratitude of a newcomer who enjoyed Roman hospitality. Whichever reading one prefers, the preface stimulates us to understand Dionysius' works within their Roman context, and to ask how precisely the classical Greek orators (and historians and poets) were to be relevant to the political and cultural situation of the city in which he himself was writing and teaching.

The complex relationship between Greece and Rome is the main theme of the *Roman Antiquities*. That work powerfully presents the – for modern readers somewhat remarkable – thesis that the earliest Romans were Greeks, who lived a Greek life, characterized by Greek virtues and organized in Greek institutions. The Greeks, as Dionysius tells us, came to Italy in five successive stages: (1) Arcadian Aborigines, (2) Thessalian Pelasgians (from the Peloponnese), (3) Arcadians from Pallantium who were led by Evander, (4) Peloponnesians who were guided by Hercules and (5) Aeneas with the Trojans (who were in fact also Greeks).³⁰ All these groups founded settlements in Italy and contributed to the gradual progress of civilization. Evander founded Pallantium, Aeneas and the Trojans (now Latins) built Lavinium and Alba. Sixteen generations after the fall of Troy, the Latins surrounded Pallantium with a wall, and 'this settlement they called Rome, after Romulus' (*Ant. Rom.* 1.45.3). Dionysius' extensive narrative of these earliest events in Roman history finds its climax in his emphatic presentation of Rome as a 'Greek city':

Hence, from now on let the reader forever renounce the views of those who make Rome a retreat of barbarians, fugitives and vagabonds, and let him confidently affirm it to be a Greek city (Ἑλλάδα πόλιν), – which will be easy

contrast Schwartz 1903, 934, who thought that Dionysius' addressees were 'no distinguished people' ('keine vornehmen Leute').

³⁰ See *Ant. Rom.* 1.11.1–4, 17.1, 31.1, 34.1–2, 45.1, 61–2, 89.1–2. Important discussions include Gabba 1991, 98–118; Fromentin 1998, xxxi–xxxiv; Luraghi 2003, 277–81; Delcourt 2005; Fox in this volume.

when he shows that it is at once the most hospitable and friendly of all cities, and when he bears in mind that the Aborigines were Oenotrians, and these in turn Arcadians (. . .). (*Ant. Rom.* 1.89.1)

Dionysius' portrayal of Roman institutions as essentially Greek, most clearly articulated in the famous Constitution of Romulus (*Ant. Rom.* 2. 3–26), has been challenged and rejected by readers through the centuries; more recently, however, his account has also provoked more positive responses. Dionysius' interpretation of Roman antiquity has received partial support from those historians and archaeologists who have identified Greek elements in the material culture of early Rome. Two millennia after Dionysius published his *Roman Antiquities*, the question 'Was Rome a *polis*?' turns out to be highly topical.³¹ Furthermore, Dionysius' understanding of Rome as a Greek city has – obviously in a strongly modified form – found serious approval in recent scholarship:

Greek culture leaves its mark on Rome at every moment we can document, and the more we learn about archaic Rome, the more we are inclined to accept, even if in a rather different sense, the argument of the Augustan historian, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that Rome was from the first a Greek city.³²

This volume will not enter the debate on the historical (in)accuracy of Dionysius' portrayal of Rome as a Greek city. What matters here is the fact that the complex relationship between Greek and Roman identity deeply informs the *Roman Antiquities*, just as it informs Dionysius' rhetorical works. This raises numerous questions about Dionysius' project. How Roman are the *Roman Antiquities*? For whom does Dionysius write that work: for Greeks, Romans or both? And how would these readers feel about Rome as a Greek city? Does Dionysius' perspective belittle the Romans (whose civilization turns out to be Greek), or does it contribute to the harmony of the *Pax Augusta* by suggesting a peaceful continuity between Greece and Rome? Who is the intended audience of the rhetorical works?³³ Was a student like Metilius Rufus supposed to apply Dionysius' analysis of Greek stylistic composition to his own (first) language, or was he trained to make speeches for audiences in the Greek-speaking parts of the Empire? Can we in fact adequately distinguish between Greeks and Romans in a world that is thoroughly bilingual? How does Dionysius' version of Rome's history differ from the Latin *Ab Urbe Condita* written by

³¹ Ando 1999. ³² Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 25. ³³ On Dionysius' audience, see below.

his contemporary colleague Livy:³⁴ And to what extent do the critical essays and the history of Rome reflect the discourse of Greek and Roman debates on literature at the end of the first century BC? The authors of this volume address many of these questions and formulate their own answers. But before we can begin pondering these and related problems, one aspect of Dionysius' project must be examined more closely, namely its complex relationship to Augustan Rome and Augustus.

Greek Literature of the Augustan Age

When scholars speak of Augustan literature, they are usually thinking of the Latin poetry of Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid.³⁵ In various different ways, the works of these Roman poets respond to the cultural and political reality of the Principate established by Augustus. To what extent might we consider Greek texts of the period to be 'Augustan' as well, and what would it mean for these texts to be called Augustan? In order further to contextualize the works of Dionysius, we single out three contemporary authors, who together with Dionysius may be considered characteristic of the Greek literature of the Augustan Age: Strabo of Amasia, Nicolaus of Damascus and Antipater of Thessalonica.

Strabo of Amasia (ca. 64 BC–AD 24) was born one year before Augustus; though an indefatigable traveler, he also spent many years in Rome.³⁶ His *Geography* includes detailed descriptions of Augustan monuments. Strabo's patron was Gaius Aelius Gallus, the second prefect of Egypt. In Rome he seems to have learnt at least some Latin, while establishing contacts with several members of the Roman elite. Throughout the *Geography* Strabo offers a positive appraisal of Augustus: the *princeps* is depicted as a pious, generous and educated man whose building projects greatly contributed to the beauty of Rome. Strabo also mentions 'Dionysius the historian' (Διονύσιος ὁ συγγραφεύς) as one of the famous men who 'in my time' came from Halicarnassus.³⁷

Nicolaus of Damascus (also born around 64 BC) was a friend of king Herod the Great; as the king's diplomat Nicolaus traveled several times to Rome, where he met Augustus himself. This meeting had consequences,

³⁴ It is debated whether Dionysius knew Livy's work: see below and Oakley in this volume.

³⁵ The four chapters on 'Augustan Literature' in Galinsky 2005a focus on Latin poetry, although Galinsky 2005b, 341–4 includes some comments on Strabo and Nicolaus. Bowersock 1965, 122–39 discusses 'Greek literature under Augustus'.

³⁶ On Strabo and Augustan Rome, see Dueck 2000, 85–106. ³⁷ Strabo 14.2.16, 656C.

for apart from a universal history, an autobiography and a *Life of Herod*, Nicolaus also wrote a *Life of Augustus*.³⁸ The latter document, of which some fragments survive, appears to be based on Augustus' autobiography *De vita sua* – an intriguing example of the interaction between Latin and Greek texts in the Augustan Age. Nicolaus' affinity with classical Greek philosophy and literature appears from the fact that he composed a treatise *On Aristotle's Philosophy* as well as some Greek tragedies and comedies.³⁹ Nicolaus' projects thus covered a variety of genres dealing with both Greek and Roman topics – an intellectual and cultural versatility that he obviously shared with Dionysius. Just like the historian and rhetorician of Halicarnassus, Nicolaus of Damascus is mentioned in the work of their contemporary colleague Strabo.⁴⁰

Antipater of Thessalonica was born around 40 BC.⁴¹ He was a client of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (the Pontifex): this famous general and senator, who was consul in 15 BC, was a protégé of Augustus himself. Antipater dedicated several epigrams to his patron when Piso had put down the revolt of the Bessii in Thrace, a military success for which the Roman statesman was honored with a triumph.⁴² Antipater accompanied his patron to Rome, where he settled to become a teacher of rhetoric, just like Dionysius, if we are allowed to infer this from one epigram in which Antipater refers to the 'endless discourses' of his pupils, for whom he has to leave his bed in the early morning.⁴³ Albin Lesky recognized 'Reflexe der augusteischen Kulturpolitik' in the epigrams of Antipater.⁴⁴ Two themes stand out in his poetry, one related to the Greek past, one rather to the Roman present. On the one hand, many of his epigrams deal with archaic and classical Greek poets like Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, Sappho and Pindar, literary models who also figure prominently in Dionysius' *On Composition* and *On Imitation*. On the other hand, Tim Whitmarsh has demonstrated that patronage is a crucial theme in Antipater's poems, which reveals the close ties between the Greek poet and the Roman elite of the Augustan Age.⁴⁵

In connection with Greek authors of the Augustan period, Bowersock has pointed out that '[i]t would be surprising if these men failed to

³⁸ Fragments in Parmentier and Barone 2011. On Nicolaus, see Bowersock 1965, 134–8.

