

plained if Apollodorus (or Aristarchus or another), using Egyptian chronology along with Herodotus' testimony and Archilochus' own poem(s) to date the poet's acme, aligned Archilochus with the famous pharaoh's inaugural year.<sup>35</sup>

There is yet a further point to be made here. From the information they could gather, the Alexandrians concluded that Archilochus was a well-known poet and mature man circa 664/3 B.C.E.: obviously there was nothing in their researches to suggest otherwise. Presumably, the scholars also believed that Archilochus was actively producing poetry sometime before that. To Apollodorus and Aristarchus then, who had available to them the considerable resources of the Alexandrian Libraries, Archilochus was a "young man" rather earlier than Jacoby's 652 B.C.E.<sup>36</sup>

B. M. LAVELLE

*Loyola University of Chicago*

35. Since Apollodorus dedicated the Χρονικά to Attalus II of Pergamon "just a year after the catastrophe in Alexandria" (cf. Pfeiffer, *History*, 254), obviously much (and perhaps even most) of the material in it will have derived from work done by him in Egypt.

36. A birth year of 704/3 B.C.E. thus seems to be indicated for Archilochus (cf. Lasserre and Bonnard, *Archiloque*, xxiii–xxiv, who propose 705 B.C.E. as the date of Archilochus' birth). Whether such a date could actually be right is, like that of Archilochus' acme, an entirely different question. It would appear, however, that the Alexandrians conceived of Archilochus, his poetry and his activity, as belonging more to the first half of the seventh century, in particular to its second quarter, than to its middle third as Jacoby and others would have it.

#### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS' *DE IMITATIONE* AND *EPISTULA AD POMPEIUM*

At *Ad Pompeium* 3.1, Dionysius informs us that his discussion of Herodotus and Thucydides there reproduces the relevant section of his *De imitatione*. Scholars have been reluctant to believe that the text we have is the fulfillment of that promise. Comparison between the *Ad Pompeium* and the extant epitome of the second book of the lost *De imitatione*, it is argued, reveals differences too striking for the *Ad Pompeium* to represent the text the epitomator had before him or her.<sup>1</sup> There are three competing views that purport to account for these differences. The first, proposed by Usener<sup>2</sup> and recently defended by Heath,<sup>3</sup> is that the *Ad Pompeium* was drawn from an early, unfinished, version of the *De imitatione*'s second book; the epitomator had the final version, into which Dionysius had introduced several changes. The second view, that of Sacks,<sup>4</sup> is that the differences are so substantial that they have to be explained by

An earlier and somewhat different version of this argument appeared as part of my dissertation "Studies in Sallust's Historical Selectivity in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*" (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000). I am grateful for the comments of my dissertation committee, Professors J. K. Newman, William M. Calder III, Richard Mitchell, and Miriam R. Pittenger Pelikan. My thanks are also due to CP's anonymous reader, whose comments and suggestions were very helpful. None of the above should be blamed for any remaining flaws.

1. The epitome perhaps dates from the third century C.E.: so H. Usener, *Dionysii Halicarnassensis "Librorum de imitatione" reliquiae epistulaeque criticae duae* (Bonn, 1889), 7.

2. Usener, "De imitatione" (n. 1 above), 8.

3. M. Heath, "Dionysius of Halicarnassus On Imitation," *Hermes* 117 (1989): 370–73; this is also the view of S. Fornaro, *Dionisio di Alicarnasso "Epistola a Pompeo Gemino": Introduzione e commento* (Stuttgart, 1997), 164.

4. K. S. Sacks, "Historiography in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus," *Athenaeum* 61 (1989): 66–80.

supposing that the *Ad Pompeium*'s section on the historians represents a complete rethinking of Dionysius' views on historiography. The third, that of Costil,<sup>5</sup> diverges from these two by dismissing the idea of separate versions of the *De imitatione* and instead suggesting that all of the apparent differences are created by lacunae in the text of the *Ad Pompeium*. The purpose of this paper is to argue that all three views may be incorrect. Dionysius in the *Ad Pompeium* could be giving us exactly what he says he is giving us: a copy of the relevant section of the *De imitatione*.<sup>6</sup> Nor need we appeal to corruption to reconcile the epitome with the *Ad Pompeium* in every case, although it may be plausible in some particular instances.

