Dionysius of Halicarnassus:
Greek Origins and Roman Games (*AR* 7.70-73)

CLEMENCE SCHULTZE

Historiography rather than history is the focus of this examination of the Augustan Greek historian Dionysius upon the Roman games (*ludi*). The overall thesis of his work is that the Romans—by then unchallenged conquerors and rulers over the *oikumenê*—are really Greeks, by virtue of their descent and their institutions. His twofold intention is thus to compliment Romans by including them within the Greek cultural ambit, and to reassure Greeks that they are not under the domination of barbarian rulers. The Roman games form an important constituent element in Dionysius' proof of Rome's Greekness. What we have here is a late *first* century B.C. historian—an eyewitness of the games in his own day— adducing a written description of the allegedly Greek-style conduct of the games in the late *third* century B.C. in order to demonstrate the continuity of such Greek practice right from the time when the games were established back in the *fifth* century B.C. The fragility of this evidence for the actual conduct of *ludi* at Rome in the fifth, third or even the first centuries B.C. is apparent and has been amply demonstrated.[1] I am not here concerned with the historical reality of the games at any of these epochs, but with the role they are made to play as a part of Dionysius' argument.

The present paper first addresses the way in which Dionysius integrates the description of the games as one evidential element among the many which contribute to his overall proof that Rome is a Greek city. In the second place, and most importantly, the paper is concerned with Dionysius' notions of cultural identity and change. These issues arise because the third-century account—that of the Roman historian Q. Fabius Pictor—was in fact written in Greek. How then, it must be asked, did the Augustan historian's notions of cultural identity and cultural change allow him to exploit Pictor's material as demonstrating customs authentically Roman, customs untainted by any borrowings from or contacts with the Greek world, customs which, by their close resemblance to Homeric practices, once and for all prove the fact of Rome's descent from founding Greek heroes? Finally, there is a brief look at Dionysius' treatment of the way in which the constitution determines and limits the operation of cultural change.

DIONYSIUS IN AUGUSTAN ROME

In making his career in Rome, Dionysius of Halicarnassus the historian follows a pattern recognisable among many contemporary Greek intellectuals.[2] In other respects his comportment with regard to Rome and the Romans is ambiguous, not to say paradoxical. Native of Greek-Carian Halicarnassus in the Roman province of Asia, and born around 55 B.C., a child and a youth during two civil wars, he settles in Rome as soon as Augustus has established peace.[3] A convinced Atticist, acknowledging the value only of classical Greek literature, he thanks the Romans for the *paideia* he has enjoyed there.[4] He benefits from association with notable Romans for at least twenty-two years down to 7 B.C. (1.3.4), and thus knows a Rome on the cusp of change, the *Urbs* as it is being shaped into the world city.[5] But in explaining Rome to the Greeks, he goes back to the earliest pre-foundation traditions of Italy, and concludes his work just before the outbreak of the first Punic war.[6] The explanation he offers of Rome's greatness is couched in terms of her all-pervading Greekness, then and now: she is a Greek city, a *polis hellênis*, by ancestry and origin;[7] all her institutions are modelled on Hellenic practice. From this fact, and not by mere chance or fortune, arises her supremacy.

THE CONTENT OF DIONYSIUS' HISTORY

His history, *Archaiologia Rhômaïke*, conventionally termed in English the *Antiquitates Romanae*, but perhaps better, the *Roman Archaeology*,[8] or *History of archaic Rome*[9] aims both at inclusion within the historiographical tradition, and at innovation with regard to subject-matter and treatment. Inasmuch as Dionysius ends at the first Punic war where Polybius starts (Polybius 1.5.1), and devotes substantial attention to constitutional matters, asserting the value of his chosen period as an essential

---

[1] Thuillier 1975; 1982; 1987; 1989; Jannot 1992.

[2] Goold 1961.

[3] 1.7.2; 1.8.4. All references where author and/or work are not specified are to the *Antiquitates Romanae*.

[4] 1.6.5; Bowersock 1965, 130-2; Gabba 1991, 23–45.

[5] Gabba 1991, 190–213.

[6] 1.8.1; Schultze 1995, 201.

[7] 1.89.1; 1.90.2.

[8] Schultze 2000, section 2.

[9] Gabba 1991, xiii.

component of universal history, his work is a pre-continuation of that of Polybius. In that the time-span covered includes much material largely unknown or inadequately understood in the Greek world, the author can claim novelty: he is rectifying the false or prejudiced notions which Greeks have, over time, acquired with regard to Rome, and which certain anti-Roman Greek historians have unscrupulously transmitted.[10]

Given Dionysius' starting and stopping points, the overall thrust of his narrative is bound to be a tale of Roman success and achievement, subject-matter he deems appropriate to history (*Ep. Pomp.* 3). The variety and comprehensiveness of his work will, he claims, render it attractive to a range of readers, serious and casual. Material on origins and the pre-foundation period caters for those with antiquarian and genealogical interests; there is also much for those who wish (merely) for enjoyment; students of philosophical politics can concern themselves with his extensive treatment of political and constitutional matters.[11]

> I begin my history, then, with the most ancient tales (*muthoi*), which the writers before me have left aside as difficult to be investigated without great study; and I bring my narrative down to the beginning of the Punic war ... I narrate all such foreign wars (*polemoi*) as the city waged in those times, and such internal uprisings (*staseis*) as rose up in her: from what causes they occurred and in what ways and by what speeches they were resolved. All the forms of the constitutions (*politeiai*) I also go through: those she used when ruled by kings and after the dissolution of the monarchy, and what was the arrangement of each. I narrate the best customs and the most remarkable laws, and altogether I demonstrate the whole early life (*archaios bios*) of the city.
> (1.8.1–2)

Five elements are thus named explicitly: combined, they make manifest the comprehensiveness of the work. The *muthoi* are the subject matter of Book 1.[12] Throughout the work, war is necessarily a constant theme, and, despite short-term setbacks, the overall picture is one of Roman success. Within the better surviving Books 1 to 11 the dominant feature is the *politeia* of Rome.[13] There is particular emphasis upon the theme of the *miktê politeia* or mixed constitution.[14] As early as Romulus the constitution is set up on *miktê* principles, in so far as is suitable for a newly founded city; changes thereafter are in the direction of a more and more perfect mixture. The successive kings contribute their share; the republic is established: mixed, but with some bias towards aristocracy; the tribunate is set up to redress the balance

by allowing appropriate input from the democratic element; the Twelve Tables and the reforms after the overthrow of the Decemvirate develop the mixture further. This theme of the constitution's growth towards mixture as a result of episodes of *stasis* averted through negotiation and compromise is used to structure the narrative into a number of major episodes. Similar structuring was doubtless carried on in the later, largely lost, portion of the work. In the second half, however, Rome's wars may well have been attributed a larger role than they enjoy in the first half, where their occurrence merely counterpoints the constitutional developments.

It is less easy to define how and where the *bios* of Rome is treated: there is no sustained survey (at least in what survives of the work). Under the *bios* heading must be included a number of allusions to social customs, cultural practices, and religious observances: these are generally linked either to the establishment of a particular institution, or to some notable occurrence involving it, and so occur as and when appropriate throughout the work.[15] Religious rituals are naturally one of the most frequently occurring instances of the *bios*, and for Dionysius, this *bios* of Rome must be manifestly Greek: the lengthy account of the games in Book 7 is the chief instance of overt demonstration of this theme. There are, however, some other notable cases: the second king Numa is the great systematiser of Roman religion (2.63–83), and his predecessor Romulus too plays a significant role with regard of course to *politeia* but also to *bios*.

