



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Between grammar and rhetoric : Dionysius of Halicarnassus on language, linguistics, and literature**

Jonge, C.C. de

### **Citation**

Jonge, C. C. de. (2006, June 27). *Between grammar and rhetoric : Dionysius of Halicarnassus on language, linguistics, and literature*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10085>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10085>

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

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Dionysius on language, linguistics, and literature: aims and methods

Dionysius of Halicarnassus arrived in Italy ‘at the very time that Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war’ (30/29 BC).<sup>1</sup> Dionysius settled in Rome, the political and cultural centre of the Augustan Principate, where he came into contact with a number of Greek and Roman scholars. For at least twenty-two years he lived in the flourishing capital of the Graeco-Roman world, and he devoted himself to a double career. In 8/7 BC, he published the first part of his *Roman Antiquities*, a history of early Rome in twenty books.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, he wrote a large number of rhetorical and literary essays, letters and treatises, which seem to be closely related to his profession as a teacher of rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> He learnt Latin and studied innumerable works by both Greek and Roman authors.<sup>4</sup> Dionysius was a man of wide reading and interests, who thought that his own time saw the revival of the culture of classical Athens.<sup>5</sup> He believed that careful study, evaluation and imitation of classical Greek literature should be the basis of eloquence and rhetorical writing.

In his rhetorical works and to a lesser extent in his history of Rome, Dionysius makes use of a great variety of theories that had been developed in different language disciplines. He borrows numerous ideas from earlier and contemporary scholars, including philosophers, philologists, grammarians, metricians, musical theorists, critics and rhetoricians, and he integrates these ideas into an effective programme of rhetorical theory. The present study, which examines Dionysius’ views on language, linguistics, and literature, has two purposes.<sup>6</sup> On the one hand, it aims to increase our

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2: ἐγὼ καταπλεύσας εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἅμα τῷ καταλυθῆναι τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἐβδόμης καὶ ὀγδοηκοστῆς καὶ ἑκατοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος μεσοῦσης ... ‘I arrived in Italy at the very time that Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war, in the middle of the one hundred and eighty-seventh Olympiad (...).’ The year in which Dionysius arrived was then 30 or 29 BC: see Hidber (1996) 1-4. Most scholars assume that Dionysius was born ca. 60 BC or a few years later: see e.g. Egger (1902) 1-4, Aujac (1978) 9 and Hidber (1996) 2.

<sup>2</sup> See *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2. In *Ant. Rom.* 7.70.2, Dionysius tells us that the first book has already been published. See Cary (1968) vii and Hidber (1996) 1.

<sup>3</sup> In *Comp.* 20.94,5, Dionysius refers his addressee Metilius Rufus to their ‘daily exercises’ (ταῖς καθ’ ἡμέραν γυμνασίαις). These exercises seem to have been part of the private education of a Roman boy by his Greek tutor. Dionysius may have taught other pupils as well, but it is not certain that he had a school: see also Grube (1965) 208.

<sup>4</sup> See *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2-3.

<sup>5</sup> See *Orat. Vett.* 1.3,5-4,19.

<sup>6</sup> Throughout this study, ‘linguistics’ will be used as a general term that covers all disciplines that deal with language as their object of study, in particular philology, technical grammar, philosophy, metrical and musical theory, rhetorical theory and literary criticism. By ‘views on language’ (as opposed to ‘linguistics’) I mean more general views on the nature of language, which do not necessarily involve technical (grammatical, philosophical, musical) theories (see esp. chapter 2).

knowledge of the language theories that circulated at the end of the first century BC. From this period, only a few fragments of grammatical and philological texts have survived, and the same holds for most of the other language disciplines. Many of Dionysius' works, however, are extant, which makes them a unique source of information for the linguistic views that were current in the Augustan age.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, this study aims to illuminate the important connections between the various ancient disciplines that dealt in some way with language as an object of study. Ancient ideas on language were formulated in such diverse disciplines as philosophy, philology, technical grammar, rhetorical theory, literary criticism, and metrical and musical studies. There were intensive contacts between scholars working in different fields, so that theories that were developed within the context of one discipline easily influenced the views of scholars working in another discipline. Over the last few decades, analysis of ancient linguistic thought has become a major field of study.<sup>8</sup> However, it is only fairly recently that scholars have begun to recognise the importance of the many connections between the different ancient language disciplines.<sup>9</sup> While the connections between ancient philosophy and grammar have received close attention, the relationship between rhetorical theory and its neighbouring areas of study has not been examined systematically.<sup>10</sup> There is no better example of the ancient integration of disciplines than the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

This study does not aim to provide a complete account of Dionysius' rhetorical works, nor will it deal with all language disciplines to the same extent. Although ideas from musical and metrical theory will be discussed in several passages, the focus of this study is on the close connections between three language disciplines in particular, namely grammar (both philology and technical grammar), philosophy and rhetorical theory. Each chapter of this book will examine a specific aspect of Dionysius' set of linguistic ideas. In chapter 2, I will bring together some of Dionysius' general ideas

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Schenkeveld (1983) 67.

<sup>8</sup> Major contributions to the history of ancient linguistics over the last decades are the following studies: Sluiter (1990), Schmitter (1996<sup>2</sup>), Swiggers & Wouters (1996), Ildefonse (1997), Lallot (1997), Blank (1998), Law & Sluiter (1998<sup>2</sup>), Matthaios (1999), Auroux, Koerner, Niederehe & Versteegh (2000), Janko (2000), Law (2003), Swiggers & Wouters (2003), and Frede & Inwood (2005).

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. Desbordes (1996a) 69-75. The handbook edited by Auroux, Koerner, Niederehe & Versteegh (2000) deals with various 'language sciences'. On the connections between these language sciences in antiquity, see the contribution by Siebenborn (2000).

<sup>10</sup> For the connections between ancient philosophy and grammar, see esp. Blank (1982), Sluiter (1990) and Swiggers & Wouters (2002). Swiggers & Wouters (1995) have made some observations on the grammatical aspects of Dionysius' rhetorical works. A number of scholars have paid attention to the borderlines between ancient syntax and rhetoric: see esp. Schenkeveld (1991) and the contributions by Viljamaa, Hyman and Vainio in Swiggers & Wouters (2003). See also Schenkeveld (2004) on the 'rhetorical grammar' of C. Julius Romanus.

on the nature of language, which form the basis of his more technical theories. In chapter 3 and 4, I will examine Dionysius' use of the grammatical theory of the parts of speech. Chapter 3 will focus on the grammatical theory itself, whereas chapter 4 will show that Dionysius (as a historian of linguistics, as a rhetorician and as a literary critic) makes effective use of grammatical theory for his own purposes. In chapter 5, the relationships between philosophy, grammar and rhetoric will become even more manifest when we interpret Dionysius' theory of natural word order, which, as I will argue, is largely based on the Stoic theory of categories. In chapter 6, I will examine Dionysius' ideas on the similarities and differences between prose and poetry, a subject that will illustrate the strong ties between poetical, musical and rhetorical theory. Finally, chapter 7 deals with Dionysius' technique of metathesis (rewriting), a language experiment that he applies as a method of literary criticism. Together, the various chapters aim to paint a precise picture of Dionysius' linguistic theories and methods.

Modern interpreters have always observed that Dionysius' rhetorical works contain a wealth of interesting fragments from earlier writers, but not all of them evaluated Dionysius' own role positively. In 1865, Friedrich Blass characterised the treatise *On Composition* as follows: 'Andererseits aber zeigt sich nirgend so glänzend wie hier die Vielseitigkeit des Dionysios, welcher weit davon entfernt ist das Gebiet seiner Kunst eng gegen das der andern abzugrenzen: Grammatik, Metrik, Musik sind hier der Rhetorik dienstbar gemacht. Es ist in dieser Schrift in der That ein reicher Schatz von Belehrung enthalten; die Gelehrsamkeit und Belesenheit des Verfassers ebenso wie die eigne feine Beobachtungsgabe muß jeden anziehen und ihn mit hoher Achtung vor dem Schriftsteller erfüllen.'<sup>11</sup> I could not agree more. Unlike Blass, however, most nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars did not appreciate Dionysius' versatility and learning. There are presumably few ancient writers who have become the object of so much scorn, pity and contempt. For a very long time, scholars believed that Dionysius' only merit was the fact that he preserved so many fragments of earlier writers: his works were the ideal *Fundgrube* for traditional *Quellenforschung*.<sup>12</sup> Scholars were grateful to Dionysius for his quotations of valuable literary fragments (Sappho, Simonides, Pindar, and Hegesias) and his references to philosophical, musical and philological works (e.g. Theophrastus, Chrysippus, Aristoxenus, and Aristophanes of Byzantium).<sup>13</sup> But since traditional

---

<sup>11</sup> Blass, *DGB* (1865) 199.

<sup>12</sup> See the *status quaestionis* in Goudriaan (1989) 466-469.

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. Kroll (1907) 101: 'Dionys selbst hat kaum mehr gethan als die ihm vorliegenden Erörterungen zu einer schriftstellerischen Einheit zusammenzufassen und ihre praktische Anwendung an einigen Beispielen durchzuführen; aber immer bleibt es sein Verdienst, peripatetische Gedanken

scholarship primarily focused on the sources that Dionysius collected and preserved, it often failed to give him credit for his own merits. The persistent idea was that Dionysius was not intelligent enough to understand the important works that he cites. According to Schwartz, he was a ‘kleine Seele’, Wilamowitz called him an ‘armen Gesellen’, and Norden thought that Dionysius was one of the ‘blöden Stubengelehrten’.<sup>14</sup>

Eduard Norden may be taken as a typical representative of the traditional approach to Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In his monumental work *Die antike Kunstprosa*, he argues that we should not take Dionysius as our guide when evaluating the prose style of Greek orators and historians: ‘So verfehlt es im allgemeinen ist, antike Urteile — zumal auf diesem Gebiet — dem modernen Empfinden von uns Nachgeborenen unterzuordnen, so muß ich doch bekennen, daß mir der von vielen bewunderte Kritikus Dionys ein äußerst bornierter Kopf zu sein scheint.’<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, Norden frequently refers to Dionysius: ‘Daß wir ihn im einzelnen trotzdem öfters werden nennen müssen, verdankt er nicht sich, sondern seinen Quellen.’<sup>16</sup> The dangers of this approach become manifest when Norden finds a useful observation in Dionysius’ works: ‘bei Dionys ep. ad Pomp. 2,7 heißt es sehr fein (*daher ist es nicht von ihm*), die Hauptstärke Platons als Schriftsteller zeige sich (...).’<sup>17</sup> Today, not many scholars will claim that every interesting element in Dionysius’ works is necessarily derived from his sources. But the approach of Norden, Schwartz and Wilamowitz has been very influential.<sup>18</sup> Their negative judgement on the rhetorician seems to be one of the reasons that there are still relatively few commentaries and monographs on Dionysius’ rhetorical works.<sup>19</sup>

---

wieder hervorgezogen zu haben, die sonst der Vergessenheit anheim gefallen wären.’ For a list of Dionysius’ quotations and references in *On Composition*, see Rhys Roberts (1910) 49-56.

<sup>14</sup> Schwartz (1900) 934; Wilamowitz (1900) 51; Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 266. For an overview of similar evaluations, see Hidber (1996) vii-x, whose discussion was an important resource for this introductory section. Radermacher (1905) 970-971, who is an exception among the German scholars of his time, defends Dionysius against Norden: ‘Dennoch ist das wegwerfende Urteil, mit dem man wohl heute über ihn weggeht (s. z. B. Norden, *Kunstprosa* 79ff.), übertrieben und unbillig.’

<sup>15</sup> Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 79.

<sup>16</sup> Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 81.

<sup>17</sup> Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 104. My italics.

<sup>18</sup> In particular Ammon (1889), Kroll (1907) and Nassal (1910) trace Dionysius’ ideas back to earlier sources, which are now lost. Kroll assigns many theories to Aristoxenus, while Nassal thinks that the similarities between Cicero and Dionysius indicate dependence on Caecilius of Caleacte (see sections 1.5 and 4.4.1 of this study). Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 79-80 argues that Dionysius’ good observations are borrowed from Theophrastus and his successors. The same approach, assigning Dionysius’ ideas to predecessors whose works we do not know, is characteristic of (parts of) Pohl (1968).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Hidber (1996) viii. The following commentaries on separate works should be mentioned: Pavano (1958) and Pritchett (1975) on *Thuc.*, Marengi (1971) on *Din.*, Ronnet (1952) and Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) on *Dem.*, Hidber (1996) on the preface to *Orat. Vett.*, Battisti (1997) on *Imit.*, and Fornaro (1997a) on *Pomp.* Pohl (1968) is an important contribution to the understanding of *Comp.*

It is true that Dionysius' works incorporate many ideas from earlier scholars, but it is dangerous to present him as a slavish copyist. In two respects, the method of this study will be different from the one that Norden represents. Firstly, this study will adopt an external rather than an internal approach to Dionysius' works. Secondly, this study aims to describe the general connections between the discourse of Dionysius and that of other ancient scholars rather than to point to specific sources that he may have read and used. I will illuminate both of these methodological aspects.

(1) There are two ways in which one can study ancient views on language and literature. On the one hand, one can interpret ancient theory for its own sake. This is what Richard Rorty calls 'historical reconstruction'.<sup>20</sup> When adopting this approach, one will carefully reconstruct the historical contexts in which ancient views were developed, and the results thus obtained will contribute to our knowledge of the history of linguistics, or of the history of literary theory. On the other hand, we can approach ancient grammarians, rhetoricians, literary critics and philosophers as our own colleagues. This is what Richard Rorty calls 'rational reconstruction'. When adopting this method, we reconstruct the answers that earlier thinkers would have given to our questions. A scholar who adopts the latter approach looks for theories that have been developed in antiquity, in the hope that these ancient theories may solve a modern problem. As far as the historiography of linguistics is concerned, the difference between these two approaches has been discussed by Sluiter, who distinguishes between the 'external' and the 'internal' approach to the history of grammar.<sup>21</sup> The dangers of rational reconstruction could not be illustrated more clearly than by Norden's treatment of Dionysius cited above.<sup>22</sup> Norden regards Dionysius primarily as a colleague who was also interested in the style of ancient Greek prose texts. Adopting an internal approach to Dionysius' theories, Norden mainly objects to the fact that Dionysius dares to criticise the style of some passages from Thucydides and Plato: according to Norden, Dionysius fails to recognise the ingenuity of these great writers: 'Dionys macht die großen Männer zu ebensolchen Pedanten, wie er, dieser σχολαστικός vom reinsten Wasser, selbst einer ist.'<sup>23</sup> Now, it

---

<sup>20</sup> Rorty (1984) 49-56. Rorty focuses on the historiography of philosophy. Apart from historical and rational reconstruction, he distinguishes two more genres, namely 'Geistesgeschichte' and doxography. See also my section 4.2.2.

<sup>21</sup> Sluiter (1998) 24-25.

<sup>22</sup> On the dangers of the internal approach to ancient linguistics and philosophy, see Sluiter (1996) 223-225.

<sup>23</sup> Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 80. Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 80-81 proceeds to express his contempt as follows: 'Von keinem sind unwürdigere Worte über den θεῖος Πλάτων, den wir als den größten Künstler auch des Stils bewundern, gesprochen worden als von diesem Epigonen, der sogar von seinem oder vielmehr seiner Zeit Liebling Demosthenes nichts Höheres zu sagen weiß, als daß er sich aus allen das Beste zusammengelesen und daraus ein neues Gewebe gemacht habe.' For a similar evaluation of Dionysius'

should be emphasised that the reason that Dionysius does not approve of the style of Thucydides (and that of Plato in his more poetic passages) is that it lacks clarity.<sup>24</sup> Dionysius primarily writes his works for students who wish to become successful orators. He thinks that in oratory one should adopt a lucid style, while avoiding obscure constructions. This Aristotelian idea is very relevant to the context of Dionysius' practice as a teacher of rhetoric. Norden, however, does not pay attention to Dionysius' own purposes, and ignores the rhetorical context of Dionysius' theories.<sup>25</sup> I will argue that Dionysius' views on literature are always subservient to the production of (rhetorical) texts through imitation of classical models (see section 1.3). In this light, Dionysius' evaluations of Thucydides and Plato are more understandable, even if we do not agree with his verdicts. Unlike Norden, I intend to interpret Dionysius' ideas within the context of his rhetorical and historical theories.<sup>26</sup>

(2) The second methodological aspect in which this study differs from the influential approach of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars is the following. Instead of assigning particular passages from Dionysius' works to specific 'sources', I will point to the possible connections between Dionysius' *discourse* and that of earlier and contemporary scholars of various backgrounds. In this way, I hope to draw a general picture of the set of ideas and technical theories that were available in the Augustan age. One of the basic assumptions on which this study rests is that it is more rewarding to describe the general world of scholarship that Dionysius' treatises reflect than to guess about his alleged use of specific sources.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, I will compare

---

judgements, see Bruns (1905) 210: 'Am allerunbegreiflichsten aber werden diese Urteile, wo es sich um Historiker handelt. Dass Dionys über Polybios, einen Mann, dem er in Wirklichkeit nicht das Wasser reichen darf, von oben herunter urteilt, ist, da Polybios der verachteten hellenistischen Periode angehört, verständlich. Aber man traut seinen Augen nicht, wenn man liest, wie er Thucydides behandelt.' Blass *DGB* (1865) 187 also thinks that Dionysius fails to treat Thucydides with the proper respect, and Thomas Hobbes likewise criticises Dionysius' evaluation of Thucydides in his introduction to his translation of Thucydides (William Molesworth [ed.], *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, Vol. VIII, London 1839-1845, xxvi). Dionysius prefers Herodotus' subject (the wonderful deeds of Greeks and barbarians) and criticises Thucydides because he describes 'sad and terrible disasters' (*Pomp.* 3.232,18-234,15). Hobbes thinks that 'there was never written so much absurdity in so few lines'. Usher (1985) 350 agrees with Hobbes and states that Dionysius' criticism of Thucydides' subject matter has been 'the object of deserved scorn'.