Dionysius introduces the passage in the *Ad Pompeium* as follows (3.1):

περὶ δὲ Ἡροδότου καὶ Ξενοφάντος ἐβουλήθη μαθεῖν τίνα περὶ αὐτῶν ὑπόληψιν ἔχω, καὶ γράψαι με περὶ αὐτῶν ἐβουλήθη, πεποίηκα καὶ τοῦτο <ἐν τοῖς> εἰς Δημήτριον ὑπομνηματισμοῖς περὶ μιμήσεως. τούτων ὁ μὲν πρῶτος αὐτὴν περιεῖληφε τὴν περὶ τῆς μιμήσεως ζήτησιν, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περὶ τοῦ τίνας ἄνδρας μιμεῖσθαι δεῖ ποιητάς τε καὶ φιλοσόφους, ἱστοριογράφους <τε> καὶ ῥήτορας, ὁ δὲ τρίτος περὶ τοῦ πῶς δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι μέχρι τοῦδε ἀτελής. ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ, περὶ Ἡροδότου τε καὶ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Ξενοφάντος καὶ Φιλίστου καὶ Θεοπόμπου (τούτους γὰρ ἐκκρίνω τοὺς ἄνδρας εἰς μίμησιν ἐπιτηδεϊστάτους) τάδε γράφω:

As for Herodotus and Xenophon, you wanted to know my opinion on them, and wished me to write about them. I have already done this in my treatise *De imitatione*, which is dedicated to Demetrius. The first book of this deals with the study of imitation, and the second, with the question of what individual authors should be imitated—poets, philosophers, historians, and orators—while the third, which deals with how they should be imitated, is still unfinished. In the second book, I write as follows on the subject of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Philistus, and Theopompus (seeing that I have determined that they are the authors who are most suitable for imitation).

Of the three theories that have been advanced, Sacks' view obviously contradicts the plain evidence of the text. If Dionysius had revised the *De imitatione*'s section on the historians, he could perfectly well have said so. Here he does not even say τοιάδε, but τάδε γράφω. If we accept Sacks' argument, then we must suppose that here Dionysius is deliberately trying to sucker his reader into thinking that the (supposed) changes he has introduced were part of the original. Why would he want to do this? Sacks does not address this crucial point.<sup>7</sup>

Usener's theory, on the other hand, is compatible with Dionysius' words, although there is nothing in them that compels acceptance of it.<sup>8</sup> However, there is no reason

5. P. Costil, "L'Ésthetique littéraire de Denys d'Halicarnasse: Étude sur le classement et la doctrine des *Opera rhetorica*" (doctoral thesis, University of Paris, 1949), pt. 4, chap. 5 (the intermittent and inconsistent page numbers written onto this typewritten manuscript make more precise citation impossible).

6. This appears to be the view of G. Aujac (*Denys d'Halicarnasse Opusculs rhétoriques*, vol. 5, "L'imitation" [fragments, épitomé], "Première lettre à Ammée," "Lettre à Pompée Géminos," "Dinarque" [Paris, 1992], 18–19), and of D. G. Battisti (*Dionigi di Alicarnasso "Sull'imitazione": Edizione critica, traduzione e commento* [Pisa, 1997], 31), but they do not explicitly deal with the issue.

7. He does, in discussing why Dionysius did not choose to enshrine his new thoughts in their own treatise, suggest that Dionysius may have been trying to avoid criticism of his friend Caecilius of Caleacte's *Περὶ ἱστορίας* (Sacks, "Historiography" [n. 4 above], 79). I can see no relevance this might have to the question of why Dionysius might want to pass off a revision as the original.

8. Dionysius' reference to the uncompleted state of *De imit.* 3 has suggested that the purpose of this section of *Ad Pompeium* is to give Geminus an excerpt from a work in progress; so Usener, "*De imitatione*," 3–4; also Heath, "Dionysius" (n. 3 above), p. 373 and n. 6 (with reservations). But there is nothing in Dionysius' words that suggests that *De imit.* 2 was in need of further revision. There is no particular reason to suppose that *De imit.* 3 was ever completed, since this is our only surviving reference to it and there are no

why his theory has to be accepted unless the differences between the *Ad Pompeium* and the epitome are sufficiently extreme that the epitomator is unlikely to have been responsible. For Costil's argument, Dionysius' opening statement is not relevant. However, it is of course the case that we should overturn the manuscript tradition only on solid grounds. Here too, we should want the differences to be quite extreme before postulating lacunae.