³⁹ Drossaart Lulofs 1965. ⁴⁰ Strabo 15.1.73, 719C.

⁴¹ A number of his poems have survived in the *Palatine Anthology*. See the edition with commentary by Gow and Page 1968. On Antipater, see Bowersock 1965, 132–3; Gow and Page 1968 vol. 2, 18–20; Whitmarsh 2011, 199–201.

⁴² See esp. Antipater 1 = *Anth. Pal.* 9.428. ⁴³ Antipater 7 = *Anth. Pal.* 5.3. ⁴⁴ Lesky 1971, 907.

⁴⁵ Whitmarsh 2011, 199–201.

encounter one another at Rome'.⁴⁶ We simply do not know, however, whether Dionysius ever met Strabo, Nicolaus or Antipater. But Strabo's references to his colleagues (like Dionysius' reference to Caecilius of Caleacte, see above, p. 8) do make it clear that Greek authors of this period were familiar with works of their Greek colleagues. All these authors were thoroughly Greek, not only in their choice of language, but also in their attitudes towards the literary past. At the same time, they were involved in the social and political circles of Augustan Rome. Dionysius' Roman friends, Quintus Aelius Tubero and the father of Metilius Rufus, were perhaps not as famous as the patrons of Strabo, Nicolaus and Antipater, but they too were members of influential families, who occupied important administrative positions under Augustus. Like Strabo, Nicolaus and Antipater, Dionysius is an 'Augustan' author – not, to be sure, in the sense that he writes Augustan propaganda, but in the sense that his works reflect the political, cultural and intellectual climate of Augustan Rome.

Dionysius and Augustus

Octavian is mentioned only once in Dionysius' oeuvre: the Greek author traveled to Italy 'at the very time that Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war' (ἄμα τῷ καταλυθῆναι τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2). He was not the only one: in the early years of the Principate many intellectuals came to Rome from Greek-speaking areas of the Mediterranean World.⁴⁷ Authors like Strabo, Antipater, Caecilius and Dionysius found employment in the flourishing capital of the Roman world, where there was great interest in the teaching and writings of learned Greek men. Coming from various parts of the Hellenized world, these authors could of course adopt different attitudes towards the political system that was gradually taking shape in the first years of the Principate. To put it very simply, some authors writing in Greek may have been enthusiastic, some critical, and some neutral, nuanced or without a strong opinion; in most cases we just do not know.⁴⁸

As far as serious attention has been given to Dionysius' Augustan context, the scholarly debate has indeed focused on his political orientation, that is, his supposed pro- or anti-Augustan sentiments. This debate

⁴⁶ Bowersock 1965, 124. ⁴⁷ See Hidber 1996, 2–4; De Jonge 2008, 29–33.

⁴⁸ One might compare the attitudes of Timagenes of Alexandria and Nicolaus of Damascus. Timagenes burnt his account of Augustus' deeds after a conflict with the emperor: Bowersock 1965, 125. Nicolaus of Damascus' presentation of Augustus substantially differed from the latter's official self-portrayal: Pausch 2011, 159.

has now a rather old-fashioned ring to it, as also do debates about pro- and anti-Augustan sentiment in Roman poetry, and it has always been conducted with a selective attitude to the evidence. Several passages from the rhetorical treatises and the *Roman Antiquities* have been cited as testimony to Dionysius' political views. On the one hand, Dionysius' praise of the Roman 'leaders' (δυναστεύοντες), who 'administer the state according to the highest principles' (ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τὰ κοινὰ διοικοῦντες, *Orat. Vett.* 3.1), has been interpreted as a pro-Augustan statement.⁴⁹ Even if we suppose that the 'leaders' are not Augustus himself but those influential Roman aristocrats (like the Tiberones and the Metilii) who acted as patrons of Greek culture, it seems undeniable that the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* presents a positive image of Roman administration, which is hailed for sponsoring and facilitating Greek and Latin literature. This appraisal of the Roman present is indeed very different from the pessimistic views that we find in the final chapter of Longinus' *On the Sublime*.⁵⁰ In the *Roman Antiquities*, there are no explicit statements on Augustus' policies, but there are many passages that could be and have been read as indirect comments on the *princeps*, like Dionysius' praise of the *gens Julia*.⁵¹

This house became the greatest and at the same time the most illustrious of any we know of, and produced the most distinguished commanders, whose virtues were so many proofs of their nobility. (*Ant. Rom.* 1.70.4)

Other passages that have been interpreted as indirectly alluding to Augustus include Dionysius' narratives of Evander, Aeneas, Hercules and Romulus, role models who figured prominently in Octavian's discourse of images.⁵² On a more general level, Dionysius' interest in the religious life and morality of the early Romans and his emphasis on virtues like piety, justice and moderation (εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη) have been understood as resonating with the Augustan program of moral reform.⁵³ Although it remains worthwhile to pursue such possible links between past and present, as several authors in this volume will indeed do, scholarship has rightly turned away from the once popular view, mainly based on the influential work of Eduard Schwartz, that Dionysius was

⁴⁹ Bonner 1939, 10: 'He found himself fully in sympathy with Augustus and his ministers'. See also, e.g., Wilamowitz 1900, 45; Kennedy 1972, 352; Luraghi 2003, 275.

⁵⁰ Cf. Heldmann 1982, 122–31, 286–93; De Jonge 2014a.

⁵¹ Luraghi 2003, 275 reads in this passage a clear confirmation of Dionysius' pro-Augustan stance.

⁵² Zanker 1987, 204–13 on Aeneas and Romulus.

⁵³ Luraghi 2003, 275: 'Die Anlehnung an Augustus' restauratorisches Programm ist unübersehbar'. On religious thought in Dionysius, see Mora 1995.

a slavish spokesman of Augustus' propaganda, who 'betrayed' his own Hellenic culture.⁵⁴

Some scholars have pointed to passages that might suggest a more critical stance towards Augustus' reign, on the basis of which Dionysius has even been accounted among the 'opposition' against the regime.⁵⁵ One much cited passage is a chapter of the *Roman Antiquities* in which Dionysius points out that 'the authority of the ancient kings (βασιλέων) was not self-willed (αὐθάδεις) and based on one single judgment (μονογνώμονες) as it is in our days' (οὐχ ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις, 2.12.4). It seems doubtful that Dionysius would describe Augustus as a 'king' of his own time – he might rather be thinking of Mithridates of Pontus and other kings who were conquered by the Romans – but such passages do make it clear that the *Roman Antiquities* should not be read simply as a (very long) pamphlet of Augustan propaganda, as publications of the early twentieth century were inclined to do.

