Παιδεία and Power in Dionysius of Halicarnassus

The case studies of the preface to On the Ancient Orators, the treatise On Isocrates and the preface to Roman Antiquities

Master Thesis Classics and Ancient Civilizations

Amalia Zoi

Student number: s2898632

Email:
a.zoi@umail.leidenuniv.nl

Thesis Supervisor:

Prof. dr. C.C. de Jonge

Date: 15/08/2021

Faculty of Humanities, Leiden University

Contents

Introduction

The power of language is an open debate since ancient times. Many ancient authors have tried to demonstrate how words can affect the masses, can persuade or even manipulate.[1] This discussion has continued in modern times, with new elements added; yet, the basis remains the same. The arena of politics is one domain where it has long been established that language can be a highly potent tool. What is always stressed in this social debate is on the one hand the need for the politicians to be well-educated and morally credible and on the other hand, the need of the masses to be educated and to dispose critical abilities. This double-sided aspect of education concerning the morality of politicians and the critical thinking of the individuals is a characteristic trait in Dionysius of Halicarnassus's work. The interrelation of education and power and its impact on society is evident throughout his work and will be the main theme of this thesis.

Dionysius was born in Halicarnassus and came to Rome in 30/29 BC,[2] after Caesar Augustus had become the first Roman emperor in 27 BC, terminating the civil wars and inaugurating a new age, when the empire was still shaping and changing, not only socially but culturally as well. While living in Rome, Dionysius occupied himself with history and rhetoric. He wrote *Roman Antiquities*, a history of early Rome down to the year 264 BC, but also many essays, letters, and treatises that seem to be related to his profession, which might have been professor of rhetoric. He was interested in educating young people, especially ambitious students that were aiming in becoming engaged with the political sphere.[3] The two disciplines of history and rhetoric were in ancient Rome not so distinguished and separate as we might expect, for there are various elements that unify both these genres.[4] The present paper focus upon a question that can be explored in both Dionysius' rhetorical works and his history of Rome: how does Dionysius of Halicarnassus present, construct and interpret the relationship between administrative power and παιδεία. I will answer this question by analyzing three of his works: the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, the treatise *On Isocrates* and the preface to *Roman Antiquities*. This thesis will also explain why power and παιδεία should be considered of crucial importance for understanding Dionysius' ideas. Living under the reign of Augustus, in a time which is characterized by continuous change, seems to have a major impact on his views and his role as a Greek educator and writer working in Rome.

---

[1] Kennedy 1963 offers a thorough examination of the art of persuasion in ancient Greece.
[2] See *Ant. Rom*. 1.7.2; Hidber 1996, 1-4.
[3] See for example *Comp.* 1.1-17; *Orat. Vett.* 4.2.
[4] For an overview of these elements, see De Jonge & Hunter 2019, 2-6.

For a long time, Dionysius was considered an insignificant writer who merely collected information from earlier authors. This changed with Bonner (1939), who presented Dionysius as an intellectual with important perspectives on rhetoric; since then, it continued to increase steadily.[5] Hidber (1996) indicated how Dionysius' classicism presents Augustan Rome as the revival of the glorious classical past of Greece, which assigns Isocratean ideas to a new context. The fusion of genres in Dionysius' project is highlighted by De Jonge (2008), who demonstrates how he integrates different language theories into one coherent rhetorical project. Wiater (2011) explores Dionysius' classicism as a socio-cultural phenomenon rather than a purely linguistic one. He focuses on the questions of how and why writers and intellectuals of the first century BC wanted to imitate classical authors, giving new perceptions of being Greek in Augustan Rome. Dionysius as an influential Augustan writer who stands between two worlds, i.e., Greece and Rome, is a theme that has been thoroughly explored in the volume of De Jonge and Hunter (2019). The contributors to this volume examine Dionysius' dual project of historiography and rhetorical criticism under the light of Augustan Rome, asking, firstly, how these two fields interrelate and secondly, how Dionysius' project fits into the new social and intellectual circumstances of Rome under the reign of Augustus. The present thesis will follow this line of research, drawing on both historiography and literary criticism.

More specifically about the notions of παιδεία and power in Dionysius' work, Goudriaan (1989) has shown the importance of the Isocratean true philosophia for Dionysius' educational purposes.[6] On top of that, Goudriaan has presented Dionysius' new definition of πολιτικοὶ λόγοι (political speeches), a term which Dionysius associates with rhetoric and true philosophia, therefore with παιδεία, and not so much with legislation, as Plato did.[7] Hidber (1996) has demonstrated that the ideal educational program of Dionysius has been re-worked within the ideology of classicism, although it is based on the Isocratean term of 'philosophical rhetoric'.[8] Whitmarsh (2001) discusses thoroughly the relation between literary texts produced by Greek-educated authors and their relationship with the Roman Empire. He has demonstrated how Greek literature reflects on new cultural and political identities that are shaped within the Roman Empire. Although his work focuses on the so-called 'Second Sophistic' period, his insights on the notions of παιδεία and power can help us to explore these notions in Dionysius' works. Wiater (2011) offers an illuminating discussion on how, for Dionysius, particular kinds of rhetoric can represent different kinds of political power. He has demonstrated in what way language, time and power intertwine and how this interrelation results in making Dionysius' classicism a socio-cultural phenomenon. Although much has been said about Dionysius' educational

---

[5] For an overview of the earlier scholarship on Dionysius and their views, see De Jonge 2008, 4-8.
[6] See Goudriaan 1989, 442-445.
[7] See Goudriaan 1989, 552-535.
[8] See Hidber 1996, 44-56.

program or his views on Augustan Rome, the two notions of παιδεία and power have not been explored as a pair. Dionysius' ideas are examined through the perspective of linguistic theories or the movement of classicism. In this thesis, I aim to fill this lacuna by shedding light upon Dionysius' ideas on power and παιδεία which, as I will argue, constitute two unbreakable and essential philosophical and social concepts in his works that intertwine and influence each other. Another innovative element of this thesis is its focus on Dionysius' treatise *On Isocrates*, which has not received the attention that it deserves. I will argue that this treatise plays a crucial role in Dionysius' entire philosophical agenda, which underlines the philosophical dimension of Dionysius' project of rhetorical education under the reign of Augustus.

Dionysius not only integrates many ideas of previous authors but also, frequently, employs as principal themes of his project the exploration and criticism of works by earlier authors. At the same time, Dionysius is a man of his age: he reflects on his own society and formulates new ideas, which are applicable to his era. The connection between the Greek (literary and historical) past and the Roman present is crucial. For this reason, the present study will examine Dionysius' discourse with intertextuality as its main tool.[9] Dionysius constantly alludes to ideas and texts of the classical past. It is also remarkable how Dionysius' use of classical phrases may generate new connotations, as he applies ancient texts to a new political context. This thesis will analyze such ambiguities by analyzing Dionysius' views on power and παιδεία, both from a synchronic and a diachronic point of view. The rhetorical analysis will be a helpful tool as well.[10] It should be reminded that Dionysius was a teacher and a critic of rhetoric; it is plausible (and it has been demonstrated) that Dionysius applies his knowledge of rhetorical theories to his own writings in order to achieve his purposes, namely to inspire young people to engage with culture and politics. This means that we will pay due attention to his style, structure, expression and argumentation.

In the first chapter, I will first discuss the notion of παιδεία as presented in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*. We will see that it has a strong connection with morality, but also with social and cultural matters. Next, I will examine how the notion of administrative power is presented in the preface: I will argue that it should be considered a principal element of Dionysius' thinking. Finally, in the last section of the first chapter, I will explore the interrelation of these two notions and their impact on Dionysius' presentation of the Roman present and future. In the second chapter, I will explore the treatise *On Isocrates*, which is one part of the volume *On the Ancient Orators*. I will first discuss the Isocratean educational ideas as Dionysius perceives and constructs them. Next, I will examine what *On Isocrates* tells us about political virtue;

---

[9] The works especially helpful for this approach are Aujac 1974, De Jonge 2008, De Jonge & Hunter 2019, Wiater 2011, Wisse 1995.

[10] For this method, of particularly value is the work of De Jonge 2008, De Jonge 2014 and Hidber 1996.

finally, I will ask why Dionysius presents Isocrates as the most important political philosopher, and what the Isocratean ideals could mean in Augustan Rome. In the third and final chapter, I will examine the preface to *Roman Antiquities*. I will focus on its educational purposes and how these are related to his explicit portrayal of Rome's power. I will call attention to the traces of Dionysius' rhetorical works in his historical writing.

The selection of these three case studies is not accidental; the preface to *On the ancient Orators* is the main work in which Dionysius manifests his most principal rhetorical ideals and explains how these ideas are significant not only for rhetoric but also for politics, culture and literature. The treatise *On Isocrates* will shed light upon Dionysius' exploitation of his most principal source for philosophical ideas, i.e., Isocrates. Lastly, the preface to *Roman Antiquities* can be seen as the epitome of his purposes and methods regarding his historiographical work and as one fascinating example of Dionysius bringing his theoretical ideas into practice. "But now that all of these things have been said", as Dionysius would have said, "it is time to turn to the real work" (*Orat. Vett.* 1.6: προειρημένων δὴ τούτων ἐπανάγειν καιρὸς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα).

Chapter one: the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*

1.1 Introduction

Dionysius considers rhetoric one of the most effective means for exerting power. The enormous potential of the art of speaking and persuasion is thoroughly revealed and elaborated in his preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, or, as Hidber has characterized this work, the 'manifesto of classicism'.[11] In this project, Dionysius presents ancient Attic rhetoric as a model of imitation for his age. At the beginning of the preface Dionysius declares that the death of Alexander the Great was the major turning point in history, when Attic rhetoric lost its influence, while Asianic rhetoric unfairly took her place (*Orat. Vett*. 1.2). Following this statement, it becomes clear that Dionysius' history of civic oratory is divided into three stages. The first stage is the distanced classical past where the ancient and philosophical rhetoric was holding its rightful position. The second stage begins with the death of Alexander the Great when the Asianic rhetoric attacks the ancient one and replaces her. The third and current stage is Dionysius's own time, i.e., first century BC, when the ancient rhetoric is thriving again and reclaiming her rightful honors.[12] The central cause of this change is identified as 'almighty Rome', the cultural and political center of the empire under the reign of Augustus (*Orat. Vett*. 3.1). A prosperous future in rhetoric and literature in general, as a result of this progress, is also implied by Dionysius throughout the entire work but more emphatically towards the ending (*Orat. Vett.* 3.2, 4.1).