What are these differences? Usener does not go into detail on the point; indeed he is quite tentative in advancing his hypothesis, basing it on the appearance of (unspecified) material in the epitome that the *Ad Pompeium* lacks.<sup>9</sup> Costil is also quite brief in his treatment of the question. He deals with only two specific instances of additional material in the epitome, and in neither case does he state precisely where his proposed lacunae are to be located.<sup>10</sup> Both are dealt with below, and neither necessarily indicates a problem with the text of the *Ad Pompeium*. Ironically, there is one important case of additional material in the epitome that Costil does not discuss, but for which his theory provides the best explanation.

Sacks, on the other hand, claims that there are several differences. Most of his arguments have been dealt with already by Heath, and so need not be discussed in detail here. Some of Sacks' supposed divergences consist of material present in the *Ad Pompeium* but absent from the epitome.<sup>11</sup> As Heath points out, such omissions are easily explained as the work of the epitomator, and no conclusions can be drawn from them.<sup>12</sup> Heath follows Usener in regarding only material that appears to be added to the epitome as evidence of revision. This adds up to a less impressive assemblage of differences, which leads Heath to the conclusion that Usener was right to suppose that it only represents minor polishing on the part of Dionysius.

So minor are the supposed additions, however, that I would argue that the epitomator could easily be at work here as well. Costil, Heath, and Sacks between them have only three possible examples of added material. The first, and most compelling, can be seen when the following two parallel passages are compared:

ἡθὸς τε κολακικὸν καὶ φιλοτύραννον ἐμφαίνει καὶ ταπεινὸν καὶ μικρολόγον. (*Pomp.* 5.2)

His *ethos* is evidently servile, partial to tyrants, low-class, and petty.

---

surviving fragments: so S. F. Bonner, *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: A Study in the Development of Critical Method* (Cambridge, 1939), 36–37; contra, Costil, "L'Ésthetique littéraire" (n. 5 above), pt. 3, chaps. 2 and 3. The relative chronology of Dionysius' works is too intricate and vexed a question to be discussed here; good surveys of the problem can be found in Bonner, *Literary Treatises*, 25–38, and Costil, "L'Ésthetique littéraire," pt. 3.

9. Usener, "De imitatione," 8: "mutuam sibi opem et epistula et epitoma ferunt. quod si quando desunt in epistula quae librarium negligentia omitti minus sit probabile, hoc tenendum erit, in epistulam illud caput translatum esse ante quam totum opus perpolitum a scriptore emitteretur, epitomam non ex epistula sed ex opere perfecto excerptam."

10. Costil ("L'Ésthetique littéraire," pt. 4, chap. 5) also claims that "on peut faire la même constation pour certains détails de l'appréciation stylistique," but he gives no examples of these "nuances." He presumably means those trivial instances where Usener (followed by other editors) has used the epitome as a basis for restoring individual entries that have apparently dropped out of lists of literary qualities in the *Ad Pompeium*: *Pomp.* 4.3 (cf. *De imit.* 3.2); *Pomp.* 5.3 (cf. *De imit.* 3.2).

11. They are as follows: the lengthy comparison between Herodotus' and Thucydides' handling of the πραγματικοὶ τόποι at *Pomp.* 3.2–15 corresponds to a single sentence of the epitome (*De imit.* 3.1); the epitome omits the three subdivisions of οἰκονομία found in the *Ad Pompeium*; there is no praise of Theopompus' devotion to historiography in the epitome to correspond to that at *Pomp.* 6.2–5.

12. Heath, "Dionysius," 372.

Φίλιστος δὲ μιμητὴς ἐστὶ Θουκυδίδου, ἔξω τοῦ ἥθους· ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἐλεύθερον καὶ φρονήματος μεστόν· τούτῳ δὲ θεραπευτικὸν τῶν τυράννων καὶ δοῦλον πλεονεξίας. (*De imit.* 3)

Philistus is an imitator of Thucydides, with the exception of *ethos*. For Thucydides' *ethos* is free and full of spirit, while Philistus' is that of a lackey of tyrants and a slave of self-aggrandizement.