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. Dionysius' description of Thucydides' style in *Thuc.* 24.360,25-364,2 and his grammatical notes in *Amm.* II. See also sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2.

<sup>25</sup> A more successful example of an internal approach to Dionysius' works is Usher (1999). In his study on Greek oratory, Usher frequently cites the views of Dionysius; unlike Norden, he pays close attention to the context of Dionysius' ideas.

<sup>26</sup> This study as a whole focuses on Dionysius' rhetorical works, but in some cases I will also discuss views that he expresses in the *Roman Antiquities*. In particular, it will be shown that Dionysius' theory of the Latin language can only be understood within the context of his historical work: see section 2.4.

<sup>27</sup> In this study, I will make only a few exceptions to this principle, when there is much evidence for Dionysius' use of a specific model: see sections 4.2.3 (on Dionysius' use of a grammatical treatise in

Dionysius' theories and terminology with the work of philologists (Aristarchus in particular), technical grammarians (Apollonius Dyscolus, and the fragmentary works of earlier scholars like Tyrannion and Tryphon), philosophers (the Stoics in particular), rhetoricians and critics (Philodemus, the Hellenistic *kritikoi*, 'Demetrius', 'Longinus', and Quintilian in particular). Occasionally, I will also point to similarities between the views of Dionysius and those of the musical theorist Aristoxenus. It will become clear that this approach, which interprets Dionysius' views within the context of his works and compares his discourse with that of other scholars, is more fruitful for our understanding of Dionysius' ideas on language than the approach of *Quellenforschung*, which has been so dominant in Dionysian scholarship.<sup>28</sup> In particular, our approach enables us to appreciate the ways in which Dionysius has blended theories from several language disciplines into one integrated programme of rhetorical theory.

Having clarified the methods of this study, I hasten to say that the approach of Norden and Wilamowitz, though very influential, has been abandoned in more recent scholarship. In this study, I will follow the lead of a number of scholars who have paid attention to Dionysius' ideas and methods, without presenting him as slavishly dependent on his predecessors. Bonner (1939) was the first who systematically analysed Dionysius' methods of literary criticism. More recently, a number of important publications have appeared. In particular, the annotated edition with French translation of the *opuscula* by Aujac (1978-1992) and the useful commentaries by Hidber (1996), Battisti (1997) and Fornaro (1997a) have contributed much to our understanding of Dionysius' rhetorical works.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, many articles on various aspects of Dionysius' rhetorical theory have been published in recent years.<sup>30</sup> With regard to the *Roman Antiquities*, recent scholarship includes the work of Gabba (1991) and Delcourt (2005), the annotated editions with translations by Fromentin

---

which the history of the parts of speech was discussed) and 4.4.2. (on his use of a philological commentary on Thucydides).

<sup>28</sup> The influence of Norden and Wilamowitz is still visible in many publications of relatively recent date. Thus, in spite of all its merits, the important article of Schenkeveld (1983) on Dionysius' linguistic theories is in my view too much inclined to assign the rhetorician's ideas to earlier sources. See esp. Schenkeveld (1983) 90: 'Dionysius only reproduces what he has read, without realizing its implications.' On this statement, see my section 2.5.

<sup>29</sup> English translations have been published by Rhys Roberts (1901, 1910) and Usher (1974, 1985).

<sup>30</sup> Among the recent contributions on various aspects of Dionysius' rhetorical works the following should be mentioned: Heath (1989), Innes (1989), Gentili (1990a = 1990b), Damon (1991), Fox (1993), Classen (1994), Wooten (1994), Toye (1995), Reid (1996), Reid (1997), Vaahtera (1997), Walker (1998), Bottai (1999a and 1999b), Donadi (2000a and 2000b), Weaire (2002), Viljamaa (2003), De Jonge (2005a and 2005b) and Wiater (forthcoming). Hurst (1982) usefully summarises the earlier interpretations. I regret that I have not been able to consult Donadi (2000b).

(1998) and Sautel (1999), and the translation edited by Pittia (2002).<sup>31</sup> The only general monograph that systematically deals with both the rhetorical and the historical works is still Goudriaan (1989), but he pays little attention to Dionysius' linguistic theories.<sup>32</sup>

In the following sections of this introductory chapter, I will explore the aspects of Dionysius' life and works that are relevant to the theme of this study, in particular his classicism (section 1.2), the relative order and the intended audience of his rhetorical works (section 1.3), and his contacts with Greek and Roman intellectuals in Augustan Rome (section 1.4). In the final sections of this introduction, we will make the transition to the central concerns of this study: I will briefly explore the various language sciences that Dionysius incorporates in his works (section 1.5), and, finally, I will introduce his important work *On Composition*, which may be considered a multidisciplinary synthesis *par excellence* (section 1.6).

## 1.2. Classicism and Atticism

For a clear understanding of Dionysius, it is very important to recognise the classicism that his works reveal.<sup>33</sup> Dionysius believes that the creation of new works of art should be based on eclectic imitation of the best qualities of classical examples. In his preface to the work *On the Ancient Orators*, a 'classicistic manifest', Dionysius describes how his own time viewed the final victory of the ancient philosophical rhetoric over her shameless antagonist from Asia, who had taken her place after the death of Alexander the Great:<sup>34</sup>

ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν χρόνοις ἡ μὲν ἀρχαία καὶ φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ προπηλακιζομένη καὶ δεινὰς ὕβρεις ὑπομένουσα κατελύετο, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνα τελευτῆς ἐκπνεῖν καὶ μαραίνεσθαι κατ' ὀλίγον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας μικροῦ δεήσασα εἰς τέλος ἠφανίσθαι· ἕτερα δὲ τις ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκείνης παρελθοῦσα τάξιν, ἀφόρητος ἀναιδεῖα θεατρικῆ καὶ ἀνάγωγος καὶ οὔτε φιλοσοφίας οὔτε ἄλλου παιδεύματος οὐδενὸς μετειληφυῖα ἐλευθερίου.

<sup>31</sup> For more literature on the *Roman Antiquities*, see Delcourt (2005).

<sup>32</sup> For very brief introductions, see the entries of Russell (1996) in *OCD* and Fornaro (1997b) in *DNP*. For an overview of Dionysius' works, see e.g. Kennedy (1972) 342-363.

<sup>33</sup> On the term 'classicism', see Gelzer (1979) 3-13. The modern use of the term is based on a quotation of Fronto in Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 19.8.5. On Dionysius' classicism, see esp. Gabba (1982), Goudriaan (1989) and Hidber (1996).

<sup>34</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 1.3,10-19. On the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, see Hidber (1996). Hidber characterises this work as 'das klassizistische Manifest'. Other scholars regard it as the manifest of Atticism: see Goudriaan (1989) 566. However, Atticism and classicism are not identical: see below, and Gelzer (1979) 13-14.

‘In the period preceding our own time, the old philosophical rhetoric, being bespattered with mud and subjected to terrible insults, fell into decline. From the death of Alexander of Macedon it began to lose its spirit and gradually wither away, and in our generation had reached a state of almost total extinction. Another rhetoric stole in and took its place, intolerable in its theatrical shamelessness, ill-bred and having no share of either philosophy or any other education fit for a freeman.’

The tripartite view of history that Dionysius here presents is characteristic of the classicism of the first centuries BC and AD.<sup>35</sup> Artists who adopt a classicistic approach towards the past divide history into three periods: first, a classical period of the glorious past; second, a period of decline and degeneration; and, finally, the present, in which the classical past revives. According to Dionysius, the period of decline started after the death of Alexander, a political date that symbolises the fall of the Macedonian empire and the gradual rise of the Roman power.<sup>36</sup> Dionysius is one of the clearest representatives of Roman classicism. In Hellenistic times, Alexandrian scholars had already selected the best authors of the classical period (the ἐγκριθέντες) and they had compiled lists of preferred authors (*canones*).<sup>37</sup> But in the Augustan period writers started to make a more systematic use of the works of the classical past by taking them as models for their own texts, and rejecting the artistic style of the immediate past.<sup>38</sup> It is typical of classicism that the creation of new works of art is based on an explicit theory.<sup>39</sup> In Dionysius’ case, we may summarise this theory by the terms μίμησις and ζήλωσις: the eclectic imitation of the best qualities of various models from the past, with the intention of surpassing them.<sup>40</sup> As Hidber has pointed out, Dionysius’ tripartite view of history, with its demarcation dates 323 BC and 31 BC, lives on in the modern term ‘Hellenism’, which is adopted in many of our histories of Greek literature.<sup>41</sup>

In his preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, Dionysius tells us that Hellenistic rhetoric was ‘altogether vulgar and disgusting’ (φορτική τις πάνυ καὶ ὀχληρά).<sup>42</sup> He

<sup>35</sup> On classicism in general and the division of history in three periods (‘der klassizistische Dreischnitt’) in particular, see Gelzer (1979), Heldmann (1982) esp. 122-131 and Hidber (1996) 14-25. Wisse (1995) 71 uses the term ‘tripartite view of history’.

<sup>36</sup> Dionysius uses Alexander’s death as a turning point also in *Ant. Rom.* 1.2.3. Cf. Hidber (1996) 18-19. Heldmann (1982) 122-131 discusses the division of history in Dionysius and other classicistic authors.

<sup>37</sup> On the terms ἐγκριθέντες and *classici*, see Pfeiffer (1968) 206-208 and Gelzer (1979).

<sup>38</sup> See Hidber (1996) 24.

<sup>39</sup> See Gelzer (1979) 10-11.

<sup>40</sup> On the classicistic theory of μίμησις, see Flashar (1979); on Dionysius’ concept of μίμησις esp. 87-88. See also Russell (1979).

<sup>41</sup> Hidber (1996) 24-25.

<sup>42</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 1.4,4.

introduces a vivid image, in which he compares the Greek world to a household in which the lawful wife has been driven away by a *ἐταίρα*.<sup>43</sup> Dionysius presents the contrast between the ‘philosophical’ rhetoric of the classical period and the shameless rhetoric that dominated the Hellenistic age as a controversy between an Attic ‘muse’ and her opponent from Asia, who has taken over the power in each city, even in the civilised ones:<sup>44</sup>

ἡ μὲν Ἀττικὴ μούσα καὶ ἀρχαία καὶ αὐτόχθων ἄτιμον εἰλήφει σχῆμα, τῶν ἑαυτῆς ἐκπεσοῦσα ἀγαθῶν, ἡ δὲ ἔκ τινων βαράθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθρὸς καὶ πρόην ἀφικομένη, Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν, [ἢ βάρβαρον] Ἑλληνίδας ἡξίου διοικεῖν πόλεις ἀπελάσασα τῶν κοινῶν τὴν ἑτέραν, ἡ ἀμαθὴς τὴν φιλόσοφον καὶ ἡ μαινομένη τὴν σώφρονα.

‘The ancient and indigenous Attic muse, deprived of her possessions, had taken a dishonoured rank, while her antagonist, who had arrived only yesterday or the day before from some Asiatic death-holes, a Mysian or Phrygian or a Carian creature, claimed the right to rule over the Greek cities, expelling her rival from public life, the ignorant driving out the philosophical, the mad one the prudent one.’

Because of this contrast between Attic and Asian rhetoric, Dionysius’ preface is the principal text for the Greek Atticism of Augustan Rome. Dionysius’ role in the Atticist movement is a complex problem: I will confine myself to the main issues.<sup>45</sup> Classicism and Atticism are of course closely related, but they are not the same. As Gelzer points out, classicism emerged in several cities in the first century BC, and became visible in various arts.<sup>46</sup> Atticism, however, began at a later moment and spread from Rome.<sup>47</sup> Atticism was not a coherent system, and at distinct moments, there were different ideas about what was typically ‘Attic’. Common to the different

<sup>43</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 1.4,7-11.

<sup>44</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 1.4,13-19. On Dionysius’ presentation of the contrast, see Hidber (1996) 25-30.

<sup>45</sup> The literature on Atticism is overwhelming. Fundamental are Rohde (1886), Schmid (1887), Rademacher (1899), Wilamowitz (1900), Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 251-270 and Dihle (1977). See the useful overview in Goudriaan (1989) 595-677. My own account owes a great deal to the illuminating discussions by Wisse (1995) and Hidber (1996) 25-44.

<sup>46</sup> Gelzer (1979) 13.

<sup>47</sup> Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 149 argues that Atticism had already begun shortly after 200 BC, but in *Orator* 89 (46 BC) Cicero refers to the *Attici* as a recent group. See Wisse (1995) 74-76. The date to which one assigns the origins of Atticism depends very much on the definition of Atticism that one uses. In Hellenistic times, writers were of course interested in the classical period of Athens, and Alexandrian scholars composed canons of selected authors: see Pfeiffer (1968) 206-207; on the canon of the ten Attic orators, see Worthington (1994) and O’Sullivan (1997). But the idea of reviving Attic eloquence and culture by systematic imitation of the classical orators on a theoretical basis seems to be a later phenomenon, the origins of which we may assign to ca. 60 BC (see Wisse [1995] 76).

versions of Atticism is the ideal of being in the tradition of the Attic culture. Our sources tell us about two distinct phases, the connection between which is not entirely clear. The first phase started around 60 BC as a Roman movement. Cicero's account suggests that its leader was C. Licinius Calvus.<sup>48</sup> Calvus and his followers, who presented themselves as *Attici*, supported the use of pure language and a plain style, and they censured the style that they referred to as 'Asian'. These Roman Atticists, who regarded Lysias and Hyperides as their models, accused Cicero of using an excessively bombastic style; they seem to have called him an *Asianus*.<sup>49</sup> Cicero defended himself in the *Brutus* and *Orator* (46 BC): he presented himself as a follower of Demosthenes, and pointed out that Lysias was not the only orator who spoke Attic.<sup>50</sup> Thus, Cicero emphasised that there were many different types of Attic models that one could imitate.

Some decades later, a second phase of Atticism became manifest in the works of Greek intellectuals in Augustan Rome. As far as we know, the representatives of Greek Atticism were Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Caecilius of Caleacte.<sup>51</sup> The latter rhetorician wrote a work *Against the Phrygians* and a treatise *Wherein does the Attic Style Differ from the Asian*.<sup>52</sup> It is well known that Caecilius admired Lysias, but the titles of his works make it clear that he allowed for many other models of imitation.<sup>53</sup> Likewise, Dionysius' Atticism is much broader than that of the original Roman Atticists, and closer to Cicero's views on the μίμησις of various Attic models.<sup>54</sup> Dionysius' concept of Atticism is very different from the ideas of the Roman *Attici*, who focused on linguistic purity and grammatical correctness.<sup>55</sup> Like Cicero, Dionysius does not think that imitation should be restricted to orators like Lysias and Hyperides, typical representatives of the plain style. According to

<sup>48</sup> See Cicero, *Brutus* 284. On the historical context of Roman Atticism, see Bowersock (1979) 59-65 and Wisse (1995).

<sup>49</sup> On Cicero as *Asianus*, see Quintilian, *Inst. orat.* 12.10.12. On Lysias and Hyperides as the models of the *Attici*, see Cicero, *Brutus* 67.

<sup>50</sup> Cicero, *Brutus* 285.

<sup>51</sup> On Caecilius of Caleacte and Atticism, see O'Sullivan (1997). On Caecilius, see the literature mentioned in section 1.4.

<sup>52</sup> Κατὰ Φρυγῶν (Caecilius of Caleacte fr. 11 Ofenloch) and Τίτι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ζῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ (Ofenloch [1907] 89). Cf. Kennedy (1972) 366 and Bowersock (1979) 66. According to Wilamowitz (1900) 6, Caecilius must have written *Against the Phrygians* when the Atticists had not yet attained the victory that Dionysius (in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*) reports. However, all evidence suggests that Caecilius was Dionysius' contemporary (Dionysius once refers to Caecilius: see section 1.3), and there is no reason to believe that Dionysius' preface marks the definite conclusion of the entire debate. For this reason, I will not follow the theory of Nassal (1910), who assumes that Caecilius influenced both Cicero and Dionysius: see section 1.5.