Within the complex environment of Augustan Rome, Dionysius presents his ideas about the cultural status of his own time, but he always regards the classical past (Greece in the 5th and 4th centuries BC) as his guide. As a result, the triangle of (distant) past-present-future has a very strong common feature: Attic rhetoric. In this chapter, I will explore how Dionysius envisages the ideal of παιδεία. After that, I will examine how this type of παιδεία is connected with political power. Through this process, I hope to demonstrate the aims, methods and position of Dionysius as an 'Augustan' author. I will argue that Greek παιδεία and Roman power are not two opposing elements in Dionysius' preface; on the contrary, this pair is presented as very dependent on one another and as a result, it is almost impossible to determine which element is the more powerful one.

---

[11] See Hidber 1996.
[12] Rhetoric is a feminine noun in ancient Greek and 'rhetoric' is presented as a woman in this text. I will therefore refer to rhetoric as 'she' rather than 'it'.

1.2 Dionysius' construction of ideal παιδεία

In the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, Dionysius introduces his readers to a tripartite view of history where political events demark the boundaries of each rhetorical period (*Orat. Vett.* 1.1-2):[13]

> Πολλὴν χάριν ἦν εἰδέναι τῷ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς χρόνῳ δίκαιον, ὦ κράτιστε Ἀμμαῖε, καὶ ἄλλων μέν τινων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἕνεκα νῦν κάλλιον ἀσκουμένων ἢ πρότερον, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ τῆς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους ἐπιμελείας οὐ μικρὰν ἐπίδοσιν πεποιημένης ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττω. 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 Μακεδόνος τελευτῆς ἐκπνεῖν καὶ μαραίνεσθαι κατ᾽ ὀλίγον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας μικροῦ δεήσασα εἰς τέλος ἠφανίσθαι·

> We ought rightfully to feel very grateful for the era in which we live, dear friend Ammaeus, for some of the most serious pursuits are being practiced now in a better way compared to the past and not least for the care bestowed upon political speeches that caused rapid progress towards the best. In the period prior to ours, the ancient and philosophic art of rhetoric, treated contumely and terribly insulted, declined. It began to lose its spirit and wilt little by little after the death of Alexander the Great. By our times, it had almost reached a dead point.

Dionysius assigns to each of these periods a particular negative or positive meaning: the classical past is seen as the most positive period, as ancient rhetoric was thriving, whereas the Hellenistic one with Asianic rhetoric is regarded as the most negative.[14] But most importantly, Dionysius' own time is also viewed as positive, since Attic rhetoric reclaimed her rightful position. Therefore, the prevailing type of rhetoric is the criterion according to which each period is identified as negative/positive. Politics and culture interrelate, as we observe that well-known political events mark the beginning and/or the ending of different cultural periods.[15]

Dionysius' desire for the restoration of Attic rhetoric and his polemic stance towards the Asianic one is evident throughout the preface. But how should we

---

[13] For Dionysius' rhetorical works, the Greek edition of Aujac 1978 is used in this thesis, with the exception of *On Imitation* for which the Greek edition of Usener-Radermarcher is cited. Translations are my own. However, I consulted the translations of Aujac 1978 (in French), Hidber 1996 (in German) and Usher 1974.

[14] It is important to stress that the term ἀρχαία ("ancient") in this context has the meaning of 'classical' rather than 'old', as Kim has pointed out, for this kind of rhetoric has a special role for the present and is not considered archaic, see Kim 2014, 360-363.

[15] Dionysius was criticized by scholars for this tripartite model and his criteria for marking each period. Wiater 2011, 60-65 addresses these criticisms and convincingly refutes them.

understand Asianic rhetoric in Dionysius' project? Although Dionysius is speaking about a rhetorical or stylistic system, he does not explicitly describe in linguistic terms what this rhetorical style would be. His description starts with Asianic rhetoric being "unbearable due to her theatrical audacity and ill-bred and ignorant of philosophy or any other of liberal arts" (ἀφόρητος ἀναιδείᾳ θεατρικῇ καὶ ἀνάγωγος καὶ οὔτε φιλοσοφίας οὔτε ἄλλου παιδεύματος οὐδενὸς μετειληφυῖα ἐλευθερίου)[16] whereas the Attic rhetoric is a Muse "who is ancient and autochthonous" (ἡ μὲν Ἀττικὴ μοῦσα καὶ ἀρχαία καὶ αὐτόχθων).[17] He further emphasizes the different moral systems that each of them represents, by introducing a very vivid allegory; the Attic rhetoric is presented as a lawful wife, whereas the Asianic one is compared to a shameful harlot.[18] As a harlot destroys noble houses, in the same way, Asianic rhetoric destroys the cities she governs, even the most educated ones (*Orat. Vett*. 1.6). In Dionysius' construct of (rhetorical) history, classical, Attic rhetoric represents morality and political stability, whereas the Asianic one is associated with moral decay and political chaos. From all these descriptions we may assume that Asianic rhetoric could be a bombastic rhetorical style but what matters most is that Attic and Asianic rhetoric is a socio-cultural phenomenon that can affect individuals and communities.[19] They are constructed and presented as two rhetorical-educational systems that can have diametrically opposite effects on Dionysius' contemporary society. And clearly, Dionysius is introducing himself as a representative of Greek Atticism and Classicism, i.e., as a representative of morality.[20]

However, we should ask if the image he presents here is accurate, i.e., was Hellenistic rhetoric as bad as he claims? The Hellenistic orators, the ones whom Dionysius considered 'Asianists', were in fact regarding themselves as continuers of the classical tradition.[21] Nevertheless, the opposition between Attic and Asianic style is not an invention of Dionysius (alone): it appeared more widely in the first century BC.[22] Dionysius was one of the first writers to present them as two different moral systems, each of them representing two different types of identity.[23] As Dionysius was able to extract the most classical elements from the classical authors, in the same way,

---

[16] *Orat. Vett.* 1.3.

[17] *Orat. Vett.* 1.5.

[18] De Jonge 2014 examines this allegory, also in relation to Longinus' classicizing allegories. After presenting the possible textual inspirations for this image, he argues convincingly in favor of Prodicus' story of *The Choice of Hercules*, as narrated by Socrates in Xenophon's memorabilia. This analogy emphasizes the moral implication of the scene even more.

[19] Wiater 2011 thoroughly examines Dionysius' classicism as a social-cultural phenomenon. See also Goudriaan 1989.

[20] For an illuminating discussion on the rise of the Atticism, see Wisse 1995; For a fruitful discussion on classicism and Atticism in Dionysius' work see Wisse 1995, 69-81; Goudriaan 1989, 566-578; De Jonge 2008, 9-20; Wiater 2011, 1-31.

[21] The most notorious example which Dionysius heavily criticized as 'Asianist' is Hegesias of Magnesia who thought of himself as an 'imitator' of Lysias, as Cicero reports (*Orat.* 67. 226).

[22] For a more detailed discussion on the origins of Atticism, see Wisse 1995, 74-76.

[23] See Hidber 1996, 43.

he was able to impose Asianic elements in a group of Hellenistic texts. By presenting Asianism in that way, he had as it were a new 'barbarian' to fight. How are we to interpret the role of this new 'barbarian' that Dionysius has constructed? Dionysius worked at Rome within a very powerful network of intellectuals and his model of classicism was a quality that could make his work purposeful, unique and necessary for Roman society;[24] it could offer Dionysius an important position in this literary and/or political circle of Rome. We could understand that by presenting himself as one of those who can expand and teach the right rhetoric, he appeared to become a cultural leader that Rome needed at that time.

But what would Dionysius and his work actually teach these people? Admiration for the classical past and its values is one central feature of the ideology of classicism. But Dionysius' project is more than that. His classicism aims to produce tangible and practical results. Dionysius claims that his work will be useful to anyone who wants to practice political philosophy (*Orat. Vett*. 4.2). At this point, it is useful to analyze the Isocratean basis of Dionysius' ideas in order to better understand Dionysius' aims and purposes. As it has been stressed by many scholars, the term πολιτικοὶ λόγοι and φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ that Dionysius often uses,[25] evoke the ideals of Isocrates;[26] political speeches (πολιτικοὶ λόγοι) are the product of Attic, philosophical rhetoric (φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ) which, in Dionysius time, have been re-animated. Isocrates used the term πολιτικοὶ λόγοι to indicate the special rhetorical education he offers.[27] His purpose was to establish the idea that learning to speak well would enforce to act well;[28] consequently, his pupils would firstly become experienced rhetoricians who would benefit their city and afterward, they would be able to create a strong Athenian identity which would unify the Greek against the so-called barbarian element.[29] According to Dionysius, Isocrates was the one who turned to political science and became the educator of great, Greek politicians, historians, and, in general, men of prominence (*Isoc.* 1.4). Therefore, we can say that Dionysius, when he is claiming that his work will benefit those who wish to practice political philosophy, indirectly presents himself as a new Isocrates. He introduces himself as an authority on the science of political discourses (πολιτικοὶ λόγοι) and an educator of powerful men, just like Isocrates. As a result, his ideology is more than just a theoretical

---

[24] Augustan Rome is a cultural center for a number of men from all over the Greco-Roman world, see De Jonge 2008, 27-34. Besides that, the fact that most of Dionysius' works have addressees is an additional evidence for the network he was part of, see De Jonge 2008, 27-28; Hunter & De Jonge 2019, 7-8.

[25] See e.g., *Orat. Vett*. 1.2, 1.4, 3.2, 4.2.

[26] E.g., Goudriaan 1989, 442-480 elaborates on how Dionysius uses Isocratean material. Very important analysis is also that of Hidber 1996, 44-56. Also, see Wiater 2011, 77-92.

[27] Isocrates, *Antidoses* 46-47. See also Too 1995, 7.

[28] See Goudriaan 1989, 476-478.

[29] For the Hellene-barbarian antithesis in Isocrates, see Wiater 2011, 65-66; Too 1995, 139-140.

framework; it is a concept of παιδεία which promises benefits both to individuals and cities, and more specifically to Rome and the Empire.

What Dionysius is actually offering his readers is examples (παραδείγματα) to emulate or avoid (*Orat.Vett*. 4.2):

> ἔστι δὲ ἥδε, τίνες εἰσὶν ἀξιολογώτατοι τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο προαιρέσεις τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τῶν λόγων καὶ τί παρ' ἑκάστου δεῖ λαμβάνειν ἢ φυλάττεσθαι, …

> The topic is this one: which of the ancient orators and writers are most worthy of study? What were their choices in their lives and works? And what do we have to adopt from each of them and what should we avoid?...