In the *Ad Pompeium*, Dionysius criticizes Philistus' bootlicking *ethos*; in the epitome, we find the same criticism accompanied by a description of Thucydides as free and proud. Clearly, Costil, Heath, and Sacks are right to note the absence of such a description in the *Ad Pompeium*. But could it not represent editorializing by the epitomator, in order to keep things straight for his or her reader? In criticizing Sacks, Heath correctly notes that omissions of material by the epitomator are no evidence for changes in Dionysius' views. But they do represent valuable evidence for the interests of the epitomator himself or herself, and so can help to explain the additional material here. It is immediately obvious that the epitomator was not drawn by Dionysius' thoughts about Herodotus and Thucydides' handling of the *πραγματικοὶ τόποι*. These are boiled down to a curt observation that Herodotus is better than Thucydides (*De imit.* 3). The epitomator is rather more generous when it comes to this topic in connection with Xenophon, Philistus, and Theopompus. The explanation for this can hardly be that he or she was not interested in historiographical *πραγματικοὶ τόποι* at all (although style is evidently his or her main concern, as indeed it is for Dionysius), or the treatment of it would be equally brief across all the historians.<sup>13</sup> It is difficult to believe that the epitomator thought that Thucydides was a less important figure than the likes of Philistus. Rather, the answer must be that the epitomator disagreed with Dionysius' evaluation of the relative merits of Herodotus and Thucydides, and/or thought it unworthy of reproduction in detail for some other reason. In that case, it is easy to see how, having eliminated all discussion of Thucydides' *ethos*, the epitomator would feel it necessary to make it clear here that Dionysius' criticism of Philistus was not part of the overall similarity of Philistus to Thucydides that Dionysius postulates. This is essentially Heath's argument, except that he believes that Dionysius himself was responsible for the clarification.<sup>14</sup> However, only a very inattentive reader of the *Ad Pompeium* would be in danger of missing this. In that work, Dionysius engages in a clear, lengthy, and vigorous criticism (3.15) of Thucydides' *ethos* from which it is obvious that he does not see Thucydides as a brownnoser; rather, his beef with the great historian is that he is too harsh and critical towards his native Athens.<sup>15</sup> It is in the epitome that such a clarification is necessary. The epitomator's description of Thucydides as "free and full of spirit" sounds more positive than Dionysius' assessment (although not completely so: *φρονήματος μεστόν* is ambiguous). As Heath notes,<sup>16</sup> it is not incompatible with it either, but it is perhaps easier to see it as the ed-

13. Costil ("L'Ésthetique littéraire," pt. 2, chap. 1) is valuable on the possible influence of Neoplatonism on the epitomator's choice of what to include and exclude.

14. Heath, "Dionysius," 373.

15. The same idea dominates Dionysius' treatment of Thucydides' *hypothesis* (*Pomp.* 3.4–6) and *taxis* (3.9–10). As the *Ad Pompeium* stands, it may well be that Dionysius intends to suggest a partial comparison between the *ethos* of Thucydides and that of Philistus. Both historians are deficient in this respect, but in different ways.

16. Heath, "Dionysius," 372; contrast Sacks ("Historiography," 69–70), who sees this as indicative of a major shift in Dionysius' thinking. Both scholars may be partially right. The content of what the epitome says about Thucydides' *ethos* is not all that different from the *Ad Pompeium*, but the attitude conveyed is

itorial clarification of the later writer who, as we have seen, found Dionysius' views on Thucydides either incorrect or uninteresting, and so was not exercised by the need to convey them with undue accuracy. Heath further argues that the difference between the order of the individual *πραγματικοὶ τόποι* in the *Ad Pompeium*, where *ethos* is the last point addressed, and the order in the epitome, where *ethos* precedes the others, is also a result of Dionysius' redrafting.<sup>17</sup> Again, the epitomator could just as easily be responsible. The order in the *Ad Pompeium* is standard, according to Heath, while that of the epitome is not. But that is not in itself an argument for Dionysius' having altered the order. If anything, it is a (weak) argument for the epitomator's as the hand at work, since the order of the *Ad Pompeium* is standard for Dionysius, specifically, and one might feel that another writer might be more likely to shift the *topoi* around.<sup>18</sup>

The other two areas where additional material is supposedly present in the epitome are less striking.

οὔτε γὰρ ὑπόθεσιν εἴληφε πολυωφελῆ καὶ κοινὴν, ὥσπερ Θουκυδίδης, ἀλλὰ μίαν καὶ αὐτὴν τοπικὴν. (*Pomp.* 5.1)

For, like Thucydides,<sup>19</sup> he took up no useful and general *ὑπόθεσις*, but a single one and a regional one at that.

ἐξήλωκεν δὲ πρῶτον μὲν τὸ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἀτελῆ καταλιπεῖν τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείνῳ τρόπον . . . (*De imit.* 3.6)

He is zealous to emulate [Thucydides], firstly, in leaving his *ὑπόθεσις* ἀτελής in the same way as [Thucydides] . . .