The rhetorical works further complicate the picture, as they clearly celebrate the democracy of classical Athens that produced the eloquence of the Attic orators: Demosthenes was Dionysius' preferred model of oratory,⁵⁶ not only because he was the master of all styles, but also because he was remembered as the fierce defender of Athenian democracy. In other words, when Dionysius expresses his gratitude for the return of the Attic muse in Augustan Rome, he must have hoped that this city would somehow adopt not only the moral and literary, but also the political values that he associated with the Athens of Pericles and Demosthenes. If this surprises us, we should realize that during the early Principate many 'Augustan' phenomena, including the form of government, 'were in a state of nascence and evolution':⁵⁷ Augustan culture was not homogeneous, but extremely dynamic and multifaceted. Dionysius lived and worked in a time of transition, even if we from our modern perspective sometimes tend to

⁵⁴ Schwartz 1903. One citation should be enough to characterize the tone and approach of this highly influential publication (p. 936): 'Sie [the Ἀρχαιολογία = *Roman Antiquities*] ist ein trauriges Dokument dafür, wie tief die geistige Potenz noch mehr als die Bildung der Griechen gesunken war, nachdem die hellenistischen Staaten verfallen waren und ehe der Weltfriede des Kaiserreichs neue Samen hatte reifen lassen'. The influence of Schwartz can still be seen in such publications as Lendle 1992, 242: 'Das Werk des Dionysios ist geprägt von einer völlig unkritischen, auf Kosten des Griechenlands gehenden Bewunderung für Rom'. On Schwartz's position, see also Fox in this volume.

⁵⁵ Egger 1902, 12; Marin 1956, 183 (the latter wrongly attributes the treatise *On the Sublime* to Dion. Hal.); Hurst 1982, 855–6. See also Hill 1961, 131 n. 3, who argues that Dionysius opposes the regime by departing from the 'official' version of Rome's early history as represented by Virgil's *Aeneid*. For a comparison of Virgil and Dionysius on the origins of Rome, see Fox in this volume.

⁵⁶ Cf. Yunis in this volume. ⁵⁷ Galinsky 1996, 8.

assume that 'Augustan Rome' had a clear-cut and stable character. Nor, of course, should we make the mistake of believing that Augustus himself directly or indirectly determined everything that was done or written in Rome.

Dionysius' perspective on Augustan Rome, in short, was necessarily complex and allusive.⁵⁸ What is certain is that Dionysius was deeply interested in Rome, its organization and its history; and it seems quite clear that upon his arrival in that city he was generally happy with the ways in which rhetorical and literary writing flourished under Roman administration. His focus on classical Athenian exempla of eloquence elegantly tied in with the Augustan interest in classical Greek culture (sculpture, architecture, literature) and also with what has been called Augustus' 're-Hellenisation' of the east.⁵⁹

Several contributions in this volume are concerned with passages of the *Roman Antiquities* (on political organization, regime change, tyranny, the treatment of women) that seem to resonate with events in Rome during the first century BC.⁶⁰ Such readings exploit, whether explicitly or implicitly, the idea that Dionysius' contemporary readers in Rome may have drawn connections between the earliest stages of Roman history, as described by Dionysius, and their own time. A strong argument in favor of such interpretations is provided by Dionysius himself, who frequently invites his readers to connect the past and the present: he talks about sacrifices 'which the Romans performed even in my time' (*Ant. Rom.* 1.32.5), reports about 'the things that I myself know by having seen them' (1.68.1) and describes the hut of Romulus, which 'remained even to my day on the Palatine hill' (1.79.11). The connection between past and present is however not only one of continuity, but also one of contrast and development, as Dionysius makes clear when contrasting the village of Pallantium with the city of Rome into which it would evolve in the course of centuries:⁶¹

Yet this village was ordained by fate to excel in the course of time all other cities, whether Greek or barbarian, not only in size, but also in the majesty of

⁵⁸ See Wiater 2011a, 8–18, who offers a nuanced approach to Dionysius as 'Augustan' author.

⁵⁹ Spawforth 2012.

⁶⁰ A similar approach in Luraghi 2003, 281, who argues that Dionysius' portrayal of the distant past contains a clear 'message' for the Romans of the Augustan Age: during the civil wars of the first century BC they have alienated themselves from their Hellenic identity. Dionysius tells his Roman readers to return to their virtuous Greek roots. See also Peirano 2010, who argues that the (fragmentary) concluding books of the *Roman Antiquities*, dealing with the Pyrrhic War, warn the readers that 'the moral supremacy the Romans have acquired by remaining true to their Greek heritage is under threat' (p. 51).

⁶¹ Cf. Fox in this volume.

its empire and in every other form of prosperity, and to be celebrated above them all as long as mortality shall endure. (*Ant. Rom.* 1.31.3)

The opposition between Greek and barbarian evoked here draws our attention to Dionysius' Hellenocentrism: the world is still divided into Greeks and barbarians, as it was for Herodotus and Isocrates; the Romans are simply included among the Greeks. For Dionysius, Rome is in fact more Greek than any other city of his time, even if the moral Greekness of the Romans is at times under threat, as in the Pyrrhic War described in the concluding books of the *Roman Antiquities*.⁶² All of Dionysius' works seek to demonstrate that the wonderful fruits of Greek civilization – rhetorical, literary, cultural and political – will continue to flourish, as long as Rome will continue to support the project of Dionysius and his community.

Dionysian Criticism

As a critic and theorist of poetry and rhetoric, Dionysius' stock has certainly fluctuated in the course of the last generations, despite (or perhaps because of) the very sizeable body of his criticism which survives.⁶³ At the beginning of the last century, W. Rhys Roberts, perhaps Dionysius' greatest champion, made plain that the virtues which he found in Dionysius were solid 'Victorian' ones, which might well be thought unfashionable in our postmodern age: Dionysius helps 'to confirm our belief in the essential continuity of critical principles – in the existence of a firm and permanent basis for the judgments of taste' and he is, moreover, 'no frivolous dabbler or dilettante (such as the many who have made literary criticism a byword for superficiality), but he believes in serious, prolonged, and fortifying literary-historical studies'.⁶⁴ Roberts (and he certainly was not alone) took at face value Dionysius' claims (notably in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* and in *On Composition*) about 'the debased standards of the ages immediately preceding his own', standards which he wished to replace with 'a classic excellence'.⁶⁵ Although we now no longer share Dionysius'

⁶² Peirano 2010.

⁶³ For a brief survey of his (poor) standing in nineteenth and early twentieth-century German scholarship, cf. De Jonge 2008, 4–5.

⁶⁴ Roberts 1901, 49; Roberts 1910, vii.

⁶⁵ Roberts 1910, vii. In the same preface Roberts has a (now) amusing reflection on the excitement being generated at that time by the papyrological revolution: if *On Composition* had 'lately been discovered in the sands of Egypt or in some buried house at Herculaneum', it is not just the citations of Sappho, Simonides, etc. which would have caused excitement; 'it would be gladly acknowledged that its skilful author had known how to enliven a difficult subject by means of eloquence, enthusiasm, humour, variety in vocabulary and in method of presentation generally (. . .)'.

classicizing and judgmental view of the history of Greek rhetoric, his confidence in a contemporary resurgence remains a matter of the greatest importance, as it offers a clear point of intersection between his criticism and the Augustan political and moral program,⁶⁶ a program which is crucial to an understanding, not just of the *Roman Antiquities*, but also of Dionysius' critical essays.