ROMULUS AND ROMAN FESTIVALS

As founder par excellence, Romulus is made responsible for some of Rome's religious institutions (2.18–23). He is also associated with three important festivals which include some of the competitive elements associated with the *ludi*: Lupercalia, Parilia, and Consualia. The occasions are traditional elements of the Romulus story, but Dionysius characteristically links each of them to a significant stage in the development of the polis. At the Lupercalia, both twins take part in the traditional run, and Remus is captured. This crucial event leads to the twins' recognition and the restoration of their grandfather Amulius as king of Alba Longa. Here is a striking instance of the approving adoption by Dionysius of a variant from the history written by Q. Aelius Tubero, his friend and patron.[16] Tubero, in contrast to Fabius Pictor, whose version is given first,[17] exculpated the future founders of Rome from any legal or moral guilt for the clash between Numitor's and Amulius' herdsmen by

[10] 1.4.2; Ferrary 1988, 227–9.

[11] 1.8.2–3; 11.1.1–4; Schultze 1986, 136.

[12] Schultze 2000, sections 6–7.

[13] The first ten books and much of Book 11 survive entire, plus substantial excerpts from Books 12 to 20.

[14] Schultze 1986, 130–3.

[15] Dionysius' concept of *bios* resembles Livy's *quae vita, qui mores* (Livy, *pref.* 9) rather than *bios* understood as the successive developmental stages of civilisation, as in Dicaearchus' *Bios Hellados* (Gabba 1991, 101).

[16] Bowersock 1965, 129–30.

[17] 1.79.12–4; 1.80.3.

having the brothers attacked when innocently running the Lupercalia circuit.[18] This occasion also associates the founders-to-be with the city-to-be, with the distant past *and* with the present: the Lupercal, sacred since the time of Arcadian Greek immigrant Evander, was still revered in Dionysius' own day (1.31–2). The second festival is the Parilia, the foundation day and birthday of the city of Rome. Here stress is put on the day's pastoral and festive nature, and Dionysius interestingly marks uncertainty (1.88.3): was the day chosen as the foundation day because already a festival, or did the festival grow up to celebrate the foundation?[19] The Parilia is thus transitional, in more than one sense, from pre-city to city. Then the Consualia—where contests and horse races were celebrated in honour of Consus (here identified with Poseidon/Neptune)—denotes the successful implementation of Romulus' *consilium*, the plan which brings about intermarriage between the Romans and their Sabine neighbours, the first of many peoples to be incorporated within the Roman state (2.30–1). Thus these Roman festivals mark points of inception, creation, and expansion, all linked with the figure of the founder Romulus: furthermore, the *politeia* aspect takes precedence over that of the *bios*. In a not dissimilar way, the description in Book 7 of the *ludi*—clearly part of the *bios* aspect—is linked to the development of the *politeia*.

THE PLACING OF THE DIGRESSION ON THE GAMES

Dionysius' description of the *ludi magni* (or *ludi Romani*), the "great" or "Roman" games, is the longest and most important description of a Roman festival in the *Antiquitates Romanae*. It runs from 7.70.1 to 7.73.5 (the end of the book), and occupies 12 pages in C. Jacoby's Teubner edition. It concludes the narrative of the consular year of Q. Sulpicius Camerinus and Sp. Larcius Flavus (490 B.C. Varronian), and constitutes a break in the lengthy account of the rise and fall of C. Marcius Coriolanus. The Coriolanus story, which stretches over the best part of two books (7 and 8), is one of the four major episodes in what survives of the *Antiquitates Romanae* to which extended treatment is accorded. The other three are Romulus and the foundation; the establishment of the Republic; the Decemvirate and its overthrow.[20] The common factor in these major episodes from the first half of the history is that they represent important stages in Rome's political development. But in a work where Dionysius' treatment grows more compressed the closer he approaches his own times, the Coriolanus narrative (6.91–8.62) is on a scale not just

somewhat disproportionate but strikingly so: speeches account for its great length. The Coriolanus story is, moreover, not merely extended but is to a considerable extent self-contained. It encapsulates virtually all the themes of Dionysius' history, having an example of every important scene type apart from a major battle. There is one lengthy senate session, and a shorter one with a speech characterising Coriolanus, a public meeting, a trial, an interlude of war preparations (assemblies, embassies, raids, reaction), a scene of distress when Veturia (Coriolanus' mother) is appealed to by the other Roman matrons, and two large-scale embassies—one unsuccessful, the other the climax of the story, with Veturia's successful plea to her son. The narrative concludes with Coriolanus' death at the hands of the Volscians, and an "obituary" from the historian. Interspersed among the set-pieces are briefer interludes—descriptions of reactions, crowd behaviour, and so on.

In addition, there are three long, carefully-spaced and varied digressions. One is on Aristodemus of Cumae, a classic instance of a tyrant and his overthrow (7.2–12); at the midway point of Coriolanus' tale comes another, on the institution of popular trials under tribunician presidency, with reflections upon the peaceable resolution of Rome's first *stasis* (7.65–66). Not long after that, and concluding Book 7, is the account of the *ludi Romani*. It is worth noting how these three digressions are also linked with the larger overall theme of *politeia* and *bios*. Aristodemus represents a case study of tyranny, and the disturbances linked with both his reign and his overthrow form an implied contrast to the way things were done in Rome, for Rome is represented by Dionysius as a political society neither liable to tyranny nor requiring resort to violence in her internal affairs. The resolution of *stasis* forms the occasion for some Dionysian reflections upon the tribunate and the right of popular trial, presented as part of the mixed constitution's development in the direction of greater democratic participation. Moreover, Dionysius' stress on the importance of the role of *prostatès tou dèmou* (7.65.4–5) may well constitute a veiled allusion to Augustus.[21] Thus both these digressions have a *politeia* aspect, while the one on the games arises out of an exemplary instance of Roman religious scrupulousness and piety. Since laws shape the character of men and of states (said apropos of Romulus at 2.18.1), here is a clear instance of interaction between *politeia* and *bios*.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE DIGRESSION ON THE GAMES

Tabular presentation will help to clarify how the major elements of the games passage interrelate.

[18] 1.80.1–3; Schultze (forthcoming).

[19] The Parilia was still celebrated in Dionysius' time, and the day remains the birthday of Rome, a public holiday.

[20] Conjecturally, Camillus and the Gallic Sack, the Caudine Forks, and Pyrrhus may have been similarly treated in the largely lost second half of the work.

[21] Schultze 1986, 139–40.

A		7.68.1–3	Year begins; plague occurs; *admonitory dream of Latinius* told to senate.
		7.69	*Slave's punishment* then recalled.
	B	7.70.1–7.71.1	*METHODOLOGICAL DIGRESSION*
			"Since I have come to this part of my history .... from his [FP's] own knowledge."
	C	7.71.2–7.73.4	*FESTIVAL ACCOUNT* (Dionysius, Fabius Pictor, Homer)
	D	7.73.5	*JUSTIFICATION OF DIGRESSION*
			"But as regards these things, it was not fitting either to give no account of them when the subject demanded it, or to lengthen it beyond the needful. It is now the moment to revert to the narrative which we left aside."
E		7.73.5	*Instauratio* of festival. Year ends.

TABLE 11.1.

The outer shell (**A** and **E**) is an aetiological account of *instauratio*, the repetition of a flawed or defective religious ceremony; the story is found also in Livy 2.36 and elsewhere.[22] During a plague Jupiter reveals to Latinius in a dream that an "unacceptable dancer" had constituted a religious flaw vitiating the celebration of his *ludi*. This turns out to be the inhumane and public punishment of a slave, who had been tied to a beam and driven by his master in such a way that he willy-nilly formed the first element in the sacred procession. Once the flaw has been identified, it is decided that the games must be repeated; at **E**, it is said that they have so been, at double the expense.[23] The next layer (**B**, picked up and concluded at **D**) is a discussion of historiographical methodology, specifically Dionysius' use of sources. The innermost kernel (**C**) is constituted by the actual account of the games, drawn largely from Fabius Pictor's history, interwoven and compared with Homeric material. I shall engage chiefly with the methodological layer (**B/D**): the relationship between historical authority and testimony, how Dionysius grounds his conclusions, and what this reveals about his notions of cultural identity and change.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The core methodological passage is 7.70.1–71.1. This is given here in the Greek of C. Jacoby's Teubner text, and in an English translation which aims to convey the repetitions and allusions of the Greek vocabulary, and, as far as possible, to preserve the structure of the original.