In the above passages, what the epitome says about Thucydides' and Philistus' *ὑπόθεσις* does not correspond with the view expressed in the *Ad Pompeium*. In the *Ad Pompeium*, Philistus' *ὑπόθεσις* resembles Thucydides' in not being *πολυωφελῆ* and *κοινὴν* but rather *μίαν* (5.1). Dionysius also describes Philistus' *ὑπόθεσις* as *τοπικὴν*, but this cannot be meant to be a direct comparison to Thucydides.<sup>20</sup> In the epitome, on the other hand, Philistus resembles Thucydides in that his *ὑπόθεσις* is *ἀτελής* (3); in the *Ad Pompeium* this charge is leveled at Thucydides in the section where he is compared with Herodotus (3.10) and in the section on Xenophon (4.1). Costil, Sacks, and Heath agree in seeing this as evidence of additional material.<sup>21</sup> Yet there is no need to suppose that the epitomator has not imported this observation about Thucydides from one part of the *De imitatione* into another, again for reasons of clarity

quite different. This is very compatible with the idea of an epitomator with his or her own views on Thucydides, who remains generally faithful in his or her *précis* of Dionysius, but allows his or her own perspective to leak in on subjects peripheral to those for which he or she finds Dionysius valuable.

17. Heath, "Dionysius," 373.

18. Although Dionysius was probably not the first or the last to examine historians under the headings of these *topoi*, we cannot be certain that the order of the *topoi* remained completely fixed (although, admittedly, the conservatism of the rhetorical schools makes it a definite possibility). The difference is not huge, of course; in one order, *ethos* comes last, in the other, first; in both cases, its position emphasizes its importance.

19. There is no warrant for Usener's decision to emend the comparison with Thucydides (a nasty swipe at Thuc. 1.22) out of existence.

20. Dionysius does, however, criticize the narrow scope of Thucydides' *πόλεμον ἔνα* at 3.4–6, so there may well be a looser comparison: both Philistus' *hypothesis* and Thucydides' are too restricted, but in different ways, the one geographically, the other chronologically.

21. Sacks, "Historiography," 69; Heath, "Dionysius," 372.

arising out of his or her elimination of most of Dionysius' comments on Thucydides himself.

An important point, on the other hand, is how the epitomator can say that Philistus has a *ὑπόθεσις* without *τέλος* in the first place. Heath and Sacks do not deal with this question. Costil hypothesizes that Philistus may have left his work on Dionysius the Elder unfinished, either in the sense of not reaching an envisaged terminus or else by not giving it its final polishing. There is no ancient testimony for such an unfinished life of the elder Dionysius. If something of the sort were needed it would be more plausible to imagine that the epitomator might be confused. Dionysius (the scholar) could have added a reference to the unfinished state of another work of Philistus, that on Dionysius the Younger.<sup>22</sup> But this supposition is not in fact necessary. There are two other possibilities. The first is that the epitomator is picking up on something Dionysius says a little later: *μικρός τε παρὰ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ἐστὶ καὶ ἀτελής* ("He is trivial in every way and ἀτελής," *Pomp.* 5.6). The reading ἀτελής here is, however, a dubious one.<sup>23</sup> The second possibility is preferable. The epitomator must intend this to relate, not to the *Ad Pompeium*'s comments on Philistus' choice of *ὑπόθεσις*, but to what immediately follows: *διήρηκε δ' αὐτὴν [his hypothesis] εἰς γραφὰς δύο, Περὶ Σικελίας μὲν τὴν προτέραν ἐπιγράφων, Περὶ Διονυσίου δὲ τὴν ὑστέραν· ἐστὶ δὲ μία· καὶ τοῦτο γνοίης ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τῆς Σικελικῆς* ("He has divided it into two works, giving the title *On Sicily* to the first, and *On Dionysius* to the second. But it is a single *ὑπόθεσις*, as one can tell from the conclusion of *On Sicily*," *Pomp.* 5.1). *Ἀτελής* in these passages does not mean so much "unfinished" in the normal English sense (which implies the possibility of unintentional failure to complete an envisaged scheme) as "lacking a proper terminus" (or, as we would put it, "lacking closure"). Dionysius does not doubt that Thucydides chose to end his history where he did.<sup>24</sup> Thucydides' organization, according to Dionysius, also acts to destroy the unity of the work: *ἀλλὰ συμβέβηκε τῷ μὲν μίαν ὑπόθεσιν λαβόντι πολλὰ ποιῆσαι μέρη τὸ ἐν σῶμα* ("The result is that one has

22. This work was completed by Athanis of Syracuse (*FGrH* 562 T 2 = *FGrH* 556 T 11c). Athanis' work was called the *Σικελικά* and extended at least as far as 337/6, well after Dionysius the Younger's retirement: *FGrH* 562 F 1, 3. It may be more accurate to regard Athanis' work as a continuation rather than a completion: so J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 239–40. However, in the *Ad Pompeium*, Dionysius is clearly talking about the bipartite work on Sicilian history down to the life of Dionysius the Elder (the tyrant), known to us also from other testimony (*FGrH* 556 T 11a; that this was distinct from the later work on Dionysius the Younger is indicated by *FGrH* 556 T 11b).

