Narratological perspectives on Dio Chrysostom's *Orations* 7, 12, and 36: ethics, rhetoric, pedagogy

Christos Chatzigiannis

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
PhD

The University of Leeds
School of Languages, Cultures, and Societies

October 2022

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The right of Christos Chatzigiannis to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by Christos Chatzigiannis in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Abstract

The present thesis examines from a narratological point of view the rhetorical dynamics between Dio Chrysostom and his readers in orations 7 (the *Euboicus*), 12 (the *Olympicus*), and 36 (the *Borystheniticus*). In these orations, Dio develops a pedagogical relationship with the readers by presenting himself as a respectable exiled intellectual and moral teacher and the readers as students in a philosophy class.

To achieve this relational depth with the readers Dio relies on various rhetorical resources each time, such as the employment of a protagonist as his alter ego, the use of authorial narration, character narration, and character-character dialogue, the development of narratorial (un)reliability and metanarratological comments, the organisation of narrative time and space, the characterisation of the narratees, etc. Through the use of rhetorical resources Dio not only affects the readers' possible responses (cognitive, affective, ethical, aesthetic) to the narratives, but also is affected by them. Thus the readers become active participants in the composition of the narratives, not mere recipients of authorial intentions.

In the *Euboicus*, the exemplification of the differences between city life and country life prompts Dio to communicate moral, social, and political messages to the readers and to lead them towards a more ethical way of living. In the *Olympicus*, the discussion of aesthetic and religious issues informs the readers about the best human conception of the divine. Lastly, in the *Borystheniticus*, the literary, philosophical, and religious materials underlying the narrative are merged into a successful educational lesson for diverse kinds of readers.

Table of Contents

Introduction

1.1. Aims and scope of the thesis

1.1.1. The Second Sophistic

In recent decades there has been an increasing interest in the works of imperial Greek authors collectively known as the Second Sophistic. The term was coined by Philostratus (*VS* 1.480) and designated a group of Greek intellectuals, starting from Aeschines in the fourth century BC and ending with those in the third century AD, with common political, social, as well as cultural characteristics. Although Philostratus' account is thought to be biased, serving personal purposes,[1] it nevertheless offers a significant insight into the overall presentation of the sophists.

Modern research has been inconsistent in its application of the Philostratean term.[2] Initially, Rohde considered it as a late flowering of Hellenism,[3] Wilamowitz as the product of Philostratean fiction,[4] and Schmid as a type of declining oratorical style.[5] Others regarded it as a social group of Greek intellectuals in the Imperial period, which had a notable impact on Roman politics[6] and celebrated its Greekness.[7] Newer approaches have shed light on several other perspectives, such as the external appearance of the sophists,[8] their relationship with the Greek cultural past[9] and with Roman intellectuals,[10] and their social formation[11] and role in

---

[1] Anderson 1986 *passim*; Eshleman 2008; Schmitz 2009; Kemezis 2011.
[2] See the introductory chapters in Whitmarsh 2005 and in Johnson and Richter 2017. For a general introduction see Anderson 1993.
[3] Rohde 1886.
[4] Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1900. After Wilamowitz, other scholars have also regarded the Second Sophistic as a fictional concept of Philostratean imagination: e.g. Swain 1991; Brunt 1994.
[5] Schmid 1887-96.
[6] Bowersock 1969.
[7] Bowie 1974; Swain 1996; Schmitz 1997.
[8] Gleason 1995; Connolly 2001a.
[9] Whitmarsh 2001a; Whitmarsh 2013; Dench 2017.
[10] Habinek 2017; Bloomer 2017.
[11] Eshleman 2012.

politics.[12] Scholarly attention on the Second Sophistic has thus resulted in a good number of edited volumes considering, among other topics, the sophists' political activity and social outlook, their educational role, and their relationship to previous Greek literature.[13]

The collective characteristics shared between the sophists affirm the legitimacy of the term Second Sophistic. First of all, apart from a wealthy familial background, experience in rhetoric and philosophy – the two cornerstones of higher education in antiquity – ensured the successful entrance of sophists into the political arena and secured a respectable place in society.[14] Nevertheless, to thrive in politics also meant to participate actively in social networks: most of the sophists maintained good relationships with people of high rank, even with the emperor himself, and thus had an impact upon members of the elite and non-elite.[15] Due to their popularity, they enjoyed political privileges in their native cities, and in some cases these privileges were extended to other cities of the Roman empire.[16] Mobility within the Roman empire is another common characteristic between the sophists: they were often appointed as representatives of cities, with the task to communicate to the Roman authorities issues that had arisen there. Thus they were bridging a significant gap between cities and the Roman palace. Yet, in every instance, the sophists did not forget their Greek identity: by showcasing their connection with Greek history and culture, they were reading and quoting famous authors of the past, such as Plato, Xenophon, Demosthenes, and others, whose work still had invaluable educational value.[17]

The work of the sophists is therefore multidimensional: not only does it form a dynamic communication with the Greek cultural past by reintroducing it to the (Greek and non-Greek)

---

[12] Horst 2013; Jarratt 2019.

[13] Goldhill 2001; Borg 2004a; Cordovana and Galli 2007; Schmidt and Fleury 2011; Richter and Johnson 2017.

[14] On the importance of rhetoric and philosophy in education see Marrou 1948, 291-321; Cribiore 2001, 220-44. Connolly 2001b, esp. 341-2; Bonner 2012, 250-76; Webb 2017.

[15] For the relationship between the elite and non-elite see Henderson 2011.

[16] Bowersock 1969, ch. 3.

[17] Above all, the sophists adopted the Atticistic style by imitation of these authors (Kim 2017).

Imperial world, but also it initiates a lively dialogue with Rome, both as a constitutional power and as a culturally different people. Whether the sophists cultivated a friendly or a less favourable image of Rome is debatable and differs from author to author;[18] however, what is beyond question is that they never remained apathetic towards the potential consequences of the uncontrollable expansion of Roman power, which could cause harm to the sense of individuality of smaller, subjected nations. The work of the sophists thus constitutes an insightful – and in many cases unique – reflection of the cultural, social, and political tensions of the Imperial Hellenism.[19]

The ancient (Philostratean) and modern uses of the term 'Second Sophistic' imply that one can either accept it as a term collectively describing a specific category of sophists, or reject it as a product of Philostratean fantasy and as a problematic term causing more confusion than clarity. For some, the Second Sophistic has gone well beyond the point of characterising only the sophists and thus includes any kind of author (orator, philosopher, poet, historian, etc.), Greek, Roman, Jewish, or of other ethnicity, whose work falls in the first three centuries of the Imperial period.[20]

---

[18] On this issue see the discussion in Whitmarsh 2005, 8-13.

[19] I adopt the term from Desideri 2019.

[20] See Johnson and Richter 2017, 4: 'appropriating the term [Second Sophistic] for a more general designation, to signal an era centered on the second century with defining characteristics (…) that go well beyond Greek sophists or even Greek literature.'

1.1.2. Dio Chrysostom: biography and oeuvre

Among the sophists presented by Philostratus, Δίων ὁ Προυσαεύς (Dio of Prusa), later known as Χρυσόστομος ('Chrysostom' or 'golden-mouthed'),[21] occupies a prominent position.[22] The biographical details about his life come from some of his works that are considered as autobiographical and from his subsequent biographers, Philostratus and Synesius.[23] In these sources, there is general agreement about Dio's early life: he came from a respectable family in Prusa (modern Bursa, north-western Turkey),[24] a city in Bithynia with a rich political, economic, and cultural history.[25] He received an advanced παιδεία ('education', 'culture') from well-known professionals,[26] comprising a detailed study of rhetoric and philosophy, and subsequently he established himself as a teacher of rhetoric[27] and as a popular orator.[28] His

---

[21] The nickname was added by later scholars (already in the rhetor Menander, *On Epideictic speeches* 389, 13-390, 4 Spengel) to honour his admirable prowess in rhetoric and to distinguish him from the historian Dio Cassius, who was possibly a relative of Dio of Prusa (Freyburger-Galland 2016). See also Jones 1978, 7; Brancacci 1985, 207-8; Gowing 1990; Amato 2014, 32-3.

[22] Philostratus categorises Dio among the intellectuals who displayed equally philosophical and rhetorical-sophistic characteristics. The other two groups are the first sophists (Gorgias, Protagoras, Hippias, etc.) and the *stricto sensu* sophists (Scopelianus, Dionysius of Miletus, Lollianus, etc.).

[23] Philostratus refers to Dio in the *VS* and in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*; Synesius in his *Dio*.

[24] Dio offers an interesting account of the social status of his parents in *or*. 44.3. That his father's name was Pasicrates is mentioned for the first time in Photius *Bibl*. 165A (see also *Suda, Δ* 1240).

[25] Von Arnim 1898, 116-8; Jones 1978, 1-7; Harris 1980 (esp. 883-94); Bekker-Nielsen 2008; Madsen 2009 (esp. 107-18).

[26] Jones 1978, 8. The citizens who 'use[d] [their] *paideia* as one of several elements of social distinction' (Borg 2004b, 165, n. 42) were called πεπαιδευμένοι ('learned men', 'people of culture'). On the term see also Anderson 1989; Anderson 1993, 7-10 *et passim*. Schmitz 1997 *passim*; Whitmarsh 2001a, ch. 2; Galli 2001; Conolly 2001, 348-52; Jones 2004; Schmitz 2017; Fron 2021, 66-72 *et passim*. Dio was a student of the Stoic philosopher Musonius Rufus (Fronto, *I.1* Naber; Lucian, *Peregr*. 18; Synesius, *Dio* 9): Jones 1978, 12-4; Whitmarsh 2001b, 271 *et passim*; Inwood 2017, 255.

[27] Dio was the teacher of Favorinus from Arelate and of other students (cf. *or*. 30). Two of his texts (*orr*. 37 and 64) are attributed to Favorinus. On the relationship with Favorinus see Swain 1989 *passim*; Amato 1995; Amato 2014, ch. 8.

[28] Philostr. *Ap*., 5.27-40 describes a fictional (Bowie 1978, 1660-62) encounter between Dio, Euphrates, Apollonius of Tyana, and Vespasian. In *VS* 1.488, he also depicts Dio as sitting by Trajan on the latter's chariot, while the emperor admires Dio's rhetorical talent. These two episodes, despite being fictional, show his rhetorical talent and inclusion in a powerful social network of people of high status.

birth was most likely between 40-45 AD;[29] he was thus a contemporary of Plutarch and might have known him.[30]

For the next period of his life, the consensus among the three sources diminishes. First of all, Dio himself, in a supposedly autobiographical account (*or*. 13), mentions that his association with a man (probably Flavius Sabinus, Domitian's cousin, who was suspected of plotting against the emperor and was eventually executed)[31] put him at great risk: by using the phrases ὅτε φεύγειν συνέβη 'when it fell to my lot to be exiled' and μὲ φεύγειν ἔδοξεν 'it was decided for me to leave', Dio suggests that he was banished from the Roman empire,[32] although his land and possessions in Prusa were not confiscated.[33] During this time, he goes on, he visited multiple places and met various people: for instance, he mentions a journey as far as the land of Γέται ('Getae'), for whom he composed an ethnographic work, the Γετικά (*Getika*), now lost,[34] and another one in Olbia (*or*. 36), in which he met the Borysthenites, who were admirers of Homer and Greek customs in general.

Philostratus presents a rather different image. According to the biographer, the Roman empire under Domitian was not safe for Dio anymore; he deliberately fled from the Roman

---

[29] Schmid 1905, 849-50 argues that his birth is no later than 40. Jones 1978, 133 and Jackson 2017, 217 propose more generally 40-50. Swain 2000, 1 suggests a time around 45.

[30] Although the two authors do not mention each other in their works, Swain 1996, 187 believes that their common social, political, and cultural background might have brought them together at some point.

[31] von Arnim 1898, 230; Schmid 1903, 853; Desideri 1978, 189; Jones 1978, 46; Swain 1996, 189 (n.8); Moles 2005, 120-1. Conversely, Sidebottom 1996 argues that his patron was L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus, whose fall instigated Dio's exile; however, this suggestion has not found support.

[32] *Or*. 13.1: Ὅτε φεύγειν συνέβη με φιλίας ἕνεκεν λεγομένης ἀνδρὸς οὐ πονηροῦ, τῶν δὲ τότε εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ ἀρχόντων ἐγγύτατα ὄντος, διὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἀποθανόντος, δι' ἃ πολλοῖς καὶ σχεδὸν πᾶσιν ἐδόκει μακάριος, διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων οἰκειότητα καὶ ξυγγενείαν 'When it fell to my lot to be exiled on account of my reputed friendship with a man of good character and very closely connected with those who at that time were Fortune's favourites and indeed high officials, a man who lost his life on account of the very things which made him seem fortunate to many men, and indeed to practically everyone, I mean his connection by marriage and blood with these officials'. On the concept of φυγή ('exile') in *or*. 13 see Bekker-Nielsen 2014. On the passivity that Dio uses to present the exile in the same oration see Krause 2003, 39.

[33] *Or*. 40.2. See also Jones 1978, 46.

[34] On the work see Terrei 2000. Desideri's proposition (2019, 299) that the *Getika* would describe an ideal community, such as those in *orr*. 7 and 36, is tempting.

empire to avoid the same fate as Flavius.[35] Upon Domitian's assassination in 96 AD, he brought himself out of the misery he had been enduring for years and returned to the empire. Synesius' narrative, however, differs considerably from that of Philostratus and seems to agree with Dio's remarks in *or*. 13: Dio was condemned by Domitian and therefore his exile was compulsory rather than deliberate. Synesius implies that Dio was obliged to accept a decision made on his behalf, as he was unable to do otherwise.

In an attempt to discern historical truth in the three differing accounts, von Arnim and Schmid agree that the exile was involuntary and lasted until the assassination of Domitian.[36] However, they generally overlook a crucial point: Dio's autobiographical details cannot be taken at face value, since they amalgamate reality with fiction. In *or*. 13 and in several other supposedly autobiographical narratives,[37] Dio constructs an artificial self-portrait, a fictional 'mask', to present his exile as a personally lived experience and less as a historical account.[38] He also develops a distorted image of the conditions of his exile by presenting himself as a man who was destined to be banished in order to discover the therapeutic power of philosophy.[39]

In *or*. 13 particularly, Dio portrays himself as a philosopher who was recalled from the exile.[40] He says that he wore rags, was unshaved, and wandered around like a beggar (cf. *orr*. 7 and 13); even people looking at him thought that he was a philosopher (13.11). These

---

[35] *VS* 1.488: τὴν δὲ ἐς τὰ Γετικὰ ἔθνη πάροδον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς φυγὴν μὲν οὐκ ἀξιῶ ὀνομάζειν, ἐπεὶ μὴ προσετάχθη αὐτῷ φυγεῖν, οὐδὲ ἀποδημίαν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ φανεροῦ ἐξέστη κλέπτων ἑαυτὸν ὀφθαλμῶν τε καὶ ὤτων καὶ ἄλλα ἐν ἄλλῃ γῇ πράττων δέει τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν τυραννίδων, ὑφ᾽ ὧν ἠλαύνετο φιλοσοφία πᾶσα 'his visit to the Getic tribes I cannot rightly call exile, since he had not been ordered to go into exile, yet it was not merely a traveller's tour, for he vanished from men's sight, hiding himself from their eyes and ears, and occupying himself in various ways in various lands, through fear of the tyrants in the capital at whose hands all philosophy was suffering persecution.', trans. Wright 1922.

[36] von Arnim 1898; Schmid 1905.

[37] E.g. *orr*. 7, 15, 19, 28, 36, 45, 47, 50, 52.1-5.

[38] On this see the detailed study of Krause 2003.

[39] Jones 1978, 46-7. Moles 1978 argues that the Dionic narrative of the thirteenth oration offers a case of self-dramatisation and, similarly, Whitmarsh 2001b, 285 suggests a 'self-consciously sophistic manipulation of [Dio's] own biography'. See also Jouan 1993; Moles 2005; Desideri 2007.

[40] See also Jackson 2017, 219.

autobiographical details, despite offering a vivid description of his outlook, cannot be considered as accurate representations of the historical circumstances of his life.

The same holds true for his biographers too. Philostratus constructs a fictional narrative about the willingness of Dio to avoid danger by fleeing from the Roman empire (which contradicts what Dio states in *or.* 13), whereas Synesius makes up a story about Dio's conversion from rhetoric to philosophy, which is rather doubtful.

Synesius' argument that Dio abandoned rhetoric once and for all by devoting himself to philosophy cannot be taken at face value for a number of reasons: first of all, the Dionic works that Synesius classifies as post-exilic have, apart from a philosophical tone, a strong rhetorical interest, style, and expression.[41] In addition, Dio's career in deliberative and epideictic oratory flourished after the exile, as numerous works show.[42] The most important reason, however, is that the opinion of Synesius serves personal purposes: a follower of Neoplatonism, Synesius supported the strict moral opposition between philosophy, which equalled truth, and sophistic and oratory, which were synonymous with deception. Thus Synesius modelled Dio as the intellectual who supposedly turned his back to the deceptive sophistic and oratory and honoured philosophy instead.[43]

Synesius takes the Dionic fictional self-portrait as factual and presents the exile as a decisive moment for the 'historical' transition of Dio to a philosophical βίος ('way of life'). However, Dio's exilic narrative serves as a means of authorial reintroduction to the public through a new, more philosophically-oriented image that could fit that of other philosophers who had also experienced exile, such as Diogenes and Musonius Rufus.[44]

---

[41] See e.g. *orr.* 1-4, 7, 12, 36.
[42] E.g. *orr.* 1-4, 12, 33-5, 38, 39, 40, 41, 62.
[43] On Synesius' depiction of Dio and the personal reasons behind it see Brancacci 1985, ch. 4; Seng 2006.
[44] On the similarities with Musonius see Whitmarsh 2001b *passim*.

In the third, post-exilic period of Dio's life, the author is mainly depicted as a political thinker, composing speeches for cities in Bithynia (Prusa, Apamea, Tarsus, Nicomedia, and Nicaea) and elsewhere (Rhodes and probably Alexandria).[45] In these orations he shows how well-informed about local political matters he is: he strives to establish political stability through ὁμόνοια ('concord') among the cities of Bithynia, since internal rivals could undermine, and ultimately cause harm to, the citizens themselves;[46] in Rhodes, he criticises the thoughtless subjection of the citizens to Roman power and warns that flattery can be the worst means for political influence; in Alexandria, he brings the attention of the citizens to their excessive focus on enjoyment and advises them not to take social and political matters lightly. Dio vividly presents the image of an intellectual, not distanced from public affairs, but rather socially and politically active, putting his rhetorical and philosophical knowledge in the service of common good.

As a political thinker, Dio raises interesting questions about Roman power. Although never condemning it overtly, he is fairly reserved, avoiding adopting a warm tone towards it. Roman imperialism is for him a means of absolute political control, which could, under specific circumstances, endanger the prosperity of individual cities. Nevertheless, he acknowledges that Roman control is undeniable and that to refuse its influence on different nations is daydreaming. For as long as the emperor administers matters correctly, individuals can thrive and prosper.[47] For this reason, he suggests that the emperor must be a just and honest ruler,

---

[45] There is no chronological consensus about *or.* 32 (*To the people of Alexandria*): it is dated either in the beginning of the Flavian era or of the Antonine period. On the dating see Jones 1978, 134; Desideri 1978, 68; Sidebottom 1992; Kasprzyk and Vendries 2012, 81-3.

[46] On the concept of concord see Stanton 1973, 359-61; Jones 1978, ch. 10; Andrei 1981; Berry 1983; Salmeri 2000 *passim*; Kremmydas 2021.

[47] *Orr.* 1-4, 6, 56, 62 reflect his stance towards emperors and monarchy. See also Valdenberg 1927; Jones 1978, ch. 13; Sidebottom 1996; Whitmarsh 2001a, 183-90; Jarratt 2019, 38-41.

without losing control or his temper. In other words, for Dio, the Roman empire can help individuals and cities thrive, on condition that the emperor fulfils his role as a good leader.[48]

In his last works, Dio is once again depicted as the victim of enmity and slander, although this time it is not an emperor like Domitian who mistreats him, but some of his Prusan fellow-citizens. In particular, he maintains, he was accused of not showing in advance his architectural plans for the beautifying of Prusa (which he aspired to achieve by using public money) and of dishonouring Trajan by placing the tombs of his wife and his son next to the statue of the emperor.[49] The accusation was made by Flavius Archippus, with whom Dio seemed to have an old quarrel, and Eumolpus, who was Flavius' advocate.[50]

Dio thematises momentous incidents of his life and presents them as narrative motifs with significant moral meanings. His friendship with Flavius Sabinus precipitated his exile, which, in turn, made him more intellectually durable and curious about the systems of political power and oppression. This intellectual curiosity, as we might call it, was responsible for the creation of feelings of hostility against him, when he was accused of an immoral act that he never committed. Thus through his works, Dio develops a fictional autobiography by presenting himself as a victim of political inequalities and as a man who strived to find (moral) stability in a continuously declining world.

---

[48] On his relationship with Roman power see Jones 1978, ch. 14; Méthy 1994; Swain 1996, 191-2 *et passim*; Salmeri 2000; Desideri 2011, 91-4; Guerber 2016; Jackson 2017, 222-6.

[49] Jones 1978, ch. 12.

[50] Cf. Pliny, *Ep*. 10 (dated ca. 109-110 AD). The result of the trial is unknown, but Pliny the Younger, who was appointed as judge, admits that Flavius and Archippus failed to submit their written statements on time. Pliny also discovered through autopsy that the second accusation was incorrect, since the tombs were situated far from the the statue of the emperor. Pliny thus lets us infer that Dio was eventually acquitted.

1.1.3. Characterisation of Dio: ancient and modern perspectives

It is interesting to see how Dio provides cases of self-characterisation in his work.[51] First of all, he regards himself as a philosopher, rather than as a sophist or an orator. For Dio, the name sophist has negative connotations[52] and is reserved for the first sophists (such as Prodicus, Gorgias, and Hippias, whose deceptiveness is compared to the true wisdom of Socrates)[53] and for those of his contemporaries who falsely claim to be wise. Dio calls the sophists charlatans and immoral eunuchs,[54] κακοδαίμονες ('wretched') and quarrelsome.[55] The title of ῥήτωρ ('orator')[56] also has negative connotations when used for the demagogues who employed their rhetorical talent for unethical purposes,[57] but positively when describing popular orators of the past (Demosthenes, Lysias, etc.), whom Dio seemed to admire.[58]

Due to his polemic against the immoral behaviour of certain sophists and orators, Dio chooses for himself the title of philosopher, particularly the one actively engaged in social matters and politics, rather than the philosopher showing an apathetic stance towards community and common good. In his formation of this model of philosopher, he was undoubtedly influenced by Stoicism, Platonism, and Cynicism.[59] Dio's early view of philosophers is not so black-or-white as Synesius believed.[60] Indeed, in multiple works Dio

---

[51] This is typical of fictional autobiographies. Other examples of the Imperial period are Lucian (e.g. *The Dream*, *Twice Accused*, *How to Write History*, *Peregrinus*) and Aelius Aristides (e.g. *Sacred Tales*).

[52] Plato's negative characterisation of the first sophists may have influenced Dio's derogatory use of the term.

[53] *Or*. 54.1. The comparison between Socrates and the first sophists is rhetorical, though, since it belongs to a certain type of προγύμνασμα ('preparatory exercise'), called σύγκρισις ('comparison', lat. *comparatio*). See also Fornaro 2009, 6-7.

[54] *Orr*. 4.33-5; 12.13.

[55] *Orr*. 8.9; 11.6.

[56] *Or*. 43.6: οὐ γάρ εἰμι ῥήτωρ ('I am not an orator'). For Dio, an orator is specialised in deliberative and judicial speeches (see e.g. the orator in *or*. 7).

[57] *Orr*. 8.9; 22.1-5.

[58] *Orr*. 18.11; 2.18.

[59] See e.g. François 1921; Brunt 1973; Brancacci 1980; Brancacci 2000; Trapp 2000; Brancacci 2017; Moreschini 2016; Jackson 2017, 218; Reydams-Schils 2017 *passim*.

[60] Synesius argues that Dio's youth was marked by a severe attack against philosophers and uses two lost Dionic works as testimony: Κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων (*Against Philosophers*) and Πρὸς Μουσώνιον (*To Musonius*). Nevertheless, these works do not necessarily imply an overall attack against philosophers, but, probably, a critique of specific kinds of philosophers, such as those philosophers who used their intellectual capacities to deceive

praises philosophers of the past, such as Diogenes, Socrates, Plato, and others,[61] and talks about a moderate kind of philosopher who is mindful of when and where to speak and what to say.[62] These elements lead us to the conclusion that, as in the case of orators, Dio categorises philosophers in two groups: on the one hand, those who act professionally and ethically and on the other, those who act unprofessionally and unethically and are thus rightly criticised. It goes without saying that he clearly positions himself in the former category.

Dio's preference for the name of philosopher to that of sophist or orator does not imply an absolute denial of sophistic or rhetoric. Rhetoric and philosophy were the top courses in education, meaning that a philosopher could make use of rhetorical elements and an orator of philosophical concepts. In the Dionic works that Synesius categorised as purely philosophical there are numerous rhetorical elements in the vocabulary, the style, and the structure. It can thus be assumed that Dio invents a clever strategy of self-presentation by calling himself a philosopher and by composing his work in a highly rhetorical style and language.

Philostratus and Synesius attempt to give a historical account of the biography of Dio, thus failing to distinguish between the historical Dio and the fictional Dio, as presented in his works. Judging from Dionic remarks about Domitian in *or*. 13, Philostratus presents Dio as an oppressed man who suffered the emperor's tyrannical unfairness. Similarly, Synesius' insistence on Dio's transition from orator to philosopher also stems from Dio's adoption of a philosophical identity in his post-exilic work. From these, we can infer that Dio's fictional self-characterisation must have influenced the accounts of his biographers to the extent that they do not distinguish between fiction and reality.[63]

---

people, or those who presented themselves as philosophers, but abstained from any social and political interaction. See also Amato 2014, ch. 4.

[61] E.g. *orr*. 2, 6, 8, 36, 37, 53, 54, 70, 71, 72.

[62] E.g. in the pre-exilic *or*. 71, Dio reflects on the duties of a σώφρων ('prudent') and σοφός ('wise') philosopher.

[63] Other ancient authors too have formed assumptions about Dio, based on his fictional representation: Quintilian (*Inst. or*. III, 3.8) and Epictetus (*Gnom*. III, 23.16-9) regard Dio as a pure orator and sophist, whereas Lucian stresses Dio's importance as a philosopher (*Peregrin*. 18).

Philostratus and Synesius were not the only biographers who failed to realise that the fictional representation of Dio does not necessarily agree with Dio in real life. The first modern biography of Dio, by Hans von Arnim, argues for a Synesian view of the Dionic work:[64] von Arnim argues that Dio started his career as a sophist, but later became a philosopher. The next two important monographs are those of Desideri and Jones.[65] Adopting a historicist approach, both surveys attempt to position Dio in the cultural, social, and political environment of his era by stressing his importance as a sophist and the centrality of his exile in the formation of his identity. However, it should be noted, both scholars cast doubts upon the validity of the Dionic self-presentation and of the biographies of Philostratus and Synesius, but do not go so far as to assume a differentiation between the real author and his fictional persona.

In the same year as the monographs of Desideri and Jones, John Moles published an article that argued, for the first time, for a clear distinction between the historical and the fictional Dio.[66] In particular, Moles claims that Dio himself is responsible for Synesius' distorted view, because he first used the exile as a narrative means for the construction of a fictional self-portrait. He concludes that neither Synesius nor Dio offer a reliable account of the latter's biography and that any historical reconstruction of it remains highly tentative. Although Moles introduced the concept of Dio's double identity – one as existing in real life and one as inferred from his work – he hardly focused on the means by which Dio constructs his self-portrait and the purposes it serves.[67]

This task was subsequently undertaken by Whitmarsh, who examines Dio's fictional representation in a series of articles. Initially, he claims that the variegated oeuvre of Dio perfectly reflects the several masks that the author uses to represent himself as an orator, as a

---

[64] von Arnim 1898.
[65] Desideri 1978; Jones 1978.
[66] Moles 1978.
[67] He attempts to do so, though, in one of his subsequent articles (Moles 2005), but only as regards *or*. 13.

sophist, or as a philosopher.[68] Next he investigates the Dionic exile not as a historical event, but as a narrative means for the creation of a fictional identity: the Dionic exilic narrative of *or*. 13 works as a motif encompassing cultural problems and identity politics.[69] Moving a step further, Whitmarsh also examines the impact of Dio's *alter ego* (fictional self-portrait) on the audience through dialogues and parables and argues for a metapedagogical relationship between them and the author.[70]

Krause conducted a similar survey.[71] Building on Moles and using rhetorical theory and structural narratology (Genette), she distinguishes between the historical Dio (*historischer Dion*) and the rhetorical Dio (*rhetorischer Dion*), the latter being the fictional Dio as seen in his works. Krause examines *orr. 7, 12, 13, 32, 33, 35, and 45* and argues that Dio presents himself either as a narrator or as a protagonist, or both by using strategies that make the orations more suitable to specific social and political circumstances.

Moles, Whitmarsh, and Krause turn from a strictly positivistic view of the Dionic corpus to distinguish between the historical Dio and the fictional Dio: Moles highlights the unreliability of the Dionic narrative as a historical source; Whitmarsh investigates, among other things, the rhetoric of the Dionic exilic narrative; and Krause explores techniques of self-dramatization in cases where Dio offers a fictional portrait of himself.

Nevertheless, what previous research has not investigated is the poetics of the dynamic communication between author (real and fictional) and audience (real and fictional) in Dionic narratives and the means by which the audience perceives, but also shapes, alongside the author, these narratives. By poetics, in its rhetorical sense, I mean the sum of techniques used by the author for the construction of narratives. As Whitmarsh and Krause show, Dio uses

---

[68] Whitmarsh 1998.
[69] Whitmarsh 2001b.
[70] Whitmarsh 2004.
[71] Krause 2003.

several rhetorical techniques. However, it is not only the author who shapes the narratives, but also the audience: the dynamic communication between author and audience does not regard the former as the active sender of messages and the latter as the passive recipient of these messages, but claims that the audience also plays an important role in the construction of narratives.

1.1.4. *Orr*. 7, 12, 36

The aim of the present thesis is the investigation of the dynamic communication between the author (in all his manifestations) and the readers in *orr*. 7 (*The Euboean*), 12 (*The Olympicus*), and 36 (*The Borystheniticus*). In these orations Dio portrays himself as an intellectual who gained invaluable knowledge by enduring exile and whose identity shows a dynamic malleability that allows him to communicate moral messages to the audience. This form of rhetorical communication affects the readerly perception of the authorial messages communicated and of the authorial persona, while, in turn, readers affect the narrative through their understanding and partial shaping of the authorial messages.

The selection of these orations is linked to Dio's post-exilic representation as a knowledgeable intellectual. In these texts Dio transforms the unfortunate incident of his exile into a literary motif and uses it as proof of his erudition and integrity and as a reliable moral compass for the audience.[72] To this end, he draws on certain rhetorical techniques aiming at establishing a form of communication with the audience and at affecting their perception of authorial precepts. In his attempt to create a pedagogical relationship with the audience, Dio enhances his image as a πεπαιδευμένος ('educated man'), who employs his prowess in rhetoric and philosophy for practical purposes.

---

[72] In *or*. 13 too, there is a similar representation of Dio as an intellectual figure having endured exile. For reasons of space, though, I have not included an analysis of this oration in the present thesis.

For a number of reasons, the Dionic text that has attracted most scholarly attention is *or*. 7, or, as it is often called, the *Euboicus*. First of all, it is one of the lengthiest texts in the corpus, comprising 152 paragraphs.[73] It is also structured in two parts, with the first (7.1-80) presenting the personal story of an unnamed man and the second (7.81-152) commenting on the story. Additionally, for those seeking historical evidence for the Dionic exile, the text has been used as proof of the author's activity during or after the exile.[74] As well as for modern scholars, the text was among the favourites in the Dionic corpus for ancient authors, such as Philostratus, Synesius, and Photius, who praised its vividness and moral exemplarity.[75]

The *Euboicus* presents the personal story of an unnamed man, whom I will call the protagonist throughout. The man says that he was fishing with his fellows near the island of Euboea, when a terrible storm broke and diverted their ship onto rocks. The ship was severely damaged, and the protagonist, separated from his companions, ended up on a shore on Euboea. While trying to find his feet, he encountered a hunter who was chasing a deer with his dogs. Without hesitation, the hunter offered shelter to the man and proposed that they walk to his home together. The primary narrative pauses and gives way to another one, which is told by the hunter and concerns an earlier visit to a neighbouring city centre: in a trial in the city, the family of the hunter was accused of having exploited public land for several years without having paid any taxes; the story also involves a detailed description of what was supposedly said in the trial and the hunter's final acquittal after the help of a good old friend and defendant

---

[73] It is not the lengthiest text, as Russell 1992, 8 mistakenly states: the *Rhodian oration* (*or*. 31) is the longest, comprising 165 paragraphs. Other long texts are *orr*. 3 (*The third discourse on kingship*), 4 (*The fourth discourse on kingship*), and 11 (*The Trojan discourse*).

[74] However, not everything in the text is to be taken at face value. On the historicity and fictionality of the *Euboicus* see ch. 1.

[75] Philostratus, *VS* 1.488 includes it in the most popular sophistic Dionic texts. Synesius, *Dio* 4 opposes the Philostratean view of the text as sophistic and regards it as a philosophical treatise displaying 'a pattern of a happy life, a work of literature of the very highest value for rich or poor people alike' (trans. Lamar Crosby 1951). Similarly, Photius *Bibl*. cod. 209 states that the *Euboicus* 'seeks to prove that the care-free life, even though it be a life of poverty, is far more pleasant and also more profitable than the life of those who in a city are surrounded by confusion and luxury' (trans. Lamar Crosby 1951).

called Sotades. After that, the primary narrative resumes: the two men arrived at the hut, while the hunter's family prepared for the wedding of their beloved daughter. The marital feast concludes the first part of the *Euboicus*, and the second part begins a prolonged authorial exposition on certain issues of morality.

Historical research on the *Euboicus* attempts to answer the following questions: is the narrator of the story identical with Dio? Did the shipwreck on Euboea ever happen or is it fictional? If the shipwreck is real, did Dio visit Euboea during or after his exile? For most historicists, Dio actually visited Euboea during his exile, although the narrative of the *Euboicus* provides a mixture of historical and fictional elements. However, they argue, to distinguish between what is real and what is fictional is practically impossible.[76]

The *Euboicus* has also benefited from narratological research. As previously said, Krause examines cases of self-dramatization in the *Euboicus*[77] and Whitmarsh argues for a strong metapedagogical relationship between the author and the audience of the text.[78] In addition, Kasprzyk investigates cases of characterisation and metacharacterisation in the *Euboicus* and points out the ethical purposes underlying the text.[79]

The next text is *or. 12* (the *Olympicus*), which shows striking similarities with the *Euboicus*. Both texts begin with a scene in which an anonymous character (the protagonist) is presented to the audience: in the *Euboicus*, it is the shipwreck and the meeting with the hunter, while in the *Olympicus*, it is the celebration of the Olympic games in Elea. Moreover, the primary narrative of each text is followed by a secondary one: in the *Olympicus*, the sculptor Pheidias presents himself as participating in a trial, in which he accounts for the reasons that led him to create the statue of Zeus in Olympia. To the question of what kind of art can depict

---

[76] v. Arnim 1898, 455; Schmid 1903, 852; Jones 1978, 61; Desideri 1978, 225; Russell 1992, 8-12; Hughes 1996; Jackson 2017, 220-2.
[77] Krause 2003.
[78] Whitmarsh 2004 (esp. 460-3).
[79] Kasprzyk 2018.

the divine most effectively Pheidias responds by choosing sculpture over poetry (in his view, sculpture encapsulates visual representation, which is lacking in poetry). Thus the Homeric depiction of Zeus cannot cause admiration because it does not contain any haptic or visual experience. The text concludes with a brief recapitulation of the main points presented.

The *Olympicus* approaches aesthetic and metaphysical ideas through the use of rhetoric. That is to say, the rhetorical form in which the text is composed is used as a means of exposition of philosophical concepts. The reference to the Olympic games in Elea as the place of narrative also implies a connection with previous epideictic orations delivered during the celebration of the Olympic games.[80]

Some scholars have attempted to define the historical circumstances of the text and its year of production, even though there is no consensus among them as to when the oration was delivered,[81] while others have focused on its philosophical aspect and maintain that the text received substantial influences from Stoicism (especially middle-Stoicism).[82] As one can see, these scholarly interests tend to focus less on the dynamic relationship that Dio strives to establish with his readers and more on the oration's textual and historical characteristics – its structure, argumentation, use of historical examples, etc.

It should be noted that the only narratological research on the *Olympicus* that has been done so far is that of Krause.[83]

The last text under discussion is the *Borystheniticus* (*or*. 36), whose name derives from the ancient river of the city of Olbia where the narrative supposedly takes place. As with *orr*. 7 and 12, here we are also presented with an initial scene that takes the form of a personal

---

[80] Before Dio, other orators had composed rhetorical speeches for the celebration of the Olympic games, such as Gorgias (cf. Phil., *VS* 1.494), Lysias (*Olympiakos*), and Isocrates (*Panegyrikos*). On the Olympian orations, as they are collectively called, see Hawhee 2004, ch. 1 (esp. 27-39); Volonaki 2011; Noël 2017; Bromberg 2022.
[81] On the proposed dates see Ventrella 2017, 1-13.
[82] Klauck and Bäbler 2000, 186-216; Ventrella 2017, 34-62.
[83] Krause 2003.

experience:[84] the anonymous protagonist recounts the time when he was travelling to the Getae and visited the Scythian city of Borysthenes, whose beauty is described in no less than six paragraphs (36.1-6). The next thing we hear about is his encounter with Callistratus, a handsome young man, and his fellows outside the city walls, which eventually turns into a conversation about whether the poet Phocylides is superior to Homer. After a strong disagreement between them – the protagonist prefers Phocylides, Callistratus Homer – the men decide to enter the city in order to resume the discussion in front of a larger audience. The protagonist deviates from the original plan and instead sets out to develop a speech about the ideal human city, which, in his view, has a distinctive divine quality. Hieroson, an old man and listener of the speech, interrupts the protagonist, urging him to focus exclusively on the divine city. As a response, the protagonist praises the superiority and divine rule of Zeus by using a Zoroastrian myth: Zeus is depicted as driving a four-horse chariot, in which each horse represents Zeus, Poseidon, Hera, or Hestia. Due to the conflict between, and the subsequent joining of, the horses – the horse dedicated to Zeus clashes with that of Poseidon and subsequently joins that of Hera – the universe collapses and regenerates eternally. The myth has a strong effect on the Borysthenites, causing them to admire the protagonist greatly and to recognise him as a wise, intellectual figure.

The *Borystheniticus* has attracted the interest of a significant and growing number of researchers. It is remarkable that it is the only Dionic text on which four modern commentaries have been published so far.[85] Initially, researchers had focused more on socio-historical issues and literary sources (*Quellenforschung*) and less on the narrative aspects of the text and the rhetorical means that the author uses to communicate with his audience. However, this tendency seems to have significantly changed.

---

[84] Cohoon and Crosby 1940, 418 describe it as leisurely and relate it to the opening of the Platonic *Phaedrus*.
[85] Russell 1992; Nesselrath *et al.* 2003; Bost-Pouderon 2011; Di Febo 2020.

One major strand in studies of the *Borystheniticus* is strongly historicist in approach. It interprets the text by analysing the historical events in the life of Dio and by proposing specific dates for both his visit to Borysthenes and for the composition of the text:[86] von Arnim argues that Dio visited the city during his exile, specifically in the summer of 95; he also maintains that the text constitutes a philosophical διάλεξις or διάλογος ('discussion') on Stoic cosmology.[87] Desideri dates the text after the Dionic exile and regards it as a treatise with a complex 'ideologia politico-religiosa'.[88] Jones believes that it was delivered after 97, when Dio had eventually returned from exile,[89] and the same date is also supported by Sheppard.[90] Other researchers date the visit to Borysthenes earlier than 97, but avoid proposing a composition date for the text.[91] However, some scholars focus on the historical validity of the narrative and conclude that the Dionic account of the city is generally distorted and hence chronologically undetermined.[92]

Another scholarly concern has been *Quellenforschung*, which shows a keen interest in the sources on which Dio possibly relied to compose the text. For these scholars, the description of Borysthenes provides a mixture of elements taken from earlier literature, such as Herodotus,[93] and philosophical works, such as those of Plato, Cynics, and Stoics. Already Bäbler has suggested that the text, despite its general agreement with archaeological evidence, cannot be a reliable witness for the history of Olbia and that the Herodotean influence on the text is so evident that it is difficult to understand what is real and what is fictional.[94] As regards

---

[86] Nesselrath 2003a, 12-5 offers an overview of the proposed dates.

[87] von Arnim 1898, 301-8.

[88] Desideri 1978, 326 (on the *Borystheniticus* in general see pp. 318-27).

[89] Jones 1978, 51.

[90] Sheppard 1984, 157.

[91] Nesselrath 2003a, 13 suggests 96, while Bekker-Nielsen and Hinge 2015, 754 propose 84.

[92] Bäbler 2002; Podossinov 2009. Conversely, Belin de Ballu 1972, 143-5, relying on archaeological evidence, believes that Dio describes Olbia accurately.

[93] See the Herodotean description of the geographical area of Borysthenes (4.17-8, 47, 53-4, 71, 101).

[94] Bäbler 2002, 315 *et passim*. See also Bäbler 2007.

the philosophical influences, there are studies arguing that the text combines Platonic, Stoic, as well as Zoroastrian philosophy,[95] although there is a debate on whether the Dionic myth of the Magi originated from Persian treatises, or was simply ascribed to a popular Eastern persona, Zoroaster, on stylistic and literary grounds.

A third strand in the study of the *Borystheniticus* investigates the socio-political ideas in the *Borystheniticus* and highlights its political messages concerning the contrast between Greeks and 'barbarians' and the latters' interest in the Greek intellectual tradition. For example, Gangloff argues that the theme of the ὁμόνοια ('concord') between the Greeks and the Borysthenites sends a political message to the audience so that they develop good relationships with each other and avoid practices potentially harmful for their social harmony.[96] Similarly, Schmidt argues that the Dionic contrast between the 'barbarians' (as seen in the *Borystheniticus* and other texts) and the Greeks is not as sharp as in other contemporary authors and that it mostly concerns their moral differences. Dio minimises this contrast by presenting a conventional image of the 'barbarians' as increasingly adopting cultural and social characteristics of their Greek counterparts.[97]

As one can see, some researchers offer a good insight into the historical and socio-political aspects of the *Borystheniticus*, as well as its literary sources, where others investigate the content of the Dionic messages communicated to the audience. My analysis aims at both the 'what' (content) and the 'how' (rhetorical strategies) of the Dionic messages by looking closely at the ways that Dio establishes a certain relationship with his audience, the nature of this relationship, and the readerly perception and evaluation of these messages.

---

[95] Forschner 2003; de Jong 2003; Tommasi 2016; On the Platonic elements in particular see Trapp 2000, 214-9; Nesselrath 2003a, 18-22. On the Platonic and Stoic elements see Schofield 1991, ch. 3.
[96] Gangloff 2006, 299-305.
[97] Schmidt 2011, 113-4. On the contrast between the Greeks and the 'barbarians' in Dio see Moles 1995 (esp. 188-90 for the *Borystheniticus*); Swain 1996, 198.

Before we proceed any further, I would like to explain why previously I used the term protagonist, and not author, to denote the agent participating in the events narrated. It is often assumed that in first-person narratives the author is perceived by the audience as being identical to the agent taking part in the narrative.[98] However, the experiencing agent – or as I call him, the protagonist[99] – is not identical to the author and does not share characteristics that the author invariably possesses.[100] For instance, the author has knowledge of the inner worlds of the characters in the story, is aware that he or she addresses a specific audience, and can manage the narrative elements (time, space, plot, etc.) in any way that he or she wants.[101] On the other hand, the protagonist, operating on an intratextual level, has access to the inner worlds of the characters only in so far as he or she is given information (directly or indirectly) from the character themselves. The protagonist is also unaware of the existence of the readers and does not have any control over the narrative elements. Nevertheless, the protagonist can sometimes become the mediator of authorial messages to the readers, especially when the author adopts an indirect (or mimetic, as is traditionally called)[102] stance in his or her presentation of the narrative. Thus we can assume the covert presence of the author in passages where the protagonist seems to share messages with the narratees that also pertain to the readers.

---

[98] For this notion see Genette 1983, 245; Prince 2003, *s.v.* 'autodiegetic narrative' and 'homodiegetic narrative'.

[99] See n. 146.

[100] My proposed distinction between the author and the protagonist in first-person narratives does not follow the strict definition of the former as a telling agent and the latter as a showing agent. Rather, it relies on a rhetorical function, in which the author encompasses the characteristics of the agent who is responsible for the production of the narrative and its communication to the audience, whereas the protagonist is one experiential aspect of the author, in the sense that he or she embodies a particular aspect that the author attempts to communicate to the audience. As regards first-person narratives, Nielsen 2004 assumes the existence of an 'impersonal narrative voice', different from the narrating-I and the experiencing-I.

[101] Phelan 2005, 69: '[…] we also must recognise that there is another, knowable agent involved: the one who determines which voices the narrator adopts on which occasions – and the one who also provides some guidance about how we should respond to those voices. That agent […] is the implied author.'

[102] It should be noted that the word 'mimetic' used here has a different meaning from the mimetic aspects of a text as outlined in Phelan's rhetorical theory of narrative (see below).

To sum up, when examining first-person narratives from a rhetorical narratological perspective, it is useful to distinguish between the author,[103] who is ultimately responsible for the construction of the narrative, and the protagonist (or experiencing agent).[104] In doing so, we respect the different levels on which these agents operate and the audiences that they address respectively.

1.2. Phelan's rhetorical theory of narrative

Phelan belongs to the so-called Chicago school critics, or Neo-Aristotelians, whose aim is the exploration of narratives through a rhetorical theory of poetics.[105] Although for the first generation of the Chicago critics (Ronald Crane, Norman Maclean, Richard McKeon, and Elder Olson), the Aristotelian *Poetics*, *Rhetoric*, and *Metaphysics* are central to their work, for the subsequent two generations, Aristotle is predominantly regarded as e.g. the theoretical template on which further analyses can be generated.[106] The main point of contact between the Neo-Aristotelians, however, is the principle that the analysis of narratives requires an *a posteriori*, rather than an *a priori*,[107] process and involves the study of the relation between authors and readers. That is to say, starting from readerly influences from, and responses to, narratives, one can trace the 'probable and necessary conditions, and understand their causes.'[108]

---

[103] And in particular, the implied author, as I show in the next section.

[104] A semantic equivalent of the protagonist is the 'narrated-I', that is, the agent participating in the narrative.

[105] On the Chicago school of formalists see Liveley 2019, 135-57. It should be noted, however, that, despite some common principles between the three generations of the Chicago critics, there are remarkable differences between them: for example, Crane (first generation) stresses the importance of emotive readerly effects for the interpretation of narratives, Booth (second generation) focuses on the interplay between authors, audiences, and texts, and Rabinowitz and Phelan (third generation) explore narrative ethics and different kinds of audiences.

[106] See Phelan 2007, 79-85.

[107] Rhetorical narratology challenges the structuralist idea of narrative as a ready-made product with a pre-existing structure and instead regards it as a multidimensional and purposive exchange between an author and the recipient(s). See Currie 2011, 7; Phelan 2017, 5.

[108] Liveley 2019, 140. This is contrasted with the New Critics, who maintain that the analysis of a narrative in its parts diminishes its importance as an artistic whole.

Phelanian theory is predominantly influenced by Wayne Booth and his *Rhetoric of Fiction*.[109] Since Flaubert, true literature was regarded as only the text from which the author was completely effaced, an assumption that inevitably led to the rejection of the idea that texts constitute authorial products with a certain ideological core.[110] Booth challenged this limiting view and proposed that authors cannot disappear from the text completely, since their presence (manifest or subtle) is revealed by elements such as the organisation of the plot, the development of character speeches, the handling of narrative time and of point of view, literary allusions, metaphors, etc. Booth's novelty was that he discarded the view of texts as devoid of authorial intentions and argued instead that authors can only choose the type of rhetoric they will employ, that is, the way in which they will select, distribute, and combine the situations and events recounted.[111] Nevertheless, the author to whom Booth assigned the above characteristics is not the real, flesh-and-blood author, but the implied author, or in Booth's words, the 'real author's second self', 'the core of norms and choices in a text', who 'chooses, consciously or unconsciously, what we read.'[112] The implied author forms a dynamic relationship with the readers by affecting their responses to the narrative and by communicating important messages to them.

---

[109] The first edition of the book appeared in 1961; the second, expanded edition, whose supplementary bibliography was compiled by James Phelan, in 1983.

[110] According to this premise, literary texts must speak by themselves without the intermediary of a historical entity (author) and without any reflection on readerly feelings, emotions, and beliefs. Since authorial intention can never be approached objectively (Barthes 1977) or can only be approached as a function of discourse (Foucault 1969), readers must necessarily rely on their responses to the text, avoiding any interpretation related to the author. For a critique of these points see Booth 1983, ch. 2-5.

[111] See Prince 2003, *s.v.* 'implied author'. As Rabinowitz 2011, 101 states, '*The Rhetoric of Fiction* was written at a dark time when author and intention were banned.'