7.70.1 (**B**) Ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο γέγονα τῆς ἱστορίας τὸ μέρος, οὐκ οἴομαι δεῖν τὰ περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐπιτελούμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν παρελθεῖν, οὐχ ἵνα μοι χαριεστέρα γένηται προσθήκας λαβοῦσα θεατρικὰς καὶ λόγους ἀνθηροτέρους ἡ διήγησις, ἀλλ' ἵνα τῶν ἀναγκαίων τι πιστώσηται πραγμάτων, ὅτι τὰ συνοικίσαντα ἔθνη τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν Ἑλληνικὰ ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀποικισθέντα τόπων, ἀλλ' οὐχ, ὥσπερ ἔνιοι νομίζουσι, βάρβαρα καὶ ἀνέστια·

2 ὑπεσχόμην γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς, ἣν περὶ τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν συνταξάμενος ἐξέδωκα, μυρίοις βεβαιώσειν τεκμηρίοις τὴν πρόθεσιν, ἔθη καὶ νόμιμα καὶ

ἐπιτηδεύματα παλαιὰ παρεχόμενος αὐτῶν, ἃ μέχρι τοῦ κατ' ἐμὲ φυλάττουσι χρόνου, οἷα παρὰ τῶν προγόνων ἐδέξαντο· οὐχ ἡγούμενος ἀποχρῆν τοῖς ἀναγράφουσι τὰς ἀρχαίας καὶ τοπικὰς ἱστορίας, ὡς παρὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων αὐτὰς παρέλαβον, ἀξιοπίστως διελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μαρτυριῶν οἰόμενος αὐταῖς δεῖν πολλῶν καὶ δυσαντιλέκτων, εἰ μέλλουσι πισταὶ φανήσεσθαι.

3 ἐν αἷς πρῶτα καὶ κυριώτατα πάντων εἶναι πείθομαι τὰ γινόμενα καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν περὶ θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων πατρίους σεβασμούς. ταῦτα γὰρ ἐπὶ μήκιστον χρόνον διὰ φυλακῆς ἔχει Ἑλλάς τε καὶ βάρβαρος χώρα, καὶ οὐθὲν ἀξιοῖ καινοτομεῖν εἰς αὐτὰ ὑπὸ δείματος κρατουμένη μηνιμάτων δαιμονίων.

4 μάλιστα δὲ τοῦτο πεπόνθασιν οἱ βάρβαροι διὰ πολλὰς αἰτίας, ἃς οὐ καιρὸς ἐν τῷ παρόντι λέγειν, καὶ χρόνος οὐθεὶς μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος ἀπομαθεῖν ἢ παρανομῆσαί τι περὶ τοὺς ὀργιασμοὺς τῶν θεῶν ἔπεισεν οὔτ' Αἰγυπτίους οὔτε Λίβυας οὔτε Κελτοὺς οὔτε Σκύθας οὔτ' Ἰνδοὺς οὔτ' ἄλλο βάρβαρον ἔθνος οὐδὲν ἁπλῶς· εἰ μή τινες ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐξουσίᾳ ποτὲ γενόμενοι τὰ τῶν κρατησάντων ἠναγκάσθησαν ἐπιτηδεύματα μεταλαβεῖν. τῇ δὲ Ῥωμαίων πόλει τοιαύτης οὐδέποτε πειραθῆναι συνέβη τύχης, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ τὰ δίκαια τάττει διὰ παντὸς ἑτέροις.

5 εἰ δὴ βάρβαρον αὐτῶν τὸ γένος ἦν, τοσούτου ἂν ἐδέησαν αὐτοὶ τὰ πάτρῳα ἱερὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους ἐθισμοὺς ἀπομαθεῖν, δι' οὓς εἰς τοσαύτην προῆλθον εὐδαιμονίαν, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν, ὧν ἦρχον, ἐν καλῷ κατέστησαν τοὺς θεοὺς τοῖς σφετέροις τιμᾶν νομίμοις· καὶ οὐθὲν ἂν ἐκώλυσεν ἅπαν ἐκβεβαρβαρῶσθαι τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἑβδόμην ἤδη κρατούμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν γενεάν, εἴπερ ἦσαν βάρβαροι.

7.71.1. Ἕτερος μὲν οὖν ἀποχρῆν ἂν ὑπέλαβε καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ νῦν πραττόμενα ἐν τῇ πόλει μνήματα οὐ μικρὰ τῶν παλαιῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑπολαβεῖν· ἐγὼ δ', ἵνα μή τις ἀσθενῆ τὴν πίστιν εἶναι ταύτην ὑπολάβῃ κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἀπίθανον ὑπόληψιν, ὅτι παντὸς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ κρατήσαντες ἀσμένως ἂν τὰ κρείττω μετέμαθον ἔθη τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ὑπεριδόντες, ἐξ ἐκείνου ποιήσομαι τοῦ χρόνου τὴν τέκμαρσιν, ὅτ' οὔπω τὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἶχον ἡγεμονίαν οὐδὲ ἄλλην διαπόντιον οὐδεμίαν ἀρχήν, Κοίντῳ Φαβίῳ βεβαιωτῇ χρώμενος καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἔτι δεόμενος πίστεως ἑτέρας· παλαιότατος γὰρ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ Ῥωμαϊκὰ συνταξαμένων, καὶ πίστιν οὐκ ἐξ ὧν ἤκουσε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ἔγνω παρεχόμενος. [**C** follows here.]

7.73.5 (**D**) ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὑπὲρ μὲν τούτων οὔτε μηθένα ποιήσασθαι λόγον ἀπαιτούσης τῆς ὑποθέσεως καλῶς εἶχεν, οὔτε μηκύνειν πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἥρμοττε. καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπολειπομένην διήγησιν ἐπανάγειν.

7.70.1 (**B**) Since I have come to this part of my history, I do not think there is any need to pass by the things done by them at this festival—not so that my narrative shall become more pleasing by gaining dramatic additions and flowery words, but so that one of the essential matters is credited: the fact that the peoples co-founding the city of the Romans were

---

[22] Ogilvie 1965, 327–8.

[23] Cardauns (1976), on Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* fr. 81 (=Augustine, *CD* 4.26): *quadruplicata*. Livy has no mention of doubling or quadrupling the cost.

Greek, sent as founders from the most distinguished places, and not, as some opine, barbarians and heartless.

2 For at the end of the first book, which I composed and published about their origin, I promised that I would corroborate that thesis by myriad testimonies, presenting ancient customs, laws and institutions of theirs, which they have preserved until my own time just as they received them from their forefathers, and not regarding it as sufficient for those writing up early and regional histories to go through recounting them in a manner worthy of credence as they have received them from the natives, but thinking that they need many indisputable testimonies too if they are going to be manifestly credible.

3 Among these the first and most valid of all are—I am convinced—the things done in each city regarding the gods and divinities: ancestral rites. For these are what both Greece and barbarian localities preserve for the longest time, and do not deem it right to bring anything new into them, overcome as they are by awe of the anger of the divinities.

4 Above all it is the barbarians who have experienced this, for many reasons which it is not at present the moment to say, and no length of time to the present has convinced the Egyptians or the Libyans or the Celts or the Scythians or the Indians or any other barbarian people at all to unlearn or to break the laws regarding the celebrations of the gods—unless some of them have at one point come under the authority of others and have been compelled to exchange their own institutions for their conquerors'. But it has never befallen the city of the Romans to make trial of such a fate, but she herself commonly disposes right things for others.

5 If, then, their origin had been barbarian, they would have been so far from unlearning the ancestral rites and their native customs, by which they have advanced to such success, that they would have established the honouring of the gods by their laws as an advantage for all the others too whom they rule. Then nothing would have prevented all Greekdom—which has now been conquered by the Romans into the seventh generation—from being barbarianised, if indeed they had been barbarians.