Dionysius will educate his readers through the mechanisms of eclectic imitation and emulation.[30] Dionysius' choice of classical texts will serve as ideal examples either of stylistic choices, or moralizing ideas, or even both. He is not going to teach specific rules of writing theory, but rather will attempt to demonstrate to his reader why one should avoid this or imitate the other in practice. Dionysius is keen on forming good orators and the requirements for that are 'able nature', 'careful learning', and 'devoted practice' as he tells us in his work *On Imitation* (fr. 2 Usener-Radermarcher).[31] *Mimesis* is a product of τέχνη i.e., of art, and not of nature. As such, the products of eclectic *mimesis* will also be unnatural. But in Dionysius' case, artificiality is considered better than naturality because it marks man's ability to surpass his nature.[32] That gives men new and more powerful opportunities to create their identities and to form their societies as they wish. In this case, the Greek classical past provides the means to Augustan citizens to become good orators, and thus effective politicians, as well as pious citizens capable of making the best decisions for themselves and their city, i.e., Rome. Being a 'Greek' or a 'Roman' is now a rather flexible concept.[33] Being born as a Greek does not make you more Greek than writing, speaking, and thinking in Greek. Furthermore, this 'Greekness' can serve as an example for Augustan Rome to imitate resulting in the production of wise men that Augustan Rome requires. Therefore, if we understand Dionysius' παιδεία in a Roman context, then maybe we can see that this process is making them more 'Roman' than ever because they would contribute to the prosperity of the Roman Empire.

---

[30] Whitmarsh 2011, 72-75 offers an interesting discussion on the term of *mimesis* in Dionysius. For a more elaborated analysis on the term of *mimesis* in Dionysius, see Hidber 1996, 56-75; Hunter 2009; Wiater 2011, 77-92; Schippers 2019, 22-50. Also, Halliwell 2002 offers a helpful examination of *mimesis* in antiquity.

[31] For this fragmentary work I followed the Greek edition of Usener-Radermarcher. Also, Hunter 2009 offers an interesting analysis on this work.

[32] See Whitmarsh 2001, 72.

[33] See Whitmarsh 2001; Wiater 2011, 107-110; Hunter & De Jonge 2019, 6-11.

Thus, the concept of imitation and emulation helps Dionysius to reanimate the distant Greek culture into an Augustan environment. He transforms the literary character of παιδεία into a powerful tool for ruling within the early Roman empire. Those who have been educated in Attic rhetoric are capable of producing political speeches (πολιτικοὶ λόγοι) and unify the Greek element against the barbarians.[34] The 'Attic-Asianic rhetoric' antithesis continues this tradition of the barbarian, immoral element as opposed to Greek, moral culture. Dionysius reintroduces this Hellene-Barbarian dichotomy as a crucial determinant for imperial prosperity. His vision of ideal παιδεία is to develop citizens who will assist their community by producing political speeches. But this community is now the Roman Empire and not a democratic *polis*. However, Dionysius tends to present Rome as a *polis* with democratic elements.[35] For this reason, the Greek-based education he extols can help the Roman society; on the one hand, it helps Rome to anchor its leadership and, on the other hand, aids other minority groups in raising their voices. It appears to be a 'crack' in the imperial system through which anyone with a good Greek education can rise to power. You can become 'Roman', but first, you have to be 'Greek'. Virgil, through the character of Anchises in a well-known passage from the *Aeneid* (6.851-52), says "you, Roman, be sure you remember to rule people with empire, these qualities will be your arts" (*tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento* (*hae tibi erunt artes*)). Now, when Dionysius writes that Rome's leaders who are most educated and virtuous made such a magnificent change (*Orat. Vett.* 3.1), we could interpret this as turning to the Romans (as well as other people within the Empire) and claiming that, instead of *imperium*, they should also rule with virtue derived from Greek παιδεία. Rome would not be a mere 'conqueror' with military force anymore but an 'educator' as well. It requires a deeper elaboration on the matter of Rome as 'conqueror' and/or 'educator' and, in general, the role of administrative power in education and the opposite. Hence, let us now turn to the power-related matters that the preface arises.

1.3 The interaction of power and παιδεία

If we want to grasp the position of administrative power as described by Dionysius in the preface, we must first comprehend Rome's role in the cultural revival, since Rome is the one who wields power.[36] After emphasizing the role of the right time and pointing out three explanations for this phenomenon, namely, a divine, a natural and

---

[34] See above, n. 11-12.
[35] See Hidber 1996, 75-81; Fox 2019, 180-200.
[36] See *Orat. Vett.* 3.1.

a human one (*Orat. Vett.* 2.1-2),[37] Dionysius presents the real cause-according to him-of the revolution: it is all-powerful Rome (*Orat. Vett*. 3.1):

> αἰτία δ᾽ οἶμαι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ὅλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν καὶ ταύτης δὲ αὐτῆς οἱ δυναστεύοντες κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τὰ κοινὰ διοικοῦντες, 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.

> It seems to me that the cause and the beginning of this change was Rome that rules over all, who forces all cities to look at her, and its rulers who govern with virtue and administer the public affairs most excellently. They are very well-educated and they are brave in their judgments and because of that, the prudent element of the city has increased even more and the ignorant element is oppressed to have more sense.

The phrase 'Rome was the cause' leads to many questions, for Rome, although a city, is presented as a vital organism that behaves like a person, and even a very powerful one. Also, if we consider the literary sense of the word 'Rome', which is 'power', 'strength', the manifestation of Rome's power becomes even more apparent. The matter becomes more complicated when Dionysius claims that Rome's leaders are responsible for the cultural renaissance. The portrayal of Rome and its leadership is emerging as a very influential one, placed in the political and cultural center of the Greco-Roman world.[38] So what does Dionysius mean when he is referring to Rome and who are these leaders? Many scholars have suggested different explanations, but the most convincing one is that Dionysius is speaking here in political terms.[39] Firstly, the political framework of this revolution is obvious from the vocabulary that is used: ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα ("that rules over all"), οἱ δυναστεύοντες ("the rulers"), τὰ κοινὰ διοικοῦντες ("to administer the public affairs").[40] Thus it can be reckoned that Dionysius is referring to the political leaders of Rome and their administrative power.[41] However, the administrative power of these leaders was not the only factor in the revolution's success. For Dionysius, their cultural and moral education was also a major factor in providing the best environment for this restoration.[42] Based on the way that Dionysius constructs this passage, it is tough to choose which comes first for

---

[37] For an interesting discussion for the notion of time in Dionysius, see Fox 2011, 99-102

[38] For Dionysius' presentation of Rome's leadership, see Gabba 1982, 53-54.

[39] Wisse 1995 speculates that these leaders are the patrons; Goudriaan 1989, 568 and Hidber 1996, 121-122 argue that Dionysius is referring to political leaders of Rome. For a more detailed discussion of the interpretation of the scholarship, see De Jonge 2008, 17-18.

[40] See De Jonge 2008, 17-18.

[41] For this interpretation, see De Jonge 2008, 18.

[42] See Hidber 1996, 120.

the restoration that occurred: administrative authority, or moral education of the leaders?

The ambiguity continues with Dionysius saying that under this leadership the sensible part of Rome (τό φρόνιμον) has increased whereas the ignorant one (τὸ ἀνόητον) was forced to have more sense. The pair of sensible-ignorant parts is remarkable as well as the attitude of administrative power towards it. In *Ant. Rom.* 5.4.3 this exact same pair (τό φρόνιμον-τὸ ἀνόητον) is used to express what wise and ignorant or barbarian men would do in terms of friendship;[43] the wise men represent the moral behavior whereas the ignorant ones choose an immoral behavior. This is reminiscent of the Attic and Asianic contradiction where Attic rhetoric represents freedom, morality, philosophy whereas the Asianic is a symbol of slavery, immorality and ignorance.[44] Therefore, this pair of sensible versus ignorant parts of Rome may refer to a symbolic representation again between those who have classical Greek education and the ones who follow the Asianic rhetoric. However, as it has been demonstrated, this presentation of Asianic as immoral is but a construction of Dionysius.[45] The vocabulary used in this passage (*Orat. Vett*. 3.1) allows us to understand that Dionysius continues his construction. The boundaries of the empire are becoming symbolic and they are expanding by reinforcing the cultural dominance of Rome.[46] Everything else outside it must be eliminated. Dionysius assigns to space and time his meaning, as he perceives it. Rome now is a power through which ancient Greek culture is spreading, but not necessarily in a peaceful way.

Dionysius clearly admires the city of Rome. He admires Rome because he sees that Rome and her rulers are reenacting the classical past, a restoration that Dionysius frequently emphasizes. Dionysius is fascinated by Rome's administrative and military supremacy, but not exclusively; according to Dionysius, Rome uses this power in the most useful way, and that is to restore Attic rhetoric, i.e., morality. This combination of administrative power in relation to ideal παιδεία is the key point to understand Dionysius' appreciation to Rome. We can see Rome as a city that seeks to imitate the classical past and become a new Athens;[47] we can also see Augustus as a new Alexander for Augustus is now the new guard of Attic rhetoric, as was Alexander whose death terminated her era.[48] In other words, Rome's *mimesis* of classical past is what Dionysius extols. On the other hand, Dionysius at times is criticizing Rome as well. He characterizes this Rome as *almighty* (ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη) that "forces (ἀναγκάζουσα) all cities to look at her". The vocabulary used in this passage (*Orat. Vett*. 3.1) indicates that the political order of Rome is harsh and has urged cities to

---

[43] See also Hidber 1996, 120-121 who points to the passage *Ant. Rom.* 6.24.2 in which the sensible (σωφρονοῦντι) part of the city is referring to Rome.

[44] *Orat. Vett*. 1.3-5.

[45] See above p. 3.

[46] See Wiater 2011, 97-98.

[47] See Hidber 1996, 75-81.

[48] See Wiater 2011, 99-100.

obey her, politically or culturally. The verb ἀναγκάζω (to force) appears again when Dionysius describes how the prudent part of Rome's people has oppressed (ἠνάγκασται) the ignorant one (τὸ ἀνόητον) to have more sense.[49] All in all, this passage may be interpreted not only as flattery but also as a critic of the harshness of Rome's political order. By critiquing Rome, positively or negatively, Dionysius proves that he is striving for the ζήλωσις (emulation) part on behalf of Rome. In that way, he brings his theoretical framework of μίμησις and ζήλωσις into life. As a teacher, he is the first to set an example and he has the power to do so because of his Greek παιδεία.