23. *Ἀτελής* is the MS reading. Usener, following Boissonadius, emends to *εὐτελής*; this emendation is retained by H. Usener and L. Rademacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae extant* (Stuttgart, 1904–29). Aujac (*Dens d'Halicarnasse* [n. 6 above]) uses the epitome here to defend *ἀτελής*; this is accepted by Fornaro, "*Epistola a Pompeo*" (n. 3 above), 244 (cf. 240), but only at the cost of taking it in a very broad sense, as referring to a work without a *τέλος* "nè morale, nè estetico." This is difficult; in comparable passages (*Pomp.* 3.10; esp. 4.1; *Thuc.* 12.2) it is clear that Dionysius is referring to a narrative that does not end properly, and he pairs it with consideration of the opening of the work. Emendation here does seem to be the best option.

24. See Fornaro, "*Epistola a Pompeo*," 190. Dionysius makes this clearest at *Pomp.* 3.8: *δεύτερόν ἐστι τῆς ἱστορικῆς πραγματείας ἔργον γνῶναι πόθεν τε ἀρξασθαι καὶ μέχρι ποῦ προελθεῖν δεῖ. φαίνεται δὲ κἀν τούτῳ Θουκυδίδου πολὺ Ἡρόδοτος φρονιμώτερος*. Note also *Thuc.* 10.1: *αἰτιῶνται δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτοῦ τινες, ὥς οὔτε ἀρχὴν τῆς ἱστορίας εἰληφότος ἦν ἐχρῆν οὔτε τέλος ἐφηρμοκότος αὐτῇ τὸ πρέπον*; this criticism is meaningless unless the unfinished state of the work is intentional. *Thuc.* 16.2 (*ὄν* [dialogues and speeches] *προνοούμενος* εἰκεν ἀτελῆ τὴν ἱστορίαν καταλιπεῖν, ὥς καὶ Κράτιππος ὁ συνακμάσας αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ παραλειφθέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συναγαγὼν γέγραφεν) at first sight appears to contradict this, but Dionysius' meaning here is clarified by *Thuc.* 24 (*διετέλεσε γέ τοι τὸν ἐπαικισσοαετὴ χρόνον τοῦ πολέμου ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕως τῆς τελευταῖας τὰς ὀκτὼ βύβλους ἃς μόνας κατέλιπεν*); he clearly envisages Thucydides as having been engaged in revision of all eight books from early on. The reference to Cratippus at *Thuc.* 16.2–3 as Dionysius'

taken up a single *ὑπόθεσις* and proceeded to divide an organic unity into several parts . . . ,” *Pomp.* 3.14). Philistus has divided a single subject into two works. This becomes apparent only from the conclusion of the earlier work. The epitomator may have felt (and his or her viewpoint is at least arguably correct) that this represents a charge that Philistus’ *ὑπόθεσις* is *ἀτελής*, either because Dionysius (the tyrant, not the writer) was a bad way to end a work on Sicilian history, or (perhaps more probably) because Dionysius implies that Philistus has given the *Περὶ Σικελίας* a *τέλος* that turns out not to be a *τέλος* at all.<sup>25</sup>

The editorial procedure involved in the epitome seems clear. The epitomator is interested mainly in the more minor historians (in this section; the epitome is of the whole of the first two books of the *De imitatione*). He or she has fastened on the main organizing principle of Dionysius’ thoughts about Xenophon (*Pomp.* 4) and Philistus (*Pomp.* 5), which is that the former resembles Herodotus and the latter Thucydides. He or she cuts out what is not necessary to understand this basic idea (and so the reference to Thucydides’ *ἀτελής ὑπόθεσις* is removed from the section on Xenophon, where it is an aside). But the epitomator also supplies what is necessary for understanding, if it falls among the material already eliminated, not making it up out of whole cloth, but simply displacing it from its original location in Dionysius’ original treatise. In the first case, he or she has done so in a slightly tendentious paraphrase, in the second, in a closer one, but the procedure is the same.