7.71.1 Anyone else might have assumed that actual current practices in the city were by themselves sufficient to provide no small indication of the ancient institutions. But I, lest anyone assume that this provides only weak proof—according to the unconvincing assumption that having overcome the whole of Greekdom they would have gladly relearnt better customs, having come to look down upon their native ones—I shall take my testimony from that time when they did not yet hold dominion over Greece nor any other overseas rule at all, using Quintus Fabius in corroboration and not needing any further proof: for that man is the most ancient of those composing Roman affairs, providing proof not only from what he heard but also from what he himself knew. [C *follows here: the Fabian account interwoven with Homeric material.*]

7.73.5 (D) But as regards these things, it was not fitting either to give no account of them when the subject demanded it, or to lengthen it beyond the needful. It is now the moment to revert to the narrative which we left aside.

HISTORICAL AUTHORITY

The passage **B** just quoted explains and justifies the inclusion of the section called, for convenience, C: i.e., 7.71.2 to 7.73.4. In C, Dionysius quotes at length from Q.

Fabius Pictor and adduces comparative material from Homer. The employment of extensive direct quotation constitutes a striking reversion to the practice adopted by Dionysius when dealing in Book 1 with the *muthoi* surrounding Rome's origins, but one which he largely abandoned thereafter. His reading for the *Antiquitates Romanae* evidently ranged widely over the genres (epic, drama, philosophy, and, of course, all the sub-divisions of history) in the pursuit of material relevant to his thesis that Rome was a Greek city. The material is concerned with mythical events, with the tracing of genealogical links, with the legends surrounding city foundations. Over fifty authors—including some very obscure ones—are named; unnamed variants or generalising allusions are frequent; most of these citations come in Book 1. But it is not merely a matter of collection: Dionysius is concerned to characterise and to evaluate his authorities, testing each author individually. Then they are all pitted one against another in the course of his demonstration of Rome's Greek character. The reader is taken through the argument step-by-step, and is on occasion invited to suspend judgement until apparent counter-examples have been answered and the full proof provided.[24] After Book 1, the practice of quotation and comparison of variants ceases except for the discussion of a few crux passages (e.g., 4.7; 8.79). The extended incorporation of Fabian and Homeric material on the games is therefore a notable resumption of Dionysius' earlier practice: his motive requires investigation.

In general, as a Greek writing about Rome for a largely Greek audience, Dionysius naturally needs to stand by the native tradition. It is an important part of his own claim to authority that he is presenting material which is both new and reliable; given his subject-matter, such material is quite likely to come from local sources. He does not, however, automatically accept the testimony of any individual Roman author as particularly valuable solely because he is a local. The issue arises in the games passage, and Dionysius defines his position thus:

> ... not regarding it as sufficient for those writing up early and regional histories (*archaias kai topikas historias*) to go through recounting them in a manner worthy of credence (*axiopistôs*) as they have received them from the natives (*epichôrioi*), but thinking that they need many indisputable testimonies (*marturia*) too if they are going to be manifestly credible (*pistai*).
> (7.70.2)

Valid testimonies are, for example, institutions and practices, religious rituals and the like, antiquarian materials and *Realien*. When, as here, the object of the exercise is to assess the Greekness of any institution, a standard of the best and purest Greek practice is required. This is supplied by Homer, invoked at 7.72.3 as

---

[24] Schultze 2000, sections 4–6.

"worthiest of credence and most ancient" (*axiopistotatos te kai archaiotatos*). Homer, of course stands apart from all other writers, even when technical subjects are at issue: Strabo, Dionysius' near contemporary, adduces Homer's authority on geographical matters in not dissimilar fashion.[25]

For the Roman practices themselves, Dionysius (with his 20-plus years' residence in Rome) is himself an observer.[26] On the present occasion, Dionysius is anticipating counter-arguments such as might be raised by a hard line sceptic. Some (he says) might regard his own eyewitness testimony as fully sufficient proof (7.71.1). Strict opponents could however claim that Greek practices had been adopted over the intervening years, the years since Rome's conquest of Greece, during which she might have been subject to Greek cultural influences. Hence more rigorous proof adduces Fabius Pictor, as (supposedly) prior to the period when Rome was liable to such influences. Dionysius, noting that Pictor possesses the authority deriving from his position as most ancient Roman historian, also emphasises the autoptic status of his knowledge:

> I shall take my testimony from that time when they did not yet hold dominion over Greece nor any other overseas rule at all, using Quintus Fabius in corroboration and not needing any further proof: for that man is the most ancient of those composing Roman affairs, providing proof not only from what he heard but also from what he himself knew. (7.71.1)

So, according to Dionysius' argument, if the ritual Pictor recorded was demonstrably Greek, this proves that these customs and practices had come down unimpaired from much earlier times. Thus Dionysius and Pictor, temporally separated by about 200 years, stand as successive eyewitnesses. The demonstration then rolls on through section C, aspect by aspect. Quotation (or paraphrase) of Pictor, plus Dionysius' own supplements (some from experience, others perhaps from his reading)[27] are juxtaposed with short Homeric passages perhaps quoted from memory.[28] Thus, while formally the passage greatly resembles the methodology of Book 1, it also lines Dionysius up with the most authoritative early sources, and asserts his authority as comparable to theirs. This, then, is a major motive for Dionysius' employment of this method.

FABIUS PICTOR'S CULTURAL CONTEXT

An absolutely crucial aspect of Dionysius' argumentation is the notion that Fabius Pictor transmitted a reliable description of the rituals which he beheld, and that, at the time he saw them, they were still being celebrated as they had been in the earliest days of the Roman republic; they were thus as yet uncontaminated by any contact with the Greek world. Here, then, arises the major problem which I indicated at the outset: how can Dionysius seriously be claiming that Fabius Pictor, a Greek-writing author, is unaffected by Hellenic culture and practice? Elsewhere (1.6.2) Dionysius shows his clear awareness of the fact that Fabius Pictor wrote in Greek, and that he had his *akme* "at the time of the Punic wars." He is no more precise than that, and does not mention Pictor's role as envoy to Delphi during the second Punic war, in 216 B.C.[29] How and with what purpose Pictor gained his acquaintance with the language, and why and when he chose to write his history in Greek is nowhere addressed by Dionysius; still less is there discussion of any Greek sources he might possibly have used.[30] Pictor could well have known the work of Timaeus of Tauromenium, writing in the mid-third century B.C. That historian is largely ignored or disparaged by Dionysius, who is concerned to controvert his opinions both on artefacts (1.67.4 on the Penates) and on chronology.[31] The mysterious Diocles of Peparethus, named by Plutarch as a precursor of Pictor,[32] is never mentioned by Dionysius.[33]

It is even possible that some Dionysian sleight-of-hand is going on here. First, the allusion in 1.6.2 is somewhat misleading, for no individual could possibly have enjoyed his *akme* at the time of *both* the first *and* the second Punic wars (264–41 and 218–201 B.C.): hence the inference must be that Dionysius wishes to push Pictor back a little earlier in time than he really belongs. Next, the failure in 7.71.1 to remind the reader of the fact that Pictor was writing in Greek would help to avoid awkward questions about his cultural context. Thirdly, there is the fact that the aetiology of *instauratio*, the story of the slave and the stake, is based on a bilingual word-play: the Greek for a stake or cross of punishment is *stauros*. This aetiology must obviously go back to a writer acquainted with Greek, and it is suggested by Frier that Fabius Pictor is probably the author responsible.[34] But if indeed Dionysius found the word *stauros* in Pictor, he ignores it, using instead the rather neutral term *xulon* (wood). Since elsewhere Dionysius is interested in the relationship between Greek and Latin terms and names (e.g., 1.20.3;

---

[25] Strabo 1.1.2; Clarke 1999, 75–6.

[26] 7.72.2; 7.72.18; cf. 7.72.12; Marincola 1997b, 101–2, 115 n. 72. Claims elsewhere in the work to autopsy of monuments are discussed by Andrén 1960.