As we have seen, political events have a crucial role in Dionysius' narrative. The death of Alexander the Great signaled the beginning of a period of rhetorical decline (*Orat. Vett*. 1.2); the loss of Attic rhetoric's political control over the cities was a defining moment for a general decay in society (*Orat. Vett*. 1.3-4); and, eventually, Rome's administrative power has proven to be very effective as a result of the cultural revival it has achieved (*Orat. Vett*. 3.1). Thus, the criteria of Dionysius to define whether the administrative power of each epoch is effective and purposeful is to look at the impact they have in the cultural domain. That is expressed first and foremost in Dionysius' description of Rome as the cause and origin of the cultural renaissance. What Dionysius extols about Rome is its proper use of administrative power in relation to Greek παιδεία. This ideal παιδεία makes the leaders admirable and sets them as examples of imitation for the multitude as well. Dionysius is setting the rules for the construction of an ideal παιδεία which aims to form perfect leaders who will use their power well and will attribute to the cultural realm of their city. All in all, in his preface, by formulating his ideas on the ultimate purpose of παιδεία, he seems to be suggesting that perfect leaders are those who will imitate and emulate the Greek classical past. Simultaneously, the administration's role is to promote this ideal παιδεία. In that way, political leaders and Greek educators will have equal power in the early Roman Empire. They must depend on each other in order to achieve a prosperous future not only in literature but also in the social, economic and political domains. Dionysius, as a Greek educator aiming at students who will practice political philosophy, presents himself as a highly influential man whose writing is very powerful.

1.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have first explained how Dionysius constructs ideal παιδεία. It is founded on Isocratean principles, as the terms φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ and πολιτικοὶ λόγοι occupy a central position in Dionysius' ideology. He exploits the Isocratean battle against the 'barbarian', 'new', 'other' element, i.e., the Hellene-Barbarian antithesis. He re-enacts this idea into his representation of Attic and Asianic rhetoric

---

[49] Also, cf. 2.2: τῇ δὲ νέᾳ καὶ ἀνοήτῳ ("the new and ignorant rhetoric").

as two opposing moral structures and identities. He claims to fight on the side of Attic rhetoric and in that way, he puts himself in the center of socio-cultural changes of the Roman Empire. More political speeches will be created in the Augustan environment, by imitating and emulating classical Greek writers. Dionysius' παιδεία aims to educate those who want to pursue political philosophy, according to the ideals of classical Greece. Later, these students will be able to gain high-ranking political positions in the Roman Empire (praetors, consuls, even emperors) and exercise their power wisely. That brings us to Dionysius' thoughts on the role of power. What Dionysius admires about powerful Rome is not her military command but rather the proper education of its political leaders. Therefore, Dionysius envisions Rome as an 'educator' and not only a mere 'conqueror'. Dionysius seems to have an ambiguous attitude towards Rome but he opts for Rome's cultural, political and social stability. And the way to achieve this is for the administrative power to support the expansion of ideal παιδεία; also, the ultimate aim of ideal παιδεία should be to create useful political leaders. Power and παιδεία are thus closely interrelated and presented as an unbreakable pair.

Chapter two: *On Isocrates*

2.1 Introduction

In the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* (*Orat. Vett*. 4.5), Dionysius declares that he will divide the six orators into two classes of three. Dionysius' work thus consists of six treatises, the second of which is *On Isocrates*.[50] His rhetorical program includes a variety of classical rhetoricians of different ages, and from different rhetoric styles. What distinguishes the treatise *On Isocrates*? It is Dionysius' explicit admiration for Isocrates' ideas on philosophy, rhetoric and politics, many of which Dionysius integrates and re-enacts in his own philosophical program. The treatise begins with biographical information about Isocrates (*Isoc.* 1). Dionysius remarks on his qualitative education, his passion for philosophical pursuit, his interest in politics but also his lack of physical aptitude and his appraisable choice to write political discourses. Dionysius then analyses Isocrates' rhetorical style in comparison with Lysias and emphasizes the rhetorical qualities of Isocrates that are censurable (*Isoc.* 2-3). Next, he presents the content of Isocrates' speeches and underlines the educative and moral influence of Isocrates' ideas (*Isoc.* 4-9). Subsequently, he further elaborates the rhetorical and subject-matter comparison with Lysias (*Isoc.* 10-14). Dionysius cites examples of deliberative and juridical discourses to demonstrate Isocrates' power, and then offers his critic (*Isoc.* 15-20). The treatise ends somehow abruptly with the excuse of lack of time on behalf of Dionysius.

The only scholar who has elaborately discussed the influence of Isocrates on Dionysius' *On Isocrates* is Hubbell.[51] Although his summary of the principal domains in which Isocrates has influenced Dionysius is useful, in his conclusion he states that ''Dionysius adopts as his own the principles of the "philosophy" held by Isocrates'';[52] this view seems obsolete and does not take into account Dionysius' own aims and time. For this reason, a re-examination of the treatise *On Isocrates* is needed.

In this chapter, I will analyze how Dionysius views and depicts παιδεία and power in his treatise *On Isocrates*. I will argue that Dionysius does not uncritically adopt Isocrates' notion of παιδεία but rather chooses and exploits Isocratean ideals to enhance his goals. Dionysius also creates new and distinct connotations for the sense of power in comparison with the ones provided by Isocrates. Again, the interrelation of power and παιδεία will turn out to be of major importance for understanding Dionysius' philosophical agenda. Through this chapter, it will also be clear how Dionysius

---

[50] *On Hyperides* and *On Aeschines*, the last two treatises, were not found.
[51] See Hubbell 1914, 41-53.
[52] See Hubbell 1914, 53.

incorporates the beliefs of Isocrates into his own, new rhetorical program in the Augustan environment. Let us begin by looking at the term παιδεία in Isocrates' program and its implications for Dionysius' thought.

2.2 Isocrates' παιδεία through Dionysius' perspective

To better understand Dionysius' exploitation and critique of the Isocratean term of παιδεία, we should first explore the meaning of παιδεία in Isocrates' works. Who is to be considered as an educated man (πεπαιδευμένος) for Isocrates? To answer this question, we should first turn to Isocrates' pedagogical system and ask what did he teach, how, and to whom.[53]

To begin with, Isocrates claimed that he was teaching λόγοι, a term into which many notions are usually ascribed.[54] The teaching of λόγοι most probably meant that Isocrates gave his students example speeches first to study and then to imitate. He claims that he did not teach eloquence by rule or according to a system nor was he able to teach virtue; after all, these two could not be taught.[55] He argues that natural ability (φύσις) along with technical knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) and intellectual exercise (παραδείγματα) was the key to being an educated man.[56] The ultimate conduct of this kind of practice would be for his students to truly possess civic virtue, which means to think well, speak well and act well concerning civic matters.[57] That brings us to our final question: what was the profile of Isocrates' pupils? It seems that these pupils were supposed to be ambitious young men who would one day be political leaders.[58] All in all, παιδεία for Isocrates is a complex ideal that refers to learning to think well and act well on behalf of the public interest in political matters, depending on the circumstances (καιρός);[59] the means to achieve this is to study carefully and imitate political discourses, examples given by a proper educator. Their λόγοι should be the direct expression of their practical wisdom (φρόνησις). It is evident that for Isocrates philosophy, rhetoric and politics are always related under the notion of παιδεία.

Dionysius' critique of Isocrates is divided into two parts: style and content. Both items however are discussed in relation to their contribution to politics. Starting first from the philosophical aspect of Isocrates, Dionysius' criticism is the most

---

[53] For a detailed discussion on the pedagogical program of Isocrates, see Too 1995, 151-199.

[54] See Livingstone 1998, 269.

[55] Isocrates, *Panathenaicus* 200.

[56] E.g., Isocrates, *Against the Sophists* 14-17.

[57] See Goudriaan 1989, 476-478; Livingstone 1998, 268-269.

[58] For an overview of the passages where Isocrates speaks about his students, see Livingstone 1998, 264-265; Isocrates had indeed many students from various disciplines, see Aujac 1978, 187.

[59] As Goudriaan has argued, παιδεία in Isocrates could be briefly characterized as 'the ideal of civilization', see Goudriaan 1989, 477-478.

favorable one could expect. He praises his innovative arguments and groundbreaking thoughts (*Isoc.* 4.1-2) but most importantly he extols Isocrates' choice (προαίρεσις) of subject-matter.[60] The themes in which Isocrates immersed himself were not trivial, individual matters but rather serious, politically related subjects, concerning Greece and/or the Persian Empire (*Isoc.* 1.3). Dionysius frequently extols Isocrates' patriotic and nationalist agenda which is focused on Greece and its prosperity. The polemic stance against the barbarian element is an idea that Dionysius has extracted from Isocrates and has re-enacted. In Dionysius' case, 'the other' is no longer the Persian Empire, but rather whatever is outside of Greek παιδεία, i.e., Asianic rhetoric. Greece's borders are symbolic this time, with the Roman Empire defining the real boundaries. Although Dionysius cannot have a role in defining the real borders, for that is a role of the Roman Empire, he creates for himself a powerful position in defining the 'symbolic' boundaries of Rome, having classical Greek παιδεία, and Isocrates in particular, as his mighty assistants.

According to Dionysius, Isocrates was the first who rejected dialectic and natural philosophy to devote himself to political science (*Isoc.* 1.4). In this way, Isocrates represents theoretical and political ideals that are of practical use to humanity. This turn to political discourses becomes one of the most important reasons for which Dionysius admires and follows Isocrates. Later on in the treatise, Dionysius will positively evaluate some of the Isocratean discourses and their content. The first sentence for each discourse (*Isoc.* 4-9) is a question through which Dionysius exemplifies the moral virtues and the pedagogical values that the readers will gain if they study and imitate the Isocratean material. To cite one example (*Isoc.* 7.1):[61]

> τίς δὲ ἂν μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν προτρέψαιτο καθ᾽ ἕκαστόν τε ἄνδρα ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ τὰς πόλεις ὅλας τοῦ Περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης λόγου;

> What greater incitement to justice and piety could there be, for every man singly and all cities collectively, than the discourse *On the Peace*?