[112] Booth 1983, 74-5. Although some narratologists, such as Bal 1981 and Genette 1988, 135-54, refuse the concept of the implied author, while others (Nünning 1999; Chatman 1978; Rimmon-Kenan 1983) propose a redefinition of it, it remains substantial in rhetorical theory of narrative: Booth 2005; Phelan 2005; Nünning 2005a; Phelan and Rabinowitz 2012; Herman et al. 2012; Phelan 2017, 26 *et passim*; Clark and Phelan 2020. On the history of, and the debate on, the concept see Kindt and Müller 2006; Schmid 2009; Richardson 2011; Ryan 2011; Kindt and Müller 2011. For refinements to the concept see Phelan 2005, 31-65; Shen 2010; Abbott 2011; Phelan 2011; Shen 2011; Shen 2013.

1.2.1. Narrative as rhetoric: author, audiences, ethics

Phelan defines narrative in its rhetorical sense, as 'somebody telling somebody else on some occasion and for some purpose(s) that something happened.'[113] Narrative thus entails a communicative quality between author and reader(s). Following Booth,[114] Phelan argues that readers, far from being mere receivers of authorial intentions, form instead a dynamic relationship with the author by affecting, and being affected by, his or her intentions. As one can see, Phelan follows the Neo-Aristotelian premise of narratives as rhetorical acts of communication between agents and focuses on the participation of readers in the development of narratives.

Phelan particularly stresses that readers not only are affected by, but also affect, the author. Authors compose narratives in order to communicate certain messages to the audience that they have in mind each time. In other words, authors shape their narratives according to the expectations of the specific readership they have in mind (reader response). According to this notion, readers play a role (albeit not the central one) in the construction of narratives, since they influence the way in which the author might eventually choose what to present (content), how to present it (style), and in what order (plot).

Faithful to the Chicago critics' *a posteriori* way of analysing narratives, Phelan starts from readerly responses to the narrative and proceeds to their origins, which invariably stem from the author.[115] Phelanian theory does not seek to determine what all narratives do, or what structure they must have, but instead what they *have done so far*. In this respect, his theory can

---

[113] Phelan 2017, 5. See also Phelan 1996, 8.

[114] E.g. Booth 1983, 105: 'the author has, in fact, worked to make his subject available to us. We think of the writer as someone who addresses us, who wants to be read, and who does what he can to make himself readable'. On Booth's influence on Phelan see Phelan 1996, 19.

[115] Phelan 2017, 6.

be applied to any narrative, even to those that are not, according to structuralist narratological criteria, 'pure' narratives.[116]

Communication between author and readers is multidimensional. During the construction of a narrative, the real, flesh-and-blood author is partially represented by an implied author, whom Phelan describes as 'a streamlined version of the real author, an actual or purported subset of the real author's capacities, traits, attitudes, beliefs, values, and other properties that play an active role in the construction of the particular text'.[117] Following Shen, I believe instead that the implied author is conceived both as the agent responsible for the creation of the text and as the textual image inferred by readers' perception of the text.[118] The implied author is different from the narrator, who is a textual agent performing the tasks of reporting, or commenting on, events.[119] In the Phelanian model, characters also play an important role in telling, since they can communicate with another character without the

---

[116] In Genette's structuralist narratology, for instance, the narrativity of a text mainly depends on the existence of a story (*histoire*), as contrasted to the *fabula* and the *discours*. Bal's (2017, 5) definition of a narrative text as 'a text in which an agent or subject conveys to an addressee ('tells' the reader, viewer, or listener) a story in a medium, such as language, imagery, sound, buildings, or a combination thereof' pays little attention to the role of readers in communicating with the author and describes a set of norms that are applicable to every narrative – an *a priori*, not an *a posteriori*, method, that is. It should be noted, however, that Genette's and Bal's models have a rhetorical dimension, but they explore what narrative must do, not what they have done already.

[117] Phelan 2005, 45. In general, Phelan strongly argues that implied authors are not creations or products of real, flesh-and-blood authors, but partial representations of them. This is also his point of disagreement with Booth: he believes that Booth conceives of the implied author as a construction of the real author and as a textual phenomenon, not as the entity responsible for the construction of the text.

[118] Shen 2011 argues that in Booth's formation of the implied author lies a double process: an encoding process, in which the implied author is the agent composing the text, and a decoding process, in which the implied author is the textual image inferred by readers' perception of the text. In his later work, Phelan (e.g. Phelan 2017, 206) comes closer to the idea of Shen: 'In Dan Shen's helpful terms, the implied author encodes the text; the reader decodes it, and through that decoding comes to know the implied author.'

[119] Nevertheless, an implied author can use a narrator as an 'alter ego' by granting him or her capacities that he or she cannot normally have. For example, if a narrator comments on how the story will be presented, if he or she reports something that is otherwise unknown (characters' motives, thoughts, feelings, etc.), or if he or she remains uncharacterised throughout – that is, the focus is more on his or her telling capacities, rather than on the delineation of his or her personality – then the narrator becomes almost indistinguishable from the implied author. This is the case when a narrator can actually perceive the fictionality of the narrative (in structuralist narratology, this narrator is called omniscient: Prince 2003, *s.v.* 'omniscient narrator'; in Booth's theory, a self-conscious narrator: Booth 1983, 155).

mediation of a narrator (unmediated transmission or character-character disclosure).[120] Thus on the one end of the communication model, we have three agents who perform the following tasks:

Implied author (both 'outside' and 'inside' the text)	- organises the plot - constructs the time of the narrative - develops point(s) of view - develops characters' speeches - permeates the text with a certain ideology - uses rhetorical resources (language, style, etc.) to communicate to the readers.
Narrator ('inside' the text)	- reports events or characters - comments on events or characters
Character ('inside' the text)	- communicates with other characters

To illustrate the role of the above agents, I will use the beginning of Dio's *or.* 7 as an example. Dio, the implied author, constructs the narrative by placing the scene of the shipwreck

---

[120] On characters' role in the communication model see Phelan 2017, ch.1. Structuralist narratology makes a sharp distinction between narrator and characters: narrators function on the level of the *fabula*, characters on the level of the story (*histoire*). Chatman 1978 proposes a schema of rhetorical communication slightly different from that of Phelan by placing the implied author within the narrative text, whereas Phelan 2005, 38-49 modifies it by placing the implied author outside the narrative text and by adding characters too in the communication. See also Phelan 2017, 13-29.

in the beginning, as a form of *in medias res*. The protagonist becomes afterwards a character narrator, who reports the shipwreck and his encounter with the hunter and comments on the first impressions made between them.

The telling agents communicate with their respective counterparts. An implied author communicates with an implied audience, or, in Phelan's words, an authorial audience. How is the authorial audience formulated? During the composition of a narrative, the implied author has a specific audience in mind for which he or she writes. Those from the real, flesh-and-blood audience who 'join' the specific audience that the implied author has in mind and decide to read the narrative – the rhetorical readers – become, in turn, the authorial audience.[121] Whereas the authorial audience is aware of the fictionality of the narrative and the presence of the implied author, the narratee, that is, the audience addressed by the narrator, is not. In the case of fictional narratives, a narrative audience is also added, which acts as the observant of the events narrated. The basic difference between narratee and narrative audience is that the former is in both fiction and non-fiction, is addressed by the narrator, and can speak, whereas the latter is in fiction only, is not addressed, and cannot speak.[122] So on the other end of the communication model, we have the following agents:

Authorial audience ('outside' the text)	- is addressed by the implied author - perceives the fictionality of the narrative

---

[121] The authorial audience is the 'hypothetical group for whom the author writes – the group that shares the knowledge, values, prejudices, fears, and experiences that the author expected in his or her readers, and that ground his or her rhetorical choices' (Phelan 2017, 7). The rhetorical audience are those who join the authorial audience, since 'not all actual readers want to join the authorial audience' (Phelan 2017, 8). In my thesis, I alternate between 'authorial audience' (or simply 'audience') and 'readers', meaning, in the latter case, the rhetorical readers, who take on the role of the authorial audience. My analysis therefore pertains to the (rhetorical) readers who are interested in deciphering the authorial messages of the narratives from a readerly perspective, as expected or anticipated by the author.

[122] The distinction between narratee and narrative audience is not always clear: Phelan 1996, 138-46; Prince 2003, *s.v.* 'narrative audience'. Phelan 1989, 5 defines the narrative audience as the 'group of readers for whom the lyric, dramatic, or narrative situation is not synthetic but real'.

Narratee ('inside' the text)	- is addressed by the narrator - cannot perceive the fictionality of the narrative
Narrative audience (only in fiction; 'inside' the text)	- unaddressed observers within the storyworld - cannot perceive the fictionality of the narrative

In Dio's *or.* 7, the implied author addresses the authorial audience, whom we, the rhetorical readers, attempt to access by considering the special characteristics attributed to them by the implied author. The protagonist, at the beginning of the narrative, addresses the narratee, which remains uncharacterised (that is, it is not described). Since the narrative entails fictional characteristics, we can also hypothesise the existence of a narrative audience, which observes the events recounted, but has no knowledge about the fictionality of the narrative.

For Phelan, there can be no rhetorical poetics of narrative if the ethical dimension of narratives is not considered. Narratives contain a certain authorial ideology, which is communicated to the authorial audience and is structured on the basis of (coherent or incoherent) systems of signification, developed by the author in an attempt to establish a relationship with the audience. Therefore any signification (authorial intentionality)[123] that is revealed within the narrative belongs to a wider ethical code, which Phelan calls the ethics of

---

[123] On authorial intentionality see Phelan 2017, 196-204. Conversely, Chambers 1984, 19, adopting a deconstructionist perspective, regards authorial intentionality as forever deferred: 'Such a text can be treated as a stable or inert thing, predetermined by an intentionality (whether that of a fictional consciousness or that of an author), only at the risk of severely impoverishing it and depriving it of what gives it its value as literary discourse'.

the narrative.[124] The ethics of the narrative are divided into two categories, namely, the ethics of the telling and the ethics of the told. The former comprises the ethical dimensions between implied author-narrator-audience (authorial and narratee) and the latter the ethical dimensions of characters and events. For example, the reduction of distance between the implied author and the narrator concerns the ethics of the telling, whereas the interactions between characters or their 'choices to act in [one] way rather than another'[125] concern the ethics of the told.

1.2.2. Narrative progression: textual and readerly dynamics

Narrative is seen as a rhetorical means in which, and through which, communication between author and audience is achieved. Instead of being a static, ready-made item, it is a complex network of signifiers that produces meaning through the combination of authorial intentions and readerly responses to them. In this sense, the progress of a narrative relies on both textual and readerly dynamics. That is to say, the implied author's rhetorical resources of signification (textual dynamics) interact with readerly responses (cognitive, affective, ethical, and aesthetic) to them (readerly dynamics).[126]

Textual dynamics entail plot dynamics and narratorial dynamics. As regards plot dynamics, implied authors construct plots by inserting specific elements into the narrative, namely, instabilities, tensions, complications, and resolutions. A narrative usually begins with a primary instability ('unsettled matters involving elements of story, typically characters and their situations') and with tensions ('unsettled matters involving elements of discourse such as unequal knowledge among authors, narrators, and audiences, or matters of different values and

---

[124] On the ethics of the narrative in Phelanian theory see Phelan 1996, ch. 4; Phelan 2005, ch. 1, 3; Phelan 2017, 8-9.
[125] Phelan 2017, 9.
[126] Phelan 2005, 161; Phelan 2017, 10.

perceptions').[127] The instabilities or tensions can be further complicated, until the final resolution is brought about.[128]

The narratorial dynamics are polymorphous, but two of them receive special attention from Phelan: reliable and unreliable narration. In reliable narration, everything said by the narrator (or a character narrator) – descriptions, evaluations, information, etc. – is endorsed by the implied author. In unreliable narration, conversely, the reliability of the narrator's values and perceptions is diminished as soon as the implied author shows to the audience that he or she disagrees with the narrator.[129] In other words, unreliable narration occurs when tension is created between the implied author and the narrator. Naturally, these tensions have an impact on the authorial audience, who can either endorse (reliable narration), or be sceptical about (unreliable narration), the narrator's words.[130]

Phelan classifies unreliability on the axis of characters and events (misreporting; under-reporting), understanding or perception (misinterpreting; under-interpreting), and values or ethics (misevaluating; under-evaluating).[131] More specifically, a narrator might lack

---

[127] The quoted passages come from Phelan 2005, 19.

[128] Phelan 2017, 10-11. It should be noted, however, that Phelan's plot dynamics differ from the traditional structuralist ones (e.g. Propp's functions), in so far as they do not take as a general rule that every narrative must have instabilities, tensions, complications, and/or resolutions. Instead, narratives can bring partial resolution to instabilities or tensions, whereas others bring no resolution at all (Phelan 2005, 20).

[129] According to the traditional definition, an unreliable narrator is 'a narrator whose norms and behaviour are not in accordance with the implied author's norms; whose values diverge from those of the implied author; the reliability of whose account is undermined by various features of that account' (Prince 2003, 103). See also Booth 1983, 339-74. Personally, I prefer the definition proposed by Phelan 2005, 49: 'a character narrator is unreliable when he or she offers an account of some event, person, thought, thing, or other object in the narrative world that deviates from the account of the implied author would offer.' For a rhetorical-cognitive aspect of the unreliable narrator see Nünning 2005b. Phelan 2017, 99: 'Unreliable narration, like character narration more generally, is a mode of indirect communication. The implied author communicates with his or her audience by means of the voice of another speaker addressing another audience. Put another way, we have one text, two speakers (one explicit, one implicit), two audiences, and at least two purposes.' Cf. also Booth 1983, 158-9: 'I have called a narrator reliable when he speaks for or acts in accordance with the norms of the work (which is to say, the implied author's norms), unreliable when he does not.'

[130] See Phelan 2005, 38-49; Phelan 2017, 11.

[131] Phelan 2005, 49-53. Other names are also used: misreading and underreading instead of misinterpreting and underinterpreting; misregarding and underregarding instead of misevaluating and underevaluating.

knowledge of (misreporting), or tell us less than he or she knows about (under-reporting),[132] an event, a character, or a situation. He or she might also give a wrong (misinterpreting) or insufficient (under-interpreting) interpretation of an event, a character, or a situation. A narrator can also make a wrong ethical judgement about an event, a character, or a situation (misevaluating), or give a right ethical judgement without going far enough.[133] Thus:

On the axis of…	What does a narrator do?
characters/events	**misreporting** (lack of knowledge) **underreporting** (knows, but tells less)
understanding/perception	**misinterpreting** (wrong interpretation) **underinterpreting** (insufficient interpretation)
values/ethics	**misevaluating** (wrong ethical judgement) **underevaluating** (correct ethical judgement, but it does not go far enough)

In unreliable narration, the audience is aware that the implied author disagrees with the narrator. Yet, the audience might recognise that through the use of unreliable narration, the implied author attempts to establish a certain relationship between the narrator and the authorial audience. That is to say, the implied author's use of unreliable narration (on whichever axis)

---

[132] In Genette's theory, it is called *paralipsis*.

[133] This is the most complex category. Here the narrator is on the right track (i.e. forms a relatively correct judgement of an event, character, or situation), but the judgement needs to be more concrete with additional information.

can be seen as a channel of communication between the authorial audience and the narrator (bonding unreliability). Otherwise, unreliability is seen as the implied author's attempt to separate the authorial audience's perspective from the narrator's and bring it closer to the implied author's perspective (estranging unreliability).[134]

Readerly dynamics consists of readers' interpretative, ethical, affective, and aesthetic responses to the textual dynamics. The audience might be interested in the extent to which events and characters within a narrative can be regarded as real-life (mimetic responses), as carrying certain ideological positions (thematic responses), or as being literary constructs (synthetic responses).[135]

In mimetic responses, readers ask: do the characters and events narrated resemble reality?[136] They do not wonder whether the characters and events are in fact real, but whether they constitute successful representations of reality.[137] In thematic interests, the focus is more on the ideational function of characters: characters can display characteristics that posit them in a certain ideological environment; in this sense, they can make statements that reinforce, or contradict, an idea (e.g. a character's opposition to moral decline), or they can teach the truth.[138] Beyond mimetic and thematic responses, readers can also develop interests in the artificiality of characters and events: for instance, a character or narrator that takes on metaliterary qualities

---

[134] See Phelan 2017, 99-110.

[135] On mimetic, thematic, as well as synthetic responses see Phelan 1989; Phelan 1996 *passim*; Phelan 2005 *passim*; Phelan 2007 *passim*; Phelan 2017, 11-12; Clark and Phelan 2020.

[136] For phenomenological reasons, Phelan 2005, 216 defines the real world (reality) as that which stands beyond fiction. So a character's imitation of the real world signifies the imitation of a quality that lies outside fiction, i.e. outside the particular fictional narrative.

[137] Phelan 2017, 11: 'Responses to the mimetic component involve rhetorical readers' interest in the characters as possible people and in the narrative world as like our own, that is, hypothetically or conceptually possible.' Clark and Phelan 2020, 146: 'the mimetic component refers to the results (evident in both textual phenomena and readerly response) of authorial shaping of readerly interests in the narrative's imitations of – or references to – the actual world, including such matters as events following the cause-effect logic of the extratextual world, characters functioning as possible people, time and space following the known laws of physics, and so on.'

[138] Phelan 2005, 219; Clark and Phelan 2020, 148: 'The thematic component refers to the results (evident in both textual phenomena and readerly response) of authorial shaping of readerly interests in the ideational, ethical, and ideological dimensions of the narrative.'

by revealing the subsequent unfolding of the narrative can attract readers' attention to his or her artificiality and his or her belonging to a wider literary construction, that is, the text.[139] Thus in cases with increased synthetic interest readers regard characters as constructs, as products of a particular authorial agency, rather than as independent agents who tell the story themselves.

Readers can display different interests at the same time. In Dio's *or*. 7, for example, the initial scene of the protagonist's salvation from the shipwreck can attract mimetic (Are the circumstances of the shipwreck possible? Does the protagonist behave in a manner consistent with a shipwrecked person in real life?) and synthetic (Does the positioning of the shipwreck at the beginning of the narrative enhance the protagonist's assimilation to the Homeric Odysseus? Is the protagonist an alter ego of Dio?) interests.

Whereas Phelan sees the mimetic, thematic, and synthetic responses as being part of the wider communication model between author-audience-purpose, he regards Clark's model of readerly dynamics as a text-centric poetics that relates readerly responses to the text.[140] More specifically, Clark states that rhetorical readers always maintain an increased synthetic interest in the text, since they are aware that they are reading a product that is written by a specific historical entity (an author). Thus the mimetic-thematic-synthetic (MTS) Phelanian model of readerly responses should be rearranged as synthetic-mimetic-thematic (SMT) due to readers' constant awareness of the artificiality of the text.[141] In the present survey, I will follow Phelan's model (the MTS model) of readerly responses.

---

[139] Phelan 2005, 218; Clark and Phelan 2020, 148: 'The synthetic component refers, first, to narrative as itself a constructed object – something artificial rather than natural, something fashioned rather than found – including the various elements that go into that construction, and, second, to the results (evident in both textual phenomena and readerly response) of authorial shaping of readerly interests in a narrative as a constructed object.'

[140] Clark and Phelan 2020, 138.

[141] Clark and Phelan 2020, 11: 'Every narrative can be considered from three aspects, the synthetic, the mimetic, and the thematic; these aspects are simultaneous and interdependent. Every text can be seen as synthetic, mimetic, and thematic. Synthetic analysis concerns all kinds of verbal construction, from sentences to whole plots, and also the construction of characters and narrative worlds. Mimetic analysis concerns the representation of characters

1.2.3. Phelanian theory and structural narratology

Phelanian theory continues the tradition of rhetorical narratology and presents remarkable differences from structural narratology. As said previously, Booth's rhetorical theory is the point of departure for Phelan; however, the latter succeeds in combining phenomena that remained previously distinct: for instance, he approaches textual and readerly phenomena as belonging to the same communication model and as being affected by each other. Thus readers' possible responses to a narrative can affect an implied author's construction of textual phenomena, and textual phenomena can, in turn, affect readers' responses to them. In this sense, Phelan's theory constitutes a rhetorical poetics in which the implied author affects, and is affected by, readers.

The prominent role of the reader in Phelan's model is indicative of its proximity to cognitive narratology.[142] Both theories share common characteristics: they define narrative as 'a purposeful communicative exchange between authors and readers', they 'offer insights into the general conditions and mechanisms governing that exchange between authors and readers', and they 'conduct interpretations in order to demonstrate how individual narratives deploy those general conditions and mechanisms and, where appropriate, to show how those deployments can lead to revisions in our understanding of those general conditions and mechanisms.'[143] Thus both theories pay attention to the communication between authors and readers and regard textual phenomena as part of this general communication model.

Phelanian theory also differs from structuralist narratology.[144] The former regards narrative as an action, the latter as a structure. Phelan gives prominence to the audience's partial shaping of the narrative, whereas structuralists regard the audience as the agent that merely

---

and worlds constructed in a narrative, realistic or not. Thematic analysis concerns all kinds of meaning imparted by or derived from a text, direct or indirect, intended by the author or not.'

[142] On cognitive narratology see Liveley 2019, 235-52.

[143] Phelan 2017, 151-2.

[144] E.g. Genette 1988; Bal 2017.

reacts to the narrative. Phelanian theory, structured as a rhetorical poetics, is interested in the communication between author and audience, whereas structuralists adopt a text-centred poetics, which is hardly interested in the author (the flesh-and-blood or the implied). Ultimately, whereas structuralists attempt to expose the rules governing the structure of what they call narrative, Phelan configures what narratives have presented so far, without excluding any particular phenomenon that does not pertain to a specific, *a priori* model.[145]

Phelan's model applies well to the Dionic orations under examination: Dio employs a series of rhetorical strategies to communicate with the readers by affecting their understanding of the narratives and by sharing important messages with them. Every oration constitutes a unique narrative developed from different authorial resources, which facilitate Dio's sharing of moral messages with the audience and his portrayal as an exiled intellectual. Nevertheless, none of these self-portraits can be fully identified with the real Dio because they constitute different, more or less fictional, representations of him. Likewise, rhetorical readers experience and understand the narrative, either relating to, or detaching themselves from, characters' thoughts, ideas, and beliefs illustrated in the text.

1.3. Structure of the thesis

The thesis is constructed in three parts: as we saw, the introductory part outlines Dio's biography and oeuvre and focuses particularly on his exile as a historical event and as a literary motif. It also offers an overview of the three Dionic orations examined and stresses their importance for the construction of Dio's exilic narrative persona. The introduction concludes with a description of Phelan's rhetorical theory of narrative, its fundamental principles, and its differentiation from other, structural and rhetorical, narrative theories.

---

[145] On the differences from structuralist narratology see Phelan 2017, x-xi.

Chapters one to three form the main part and examine *orr*. 7, 12, and 36 respectively. The order of the orations is not chronological, but follows the standard modern numbering of the Dionic works. Each chapter contains a brief introduction to the oration and the issues involved and ends with the conclusions drawn from the analysis.

The first chapter explores Dio's rhetorical strategies of communication with the readers in the *Euboicus* (*or*. 7). It is divided into four parts: the first two concentrate on how Dio organises the narrative part (7.1-80) and the metanarratological part (7.81-152) respectively, while the other two (The pedagogy of the *Euboicus* (I) and (II)) explore his pedagogical relationship with the audience. In the *Euboicus*, communication is achieved through a series of authorial resources (the distinction between authorial narration and character narration, the use of character-character dialogue, the thematic opposition between city and country life, the unreliability of the character narrator, the repetition of main events, the focus on the unity of the text) and through the audience's mimetic, thematic, and synthetic responses to the narrative. Dio also seems to construct the image of a philosophical teacher for himself and that of students in a philosophy class for his readers, thus suggesting a strong pedagogical relationship, revolving around issues of morality.

The next chapter concentrates on the *Olympicus* (*or*. 12), whose narratological elements have generally been neglected by previous research. By contrast, the chapter first seeks to define the narrative elements of the oration by defining narrative in its Phelanian sense, that is, as a purposeful communication between the author and his readers. Following this, I explore Dio's rhetorical means of communication with the readers: he shapes the textual dynamics by making himself perceptible to the readers (metanarratological function), by using multiple character narrators, and by highlighting the logical organisation of the events narrated. In the second part of the chapter, I turn to the pedagogical aspects of the narrative and argue that Dio

infuses certain pedagogical characteristics into the narrative to which the readers are invited to respond by perceiving the text as a philosophical discussion.

The last chapter focuses on the *Borystheniticus* (*or*. 36). At the beginning, I describe the reasons that the text can benefit from a rhetorical narratological examination, since its rhetorical means of communication have received little, if any, attention from scholars. Next, I explore particular authorial resources, such as the organisation of the narrative material and plot, the characterisation, the protagonist's reliability as a narrator, the focus on the protagonist's malleability, the handling of narrative spatiality, as well as the synergy between author-audience and narrator-narratee relationships. These techniques seem to have an impact on the readers' perception of the narrative, especially as regards the ethics of the telling and the told.

In the conclusions, I summarise the main points of my analysis of each of the three Dionic orations and offer general remarks about the advantages of the application of Phelanian narrative theory to texts (Dionic or not) from different eras and different genres. I also describe the ways in which my thesis complements previous research, and cogitate on how the Dionic research, in particular, and narratological research on Greek and Latin texts, in general, can proceed in the future.

The *Euboicus* (*Or.* 7)

Paragraphs 1-80: The narrative part

Dio Chrysostom's *Euboean Discourse* (henceforth *Euboicus*) tells the story of an unnamed sailor who had a shipwreck on the island of Euboea and was subsequently offered hospitality by a noble yet poor hunter of the country. Even though the protagonist's[146] name remains unknown throughout, the repetitive use of first person singular yields an autobiographical tone[147] and consequently implies a conflation between the protagonist and Dio.[148] Although one cannot know if, and to what extent, the protagonist shares common characteristics with Dio,[149] we had better regard the protagonist, who participates in the narrative and addresses the narratees, as (at least partially) distinct from Dio, who composes the narrative and addresses the authorial audience.[150] Throughout my analysis, any reference to Dio will concern the implied author.[151]

The first paragraph constitutes the opening part of the text and offers details about the context according to which Dio develops the narrative:[152]

---

[146] To avoid confusion, I will reserve the term 'protagonist' for the anonymous sailor, but not for the hunter, despite the latter displaying characteristics of a protagonist in the embedded narrative of his visit to the city.

[147] On this matter see Krause 2003, 69-72.

[148] See *e.g.* von Arnim 1898, 492; Brunt 1973; Berry 1983, 73-4; Billault 2013. On the opposite opinion see Russell 1992, 8-9. Gall 2012 chooses the more neutral 'I-narrator' (*Ich-Erzähler*).

[149] As Whitmarsh 2009, 62 puts it, 'in fictional autobiography, the narrative 'I' continually serves as a wormhole connecting the real author and the fictional'. Adjusting this argument to rhetorical narratology, we could maintain that there can also be a connection between the narrative 'I' (the protagonist), the implied author, as well as the real, flesh-and-blood author.

[150] Krause 2003, 60-1 similarly distinguishes between 'Ich-Erzähler' and 'erlebendes Ich'.

[151] Moles 1978, 97 suggests that Dio constructs a persona of himself as a wanderer 'to distract attention from Dio the successful sophist'. I am not fully convinced, though, that the purpose of the construction of this persona is actually the audience's distraction from the sophist Dio. On the contrary, the elevated literary and rhetorical style with which Dio develops his protagonist points out to the audience the author's prowess in sophistic writing.

[152] *The Trojan Oration* has a very similar phrase (11.27: οἱ δὲ οὐχ ὡς αὐτοί τι εἰδότες, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἑτέρων ἀκούσαντες 'others [speak] as if they themselves did not know but spoke from hearsay'). According to the internal logic of narratives, every narrative begins with particular *instabilities*, that is, 'unsettled matters involving elements of story, typically characters and their situation' (Phelan 2005, 19; see also Phelan 1996, 30), which subsequently 'fuel' or prompt the progression of subsequent narrative events. In the case of the *Euboicus*, the primary instability is the protagonist's shipwreck on the island of Euboea, which prompts the progression of the rest of the narrative – i.e. his unexpected meeting with the hunter, the latter's analeptical narrative of his visit to the city, the marriage

τόδε μὴν αὐτὸς ἰδών, οὐ παρ᾽ ἑτέρων ἀκούσας, διηγήσομαι. ἴσως γὰρ οὐ μόνον πρεσβυτικὸν

πολυλογία καὶ τὸ μηδένα διωθεῖσθαι ῥᾳδίως τῶν ἐμπιπτόντων λόγων, πρὸς δὲ τῷ πρεσβυτικῷ

τυχὸν ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀλητικόν. αἴτιον δέ, ὅτι πολλὰ τυχὸν ἀμφότεροι πεπόνθασιν, ὧν οὐκ ἀηδῶς

μέμνηνται. ἐρῶ δ᾽ οὖν οἵοις ἀνδράσι καὶ ὅντινα βίον ζῶσι συνέβαλον ἐν μέσῃ σχεδόν τι τῇ

Ἑλλάδι. (7.1)[153]

A prominent characteristic of the passage is that it constitutes a direct authorial commentary

through which Dio develops a relationship with the authorial audience by showing them how

the rest of the narrative will unfold. This synthetic, in Phelan's formulation, element involves

the authorial audience's understanding of the text as a literary construct: through the use of the

verbs διηγήσομαι ('I will narrate') and ἐρῶ ('I will tell'), Dio is perceived by the authorial

audience as the storyteller of a particular narrative.[154]

Dio next builds up the setting of the narrative: he refers to the age of the protagonist,

describes his unfortunate experiences, and places the narrative within geographical boundaries,

and more particularly at the centre of Greece (7.1: ἐν μέσῃ σχεδόν τι τῇ Ἑλλάδι 'in practically

the centre of Greece'). All these elements are important for the understanding of the narrative

because they convey essential details to the audience about the setting of the narrative and the

---

of the hunter's daughter, as well as the metaliterary commentary of paragraphs 81-150. As this instability is expected to be resolved at the beginning of, or later in, the narrative, we see that the protagonist's arrival to the shore and his unexpected meeting with the hunter puts an end to his wandering, and thus to the primary instability. This instability furthermore serves as a suitable opening of the overall narrative, and encourages the readers to focus on the relationship of the protagonist and the hunter and on the former's unlucky situation, which eventually prompts Dio to discourse on the citizens' ethical deficiencies.

[153] 'I shall now relate a personal experience of mine; not merely something I have heard from others. Perhaps, indeed, it is quite natural for an old man to be garrulous and reluctant to drop any subject that occurs to him, and possibly this is just as true of the wanderer as of the old man. The reason, I dare say, is that both have had many experiences that they find considerable pleasure in recalling. Anyhow I shall describe the character and manner of life of some people that I met in practically the centre of Greece'. The text follows the standard edition of von Arnim 1893-6; the translations the edition of Cohoon 1932. Where appropriate, I have suggested different translations from Cohoon's.

[154] According to Lehmann 2012, 86, Dio's apology for his old age and for the content of the narrative captivates the (authorial, I would add) audience's attention (*captatio benevolentiae*).

characterisation of the protagonist. Moreover, the focus on the quality of life (7.1: ὄντινα βίον ζῶσι 'the manner of life') of different people guides the audience's thematic responses to the narrative, since they are invited to read the narrative as a moral-philosophical treatise focusing on rather contrasting character models.[155]

Paragraphs 2-10 constitute the beginning of the story of the protagonist, in which narration slowly shifts from authorial to character narration[156] The protagonist presents in detail what was anticipated in the first paragraph by describing an old personal experience: while he was sailing near the island of Euboea with his companions, a storm suddenly broke and crashed their ship onto sharp rocks. Left alone and far from the rest of the crew, the protagonist ended up on a deserted shore where the only thing he could see was a deer chased by a hunter and his dogs. The deer was ultimately trapped and killed by the hunter with the help of the protagonist, and, because of that, the latter was offered shelter, food, and clothes at the hunter's hut. After this point, the narrative progresses through temporal flashbacks, especially when the hunter narrates his personal story (7.11-63): on the way to the hut, the hunter seizes the opportunity to talk about his past visit to the city and his experience with the greediness and selfishness of the city-dwellers. By becoming a secondary character narrator,[157] the hunter makes a flashback to describe how much the people of the country differ from those of the city in terms of character and morality. Subsequent to the hunter's detailed narrative, paragraphs 64-80 cover the time between the initial meeting of the two men and their stay at the hunter's hut, while

---

[155] Brancacci 2016, 108.

[156] The first two paragraphs present a slow, progressive shift from Dio's voice to that of the protagonist: the former uses the future tense to address the authorial audience, whereas the protagonist uses past tense to narrate the story to his narratees. The shift is progressive because the audience keeps in mind the conflation between Dio and the protagonist, arising from the use of first person singular.

[157] Phelan 2005, 214 defines character narration as 'narration in fiction or nonfiction by a participant in the story events.' However, in Phelan's theory there is no distinction between the various levels of character narration; therefore for the purposes of my research I will regard both the protagonist and the hunter as character narrators – each at their own point within the text – and will subsequently define the former as a primary, and the latter as a secondary character narrator. The reason for this is not a qualitative criterion, but rather the fact that the hunter's narrative is embedded in and comes after that of the protagonist.

paragraphs 81-152 comprise Dio's metaliterary commentary on the stories of the protagonist and the hunter, focusing on ethical issues.

At this point, I would like to make some preliminary remarks on the distinction between authorial and character narration. As has already been noted, the voice[158] of the first paragraph belongs to Dio, who promotes a particular reading and interpretation of the narrative to the readers: although the story might seem dull and out-of-date to some readers, it is not Dio who is to blame, but his advanced age preventing him from having a *comme-il-faut* writing style.[159] However, from paragraph 2, the authorial voice progressively gives way to that of a character narrator, who presents the narrated events from the standpoint of a protagonist – he participates in the story and reflects on both his and other characters' actions and behaviours.[160] The case in which two voices (in the *Euboicus*, Dio's and the protagonist's) almost coincide, but are not identical, marks, according to Phelan,[161] a remarkable fusion between the narrating-I (authorial narration), and the narrated-I (character narration). In other words, in autobiographical narratives, whether real or fictional, the 'I' that narrates forms a connection with the 'I' that participates in the storyworld, although the former addresses the authorial audience and the latter the narratees. As a consequence, the authorial audience 'operates with the tacit knowledge that the characters and events are synthetic (*i.e. literary*) constructs rather than real

---

[158] Since Genette pointed out the conflation of voice and focalization in the old concept of 'point of view', narratologists – among those, rhetorical narratologists too – have preserved the term *voice* as an answer to 'who speaks?', and *focalization* to 'who sees/perceives?'. Here, the implied author plays the role of both the narrator (who speaks) and the focalizer (who perceives) 'functioning as a set of lenses through which the audience perceives the story world' (Phelan 2005, 115). In my analysis, I accept Phelan's proposal that narrators can actually be focalizers too, as the beginning of the *Euboicus* indicates. On the connection between narrators and focalizers see Phelan 2005, 110-9. On the opposite opinion, i.e., that narrators belonging to the discourse level, and focalizers belonging to the story level are incompatible agents see Chatman 1978; Prince 2001.

[159] Dio's depiction as an old person, whose deteriorating memory raises questions about the validity of his sayings, resembles that of Socrates in Plato's *Rep.* 394D. See Russell 1992, ad τὸ μηδένα διωθεῖσθαι...λόγων.

[160] Brancacci 2016, 112 maintains that 'Dion réel avait entièrement disparu derrière lui pour se réduire au Dion personnage de ce voyage et de cet aventure.' Interestingly, the change of voice means also a change in focalisation: in structuralist terms, the protagonist's narration has internal focalisation ('what is presented [is] governed by one character's or another's perspective' (Prince 2003, *s.v.* 'focalisation')).

[161] Phelan 2005, 68-9.

people and historical happenings',[162] whereas the narratees treat the fictional world as real, without doubting the veracity of the narrated events. Thus despite the fusion between the voice of Dio and that of the protagonist, the two voices are addressed to disparate audiences that respond to the narrative differently.[163]

The distinction between the voice of Dio and that of the protagonist is further reinforced by the use of future and past tenses respectively. More specifically, when revealing his intentions to the authorial audience, Dio makes use of the future tense twice (διηγήσομαι, ἐρῶ), taking on the role of a storyteller, who recounts a story for a certain purpose. On the other hand, it is evident even from the very first word of the protagonist's speech that he uses exclusively the past tense (ἐτύγχανον), in an attempt to take the narratees back to a time prior to that of the present of the narrative. It is no coincidence, then, that the two voices have, apart from different audiences, different temporal levels too: in order to enhance the distance from the protagonist and to signal a change of voice, Dio uses temporality as a rhetorical resource[164] and marks a transition from the future to the past tense by having the protagonist narrating the events and himself commenting on them. In particular passages, Dio comes forward again, momentarily interrupting the 'fictionality of the scene',[165] by providing comments on how the authorial audience should (or could) perceive the narrative. Since these passages require special attention, I will analyse them later in more detail.

---

[162] Phelan 2005, 213. Italics are mine.

[163] For the rest of the analysis, it is important to keep in mind that the implied author and the character narrator(s) address different audiences.

[164] On temporality as a rhetorical resource see Phelan 2017, 26. Here, Dio also handles narrative speed, since the protagonist's and the hunter's return to the hut takes as much time as is needed for the hunter to finish the story of his visit to the city. In this way, 'the pace of the authorial audience's experience [is] rooted in the interaction of [ethical] instabilities and complications' (Phelan 2017, 85), as shown in the hunter's story.

[165] It should be noted that the fictionality of the scene is interrupted as soon as the authorial audience notices that the story is a literary construct. Conversely, the narratees are unaware of the implied author's comments, and therefore do not comprehend them as an interruption to the fictionality of the scene, since they have no such capacity. Thus the author establishes a certain connection with the authorial audience, that is, the audience that he *wants to* address.

In the first ten paragraphs, the characters of the story are delineated mainly mimetically,[166] as real-life people, with a focus on their external appearance: the protagonist is described as an old fisherman and shipwrecked sailor (7.2), and is perceived primarily as a ξεῖνος ('stranger') and later as a citizen (7.8: δοκεῖς δέ μοι τῶν ἀστικῶν εἶναί τις 'you look to me like a man from the city').[167] On the other hand, the countryman's identity as a hunter is given away by his special clothes (7.4: κυνηγέτην ἀπὸ τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τῆς στολῆς 'a hunter, to judge by his appearance and dress'), whereas what is also important for his characterisation is his familial status (7.10: τὸν βίον ὃν ἔζη μετὰ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ παίδων 'how he lived with his wife and children'). It is interesting that in these paragraphs the information is given through a combination of the dialogue between the two characters and the inner thoughts of the protagonist: by asking him directly, the hunter explores how the protagonist ended up in the Koila of Euboea, whether he was alone, or if anyone else was on the ship with him. Although the authorial audience is aware of the protagonist's background thanks to the authorial comments (7.1), the hunter is not and therefore has to ask the protagonist – this could be a strong argument for the transition from the authorial to character narration in the first two paragraphs. Additionally, the thoughts of the protagonist enhance his self-characterisation as a poor but prudent man with ragged clothes:

οὐ γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθῆναί ποτε ἔδεισα, οὐδὲν ἔχων ἢ φαῦλον ἱμάτιον. καὶ πολλάκις μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλοτε ἐπειράθην ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καιροῖς, ἅτε ἐν ἄλῃ συνεχεῖ, ἀτὰρ οὖν δὴ καὶ τότε, ὡς ἔστι

---

[166] In Phelanian theory, an authorial audience may develop interests in, and respond to, the textual dynamics of mimesis, by regarding situations, people, and events as possible realities. Thus it becomes part of the narrative audience, without paying too much attention to the synthetic components of the narrative, and develops responses based on how likely a situation, person, or event is, judging from the experiences of the real world. See also Phelan 2017, 11-2.

[167] It is obvious that the protagonist has striking similarities with Odysseus as illustrated in the *Odyssey*. See Russell 1992, 8. Jones 1978, 46-51 argues that the protagonist's resemblance to Odysseus constitutes a Cynic influence.

πενία χρῆμα τῷ ὄντι ἱερὸν καὶ ἄσυλον, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀδικεῖ, πολύ γε ἧττον ἢ τοὺς τὰ κηρύκεια ἔχοντας· (7.9-10)[168]

He mentions that all he had been left with was a dirty cloak and therefore did not fear that perhaps the hunter, being revealed as a robber, might actually steal anything precious from him. This thought depicts the hunter in a positive light, showing that his intuition was right, and that the hunter was indeed a noble man.[169] Furthermore it makes the protagonist reflect on the ethics of poor people more generally, maintaining that poverty is 'indeed something righteous and respectable.'

Another element that needs to be stressed is the role of the hunter as a character narrator. From paragraph 10, the protagonist remains in the background and grants the hunter the role of a narrator. In Bal's terms, the hunter is a secondary internal and overt narrator; in Genette's, a homodiegetic, intradiegetic narrator;[170] and in Phelan's, a character narrator who recounts the story both as an observer and as a protagonist. Additionally, the authorial audience witnesses a balanced transition from the first character narrator to the second by focusing on the hunter's story in the city. One should not, however, forget that what is recounted by the hunter is also part of the narrative of the protagonist. In other words, the authorial audience is aware that the speech is on the one hand told by the hunter and on the other embedded in the protagonist's wider narrative, whereas the narratees comprehend everything as real and completely truthful.

From paragraph 10 onwards, the narrative follows the story of the hunter in the city and his contrast to the ethics of the city-dwellers. It remains a question whether the description of

---

[168] '[I followed him gladly] without fear of any treachery, since I had nothing but a shabby cloak. Now I had often found in other situations like this — for I was continually roaming about — and I certainly did in this one, that poverty is in reality a sacred and inviolable thing and no one wrongs you; yes, much less than they wrong those who carry the herald's wand.'

[169] According to Russell 1992, ad ἐπιβουλευθῆναί ποτε ἔδεισα, it is a commonplace that poor people do not need to fear robbers because they do not carry anything valuable.

[170] Bal 2017; Genette 1983.

the Dionic Euboea accurately reflects the real Euboea.[171] In any case, the narrative of the hunter focuses on his trial and serves as a moral 'manifesto' of the people of the country. Its ethical tone is presented by the way in which the hunter contrasts himself and his family to the people of the city: he lives in an idyllic place in the countryside, full of greenery and clear water, encounters a plethora of farm and wild animals everyday – cows, calves, dogs, wolves, boars, deer, bears, hares, and gazelles (7.14-19) – and has the honour to be father of a beautiful young daughter, husband of a kind woman, as well as a friend to country men with youthful and vigorous bodies (7.20).

The vocabulary used to describe the country setting creates the impression of an ideal place in which everyone would like to live.[172] Additionally, the continuous use of past tenses promotes a distance between the present and the past of the narrative, for the sublimity of the idyllic country has turned out to be defective due to the corrosive power of the city – the involvement of city-dwellers in the affairs of the country is seen by the hunter as highly alarming and disturbing. It is no wonder, then, that the city is described in generally derogatory terms: it is considered as an off-putting place with huge houses and surrounding walls, with a great many ships, and people who make disturbing noises, laugh loudly, and cry to each other (7.21-23). The cultural shock that the hunter experiences is also seen in the way that he characterises the residents as an ὄχλος, that is, as a big, noisy crowd.[173] Nevertheless, his vocabulary is that of a countryman, and therefore places and people are presented through the lens of a person who seems to have never been to a city before: the most prominent example

---

[171] Jouan 1977, 45; Russell 1992, 8-9; Hughes 1996, esp. 94. Engster 2012 offers a comprehensive analysis of the various opinions on the fictionality and/or reality of the *Euboicus*.

[172] This could be a *locus amoenus*, that is, an idyllic place whose beauty is reflected in every living thing. On the *locus amoenus* in ancient literature see Schönbeck 1964; Hass 1998; Schlapbach 2007. However, Anderson 2000, 146 argues that the hunter's description of his area is far from being considered as a *locus amoenus*. Likewise, Hass 1998 does not include it in her long list of Greek and Roman *loci amoeni*.

[173] Russell 1992, ad εἶδον οὖν.

of his naivety is the description of the theatre as a crowded, semi-circular, ravine-like place, where people gather to hear orations from public speakers:

οἱ δὲ ἄρχοντες εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἐβάδιζον, κἀγὼ σὺν αὐτοῖς. τὸ δὲ θέατρόν ἐστιν ὥσπερ φάραγξ κοῖλον, πλὴν οὐ μακρὸν ἑκατέρωθεν, ἀλλὰ στρογγύλον ἐξ ἡμίσους, οὐκ αὐτόματον, ἀλλ᾿ ᾠκοδομημένον λίθοις. ἴσως δέ μου καταγελᾷς, ὅτι σοι διηγοῦμαι σαφῶς εἰδότι ταῦτα. (7.24)[174]

Of particular importance is that the hunter momentarily disrupts his story to address the protagonist by sympathising with him, in case the latter burst out laughing at the former's naïve description. However, there is good reason to believe that this comment constitutes, apart from the hunter's address to the protagonist, an indirect comment of Dio.[175] More particularly, the authorial audience's perception of the passage (or of the hunter's narrative as a whole) as something humorous is influenced by the ethical characteristic of naivety that Dio attributes to the hunter. In other words, Dio uses a certain kind of rhetoric that guides the authorial audience towards a more sympathetic image of the hunter by presenting the latter as a naïve character narrator, whose story can provoke laughter.[176]

Interestingly, laughter plays a prominent role in the hunter's narrative. The first reference to laughter is in the aforementioned passage, in which laughter comes as an emotional

---

[174] 'Then the officials went into the theatre and I with them. The theatre is hollow like a ravine, except that it is not long in two directions but semi-circular, and not natural but built of stone. But perhaps you are laughing at me for telling you what you know perfectly well.'

[175] Alexiou 2003, 308 contends that the hunter's address to the protagonist serves as a humorous sarcasm towards the latter, since he is regarded as a citizen, and therefore a potential member of the noisy crowd like that in the trial.

[176] The hunter, by presenting elements of naivety in his description of the city in general, and by mistaking the theatre for something else in particular, displays signs of unreliability on the axis of events (misreporting), and of understanding/perception (misinterpreting). In the case of misreporting, the hunter shows lack of knowledge of what a theatre is, and moreover of what purpose it serves, while in the case of misinterpreting, he makes a mistaken interpretation when he interprets the mob's shouting as something irrational and highly disturbing – due to his restricted point of view, he does not realise that it is reasonable for the mob to shout loudly in crowded cities. Also it is important to note that throughout his narrative, the hunter displays signs of unreliability, either by misinterpreting, or by mistakenly understanding a situation, other characters, or events. On the different categories of unreliability see Phelan 2005, 38-53.

response to the narrative – especially, the prefix κατά (καταγελᾷς) adds a tone of ridicule to the word.[177] At the same time, all the other references to laughter within the narrative of the hunter serve the same purpose, i.e., laughter is the physical, spontaneous reaction to someone else's words or behaviour. For example, in paragraph 29, the countryman is said to take part in a trial concerning his and his father's exploitation of a rural area and their subsequent avoidance of paying any tax. The prosecutor states the accusation clearly, maintaining that the hunter and his father have not paid any tax at all; to that the hunter shakes his head and the audience bursts out laughing (7.29: κἀγὼ ἀνένευσα. ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐγέλασεν, ὡς εἶδε. καὶ ὁ λέγων ἐκεῖνος ὠργίσθη ἐπὶ τῷ γέλωτι καί μοι ἐλοιδορεῖτο 'I shook my head, and the crowd laughed when they saw. This laughing enraged the speaker and he abused me roundly').[178] Here, laughter is both the consequence of the hunter's naivety and weakness in defending himself in the trial effectively and a reason for further annoyance, as the reaction of the prosecutor shows.

In the next paragraph, the countryman laughs as loudly as possible at the words of the prosecutor, when the latter argues that a fair penalty would be to inflict major taxes upon the hunter (7.30: ἐγὼ δὲ ἀκούσας ἐγέλασα ὅσον ἐδυνάμην μέγιστον. τὸ δὲ πλῆθος οὐκέτ᾽ ἐγέλων, ὥσπερ πρότερον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐθορύβουν 'When I heard this, I laughed as loud as I could. The crowd, however, did not laugh as before but became very noisy'). In this case, laughter comes as a spontaneous act of emotional defusion, since the hunter knows that he is unable to pay all those taxes due to his poor financial situation, while the city-dwellers' laughter enhances the moral difference between them and the hunter – the former laugh at the expense of someone else's hard time and distress.

---

[177] See *LSJ⁹*, *s.v.* καταγελάω, 'laugh scornfully, mock'.

[178] Note here again the hunter's unreliability on both the axis of events (misreporting), and understanding/perception (misinterpreting): instead of reacting to the accusation negatively, by trying to confute it (as people would normally do in a trial), he simply shakes his head, provoking laughter in the audience.

With the exception of a reference to laughter as an indication of the immorality of the city-dwellers (7.39), the next mention occurs in paragraph 43, where the hunter defends himself by using frivolous arguments. In particular, when asked what he could possibly give to the city as a payback for the rural area he was exploiting, the hunter proposes four outstanding deer coats (7.43: κἀγώ, τέσσαρα, ἔφην, ἐλάφεια δέρματα πάνυ καλά. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ αὐτῶν ἐγέλασαν '(…) to which I replied, 'Four deer pelts of excellent quality'. Here the majority laughed'). Instead of showing the city-dwellers' disrespect, this passage presents the hunter's lack of any knowledge of (fair) trading. Indeed, literature often depicted countrymen as inadequately informed about urban and cultural affairs, thus presenting a fundamental social difference between city and country.[179] Here, the hunter's innocent response and the city-dwellers' subsequent laughter indicate that the lack of any kind of sophistication is in fact a characteristic of countrymen that makes them culturally ignorant and socially inferior to their urban counterparts. It shows also that the people who live far from a city and abstain from its affairs are less interested in doing fair deals and more interested in living a simple, primitive life.