The current renewal of interest in Dionysius' criticism may be traced to several causes. In the first place, 'rhetoric' is no longer a dirty word. Some thirty years after Rhys Roberts, Stanley Bonner, in what was in some ways a groundbreaking study of the chronology and presuppositions of the critical treatises, was no less quick than Dionysius himself to award praise and blame, and for Bonner there was no doubt where the blame for what he perceived to be Dionysius' faults lay: Dionysius was a victim of 'the singular lack of mental elasticity which was so peculiar a product of the rhetorical training'.⁶⁷ Humane studies now approach the nature and purposes of systematized ancient rhetoric rather more sympathetically than did Bonner. The renaissance in the last decades of 'rhetoric' as an academic discipline has often been charted, and Dionysius has, to some extent, shared in this renewed interest. Various strands of this new attention may be teased out. First of all, an interest in the techniques and theorization of persuasion has naturally brought new focus on Dionysius' essays on the orators of classical Athens, for no comparable ancient comparative study exists. It is not simply that Dionysius' repeated concern with questions of authenticity – 'is this a genuine speech of Lysias or not?' – foreshadows a particular concern of modern philology, but rather that Dionysius is now seen as a kind of prism reflecting several important ancient debates. As a Greek critic writing in Rome under Augustus, Dionysius is, after Cicero, our best evidence for the form in which Greek rhetorical theory reached Rome; as, moreover, it is much more likely than not that Dionysius himself was familiar with some at least of Cicero's rhetorical works,⁶⁸ Dionysius is a key witness not just for the Greek side of the Augustan intellectual milieu, but for the two-way interchange between Greek and Latin theorizing and literature from the late Republic onwards which modern scholarship is coming more and more to appreciate.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Cf. already Bonner 1939, 10. ⁶⁷ Bonner 1939, 72.

⁶⁸ For the relevant texts and bibliography, cf., e.g., Calboli 1987, 47; Fromentin 1998, xix; De Jonge 2008, 14–15, 214–16; see further below pp. 25, 261–3. Steven Ooms (Leiden University) is currently preparing a PhD thesis on the connections between the stylistic theories of Cicero and Dionysius.

⁶⁹ On Dionysius and Horace, see De Jonge in this volume.

Dionysius and Cicero travel together in another way also, as they are respectively our best witnesses to the Greek and Roman ‘Atticist’ rhetorical movements, both of which, though to different degrees,⁷⁰ seem to have constructed an ‘other’, so-called ‘Asian’, rhetoric as a term for stylistic features of which they disapproved. Although the precise connection between the two movements remains unclear,⁷¹ a shared stylistic terminology, shared admiration – more tempered in the case of the Greek Atticists – for the ‘slender’ qualities of Lysias, and a shared identification of Hegesias, a historian of Alexander and rhetorician of the late fourth / early third centuries, as the ‘founder’ and poster-boy of the hated ‘Asianism’ show the close connection between them.⁷² In his *Brutus* and *Orator* (46 BC), Cicero was forced to defend himself against the attacks of C. Licinius Calvus and his fellow *Attici*, who aspired to write in the clear and unadorned style of Lysias and Hyperides. Dionysius likewise hails ‘the Attic muse’ in his preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, and devotes one treatise to Lysias. In these respects, his interests echo the concerns of the Roman *Attici* of the previous generation; his flexible version of Atticism, however, with separate treatises also on Isocrates, Isaeus and Demosthenes, reminds us rather of Cicero’s inclusive openness to various Attic models with different styles, and his privileging of Demosthenes as the champion who masters all those registers. As with Livy and Dionysius, scholars are nowadays more ready than in the past to accept Ciceronian influence on Dionysius.

For Dionysius, Atticism also serves a larger agenda, namely that of a classicism which sees in the new world order established by Rome a revival of ‘classical’ Greek cultural values, and not merely rhetorical styles;⁷³ these values were to be found, above all, in the πολιτικοὶ λόγοι and φιλοσοφία of Isocrates. Rhetorical style and political ideology are always intertwined: Augustus himself, who was known for his clear and

⁷⁰ Passages such as Cicero, *Brutus* 325 show that Roman theorists could use ‘Asian’ to describe particular types of style, without that term being inherently pejorative.

⁷¹ For a survey and bibliography, cf. Wisse 1995; De Jonge 2008, 11–14; Wiater 2011, 113–14; Lucarini 2015; Yunis in this volume.

⁷² For Dionysius’ distaste for Hegesias, cf. *Comp.* 4.11, 18.21–8; it is usually thought, and probably rightly so, that Dionysius also has Hegesias in mind in his attack on ‘Asian’ rhetoric in the Preface to *Orat. Vett.*; he traces its origins to the period after death of Alexander, and that would certainly fit Hegesias. Hegesias’ style comes in for some strong criticism in our earliest witness, Agatharchides of Cnidus (probably late second century), cf. *FGrH* 142 T3, but there is no suggestion there of the language of Asianism which we encounter in Cicero (cf. *Brutus* 286–7, *Orator* 226), Dionysius and Strabo 14.1.41, though Lucarini 2015, 21–2 suggests that there is no other reason for this persistent and early interest in Hegesias. On Hegesias’ style, cf. Norden 1898, vol. 1, 133–9; Russell 1964 on ‘Longinus’, *On the Sublime* 3.2; Calboli 1987.

⁷³ Wiater 2011a is the fullest exposition of Dionysius’ classicism.

unadorned style of writing, seems to have affiliated himself with the supporters of Atticism – possibly under the influence of his teacher Apollodorus of Pergamon. According to Suetonius, Octavian reproached Marcus Antonius for his inconsistent style, which swung between the extremes of obscure archaism and ‘the verbose and unmeaning fluency of the Asiatic orators’ (*Asiaticorum oratorum inanis sententiis uerborum uolubilitas*): Suetonius’ report of the polemic resonates with Dionysius’ vivid portrayal of the contest between the Attic muse and the Asian harlot.⁷⁴

One aspect of this classicism is the persistent manner in which Dionysius retrojects his own interests and indeed critical presuppositions back onto poets and prose-writers of the ‘classical’ age, that is, before the death of Alexander.⁷⁵ A striking illustration may be drawn from *On Composition*:

Virtually all of the ancient writers (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι) gave considerable attention⁷⁶ to [word-order], so that their metres, their lyrics and their prose-works are things of beauty. With a few exceptions, the same is not true for their successors (οἱ μεταγενέστεροι), and as time passed it became completely neglected and no one thought that this matter was essential or that it contributed anything to the beauty of discourse. (*Comp.* 4.14)⁷⁷

‘Classical’ writers, whether poets or prose-writers, philosophers or orators (*Comp.* 5.12), were in fact surprisingly like Dionysius himself: they had a τέχνη of good composition and followed rules (θεωρήματα) which meant that they left nothing to chance, whether at the level of the word, colon or period. Dionysius is therefore not imposing a system upon them, so much as simply, to the best of his ability (*Comp.* 5.13), describing their own system, one of which they were fully conscious. As for later writers, although Dionysius proceeds to a catalogue of those ‘whom no one could bear to read to the very end’, it is Chrysippus (*Comp.* 4.17–21), as (in part) a representative of a philosophical theorizing about language and (in part) a notoriously bad stylist, who is then singled out as offering, as it were, a reversed mirror-image of Dionysius, namely a theorist (though not

⁷⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 86. See De Jonge in this volume.

⁷⁵ One perhaps paradoxical result of this classicism is that Thucydides can be praised for following some of Dionysius’ precepts and criticized for failing to follow others, cf. Hunter in this volume. Dionysius’ assumptions about earlier writers are not, of course, unique to him; very many examples of this attitude could, for example, be selected from ‘Demetrius’, *On Style*.

⁷⁶ The transmitted ἐπίδοσις is (pace Wiater 2011, 236 n. 611) hard to understand; Sylburg’s ἐπιτήδευσις gives excellent sense, though the corruption seems hard to explain. Dionysius’ recapitulation in *Comp.* 5.12, which looks like a variation upon *Comp.* 4.14, suggests that the required word will have been a synonym for πρόνοια.

