DIO'S *BORYSTHENITICUS*

H.-G. Nesselrath, B. Bäbler, M. Forschner, A. de Jong: *Dion von Prusa. Menschliche Gemeinschaft und göttliche Ordnung: Die Borysthenes-Rede. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen*. (SAPERE: Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam REligionemque pertinentia 6.) Pp. 207. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003. Cased, SFr 49.90/€29.90. ISBN: 3-534-15572-6.

The declared aims of the series to which this volume belongs are: to bring relatively neglected texts of the first four centuries A.D., bearing on religion and ethics, to the attention of an interested public; to expound them without superstitious regard for disciplinary boundaries; and, for each, to catch its distinctive flavour (*sapere*/ SAPERE). A general introduction is followed by a text with facing translation, a set of notes keyed to the translation, and a series of essays by different hands, with indexes and bibliography to conclude. It is a neat formula (very tidily presented), and Dio Chrysostom's *Borysthenitikos* (*Or*. 36) is an excellent choice for this kind of treatment. In an epideictic speech, which is also a first-person narrated dialogue, Dio tells of a visit he made to the remote Greek frontier town of Borysthenes (Olbia) on the north shores of the Black Sea, and of the instruction he there gave its inhabitants on the subject of the true (human and cosmic) city. This is among the most sophisticated literary products of the first two centuries A.D., of central importance for our understanding of both rhetorical culture and philosophical ideology in the period, and it raises questions over a range that no one scholar can deal with convincingly on his or her own.

Heinz-Günther Nesselrath contributes the text (based on Donald Russell's of 1992, but with some well thought-out variations) and the translation, as well as the introduction. Balbina Bäbler gives a lucid survey of the archaeology and history of Olbia, followed by a discussion of the ways Dio may have manipulated the data for his own particular ideological ends. She is admirably clear on the point that Dio is not engaged in descriptive geography or ethnography, but slants his account so as to speak to his own fellow citizens back home in Prusa; she also broaches (but does not do much with) the important issue of Dio's manipulations of the ideas of Hellenism and barbarism. Maximilian Forschner, in dealing with the political and philosophical aspects of the oration, is likewise rightly emphatic that we have to keep the question of what Dio was trying to get across to his Prusan audience firmly in view. He concludes that Dio's essential message is to do with the integration of Greek cities and their ruling élites into the structure of the Roman Empire, for which the pattern is set by the harmonious operation of the cosmos under its supreme God; and he suggests that this use of the cosmos as a pattern for human political organization (rather than as an alternative to human political states) makes Dio a Platonist rather than the Stoic he is usually taken to be. To my mind this gets Dio in general, and the specific emphases of this oration, wrong in several important respects; but it is undeniably an intelligently revisionary reading. Albert de Jong, finally, tackles the 'myth of the Magi' with which the oration ends, arguing that Dio's confection is neither a free invention nor based on genuine Zoroastrian sources, but rather built out of earlier Greek accounts of Persian religious ritual and thought. The conclusion is not new, but it is here set on a sounder footing than before, by a scrupulous demonstration of the discrepancies between Dio's

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni046 Published online by Cambridge University Press