Laughter is used again as an indication of the hunter's naivety in paragraph 48, when he exclaims that the statement of the prosecutor that countrymen can bury large amounts of silver coins makes no sense, since money is not like fruit – it cannot grow in the ground! (7.48: οὐκοῦν, ἔφην, ἀνάσκαψον ἐλθών, ὦ μῶρε. τίς δὲ κατορύττει ἀργύριον; οὐ γὰρ δὴ φύεταί γε. ἐνταῦθα πάντες ἐγέλων, ἐκείνου μοι δοκεῖν καταγελάσαντες ''Well then,' said I, 'come and dig it up, you fool! Who buries money in the ground? It certainly does not grow.' Then

---

[179] The difference between urban and country life is as old as Western literature: in the *Odyssey* (*e.g.* 14.50-70), the Suitors' inappropriate behaviour is compared to the herdsmen's decision to live a peaceful life, far from the palace of Ithaca. In Hellenistic pastoral poetry, and more particularly in Theocritus, shepherds often care more for their animals than for the affairs of humans (*e.g. Id*. IV). In Longus, who is chronologically closer to Dio, Lycaenion is described as a treacherous citizen, and Chloe as an innocent country girl that has no knowledge about the city matters (3.15). Another example is Alciphron's *Epistle* 1.4 supposedly sent by Kymothöos to Tritonis. See also Anderson 2000, 149-50. On the different depiction of city life and country life in the ancient novel see Saïd 1999.

everybody laughed, and it was at him, I thought').[180] What the prosecutor maintains was in fact a standard habit of the people who wanted to secure their money in times of danger.[181]

From all these references, it is clear that laughter is used as both an ethical element promoting a distinction between the norms and principles of city-dwellers and country people – whereas the former might laugh at the hunter's lack of, and inexperience in, city manners and craftiness (he is innocent enough not to realise that the prosecutor was 'plotting' against him), the latter laughs because of his naivety and inability to understand that not all people are to be trusted – and as a sign of unreliability pertaining to the authorial audience's estranging distance from the hunter as a character narrator.[182] Indeed, the last reference to laughter definitely highlights this distinction: the hunter spontaneously kisses Sotades, an old friend of his from the city, to whom he had offered shelter in the past and the audience immediately bursts out laughing, leaving the hunter with the impression that kissing someone on the cheek does not belong to the repertoire of citizens (7.59: καὶ προσελθὼν ἐφίλουν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν ἕτερον. ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐγέλα σφόδρα, ὅτι ἐφίλουν αὐτούς. τότε ἔγνων ὅτι ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν οὐ φιλοῦσιν ἀλλήλους 'And I approached and kissed him and the other man. However, the people laughed heartily because I kissed them. Then I understood that in the cities people do not kiss one another').

Through the examination of the references to laughter within the hunter's narrative, we see that Dio designates a particular contrast between city and country.[183] Firstly, laughter is the reaction to someone's words or behaviour, so it is an interpersonal construct maintaining

---

[180] This is one of the clearest examples of the hunter's unreliability through misinterpreting: he fails to understand the prosecutor's proposition, and therefore tries to show what a foolish idea that is. The audience's laughing comes then as a physical reaction to a countryman's rusticity preventing him from understanding basic financial matters.
[181] Russell 1992, ad ὅπου…κατορύττετε.
[182] In Phelanian theory, any sign of (un)reliability, either through plot dynamics or narrative dynamics, has a particular effect on the readerly dynamics and on the authorial audience. On the one hand, the authorial audience recognises that adopting the narrator's perspective would mean 'moving far away from the implied author's perspective' (the estranging effect of unreliability), while on the other, although the authorial audience recognises the narrator's unreliability, this unreliability 'includes some communication that the implied author approves of' (the bonding effect of unreliability). On the bonding and estranging effects of unreliability see Phelan 2017, 96-116.
[183] Trapp 2019 reaches similar conclusions.

certain social and ethical boundaries among people. Secondly, through laughter people display either an ironic and superficial behaviour (city-dwellers), or naivety and lack of formal communicative skills (hunter). Finally, as the narrator concludes in passage 7.59, laughter can also bring about social shyness through its corrosive power over one's self-consciousness – the hunter feels embarrassed for doing something that is acceptable in the country only.

Another element of the hunter's narrative is the language that he uses and the narrative techniques with which he enhances the distinction between city and country life. As his personal story unfolds, the hunter describes in detail what the people said in the trial and his reaction to their words. More particularly, in paragraphs 27-41, the hunter, as a secondary character narrator, presents the speeches of the prosecutor and the defendant in the trial; each one shows his arguments in a highly rhetorical way: apart from formal apostrophes, such as 'men' (7.27, 34), they make good use of forensic words,[184] of Demosthenic classical terms of invective (e.g. τοῖς θηρίοις τούτοις 'these backwoodsmen', 7.29),[185] and of rhetorical tropes.[186]

The highly rhetorical style with which the hunter presents the speeches of the orators makes the authorial audience suspect the indirect presence of Dio. The readers notice that, given the hunter's limited intellect, he would in no case be able to remember precisely what

---

[184] Here I mean words and phrases that are considered as mostly appropriate to a trial: e.g. τιμὴν καταβαλόντες (7.27), λειτουργίαν (7.28), ἀτελεῖς, ἀλειτούργητοι (7.28), εἰρωνείαν, ὕβριν (7.30), προῖκα δοίην (7.34), συκοφαντοῦσι (7.38), τὰ περὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον καὶ τὰ ἀρχεῖα (7.39). We had better keep in mind that these words were primarily used by highly educated citizens, and not by everyday people, and especially countrymen.

[185] According to Russell 1992, ad τοῖς θηρίοις τούτοις, this phrase is taken from Demosthenes' twenty-first speech (21.185).

[186] Some of those are e.g. metaphor (7.29: τοῖς θηρίοις τούτοις 'these backwoodsmen'), simile (7.28: ὥσπερ εὐεργέται τῆς πόλεως 'as though they were benefactors of the city'; 7.32: ὥσπερ οἶμαι τὸν Ναύπλιον ὁρῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καφηρέως ἥκοντα 'as I fancy I should be if I saw Nauplius come from Cap*hereus'; 7.38: ὥσπερ ἐν ἐρημίᾳ τῇ βαθυτάτῃ 'as though it were in the depths of a wilderness'), zeugma (7.31: πολυτελεῖς ἀγρούς, μᾶλλον δὲ ὅλας κώμας κατεσκευάσαντο καὶ τοσοῦτον πλῆθος βοσκημάτων καὶ ζεύγη καὶ ἀνδράποδα 'where, otherwise, did they get such valuable fields, nay, rather, entire villages, and such numbers of cattle and draught animals and slaves?'), erotema (7.30: Ὁρᾶτε τὴν εἰρωνείαν καὶ τὴν ὕβριν τοῦ καθάρματος, ὡς καταγελᾷ πάνυ θρασέως; 'do you see the deceitfulness and imprudence of the scamp and how insolently he mocks me?'), hyperbole (7.36: δύο τῶν μεγίστων ἀπηλλαγμένοι κακῶν, ἀργίας καὶ πενίας 'may be free from two very great evils – idleness and poverty').

was mentioned in the trial, let alone to reconstruct carefully the original words of the orators.[187] Additionally, the fact that their speeches are much more different, at least stylistically, from the hunter's subsequent account (7.41-63) shows that Dio exploits a particular rhetoric suitable to each character narration. For example, the hunter's excessive use of the first person singular places him in the centre of interest,[188] showing that he is concerned primarily with the impact that the result of the trial has upon himself and his family. Also his vocabulary comprises words designating particular objects and animals traditionally found in the country[189] and even his recounting of a past experience with the once shipwrecked Sotades is presented without any rhetorical embellishments in style and vocabulary.

The fact that the hunter displays two quite different types of style in speaking (the one, the rustic, is his, and the other, the rhetorical, is the orators') shows that Dio uses language as a rhetorical resource to enhance the distinction between the way of life of city-dwellers and of countrymen. In combination with laughter, as examined above, Dio gives an ethical tone to the hunter's narrative by establishing boundaries between the two types of living. One could argue that the attribution of highly rhetorical characteristics to the orators within the hunter's speech constitutes a weak narrative technique, due to the fact that the hunter could not actually know or even remember precisely what the orators had said in the trial.[190] However, this technique

---

[187] Anderson 2000, 147. However, this could be a case of *paradoxical paralepsis*, in Phelan's words. The implied author could be considered as forming a narrative gap by having the hunter speaking like a true orator; nevertheless, this fails to get noticed by the readers – at least by the non-experts in the theory of narrative – who in the meantime have been engrossed in the narrative's ethical question of how much the hunter's behaviour differs from that of the citizens. A *paradoxical paralepsis* then signals the gradual progression of the narrator from naivety to the realisation and loss of that naivety, which in our case is illustrated in the hunter's awareness of his fundamental differences from the people of the city in terms of ethics. On paradoxical paralepsis see Phelan 2011, 57-59. On paralepsis in first-person narratives see Heinze 2008.

[188] The hunter uses the personal pronoun ἐγώ and its various forms, as well as first singular and plural verbs thirty-eight times in total.

[189] He refers to animals (horses, asses, bulls, cows, goats), to everyday clothes worn by countrymen only (deer coats, bear skins), to grains for cultivation (wheat, barley, millet, beans), as well as to certain types of meat and wine. Cf. also Theoc. *Id.* 11, in which the naïve Cyclops flatters and praises his beloved for her beauty, using the rustic vocabulary of dairy and animal products.

[190] Since the orators' speeches are embedded into the hunter's narrative of paragraphs 10-64, one could say that it is strange for the hunter, as a rustic and naïve character narrator, to transform his cognitive skills entirely, and

is often inevitable in fictional narratives, since implied authors (or narrators) can choose to break the verisimilitude of a character portrayal in order to convey the story and narration the way they want to. In the case of the *Euboicus*, the tacit presence of Dio lies in the different styles in speaking that the hunter displays in his narrative. Thus the authorial audience, during the process of perceiving and interpreting the text, understands that Dio is ultimately responsible for the shaping of the whole text, even if he chooses to give voice to another character, as happens in the case of the embedded narrative of the hunter.

The presence of Dio within the hunter's embedded narrative hints at one more characteristic of the former's identity. As has been noted earlier, an implied author is also a version of the real author, an *alter ego* appearing in the process of encoding, that is, during the development of a narrative.[191] That means that the real, flesh-and-blood author may choose to add certain characteristics of himself or herself to their implied 'version', depending on what kind of rhetoric he or she might want to communicate to the readers.[192]

Coming back to the *Euboicus*, we have seen that the indirect presence of Dio lies in the two different styles with which the hunter reproduces the speeches from the trial: the first type is a more rustic one, suitable for the people of the country, whose literary representation was, as has been argued, very simplistic and naïve; the second is a highly rhetorical and stylistic one, displaying an abundance of *termini technici* and a sound knowledge of how the legal system of the time actually worked. In addition, the hunter's purported representation of the

---

reproduce the orators' words with impeccable accuracy. Thus Dio seems 'trapped' into an incompatible double mindset of the hunter – the authorial audience might reasonably ask, is the hunter as naïve as he (or Dio) wants them to think?

[191] I use the word 'also' because, according to Shen 2011, the concept of the implied author is constructed by *both* an encoding and a decoding process; in the latter case, the audience is the one that decodes, interprets, and perceives the implied author as seen throughout the text.

[192] Although common in the different strands of rhetorical narratology, this idea was originally conceived by Booth 1983. He supported the idea that the real question of an author is not whether he or she will appear within the narrative or not, but to what extent and in what way he or she will appear. Thus the author's omnipresence within the narrative is defined by the kind of rhetoric (the way) that they employ in order to communicate messages to the readers. See also the introduction.

orators has a highly rhetorical dimension, not only in the terms used (see above), but also in its general structure – it consists of a προοίμιον, a διήγησις, a lengthy θέσις, as well as an ἐπίλογος (7.27-33, 34-40, 54-58).[193]

One could reasonably suspect that in this second type of style lies Dio's revelation of some of his characteristics as an orator: as several modern biographical accounts suggest,[194] for example, Dio, the flesh-and-blood author, was, apart from a prolific author, also knowledgeable about rhetorical theory. Nevertheless, the attribution of the above characteristics to the real, rather than the implied, author contradicts the basic tenet of rhetorical narratology that assumes the concept of an implied author as encoded by the real author and as decoded by readers. Remaining within the Phelanian theory, we can thus assume that through the attribution of highly rhetorical skills to the hunter, the implied (not the flesh-and-blood) Dio makes himself perceptible to the audience as being well informed in rhetorical theory and practice.

After a brief account of Sotades' past shipwreck (7.54-8), which actually serves as the strongest argument for the hunter's acquittal, the hunter concludes his narrative with a description of the benefits that the city-dwellers granted him: he was permitted to dine in the city and was given nicer clothes and money as a polite expression for his service to the state and his care for the rural area all this time (7.59-63). The second reference to a shipwreck is beyond doubt a significant narrative block permitting the audience to make a connection between the shipwrecked protagonist and Sotades: Dio uses thematic repetition here by presenting the theme of shipwreck twice (7.1 and 7.55-8) in order to guide the audience towards

---

[193] On the contrary, the hunter's speech displays hardly any rhetorical characteristics – his sentences are short and stylistically unadorned, he uses the imperative quite a lot, which makes his speech rough (7.48-50), and also insults his opponents by calling them idiots (7.48). This rhetorical style is probably quite close to the so-called *genus humile* ('low style').

[194] See *e.g.* von Arnim 1898; Desideri 1978; Jones 1978; Moles 1978; Salmeri 1980; Amato 2014. See also Anderson 2000, 147-8.

a more concrete ethical characterization of the hunter and also to bring the protagonist to the narrative surface once again by reminding the readers that the protagonist actually enjoys (or is expected to enjoy) the same kind of hospitality from the hunter as Sotades did. Thus behind the use of thematic repetition, a double effect can be detected: firstly, Dio handles the plot dynamics by repeating a common sequence of events in favour of the hunter's moral characterization and secondly, he has two distinct character narrators (the protagonist and Sotades) acknowledging the hospitality and goodwill of the hunter. To put this point simply, with his double reference to the shipwreck theme, Dio enhances the ethical image of the hunter, as seen by both the (intratextual) character narrators and the authorial audience, which prompts an interpretive evaluation of the overall behaviour of the hunter.

Before I move on to the next section of the text (7.65-80), I would like to examine the relationship between the hunter, as a character narrator, and the authorial audience. First of all, the hunter's addressee (narratee) is the protagonist, who, apart from a brief reference to his possible display of irony when listening to the story,[195] remains uncharacterised for the whole narrative, thus being given little importance by the hunter – the latter gives more prominence to the ethical messages behind his story and less to the characterisation of the protagonist.[196] In fact, the protagonist remains in the background of the story as a mere listener and as an agent whose main role is to become informed about, and interpret, the events narrated by the hunter. Simultaneously, the authorial audience is prompted by the character narrator to pay attention to the story and later to infer what the ethical messages of the story are. In order to achieve a connection between the narratee (the protagonist) and the authorial audience, Dio has the hunter avoiding characterisation of the narratee and also narrating everything from a personal

---

[195] 7.24: ἴσως δέ μου καταγελᾷς, ὅτι σοι διηγοῦμαι σαφῶς εἰδότι ταῦτα 'perhaps you are laughing at me for telling you what you know perfectly well.'

[196] This is probably due to the fact that Dio has adequately presented the protagonist at the beginning of the text. Thus it would be considered by the authorial audience as unnecessarily repetitious if the hunter chose to refer to the characteristics (internal and external) of the protagonist again, as Dio did earlier.

perspective without any direct intrusions from Dio. In other words, the less Dio appears in the hunter's narrative, the closer the authorial audience moves towards the narratee (the protagonist); otherwise, the authorial audience would be aware of any direct comments of Dio on the hunter's narrative and would consequently distance themselves from the protagonist by trying to figure out how much the character narrator's perspective of the events differs from that of Dio (or the protagonist).[197]

Once Dio has made sure that the authorial audience shares the same kind of information with the narratee, he grants the hunter the role of both the character narrator and the focaliser so that the hunter guides not only the narratee, but also the authorial audience through the story. In terms of rhetorical resources, the hunter reverses the temporally linear progression of the story by referring to events that happened before the Narrative Now,[198] while also introducing a minor instability that will be resolved only at the end of the story (7.64).

Moreover, as regards the narrative dynamics of the hunter's story, there is a certain complication of the relation between the teller and the authorial audience: the hunter, far from being a mere teller, makes a plethora of evaluative comments on his narrative by interpreting the events that happened during his visit to the city and in his trial. In other words, the hunter, as a character narrator, sets in motion his reporting, interpreting, and evaluating functions by guiding at the same time the narratee's and the authorial audience's interpreting and evaluating functions. More specifically, the hunter reports from a personal perspective his experience of his visit to the city, although sometimes he mistakes places (in 7.23, e.g., he mistakes the port

---

[197] The relationships between authors, narrators, and audiences play a crucial role in the construction of the ethical dimensions emerging 'from plotting to direct addresses to the audience' (Phelan 2017, 8-9).

[198] I am adopting Phelan's term for signifying the moment that the narrative starts, the point zero of the narrative, in Genette's words. This Narrative Now can be placed at the moment of the protagonist's revelation of his experience on Euboea, or, if one regards Dio's introductory comments as the very start of the whole narrative, at the moment in which Dio, now an old man, 'sits down' and decides to present a story. Whichever of the two we choose, the hunter's narrative is chronologically earlier than both the protagonist's shipwreck, and Dio's presentation of the narrative. On Narrative Now see Phelan 2017, 84-91.

for a river).[199] What is more striking though is that he consistently misinterprets events and certain behaviours with a tone of naivety: for instance, he perceives the crowd's shouting as a terrible thunder (7.25), he regards the words of the prosecutor as part of a dream (7.42), and he judges the prosecutor's metaphorical idea of keeping money in the ground as realistically impossible (7.48). Finally, his judgement of the behaviour of the other characters seems to be inaccurate or rushed, with the most notable being the misjudging of Sotades as a slanderer (7.54).[200] The misinterpretation and misevaluation that the hunter displays constitute signs of narratorial unreliability, which has bonding, rather than estranging, effects on the authorial audience: that is to say, the authorial audience understands the hunter's narration (albeit unreliable) as not contradicting, but rather as agreeing with, Dio's perspective on the fundamental differences between city and country, which is subsequently exemplified by the hunter's comment that even commonly accepted practices in the city may seem completely alien to a country-dweller.[201]

I would like now to turn to a crucial question about the kind of readerly responses that the authorial audience displays when perceiving the hunter's story. Does the audience perceive the story as a possible real-life scenario (mimetic function), as a story with deeper universal meanings (thematic function), or as a purely literary construct (synthetic function)? To answer this question, I will go back to the hunter's narrative and, by examining its textual dynamics, I will attempt to show that the authorial audience perceives the narrative mainly mimetically and thematically.

---

[199] This kind of unreliability belongs to the category of misreporting, since the character narrator fails to report correctly to the narratee and the authorial audience where he is every time. Let me note here that, even though later in the text he informs us that it is the theatre that he is in, he still fails to tell his audience that it is the port that he sees, and not a huge lake.

[200] Upon Sotades' arrival, the hunter's 'first reaction is fear and the naïve apprehension that this man, too, will attack him with lies' (Ma 2000, 115).

[201] The only case of a (momentary) estranging effect is when the hunter initially evaluates Sotades' intention as vicious, even though afterwards he realises his goodwill.

I start with the mimetic elements because they are the most evident. The hunter describes the country (7.10-20) and the city (7.21-26) with adjectives that on the one hand characterise both places and on the other provide a certain distance between them: in the country, people are mostly shepherds, cultivate small pieces of land, go hunting in summer, whereas in winter they prefer to spend more time in their huts due to heavy snow. On the contrary, the city is a concrete jungle – tall buildings and walls, huge ships, large crowds, and public places considerably uglify the image of the city, which is far from ideal. The vivid description of 'stock' characteristics in both country and city contributes to the overall mimetic dimension of the narrative: it has been argued that in the first century AD, cities would more or less resemble that of the *Euboicus*.[202] In other words, the hunter's realistic description of the places provokes mimetic interests in the authorial audience, who perceive the descriptions of the city and the country as representing real-life places.[203]

Although the beginning of the narrative is mainly mimetic, there seems to be a progressive transition towards a more thematic, and hence less mimetic, dimension, once the character narrator turns to the trial scene. Undoubtedly, the trial scene has obvious mimetic characteristics,[204] but the focus of the hunter on the words of, and the dialogue between, him

---

[202] Berry 1983, 73 assumes that it is Chalcis. Hughes 1996 attempts a socio-historical reconstruction of how Greek cities of the Imperial period would seem, based on Dio's text, and defines the city described by the hunter as the Euboean Carystos. The same city is also proposed by Ma 2000, 109; 120. Goette 2012 also argues that specific characteristics of the Dionic city are far from fictional and agree with the archaeological evidence of that time. In my opinion, though, it is not the specifications of these characteristics that matter, but rather the means with which Dio constructs an image for the city, and furthermore communicates it to the authorial audience. Thus, in the frame of a narratological analysis, it is more essential to define the kind of literary techniques that the author uses to present the city and the country, than to decide if the text's environment is real or artificial, or both.

[203] Brenk 2000, 271 argues that there is a mix of real and fictional elements in the text. See also Russell 1992, 13.

[204] Indeed, the way in which the trial is presented can be considered as mimetically constructed: the hunter enters the place, and hears the crowd's shouting. Later a prosecutor turns up and begins the *vituperatio* against the hunter. Another mimetic characteristic is the organisation of the whole trial, according to which the prosecutor speaks first, the hunter second, and Sotades, acting as a συνήγορος, speaks in favour of the hunter's acquittal. It should be noted here that according to the logic of narratives, the hunter cannot completely abandon the formerly exploited mimetic aspect in favour of a solely thematic one, since that would confuse the audience's interest and would disrupt the narrative dynamics. Thus the only thing he can do is to infuse progressively thematic components into the trial scene by letting the audience infer these interests in the course of the narrative.

and the orators gives a thematic tone to the narrative and shows that behind the speeches lies the theme of 'city life vs country life'. This is where I now turn.

The trial scene (7.27-63) serves a distinctive role within the hunter's narrative, since it occupies the largest part of it, and also intensifies the fundamental difference between city and country that the hunter implicitly announced through his description of the country as a *locus amoenus* and the city as a *locus horrendus*. With the introduction of a new instability – the hunter's call to participate in a trial in the city – Dio progressively develops the thematic difference between the naïve yet honest hunter and the dishonest and greedy city-dwellers.

More particularly, the prosecutor's insults to the hunter signal a shift towards a more thematic interest, since the latter is described as a wild animal,[205] a rascal,[206] and a rustic.[207] It is the second orator who then refutes the accusation against the hunter by calling him hard-working[208] and humble,[209] thus establishing a basic difference from the claims of the prosecutor about the overall conduct of the hunter. At this point, the authorial audience witnesses the double (positive and negative) characterisation of the hunter and subsequently attempts to comprehend which form of characterisation holds true, judging from the thematic characteristics that each orator attributes to him: he is either an uncivilised beast or a respected man. Last but not least, the hunter's response to the orators gives a thematic perspective to his depiction, since he characterises himself in ethical terms as an honest, reliable man, aiding everyone who is in need.[210] The diverse characterisations by the orators and the hunter pertain

---

[205] Cohoon's suggested translation of τοῖς θηρίοις τούτοις as 'backwoodsmen' does not capture adequately the sense that a person is regarded as an animal (θηρίον). Therefore not only is the hunter regarded as a rustic man, but also as an animal, i.e., as an inferior creature, a beast.

[206] 7.30: τὴν ὕβριν τοῦ καθάρματος 'imprudence of the scamp'.

[207] 7.43: ἔφη με ἄγροικον εἶναι '[he] said that I was a downright landloper'.

[208] 7.38: τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ Καφηρεῖ φιλεργοῦντας 'the industrious people of Caphereus'.

[209] 7.40: τοὺς ταλαιπώρους ἰδιώτας 'humble and needy citizens'.

[210] See in particular 7.49-50.

to the thematic interests of the authorial audience because they are directed towards the appreciation of the moral differences between city-dwellers and countrymen.

I now turn to paragraphs 65-80, which conclude the first part of the text, with the hunter and the protagonist arriving at the former's hut, and the hunter's family preparing for the daughter's wedding feast. Prior to the examination of the rhetorical elements pertaining to the narratological scope of my analysis, I will outline briefly what happens in these paragraphs and how the story progresses after the embedded story of the hunter.

The two men have left the deserted shore (cf. 7.2-8) and have eventually reached the hunter's farmhouse, the natural beauty and peacefulness of which immediately catch the narrator's eye.[211] The narrative then shifts to the detailed description of the feast, where the hunter's daughter gets married to a handsome young country boy. The preparations include the festive decoration of the maiden's house, the decision of when the most appropriate day for the wedding is, as well as the religious ritual performed in the temple prior to the wedding. The delightful event takes place three days later and the narrator has the opportunity to witness, for the first time, how a wedding between country-dwellers is actually held. This section of the text is harmoniously linked to the previous one: thematically, since it refers to already known characters and resumes the story from where the protagonist had left it and structurally, since the anticipation (or in narratological terms, prolepsis) of paragraphs 5 and 6 that the two men will stay at the hunter's hut is eventually fulfilled.[212]

As is seen from the summary above, paragraphs 65-80 create a mimetic readerly interest to the narrative. The transition from the thematic interest, which is implied in the hunter's personal story, to the mimetic interest, which is reintroduced by the description of the wedding

---

[211] In this part, the narrator is again the protagonist, the shipwrecked sailor of the beginning of the text, not the hunter. This change of voice has significant effects on the authorial audience, as I will argue later.

[212] In this case, Dio handles narrative speed in a such a way that the narration of the return of the men to the hut is significantly paused by the hunter's telling of his trial in the city.

feast, is successfully developed by the protagonist, who confesses that he has witnessed the destructive moral behaviour of great men and kings falsely believing that wealth is the ultimate source of happiness and appreciation:

(…) ὥστε ἐμὲ εὐδαιμονίζειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνους καὶ οἴεσθαι μακαρίως ζῆν πάντων μάλιστα ὧν ἠπιστάμην. καίτοι πλουσίων οἰκίας τε καὶ τραπέζας ἠπιστάμην, οὐ μόνον ἰδιωτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων, οἳ μάλιστα ἐδόκουν μοι τότε ἄθλιοι, καὶ πρότερον δοκοῦντες, ἔτι μᾶλλον, ὁρῶντι τὴν ἐκεῖ πενίαν τε καὶ ἐλευθερίαν, καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀπελείποντο οὐδὲ τῆς περὶ τὸ φαγεῖν τε καὶ πιεῖν ἡδονῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτοις ἐπλεονέκτουν σχεδόν τι. (7.65-6)[213]

These paragraphs constitute a turning point in the text, commenting on the lengthy narrative of the hunter and also preparing the audience for Dio's lengthier metaliterary description in paragraphs 81-152. With his use of the previous narrative as an exemplary story, the protagonist briefly remarks on the morality of poor people compared to that of the rich, thus offering important insight into the ethics of different kinds of people:[214] by adopting the perspective from which the protagonist views the events narrated, the audience is asked to sympathise with the hunter, whose purity and honesty are substantially differentiated from the corruption of the city-dwellers. Thus the protagonist develops a substantial ethical idea and shifts the authorial audience's perspective towards a more sympathetic view of the hunter,

---

[213] '(…) so that I could not help deeming these people fortunate and thinking that of all the men that I knew, they lived the happiest lives. And yet I knew the homes and tables of rich men, of satraps and kings as well as of private individuals; but then they seemed to me the most wretched of all; and though they had so appeared before, yet I felt this the more strongly as I beheld the poverty and free spirit of the humble cottagers and noted that they lacked naught of the joy of eating and drinking, nay, that even in these things they had, one might almost say, the better of it.'

[214] Similarly, in paragraph 80, the narrator repeats the differences between country men and citizens in terms of how they arrange a wedding, and thus intensifies the ethical idea that a simple rural wedding is preferable to a bureaucratic, complicated marriage like the ones held in the city.

while at the same time preparing the ground for the development of his points through the mimetic description of how country people used to eat and drink without losing their pleasure in things.

From that point onwards, the text turns exclusively to the preparation of the wedding and to other related issues, such as the definition of the dowry and the day that the wedding would be suitable to be held. The protagonist thoroughly describes the wedding preparations and the conversations between the members of the hunter's house and the young groom's family (7.67-75). The importance of this scene is that the narratees, and through them the authorial audience, gain access to the setting of a rural household and witness how much country people differ from their city counterparts: the young groom brings a rural gift to the bride (a hare)[215] and kisses her and her parents, which, as mentioned previously (7.59), was thought of as indecent among citizens. In terms of the girl's dowry, it is argued that the family's garden is full of greenery, and therefore they can cater for themselves, cultivating vegetables and cabbages, whereas another source of income is hunting – her father is an excellent hunter and 'whatever he catches, he brings it back to the family' (7.69).

In this mimetically constructed setting, the protagonist, judging by his urban way of living, demands the reason why the girl does not take the young man as her husband right away; to this the hunter replies that before anything else, the most suitable day for the marriage has to be determined. The protagonist's lack of knowledge prompts a dialogue with the hunter that offers more insight into the practices of rural people and their contrast to city-dwellers.[216] First of all, the hunter states that in order for a marriage to be successful, the moon needs to be

---

[215] Russell 1992, ad λαγὼν φέρων.

[216] This is a case of character disclosure, which, according to Phelan 2017, 168, constitutes 'what characters communicate to each other in a scene of dialogue.' Additionally, in character disclosure, the authors 'rely on the inferences their audiences make on the basis of earlier scenes of dialogue in their construction of subsequent scenes' (Phelan 2017, 169). In the above section of the *Euboicus*, the authorial audience receives enough information about rural practices, and is supposed to make use of it in the subsequent part of the text, where Dio theorises, on a metaliterary level, the fundamental differences between city and country in terms of morality.

measured appropriately and the air has to be thin (7.71). The two families also need to sacrifice to the gods the best hog that they possess, which, in this case, is described as mature and ready to be offered to the deities at the time of the wedding of the two young people.[217] The fact that the authorial audience is offered a detailed delineation of the issues involved in a rural wedding remarkably enhances the difference from the city practices and also prepares the ground for the lengthy meta-analysis in the second part of the text.

It is now time to examine in more detail what rhetorical techniques Dio uses to intensify the contrast between city and country in this section. The techniques concern two categories; the narratorial techniques used throughout and the content that the narratorial techniques communicate to the authorial audience. However, since both are tightly intertwined, I will not examine them separately, but I will offer an image of how Dio uses specific narratorial techniques to develop certain mimetic, thematic, or synthetic interests.

As regards the narratorial techniques, the shift in voice from the hunter's to that of the protagonist provides a parallelism with the hunter's previous discourse: the hunter describes a central moment (the trial) during his visit to the city from the perspective of a naïve countryman, and likewise the protagonist describes a key moment (the wedding) during his stay in the country from the perspective of a sophisticated city-dweller.[218] Additionally, most of this scene is developed through dialogue, not only between a city and a country man, but also between countrymen, as the example of the hunter and the young man's family shows. Normally dialogue as a narrative means comprises two (or more) different perspectives on the same theme; however, in the case of the *Euboicus*, it also reverses the ethics by which the

---

[217] Behind the importance of these physical phaenomena lies possibly Dio's intention to refer implicitly to the countrymen's exaggerated belief that the moon and the atmosphere need to be ideal in order for the wedding to succeed. The passage thus contrasts with the formal religious practices of the citizens. See also Hughes 1996, 95.

[218] The shift in voice simultaneously signals a shift in perspective: Dio exploits the narrative voice as a moral compass entailing elements from the socio-cultural environment from which every character comes. See also e.g. *orr*. 1 (protagonist, old woman), and 4 (Alexander, Diogenes).

protagonist and the hunter are characterized. The hunter becomes the sophisticated connoisseur of the rural wedding practices, whereas the protagonist turns into a naïve character, ignorant of the preparations of a rural wedding. Also, the protagonist asks questions and the hunter answers in a straightforward way, explaining why things are like that. At the same time, the dialogue between the countrymen helps the audience understand that the former do not want any interference from the city, whereas city-dwellers are extremely bothered when left out of country affairs: thus the city-dwellers wish to be involved in the administration of the minor rural territories, unlike the countrymen, who live happily in their own agricultural habitat.[219]

One can recognise that Dio's use of narrative techniques such as the shift in voice and the use of dialogue serves the amplification of the thematic contrast between city and country and the subsequent reversal of the norms, as illustrated in the previous paragraphs: instead of perceiving the hunter as naïve and the sailor as wise, the authorial audience now tunes in to the understanding that a character's cognitive skills are heavily influenced by the environment in which these characters live. In other words, the change of the *locus* involves the simultaneous dynamic change of the characters, which, in turn, proves that the hunter and the protagonist are far from static.

Paragraphs 81-152: The metaliterary part

Billault characterises paragraphs 81-152 as a meta-discourse, as the section in which Dio comments on the purposes of his writing the previous narrative.[220] The prefix 'meta-', as in metafiction, metaliterature, meta-discourse, etc., signifies 'the explor[ation] [of] the relationship between th[e] arbitrary linguistic system and the world to which it apparently

---

[219] Presumably, this characteristic of dialogue enhances the negative representation of the city and the positive representation of the country in the *Euboicus*. See also Billault 2013; Milazzo 2016; Bryen 2019.
[220] Billault 2013, 90.

refs'.[221] It indicates, in other words, an author's explicit highlighting of the artificiality of the text's and his or her play with generic conventions.[222] In Phelanian theory, metaliterary or metafictional features are manifest when implied authors use rhetorical resources that evoke the audience's synthetic responses to the narrative (the audience perceives the narrative as an artificial construct).[223]

In the *Euboicus*, the second part of the text is considered as metaliterary or a meta-discourse because Dio emphasises the artificiality of the narrative by explicitly taking on the role of a commentator of the story of the protagonist and the hunter.[224] In paragraph 81, Dio states that the story, far from being a pastime activity, constitutes an illustrative παράδειγμα ('paradigm') of how ethically poor people live, compared to rich people and especially wealthy city-dwellers.[225] It is, he argues, an exposition in the form of a moral narrative (πρὸς τὸ ζῆν εὐσχημόνως 'living a seemly life') focusing on the ethical differences between poor and rich

---

[221] Waugh 2002, 3.

[222] Hodgson 1972, 36 defines metaliterature as 'literature that is about literature', according to which 'a good deal can be learned about [an author's] craft, both its ethical motivation and its technical manifestation'. Waugh 2002, 2: 'metafiction is a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality.' From a more theoretical point of view, Scholes 1970 understands metafiction as 'a border-line territory between fiction and criticism', for it constitutes a 'moment of critical vertigo in which the relations between real life and representation are no longer clear, either within or beyond the fiction' (see also Currie 2013, 21). For Macrae 2019, 2 metafiction is defined as 'fiction which overtly uses both its narrative form and its thematic content to explore the nature of fiction, and through it the nature of reality'. On metafiction, metaliterature, and metalepsis (a type of metafiction proposed by Genette) in Greek literature of the Imperial period, see e.g. Gyselinck and Demoen 2009; Whitmarsh 2011, 69-107; Ní Mheallaigh 2014, 8-17; Lefteratou 2018, 204-98; Hodkinson 2019.

[223] Phelan 2017, 49.

[224] Russell 1992, 9-10.

[225] ἅπαντα δὴ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον διῆλθον οὐκ ἄλλως οὐδ' ὡς τάχ' ἂν δόξαιμί τισιν, ἀδολεσχεῖν βουλόμενος, ἀλλ' οὗπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπεθέμην βίου καὶ τῆς τῶν πενήτων διαγωγῆς παράδειγμα ἐκτιθείς, ὃ αὐτὸς ἠπιστάμην, τῷ βουλομένῳ θεάσασθαι λόγων τε καὶ ἔργων καὶ κοινωνιῶν τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, εἴ τι τῶν πλουσίων ἐλαττοῦνται διὰ τὴν πενίαν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἢ τῷ παντὶ πλέον ἔχουσιν ('Now I have not told this long story idly or, as some might perhaps infer, with the desire to spin a yarn, but to present an illustration of the manner of life that I adopted at the beginning and of the life of the poor – an illustration drawn from my own experience for anyone who wishes to consider whether in words and deeds and in social intercourse the poor are at a disadvantage in comparison with the rich on account of their poverty, so far as living a seemly and natural life is concerned, or in every way have the advantage').

people, on the one hand, and city-dwellers and countrymen, on the other, and on whether these people live according to the laws of nature (κατὰ φύσιν).

What are the elements that give metaliterary aspects to the passage and how are they connected to the authorial agency? First of all, I want to focus on the introductory phrase ἅπαντα δὴ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον διῆλθον. If we assume that the phrase belongs to Dio, then λόγος means (a) the story of the protagonist's encounter and subsequent friendship with the hunter ('I have told the whole story [of the protagonist and the hunter]'). If we assume, on the other hand, that the phrase belongs to the protagonist, then λόγος means (b) the episode of the hunter's trial in the city ('I have told the whole story [of the hunter's trial in the city]').

Possibility (b) is relatively weak because paragraphs 81-152 do not solely comment on the story of the hunter, but exemplify fundamental moral practices among the poor country-dwellers and the rich city-dwellers, as proposed in the entire narrative of paragraphs 2-80.[226] Possibility (a) seems thus most attractive: if λόγος here means the story of the protagonist *and* the hunter, then the metaliterary section constitutes an analysis of how the socio-political dynamics between two very distinct groups of people operate. That is to say, paragraphs 81-152 offer a well-structured discourse on how rich city-dwellers can affect poor countrymen and *vice versa*.

Dio also seems to communicate the section to the authorial audience with the expectation that the latter will successfully comprehend the ethical messages expressed in the narrative, whereas the protagonist's uncharacterised narratees do not display any such intellectual properties. We have encountered multiple instances in which the words of the protagonist serve as a covert channel of communication between Dio and his audience; however, we should keep in mind that Dio has responsibility for the composition and

---

[226] Such moral practices include, e.g., the spontaneity of the hunter to receive the protagonist at his hut, and the thematization of country-dwellers' sexual morality through marriage: both these examples are taken, not from the story of the hunter, but from the protagonist's.

organisation of the *Euboicus*,[227] whereas the protagonist (as an intratextual character narrator) is unaware of the artificiality of the narrative, and therefore the commentary of the above paragraphs cannot have been developed by him.

From the above, we can infer that there are good reasons to believe that paragraphs 81-152 constitute a metaliterary commentary of Dio, addressed to the authorial audience, and addressing particular ethical issues. As the ultimate composer of the text, Dio takes on the role of a commentator and provides valuable insight into the power dynamics of certain socio-political groups by stressing the similarities and differences between rich city-dwellers and poor country-dwellers. The metaliterary qualities of the section provide a set of rhetorical resources with which Dio communicates with his readers without a mediator, such as the protagonist.[228]

On a semantic level, the metaliterary qualities are highlighted through the description of the section as an interpretation of the previous story. Dio explicitly points out the main points of the story of the protagonist and the hunter:

ἀλλ᾿ οὗπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπεθέμην βίου καὶ τῆς τῶν πενήτων διαγωγῆς παράδειγμα ἐκτιθείς, ὃ αὐτὸς ἠπιστάμην, τῷ βουλομένῳ θεάσασθαι λόγων τε καὶ ἔργων καὶ κοινωνιῶν τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, εἴ τι τῶν πλουσίων ἐλαττοῦνται διὰ τὴν πενίαν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἢ τῷ παντὶ πλέον ἔχουσιν. (7.81)[229]

---

[227] As Phelan 2017, 25-9 argues, the authorial agency is the one ultimately responsible for the composition and organisation of the narrative.

[228] Readers perceive implied authors' highlighting of the fictionality of a narrative as a rhetorical resource, through which readers are asked to think about the boundaries between reality and artificiality, and the relationship of literature with reality. Especially in the case of metafiction, the synthetic response becomes more apparent, where the mimetic 'typically recedes into the background' (Phelan 2007, 6). In his revision of Phelan's model, Clark proposes that the synthetic element is omnipresent within narratives, is more easily discernible compared to the mimetic and thematic responses, and concerns 'all kinds of verbal construction, from sentences to whole plots, and also the construction of characters and narrative worlds' (Clark and Phelan 2020, 7).

[229] For a translation see n. 225.

Here, Dio takes on the role of an interpreter and considers the previous story as a paradigm of how different from rich citizens poor countrymen are – their contrast lies in the idea that the latter, although deprived of luxury, behave morally and live a life according to the laws of nature. The message that Dio indirectly communicates to the authorial audience is that the narrative *should be* interpreted as an exemplary story about the (im)morality of people of various kinds and about how this display, or lack of, morality can substantially be shaped by socio-political rules and norms.[230] It is according to this authorial intention that I will examine the rest of the text by focusing on issues related to its content and on how Dio directs his readers towards an examination and appreciation of their personal moral values.

Before I delve into how the communication between Dio and the authorial audience is achieved, I want to examine the relationship between the metaliterary part and the previous narrative part. I will argue that, contrary to the opinions of previous scholars that the two parts are loosely connected, Dio founds the text on steady narrative blocks that give it a sense of unity and consequently enhance its structural and semantic coherence.

For Bryen, the first and the second part of the *Euboicus* are 'tenuously connected to each other', and there is little interrelation between them, with the first presenting a narrative story and the second shifting to a more philosophical tone through the presentation of a 'wide-ranging program of social reform'.[231] Even though Dio argues that the first part is an example of what he sets out to delineate in more detail in the second part, it is Bryen's belief that there is little coherence, since the text 'ranges widely and in a dizzying fashion'. He concludes that Dio fails to develop a successful transition from the first part to the second, thus creating a logical gap.

---

[230] Milazzo 2016, 127 suggests that, similarly to his fellow countrymen, the hunter serves as an *exemplum maiorum* through his display of positive *rusticitas* and *hospitalitas*.
[231] Bryen 2019, 128.

Bryen's argumentation is not the only one suggesting a certain inconsistency between the two parts of the *Euboicus*: Jouan sees anomalies in structure and different content for the two parts;[232] Avvisù and Donadi argue that there is a weak transition from the first to the second part;[233] Russell barely sees any unity and, following von Arnim,[234] believes that the text is incomplete.[235] Moles, following Desideri,[236] describes the text as a patchwork of different texts;[237] Billault believes that the two parts have serious thematic inconsistencies;[238] and Jackson sees problems of tone, structure, and context.[239] A similar idea is expressed by Swain, who maintains that the two parts display different styles (the second is more 'declamatory') and therefore they are incoherently structured.[240]

In the debate on the (dis)unity of the two parts of the *Euboicus*, I will stand on the opposite side, arguing for the text's (thematic and narrative) unity.[241] I will first of all provide a brief account of the content of the metaliterary part and then I will present the resources with which the unity between the two parts is enhanced by Dio.

Dio makes himself perceptible to the audience by maintaining that his centre of attention will be around ethical issues arising from the previous story. In the first part of the metaliterary section (7.81-102), he examines two literary passages, a Euripidean and a Homeric, commenting on the way of life of rich and poor people, as well as of city-dwellers and countrymen: whereas the Euripidean peasant in *Electra* argues that rich people can take

---

[232] Jouan 1977, 39.
[233] Avvisù and Donadi 1985, 27.
[234] von Arnim 1891, passim.
[235] Russell 1992, 12.
[236] Desideri 1978, 223.
[237] Moles 1995, 177.
[238] Billault 2013.
[239] Jackson 2017, 220: 'In the first place, the *Euboicus* itself is a problematic text, given its uneven tone, unstable structure, and unclear context.'
[240] Swain 1994, 168.
[241] On the text's unity see Russell 1992, 9; Brenk 2000, 272; Trapp 2000, 219; Alexiou 2003, 322; Gall 2012, 132-6.

better care of themselves and of others due to their abundance and wealth,[242] the Homeric Eumaeus, despite being a poor countryman and of humble birth, displays great kindness and empathy towards Odysseus, taking care of the latter even more than Penelope herself. Here, Dio highlights an ethical contrast – the rich are not necessarily more ethical than the poor – and also praises the humbleness and ethical behaviour of the poor, as exemplified by the Homeric Eumaeus.[243] In this part, as one can see, Dio shows literary interests,[244] a point to which I shall return when I examine his connection with the authorial audience.

The next section, which covers the rest of the text (7.103-52), discusses the most suitable occupations for poor city-dwellers and criticises prostitution, adultery, as well as homosexuality, due to their moral drawbacks.[245] In paragraphs 103-132, Dio explains why certain occupations prove more beneficial than others: the morality entailed in occupations involving physical labour (7.112: χρείαν γε ἱκανὴν παρέχοντα πρὸς τὸν βίον 'enable one to make a satisfactory living') is the fundamental value separating these jobs from their immoral counterparts; additionally, jobs pertaining to beauty, ornaments, acting, and dancing are equally condemned because they do not aid the person in adopting a more ethical behaviour. In the last paragraphs (7.133-52), Dio delineates, albeit not thoroughly, the moral disadvantages of engaging in prostitution, adultery, and homosexuality: in the first case, one sells their body in exchange for money, which is considered as a highly denigrating action of slavery to unethical sexual practices; in adultery, shame and indignity (αἰσχύνη) bring about

---

[242] Without explicitly referring to it, Dio alludes to lines 424-31 of Euripides' *Electra*, a famous work during that time, which Plutarch and Stobaeus cited as well (Russell 1992, ad τὸ τοῦ Εὐριπίδου). See also *or*. 74, 6. On the Dionic reception of Euripides see Fornaro 2020; Chatzigiannis (forthcoming).

[243] Dio's exploitation of Homeric characters as models of right behaviour is well-attested in many of his discourses, (see e.g. *orr*. 2, 7, 11). On Homeric influences on the Dionic corpus in general see Schmid 1903, col. 861; Montgomery 1901; Desideri 1978, 471-503 (esp. 474-6) Drules 1998; Zeitlin 2001, 203-4, 221-3, 230; Hunter 2009; Kim 2010, 85-139; Vagnone 2016; Busch 2018, 204-10.

[244] Dio makes use of *Hilfszitate* from Euripides and Homer to enhance the power of his arguments: Kindstrand 1973, 32-7; Alexiou 2003, 320. To this, I would add that the use of poetic passages reveals the literary aspect of Dio to his audience.

[245] On the passage's affiliation to the Platonic ideas of city-founding and role-definition see Trapp 2000, 219-21.

moral corruption, since the person – usually the male – deceives his wife and children and succumbs to the easy, but morally wrong, behaviour of living in distrust and deceit. When it comes to homosexuality, Dio maintains that males should be satisfied only with the pleasure they get from heterosexual intercourse and not by the 'unnatural' pleasures of homosexuality (7.149: ἑτέραν μείζω καὶ παρανομωτέραν ὕβριν 'some other worse and lawless form of wantonness'): he goes on to explain that homosexuality occurs when a heterosexual male, driven by powerful sexual forces (τῶν ἡδονῶν εἶδος), desires to taste the pleasures of an 'unnatural' practice in terms of procreation.[246] It is easy to notice that in the above paragraphs Dio takes on the role of a παιδαγωγός discoursing on the morality of certain kinds of people and their practices and highlighting the vital differences between ethical and unethical occupations.

The centrality of the theme of morality and its consequences constitutes, in my opinion, the strongest argument against those arguing that there is little (if any) connection between the first (7.1-80) and the second (7.81-152) part of the *Euboicus*, which is where I now turn. More specifically, I will attempt to show that a certain thematic commonality between the two parts exists and also that the thematic component of morality is harmoniously linked to the synthetic function that Dio makes to permeate through the second, metaliterary part.

Starting with the introductory part, prior to the initial encounter between the protagonist and the hunter, there is an implicit reference to the Dionic morality. In particular, Dio states that what he is about to narrate will not be garrulously presented – a characteristic often attributed to people advanced in years[247] – but rather in a serious and reliable way (7.1). By catching the readerly attention, Dio inspires trust in himself and adopts the identity of a

---

[246] Dio regards homosexuality as 'unnatural' because it deviates from heterosexuality, which can ensure the creation of offspring. For him, then, sexuality is morally meaningful only when its ultimate goal is the family, whereas any connection with sensual pleasures is ignored and condemned.
[247] Russell 1992, ad οὐ μόνον πρεσβυτικὸν… ἀλητικόν.

pedagogical storyteller whose words are to be taken seriously, not lightly.[248] The moral comment behind this statement lies in the fact that, unlike previous authors, whose status depended upon the immoral act of telling lies and of demoralising people, he is an ethical storyteller who respects his readers' need for truth.[249]

As the narrative progresses, one of the major themes becomes the hunter's display of morality and its subsequent perception from other characters: the protagonist does not really doubt the hunter's reliability and honesty, since the former was completely devoid of anything valuable and was not afraid of being robbed (7.9); later, the morality of the hunter is again tested by the city-dwellers in the trial, who express their hesitation in letting him go away and in keeping the property that his family has been cultivating for years (7.27-33). It is the timely intervention of Sotades that ensures the restoration of the hunter to the state of being respected for his moral behaviour (7.53-9) and shows to the readers that the initial concerns of the protagonist about the hunter's reliability as moral character carry less weight in the course of the narrative. Afterwards, Dio celebrates the morality not only of one person, but of a whole kind of people, countrymen, maintaining that rural weddings, unlike urban ones, do not entail deceptions (ἀπατῶν), injustice (λοιδοριῶν), and quarrels (ἀπεχθειῶν) (7.80).