After these questions, Dionysius analyzes in more detail the five Isocratean speeches he has chosen. Through this examination, Dionysius demonstrates that the philosophical part of Isocrates' παιδεία is almost identical with his own agenda.[62] Even if these beliefs were aiming to enhance the Greek identity during the classical period,[63] Dionysius manages to reveal their intertemporal value. Through these questions, he enacts the mechanism of eclectic *mimesis*, as presented in the preface.[64] Dionysius'

---

[60] For the meaning of προαίρεσις in Dionysius as a critic, see Hunter 2019, 38-41.
[61] For an illuminating discussion on the moral and political lessons of these speeches, see Wiater 2011, 71-77.
[62] For παιδεία concept in Dionysius' work based on Isocratean ideas, see Hidber 1996, 44-56.
[63] Wiater 2011, 65-68 examines Isocrates' role in forming Athenian and Greek identity against what he considered to be the 'barbarian' element.
[64] Cf. *Orat.Vett.* 4.2.

discussion of these speeches aims to shape the classical *ethos* of his readers.[65] He is offering examples (παραδείγματα) of how Greeks acted in different situations and the (Roman) reader of Dionysius can now imitate and emulate the Greeks. In addition, the summary of every Isocratean speech contains lessons to be learned both for political leaders and the common people. Thus, Dionysius does not only aim to bring political changes but also envisages a broader social impact, just like Isocrates envisaged the enosis of Greece as a whole. This pursuit fits well with the general climate of Dionysius' time: he settled in Rome after Caesar Augustus had terminated the civil wars;[66] the early Roman Empire, now under the rule of one man, is striving for peace and union. Dionysius' ambitions have much in common with Isocrates' aspirations.

Nevertheless, we must not forget that Dionysius strives to surpass Isocrates. After praising the philosophical part of Isocratean speeches, Dionysius turns to Isocrates' style and emphasizes many flaws in his arrangement of words. This is the part where Dionysius can prove his supremacy. Dionysius claims that Isocrates' style is complicated and exaggerated, rather than concise and compact (*Isoc*. 2.3). His arrangement of words is not natural and simple and for this reason, his discourses are not ideal for law courts or the assembly but they fit better in ceremonial occasions (*Isoc*. 2.4-7). All in all, his style does not follow his excellent choice of subject matter; and that is a big fault according to Dionysius' criticism. One of the *mimesis* key goals is for readers to 'internalize' the beauty of language in order to re-produce beautiful speeches. Isocratean style, on the other hand, makes use of an obscure language, which Dionysius does not approve of. Clarity is his key stylistic aim; for example, a hybrid rhetorical style consisting of Isocratean ideas and Lysias style would serve Dionysius' purposes. Dionysius makes extensive use of Isocratean stylistic weaknesses and through this fact, we may be able to better comprehend his goals. His quest for clarification continues his constructed fight against his adversary, the Asianic rhetoric, as he presented in the preface. For Dionysius, the cultural dominance of Greek was the main aim, in order for Roman Empire to become not only a 'conqueror' but also an 'educator'.[67] In that way, Rome itself will surpass Athens.

By criticizing Isocrates, Dionysius demonstrates how his audience should think, write and act. Isocrates has chosen the right subjects (προαίρεσις) but he partly failed in his style. Dionysius is said to have been the one who discovered the discord and set out to correct it. He gives the style much more weight than Isocrates did, and this addition helps him to construct a new, promising version of παιδεία. This new concept has its values in the interrelation of rhetoric, philosophy, and politics, but Dionysius

---

[65] Wiater 2011, 67-77 offers a more elaborated discussion on the formation of classical *ethos* through Dionysius' *On Isocrates*.
[66] *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.2.
[67] Cf. chapter one, pp. 11-12.

has the power to perfect it in every way.[68] The means to achieve this is eclectic *mimesis* and the method of *metathesis*, i.e., the re-arrangement of classical texts.[69] Through his rewriting of Isocrates Dionysius appears to be emerging as a new yet superior Isocrates as a result of his writing. He presents himself not only as a teacher who is educating young ambitious students engaging themselves with political discourses, but also as a very powerful thinker and rhetorician. It remains to be seen how effective this new construction of παιδεία could be in comparison to Isocrates' one.

2.3 Power in action: from Isocrates to Dionysius

According to Dionysius, Isocrates gained the prestige and honor he sought by engaging in political discourses and selecting the right content (*Isoc*. 1.3-4). His students learned how to advise and support their communities (*Isoc.* 1.4).[70] Isocrates helped them to become the best forensic speakers, the best politicians and civil officials, as well as the best historians of Greek and barbarian affairs (*Isoc*. 1.5) The power of his παιδεία can be seen in the realms of rhetoric and politics and it has proved to have a very tangible impact on society. It was a παιδεία intended for those who aspired to high-ranking positions or, in general, for men of prominence. It was also a παιδεία through which the Athenian and Greek identity would become even more powerful. Dionysius introduces a very vivid image to explain the vast influence of Isocrates' παιδεία (*Isoc*. 1.6):

> καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως εἰκόνα ποιήσας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σχολὴν κατὰ τὰς ἀποικίας τῶν λόγων,…

> and he made his own school representative of the city of Athenians through the colonies of speeches,…

This expression can have multiple meanings and is noteworthy for several reasons.[71] To begin with, Dionysius underlines Isocrates' place in classical culture. Dionysius adds to this portrayal of Isocrates by commenting on Isocrates' power to make Greek education accessible to any other non-Greek literate man. Second, this comment might also apply to Dionysius' own situation and period. Isocrates' school made

---

[68] For a more nuanced discussion on the new Dionysius' construction of παιδεία based on the method of eclectic mimesis, see Hidber 1996, 56-75.

[69] For the use and aims of *metathesis* in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, see De Jonge 2005, 463-480 and 2008, 367-390. Dionysius uses this method also *On Isocrates*, 14.

[70] Although Dionysius does not mention by name any student of Isocrates, it is useful here to remind some of Isocrates' pupils had indeed political or cultural power, such as the young king Nicocles, see Livingstone 1998, 276-281.

[71] Wiater 2011, 69 very briefly discusses this image.

Athens and her culture known not only in her day but throughout history, wherever a 'colony of speech exists'; Rome in the first century BC might also be such a colony of speeches. Another noteworthy element of the text cited above is how λόγοι can build an ἀποικία: λόγοι seem to be presented as travelers who can cross space and/or time and wield such power that they can establish new settlements and colonies. It seems that in this metaphor λόγοι have political and administrative power. Finally, the expression ἀποικίας τῶν λόγων is reminiscent of Dionysius' status as well: a traveler with the power to establish new colonies of literature even within the Roman Empire, thanks to his Greek/Isocratean παιδεία. In short, Dionysius uses a very vivid picture to illustrate Isocrates' influence and his importance to Athenian and Greek identity.

Let us now consider Isocrates' influence and how Dionysius presents and exploits it. Political and cultural power are not two distinct realms in Dionysius' work, particularly in this treatise, because the term παιδεία unifies them.[72] Isocrates had cultural power because his school was well-known, but he also had political power because his students had a lot of political influence (*Isoc.* 1.5).[73] Isocrates, through his speeches, presents himself in a similar way that Dionysius does. In the speech *Panegyricus* 50, for example, Isocrates praises Athens and its pupils for extending the meaning of 'Hellenism' to all those who have Greek education and not only the ones who share a common race. If the pupils of Isocrates imitate him, they would learn how to become authorities who extend Hellenism beyond its limits.[74] Isocrates urges Greece to wage war against the barbarians but also urges Greece to extend its cultural limits.[75] His speeches deal both with political and cultural matters. While Isocrates presents himself as an authority on both topics, Dionysius follows Isocrates' example and reclaims cultural influence through his classicizing program and the revival of Attic rhetoric. He also seems to claim a certain kind of political power since his work is aimed at men in positions of power, though not exclusively.[76] But how exactly does Dionysius introduce and exploit the Isocratean material within Augustan Rome?

Dionysius cites five speeches in his analysis of Isocratean subject matter from which not only men in administrative authority but also individuals and ultimately entire societies, could benefit. More specifically about administrative power, although Dionysius addresses the speech *To Phillip* to those men "in high office and power",[77]

---

[72] Whitmarsh discusses the concept of political and cultural power as two elements not opposed in the 'Second Sophistic' period. This observation applies also for Dionysius' era. See Whitmarsh 2001, 17-20.

[73] Too 1995, 200-232 argues that Isocratean pedagogy arrogates power to itself. This analysis is crucial in order to understand the difference between the actual influence Isocrates may had and the one he claims to have.

[74] See Livingstone 1998, 274-276.

[75] E.g., Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 3.

[76] E.g., cf. *Orat.Vett*. 4.2: "I think these are good points and necessary for those who are engaged with political philosophy". Also, this is evident from his addressees and friends; the families of Q. Aelius Tubero and Metilius Rufus were very influential, see De Jonge 2008, 25-34.

[77] *Isoc.* 6.1: μέγεθος ἔχων ἀνὴρ καὶ δυνάμεώς τινος.

he urges them not to seek prizes as wealth, eminence and power but rather virtue and popular esteem (*Isoc.* 6.2). In the next example of *On Peace*, Dionysius points out how Isocrates managed to persuade (πείθειν) the Athenian mass to be content with what they have and he convinces them (*Isoc.* 7.1)

> … καὶ τῶν μὲν μικρῶν πόλεων ὡσπερανεὶ κτημάτων φείδεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ συμμάχους εὐεργεσίαις πειρᾶσθαι κατέχειν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ταῖς ἀνάγκαις μηδὲ ταῖς βίαις.

> … to be as considerate in their treatment of small cities as if they were their own possessions, and to secure the loyalty of their allies by good deeds and not by force and acts of violence.

The methods of ἀνάγκη ("force") and βία ("violence") are here condemned by Dionysius and he gives the example from Isocrates for how Athenians could thrive without using these methods. However, these are precisely the two methods (ἀνάγκη and βία) employed by the leadership of Rome in order to re-establish the Attic rhetoric.[78] The harsh vocabulary used for Rome "who forces all cities to look at her" (ἀναγκάζουσα τας πόλεις) stands in sharp contrast to what Dionysius here supports through his reading of Isocrates. So, Dionysius here is also implicitly advising and criticizing Rome. Furthermore, through the speech of *Panegyricus* (*Isoc.* 5.1), Dionysius claims that every person will become φιλόδημος ("supporter of democracy") whereas he is writing in a non-democratic environment. Dionysius selects the most important principles of a democratic system and attempts to infuse them into a particular political system, such as an Empire, through his work. This results in a very powerful writing through which παιδεία can distribute new social roles: the administrative power of Rome is taught to embrace the powerful ideal of democratic παιδεία. Dionysius here seems to resist Rome and its political order by embracing democratic ideals taken from Isocrates.