<sup>53</sup> See Hidber (1996) 41 n. 184 and Innes (2002) 276-278, who points out that Demosthenes was presumably Caecilius' main model.

<sup>54</sup> See Bowersock (1979) 67.

<sup>55</sup> On the different concepts of Atticism, see Hidber (1996) 37-44.

Dionysius, one should study the best elements of various classical writers: his work *On the Ancient Orators* dealt with Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, Hyperides and Aeschines (though his treatment of the latter two orators has not survived: see section 1.3). Moreover, Dionysius clearly believes that not only Attic language and literature were to be studied and imitated, but also certain moral and political ideas, especially those of the Attic orator Isocrates.<sup>56</sup> In his essay *On Isocrates*, Dionysius asks: ‘Who could fail to become a patriotic supporter of democracy and a student of civic virtue after reading his *Panegyricus*?’<sup>57</sup> ‘What greater exhortation to justice and piety could there be, for individuals singly and collectively for whole communities, than the discourse *On the Peace*?’<sup>58</sup> ‘Who would not become a more responsible citizen after reading the *Areopagiticus* (...)?’<sup>59</sup> For Dionysius, Atticism is thus much more than an imitation of pure language and plain style; it represents a general ‘Bildungsideal’, a symbol of elevated culture (παιδεία).<sup>60</sup> It should be noted that Dionysius’ idealisation of Attic culture is far removed from the narrow concept of Atticism that is characteristic of some works of the Second Sophistic: in that period we find a purely linguistic Atticism.<sup>61</sup>

The connection between the earlier Roman phase of Atticism and the Greek Atticism of the Augustan period is unclear.<sup>62</sup> Most scholars believe that the origins of Atticism must have been Greek. Thus, Norden and Wilamowitz think that Greek scholars initiated the Atticist debate and influenced both the Roman circle of Licinius Calvus and, in later times, Dionysius and Caecilius.<sup>63</sup> More recently, Wisse has argued that the origin of the debate was Roman and that Calvus himself was the originator of Atticism.<sup>64</sup> Bowersock suggested that Dionysius learnt about the first Atticist movement from his addressee Aelius Tubero, whose father was a friend of Cicero.<sup>65</sup> However, Wisse has rightly pointed out that we should not suppose that Dionysius’ knowledge of Roman ideas was dependent on one individual like Tubero, important

<sup>56</sup> See Hidber (1996) 50 on *On Isocrates*: ‘Es geht also bei Literaturkritik nicht etwa bloss um stilistische Fragen, sondern auch darum, ob bei einem Autor (...) Beiträge zu einer allgemeinen, “philosophischen” und “politischen” Bildung zu finden sein.’

<sup>57</sup> *Isoc.* 5.61,10-12: τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο φιλόπολις τε καὶ φιλόδημος ἢ τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐπιτηδεύσειε τὴν πολιτικὴν καλοκἀγαθίαν ἀναγνοὺς αὐτοῦ τὸν Πανηγυρικόν;

<sup>58</sup> *Isoc.* 7.64,1-3: τίς δὲ ἂν μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν προτρέψαιτο καθ’ ἕκαστόν τε ἄνδρα ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ τὰς πόλεις ὅλας τοῦ Περί τῆς εἰρήνης λόγου;

<sup>59</sup> *Isoc.* 8.65,1-2: τίς δὲ τὸν Ἀρεοπαγιτικὸν ἀναγνοὺς λόγον οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο κοσμιώτερος ...;

<sup>60</sup> Hidber (1996) 44-56 shows that Dionysius’ φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ stands in the tradition of Isocrates.

<sup>61</sup> See Hidber (1996) 43-44. On Atticist language and its relation to *koinê* Greek, see Frösén (1974).

<sup>62</sup> See Wisse (1995) 73-74.

<sup>63</sup> Norden (1915<sup>3</sup>) 149 places the origins shortly after 200 BC. Wilamowitz (1900) 31-51 thinks that Greek scholars in Rome started the Atticist movement around 60 BC.

<sup>64</sup> Wisse (1995) 76-77.

<sup>65</sup> Bowersock (1979) 68-70. See also Hidber (1996) 38.

though he may have been.<sup>66</sup> Dionysius was part of a Graeco-Roman ‘network’ of intellectuals (see section 1.4), so that there were many opportunities and ways in which Dionysius could learn about Roman Atticism.<sup>67</sup> Although I agree with Wisse’s explanation, I would like to add another possibility (which does not exclude the former one): Dionysius may simply have read the works of Cicero and his opponents. We know that Dionysius knew Latin and that he read many Roman works (see section 2.3). Besides, there is one passage where Dionysius seems to allude to the views of Cicero on the imitation of Thucydides’ style: Cicero expressed these views in the *Orator* and *Brutus*, which are exactly the works in which he defended himself against the *Attici* (see section 4.4.1).<sup>68</sup> We might add that Dionysius’ presentation of Asian rhetoric as ‘a Mysian or Phrygian or Carian creature’ (Μυσὴ ἢ Φρυγία τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν) seems to echo Cicero’s aversion to *Caria et Phrygia et Mysia* in the *Orator*.<sup>69</sup> References to these three regions may have been standard in characterisations of Asian rhetoric, but it is not impossible that Dionysius knew Cicero’s ideas and alluded to them. In any case, we should not understand Caria, Phrygia and Mysia as geographical regions where certain Asian schools of rhetoric were situated, but rather as representing Asianic style in general.<sup>70</sup> Wilamowitz already pointed out that ‘Asianism’ was not the name of a movement; it was a negative term, used by Atticists to denote everything that they did not like.<sup>71</sup> Thus, when Dionysius tells us that apart from ‘a few Asian cities’ (ὀλίγων τινῶν Ἀσιανῶν πόλεων) the world has ceased to admire bombastic Hellenistic rhetoric, he is presumably not thinking of specific schools in Asia Minor.<sup>72</sup> Dionysius does not refer to Asia outside his preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, but he does mention Hegesias

<sup>66</sup> Wisse (1995) 78.

<sup>67</sup> See Wisse (1979) 78-80. Hidber (1996) 38-39 argues that it is ‘unwahrscheinlich’ that the Greek phase of Atticism depended on the Roman phase because Dionysius’ concept of Atticism is so much broader than that of Calvus. In my view, it is unconvincing that Dionysius would picture the contrast between an Attic muse and her Asian opponent without thinking of the debate in Cicero’s days, although it is true that he gives his own and original interpretation of Atticism. See Whitmarsh (1998): ‘It would be better, I submit, to consider Atticism to have been an ever-negotiable concept, malleable according to the predilections and ambitions of the writer in question.’

<sup>68</sup> See *Thuc.* 50.409,8-410,7 and compare Cicero, *Orator* 31 and *Brutus* 287.

<sup>69</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 1.4.16-17; *Orator* 25: *Itaque Caria et Phrygia et Mysia, quod minime politae minimeque elegantes sunt, asciverunt aptum suis auribus opimum quoddam et tanquam adipale dictionis genus* (...). ‘Accordingly, Caria, Phrygia and Mysia, where there is the least refinement and taste, have adopted a rich and unctuous diction which appeals to their ears.’ (Translation Hubbell.) Bowersock (1979) 65-66 remarks that Dionysius repeats Cicero’s ‘refrain’. It should be noted that Μυσὴ (*Orat. Vett.* 1.4.16) is Kiessling’s conjecture for μοῦσα. Goudriaan (1989) 570-572 defends the reading of the MSS and refers to *Orator* 57, where Mysia is not mentioned either. But I doubt that Dionysius would portray Asianic rhetoric as a ‘muse’. The parallel from *Orator* 25 seems to be more convincing.

<sup>70</sup> Gabba (1991) 28 n. 12 thinks that Dionysius refers to ‘concrete examples’, but Hidber (1996) 111 rightly argues that Caria, Mysia and Phrygia stand for Asianic style in general. Goudriaan (1989) 570-572 relates the three regions of Asia Minor to the evaluation of musical modes that we find in Plato.

<sup>71</sup> Wilamowitz (1900) 1-8.

<sup>72</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 2.5,11-14.

of Magnesia (ca. 300 BC), whom he regards as the archetype of the bombastic Hellenistic style.<sup>73</sup>

In his ‘classicistic manifest’, Dionysius tells us about the revolution (μεταβολή) that took place in his own time (ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνος): the ancient, sobre Rhetoric has been restored to her former rightful place.<sup>74</sup> Dionysius gives three possible reasons for this revolution, namely a divine, a natural and a human explanation.<sup>75</sup> Having outlined these three general causes, Dionysius expounds what, in his view, is the real cause of the change:<sup>76</sup> ‘I think the cause and origin of this great revolution to be almighty Rome, which forces the cities in their entirety to look at her as a model, and those who rule her virtuously and administer the world in all good faith: they are thoroughly cultured and noble in their judgements; under their ordering influence the sensible section of the city has increased its power even more and the foolish section has been forced to be sensible.’<sup>77</sup>

Dionysius’ reference to Rome as the cause (αἰτία) and origin (ἀρχή) of the revival of Attic culture has been interpreted in different ways. Some scholars have supposed that it is mere flattery intended for Dionysius’ Roman patrons, or even for Augustus himself.<sup>78</sup> On the other hand, Dionysius’ praise of the Rome of earlier generations has

<sup>73</sup> *Comp.* 4.19,5-15; *Comp.* 18.79,9-82,10. Ironically, Hegesias himself presented himself as an imitator of Lysias: see Cicero, *Orator* 226. On Hegesias, see Swain (1996) 22; on Dionysius’ quotation of Hegesias in *Comp.* 18, see Donadi (2000a).

<sup>74</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 2.4,20-5,20.

<sup>75</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 2.4,23-5,5. Hurst (1982) 859 thinks that the three general causes (god, nature, human beings) aim to weaken the importance of Rome, but I agree with Hidber (1996) 113 that the three general motives are so vague that they are better interpreted as a ‘Priamel’ that prepares the reader for the real cause.

<sup>76</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 3.5,21-6,1: αἰτία δ’ οἶμαι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἢ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν καὶ ταύτης δὲ αὐτῆς οἱ δυναστεύοντες κατ’ ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τὰ κοινὰ διοικούντες, εὐπαίδευτοι πάνυ καὶ γενναῖοι τὰς κρίσεις γενόμενοι, ὑφ’ ὧν κοσμούμενον τό τε φρόνιμον τῆς πόλεως μέρος ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπιδέδωκεν καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον ἠνάγκασται νοῦν ἔχειν.

<sup>77</sup> My translation is based on that of Wisse (1995) 76-77 (see also his correction in Wisse [1998]). In *Orat. Vett.* 3.5,27, Wisse (1995) 77 reads ἐκάστης πόλεως instead of τῆς πόλεως, because he thinks that Dionysius refers to the sensible section of ‘each city’ and not to that of Rome only (see also Wisse [1998]). This would indeed agree with the interpretations of some modern scholars, who interpret the phrase as referring to the cities reigned by Rome: see esp. Gabba (1991) 31-32 (‘πόλις [...] has a collective value’) and Kennedy (1994) 162 (‘every city’). Goudriaan (1989) 568 n. 1 correctly points out that τῆς πόλεως cannot mean ‘each city’, so Wisse’s conjecture seems to be a welcome solution. However, I agree with Goudriaan (1989) 568 n. 1 and Hidber (1996) 121-122 that Dionysius presumably means to say that the leaders of Rome first and foremost effected the change within Rome itself. Hidber points to *Ant. Rom.* 6.24.2, where τῶ σοφρονούντι μέρει τῆς πόλεως (‘the sensible part of the city’) refers to Rome. We may add that Dionysius states that the other cities look at Rome as a model (ἀποβλέπειν) so that it seems acceptable that he focuses on the change within Rome itself. With this interpretation, the text of the MSS can stand.

<sup>78</sup> See e.g. Schwartz (1905) 934. Wisse (1995) 77 is more cautious: ‘he might just be flattering his patrons’.

also been explained as criticism (in veiled terms) of Augustus.<sup>79</sup> Hidber, however, has convincingly argued that we should take Dionysius' words seriously: his positive attitude towards Rome in the *Roman Antiquities* corresponds to his words in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* (see below).<sup>80</sup> But what does Dionysius mean when he mentions Rome? Wisse suggests that the 'cause and origin' of the change refers to the Roman phase of Atticism.<sup>81</sup> Grube and other scholars argue that Dionysius is thinking of Roman writers like Cicero and Caesar.<sup>82</sup> Indeed, Dionysius tells us that in recent times, 'many fine works written by both Romans and Greeks' (πολλὰ καὶ καλά πραγματεῖαι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ἑλλησιν) have been published, and here Dionysius may indeed be thinking of Cicero, Livy, Tubero and other writers.<sup>83</sup> However, when he portrays Rome as the origin of the revolution of his time, he is mainly speaking in political terms.<sup>84</sup> Dionysius claims that Rome has become more sensible under the rule of her leaders, who combine administrative competence with cultural education: their influence results in the development of literary production.<sup>85</sup> In other words, Rome's leaders (οἱ δυναστεύοντες) have created the ideal circumstances for a cultural revival.<sup>86</sup> Now, the new social and political context of Rome was indeed very fertile for the development of literature and other works of

<sup>79</sup> In *Ant. Rom.* 2.12.4, Dionysius claims that 'the authority of the ancient kings was not self-willed and based on one single judgement as it is in our days' (καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις ἀνιθάδεις καὶ μονογνώμονες ἦσαν αἱ τῶν ἀρχαίων βασιλέων δυναστεῖαι), for the ancient kings had a council (βουλευτήριον) composed of the best men. Egger (1902) 12 thinks that this text implies criticism of the Augustus' dominion. Marin (1956) 183 draws the same conclusion on the basis of his mistaken identification of Dionysius as the author of *On the Sublime*. For similar views on Dionysius' political attitude, see Usher (1974) 1-2 and Hurst (1982). For a discussion of these views, see Goudriaan (1989) 301.

<sup>80</sup> Hidber (1996) 78-79.

<sup>81</sup> When discussing Dionysius' reference to Rome as the 'cause and origin', Wisse (1995) 77 states that 'in itself this is not decisive', and admits that Dionysius 'does not clearly speak about the origin of the movement, only about the reason of its success'. But Wisse seems to imply that when one takes Dionysius' text together with Cicero, *Brutus* 284, one cannot but conclude that Dionysius is thinking of Calvus as the originator of Atticism.

<sup>82</sup> Grube (1965) 212. Egger (1902) 42 supposes that Dionysius thinks of Cicero. Heldmann (1982) 125 argues that Dionysius refers to the Roman literature of the Ciceronian and Augustan periods.

<sup>83</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 3.6,5-6. See Hidber (1996) 122-123. Usher (1974) 10 n. 2 thinks that Dionysius merely mentions Roman works because Atticism began as a Roman movement. According to Gabba (1991) 31-32, 'Latin literature is mentioned only as a fortuitous consequence of the classicistic revival'.

<sup>84</sup> See Gabba (1982) 31-32.

<sup>85</sup> When interpreting Dionysius' statements about Rome, Gabba (1991) 31 emphasises the administrative aspect, whereas Hidber (1996) 120 thinks that Dionysius refers to the cultural quality of the leaders of Rome. In my view, Dionysius presents both aspects as important (οἱ δυναστεύοντες κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τὰ κοινὰ διοικούντες, εὐπαίδευτοι πάνυ καὶ γενναῖοι τὰς κρίσεις γινόμενοι), but the real change, the cultural revival, is attributed to the ordering power of the leaders: 'being ruled by them' (ὅφ' ὧν κοσμούμενον) the sensible part of the city has increased its power. Therefore, the administrative quality of Rome's leaders seems to be presented as the decisive factor.

<sup>86</sup> Wilamowitz (1900) 45, Bonner (1939) 10 and Kennedy (1972) 352 think that the word δυναστεύοντες refers to Augustus or 'Augustus and his ministers' (Kennedy). This is possible, but, as Hidber (1996) 119-120 points out, Dionysius may also be thinking of those Roman aristocrats who acted as patrons of Greek and Roman writers.

art.<sup>87</sup> Dionysius was only one of the many intellectual Greeks who came to Augustan Rome (see section 1.4). Therefore, it seems reasonable to believe that with his reference to Rome as the cause and origin of the important change, Dionysius primarily acknowledges the importance of the new political order that supported the cultural revival in Augustan Rome, and from there the flourishing of the arts in the Graeco-Roman world as a whole.<sup>88</sup>

Dionysius' gratitude to Rome in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* is mirrored in his *Roman Antiquities*. In the latter work, he presents early Rome as a Greek city, which was founded by Greeks.<sup>89</sup> In the preface to the first book, he admits that some readers may be surprised by the fact that he decided to treat the early history of Rome, which was, according to some Greeks, obscure and inglorious, and therefore unworthy of historical record.<sup>90</sup> But Dionysius says that he will take away these false beliefs, and teach the ignorant Greeks that the early period of Rome was a noble one.<sup>91</sup> From now on, the Greeks should not look down on the origins of Rome, because, according to Dionysius' thesis, the founders of Rome *were* in fact Greeks.<sup>92</sup> Many scholars have pointed out that Dionysius' argument that the Romans were Greeks contributed to the justification of the new Augustan world, in which Greeks and Romans were unified into one culture.<sup>93</sup> It is important to recognise that Dionysius' preface to *On the Ancient Orators* shares this perspective with his historical work on early Rome. In section 2.4, I will come back to this theme when discussing Dionysius' views on Greek and Latin.