Accordingly, in the metaliterary section Dio describes the previous story as exemplary due to its depiction of moral people who, despite being impoverished, exhibit notable morality (7.81: τῆς τῶν πενήτων διαγωγῆς παράδειγμα ἐκτιθείς 'to present an illustration of the manner

---

[248] Of course, the opposite could also be said; namely, that Dio's words could be interpreted as an attempt of the author to discuss moral issues in a playful and ironic way. As Brenk 2000, 271 argues, Dio's first words 'immediately arouse suspicion'. However seriously or ironically Dio's words are to be taken, they still succeed in communicating a Dionic moral message to the audience.

[249] The theme of literary truthfulness (or falsehood) is testified as early as in Hesiod's *Theogony* (1-35), where the poet, upon a sudden encounter with the Muses, learns about literature's ψεύδεα ('falsehood') and ἀληθέα ('truth'): see Heath 2013, ch. 1. At the beginning of the *Trojan Oration*, Dio rather humorously makes a similar comment on how easily people can be deceived by authors' ability of telling lies (11.1: οἶδα μὲν ἔγωγε σχεδὸν ὅτι διδάσκειν μὲν ἀνθρώπους ἅπαντας χαλεπόν ἐστιν, ἐξαπατᾶν δὲ ῥᾴδιον 'I am almost certain that while all men are hard to teach, they are easy to deceive'), and on what moral consequences this practice entails (11.1: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθὲς πικρόν ἐστι καὶ ἀηδὲς τοῖς ἀνοήτοις, τὸ δὲ ψεῦδος γλυκὺ καὶ προσηνές 'for the truth is bitter and unpleasant to the unthinking, while falsehood is sweet and pleasant').

of life of the poor'). Indeed, the words παράδειγμα ('paradigm') and διαγωγή ('conduct') impart an ethical tone to the passage, showing that morality plays a central role within the *Euboicus* and also characterises not only Dio, as a moral storyteller, but also the intratextual characters of countrymen.

Having highlighted the important moral messages of the previous story, Dio introduces a theoretical discussion by setting out to explore how good morals in urban environments run the risk of extinction due to the immorality of certain city practices. First of all, he is in favour of a more rural than urban social environment: the former can achieve a higher level of purity and innocence (7.81: ζῆν εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ φύσιν 'living a seemly and natural life'),[250] whereas in cities, people have to work harder to become genuinely moral. To achieve this, they should look up to Eumaeus in the *Odyssey*, who, in spite of his poverty, wholeheartedly offered shelter to, and respected, an unknown man, and not the Euripidean peasant in the *Electra*, who argued that wealth is a valuable source of contentment (7.82). Thus, apart from truthfulness and honesty, morality also requires humbleness, instead of extravagant practices provoking frenzy over money and power.

If morality was up to this point approached as an intrapersonal value, from paragraph 103, it is examined from an interpersonal perspective, through its link to occupations practiced within cities. More particularly, careers in cosmetics, acting, or dancing are fiercely condemned, for they do not prompt moral, but rather deceptive, behaviours: occupations that shift one's identity aim at gaining profit by presenting a false and distorted image of one's true self and by moving people a step further from genuine ethical conduct.[251] Therefore morality

---

[250] Russell 1992, ad εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ φύσιν sees an influence from Stoic ethics, whereas Brancacci 2016, 108 interprets it as a Cynic concept.

[251] Interestingly, Dio seems to promote the idea that external alterations to one's 'façade' can actually harm or severely damage the quality of the human soul (ψυχή). Therefore occupations that involve change (even temporary) of one's facial and corporeal characteristics distort the person's authenticity and deteriorate the quality of the soul.

can be achieved solely through physical labour, which exercises the body, rather than through occupations that invest in pretence and in alteration of one's true identity (7.117-32).[252] Here, Dio assigns a social dimension to work and believes it to entail ethical interaction with others; therefore, his argument goes, work has to be carefully designed so that it does not provoke any unwanted consequences, such as loss of one's true identity. In fact, he does not strive to ameliorate the moral qualities of these occupations, but rather, as Plato did before him,[253] to condemn them as irreversibly unethical.

Morality is finally examined through the lens of both the private and social sphere and more particularly through the ethically debated issues of prostitution, adultery, and homosexuality (133-52). In a vitriolic way, Dio critiques the aforementioned 'deviances' from 'normal' sex and evaluates them as highly immoral, since they perceive love as either a financial, my-money-for-your-body exchange (prostitution), as a dishonest and deceptive act (adultery), or even as a dirty habit of succumbing to one's lowly desires, not appropriate for the creation of a family (homosexuality). Sexual behaviour is considered by Dio as forming part of both the private and public sphere, since private sexual activity could ensure the continuation of one's *oikos*, whereas a public display of sexuality was precluding one's moral integration into the *polis*.[254] In other words, prostitution, adultery, and homosexuality blur the traditional boundaries between privacy and public attention and are thus considered as morally inappropriate. In particular, homosexuality is considered as contrary to nature (7.149: ὅρον τὸν τῆς φύσεως 'limit set by nature') and as a 'lawless form of wantoness' (7.149: μείζω καὶ παρανομωτέραν ὕβριν), for it changes social beings into uncontrollable and addicted-to-cheap-

---

[252] This is another central Platonic idea, which summarises books 2-5 and 8-9 of the *Republic* (Trapp 2000, 220).
[253] Cf. *Rep*. 415e-427c.
[254] Milazzo 2007, 181. Accordingly, Musonius Rufus, the Stoic philosopher and Dio's teacher, endorsed the idea that sexual activity was ethical only in the case of creating a family which was 'the very cornerstone of society, whereas marriage is the foundation on which the familial structure is built' (Thornsteinsson 2010, 47).

sex drunkards (7.152: τοῖς ἄγαν φιλοπόταις καὶ οἰνόφλυξι 'men who are addicted to drinking and wine-bibbing').

On a thematic level, the text is developed upon the axis of morality: morality is achievable only when one is truthful, reliable, honest, and humble, performs a job involving physical labour, and keeps his modest, heterosexual conduct within the boundaries of his *oikos*. The connecting line between the first and the second part of the *Euboicus* then lies in the Dionic exploration of how morality can be attained (or, conversely, harmfully damaged). Nevertheless, what presumably makes scholars disbelieve in the unity of the text is the differentiation between the narrative techniques employed by Dio in the first and the second part of the text respectively.

I will now investigate the distinct ways in which Dio presents the lesson of morality to his readers. More particularly, I will highlight the importance of his use of intratextual characters as speaking agents and his distinguishing between authorial audience and narratees. This will assist in arguing for the text's unity, since unity is presented by both the plot and the narratorial dynamics. After I have sketched the narratorial dynamics, I will return to the issue of the unity of the text by examining the combination of the thematic, synthetic, and mimetic responses to the text. In this way, I hope to show that, contrary to the idea of a haphazardly organised text, the *Euboicus* constitutes a harmoniously coherent discussion of ethical issues that are communicated to the readers.

Dio uses specific narrative techniques to establish contact with his audience. The first is the use of intratextual characters as narrators, or, in Phelan's theory, character narration. Character narration constitutes a frequent rhetorical technique with which authors form a dynamic relationship with the readers by letting intratextual characters communicate messages

to the narratees, which ultimately affects the communication with the authorial audience.[255] In the *Euboicus*, the voice of Dio at the beginning of the text (7.1) changes to that of the protagonist and later to that of the hunter. Although it is tempting to assume that the voice of the author coincides with the protagonist's (due to the autobiographical style of the text), it is essential, as said previously, to keep in mind that they address completely different audiences: Dio speaks to the authorial audience, whereas the protagonist speaks to the narratees. Dio then moves to the background and allows a character narrator to recount the story. In this way, the authorial audience receives information on the events by the protagonist.[256] However, Dio's choice of having character narrators presenting the events contributes to the audience's doubt as to whether what is recounted by the character narrators is endorsed by Dio or not.

Since character narration entails a question about the level of reliability of the speaking agent, it can be said in advance that the protagonist displays reliability on the axis of reporting (how he presents the events and the characters) and of understanding (how he perceives and evaluates the events and the characters). This is in fact another narrative technique employed by Dio: the protagonist displays a high level of narratorial reliability, since he presents the events in a straightforward way, without obscuring the audience's understanding of them: for instance, in terms of reporting, he claims that the Euboean Koila are a very dangerous place for ships; thus it is no wonder that he ended up shipwrecked (7.7); in terms of perceiving and evaluating too, he argues that the hunter is a good man, even though his external appearance has something rustic in it (7.9); or again, he states that rural weddings are preferable to urban

---

[255] Phelan 2017, 26. When an implied author allows a character to report, interpret, or evaluate an event or a series of events, it is always a purposeful act aiming at forming a particular kind of relationship with the authorial audience.

[256] 'Authors adopt such filters because anchoring the reporting, interpreting, or evaluating functions of narration in the perspective and experiences of an actor in the storyworld can increase the thematic, affective, and ethical force and significance of the whole narrative' (Phelan 2017, 218).

ones because they do not entail formal and time-wasting bureaucratical procedures that impede the successful celebration of such a delightful event (7.80).

Although the narration of the protagonist is reliable, the same cannot be said for the hunter, who acts as a secondary character narrator. Undeniably, the reliability of the protagonist is in contrast to the unreliability of the hunter:[257] first of all, the hunter displays misreporting when he considers Sotades as a slanderer, not as a defendant (7. 53);[258] in terms of perceiving, he does not realise, for instance, that the city-dwellers' laughter is caused by his rural practices and from the eccentric ideas that he is proposing in the trial (7.30-53). In terms of judgement, however, he seems to be fairly reliable, since he has a sound knowledge of the ethics of the city-dwellers (7.42-53).[259]

The narrative techniques outlined above concern exclusively the first part of the *Euboicus*, while the following two concern the metaliterary part. Further to what I suggested about the narrators and narrative levels, I want to highlight another narrative technique, which I will call 'narrative ring composition'. By that, I mean Dio's explicit resumption of control of the narration and the shift from authorial narration to character narration and, ultimately, back to authorial narration. The transition from authorial narration (7.1) to character narration (7.2-80) to authorial narration again (7.81-152) hints at Dio's attempt to achieve a certain point of differentiation from the character narrators, which subsequently points out to the harmonious combination of, and smooth transition between, the first part and the second part of the text.

---

[257] As Ma 2000, 109 has it, 'there is no assurance that [the hunter] is not exaggerating or recasting facts for political purposes.'

[258] For reasons of narrative suspense, the hunter fails to report from the beginning (7.53) that Sotades is actually a defendant, not a slanderer. The revelation of his true identity only comes afterwards (7.59) when the hunter recognises Sotades as being a friend of the old times.

[259] One could suggest that the rural effects on the hunter also obscure his accurate evaluation of the ethics of the citizens. However, his passionate display of affection towards Sotades, upon recognising him as a friendly city-dweller, shows that he is in fact aware that some citizens are bad, and some are good.

The *Euboicus* commences with an explicit indication of the Dionic presence. Afterwards, this presence becomes less obvious, once the characters narrate the events from their personal perspective. In a form of metaphorical dialogue with the character narrators, Dio comes to the fore again by commenting upon their presentation of the events. According to the technique of 'narrative ring composition', Dio remains silent for as long as the protagonist and the hunter present the story,[260] while he later makes himself perceptible to the authorial audience as a commentator on this story. To put it simply, Dio opens the text by addressing the authorial audience and closes it by reflecting on the meaning of the story of the protagonist and the hunter. This form of narratorial circularity constitutes, in my opinion, a strong argument for the unity of the text.

The next technique concerns the temporality of the *Euboicus*, which is 'stretched' into fitting in both the authorial and the narrative level.[261] More particularly, the beginning of the text places the authorial audience into the Narrative Now; next, they are taken back to the past through the protagonist's narration, which can be considered as being one level below the Narrative Now. The embedded story of the hunter (7.10-63) takes the audience even further back (level two below the Narrative Now), to a series of events that took place prior to the encounter with the protagonist. When the protagonist describes his stay at the hunter's hut and the young couple's wedding (7.64-80), the authorial audience is once again on level one below the Narrative Now. Finally, when Dio resumes his narratorial properties in paragraph 81, the authorial audience returns where it started from, that is, the Narrative Now. I would thus like

---

[260] However, as argued earlier, he makes himself implicitly present in specific passages in the protagonist's and the hunter's story.

[261] The narrated time (Erzählte Zeit) is extended on the level of the author's communication with the authorial audience, and on the narrators' communication with the narratees. Thus the authorial passages (7.1 and 7.81-152) are included into the narrated time, which has the following organisation: Dio introduces the narrative (7.1) – the protagonist presents his meeting with the hunter before the arrival at the hut (7.2-63) – the hunter embeds the narrative of his visit to the city (7.10-63) – the protagonist describes the stay at the hut and the rural wedding (7.64-80) – Dio concludes by presenting a moral commentary on the narrative (7.81-152).

to argue that the symmetry of the narratorial voice (author – protagonist – hunter – protagonist – author), or what I call 'narrative ring composition', informs the temporal organisation of the *Euboicus* and exemplifies the unity between the two parts of the text.

I now turn to the examination of the way that the mimetic, synthetic, and thematic components of the text are interrelated. With this final analysis, I hope that I will have satisfactorily argued for the unity of the *Euboicus* by showing that both the textual and readerly dynamics pertain to the unity of the text.

We are reminded that in the Phelanian system, the progression of a narrative proceeds through textual dynamics, which concern the sequence of events (plot dynamics) and the relations among authors, tellers, and audiences (narratorial dynamics), and readerly dynamics, which concern readerly responses to the textual dynamics. Readers have various ways of responding to a narrative: they can perceive it as a 'micrography' of real-life events and characters (mimetic response), as a system of characters operating on a symbolic, ideational level (thematic response), or as an artificial construct with purely fictional characters and events (synthetic response).[262] With these in mind, we can argue that the readers of the *Euboicus* can develop various interests (mimetic, thematic, synthetic) on the narrative, depending on their perception of Dio's handling of rhetorical resources, such as the organisation of the plot, the employment of reliable and unreliable character narrators, the insertion of authorial comments, the handling of the temporality, and so on.

The text commences in a highly synthetic tone, with Dio referring to the construction of the narrative.[263] The readers, responding to Dio's comment on the progress of the narrative, establish an initial perception that the *Euboicus* constitutes an artificial construct developed by

---

[262] For a more thorough description of textual and readerly dynamics, see the introduction.

[263] In some texts of the same era, the author is highlighted as the composer of the narrative from the very beginning – *e.g.* Chariton 1.1-2; Philostr. *VS* praef. According to Holzberg 1996, 640 and Anderson 2000, 147, Dio's opening words reveal the text's affinity with realistic novellas.

an author, who wishes to communicate certain messages to his audience. In fact, these messages contain an ethical dimension (cf. 7.1: ἐρῶ δ᾽ οὖν οἵοις ἀνδράσι καὶ ὅντινα βίον ζῶσι 'I shall describe the character and manner of life of some people'), since Dio acknowledges that the narrative will describe characters who carry ideational functions, i.e., act as paradigms of morality to the readers.[264] Thus the first paragraph provides a combination of synthetic and thematic readerly responses.

In the course of the narrative, the synthetic interests give way to more mimetic ones, while the thematic interests remain stable. Dio presents the story of a shipwrecked sailor in the Euboean Koila, his unexpected encounter with a hunter, and the agreement between the two men to spend the night in the hunter's hut until the weather permits the sailor to return to his country. The continuous use of past tenses and the focus on the external qualities of the characters spark a mimetic response, since the readers progressively perceive the characters less as embodied ideas and more as real-life people. The same mimetic response is also evident in the hunter's recounting of his visit to the city: before endeavouring to delineate the trial scene, the hunter dedicates no less than eleven paragraphs to present the idyllic environment of the country and the happy life of his predecessors (7.10-20). The swift progression from the country to the city environment, which takes place in paragraph 21, temporarily suspends the mimetic interests and brings to the fore the thematic ones: the readers now notice that the text promotes a contrast between countrymen and city-dwellers.

The thematic readerly responses are mainly developed by the shift of narrative voice: the hunter presents in detail what was supposedly argued in the trial by giving voice to the prosecutor and the defendant and by attempting to colour other characters as positive and moral and others as arrogant and unethical. The readers thus realise that the hunter represents the model of the moral countryman, whereas city-dwellers (with the notable exception of Sotades)

---

[264] On the moralising aspect of the text see *e.g.* Russell 1992, 13; Ma 2000, 108.

are dangerously immoral. We can thus infer that the readers grasp the opposition between city and country as not only in geographical terms (see e.g. the hunter's description of the two places), but also ethically, for the hunter is completely different from his urban counterparts in terms of conducting a moral life.[265]

From paragraph 64, the protagonist resumes the role of the narrator and describes his stay at the hunter's hut, as well as his attendance at the young couple's wedding. Through the recounting of the rural practices of the wedding and the divergence from urban ones, the readers develop mimetic responses by perceiving the practices as indicative of a real-life, rustic wedding style and thematic responses by noticing the cultural differences between country and city, as exemplified, for example, in countrymen's belief that the moon plays a significant role in a successful wedding.

In the metaliterary part, Dio makes himself perceptible as a commentator of the previous story, and the readers again perceive the events and the characters as literary constructs. What is noteworthy in this section is how the attention of the readers progressively shifts from mimetic-thematic to synthetic: firstly, Dio implicitly argues that the second part of the *Euboicus* is a form of commentary on the first story and secondly, he compares his hunter with other literary representations of the same type of character (the Homeric and the Euripidean versions). The readers cannot but perceive the hunter as the by-product of a Dionic literary δοκιμή ('attempt). What also increases the readerly synthetic responses is Dio's development of the role of a παιδαγωγός ('teacher'), which informs the ethical messages that he communicates to his readers.

Before delving deeper into Dio's pedagogical identity, I would like to sum up the main points of my rhetorical analysis so far: although previous bibliography has often accused the *Euboicus* of being haphazardly organised and lacking coherence and unity, I have decided to

---

[265] See also Desideri 2000, 99-101.

challenge that view by presenting certain characteristics that support the harmonious unity of the text. As regards the readerly dynamics, the thematic response of the readers to morality plays a central role within the whole text: whereas in the first part, Dio uses a particular story to describe two undeniably different ways of living, in the metaliterary section, he comments on this story and explicitly reveals the network of thematic connections that are centred around morality – these connections concern, first of all, the strong opposition between city and country in terms of living poorly or in wealth and, secondly, the moral differences between the hunter (and other countrymen) and his urban counterparts.

With regard to textual dynamics, Dio relies on plot and narratorial dynamics, which concern the means with which Dio and his readers communicate. When it comes to the narratorial dynamics, he 1) makes good use of character narration to distinguish between his voice and that of the characters, which subsequently leads to 2) different levels of reliability: where the primary character narrator (the protagonist) displays a high level of reliability, the hunter, as a secondary character narrator, generally displays unreliability on the axes of presenting and understanding. Additionally, Dio 3) shifts from authorial to character narration and eventually, back to authorial narration, which is what I have termed as 'narrative ring composition'; also, he 4) complicates the temporal relationship between the authorial and character narration levels by letting his characters (unknowingly) deviate from the Narrative Now as much as possible, but by giving himself, as the main organiser of the narrative, the freedom to return to the Narrative Now and pause at this point until the very end of the text. Thus this creates a sense of open-endedness so that the readers are invited to infer the underlying ethical messages that Dio strives to communicate to his readers.

Dio's handling of plot dynamics and narratorial dynamics generate, as we saw, mimetic, thematic, and synthetic interests for the readers. More particularly, at the beginning and at the end of the narrative (7.1 and 7.81-152), where Dio directly addresses his audience,

the readers perceive the characters and the events recounted as fictional, literary products. Throughout the narrative, however, especially when the focus is on the delineation of the appearance and the way of life of the characters involved, the readers are more likely to develop mimetic responses by considering the protagonist, the hunter, and the others as historical entities and as real-life people who behave in a certain way. Beyond these responses, though, the opposition between the rich, yet immoral, city-dwellers and the poor, yet moral, countrymen, as exemplified in the story of the hunter and elsewhere, creates thematic responses to the readers, so that the latter perceive the characters as ideational entities, that is, as agents embodying certain moral ideals and precepts.

The pedagogy of the *Euboicus* (I)

The rhetorical narratological examination of the *Euboicus* so far has led me to the following conclusions: 1) Dio makes use of particular rhetorical techniques to construct the narrative, on the one hand, and to develop a strong relationship with his readers, on the other; 2) these techniques are primarily generated by Dio, but are also indirectly affected by readers' responses to, and interests in, the narrative; and 3) for both Dio and the readers, the narrative of the *Euboicus* is characterised by unity and coherence.

It is now time to examine in more detail what was scarcely mentioned previously, namely Dio's assumption of the role of a pedagogical figure and his communication with the readers in the form of a teacher-student relationship. For my analysis, I have again relied on Phelan's theory and, where appropriate, I have taken into account the theoretical discussions on the role of the narrative autobiographical-I and the ways in which it is formed by the author and perceived by the readers.[266] In this section, I explore Dio's role as a παιδαγωγός ('teacher')

---

[266] From the vast amount of research available, I have mainly consulted the following: Misch 1951; Eakin 1985; Folkenflik 1992; Bruner 1992; Freeman 1993; Brockmeier 1997; Barros 1998; Freeman 1999; Cavarero 2000; Jolly 2001; Gusdorf 2014.

and the construction of his pedagogical relationship with the readers, while in the next, and final, section, I approach the ways in which the readers likely respond to, and perceive, this relationship.

As I hope to show, Dio exploits the technique of direct and indirect characterisation in order to enhance his depiction as a philosophy teacher and his readers as students of a philosophical class. We have already seen that Dio makes himself perceptible to the readers in the first paragraph (7.1), in the metaliterary part (7.81-152), and in passages where he indirectly manifests himself as the agent responsible for the construction of the text (e.g. 7.24). Even in the cases where character narration replaces the authorial narration, the readers can still get a grip on the differentiation between the words of the intratextual characters speaking to their respective narratees and those of Dio addressed to the readers themselves.

To describe Dio's presence within the narrative, one does not need to go far, but to examine the authorial techniques (that is, the manifest by-products of this presence) through which Dio establishes connection with the readers and assumes the role of a pedagogical figure.[267] In other words, the analysis of the pedagogy of Dio relies on the rhetoric that he employs in order to relate to his recipients. Once again, I wish to remind the reader that what will be discussed concerns the implied Dio, as encoded by the real, flesh-and-blood Dio, and as decoded by the readers of the *Euboicus*.

Let us begin with the plot dynamics. At the beginning, Dio highlights the predicament of the protagonist as an initial instability, which is resolved only by the aid and the goodwill of the hunter and which introduces the paradigmatic image of a poor countryman who displays altruism and acts as a moral example.[268] In the protagonist's narration, the positive image of

---

[267] As Booth 1983, 149, argues, '[T]he author cannot choose to avoid rhetoric; he can choose only the kind of rhetoric he will employ. He cannot choose whether or not to affect his readers' evaluations by his choice of narrative manner; he can only choose whether to do it well or poorly.'

[268] According to Anderson 2000, 148, the hunter constitutes a model of Cynic self-sufficiency. On the Cynic aspects of the *Euboicus* see Bost-Pouderon 2008, 113 (n. 20); Brancacci 2016, 111-8; Jackson 2017, 227-33.

the hunter is maintained and in the embedded narration, it is contrasted to the malevolence and immorality of the city-dwellers. Thus the resolution of the primary instability of the text is indicative of the morality of the hunter and serves as a general moral compass for the readerly appreciation of the hunter's character. As regards this last point, Dio seems to manage the plot dynamics in such a way that it renders a certain *exemplum positivum* to the readers which is exemplified throughout the narrative. Additionally, the framing of the story with the metaliterary comments of paragraphs 1 and 80-152 indicates that the story can be read as a paradigm of how morality, or the lack thereof, can influence the way that people live.[269]

With regard to the narratorial dynamics, Dio builds a connection with the character narrators, whose narration occupies almost half of the text (7.2-80). Through this connection, we can observe a fusion of the narrative levels, since, through the character narrators' addressing of the narratees, Dio addresses the authorial audience.[270] At times, though, when Dio attempts to motivate each character's speech and stresses the moral difference between country and city in terms of morality, character narration is shifted to character-character dialogue: the initial conversation between the protagonist and the hunter aims at depicting the latter as a morally reliable person in the protagonist's (and in the authorial audience's) mind (7.2-10); later on, the detailed discussion between the hunter and the citizens in the trial (7.25-63) reinforces the thematic differences in morality between city and country, as does the final dialogue of paragraphs 64-79. Thus Dio uses the narratorial dynamics to establish a strong

---

[269] Desideri 2019, 106, 178. Cf. also 7.1: οἵοις ἀνδράσι καὶ ὅντινα βίον ζῶσι 'the character and manner of life of some people'; 7.80: βίου καὶ τῆς τῶν πενήτων διαγωγῆς παράδειγμα 'an example of life and of how poor people live'.

[270] Milazzo 2007, 183-4; Gall 2012, 134-5. Note that both Milazzo and Gall use Genettian terms to define the implied author – 'primary narrator-focaliser' and 'auktorialer Autor/extradiegetischer Erzähler' respectively. Phelan 2017, 168 argues that in character-character dialogue, there can also be an authorial disclosure: '[A]uthors communicate to their audiences by means of the links between and among the scenes of dialogue.'

relationship with the character narrators and to transform them into mediators of significant thematic meanings.[271]

What we can infer from the way that Dio manages the textual (plot and narrative) dynamics is that he communicates important messages to the readers about the importance of morality in how countrymen and city-dwellers build their lives. In this way, Dio is perceived as a pedagogical figure (or a teacher) who weaves stories in the form of moral paradigms in order to educate and enlighten the readers;[272] and he does so by letting the characters often speak for themselves in order to reveal, through their experiences, their beliefs about morality as a value and as an attainable (through hard work) aim. We could consequently assume that Dio, as a moral teacher, allows the exemplary character-figures to reveal their original qualities themselves, without his explicit mediation, which eventually pertains to the immersion of the readers in the text;[273] it is only for specific purposes that his intervention becomes apparent, when he comments on how the exemplary story should be interpreted by the readers.

The pedagogical role that Dio assumes for himself is an amalgam of different principles that were shared among philosophical schools of the first century AD. It might seem unusual for some (especially structuralist narratologists) that the present narratological analysis of the *Euboicus* is concerned with issues related to the historical era in which the work was produced – an 'atemporal' approach would probably suffice. However, Phelanian theory underlines the historicity of narratives and regards them as products of a specific historical, cultural, and social

---

[271] In the narration of Dio, the protagonist, as well as the hunter, morality is a central value: Dio develops a whole metaliterary part on morality, the protagonist lies at the receiving end of the morality of country-dwellers, and the hunter is the 'living example' of rural morality.

[272] On the educative function of the *Euboicus* see Desideri 2000, 99; Milazzo 2007, 185-8; Milazzo 2016, 127 ('autorità morale con funzioni pedagogiche').

[273] Allan 2020, 19 includes the 'transparency of the text' through the effacement of 'the narrator as a mediating voice' as a criterion of readerly immersion.

environment.[274] Far from the traditional premise of structuralist narratology that narratives can be examined by the analysis of their internal networks only,[275] Phelanian theory embraces a wider spectrum of interpretive possibilities and sees narratives as historical, social, political, literary, and so on, artefacts. So if narratives cannot be separated from their place in history (as encompassing all the above aspects), then their analysis is also partially dependent on the examination of their external networks.

Much has been written about the differing and often contradictory philosophical aspects of the *Euboicus*, and, for that, I will not propose a different systematic approach, but rather I will refer to some opinions of previous scholars that are most compatible with my narratological analysis. In this way, I hope to show that the use of narratological resources as a form of analysis of Dio's self-fashioning as a moral teacher can support other interpretive methods in the understanding of the philosophical ideas that predominate in the *Euboicus*.

It is well evidenced that in the first century AD, literary texts were often reproducing, in one way or another, fundamental ideas of Plato or of other later Platonists.[276] In the *Euboicus*, in particular, Dio implicitly refers to the Platonic ideal *politeia* (cf. 7.130: περὶ πολιτείας 'the constitution of the state'), arguing that there have been significant intellectuals before him who have explored the idea of the exemplary city (7.130: πόλεως παραδείγματος ἔνεκεν 'a city for the sake of illustration'), inhabited by fair people, and being governed by a sound understanding of justice (7.130: ἀνδρὸς δικαίου καὶ δικαιοσύνης 'the just man and justice'). Dio seems to be aligned with the Platonic depiction of the current world as an unsuccessful

---

[274] Phelan 2017, 9: 'Because rhetorical theory emphasizes author-audience relations and because it views both as always already situated in historical and social contexts, rhetorical theory is not just compatible with but dependent on historical knowledge – and historical analysis – of all kinds: literary, cultural, social, political, and so on.'

[275] E.g. Genette 1983, 28 explicitly chooses to disregard the historical facts behind Proust's work, and focuses exclusively on the semiotic characteristics of the narrative. However, not all structurally-oriented narratological approaches de-emphasise the significance of the socio-historical context.

[276] On Platonism in the imperial period see *e.g.* Dörrie and Baltes 1993; Bowersock 2002; Bonazzi and Opsomer 2009; Fowler 2018. On Platonism in Dio see Trapp 2000; Moreschini 2016; Desideri 2018.

mimesis of the real world of the *ideai*, as he argues that the concept of πόλις ('city') can and should be redefined with the guidance of specific political theorists and with the exclusion of certain kinds of occupations and types of entertainment (cf. 7.104). However, he engages in an indirect rivalry with Plato, when, on the one hand, he acknowledges that his proposed ideal society can in no way be compared with Plato's, while, on the other, he seems keen on inscribing himself into the arena of political thinkers 'venturing on to the same territory as Plato.'[277] Thus, by following Platonism, but by deviating from its theoretical frame tacitly, Dio adopts the identity of a philosophical teacher who discusses moral, political, as well as social issues and combines traditional philosophical theories with newer (and individually developed) ones.

The same holds true for his affiliation with Cynic and Stoic concepts of morality. Far from the basic premises of Platonism, Cynics advocated the simplicity of life and the superiority of poverty over wealth, rather than a coordinated socio-political system governed by just ἄρχοντες ('governors'). Simultaneously, Stoics believed that 'living in accordance with virtue means living in accordance with what happens by nature' (φύσεως τέλος […] τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν ζῆν).[278] Indeed, in terms of moral behaviour, the hunter of the *Euboicus* represents the type of Cynic-Stoic philosopher, for he enjoys his state of poverty and is not in need of anything excessive to live a happy, moral life.

Dio's ideas about poverty (7.81: τῆς τῶν πενήτων διαγωγῆς 'an illustration of the life of the poor'), morality (7.81: πρὸς τὸ ζῆν εὐσχημόνως 'living a seemly life'), and rural life (κατὰ φύσιν 'according to nature') seem to have been influenced by Cynic, as well as Stoic precepts.[279] Through the constant repetition of the benefits of poverty and simplicity of life, which to a large extent contribute to an ethical life, Dio's association with Cynicism and

---

[277] Trapp 2000, 220.
[278] Diog. Laert. *VII*, 87-8.
[279] On the combination of Stoic and Cynic ideas in the *Euboicus* see Brancacci 2016.

Stoicism becomes more evident: there are explicit references to the supremacy of poverty and the condemnation of wealth, not only in most of the passages of authorial narration,[280] but also in passages where the character narrators explain their personal ideas about the advantages of living a simple βίος ('life') in the country.[281]

Back to the pedagogical function of Dio: it seems that he exploits the Cynic and Stoic opposition between poverty and country, on the one hand, and wealth and city, on the other, in terms of morality, in an attempt to account for the moral superiority of the hunter and the protagonist's revelation of the merits of country life and also to inform his audience about the advantages of adopting a low profile and abstaining from the corrupting power of toxic, urban environments.[282] This is an idea to which I will return shortly.

All in all, Dio uses plot dynamics and narratorial dynamics in order to construct a particular identity for himself. He develops philosophical characteristics pertaining to his pedagogical representation, using specific traits from Platonism, Cynicism, and Stoicism. In the metaliterary section, he implicitly reveals his intention of being among those who, like Plato, have developed a certain socio-political theoretical system of government ensuring the correctness of any immoral state, whereas in the first part, he expands the Cynic-Stoic idea of the moral superiority of living κατὰ φύσιν ('according to nature') and of poverty. Therefore Dio works towards enhancing his self-fashioning as a philosophical teacher with wider social, political, and ethical interests,[283] like the ones developed by famous philosophers of the past, such as the Platonists, Cynics, and Stoics.

---

[280] E.g. 7.1; 81-86; 91-6; 97-102; 103-8.
[281] E.g. 7.10-20; 33-40; 41-2; 52; 62-3; 65-6.
[282] More on this can also be found in Desideri 1978, 225-6.
[283] Russell 1992, 12 also argues that Dio's self-presentation bears philosophical characteristics from the Socratic tradition.

The pedagogy of the *Euboicus* (II)

In the previous section, I tried to show how Dio's development of the textual dynamics contributes to the promotion of his identity of a παιδαγωγός debating moral issues. It is now time to examine the ways in which the audience perceives, and develops interests in, these textual dynamics. More particularly, I will investigate how the readers co-assist in the construction of the author's pedagogical identity and subsequently how they adopt for themselves the role of students in a philosophy class.

Phelanian theory repeatedly highlights that readers have, far from a passive, an active role in the construction of narratives.[284] However, to comprehend this readerly activity we need to think about it through the activity of the author: authors show an elevated interest in the possible responses of the readers to the narrative because they want their messages to be effectively communicated to, and as adequately 'absorbed' as possible by, the readers. For this reason, authors construct their narratives according to the potential readerly interests. Also, apart from ensuring that the content or the messages of the narrative appeal to the readers' interests, authors use language and style in a way that seems most appropriate to readers. Thus during the construction of narratives, authors have to keep the readers in mind. It might sound absurd that readers can affect the narrative even before reading it, but it is equally absurd to restrict readers' participation in the narrative by assuming for them a merely passive role.[285]

Returning to the *Euboicus*, we can assume that Dio takes into account the possible responses of his readers and organises the narrative material according to these responses. First

---

[284] What I call here 'ideal readers' corresponds to Phelan's authorial audience, that is, 'the hypothetical group for whom the author writes — the group that shares the knowledge, values, prejudices, fears, and experiences that the author expected in his or her readers, and that ground his or her rhetorical choices.' (Phelan 2017, 7).

[285] For those who do not distinguish between real and ideal readers, the above argument is indeed absurd. The Phelanian proposition, instead, makes the distinction, and concerns the ideal readers that authors have in mind when composing a narrative. Since narratives are considered as products of the dynamic communication between implied authors and ideal readers, then the latter can exert influence upon authors by inspiring them and by affecting the ways in which they choose to present the material to the readers. On the different audiences in Phelanian theory see Phelan 2017, 7-8, and in narratology in general, see Prince 2009.

of all, in the metaliterary sections (7.1, 7.81-152), which frame the story of the protagonist and the hunter, the audience perceives the events recounted and the characters as predominantly artificial, as fictional constructs through which Dio sends the audience a particular message: wealth does not ensure morality and life in the city is not superior to that in the country. Through this philosophical θέσις ('position'), which entails elements from Platonism, Cynicism, and Stoicism, Dio makes himself perceptible to the audience as an erudite figure, capable of developing stories that can assist ambitious readers in their quest for a more ethical and meaningful way of life.[286]

The mimetic and thematic readerly interests also play a role in the characterisation of Dio as a pedagogical figure and of the readers as students in a philosophy class. First of all, the careful delineation of the corporeal, behavioural, cognitive, as well as affective features of the intratextual characters pertains to their mimetic depiction, that is, to their representation as real-life people with commonly seen adventures. However, the progression from the synthetic (7.1) to the mimetic (7.2 and so on) interests is, as noted earlier, not as clear-cut, since it takes time for the readers to shift their perception of the characters from fictional figures to possible real-life people. Even though the readers initially notice the artificiality of the text, they increasingly invest in the interest in seeing the characters as assimilating to common, ordinary people, and so they can either identify with, or dissociate themselves from, them. We could consequently argue that the mimetic readerly interest aims at bridging the gap between the readers and the characters by motivating the former to sympathise with the hunter and to make them believe that they could also be in the position of the protagonist or the hunter.

---

[286] Cf. Jarratt 2019, 37 endorses a similar idea: 'We might understand the hybrid genre of the work as an attempt to open the doors of interpretation for his listeners. He presents to them the pleasurable fiction of the conflict between city and country with its fictional resolution but goes on to demonstrate the political uses of rhetorical fictions.'

Assuming that the readers are indeed capable of adopting the aforementioned position, it lies with them to make sense of the ideational messages of the narrative that concern the opposition between moral country life and immoral urban life. To achieve this understanding, they need to perceive the characters as embodying distinct values and moral principles. For example, the protagonist serves as the symbol of the person who changes his mind for the better by turning his initial prejudice against countrymen into empathy towards them and by witnessing, first-hand, their hospitality and goodwill. The hunter embodies the type of the person whose morality complements and elevates his rural upbringing. Also the city-dwellers in the trial represent the villain because they do not show any understanding of the hunter, while the young couple at the end of the narrative represent the 'happily ever after' of the stories that conclude with the unity of the loved ones.

The thematic nuances underlying the contrast between the moral benefits of the country and the disadvantages of the city are more visibly seen through the ideational function of the characters. Also the shift from authorial narration to character narration and character-character dialogue reinforces the readers' perception of the narrative as more thematic and less as a synthetic product of Dio. In other words, the fact that Dio is transferred to the background, leaving the stage to characters interacting with each other, has significant thematic responses, since the readers depend almost exclusively on the references of the characters to the oppositions between country life and city life.

To sum up, the readers respond to the textual dynamics by developing mimetic, thematic, as well as synthetic interests, depending on the circumstances. However, the fact that the story of the protagonist and the hunter is framed by two metaliterary sections makes us wonder about the role that the preponderance of the synthetic readerly interests play in the construction of the identities of Dio and the readers. In my opinion, it is very important that Dio reveals himself to the readers at the beginning and at the end of the text. This significance

is relevant to his intention of inviting the readers to perceive him as a philosophical teacher constructing a pedagogical narrative on moral grounds. It is indeed through the framing of the text in an explicitly synthetic picture, that Dio asks his readers to infer for him the image of a philosophical παιδαγωγός guiding his students towards morality.

To explain why Dio strives to establish a pedagogical relationship with his readers, we should take a look at the historical (social, political, literary) context of the narrative. It has been proposed that for the authors of the Second Sophistic, the identity of an intellectual was heavily reliant on specific social practices, such as his participation in public cultural centres, the popularity of both his former teachers and his existing students, his interaction with members of specific circles (sophists, philosophers, Christians, etc.), as well as the conformity of his external appearance.[287] I will now attempt to show that some of these social practices have significance in the development of certain identities in the *Euboicus*.

One can see how difficult it is for the hunter to fit into the public place of the theatre where his trial takes place. He is mocked due to his improperly rural behaviour, which is thereby bound to be condemned, and which significantly excludes him from the defined circle of intellectuals who used to visit such important places. Even though he does not claim any intellectual quality for himself and visits the theatre solely for his trial, he quickly comes to the realisation that in a socio-political arena there is no mercy for the wicked, since the alleged severity of the place runs the risk of being contaminated by his rurality.

For Dio, however, it is through this monstruous and deceiving severity that the city shows its worst face against those jeopardising its internal urban consistency. In his opinion, as expressed in the metaliterary section, the idea of internal urban consistency is completely distorted because it is based on the social status of its members, rather than on their sense of

---

[287] On the social practices employed by Second Sophistic authors see the studies of Gleason 1995, Schmitz 1997, and Eshleman 2012.

morality: although the city-dwellers believe that the hunter bastardises the purity of the theatre with his behaviour, it is, on the contrary, Dio's belief that the real contamination comes from the city-dwellers themselves, whose false claim of superiority deteriorates, and eventually disintegrates, their moral qualities.[288] So in the case of inclusivity and exclusivity, Dio opposes the traditional idea of urban supremacy by maintaining that what really matters is moral purity, which is not an (exclusive) privilege of city-dwellers. Thus the readers realise that a noble purpose, according to Dio, their 'teacher', is to look after their moral well-being, rather than to seek to grow in popularity.

The same is true for the social practice of showing off popularity through the recognition of previous teachers and existing students. Even though there is no explicit reference to any such social practice in the *Euboicus*, Dio attacks vigorously views about morality by criticising the beliefs about poverty that the slave in Euripides' *Electra* holds. Undoubtedly, authors such as Euripides were considered as valuable teachers and their works had a profound impact upon contemporary discourses debating social and political issues.[289] In particular, Dio rejects the idea that wealthy city-dwellers are higher-ranking than poor countrymen and proposes the exact opposite. With this move, he revises the ideas of a former teacher, while at the same time endorsing the Homeric concept of morality, which brings the hunter closer to the Homeric Eumaeus. As for the respectability of his students, Dio seems hopeful that if they do not go after social popularity, but rather try to remain within the ethical boundaries of nobility, they will soon be able to become masters of themselves.

---

[288] In addition, it can be argued that they deteriorate the morality of the hunter too. The latter describes how pure and moral his life in the country is, whereas his contact with the city-dwellers takes away some of his morality, and fills him with 'impurities'.

[289] On the influence of Euripidean poetry on imperial Greek literature see e.g. Hopkinson 1994, 4; Whitmarsh 2001a, 144; Morgan 2007, 223; Lauwers 2011, 232. On Dio particularly see Chatzigiannis (forthcoming).

Conclusions

I hope to have shown through my analysis of the *Euboicus* the depth with which Dio communicates with his audience and offers a thoroughly refined narrative, which has mimetic, thematic, and synthetic characteristics. Since my main interest has been to show the means by which Dio achieves this kind of connection with his audience, I have approached his rhetorical resources by looking simultaneously at how he handles them and how the audience perceives them.

As a primary resource of rhetorical communication and as an example of narratorial dynamics, the use of authorial narration and character narration gives Dio an appropriate distance from the protagonist and the hunter and furthermore reinforces the readerly synthetic responses to the events narrated. Additionally, the use of different character narrators and of character-character dialogue helps the audience recognise whether what is said by the characters is endorsed by Dio or not.

The thematic opposition between city and country life constitutes a readerly response to Dio's exploitation of another resource, that of the hunter's unreliability as a character narrator, when he inaccurately reports and interprets specific events and characters. However, this kind of unreliability has bonding rather than estranging effects for the readers. Moreover, a resource of plot dynamics is the repetition of main events (e.g. the shipwreck of the protagonist and of Sotades), which has an impact upon the readers, who are guided towards an evaluative interpretation of the overall morality of the characters. Last but not least, although not necessarily connected to the plot dynamics, Dio's numerous techniques of enhancing the unity of the text could be regarded as a broader resource with which Dio effectively communicates with his readers.

Naturally, the readers respond to these authorial resources by perceiving the narrative in a mimetic, thematic, or synthetic way. Although much has been said in the above analysis

about the role of the readers in the construction of the narrative, here I will repeat that the readers both effect, and are affected by, the aforementioned authorial techniques: according to the Crossover affect, textual dynamics sought to influence the readerly ones, but at the same time they are influenced by them, that is, by the ways in which the readers are likely to respond to the narrative.

Dio takes into consideration the readerly responses and subsequently constructs for himself the image of a philosophical teacher debating moral issues and for his readers the image of students in a philosophy class. More particularly, Dio aims at cultivating such a pedagogical relationship with his authorial audience through lessons of exemplarity and allusiveness: in the first case, he points out that the narrative of the protagonist and the hunter serves as an illustration of different stages of human morality and thus his students are indirectly asked to decide on whose side they would choose to be. Accordingly, in the second case, the students are invited to infer the literary or philosophical inferences that Dio draws upon, so that they can claim a certain relationship with the author as a true παιδαγωγός, who ultimately attempts to offer something different from the other authors of his time.[290]

---

[290] Connections with respected scholarly authorities, such as sophists, orators, and philosophers, could ensure one's social formation and success (Eshleman 2012, 139-48). Accordingly, rivalry among teachers was common, since they strived to attract students to their schools but were sometimes rejected for someone else.

The *Olympicus* (*Or*. 12)

The aim of this chapter is the narratological examination of the *Olympicus* through the consideration of the elements pertaining to the rhetorical communication between Dio and his audience, and of the impact that each of these agents exerts on the other. By employing Phelan's rhetorical theory,[291] I will attempt to read the text as a narrative, in its broad sense, by presenting its characteristics – the presence of an implied author and of narrators, the sequence (progression) of the events, and key functions in the characters' presentation – and will examine the ways in which Dio offers a moral discourse to his audience. In the second part, I will exclusively focus on the role of Dio as a philosophical παιδαγωγός ('teacher'), offering useful advice to the audience, and on the rhetorical techniques with which he achieves a connection with the readers.

Could Phelan's rhetorical theory of narrative be applied to a rhetorical text such as the *Olympicus*? First of all, the statement that 'narrative theory in general needs to expand its horizons to include more discussion of narratives from other times and other cultures'[292] reflects the need for wider applications of narratological theories, including applications to ancient, Greek and Roman, texts. Additionally, what hinders the narratological analysis of rhetorical texts is that they are generally neglected as belonging to non-narrative genres and that scholars have tended to assume that only the part of *narratio* (διήγησις) is of narratological interest.[293] Nevertheless, this opinion contradicts modern notions according to which narratives should not be limited to the so-called narrative genres (e.g. epic poems, novels, short stories). For instance, it does not accord with Bal's proposed definition of narrative as 'a text in which

---

[291] As delineated in the introduction. See also Phelan 1989; Phelan 1996; Phelan 2005; Phelan 2007; Phelan 2017; Clark-Phelan 2020.
[292] Clark-Phelan 2020, 14.
[293] This seems to be the opinion of Edwards 2004, 317-8, who argues that a rhetorical text's primary intention is persuasion and that the clearly narrative part is διήγησις ('narration', Lat. *narratio*). However, he believes that all the other parts of a rhetorical speech can convey narrative characteristics.

an agent or subject conveys to an addressee ('tells' the reader, viewer, or listener) a story in a medium, such as language, imagery, sound, buildings, or a combination thereof.'[294] In fact, a rhetorical speech seems to fit perfectly into this template: it is a text, written and/or oral,[295] in which an agent addresses a particular audience, presenting a story in a certain medium. However, the misunderstanding occurs when *narratio* (διήγησις), which is a part of a rhetorical speech, is considered as semantically approximate to the modern term 'narrative', which is a rather different concept.[296]

In its modern, broad sense, narrative comprises three distinct aspects: story, narrative (in its narrow sense), and narrating. Story is 'the signified or narrative content', narrative (in its narrow sense) is the 'signifier, statement, discourse or narrative text', and narrating is 'the producing narrative action and, by extension, the whole of the real or fictional situation in which that action takes place.'[297] Ancient rhetorical *narratio* is a subcategory of the narrative in its narrow sense.[298] That is to say, if a rhetorical speech is considered as a narrative in its broad sense, conveying particular messages to recipients, *narratio* is then the part that prepares the ground for the analysis of arguments (Lat. *argumentatio*) by presenting proofs in continuous form.[299] Thus the confusion begins when *narratio* is regarded not as a structural, textual part of a broader narrative, but as the narrative *itself*.

---

[294] Bal 2017, 5. It does not even agree with Phelan's (rhetorical) definition of narrative as 'somebody telling somebody else on some occasion and for some purpose(s) that something happened' (Phelan 2017, 5).

[295] In Greece and Rome, rhetorical texts constituted a combination of written and oral material: written, for the speech was composed in advance, prior to public demonstration, and oral, for it was delivered verbally in front of an audience.

[296] Perhaps the misunderstanding occurred as soon as modern narratologists, such as Genette 1983, borrowed terms from Greek and Latin rhetorical treatises to describe their own semiotic narrative models. See also Futre Pinheiro 2018.

[297] All quotes come from Genette 1983, 27. Bal 2017, 5 follows Genette's schema, but instead of 'narrating', she uses the term 'fabula'.

[298] Already Yvancos 1986, 235 contends that rhetorical *narratio* is not equivalent to modern narration: 'Estoy lejos de identificar *narratio* retórica y narración literaria, pero también veo forzada y lejos de la realidad de ios tratados la exclusiva subsidiariedad argumentativa de la *narratio*.'