As I have pointed out, Dionysius can use Isocrates' influence to criticize and resist Rome and its dominant methods. The opposite approach that Dionysius also embraces is to flatter and praise Rome and its leaders. The speech *To Philip* provides the most illuminating example. At the beginning of his summary of this Isocratean speech, Dionysius argues (*Isoc.* 6.1):

> τίς δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἀγαπήσειε μέγεθος ἔχων ἀνὴρ καὶ δυνάμεώς τινος ἡγούμενος, ἃ πρὸς Φίλιππον αὐτῷ τὸν Μακεδόνα γέγραπται; ἐν οἷς ἀξιοῖ στρατηγὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τηλικαύτης ἐξουσίας κύριον διαλλάττειν μὲν τὰς διαφερομένας πόλεις ἀλλὰ μὴ συγκρούειν πρὸς ἀλλήλας, τὴν δὲ Ἑλλάδα μεγάλην ἐκ μικρᾶς ποιεῖν,…

> What man in high office and power would not appreciate his letter to Philip of Macedon? In this letter he urges the man who is general and entitled of such a great authority, to reconcile the quarreling cities rather than setting them

---

[78] Cf. *Orat.Vett*. 3.1.

against one another, and to convert Greece from an insignificant country to a great one,…

Isocrates, according to Dionysius, considers Philip as the man who can effectively unite the Greek element against the barbarian and make Greece prominent again. In this speech, Isocrates offers Philip some guidance on how to achieve this unity. However, one could say that in Dionysius' time Augustus has actually done what Isocrates is urging Philip to do. The Roman emperor put an end to the civil wars and united the Empire under one man's rule. The 'barbarian' element now is identified as Asianism, which, according to the preface, was abolished during Augustus' reign.[79] Therefore, Augustus is portrayed as a new and better version of Philip who achieved his aspirations and brought stability to the Roman Empire.

Dionysius' exploit of Isocrates' power for his own aims under the Augustan principate is reflected also in his negative aspect of criticism towards Isocrates. At the beginning of the treatise *On Isocrates*, Dionysius addresses Isocrates' physical inability to effectively engage in rhetoric and politics.[80] Despite the fact that Isocrates did not achieve to become an actual politician, he ended up wielding more influence in Greek politics than the majority of Athenians as a result of his παιδεία. Dionysius, on the other hand, is portraying himself as capable of critiquing and correcting Isocrates' rhetorical style. The interconnection of morality and excellent rhetoric stressed by Dionysius will theoretically make his students much more effective than those of Isocrates. In order to prepare his students for the political power they would seek in Augustan Rome, his concept of παιδεία should be perfect. Isocrates was training young men to pursue influence in a Greek-dominated world by teaching them Greek. Dionysius has a much more challenging task: he is training young, ambitious, Roman men to enter the political stage in a Roman setting by teaching them Greek.

On the one hand, παιδεία has power. On the other hand, administrative power uses παιδεία to enhance its position and that is even more crucial in Dionysius' time. Dionysius takes on the difficult task of educating those who want to learn about political theory and/or political practice. In order to succeed and prevail in a Roman setting, he must create a very strong philosophical agenda with a clear and persuasive message.

---

[79] See chapter one, pp. 6-8.
[80] Cf. Isocrates, *Panathenaicus* 9-10; Isocrates, *To Philip* 81; Isocrates, *Epistle* 8.7. Also, for an interesting discussion on Isocrates' self-representation, see Too 1995, 75-112.

2.4 Summary

In this chapter, we have focused on the notions of παιδεία and power as presented in Dionysius' treatise *On Isocrates*. The educational program of Isocrates was discussed first, followed by an examination of Dionysius' twofold critique. For both Isocrates and Dionysius, παιδεία is a complex ideal that includes the fields of philosophy, rhetoric, and politics. Dionysius finds the Isocratean philosophical ideas to be a great model for creative imitation in Augustan Rome. Isocrates' style, however, was less valued by Dionysius: he did not regard Isocrates as a perfect orator, as his style did not suit his excellent choice of subject matter. The decision of Dionysius to emphasize the rhetorical aspect of Isocrates' discourses is influenced by his own era. As a Greek-educated literary man living in Augustan Rome, he hopes to create a very powerful new system of παιδεία through his rhetorical criticism. Through his formulations and citations, Dionysius suggests that Isocratean values would help Roman leaders to rule the world fairly and effectively. That brings us to the second part of our discussion, the interrelation with power. This matter was examined in a double manner: first Isocrates' power was explored as presented through Dionysius; second, I discussed what role Dionysius assigns to Isocratean παιδεία in the Augustan environment: how could administrative authorities in Rome profit from Isocrates' lessons? In a non-democratic political scene, Dionysius seeks to incorporate several democratic elements. Following Dionysius' instructions, the practitioners of political speeches will represent classical morality and rhetoric, i.e., they will exhibit their perfect mastery of classical παιδεία. In this way, they will be able to extol the new political order and establish a world of justice and morality.

Chapter three: the preface to *Roman Antiquities*

3.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters explored the notions of παιδεία and power in Dionysius' rhetorical works. As we saw, through these works Dionysius introduces a model of ideal παιδεία, as he envisages it, which is based on the classical past and the process of μίμησις and ζήλωσις. He assigns a central role to Isocrates whom he presents as an ideal example for ideas that Dionysius' readers should imitate and emulate. This ideal construction of παιδεία has as its main objective to create powerful leaders in the first century BC who, based on their education, will be able to govern cities most excellently. Dionysius claims to be very glad that in his era Rome has created the ideal conditions for a cultural revival that restored the Attic, ancient, philosophical rhetoric to its rightful position. In order to demonstrate this, Dionysius points to the numerable excellent works of literature that are composed in his age, including rhetorical, but also historical works (*Orat. Vett.* 3.2).

In this chapter, we move from rhetoric to historiography: we will examine how Dionysius integrates himself into the literary circle that produces "many and worthy treatises" (*Orat. Vett.* 3.2: ἄλλαι τε πολλαὶ καὶ καλαὶ πραγματεῖαι). More specifically I will investigate the role of power and παιδεία in the opening sections of Dionysius' history of Rome. I will compare his observations in the *Roman Antiquities* with his views as formulated in his rhetorical works. I will argue that in his historiographical work, too, Dionysius introduces his readers to a certain system of παιδεία which can prove to be valuable for their contemporary society. Through his historiographical analysis of the earliest period of Rome, he will prove that Rome's present power is rightful because it is based on noble and excellent, *Greek* roots. His construction of history, which focuses on Greek values and the pre-history of Rome makes clearer than anywhere else how Greek παιδεία and Roman power are interrelated.

This chapter aims to demonstrate how Dionysius presents and interprets the notions of παιδεία and power and how he combines them in order to construct Rome's current identity. For this reason, I will focus on the preface to *Roman Antiquities*, because it is the part where Dionysius clearly demonstrates his aims, method and ideology concerning history in general and power in particular.

3.2 Παιδεία and historiography

Early in the preface, Dionysius declares that the right path, according to him, for a historiographer is firstly to choose an appropriate subject and second to treat it carefully (*Ant. Rom.* 1.2-3):[81]

> ἐπείσθην γὰρ ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς προαιρουμένους **μνημεῖα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ψυχῆς τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις** καταλιπεῖν, ἃ μὴ συναφανισθήσεται τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου, καὶ πάντων μάλιστα τοὺς ἀναγράφοντας ἱστορίας, ἐν αἷς καθιδρῦσθαι **τὴν ἀλήθειαν** ὑπολαμβάνομεν ἀρχὴν φρονήσεώς τε καὶ σοφίας οὖσαν, πρῶτον μὲν **ὑποθέσεις προαιρεῖσθαι καλὰς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς καὶ πολλὴν ὠφέλειαν** τοῖς ἀναγνωσομένοις φερούσας, ἔπειτα παρασκευάζεσθαι τὰς ἐπιτηδείους εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἀφορμὰς μετὰ πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας τε καὶ φιλοπονίας.

> For I am convinced that all who choose to leave **such monuments of their souls to posterity**, which will not be vanished along with their bodies by time, and particularly those who write histories, in which we have the right to assume that **Truth**, the source of both prudence and wisdom, is enshrined, ought, first of all, **to make choice of noble and lofty subjects and such as will be of great utility** to their readers, and then, with great care and pains, to provide themselves with the proper equipment for the treatment of their subject.

Dionysius strongly believes that the right choice of subject-matter is the first and foremost duty of a historiographer. With this statement, Dionysius has entered a discussion that has been happening for a long time in the historiographical tradition. This discussion centers on the question of what is considered lofty subject matter.[82] This is not a universal, objective fact, but rather an ambiguous issue that one must learn to value.[83] Dionysius will educate his readers on what he considers to be a subject worthy of study. When he finally announces the subject of his history, i.e., the early history of Rome (*Ant. Rom.* 1.4.) and although he claimed that he did not have to say much in order to convince the reader that his subject is worthy and useful (*Ant. Rom.* 1.2), he actually displays many arguments to support his choice.[84]

---

[81] For the work *Roman Antiquities*, I use the edition and translation (slightly modified) of Cary, 1937-1950.

[82] Hogg 2008, 29-38 points to this *topos* and elaborates on the comparison between Dionysius' preface and passages from Polybius, Sallust and Herodotus.

[83] Fox 1993, 38-41 analyzes more in depth the opposition between objectivity and Dionysius' interpretation of history.

[84] Note also that although Dionysius in the first sentence of the preface stresses that he does not want to praise himself, he indirectly extols himself as well, see Hogg 2008, 21-29.