[27] It is thus difficult to identify Pictor's *ipsissima verba*: Peter 1914, fr. 16; Jacoby *FGH* 809 F13b; Chassignet 1996, fr. 20.

[28] This is suggested by slight misquotations and misattributions of the Homeric lines: the Loeb translator (Cary 1937–50, vol. 5) identifies these *ad loc.*

[29] Livy 22.57.5; 23.11.1–6.

[30] Chassignet 1996, liv–lxxiii.

[31] Schultze 1995, 196–9.

[32] *Rom.* 3.1; 8.9=*FGH* 820 T2.

[33] Chassignet 1996, fr. 7, with notes p. 76–9 and p. xlvii.

[34] Frier 1999, 242 n. 40. Varro's etymology for *instauratio* was pure Latin, for he derived it from *instar*: see Maltby 1991.

5.47.2), his silence here could conceivably be because it does not suit him at this point to remind his readers that Pictor wrote in Greek.

This raises the whole question of how Dionysius conceives of cultural difference and cultural change: a crucial issue, and one which becomes especially acute when one of the cultures in question is Greek, and the other is—or may be—barbarian. Dionysius' application of the terms "Greek" and "barbarian" will be examined before proceeding to an investigation of his models of cultural change, and then to their application in the methodological passage about the games.

GREEKS AND BARBARIANS

Dionysius' language often suggests that there is a polar opposition between Greeks and barbarians: a racial criterion would seem to be implicit here—the notion that everyone must be either Greek, or barbarian, and that together these two groups make up the totality of mankind. Extremely common usages in his work are "among both Greeks and barbarians" (e.g., 1.16.1; 6.8.2) or "in Greece and in barbarian areas," to convey the universality of customs or occurrences; or, expressed negatively, as in "neither among Greeks nor barbarians [is phenomenon X observed]" (e.g., 7.3.2); or, comparatively, "neither among Greeks nor barbarians [is phenomenon Y more prevalent than in the case of such-and-such a people ...]" (e.g., 2.19.2; 2.63.2). So these seem to be merely somewhat elaborate ways of saying "all mankind does [*or*, does not do] this"; "the Romans [*or whoever it might be*] are the most Z [e.g., virtuous, religious, *or* whatever] people known among mankind" and so on. In other words, such usages are scarcely to be regarded as expressing carefully considered theories about Hellenic and barbarian culture.

Secondly, when "barbarian" is employed without any immediate juxtaposition to "Greek" or "Greece", it is often—as might be anticipated—a term used persuasively to express disapproval or repudiation of a practice. For example, wise men waive enmities, but the barbarian and foolish destroy both friends and enemies (5.4.3, in a reported speech); Kaeso Quinctius displays barbarian *hubris* (10.6.2, in a speech).

"Greek" is sometimes used as a term of outright praise for a practice or action but with explicit disjunction from actual ethnic Greekness. In a most significant passage, Roman behaviour is endorsed as more truly Greek than that of the (actual) Greeks themselves: Hellene is as Hellene does, in fact. The occasion is the granting or "equal sharing" (*isomoiria*) of citizenship to the Tusculans in 381 B.C., where Romans are contrasted very favourably with Greeks (Athenians and Spartans), who in similar circumstances had treated Samians and Messenians with extreme harshness, behaving like the

"fiercest of barbarians" (14.6.5). Dionysius then proceeds to define Greekness:

> For I claim that Greekness (*to Hellênikon*) differs from barbarianness (*to barbarikon*) not by name, nor in regard to speech, but by intelligence (*sunesis*) and by the preference for the best institutions (*epitedeumata*), and particularly by never transgressing the laws of human nature (*anthrôpine phusis*) against one another. Those in whose nature these things for the most part prevail, I think ought to be termed Greeks; the opposite, barbarians. And the fair and humane plans and deeds of theirs, I reckon to be Greek; the fierce and savage ones—especially when they concern kinfolk and friends—barbarian. (14.6.5).

Thus the usual ethnic and linguistic criteria—that a people claims the description (*onoma*) "Greek" and that they speak the Greek language (*dialektos*)—are disregarded by Dionysius in favour of a criterion of behaviour. This strongly recalls the story, cited in Strabo 1.4.9, of Eratosthenes' advice to Alexander the Great: treat Greeks and barbarians not according to ethnic origin but according to conduct, judged by "the lawful, the political, and that pertaining to education and discourse" (*to nomimon, to politikon, to tês paideias kai logôn oikeion*) as the appropriate criteria.[35] This formulation could be programmatic for Dionysius' entire treatment of the Romans, their state and way of life.

COMPARISON OF CUSTOMS

Here, then, is one notable instance of Dionysius' preference for Roman behaviour to Greek. Although this case is particularly striking in its explicit redefinition of Greekness, it is by no means uncommon for Dionysius to compare Roman institutions or customs favourably with Greek, or for him to recommend them to Greeks. The increase of population by incorporation of conquered peoples and the creation of colonies is expressly said (2.16.1) to be more advantageous than the exclusivity which led to the decline in citizen numbers of notable Greek states such as Sparta (2.17).[36] Related to this is the endorsement of the extension of citizenship to manumitted slaves, regarded by Dionysius as an important means of increasing Roman manpower, at least in former generations,[37] but in his own time as a practice

---

[35] Strabo's own take on this has received a number of differing interpretations: perhaps he reasserts the importance of Greekness (Vanotti 1992, 82-3; Dueck 2000, 76); or treats the advice with sarcasm (Desideri 1992, 28-9); for Aujac, he fails to recognise the irony in Eratosthenes' advice (Aujac 1966, 55). Thollard 1987, 27-39 usefully sets Strabo within the immediately preceding and contemporary intellectual context of this issue, although without discussing Dionysius. See also Dauge 1981, 514-6.

[36] This was at least implied—perhaps even made explicit to a doubtless interested Greek world—in the manpower figures supplied by Fabius Pictor for the Gallic *tumultus* (Polybius 2.24; see Walbank 1957, 196).

[37] This observation had been made by Greeks at least as early as Philip V of Macedon in his letter (ca. 215 B.C.) to the citizens of Larisa in Thessaly (Dittenberger 1915, no. 543).

to be kept within limits (4.24). This passage, one of Dionysius' rare allusions to socio-political issues of his own age, should perhaps be linked with Augustus' limitations on manumission.[38] Roman *patria potestas* is said to be better than Greek practice with regard to familial authority (2.26–7). Romans are more religious than any other people, Greek or barbarian (2.63.2): this is plainly perceived by Dionysius as a good thing. Roman avoidance of political extremity is contrasted with Greek excesses during *staseis* (7.66.4–5). It is evidently both appropriate and worthwhile for the historian to point out superior customs and practices, since reflection might lead to their deliberate adoption. These passages suggest that Dionysius takes a rather rational, not to say utilitarian, view of the nature of institutions and the possibility of institutional change, and that he regards such change as a matter of choice. When it comes, however, to cultural change, two main models are identifiable. Cultural change results from (1) incorporation (usually following conquest); (2) education.

THE CONQUEST AND INCORPORATION MODEL OF CULTURAL CHANGE

This model is certainly the predominant one in the actual narrative. There are numerous examples of the coming together of two peoples or communities. It is apparent that Dionysius' main model for this phenomenon views it as the result of a deliberate political choice of one people to incorporate the other, with the latter's acquiescence; this often follows conquest by the former of the latter. Examples are the following: 1.9.4 (general); 1.20 (Aborigines incorporate suppliant Pelasgians); 2.16 (incorporation in general); 2.35–6 (Roman colonies); 2.46 (Sabines); 4.58 (Gabii); 5.43 (Fidenae); 8.70.2 (Sabines by conquest, Latins by *isopoliteia*); 14.6 (Tusculum). In a few cases, a more equal model, perhaps better described as assimilation, is to be seen. Notable instances are Faunus' kindly reception of Evander's Arcadians (1.31.2); and the intermingling of Aeneas' followers with the Latins, on equal terms (1.57-9, and especially 1.60.1–2). Since Arcadians and Trojans (who are, of course, Greeks: see 1.61) are foremost among the Greek races as ancestors of Rome, it may be significant that they are received on equal terms by the earlier inhabitants, and that there is no question of conquest before incorporation.