[299] Quint., *Inst*. 4.2.1: *praeparato per haec quae supra dicta sunt iudice res de qua pronuntiaturus est indicetur: ea est narratio* 'after the judge being prepared in the way described above, the subject which he will have to judge is indicated: this is *narratio*'; *Inst*. 4. 2. 79: *narratio est probationis continua propositio, rursus probatio*

Perhaps, the reason why *narratio* has tended to be considered as equivalent to a narrative in its broad sense is the presence or absence of an (implied) author within a rhetorical text:[300] traditionally, the speaker focuses on his or the audience's personality at the beginning of the text to achieve the three *loci* of the *exordium* (*docere* 'to inform', *delectare* 'to delight', and *movere* 'to affect'). Afterwards, a less explicit and more impersonal presentation of the events is promoted to facilitate the 'objective' recounting of the events. Thus after the *exordium* the speaker usually becomes less perceptible to the audience as a teller and more as a participant in the events narrated. The illusion of the objective narration in *narratio* then contributes to the assumption that only this part is worthy of narratological attention. Finally, in *peroratio*, the speaker becomes again the explicit presenter of the events by referring to his personality and by addressing the audience directly to ask for their sympathy. Thus what seems to be the reason for the narratological neglect of the whole rhetorical speech is that *narratio* is the only part lacking the explicit role of an (implied) author as a storyteller and is consequently regarded as narratively 'purer' than the other parts.[301]

If one accepts the idea that a rhetorical text is actually a narrative, one can also accept that there is an implied author, distinct from the real orator composing the discourse, recounting a story that includes particular characters and events. The implied author can either present the story himself, or let other agents, such as narrators or characters, recount it. This is the case for

---

narrationi congruens confirmatio '*narratio* is a continuous evidence put forward, while *probatio* is a confirmation of the facts as combined in *narratio*'. Similarly, Cicero focuses on the verisimilitude of the events presented in the *narratio* by defining the latter as a recounting of verisimilar events: *De Or.* 2.19.80: *rem narrare ita ut verisimilis narratio sit, ut aperta, ut brevis* 'to state our case in such a manner, that the *narratio* may be probable, clear, and concise'; *Inv.* 1.19.27: *narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio* '*narratio* is a clarification of facts already been done, or of facts as if they have been done.'

[300] In judicial speeches, I consider as author the logographer, despite the fact that he was not delivering the speech in front of the people of the court – this was the task of the client. In deliberative and demonstrative speeches, on the other, an author is the same person who writes the speech and delivers it in front of an audience. The *Olympicus* falls into the latter category.

[301] Already Booth 1983, 3-147 has warned against the reductionist notion that a successful narrative is an impersonal narrative and has pointed out that the presence of an author within a narrative should not be considered as an artistic flaw, but as a necessary and unavoidable condition of narratives. Thus what an author can do is to choose how to appear – that is, what type of rhetoric to employ – within the narrative.

Dio Chrysostom's *Olympicus*, wherein Dio becomes perceptible at the beginning, while later granting narrators the task of presenting an embedded story. The discourse concerns the human conception of the divine and the implications occurring when different artists (in this case, sculptors and poets) represent the divine from different perspectives and with different materials.

To sum up, my analysis of the *Olympicus* is mainly narratological and rhetorical in nature and suggests specific notions: first of all, it regards the text as a purposeful rhetorical form of communication between the implied Dio, who is distinct from the flesh-and-blood author, and his readers. This communication is based on certain rhetorical techniques that Dio employs in order to affect his audience's various responses to the text. To investigate these techniques I will apply Phelan's rhetorical theory of narrative to the whole text, not simply the part of the διήγησις (*narratio*), which has traditionally, but falsely, been considered as the only part of a rhetorical speech worthy of narratological analysis due to its equation with the narrative in its broad sense.

The *Olympicus*: an overview

Among the discourses of Dio Chrysostom, the *Olympic Discourse* stands out as an informative source for religious and metaphysical matters.[302] In the form of a rhetorical speech,[303] the eighty-five-paragraph text was supposedly delivered before a Greek audience in Elea during the celebration of the Olympic games.[304] Although the text can be divided into five parts,

---

[302] Swain 1996, 197. Dio develops religious and metaphysical ideas in other texts too, some of the most notable being *orr*. 36, 63, 64, 65.

[303] The *Olympic Discourse* cannot be considered as a purely rhetorical text because, according to Ventrella 2016, 363, 'inquadrare l' *Olimpico* in un preciso genere letterario risulta impresa ardua se non impossibile.' Discerning traits of philosophical treatise (διατριβή) and prose hymns, he acknowledges that the *Olympic Discourse* mainly approximates the genre of philosophical *epideixis*. See also Klauck and Bäbler 2000, 160-3.

[304] Other authors have also composed texts for the celebration of the Olympic games: Gorgias (*Olympian oration*), Lysias (*Olympic oration*), and Isocrates (*Panegyrikos*). See Volonaki 2011; Pepe 2013, 18-9.

namely, the introductory προλαλιά (*prolalia*) (12.1-15),[305] προοίμιον ('introduction') (12.16-20), διήγησις ('narration') (12.21-26), πίστις ('argumentation') (12.27-83), and ἐπίλογος ('peroration') (12.84-85),[306] different categorisations have also been proposed.[307] However, apart from its rhetorical structure, the text comprises a series of events related to each other: in the beginning, an Aesop-like fable is presented (12.1-8)[308] and is connected to the protagonist's intention of offering advice to his narratees (12.9-12). In paragraphs 13-48, the protagonist provides particular characteristics about his personality by pointing out his parallelism both with a wise owl and with Socrates and offers a detailed commentary on the philosophical idea of the human conception of the divine. In the next part (12.49-83), in an attempt to emphasise his idea, he depicts Pheidias in a fictional trial, in which he accounts for his choices that led to the erection of his monumental statue of Zeus in Olympia. Finally, as a brief summary, the last two paragraphs (12.84-5) repeat the essential points of the text.

In the first half (12.1-48), the protagonist develops the identity of an intellectual-philosopher by commencing the narrative in a Platonic manner[309] and by comparing himself to the wise owl.[310] As a character he takes on certain anthropomorphic characteristics through which the readers perceive him mainly *mimetically*: his intellectuality is compared to the wise

---

[305] According to Pernot 2005, 179, προλαλιά (*prolalia*) is the introductory part of a text that 'provide[s] a light-hearted and amusing preamble to a declamation or the recitation of an oration or any literary work.'

[306] Russell 1992, 16-7.

[307] Betz 2004, 218-9: *narratio* (12.16-20), *propositio* (12.21-26). Pavlík 2004, 46: *propositio* (12.21-47), *probatio* instead of *argumentatio*. More recently, Ventrella 2017, 33-4 proposed a tripartite organisation of the text, that is, *exordium* (12.21-26), *tractatio* (12.27-83), *peroratio* (12.84-85); note that by designating the first part (12.1-20) as a *prolalia*, he excludes it from his proposed schema.

[308] The Aesopic fables usually present an animal-protagonist whose actions and thoughts entail a moral message. Such fables were very popular in Greece and Rome and soon became part of the preparatory exercises of rhetorical schools. See also Chiron 2018, 99-113.

[309] Plato's *Gorgias* starts with the same phrase ἀλλ᾽ ἦ τὸ λεγόμενον 'to use a familiar saying'. On the Platonic influence on Dio see Trapp 2000; Desideri 2018.

[310] 12.1: ἀλλ᾽ ἦ τὸ λεγόμενον, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐγὼ καὶ παρ᾽ ὑμῖν καὶ παρ᾽ ἑτέροις πλείοσι πέπονθα τὸ τῆς γλαυκὸς ἄτοπον καὶ παράδοξον πάθος; 'can it be, Sirs, that here before you, just as before many another audience – to use a familiar saying – I have met with the strange and inexplicable experience of the owl?'. The standard edition of the *Olympic Discourse* is that of von Arnim 1893-6. Where necessary, I cite the different readings of the modern edition of Ventrella 2017. All translations are that of Cohoon 1939.

owl's wisdom and is subsequently contrasted to ignorant philosophers' false claim to wisdom; additionally, he is depicted as a public speaker (12.12), possessing no students (12.13), and having travelled as an exile to foreign lands (12.18-20). These details enhance his depiction as a real human and promote characteristics that reveal his passion for philosophy. Yet the most significant trait of his mimetic dimension is the claim that he is

> a man who is neither handsome in appearance, nor strong, and in age is already past his prime, one who has no disciple, who professes no art or special knowledge either of the nobler or of the meaner sort, no ability either as a prophet or a sophist, not even as an orator or as a flatterer, one who is not even a clever writer, who does not even have a craft deserving of praise or of interest, but who simply wears his hair long. (12.15)

Despite addressing the narratees, the protagonist indirectly communicates to the authorial audience how he should be perceived: he puts emphasis on his characteristics, such as his claim to be humble and his opposition to prophets, sophists, orators, flatterers, and clever writers. In addition, his use of first person singular denotes a fusion with Dio, in so far as the protagonist constitutes a partial representation of the latter. In this way, the authorial audience not only perceives the protagonist as a humble man, but also develops similar assumptions for Dio too.[311]

What is interesting in the protagonist's words is that he undermines his own reliability as a character-narrator by contending that he possesses no knowledge and by recognising his lack of any kind of skills. This ironic self-characterisation, despite resembling Socratic precepts,[312] becomes perceptible to the readers as a kind of invitation not to take everything

---

[311] This is by no means the only time that Dio promotes a fusion between himself and the protagonist through the use of first-person singular. Other Dionic texts too (i.e. *orr.* 7, 13, 34, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 47) display the same technique.

[312] Klauck and Bäbler 2000, ad οὐδὲ δεινοῦ ξυγγράφειν οὐδὲ ἔργον τι ἔχοντος ἄξιον ἐπαίνου καὶ σπουδῆς. On the epistemological aspects of Socratic self-knowledge see Rappe 1995.

the protagonist says with earnest intent because his status as a speaker is primarily weakened by himself.[313]

Through the Socratic overtones in the protagonist's self-ironical unreliability Dio generates synthetic responses to the authorial audience by highlighting the affiliation of his narrative to the generic conventions of Platonic philosophical discourses, according to which knowledge can be approached primarily through dialogue. Plato, using dialogue as a vehicle for the discovery of knowledge, involves two or more characters in a conversation, in which each presents their distinct opinions on the same topic.[314] Of course, this dialectic form of approaching the truth has a significant impact on the readers,[315] since they are invited to synthesise a relatively accurate approximation of the truth through the combination of two opposing notions (thesis and antithesis). Similarly, in the *Olympicus* the protagonist promotes a dialogue with the narratees by using his supposed unreliability as a starting point and by addressing them directly: apart from being great in number (12.15: τοσοῦτον πλῆθος ὄντες 'great as is your number'), the narratees can also employ certain cognitive responses to examine the validity of the protagonist's ideas (e.g. 12.3: σκοπεῖ 'examine'), and pay attention to the events recounted (12.5: βούλεσθε ἀκούειν 'want to hear'). This description makes the narratees *characterised*, in Phelan's formation,[316] and reduces the distance from the authorial audience, since the latter, due to their fusion with the narratees, have already established an indirect kind of communication with the protagonist.

In this first part of the *Olympicus*, we saw that the communication between the protagonist and the narratees also constitutes a covert communication between Dio and the authorial audience, since the protagonist is fused with Dio through the use of the first person

---

[313] In Phelan's taxonomy of unreliable narration (Phelan 2005, 49-53), the protagonist displays *misregarding*, 'which involves unreliability at least on the axis of ethics and evaluation' (Phelan 2005, 51).
[314] On the importance of dialogue for the approximation of truth see Hyland 1968.
[315] See e.g. Cotton 2014.
[316] Phelan 1989, 135-41.

singular and the comparison with pseudo-intellectuals. However, the unreliability of the protagonist as a character-narrator also generates another, subtle, yet significant, communication between Dio and the authorial audience.

At the beginning of the text, the protagonist – and through him, Dio – parallels himself to the wise owl that mourns, in contrast with the other birds that gather around it and scorn it as insignificant and weak.[317] The reason the birds prefer to gather around a mournful creature is explored through a *priamel*: birds do not prefer peacocks, which demonstrate their beautiful feathers, or nightingales, whose voices are a precious gift from nature, or even swans, which sing the wonderful swansong, but rather owls. Here, the protagonist provides a remarkable parallelism for his case: like birds that gather around an owl, no matter how sad its words are, people prefer to assemble near the protagonist, who may discuss negative or unpleasant things. The narratees receive a characterisation, to which the readers respond by developing a more sympathetic view of Dio as a composer of narratives that might cause upset and distress. In other words, through the subtle channel of communication with the audience, Dio uses the technique of εὔνοια ('goodwill') as a rhetorical means of influence and asks his audience to create sympathy for him, for what is about to be presented is based on his intention of approaching the truth behind philosophical issues through a dialectical relationship with them.

Before moving to the next part of the *Olympicus*, I would like to explore briefly the readerly interests developed by the protagonist's association with the wise owl.[318] As presented in the narrative, the owl is not a mere animal, but an important symbol: it is the best friend of the goddess Athena, it was inscribed on Pericles' shield (12.6), and it was used by Aesop as

---

[317] 12.1: τὰ μὲν καθιζόμενα ἐγγύς, τὰ δὲ κύκλῳ περιπετόμενα, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, καταφρονοῦντα τῆς φαυλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀσθενείας 'some alighting near and others circling about her, the reason being, as it seems to me, that they look with scorn upon her insignificance and weakness'.

[318] 12.12: ἐρῶ δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ ἄλλο, ὃ πέπονθα τῇ γλαυκὶ παραπλήσιον, ἐὰν καὶ βούλησθε καταγελᾶν τῶν λόγων 'and I shall tell you of another respect too in which I am like the owl, even if you are ready to laugh at my words.'

the symbol of wisdom (12.6-8). These positive qualities contrast with its ugly appearance and its contempt by the other birds.

In a similar vein, the protagonist is presented as a scorned elderly man with a poor appearance, who is often ignored because people do not put faith in his words.[319] Even though the parallelism is between a human and an animal, the readers cannot but generate mimetic interests in the way that the protagonist presents himself. The mimetic components are again found in paragraphs 17-20, in which the protagonist provides details about his past experiences and, more particularly, about his exile: he did not have heavy armour, was unable to cut timber, and was not a good and efficient soldier; he was simply a peacemaker in a military camp with no rich sceptre like that of Chryses in the *Iliad*.[320]

In short, the first twenty paragraphs provide the readers with noteworthy details about the perception of the identity of the protagonist: by comparing himself to the wise owl, he contends that what he is about to present may not be pleasant but will certainly be beneficial to the recipients;[321] by adopting the Socratic model of the ignorant philosopher, he is presented as a humble man who does not brag about any of his intellectual skills; lastly, by referring to his past experiences, he affirms his inability to carry out certain corporeal tasks, thus resorting to the relatively harmless endeavour of discussing the topic of the human conception of the divine.

Overall, the protagonist constructs an important figure within the text and makes himself perceptible to the authorial audience as an agent with both mimetic and synthetic components. As mentioned earlier, there is good reason to believe that behind the mimetic and

---

[319] As Ventrella 2017, 143 maintains, the character-narrator's parallelism with the wise owl and the sophists' with peacocks constitutes an indirect polemic against the sophists' speeches that consisted of verbalisms devoid of meaning.

[320] The phrase ἐπὶ λύσει θυγατρὸς ἥκων εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον 'arrived at the camp on an enforced journey to gain a daughter's release' is similar to 1.12-5 of the *Iliad*. For the political-historical aspect of the parallelism between the author and Chryses see Ventrella 2017, 215.

[321] Nikolsky 2016, 181: 'Th[e] comparison [of Dio to an owl] may perhaps be interpreted in a political sense, Dio's speech being thus presented as a lesson for his Greek audience.'

synthetic readerly interests lies Dio's intention of creating a certain intratextual persona, with which he can identify or from which he can distance himself, and through which he can communicate certain messages to the readers. Dio thus invites his readers to exercise certain cognitive skills in order to perceive the protagonist as a real-life human and the narrative as a synthetic, that is, literary, product.

From paragraph 21, the protagonist, having adopted a basic – yet still important for his connection with the audience – image of a philosopher-public speaker, proceeds to the examination of the main topic of his discussion. At the beginning, he asks the narratees, in the form of a rhetorical question, whether they would like to hear an agreeable story or one about human conceptions of the divine. At the end, he chooses the second topic as more appropriate to the religious atmosphere of the Olympic games. The synthetic element is once again displayed: by asking the narratees about the most suitable topic for conversation, the protagonist also reveals to the authorial audience the organisation of the future events in the narrative and highlights his role as a character-narrator.

From this point on, the narrative takes on a highly religious dimension. The protagonist starts by examining the various appellations in honour of the god Zeus: he is called king of men and gods, ruler, lord, father, and dispenser of peace and war.[322] Directly afterwards, the protagonist looks for the most suitable and subtle way to praise the god, wondering if he could possibly imitate Hesiod's invocation to the Muses, with which his *Works and Days* commences: at this point, the protagonist becomes perceptible to the readers as an agent introducing another literary work into the narrative. This synthetic characteristic brings him closer to Dio, since he is not willing to imitate Hesiod, but rather strives to find a more genuine mode of praise.

---

[322] Although these appellations could be regarded as an apparent trait of a prose hymn – the use of verb ὑμνῆσαι ('to praise') fits with this – the *Olympicus* is definitely more than just a prose hymn. See Ventrella 2016, 352-6.

The synthetic dimension of the passage is further elaborated in paragraphs 25-6, in which there is a reference to the development of the narrative. Through the protagonist's wish to discourse at length on 'all the statues which are upon the earth the most beautiful and the most dear to the gods, Pheidias having, as we are told, taken his pattern from Homer's poetry',[323] Dio presents a prolepsis, since he indirectly points out to the readers how the rest of the narrative will unfold. In paragraph 26, the main topic is again introduced (τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην περὶ τοῦ δαιμονίου δόξαν 'man's conception of the deity') and is compared to a philosophical treatise (ἅτε ἐν φιλοσόφου διατριβῇ τὰ νῦν 'as if we were in a philosopher's lecture-room at this moment').[324] Thus the authorial audience is asked to take on the role of a participant in a philosophical dialogue.

People conceive of the divine in two distinct ways: either by discovering the religious idea inherently lying in them, or by developing this idea in later years thanks to the work of poets, lawgivers, sculptors, and philosophers. In paragraphs 27-39, the protagonist offers a detailed analysis of how people inherently conceive of the divine: all rational living creatures have developed a unique connection with the divine by using language, which, through its inherent systems of logic and reasoning, enables them to describe and interpret the world they live in. Even though plants and animals lack reason and logic, they are, nevertheless, administered by the divine and, in order to comply with the religious idea, they provide essential service to humans (predominantly nutritional). In such a universe, Zeus, the supreme god, exercises his power over the other gods, the humans, as well as over the animals and the plants.[325]

---

[323] 12.25: ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀγάλματα, κάλλιστον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον, πρὸς τὴν Ὁμηρικὴν ποίησιν, ὥς φασι, Φειδίου παραβαλλομένου 'of all the statues which are upon the earth the most beautiful and the most dear to the gods, Pheidias having, as we are told, taken his pattern from Homer's poesy.'
[324] Already von Arnim 1898, 406 acknowledges the philosophical tone with which the religious theme of human conception of the gods is presented in the text.
[325] This universe seems fairly Stoic in conception: see François 1921, 179; Inwood 2022, 450. Hertz 2016, 200-3, on the other, argues that there is an apparent influence of Platonic philosophy. Ventrella 2017, 316-8 adopts a

In the next paragraphs, the protagonist turns to the second way in which humans conceive of the divine. Poets, lawgivers, artists, and philosophers[326] offer an acquired, implanted idea of the divine: poets by presenting myths and by exhorting the audience to follow their religious precepts and lawgivers by conforming to a divine system of legislation that favours justice and equality. Sculptors, as a particular kind of artist, use another way to represent the divine: by exploiting tangible materials, such as stone, wood, metal, and wax, they attempt to represent the divine in a way that complies with the poetic myths about gods of the past. This proposition explains why famous sculptors of the past, such as Pheidias, Alcamenes, and Polycleitus, partially relied on poetic myths to capture the most satisfying image of the divine – only partially, though, because, as Pheidias contends later in the narrative, sculptors' conception of the divine more often than not supersedes that of poets.

Having outlined a clear distinction between poetry and sculpture, the protagonist now focuses on Pheidias exclusively and involves him in a trial scene. Pheidias is presented as a character in an embedded narrative in which he explains the reasons behind his choice of representing Zeus as seen by his statue at Olympia.[327] To immerse the audience into the embedded narrative, Dio de-emphasises the narratorial properties of the protagonist[328] and introduces an anonymous interlocutor or inquisitor,[329] who praises the statue of Zeus, while also asking Pheidias to account for it. In narratological terms, the interlocutor becomes a

moderate opinion, maintaining that Zeus as 'le timonier du monde' is an idea adopted by both Plato and the Stoics. On the contrast to Epicurean philosophy see Desideri 1978, 327. On the similarities to biblical readings see Wojciechowski 2011.

[326] As Becker 1993, 70 maintains, philosophers' conception of the divine is implicitly treated in the previous section of the innate conception of gods, to which traits of a modified version of the *theologia tripertita* can be traced.

[327] The embedded narrative covers paragraphs 50-54.

[328] According to the logic of the narrative, since Pheidias' story is embedded into that of the protagonist, the protagonist retains his narratorial properties (as he is the one recounting the story of Pheidias to his narratees). Nevertheless, Dio enhances the character-character dialogue between the interlocutor and Pheidias, so that the authorial audience can immerse themselves into the embedded story more easily. This is the immersion quality that Allan 2020, 19 calls the 'transparency of the text': 'The text directs the addressee's attention to the storyworld, that is, it defocuses from the text itself as a medium and from the narrator as a mediating voice.'

[329] O'Sullivan 2011, 139.

secondary character-narrator, whereas Pheidias, to whom the words of the interlocutor are addressed, constitutes a secondary narratee. Afterwards, when Pheidias takes on the role of a speaking agent, he becomes a tertiary character-narrator.[330]

The thematic transition from the protagonist's story to the embedded narrative is smooth:[331] the interlocutor commends Pheidias and his artistic excellence as unparalleled in the way that he represented the divine through his statues. His art is first of all said to be so flawless that even Hephaestus would be unable to find a point of imperfection. However, the interlocutor's exaggeration is partially lessened once he exclusively focuses his attention to the statue of Zeus at Olympia, asking for the artistic and aesthetic reasons behind its conception.

As regards the characterisation of Pheidias, it is important to note that the interlocutor delineates him by emphasising his mimetic features: he is deemed the best and noblest of artists, who has conquered and united Greece with his art and who could be regarded as an illuminating example of artistic perfection. Through this mimetic representation, the authorial audience perceives him less as a literary construct and more as a real-life human. In addition, his art is considered as one of the noblest, since it depicts gods realistically, which, in turn, creates the impression to his viewers that they see the most charming and pleasing θέαμα ('spectacle').[332]

In the characterisation of Pheidias, one notices that Dio cleverly blurs the boundaries between mimetic and synthetic qualities by comparing himself to Pheidias.[333] On the one hand,

---

[330] It is essential here to say that the dialogic form in which the conversation between the interlocutor and Pheidias is held can be considered as an element of character-character narration, despite the speeches of both the interlocutor and Pheidias being quite lengthy.

[331] I do not see why 'the transition from the account of natural religion to the episode of Phidias' imagined trial is confused' (Russell 1992, 18).

[332] 12.50: ὡς μὲν ἡδὺ καὶ προσφιλὲς ὅραμα καὶ τέρψιν ἀμήχανον θέας εἰργάσω πᾶσιν Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις 'how charming and pleasing a spectacle you have wrought, and a vision of infinite delight for the benefit of all men, both Greeks and barbarians.'

[333] Hertz 2016, 207 highlights a thematic similarity between the author and Pheidias as regards their ἀπορία ('lack of means') and ἀμηχανία ('lack of resources').

the readers are encouraged to perceive Pheidias mimetically, as a real-life human; on the other, though, they are told that his art literally brings fictional representations in front of the eyes of the spectators, in the sense that it turns a synthetic element (an artistic product) into a mimetic one (a real-life product). Here, Dio argues that the synthetic components of Pheidias' art can be transformed into a mimetic product in his viewers' eyes. In a similar way, we could say, the narrative of the *Olympicus* borrows the same order by claiming that it can turn a synthetic component into a mimetic one: whereas the authorial audience is initially aware that they read a narrative, that is, a synthetic product, they are soon prompted to perceive Pheidias mimetically, that is, as a real-life human. Thus, through his own artistic excellence, Dio can bring in front of his audience's eyes not *the image* of a fictionally represented Pheidias, but Pheidias *himself*.[334]

Pheidias is described not through his own words, but through the way in which the interlocutor characterises him. There is good reason to believe that in the interlocutor's praise of the artistic excellence of Pheidias there is an implicit, authorial commentary. Although it may be hard and misleading to distinguish between the words of Dio and of the secondary character-narrator, I believe that there is a certain point in the latter's words that reveals the authorial presence: in paragraph 53, Pheidias is contrasted to other artists who made 'small and insignificant likenesses for every divine manifestation' and whose works are neither 'very much trusted, nor paid much attention'.[335] It is not, in my opinion, a mere coincidence that the technique of σύγκρισις ('comparison', Lat. *comparatio*) is once again employed here. The authorial audience is prompted to return to the beginning of the narrative, where the protagonist compared himself to pseudo-intellectuals only to show that his supposed ignorance was far

---

[334] In the *Olympicus*, issues of representation (mimetic and synthetic qualities) are of central importance. Note also that towards the end of his speech, Pheidias provides a reference to Hephaestus' creation of the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad*, which is ultimately concerned about issues of representation (cf. Becker 1995).

[335] 12.53: εἴ τέ πού τινα μικρὰ καὶ ἄσημα τῶν ἔμπροσθεν εἰκάσματα τεχνιτῶν, οὐ πάνυ τούτοις οὔτε πιστεύοντες οὔτε προσέχοντες τὸν νοῦν.

superior to that of sophists who falsely claimed to be wise. In other words, the way in which

Pheidias is compared to the other, unknown artists is strikingly similar to the way in which the

protagonist is compared to other unknown intellectuals. Since the interlocutor cannot be aware

of what was previously presented – for he is introduced later in the narrative – I suspect that

Dio's use of the rhetorical technique of σύγκρισις reflects a similarity between the protagonist

and Pheidias, and, ultimately, between Dio and Pheidias.

Paragraphs 55-83 contain Pheidias' response. By becoming a tertiary character-

narrator, he addresses the people of the trial and the interlocutor, who become tertiary narratees.

Pheidias' reference to the differences between poetry and sculpture is harmoniously combined

with the previous section and reveals his intention of showing that the Homeric representation

of Zeus is not as successful as his, for it moves away from the ideal depiction of the true essence

of the divine.

At the beginning, Pheidias maintains that he has little to do with old poets and

subsequently offers a historical account of how Greeks conceived of the divine: apart from

poetic myths, they created anthropomorphic statues to communicate with it and did not grant

trees and stones divine characteristics, as the barbarians would often do.[336] Homer, particularly,

represented gods as anthropomorphic, as creatures who could express human emotions, who

had the power of speech, and who quarrelled with each other. He also used a rich vocabulary

to describe how the gods felt or what they thought at a specific time.[337] Here, the variety and

---

[336] 12.61: ὥστε καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων πενίᾳ τε καὶ ἀπορίᾳ τέχνης ὄρη θεοὺς ἐπονομάζουσι καὶ δένδρα ἀργὰ καὶ ἀσήμους λίθους, οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς οἰκειότερα τῆς μορφῆς 'consequently many of the barbarians, because they lack artistic means and find difficulty in employing them, name mountains gods, and unhewn trees, too, and unshapen stones, things which are by no means whatever more appropriate in shape than is the human form.' Interestingly, Pheidias seems to adopt a favourable attitude towards the Greeks by maintaining that the latter did not grant divine characteristics to physical elements. However the *Iliad* – in which, for example, god Simoeis is depicted as a river – proves that the deification of physical elements was not an exclusive characteristic of the non-Greeks. What interests Pheidias here, though, is not so much the comparison between the Greeks and non-Greeks, but the early Greek concept of depicting gods with human characteristics.

[337] 12.64: δαψιλὲς γὰρ χρῆμα ποίησις καὶ πάντα τρόπον εὔπορον καὶ αὐτόνομον, καὶ χορηγίᾳ γλώττης καὶ πλήθει ῥημάτων ἱκανὸν ἐξ αὑτοῦ πάντα δηλῶσαι τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς βουλήματα, κἂν ὁποιονοῦν διανοηθῇ σχῆμα ἢ ἔργον ἢ πάθος ἢ μέγεθος, οὐκ ἂν ἀπορήσειεν ἀγγέλου φωνῆς πάνυ ἐναργῶς σημαινούσης ἕκαστα 'for an extravagant thing

adaptability of Homeric language is almost praised by Pheidias, but only to be condemned later: even though language, Pheidias contends, is a practical everyday tool for human communication, effectively expressing all sorts of emotions, it cannot escape a certain amount of ambiguity that lies in it. For instance, Homeric Zeus was depicted as at times mild and at times fear-inspiring, whereas Pheidias' Zeus showed an always peaceful and altogether gentle god. Hence, although Homer exploited language as a powerful source of stylistic nuances, he did not escape from the inherent ambiguity of meaning that language entails. On the other hand, Pheidias, despite the limitation of his resources, offered a consistent picture of how Zeus should be depicted.

We examined earlier the authorial presence in the interlocutor's speech, when he referred to the artistic contrast between Pheidias and other artists. Dio seems to re-emerge in Pheidias' speech by implicitly commenting on the process of the creation of a text. It is noteworthy that Pheidias, although a sculptor, offers a thorough description of how a literary work is created: he maintains that it constitutes a careful combination of different words and meanings, through which various emotions are generated to the audience, and takes Homeric poetry as an example. However, it is not Pheidias' discussion about literary issues that makes me suspect an implicit authorial commentary, but rather the depth of his knowledge of literary matters: he maintains that Homer mixed different – older and modern – dialects (Dorian, Ionian, etc.) with 'barbarian' words, that he used metaphors by comparing everyday items with those of the remote past, and that he enhanced his vocabulary with a plethora of synonyms; additionally, he produced different sounds, each one yielding a characteristically musical tone appropriate to every episode, and imitated the sounds of rivers, forests, winds, etc.; he even

---

is poetry and in every respect resourceful and a law unto itself, and by the assistance of the tongue and a multitude of words is able all by itself to express all the devisings of the heart, and whatever conception it may arrive at concerning any shape or action or emotion or magnitude, it can ever be at a loss, since the voice of a messenger can disclose with perfect clearness each and all these things.'

coined new words and attached fear-inspiring, pleasant, smooth, or rough names to specific objects. Pheidias thus concludes that Homer was 'able to implant in the soul any emotion he wished.'[338]

It is surprising that Pheidias is so well-informed about the linguistic and stylistic mechanisms of literary works and the means with which the audience emotionally responds to them.[339] It is exactly this deep knowledge of literary compositions that makes me suspect the implicit existence of Dio in Pheidias' speech, which offers to the authorial audience an idea of how literature is composed. In the way that the embedded narrative unfolds, we can see that the interlocutor and the people in the trial are much less interested in the mechanisms of literary compositions and more interested in the artistic reasons that led Pheidias to create his statue.[340] Even if they had general literary interests (which is not supported by the text), it is unnatural – or, better, impractical – for Pheidias to recount how Homer conceived of his poetry, whereas the main point of the trial is the reasons behind his choices in how to represent Zeus. Again, if one regards Pheidias' commentary on Homeric poetry as absolutely necessary for the comparison between sculpture and poetry, then why does Pheidias pay so much attention to

---

[338] 12.69: ὑφ᾽ ἧς ἐποποιίας δυνατὸς ἦν ὁποῖον ἐβούλετο ἐμποιῆσαι τῇ ψυχῇ πάθος 'as a result of this epic art of his he was able to implant in the soul any emotion he wished.'

[339] Pheidias is described as οὐκ ἄγλωττος (12.55), which Cohoon 1939, 61 translates as 'not tongue-tied', and Klauck (in Klauck and Bäbler 2000, 87) as 'nicht auf den Mund gefallen'. To these politically coloured translations (cf. Klauck and Bäbler 2000, ad n. 280) I would like to add an aesthetic one, that of 'lacking eloquence' (cf. Pindar N. 8.24), which partially explains the authorial audience's perception of Pheidias as a man not interested in literature, but in sculpture. Is it also a mere coincidence that a few paragraphs later (12.81) Pheidias quotes a passage from Pindar (see also n. 346)?

[340] 12.52: εἰ δ᾽ αὖ τὸ πρέπον εἶδος καὶ τὴν ἀξίαν μορφὴν τῆς θεοῦ φύσεως ἐδημιούργησας, ὕλῃ τε ἐπιτερπεῖ χρησάμενος, ἀνδρός τε μορφὴν ὑπερφυᾶ τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος δείξας, πλὴν ἀνδρὸς καὶ τἄλλα ποιήσας ὡς ἐποίησας, σκοπῶμεν τὰ νῦν· ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπολογησάμενος ἱκανῶς ἐν τοῖς παροῦσι, καὶ πείσας ὅτι τὸ οἰκεῖον καὶ τὸ πρέπον ἐξεῦρες σχήματός τε καὶ μορφῆς τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ μεγίστῳ θεῷ, μισθὸν ἕτερον τοῦ παρ᾽ Ἠλείων προσλάβοις ἂν μείζω καὶ τελειότερον 'but, on the other hand, was the shape you by your artistry produced appropriate to a god and was its form worthy of the divine nature, when you not only used a material which gives delight but also presented a human form of extraordinary beauty and size; and apart from its being a man's shape, made also all the other attributes as you have made them ? that is the question which I invite you to consider now. And if you make a satisfactory defence on these matters before those present and convince them that you have discovered the proper and fitting shape and form for the foremost and greatest god, then you shall receive in addition a second reward, greater and more perfect than the one given by the Eleans.'

the way in which Homer produced poetry? He dedicates no less than eleven paragraphs, that is, nearly one third of his whole speech, to the study of Homeric stylistics.[341]

Nevertheless, the most striking feature that reveals the authorial presence is the readers' invitation to consider the differences between poetry, plastic arts (sculpture), philosophy, and law, as seen in the preceding paragraphs 39-40. This section, which has a strong authorial synthetic dimension, is presented by the protagonist and provides, among others, a comparison between poetry and sculpture, which is exactly what Pheidias attempts to do in his speech. Also, as we have seen with the interlocutor, Pheidias cannot have knowledge of the previous passages because he is inserted later in the narrative. Thus one can see that through the authorial commentary in Pheidias' analysis of Homeric poetry, there is a remarkable reduction of distance between Dio and Pheidias and between the secondary narratees and the authorial audience.[342]

In the next paragraphs (12.75-7), Pheidias provides a list of some of Zeus' appellations. The reason behind it should once more be traced to the differences between poetry and sculpture: whereas the former is able to grant many names to Zeus, the latter is incapable of condensing them into a single statue. Despite this, Pheidias' art is said to be morally superior to poetry, since it represents the real essence of the god in the most realistic way.[343] Towards the end of the discourse, Pheidias highlights the inferiority of human materials when it comes to the depiction of the divine: however laborious the artistic product may be, it is not entirely capable of conceiving of the grandeur and excellence of the divine.[344] Additionally, since

---

[341] These are paragraphs 62 to 74.

[342] On the one hand, the authorial audience is the recipient of the authorial commentary in Pheidias' speech and, on the other, it identifies with the narratee, that is, the agents addressed by Pheidias.

[343] 12.77: ἥ τε ἁπλότης καὶ ἡ μεγαλοφροσύνη, δηλουμένη διὰ τῆς μορφῆς: ἀτεχνῶς γὰρ διδόντι καὶ χαριζομένῳ μάλιστα προσέοικε τἀγαθά 'simplicity and grandeur shown by the figure, for the god does it in very truth seem like one who is giving and bestowing blessings'. On the influence of Platonic ideas see Nikolsky 2016, 183.

[344] 12.80: οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἑτέρα φύσις ἀμείνων οὐδὲ λαμπροτέρα πρὸς ὄψιν, ἣν δυνατὸν εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἀφικέσθαι καὶ μεταλαβεῖν δημιουργίας 'for there was no other substance better or more radiant to the sight that could have come into the hands of man and have received artistic treatment'. As Deligiannakis 2015, 174 argues, 'Dio,

humans primarily rely on a restricted number of materials (stones, timber, etc.) and cannot control the three basic elements (air, fire, water), their conception of the divine is incomplete. Pheidias concludes his speech by quoting a verse from Pindar[345] and by referring to Hephaestus' creation of the shield of Achilles as illustrated in the *Iliad*. He inserts a literary work into his speech to show that Hephaestus was presented as a craftsman by Homer, not as someone who showed his skill in the three basic materials.

The last two paragraphs constitute a brief résumé of the text's content. The protagonist summarises the main points of the text: he discussed the dedication of statues, the first conception of the divine, and the power and titles of Zeus. Thus he offers a suitable conclusion by cyclically returning to where he started.

Philosophy and narrative: Dio as *παιδαγωγός*

The previous analysis argued for the narrativity of the *Olympic discourse*, which is achieved through (a) textual and (b) readerly dynamics. The textual dynamics involves plot dynamics and narratorial dynamics. With regard to the plot dynamics, I analysed the sequential presentation of the logically organised events around the religious-philosophical issue in the *Olympicus* and argued that, contrary to the notion that the text lacks organisation or is loosely structured, there are certain thematic links that actually connect the supposedly disparate parts of the text. With regard to the narratorial dynamics, I explored the use of different intratextual agents (protagonist, interlocutor, Pheidias) as character-narrators, the protagonist's unreliability at the beginning of the text, and the implicit presence of Dio in certain passages. For this last point, I maintained that Dio enhances the distance from the character-narrators by

---

through Pheidias, explains the use of the human form in the depiction of gods as evidence of the inadequacy of man's intellect.'

[345] 53.81: Δωδωναῖε μεγασθενὲς ἀριστοτέχνα πάτερ 'Lord of Dodona, father almighty, consummate artist'. Although not belonging to any of the existing Pindaric poems, it is thought to be a fragment from a lost poem (fr. 57 Snell-Maehler). See also Cohoon 1939, 84.

providing a self-ironic and unreliable image of the protagonist and by inserting authorial comments into the narrators' speeches so that the authorial audience can distinguish between the words of Dio and those of the narrators. The second quality affecting the narrativity of the text is the readerly dynamics, that is, the readers' interpretive and aesthetic responses to the textual dynamics, which have, as we saw, mainly mimetic and synthetic interests.

It was furthermore suggested that the text can be read as a philosophical narrative with pedagogical extensions and that Dio (through his assimilation to the protagonist) can be perceived as a philosophical παιδαγωγός ('teacher') offering significant lessons to his audience.[346] This is where I now turn: by analysing the elements yielding a pedagogical and philosophical tone to the text, I will emphasise the techniques through which Dio adopts the role of a philosophical teacher and the authorial audience that of participants in a philosophical dialogue. I begin with the assumption that, since Dio uses particular rhetorical techniques to affect his audience and to shape their understanding of the narrative, he also provides textual remarks pertaining to the philosophical-pedagogical tone of the narrative.

As has been noted, Phelan regards narrative as a dynamic exchange between an author and an audience. Therefore if we attempt to read the *Olympicus* as a dynamic form of communication between Dio and his readers, we need to take into consideration not only the role of the author, but also the role of the authorial audience in the co-creation of the text. However, the authorial voice in the text is rather implicit and is partially revealed, as I hope to have shown, through the words of character-narrators; in addition, the authorial audience sometimes identifies with, and at other times distances itself from, the narratees. These observations indicate that the investigation of the dynamic relationship of Dio and the authorial audience can mainly be approached through the interaction between the character-narrators

---

[346] On the (meta-)pedagogical tone of particular Dionic discourses (the *Olympicus* is not included) see Whitmarsh 2004, who maintains that dialogue and parables are two means with which Dio provides a pedagogical tone to his narratives.

(primary, secondary, and tertiary) and the narratees (primary, secondary, and tertiary) and through the ways in which Dio and the authorial audience perceive, and build upon, this interaction.

The protagonist, who is fused with Dio at the beginning of the narrative, does not fail to develop a descriptive image of the primary narratees, calling them 'men' (12.1) and 'sons of Elis' (12.25) and likening them to a flock of birds gathering to hear an important discourse (12.5). He furthermore describes his discourse as philosophical (12.9, 12.26), although he hypothesises that the narratees might consider it as a dull conversation on religious topics (12.21). What the protagonist achieves at the beginning of the text is thus to characterise the narratees as listeners and participants in a dialogue – they are, in other words, invited to a discussion and are given the role of an active group of people with philosophical and religious interests.

The narratees are regarded as exhibiting certain cognitive skills. For instance, they can choose to hear the words of the protagonist or not (12.5), to neglect certain points of the discourse (12.10), or to laugh at the protagonist's words (12.13); they are also believed to have knowledge of past discourses (12.16) and to be able to decide whether a Hesiod-like hymn to Zeus would be more appropriate to religious circumstances or not (12.25). Thus it seems that the protagonist promotes an interesting dialogue with the narratees through the use of certain rhetorical strategies: he uses second-person address to initiate a dialogue and to mark his narratees as recipients of his speech; he characterises the narratees as willing to take decisions about the development of his speech;[347] most importantly, the protagonist explicitly states that his speech can prove beneficial to those engaging with philosophy.[348] By characterising the

---

[347] Indeed, the verbs βούλομαι and ἐθέλω ('be willing to') are used a total of six times, enhancing the illusion of the narratees' independence, for they are presented as agents who enjoy a supposed level of autonomy and who can choose how the rest of the protagonist's speech will unfold.

[348] 12.84: ἴσως δὲ τοὺς πολλοὺς λέληθεν ὁ λόγος ὑπὲρ ὧν γέγονε, καὶ μάλα, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, φιλοσόφοις τε ἁρμόττων καὶ πλήθει ἀκοῦσαι 'but perhaps the majority of my hearers have failed to notice the several topics of my address,

narratees once again, the protagonist describes it as a group of people with general philosophical interests, making them participate in the dialogue that he attempts to promote through his speech.

The same qualities could be equally attributed to the authorial audience, who identify with the primary narratees, especially with regard to their employment of cognitive skills that can help them initiate a dialogue with the protagonist. In other words, the dynamic dialogue between the protagonist and the primary narratees is an indirect way of communication between Dio and the audience: the audience is invited not only to identify with the narratees, but also to participate in a dynamic dialogue with Dio, in which there is mutual interest in the construction of the narrative. In the same way that the narratees can enjoy an (illusory) state of cognitive independence, so the authorial audience is offered the intellectual means to have its fair say in the construction of the narrative.

With regard to the protagonist's role within the narrative, he adopts the image of a philosopher by describing himself as such and by regarding the narrative as a philosophical treatise. As we saw earlier, at the beginning of the text, he makes himself perceptible to the narratees (and the authorial audience) as a character-narrator recounting specific events in a certain medium. He develops a personal identity and points out his parallelism with other intellectuals, such as Socrates, and with the wise owl. This is the first instance of the protagonist's attempt to adopt a philosophical identity. Even though he insists that his ignorance prevents him from calling himself a philosopher, he is immediately contrasted to

---

although, in my opinion, it has been quite as suitable for the multitude as for the philosophers to hear'. Ventrella 2017, 481-2 reads μᾶλλον, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, φιλοσόφοις γε ἁρμόττων ἢ πλήθει ἀκοῦσαι, 'les sujets qu[e mon discours] aborde, est, me semble-t-il, plus adapté à un auditoire de philosophes qu' au commun des mortels', trans. Ventrella) thus maintaining that Dio (in our case, the protagonist) provides a comparison between philosophers and the *turba* who do not have any contact with philosophical and religious matters. I hardly believe that the intention of Dio (the protagonist) would be to reduce the importance of his narratees, but rather to make them, even the common people gathered in Olympia, feel that they have participated in a philosophical dialogue. Thus the protagonist does not seem, in my opinion, to argue that his discourse is suitable for philosophers *only*, but also for those who could *potentially* develop philosophical interests.

pseudo-intellectuals whose wisdom proves illusory. Nevertheless, due to his self-irony –
which, as proposed, is a rhetorical device for the narratees' persuasion rather than a statement
of fact – he refers to himself as a philosopher only once[349] and he never praises his wisdom:
this Socratic model is what he actually strives to achieve for himself.[350] Although he displays
a certain degree of irony and contends that he possesses no knowledge, in fact he creates a very
powerful image of himself. In particular, through the protagonist's unreliability, the authorial
audience becomes aware that his self-irony indicates quite the opposite from what he
purportedly contends: whereas the other intellectuals call themselves wise,[351] the protagonist
lets the audience infer whether he truly deserves to be called wise.[352]

In many passages, the protagonist, and through him Dio, comments on the function of
the narrative by calling it a philosophical treatise. For example, in 12.9, he maintains that his
recipients, having knowledge of previous philosophical discourses, can perhaps compare these
to his speech. In 12.26 again, it is argued that, since the text discusses philosophical matters,
such as the human conception of the divine, it can be regarded as an illustrative example of a
philosophical treatise. Later in the narrative (12.35-7), the protagonist makes an implicit
reference to philosophy by contending that people are sometimes forgetful of the importance
of the supreme god who is the primary administrator of the universe and who cares about
humans: this idea has generally been considered as a polemic against Epicurean philosophy,[353]
whose teachings advocated a more hedonistic view of the world and life, the infinity of the

---

[349] 12.38: τυχὸν γὰρ οὐ ῥᾴδιον τὸν τοῦ φιλοσόφου νοῦν καὶ λόγον ἐπισχεῖν 'for perhaps it is not easy to check the course of a philosopher's thoughts and speech.'

[350] Torraca, Rotunno and Scannapieco 2005, n. 63; Ventrella 2017, ad ἐξεπλήττετο.

[351] 12.14: ὧν ἕκαστος αὐτὸν μάλιστα ἐθαύμαζε καὶ ἐξεπλήττετο, σοφοὺς ἂν ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ μακαρίους 'each of whom was more struck with admiration of himself than of anyone else, you would have considered wise and blessed.'

[352] This constitutes a powerful indication of the authorial audience's participation in the construction of the narrative, since they are not told beforehand that the protagonist (and Dio) is wise; instead, they need to infer it from what will follow.

[353] Klauck and Bäbler 2000, 131; Hertz 2016, 201.

universe, and the lack of divine rule. Here, the protagonist describes not what philosophy is, but instead what philosophy is not – there are people who have deified ἡδονή ('wantonness'), have completely indulged in luxury, and 'have hung before their eyes a curtain of deep darkness and mist.'[354] All these people, in the protagonist's opinion, are incapable of conceiving the true essence of the divine. What is proposed, then, is a Stoic model of the divine, according to which only the care of a supreme god can ensure the order of the universe and the prosperity of humans.

Up to this point, we have seen the ways in which the protagonist's communication with the narratees simultaneously points out another communication between Dio and the readers. By being directly addressed, the primary narratees take on the role of active participants in a philosophical conversation, and, likewise, the readers adopt a similar position. The protagonist, on the other hand, adopts the persona of Socrates by indirectly characterising himself as a philosopher, which also implies that Dio asks his audience to regard him as a philosopher. Last but not least, in a highly synthetic 'scene', the protagonist characterises the text as a philosophical treatise that can prove beneficial to his narratees, whereas Dio sends exactly the same message to his readers. From the above characteristics, one can infer that Dio sets the intention to give a certain philosophical tone to his narrative by adopting the identity of a philosopher and by making the readers members of a dynamic dialogue.

It is now time to turn to the embedded narrative and to investigate the ways in which the communication between the interlocutor (secondary character-narrator and tertiary narratees) and Pheidias (tertiary character-narrator and secondary narratees) informs the philosophical-pedagogical tone with which Dio disguises his rhetorical communication with the authorial audience.

---

[354] 12.36: ἔτι δὲ οἶμαι πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σκότος πολὺ προβαλόμενοι καὶ ἀχλύν.

In examining the channel of communication between Dio and his audience in the embedded narrative of the trial of Pheidias, we observe that here the roles are reversed, compared to the communication between the protagonist and the primary narratees. That is to say, whereas in the protagonist's narrative, Dio identifies with the protagonist, and the authorial audience with the primary narratees, in the embedded narrative (at least in the beginning of it), Dio identifies with the secondary narratee (Pheidias), and the authorial audience with the secondary character-narrator (interlocutor).[355] Through his identification with the narratee and not the character-narrator, Dio successfully enhances the role of the authorial audience in the development of the narrative by letting them decide how the rest of the embedded narrative will unfold.

We saw that the interlocutor takes on the role of a secondary character-narrator at the beginning of the embedded narrative in order to set up the trial scene in which Pheidias is asked to account for the reasons of his construction of the statue of Zeus. His role in the text is thus structural, since he harmoniously links the protagonist's speech with the embedded narrative, and informative, since he provides the necessary details about Pheidias' trial. The interlocutor's interest in the causes that led to Pheidias' Zeus is strikingly similar to the interest that the men of Elis (primary narratees) show in the causes that led to the protagonist's conception of the divine. It is almost as if Dio replicates, in reverse order, the original discussion with the primary narratees in the embedded narrative: the difference is that this time the authorial audience actually reveals, through the interlocutor's words, their interest in knowing more about Pheidias' Zeus, whereas Dio, by identifying with the secondary narratee (Pheidias), remains silent and expects a response from the audience of how the story should proceed.

---

[355] As noted earlier, due to the dialogic scene of the embedded narrative, Pheidias starts as a secondary narratee, but later he becomes a tertiary character-narrator; the interlocutor starts as a secondary character-narrator, but later becomes a tertiary narratee.

By identifying with the interlocutor, the authorial audience takes the lead of the progression of the narrative and directs Dio's attention to how Pheidias is likely to respond to the interlocutor's questions. To be clear, what I am trying to explain here is an *a posteriori* process, since the one ultimately responsible for the composition of the text is Dio himself. Nevertheless, my aim is to promote the notion that *during* the composition of the text, Dio must have taken into account the audience's possible responses to it and to have shaped his text appropriately so that it satisfies the audience's interests. Therefore through the interlocutor's interest in Pheidias' artistic 'poetics', Dio also aims at satisfying the audience's potential responses to the progression of the narrative up until the point where the embedded narrative starts developing.

