marker indicating a place of worship. Collard shows that, in scenes of prayer and sacrifice, the herm takes on another function by operating as a ritual means of communication between men and gods. Thus, the presence of the herm on vases does not necessarily indicate a cult of Hermes or a place of worship dedicated to the god, but it enhances the prerogatives of the god in matters of mediation.

The second group of essays shows that the image of Mercury in various Roman literary genres is largely influenced by the Greek Hermes, to the point that in the *Aeneid* Virgil makes Mercury the envoy of Jupiter just as Homer's Hermes is the messenger of Zeus (see Sergio Casali's article in the volume under review). While the Hellenization of Mercury is an undeniable fact, it must be noted that several articles tend to establish an equivalence between the Greek and the Roman gods, almost considering Hermes and Mercury as two different names of the same divine power, on the basis of a perspective that has recently been questioned: *cf.* C. Bonnet, V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Pironti (eds), *Dieux des Grecs, dieux des Romains: panthéons en dialogue à travers l'histoire et l'historiographie* (Brussels and Rome 2016). An exception is offered in the essay by Duncan E. MacRae, who studies the images of Mercury on the façades of *tabernae* at Pompeii. These images, which represent Mercury using Greek models, express the Roman deity's prerogatives, functioning as a 'divine correlate for shoppers', 'phallic protector' or 'bringer of profit' (205). In the same way, Ljuba Merlina Bortolani analyses the Greek Magical Hymn to Hermes, showing that the Hellenization of Thoth does not imply a precise identification of the Egyptian god with the Greek one, but is a stratagem used by the Egyptian authors of similar texts 'to make them appealing to a hellenized clientele' (303).

In conclusion, the volume deserves to be appreciated for the plurality of its fields of investigation as well as for the varied methodological approaches adopted by individual authors. Its value lies mainly in this plurality of perspectives, although this may occasionally seem to contradict the stated purpose of presenting a coherent and unitary investigation.

CARMINE PISANO
Università di Napoli Federico II
carmine.pisano@unina.it

NETZ (R.) **Scale, Space and Canon in Ancient Literary Culture**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xiv + 890. £44.90. 9781108481472.
doi:10.1017/S0075426921000306

This remarkable book is, among other things, an attempt to show that we can say more about ancient literary culture as a whole than we thought we could, in part because we actually know more about it than we thought we did. The principal tools of Reviel Netz's investigation are quantitative and statistical, and the results are, to use the author's own term, 'broad brush', but the very ambition with which he sets out a largely plausible map of literary, philosophical and scientific culture up to and beyond late antiquity (which for Netz essentially begins *ca*. AD 200) make reviewing this book a humbling experience. There is much here, both in its subject matter and its methodology, on which I am quite unqualified to comment.

The 'scale', 'space' and 'canon' of the title refer (in reverse order) to the three parts of the book. Among the principal messages of the first part are: the classical canon was formed early (in some genres by the late fifth century BC) and in Athens; it persisted, essentially unchanged, until Byzantium; what mattered was the performativity of the genres; what we think of as 'canon formation', a practice usually associated with Alexandria, was not one of contraction, but of addition to a small set of 'truly central authors' in order to give the list 'a certain ballast, so as to reach larger, more interesting lists' (216). Netz argues that the literary papyri which happen to survive from Egypt, bolstered by counting how often writers are name-checked or cited in *TLG* (Athenaeus, Plutarch, etc.), are in fact a much better guide both to what existed and to what was read than is often thought, and crucial for him is a distinction between 'big' and 'small' libraries, the latter holding only parts of the central canon (from Homer perhaps just book 1 of the *Iliad*?). Demosthenes, Isocrates and Aeschines did not join those 'small-library must-haves' until the Roman period (94). Across the Mediterranean, incidentally, we should be thinking of up to 10,000 'big libraries' and up to 100,000 'small libraries' throughout antiquity (541). What were collected were 'names' (Homer, Euripides, Demosthenes, even Callimachus), and Netz offers very interesting pages on how one got to be a (Greek) name (usually, in an author's own lifetime – and longevity helped). Quality does matter to canonicity (237 n.290), though Netz reasonably reserves the matter for another day; this is not a book of 'close reading' (4). More important is why this business of the persistence of the 'performative' canon matters. For well over a millennium, in Netz's view, the 'ideals of the face-to-face city … "the polis of letters"' was preserved, even in remarkably different sociopolitical situations, and this meant that 'what was canonized was not a state ideology but … defined a social space away from the state, providing … the conditions for the emergence of civic society' (3). As with much in this book, there is a sense in which we knew some version of this already (much work on, for example, the Second Sophistic almost assumes it), but Netz gives us

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426921000306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reasons for thinking this picture might well be based on more than just our instinct. Along the way we are treated to all manner of smaller-scale observations which hardly ever fail to offer food for thought. Almost at random I choose the claims that 'the only belletristic author extant on codex but not on papyrus is the novelist Longus' (73) and that, with the exceptions of the *Phaedrus* and the *Phaedo*, Platonic papyri suggest a 'flat distribution between all the works': 'all dialogues are equally likely to survive' and what mattered was having the collected works in one's library (120–21).

