

the appendix already mentioned, the end matter includes a glossary, a pretty thorough bibliography, and an index.

The text is based on Ross's, though with some differences, which are annotated at the foot of the relevant page. There is no apparatus criticus as such. Each section of the translation, whether or not it corresponds with a chapter break, receives a brief italicized summary. The translation is excellent. G. has succeeded where many fail, in combining fidelity to Aristotle's Greek with largely readable English.

The function of the notes is chiefly to explicate Aristotle's crabbed arguments and so guide the reader through the text, and to subject his theories to criticism. G. is sympathetic to Aristotle's views, and in this section of the book more often defends them than finds fault with them. Where there are gaps in the text—where, say, Aristotle is making some unknown assumptions—G. comes up with reasonable suggestions to fill the void.

The introduction gives a broad overview of Aristotle's views on sleep and dreaming, and compares them both with pre-Aristotelian thought on the subject and with modern psychology (especially Freud) and philosophy (especially Malcolm). This approach is highly illuminating. Aristotle comes across as astonishingly modern, although G. is not afraid to point out where his work has been overtaken by recent discoveries, e.g. about the function of REM dreaming and the different depths of sleep. But compared with the views he inherited both from pre-philosophical tradition and from Plato (i.e. above all, that sleep is a state in which we are susceptible to the gods), the great pleasure of reading Aristotle is that he develops and defends a sensible, mechanistic theory of dreams, and allows it to stand on its own merits as rebuttal of any view that mentions the gods. Sleep for Aristotle is, in G.'s formulation, 'a state of perceptual incapacitation' (p. 20), and dreams are due to perceptual traces which linger in the sense-organs and become reactivated during sleep. Interestingly for a thinker who is generally regarded as highly given to teleology, it follows that dreams have no purpose or function. Aristotle allows that dreams may be 'daemonic' or subject to uncanny external influences—but, G. argues, Aristotle is not referring to gods, but to factors such as chance. Overall, then, the treatises display an early application of Occam's razor which is a delight, and is in itself sufficient justification for G.'s isolating these three treatises and making a single book out of them.

Thanks chiefly to the excellence of the introduction and the clarity of the translation, this book will be appreciated not only by classical scholars and philosophers, but also by contemporary psychologists who want to learn something of their eminent predecessor's views. No classicist reading this review need hesitate to recommend the book to members of other academic departments.

*Teddington, Middlesex*

ROBIN WATERFIELD

F. MONTANA: *L'Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele negli scholia vetera ad Aristofane*. (Biblioteca di Studi Antichi, 80.) Pp. 301. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-043-8.

M.'s primary interest is in the scholia on Aristophanes and in the ways in which material from classical texts and Hellenistic exegesis was transmitted to those scholia.

M. begins with an extended introduction. (§i) He notes that the scholiasts on Aristophanes tended to use *Ath. Pol.* for Athenian institutions and for sixth-century history (specifically, the history of the Pisistratid tyranny), but Philochorus for fifth-century history. (§ii) He next outlines the history of the scholia on Aristophanes. (§iii) He then considers some recent developments in the study of texts, noting that some analytical categories devised for the study of quotations and allusions in literary texts cannot be applied to scholia, but that a useful distinction can be made between references in compendia, paraphrases, and literal quotation. For the last he stresses the need to distinguish between deliberate adaptation of a text to fit it to its new context, and corruption, whether in the original consulted by the commentator or in the transmission of the comment. (§iv) He lists nineteen citations of *Ath. Pol.* in the *scholia vetera*, distinguishing between historical and institutional, unacknowledged and acknowledged (the latter with varying degrees of specificity), compendiary, paraphrastic, and literal. (§v) He justifies the exclusion of some other scholia from his collection, *inter alia* arguing that what editors of *Ath. Pol.* treat as fr. 1 should contain not schol. *Av.* 1527 on Apollo *Patroos* but schol. *Vesp.* 1223 and *Lys.* 58 on

Pandion and his sons. (§vi) Finally he considers the routes by which these passages from *Ath. Pol.* found their way to the *scholia vetera*: where there is an overlap with Hesychius, he suggests Didymus' *Lexis Komike* as a source; where passages from other classical texts have been combined with passages from *Ath. Pol.*, they will have been put together by one or another of the Alexandrian commentators; the reference to *Ath. Pol.* 34.1 in schol. *Ran.* 1532 will have come from a catalogue of *komodoumenoi*; passages on law-court procedure may have been put together by Callistratus.