To conclude this section on Atticism and classicism, I should add that Dionysius' rhetorical and historical works have more in common: both the rhetorical treatises and the *Roman Antiquities* are based on the principle of μίμησις (imitation).<sup>94</sup> According

---

<sup>87</sup> On the flowering of literature under Augustus, see Bowersock (1965) 122-139.

<sup>88</sup> See Bowersock (1979, 73-74): '(...) all the evidence suggests that Rome initiated and encouraged the return of Greece to the traditions of her classical past. Whatever the motives that led to this policy (some may suspect political emasculation through nostalgia), it is interesting to see the Romans as patrons of Hellenism.' It is possible that one of the leaders Dionysius praised for their cultural taste was the historian and lawyer Quintus Aelius Tubero, as Bowersock (1979) 68-69 suggests. See section 1.4.

<sup>89</sup> On Dionysius' presentation of Rome as a new Athens, see Hidber (1996) 75-81.

<sup>90</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.4.1.

<sup>91</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.5.1.

<sup>92</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.5.1: ... 'Ἑλληνάς τε αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἐπιδείξειν ὑπισχνοῦμαι καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἢ φαυλοτάτων ἔθνῶν συνεληλυθότας. '(...) I engage to prove that they [i.e. the first Romans] were Greeks and came together from nations neither the smallest nor the least considerable.'

<sup>93</sup> See e.g. Bowersock (1965) 131-132: 'Dionysius gave expression to the fusion of cultures which characterized the Graeco-Roman world.' See also Cary (1968) xx, Gabba (1982) 49-53 Goudriaan (1989) 299-329 (esp. 300) and Hidber (1996) 75-81.

<sup>94</sup> On the importance of μίμησις in Dionysius' rhetorical and historical works, see also Delcourt (2005) 43-47.

to Dionysius, his history of early Rome will serve two purposes. First, he will make the real origins of Rome known to the Greeks, who were ignorant until now, because an accurate history of Rome did not exist.<sup>95</sup> Second, he will provide the Roman readers with models of imitation.<sup>96</sup> Having read Dionysius' history, the descendants of the first Romans will be able to live up to their ancestors: '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.'<sup>97</sup> Dionysius' history of Rome will thus portray the first Romans as models, whose lives should be imitated by their descendants in the present and future. This passage reminds us of the questions that Dionysius asks in the final part of the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*: '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?'<sup>98</sup>

We may conclude, then, that there is a close connection between Dionysius' rhetorical works and his history of early Rome. First, both genres are based on the theory of μίμησις. The rhetorical works, on the one hand, are concerned with the imitation of the best aspects of the works of various classical writers. The history of Rome, on the other hand, is concerned with the imitation of the lives of the early Romans. Second, as we have seen, Dionysius' rhetorical and historical works are similar in that they connect the classical past with the present, thus supporting the unity of the Graeco-Roman culture of Augustan Rome.

### 1.3. Dionysius' rhetorical works: their relative order and intended audience

Apart from the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* and the treatise *On Imitation*, of which we possess a number of fragments and an epitome, a total of ten rhetorical

<sup>95</sup> On Dionysius' Greek and Roman audience, see Schultze (1986) esp. 138-139, and Wiater (forthcoming).

<sup>96</sup> See *Ant. Rom.* 1.5.3.

<sup>97</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.4: τοῖς δὲ ἀπ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἰσοθέων ἀνδρῶν νῦν τε οὐσι καὶ ὕστερον ἐσομένοις μὴ τὸν ἥδιστόν τε καὶ ῥῆστον αἰρεῖσθαι τῶν βίων, ἀλλὰ τὸν εὐγενέστατον καὶ φιλοτιμώτατον, ἐνθυμουμένους ὅτι τοὺς εἰληφότας καλὰς τὰς πρώτας ἐκ τοῦ γένους ἀφορμὰς μέγα ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς προσήκει φρονεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἀνάξιον ἐπιτηδεύειν τῶν προγόνων.

<sup>98</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 4.6,21-24: τίνες εἰσὶν ἀξιολογώτατοι τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο προαιρέσεις τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τῶν λόγων καὶ τί παρ' ἐκάστου δεῖ λαμβάνειν ἢ φυλάττεσθαι ...

works (essays, letters, treatises) of Dionysius have survived.<sup>99</sup> The relative chronology of Dionysius' rhetorical works is one of the most studied problems in Dionysian scholarship.<sup>100</sup> Because in a number of passages Dionysius refers to other works that he has already published, modern scholars have been able to establish the chronological order of some of his works. However, complete certainty about the exact order of Dionysius' works cannot be attained by this method. Therefore, some scholars went further by taking an alleged evolution in Dionysius' rhetorical system as evidence for the chronological order of his works.<sup>101</sup> The latter approach is dangerous because it may well be that the character of a specific treatise requires certain methods and theories that are not relevant to other works.<sup>102</sup> For example, the fact that the work *On Composition* makes use of musical theories not found in other works does not imply that this is a late work, for it is the subject of the treatise that accounts for the theories that it uses. For the purpose of the present study, the order of the rhetorical works is of only minor importance. My interpretations are not dependent on an exact reconstruction of the relative chronology of Dionysius' works. However, in a few cases I make use of a rough and undisputed division of Dionysius' works into an earlier period, a middle period, and a later period.<sup>103</sup> This classification, which is based on Dionysius' explicit references, can be useful when examining the development of Dionysius' methods and theories. Bonner, Lebel and Damon have shown that there is a clear evolution in Dionysius' critical methods, which become more sophisticated in his later works.<sup>104</sup> Besides, it seems justified to assume that Dionysius became acquainted with technical theories on language in the course of his career. A certain evolution is manifest, for example, in Dionysius' analyses of 'natural' and 'unnatural' style: whereas in his early works he merely points to the 'natural' (φυσικόν) character of a certain passage, in his later works he uses an impressive apparatus of grammatical terms to describe similar passages (see section 5.2). Therefore, it seems reasonable to believe, with Schenkeveld, that Dionysius obtained or developed his knowledge of technical grammar and other disciplines

---

<sup>99</sup> *Lys., Isoc., Is., Dem., Comp., Pomp. Amm. I, Amm. II, Thuc., Din.* For *On Imitation*, see Battisti (1997).

<sup>100</sup> On the relative chronology of the rhetorical works, see Blass (1863), Rabe (1893), Wilamowitz (1899) 625-627, Rhys Roberts (1901) 4-7, Egger (1902) 29-33, Tukey (1909a), Tukey (1909b), Kalinka (1922-1923), Kalinka (1924-1925), Bonner (1939) 25-38, Pavano (1942), Costil (1949), Pavano (1958) ix-xxiv, Lebel (1973), Usher (1974) xxiii-xxvi, Aujac (1978) 22-28, Sacks (1983) 83-87, Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) 52-92, Goudriaan (1989) 21-24 and 738-740, and Weaire (2002). I regret that I have not been able to consult the work of Costil (1949), which is known to me only through Aujac (1978-1991). The discussion of the problem in Goudriaan (1989) 738-740 is illuminating.

<sup>101</sup> In particular Kalinka (1922-1923, 1924-1925) adopts this risky approach.

<sup>102</sup> On the risks of this approach, see Goudriaan (1989) 21-23.

<sup>103</sup> For the division of Dionysius' rhetorical works into three periods, see also Bonner (1939) and Usher (1974) xxvi.

<sup>104</sup> Bonner (1939); Lebel (1973); Damon (1991).

during his stay in Rome.<sup>105</sup> It is possible that his contacts with the many Greek and Roman scholars in Augustan Rome played an important role in the development of his linguistic knowledge (see section 1.4).

Dionysius' works *On Lysias*, *On Isocrates* and *On Isaeus* comprise the first part of his *On the Ancient Orators*. In the preface to that work, Dionysius announces that he will treat six orators in two groups.<sup>106</sup> The second group will consist of Demosthenes, Hyperides and Aeschines. We do not possess the treatments of Hyperides and Aeschines, and according to some scholars Dionysius never completed the second part of his *On the Ancient Orators*.<sup>107</sup> We do have a work *On Demosthenes*, but it is sometimes disputed that this treatise is identical with the treatment of Demosthenes that Dionysius announces in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*.<sup>108</sup> The work *On Demosthenes* provides us with yet another problem. In *Dem.* 49-50, Dionysius refers to the treatise *On Composition*, but in *Comp.* 18 he seems to refer to *Dem.* 5-7.<sup>109</sup> Therefore, most scholars believe that Dionysius interrupted his work on *On Demosthenes* in order to write *On Composition* (which he presented as a birthday gift to his pupil Metilius Rufus):<sup>110</sup> the latter treatise would in that case have been written between two parts of *On Demosthenes* (scholars disagree on the dividing line between the two parts).<sup>111</sup> In my view, it is also possible that Dionysius was working on the

<sup>105</sup> Schenkeveld (1983) 69: '(...) it is evident that he [Dionysius] acquired his information when he had already been in Rome for some time.'

<sup>106</sup> *Orat. Vett.* 4.7,15-22.

<sup>107</sup> Wilamowitz (1899) thinks that Dionysius changed his mind after the completion of *On Demosthenes*, and that he never treated Aeschines and Hyperides. Wilamowitz (1899) 627: '(...) und so ist der Schluss berechtigt, dass er das Versprechen der Vorrede, das er am Schlusse des Buches über Demosthenes schon einschränkt, nie ausgeführt hat.' Blass (1863), Tukey (1909b) and Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) 66 think that Dionysius did write *On Aeschines* and *On Hyperides*. Cf. *Din.* 1.297,2-14.

<sup>108</sup> Tukey (1909b) 391 argues that 'Dionysius completed the *De oratoribus antiquis* according to his original plan and that afterward (...) he wrote another essay on Demosthenes and incorporated it into the *De oratoribus antiquis*.' Most scholars do not accept Tukey's view, because it forces him to present rather complicated scenarios (Tukey [1909b] 404): 'According to this hypothesis, we are to suppose that the *De oratoribus antiquis* at first contained two sections (συντάξις); that later a third was added which contained a new presentation of the stylistic merits of Demosthenes and proof of his pre-eminence; that still later, probably after the death of Dionysius, the second section, containing the essays on Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Hyperides, ceased to be copied and disappear from circulation (...).'

<sup>109</sup> *Dem.* 49.236,10; *Dem.* 50.239,14; *Comp.* 18.77,9-10. Pavano (1942) 303 thinks that the latter passage refers to another work on Demosthenes, but see Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) 97-99.

<sup>110</sup> See Tukey (1909a) 188: 'After finishing the first half of the essay, Dionysius laid it aside in order to prepare an essay on the arrangement of words (...) With his new grasp of the subject he returned to the essay on Demosthenes, and instead of proceeding according to his original plan with a discussion of Demosthenes' subject matter, he restated his doctrine of composition as developed in the *De compositione* and applied it to Demosthenes.'

<sup>111</sup> See Tukey (1909a) and (1909b), Kalinka (1924-1925) 49-50 and Bonner (1939). Opinions are divided on the separation between the two parts of *On Demosthenes*. Tukey (1909a) argues that *On Composition* was written after *Dem.* 1-34, and before *Dem.* 35-58. Kalinka (1924-1925) thinks that Dionysius turned to *On Composition* when he had finished *Dem.* 32. Bonner (1939) 32 divides *On*

two treatises at the same time. Nevertheless, it is true that the first part of *On Demosthenes* is rather different from the second part: in *Dem.* 1-3, Dionysius expounds the theory of three styles (χαρακτῆρες λέξεως), whereas *Dem.* 37-41 adopts the theory of three composition types (χαρακτῆρες συνθέσεως) from *Comp.* 21-24, but Dionysius does not tell his audience how the two theories are related. In any case, the relative chronology of *On Demosthenes* and *On Composition* is not very important for our purposes. It suffices to assign both of these treatises to the middle period of Dionysius' works, to which the *Letter to Pompeius* (which elaborates *Dem.* 5-7) belongs as well. The group of later works includes at least the treatise *On Thucydides* and its appendix, the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*.<sup>112</sup> *On Dinarchus* also seems to be one of the later works.<sup>113</sup> The relative date of the treatises *On Imitation* and the *First Letter to Ammaeus* is uncertain, but this does not affect our examinations: these essays will be less prominent in this study because they do not contain many relevant passages on linguistic topics. The four works that will concern us most are *On Demosthenes*, *On Composition*, *On Thucydides* and the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*. In these works, Dionysius frequently uses grammatical theories, which we do not find in the works of the early period (see also section 3.3). Unfortunately, nothing is known about Dionysius' work *On Political Philosophy*, to which he refers in *On Thucydides*.<sup>114</sup> The *Ars rhetorica* that has come down to us under Dionysius' name is not authentic.<sup>115</sup> Finally, it should be mentioned that Quintilian refers to a work by Dionysius *On Figures*.<sup>116</sup>

To this brief survey, I would like to add some thoughts on the pedagogical nature of most of Dionysius' works. Because of the many theories that Dionysius' rhetorical works incorporate, it might seem difficult to determine the genre to which they belong. Thus, Viljamaa remarks the following: '[Dionysius'] critical essays are not easy to classify: are they literary criticism, rhetoric, stylistics or grammatical treatises?'<sup>117</sup> It is true that some of the works seem to focus more on the criticism of

---

*Demosthenes* into *Dem.* 1-33 and (after *Comp.*) *Dem.* 34-58. Van Wyk Cronjé (1986) 123-133 thinks that *Comp.* was written before the complete *Dem.*, but he needlessly complicates things by postulating four instead of two parts of *On Demosthenes* (1-34, 35-52, 53-54, 54-58) (see Van Wyk Cronjé [1986] 36-51).

<sup>112</sup> In *Amm.* II 1.421,5-15, Dionysius remarks that he has already treated Thucydides' style in *On the Ancient Orators* (i.e. *Dem.* 10) and 'a short time ago' in the work *On Thucydides*. Cf. Bonner (1939) 35.

<sup>113</sup> *On Dinarchus* was written after *On the Ancient Orators* and *On Demosthenes*: see *Din.* 1.297,1-2; *Din.* 11.313,21-22; *Din.* 13.320,12.

<sup>114</sup> *Thuc.* 2.327,20-22: ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτικῆς φιλοσοφίας.

<sup>115</sup> On Pseudo-Dionysius, *Ars rhetorica*, see Russell (1979) and Heath (2003).

<sup>116</sup> Quintilian, *Inst. orat.* 9.3.89. See also section 4.4.1 n. 222. On these and other treatises that Dionysius may have written, see Aujac (1978) 19-22.

<sup>117</sup> Viljamaa (2003) 164.

earlier writers than on the production of texts. However, it is clear that both literary criticism and the other language disciplines that Dionysius applies are always subservient to his rhetorical teaching: literary criticism is subsidiary to the production of texts.<sup>118</sup> Therefore, I will refer to these treatises as ‘rhetorical works’. The only seeming exceptions to this rule are the *First Letter to Ammaeus* and *On Dinarchus*, which deal with problems in the history of rhetoric: the former work discusses Demosthenes’ alleged dependence on Aristotle, and the latter work distinguishes between Dinarchus’ genuine and spurious speeches. But even these treatises on the history of literature ultimately aim to contribute to the production of texts: *On Dinarchus* shows which of Dinarchus’ speeches should be taken as models for imitation (namely the genuine ones) and which speeches are spurious; the *First Letter to Ammaeus* proves that Demosthenes, Dionysius’ preferred model, was not dependent on Aristotelian rhetorical rules: the conclusion might be that reading Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* (or any technical manual) is not enough for students of rhetoric either.<sup>119</sup> In other words, even in these two works, as in all his other rhetorical treatises, letters and essays, Dionysius’ primary interest is μίμησις (the eclectic imitation of the best qualities) of classical authors.<sup>120</sup> His discussions of Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes and other authors aim to show the future orator which qualities he should adopt and which mistakes he should avoid.<sup>121</sup> Likewise, in the treatise *On Thucydides*, Dionysius aims to assist ‘those who will wish to imitate the historian’ (τῶν βουλευσομένων μιμεῖσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα) (see also section 4.4).<sup>122</sup>

Although all these treatises are characterised by a didactic approach in the sense that they instruct the reader on stylistic writing, we should not ignore the fact that the intended audiences of the works differ. The work *On Composition* (see section 1.6) is primarily addressed to Dionysius’ pupil Metilius Rufus and more generally ‘young men and those who are just beginning to take up the study’ (τοῖς μεираκίοις τε καὶ νεωστὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ἀπτομένοις).<sup>123</sup> Despite Dionysius’ characterisation of his treatise as a ‘manual’ (παραγγελματικόν) rather than a ‘lecture course’ (σχολικόν), it is clear that his approach is that of the tutor who instructs his pupils: this becomes manifest in the frequent questions that Dionysius asks when evaluating or analysing a literary text (see section 7.3.2).<sup>124</sup> The other rhetorical works are addressed to

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Innes (1989) 267. On the relationship between ancient literary criticism and rhetoric, see Classen (1995).

