formula to explain the differences that in fact do exist between them. This relates to question (2) above. Sometimes Plutarch himself seems to express doubts whether an image is a reliable representation of a noetic world, both in single passages (like *Cim.* 2.2–5 where Plutarch describes a linguistic image as more truthful than one expressed in a work of art) and in entire writings: *De glor. Ath.* as a whole makes a case for the inferiority of any representation. This is not to say that H.-L. is unaware of the ambiguous character of representation (cf. pp. 161–5 for the good discussion of Plato's influence on Plutarch's views in imagery); rather, his interpretations tend to gloss over rather than to explore such complexities, using phrases like 'man sollte nicht jedes Wort auf die Goldwaage legen' (p. 56)—but what else should a philological reading do? It is not accidental in this context that T. Duff's *Plutarch's Lives. Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford, 1999), which recently put forward a non-unifying reading of Plutarch, is absent from H.-L.'s bibliography.

But this should not conceal the fact that future discussions especially of *De Iside* will profit from H.-L.'s book, and that in general it will make its way into Plutarch bibliographies: H.-L.'s final analysis of *De sera* in Chapter 5, for instance, shows that the author's approach can be used fruitfully for bringing out the way imagery supplements argument over the course of an entire work. Thus he argues successfully for the literary qualities of Plutarch's writings—and it is for such arguments that Plutarcheans will enjoy this book.

The proofreading of this well-produced book (which betrays its origin as a German thesis in the 'Literaturzusammenfassung' and some other passages which do no more than summarize the state of scholarship) has been meticulous for the Greek (but ἄντικρυς instead of ἀντικρύς on p. 33), yet occasional mistakes have escaped in the German (one which makes it hard to catch the sense is to be found on p. 210, before n. 181). The style is good, though at times repetitive (e.g. 'von Anfang—zu Anfang', p. 33).

Corpus Christi College, Oxford/Princeton University CHRISTIAN KAESSER

ESSAYS ON DIO CHRYSOSTOM

L. Baldi, G. Caiazza, M. di Florio, A. Ricciardi, R. Scannapieco: *Ricerche su Dione di Prusa* (Introduzione di P. Volpe e F. Ferrari). Pp. 177. Naples: Luciano Editore, 2001. Paper, L. 12,480.

With its celebrated ('novelistic') account of the hospitality of a family of good-hearted rustics, its praises of poverty and of self-sufficient country life, and its biting disquisition on the corrupt activities from which the urban poor must be shielded, the *Euboean Oration* is one of Dio Chrysostom's richest and most intriguing, and at the same time one of the most difficult to be sure one has got right. So it is appropriate that the most substantial of the papers in this volume, by members of the Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità of the Università degli Studi di Salerno, should be devoted to it. Rosario Scannapieco's intelligent and well-informed analysis, though aiming to give an account of the spirit and purposes of the oration as a whole, in practice concentrates principally on its first half, which

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.53 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he scrutinizes carefully for evidence both of the traditions of thought and expression that Dio was working in and modifying, and of Dio's own individual views.

The *Euboean*, on S.'s reading, is a utopian text, but one which seeks to register only a spiritual protest against the tyranny of present circumstances, rather than proposing itself as a programme for practical action (as argued by scholars from von Arnim to Desideri). Diagnosing a 'spiritual crisis' in Greek society, Dio can offer a vision from a vanished past (Greece's and his own), and negative criticism of contemporary degeneracy, but no detailed positive proposals. Central to his wistful message is a concept of virtuous self-sufficiency (*autarkeia*), understood not as isolationist, but as the essential precondition for active benevolence to one's fellow citizens (*philanthropia*). This draws on traditional Cynic and Stoic thinking, but modifies it in a spirit seen also in other late Hellenistic and Imperial period philosophical texts; S. is particularly attracted by the notion that Dio may have benefited from currents in Epicurean thought (seen in Philodemus and Diogenes of Oenoanda), besides those closer to home (e.g. his teacher Musonius).

This is a coherent and well thought out reading, which makes the right sorts of effort to relate the specifics of the *Euboean* to other orations of Dio's, and to his literary and philosophical background. There is much in it to argue with—for instance, I would question the idea of (Dio's notion of) a 'spiritual crisis', which seems to me over-drawn, the hypothesis of Epicurean 'influence' on Dio, and the lack of any serious attempt to relate Dio's concept of *philanthropia* to contemporary civic discourse—but that is surely all to the good.

The volume's other contributions are slighter, though none is entirely without interest and merit, and collectively they touch on a good proportion of Dio's intellectual and thematic range. Guglielmo Caiazza examines Dio's exploitation of scholarly material in the construction of his 'refutation' of the Homeric version of the story of the Trojan War in *Or*. 11, concentrating on the specific case of the Achaean wall (11.76)—a rewarding line of approach which deserves to be taken further (if not now pre-empted by Gustavo Vagnone's commentary [Rome, 2003]). Maria di Florio does what she can to extract an 'aesthetics of comedy' from Dio's very scanty mentions and citations of Aristophanes and Menander. She hints at an interesting contrast between Dio and Plutarch in this area, but lacks the space to develop it; and there are some curious gaps in her account of the reception of comedy in general in the Roman period (Horace, *Sat*. 1.4?). Anna Ricciardi explores the background to Dio's discussion of *daimones* in *Or*. 25 in earlier philosophical texts, and parallels elsewhere in the *Orations*. There is useful material here, but not everyone will share R.'s confidence that the text of this oration is complete, and that it contains Dio's own views rather than a provisional testing of his interlocutor's. Laura Baldi, finally, offers a regularized transcription of Carlo Valgulio's humanist translation of *Or*. 38 (*To the Nicomedeans, on concord with the Nicaeans*) not printed since 1497. It is disappointing that B.'s introduction is limited to a fairly general account of the contents of Dio's text, with practically nothing about the translator and his context, and her (very brief) notes to editorial matters, with no consideration of Valgulio's Latinity or translation strategies. Both this translation and, still more, the whole volume of which it forms part (containing also versions of *Or*. 39 and works by Plutarch and Aristides) would surely repay further study.

There is a fourteen-page bibliography and an index of ancient texts cited, but no general index.

King's College London M. B. TRAPP

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.53 Published online by Cambridge University Press