account and what is known of contemporary Zoroastrianism, and it is prefaced by a very informative survey of earlier scholarship on the topic, from Cumont onwards.

This all adds up to a very handy and informative companion to Dio 36. There are only a few respects in which one might have hoped for something different, or something more. The issue of Hellenism and (different flavours of) barbarism in the oration—the question of what Dio is trying to do to or for his Prusan audience by juxtaposing primitive Hellenes with Scythians on the one hand and wise, but stylistically extravagant Easterners on the other—is not really got to grips with by any of the contributors. Nesselrath's introduction is not as forthcoming on issues of style and structure as might have been expected. He deals with Dio's *mimesis* of Plato (as also, from another angle, does Forschner), but says less about the Herodotean elements and their ramifications (comparison with Pausanias?), and about the oration's character as a dialogue intended for epideictic delivery (and itself enclosing a reported epideictic speech). Neither Nesselrath nor any other contributor says much about how Dio's self-representation in this speech relates to the larger project of self-presentation that runs through his work as a whole. And there is, finally, a curious uncertainty about the book's intended readership. The aim of appealing to a broad public seems to be reflected in the attachment of the notes to the translation rather than the Greek text of the speech. But the notes themselves turn out to contain a high proportion of professional philological detail, with much quoted Greek, and some long lists of text references that only a specialist would want to follow up.

King's College London MICHAEL TRAPP
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni046

THE BUDÉ LUCIAN II

J. BOMPAIRE (ed.): *Lucien: Oeuvres. Tome II. Opuscules 11–20*. (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Pp. xii + 359. Paris: Les Belles Lettres,1998. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00463-7.

The second volume of the Budé Lucian follows the first of 1993 (reviewed by this author in *CR* 45 [1995], 24ff.). This time as expected the apparatus is considerably lengthier, as for opuscula 13–20 both γ and β traditions are in play, but in accordance with the aims and practical limitations of the series, B. follows Macleod's compromise in OCT IV of favouring the chief representative of γ, Vaticanus 90 (Γ), and resorts to *recentiores* of β to represent the latter's generally inferior tradition much of the time.

Bompaire has exercised judgement and commonsense as before, and only a few marginalia need be given to illustrate different sorts of problems. There are times when the Brobdignagian fun-words in *Verae historiae* must be corrected from 'nonsense nonsense' to 'funny nonsense': Ἀεροκόρδακες is obviously the right choice at *VH* 1.18, in spite of Nilén's sympathy for Lehmann's Ἀεροσκόρδακες. The trouble is that although they are later said to fight with radishes which inflict a fetid wound, suggesting some weapon based on σκόρ[ο]δον, they are immediately characterized as ψιλοί τε ὄντες καὶ πεζοί, which obviously and brilliantly favours an allusion to the kordax; in any case radishes are not garlic, and the Σκοροδομάχοι have already featured in 13.

For the puzzle over the Τριτωνομένδητες (*VH* 1.35), where there is a genuine

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

problem in interpreting Lucian's description of the creatures, B. notes Winkler's insight of 1980, and amusingly quotes Graevius' despair at not making sense of the creatures (*quaerant otiosi* . . .). Unfortunately B. was probably too late to take account of this reviewer's solution in Schmeling's *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden, 1996): an amalgam of swordfish (rather than weasel) and satyr (cf. μένδης), with the sword providing the ithuphallic element appropriate to the satyr, so that they make love not war and so are more peaceful than their neighbours, as Lucian wryly points out.

B. opts for the acknowledged *lectio facilior* at *J. Conf.* 16, where the adopted β text contrasts Sardanapalus with *Περσῶν τοσοῦτοι καλοί τε κἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες*, and the *lectio difficilior* contrasts him with an otherwise unknown Goches or Gonches; there seems no doubt that some kind of corruption has crept in, and there is no doubt that the adopted text makes sense, but with the air of a rather colourless explanation which may have begun as a gloss on the unusual name. What makes me confident that the Budé text as printed is wrong is B.'s retention of *θῆλυς ὤν* after Sardanapalus. The wider rhetorical context perhaps on balance favours another single instance of the prosperous wicked in contrast to the suffering just (Socrates has not long before been contrasted with Meletus); in the γ tradition Goches is said to be *ἐνάρετος* ('upstanding'), exactly the kind of one-to-one contrast we ought to be expecting. At any rate B.'s apparatus enables us to speculate if, like B. himself, we suspect that the printed text is probably second-best to *something*. Has Goches or Gonches begun life as *ἐνόρξης*, glossed in turn as *ἐνάρετος*?

The *Soloecista* has special problems: I am inclined to feel that B. is being a little too trustful of *ὅλους* ('dans leur intégrité') at *Sol.* 8, though none of the improvements relegated to the apparatus commend themselves. Faced with so flat and probably spurious a piece, it is hard to do anything else than be prepared to condone awkwardness, and feel there is something still eluding us.