<sup>119</sup> See Goudriaan (1989) 19.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Grube (1965) 211-212.

<sup>121</sup> See *Orat. Vett.* 4.6,21-24: see section 1.2.

<sup>122</sup> *Thuc.* 25.364,15-16.

<sup>123</sup> *Comp.* 1.4,3-4.

<sup>124</sup> *Comp.* 22.98,15-17.

competent scholars rather than young students. *On Demosthenes* is not for ‘those who do not know the orator’s work’.<sup>125</sup> *On Thucydides* was written for the historian Tubero (see section 1.4) and ‘other scholars who will read this treatise’ (τῶν ἄλλων φιλολόγων τῶν ἐντευξομένων τῇ γραφῇ).<sup>126</sup> In the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, Dionysius shows himself reluctant to illustrate his views on Thucydides with many cited passages, because this is the habit of ‘the authors of rhetorical handbooks and introductions’ (οἱ τὰς τέχνας καὶ τὰς εἰσαγωγὰς τῶν λόγων πραγματευόμενοι); but at the special request of Ammaeus’ he will adopt ‘the didactic instead of the epideictic method’ (τὸ διδασκαλικὸν σχῆμα λαβὼν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπίδεικτικοῦ) (see section 4.4).<sup>127</sup> When we examine Dionysius’ linguistic theories and methods, it will be useful to take the intended audience of each work into account.

#### 1.4. Dionysius and the network of intellectuals in Augustan Rome

Dionysius was not the only Greek scholar who arrived in Rome at the beginning of the Augustan period.<sup>128</sup> Rome was a cultural centre that attracted a great number of learned men from all parts of the Graeco-Roman world. Among these men were Strabo of Amasia (who came to Rome in 29 BC) and Nicolaus of Damascus (who visited Rome several times as a diplomat of king Herod of Judaea).<sup>129</sup> Strabo wrote a *History* and a *Geography*, and Nicolaus composed, among other things, a historical work and a biography of Augustus. In an earlier period, other Greeks had already visited or settled in Rome, such as the rhetoricians Apollodorus of Pergamon and Theodorus of Gadara, and the historians Diodorus Siculus and Timagenes of Alexandria.<sup>130</sup> Many of these Greeks lived under the protection of Roman aristocrats, who acted as their patrons. An interesting example is Timagenes, who, having come to Rome as a captive in 55 BC, composed not only a historical work but also a biography of Augustus; after a conflict with the latter he joined the house of Asinius Pollio.<sup>131</sup> Apart from Greek scholars, many Roman intellectuals and literary writers were of course active in Augustan Rome. It is exciting to remember that Dionysius was roughly contemporary with Horace, Vergil, Ovid and Livy, although we do not

<sup>125</sup> *Dem.* 46.231,22-23: οὐ γὰρ δὴ γε τοῖς ἀπείροις τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τάδε γράφω. ‘I do not write these things for those who do not know the orator’s works.’

<sup>126</sup> See *Thuc.* 25.364,10-11.

<sup>127</sup> *Amm.* II 1.422,6. Cf. Goudriaan (1989) 18.

<sup>128</sup> On Greek literature under Augustus, see Bowersock (1965) 122-139. On Greek scholars in Rome, see Dueck (2000) 130-144.

<sup>129</sup> See Hidber (1996) 2-3. On Strabo see Dueck (2000), who also discusses Nicolaus of Damascus (133-135). On Nicolaus, see also Bowersock (1965) 134-138.

<sup>130</sup> See Hidber (1996) 3-4.

<sup>131</sup> On Timagenes, see Bowersock (1965) 125-126 and Dueck (2000) 135-136.

know whether he ever met them.<sup>132</sup> In recent literature, the importance of Dionysius' contacts with Greek and Roman intellectuals in Augustan Rome has been firmly established.<sup>133</sup> It has been pointed out that Dionysius was part of a 'network' of intellectuals, who exchanged their ideas on language and literature.<sup>134</sup>

We can uncover part of this network by examining the addressees of Dionysius' rhetorical works, and this has been successfully done by a number of modern scholars.<sup>135</sup> Unfortunately, most of these addressees are only known from Dionysius. Thus, Ammaeus, the Greek or Roman addressee of two literary letters and the work *On the Ancient Orators* cannot be identified.<sup>136</sup> The same holds for the Greek Demetrius, to whom Dionysius dedicated his treatise *On Imitation*.<sup>137</sup> Cn. Pompeius Geminus received copies of Dionysius' works from their mutual friend Zeno (otherwise unknown).<sup>138</sup> He objected to Dionysius' criticism of Plato and thus forced Dionysius to illuminate his views in his *Letter to Pompeius*. Most scholars assume that Pompeius Geminus was Greek, but Hidber argues that he may have been

---

<sup>132</sup> See Schultze (1986) 121 citing Spelman. Schultze correctly points out that we know nothing about the acquaintanceship of Dionysius and these Roman writers. On Horace and Dionysius, see also Rhys Roberts (1900a) 442 and Innes (1989) 267. Görler (1979) shows that in the Augustan period there are many interesting parallels between Greek literary theory (e.g. Dionysius) and Roman practice (e.g. Vergil and Horace), although he is rightly cautious about the exact relationship between Dionysius and the Roman poets. See esp. Görler (1979) 176: 'Eine direkte Benutzung der uns vorliegenden Schriften bzw. Fragmente griechischer Theoretiker ist, wie betont, fast unmöglich. Aber es ist durchaus denkbar, dass es in den Grundanschauungen und auch in manchen Details Übereinstimmungen zwischen der griechischen Theorie und der römischen "Praxis" gibt.' Görler (1979) 177 explains the parallels by assuming that earlier theories influenced both Dionysius (and Caecilius of Caleacte) and Roman poets such as Vergil and Horace.

<sup>133</sup> See esp. Wisse (1995) 78-80, Hidber (1996) 2-8 and Delcourt (2005) 30-35.

<sup>134</sup> I adopt the term 'network' from Wisse (1995) 78-80, with his explanation of the term: '(...) there must have been many contacts, of various sorts and varying intensity, between numerous Greek and Roman intellectuals.' See now also Dueck (2000) 131. Many scholars refer to a 'circle' in which Dionysius may have been active: see e.g. Rhys Roberts (1900a), Schultze (1986) 122 ('a circle of Greeks and cultured philhellene Romans'), and Hidber (1996) 7 and Delcourt (2005) 30-35 ('les cercles intellectuels'). Wisse (1998) rightly warns us for the word 'circle', which might suggest a specific group of writers under the protection of one patron. The contacts of Dionysius seem to have had a much wider range than that of a literary circle. Dionysius, for example, interchanged ideas with Pompeius Geminus, whom he did not personally know (see below): this and various other possible types of contact should also be taken into account. On Dionysius' personal contacts, see also his remark on his research for his history of early Rome in *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3: καὶ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῶν λογιωτάτων ἀνδρῶν, οἷς εἰς ὀμιλίαν ἦλθον, διδαχῆ παραλαβῶν ... 'Some information I received orally from men of the greatest learning, with whom I associated (...).' (See also section 2.4.)

<sup>135</sup> See esp. Rhys Roberts (1900a), Bonner (1939) 3-6, Bowersock (1965) 130-132, Goudriaan (1989) 2-3, and Hidber (1996) 5-7.

<sup>136</sup> See *Orat. Vett.* 1.3,6; *Amm.* I 1.257,1; *Amm.* II 1.421,2; 17.438,1. Ammaeus may have been Greek or Roman: see Hidber (1996) 7.

<sup>137</sup> See *Pomp.* 3.232,8.

<sup>138</sup> Therefore, Pompeius Geminus did not belong to the closer friends of Dionysius, and he may not have been in Rome: see Aujac (1978) 26 n. 1 and Usher (1985) 352 n. 1.

Roman.<sup>139</sup> Many hypotheses have been expressed concerning this Pompeius: some scholars suggest that he was a client of Pompeius Magnus, which is an interesting idea because we know that Pompeius acted as a patron of Greek intellectuals.<sup>140</sup> Richards and Goold thought that Pompeius Geminus wrote the treatise *On the Sublime*, but this is mere speculation, rightly rejected by other scholars.<sup>141</sup> Two more recipients of Dionysius' works should be mentioned. He presented the treatise *On Composition* as a birthday gift to his Roman student Metilius Rufus, whose father was Dionysius' 'most esteemed friend'.<sup>142</sup> Bowersock has shown that Metilius Rufus is the same man who was to become proconsul of Achaëa under Augustus.<sup>143</sup> Finally, there is Q. Aelius Tubero, to whom Dionysius addressed his treatise *On Thucydides*.<sup>144</sup> Tubero was a historian and a lawyer; his father was a legate in Asia, and his sons became consuls in 11 and 4 BC respectively.<sup>145</sup> Interestingly, Cicero knew both Quintus Aelius Tubero and his father Lucius.<sup>146</sup> Bowersock has suggested that Tubero was Dionysius' patron in Rome, which is possible but not certain.<sup>147</sup>

So far, I have restricted myself to the scholars to whom Dionysius' dedicated his works. However, Dionysius must have been in contact with many other intellectuals whom he does not mention in his works. Consequently, some scholars have made partly interesting and partly more fanciful conjectures about the 'professorial circle' in which Dionysius may have taken part.<sup>148</sup> Thus, it has been thought that Dionysius was

---

<sup>139</sup> Hidber (1996) 7 n. 50.

<sup>140</sup> On the alleged connection between Pompeius Geminus and Pompeius Magnus, see Rhys Roberts (1900a) 439, Schultze (1986) 122, and Fornaro (1997) 4 n. 7. On the contacts between Pompeius and Greek intellectuals, see Anderson (1963) and Crawford (1978) 203-204.

<sup>141</sup> Richards (1938) and Goold (1961) 173-174. Rhys Roberts (1900a) 440 already hinted at the possibility. Bowersock (1979) 70 and Schultze (1986) 122. n. 6 reject the idea because *On the Sublime* is probably from later date. Aujac (1978) 26 n. 1 identifies Pompeius Geminus with Geminus of Rhodes, who wrote a treatise on astronomy. On these conjectures, see also Goudriaan (1989) 2-3. On the date of *On the Sublime*, see the literature cited in my section 1.5.

<sup>142</sup> See *Comp.* 1.4,4-5: ὃ Ῥοῦφε Μετίλιε πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ κάμοι τιμιωτάτου φίλων. 'Rufus Metilius, born from a father who is excellent and the most esteemed of my friends.' On Rufus Metilius' birthday, see *Comp.* 1.3,5-9. Some MSS give the pupil's name as Melitius, but see Bowersock (1965) 132 n. 2. Bowersock points out that Dionysius includes the Metilii in the list of Alban *principes* in *Ant. Rom.* 3.29.7, whereas this family is absent from Livy's corresponding list (1.30.2).

<sup>143</sup> See Bowersock (1965) 132.

<sup>144</sup> See *Thuc.* 1.325,5-6; 55.418,20. Cf. *Amm.* II 1.421,13. In *Ant. Rom.* 1.80.1, Dionysius refers to Tubero's historical work.

<sup>145</sup> See Bowersock (1965) 130 and Bowersock (1979) 68-69.

<sup>146</sup> See Cicero, *Pro Ligario* 5.12. Cf. Bowersock (1979) 69.

<sup>147</sup> Bowersock (1965) 130. See also Bowersock (1979) 68 and Hidber (1996) 6. Bowersock (1965) 130 n. 1 points out that there was a lexicographer Aelius Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who was active under Hadrian and who seems to be a descendant of our Dionysius. Bowersock argues that the lexicographer received his name Aelius from the Aelii Tuberones. Cf. Goudriaan (1989) 3 n. 3.

<sup>148</sup> See esp. Goold (1961), and the cautious discussion in Goudriaan (1989) 3-4. As I pointed out above, the term 'circle' does not cover all types of contacts that Dionysius may have had with various scholars.

in contact with ‘Longinus’ (the author of *On the Sublime*), ‘Demetrius’ (the author of *On Style*), Timagenes, and the house of Asinius Pollio.<sup>149</sup> We are on more solid ground when we think of Caecilius of Caleacte, whom Dionysius mentions as a ‘dear friend’.<sup>150</sup> We have already observed that Caecilius and Dionysius represent the Greek Atticism of Augustan Rome (see section 1.2). Caecilius also adopted the method of σύγκρισις (the detailed comparison of two authors), which Dionysius considers ‘the best method of assessment’ (κράτιστος ἐλέγχου τρόπος).<sup>151</sup> Unlike Dionysius, Caecilius applied this method also in order to evaluate Latin literature, for he made a famous comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero.<sup>152</sup> The only contemporary author who refers to Dionysius is Strabo.<sup>153</sup>

The conjectures about Dionysius’ acquaintances are fascinating, but they do not help us much further. Therefore, I will adopt a slightly different approach to the problem, which will be more relevant to the subject of this study on Dionysius’ linguistic ideas. Since this study focuses on Dionysius’ integration of ideas from various language disciplines, it is useful to examine the presence of representatives of these disciplines in Augustan Rome. In the remaining part of this section, I intend to demonstrate that the presence of many grammarians in Rome may have influenced Dionysius’ ideas on language. I will not claim that Dionysius was in contact with specific scholars or that he read specific treatises, although we may assume that some of these scholars were indeed known to him. My overview of contemporary linguists in Rome rather serves as a sketch of the scholarly context in which Dionysius was working, a context that shaped the ideas on which he built his rhetorical programme. A whole range of grammarians came to Rome in the first century BC. Some of them, such as the elder Tyrannion, Philoxenus and presumably Asclepiades of Myrlea, had either visited

<sup>149</sup> On Dionysius’ alleged contact with ‘Longinus’ and Manilius, see Goold (1961) 168. Richards (1938) and Goold (1961) 173-174 argue that Dionysius’ addressee Pompeius Geminus is the author of *On the Sublime*. Marin (1956) believes that Dionysius himself wrote that treatise. Goold (1961) 186-189 argues that ‘Demetrius’ (the author of *On Style*) is identical with the Demetrius to whom Dionysius refers in *Pomp.* 3.232,8. Rhys Roberts (1900b) 440 already hinted at the possibility. On Dionysius’ alleged contact with Asinius Pollio and Timagenes, see Hurst (1982) 848, who draws on Costil (1949). On further possible contacts, see Goudriaan (1989) 3.

<sup>150</sup> In *Pomp.* 3.240,14, Dionysius refers to Caecilius as τῷ φιλάτῳ Καικιλίῳ. On this formulation, see Tolkiel (1908), who points out that, given the rarity of the word φίλατος in Dionysius’ works, we may assume that there was a close connection between the two rhetoricians. On Caecilius of Caleacte, see further Rhys Roberts (1897), Brzoska (1899), Kennedy (1972) 364-369, Weißberger (1997) and Innes (2002).

<sup>151</sup> *Pomp.* 1.224,9-10. See also section 7.4.

<sup>152</sup> Caecilius, fr. 153-154 Ofenloch. See Plutarch, *Demosth.* 3. ‘Longinus’, *Subl.* 12.4 also compares Demosthenes and Cicero. Russell (contribution to the discussion of Bowersock [1979] 76) supposes that Caecilius’ comparison was not positive for Cicero. See also Kennedy (1972) 368 and Innes (2002) 277-278.

<sup>153</sup> Strabo 14.2.16. On Dionysius and Strabo, see Bowersock (1965) 129-130, Schultze (1986) 122, Goudriaan (1989) 2 and Dueck (2000) 130-133.

Rome or even settled there some decades before Dionysius arrived. Others, such as Tryphon and Diocles, also known as the younger Tyrannion, arrived in Rome in the same year as Dionysius (30 BC). Further, we should not forget that the Roman Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BC) was still alive when Dionysius settled in Rome. I will briefly discuss the most important facts concerning these scholars.