⁷⁷ Our translation. For further discussion of this passage, cf. Wiater 2011a, 235–9; Kim 2014, 363–4.

of the right theory)⁷⁸ and someone with no concern for the style of his own writings, and – of course – a figure of the postclassical age (third century BC).

It is easy to accuse Dionysius here of an ahistorical circularity, particularly as he is notoriously vague on the detail of the virtues of classical writers, frequently appealing to what should be obvious to any person of proper literary sensitivity;⁷⁹ thus, for example, anyone ‘with a moderate literary sensibility’ will accept his classification of the opening of one of Pindar’s dithyrambs (fr. 75 Maehler = *Comp.* 22.12) as belonging to the ‘austere’ style and his description of the aesthetic effects of that passage, although the detailed analysis of the sound effects of the passage which follows is clearly also designed as a display of critical τέχνη which very few of Dionysius’ contemporaries could match. To dissent from Dionysius, in other words, is to display one’s own ignorance. In the case of what is perhaps his most famous citation, that of Sappho fr. 1 (*Comp.* 23.11–17), Dionysius offers an explicitly brief and incomplete account of the poem, which his young addressee and ‘everyone else’ will have ‘ample opportunity and leisure’ to expand upon by following Dionysius’ outline analysis; Dionysius has no space for a full account, so he is content simply to set out his views ‘sufficiently for those who will be able to follow me’. Throughout Dionysius’ critical essays, these two voices – that of the teacher instructing his pupils and that of the educated πεπαιδευμένος speaking with his equals – mingle to create a very particular version of the rhetoric of community and shared values. As the critical ideas and doctrines are themselves manifestations of those values, which are assumed to be inherent in the class of people to whom Dionysius addresses himself, Dionysius cannot just offer ‘instruction’ in areas alleged to be unknown to his audience; rather, he must draw to the surface that which was already (at some level) familiar to his audience, or so that audience must believe. We may perhaps liken Dionysius’ critical procedure to a version of Platonic ἀνάμνησις, however unlike Dionysius and the Platonic Socrates may be.

Many of Dionysius’ attitudes, just as some of his characteristic metaphors and images for style, were not his alone, but were inherited or developed from a very long tradition. Thus, for example, his attitude to the ‘ignoble and feminised’ rhythms of a Hegesias (*Comp.* 4.11) lies in a line of descent from Attic comedy’s mocking attitude to the ‘broken and

⁷⁸ On Dionysius’ actual debt to the Stoics, see esp. De Jonge 2008, esp. 36–7, 273–314.

⁷⁹ Cf., e.g., Damon 1991; Hunter in this volume.

feminised' rhythms of the 'New Music'; appropriately enough, elements of Dionysius' classicism do indeed go back to the 'classical' period, just as Aristophanes' *Frogs* has long been recognized as a central 'classicizing' text. Dionysius' criticism is in fact a remarkable blend of the traditional and what might seem very new indeed; Plato and Aristotle have both made major contributions, but so also have lesser names of whom we know much less and that only by chance.⁸⁰

We are now in a better position than was W. Rhys Roberts to judge where Dionysius stands with regard to 'the debased standards of the ages immediately preceding his own'. Our evidence for Hellenistic oratory has to some extent increased since his day, thanks to the steady flow of new (often, of course, very fragmentary) epigraphic texts, and appreciation of what inscriptions have to teach us in these areas has grown significantly, as part of a more general (and very welcome) collapsing of boundaries in classical studies between types of textual evidence.⁸¹ More striking than advances in the field of oratory is the very significant growth in knowledge of Hellenistic poetic and rhetorical criticism, both through the very detailed work which has been devoted to the Peripatetic and other sources of Horace's *Ars Poetica*,⁸² and through the decipherment and publication of further significant texts from the critical works of Philodemus (110–35 BC), preserved on the charred papyrus rolls of Herculaneum. This material, which is very difficult to decipher and interpret, nevertheless offers a glimpse of critics of the third and perhaps also early second centuries, now standardly referred to as οἱ κριτικοί, from Philodemus' designation of them in several of these texts, who – in varying degrees and with varying nuances – placed high store on euphony in poetry and who shared with Dionysius later such fundamental frameworks of analysis as the opposition between diction (ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων) and word-arrangement (σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων) and techniques of analysis such as *metathesis*.⁸³ Dionysius' particular concerns in *On Composition* are now much more clearly contextualized for us, though new questions inevitably arise. Philodemus seems to owe his knowledge of this body of criticism to the work of the Stoic Crates of Mallos (mid-second century BC), and as Dionysius never

⁸⁰ A recent account of some of the central issues in Dionysius' criticism can be found in Porter 2016, 213–45.

⁸¹ On Hellenistic oratory, see Kremmydas and Tempest 2013, with a contribution by Edwards 2013 on Dionysius' *On Isaëus*.

⁸² The work of Brink 1963–1971 is obviously crucial here.

⁸³ Cf., e.g., Janko 2000, 227; Janko 2000 is fundamental to this whole area. For a brief survey and bibliography of the κριτικοί, cf. de Jonge 2008, 37–40, 193–6. See also below, pp. 25–6.

names any of the κριτικοί whose names we happen to know from Philodemus, it remains very difficult to interpret apparent parallels between this body of criticism and Dionysius' works. We can, however, see more clearly than ever before that there *is* a Hellenistic context for Dionysius' criticism (particularly for *On Composition*), although we still lack the evidence which would allow us to construct a coherent picture out of the fragmentary pieces which have survived. It is this tantalising interplay between this still shadowy Hellenistic background and the much better illuminated Augustan intellectual milieu which is central to the essays on Dionysius' criticism in this volume.

Dionysius makes another call on our attention as a critic, and this arises simply from the very number of passages, often surprisingly lengthy, of both prose and poetry which he cites and discusses. Modern attention tends, unsurprisingly, to focus on his citations of, in particular, Sappho and Pindar, which preserve for us poems (or parts of poems) which would otherwise be lost, but Dionysius' role as a critic of prose texts, discussed by several contributors to this volume, is in many ways more important when viewed within the longer history of critical practice. In particular, Dionysius' transference to the realm of prose of the comparative method of criticism (a practice explicitly defended in *Letter to Pompeius* 1), long familiar for poetry (cf., e.g., Aristophanes, *Frogs*), marks for us an important step forward in critical practice, though it will hardly have been original to him. When it comes, however, to the actual discussion of texts from the past – what we think of as 'literary criticism' – Dionysius' practice can sometimes surprise and, it must be admitted, disappoint. It is hard for us now to imagine that someone would feel, for example, that what really matters in Sappho fr. 1 is the number of conjunctions of semivowels with voiceless consonants (*Comp.* 23.10–17); in some of Dionysius' best known criticism, it may be felt that there is a remarkable divorce of any consideration of subject-matter from that of style, particularly in comparison to, say, the essay of 'Demetrius', *On Style*. In *On Composition*, however, Dionysius chooses to focus very exclusively upon (precisely) 'composition', σύνθεσις, in part as a result of his much heralded claim that the nature of this work is all but entirely novel (*Comp.* 4.19–23); to deviate into other areas would have been to diminish the novel achievement. The ancient practice of seeing 'composition' as separate from both diction and 'thought' here produces what might appear to us a strangely unbalanced form of criticism. It is clear, however, particularly from the rich imagery with which he describes the style of Plato and the fourth-century orators, that Dionysius was indeed well aware of the linkage

between subject and style.⁸⁴ The very differences between the scope of *On Composition* and the individual treatises dedicated to the Attic orators and to Thucydides are instructive as to the frameworks within which rhetorical critics, both Greek and Latin, operated.