The debate between the Alban Mettius Fufetius and Rome's king Tullus Hostilius (3.10–11) bears upon the right to rule and the incorporation of alien, and indeed, barbarian elements within a state. The issues arise apropos the union of Rome and her mother-city Alba. Speeches put into the mouths of the two rulers express contrasting views as to what constitute just claims for one community to rule over another or others.[39] Mettius asserts that the right lies with Alba: the greater and older rule the lesser and younger; fathers (ancestors) rule children (descendants); those of purer descent rule inferior communities whose blood is mixed; in particular, Greeks, or those of Greek descent, rule over barbarian or partly barbarian communities; Alba, moreover, has throughout its whole period of existence maintained its customs and traditions unchanged. Tullus replies that mother cities do not necessarily rule their colonies; that city-progeny can come to be greater and more successful than their mother city, and hence rightly in a position to rule over them, and that the assimilation of outsiders, even of barbarians, into a community does not render that community barbarian; Rome's receptiveness to incomers has made the city great and powerful; even her political divisions conduce to healthy emulation where men are judged in terms of merit, not of birth. Richard's examination of the passage sets the speeches in a context of the philosophical rhetoric advocated by Dionysius, who here derives lines of argument from analogous historical situations in the Greek world;[40] Roman inclusiveness is specifically compared with Athenian (3.11.4). The underlying issue is the nature of Hellenism—is it to be ethnically defined, or culturally defined? Advantage is of course with Tullus and the politico-cultural definition. Richard acutely notes that the policies of asylum and political incorporation derive from Romulus: in this respect as in others, it is the founder who has laid the groundwork.[41] And, strikingly, the very practice which evoked Greek contempt for the Romans ("heartless wandering barbarians, not even free men, as founders": 1.4.2) is here turned to their praise.

The passages so far considered suggest that Dionysius' main model for the coming together of communities is one that results from a conscious decision by one state to incorporate another; that this normally entails the adoption by the incorporated entity of the laws, customs and practices of the incorporating state, and that the culture of the superior or dominant incorporating partner is not weakened, and should not be deemed to be changed—certainly not to be barbarianised—by that of the incomers. By and large, then, this model represents "top downwards" cultural influence.

THE EDUCATION MODEL OF CULTURAL CHANGE

This model recognises the possibility that cultural change may result from effects exerted by the conquered upon the conqueror: thus, it represents "bottom upwards"

---

[38] Treggiari 1996, 893–7.

[39] At 4.26.2, arguments which combine those of Mettius Fufetius and Tullus Hostilius are attributed to Servius Tullius when he institutes the Latin league on the model of the Delphic Amphictiony.

[40] Richard 1993, 129–32.

[41] Richard 1993, 141 n. 50.

influence, of inferiors upon their superiors. As the influence of post-conquest Greece upon Rome it constitutes the core of the sceptical argument in the games passage, and is summed up in the words of 7.71.1:

... lest anyone assume that this [Dionysius' eyewitness testimony to Greek ritual] provides only weak proof — according to the unconvincing assumption that having overcome the whole of Greekdom they [the Romans] would have gladly relearnt (*metemathon*) better customs, having come to look down upon their native ones.

The hypothesised sceptic here would not deny that Dionysius has witnessed Greek-type rituals at the games in Augustan Rome but he would argue that these are not inherited from way back, but instead have been learnt in the two or so centuries of Rome's domination over Greece. Although Dionysius terms this assumption "unconvincing", the fact that he organises his evidence so as to answer it strongly suggests that he recognises its validity, and that he accepts the possibility of "bottom upwards" cultural change, from the conquered upon the conqueror.

At the end of Book 1.89–90 a similar model of change is discussed within the Italian context. Rome, founded by a number of Greek peoples, underwent "admixtures" (*epimixiai*) of very many, highly diverse barbarian races (Opicans, Marsians, Samnites, Tyrrhenians, Bruttians, Umbrians, Ligurians, Iberians, Gauls), each with their own *bios*.[42] Some of these races are autochthonous, in Dionysius' view,[43] some are not.[44] All this variety of language and habit was bound to cause changes in the ordering (*kosmos*) of the city—to the extent that Dionysius expresses amazement that the Romans were not totally barbarianised. At issue here is barbarianisation resulting from an intermixing which is a consequence of incorporation. Dionysius does not explicitly state that incorporation follows on after Roman conquest, but the identities of the various peoples render this clear: intermarriage and participation in citizenship are implied. So here again is bottom upwards influence, from the conquered and incorporated peoples upon their conqueror. At any rate, the intermingling with all these *bioi* have a major effect on Rome's Greek *epitêdeumata* (institutions).

There is no doubt here but that barbarian is bad and Greek good; but this model evidently allows for varying degrees of perviousness or imperviousness to alien customs. Dionysius supplies a counter-example: some true Greeks, as it was supposed, Achaean by origin, were notorious for having unlearnt their Greekness (*hapan to Hellênikon apemathon*). This people, the Achaioi of the

Black Sea are also known to Strabo 11.2.2 for their piratical life. Dionysius treats them as having been influenced away from the true Greek *phusis*. This, it turns out, inheres in three main factors: language;[45] worship of the gods; and, above all, fair laws (*nomoi epieikeis*). Romans, the reader should at this point conclude, are evidently very much more impervious to deleterious foreign influences than were these unfortunate Achaeans. Dionysius states that the Romans have managed to maintain a partially Greek language; they have always lived a Greek life (*bios Hellên*), with the aim of friendly intercourse (*pros philian*); and their institutions aim at virtue or *aretê* (*epitêdeuontes pros aretên* 1.90.1; cf. also 5.75.1). The terminology of learning, relearning and unlearning is very apparent in this model.

MODELS OF CULTURAL CHANGE WITHIN THE GAMES PASSAGE

It is now appropriate to turn to a close examination of the methodological passage relating to the games with the following aims in view: (1) to examine how and with what degree of consistency Dionysius draws the boundary between Greek and barbarian; (2) to identify which model(s) of cultural change Dionysius stresses; also (3) to see why he plays down other available models.

The argument of 7.70.1–2 alludes back to the preface (1.5; 1.8). Dionysius is a serious historian, with a thesis (*prothesis*) to demonstrate: the Romans are not heartless (an epic word) barbarians but Greeks.[46] So this first Greek-barbarian contrast appears to be a simple matter of deciding which side of the line (good Greek, bad barbarian) any particular race falls, and the Romans fall on the Greek side. Customs, laws and institutions *prove* their origin to be Greek: i.e., both *politeia* and *bios* are Greek. Now the theme of Rome's colonial foundation[47] and the creation of her constitution by Romulus, as from the outset a *mikte politeia* inherently Greek which was to develop as the city grew and matured, is found throughout the work, in the narrative and in the speeches.

It transpires that religious observances are a central aspect of the (non-political) *bios*. These (7.70.3) are scarcely liable to change, owing to the restraining fear (or awe: *deima*) felt for the *daimones* on the part of both Greece and barbarian land(s): *Hellas te kai barbaros chôra*. So such institutions endure for long ages, especially among some classic instance of barbarian races: Egyptians,

---

[42] 1.89.2–3; 2.2.2; Gabba 1991, 109–10.

[43] Musti 1970; Gabba 1991, 111.

[44] Gabba 1991, 104–5.

[45] Gabba 1963; Schöpsdau 1992, 117–9.

[46] This hostile description probably derives from the anti-Roman historiographical tradition associated with the court of Mithridates. See also 1.4.3, usually taken to be a reference to Metrodorus of Scepsis (Gabba 1991, 91).

[47] Terminology appropriate to colonisation (*apoik-* compounds) and of synoecism (*synoik-*) is frequent. This establishes Rome within the context of Mediterranean-wide foundations by Greek peoples.