After a primary and a supplementary bibliography (at a point where the casual user might not easily find them), M. devotes the remainder of the book to studying one by one his nineteen citations of *Ath. Pol.*, giving in each case the text and a translation of the scholium, the context of the lemma to which the scholium is attached, and a discussion of the use made of *Ath. Pol.* in the scholium. I note just a few points.

19.3 (schol. *Lys.* 666): M. argues that *Ath. Pol.*'s text was ὑπὸ Πάριον, which was then corrupted in different ways. That is one of the two possibilities which I considered in my *Commentary*: the other, R's περὶ, he persuades me is one of the corruptions.

19.6 (schol. *Vesp.* 502): M. is prepared to believe that *Ath. Pol.* gave the total length of the tyranny as 49 years. I still prefer 36, as the total of the actual periods of tyranny in *Ath. Pol.*'s scheme.

27.3, 28.3 (schol. *Vesp.* 684): M. may be right to detect a confusion between jury pay and the *diobelia*, but the 3 obols come not from 27.3 but from 62.2.

34.1 (schol. *Ran.* 1532): against my view that *Ath. Pol.* has misdated the Spartan peace offer and the frustration of it by Cleophon which in fact followed the battle of Cyzicus, M. doubts whether Aristophanes would have alluded at the end of the *Frogs* to an episode that took place so long before (and wonders if with Salviat we should regard the passage as an addition made for the second performance of the play)—but, if Cleophon was continuously opposed to the ending of the war without a decisive Athenian victory, I think Aristophanes himself need not have been alluding to any one episode.

42.2 (schol. *Vesp.* 378): M. wonders if the original comment which is the source of the scholium distinguished between fifth- and fourth-century practice in the *dokimasia* of eighteen-year-olds.

65.2 (schol. *Plut.* 278): this scholium is important for reconstructing the fragmentary text of *Ath. Pol.*, and M. insists that we should use the best text, reading σύμβολον δημόσιον rather than δημοσίᾳ—but the change does not eliminate my puzzlement as to why this out of the various objects mentioned in connection with law-court procedure should be specially labelled 'public'.

This is a learned and a meticulous piece of work, which usefully clarifies the employment of *Ath. Pol.* by commentators on Aristophanes.

University of Durham

P. J. RHODES

M. MUND-DOPCHIE: *La fortune du 'Périple d'Hannon' à la Renaissance et au XVIIe siècle: Continuité et rupture dans la transmission d'un savoir géographique.* (Collection d'Études Classiques, 8.) Pp. viii + 178. Namur: Société des Études Classiques, 1995. Paper, Belg. frs. 1300. ISBN: 2-87037-214-4.

This fascinating study traces the use of Hanno's *Periplus* from early citations in antiquity through to the seventeenth century. The received Greek text is derived from *Palatinus Graecus* 398, though the original, presumably in Punic, was apparently hung in the temple of Baal ('Kronos') at Carthage. Although the authenticity of the text is mentioned (see pp. 81–4), this volume concentrates on the way that Hanno's work has been cited and used in subsequent centuries. The first two chapters form a prolegomena to the book, and provide a survey of ancient citations of or familiarity with Hanno's work. These include [Aristotle] (*De mir. ausc.*), Pomponius Mela, and Pliny. Similar citations continued into late antiquity and through the Middle Ages. The transmission of these texts from antiquity is also briefly considered.

There are two main parts to this study of Hanno. The first covers the early editions and translations. The first Greek text was edited by Sigismund Gelen and appeared in 1533 along with some other geographical works. This seems to have been based on the manuscript which was then in Basle (p. 33); the history of *Palatinus Graecus* 398 is documented, including its reintegration into the library in Heidelberg in 1816. It is not surprising that one of the earliest