Dionysius and Augustan Rome: This Volume

The words ‘Augustan Rome’ in the title of this volume should be understood in their broadest sense. Augustan Rome here refers not just to the politics of Augustus, but also to the social, intellectual, literary and cultural reality in which Dionysius developed and presented his dual project of rhetorical criticism and historiography. In the past, many studies have ignored this important synchronic dimension of his works, looking at Dionysius’ contributions from an exclusively diachronic (and Greek) perspective: such studies typically focus on Dionysius’ relationship to earlier Greek scholars and critics, like Theophrastus, Aristoxenus and Chrysippus, and on his reception of earlier historians, like Herodotus, Polybius and Fabius Pictor, rather than on the connections with contemporary authors, patrons, politicians, students and readers in Rome.⁸⁵

This volume takes the Roman context of Dionysius’ project seriously and draws attention to the complex interactions of his history and rhetorical criticism with the political, historiographical, rhetorical and literary discourse at Rome.⁸⁶ The volume consists of three parts: (1) Dionysius and Augustan Rhetoric and Literary Criticism, (2) Dionysius and Augustan Historiography, and (3) Dionysius and Augustan Rome. Below, we will illuminate Dionysius’ position within each of these three contexts and prepare the ground for the chapters of this volume. The close connections between the three parts will be clear from the chapters themselves, but also from the ‘envoi’ by Joy Connolly, who draws special attention to Dionysius’ status as a ‘migrant thinker’ and how this impacts on the issues raised throughout the book.

1. *Dionysius and Augustan Rhetoric and Literary Criticism*

Rhetorical teaching flourished at Rome in the first century BC. The most famous Greek rhetoricians of the period were Apollonius Molon, the

⁸⁴ On the imagery of Dionysius’ stylistic discussions, cf. Hunter 2012, 151–84; Worman 2015, 282–93.

⁸⁵ E.g., Bonner 1939, Pohl 1968, Fornaro 1997.

⁸⁶ Although some publications on Dionysius have ‘Augustus’ or ‘Augustan Rome’ in their title (e.g., Egger 1902, Hurst 1982), they hardly address the Roman context of Dionysius’ works.

teacher of Caesar and Cicero, who visited Rome twice as an ambassador from Rhodes, Dionysius' friend Caecilius of Caleacte (mentioned above), Apollodorus of Pergamon, the teacher of Octavian, and Theodorus of Gadara, the teacher of Tiberius. Quintilian mentions in one breath these four names and that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which suggests that he thought of Dionysius as playing in the same league.⁸⁷ There were also Latin rhetoricians, the successors of Lucius Plotius Gallus, who had opened his school in 93 BC. All these rhetoricians taught in the shadow of the great Cicero (106–43 BC), who was soon 'to be regarded as the name, not of a person, but of eloquence itself',⁸⁸ and although Dionysius never mentions the name of Cicero, it seems almost unthinkable that one could teach students in Rome (like Metilius Rufus) without being familiar with the great Republican orator's contributions to the practice and theory of rhetoric.⁸⁹

For Dionysius, the criticism of literature and rhetorical theory were inseparable aspects of one discipline: with his critical analyses of classical Greek prose and poetry (cf. above p. 17–24) he intended to guide his contemporary readers and students in the composition of new texts. In Rome, literary criticism was practiced by rhetoricians, but also by grammarians, philosophers and poets. In the Augustan Age, the interests of Caecilius of Caleacte were especially close to the concerns of Dionysius: Caecilius published many works, including *On the Style of the Ten Orators*, *On the Sublime*, an Atticizing pamphlet *Against the Phrygians* and a treatise *On Figures* that draws on the speeches of Demosthenes.⁹⁰ In this context (Pseudo-)Longinus should also be mentioned, as some scholars have argued that the extant treatise *On the Sublime*, attributed to 'Dionysius (or) Longinus', should be dated to the Augustan period.⁹¹

It is in many cases difficult to establish the precise connections between Greek literary criticism and contemporary Latin literature, but there is one important exception: the Epicurean philosopher, rhetorician, scholar and poet Philodemus (mentioned above), who came to Italy around 80 BC, embodies one link between Greek criticism and Latin poetry. In some respects, Philodemus' social and intellectual position foreshadows that of Dionysius, who would arrive in Rome fifty years later. A friend of Lucius

⁸⁷ Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.16–18. For the fragments of Apollodorus and Theodorus, see Woerther 2013.

⁸⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.112.

⁸⁹ Caecilius T6 Woerther (Plutarch, *Demosth.* 3.1–2) and Longinus, *Subl.* 12.4–5 compare Demosthenes and Cicero. On Cicero and Dionysius, see Fromentin 1998, xix; De Jonge 2008, 14–15, 214–16; above p. 18.

⁹⁰ Innes 2002, Woerther 2015.

⁹¹ E.g., Mazzucchi 2010. On Dionysius and Longinus, see De Jonge 2012.

Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, Philodemus was admired by Cicero, and connected to several famous writers of Latin poetry: Virgil, Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus and Quintilius Varus were among the addressees of his works; and most probably he knew Horace as well (see De Jonge in this volume). The carbonized fragments of Philodemus' works, which survived in the library of the Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum, continue to be examined, as new technologies provide access to the damaged papyrus scrolls. Recent scholarship has explored Philodemus' influence on the Augustan poets, especially on Virgil and Horace.⁹² But the fragments of his *On Poems* also cast light on critical theories that were available and circulating in Rome in the first century BC,⁹³ and, as we have seen (above p. 22), this new material has greatly enriched our sense of the intellectual context of Dionysius' criticism. Several authors in this volume (Hunter, De Jonge, Viidebaum) reflect on the connections among Philodemus, the κριτικοί and Dionysius.

Richard Hunter, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Idea of the Critic' (chapter 1), offers an introduction to Dionysius as a literary critic, focusing on the treatise *On Thucydides*. Hunter examines the assumptions underlying Dionysian criticism, including the important concepts of προαίρεσις (an author's 'project') and δύναμις (his capacity); he shows that many of Dionysius' aesthetic categories have a moral flavor, which ties in with the ethical aspects of his project (for which cf. the contributions of Schultze and De Jonge). One defining aspect of Dionysian criticism, indeed, is a multifaceted continuity between classical Athens and Augustan Rome, which are presented as sharing similar ethical and aesthetic values.

This constructed continuity is also on show in Nicolas Wiater's 'Experiencing the Past: Language, Time and Historical Consciousness in Dionysian Criticism' (chapter 2). Classicism is often summarized simply as a nostalgic desire for the classical Greek past, but Wiater proposes a distinction between two versions of the past in Dionysius' thinking: on the one hand, the ideal past ('a structure of feelings'); on the other hand, the historical past. Dionysius is not so much interested in the latter version of the past, that is, the historical, cultural and political contexts in which Lysias, Demosthenes and Thucydides actually wrote and lived. His fascination is rather with the idealized past that he constructs in his reading of the classical texts and presents as the model for Augustan Rome. Dionysius wants his readers to have a direct, immediate experience of this idealized

⁹² Armstrong, Fish, Johnston, Skinner 2004. See also De Jonge in this volume.

⁹³ Porter 1995, Janko 2000.

classical past. The speeches in the *Roman Antiquities* function as models for the political practice of his readers and students. The technique of rewriting texts (μετάθεσις), Wiater argues, enables Dionysius and his readers to engage directly with classical texts and thus to construct the idealized image of the past that is to inspire the present.