The covert assertiveness that the protagonist exhibits when comparing himself to the *turba* of pseudo-intellectuals is similar to the assertiveness of Pheidias when claiming that his art is aesthetically superior to poetry in representing the divine. Dio, whose endorsement of the protagonist's uniqueness is an implicit statement of his own quality as a writer, is in need of another, more famous example of artistic superiority, with which he can identify; and this is Pheidias: Pheidias accounts for his reasons of making the statue of Zeus, in the same way that the audience expects Dio to account for his reasons of composing the *Olympicus*. In Pheidias' account, in other words, we witness Dio's covert support of his own work, both as a writer and as a pedagogical teacher.[356]

Dio has extensive knowledge of how literature is composed. This is why the first part of Pheidias' speech is infused with details about Homeric poetry that only a true *homme de lettres* would know. Nevertheless, Pheidias does not insist so much in 'outscoring' Homeric

---

[356] Notwithstanding being unaware of the authorial audience's existence, Pheidias forms a channel of communication with them by offering an aesthetic account of his own art in the same way that Dio does through the protagonist's comparison with the pseudo-intellectuals. Phelan describes this kind of communication as having a 'disclosure function'. In disclosure functions, 'a narrator unwillingly reports information of all kinds to the authorial audience (the narrator does not know that the authorial audience exists)' (Phelan 2005, 12).

poetry, but in establishing himself as a reliable compass for those who feel the need to come in contact with the divine in the most appropriate way possible. In other words, due to his artistic grandiosity, Pheidias (and through him, Dio) is perceived as an important παιδαγωγός ('teacher') of religious matters. The interlocutor and the people in the trial (that is, the tertiary narratees) thus become disciples in Pheidias' class, where they are encouraged to ask their teacher about the reasons that led him to represent the divine Zeus in a specific way.

From the above analysis, I hope to have adequately shown that the author-authorial audience relationships can also be traced in the embedded narrative, albeit in reverse order: whereas previously Dio identified with the primary character-narrator (protagonist), and the authorial audience with the primary narratees (the men of Elis), this time Dio identifies with the secondary narratee (Pheidias), and the authorial audience with the secondary character-narrator (interlocutor). Moreover, through Dio's identification with Pheidias, the latter is perceived by the tertiary narratees as a παιδαγωγός of religion and art, in the same way that Dio constitutes a παιδαγωγός of morality for the readers.

Conclusions

The above analysis investigates the narrativity of the *Olympicus* and the rhetorical techniques with which Dio initiates a philosophical dialogue with his audience. In the first section, I used Phelan's rhetorical theory in order to read the text as a narrative, giving emphasis to its textual and readerly dynamics – the presence of an author and of narrators, the logical organisation of the events, and the use of mimetic and synthetic functions pertaining to the characters' presentation. In the second section, I focused on the interpretative codes of the text and highlighted the philosophical and educational nuances according to which Dio, the authorial audience, and the text itself are characterised. This chapter, which constitutes the first systematic narratological analysis of the *Olympicus*, permits both a general re-evaluation of the application of narratological theories to supposedly non-narrative genres and the

comprehension of the narrative means with which Dio constructs a particular relationship with his readers.

The *Borystheniticus* (*Or.* 36)

Once upon a time, there was an ancient city called Borysthenes, which drew its name from its famous river. Because enemies repeatedly seized the city, Borysthenes had lost much of its former beauty: its idyllic environment with the refreshing breeze from the waters and the dense forestation had now been transformed into a dry urban area with weak city walls, haphazardly built houses, and temples that resembled more cemeteries than places of worship.

An old man happened to pass by outside the city walls and came across citizens from Borysthenes. Among them, a young man called Callistratus, a typical example of the bourgeoisie, greeted the old man in friendly manner and shared with him his admiration for Homeric poetry and ancient morals. After an interesting, albeit tense, dispute on whether Homer or Phocylides was a better poet (no need to guess whom the young man chose), Callistratus invited the old man into the city and asked him to share his ideas with the other Borysthenites. The old man kindly accepted the invitation and decided to discourse on the definition of the city, the character of city governors, and the relationship between human and divine cities.

His endeavour would have successfully been completed, had not Hieroson, an elderly Borysthenite, interrupted him, prompting him to analyse the concept of the divine city more thoroughly. The old man responded with a story about the divine authority of Zeus and his just administration of the universe: the story goes that Zeus travels from the Sun to the Moon on his brilliant four-horse chariot, of which one horse is dedicated to each of Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, and Hestia. The old man maintained that sometimes the horses dedicated to Zeus and Poseidon get off track and either burn the world (Zeus') or drown it (Poseidon's), thus providing an eternal natural regeneration, a cosmic rebirth that secures the harmonious transition from one state to a new one. In addition, through the 'marriage' between the horse of Zeus and that of Hera, humankind is brought to the world, which actually explains the divine origin of the

human species. The myth was so appealing to the Borysthenites that they could not restrain their admiration for the old man and for his exceptional story about the birth and rebirth of the universe.

This story sums up the main points of Dio Chrysostom's *Borystheniticus*, which will concern us in this chapter.

Structure of the chapter

In the first part of my analysis, I examine Dio's communication with the audience through the use of the protagonist's telling functions. Particularly, Dio uses the protagonist as his alter ego and grants him reliable characteristics both as a narrator and as a character. He also 'stretches' the protagonist's identity by highlighting his intellectual abilities, which supersede those of the Borysthenites.

The second part considers more authorial techniques, but the focus is also on the readers' responses to them. Firstly, I discuss the readers' perception of the protagonist's malleability and his assimilation to Dio. I also look at the effects that Dio's handling of narrative spatiality has on the audience, and I conclude with the readers' responses to the synergy between Dio and the character narrator and between the authorial audience and the narratees at the end of the narrative (36.61). For my analysis, I use the Phelanian rhetorical theory and, partly, the theoretical framework of cognitive narratology, especially when investigating the readers' responses to authorial techniques of communication. Nevertheless, my approach is predominantly rhetorical, considering the *Borystheniticus* as a purposeful form of communication between Dio and the readers.

Dio's handling of the protagonist's role(s)

The very first words of the text, ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἐπιδημῶν ('I happened to wander'),[357] introduce the central character of the *Borystheniticus*, that is, the character whose story is recounted in the narrative.[358] This character, who will again be called protagonist,[359] is described as visiting the foreign land of Borysthenes, making his way to the Getae, a people on the fringes of the Roman empire with a different way of life:[360]

Ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἐπιδημῶν ἐν Βορυσθένει τὸ θέρος, ὡς τότε εἰσέπλευσα μετὰ τὴν φυγήν, βουλόμενος ἐλθεῖν, ἐὰν δύνωμαι, διὰ Σκυθῶν εἰς Γέτας, ὅπως θεάσωμαι τἀκεῖ πράγματα ὁποῖά ἐστι. (36.1)[361]

The phrase μετὰ τὴν φυγήν ('after my exile' or 'at the end of my exile')[362] introduces a primary instability, in Phelanian terms,[363] and presents the protagonist in an unsettled situation, since he is purportedly far from his homeland. The geographical and temporal indications (ἐν Βορυσθένει τὸ θέρος 'in Borysthenes during the summer') set up the narrative place and time,

---

[357] The text throughout follows the edition of Bost-Pouderon 2011. For the translation, I have consulted the English translation of Cohoon and Crosby 1940 and the Italian translation of Di Febo 2020.

[358] As I hope was shown in the *Euboicus* and the *Olympicus*, the implied author of the *Borystheniticus* is differentiated from the central character of the story in the sense that the former recounts the events, while the latter participates in them.

[359] As in *orr*. 7 and 12.

[360] Dio's interest in the Getae is attested to by his lost *Getica*, if we can safely assume that this text offered ethnographic information about the way of life and culture of these people. See Terrei 2000.

[361] 'I happened to be visiting in Borysthenes during the summer, for I had sailed there then, after my exile, with the purpose of making my way, if possible, through Scythia to the Getan country, in order to observe conditions there.'

[362] The phrase has generally been considered as an addition by a later copyist, who intended to date the text after Dio's departure (either forced or deliberate) from the Roman empire. More troublesome, though, seems the meaning of the phrase, since it cannot be decided whether it means 'after the exile' (right after Dio left the empire) or 'after the end of the exile'. In my opinion, the phrase is not an interpolation and refers to a period when Dio was away. On the issue see von Arnim 1898, 302; Desideri 1978, 361; Russell 1992, ad [μετὰ τὴν φυγήν]; Nesselrath 2003b, 66; Desideri 2007, 194 (n. 7); Bost-Pouderon 2011, 109, 203; Bekker-Nielsen and Hinge, 2015; Di Febo 2020, 129.

[363] On Phelan's definition of narrative instabilities see p. 34.

and the reference to the names of the Scythians and the Getae connect the narrative to historical and literary figures[364] that act, as we will see later, as indicators of reliability with regard to the audience's perception of the narrative.

Another technique is Dio's choice of the first person singular throughout, with which he establishes a firm connection with the protagonist of the story. As noted in the previous chapters, this technique indicates a reduction in the distance between Dio and the protagonist, while at the same time enhancing Dio's self-presentation as a respectable figure delivering important lessons to his audience.

In the first paragraph, the protagonist is depicted in a positive light: he is regarded as a literary descendant of Herodotus, who, likewise, offers a description of the city of Borysthenes. However, the affiliation with Herodotus is complex and requires further attention: whereas in the case of Herodotus, the historical exposition on the expedition of Darius prompts the ethnographic description of Borysthenes, in the case of the *Borystheniticus*, the ethnographic description of Borysthenes (36.1-8)[365] prompts the historical exposition of the affinities between the Greeks and the 'barbarians' with regard to philosophy and literature. In this way, the protagonist, despite highlighting implicitly his connection to the Herodotean narrative, offers a fresh view of Borysthenes by presenting its ethnographic interests in an inverted Herodotean narrative style. Through this technique, the protagonist (as well as Dio) calls attention to the harmonisation of 'barbarians' with Greekness.[366]

---

[364] Special attention is given to the ethnographic description of the Scythians in the fourth book of Herodotus' *Histories* (4.1 *et passim*). He mentions that, despite their barbaric practices, the Scythians had well-established relations with the Greeks (cf. 4.17, 24). It is impossible that Dio's cultivated audience would not notice the similarities of the *Borystheniticus* with the Herodotean account, and therefore from the beginning of the narrative, Dio attempts to establish a certain relationship with his literary predecessor.

[365] Dio's description of Borysthenes is undoubtedly ethnographic and close to the Herodotean narrative: in paragraphs 1-3, he describes the topography of the city; in 4-6, the interaction with adjacent nations; and in 7-8, the external appearance and the displayed behaviour of the citizens. On the Herodotean description of Borysthenes see West 2007.

[366] This Greekness is the result of the social practices of Greek intellectuals in the Roman period, who promoted a sense of belonging to a common historical tradition marked by the extraordinary achievements of Greek figures of the past. Authors such as Dio (Schmidt 2011), Plutarch (Preston 2001), and Pausanias (Auberger 2011)

The connection with Herodotus is mainly observed in the first eight paragraphs, where the protagonist provides an account of the history of Borysthenes. He offers details about the old name of the city (it was named after the famous river passing through it),[367] its geographical location, its turbulent relationship with neighbouring cities, and the character of its inhabitants. The plethora of ethnographic information provided enhances the illustration of the protagonist as a figure who, like Herodotus, has extensive knowledge of the history and culture of nations as distant as Borysthenes. In this way, Dio develops the primary characteristics of the protagonist's identity, which is that of an intellectual with historical and ethnographic interests, while at the same time forming a link to the Herodotean genre by presenting an image of Borysthenes that is compatible with, and complements, that of Herodotus.

Apart from ethnography, the protagonist also shows an interest in literature. The initial contact with Callistratus and the young Borysthenites indicates a progressive transition from Herodotus to Homer. Dio succeeds in marking this transition smoothly: the protagonist's unexpected meeting with the young fellows (36.7-8) immediately focuses the readerly attention upon their external characteristics, such as their clothes. The protagonist then notices that not only their appearance, but also their way of living, is highly Homeric and that even their education is founded upon the good knowledge and continuous reading, or even citing by heart, of Homer. By shifting the readerly focus in this way, Dio ascribes literary and ethnographic elements to the protagonist and presents him as a literary connoisseur.

Callistratus, as all Borysthenites, has a proclivity for Homeric poetry,[368] since it forms the basis for the correct exercise of social practices and acceptable behaviours. In fact, their

---

highlighted the importance of such social practices, through which the distinctive features of the Greek past would not go unnoticed. Dio was particularly interested in the way that this Greekness could be communicated to nations outside the Roman empire, as the example of the *Borystheniticus* shows (see also Di Febo 2020, 58-60).

[367] Already in Herodotus' time the city was called Olbia: see Avram 2004, 990, s.v. 'Olbia'. The use of the old name Borysthenes reinforces the ethnographic interests of the protagonist.

[368] 36.9: Εἰδὼς οὖν αὐτὸν φιλόμηρον ὄντα περὶ τούτου εὐθὺς ἐπυνθανόμην 'knowing, then, that Callistratus was fond of Homer, I immediately began to question him about the poet.'

admiration for Homer is so apparent that their external appearance resembles that of the Homeric heroes and that their religious practice includes the deification and worship of Achilles.[369] In addition to these, their display of manhood and bravery (36.8: τὰ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἀνδρεῖος εἶναι 'in matters pertaining to warfare he was a man of courage') was reminiscent of the manly, military behaviour of Homeric heroes, and more particularly, of Achilles (36.9).

Borysthenites' obsession with Homer further develops the identity of the protagonist as a literary connoisseur. To Callistratus' opinion that Homer is the best poet the protagonist responds by arguing that Phocylides' poetry is superior. This dispute is, in my opinion, the first passage that reveals the attempt of the protagonist to adopt the role of a παιδαγωγός: in a Socratic manner,[370] he confronts Callistratus' main argument that Homer is the best poet and subsequently sets out to prove that a supposedly lesser poet, like Phocylides, might actually be preferable. Resembling a student in a classroom, Callistratus provides evidence for the superiority of Homer by presenting the following arguments: Homer is quoted by nearly all later authors (36.10); his poetry is so superior that even his heroes, like Achilles, are worshipped as gods (36.14); also, as regards the content of his poetry, Homer mentions only things that are profitable to people, and therefore his works bear a significant ethical dimension (36.15).

The protagonist, on the other hand, is of a different opinion: first of all, the σύγκρισις ('comparison') between the two poets is by definition deficient, for the Borysthenites are ignorant of Phocylides and therefore are intuitively inclined to choose Homer, as the only

---

[369] On the cult of Achilles in Borysthenes see Russell 1992, ad τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἀχιλλέα…ἐν τῆι πόλει; Hupe 2006 (esp. 165-72); Hupe 2007; Bost-Pouderon 2011, 206-7; Di Febo 2020, 136-7. Despite the popularity of Achilles' worship and cult, the Borysthenites are summoned at the temple of Zeus to hear the protagonist. Perhaps the reference to Achilles' temple offers an additional ethnographic detail, without playing an essential role for the subsequent narrative progression.

[370] Trapp 1990, 150; Bost-Pouderon 2011, 142, n.5; Di Febo 2020, 137, n.29. Socratic irony is also seen in the protagonist's words (Nesserath 2003, n. 59).

author they know well (36.11).[371] In a Callimachean manner, the protagonist suggests that the Homeric epics present ethical inconsistencies, for their immense number of lines might carry ambivalent or contradictory opinions (36.12).[372] Additionally, the argument about the popularity of Homeric quotes among later authors is irrelevant according to the protagonist because Homer's impersonal narration in fact forms an abdication of responsibility and detachment from reality: any later reference to his name is invalid, since it refers to his literary, fictional persona, not his real self, as happens in Phocylides for example (36.12).[373]

By allowing Callistratus to present his arguments about Homeric superiority, the protagonist invites him – and along with him the readers too – to reconsider his initial thesis and to approach the artistic dilemma with genuine curiosity, not with uncritical absolutism. The protagonist adopts the role of a sophistic teacher delivering literary lessons to the Borysthenites (his narratees), and, through him, Dio endorses similar pedagogical purposes for his audience: he aims at providing them with an important lesson, not as a historiographer, but as a sophistic teacher.

Let us now move on to the next part of the text, which includes the moving of the characters from the city walls to the city centre. Because of his disagreement with Callistratus over poetry and because of his interesting ideas on various issues,[374] the protagonist is invited to Borysthenes to discuss matters concerning the theoretical concept of the city as a social and

---

[371] 36.10: Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι ἔγωγε τοῦ ἑτέρου ποιητοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, οἶμαι δὲ μηδὲ τούτων μηδένα 'Why, as for myself, I do not even know the other poet's name, and I suppose that none of these men does, either.'; 36.11: τὸν δὲ Φωκυλίδην ὑμεῖς μὲν οὐκ ἐπίστασθε, ὡς λέγεις 'But your people do not know Phocylides, as you say'. See also Di Febo 2020, 63.

[372] The protagonist responds to the arguments of Callistratus 'by way of jest' (προσπαίζων), which resembles the παίγνιον ('playful response') that Callimachus offers to the Telchines at the beginning of his *Aetia* (fr. 1 Pfeiffer).

[373] Dio possibly alludes to the literary σφραγίς (lit. 'stamp'), first attested in Hesiod (*Theog.* 22), and further used by Theognis and Phocylides, among others. As a direct reference to the poet's name, the σφραγίς constituted, apart from the poet's signature and artistic 'fingerprint' or 'stamp', a formal recognition of, and appreciation for, his work too. See also Russell 1992, ad προστίθησι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ; Di Febo 2020, 139.

[374] Callistratus states that the protagonist initially provoked anger, but now he is regarded as an agreeable person to speak with (36.14: καὶ ὃς οὐ μάλα ἡδέως ἀποδεξάμενος, Ὦ ξένε, εἶπεν, ὅτι ἡμεῖς σε ἀγαπῶμεν καὶ σφόδρα αἰδούμεθα 'and Callistratus, receiving my remarks with no great pleasure, replied, "My friend, we admire and respect you greatly"').

political system. The geographical shift also marks, in my opinion, a shift of the characterisation of the protagonist: although previously he was considered by Callistratus and his fellows as a ξένος ('stranger'), as someone who could hardly fit with the Borysthenites' way of thinking, now he is perceived as someone with an interesting personality, who definitely deserves to be heard.[375] In other words, his entrance to the city marks a new relationship with the people who previously regarded him as an outsider.

Upon his arrival to the city centre, the protagonist attracts a large number of citizens around him, who take a break from their military duties and walk to the temple of Zeus, where the talk will take place. Prior to the talk, the protagonist offers some more details about the Homeric appearance of the Borysthenites, saying that they were long-haired and bearded, which is also considered as an image pleasurable to philosophers (36.17: πάνυ οὖν ἄν τις ἥσθη τῇ ὄψει φιλόσοφος ἀνήρ, ὅτι ἅπαντες ἦσαν τὸν ἀρχαῖον τρόπον, ὥς φησιν Ὅμηρος τοὺς Ἕλληνας, κομῶντες καὶ τὰ γένεια ἀφεικότες 'a philosopher would have been vastly pleased at the sight, because all were like the ancient Greeks described by Homer, long-haired and with flowing beards'). Only one of the citizens is bald and shaved and is laughed at because of his appearance, which was regarded as a disgraceful means of flattery towards the Romans and as an example of femininity.[376]

The protagonist's focus on the external characteristics of the citizens works as an indication of their political and social organisation – their society resembles the serious,

---

[375] 36.15: ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ σφόδρα καλῶς λέγειν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως. Σκόπει, ἔφη, ἐπεὶ καὶ τούσδε ὁρᾷς πάντας ἐπιθυμοῦντας ἀκοῦσαί σου καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συνερρυηκότας δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν ποταμόν, καίτοι οὐ σφόδρα ἀθορύβως ἔχοντας '…since in my opinion he speaks very nobly regarding the city.' 'Pray do so,' said he, 'since you can see that all these men now present are just as eager as I am to listen to you, and that for that very reason they have streamed together here beside the river, although in no very tranquil state of mind.'

[376] Even though the Roman presence in Borysthenes at that time is disputable (Russell 1992, ad ἐξυρημένος), the passage seems to reflect some fundamental differences between the two nations as regards their appearance. Borysthenites thus follow the Greek custom of letting their hair loose and their beard unshaved. The Roman custom recalls the habit of Greek prostitutes and effeminate men of shaving their hair (and beard), and therefore is condemned as immoral (Di Febo 2020, n.45).

Homeric, and virile Greek model, rather than the ethically and aesthetically deficient Roman model – and as a means of identity shaping for both the protagonist and his narratees. The Borysthenites are rushing to the temple to listen to the protagonist, while the latter rejoices at their eagerness and praises their appearance as pleasurable to philosophers. Dio depicts the protagonist as a philosophical teacher and the citizens as students in a philosophy class, enthusiastically awaiting the beginning of the lesson. By attributing these roles to the characters, Dio creates the ideal circumstances for a philosophical discussion. At the same time, he adopts a similar student-teacher relationship with his audience and reduces the distance from the protagonist by making himself perceptible to the authorial audience as a philosopher with pedagogical qualities. How the authorial audience actually perceives Dio's role is something I will return to when discussing the audience's understanding of the narrative.

From paragraph 18, the identity of the protagonist remains philosophical. His discourse concerns the concept of city (cf. περὶ πόλεως) or πολιτεία ('constitution') and its associations. Borrowing elements from the Stoics,[377] the protagonist investigates the meaning of the term πόλις because people often use it vaguely, without understanding its true meaning. Initially, he defines πόλις in social and forensic terms: it is governed by justice (ὑπὸ νόμου), and all its inhabitants obey the law. However, νόμος ('law'), as the link that holds the people of a city together, derives from the gods, without whose care any human endeavour fails. The protagonist thus arrives at a metaphysical definition of πόλις: it is a κοινωνία ('community') of gods and people, governed by divine law. In this community, people do not superficially have faith in the gods, but regard the communication with them as an invaluable transcendental experience that brings them closer to the sense of the divine:

---

[377] Russell 1992 *ad* πλῆθος…διοικούμενον; Di Febo 2020, n.51. Bost-Pouderon 2011, 211 argues that Dio's definition of polis is a 'commune à des nombreuses écoles philosophiques, mais plus nettement stoïcienne'. Cf. e.g. Arist. *Pol*. 1252a.

μίαν γὰρ δὴ ταύτην καθαρῶς εὐδαίμονα πολιτείαν εἴτε καὶ πόλιν χρὴ καλεῖν, τὴν θεῶν πρὸς

ἀλλήλους κοινωνίαν, ἐάν τε καὶ ξύμπαν τὸ λογικὸν περιλάβῃ τις, ἀνθρώπων σὺν θεοῖς

ἀριθμουμένων (36.23)[378]

The theoretical model of πόλις suggested by the protagonist is undoubtedly influenced by the

Platonic πολιτεία, for it is described as the ideal city that is governed by gods, and its people

act like gods, that is, they behave in a way that promotes justice and the good.[379] This does not

mean, however, that in reality there are only good cities with just people; to the protagonist's

disappointment there are also φαῦλαι κοινωνῖαι ('faulty communities'), which are utterly

corrupted, and their people are νοσοῦντες ('ill'). A double meaning of πόλις is implied here:

when approached theoretically, the term describes an ideal city, but when applied in real life,

it signifies a city far from ideal. One can thus argue that the protagonist takes on the role of a

Platonic-Stoic philosopher, offering information about both the theoretical and the practical

meaning of πόλις.[380]

    Up to this point, the protagonist displays a good knowledge of political philosophy,

combining theories from Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics. At the same time, Dio endorses what

the protagonist says, without undermining the validity of his sayings by means of indirect

commentary or signs of narratorial unreliability. Thus through the close relationship with the

protagonist Dio enhances his self-image as a philosopher and offers a redefinition of the term

πόλις by stressing its theoretical and practical inconsistencies.

---

[378] 'For that, indeed, is the only constitution or city that may be called genuinely happy — the partnership of god with god; even if you include with the gods also everything that has the faculty of reason, mankind being thus included.'

[379] Cf. Pl. *Resp.* 592a-b. See Bost-Pouderon 2011, 211; Di Febo 2020, n. 53.

[380] Russell 1992 ad ἀγαθὴν ἐξ ἁπάντων ἀγαθῶν πόλιν argues that here Dio deviates from Platonic and early Stoic political philosophy, since he 'denies the bare possibility (…) of a perfect πόλις upon earth.'

Once the protagonist ensures that his philosophical, pedagogical identity is established through his focus on political theory, a brief episode is embedded. Old Hieroson, one of the citizens, interrupts him at a critical moment,[381] maintaining that a lengthier delineation of political philosophy would be unnecessary. Rather, he asks him to talk exclusively about the divine πόλις in a Homeric and Platonic style, which the protagonist skilfully turns down.[382] Hieroson resembles a recipient of philosophical and sophistic διαλέξεις ('discourses'). The recipients, once hit by boredom and lack of enthusiasm, would often interrupt the speaker to ask for a new topic that would address better their interests. In a strikingly similar way, Hieroson interrupts the protagonist and asks him to change the topic because political philosophy does not respond to their interests at the moment – besides, there are, in Hieroson's opinion, better authors, such as Plato, who can analyse the topic more effectively. At this point, it is very likely that the readers form a parallelism between the sophistic-philosophical outlook of the protagonist as a public speaker and that of Dio.[383] It thus seems that through the episode with Hieroson, the protagonist identifies with Dio by being presented as a public speaker communicating with his recipients in the form of a dynamic conversation.

As an apology, the protagonist says that he did not intend to rival Homer or Plato. His analysis should rather be regarded as a brief introduction to a wider discussion about the universe. He claims that a πόλις behaves like a living organism, and as such, it forms part of

---

[381] Hieroson makes the protagonist postpone his (Platonic) discussion about the best πολιτεία and instead focus on a (Stoic) exposition about the harmony of the universe. See also Russell 1992 ad 24-9. The episode with Hieroson is also relevant to the end of the narrative (36.61), where the protagonist asks for his narratees' pardon, if the choice of topic (the myth of Zeus' chariot) does not fulfil their desires – besides, it was clearly Hieroson's request to change the topic, not his.

[382] Hieroson takes Homeric style and Platonic style as almost identical (36.27: ὡς δύνασαι ἐγγύτατα τείνων τῆς τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐλευθερίας περὶ τὴν φράσιν, οἷον δὴ καὶ ἄρτι ποιεῖν ἡμῖν ἔδοξας. εἰ γὰρ μηδενὸς ἄλλου, τῆς γε φωνῆς ξυνίεμεν ὑπὸ συνηθείας ὅτι οὐ σμικρὸν οὐδὲ πόρρω τοῦ Ὁμήρου φθέγγεται 'aiming as closely as possible at Plato's nobility of expression, just as but now you seemed to us to do. For if we understand nothing else, we do at least understand his language because of our long familiarity with it, for it has a lofty sound, not far removed from the voice of Homer'). The conflation between Homer and Plato is seen not only in Dio (cf. also 48.5), but in other authors too, such as [Longinus], *Subl*.13.3-4 and Maximos of Tyre, *Diss*. 26.3. See also Bost-Pouderon 2011, 213-4; Di Febo 2020, n. 68.

[383] The implied author is meant here.

the universe, which also includes plants, animals, air, earth, water, fire, and, of course, the immortals (36.30). Since it is only a part of a wider sum, the human πόλις functions in accordance with the universal τάξις ('regularity') and εὐκοσμία ('orderly behaviour') and it is in harmony with the divine πόλις, which is governed by τὸ λογικόν ('reason'). The audience notices here a smooth combination of Platonic and Stoic ideas:[384] the protagonist commences with a Platonic view of the ideal πόλις and argues that it is connected to that of the gods; later on, he adopts a more Stoic perspective[385] and examines the πόλις as a part of a wider whole, the universe, which is a living organism functioning according to the qualities of fellowship and justice (κοινωνίας ἀρχὴν καὶ δικαιοσύνης), friendship and concord (φιλίας καὶ ὁμονοίας). This organismic whole operates under the guidance of the supreme gods, who govern the universe by promoting a sense of security and harmony to all creatures.

The protagonist assumes next that if the human πόλις resembles (or must ideally resemble) that of the gods, then it is in need of certain people who can articulate this sense of connection. In poets the protagonist sees the human medium that is able to facilitate the connection with the gods: poets are inspired by the Muses and can transfer through their art a sense of divine presence in human affairs. However, the protagonist warns that not all poets are authentic transmitters of the divine: those after Homer and Hesiod who failed to go through the necessary religious initiation (ἀμύητοι ἀμυήτοις) in order to speak honestly about gods and divine administration are not considered as truly god-inspired, but rather, as charlatans deceiving the mob by making them believe in a distorted divine image (36.35).[386] The only point of agreement that the protagonist can see between the authentic poets and the charlatan

---

[384] Platonism and Stoicism share some common ideas, such as the creation and administration of the universe by a supreme power. Plato has undoubtedly influenced the Stoics, while the Stoics have also influenced the New Academy. For a thorough examination of the similarities between the two theories see the edited volume of Engberg-Pedersen 2017.

[385] On the Stoic aspects of the myth see Gangloff 2006, 356-9.

[386] The protagonist implies that, since the poets are not initiates, their audience is uninitiated too; the idea recalls the blind (not physically, but mentally) leader, who leads a respectively blind mob to catastrophe.

ones is that in the face of Zeus lies the supreme divine power that governs the universe. Zeus is the supreme power (τὴν μείζονα ἀρχήν) of the universe. He is the god who governs with his divine mind, and nobody can oppose it.

Towards the end of the philosophical part of his discourse,[387] the protagonist resumes his distinction between the theoretical and the practical implications of the πόλις. Poetry and philosophy can only theoretically describe the πόλις in its ideal state: it is a community that complements the image of the lawful, harmonious, and godly universe. In reality, though, as observed empirically in everyday examples, the human πόλις is reduced to its interpersonal, but in no case transcendental, framework. As proof of it, the protagonist offers the example of the Spartan legislation, according to which a Helot who was unable to become a citizen of Sparta would often plot against the city.[388]

Since the human πόλις is in reality worse than its ideal state, then, the protagonist proposes, a description of the divine community might be of more importance to those listening to him. Readers might wonder why he is willing to undertake such an endeavour, when it is a well-known belief that Zeus is the creator and the supreme administrator of the universe. In other words, if one accepts that the protagonist teaches a lesson on Greek religion to the Borysthenites, who were foreigners, can this really explain his choice to spend a good deal of his discourse talking about the 'self-evident' supremacy of Zeus?

Notwithstanding being regarded as non-Greeks, the Borysthenites, as Callistratus and Hieroson testify, were great connoisseurs of Homer and Plato and admirers of Greek culture.

---

[387] This part extends until paragraph 38.

[388] 36.38: ὅδε μὲν οὖν ὁ τῶν φιλοσόφων λόγος, ἀγαθὴν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ἀποδεικνὺς κοινωνίαν δαιμόνων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, μεταδιδοὺς νόμου καὶ πολιτείας οὐ τοῖς τυχοῦσι τῶν ζῴων, ἀλλ᾿ ὅσοις μέτεστι λόγου καὶ φρονήσεως, πολὺ κρείττω καὶ δικαιοτέραν τῆς Λακωνικῆς νομοθεσίας εἰσηγούμενος, καθ᾿ ἣν οὐδὲ ὑπάρχει τοῖς Εἵλωσι γενέσθαι Σπαρτιάταις· ὅθεν δὴ καὶ διατελοῦσιν ἐπιβουλεύοντες τῇ Σπάρτῃ 'This, then, is the theory of the philosophers, a theory which sets up a noble and benevolent fellowship of gods and men which gives a share in law and citizenship, not to all living beings whatsoever, but only to such as have a share in reason and intellect, introducing a far better and more righteous code than that of Sparta, in accordance with which the Helots have no prospect of ever becoming Spartans, and consequently are constantly plotting against Sparta.'

So the protagonist's discussion of Zeus does not at first seem to have educational or informative grounds. I would, instead, argue that, from an authorial perspective, Dio experiments with the malleability of the identity of the protagonist by preparing the readers for another identity transformation: this time the protagonist will adopt a Persian, religious persona. After his discussion on the qualities with which Zeus governs the universe,[389] the protagonist takes on the role of a religious figure, a sage. In other words, the protagonist initially adopts a philosophical identity, setting out to discourse on the administration of the universe, but he ends up examining the same metaphysical matters from a religious point of view. Therefore it could be argued that the protagonist's lengthy speech on the superiority of Zeus is due to Dio's attempt to stretch the protagonist's identity even further, which results in specific readerly responses that I will analyse later.

Up to this point, the protagonist has been promoted from a historiographer with ethnographic interests to a philosopher. His philosophical identity is not influenced by one theory only, but, as we have seen, Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic elements have played a prominent role in his philosophical formation. The content of his speech is initially directed towards political matters, although later it shifts towards a more metaphysical discussion.

For the protagonist, it is unanimously accepted that Zeus constitutes the supreme ruler of the universe, as he always provides the right means with which people can develop good relationships with each other and with the gods. However, since post-Homeric poets have not been granted true inspiration by the Muses, they have resorted to empty expressions of celebration of the supremacy of the god. To this purported lack of authentic speakers about the divine the protagonist responds by presenting a religious myth from Zoroaster, who, despite being non-Greek, cherished for himself the divine inspiration that Homer and Hesiod had also experienced in the past.

---

[389] This section extends until paragraph 38.

From paragraph 39, the identity of the protagonist is shifted again.[390] Now he becomes a μάγος ('sage'), like those praising Zeus' perfection and superiority over gods and humans. With the announcement of a religious myth, which attempts to explain the symbolism behind the chariot of Zeus, the protagonist enters – or better inserts his narratees into – the metaphysical, transcendental environment that was anticipated already in Hieroson's plea for a change of topic. The myth begins paradoxically with the appreciation of how old and invaluable the chariot is: compared to that of the Sun, Zeus' is older, but not visible with the naked eye (36.39). Before describing the chariot in more detail, though, the protagonist maintains that the myth is actually of eastern origin, for neither Homer nor Hesiod refer to it at all (36.40).[391] Instead, Zoroaster, the old Persian sage, is thought to be the original composer of the myth.[392]

According to the story, Zoroaster, 'passionate for wisdom and justice' (36.40: ἔρωτι σοφίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης), abandoned his city and resorted to the top of a mountain. There, he received blessings by a fire sent by the god, which was burning on the top. When the other citizens arrived to examine whether Zoroaster had suffered any harm, they were surprised to find him unhurt and completely unburned. This kind of blessing permitted Zoroaster and other wise people who were taught by him (the μάγοι) to perform a unique exhibition of wisdom, revealing 'how the divine power could be cultivated' (36.41: ἐπισταμένους θεραπεύειν τὸ δαιμόνιον). For whole generations, the story says, the sages have been honouring Zeus more than the Sun, reserving for the former the best Nisaean horses, whereas for the latter only one common horse.

---

[390] The phrase ἕτερος δὲ μῦθος 'another myth' implicitly denotes this shift.

[391] Indeed, this myth does not exist in Homer or Hesiod. The rising of the Sun is referred to in *Theogony* 760-1, although there is no reference to a chariot. The pseudo-Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* 68-9 is the oldest text explicitly talking about the Sun's chariot (Cohoon and Crosby 1940, 456, n.1).

[392] Could Zoroaster's Zeus in the *Borystheniticus* be the same with Ahura Mazda, the Persian god, to which Zoroaster is traditionally linked? Cohoon and Crosby 1940, 457, n. 4 argue that no safe inference from the Dionic text can be made. Trapp 1990, 148-50 claims that the myth is pseudo-Eastern.

Whereas the myth of the chariot of Zeus is, according to the protagonist, incompatible with the Greeks' rationalistic and empirical way of thinking, for the Persians it is truthful and describes visible phenomena:

εἶναι γὰρ δὴ τοῦ ξύμπαντος μίαν ἀγωγήν τε καὶ ἡνιόχησιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἄκρας ἐμπειρίας τε καὶ ῥώμης γιγνομένην ἀεί, καὶ ταύτην ἄπαυστον ἐν ἀπαύστοις αἰῶνος περιόδοις. τοὺς δὲ Ἡλίου καὶ Σελήνης δρόμους, καθάπερ εἶπον, μερῶν εἶναι κινήσεις, ὅθεν ὑπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾶσθαι σαφέστερον. τῆς δὲ τοῦ ξύμπαντος κινήσεως καὶ φορᾶς μὴ ξυνιέναι τοὺς πολλούς, ἀλλ᾽ ἀγνοεῖν τὸ μέγεθος τοῦδε τοῦ ἀγῶνος. (36.42)[393]

The myth describes the perennial cyclical movements of the universe, which extends periodically to the same path of the Sun and the Moon. More importantly, unlike the periodic motion of the Sun and the Moon, the motion and the magnitude of the universe are not perceptible to the people. As stated later, in this infinite cosmic movement, the chariot of Zeus is driven by four distinct horses, each of which is dedicated to one major divinity: the strongest and most beautiful horse belongs to Zeus, the second to Hera, the third to Poseidon, and the fourth to Hestia. However, before I delve more deeply into the content of the myth, some remarks on the identification of the protagonist with the μάγοι need to be made.

In the beginning of the mythical narrative (36.39), the protagonist explicitly refers to Zoroaster and other Persian sages as authorities that, despite being 'barbarians',[394] that is, non-

---

[393] 'The universe is constantly being propelled and driven along a single path, as by a charioteer endowed with highest skill and power, and that this movement goes on unceasingly in unceasing cycles of time. And the coursing of Helius and Selenê, according to their account, is the movement of portions of the whole, and for that reason it is more clearly perceived by mankind. And they add that the movement and revolution of the universe as a whole is not perceptible to the majority of mankind, but that, on the contrary, they are ignorant of the magnitude of this contest.'

[394] Cf. 36.43: ἴσως γὰρ ἂν φαινοίμην ἄτοπος παρὰ Ἑλληνικά τε καὶ χαρίεντα ᾄσματα βαρβαρικὸν ᾆσμα ἐπᾴδων 'quite possibly I may appear absurd when, in contrast with Greek lays of grace and charm, I chant one that is barbarian'. The reference to βάρβαροι does not designate a sharp moral distinction between the Greeks and non-

Greeks, were in close contact with the divine. By recognising the authoritative status of the sages as a guarantee of the truthfulness of the myth, the protagonist metaphorically becomes, in the readers' mind, a sage himself, recounting the myth in all its detail and commenting on it. The description of the sages could thus be applied to the protagonist: like a Persian sage, he communicates with the divine and offers an interesting explanation of the myth (cf. 36.42: ἐξηγοῦνται δὲ τὸν μῦθον […] μάλα αὐθαδῶς '[they] narrate the myth (…) with stubborn insistence'). He is also a divinely-inspired authoritative figure, such as Homer, Hesiod, Zoroaster, and the μάγοι, whose ultimate purpose is the revelation of truth (36.41: τοῖς ἄριστα πρὸς ἀλήθειαν πεφυκόσι 'only with such as are best endowed with regard to truth').[395]

The idea that Zoroaster and the μάγοι are said to have, as well as differences, commonalities to the Greeks, such as Homer and Hesiod (36.39: ἀπὸ πρώτων σχεδόν τι τῶν ποιητῶν 'the poets, beginning practically with the ancient times'), shows that they are not so distinct as one might think. In fact, their association with the Greeks can be regarded as an implicit hint of a new shift of the identity of the protagonist. More particularly, the commonalities that the protagonist traces between the Greeks and the Persians with regard to religion and metaphysics reinforce his cosmopolitanism because he is perceived as an authoritative figure expressing ideas from both eastern and western philosophy. This cosmopolitan aspect of the protagonist is revealed to his narratees (as well as to the authorial audience) as a Stoic trait pertaining to his philosophical formation. This is not to say, however, that the myth of Zeus's chariot should be regarded as only Stoic in origin, given the strong

Greeks, as in other authors (e.g. Herodotus); rather, the Dionic endorsement of the Stoic-Cynic idea of cosmopolitanism makes βάρβαροι a geographically remote group of people whose way of living can be examined from a Greek perspective. On the term βάρβαρος in Dio see Schmidt 2011; Jackson 2017, 226-7.

[395] Similarly, Hieroson believes that the protagonist was sent by the god Achilles and that his words are pleasant for those who listen (36.25: σὲ δὲ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἔοικε δεῦρο ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου διαπέμψαι, καί σε πάνυ μὲν ἡδέως ὁρῶμεν, πάνυ δὲ ἡδέως ἀκούομεν ὅ,τι ἂν λέγῃς 'but you would appear to have been sent to us by Achilles himself from his holy isle, and we are very glad to see you and very glad also to listen to whatever you have to say').

Platonic sense in the presentation and interpretation of the myth.[396] Instead, the Stoic cosmopolitanism is manifested in the way that the protagonist combines various systems of thought, both eastern and western.[397]

The Stoic aspects of the protagonist's identity can also be seen through his use of the concept of ἐκπύρωσις ('conversion into fire') as a cosmogonic power.[398] According to the Stoics, 'the world would be resolved into one of its elements, fire, and then re-created, to run its course again'.[399] Similarly, in the *Borystheniticus*, the protagonist argues that the horses of Zeus' chariot ultimately collide with each other, forming a wax-like mass, soft enough to be moulded into the shape of a new horse, which is superior in power to all others (36.51: μέχρις ἂν εἰς μίαν ἅπαντα συνέλθῃ φύσιν, ἡττηθέντα τοῦ κρείττονος 'until all come together into one being, having been overcome by that one which is superior in power'). Here, the protagonist provides a mythical exegesis of the ἐκπύρωσις to describe the divine ability of Zeus to re-create the world from its ashes,[400] and at the same time, confirms his (Stoic) cosmopolitanism by inserting a western philosophical concept (ἐκπύρωσις) into an eastern myth.

Before I move on to the next part of the chapter, I would like to assemble here the remarks made about the shift of the identity of the protagonist. As I hope to have shown, in the *Borystheniticus* Dio skilfully manages the identity of the protagonist by assigning distinct characteristics to him. At the beginning, he depicts the protagonist as a Herodotean ethnographer offering geographical and cultural details about the remote city of Borysthenes, and thus informs the readers on the time and the place of the narrative. Afterwards, the

---

[396] Trapp 1990, 148-50; Russell 1992, 22; Trapp 2000, 214-9; Gangloff 2006, 359-63; Tommasi 2016, 156; Di Febo 2020, 74.

[397] By various systems of thought I mean both Greek philosophy and Persian religion.

[398] It should be noted, however, that the concept is not originally Stoic, but originates from Heraclitus (Mondolfo 1958), who believed that fire was the supreme power that generates and regenerates the universe (cf. Clem. Al., *Strom*. II v 24.5). The Stoic Panaetius adopted this idea early on and integrated it into the Stoic cosmogonic theories (Girt 1969, 176).

[399] Russell 1992 ad 51-60. See also Stob., *Ecl*. I, 20, 1e. On ἐκπύρωσις see van der Horst 1994; Usener 2013.

[400] Di Febo 2020, n. 117.

encounter with Callistratus and the other young Borysthenites is marked by another shift of the identity of the protagonist. The protagonist now represents a sophist and a pedagogical figure focusing on poetical and literary issues: in particular, he uses Phocylides as a counterexample to Homeric poetry, thus artfully refuting the arguments of Callistratus.

Although the literary opinions of the protagonist are perceived by the Borysthenites as hard to endorse, he is nevertheless asked to develop his ideas on another topic, and more particularly, political philosophy. One does not fail to see here the change of the protagonist into a philosopher lecturing about themes linked to the definition of πόλις. The protagonist would possibly have maintained his role as a philosopher, if it were not for Hieroson, who interrupted him with the request that the former focus on the divine πόλις. At this point, the protagonist's identity is transformed again, even though this time the transformation combines the philosophical identity with the religious one: the recounting of the myth of Zeus' chariot, apart from exemplifying the Stoic ἐκπύρωσις, also has a religious perspective, since it is connected with the figure of Zoroaster.

From the above, one can see that the identity of the protagonist is highly malleable. Dio handles this malleability as a rhetorical technique in order to establish communication with the authorial audience: we saw earlier that whenever the content of the narrative shifts, the identity of the protagonist shifts as well. From an authorial perspective, the continuous transformation of the protagonist's identity seems to show tacitly to the readers how the narrative unfolds and what kind of narrative content the readers are expected to recount next. In other words, the protagonist's change of identity simultaneously signals the change of topics – ethnographical, literary, political, and metaphysical – covered in the narrative.

If we accept that the malleability of the protagonist's identity constitutes an authorial means of communication with the audience, we need to examine it from a readerly perspective by looking at the effects that it has upon the audience. In the next part, I will start by

147

investigating the ways in which the audience perceives the authorial handling of the protagonist's malleability and then I will analyse some more authorial techniques that have significant effects on the readers.

The audience's perception of the authorial techniques

I would like to start with some introductory narratological remarks. The story of the *Borystheniticus* is, for the most part, narrated in the first person singular by the protagonist, who also participates in the events recounted. In this seemingly autobiographical frame, however, one cannot rule out the presence of Dio, who is responsible for the construction of the narrative and the dissemination of its messages to the readers, even though he does not appear to communicate with his readers explicitly through metanarratological comments (as happens in the *Euboicus*, e.g.).[401] This implication leads the audience to rely exclusively on the words of the protagonist in order to perceive and evaluate the authorial messages provided. The narratees, on the other hand, while also relying on the narration of the protagonist, are unaware of the presence of Dio and, consequently, of whether Dio endorses or not the words of the protagonist.[402]

My aim here is to show that the various responses of the authorial audience to the narrative are mainly formulated by 1) the dominant focus on the malleability of the identity of the protagonist, 2) the spatial dimension of the protagonist's journey to Borysthenes, and 3) the interplay between author–audience and narrator–narratee at the end of the narrative.

Earlier, I suggested that the handling of the protagonist's malleability serves as a means of communication between Dio and the authorial audience. With each identity shift, the

---

[401] As has been said, in so-called first-person narratives or autobiographies, the implied author's communication with the authorial audience is fused with the character narrator's communication to the narratee (Phelan 2005, 1), even though the implied author can sometimes implicitly or explicitly comment on what the characters say or do.
[402] On the differences between authorial audience and narratee see Phelan 2017, 7.

protagonist is perceived by the audience not only as a character with a certain ethical code (ethics of the told), but also as an authorial medium of communication (ethics of the telling).[403]

As the narrative evolves, the protagonist evolves as a character too: the initial narrative instability – the exile of the protagonist and his subsequent arrival to Borysthenes – arouses certain ethnographic questions, while at the same time the protagonist shows curiosity about the culture and history of the Borysthenites. Later on, when the encounter with Callistratus momentarily threatens his security, the protagonist becomes a sophist with literary interests in order to ensure that the Borysthenites will regard him as a respectful intellectual and will grant him entrance into the city.[404] The next episode with Hieroson presents another potential complication in the protagonist's relationship with the Borysthenites: in order to remain into the city and to please his listeners, the protagonist must divert from his initial discussion of the concept of human πόλις and focus instead on divine πόλις.[405] His discussion of metaphysical matters is initially philosophical, whereas afterwards, perhaps due to the interests of the Borysthenites, it acquires a religious dimension.[406] To accomplish his task, the protagonist now

---

[403] On the ethics of the telling and the told see Phelan 1996, 100-4; Phelan 2005, 20-3; Phelan 2017, 8-9. The investigation of ethics in narratives is as old as Plato, as the third book of his *Resp.* indicates (see also Lively 2019, 15-21). Speaking of morality in narratives, Booth 1983, 149 emphatically argues that '[an author] cannot choose whether or not to affect his readers' evaluation by his choice of narrative manner; he can only choose whether to do it well or poorly.'

[404] Callistratus has already mentioned that the Borysthenites are in war with the Scythians and that the situation outside the city walls is perilous (36.15). The protagonist, who, in the meantime, is exiled, must find a safe place to stay and asks the Borysthenites to 'go and sit down somewhere in the city' (καθιζώμεθα ἰόντες ποι τῆς πόλεως). Cleverly, though, his request is masked as a need for all Borysthenites to listen to him comfortably, whereas in fact it aims at ensuring that he will be safe within the city walls. A similar motif can also be found in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, where the group of young people assemble in the villa and tell stories in order to escape death.

[405] The protagonist attempts to live up to Hieroson's expectations, even though he acknowledges that his description of the divine πόλις cannot, and should not, be rivalled that of Homer or Plato (36.28). It is, in other words, a conscious effort of the protagonist to come across as a pleasant speaker, despite Hieroson's high expectations of him.

[406] According to the myth recounted by the protagonist, Zoroaster received divine inspiration and was later celebrated as a god-like figure (cf. 36.40-1). This case of deification resembles that of Achilles, as shown in the Borysthenitic culture. It could thus be argued that the protagonist analyses the concept of divine πόλις from a religious point of view because he knows that the Borysthenites are quite fond of religious explanations.

adopts the identity of a Persian sage by using a myth in order to examine metaphysical and religious ideas.

The continuous shift of identities of the protagonist, apart from being indicative of his harmonisation with, and integration into, the plot dynamics, also highlights his progression as a character, whose intellectuality and knowledge are comparable to those of other characters.[407] For example, when Callistratus and his peers show blind faith in Homeric poetry as morally infallible (36.10),[408] or when Hieroson considers Homer as stylistically similar to Plato (36.27), the protagonist thinks carefully and responds to these ill-considered opinions assertively (36.18-19; 28).[409] For him, Homeric poetry is too lengthy and therefore it entails thematic inconsistencies and ambivalences;[410] Homeric style is also distinct from Platonic, for the former is linked to poetry, the latter to philosophy.