B. finds room for useful introduction and annotation to individual opuscula, in some cases necessarily considerable: it would have been desirable to emulate Macleod's parallels in the Attic lexicographers for the faults in *Soloecista*. B. offers a considerable amount of secondary bibliography, including generous representation of the critics and opponents of the approaches of *Lucien écrivain*. Sometimes the information is basic, but at times, and especially in the supplementary notes, he has been able to smuggle in a very conveniently compressed commentary. The range is wide: B. can find useful things not only in the predecessors and constituents of Hemsterhuys's *variorum* or the latest of Bracht Branham, but even in Boldermann, of whom this reviewer thought he had long heard the last. Unfortunately Georgiadou-Larmour's commentary on *Verae historiae* appeared too late for notice to be taken of it.

There is little by way of misprint: I found a single wrong breathing in repeated samplings of the apparatus. On the translation, an anglophone preference would be for Reardon's Coucouville-les-Nuées over Bompaire's in its way more accurate Coucou-les-Nuées.

All in all, B. has raised the level of reader support from that in Volume I. He does not, and does not set out to, edge out Macleod's OCT Volume I (with the added annotation on the *Soloecista* from *LCL* Volume 8). I have not set out to apply the concept of an edition urged by the regrettable exchange between Nesselrath and Macleod, in the course of which the latter noted the forty years he had spent, into retirement, on the text of this one author. With so extensive a writer as Lucian we shall long have to be content with a product of *Ars longa vita brevis*, except for special large-scale apparatus in commentaries on individual works. Bompaire has expended enormous labour in his retirement in turn: here the result is a generously proportioned

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

companion to some of the best of the *corpus Lucianeum*. *Quaerant otiosi*, as Graevius said . . .

University of Kent GRAHAM ANDERSON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni047

THE BUDÉ LUCIAN III

J. BOMPAIRE (ed.): *Lucien: Oeuvres. Tome III. Opuscules 21–25.* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Pp. xiv + 336. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003. Paper, €65. ISBN: 2-251-00509-9.

Lucianic scholars fully acknowledge the impact that J. Bompaire's seminal monograph (*Lucien écrivain. Imitation et création* [Paris 1958, repr. 2000]) has had on later Lucianic studies. Having placed Lucian and scrutinized him against the manifold literary traditions he draws on (the background of *mimésis et culture* cultivated in the contemporary rhetorical tradition), B. paved the way for a re-evaluation of the Lucianic corpus within this tradition, but also in relation to the cultural trends in the Imperial Greek literature and the Second Sophistic. Lucianic scholarship still remains greatly indebted to B.'s work, although it has moved away from his earlier 'création mécanique' condemnation of Lucian's writings, and certainly even further away from Helm's charges of superficiality and plagiarism (*Lucian und Menipp* [Leipzig and Berlin, 1906]) to areas in which the centrality of the dialogue form, parody and humour, as well as the complexity of Lucian's compositional methods and the study of modes of transforming his sources or contexts, are given due attention (e.g. B. P. Reardon, *Courants Littéraires Grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* [Paris, 1971]; G. Anderson, *Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* [Leiden, 1976]; B. Branham, *Unruly Eloquence: Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions* [Cambridge, MA and London, 1989]).

B.'s Lucianic fervor has remained undiminished throughout the years and has finally led to the long awaited edition of Lucian's extensive corpus in the Collection Budé. This is the third volume in the Les Belles Lettres series edited by the distinguished scholar. The first and second volumes were published in 1993 and 1998 respectively, and include: a General Introduction to Lucian and his work, a lengthy discussion of the manuscript tradition that includes a detailed presentation of the successive stages towards establishing the two major families of manuscripts, β and γ (this section is somewhat disproportionate to the rest of the introduction), a survey of previous editions, translations, and scholia (Volume I, pp. XI–CLVI), together with the text, the translation, and a brief commentary (in the footnotes) on the first twenty opuscula (ten in each volume). Their order of presentation in the series is suggested by that of the codex *Vatic. Gr*. 90 of the γ family, the principal manuscript tradition upon which the present edition of Lucian's works is based. This review aims more at a general presentation and appraisal of the present volume rather than a detailed examination of views, problems, and controversies in Lucianic scholarship presented in the volume, which the editor undertakes to address.

The present volume follows the pattern established in the earlier volumes. It comprises five dialogues: *Juppiter Tragoedus*, *Gallus s. Somnium*, *Prometheus s. Caucasus*, *Icaromenippus s. Hypernephelus*, and *Timon s. Misanthropos* (nos 21–5 of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni047 Published online by Cambridge University Press