

Responding to doubts cast in previous scholarship (especially by J. Jouanna) on the authenticity of *Black Bile*, S. argues convincingly that this particular problem is soluble through the clear Galenic distinction between hot and cold versions of the substance. His broader defence of a consistent overall Galenic position on terminology and demarcation, however, as well as of a positive or elemental role for the substance, seems less convincing. The former depends, by his own admission, on the allowance of considerable verbal inconsistency on Galen's part; and it seems that the only clear positive function for black bile that emerges consistently is that it should not be present in excess.

Chapter 6 proceeds to an important account of black bile in physiological terms, in relation to the liver and spleen; central here is the way in which these organs deal with the 'non-ideal' black bile. But again the question arises, what is the theoretical role of the 'ideal' version? The problem is ultimately Galen's, not S.'s; nor is the latter unaware of the extent of the challenge. 'Understanding of the distinction between the three types' is, as he says, 'hindered by Galen's ... "looseness of language"' (p. 127); but he does seem to me over-optimistic in his presentation of the solution.

The last chapter examines diseases caused by black bile and its relationship with two in particular: quartan fever and melancholy (the latter conceptualised in terms of particular 'mental' diagnostic features and enjoying a rich pre- and post-Galenic history), and offers a helpful account, both of the previous tradition and of the most important Galenic texts in this area.

This is a cogently argued study, with a wealth of careful and dense textual justification. There are just a few points where the presentation of the argument could be clearer. There is also an unfortunate number of errors in Greek accentuation (a trivial enough point, although I find it hard to rid myself entirely of the fantasy that a publisher of Brill's classical credentials – not to mention prices – might stretch to editorial resources that would help eliminate such avoidable blemishes).

This work will be of great value, both as a textual resource, assembling and commenting on the most important texts on this topic, and as a stimulating and penetrating discussion of Galen's intellectual strategy and his views in this medically significant area.

Birkbeck, University of London

P. N. SINGER
p.singer@bbk.ac.uk

CASSIUS DIO REVISITED

FROMENTIN (V.), BERTRAND (E.), COLTELLONI-TRANNOY (M.), MOLIN (M.), URSO (G.) (edd.) *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*. In two volumes. (Scripta Antiqua 94.) Pp. 881. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2016. Paper, €45. ISBN: 978-2-35613-175-1.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X19000088

This ambitious publication arrives as one of the many fruits of the *Dioneia* round table, a collaboration between 24 scholars funded by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche. Since 2011 *Dioneia* had as its principal object the translation, commentary and re-edition of many books of Cassius Dio's *Roman History* in the Belles Lettres texts of the Collection des Universités de France. Eight fine new editions of Dio's books have now appeared in

the collection, with translation and commentary. In keeping with the scope of *Dioneia's* task, and as a complementary summary of the findings of the *équipe*, this volume revisits all portions of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*, exploring questions of tradition, reception, theme and style.

The two volumes contain 48 contributions (including a preface by F. Millar and general introduction by Fromentin). These are organised into three main parts: 'Tradition et réception du texte de l'*Histoire romaine*'; 'Écrire l'histoire de Rome sous les Sévères'; and 'Cassius Dion, historien du pouvoir'. Helpfully, these intimidatingly broad categories are divided into smaller sections. Almost all the contributions are in French, with half a dozen in Italian, two in English and one in German.

To draw together Dio's manuscript tradition, later reception, speeches, lexicon, sources and literary models, and narrative strategy is no easy task. For postgraduates, much of this will be very new and thought-provoking indeed. For Diophiles, however, some of the questions posed will already be familiar, and the answers given to those questions equally recognisable. Nevertheless, some of the contributions within these well-trodden sections are innovative: for example, M. Christol's analysis of Dio alongside Marius Maximus and Ulpian (Chapter 28), M. Platon on the much neglected Books 57–8 (Chapter 40) and Urso on the non-Livian tradition for the first decade (Chapter 10). Although there is inadequate room to give a full discussion of each of the chapters, a survey of noteworthy examples in each of the sections will illuminate the scope of the collection and the generally high quality of the contributions.