The last supposed addition, of concern only to Sacks and Heath, is trivial. In the epitome (3.9), Theopompus is praised for his refusal to conceal the unspoken causes of events and speeches (*τὰς ἀπορρήτους τῶν γενομένων ἢ λεχθέντων αἰτίας*); in the *Ad Pompeium* (6.7) we hear of actions and agents (*τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν πράξαντων αὐτάς*). But the epitomator may have seen it as obvious that this included speeches, at least by implication. As Heath admits, we cannot say that this is “beyond the reach of the epitomator’s phrasing.”<sup>26</sup>

None of the cases that have been adduced so far seems to be decisive for any of the three modern theories. There are, however, three further possible appearances of additional material in the epitome that have so far escaped comment.<sup>27</sup> One is:

ἔπονται ταύταις αἱ τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὸν τόνον καὶ τὰς ὁμοιοτρόπους δυνάμεις τῆς φράσεως ἀρετὰ περιέχουσαι κρείττων ἐν ταύταις Ἡροδότου Θουκυδίδης. (*Pomp.* 3.19)

source for the opinion that the speeches in Book 8 were omitted deliberately indicates that Cratippus is likely also to be Dionysius’ source for the belief that Thucydides intended Book 8 to be the last. There is no need for the present purpose to go into the controversy over whether Cratippus’ statement is correct; for this see W. K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus “On Thucydides”* (Berkeley, 1975), 67–68.

25. Fornaro, “*Epistola a Pompeo*,” 244, has revived the idea of emending the epitome as another way around this problem; he accepts K. W. Krüger’s emendation of *ἀτελῆ* to *ἀφελῆ* (*Dionysii Halicarnassensis Historiographica*, h.e. “*Epistolae ad Cn. Pompejum*,” “*ad Q. Aelium Tiberonem*” et “*ad Ammaeum Altera*” [Halle, 1823]); Usener reads *ἀπλήν*; Usener-Radermacher sensibly returns to the MS reading. As Costil points out (“*L’Ésthetique littéraire*,” pt. 4, chap. 5), it is unlikely that corruption of an epitome would produce a statement that paralleled a statement from the original from which the epitome was drawn, almost word for word: *Pomp.* 4.1.

26. Heath, “Dionysius,” 373, who considers it only a “possible” addition. For Sacks “Historiography,” 71, it is important, but only as part of several striking divergences he sees between the epitome and the *Ad Pompeium*; all of the others consist of omitted material. He does not claim that in itself it is more than “cosmetic.”

27. I am grateful to CP’s anonymous reader for drawing my attention to these.

There follow the virtues that encompass strength, energy, and similar stylistic faculties; Thucydides is better than Herodotus in these respects.

ῥώμη δὲ καὶ ἰσχύι καὶ τόνῳ καὶ τῷ περιττῷ καὶ πολυσχηματίστῳ παρηυδοκίμησε Θουκυδίδης. (*De imit.* 3)

Thucydides is surpassingly famous for power, strength, energy, elaboration, and variety of figures.

The addition of the last two stylistic virtues in the epitome can be explained by reference to one of the editorial principles that I have already suggested may be at work elsewhere. Here too it appears that the epitomator may have transferred this observation from elsewhere in Dionysius, in the section on Philistus (*Pomp.* 5.4):

ἡ μὲν γὰρ πλήρης σχημάτων (καὶ οὐδὲν οἶμαι περὶ τῶν φανερῶν ἐπὶ πλεόν δεῖν λέγειν) ἡ δὲ Φιλίστου φράσις ὁμοειδὴς πᾶσα δεινῶς καὶ ἀσχηματιστός ἐστι.

[Thucydides' style] is full of figures (I think there is no need for me to discuss the obvious at further length); in contrast, the entire style of Philistus is exceedingly uniform and lacks figures.

It seems more likely that the epitomator summarized Dionysius' statement out of its original context in order to collect all of Dionysius' stylistic judgments on Thucydides in one place than that Dionysius decided to give greater emphasis to what he explicitly regards as a trivially obvious point.

Another apparent case of additional material concerns precisely this unfortunate deficiency of figurative expression in Philistus:<sup>28</sup>

καὶ πολλὰς εὖροι τις ἂν περιόδους ὁμοίως ἐφεξῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ σχηματιζόμενας, οἷον ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς δευτέρας τῶν περὶ Σικελίας. . . . ταῦτα δὲ ἀρῆθ' ἅπαντα ὄντα ἐμοὶ φαίνεται. (*Pomp.* 5.4–5)

Many periods may be found in succession that he has constructed similarly, for example, in the opening of *On Sicily* Book Two. . . . I find this wholly unpleasant.