Even when asked to talk about the human relationship with the divine, the protagonist does so by using philosophy, although later – since philosophy is difficult for the Borysthenites to digest[411] – he uses a myth with an allegorical dimension that brings it close to philosophical thought. The most prominent example of the protagonist's intellectual skills is that his explanation of the concept of ἐκπύρωσις relies on the use of a religious myth. That the eastern origin of the myth enhances his cosmopolitanism is an idea already discussed. What is striking here, though, is that this mythical exegesis complies with the mentality of the Borysthenites:

---

[407] Cf. Trapp 2000, 218: 'Dio […] show[s] up the inadequacy of his interlocutor's comfortable convictions.'

[408] Interestingly, Callistratus maintains that only blind poets, such as Homer, are real poets (36.10) – Russell 1992 ad μόνου…ἐλέγετο, following Emperius, takes, rightly I believe, the reference to Turtaeus ({παρακελεύονται τοῖς αὑτῶν ὥσπερ τὰ Τυρταίου ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ἐλέγετο} 'just as the songs of Tyrtaeus used to be employed in Lacedaemon') as a later addition. The reference to blindness of course hints at Homer's supposed blindness (and of Thamyris and Demodocus in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* respectively), but it could also indicate that, for the protagonist, the Borysthenites have literally 'turned a blind eye' to anything non-Homeric.

[409] I say assertively because he communicates his personal ideas to the Borysthenites by being careful not to insult or denigrate them (cf. 36.14: κἀγὼ πραῦναι βουλόμενος αὐτόν, ἅμα δὲ ἐπί τι χρήσιμον ἀγαγεῖν, 'and I in turn, wishing to appease him and at the same time to guide him in the direction of his own advantage').

[410] See Gangloff 2006, 161, n. 232.

[411] 36.26: τῆς μὲν γὰρ ἀκριβεστέρας ταύτης φιλοσοφίας ἄπειροί ἐσμεν 'we are unacquainted with this more refined form of philosophy.'

they struggle to endorse the protagonist's ideas, even though they are amazed by the consistency and clarity of his thought (36.14-5; 16; 25-6). In a sense, then, the malleability of the protagonist's identity is a counterexample to the rigidity of the Borysthenites and, as such, it can be regarded by the readers as an ethical value of the protagonist.

Apart from the above function, the protagonist's malleability can also be perceived as an authorial means of communication with the readers. In examining the ethics of the telling, that is, the 'ethical dimensions of author-narrator-audience relationships',[412] in the *Borystheniticus*, one has to keep in mind that Dio carefully develops a relationship with the protagonist, with whom he shares many characteristics: the protagonist is depicted as an intellectual with a broad knowledge of philosophy, rhetoric, literature, and religion. He thus stands out from all the other characters of the narrative because of his intellectuality and wisdom, which enhance his sense of 'otherness' compared to the Borysthenites.[413]

The readers do not fail to recognise that most of these characteristics pertain to Dio: his composition of the narrative aims at creating a rhetorical relationship with his audience, which remains, nevertheless, vaguely characterised (cf. 36.61).[414] As regards the philosophical perspective, his handling of the protagonist as a philosopher recalls that of Plato, who used the image of Socrates in order to artfully present his philosophical ideas. Other similarities between Dio and the protagonist concern their focus on literature: that the protagonist is well-acquainted with Homer and Phocylides is due to Dio. The latter, who bears ultimate responsibility for what is included in the narrative and what is omitted, can decide whether the protagonist will share

---

[412] Phelan 2017, 8.

[413] By revealing his intellectual skills the protagonist never completely mingles with the Borysthenites, but stands out as another (lit. an-other) character. What is also interesting is that his intellectuality is seen through the eyes of Callistratus and Hieroson, who commend his clarity of thought and wisdom (36.14; 26). Through these characters, the readers also perceive the protagonist as knowledgeable and reliable.

[414] It has been widely accepted that the *Borystheniticus* was delivered to Dio's co-citizens in Prusa. See Cohoon and Crosby 1940, 418; Russell 1992, 19; Bost-Pouderon 2011, 106-7; Di Febo 2020, 58. The information comes from the title of the text, which, in the manuscript tradition, is Βορυσθενιτικὸς ὃν ἀνέγνω ἐν τῇ πατρίδι.

his own literary preferences or not. As far as we can see, Dio does not introduce any kind of indirect commentary or any sign of unreliability into the passages where the protagonist refutes the Homeric poetry. Thus the authorial audience reasonably assumes that Dio actually endorses the protagonist's criticisms of Homeric poetry.[415] From the above examples, then, it can be assumed that Dio intentionally presents his protagonist as a reliable character narrator, so that the readers can notice the contact between the two agents.

From the above, we notice that the handling of the malleability of the protagonist's identity constitutes a significant authorial resource that has an impact on both the ethics of the told and the ethics of the telling: as a character, the protagonist shifts his identity according to the course and the content of the events narrated and presents his knowledgeability about different topics as being in sharp contrast to the cognitive inflexibility of the other characters. As a narratorial mechanism, the protagonist is perceived as a reliable character narrator, who shares many characteristics with Dio. Due to this resemblance, the malleability of the identity of the protagonist can also be said to function as a means of communication between Dio and his audience.

The argument that the protagonist displays reliability as a character narrator moves our analysis closer to the connections between Dio, the character narrator, and the audience, and more particularly, into the effects that the protagonist's reliability has on the readers. Reliability, as we have seen, occurs when the implied author endorses a character narrator's description, perception, or evaluation of events, characters, or situations. Conversely, when the implied author creates a distance from the character narrator on the axis of characters, perception, or ethics, there is unreliability.

In the *Borystheniticus*, there is general agreement between Dio and the protagonist. The latter narrates his visit to the city from a personal point of view by describing the behaviour of

---

[415] The same is true for other Dionic narratives, e.g. *orr*. 11 and 12.

the characters that he meets and by evaluating their cultural and social traditions. He introduces these characters and the place they live in a reliable way: for example, he describes Borysthenes in detail (its history, its natural habitat, etc.) and presents the characteristics (external and internal) of the Borysthenites as thoroughly as possible. In combination with this, the fact that the first six paragraphs, that is, nearly one tenth of the whole narrative, cover the description (ethnographic, geographic, morphological) of Borysthenes demonstrates that Dio invests in bringing the setting in front of his audience's eyes so that they can perceive the characters as being influenced by it:[416] the audience slowly becomes aware that, despite the cultural similarities with Greek cities, Borysthenes remains a place among 'barbarians',[417] and therefore it is no wonder that the advent of the protagonist is initially perceived by Callistratus as a welcoming, yet scepticism-arousing, incident.[418]

On the axis of understanding, the protagonist's overall interpretation of the events, the characters, and the situations is consistent with Dio's norms. In other words, the protagonist reliably interprets the behaviour of the other characters. Firstly, he realises that the Borysthenites' high esteem for Homer permeates all aspects of their life: Callistratus and his peers wear attires inspired by Homeric heroes; Hieroson conflates Platonic style with Homeric style; and the Borysthenites in general have deified Achilles and are said to know Homer by heart. Secondly, the protagonist is right in believing that the Borysthenites, despite being aware of the disciplines of philosophy and rhetoric, are more amused by mythology: Callistratus and Hieroson confirm that they have studied philosophy (and rhetoric),[419] but appear more fond of

---

[416] Dio brings the scene in front of his audience's eyes in the *Borystheniticus*, as does, for example, in the *Euboicus* (7.1-26): Jouan 1993, 194-5; Bost-Pouderon 2011, 113, n. 2

[417] 36.9: καὶ τἄλλα οὐκέτι σαφῶς ἑλληνίζοντες διὰ τὸ ἐν μέσοις οἰκεῖν τοῖς βαρβάροις 'and although in general they no longer speak Greek distinctly, because they live in the midst of barbarians.'

[418] Callistratus, for example, is suspicious of the advent of the protagonist (cf. 36.14).

[419] 36.8: ἐσπουδάκει δὲ καὶ περὶ λόγους καὶ φιλοσοφίαν 'had become interested in oratory and philosophy'; 36.27: ὡς δύνασαι ἐγγύτατα τείνων τῆς τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐλευθερίας περὶ τὴν φράσιν, οἷον δὴ καὶ ἄρτι ποιεῖν ἡμῖν ἔδοξας. εἰ γὰρ μηδενὸς ἄλλου, τῆς γε φωνῆς ξυνίεμεν ὑπὸ συνηθείας 'aiming as closely as possible at Plato's nobility of

listening to a myth about the divine πόλις. As one can see, Dio does not show any signs of narratorial unreliability in the protagonist's conclusions, thus ensuring that the audience's perception of the narrative is, and should be, based on the protagonist's overall understanding of the events narrated.

The last point regarding the effects of the protagonist's reliability on the readers lies on the axis of values and ethical judgements that the protagonist makes throughout. His moral opinions are mostly observed in the passages that deal with the Borysthenites' association with 'barbarian' and obsolete practices. For example, the success of Callistratus in male lovers is considered by the protagonist as highly unethical and licentious;[420] elsewhere, a man's baldness and shaving are thought of as flattery of the Romans and as a feminine and disgraceful practice.[421] Dio does not oppose any of these judgements, and therefore the readers are prompted to value the morality of the characters through the ethical judgments provided by the protagonist himself.

The reliability of the protagonist is perceived by the readers as connecting the protagonist with Dio. The fact that there is no direct authorial commentary in the passages that the protagonist reports, interprets, or evaluates shows that Dio wants to be regarded as inseparable from the protagonist. To achieve this reduction of distance he also uses the first person singular, which gives the narrative an autobiographical tone. The readers thus perceive

---

expression, just as but now you seemed to us to do. For if we understand nothing else, we do at least understand his language because of our long familiarity with it.'

[420] 36.8: διὰ πάντα δὴ ταῦτα εὐδοκίμει παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κάλλους, καὶ εἶχε πολλοὺς ἐραστάς. πάνυ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἐμμεμένηκεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως, τὸ περὶ τοὺς ἔρωτας τοὺς τῶν ἀρρένων· ὥστε κινδυνεύουσιν ἀναπείθειν καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐνίους οὐκ ἐπ΄ ἀγαθῷ σχεδόν, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἂν ἐκεῖνοι τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀποδέξαιντο, βαρβαρικῶς καὶ οὐκ ἄνευ ὕβρεως 'for all these reasons, then, he was in high repute with his fellow-townsmen, and not least of all because of his beauty, and he had many lovers. For this practice has continued among them as a heritage from the city of their origin — I refer to the love of man for man — so much so that they are likely to make converts of some of the barbarians, for no good end, I dare say, but rather as those people would adopt such a practice, that is to say, like barbarians and not without licentiousness.' On the condemnation of homosexuality see also *or*. 7.148-52.

[421] 36.17: τὸ αἰσχρὸν τοῦ πράγματος καὶ οὐδαμῇ πρέπον ἀνδράσιν 'how disgraceful the practice is and how unseemly for real men.' On the political implications of the passage see Russell 1992 ad ἐξυρημένος. As Di Febo 2020, n. 45 maintains, the man is regarded as the opposite of a καλὸς κἀγαθός.

Dio as a wandering intellectual teaching social, political, and metaphysical lessons, and they also distinguish themselves from the Borysthenites, for they represent an archaic, distorted image of Greekness.[422]

As mentioned earlier, to Dio's rhetorical resources belong, among others, his handling of narrative spatiality and the interplay between author–audience and narrator–narratee. In what remains, I will explore these resources from a rhetorical perspective, regarding them as means achieving a communication between Dio and the readers.

The spatial organisation of the narrative depends heavily on the centrality of Borysthenes as the main setting. Prior to the first reference to the city, the protagonist is initially shown in exile, far from his homeland, which remains unknown throughout (36.1). By placing the protagonist in an unusual setting, but closer to Borysthenes than to his homeland, Dio marks a smooth transition from a state of being exiled to a sense of belonging, even if belonging means temporarily visiting a distant, non-Greek city like Borysthenes. Immediately afterwards, the protagonist is placed into a new territory outside of the city; Borysthenes draws his attention because of its geographical location, which approximates the land of the Getae, and its association with the Greeks (36.1-15).[423] The exhaustive description of the new setting indicates to the readers that the protagonist will attempt to form a relationship with this city and its dwellers – it remains to see, however, what kind of relationship it will be.

Still remaining outside of the city walls, which is considered as a precautionary, safety-seeking measure of the Borysthenites and as a warning sign that for them everyone is a potential threat,[424] the protagonist encounters Callistratus and other young men. Their subsequent disagreement over literary issues enhances their intellectual differences and serves as a useful scene aiming to prove that the entrance of the protagonist into the city was rightfully permitted:

---

[422] Russell 1992, 22-3.
[423] Di Febo 2020, 59.
[424] See Callistratus' remarks in 36.15.

instead of looking at him as a threat, the Borysthenites eventually perceive him as a wise, Socrates-like figure[425] and allow him to enter the city on condition that he reveal to the other citizens – and to the authorial audience too, we might say – a Greek's point of view of the Greek intellectual past.

Upon his entrance, the protagonist offers an overview not only of the Borysthenites, but also of the temple of Zeus, where the discussion about philosophical and religious issues takes place (36.16-61). Up to this point, the readers are given essential information about the place of the events happening (inside and outside Borysthenes) and the characters involved. The narrative space does not in fact change until the end, except for when the protagonist develops the myth of Zeus' chariot, which marks a metaphorical change of place from the earth to heaven (36.39-60). Nevertheless, the narrative often refers to other places that play a minor role compared to that of Borysthenes: Scythia, the Tauric Chersonese, Sauromatia, Pontus, Apollonia, Ionia, Sparta, Rome, Persia, etc. We could assume here that the depiction of the protagonist as an ethnographer accounts for his continuous references to different places; however, the question that concerns us here is not so much why Dio allocates ethnographical characteristics to the protagonist, but how the readers perceive this, sometimes rapid, sometimes slow, transition from one place to another.

It could be maintained that the readers respond to this transition by understanding it as a necessary component of narrative progression. Without the references to various places, the readers could not otherwise explain the encounter between the protagonist and Callistratus, which happens outside of the city walls, nor his invitation into the city. It also seems that when the place changes, the narrative content changes as well:[426] the exilic state of the protagonist

---

[425] Bost-Pouderon 2011, 114 describes the encounter between the protagonist and Callistratus as 'un dialogue tout socratique'. See also n. 25. On Socratic echoes in the Dionic corpus see Brancacci 2000; Moles 2005, 115 *et passim*; Trapp 2007, 57.
[426] Russell 1992, 20.

occasions his visit to Borysthenes; his disagreement with Callistratus in front of the city walls occasions his permission to visit the city; finally his visit to the temple of Zeus occasions his description of a religious myth concerning Zeus' supreme power. If it was not for the spatial differentiation, Dio would be unable to explain the change of subject that occurs in the narrative, and the readers would thus witness narrative gaps and authorial inconsistencies.[427]

Apart from the ethics of the telling, the focus of Dio on narrative spatiality serves the ethics of the told. In particular, the readers rely on spatial information to explain the cosmopolitanism of the protagonist. What I mean here is that they would hardly endorse his depiction as a cosmopolitan intellectual, if there was little evidence that Dio endorses this idea. To convince the readers, Dio offers a plethora of geographical names of other cities and indirectly guides his readers towards accepting the cosmopolitanism of the protagonist. Dio could also interrupt the narrative in order to attribute this characteristic to the protagonist through direct authorial commentary. However, he seems to rely on indirect telling by letting his readers infer the image of a cosmopolitan protagonist.

Narrative spatiality also explains the distorted image of Greekness that the Borysthenites have. Again, the readers need authorial evidence to accept that these people are culturally different from the Greeks. For this reason, Dio emphasises the geographical remoteness of Borysthenes from Greece, although attributing to it some Greek, albeit dubious, practices. More particularly, he promotes the idea that the Borysthenites exaggerate their admiration for the Greeks and are thus incapable of constructing a genuine image of Greekness: for example, not only do they admire Achilles, but they worship him as a god; they recite the Homeric epics by heart, but they are ignorant of any other kind of Greek poetry; they strictly condemn any Roman, that is, non-Greek, appearance, but their old-fashioned dresses, their

---

[427] Tally Jr. 2013, 81 notes that: '[i]t appears that the spirit of place has […] to do with how readers read the works; […] many readers of literary texts engage in a form of map-reading when they approach certain works.'

beards, and long hair, which recall obsolete Homeric practices, do not seem to bother them at all. Thus the Borysthenites adopt an outdated, limited view of Greekness and also are unaware that they do it; on the other hand, knowing that this Greekness is profoundly archaic, the readers witness the Borysthenites' unreliable understanding of what Greekness is: one such example is the assumption of Hieroson that Homeric style and Platonic style are identical. It can be argued then that spatiality here aims at creating a certain distance between the readers and the Borysthenites, since the former are aware of something that the latter are unaware of.[428] In sum, the handling of narrative spatiality constitutes a significant rhetorical resource, by means of which Dio affects the readerly responses to the narrative.

The last rhetorical resource under examination is the interplay between author–audience and narrator–narratee relationships at the end of the narrative. In paragraph 61, the protagonist announces emphatically:

ὅθεν δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐάσωμεν τὰ νῦν, ὅσον ἡμῖν δυνατὸν ἐπᾶραι τὸν λόγον οὐκ ὀκνήσαντες. εἰ δὲ ἀτεχνῶς ὑψηλόν τε καὶ ἐξίτηλον ἀπέβη τὸ τοῦ λόγου σχῆμα, ὥσπερ οἱ δεινοὶ περὶ τοὺς ὄρνιθάς φασι τὸν σφόδρα ἄνω χωρήσαντα καὶ τοῖς νέφεσιν ἐγκρύψαντα αὑτὸν ἀτελῆ τὴν μαντείαν ποιεῖν, οὐκ ἐμὲ ἄξιον αἰτιᾶσθαι, τὴν δὲ Βορυσθενιτῶν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς τότε ἐκεῖνοι λέγειν προσέταξαν. (36.61)[429]

---

[428] On the level of evaluating the ethics of the told, the authorial audience distances itself from the Borysthenites, who are seen in a negative light. Cf. also Russell 1992, 23: '[The authorial audience is] perhaps assumed to be wiser than the Borysthenites, and to have a sounder and more modern conception of their Hellenic heritage and their place in the Roman world.'

[429] 'For that reason let us also refrain for the present, now that we have not shirked exalting the myth to the best of our power. And if the form of that myth has turned out to be utterly lofty and indistinct, just as those who are expert in augury declare that the bird which ascends too high into the heavens hides itself in the clouds makes divination incomplete, still it is not I whom you should blame, but rather the insistence of those men of Borysthenes, because it was they who bade me speak that day.'

From the first words of the paragraph it becomes evident that the protagonist develops an increased awareness of narrating a story. He is also aware of the narrative progression because he can freely decide what can be omitted (ἐάσωμεν τὰ νῦν) and what can be kept so that the narrative achieve a prominent level of accuracy (ὑψηλόν τε καὶ ἐξίτηλον ἀπέβη τὸ τοῦ λόγου σχῆμα). It is interesting, though, that he not only warns that the narratees might perceive the myth as a prophetic text or an omen (περὶ τοὺς ὄρνιθάς […] ἀτελῆ τὴν μαντείαν ποιεῖν), but also apologises in advance, claiming that the Borysthenites are responsible for the shift of the narrative style and content and for any negative views of the narrative in total (οὐκ ἐμὲ ἄξιον αἰτιᾶσθαι, τὴν δὲ Βορυσθενιτῶν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς τότε ἐκεῖνοι λέγειν προσέταξαν).[430]

Whom does the protagonist address in this last paragraph? Does the protagonist here address his narratees (the Borysthenites) or somebody else? We could assume that the protagonist addresses the readers of the text, but the logic of narrative levels does not permit such an assumption: character narrators are intratextual agents unaware of the existence of readers. Nevertheless, if we assume that in the words of the protagonist lies an indirect authorial commentary, then the problem is solved. A *caveat* is needed here: I am deliberately avoiding the suggestion that these words are pronounced by Dio, the implied author (as e.g. happens in the metanarratological section of the *Euboicus*, 7.81-152), but that the protagonist's words reveal a strong authorial commentary, which remains tacit due to the use of first person singular. Therefore by regarding the passage as an indirect authorial commentary, we can also examine the readerly responses to it.

Why does Dio prefer an indirect commentary to a direct, metanarratological one? First of all, to distinguish between himself and the protagonist would significantly disturb his perceived image as seen through his assimilation to the protagonist: Dio continuously relies

---

[430] For Russell 1992, ad §61 the conclusion of the last paragraph is: 'Let us stop here. If it all seems fantastic, blame the Borysthenites, not me.'

upon the self-presentation of the protagonist as an intellectual figure, so a separation of their identities at the end of the narrative would cause a disruption to the way that the readers perceive them as an inseparable entity. Secondly, a direct authorial commentary at that point would be regarded as reducing the reliability of the protagonist as a character narrator: Dio employs the protagonist as an intratextual *alter ego* who can communicate various messages to the readers. Therefore any reduction of the protagonist's importance in telling would also affect Dio's importance in telling. Finally, there is no reason for a metanarratological comment here because the resolution of the narrative (which is the final part of narrative progression) cannot otherwise be explained by Dio himself. That is to say, the protagonist would again be undermined as a character if Dio resolved the initial instabilities and complications himself; it is assumed, then, that, if the protagonist is responsible for the solution of his instabilities and complications, *he* can also bring about the final resolution, without interrupting the narrative logic. For these reasons, I believe that Dio does not take over the narration of the protagonist, but instead offers an indirect, through-the-protagonist commentary, which has significant effects on the readers.

Even if we accept that there is an indirect authorial commentary in the words of the protagonist in the last paragraph, the question still remains as to the kind of audience that the protagonist addresses. The manuscript tradition informs us that the text addresses (or better, was delivered in front of) Dio's fellow-Prusans.[431] However, there is no other evidence for the validity of this idea, except for the very last sentence of the text, where 'Dio' informs his 'fellow-Prusans' that he was pushed by the Borysthenites to tell the myth. In my opinion, this idea, which is historicist in approach, cannot be inferred from the text, since the audience that the last phrase is addressed to is never characterised. Since nowhere else in the text does the protagonist (or 'Dio') address this audience, only tentative conclusions can be made about the

---

[431] Russell 1992, 19; Bost-Pouderon 2011, 106-7; Di Febo 2020, 58.

character of the audience. My analysis, based on purely narratological concepts, will attempt to describe this audience as the agents with which Dio – through the words of the protagonist – communicates.

The audience of the last paragraph constitutes a hybrid of the authorial audience and the narratees. More particularly, the protagonist addresses an intratextual audience, which is distinct from the Borysthenites, but whose identity remains uncharacterised. At the same time (though tacitly), Dio addresses his readers, who are merged with the uncharacterised narratees of the protagonist, but who can notice the authorial meanings of the passage. The narratees, unaware of Dio's existence,[432] simply regard the pardon of the protagonist (οὐκ ἐμὲ ἄξιον αἰτιᾶσθαι) as a mere attempt of the latter to make his myth as agreeable as possible, whereas the readers see behind it a refutation of any responsibility pertaining to the telling of a mythical story as an explanation of transcendental and metaphysical issues.

The phrase οὐκ ἐμὲ ἄξιον αἰτιᾶσθαι, τὴν δὲ Βορυσθενιτῶν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς τότε ἐκεῖνοι λέγειν προσέταξαν, pronounced by the protagonist and endorsed by Dio, is perceived by the readers as an endeavour of Dio to address the reasons that led him to develop a myth in order to describe the supreme power of Zeus over the universe. In the context of the *Borystheniticus*, the myth is developed in order to explain (cf. 36.43: ὅπως ἐξηγούμενοι λέγουσιν 'the manner in which the Magi set it forth in their narrative') to the Borysthenites the notion put forth by the protagonist that what rules the universe and keeps beings in harmony is Zeus, the divine δημιουργός ('creator', cf. 36.59). Due to their 'barbaric' and obsolete Greek practices, the Borysthenites could not otherwise conceive of the divine superiority of Zeus, which also explains why the protagonist chose to develop a myth, instead of continuing his philosophical discussion. With the excuse of Dio at the end of the narrative, the message sent to his readers seems to me to be the following: 'Where Achilles is deified, where Phocylides is unknown,

---

[432] Phelan 2017, 8-9. See also Prince 2003, s.v. 'authorial audience', 'narratee'.

and where 'barbaric' neighbours fight for sovereignty, it is better to teach a lesson on the divine superiority of Zeus in the form of a myth, rather than of an exquisite philosophical conversation.'[433]

The readerly responses to the authorial indirect commentary are predominantly synthetic. The readers become aware of the artificiality of the narrative, since the words of the protagonist concern the progression of the myth (cf. ἐάσωμεν τὰ νῦν, ὅσον ἡμῖν δυνατὸν ἐπᾶραι τὸν λόγον οὐκ ὀκνήσαντες 'let us also refrain for the present, now that we have not shirked exalting the myth to the best of our power') and the readerly responses to it (cf. οὐκ ἐμὲ ἄξιον αἰτιᾶσθαι 'it is not I whom you should blame'). Simultaneously, the readers perceive the words of the protagonist about the myth as potentially applying to the whole narrative: the protagonist asks for an apology about any unsuccessful elements found in the myth, and similarly, Dio asks for an apology from the readers about any unsuccessful elements found in the whole narrative.

As a conclusion, through the analysis of author–audience and narrator–narratee relationships in the last paragraph, it appears that Dio communicates indirect messages to the authorial audience through the protagonist and attempts to affect the readerly emotional responses to the narrative.

Conclusions

Dio Chrysostom's *Borystheniticus* has attracted a considerable amount of scholarly attention. However, this research has tended to focus exclusively on socio-historical and political issues, thus ignoring the narrative means by which Dio achieves communication with his readers. The present chapter has attempted to fill this gap by investigating the ways in which Dio represents himself in the narrative, develops a relationship with the readers, and affects their responses to the narrative.

---

[433] Indeed, in paragraph 38, the protagonist seems to become aware of the limitation of philosophy in explaining a transcendental concept to the Borysthenites.

The first part of my analysis considered some authorial rhetorical techniques. Dio organises the material of the narrative and chooses how the plot will progress. He also presents the characters in a certain light, or lets them present themselves from a certain perspective, and provides signs to the readers of how to respond to the narrative. He is thus ultimately responsible for the functions or techniques pertaining to establishing a certain kind of rhetorical communication with the audience.

The most prominent authorial technique concerns Dio's assimilation to the protagonist. Throughout the narrative, Dio does not provide any sign of unreliability in the words of the protagonist; on the contrary, he endorses what the protagonist maintains and singles him out from the rest of the characters due to his intellectual prowess. The protagonist thus becomes the most suitable character for the indirect depiction of Dio in the narrative.

What also separates the protagonist from the rest of the characters is his malleability. His identity is transformed every time the narrative topic shifts. He is initially introduced to the audience as an ethnographer; soon afterwards, though, he reveals distinct identities: he becomes a literary connoisseur, a sophist, a philosophical teacher, even a religious sage. Undoubtedly, this malleability, which is contrasted to the other characters' lack thereof, makes the protagonist the most significant character and enhances even more the relationship with Dio.

The malleability of the protagonist also affects the readerly perception of the narrative through the understanding of the ethics of the narrative and the told. Since everything narrated by the protagonist is at the same time endorsed by Dio, it goes without saying that the readers do not need to cast any doubts upon the reliability of the protagonist as a character narrator and can therefore follow more easily the narrative progression through the viewpoint of the protagonist. His reliability also helps the readers appreciate him as a character of the narrative. Once the readers establish that the narrative progresses reliably, they reconstruct the ethical

map of the narrative. Through the depiction of the protagonist as a reliable character narrator, the audience moves closer to endorsing his judgements on the other characters. More particularly, the Borysthenites are depicted in a less positive light, since what is pointed out is their arrogance and lack of knowledge of anything else than Homeric poetry. In other words, the readers know that the protagonist, who is an alter-ego of Dio, possesses knowledge that cannot be surpassed by that of the Borysthenites, and thus there is general acknowledgement of the intellectuality and ethical behaviour of the protagonist (and of Dio) and potential condemnation of the narrowmindedness of the Borysthenites.

Another authorial means of communication with the readers is the handling of narrative spatiality. The text refers to multiple places that are more or less connected to Borysthenes, which constitutes the centre around which the action takes place. Again, this technique influences the readerly perception of the narrative: as regards the ethics of the telling, the geographical transition from one place to another prevents any narrative gaps and authorial inconsistencies. As regards the ethics of the told, the readers need proof of the cosmopolitanism of the protagonist and of the narrowmindedness of the Borysthenites: it comes as no surprise that the former, who is repeatedly said to have travelled widely, is considered as a knowledgeable, open-minded figure, whereas the latter are seen as socially isolated and less culturally educated.

The last technique examined is the synergy between author–audience and narrator–narratee, especially at the end of the text. That Dio provides an authorial picture of himself similar to that of the protagonist has already been analysed. What is striking at the end of the text, though, is that this synergy affects the readers' synthetic responses. In particular, there seems to be a fusion of narrative agents, since the protagonist apologetically asks the narratees to appreciate that he was pushed by the Borysthenites to approach a transcendental issue

through a myth, while at the same time, Dio tacitly asks from the readers to pardon himself for anything unsuccessful found in the narrative.

Overall it could be said that Dio carefully organises the narrative of the *Borystheniticus* by using rhetorical techniques that establish a solid relationship with the readers and affect their responses to the narrative.

Conclusions

The present thesis has examined Dio Chrysostom's orations 7 (the *Euboicus*), 12 (the *Olympicus*), and 36 (the *Borystheniticus*) from a narratological perspective and has suggested that in these orations Dio establishes a dialectical relationship with his readers by delivering moral messages to them and by creating for himself the image of an intellectual who endured exile. A common theme among the orations is the exile, which serves both as a provider of wisdom, reinforcing Dio's self-depiction as a wise man, and as a moral compass for the readers, through which they can be guided towards a more ethical and meaningful way of living.

During the first six decades of the twentieth century, previous research on Dio had generally neglected the narrative and experiential aspects of the orations, instead focusing on biographical details such as Dio's position within the wider social and political milieu. Beyond this view, which considers the orations as predominantly historical sources and as reliable testimonies to Dio's life, there has been, since the seventies, a growing interest in the structural, aesthetic, and cultural elements of the orations, which emphasises also the mechanisms by which Dio constructs the orations and develops his thematic. As we saw in the introduction, the surveys of Moles, Whitmarsh, and Krause, among others, significantly broaden the scope of Dionic studies; however, they hardly take into account the role of the readers in the shaping of the orations, which is achieved through the establishment of a rhetorical communication with Dio.

As a response to this gap in Dionic studies, the present thesis has undertaken the task of exploring the rhetorical relationship between Dio and his audience and the importance of both agents in the co-creation of the texts. A central aim has been to suggest that Dio in fact relies on the various responses of the readers to the text (aesthetic, cognitive, affective, etc.) and accordingly chooses what to include in, and what to exclude from, the texts. The thesis significantly differs from previous research for a number of reasons: it approaches the orations

not from a biographical, but from a narratological perspective; it focuses on the rhetorical elements of the communication between author and audience, instead of examining the authorial strategies as textual phenomena only; and also, it regards the readers as active participants in the development of the texts, not as passive recipients of authorial messages.

In order to investigate this dialectical relationship between author and readers, I have made use of James Phelan's rhetorical theory of narrative, which complements and refines previous rhetorical models such as that of Wayne Booth. Phelan's theory relies on an *a posteriori* process, examining what texts have done so far, not what they are supposed to do. Central to this approach is the idea of an implied author, responsible for the choices and ideas expressed in the text and for the rhetorical resources used in the formation of a certain kind of communication with the readers. To achieve an effective communication with the readers, the implied author exploits resources pertaining to the plot and the narratorial techniques (textual dynamics), while at the same time considering the readerly responses to them (readerly dynamics). Phelan's equal attention to authors and readers in the construction of texts is the main reason that I have chosen this methodological tool to analyse the Dionic communication with the readership in the aforementioned orations.

The first text examined is *or.* 7 (the *Euboicus*). Because the text displays a remarkable number of rhetorical characteristics through which Dio conveys messages to his readers, my textual analysis has primarily relied on the synergy between textual dynamics and readerly dynamics and also on the uses of authorial commentary. Dio begins in a highly synthetic way, distinguishing between himself, the (implied) author, and the anonymous protagonist. This distinction is achieved through change in tenses and in voice (who speaks each time) and through an introductory authorial comment suggesting possible interpretations of the text to the readers.

Readerly responses to the narrative are initially mimetic, since the characters approximate real-life people. Afterwards, though, a more ethical, that is, thematic, response is developed, since the hunter, taking on the role of a secondary character narrator, presents a personal story: everything that is told from the perspective of the hunter as regards his visit to the city has a highly thematic interest because it focuses on the opposition between the malignity of the city dwellers and the innocence of the countrymen. In order to reinforce this moral opposition and to provide an analysis of the characters involved, Dio – through the narration of the hunter – uses the themes of laughter and language: the city dwellers laugh at the naivety of the hunter and employ a stylised language, whereas the hunter fails to make sense of the jokes and speaks in a rustic language appropriate to countrymen.

In the narration of the hunter, language also signifies to the readers the implicit presence of Dio. When repeating to the protagonist what his legal opponents mentioned in court, the hunter suddenly shifts from a rustic language to a very sophisticated one. This change should ultimately be ascribed to Dio, since we are told that the hunter does not possess the knowledge to speak in an elevated style. Another sign of the Dionic presence is the handling of the plot dynamics: key events such as the shipwreck or the theme of hospitality are mentioned twice, both in the story of Sotades and in that of the protagonist at the beginning of the narrative.

As regards the levels of narration, Dio differentiates between three distinct voices – his own, the protagonist's, and the hunter's. He also reduces the reliability of the hunter as a character narrator by having the latter misreporting or misinterpreting events and at other times misjudging the motives and behaviour of other characters. However, I have argued that this unreliability has bonding, rather than estranging, effects because the readers are more likely to sympathise with the hunter's negative view of the city and his positive view of the country.

After my analysis of the authorial techniques, I have shifted my attention to how readers are likely to respond to them. I have observed that readerly interests in the narrative change

every time Dio introduces a different episode: the authorial comment at the beginning of the text has a remarkable synthetic dimension, while later the protagonist's narration of his encounter with the hunter creates more mimetic than synthetic interests, since the characters resemble real-life people. However, the story of the hunter signifies a change from mimetic to thematic responses because the hunter highlights fundamental ethical differences between city dwellers and country dwellers. When the protagonist resumes his narration by describing the festive celebration in the hunter's hut, a mimetic response is once again generated, while the metaliterary part of the text, on which I next focused, signifies a synthetic interest. I have therefore concluded that readerly interests in the *Euboicus* present a ring structure of 'a-b-c-b-a', with 'a' signifying synthetic responses, and 'b' and 'c' mimetic and thematic responses respectively.

The next part of the first chapter has been devoted to the metaliterary part of the *Euboicus*, which shows a highly synthetic aspect. My analysis has led me to the conclusion that the voice of the passage belongs to Dio, who comments on the previous narrative by regarding it as an exemplary ethical story from which the readers can benefit. Additionally, contrary to previous research, I have argued that the first part and the metaliterary part of the text, far from being disunited or haphazardly linked, present instead a harmonious relationship through their focus on the theme of morality and its consequences, which is highlighted in several passages.

If morality is the lesson that Dio attempts to teach his readers, he needs the rhetorical resources to do so. First of all, he uses intratextual characters as narrators in order to fuse the narrative levels, which inevitably leads to different kinds of reliability – the hunter is mainly an unreliable narrator, whereas the protagonist is very reliable. Next, Dio employs the technique that I have called narrative ring composition, according to which there is a change from authorial narration to character narration and ultimately back to authorial narration. The

last authorial technique is the use of temporal circularity, which brings readers back to the Narrative Now every time a narration (authorial or character narration) concludes.

Readers respond to the metaliterary section by developing synthetic interests. This means that they are more inquisitive about the characters as literary constructs, as fictional agents promoting certain Dionic messages.

My investigation of the pedagogical relationship between Dio and his readers in the *Euboicus* has led me to consider the ways in which Dio indirectly characterises his readers as students within a classroom, who are invited to attend to his moral lesson. Dio's role as a moral teacher is seen in passages where he provides a description of his lesson: he uses the story of the hunter as an *exemplum positivum* to educate the readers and employs different characters (the protagonist and the hunter) as 'teachers of knowledge'; he also shifts from authorial narration or character narration to character-character dialogue in order to emphasise the thematic importance of morality and frames the narrative part within a metaliterary framework (including the authorial commentary of the first paragraph), so as to point out the messages that the readers must take with them from reading the narrative. As I have shown, the moral lesson that Dio communicates to his readers has a rich Platonic, Cynic, and Stoic philosophical background.

In an attempt to link narratological research to cultural studies, I have concluded my investigation of the *Euboicus* with the hypothesis that the pedagogical relationship between Dio and his audience reflects the moral anxieties around which educational systems in the Second Sophistic were developed: students should strive to attain *Moralbildung* by following the paradigm of ethical figures who possess knowledge and who can, when appropriate, effectively communicate this knowledge to their students.

The second chapter of my thesis was the investigation of *Or.* 12, the *Olympicus*, from a rhetorical narratological perspective. The aim of my analysis was twofold: primarily, to

highlight the characteristics that yield the narratological (in its rhetorical sense) aspects of the text and secondly, to determine the authorial resources used for the communication with the readers. Despite efforts to apply narrative theory in diverse kinds of texts, modern research has generally favoured a dichotomy between narrative and 'non-narrative' texts, regarding the latter as lacking a story, a fabula, or a narrator. According to this notion, rhetorical speeches (judicial, deliberative, epideictic) are non-narrative texts, except from the part of the narration (διήγησις, *narratio*), which, due to its name and its structural characteristics, is the sole part that can benefit from a narratological analysis. Thus for modern research the Dionic *Olympicus* is a non-narrative text and only the part of the narration is worthy of a narratological analysis.

My approach, however, has presented a wholly different image. Instead of looking for structuralist elements pertaining to the 'narrativity' of (a part of) the text, I have regarded the *Olympicus* as a purposeful form of rhetorical communication between Dio and his readers, or in other words, as a narrative in its Phelanian sense. Initially, by challenging the notion that the term narration, in its modern narratological sense, is equal to the rhetorical part of the *narratio*, I have argued that rhetorical speeches can benefit from a narratological approach that focuses on the rhetorical (that is, the communicative), as well as the structural, characteristics. Therefore my analysis of the *Olympicus* has sought to delineate the rhetorical resources through which Dio communicates with his readers and also to determine the special characteristics of this type of communication.

It is beyond doubt that the *Olympicus* displays a complex rhetorical form, combining a *prolalia* with other parts of a rhetorical speech. The protagonist begins by addressing the narratees in the second person and by constructing a detailed picture of himself, which highlights two important points: on the one hand, his anthropomorphic characteristics and on the other, his unreliability as a speaker – since he adopts a Socratic way of self-questioning. His characterisation is also seen through his metaphorical assimilation to the wise owl that

educates the other birds, even though its lessons might not always be pleasurable to them. Thus by offering a detailed picture of himself the protagonist captures the attention of the narratees (and through them, the readers too).

In the words of the protagonist, one can see Dionic references to the content of the narrative. Not only does Dio inform the readers about the unfolding of the narrative, but he also uses a prolepsis by referring to Pheidias, who plays a vital role as a character later in the narrative. The main theme of the first part is human conception of the divine and how it can successfully be achieved. The protagonist sees the divine either as inherent in people or as artificially 'implanted': whereas certain people witness the existence of the divine within themselves, others develop a religious idea through the work of poets (such as Hesiod), lawgivers (who create laws by imitation of the supreme justice of Zeus), philosophers, or sculptors. To this last profession the protagonist directs the attention of the narratees. In a comparison between sculptors and poets, Pheidias contends that the former use tangible materials to capture the image of the divine, whereas poets rely on the verbalising effects of their art to instil a religious idea in the minds of humans.

In the second part of the text, Pheidias takes on the role of a secondary narratee and later of a tertiary character narrator and answers the questions of an anonymous interlocutor (who becomes a secondary character narrator) by supporting the power of sculpture in depicting the divine. The characterisation of Pheidias here is mainly mimetic because it highlights the achievement that he was mostly famous for, namely, his statue of Zeus. From this example, it is maintained that the visual and haptic effects by which sculpture impresses its viewers are far superior to the verbalising effects of poetry.

When Pheidias speaks in favour of his art, he does that by means of a harsh critique against poetry. More particularly, he contends that the only tool of poetry is language, which at times can be highly ambiguous. Thus whereas the Zeus of Pheidias is consistently good, the

Zeus of Homer is more incongruent, at times being peaceful and at times being exasperated. Pheidias then goes on by offering a detailed analysis of the ways in which Homer conceives of the divine in his poems.

It is exactly in Pheidias' extensive knowledge of poetic techniques that I have suspected the implicit presence of Dio. Despite being in the background, Dio shares with his readers – through the speech of Pheidias – invaluable information about the reliance of Homer on nuances in dialects, on metaphorical language, on the music of the words, and on synonyms. Pheidias concludes that the only power of Homer is his ability to offer numerous appellations to Zeus, but ultimately this is of little importance, given that sculpture represents Zeus as displaying consistent characteristics and as being more ethical.

Through the self-presentation of the protagonist as a philosopher and the employment of secondary and tertiary character narrators as conveyors of implicit authorial messages, Dio aims at constructing a pedagogical relationship with the readers. To achieve that he exploits the dynamic role of the readers: he characterises them as active participants in a philosophical-religious dialogue and guides them towards employing cognitive responses to the narrative by using the second person singular and by regarding them as willing participants in a lively discussion that can ensure deep philosophical knowledge.

My examination of the *Olympicus* has thus concluded with the argument that Dio depicts himself as a wise philosophical teacher, his audience as active participants in a philosophical discussion, and his narrative as the medium through which this discussion between the two parts is ultimately achieved.

As one can see, the image of the exiled man that Dio employs for himself in the *Euboicus* and the *Olympicus* has important implications in the relationship that he attempts to establish with his readers and in the way that the readers participate in, and further affect, this relationship. Something similar can be said about the *Borystheniticus* (*or*. 36), which is the last

text under examination. Here too, Dio is portrayed as the intellectual man who endured exile and gained, through the harsh experience of his exile, profound knowledge on philosophical (moral, metaphysical, and aesthetic) matters.

The third chapter of my thesis has investigated the narrative rhetorical strategies employed by Dio in the *Borystheniticus*, and how these strategies are likely to be perceived by the readers.

Analogously to *orr.* 7 and 12, Dio commences the narrative by introducing into the story a central character as his alter ego, whom I have called the protagonist, and who is presented as an exiled man wandering around foreign cities far from his homeland. The time and the place of the narrative (summertime in Borysthenes) are directly provided by Dio, who establishes a connection with the protagonist – by presenting the story in the first person singular – and the readers – by making himself perceptible to them as a respectable figure.

With regard to the protagonist, my analysis has suggested that his characterisation has mainly ethnographical and literary aspects: ethnographical, for he describes Borysthenes in a Herodotean style, notwithstanding deviating from the strict ethnographical intentions of Herodotus, and literary, for his encounter with the young Callistratus eventually turns into a disagreement between them as to whether Homer or Phocylides is the best poet. The apparent literary dimension of the episode entails pedagogical overtones as well, since Callistratus, acting as a student, fervently argues for the superiority of Homer in an attempt to convince the protagonist, whereas the latter, taking on the role of the teacher, calmly and assertively considers Homeric poetry as detached from reality and as ethically inconsistent and Phocylidean poetry as morally and aesthetically elevated. The dynamic exchange of ideas between the two characters metaphorically reflects, in my opinion, the environment of a classroom in which literary matters were often scrutinised.

The entrance of the protagonist into the city signifies a shift in identity, in the sense that he is now regarded as a respectable figure, not as a mere outsider, a ξένος ('stranger'). What immediately captures the attention of the readers is the way in which the protagonist presents the Borysthenites: by following a strict Homeric style in their behaviour, appearance, and even grooming, the citizens are said to be the perfect audience for philosophers to discuss stimulating topics, which is expected to happen in the course of the narrative. The protagonist thus reduces the distance with Dio by laying the foundation for a philosophical dialogue and at the same time initiates a student-teacher relationship with the narratees by lecturing them on political and metaphysical matters.

By combining ideas from Plato, Aristotle, and Stoic philosophy, the protagonist defines πόλις ('city') as a human society constructed by imitation of the divine κοινωνία ('community') and as a place of harmonious contact between humans and gods. Nevertheless, the discourse of the protagonist is interrupted by the insertion of Hieroson, an old Borysthenite, who, due to his familiarity with the Platonic conception of city, urges the protagonist to change topic and instead talk about something else.

Before responding to the request by shifting the focus of attention from the human city to the city of the gods, the protagonist employs the example of poetry as a means of human communication with the gods – even though some poets fail to do so (Homer and Hesiod are among those). After this point, the identity of the protagonist progressively transforms again into that of an Eastern sage who speaks about religious issues. More particularly, the protagonist maintains that the divine community is ideal and imitable because it is governed by the divine superiority and justice of Zeus. In this Stoically influenced environment, Zeus' λόγος ('reason') is the primary distributor of justice, which everybody should obey, although it cannot be effectively communicated to humans because of poets' lack of authentic inspiration

from the Muses. For this reason, the protagonist develops the paradigm of the Persian sage Zoroaster, whose divine inspiration is, according to the protagonist, original and truthful.

The myth of Zoroaster tells the story of the cosmic journey that the four-horse chariot of Zeus makes and the eventual collision between two of the horses that signifies the destruction of the old universe and the creation of a new one – this concept, as we saw, is similar to the Stoic ἐκπύρωσις. Through this myth, my analysis has shown, the protagonist combines his philosophical (Stoic) identity with the identity of a μάγος ('sage') and displays his cosmopolitanism, while his assimilation to Dio (through the first person singular) has a profound impact on how the readers perceive Dio as a cosmopolitan author.

The various readerly responses to the narrative are affected by the rhetorical techniques that Dio employs in order to establish a relationship with his readers. First is the handling of the malleability of the identity of the protagonist: he takes on the role of an ethnographer, a sophist, a philosopher, and a religious sage; this continuous transformation informs both the ethics of the telling, since the protagonist is successfully harmonised to the content of the narrative, and the ethics of the told, since he is projected as a knowledgeable figure whose intellectuality significantly exceeds that of other characters, such as Callistratus and Hieroson. Additionally, there is no direct authorial commentary pointing out any hint of unreliability in the words of the protagonist, which leads readers to the conclusion that Dio infuses personal characteristics into, and reduces the distance from, the protagonist, ensuring that the readers are aware of this kind of 'identification'.

The second technique is that of narrative spatiality as a key component of narrative progression. Undoubtedly, the central place of the narrative is Borysthenes, outside of which the protagonist initially finds himself: exiled from his homeland, he approaches the foreign city with caution, as his encounter with Callistratus outside the city walls implies. As he gains more trustworthiness, the protagonist moves (and moves the readers too) into the city, where he gives

a detailed account of its architecture and its people. These changes of place also indicate a shift in the narrative progression: his exile leads him outside Borysthenes, his disagreement with Callistratus into the city, and his description of the chariot of Zeus into a metaphysical, celestial universe. Moreover, these topographical shifts also account for the readerly perception of the protagonist as a cosmopolitan figure and explain the Borysthenites' distorted sense of Greekness, which ultimately promotes a distance between them and the readers.

The third technique mostly concerns the last paragraph of the text, in which the protagonist apologises in advance in case the story presented was not appealing. Naturally, the protagonist, as a character narrator, has limited knowledge of the readerly perception of the story, but, as an alter ego of the author, his words reveal an indirect authorial commentary. In other words, in the same way that Dio reduces the distance with the protagonist at the beginning of the narrative, he applies the same technique at the end of it. Dio adopts a non-intrusive, indirect communication with his readers and adds authorial messages into the words of the protagonist in order to avoid confusion: a distance between them would undermine the reliability of the protagonist as a character narrator and would also fail to explain adequately why Dio decided to narrate the events himself, whereas the narrative is mainly told by the point of view of the protagonist.

The above observations have thus led me to examine a fusion of Dio and the protagonist, on the one hand, and readers and narratees, on the other. More specifically, the protagonist addresses his narratees, but at the same time Dio addresses the readers, who develop synthetic interests in the narrative and are thus concerned with issues of plot, progression, and reader response. It could thus be said that the readers identify with the narratees, but also deviate from them in passages that reveal a significant authorial commentary.

The examination of the three Dionic orations reveals striking information about the ways in which the author communicates with his readers, affects their responses to the texts, and is affected by their readerly responses. In these orations, Dio employs an alter ego, or as I have called him, a protagonist, who is presented as an exiled man of profound wisdom. This sympathetic image of the protagonist does, in fact, affect the readerly perception of Dio as a man who is expected to be as noble and wise as the protagonists in the different narratives are.

Once he has made sure that the readers are ready to delve into a dynamic rhetorical communication with him, Dio grants the protagonist narratorial properties, so that the telling of the narratives depends heavily on the point of view of the protagonist. Dio goes to great pains to present the protagonist in a favourable light by empathising with his predicament, by exerting his wisdom, and by acknowledging his sound sense of ethics. For the readers, this positive characterisation arouses mimetic, thematic, and synthetic interests because the protagonist is depicted as the successful example of a real-life man (mimetic) who has ethical qualities (thematic) that are also shared by Dio himself (synthetic).

Nevertheless, Dio does not solely rely on the characterisation of his protagonist, but employs several other rhetorical techniques to communicate with his readers. For example, he encourages the development of secondary and tertiary character narrators, who display either reliable or unreliable characteristics in their presentation of the events narrated. He also manipulates the time and the place of the narrative so that they are in harmony with the identity of the protagonist or with the gradual revelation of essential information about the progression of the narrative to the readers. Most importantly, Dio inserts direct (*or*. 7) or indirect (*orr*. 12, 36) commentaries into the speeches of some of the character narrators in order to affect the readerly perception of the narrative.