Chapters 2 and 3 are broad summaries of the transmission of the *Roman History*, first in the *editio princeps* (M. Bellissime) and then more widely as a source consulted in antiquity, from Herodian to John Lydus (L. Mecella). These short chapters necessarily paint with a broad brush, and the treatment is descriptive. Hence in her discussion of the debate surrounding Herodian's relationship with Dio, it is sufficient for Mecella to conclude that Herodian may have directly consulted the *Roman History* without a *Zwischenquelle* (pp. 43–4), but Mecella avoids comment on why Dio may have been an attractive option and what this indicates about the character of both works.

Chapters 4 and 5, both by U. Roberto, are especially enjoyable. These cover the reception of the *Roman History* in Peter the Patrician and in John of Antioch. Roberto argues that both authors drew from Dio, having in mind contemporary political concerns for which the *Roman History* was an ideal foil; but in using this source, both took varying liberties. Peter, often epitomising drastically, sheds precious light on the tradition of factual details, but the extent of his modifications renders him less useful for 'reconstructing' the *Roman History* (p. 67). On the other hand John of Antioch entirely altered Dio's view of the Republic. For John, the *res publica libera* was Rome's golden age, ruined by the decadence of monarchy. Accordingly, John resisted the urge to be influenced by the complex view of his source on Octavian, preferring instead a much more hostile portrait (p. 76). These excellent studies provide sound guidance on the uses to which Peter and John may, and may not, be put in our search for lost portions of Dio's narrative.

Chapters 6 and 7 discuss the epitomators of the *Roman History*, Xiphilinus (B. Berbessou-Broustet) and Zonaras (Bellissime & Berbessou-Broustet). Both deal with the critical question of the epitomators' fidelity to their original source. As is shown in these studies, Xiphilinus' and Zonaras' treatment of their source can have dramatic implications for our understanding of Dio. For example, comparison of Xiphilinus' account of Pompey's landing at Brindisi with the direct tradition (p. 88) demonstrates that the epitomator modified the original vocabulary, so creating a foreshadowing of monarchy where Dio's original did not. Thus, while the raw content may be faithful, there occur changes in emphasis. Oddly, these two chapters rarely speak to one another. The differences between

the two Byzantines are noted (p. 108), yet the direct comparison is brief (p. 101). A more synoptic overview would be a welcome conclusion to this otherwise excellent duet.

Chapters 10–13 represent a third of the section devoted to Dio's sources and models. Of these, the contributions of Urso (Chapter 10) and Fromentin (Chapter 12) are especially persuasive. Through a rich set of examples, Urso argues that Dio frequently followed pre-Livian sources in crafting his vision of early Roman history. Especially striking are the points at which Dio clearly deviated from the tradition – for example, his (unique) detail that the dyarchy of consuls was a much later development than Livy suggests (pp. 144–5) and his treatment of the 'disaster' (not so, it would seem) at Caudium (pp. 152–3). Fromentin's chapter considers Cassius Dio's use of Dionysius as a literary model, with particular emphasis on the speeches. Through comparison of Dio's speeches on the birth of the Republic (p. 184) or on Menenius Agrippa's fable (p. 188) with Dionysius' version, Fromentin suggests that Dionysius may have served as a rhetorical model for our historian.

É. Foulon's study of Dio's use of Polybius (Chapter 11) proposes that the significant differences between the two historians, from the beginning to the end of the Punic Wars, preclude a source-relationship (p. 176). The analysis, based on comparison of specific passages (pp. 165–76), is convincing, and Foulon adduces sympathetic reasons for why Dio looked elsewhere (p. 177). M. de Franchis's contribution (Chapter 13) returns to the vexed question of Dio's relationship with Livy: 'modèle, ou contre-modèle?' As de Franchis notes, this is a problematic task, and some readers may question whether this analysis fulfils it. The discussion rarely moves beyond the general, and the raw material is restricted to a few pages: for example, a few points on the lengths of speeches (pp. 196–7) and broad comments on the historians' envisaged readership (pp. 200–1). The perspective of E. Schwartz 1899 is given disproportionate treatment (pp. 191–4), and readers may question whether it is still necessary that Schwartz set the agenda.