Libyans, etc. (7.70.4). (There may be a sense that these barbarians are, as it were, tied to, or at one with their respective *chôrai*.)

Some points are worthy of note. In the first place, Dionysius is here speaking, if not as an actual traveller, at least as a student of ethnography. He is, of course, a traveller in the fairly limited sense that for many years he resided at Rome: as far as can be told from the *Antiquitates*, he went nowhere else. Moreover, even if no Odysseus, no Polybius,[48] he does use the language of travel in relation to his historical project.[49] By this further claim to pronounce on ethnographical and anthropological matters, he extends his own authority as a historian.[50] He is, secondly, taking up a stance on religion implicitly opposed to that of Polybius (his respected precursor, whose work he is in effect claiming to fill out by means of his "pre-continuation)". His choice of the term *hupo deimatos daimoniôn* is, surely, made advisedly: the phrase lacks the sometimes negative connotations of *deisidaimonia*, so it is *not* superstition, but due and proper awe of the gods. Dionysius is far removed from the Polybian attitude towards Roman religion (Polybius 6.56): half-disdainful of it, half-admiring for its useful civic result.[51] Thirdly, the Greek/barbarian contrast is here not a simple one of good Greeks versus bad barbarians, for the behaviour of the barbarians in maintaining their customs is surely being approved and endorsed. The Greeks have evidently fallen away in this respect, in contrast to the notable barbarian races listed. A tiny, implicit criticism of Greeks lurks here but Dionysius does not pursue it.[52]

Passing on to the middle of 7.70.4: foreign conquest is a prime reason for the enforced abandonment of traditional religious institutions, since conquerors impose their own practices. Dionysius employs verbs such as *krateô* (overpower), *anankazô* (force) to express the very strong notion of forcible change. This fate, (*tuchê*: here clearly "*misfortune*") has never befallen the Romans, who instead are conquerors, and thus in a position to impose their rites and customs (*hiera, ethismoi*) on others. "If Romans had indeed been barbarians, all the Greek world would have been barbarianised; it has not been, so the Romans were not barbarians." That is the form of the argument: Dionysius' readership has of course already been given other grounds for believing this, but a quite separate proof is plainly intended here. So the polarity has shifted yet again: Greeks, it appears, are no less liable than

barbarians to submit to enforced change when and if conquered (as, it is plainly stated, they have been: *hapan ... to Hellênikon ... kratoumenon*). So barbarians and Greeks are now on the same side of the fence, and it is not a case either of Greeks good, barbarians bad, or the reverse, but rather: Romans successful (query: good?), Greeks and barbarians unsuccessful, (query: bad?) And note further that this is definitely a case of top downwards cultural change, change which eventuates when the winning power imposes a different state upon the loser.

At 7.71.1, it transpires that this top downwards model of change is intimately related to its converse, the education model. This part of the passage (examined above in relation to Fabius Pictor) is where Dionysius implicitly recognised the validity of the sceptic's position that Greek rituals at Rome might have derived from post-conquest influences rather than from inherited and long maintained Hellenism. The significant point now is that captured Greece is evidently also conceived of as exerting her own (presumably milder, slower, more insidious) influence only *after* a situation of confrontation. Dionysius' notion is that Greece did not, *could* not, influence Rome to adopt Greek rites and customs until Rome had gained the *hegemonia* and *archê* over Greece and the Mediterranean. Thus Dionysius' two models of change prove to be not opposite and incompatible but related: the "conquest/incorporation" model which imposes change from above, and the "education" one where influence seeps up from underneath are both revealed as dependent upon confrontation. It is as if mere proximity does not matter at all; peaceful contacts, sharing of practices, assimilation between neighbours—all these are nowhere mentioned nor admitted to be important.[53] This, then, is how Dionysius can ignore the possibility that complex cultural influences may have operated upon the Romans (including of course Fabius Pictor) from at least the middle of the third century; how he can fail to draw the obvious inferences from the fact that Pictor wrote his history in Greek. For Dionysius, influence—in either direction—can only operate once the issue of sovereignty has been resolved following conquest.

When, in that case, did Dionysius suppose that the conquest had occurred? At 7.70.5 he states that Greekdom (*to Hellênikon*) has been under Roman rule for seven generations, in very similar wording to that which he employs at 1.3.5: "Rome ruling every region persists already for the seventh generation in my time". The notion of a generation, and of its length, is of course a notoriously slippery one: figures between 25 and 40 years are variously used by ancient authors.[54] For some purposes, Dionysius appears to accept a 27-year

---

[48] Marincola 1997a.

[49] Schultze 2000, section 1.

[50] Marincola 1997b, 83–5.

[51] Pédech 1965.

[52] The way in which the topic is ended at 7.70.4 with the words "for many reasons which it is not at present the moment to say" resembles 1.77.3—another instance of avoidance of sustained religious speculation, though that is theological, this perhaps sociological.

[53] Strabo 7.3.7 recognises the possibility of influence operating through means such as trade and proximity, and regards it as often harmful (Müller 1972, 331–2; Dueck 2000, 75–6).

[54] Cazanove 1992, 86–90; Mosshammer 1979, 101–5.

generation, and, on that basis, seven full generations would amount to 189 years.[55] Dionysius published Book 1 in 7 B.C.: hence, even if the seven generations have to be understood as fully completed (which is not necessarily the implication of 1.3.5 and 7.70.5), 189 years take us back to 196 B.C. and thus to the conclusion of the second Macedonian war. Slight confirmation that Dionysius indeed has this date in mind as the key one is provided by 1.90.1, where "undoing the rule of the Carthaginians and the Macedonians" is posited as a crucial stage in Rome's rise to power. Accordingly, Dionysius' position can be saved: he can just about deem Pictor, active during the second Punic war or very shortly thereafter, as unaffected by any Greek cultural influences.[56]

BIOS, POLITEIA AND CONTROLLING CHANGE

According to Dionysius' argument, then, the Romans originated from Hellenic stock, although he allows that the ethnic Hellenism has been tempered by the incorporation of non-Greek peoples, making the Romans a racially mixed people.[57] He refuses, however to count this as of any great significance, emphasising their Hellenic cultural and political inheritance rather than their racial descent (1.89–90); despite exposure to barbarian *bioi*, their constitution and customs are Hellenic through and through, entitling them to be considered Greek.[58] Any community, however, is liable to feel the effects of an alien culture when—according to Dionysius' way of thinking about cultural change—a relationship has been established as a result of conquest; bilateral post-conquest influence appears to be inescapable but to vary in degree. But the extent of resistance or imperviousness to such foreign influence is regarded by Dionysius not just a matter of luck or chance (*tuchê*). It is (partly at least) a matter of rational decision, based on good laws and institutions from the very outset, and hence is determined by the *politeia*. As was briefly mentioned earlier, Dionysius depicts Rome's *politeia* as a mixed constitution even under Romulus, to the extent that was suitable for a small young *polis* at that time. Successive changes (other kings' reforms, institution of republic, tribunate, *staseis* resolved by compromise) take it in the direction of ever more perfect mixture. So too, for Dionysius, Romulus was necessarily responsible for the basic framework of Rome's religious institutions (which should in any case be seen as integral to the *polis*). The way in which Dionysius

presents Romulus' involvement in key festivals was discussed above; he further depicts the founder as devising means to inculcate piety, moderation, justice and bravery (*eusebeia, sôphrosune, dikaiosunê,* and *gennaiotês*) into the *polis* and its citizens (2.18.1). He encourages these by his religious institutions: temples, cults and festivals; he defined the powers of the various deities and prescribed their appropriate rituals. In all this "he followed the best customs (*kratista nomima*) in use among the Greeks" (2.18.2). But he eschewed all the handed down stories (*paradedomenoi muthoi*), and any tales which were indecent, or which depicted the gods as inflicting or undergoing suffering. A number of unsuitable or indecent Greek myths and religious practices are then described (2.19.1–2).

