

This paper surveys the modern criticisms of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, offers a corrective viewpoint and demonstrates his usefulness as a historian by comparing selected passages from his *Roman Antiquities* with corresponding sections of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*.

The *Roman Antiquities* was admired in antiquity and used as a model of historiography. Josephus, for example, copied not only the name and structure for his twenty books of *Jewish Antiquities*, but was also greatly influenced by Dionysius' style (Shutt 92ff); Plutarch used Dionysius as a source for his *Life of Romulus*. But Dionysius' reputation subsequently began to falter, and the death blow in modern times was given by Eduard Schwartz' 1905 *RE* article. Schwartz' teacher Wilamowitz and subsequent critics such as Dover (9) and Cary (xix) have been no less harsh, but generally assert rather than demonstrate his mediocrity. Even such a defender as Emilio Gabba is not inclined to "revalue or exalt him as a model of historiography" or defend him against Schwartz' criticisms. (p. 9) But such a defense is possible. For Schwartz to assert, for example, that Dionysius was in effect a spiritual collaborator in thrall to the Roman overlords of an oppressed Hellenic world (*RE* V [1905], col. 934) presumes rather than demonstrates the sentiments of Dionysius' audience, ignores Dionysius' stated purpose and finds little support in a careful reading of the text.

To expose the biases of modern critics is one thing; to demonstrate Dionysius' usefulness and worth as a historian is another, leading us to look closely at the criteria for good historiography. A comparison of the respective chapters in Dionysius (*AR* II.51-55) and Livy which cover the death of Romulus' colleague Tatius and the wars against Fidenae and Veii help define these criteria. In these chapters Dionysius gives information not found in Livy, and which is not trivial: the conflict with the Camerini and the attendant second triumph and dedications to Hephaistos; the alleged reasons for the incursion of the Veii, and Roman seizure of their salt-works; and other details showing his attention to archaeology, chronology, sources, and motivations. Livy's account is oriented towards the deeds of Romulus, and shows early Roman expansion as a set of battles of conquest; Dionysius' account is in a sense more realistic, showing in significant detail how events unfolded that resulted in that expansion.

The paper's analysis considers more than Livy's omissions, and when extrapolated to the works as a whole shows that although Livy's justly praised historiography may make for a better, more elegantly crafted story than that of Dionysius, the latter's account gives us more useable information on many levels. One may prefer elegance to information, and which approach makes for a "better" historian may be a matter of taste, but Dionysius can fairly be rescued from the charge of abject mediocrity. He stands with Livy as a worthy chronicler of Roman history, and in many ways is a better one.