Chapters 19–20 and 24–5 make up half of the fourth section of the volume, devoted to the Dio's narrative technique. J. Rich (Chapter 19) convincingly shows that Dio used an annalistic structure down to Book 35 with significant flexibility, sometimes even abandoning year-by-year narration altogether. In particular, the historian was more selective in the intervening periods between major conflicts. An excellent follow-on to this chapter is provided by M. Coudry (Chapter 20). Thanks to the editors' thoughtful distribution, Coudry neatly picks up the thread with a study of Dio's narrative methods in Books 36–44. Coudry demonstrates the historian's increased use of biographical techniques as his subject progressed. Importantly, Coudry argues that the historian deployed these character-sketches in order to explore historical problems integral to his explanation of the decline of the Republic (esp. pp. 293, 295).

Later in this section, Bellissime (Chapter 24) investigates Dio's margin of artistic license in composing the speeches. Eschewing the approach that has traditionally dominated this topic, Bellissime shelves questions of 'historicity' and instead suggests that we search for 'verisimilitude'. This, as Bellissime convincingly argues, is far more appropriate to the tenets of rhetorical education. There is sensible discussion here of Dio's training in the *progymnasmata* – a topic usually (and oddly) ignored in the study of Dio's speeches (e.g. pp. 364–5, 368–9). This chapter is followed neatly by S. Gotteland's contribution on Dio's use of ἔκφρασις and ἐνάργεια in the battle-narratives (Chapter 25). In a fresh analysis on the battles of Naulochus (pp. 386–90) and Cappadocia (pp. 390–3), Gotteland shows that the historian not only crafted such set pieces to show his mastery of the rhetorical schools. Rather, such use of ἔκφρασις could fulfil explanatory functions also, turning the spectators of Naulochus into active participants and so underscoring the universal impact of civil war: in civil war no one is truly a mere spectator.

Volume 2 consists of shorter sections, opening with a collection of three chapters on Dio's identity as a Roman senator of the Severan age. Notable here is Molin's contribution (Chapter 29), which uses the programmatic speeches of Agrippa and Maecenas in Book 52 as a point of departure for exploring wider questions about Dio's perspective on his own age. This is a familiar approach, and some of the conclusions are widely understood: for example, that Dio articulates a view of a collaborative and 'senatorial' monarchy (pp. 469–70) or retrojects into Augustus' time concerns about the Severan age (pp. 471–6). Likewise, many readers will already recognise the picture of a conservative senator painted in the conclusions.

The next section, 'Dire en grec les choses romaines', is also a collection of three contributions, opening with a rigorous study by Coudry of Dio's Greek institutional vocabulary for Republican practices (Chapter 30). In a marked departure from purely philological work (p. 485), Coudry rather explores *why* Dio chose between translation, transliteration or equivalence of Latin institutional terms, and how his commentary on these terms fits within his political reflection on the declining Republic. Coudry shows that Dio often translated with high levels of precision in order to explore topics of political significance, for example concerning the term *legatus* (pp. 488–9); likewise, Dio's remarkable care with regard to institutional vocabulary could serve polemical functions (p. 488). Furthermore, Coudry shows that, where Dio seeks less precision, using catch-all terms such as νομοθετεῖν for the legislative process, this emerges not from ignorance, but rather a deliberate simplification in order to focalise the central issues at stake (p. 497).

A very different study of the historian's political reflection is given by C. Ando (Chapter 35) within a further collection of three chapters devoted to Dio and the Roman πολιτεία. In an innovative analysis, Ando pairs the Agrippa–Maecenas controversy of Book 52 with Book 53 in order to explore Dio's view of the paradox of imperial rule. Ando makes three claims (pp. 576–7): first, that for Cassius Dio 'legitimacy' was based on the conduct of the emperor in office, not the means by which he attained it; second, that the tension between the conventional communication of power on the one hand and the corrosive effect of possessing it on the other was an unresolved (and perhaps unresolvable) problem; and third, that Dio viewed historiography as a potential remedy. Maecenas' proposals to Augustus establish a dichotomy between public communication and the realities of power, which from the very birth of the Principate would be deleterious and irreconcilable. The analysis is insightful and a delight to read.