Two contributors to this volume ask how the rhetorical role models of Attic oratory discussed by Dionysius were relevant to the Roman context in which he was writing. Harvey Yunis, 'Dionysius' Demosthenes and Augustan Atticism' (chapter 3), examines the rhetorical and critical backgrounds of Dionysius' *On Demosthenes* and its celebration of Demosthenes as the champion of stylistic writing. He reviews what we know about Roman and Greek Atticism, examines some of the assumptions underlying postclassical stylistic theory and focuses on the theory of three styles, different versions of which appear in three rhetorical treatises of the first century BC: the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero's *Orator* and Dionysius' *On Demosthenes*. In his analysis of Demosthenes' style, Dionysius applies the insights of his theory of composition, including the distinction of pleasure (ἡδονή) and beauty (καλόν), but Dionysius' *On Demosthenes* is especially successful, Yunis argues, in asserting the interdependence of stylistic, aesthetic and political values: Demosthenes stands not only for the limit of stylistic possibilities, but also for what active citizens can achieve within society. On this reading, *On Demosthenes* is a vital witness to the links between classical Greece and contemporary Rome.

Laura Viidebaum, 'Dionysius and Lysias' Charm' (chapter 4), examines why Dionysius and his audience felt so attracted to the 'simple' style of Lysias. Like the Roman Atticists before him, Dionysius obviously admired the linguistic purity and clarity of Lysias' speeches, as the early treatise *On Lysias* testifies, but the real secret of the Attic orator's style lay for him in the notion of χάρις (charm). Viidebaum investigates the connotations that this term had acquired through its use in classical poetry, and shows how the term was used before Dionysius in the criticism of poetry on show in Philodemus' *On Poems*. The concept of 'instinctive' (or 'irrational') feeling (ἄλογος αἴσθησις), which plays an important role in Dionysius' critical essays (see also Hunter in this volume), casts light on his admiration of Lysias' charm. Viidebaum argues that the elusive quality of χάρις, with its connotations of wit and enchanting simplicity, had a special appeal to young Roman students. In the speeches of Lysias one could find all the (stylistic and civic) virtues that a Roman audience of the time would appreciate. In devoting his first treatise to precisely this Attic orator,

Dionysius thus seems to have aimed to bridge the gap between classical Athens and Augustan Rome.

2. *Dionysius and Augustan Historiography*

Dionysius mentions several of his colleagues in historiography at Rome, including Varro (116–27 BC) and Quintus Aelius Tubero (see above, pp. 7–8). The one author whom he does not mention is his exact contemporary Titus Livius (59 BC–AD 17), who treated the early history of Rome in his *Arb Urbe Condita*. Of Livy's 142 books only 35 are extant (1–10 and 21–45). He probably started writing before 31 BC and published the first pentad, covering Roman history down to 390 BC, between 27 and 25 BC; the second pentad, covering the period up to 293 BC, was published before 23 BC.⁹⁴ It is chronologically possible, then, that Dionysius, whose history ran down to 264 BC, had read Livy's treatment of the origins of Rome when he published the first part of his *Roman Antiquities* in 8/7 BC – and this is indeed the view adopted by Oakley in this volume.⁹⁵ Whereas it was once assumed that everything is Greek before it becomes Roman, it is nowadays rightly accepted that the Greeks were also 'heirs' of the Romans.⁹⁶ Dionysius may have studied Livy, and he may have read Cicero, as well.⁹⁷

Comparisons between Dionysius and Livy are not rare in previous scholarship, which has examined various differences between the two authors and their treatment of the same material.⁹⁸ But in the past such comparisons have too often started from the (implicit) assumption that Livy was a much better historian than Dionysius: differences between their historical narratives have in many cases been explained as confirming the superiority of the Latin historian.⁹⁹ A more valuable approach is to ask how the differences between the two versions of early Rome are related to the aims and methods of their authors, their intended audiences and their cultural backgrounds. One major difference between Dionysius and Livy, commented upon by several authors in this volume (Pelling, Oakley,

⁹⁴ Luce 1965.

⁹⁵ See the discussion in Schwartz 1903, 946. Cary 1937, xvii rules out Livy as one of Dionysius' sources.

⁹⁶ On the Greeks as heirs of the Romans, see Schubert, Ducrey, Derron 2013.

⁹⁷ Virgil's *Aeneid* offers yet another Augustan version of the origins of Rome: for a comparison between Virgil and Dionysius, see Fox in this volume.

⁹⁸ See, e.g., Schwartz 1903, 946–60. Fromentin 2003 and Oakley 2010 provide more recent case studies.

⁹⁹ See, e.g., Schwartz 1903, 946; Cary 1937, xix–xx: 'The dignified restraint shown by Livy in relating these same events is far more impressive'.

Schultze), is the extraordinary length and attention to detail that characterizes the Greek account. Earlier commentators and translators complained about Dionysius' 'tiresome speeches' and his 'cumulation of pathetic or gruesome details'.¹⁰⁰

In this volume, Stephen Oakley, 'The Expansive Scale of the *Roman Antiquities*' (chapter 5), takes a fresh look at Dionysius' fondness for detail. He shows that Dionysius' theoretical observations on historiography in the rhetorical-critical essays help us to understand why Dionysius wished his history of Rome to be so lengthy and detailed; he argues that the expansiveness of the *Roman Antiquities* depended on the material that Dionysius found in the Roman annalistic tradition; and he demonstrates that the difference between Dionysius' expansiveness and Livy's relative brevity is closely related to the reception that the authors expected for their works.

Clemence Schultze, 'Ways of Killing Women: Dionysius on the Deaths of Horatia and Lucretia' (chapter 6), analyzes two stories of the *Roman Antiquities* that feature female characters. Horatia is killed by her brother, because she has disgraced her family by openly expressing grief for her beloved cousin, the slain Curiatius; Lucretia commits suicide after having been raped by Sextus Tarquinius. Schultze explains how Dionysius' framing of the narratives resonates with the moral legislation of Augustus (18 BC), which aimed at securing family morality. The connection between past and present becomes even more suggestive when we realize that Dionysius elsewhere presents the proper interaction with women as a central element of Romulus' legislation. Again, the emphasis on decent family values need not be Augustan in the sense that Dionysius 'presents' the views or the moral program of Augustus himself; but the prominence of such themes does suggest that Dionysius' text interacts with the contemporary discourse of civic morality, which leaves its marks in various texts and documents of the Augustan period. Schultze also shows how Dionysius' criticism of Herodotus and Thucydides in the rhetorical works helps us to understand the choices that he as a historian makes in narrating the stories of Horatia and Lucretia.

Matthew Fox, 'The Prehistory of the Roman *polis* in Dionysius' (chapter 7), asks what Dionysius' discussion of the earliest stages of Roman history tells us about his political orientation. He observes that Dionysius focuses on details, emphasizes the difficulties of the conflicting sources and keeps involving his readers in the evaluation of those sources. His examination of the source material and his insistence on variant versions, which reminds us

¹⁰⁰ Cary 1937, xix–xx.

of the method of his fellow-townsmen Herodotus, show that Dionysius is a critical historian, who is indeed far removed from being a propagandist of either (classical) Greece or (Augustan) Rome. Dionysius' emphasis on the complexity of the source material mirrors the complexity of his own attitude towards Rome.

3. *Dionysius and Augustan Rome*

The third part of this volume further explores the ways in which both Dionysius' historiography and his critical essays relate to the Roman world of Augustus. Attention is drawn to those political and intellectual dimensions of his works that suggest connections and interactions with the Roman context in which they were written. Above we have suggested various different ways in which Dionysius' works may be seen to respond to the political reality of Augustan Rome. Turning away from simplified readings of Dionysius as either a spokesman of Augustus or a voice of the 'opposition', two contributors ask how different elements of Dionysius' history of early Rome might resonate with the events and developments of the late Republic and early Principate.