The 'space' part of the book is in part devoted to a very detailed examination of the cultural picture of the Hellenistic age and the rise of Roman influence (the crucial date here being, from a cultural point of view, *ca*. 100 BC), with Netz's maps of the world and his book dominated by the polarity of Athens (philosophy) and Alexandria (science). As far as the former is concerned, we witness a Weberian 'routinization of charisma' (330), as the schools settle down to technical arguments about a frozen canon of authors from the past, whereas the only 'literary' genre still really active is Menandrian comedy, which is itself both performative and routinized. The broad picture of Hellenistic science offered here is, to a neophyte, quite eye-opening, but there is also much in these pages for those whose eyes tend rather to glaze over when ancient science is mentioned: Netz offers, for example, a very readable and accessible survey of the characteristics of Alexandrian literature (350–75) and an account of the non-Stoicism of Aratus' *Phainomena* with suggestive methodological considerations of how we identify philosophical influence in poetry (416–20).

When we move to 'scale', Netz's style changes somewhat. Now he is concerned with estimating probable numbers of book-rolls in circulation (perhaps between 1 and 2.5 million in the Nile Valley in the second century AD) and with the numbers of authors in each genre and in totality ('more likely than not … there were between 30,000 and 40,000 authors [prior to AD 200]', 621). Netz is well aware of the very loose parameters of these speculations and of the likely reaction of many readers to them, but he insists (rightly) that 'knowledge of probabilities is a form of knowledge' (620); he does not, however, always make it as clear as one would like what this knowledge is actually 'for', but a good part of the answer seems to be that he wants to chart the reality (or otherwise) of such phenomena as 'the third-century decline' with as much numerical precision as the evidence allows.

Not many people will, I think, read this book from cover to cover or with equal attention throughout; Netz's unflagging engagement and argumentative enthusiasm for his own project would be very hard to match (and some stylistic tics, such as the exclamation mark, and what appear to be attempts at humour ('I get to cite Foucault!', 96) can prove wearying). Of course there are errors and inconsistencies, and every 'specialist' will find it easy to nominate bibliographical absences, but I do not think that these blemishes seriously diminish the whole; for a project of this sweep, the book is also both all encompassing and rather 'local': Netz's Stanford colleagues and their work are cited with approval touchingly often. Moreover, the book is too long (much that is familiar to any imaginable reader is spelled out at length) and in several places rather self-indulgent (103–14 on 'theory' is one prime example), but perhaps that does not really matter. This book has taught me a great deal and constantly made me think about things which I, as a rather traditional 'philologist' (a dying breed, apparently, 4), consider important; for that I am very grateful.

Cambridge University Press is to be congratulated on the quality of production and the price. There are remarkably few typos; 'Semonides' for 'Simonides' (172 and the index *s.v.*) is one that slipped through the Netz.

RICHARD HUNTER
University of Cambridge
rlh10@cam.ac.uk

HAMMOND (M.) and THONEMANN (P.) (eds) **Artemidorus: *The Interpretation of Dreams*** (Oxford World's Classics). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. xxx + 372. £10.99. 978019879795.

THONEMANN (P.) **An Ancient Dream Manual: Artemidorus' *The Interpretation of Dreams***. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. 239. £20. 9780198843825.

doi:10.1017/S0075426921000318

A rich social tapestry unfolds in Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*, a work in which so-called 'ordinary people' have a prominence rare in classical literature. Everyone is there: priests and prostitutes, shopkeepers and beggars, seafarers, fruit farmers, midwives, cobblers, beekeepers, fowlers, barbers, tanners – the list is endless (almost), and Artemidorus' book is endlessly fascinating. Bigwigs appear from time to time, Cornelius Fronto (strikingly), the odd Imperial official and god-like civic magistrates. But they are few and far between. In this testament from the Greek East to life in Rome's high Imperial age, the most powerful figure of all, the emperor, is in every sense a distant figure.

The tapestry reflects the pyramidal shape of the Empire's population at large: a narrow band of movers and shakers at the top, with an ever-broadening panoply of the anonymously forgettable beneath. On the evidence of the *Oneirocritica*, however, all in this motley crew believed that what they saw in their dreams when sleeping could

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426921000306 Published online by Cambridge University Press