In that way, he further engages himself in a dialogue concerning the ideal historical writing, which corresponds to the modern term of 'metahistory'.[85]

The concept of 'truth' is one of the most prominent factors of Dionysius' subject-choice. As we saw before, a truly noble subject for Dionysius must be able to do two things: first, leave monuments of historiographers' souls to posterity, and second, promote the 'truth'. 'Truth', however, can mean different things among different historians.[86] In the passage quoted above (*Ant*. *Rom.* 1.2), 'truth' is defined as "the source of prudence and wisdom". Later on, Dionysius emphatically announces that he aims to eliminate previous erroneous accounts and restore the 'truth' (*Ant. Rom.* 1.5.1):

> Ταύτας δὴ **τὰς πεπλανημένας**, ὥσπερ ἔφην, **ὑπολήψεις ἐξελέσθαι τῆς διανοίας τῶν πολλῶν προαιρούμενος καὶ ἀντικατασκευάσαι τὰς ἀληθεῖς**, περὶ μὲν τῶν οἰκισάντων τὴν πόλιν, οἵτινες ἦσαν καὶ κατὰ τίνας ἕκαστοι καιροὺς συνῆλθον καὶ τίσι τύχαις χρησάμενοι τὰς πατρίους οἰκήσεις ἐξέλιπον, ἐν ταύτῃ δηλώσω τῇ γραφῇ,…

> In order, therefore, **to remove these erroneous impressions, as I have called them, from the minds of the many and to substitute true ones in their room**, I shall in this work show who the founders of the city were, at what periods the various groups came together, and through what turns of fortune they left their native countries.

The 'truth' that Dionysius presents in his work is the claim that Rome's founders were actually Greeks and not barbarians, therefore they were virtuous, pious, just and free men (*Ant. Rom.* 1.4.2). His eagerness to prove this claim will soon be justified: if Dionysius can demonstrate that Rome's origin was not a matter of chance, but rather righteous, then Rome's current domination will be legitimized. As a result, all people living under the Roman Empire, particularly Greeks, should accept and praise Rome's current reign. In other words, the reason why Dionysius chose to treat such a distant subject-matter is his aspiration to legitimize Rome's current power and benefit his own society, i.e., first century BC Rome.[87]

So, if his readers comprehend the 'truth' he presents in his history, what would they actually learn? How will Dionysius benefit his own society? A closer reading of

---

[85] It is not the aim of this thesis to give an elaborate account on Dionysius' thoughts of how to write historiography, i.e., his comments on metahistory. For this, see Fox 1993, 31-47; Wiater 2011, 121-130.

[86] For a more elaborated analysis on Dionysius' notion of 'truth' and its implications in Dionysius, see Wiater 2011, 124-130; Meins 2019, esp. 67-70. For the notion of 'truth' in Dionysius' *On Thucydides*, see De Jonge 2017, 649-656.

[87] Fox 2011, 93-114 offers a more elaborated analysis on Dionysius' relation of language and time as seen through his historical interests and on Dionysius' concern to continue the Greek culture in Roman present as a critic and historian.

Dionysius' ambitions and aims reveals the nature of 'truth' he claims to offer: it is a construction equal to the ideal παιδεία construction we encountered at his rhetorical works (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.4-5):[88]

> τοῖς δὲ ἀπ᾿ ἐκείνων τῶν ἰσοθέων ἀνδρῶν νῦν τε οὖσι καὶ ὕστερον ἐσομένοις μὴ τὸν ἥδιστόν τε καὶ ῥᾷστον αἱρεῖσθαι τῶν βίων, ἀλλὰ τὸν εὐγενέστατον καὶ φιλοτιμότατον, ἐνθυμουμένους ὅτι τοὺς εἰληφότας καλὰς τὰς πρώτας ἐκ τοῦ γένους ἀφορμὰς μέγα ἐφ᾿ ἑαυτοῖς προσήκει φρονεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἀνάξιον ἐπιτηδεύειν τῶν προγόνων·

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

Just like the ancestors of Rome chose the noblest lifestyle and performed great deeds of virtue (*Ant. Rom.* 1.4.2), it is now expected that the contemporary reader will continue this noble emulation and will keep those Greek values alive.[89] All in all, Dionysius will provide direct examples of behavior worthy of imitation.[90] This aim of Dionysius recalls the preface to *On the Ancient Orators* where he announces the subject of his treatise, i.e., to present the best of the ancient orators as well as their choices in life and works (προαιρέσεις τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τῶν λόγων) and then determine which of these choices should adopt or avoid (*Orat. Vett*. 4.2).[91] As a result, a good rhetorician's and a good historiographer's goals are nearly identical.[92]

The most important expected outcome of historiography's ideal παιδεία is Dionysius' intention to legitimize Rome's current ruling. At a first glance, this could be seen as mere flattery towards Rome and its ruling leaders; Dionysius thus can be characterized as a historiographer who will just praise Rome's longevity, power and rule.[93] On the other hand, his ambition to establish the Roman Empire as a powerful dominion, as firmly as possible, could allude to some deficiencies in Rome's administrative power that the governed people are already aware of. He openly states that the goal of his historiographical project is for people to no longer be indignant about their current subjection (*Ant. Rom.* 1.5.2). This seems like a potential threat to the Roman Empire, which Dionysius recognizes, expresses, and is eager to remove.

---

[88] Meins 2019, 108-118 offers an illustrating and clear discussion about the notion of παιδεία in the historiographical work of Dionysius.

[89] Wiater 2011, 167-170 explains the two different kinds of *mimesis* as presented in the preface to *Roman Antiquities*: intratextual and intertextual.

[90] For the *mimesis* term in Dionysius' historiographical work, see Fox 1993,38-42; Hogg 2008, 61-65; Wiater 2011, 167-171; Meins 2019, 54-61.

[91] See chapter one, pp. 10-11.

[92] See Fox 1993, 41-42.

[93] See e.g., *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.5.

The Roman Empire's image is no longer that of a powerful dominion, but rather a fragile state, and Dionysius' project is promoted as the work that can help both the people of Rome and the governing class, by teaching them the 'truth'. We can see that the concept of 'truth' that Dionysius is introducing, even though is presented as objective and universal, is something that can be shaped to meet society's needs. [94] Therefore, this 'truth' he is building has the qualities of an educational program through which Dionysius aims at benefiting first century BC Rome.

That brings us to another crucial question for understanding Dionysius' work: for whom is Dionysius writing his work? A first observation is that the target audience is very similar to the one that he described in the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*. Dionysius asserts that his writing will set proper examples for the individuals who are descended from the people who are the subject of this work (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.4-5). Also, his work is aimed at an audience that aspires to high and prominent political positions. This is made clearer in a passage in which Dionysius describes how his work will benefit others (*Ant. Rom.* 1.8.3-4):

> …ἵνα καὶ τοῖς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς διατρίβουσι λόγους καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν φιλόσοφον ἐσπουδακόσι θεωρίαν καὶ εἴ τισιν ἀοχλήτου δεήσει διαγωγῆς ἐν ἱστορικοῖς ἀναγνώσμασιν ἀποχρώντως ἔχουσα φαίνηται.

> …in order to afford satisfaction both to those who occupy themselves with political debates and to those who are devoted to philosophical speculations, as well as to any who may desire mere undisturbed entertainment in their reading of history.

The ideal audience of Dionysius consists of people who pursue philosophical aspirations but also of those who are engaged in the practical, political sphere. The rhetorical echo in Dionysius' historiography is particularly strong in this passage because he is addressing those who want to compose persuasive political speeches and yield power in the framework of the Roman Empire. Again, Dionysius' παιδεία, this time through his historiographical project, is emerging as a powerful tool in the hands of those who seek power. But how are we to interpret this aspiration of his? What does this imply about the power dynamics between Greeks and Romans throughout the Roman Empire, as well as Dionysius himself?

3.3 Power Relations and Dionysius᾽ παιδεία

For Dionysius, Rome's power and supremacy are the embodiment of a noble, lofty and useful subject matter.[95] To convince his readers, he sets out to demonstrate why Rome's power surpasses every other supremacy by comparing it with other successful regimes (*Ant*. *Rom.* 1.2.1-4). In this way, he establishes the criteria by which it can be judged who has the most prominent superiority. It is not only deeds and dominion that count, but also longevity, and Rome's rule is prominent until Dionysius' time (*Ant*. *Rom.* 1.2.1: μέχρι τῆς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας). Although Dionysius will treat the early period of the Roman empire, he has already shown that *Roman Antiquities* is a project about the long-lasting Roman Empire which in its turn aims to enhance Rome's future longevity. As a result, it aids the Roman Empire in maintaining its dominance by praising and legitimizing it.

At the same time, Dionysius will gain power from this endeavor since he will leave behind an intellectual monument that will benefit the readers as well. But in this equation, there is not only Dionysius and Rome but also Greeks; this is evident in the following passage (*Ant. Rom.* 1.5.1-2):[96]

> ἐν ταύτῃ δηλώσω τῇ γραφῇ, δι᾽ ἧς Ἕλληνάς τε αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἐπιδείξειν ὑπισχνοῦμαι καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἢ φαυλοτάτων ἐθνῶν συνεληλυθότας... ἵνα τοῖς γε μαθοῦσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἃ προσήκει περὶ τῆς πόλεως τῆσδε παραστῇ φρονεῖν, εἰ μὴ παντάπασιν ἀγρίως καὶ δυσμενῶς διάκεινται πρὸς αὐτήν, καὶ μήτε ἄχθεσθαι τῇ ὑποτάξει κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς γενομένῃ (φύσεως γὰρ δὴ νόμος ἅπασι κοινός, ὃν οὐδεὶς καταλύσει χρόνος, ἄρχειν ἀεὶ τῶν ἡττόνων τοὺς κρείττονας) μήτε κατηγορεῖν τῆς τύχης, ὡς οὐκ ἐπιτηδείῳ πόλει τηλικαύτην ἡγεμονίαν καὶ τοσοῦτον ἤδη χρόνον προῖκα δωρησαμένης.

> By this means I engage to prove that they [the first Romans] were Greeks and came together from nations not the smallest nor the least considerable... to the end that I may instill in the minds of those who shall then be informed of the truth the fitting conception of this city,—unless they have already assumed an utterly violent and hostile attitude toward it,—and also that they may neither feel indignation at their present subjection, which is grounded on reason (for by a universal law of Nature, which time cannot destroy, it is ordained that superiors shall ever govern their inferiors), nor rail at Fortune for having wantonly bestowed upon an undeserving city supremacy so great and already of so long continuance.

---

[95] Gabba 1991, 200-216 discusses the political meaning of Dionysius' choice to treat the early Roman period and, in general, of his historiographical work.

[96] Fox 1993, 33-34 explains in more detail why this passage is specifically addressed to Greek leadership and he also notices a parallel passage from Timagenes.