. . . ἀπεμάξατο, οὐ μὴν ὁμοίως . . . τὰ βάρη καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τοὺς σχηματισμούς. (*De imit.* 3.2)

He copied [some stylistic virtues], but really did not similarly copy [Thucydides'] . . . weight, emotion, and use of figures.

The epitomator's addition of references to Philistus' lack of weight and feeling is, I think, intended to substitute for Dionysius' specific example of Philistus' "unpleasant" lack of figures. It indicates how he or she understood Dionysius' vague criticism of this stylistic flaw as ἀρῆθ'. This also corresponds to one of the editorial principles identified in connection with the earlier divergences. It is parallel to the epitomator's interpretation of Dionysius' specific criticism of Philistus' division of his ὑπόθεσις as a general charge of having an ἀτελὴς ὑπόθεσις. In both cases, we can perhaps observe the epitomator wrestling with one of the key problems that the composition of an

28. At this point, the epitomator has done an exceptionally good job of boiling down what was a lengthy passage. In order not to have to quote too much extraneous material from the *Ad Pompeium*, I have chosen to confine the quotation from the epitome to what is required to appreciate that additional material appears.



epitome entails. Specific details must be eliminated in favor of summarizing the general thrust of the original. However, there will be cases where the original author allows the specifics to speak for themselves, forcing the epitomator to tease out the implied point.

There is, however, a further divergence that is difficult to explain as due to the epitomator. This is the case mentioned above, where Costil's theory probably supplies the best explanation:

οὐ γὰρ μόνον οὐκ ἴσχυσε τοῦτο παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποτε διεγεῖραι βουλευθῆναι τὴν φράσιν, ὀλίγον ἐμπνεύσας ὥσπερ ἀπόγειος αὔρα ταχέως σβέννυται. . . . μακρότερος γὰρ γίνεται τοῦ δέοντος ἐν πολλοῖς, καὶ τοῦ πρέποντος οὐχ ὡς Ἡροδότου ἐφάπτεται τῶν προσώπων εὐτυχῶς, ἀλλ' ἐν πολλοῖς ὀλιγωρὸς ἐστίν, ἂν τις ὁρθῶς σκοπῇ. (*Pomp.* 4.4)

Not only was [Xenophon] incapable of adopting this ["historically formed style"] from him [Herodotus], but even when from time to time he wants to make his style stimulating, like a breeze from the land he blows briefly and is quickly lulled. . . . for he is larger than he should be in many places and unlike Herodotus does not have appropriate character portrayal, but on rigorous inspection is negligent in many places.

ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ πρέποντος τοῖς προσώποις ἐστοχάσατο, περιτιθεὶς ἀνδράσιν ιδιώταις καὶ βαρβάρους ἔσθ' ὅτε λόγους φιλοσόφους, λέξει χρώμενος διαλόγοις πρεπούση μᾶλλον ἢ στρατιωτικοῖς κατορθώμασι. (*De imit.* 3.2)

Nor did [Xenophon] aim at appropriate character portrayal; he sometimes attributed philosophical talk to ordinary men and foreigners and used language appropriate to dialogues rather than correct military usage.

The addition of the specific discussion of the inappropriate nature of the language Xenophon supplies for his characters cannot be explained on the basis of our picture of the epitomator's working methods. Here it is more likely that the epitomator did indeed have a different text before him or her, probably one with specific examples illustrating Xenophon's failures. It is striking that this divergence appears in a passage where Usener had already postulated that something had dropped out on quite different grounds.<sup>29</sup> Consequently, here it is best to accept Costil's argument; the epitomator is summarizing material that came before μακρότερος γάρ but that has been lost to our text of the *Ad Pompeium*.

In conclusion, there are no cases where additional material forces us to accept either Usener's theory of a minor revision or Sacks' theory of a major one. There is only one important divergence that demands Costil's explanation and we need not suppose that the text of the *Ad Pompeium* is especially lacunose aside from that. We are left free to entertain the idea naturally conveyed by Dionysius' words: a substantial section of the *De imitatione* has been preserved for us as a quotation in the *Epistula ad Pompeium*.

GAVIN WEAIRE  
Union College

29. Usener-Radermacher ad loc.: "Hiatum notavi. intercidit propositio sequentis περί τοῦ πρέποντος disputationis."