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Why would one spend more than four years of one’s life on Dionysius of Halicarnassus? This question has been asked to me innumerable times (normally by friends who pronounced the rhetorician’s name as slowly as possible), and I must admit that there have been periods when I had trouble finding the correct answer. Now that the work on my dissertation is coming to an end, I would not hesitate to state that Dionysius has been worth every minute that I spent on him. Dionysius was a multitalented intellectual of wide reading, who lived in one of the most interesting periods and in one of the most fascinating cities in western history, namely in Augustan Rome. Besides, he was in many respects our predecessor: because of his interest in classical Greek literature (rhetoric, historiography and poetry), Dionysius can rightly be considered the precursor of modern students of ancient literature. It is not surprising, then, that Dionysius has often been interpreted as if he were a colleague of modern classicists: scholars of various disciplines are ready to state that they agree or disagree with Dionysius’ verdicts on Plato, Thucydides, and Herodotus, or with his ideas on the origins of Rome. But here is another reason why it has been worth studying the works of Dionysius: it is exactly the modern tendency to interpret Dionysius as someone with whom we can discuss classical literature or history that has resulted in misunderstanding of his works. Traditional scholarship, which treated Dionysius as a colleague of modern classicists, has often failed to appreciate the practical purposes of this teacher of rhetoric. I hope that this book will contribute to a better understanding of Dionysius’ views by interpreting them within the historical context of his rhetorical theories.

Since I started working on my thesis in September 2001, I have been able to present my views to several audiences. I am very grateful that I had the opportunity to discuss my work with colleagues and friends of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric, in particular during our meetings in Madrid, Calahorra (at the feet of Quintilian’s statue) and Los Angeles. Furthermore, I was very fortunate that I was given the opportunity to spend seven months in Oxford, where prof. Chris Pelling welcomed me most friendly in the wonderland of Christ Church. I learnt many important things both about Dionysius and about life while spending this fantastic period in Oxford.

It would have been impossible to write this dissertation without the heartwarming support of my colleagues at the Classics Department of Leiden University. The homey and yet challenging atmosphere of our department has been very important for the progress of my research. Since academic tradition forbids me to name some of the senior staff members who guided me, I will direct my words of
gratitude to the many colleagues and friends who constitute the unique group of junior staff in the Leiden Classics Department. I thank my colleagues of the research school OIKOS for many inspiring conversations in Athens, Rome, and Katwijk. I am also grateful to Maartje Scheltens for correcting my English — all the mistakes that remain are mine.

For Dionysius, oratory is ‘a kind of music’. Perhaps it is this view that has connected us somehow, for without music I would not have persisted. I wish to thank those musicians with whom I was allowed to play; in particular, I express my warm gratitude to Nina for the sublime harmony that our four hands have produced so far.

I would never have finished this dissertation without the constant support of my parents and brothers, and my dear friend Joris, who has always been near to me during the last decade. Almuth, my guide in wonderland: I am extremely grateful that you have never lost faith in me. Regine, Tazuko, and Maaike: thank you for your presence, prudence, and patience in different periods. Finally, I thank my friends Adriaan, Colin, Hugo, Mark, Michel, Pieter, Susanna, Susannah, Wouter, and many others who have encouraged me. I hope that you will now understand why I spent these four years with Di-o-ny-si-us-of-Ha-li-car-nas-sus.
1. References to the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (DH) are to the chapter, page, and line number of the edition by H. Usener & L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant* 5 and 6, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1899 and 1904-1929. The English translations of passages from Dionysius’ rhetorical works are based on S. Usher, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Critical Essays* 1 and 2, Cambridge, MA / London 1974 and 1985. In many cases, however, I have adapted Usher’s translations.


3. Unless indicated otherwise, English translations are borrowed and adapted from the Loeb Series.

4. Abbreviations for Greek and Latin authors generally follow LSJ and OLD, but Thuc. is Thucydides. ‘Demetrius’ (between inverted commas) is the unknown author of the treatise *On Style (De elocutione)*. ‘Longinus’ (between inverted commas) is the unknown author of the treatise *On the Sublime (De sublimitate)*.

5. Abbreviations for the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Amm.</em> I</td>
<td><em>Epistula ad Ammaeum</em> I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amm.</em> II</td>
<td><em>Epistula ad Ammaeum</em> II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ant. Rom.</em></td>
<td><em>Antiquitates Romanae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Comp.</em></td>
<td><em>De compositione verborum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dem.</em></td>
<td><em>De Demosthene</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Din.</em></td>
<td><em>De Dinarcho</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imit.</em></td>
<td><em>De Imitatione</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Is.</em></td>
<td><em>De Isaeo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Isoc.</em></td>
<td><em>De Isocrate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lys.</em></td>
<td><em>De Lysia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orat. Vett.</em></td>
<td><em>De oratoribus veteribus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pomp.</em></td>
<td><em>Epistula ad Pompeium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thuc.</em></td>
<td><em>De Thucydide</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Abbreviations for collections of texts and works of reference are as follows:


**G.G. II 1** Volumen primum: Scripta minora, ed. R. Schneider, Leipzig 1878.


Lausberg  Heinrich Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft, München 1960². [References are to Lausberg’s paragraphs.]
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