Christopher Pelling, 'Dionysius on Regime Change' (chapter 8), examines the interpretation of constitutional shifts in the *Roman Antiquities*, focusing on the transition from the regal period to the Republic. The continuity that Dionysius suggests between those periods, as Pelling observes, might well remind his audience of the Augustan claims for continuity between Republic and Principate. In Dionysius' descriptions of regime change Pelling detects various themes with an 'Augustan ring', but he also warns that such resonances can often be interpreted equally as criticism and as praise of the Principate. Furthermore, he raises the important question whether Dionysius' history of Rome as a whole suggested the same tripartite pattern that is characteristic of his history of rhetorical writing (presented in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*), that is, a model of a glorious beginning, a period of decline and a revival in the (Augustan) present.

Daniel Hogg, 'How Roman Are the *Antiquities*? The Decemvirate according to Dionysius' (chapter 9), focuses on a fascinating episode in Roman history, which is narrated by both Dionysius and Livy (*Ant. Rom.* 10.54–11.44; Livy 3.33–49). The decemvirate was the board of ten Roman men who codified Roman law, but who turned tyrannical and were then expelled in 449 BC. Hogg's comparison of the two accounts, one in Greek and one in Latin, reveals what is typical and characteristic of Dionysian

narrative: his treatment of the *decemviri* focuses on senatorial conflicts and procedural chaos, which, as Hogg suggests, resonate with the weak performance of the senate in the first century BC. Again, a woman must die in order to preserve her honor – this time her name is Verginia (cf. the stories of Horatia and Lucretia discussed by Schultze) – before the people finally get rid of the decemvirate. Whereas Livy emphasizes the connection between the decemvirate and the regal period, Dionysius seems to hint at a link with the Rome of the late Republic: Hogg argues that the decemvirate episode is really a story about the political chaos that is caused when a failing senate loses its control. Again, readers of Dionysius may draw different conclusions about the role that might be assigned to Augustus in this story – do the tyrannical *decemviri* foreshadow the reign of the *princeps*, or is he the one who, by reforming the senate, puts an end to the chaos and disorder?

The Augustan Age is commonly regarded as the Golden Age of Latin literature. Turning once more from historiography to literary criticism, the final chapter of this volume concentrates on Rome as a place where literary notions and concepts were constantly traded and exchanged. The Roman poet Horace (65–8 BC) was a direct contemporary of Dionysius in Rome, and his *Ars Poetica*, or *Epistle to the Pisones*, is one of the most influential texts in the history of literary criticism. The close relationship between Dionysius' criticism and Horace's *Odes* and *Satires* has been explored in recent scholarship, and this volume extends this research to the *Ars Poetica*.¹⁰¹ Casper C. de Jonge, 'Dionysius and Horace: Composition in Augustan Rome' (chapter 10), explores the relationship between two major works of literary criticism of the Augustan Age: Dionysius' *On Composition* and Horace's *Ars Poetica*. De Jonge points to a number of shared traditional themes and more innovative ideas linked to the contemporary Roman world. The shared ideal of a 'clever arrangement' of commonplace words is anticipated by the views of the critics discussed in Philodemus' *On Poems*, but it was especially celebrated in Augustan poetry, rhetoric and literary criticism, and De Jonge reminds us that Virgil's style and artful syntax in the *Aeneid* is very much part of the same critical scene in which Dionysius wrote.

Dionysius' Audience

Did Dionysius write for Greeks or (also) for Romans? The rhetorical-critical works, as we have seen, are dedicated to both Greek and Roman

¹⁰¹ For earlier contributions, cf. Freudenburg 1993 on the *Satires*; Hunter 2009, 124–7 on the *Odes*.

intellectuals, who were the members of Dionysius' circle or network: it seems clear that he intended his essays to be read by all cultured and civilized men – whether they thought of themselves as Greek or Roman – who were interested in questions of rhetorical theory and literary criticism. In the *Roman Antiquities*, Dionysius himself makes explicit statements on the relevance of that work to both Greek (*Ant. Rom.* 1.4.2) and Roman readers (1.6.4: cited above). Modern scholars, however, have questioned these statements, which has resulted in a fierce debate on the intended audience of Dionysius' history of early Rome.

Bowersock stated that Dionysius wrote the *Roman Antiquities* 'for upper-class Roman readers'.¹⁰² Gabba, on the other hand, argued for a 'Greek readership', and many other scholars adopted the same view.¹⁰³ Schultze proposed a third option, claiming that Dionysius wrote for a 'mixed readership'.¹⁰⁴ Luraghi refueled the debate by making a refined distinction between a real and a fake audience.¹⁰⁵ According to this interpretation, the 'real' intended readers of the *Roman Antiquities* were Romans. In describing the gradual decline of Roman civilization, Dionysius had an implicit message for the Romans of his time: having become alienated from their Hellenic identity through the civil wars, they should go back to their Greek roots and look to the virtuous lives of their earliest ancestors. According to Luraghi, Dionysius' references to the Greek audience of his work would merely function as a disguise: being an outsider, he did not have the authority to convey his message directly to the Romans, since the elite of Augustan Rome would not be pleased with a Greek voice lecturing them on the importance of the *mos maiorum*.

Luraghi's contribution to the debate has been important, because it has rehabilitated the idea that Dionysius (also) aimed at Roman readers. That is not to say, however, that he did not hope to be read by Greeks: it is not necessary to assume that Dionysius' statements on the relevance of his narrative to a Greek audience are nothing more than a 'disguise' – and in fact, one might wonder whether such a camouflage would be very effective: Dionysius' admonition to the Romans to follow the example of their early predecessors (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.4, cited above) is clear and explicit enough.

Several authors in this volume contribute to this ongoing debate on Dionysius' audience (in particular, Hogg and Schultze). The position adopted here is that Dionysius wrote both his rhetorical-critical and his

¹⁰² Bowersock 1965, 131. ¹⁰³ Gabba 1982, 79–80. See also Fox 1993, 34; Galinsky 1996, 340–1.

¹⁰⁴ Schultze 1986. See also Fromentin 1998, xxxv–xxxvii. Weaire 2005, 246 adopts a similar position on the audience of the critical essays.

¹⁰⁵ Luraghi 2003, 270–7.

historical works for all those readers who were trained and competent enough to read Greek: and this obviously includes a substantial number of (bilingual) Roman citizens, people like his addressees Quintus Aelius Tubero and Metilius Rufus, as well as their families. It seems that the debate on Dionysius' intended audience is one of many themes where Dionysian scholarship has been too much divided between the *Roman Antiquities* and the rhetorical treatises. If we accept that Dionysius hoped and expected both Greeks like Ammaeus and Romans like Aelius Tubero to read his contributions to rhetoric and criticism, as the names of his addressees put beyond any doubt, we should also feel encouraged to accept that he intended his history of early Rome to inspire a mixed audience.

One might actually wonder whether the sharp distinction between 'Greeks' and 'Romans' that modern readers tend to make in this debate was in any strict sense applicable to the world in which Dionysius worked. Many Greek-speaking men of the Roman Empire acquired Roman citizenship and adopted a Roman name: they acquired a Roman *praenomen* and *nomen*, while using their Greek name as a *cognomen* (e.g., Lucius Mestrius Plutarchus, Lucius Flavius Arrianus). It has been suggested that Dionysius' addressee Gnaeus Pompeius Geminus belonged to this group of Greek men, who carried Roman citizenship, a Roman name and a Roman identity.¹⁰⁶ Were these men Greeks or Romans? For Dionysius, Romans were Greeks anyway – and from that perspective we might say that the modern debate about his intended audience somehow misses the point of his project. If our interpretation of Dionysius' mixed readership is correct, it shows yet another dimension of his tireless efforts to unite Greece and Rome.

¹⁰⁶ See the discussion in Hidber 1996, 7 n. 50.