Tyrannion from Amisus in Pontus (the elder Tyrannion) came to Italy in 71 BC as a captive of the second Mithridatic war.<sup>154</sup> Before that time, he had been a student of Dionysius Thrax in Rhodes, if we may believe the ancient testimony.<sup>155</sup> Tyrannion worked in Rome from 67, and may have lived until 25 BC. In Rome, Tyrannion was not only the teacher of Strabo and of Cicero's son Marcus and nephew Quintus, but he had also connections with Caesar.<sup>156</sup> Furthermore, he took care of the Peripatetic library of Apellicon, which Sulla had brought to Rome in 84 BC. This library included many valuable manuscripts of works by Aristotle and Theophrastus.<sup>157</sup> Only a few fragments of Tyrannion's works survive, but we know that Tyrannion wrote a treatise *Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν* (*On the Classification of the Parts of Speech*) (see section 3.2).<sup>158</sup> Tyrannion is the first *grammarian* in whose fragments the originally philosophical expression τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου is used. Some of the other book titles that have been preserved under the name of Tyrannion do not belong to him, but to his pupil Diocles, who was presumably named Tyrannion after his teacher.<sup>159</sup> Just like Tryphon (see below) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diocles, or the younger Tyrannion, came to Rome around 30 BC.<sup>160</sup> He was given as a slave to Cicero's widow Terentia, who freed him. It is certain that he wrote, apart from other works, an Ἐξήγησις τοῦ Τυραννίωνος μερισμοῦ, which was a commentary on his teacher's treatise mentioned above.<sup>161</sup>

<sup>154</sup> For the testimonia on the elder Tyrannion's life, see Haas (1977). For Tyrannion's life and works, see also Wendel (1943), Pfeiffer (1968) 272-273, Rawson (1985) 69 and Baumbach (2002b).

<sup>155</sup> See Suda s.v. Tyrannion. Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 266 and Rawson (1985) 69.

<sup>156</sup> On Tyrannion as one of Strabo's teachers, see Dueck (2000) 9.

<sup>157</sup> Strabo 13.1.54. See Pfeiffer (1968) 273, Rawson (1985) 40 and Dueck (2000) 9. See also my sections 1.5 and 3.3.1.

<sup>158</sup> Tyrannion fr. 55-56 Haas. The titles *Περὶ μερισμοῦ* and *Περὶ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου*, both mentioned in Suda, have been identified as one treatise that carried the title *Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν*, which was also the title of one of the works of Apollonius Dyscolus. Cf. Wendel (1943) 1815.

<sup>159</sup> See the discussion in Haas (1977) 97-98.

<sup>160</sup> According to Tyrannion T[estimonium] 17 Haas, Diocles came to Rome after Actium. If this information is correct, the elder Tyrannion must have taught Diocles at a very high age. Therefore, some scholars have suggested that Diocles came to Rome already in 48 BC (after Pharsalos): see Haas (1977) 96-97.

<sup>161</sup> Tyrannion T 17 Haas; cf. Haas (1977) 97.

We are told that the grammarian Asclepiades of Myrlea came to Rome in the first half of the first century BC, but this is not entirely certain.<sup>162</sup> Asclepiades wrote books on various subjects, including the biographical work *Περὶ γραμματικῶν* (*On Grammarians*) and a treatise on Nestor's cup (*Iliad* 11.352ff.).<sup>163</sup> Our limited knowledge of Asclepiades' book *Περὶ γραμματικῆς* (*On Grammar*) can presumably be enhanced by the study of Sextus Empiricus' *Against the Grammarians*, for Blank has argued that Sextus Empiricus' attacks on grammar (including the theory of the parts of speech) respond to Asclepiades.<sup>164</sup> Blank also believes that Dionysius of Halicarnassus follows Asclepiades' argument in his work *On Composition*: we will examine this claim in section 3.3.2.<sup>165</sup>

A grammarian who definitely went to Rome in the first half of the first century BC was Philoxenus, who came from Alexandria.<sup>166</sup> He wrote a treatise *Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου*, in which he stated that Latin was a Greek dialect that was very close to Aeolic.<sup>167</sup> In section 2.4, I will discuss this theory, and we will see that Dionysius of Halicarnassus expresses the same view in his *Roman Antiquities*.<sup>168</sup> Philoxenus' work on the Latin language is not only interesting because of the theory it contains, but also because it implies that the author knew Latin to a certain extent. Philoxenus was also active in the field of technical grammar: we know the title of a work *On Monosyllabic Verbs* (*Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων ῥημάτων*).<sup>169</sup>

The influential grammarian Tryphon arrived in Rome in the same year as Dionysius (30 BC).<sup>170</sup> Tryphon wrote a number of grammatical works on the parts of speech, namely *Περὶ ἄρθρων* (*On Articles*), *Περὶ προθέσεων* (*On Prepositions*), *Περὶ συνδέσμων* (*On Conjunctions*), and *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* (*On Adverbs*).<sup>171</sup> Although

<sup>162</sup> See Suda s.v. Asclepiades, where it is said that Asclepiades came to Rome under Pompeius Magnus. Pfeiffer (1968) 273 thinks that Asclepiades 'certainly went to Rome', but Rawson (1985) 69 n. 11 thinks that the Suda article is mistaken here. On Asclepiades, see further Wentzel (1896), Blank (1998) xlv-xlvi and Blank (2000) 407-411.

<sup>163</sup> See Pfeiffer (1968) 273.

<sup>164</sup> Blank (1998) xlvi and Blank (2000).

<sup>165</sup> On the relationship between Asclepiades and Sextus Empiricus, see Blank (1998) xlv-l and Blank (2000) 405. For the alleged connection between Asclepiades and Dionysius, see Blank (2000) 410.

<sup>166</sup> On Philoxenus, see Wendel (1941), Pfeiffer (1968) 273-274 and Rawson (1985) 68-69. On his works, see Theodoridis (1976) 8-14.

<sup>167</sup> For the fragments, see *GRF* 443-447 and *GRFAC* 396-397. The same topic was treated by the younger Tyrannion mentioned above. See Pfeiffer (1968) 274.

<sup>168</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.90.1.

<sup>169</sup> See Wendel (1941) 197-198 and Pfeiffer (1968) 274.

<sup>170</sup> The fragments have been collected by Von Velsen (1853). For Tryphon's life and works, see also Wendel (1939) and Baumbach (2002a).

<sup>171</sup> See Von Velsen (1853) and Wendel (1939). Tryphon also wrote a work on the verbal moods, the title of which Suda cites as *Περὶ ῥημάτων ἐγκλιτικῶν καὶ ἀπαρεμφάτων καὶ προστακτικῶν καὶ εὐκτικῶν καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντων*: see Wendel (1939) 734-735. See also my section 3.8. It is uncertain

we do not have any evidence, we should not exclude the possibility that Tryphon was part of the network of intellectuals in which Dionysius participated.<sup>172</sup> Dionysius may also have known one or more of Tryphon's grammatical treatises.

Apart from the Greek grammarians mentioned, Didymus (who was active in the second half of the first century BC) may have come from Alexandria to Rome, but this is not certain.<sup>173</sup> Didymus wrote a large number of works, including commentaries on Homer, Aristophanes, Pindar and Sophocles, but also on Demosthenes and perhaps on Thucydides.<sup>174</sup> It is possible that Dionysius of Halicarnassus knew a commentary of the type that Didymus wrote: in section 4.4.2, I will discuss some remarkable parallels between Dionysius' grammatical notes on Thucydides and the observations in the Thucydides scholia.

What about Roman grammarians? It is possible that Dionysius was acquainted with the works of Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BC), who wrote his *De lingua latina* in the middle of the first century BC.<sup>175</sup> Dionysius knew at least one work by this erudite Roman scholar, for he refers to Varro's *Antiquities* when discussing the origins of Rome.<sup>176</sup> Varro died shortly after Dionysius' arrival in Rome, but we are informed about a number of Roman *grammatici* who were active in the same period as Dionysius. In his *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, Suetonius lists twenty grammarians who taught in Rome between the end of the second century BC and the end of the first century AD.<sup>177</sup> Some of them belong to the intellectual world of the Augustan period, in which Dionysius was active as well. Marcus Verrius Flaccus (ca. 55 BC - 20 AD), for example, taught Augustus' grandsons and had a grammar school at the Palatium.<sup>178</sup> Suetonius does not mention his writings, but we know that Verrius wrote a lexicographical treatise *De verborum significatu* (*On the Meaning of Verbs*). Quintus Caecilius Epirota (ca. 75-15 BC), Lucius Crassicius (ca. 70-20 BC),

---

whether Tryphon wrote separate treatises *Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας* and *Περὶ μετοχῆς*, as is sometimes assumed. Further, the titles of a number of unauthentic works have survived under Tryphon's name, among which a *Τέχνη γραμματική* and a work *Περὶ τοῦ ὄς*. On Tryphon's views on syntax, see now Matthaïos (2003).

<sup>172</sup> Here I may borrow the words that Bowersock (1965) 124 uses when discussing the connections between Dionysius, Strabo, Timagenes and Nicolaus: 'It would be surprising if these men failed to encounter one another at Rome (...).'

<sup>173</sup> See Pfeiffer (1968) 274-275. On Didymus, see Pfeiffer (1968) 274-279.

<sup>174</sup> See Pfeiffer (1968) 275-278. On the alleged commentary on Thucydides, which may even go back to Aristarchus, see Pfeiffer (1968) 225 and 277.

<sup>175</sup> On Varro and his connections to the intellectuals of his time, see Rawson (1985) *passim*.

<sup>176</sup> See *Ant. Rom.* 1.14.1: Οὐάπρῶν Τερέντιος. Varro was an important source for Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities*: see Gabba (1991) 98-101 and Fantham (1996) 95-96.

<sup>177</sup> See Kaster (1995).

<sup>178</sup> Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 17. See Kaster (1995) 190-196.

Scribonius Aphrodisius (born ca 50 BC), Gaius Iulius Hyginus (born ca. 60 BC), and Gaius Melissus (ca. 50 BC - 20 AD) also taught grammar while Dionysius was at Rome.<sup>179</sup> Because Suetonius is more interested in the lives of these grammarians than in their writings, it is difficult to determine the connections between their views and the ideas of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>180</sup>

The foregoing survey clearly shows that, in the first century BC, Rome was a place where linguistic knowledge was omnipresent. There were many opportunities for someone like Dionysius to come into contact with the theories of grammarians. Although we do not have any hard evidence, we should take into account the possibility that Dionysius knew one or more treatises by Asclepiades, the elder Tyrannion or other grammarians, and that, during his stay in Rome, he was in contact with scholars like Tyrannion, Tryphon and Diocles (the younger Tyrannion) or their Roman colleagues. It is clear that in particular Dionysius' grammatical treatment of the parts of speech (with which we will be concerned in chapters 3-5 of this study) cannot entirely depend on his reading of earlier Peripatetic and Stoic sources, though the works of Theophrastus and Chrysippus seem to have been important for him (see section 3.3.1). Schenkeveld has rightly suggested that Dionysius' remarks on grammar 'correspond with the level of common knowledge of linguistic views which then at Rome, at least in Greek circles, were circulating.'<sup>181</sup> The network of Greek and Roman intellectuals in Augustan Rome, the contours of which I have tried to sketch above, may have played an important role in the formation of Dionysius' ideas. I have focused on grammarians, but we should not ignore the representatives of other disciplines. Apart from the Greek and Roman linguists mentioned above, the Roman Vitruvius will also concern us, in particular in connection with Dionysius' views on the architectural character of discourse (section 4.3.1). We will see that the classicistic ideas that pervade Vitruvius' *De architectura* (written in the early Augustan period) are very similar to the views that we find in Dionysius' rhetorical works.

### 1.5. Rhetoric, philosophy, philology, grammar, musical and poetical theory

Ancient Greek and Roman ideas on language were developed in the context of various disciplines. Dionysius of Halicarnassus makes use of these ideas and blends them into a programme of rhetoric that is to guide the future orators of his time. In this section, I

<sup>179</sup> Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 16-21. See Kaster (1995) 182-222.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. Kaster (1995) 231. In his chapter on Quintus Remmius Palaemon, Suetonius does not even mention his *ars grammatica* (but we are informed about that treatise by Quintilian, *Inst. orat.* 1.4.19-20 and Juvenal 6.451-453).

<sup>181</sup> Schenkeveld (1983) 93.

will briefly introduce the most relevant facts concerning the disciplines that influenced Dionysius. I will start with the various philosophical schools to which Dionysius refers. Then I will present some of the other disciplines that play a role in his works.

Dionysius frequently refers to representatives of various philosophical schools.<sup>182</sup> The Peripatos is particularly prominent in Dionysius' rhetorical works.<sup>183</sup> As a rhetorician, Dionysius knew not only Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (at least the third book), but also Theophrastus' *On Style*.<sup>184</sup> From the latter work, he quotes more than once.<sup>185</sup> Dionysius may have known more works by these philosophers, for in 84 BC Sulla had brought the Peripatetic library of Apellicon, containing a number of Theophrastus' and Aristotle's manuscripts, from Athens to Rome (see section 1.4). One of the scholars who took care of this library was the elder Tyrannion mentioned above.<sup>186</sup> In Dionysius' rhetorical works, we find a number of Aristotelian ideas. Thus, the Aristotelian quality of 'clarity' (σαφήνεια) is central to Dionysius' stylistic theory, from his earliest to his later works (see also sections 5.2 and 7.3.1).<sup>187</sup> Besides, he applies a number of stylistic ideas that were developed by Aristotle's successors. Dionysius' theory of essential and additional virtues of style (ἀρεταὶ λέξεως) elaborates Theophrastus' list of four virtues (purity of language, lucidity, appropriateness and ornament) (see section 6.5).<sup>188</sup> Dionysius also refers to Theophrastus' theory of the 'naturally beautiful words' (ὀνόματα φύσει καλά) (see section 4.3.1).<sup>189</sup> Furthermore, Bonner has shown that Dionysius' theory of three styles (*Dem.* 1-3: see section 5.2) as well as the theory of the three composition types (*Comp.* 22-24: see section 4.3.2) is based on the Peripatetic concept of the right mean of style (μεσότης, τὸ μέσον): the mixed style is preferred above the plain and elevated

<sup>182</sup> See the overview in Goudriaan (1989) 439-469.

<sup>183</sup> Kroll (1907) 100-101 already pointed to the importance of 'altperipatetische Quellen (...), für welche Musik, Poesie und Prosa innerlich zusammengehören.' On the Peripatetic influence on Dionysius, see also Bonner (1938), Aujac & Lebel (1981) 35-36, Goudriaan (1989) 439-440 and 456-458 and Wooten (1994). Fortenbaugh (2005) 14-17 discusses Dionysius' use of Theophrastus and other Peripatetic sources.

<sup>184</sup> In *Comp.* 25.126,2-11, Dionysius refers to the third book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (see section 6.1). On Dionysius' references to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, see also Sauppe (1896).

<sup>185</sup> Dionysius is one of the most important sources for our knowledge of Theophrastus' *On Style*. For Dionysius' use of Theophrastus, see Fortenbaugh (2005) 14-17. Dionysius mentions Theophrastus sixteen times: once in the *Antiquitates Romanae* (5.73.3), and fifteen times in the rhetorical works. Passages from Theophrastus' *On Style* are discussed in *Lys.* 14.23,16-24,20 (Theophrastus fr. 692 Fortenbaugh) and *Comp.* 16.66,8-18 (Theophrastus fr. 688 Fortenbaugh).

<sup>186</sup> See Pfeiffer (1968) 273 and Rawson (1985) 40.

<sup>187</sup> See e.g. *Lys.* 4.12,11-13; *Thuc.* 24.363,4-9.

<sup>188</sup> See *Pomp.* 3.239,5-240,16 and *Thuc.* 22.358,19-23. For an analysis of Dionysius' theory, see Bonner (1939) 16-19. Innes (1985) 255-263 discusses the history of the theory virtues of style.

<sup>189</sup> *Comp.* 16.66,8-18 (Theophrastus fr. 688 Fortenbaugh).

style, and the same holds for the mixed composition type.<sup>190</sup> It should be noted that Dionysius knows at least one representative of the Peripatos of his own time: in the *First Letter to Ammaeus*, Dionysius refutes a contemporary Peripatetic philosopher who had argued that Demosthenes learned his rhetorical skill from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.<sup>191</sup>

Dionysius' relationship with Plato is complex.<sup>192</sup> Because of the focus of his rhetorical works, Dionysius is more interested in Plato's style than in his ideas. In his work *On Demosthenes*, Dionysius points out that Plato's style, which is a mixture of the grand and the plain style, is attractive as long as the author uses common words and inartificial language.<sup>193</sup> But as soon as Plato's expressions become more ornate, poetic and 'dithyrambic', Dionysius sharply objects to them (see sections 5.2 and 6.4). Dionysius hastens to say that he knows that 'Plato produced many works on a variety of subjects that are great and admirable and show the highest ability'.<sup>194</sup> But the damage has already been done: the *Letter to Pompeius* proves that not all readers approved of Dionysius' attacks on Plato's 'poetic' style.<sup>195</sup> Occasionally, we find references to Plato's philosophical ideas. Thus, Dionysius knew Plato's 'views concerning the Form, his views concerning the good and his ideas concerning the state'.<sup>196</sup> In section 2.5, I will examine Dionysius' reference to Plato's *Cratylus*, which plays an interesting role in his discussion of mimetic words.<sup>197</sup> On the whole, however, Plato's influence is not as significant as that of Aristotle and Theophrastus.