The subsequent section consists of five chapters centred around the function and dysfunction of institutions, following on neatly from Ando's contribution. Of these I restrict my comments to two case studies: Coudry on Senate and magistrates in the 50s BCE (Chapter 38) and Platon on the Senate under Tiberius (Chapter 40). Coudry explores Dio's presentation of matters of constitutional law and convention, followed by a discussion of the magistrates in Books 36–40. What clearly emerges is Dio's historical interest in the destructive impact of innovation and dysfunction (p. 613): thus the exiled Senate in Thessalonica clings to titles at once both traditional and yet an inversion of the proper order (p. 623). These books are not a story of 'great men', but rather a history of the Republic as a political regime (p. 624). In a similar way, Platon suggests that we may view the imperial portions of Dio's work as much as a 'senatorial' history as an imperial history. Platon shows that for Dio, the gradual breakdown in relationship between Tiberius and the Senate in Books 57–8 was attributable not only to the flaws in the *princeps*' character, but also to fundamental structural issues: notably, the corrosive cycle of flattery prevalent in monarchies. Dio's Tiberius and Dio's Senate simply do not understand one another, and communicate in radically different ways.

The closing part of Volume 2 addresses Dio's responses to imperial expansion in six chapters. This section opens with Bertrand's study of Cassius Dio's view of Roman imperialism (Chapter 41): this is an authoritative and convincing synthesis that provides excellent context for the ensuing five chapters. As Bertrand notes (p. 679), Dio's theoretical view on Rome's empire is usually studied from the perspective of political changes (μεταβολαί). But here instead, Bertrand attributes these μεταβολαί explicitly to Roman imperialism in Dio, not only for the Republican period but for the imperial period also. Bertrand connects, rather than divides, these two periods in a meaningful way: for example, her survey of Dio's lexicon shows that his Greek translation for *imperium populi Romani* only appears with the subjugation of Egypt in 30 BCE and recurs regularly thereafter (pp. 684–5), revealing a gradual development. The discussion is crisp and persuasive. To move from Bertrand's synthesis to a more specific case study, G. Brizzi focuses on eastern campaigns in the *Roman History* (Chapter 44). Brizzi shows that Dio's general attitude to Roman imperial expansion in the east is unfavourable, from Crassus (pp. 744–7) to Septimius Severus. This long and scholarly chapter is rich in evidence and gives a wide treatment of Dio's account. Analysis of the *Roman History* itself is, however, rather brief, and many of the wider questions are left unexplored, for example the degree to which Dio complements or corrects other narratives or introduces distinctive material.

This is a fine collection. All sections hang together, and the contributions are coherently organised, often in meaningful series. Although many chapters revisit familiar questions, several interrogate these in thought-provoking ways; a few break new ground. Moreover, the presentational standard is very high (minor errors on pp. 42, 575, 660, 741, 790), including a full bibliography and an *index locorum*. The contents page at the back of each volume is a luxury the reader can manage without (pp. 415–17, 799–881), and in view of the impressive range of topics such space might be more helpfully devoted to an editors' conclusion, akin in scope to the general introduction (pp. 11–16). Nevertheless, this excellent volume fulfils its aim – to synthesise over 50 years of research since Millar's *Study* – and will remain for many years an essential resource for any specialist working on this now much better-understood historian.

The University of Kent

CHRISTOPHER BURDEN-STREVENS

c.burden-stevens@kent.ac.uk

QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS' *POSTHOMERICA*

SCHEIJNEN (T.) *Quintus of Smyrna's Posthomerica. A Study of Heroic Characterization and Heroism. (Mnemosyne Supplements 421.)* Pp. xviii + 393, colour figs. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018. Cased, €138, US\$166. ISBN: 978-90-04-37343-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X19001252

Widely held to have been written in the third century AD, Quintus Smyrnaeus' (of Smyrna) *Posthomerica* famously fills the narrative gap between the end of the *Iliad*, where Hector's funeral takes place, and the beginning of the *Odyssey*, as the hero begins his long travels home; the attentive reader soon notices the lines of epic convergence and then the engagement with Homer, including use of similes, type-scenes and characterisation. But, in