It goes without saying that the above techniques require careful usage of language and style. Dio employs language that is appropriate to the characters speaking (e.g. Sotades,

Pheidias, Hieroson, etc.), but he also sometimes allocates to characters a language that they are unfamiliar with (e.g. the hunter in the court) in order to reveal an authorial commentary or to destabilise the reliability of the character narrators. As regards style, he uses irony (e.g. through the theme of laughter in *or*. 7) in passages where the characters display characteristics that attract the readerly attention to thematic or synthetic interests.

Last but not least, Dio makes use of various philosophical systems of thought (Platonism, Aristotelianism, Stoic philosophy), poems (e.g. Homeric poems, Phocylidean poetry), or religious fables (e.g. the Zoroastrian myth) into the narratives. These elements, far from being haphazardly inserted, are carefully framed within the wider narrative content. So, for example, Hieroson – and through him the readers of *or*. 36 – acknowledges the presence of the Platonic *politeia* in the narrative, even though the protagonist – and though him, Dio – playfully claims that he does not want to be considered as an imitator of Plato.

All these characteristics amount to Dio's clever handling of rhetorical techniques used throughout the narratives and reveal the relational depth in which Dio engages his audience. That is to say, Dio relies on the active participation of the readers in the dynamic communication and attempts to affect, and be affected by, their perception of the narrative. It is thus no exaggeration to contend that Dio, in his *Euboicus*, *Olympicus*, and *Borystheniticus*, displays a mastery of multiple rhetorical techniques that amount to the successful construction of a deep dialectical relationship with his readers.

The aforementioned conclusions, despite concerning three Dionic discourses, can also be applied to the wider Dionic corpus. In fact, there are numerous cases in which Dio employs similar rhetorical techniques to the ones delineated to develop a dialectical, dynamic relationship with the readership: for instance, he reduces the distance between the audience and the protagonist by using the first person singular and presents the protagonist as an exiled man (e.g. *orr*. 13, 40, 43, 45) or as an ignorant, Socrates-like intellectual (e.g. *orr*. 34, 35, 38, 39,

47), thus cultivating a sympathetic image of the protagonist. He also employs secondary and tertiary, reliable or unreliable, character narrators (e.g. *orr*. 1, 3, 4, 6), with whom he identifies, or from whom he distances himself, or uses character-character dialogue (e.g. *orr*. 2, 21, 23, 25, 26) to convey a sense of directness to the readers. To these rhetorical techniques one could also add the handling of narrative time and space, the use of metanarratological comments and of irony, the malleability of the identity of the protagonist, the familiarity with previous literature, and so on.

A rhetorical narratological analysis of other Dionic discourses can open the way to research on how authors achieve communication with their readers and what kind of communication is achieved. Compared to other approaches of textual analysis, rhetorical narratology is not solely concerned with the internal logic of texts (as semiotic narratology), nor with their purely linguistic aspects (as formalist narratology), nor with the internal cognitive processes of the readers (as cognitive narratology). Instead, it successfully incorporates, and significantly expands, the sum of the capabilities of textual analysis by focusing equally on the author and the readers – as sociohistorical entities and as agents communicating through, and affecting, the narratives – as well as on textual phenomena pertaining to the rhetorical exchange between the agents.

The novelty of rhetorical narratology and, in particular, Phelan's theory of narrative, with its equal focus on authorial, textual, and readerly phenomena and the interaction between them, lies in the ways in which the various channels of communication that authors construct with their readers are encoded and subsequently decoded. However, these processes are by no means limited to specific genres, but can successfully be applied to other texts.

Phelanian theory is able to lay the foundations for a thorough analysis of texts previously neglected by narratology, such as rhetorical speeches. My analysis of the *Olympicus* has challenged the notion that the διήγησις (Lat. *narratio*, 'exposition') is the only part of a

rhetorical speech that is of narratological significance and, with the use of a rhetorically-informed methodology, it has revealed the multi-layered narrative mechanisms of communication between Dio and his readers. It goes without saying that the same procedure can be followed for a plethora of other rhetorical texts, even those from different eras and/or written in different languages. For instance, the Greek and Roman rhetorical production of the Imperial period, to which Dio belongs, comprises an impressive number of authors whose texts were composed either for oral delivery (Favorinus, Herodes Atticus, Aelius Aristides, Fronto, Lucian, Apuleius, Libanius, etc.) or for theoretical discussions on rhetoric (cf. Quintilian, Aphthonius, Aelius Theon, Hermogenes, etc.), and whose texts can be examined from a rhetorical narratological perspective.

These texts communicate significant authorial messages, ideas, and beliefs to readers by overtly pointing out their rhetorical characteristics (e.g. rhetorical speeches using the second person singular or plural), or by covertly using mechanisms aiming at promoting a certain communicative relationship with the recipients (e.g. texts that play with different levels of narration, with readerly expectations, with synthetic interests, and so on). To use an example similar to Dio, Lucian incorporates several rhetorical techniques in his works, by means of which he establishes a communication (sometimes overt sometimes covert) with his readers:[434] in his *Dream*, for instance, he reduces the distance between the readers and his protagonist by employing the first person singular; he undermines the reliability of the protagonist as a character narrator; and he also generates synthetic responses to the audience by suggesting to them possible interpretations of the work. Or, in his *Praise of the fly*, he attempts to convince his audience that the eulogy of an insect is insightful, as well as entertaining, by using a relaxed and at times ironic style, by communicating with previous encomiastic speeches, and by assuming for himself the role of an informed entomologist!

---

[434] On this see e.g. Ní Mheallaigh 2008.

To return to Dio, I hope that my rhetorical analysis of the *orr.* 7, 12, and 36 has adequately shown that the motif of the exile, which Dio promotes, cannot be solely considered as an authorial means of self-representation, but also as a mechanism that affects, and is subsequently affected by, the readers and their expectations for the narratives. My research has led me to the conclusion that Dio's employment of the theme of the exile serves communicative, pedagogical, aesthetic, and moral purposes, since, through it, he provokes particular responses to the readers and enhances their perception of him as a respectable intellectual.

As a result, to the existing bibliography, which regards the Dionic exile as historically unreliable (John Moles), as a narrative means for the creation of a fictional identity (Tim Whitmarsh), and as a socio-political dramatization of the Dionic persona (Christiane Krause), I would like to add that the theme of Dio's exile supports the development of the communication with the readers and constantly challenges, while appropriately redefining, readerly perceptions of Dio as an orator, a philosopher, and a teacher.

Such conclusions introduce a new dimension into Dionic studies, namely, the role that readers play in the formation of the texts. My approach has thus been characterised by a more nuanced position, since it takes a balanced view of the authorial, the textual, and the readerly dynamics: authorial intentions are impossible without the mediation of texts, which promote numerous rhetorical techniques through the use of linguistic signs, and readers, who serve as the receivers of authorial intentions; texts are also stripped of their essential purpose if they are separated from the rhetorical dimension between their composer (author) and their recipients (readers); last but not least, recipients lose their readerly status if there are no authors to mediate their intentions and no texts to codify these intentions.

My hope is that through the present thesis, which is the first that applies the rhetorical theory of narrative of James Phelan to any classical (Greek or Latin) text, other researchers too

will make use of this methodology for different genres of different eras and in different languages, and will thereby reveal some of the striking characteristics that still remain 'hidden' in these texts.

Bibliography

(Unless otherwise stated, titles of periodicals are cited according to the abbreviations in *L'Année Philologique*)

Abbott, Porter. 'Reading intended meaning where none is intended: A cognitivist reappraisal of the implied author', *Poetics Today* 32 (2011): 461-487.

Avram, Alexandru. 'The Propontic Coast of Asia Minor' In *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical* Poleis*: An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, edited by Mogens Herman Hansen and Thomas Heine Nielsen, 974-99. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Alexiou, Evangelos. 'Ρητορικές τεχνικές και ηθικές επιταγές στον *Ευβοϊκό* του Δίωνος Χρυσοστόμου', *Hellenica* 53 (2003): 305-26.

Allan, Rutger. 'Narrative Immersion: Some Linguistic and Narratological Aspects' In *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece. Under the Spell of Stories*. Cognitive Classics, edited by Jonas Grethlein, Luuk Huitink, and Aldo Tagliabue, 15-35. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Amato, Eugenio. *Studi su Favorino. Le orazioni pseudo-crisostomiche*. Salerno: Edisud Salerno, 1995.

Amato, Eugenio. *Traiani Praeceptor: Studi su biografia, cronologia e fortuna di Dione Crisostomo*. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comte, 2014.

Anderson, Graham. *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* London; Sydney; Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm, 1986.

Anderson, Graham. 'The *pepaideumenos* in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Empire.' *ANRW* II.33.1 (1989): 79-208.

Anderson, Graham. *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London; New York: Routledge, 1993.

Anderson, Graham. 'Some Uses of Storytelling in Dio' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 143-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Andrei, Osvalda. 'Il tema della concordia in Dione di Prusa (Or. xxxviii, xxxix, xl, xli). Ceti dominanti ed ideologia nel II sec. d.C.', *Studi e ricerche. Istituto di storia, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università degli studi di Firenze* 1 (1981): 89-120.

Auberger, Janick. 'Pausanias le Périégète et la Seconde Sophistique' In *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times/Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*, edited by Thomas Schmidt and Pascale Fleury, 133-45. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Avvisù, Elisa and Donadi, Francesco. *Dione di Prusa: Il Cacciatore*. Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1985.

Bäbler, Balbina. '"Long-haired Greeks in Trousers": Olbia and Dio Chrysostom (Or. 36, 'Borystheniticus')', *Ancient Civilizations* 8 (2002): 311-27.

Bäbler, Balbina. 'Dio Chrysostom's Construction of Olbia' In *Classical Olbia and the Scythian World: From the Sixth Century BC to the Second Century AD*. Proceedings of the British Academy, edited by David Braund and Sergej Dmitrievič Kryžhitskiy, 145-60. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Bal, Mieke. 'Notes on Narrative Embedding', *Poetics Today* 2 (1981): 41-59.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative.* Fourth edition. Toronto; Buffallo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Barros, Carolyn. *Autobiography: Narrative of Transformation*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Barthes, Roland. 'The Death of the Author' In *Image, Music, Text*, translated by Stephen Heath, 142-8. New York: Hill & Wang, 1977.

Becker, Andrew. 'The 'Theologia Tripertita' in Dio Chrysostom's Olympian Oration', *CW* 87 (1993): 67-71.

Becker, Andrew. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis*. Maryland; London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1995.

Bekker-Nielsen, Tønnes. *Urban Life and Local Politics in Roman Bithynia: The Small World of Dion Chrysostomos*. Black Sea Studies 7. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2008.

Bekker-Nielsen, Tønnes. 'Die Wanderjahre des Dion von Prusa' In *Mobilität in den Kulturen der antiken Mittelmeerwelt: Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 11, 2011*. Geographica Historica 31, edited by Eckart Olshausen and Vera Sauer, 25-33. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014.

Bekker-Nielsen, Tønnes and Hinge, George. 'Dio Chrysostom in exile: *Or*. 36.1 and the date of the Scythian journey', *CQ* 65 (2015): 747-55.

Belin de Ballu, Eugène. *Olbia: Cité antique du littoral Nord de la mer Noire*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Berry, Edmund. 'Dio Chrysostom the Moral Philosopher', *G&R* 30 (1983): 70-80.

Betz, Hans Dieter. 'Paraenesis and the concept of God according to *Oratio XII* (*Olympikos*) of Dio of Prousa' In *Early Christian paraenesis in context*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 125, edited by James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 217-34. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.

Billault, Alain. 'La composition politique du *Discours* VII de Dion Chrysostome', *REG* 126 (2013): 85-102.

Bloomer, Martin B. 'Latinitas' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson, 67-79. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Bonazzi, Mauro and Opsomer, Jan. (eds) *The Origins of the Platonic System: Platonisms of the Early Empire and their Philosophical Contexts*. Collection d' Études Classiques 23. Louvain; Namur; Paris; Walpole, MA: Éditions Peeters; Société des Études Classiques, 2009.

Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the elder Cato to the younger Pliny*. Routledge Library Editions: Education 91. London; New York: Routledge, 2012.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Second edition. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Booth, Wayne. 'Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?' In *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 33, edited by James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz, 75-88. MA; Oxford; Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Borg, Barbara. (ed.) *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Millennium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 2. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004a.

Borg, Barbara. 'Glamorous intellectuals: Portraits of *pepaideumenoi* in the second and third centuries AD' In *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Millennium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 2, edited by Barbara Borg, 157-78. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004b.

Bost-Pouderon, Cécile. 'Ethnographie et utopie chez Dion Chrysostome (*Or.* 35, 18-22 et *Or.* 7, 1-80)', *Kentron* 24 (2008): 105-122.

Bost-Pouderon, Cécile. *Dion de Pruse dit Dion Chrysostome. Oeuvres: Premier discours à Tarse (*Or. *XXXIII), Second discours à Tarse (*Or. *XXXIV), Discours à Célènes de Phrygie (*Or. *XXXV), Discours Borysthénitique (*Or. *XXXVI). Texte établi, traduit et annoté*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011.

Bowersock, Glen. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Bowersock, Glen. 'Philosophy in the Second Sophistic' In *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin*, edited by Gillian Clark and Tessa Rajak, 157-72. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Bowie, Ewen. 'Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic' In *Studies in Ancient Society*. Past and Present, edited by Moses Finley, 166-209. London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Bowie, Ewen. 'Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality', *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978): 1652-99.

Brancacci, Aldo. 'Tradizione cinica e problemi di datazione nelle Orazioni Diogeniane di Dione Crisostomo', *Elenchos* I (1980): 92-121.

Brancacci, Aldo. *Rhetorike Philosophousa. Dione Crisostomo nella cultura antica e bizantina.* Elenchos 11. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1985.

Brancacci, Aldo. 'Dio, Socrates, and Cynicism' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 240-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Brancacci, Aldo. 'Dion Chrysostome entre cynisme, stoïcisme, et Platon: axiologie, *mos maiorum* et vie heureuse dans l' *Euboïque*' In *Dion de Pruse, l'homme, son oeuvre et sa posterité: actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, and Thierry Grandjean, 101-22. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016.

Brancacci, Aldo. 'Dione Crisostomo tra Cinismo, Stoicismo e Platone' In *Studi su Ellenismo e Filosofia romana*. Studi di Storia della Filosofia antica 5, edited by Francesca Alesse, Arianna Fermani, and Stefano Maso, 95-122. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2017.

Brenk, Frederick. 'Dio on the Simple and Self-Sufficient Life' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 261-78. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Brockmeier, Jens. 'Autobiography, narrative, and the Freudian concept of life history', *Philosophy, Psychiatry, and Psychology* 4 (1997): 175–199.

Bromberg, Jacques A. 'Sport and Peace: Panhellenic Myth-Making and the Modern Olympics' In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Ancient Rhetoric*. Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 23, edited by Sophia Papaioannou, Andreas Serafim, and Michael Edwards, 356-78. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2022.

Bruner, Jerome. 'The autobiographical process' In *The Culture of Autobiography*, edited by Robert Folkenflik, 38–56. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Brunt, Peter. 'Aspects of the Social Thought of Dio Chrysostom and of the Stoics', *PCPS* 19 (1973): 9-34.

Brunt, Peter. 'The Bubble of the Second Sophistic', *BICS* 39 (1994): 25-52.

Bryen, Ari. 'Politics, Justice, and Reform in Dio's *Euboicus*', *TAPA* 149 (2019): 127-48.

Busch, Austin. 'Gnostic Biblical and Second Sophistic Homeric Interpretation', *ZAC* 22 (2018): 195-217.

Cavarero, Adriana. *Relating narratives: Storytelling and selfhood*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Chambers, Ross. *Story and Situation: Narrative Seduction and the Power of Fiction*. Theory and History of Literature 12. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Chatzigiannis, Christos. 'The tragic myth of Philoctetes in Dio Chrysostom's *Oration LII*: rhetorical aspects in literary criticism' In *Myth and Rhetoric – Mythos und Rhetorik. Novel Approaches to Greek Tragedy*. Vertumnus. Berliner Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie und zu ihren Nachbargebieten 13, edited by Sabrina Mancuso and Vanessa Zetzmann, Ruprecht: Edition Ruprecht, forthcoming.

Chiron, Pierre. *Manuel de Rhétorique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2018.

Clark, Matthew and Phelan, James. *Debating Rhetorical Narratology: On the Synthetic, Mimetic, and Thematic Aspects of Narrative*. Theory and Interpretation of Narrative. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2020.

Cohoon, James. *Dio Chrysostom: Discourses 1-11*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Cohoon, James. *Dio Chrysostom: Discourses 12-30*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Cohoon, James and Crosby, Lamar. *Dio Chrysostom. Discourses 31-36*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Connolly, Joy. 'Reclaiming the Theatrical in the Second Sophistic', *Helios* 28 (2001a): 75-96.

Connolly, Joy. 'Problems of the Past in Imperial Greek Education' In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity,* edited by Yun Lee Too, 339-72. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001b.

Cordovana, Orietta and Galli, Marco. (eds.) *Arte e memoria culturale nell'età della Seconda Sofistica*. Catania: Edizioni del Prisma, 2007.

Cotton, Anne. *Platonic Dialogue and the Education of the Reader*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Currie, Mark. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. Second edition. Transitions. Hampshire; New York: Red Globe Press London, 2011.

Currie, Mark. *Metafiction*. London; New York: Routledge, 2013.

Deligiannakis, Georgios. 'Religious Viewing of Sculptural Images of Gods in the World of Late Antiquity: From Dio Chrysostom to Damaskios', *JLA* 8 (2015): 168-94.

Dench, Emma. 'Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter and William Johnson, 99-114. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Desideri, Paolo. *Dione di Prusa. Un intellettuale greco nell' impero romano*. Messina; Firenze: G. D' Anna, 1978.

Desideri, Paolo. 'Dio's exile: politics, philosophy, literature' In *Writing Exile*: *The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. Mnemosyne Supplements 283, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 193-207. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.

Desideri, Paolo. 'Greek *Poleis* and the Roman Empire: Nature and Features of Political Virtues in an Autocratic System' In *Virtues for the People: Aspects of Plutarchan Ethics*. Plutarchea hypomnemata, edited by Geert Roskam and Luc Van der Stockt, 83-98. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2011.

Desideri, Paolo. 'Platonismo di Dione', *AntPhilos* 12 (2018): 51-68.

Desideri, Paolo. *Ellenismo Imperiale. Nuovi studi su Dione di Prusa*. Studi ellenistici 4. Pisa; Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2019.

Di Febo, Michele. *Dione di Prusa. Boristenitico (*Or. *XXXVI*). Lanciano: Carabba, 2020.

Dörrie, Heinrich and Baltes, Matthias. *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus. Bausteine 73-100: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Stuttgart, Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-holzboog, 1993.

Drules, Pierre-Alain. 'Dion de Pruse lecteur d' Homère', *Gaia* 3 (1998): 59-79.

Eakin, Paul John. *Fictions in autobiography: Studies in the art of self-invention*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Edwards, Michael. 'Antiphon' In *Narrators, Narratees, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative 1*. Mnemosyne 257, edited by Irene de Jong, René Nünlist, and Angus Bowie, 317-23. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. (ed.) *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE—100 CE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Engster, Dorit. 'Fiktion oder Realität? Dions *Euboikos Logos* in der althistorischen Forschungsdiskussion seit Eduard Meyer' In *Armut - Arbeit - Menschenwürde: Die Euböische Rede des Dion von Prusa*, by Gustav Adolf Lehmann, Dorit Engster, Hans Rupprecht Goette, Elisabeth Herrmann-Otto, Werner Heun, and Barbara Zehnpfennig, 143-65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck GmbH and KG, 2012.

Eshleman, Kendra. 'Defining the Circle of Sophists: Philostratus and the Construction of the Second Sophistic', *CP* 103 (2008): 395-413.

Eshleman, Kendra. *The Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire: Sophists, Philosophers, and Christians*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Folkenflik, Robert. (ed.) *The culture of autobiography*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Fornaro, Sotera. 'Inhalt und Themen der Reden' In *Dion von Prusa: Der Philosoph und sein Bild*. SAPERE 13, edited by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 3-20. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Fornaro, Sotera. 'Dion Chrysostomos und Euripides' In *Euripides-Rezeption in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Millennium-Studien/Millennium Studies 83, edited by Michael Schramm, 153-76. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2020.

Forschner, Maximilian. 'Philosophie und Politik: Dions philosophische Botschaft im *Borysthenitikos*' In *Dion von Prusa. Menschliche Gemeinschaft und Göttliche Ordnung. Die Borysthenes-Rede*. SAPERE 6, edited by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, Balbina Bäbler, Maximilian Forschner, and Albert de Jong, 128-56. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. 'Qu' est-ce qu' un auteur ?', *BSPh* 3 (1969): 73-104.

Fowler, Ryan. 'Variations of Receptions of Plato during the Second Sophistic' In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*. Brill's Companions to Classical Receptions 13, edited by Harold Tarrant, Danielle Layne, Dirk Baltzly, and François Renaud, 223-49. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018.

François, Louis. *Essay sur Dion Chrysostome: philosophe et moraliste cynique et stoïcien*. Diss. Paris, 1921.

Freeman, Mark. *Rewriting the self: History, memory, narrative*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Freeman, Mark. 'Culture, narrative, and the poetic construction of selfhood', *Journal of Constructivist Psychology* 12 (1999): 99–116.

Freyburger-Galland, Marie-Laure. 'Dion de Pruse, Dion de Nicée: vision du principat et des premiers empereurs chez Dion Chrysostome et chez son « arrière-neveu » Dion Cassius' In *Dion de Pruse : l'homme, son oeuvre et sa postérité. Actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, Thierry

Grandjean, Lucie Thévenet, and Gianluca Ventrella, 17-30. Hildesheim; Zurich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2016.

Fron, Christian. *Bildung und Reisen in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Pepaideumenoi und Mobilität zwischen dem 1. und 4. Jh. n. Chr*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 146. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2021.

Futre Pinheiro, Marília. 'Thoughts on *Diēgēma* (*Narratio*) in ancient rhetoric and in modern critical theory' In *Literary Currents and Romantic Forms: Essays in Memory of Bryan Reardon*. Ancient Narrative 26, edited by Kathryn Chew, J.R. Morgan, and Stephen M. Trzaskoma, 19-32. Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Library, 2018.

Gall, Dorothee. 'Mythos, Utopie und Sozialprogramm. Struktur und Gattung des *Euboikos Logos*' In *Armut - Arbeit - Menschenwürde: Die Euböische Rede des Dion von Prusa*, edited by Gustav Adolf Lehmann, Dorit Engster, Hans Rupprecht Goette, Elisabeth Herrmann-Otto, Werner Heun, and Barbara Zehnpfennig, 123-42. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck GmbH and KG, 2012.

Galli, Marco. 'Pepaideumenoi am Ort des Heiligen: Kommunikations-formen und euergetische Initiativen in griechischen Heiligtu̇mern zur Zeit der Zweiten Sophistik' In *Griechenland in der Kaiserzeit: Neue Funde und Forschungen zu Skulptur, Architektur und Topographie*, edited by Christoph Reusser, 43-71. Bern: Institut für Klassische Archäologie der Universität Bern, 2001.

Gangloff, Anne. *Dion Chrysostome et les mythes. Hellénisme, communication et philosophie politique*. Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon, 2006.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Girt, John Michael. *Stoic Philosophy*. London; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Gleason, Maud. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Goette, Hans Rupprecht. 'Die Topographie der Karystia in der Euböischen Rede des Dion von Prusa – Autopsie oder Fiktion?' In *Armut - Arbeit - Menschenwürde: Die Euböische Rede des Dion von Prusa*, edited by Gustav Adolf Lehmann, Dorit Engster, Hans Rupprecht Goette, Elisabeth Herrmann-Otto, Werner Heun, and Barbara Zehnpfennig, 167-89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck GmbH and KG, 2012.

Goldhill, Simon. (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Gowing, Alain. 'Dio's Name', *CP* 85 (1990): 49-54.

Guerber, Éric. 'Dion de Pruse, la cité grecque et les gouverneurs romains: un discours multiple?' In *Dion de Pruse: l'homme, son oeuvre et sa postérité. Actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, Thierry Grandjean, Lucie Thévenet, and Gianluca Ventrella, 31-58. Hildesheim; Zurich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2016.

Gusdorf, Georges. 'Conditions and Limits of Autobiography' In *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, edited by James Olney, 28-48. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Gyselinck, Wannes and Demoen, Kristoffel. 'Author and narrator: fiction and metafiction in Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii*' In *Theios Sophistes: Essays on Flavius Philostratus*' Vita Apollonii, edited by Kristoffel Demoen and Danny Praet, 95-128. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Habinek, Thomas. 'Was There a Latin Second Sophistic?' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson, 25-37. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Harris, Bruce. 'Bithynia: Roman Sovereignty and the Survival of Hellenism' In *ANRW* VII.2 (1980): 857-901.

Hass, Petra. *Der locus amoenus in der antiken Literatur: Zu Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Motivs*. Bamberg: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1998.

Hawhee, Debra. *Bodily Arts. Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.

Heath, Malcolm. *Ancient Philosophical Poetics*. Key Themes in Ancient Philosophy. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Heinze, Ruediger. 'Violations of Mimetic Epistemology in First-Person Narrative Fiction', *Narrative* 16.3 (2008): 279–97.

Henderson, Ian. 'The Second Sophistic and Non-Elite Speakers' In *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times/Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*, edited by Thomas Schmidt and Pascale Fleury, 23-35. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Herman, David, James Phelan, Peter Rabinowitz, Brian Richardson, and Robyn Warhol. (eds.) *Narrative Theory: Core Concepts and Critical Debates*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2012.

Hertz, Géraldine. 'Dion aux prises avec la θεία καὶ ἀμήχανος φύσις: étude de l' Olympikos et de son ancrage platonicien' In *Dion de Pruse: l'homme, son oeuvre et sa postérité. Actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, Thierry Grandjean, Lucie Thévenet, and Gianluca Ventrella, 199-215. Hildesheim; Zurich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2016.

Highet, Gilbert. 'The Huntsman and the Castaway', *GRBS* 14 (1973): 35-40.

Hodgson, Peter. 'Metaliterature: An Excerpt from the Anatomy of a Chekhovian Narrator', *Pacific Coast Philology* 7 (1972): 36-42.

Hodkinson, Owen. 'Les lettres dangeureuses: Epistolary narrative as metafiction in the Epistles of Chion of Heraclea' In *Some Organic Readings in Narrative, Ancient and Modern. Gathered and originally presented as a book for John*, edited by Ian Repath and Fritz-Gregor Herrmann, 127-54. Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 2019.

Holzberg, Niklas. 'Rhetoric: Dio Chrysostom' In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Mnemosyne: Bibliotheca Classica Batava 159, edited by Gareth Schmeling, 640-4. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Hopkinson, Neil. *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Horst, Claudia. *Marc Aurel: Philosophie und politische Macht zur Zeit der Zweiten Sophistik*. Historia–Einzelschriften 225. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013.

Hughes, Donald. 'The Hunters of Euboea: Mountain Folk in the Classical Mediterranean', *Mountain Research and Development* 16 (1996): 91-100.

Hunter, Richard. 'The *Trojan Oration* of Dio Chrysostom and Ancient Homeric Criticism' In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volume 4, edited by Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos, 43-61. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Hupe, Joachim. 'Die olbische Achilleus-Verehrung in der römischen Kaiserzeit' In *Der Achilleus-Kult im nördlichen Schwarzmeerraum vom Beginn der griechischen Kolonisation bis in die römische Kaiserzeit. Beiträge zur Akkulturationsforschung*. Internationale Archäologie 94, edited by Joachim Hupe, 165-234. Rahden, Westphalia: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2006.

Hupe, Joachim. 'Aspekte des Achilleus Pontarches-Kultes in Olbia' In *Une Koine pontique. Cités greques, sociétés indigènes et empires mondiaux sur le littoral nord de la Mer Noire (VIIe s. a.C. – IIIe s. p.C.)*. Mémoires 18, edited by Alain Bresson, Askold Ivantchik, and Jean-Louis Ferrary, 213-23. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2007.

Hyland, Drew. 'Why Plato Wrote Dialogues', *Ph&Rh* 1 (1968): 38–50.

Inwood, Brad. 'The Legacy of Musonius Rufus' In *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE*, edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 254-276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Inwood, Brad. *Later Stoicism. 155 BC to AD 200. An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Cambridge Source Books in Post-Hellenistic Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Jackson, Claire. 'Dio Chrysostom.' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter and William Johnson, 217-32. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Jarratt, Susan. *Chain of Gold. Greek Rhetoric in the Roman Empire*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2019.

Johnson, William and Richter, Daniel. 'Periodicity and Scope' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter and William Johnson, 3-9. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Jolly, Margaretta. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of life writing: Autobiographical and biographical forms* (vols. 2). London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001.

de Jong, Albert. 'Dions Magierhymnen: zoroastrischer Mythos oder griechische Phantasie?' In *Dion von Prusa. Menschliche Gemeinschaft und Göttliche Ordnung. Die Borysthenes-Rede*. SAPERE 6, edited by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, Balbina Bäbler, Maximilian Forschner, and Albert de Jong, 157-78. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003.

Jones, Christopher. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Loeb Classical Monographs. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Jones, Christopher. 'Multiple identities in the age of the Second Sophistic' In *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Millennium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 2., edited by Barbara Borg, 13-21. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Jouan, François. 'Les themes romanesques dans l' Euboicos de Dion Chrysostome', *REG* 90 (1977): 38-46.

Jouan, François. 'Les récits de voyage de Dion Chrysostome: réalité et fiction' In *L' Invention de l' autobiographie d' Hésiode à saint Augustin. Actes du deuxième colloque de l' Équipe de*

recherche sur l' hellénisme post-classique (Paris, École normale supérieure, 14-16 juin 1990), edited by Marie-Françoise Baslez, Philippe Hoffmann and Laurent Pernot, 189-98. Paris: Presses de l' École Normale Superieure, 1993.

Kasprzyk, Dimitri. 'Dio Chrysostom' In *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Literature 4*. Mnemosyne 411, edited by Koen De Temmerman and Evert van Ende Boas, 523-41. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018.

Kasprzyk, Dimitri and Vendries, Christophe. *Spectacles et désordre à Alexandrie: Dion de Pruse Discours aux Alexandrins*. Collection Histoire. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2012.

Kemezis, Adam. 'Narrative of Cultural Geography in Philostratus's *Lives of the Sophists'* In *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times/Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*, edited by Thomas Schmidt and Pascale Fleury, 3-22. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Kim, Lawrence. *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Kim, Lawrence. 'Atticism and Asianism' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter Daniel and William Johnson, 41-66. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Kindstrand, Jan Frederik. *Homer in der zweiten Sophistik: Studien zu der Homerlektüre und dem Homerbild bei Dion von Prusa, Maximos von Tyros, und Ailios Aristeides*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 7. Upsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1973.

Kindt, Tom and Müller, Hans-Harald. *The Implied Author. Concept and Controversy.* Narratologia: Contributions to Narrative Theory/Beiträge zur Erzähltheorie. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

Kindt, Tom and Müller, Hans-Harald. 'Six Ways Not to Save the Implied Author', *Style* 45 (2011): 67-79.

Klauck, Hans-Josef and Bäbler, Balbina. *Dion von Prusa. Olympische Rede oder Über die erste Erkenntnis Gottes.* SAPERE 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000.

Krause, Christiane. *Strategie der Selbstinszenierung: Das rhetorische Ich in den Reden Dions von Prusa*. Serta Graeca 16. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2003.

Kremmydas, Christos. 'The Rhetoric of *Homonoia* in Dio Chrysostom's Civic Orations' In *The Rhetoric of Unity and Division in Ancient Literature*, edited by Andreas Michalopoulos, Andreas Serafim, Flaminia Beneventano della Corte, and Alessandro Vatri, 293-316. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2021.

Lamar Crosby, Henry. *Dio Chrysostom. Discourses 61-80*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Lauwers, Jeroen. 'Reading Books, Talking Culture: The Performance of *Paideia* in Imperial Greek Literature' In *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World*. vol. 9; Mnemosyne Supplements: Monographs on Greek and Roman Language and Literature 335, edited by Elizabeth Minchin, 227-44. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.

Lefteratou, Anna. *Mythological Narratives. The Bold and Faithful Heroines of the Greek Novel.* MythosEikonPoiesis. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Lehmann, Gustav. 'Anmerkungen zur Übersetzung' In *Armut - Arbeit - Menschenwürde: Die Euböische Rede des Dion von Prusa*, edited by Gustav Adolf Lehmann, Dorit Engster, Hans Rupprecht Goette, Elisabeth Herrmann-Otto, Werner Heun, and Barbara Zehnpfennig, 86-120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck GmbH and KG, 2012.

Lively, Genevieve. *Narratology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Ma, John. 'Public Speech and Community in the *Euboicus*' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 108-24. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Macrae, Andrea. *Discourse Deixis in Metafiction. The Language of Metanarration, Metalepsis and Disnarration*. Routledge Studies in Rhetoric and Stylistics. New York; London: Routledge, 2019.

Madsen, Jesper. *Eager to be Roman. Greek Response to Roman Rule in Pontus and Bithynia*. London; New Delhi; New York; Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2009.

Marrou, Henri-Irénée. *Histoire de l' éducation dans l' Antiquité. Tome 1: Le monde grec*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1948.

Méthy, Nicole. 'Dion Chrysostome et la domination romaine', *AC* 63 (1994): 173-92.

Milazzo, Antonino. *Dimensione retorica e realtà politica. Dione di Prusa nelle orazioni III, V, VII, VIII*. Spudasmata 115. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag AG, 2007.

Milazzo, Antonino. 'Il tema retorico della 'scelta di vita' nell' *Euboico*' In *Dion de Pruse, l'homme, son oeuvre et sa posterité: actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, and Thierry Grandjean, 123-32. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016.

Misch, Georg. *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity.* 2 vols. The International Library of Sociology. Trans. in collaboration with the author by Ernest Walter Dickes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Moles, John. 'The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *JHS* 98 (1978): 79-100.

Moles, John. 'The Thirteenth Oration of Dio Chrysostom: Complexity and Simplicity, Rhetoric and Moralism, Literature and Life', *JHS* 125 (2005): 112-38.

Mondolfo, Rodolfo. 'Evidence of Plato and Aristotle relating to the *Ekpyrosis* in Heraclitus 1', Phronesis 3 (1958): 75-82.

Montgomery, Walter. *Dio Chrysostom as a Homeric Critic.* Diss., Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1901.

Moreschini, Claudio. 'Dione di Prusa tra stoicismo e medioplatonismo: una 'filosofia popolare'?' In *Dion de Pruse: l'homme, son oeuvre et sa postérité. Actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, Thierry Grandjean, Lucie Thévenet, and Gianluca Ventrella, 133-46. Hildesheim; Zurich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2016.

Morgan, Teresa. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther, Bäbler, Balbina, Forschner, Maximilian, and de Jong, Albert. *Dion von Prusa. Menschliche Gemeinschaft und Göttliche Ordnung. Die Borysthenes-Rede.* SAPERE 6. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther. 'Einführung in die Schrift' In: *Dion von Prusa. Menschliche Gemeinschaft und Göttliche Ordnung. Die Borysthenes-Rede.* SAPERE 6, edited by Heinz-Günther

Nesselrath, Balbina Bäbler, Maximilian Forschner, and Albert de Jong, 11-26. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003a.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther. 'Die Borysthenes-Rede: Anmerkungen zur Übersetzung' In *Dion von Prusa. Menschliche Gemeinschaft und Göttliche Ordnung. Die Borysthenes-Rede*. SAPERE 6, edited by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, Balbina Bäbler, Maximilian Forschner, and Albert de Jong, 66-92. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003b.

Nielsen, Henrik Skov. 'The impersonal voice in first-person narrative fiction', *Narrative* 12.2 (2004): 133-150.

Nikolsky, Boris. 'Images of Zeus in Dio's Olympian Oration' In *Dion de Pruse: l'homme, son oeuvre et sa postérité. Actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, Thierry Grandjean, Lucie Thévenet, and Gianluca Ventrella, 177-84. Hildesheim; Zurich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2016.

Ní Mheallaigh, Karen. 'Pseudo-Documentarism and the Limits of Ancient Fiction', *AJPhil* 129 (2008): 403-31.

Ní Mheallaigh, Karen. *Reading Fiction with Lucian: Fakes, Freaks, and Hyperreality*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Noël, Marie-Pierre. 'Discours panhellénique et discours de conseil: des *Olympiques* de Gorgias et Lysias au *Panégyrique* d'Isocrate', *DHA* suppl. 17 (2017): 291-299.

Nünning, Ansgar. 'Deconstructing and Reconceptualizing the Implied Author: The Resurrection of an Anthropomorphized Passepartout or the Obituary of a Critical Phantom?', *Anglistik. Organ des Verbandes Deutscher Anglisten* 8 (1997): 95-116.

Nünning, Ansgar. 'Unreliable, Compared to What? Towards a Cognitive Theory of Unreliable Narration: Prolegomena and Hypothesis' In *Grenzüberschreitungen: Narratologie in Kontext / Transcending Boundaries: Narratology in Context*. Walter Grünzweig and Andreas Solbach, 53-73. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1999.

Nünning, Ansgar. 'Implied Author' In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan, 239-40. London; New York: Routledge, 2005a.

Nünning, Ansgar. 'Reconceptualizing Unreliable Narration: Synthesizing Cognitive and Rhetorical Approaches' In *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 33, edited by James Phelan and Peter Rabinowitz, 89-107. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005b.

O'Sullivan, Patrick. 'Dio Chrysostom and the Poetics of Phidias' Zeus.' In *The Statue of Zeus at Olympia: New Approaches*, edited by Janette McWilliam, Sonia Puttock, Tom Stevenson, and Rashna Taraporewalla, 137-54. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

Pavlík, Jiří. *Dión Chrýsostomos o výtvarném umění, náboženství a filosofii. Řeč olympijská*. Karolinum: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 2004.

Pepe, Cristina. *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. International Studies in the History of Rhetoric 5. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.

Pernot, Laurent. *Rhetoric in Antiquity*. Trans. W.E. Higgins. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Phelan, James. *Reading People, Reading Plots: Character, Progression, and the Interpretation of Narrative*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Phelan, James. *Narrative as Rhetoric: Technique, Audiences, Ethics, Ideology*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1996.

Phelan, James. *Living to Tell about It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Phelan, James. *Experiencing Fiction: Judgments, Progressions, and the Rhetorical Theory of Narrative*. Theory and Interpretation of Narrative. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2007.

Phelan, James. 'The Implied Author, Deficient Narration, and Nonfiction Narrative: Or, What's Off-Kilter in The Year of Magical Thinking and The Diving Bell and the Butterfly?', *Style* 45.1 (2011): 119-137.

Phelan, James. *Somebody Telling Somebody Else: A Rhetorical Poetics of Narrative*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2017.

Phelan, James and Rabinowitz, Peter. 'Authors, Narrators, Narration' In *Narrative Theory: Core Concepts and Critical Debates*. Theory and Interpretation of Narrative, edited by David Herman, James Phelan, Peter Rabinowitz, Brian Richardson, and Robyn Warhol, 29-38. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2012.

Podossinov, Alexander. 'Barbarians and Greeks in the Northern Pontus in the Roman Period: Dio Chrysostom's Account of Olbia and Archaeology', *AWE* 8 (2009): 147-68.

Preston, Rebecca. 'Roman questions, Greek answers: Plutarch and the construction of identity' In *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 86-119. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Prince, Gerald. 'A Point of View on Point of View or Refocusing Focalization' In *New Perspectives on Narrative Perspective*, edited by Willie van Peer and Seymour Chatman, 43-50. Albany: SUNY Press, 2001.

Prince, Gerald. *A Dictionary of Narratology: Revised Edition*. Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.

Prince, Gerald. 'Reader', In *Handbook of Narratology*. Narratologia: Contributions to Narrative Theory 19, edited by Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert, 398-410. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Rabinowitz, Peter. '"The Absence of Her Voice from that Concord": The Value of the Implied Author', *Style* 45 (2011): 99-108.

Rappe, Sara. 'Socrates and self-knowledge', *Apeiron* 28.1 (1995): 1-24.

Reydams-Schils, Gretchen. 'The Stoics' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter and William Johnson, 527-37. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Richardson, Brian. 'Introduction. The Implied Author: Back from the Grave or Simply Dead Again?', *Style* 45.1 (2011): 1–10.

Richter, Daniel and Johnson, William (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Rimmon-Kenan, Schlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. New York: Methuen, 1983.

Rohde, Erwin. 'Die asianische Rhetorik und die zweite Sophistik', *RhM* 41 (1886): 170-90.

Russell, Donald. *Dio Chrysostom, Orations VII, XII, XXXVI*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. 'Meaning, intent, and the implied author', *Style* 45.1 (2011): 29-47.

Saïd, Suzanne. 'Rural Society in the Greek Novel, or The Country Seen from the Town' In *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, edited by Simon Swain, 83-107. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Salmeri, Giovanni. 'Per una biografia di Dione di Prusa: Politica ed economia nella Bitinia imperiale (I-II s. d. C.)', *SicGymn* 33, 1980, 671-715.

Salmeri, Giovanni. 'Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 53-92. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Schlapbach, Karin. 'The pleasance, solitude, and literary production. The transformation of the *locus amoenus* in Late Antiquity', *JAC* 2007, 34-50.

Schmid, Wilhelm. *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, 4 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1887-96.

Schmid, Wilhelm. 'Dion (18.)', *RE* V.1 (1905): coll. 848-77.

Schmid, Wolf. 'Implied Author' In *Handbook of Narratology*. Narratologia: Contributions to Narrative Theory 19, edited by Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, and Jörg Schönert, 161-73. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Schmidt, Thomas and Fleury, Pascale. (eds.) *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times/Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Schmidt, Thomas. 'Sophistes, barbares et identité greque: le cas de Dion Chrysostome' In *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times/Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*, edited by Thomas Schmidt and Pascale Fleury, 105-19. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Schmitz, Thomas. *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Zetemata 97. Munich: Beck, 1997.

Schmitz, Thomas. 'Narrator and audience in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*' In *Philostratus*. Greek Culture in the Roman World, edited by Ewen Bowie and Jaś Elsner, 49-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Schmitz, Thomas. 'Professionals of *paideia*? The Sophists as Performers' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter and William Johnson, 169-80. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Schofield, Malcolm. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Scholes, Robert. 'Metafiction', *The Iowa Review* 1 (1970): 100–15.

Schönbeck, Gerhard. *Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz*. Cologne: Gerd Wasmund, 1964.

Seng, Helmut. 'Die Kontroverse um Dion von Prusa und Synesius von Kyrene', *Hermes* 134 (2006): 10-216.

Shen, Dan. 'Implied Author, Overall Consideration, and Subtext of "Désirée's Baby"', *Poetics Today* 31 (2010): 285-311.

Shen, Dan. 'What is the Implied Author?', *Style* 45 (2011): 80-98.

Shen, Dan. 'Implied author, authorial audience, and context: Form and history in Neo-Aristotelian rhetorical theory', *Narrative* 21.2 (2013): 140-158.

Sheppard, Antony. 'Dio Chrysostom: The Bithynian Years', *AC* 53 (1984): 157-73.

Sidebottom, Harry. 'The Date of Dio of Prusa's Rhodian and Alexandrian Orations', *Historia* 41 (1992): 407-19.

Sidebottom, Harry. 'Dio of Prusa and the Flavian Dynasty', *CQ* 46 (1996): 447-56.

Stanton, Greg. 'Sophists and Philosophers: Problems of Classification', *AJP* 94 (1973): 351–364.

Swain, Simon. 'Favorinus and Hadrian', *ZPE* 79 (1989): 150-58.

Swain, Simon. 'The Reliability of Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*', *CA* 10 (1991): 148-63.

Swain, Simon. 'Dio and Lucian' In *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, edited by John Morgan and Richard Stoneman, 166-80. London: Routledge, 1994.

Swain, Simon. *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Swain, Simon. 'Dio's Life and Works' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 1-10. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Tally Jr., Robert. *Spatiality*. The new critical idiom. London; New York: Routledge, 2013.

Terrei, Sabrina. 'I *Getica* di Dione Crisostomo', *Aevum* 74 (2000): 177-86.

Thornsteinsson, Runar. *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism. A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Tommasi, Chiara. 'Le chant sacré des Mages (D. Chr. 36, 39-60): croyances iraniennes en tenue greque' In *Dion de Pruse, l'homme, son oeuvre et sa posterité: actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, and Thierry Grandjean, 147-75. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016.

Torraca Luigi, Rotunno Anna, and Scannapieco Rosario, *Dione di Prusa, Olympico (or. XII). Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Napoli: Luziano editore, 2005.

Trapp, Michael. 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature' In *Antonine Literature*, edited by Donald Russell, 141-73. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Trapp, Michael. 'Plato in Dio' In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by Simon Swain, 213-39. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Trapp, Michael. 'Beyond Plato and Xenophon: some other ancient Socrateses' In *Socrates from Antiquity to the Enlightment*. Centre For Hellenic Studies, King's College London 9, edited by Michael Trapp, 51-63. London; New York: Routledge, 2007.

Trapp, Michael. 'Laughter and the Moral Guidance: Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch' In *Laughter, Humour, and Comedy in Ancient Philosophy*, edited by Pierre Destrée and Franco Trivigno, 145-62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Usener, Knut. 'Ekpyrosis – ein (nicht nur) mythologisches Denkmodell in der Antike: Der Weltenbrand in der antiken Literatur' In *Der eine Gott und die Völker in eschatologischer Perspektive. Studien zur Inklusion und Exklusion im biblischen Monotheismus*. Biblisch–Theologische Studien 137, edited by Luke Neubert and Michael Tilly, 149-81. Göttingen: Hubert & Co., 2013.

Vagnone, Gustavo. 'L'esegesi omerica di Dione di Prusa: metodi e modelli' In *Dion de Pruse, l'homme, son oeuvre et sa posterité: actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, and Thierry Grandjean, 421-33. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016.

Valdenberg, Vladimir. 'La théorie monarchique de Dion Chrysostome', *REG* 40 (1927): 142-62.

van der Horst, Pieter Willem. '"The Elements Will Be Dissolved With Fire": The Idea of Cosmic Conflagration in Hellenism, Ancient Judaism, and Early Christianity' In *Hellenism-Judaism-Christianity. Essays on Their Interaction*. Contribution to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 8, edited by Pieter Willem van der Horst, 227-51. Kampen: Peeters, 1994.

Ventrella, Gianluca. 'Sul genere letterario dell' Olimpico" In *Dion de Pruse, l'homme, son oeuvre et sa posterité: actes du colloque international de Nantes (21-23 mai 2015)*. Spudasmata 169, edited by Eugenio Amato, Cécile Bost-Pouderon, and Thierry Grandjean, 345-64. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016.

Ventrella, Gianluca. *Dion de Pruse dit Dion Chrysostome: Oeuvres. Discours olympique, ou sur la conception première de la divinité (Or. XII). À Athènes, sur sa fuite (Or. XIII). Texte établi, introduit, et commenté. Traduit par Grandjean Thierry et Thévenet Lucie.* Paris: Les belles lettres, 2017.

Volonaki, Eleni. 'Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games' In *Thinking the Olympics: the Classical Tradition and the Modern Games*, edited by Barbara Goff and Michael Simpson, 76-89. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2011.

von Arnim, Hans. 'Die Enstehung und Anordnung der Shriftsammlung Dios von Prusa', *Hermes* 26 (1891): 366-407.

von Arnim, Hans. *Dionis prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia. Vol. I-II*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1893-6.

von Arnim, Hans. *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa. Mit einer Einleitung: Sophistik, Rhetorik, Philosophie in ihrem Kampf um die Jugendbildung*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1898.

Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London; New York: Routledge, 2002.

Webb, Ruth. 'Schools and *Paideia*' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel Richter and William Johnson, 139-53. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

West, Stephanie. 'Herodotus and Olbia' In *Classical Olbia and the Scythian World: From the Sixth Century BC to the Second Century AD*. Proceedings of the British Academy, edited by David Braund and Sergej Dmitrievič Kryžhitskiy, 79-92. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Whitmarsh, Tim. 'Reading Power in Roman Greece: The *Paideia* of Dio Chrysostom' In *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*. Ideas in Context 50, edited by Yun Lee Too and Niall Livingstone, 192-213. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001a.

Whitmarsh, Tim. ''Greece is the world': exile and identity in the Second Sophistic' In *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 269-305. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001b.

Whitmarsh, Tim. 'Dio Chrysostom' In *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative 1*. Mnemosyne 257, edited by Irene de Jong, René Nünlist, and Angus Bowie, 451-64. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *The Second Sophistic*. Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics 35. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Whitmarsh, Tim. 'An I for an I: Reading Fictional Autobiography', *CentoPagine* III (2009): 56-66.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel. Returning Romance*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2013.

Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Ulrich von: 'Asianismus und Atticismus', *Hermes* 35 (1900): 1-52.

Wojciechowski, Michał. 'Views of God in the Olympic Oration of Dio Chrysostom and the Bible', *Folia Orientalia* 48 (2011): 157-68.

Wright, Wilmer. *Philostratus and Eunapius: The Lives of the Sophists*. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1922.

Yvancos, José María Pozuelo. 'Retórica y narrativa: la narratio', *Epos: Revista de filología* 2 (1986): 231-252.

Zeitlin, Froma. 'Visions and revisions of Homer' In *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 195-266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.