Dionysius' work clearly aims to convince the Greeks to accept their Roman rulers: he claims that it is a natural law that the superiors will govern the inferiors and in our case the superiors are Romans and the inferiors are all the nations they have subjugated, among them also the Greeks. But Dionysius does not promote an uncritical idealization of Rome.[97] He declares that the first Romans were Greeks and that Rome is now superior because of its Greek roots, morals and values.[98] If we read again now the sentence "it is ordained that superiors shall ever govern their inferiors", we will understand that it is difficult to determine which nation actually is superior and which one is inferior or what traits make someone 'superior' or 'inferior'. As a result of this ambiguity, the reader's attention is drawn to the connection between Rome's power and Greek virtues. It is established that power owes its supremacy to culture.

If this is true, then the definition of 'power' in Dionysius' work is the successful interrelation between cultural supremacy and military dominion. Because the Romans were able to emulate the Greek virtues from the very beginning (*Ant. Rom.* 1.3.4: εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς) they became worthy of managing excellently the administrative power. That is the reason, according to Dionysius, for their long-lasting success, not fortune or any other arbitrary event. Mere military supremacy would not be enough and it would install ambiguity through the empire. It is interesting to see how a Greek-educated man based in Augustan Rome depicts Archaic Rome's power relations in order to establish power relations in the present.[99] One may argue that Dionysius is trying to promote an idealized image of Rome's power; however, this power is established in Greek values, that the first Romans imitated. We can see that the lines between what is 'Greek' and what is 'Roman' are getting blurred.

Roman Antiquities is thus presented as a project that can yield power -cultural and administrative- to many groups. First of all, it legitimizes Rome's administrative dominion and extols its past. It also extols Greece's cultural supremacy and it gives to Greek leadership a reason to accept Rome's dominion. This is applicable not only for Greeks but also for all the nations that Rome has conquered. On a cultural level, it serves as a useful guide for those interested in philosophy, from which they can derive examples of imitation and emulation. This historic writing provides also the milestones for people seeking access to political positions. Furthermore, it is both a memorial and a tangible product founded on Dionysius' own παιδεία. But, most importantly, it is presented as a text that can serve as worthy models for all citizens of the Roman Empire, ensuring the empire's success, unity, and advancement not just culturally, but

---

[97] Fox 2019, 180-200 examines how Dionysius' narrative of the prehistory of Rome reveals the complexity of his political situation and why Dionysius does not promote an uncritical idealization of Rome but rather contributes to an ideal international, Augustan society.
[98] Wiater 2011b, 70-88, elaborates on what is the result of the preface to *Roman Antiquities* to the shaping of Greek or Roman identity.
[99] See also Fox 1993, 38-39.

also politically, economically, and socially.[100] Dionysius has constructed his historical narrative in such a way that he appears to be able to deliver all of these benefits to all of the various groups. However, he emphasizes that these advantages will only come from proper παιδεία and knowledge. And Dionysius is the one who can give the ideal παιδεία, making him one of the few people capable of leading individuals and communities to positions of power. He claims to understand the thin boundaries between facts and perception of facts, and he carefully chooses his material in order to give meaning to his historical account.[101] Dionysius' literary and political goals at some point converge in order to create a work that will not only offer amusement or theoretical knowledge of the past but will influence the present and aspire contemporary people to pursue higher (Greek) values in action, i.e., in the political sphere.

3.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have explored the aims, methods and ideology of Dionysius' historiographical project. The main objective of *Roman Antiquities* is to establish Rome's fair hegemony in the present by proving its Greek origins and values. Through his subject-matter, Dionysius introduces a clear purpose of historiography: to offer moral ideals and paradigms for contemporary society. In that sense, it is obvious that παιδεία has again a crucial role in Dionysius' work: by reading the *Roman Antiquities* readers will learn and be trained to think in terms of the Greek values that inspired the first Romans. Dionysius' historical account aims at a very tangible and practical result: to remove erroneous mistakes and educate in the right way all those who want to learn the 'truth'. Only by imitation and emulation of past Greek values and virtues Dionysius' contemporary society, i.e., Augustan Rome, can flourish and yield power. Therefore, the definition of power is emerging as the successful balance between appropriate administrative leadership and possession of true knowledge. Since Dionysius is the one who is going to offer this 'truth', he is the one who defines what true power means. Again, the interrelation of παιδεία and power turns out to be crucial for our understanding of Dionysius' historiographical agenda.

---

[100] This is also the main conclusion of Fox 2019, 199-200.

[101] See *Ant. Rom.* 1.8.4: ἡ μὲν οὖν ἱστορία περὶ τοιούτων τε γενήσεται πραγμάτων καὶ τοιούτου τεύξεται σχήματος. ("My history will be concerned with such things, and it will have such form").

Conclusion

It was the subject of this thesis to explore how παιδεία and power intertwine and interrelate in Dionysius' of Halicarnassus rhetorical and historiographical work. Beginning with the preface to *On the Ancient Orators*, we saw that Dionysius presents his ideal παιδεία through the Attic-Asianic rhetoric opposition. He has constructed his educational program based on the Greek, classical past which he critically re-animates in his work. His intention is for anyone interested in political philosophy to have good examples to imitate in order to think and act well themselves. Individuals and communities will benefit as a result, and the Roman Empire will have the best administrative authority and the wisest citizens. The treatise *On Isocrates* provides us with more tangible examples of what the proper παιδεία for Dionysius would be. Dionysius extracts from Isocrates the most valuable democratic ideals in order to sometimes praise, at other times criticize, or even advise the Roman Empire. These ideas are again addressed to practitioners of political speeches, making his system of ideal παιδεία useful not only for rhetoricians but also for the political order of the Augustan Rome. Lastly, His historiographical work is a practical result of his rhetorical treatises, in which knowledge of the 'truth' about Rome's origins may legitimate Rome's contemporary domination. This 'truth' is part of his ideal system, which he builds in order to give power to both Greeks and Romans, the Roman Empire, and anybody interested in political philosophy.

What should be called 'ideal παιδεία' and what its objectives should be is a constant source of debate. Ideal education, according to Dionysius, is based on Greek values, but its aims are focused on the Roman society of Dionysius' day. Even in today's world, the struggle to discover the correct means of wielding power, whether political, cultural, or even simpler, everyday types of power, is a relatable issue. Dionysius has presented his ideal construction. Perhaps this could serve as a motivator to begin thinking more deeply about what ideal παιδεία and power would mean to us.

Bibliography

Aujac, G. (ed.). 1978. *Denys d' Halicarnasse: Opuscules rhétoriques. Tome I: Les orateurs antiques*. Paris.

Bonner, S. 1939. *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: A Study in the Development of Critical Method*. Cambridge.

Cary, E. 1937-1950. *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. Cambridge, MA.

Fox, M. 1993. 'History and Rhetoric in Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *Journal of Roman Studies* 83, 31-47.

Fox, M. 2011. 'The style of the Past: Dionysius of Halicarnassus in Context', in Schmitz, T. A., & Wiater, N. (eds), *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart, 93-114.

Fox, M. 2019. 'The Prehistory of the Roman Polis in Dionysius', in Hunter, R., & C.C. de Jonge (eds.), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Augustan Rome: Rhetoric, Criticism and Historiography*. Cambridge, 180-200.

Gabba, E. 1982. 'Political and Cultural Aspects of the Classicistic Revival in the Augustan Age', *Classical Antiquity* 1, 43-65.

Gabba, E. 1991. *Dionysius and The History of Archaic Rome*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford.

Goudriaan, K. 1989. *Over classicisme: Dionysius van Halicarnassus en zijn program van welsprekendheid, cultuur en politiek*. Diss. Amsterdam.

Halliwell, S. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton, New Jersey.

Hidber, T. 1996. *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass: Die Praefatio zu De oratoribus veteribus.* Stuttgart and Leipzig.

Hogg, D. 2008. *Speech and Action in the Antiquitates Romanes of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: The Question of Historical Change*. Diss. Oxford.

Hubbell, H. M. 1914. *The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides*. Diss. New Haven.

Hunter, R. 2009. 'The Ugly Peasant and the Naked Virgins: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Imitation', in Hunter, R. (ed.), *Critical Moments in Classical*

Literature: Studies in the Ancient View of Literature and its Uses. Cambridge, 107-127.

Hunter, R. 2019. 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Idea of the Critic', in Hunter, R., & C.C. de Jonge (eds.), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Augustan Rome: Rhetoric, Criticism and Historiography*. Cambridge.

de Jonge, C. C. 2005. 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Method of Metathesis', *Classical Quarterly* 55, 463-480.

de Jonge, C.C. 2008. *Between Grammar and Rhetoric*. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature.* Leiden and Boston.

de Jonge, C.C. 2014. 'The Attic Muse and the Asian Harlot: Classicizing Allegories in Dionysius and Longinus', in J. Ker and C. Pieper (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World. Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII*. Leiden, 388-409.

de Jonge, C.C. 2017. 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Thucydides', in Forsdyke S., Foster E., and Balo R., (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on Thucydides*. Oxford, 642-661.

Kennedy, G. A. 1963. *The art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, New Jersey.

Kim, L. 2014. 'Archaizing and Classicism in the Literary Historical Thinking of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', in Ker, J., Pieper C. (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World. Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII*. Leiden, 357-387.

Livingstone, N. 1998. 'The voice of Isocrates and the Dissemination of Cultural Power', in Too Y. L., & Livingstone N. (Eds.), *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning (Ideas in Context).* Cambridge, 263-281.

Meins, F. 2019. Paradigmatische Geschichte: Wahrheit, Theorie und Methode in den Antiquitates Romanae des Dionysios von Halikarnassos. Stuttgart.

Schippers, M. A. 2019. *Dionysius and Quintilian: Imitation and Emulation in Greek and Latin Literary Criticism*. Diss. Leiden.

Too, Y. L. 1995. *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates*: *Text, Power, Pedagogy.* Cambridge.

Usener, H. & Radermacher, L. (eds.). 1899; 1904-1929 [reprint 1997]. *Opuscula Rhetorica: Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant Vol. V-VI.* Leipzig.

Usher, S. (ed.). 1974. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Critical Essays. Vol.1*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.

Wiater, N. 2011. *The Ideology of Classicism: Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. Berlin.

Wiater, N. 2011b. 'Writing Roman History-Shaping Greek identity: The Ideology of Historiography in Dionysius of Halicarnassus', in Schmitz, T. A., & Wiater, N. (eds), *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart, 61-92.

Wisse, J. 1995. 'Greeks, Romans and the Rise of Atticism', in J.G.J. Abbenes, S.R. Slings and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D.M. Schenkeveld*. Amsterdam, 65-82.