Many scholars have recognised the Isocratean influence on Dionysius.<sup>198</sup> In section 1.2, we have already seen that Dionysius presents Isocrates' life (rather than his style) as a model for imitation. He even holds that anyone who is interested in 'true philosophy' (τὴν ἀληθινὴν φιλοσοφίαν) should imitate (μιμῆσθαι) the principles of this orator.<sup>199</sup> Here, Dionysius adopts Isocrates' concept of 'philosophy' (very different from that of Plato or Aristotle), which is also related to Dionysius' 'philosophical rhetoric' (see section 1.2).<sup>200</sup> Dionysius thinks that a practical type of

<sup>190</sup> Bonner (1938). For the 'Peripatetic mean of style', see also Hendrickson (1904).

<sup>191</sup> See Goudriaan (1989) 456-457.

<sup>192</sup> On Dionysius and Plato, see Goudriaan (1989) 555-565.

<sup>193</sup> *Dem.* 5-7.

<sup>194</sup> *Dem.* 6.138,12-14: πολλὰ ... περὶ πολλῶν οἶδα μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας δυνάμεως ἐξενηγεμένα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

<sup>195</sup> See esp. *Pomp.* 1.221,7-18.

<sup>196</sup> *Thuc.* 3.329,1-2: τὰ περὶ τῆς ἰδέας καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰ γαθοῦ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας.

<sup>197</sup> See *Comp.* 16.62,18-63,3.

<sup>198</sup> I regret that I have not been able to consult Hubbell (1913), who discusses Isocrates' influence on Dionysius. On this topic, see also Hidber (1996) 44-56.

<sup>199</sup> *Isoc.* 4.61,4-9.

<sup>200</sup> See Goudriaan (1989) 439 and 442-445 (on Dionysius' use of the term 'philosophy').

philosophy (which might also be called παιδεία) should characterise the leaders of cities, having attained high cultural standards through the study of rhetoric.<sup>201</sup> We may assume that Dionysius' lost treatise *On Political Philosophy* contained Isocratean ideas on the participation in public life (see section 1.3).<sup>202</sup> Like Isocrates, Dionysius is mainly interested in the genre of the πολιτικὸς λόγος (see section 1.6).<sup>203</sup> Isocrates' influence on Dionysius' political ideas is significant, but it will be of limited importance in this study on Dionysius' linguistic views. An exception is section 6.2, where I will compare Dionysius' and Isocrates' views on the styles of prose and poetry.

For our purposes, the Stoic influence on Dionysius is much more important. Dionysius knew the work *Περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν* (*On the Syntax of the Parts of Speech*) by the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (see sections 3.3.1 and 5.3.1).<sup>204</sup> Dionysius may also have known other Stoic works.<sup>205</sup> In chapter 3, I will argue that Dionysius' theory of the parts of speech combines elements from Stoic philosophy and Alexandrian grammar. In chapter 5, I will argue that Dionysius' passage on natural word order (*Comp.* 5) is based on the Stoic theory of categories. Despite the importance of Stoic ideas for Dionysius' linguistic theories, I will not follow the suggestion of Aujac, who thinks that Dionysius may have been a Stoic himself.<sup>206</sup> Dionysius' profound abhorrence of Chrysippus' style renders it highly improbable that he was a member of the Stoic school.<sup>207</sup>

The Epicurean school is the object of Dionysius' contempt. At the end of his discussion of the three composition types in the treatise *On Composition*, Dionysius explicitly expresses his aversion to 'the chorus of Epicureans, who have no regard for these things' (Ἐπικουρείων δὲ χορόν οἷς οὐδὲν μέλει τούτων).<sup>208</sup> It has been suggested that this remark is particularly directed at the philosopher Philodemus, who was active in Rome and Naples and who died about one decade before Dionysius arrived in Rome.<sup>209</sup> Philodemus wrote many treatises, including *On Rhetoric*, *On*

<sup>201</sup> In *Dem.* 15.161,10-11 characterises the well educated few as οἱ δὲ πολιτικοὶ τε καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορῶν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ἐληλυθότες, 'men experienced in public life and with a broad education'. On Dionysius' 'Bildungsideal', see Goudriaan (1989) 442-443 and Hidber (1996) 44-56.

<sup>202</sup> Cf. Grube (1965) 208.

<sup>203</sup> On the πολιτικὸς λόγος, see Goudriaan (1989) 71-76.

<sup>204</sup> *Comp.* 4.22,12-17.

<sup>205</sup> Atkins (1934 II) 133 thinks that Dionysius may be influenced by the Stoic Crates of Mallos (see below).

<sup>206</sup> Aujac & Lebel (1981) 77 n. 1.

<sup>207</sup> See *Comp.* 4.20,19-21,15.

<sup>208</sup> See *Comp.* 24.122,3-12.

<sup>209</sup> See Aujac & Lebel (1981) 174 n. 2 and Usher (1985) 209 n. 2. On Philodemus' life, see Janko (2000) 4-7.

*Music* and *On Poems*. Thus, unlike other Epicureans, Philodemus was interested in the artistic composition of prose and poetry.<sup>210</sup> For this reason, it seems in the first instance improbable that Dionysius refers to Philodemus when criticising ‘the chorus of Epicureans’. Nevertheless, we should not rule out the possibility that Dionysius is indeed thinking of Philodemus: this becomes manifest when we introduce another group of scholars that seems to have influenced Dionysius’ views, namely the so-called *kritikoi*, whom we know from Philodemus’ *On Poems*.

The *kritikoi* were Hellenistic scholars who were interested in the criteria for good poetry.<sup>211</sup> In his work *On Poems*, Philodemus discusses and refutes the theories of these critics.<sup>212</sup> Philodemus’ intermediate source was the Stoic philosopher Crates of Mallos, an older contemporary of Aristarchus.<sup>213</sup> Crates was one of the leading scholars of Pergamon and he visited Rome in 168 BC, where he taught grammar while recovering from a broken leg.<sup>214</sup> In the treatise *On Poems*, Philodemus refutes the views of Crates and the various earlier writers (*kritikoi*) whom Crates discussed in his work. The work *On Poems* has come down to us in ‘what are probably the most damaged, disordered, and difficult fragments to survive from classical antiquity’.<sup>215</sup> But recent scholarship, including Janko’s edition of *On Poems* 1, has increased our knowledge and understanding of the badly damaged papyri fragments from the book-rolls of the ‘Villa dei Papiri’ at Herculaneum, which was covered with ash in the eruption of the Vesuvius in 79 AD.<sup>216</sup> The views on poetry expressed in the fragments of *On Poems* 1 also shed new light on the literary theories of other critics, such as Horace and Dionysius.<sup>217</sup> The exact theories of the various *kritikoi* differ widely, but they all concentrated on the euphonic aspects of poems. They thought that poetry should merely ‘please the ear’ and that, consequently, the ear was the only criterion for the *evaluation* of poetry (see section 4.3.1). One of the critics is Heracleodorus, who seems to have argued that the only relevant aspect of poetry is composition (σύνθεσις) and ‘the sound that supervenes upon it’.<sup>218</sup> Thus, for Heracleodorus and other critics, the understanding of the words of a poem is irrelevant to its quality.

---

<sup>210</sup> Cf. Janko (2000) 8.

<sup>211</sup> On the *kritikoi*, see Schenkeveld (1968), Porter (1995a) and Janko (2000) 120-189.

<sup>212</sup> See Janko (2000) 120-189.

<sup>213</sup> See Janko (2000) 120-134.

<sup>214</sup> On Crates of Mallos, see also Ax (1996) 288-289.

<sup>215</sup> Janko (2000) v.

<sup>216</sup> On Philodemus and poetry, see also Obbink (1995) and the literature mentioned there.

<sup>217</sup> See Janko vi: ‘Although under half of it survives, *On Poems* 1 is an addition to the corpus of ancient literary criticism on the scale of the *Poetics* or *On the Sublime*. The theories which it contains are at least as significant as those in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ *De compositione verborum*, and will require us totally to reassess Horace’s *Ars Poetica*.’

<sup>218</sup> Cf. Janko (2000) 156.

Here, Philodemus disagrees, for he thinks that words and sense together determine the quality of a poem, and that one cannot separate the words (or the composition) from the meaning.<sup>219</sup> As some modern scholars have observed, there are interesting parallels between the critics whose views Philodemus refutes on the one hand and Dionysius on the other.<sup>220</sup> In this study, it will turn out that the connection between the *kritikoi* and Dionysius is even closer than scholars have thought so far. In several passages of this study, I will compare Dionysius' views with those of the *kritikoi*. In particular, I will point to similarities in their use of the theory of the parts of speech for stylistic theory (sections 3.2 and 3.3), their views on σύνθεσις (composition), on the architectural character of composition and on the role of the 'ear' in evaluating literature (section 4.3.1), their ideas on the similarity between prose and poetry (sections 6.2 and 6.6), and their use of the method of metathesis (section 7.2).

Coming back to Dionysius' criticism of Epicurean philosophers (see above), we may now reconsider the possibility that Dionysius is thinking of Philodemus. Given the fact that Philodemus objected to the critics who claim that the quality of a poem depends only on the composition (σύνθεσις) and its sound, we should not exclude the possibility that Dionysius' disgust at the Epicureans is indeed directed at Philodemus: it may be significant that Dionysius' reference to the Epicureans directly follows his discussion of the three composition types, in which euphony is the central concern. But it is perhaps better to leave the question open.

The views of the *kritikoi* are closely related to musical theory.<sup>221</sup> The influence of musical theory on Dionysius' rhetorical works (especially his composition theory) has long been recognised.<sup>222</sup> According to Dionysius, oratory and music differ from each other 'only in degree, not in kind' (see section 6.5).<sup>223</sup> Dionysius twice refers to the teachings of Aristoxenus 'the musical theorist': Aristoxenus is cited as an authority on

<sup>219</sup> Cf. Janko (2000) 8. Like Philodemus, Crates of Mallos denied that the content of a poem is irrelevant: see Janko (2000) 121.

<sup>220</sup> See Schenkeveld (1968) and Janko (2000) 178. Goudriaan (1989) 153-154 thinks that Dionysius' theories are not dependent on the *kritikoi*, but see my section 4.3.1 for a refutation of his arguments. Atkins (1934 II) 133 already pointed to the similarity between the doctrines of Dionysius and the *kritikoi*: 'The closest analogy to his [i.e. Dionysius'] theorising is presented by those Hellenistic scholars whom we learn from Philodemus, notably Heracleodorus, and the Stoics, Ariston of Chios and Crates of Mallos, who insisted for the first time on the importance of "composition" in poetry, on the need for beautiful words harmoniously arranged, and for those euphonious and rhythmical effects inherent in syllables and letters (...) so that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that, directly or indirectly, the animating ideas of Dionysius were drawn from these sources.'

<sup>221</sup> See Janko (2000) 134-138, esp. 134: '(...) musical theory came to influence Hellenistic poetics.'

<sup>222</sup> Kroll (1907) 91-101 argued that large parts of Dionysius' *On Composition* depend on musical theory. This seems to be true (see also Pohl [1968] 90-97), but *pace* Kroll (1907) 97-98, I do not think that the discussion of rhythm in *Comp.* 17 is based on Aristoxenus: see section 6.3.

<sup>223</sup> *Comp.* 11.39,17-40,16. See Goudriaan (1989) 536-554.

rhythms and on vowels and other letters.<sup>224</sup> It is possible that Dionysius' four means of σύνθεσις (composition), namely μέλος (melody), ῥυθμός (rhythm), μεταβολή (variety) and πρέπον (propriety), are originally musical categories.<sup>225</sup> Although this study focuses on the relationship between rhetoric, grammar, and philosophy, we will occasionally touch upon the connections between Dionysius and Aristoxenus and other musical theorists (see sections 4.3.2, 6.3 and 6.5).

When we turn to grammar, we should distinguish between Alexandrian philology on the one hand, and technical grammar on the other. It is not certain when exactly technical grammar emerged (see section 3.2), but I have already pointed out above (section 1.4) that Dionysius may have known the works of the elder Tyrannion, Asclepiades or Tryphon. Concerning the Alexandrian philologists, the scholars who wrote commentaries and compiled lists of selected authors, the following should be added. Dionysius twice refers to Aristophanes of Byzantium and his division of poems into metrical *cola* (see also section 3.3.1).<sup>226</sup> He also mentions Callimachus and 'the grammarians from Pergamon' (τοὺς ἐκ Περγάμου γραμματικούς).<sup>227</sup> Aristarchus and Dionysius Thrax are not mentioned in Dionysius' works. There is, however, reason to believe that Dionysius made use of the work of philologists: one of Dionysius' more famous remarks is that nobody could understand Thucydides without a 'linguistic interpretation' (ἐξηγήσεως γραμματικῆς) (see section 4.4).<sup>228</sup> In section 4.4.2, we will encounter some interesting similarities between the scholia on Thucydides and Dionysius' grammatical notes on Thucydides in the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*. I will argue that Dionysius used a commentary on Thucydides, which might ultimately go back to Aristarchus.

The influence of the rhetorical tradition on Dionysius can of course not be overestimated. I have already mentioned the importance of Isocrates. In this study, we will frequently compare Dionysius' views with those of 'Demetrius', the author of the treatise *On Style*, and 'Longinus', the author of the treatise *On the Sublime*. The date of both works is uncertain. With Russell and Innes, I will assume that 'Demetrius' belongs to the second century BC (preceding Dionysius) and that 'Longinus' belongs to the first century AD.<sup>229</sup> In some cases, I will compare Dionysius with the Roman

<sup>224</sup> *Comp.* 14.49,2 and *Dem.* 48.233,8-9.

<sup>225</sup> See Kroll (1907) 94-95. The four means of composition are treated in *Comp.* 11-20.

<sup>226</sup> *Comp.* 22.102,2 and *Comp.* 26.140,19.

<sup>227</sup> *Din.* 1.297,15-16.

<sup>228</sup> *Thuc.* 51.410,15-17.

<sup>229</sup> On the date and authorship of *On Style* and *On the Sublime*, see Innes (1995) 312-321 and Russell (1995) 145-148 in the Loeb edition. On 'Longinus', see also Russell (1964) xxii-xxx. For a different

rhetorician Quintilian (ca. 40-100 AD), who uses Dionysius' rhetorical works in his *Institutio oratoria*.<sup>230</sup> Not surprisingly, we will also find that there are parallels between Dionysius and his contemporary colleague Caecilius of Caleacte (see section 1.4). We possess only fragments of his works, but these clearly show that, just like Dionysius, Caecilius made use of grammar for his stylistic theory (see section 4.4.2). However, I will not follow the view of Nassal, who argued that the aesthetic theories of both Dionysius and Cicero depend on Caecilius of Caleacte.<sup>231</sup> This thesis is very unlikely, because all evidence suggests that Caecilius was contemporary with Dionysius and perhaps even slightly younger (see section 4.4.2).<sup>232</sup> Although he was wrong about Caecilius' date, Nassal correctly pointed out that there are remarkable parallels between the composition theories of Cicero and Dionysius. Instead of assigning these parallels to a Greek source, I will argue that Dionysius may have known some of Cicero's works:<sup>233</sup> despite the modern reluctance to make a Greek scholar dependent on a Roman author, parallels between Cicero and Dionysius may be based not only on their use of earlier theories, but also on Dionysius' knowledge of Cicero's treatises.

### 1.6. Dionysius' *On Composition* as a synthesis of ancient language disciplines

Dionysius' integration of various language disciplines is most successful in his work *Περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνόματων* (*De compositione verborum*), which deserves a separate introduction. Literally, the title of this treatise could be rendered as 'the putting together of words', but it also deals with the arrangement of letters and syllables, and with the juxtaposition of clauses and periods. The traditional English title is *On Literary Composition*, and it is indeed true that the treatise develops a method of σύνθεσις that covers all genres of prose and poetry.<sup>234</sup> Nevertheless, the adjective 'literary' carries connotations that do not entirely fit Dionysius' introduction to his work: he regards the treatise as 'the most necessary of all aids (...) to all alike who

---

view, see Heath (1999), who revives the old attribution of *On the Sublime* to Cassius Longinus (third century AD).

<sup>230</sup> Quintilian refers to Dionysius in *Inst. orat.* 3.1.16; 9.3.89; 9.4.88.

<sup>231</sup> Nassal (1910).

<sup>232</sup> Blass, *DGB* (1865) 174, Bowersock (1965) 124 and Kennedy (1994) 160 assign Caecilius to Augustan Rome. Hidber (1996) 41 n. 184 rightly rejects the earlier dates of Caecilius advocated by Wilamowitz (1900) 6 and Nassal (1910). See also section 4.4.1.

<sup>233</sup> Egger (1902) 77 already considered the possibility that Dionysius read Cicero's rhetorical works and used them for his composition theory.