The passage then slips from Romulus *via* a passing acknowledgement that "their customs (*ethê*) are now corrupted" to a description of Roman religion in Dionysius' day. Their observances include no mourning, indecency, begging, ecstasy, mysteries, being instead performed "reverently in all their doings and sayings with regard to the gods, in a manner unlike both Greeks and barbarians" (2.18.2).

Rome selects only the more reverent and purer traditions and practices. Even though she is especially exposed to foreign rituals, because of the many *ethnê* who have come to live there, and who maintain their *patrioi theoi* (2.19.3; cf. 7.70.4, examined above), she has only adopted foreign cults unofficially, and with due modifications in accordance with her own *nomima*. The Magna Mater is a case in point (2.19.4). Reverting to consideration of the *muthoi*, Dionysius holds that it is a very good thing to follow the *theologia* of the Romans, as "the many" cannot properly understand the allegorical, consolatory or purificatory functions of the Greek *muthoi*: these are indeed useful ends, but are only available to those versed in philosophy. If taken literally, the myths lead the many to despise the gods, or use their example in order to transgress (2.20). Thus, both in the practice of ritual, and in the *theologia* which underlies it, Roman is better than Greek; and Rome's first founder was the one to regulate her politico-religious institutions in this way.

Dionysius here endorses the Polybian view that culture (*ethê kai nomima*) is integral to the *politeia*, and that its regulation affects national character and inculcates the desired qualities.[59] Given the scope of his history, Dionysius is not required to address how and if constitutional degeneration causes *ethê kai nomima* to degenerate too. He can instead suggest that the pristine Greekness of Rome's institutions validates the claim that she has maintained a Greek life (*bios Hellên*) throughout

---

[55] Schultze 1995, 209 n. 29.

[56] With a 24-year generation it would be even easier to maintain this: 168 would be the crucial date for definitive conquest, and so Pictor's *floruit* would fall comfortably before it.

[57] The concept of a mixed Greek-barbarian *genos* was usually regarded as inferior (Desideri 1992, 25–7).

[58] Contrast Polybius, who at 12.4b-c argues against Timaeus' view of the "October Horse" in such a way as to imply his own belief in Roman barbarianness (Champion 2000).

[59] See Martinez Lacy 1993: 85-6 on Polybius 1.65.7; 6.11.3–4; 6.47.1–6. Cf. also Aristotle, *Politics* 3.9 and 5.9 on the relation between laws and goodness.

the years of growth, overseas expansion, and the present high tide of fortune (1.90.1). The account of the games is one—and a highly important one—of the "many indisputable testimonies" (7.70.2) which he can adduce.

Works Cited

Andrén, A. 1960. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Roman monuments." In *Hommages à Léon Herrmann*, 88–104. *CollLatomus* 44. Brussels: Latomus.

Aujac, G. 1966. *Strabon et la science de son temps*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Bowersock, G.W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cardauns, B. 1976. *M. Terentius Varro: Antiquitates rerum divinarum*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Cary, E. 1937–50. *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann.

Cazanove, O. de. 1992. "La détermination chronographique de la durée de la période royale à Rome." In *La Rome des premiers siècles: légende et histoire. Actes de la table ronde en l'honneur de Massimo Pallottino, Paris, 3-4 mai 1991*, 69–98. Biblioteca di "Studi Etruschi" 24. Florence: Olschki.

Champion, C. 2000, December. "*Histories* 12.4b.1–c.1: an overlooked key to Polybios' views on Rome." *HISTOS. The Electronic Journal of Ancient Historiography at the University of Durham* 4 (2000). http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/2000/champion.ht ml (27 December 2000).

Chassignet, M. 1996. *L'annalistique romaine. T.1. Les annales des pontifes et l'annalistique ancienne (fragments)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Clarke, K. 1999. *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dauge, Y.A. 1981. *Le barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*. *CollLatomus* 176. Brussels: Latomus.

Desideri, P. 1992. "Eforo e Strabone sui 'popoli misti' (Str. XIV, 5.23–26)." In *Autocoscienza e rappresentzione dei popoli nell' antichità*, edited by M. Sordi, 19–31. Contributi dell'Istituto di storia antica 18. Milan: Vita e Pensiero. Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica.

Dittenberger, W. 1915. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Dueck, D. 2000. *Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome*. London: Routledge.

Ferrary, J.-L. 1988. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique*. *BÉFAR* 271. Rome: École française de Rome.

Frier, B.W. 1999. Reprint. *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*.

PAAR 27. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Original edition, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1979.

Gabba, E. 1963. "Il latino come dialetto Greco." In *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*, 188–94. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo.

Gabba, E. 1991. *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome*. Sather Classical Lectures 56. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goold, G.P. 1961. "A Greek Professorial Circle at Rome." *TAPA* 92:168–92.

Jannot, J.-R. 1992. "Les danseurs de la 'pompa' du cirque. Témoinages textuels et iconographiques." *RÉL* 70:56–68.

Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 25. Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Marincola, J. 1997a. "Odysseus and the historians." *HISTOS. The electronic journal of ancient historiography at the University of Durham* http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1997/marincola.ht ml (27 December 2000).

———. 1997b. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martínez Lacy, J.R.F. 1991. "*Ethe kai nomima*. Polybius and his concept of culture." *Klio* 73:83–92.

Mosshammer, A.A. 1979. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press.

Müller, K.E. 1972. *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologische Theoriebildung*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Musti, D. 1970. *Tendenze nella storiografia romana e greca su Roma arcaica*. Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica 10. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Ogilvie, R.M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pédech, P. 1965. "Les idées religieuses de Polybe. Étude sur la religion de l'élite gréco-romaine au IIe siècle av. J.-C." *RHR* 167:35–68.

Peter, H. 1914. *Historicorum romanorum reliquiae*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner.

Richard, J.-C. 1993. "Sur deux discours-programmes: à propos d'A.R. 3, 10, 3–11, 11." In *Denys d'Halicarnasse. Historien des origines de Rome*, edited by P.M. Martin, 125–41. Pallas 39. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

Schöpsdau, K. 1992. "Vergleiche zwischen Lateinisch und Griechisch in der antiken Sprachwissenschaft." In *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike: Kolloquium der Fachrichtungen klassische Philologie der Universitäten Leipzig und Saarbrücken am 21. und 22. November 1989 in Saarbrücken*, edited by C.W. Müller, K. Sier and J. Werner, 115–36. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Schultze, C.E. 1986. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus and His Audience." In *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, edited by I. Moxon, J.D.

Smart and A.J. Woodman, 121–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1995. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Roman Chronology." *PCPS* 41:192–214.

——. 2000, December. "Authority, Originality and Competence in the *Roman Archaeology* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus." *HISTOS. The Electronic Journal of Ancient Historiography at the University of Durham.* http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/2000/schultze1.html (27 December 2000)

——. Forthcoming. "From *muthos* to *historia* in Dionysius of Halicarnassus."

Thollard, P. 1987. *Barbarie et civilisation chez Strabon. Étude critique des livres III et IV de la* Géographie. *Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne* 77. Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 365. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Thuillier, J.-P. 1975. "Denys d'Halicarnasse et les jeux romaines (*Antiquités romaines*, VII, 72–73)." *MÉFRA* 87:563–81.

——. 1982. "Le programme 'athlétique' des *ludi circenses* dans la Rome républicaine." *RÉL* 60:105–22.

——. 1987. "Le programme hippique des jeux romaines: une curieuse absence." *RÉL* 65:53–73.

——. 1989. "Les jeux dans les premiers livres des *Antiquités romaines*." *MÉFRA* 101:229–42.

Treggiari, S. 1996. "Social Status and Social Legislation." Iin *CAH,* Vol. 10, *The Augustan Age*, edited by A.K. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. Lintott, 873–904. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vanotti, G. 1992. "Roma e il suo impero in Strabone." In *Autocoscienza e rappresentazione dei popoli nell'antichità*, edited by M. Sordi, 173–94. Contributi dell'Istituto di storia antica 18. Milan: Vita e Pensiero. Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica.

Walbank, F.W. 1957; 1967; 1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Vols. 1–3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.