<sup>234</sup> See Rhys Roberts (1910) 10-11 and Usher (1985) 5. Aujac & Lebel (1981) 9-12 translate the title as *La composition stylistique*. Cf. Rhys Roberts (1910) xii: 'Though he has the art of speaking specially in view, Dionysius draws his literary illustrations from so wide a field that the art of literature may be regarded as his theme.'

practice civil oratory, whatever their age and disposition may happen to be'.<sup>235</sup> In this study, it will become manifest that we can only understand Dionysius' works when we pay due attention to his practical (rhetorical) aims (see section 1.3). Although Dionysius' treatise blurs the borders between prose and poetry, and even those between music and oratory, we should not ignore the fact that Dionysius is primarily focusing on those readers who wish to become successful orators. Throughout this book, therefore, I will use the neutral title *On Composition*, which seems to be the least unsatisfactory translation of the Greek title.<sup>236</sup>

*On Composition* is generally considered to be Dionysius' most original contribution to rhetorical theory and literary criticism.<sup>237</sup> In fact, this treatise on σύνθεσις is a very successful *synthesis* itself. Nowhere is Dionysius' versatility so manifest as in this treatise on composition, which incorporates views from all ancient language disciplines that are relevant to the subject.<sup>238</sup> A brief overview of the structure of the work can illustrate the broad range of theories that the work brings together.<sup>239</sup>

*Comp.* 1-5: introduction; definition of σύνθεσις (composition); the powerful effects of composition (illustrated with passages from Homer and Herodotus); natural word order;

*Comp.* 6-9: the three ἔργα (activities) of composition, namely ἀρμογή (the basic arrangement), σχηματισμός (the shaping of the form of the units) and μετασκευή (the modification of the material by subtraction, addition or alteration); the three ἔργα are applied to the level of words (ὀνόματα) (*Comp.* 6), to the level of clauses (κῶλα) (*Comp.* 7-9), and to the level of periods (περίοδοι) (*Comp.* 9);

<sup>235</sup> *Comp.* 1.3,15-4,3: ἀναγκαιότατον ἀπάντων χρημάτων ... ἅπανσι μὲν ὁμοίως τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους, ἐν ἧ ποτ' ἂν ἡλικία τε καὶ ἔξει τυγχάνωσιν ὄντες. On the genre of the πολιτικός λόγος, see Aujac (1978) 175-176 n. 2 and Goudriaan (1989) 71-76 (see also my section 1.5). Although the aesthetical aspect of the 'political speech' is in some cases more relevant than its role in the political domain, Dionysius normally associates this genre with the orator who is politically active: see e.g. *Dem.* 15.160,20-22. In *Comp.* 22.98,7, Dionysius distinguishes three genres of writing, namely ποίησις (poetry), ἱστορία (history) and λόγοι πολιτικοί (political speeches).

<sup>236</sup> *On Word-Arrangement*, the title that Grube (1965) 217 uses, aptly brings out the importance of words as Dionysius' starting point, but it lacks the crucial idea of συντιθέναι (putting together). Egger (1902) 67 also adopts the title *Sur l'arrangement des mots*.

<sup>237</sup> See e.g. Grube (1965) 217 and Goudriaan (1989) 698.

<sup>238</sup> In section 1.1, I have already drawn attention to the apt characterisation of the work by Blass, *DGB* (1865) 199. It has been pointed out that Dionysius' older contemporary Varro, too, integrated many linguistic theories in his works. See Taylor (1996a) 335: 'Varro blends Aristotelian, Stoic, Alexandrian, Epicurean, and even Pythagorean linguistic thought into a typically eclectic Roman amalgam of language science.' But the wide range of Dionysius' theories also includes views from musical, metrical and rhetorical theory.

<sup>239</sup> For more detailed summaries of *On Composition*, see Rhys Roberts (1910) 1-10 and Goudriaan (1989) 160-166. Note that Dionysius himself announces the structure of the work in *Comp.* 1.6,3-16.

*Comp.* 10-20: the two aims of composition: ἡδονή (attractiveness) and καλόν (beauty); the four means of attaining these aims: μέλος (melody), ῥυθμός (rhythm), μεταβολή (variety) and τὸ πρέπον (appropriateness);

*Comp.* 21-24: the three composition types (χαρακτῆρες συνθέσεως or ἁρμονίαι): σύνθεσις αὐστηρά (austere composition), σύνθεσις γλαφυρά (smooth composition) and σύνθεσις εὐκρατος or κοινή (well-blended or intermediate composition);

*Comp.* 25-26: the relations between prose and poetry: in what way can prose be made to resemble a beautiful poem, and in what way can a poem be made to resemble beautiful prose?

The success of Dionysius' integration of various disciplines into one coherent whole is a result of two factors. On the one hand, Dionysius makes use of linguistic views where they are relevant to a certain aspect of composition. On the other hand, he always keeps the practical aims of his treatise in mind. Thus, we find Dionysius selecting the workable ideas from different language sciences, while at the same time avoiding elaborate discussions of technical details that are not useful for his intended audience. I will illustrate both aspects of the work *On Composition*, thus previewing some of the linguistic theories that we will encounter in this study (the following list of theories is not exhaustive).

At the beginning of his treatise, Dionysius demarcates his subject: all kinds of discourse (λόγοι) consist of ideas (νοήματα) on the one hand and words (ὀνόματα) on the other; the former aspect corresponds to 'subject matter' (ὁ πραγματικὸς τόπος) and the latter aspect to 'expression' (ὁ λεκτικὸς τόπος).<sup>240</sup> Expression in its turn is divided into two parts, namely the selection of words (ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων) and the putting together of words (σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων), which is the subject of this treatise.<sup>241</sup> The definition of σύνθεσις (*Comp.* 2) introduces τὰ τοῦ λόγου μέρη (the parts of speech) as the building blocks of composition (see section 4.3.1).<sup>242</sup> Dionysius then discusses the history of the theory of the parts of speech, listing the various philosophers and grammarians who used different numbers of parts of speech (see section 4.2.1).<sup>243</sup> Here we enter the realm of grammatical theory. It has been claimed that Dionysius rejects the grammatical approach after the first part of his

<sup>240</sup> *Comp.* 1.4,6-11.

<sup>241</sup> *Comp.* 1.5,5-8. On Dionysius' rhetorical system, see Kremer (1907).

<sup>242</sup> *Comp.* 2.6,17-19.

<sup>243</sup> *Comp.* 2.6,20-7,13.

work on composition, but this analysis is not correct.<sup>244</sup> The parts of speech play a fundamental role in Dionysius' theory of composition as a whole: they are the elements (στοιχεῖα) from which clauses (κῶλα) are built, thus constituting the starting point in the process of composition.<sup>245</sup> Dionysius' use of the term στοιχεῖα reminds us of the Stoic views on the μέρη λόγου (see section 3.5). Having cited some attractively composed passages from Homer and Herodotus, Dionysius intends to prove the power of composition by applying the method of metathesis: he rewrites a number of Homeric lines in order to illustrate his view that their quality depends on their σύνθεσις: this is a linguistic experiment that we also find in the works of other rhetoricians and in the fragments of the *kritikoi* in Philodemus' *On Poems* (see section 7.2). At the end of *Comp.* 4, Dionysius reports that when examining the views of his predecessors on the subject of his treatise, he came across some treatises by Chrysippus (see sections 3.3.1 and 5.3.1). Although Dionysius tells us that these Stoic works contained logical rather than rhetorical investigations, it seems that they have nevertheless influenced his thinking. In *Comp.* 5, Dionysius examines whether a natural word order results in beauty and attractiveness. The rules of nature are here the rules of logic: Dionysius arranges the parts of speech according to the logical order of their categories (see section 5.3). This is a unique example of the integration of grammatical, philosophical and rhetorical theory, even if Dionysius decides to reject the approach. In *Comp.* 6, Dionysius starts the discussion of the three ἔργα of composition. These are first applied to the level of the μόρια λόγου, which are both parts of the phrase and word classes (see sections 3.4 and 4.3.1), and subsequently to the level of the κῶλα (clauses).<sup>246</sup> On the level of words, the second ἔργον of composition deals with the selection of the correct *grammatical* form of nouns, verbs, and other parts of speech: here we find the earliest extant discussion of the *accidentia* of the parts of speech, but it should be noted that the grammatical theory is completely subservient to Dionysius' rhetorical theory (section 4.3.1).<sup>247</sup> Dionysius' treatment of the modification (μετασκευή) of the parts of speech for the sake of euphony (as perceived by the ear) corresponds to what we know of the views of the Hellenistic *kritikoi*.<sup>248</sup> On the level of clauses (κῶλα), Dionysius adopts the Stoic speech act theory and applies it to his theory of composition.<sup>249</sup> The discussion of the two aims and the four means of composition (*Comp.* 10-20) contains a number of ideas that originate in poetical, metrical and musical theory. The four means of composition,

<sup>244</sup> Pohl (1968) 3 thinks that Dionysius leaves the grammatical perspective after *Comp.* 5, but see my section 4.3.

<sup>245</sup> *Comp.* 2.6,19; *Comp.* 2.7,14-18.

<sup>246</sup> *Comp.* 6-9.

<sup>247</sup> *Comp.* 6.28,20-29,14.

<sup>248</sup> *Comp.* 6.29,14-19.

<sup>249</sup> *Comp.* 8. See Schenkeveld (1983) 90-91 and Schenkeveld (1984).

melody, rhythm, variety and appropriateness, seem to be borrowed from musical theory.<sup>250</sup> The passage on the values of the different letters and syllables (*Comp.* 14-15) builds on the doctrines of Aristoxenus (see section 1.5), and Dionysius' observations largely correspond to the views that we find in the fragments of the *kritikoi* in Philodemus' *On Poems*.<sup>251</sup> The passage on the various sounds of letters and syllables culminates in a discussion of mimetic words (*Comp.* 16), in which Dionysius refers to Plato's etymologies in the *Cratylus*. Dionysius' account of prose rhythm (*Comp.* 17-18) seems to build on the theories of 'metricians' rather than on the views of Aristoxenus (section 6.3).<sup>252</sup> The discussion of appropriateness (*Comp.* 20) includes a close analysis of the tortures of Sisyphus as portrayed by Homer.<sup>253</sup> In this 'splendid appraisal' of the Homeric passage, more than anywhere else, Dionysius shows that he is a sophisticated literary critic.<sup>254</sup> His theory of the three composition types (*Comp.* 21-24) incorporates views from musical, poetical and grammatical theory (see section 4.3.2).<sup>255</sup> The building blocks of the three ὁρμονίαι are again the grammatical parts of speech. Thus, the composition types (austere, smooth, and well-blended) are not only characterised by their rough or smooth sounds, but also by their use of 'conjunctions' and 'articles'. Besides, Dionysius uses the concept of συνέχεια (continuity), which we know from musical and poetical theory, and the concept of the παραπληρώματα (filler words), which we find in rhetorical and grammatical theory (notably in the fragments of Dionysius' contemporary Tryphon). In his discussion of prose and poetry (*Comp.* 25-26), Dionysius refers to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (see sections 1.5 and 6.1), but his views are more similar to those of 'Longinus' and the *kritikoi* (see section 6.5). In a polemical passage, Dionysius provides an interesting description of the grammatical curriculum, which seems to inform us about the contemporary practice of grammar schools (see section 3.3.3).

This summary of *On Composition* has shown that this treatise is indeed a *synthesis* of language disciplines. But in spite of all the different theories that he uses, Dionysius always keeps an eye on the unity of his work and on its practical purposes.<sup>256</sup> Thus, he never loses himself in technical discussions of details that are not relevant to the subject of his treatise. In many passages, Dionysius states that he will leave the technical details to grammarians, philosophers or metricians, thus explicitly

<sup>250</sup> See Kroll (1907) 91-101 and Pohl (1968) 90-97. See also section 1.5.

<sup>251</sup> See Janko (2000) 178.

<sup>252</sup> See *Comp.* 17.73,2. On the ancient metricians, see Leonhardt (1989).

<sup>253</sup> *Comp.* 20.89,18-93,19 on *Odyssey* 11.593-598.

<sup>254</sup> Grube (1965) 219. See also Innes (1989) 271.

<sup>255</sup> Cf. Pohl (1968) 121-122.

<sup>256</sup> Goudriaan (1989) 161-165 shows that *On Composition* complies with the rules of the systematic handbook (τέχνη) as analysed by Fuhrmann (1960).

demarcating his own profession as a teacher of rhetoric. I will give a few examples of this attitude. Having started his discussion of letters, the sounds of which contribute to the presence or absence of euphony, Dionysius touches upon the problem of the exact number of letters: some have thought that there are only thirteen ‘elements of sound’ (φωνῆς στοιχεῖα) and others have thought that there are more than twenty-four.<sup>257</sup> Dionysius decides that he is not going to deal with these irrelevant examinations: ‘Now the discussion of these matters belongs more properly to grammar and prosody, or even, if you like, to philosophy. It is enough for us to assume that there are neither more nor less than twenty-four elements of sound, and to describe the properties of each, beginning with the vowels.’<sup>258</sup> In his discussion of the syllables formed from letters, Dionysius comes to speak about the different lengths of short and long syllables. The first syllable of the word ὁδός remains short even if one adds one letter (ῥόδος), two letters (τρόπος) or three letters (στρόφος) before the vowel. On the other hand, the syllable of the word σπλήν remains long even if one subtracts one or more letters. These facts are still supposed to be relevant to the discussion of μέλος, but Dionysius does not wish to run further into difficulties: ‘As to the reason why long syllables do not exceed their natural quantity when lengthened to five letters, nor short syllables lose their shortness when reduced from many letters to one (...) this does not need to be considered at present. It is enough to have said what is relevant to the present subject (...).’<sup>259</sup> Dionysius adopts the same attitude when he has listed the twelve basic rhythms of two or three syllables in *Comp.* 17: ‘Otherwise it was certainly not my intention to touch upon metrical and rhythmical questions, but only in so far as it was necessary to do so.’<sup>260</sup> Again and again, Dionysius delineates the borders of his field, thus showing that the various linguistic theories that he uses are all subservient to the theory of composition.<sup>261</sup>

Dionysius thus combines a wide knowledge of many different disciplines on the one hand with a focus on the practical purposes of his own work on the other hand. This attitude has important consequences for our interpretation of Dionysius’ theories on

<sup>257</sup> *Comp.* 14.50,1-6.

<sup>258</sup> *Comp.* 14.50,6-11: ἡ μὲν οὖν ὑπὲρ τούτων θεωρία γραμματικῆς τε καὶ μετρικῆς, εἰ δὲ βούλεται τις, καὶ φιλοσοφίας οἰκειότερα· ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπόχρη μήτ’ ἐλάττους τῶν κδ μήτε πλείους ὑποθεμένοις εἶναι τὰς τῆς φωνῆς ἀρχὰς τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτοῖς λέγειν, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τῶν φωνηέντων ποιησαμένοις.

<sup>259</sup> *Comp.* 15.59,2-14: αἰτία δὲ τίς ἐστὶ τοῦ μήτε τὰς μακρὰς ἐκβαίνειν τὴν αὐτῶν φύσιν μέχρι γραμμάτων ἢ μηκνομένας μήτε τὰς βραχεῖας εἰς ἕν ἀπὸ πολλῶν γραμμάτων συστελλομένας ἐκπίπτειν τῆς βραχύτητος, ... οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῷ παρόντι σκοπεῖν. ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ὅσον εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπόθεσιν ἤρμοσται εἰρησθαι, ...

<sup>260</sup> *Comp.* 18.73,10-13: οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὴν ἄλλως γέ μοι προὔκειτο μετρικῶν καὶ ῥυθμικῶν ἄπτεσθαι θεωρημάτων, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου ἕνεκα.

<sup>261</sup> Dionysius frequently tells his readers that he could say more about a certain subject, if time would not force him to return to his actual theme: on this aspect of his discourse, see also Bottai (1999b) 146-147.

language, linguistics, and literature. Although Dionysius deals with theories from grammar, philosophy, metrical studies, we should not interpret these passages as if they were parts of a grammatical, philosophical or metrical treatise.<sup>262</sup> This principle will prove to be fruitful throughout this study.<sup>263</sup> The diverse theories that *On Composition* and other works contain will be interpreted within the framework of Dionysius' rhetorical (and historical) theories and analyses.<sup>264</sup>

---

<sup>262</sup> It is dangerous to ignore the unity and structure of *On Composition*. Those scholars who adopt the method of *Quellenforschung* focus so much on Dionysius' alleged sources that they find inconsistencies everywhere. See e.g. Kroll (1907) 94: 'Es scheint also, als habe Dionys Gedanken, die in seiner Vorlage nur skizziert waren, um jeden Preis in ein System bringen und auf Flaschen ziehen wollen und sei damit nicht recht fertig geworden — was bekanntlich Schulmeistern zu allen Zeiten passirt.'

<sup>263</sup> See esp. sections 2.5 (on Dionysius' alleged philosophy of language) and 3.6.6 (on Dionysius' alleged system of nine word classes).

<sup>264</sup> Cf. Van Ophuijsen (1993) 768, who warns us that, when interpreting isolated statements of the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus with a philosophical terminology, we should 'remember that A. still is not himself a philosopher'.