Horatius Cocles (11), Mucius Cordus (12), Cloelia (13), the 306 Fabii (14), L. Valerius (15), A. Postumius (16), L. Quinctius Cincinnatus (17), Menenius Agrippa (18), Cn. Marcius Coriolanus (19), Licinius Stolo (20), Appius Claudius *decemuir* (21), and Q. Ogulnius (22).

F. argued in his first volume, and here rightly insists, that the anonymous author's main source was independent of the Livian tradition (with proper caution, he suggests Hyginus' *De uiris illustribus* as the most likely candidate). The only partly chronological order of those thirteen chapters confirms that the source was not an annalistic history: 'dagegen erweist sich auch hier die Annahme einer ursprunglich systematischen, nach Kategorien gegliederten Vorlage als die plausibelste Hypothese' (p. 209). Yes, but what categories were they? One possibility not noticed by F. is that the exemplary stories in 14–20 (i.e. after the statutory heroes of the first two years of the Republic) were categorized by the status of the protagonists: four great patrician families (Fabii, Valerii, Postumii, Quinctii), followed by a minor patrician (Menenius), an alleged patrician from a plebeian *gens* (Marcius), and finally a real plebeian (Licinius, chronologically misplaced).

It is interesting that this arrangement disengages Valerius 'Publicola' from the liberation story. That is one of several indications of what a non-Livian, and probably pre-Livian, early Republic may have looked like: note also Kaeso Quinctius as an unredeemed villain who deserts to Rome's enemies (17.1), Coriolanus holding the consulship (19.2), and Licinius Stolo rather than Sextius Lateranus as the first plebeian consul (20.2). F. indeed regards the last of these as a mere mistake by the compiler; more likely, perhaps, a version from Licinius Macer taken as factual by a late-republican collector of *exempla*. The displacement of Q. Ogulnius from his early-third-century Livian context may imply a version of the bringing of Aesculapius which attached it to the plague of 432 B.C., when the Sibylline Books were consulted and a temple to his father Apollo vowed (Livy 4.25.3).

Careful, sensible, and with exhaustive reference to previous scholarship, this is an exemplary commentary on an important and unjustly neglected historical text.

University of Exeter T. P. WISEMAN

T. DORANDI: *Le Stylet et la tablette. Dans le secret des auteurs antiques.* Pp. 218. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000. Paper, frs. 120. ISBN: 2-251-42012-6.

Dorandi, a scholar who has written on Epicureanism and the Herculaneum papyri, and is the author of many articles in *Der Neue Pauly* on such subjects as *Kartonnage* and *Korrekturzeichen*, here presents a survey of the mechanics of composition and publication in classical antiquity. The graphic on the cover of this small book, an ass more garish yellow than gold, seated on a teacher's bench, alerts the reader to the fact that the volume belongs to the L'Âne d'Or series, which the blurb advertises as meant to encourage communication among 'les publics spécialisés' (classicists of various specializations? Academics in other disciplines altogether?); a work of uncompromising scholarship is promised, yet (the blurb assures us) 'prigs and pedants' are explicitly excluded from writing for this series. Potential readers intrigued by 'le secret' in the title will be disappointed if they expect something sensational. All the Greek and Latin is translated into French, and though the reader is expected to understand English, he or she need not know any German.

D.'s book descends from a series of lectures he gave at the Institute of Papyrology at the Sorbonne a few years ago. Whatever the publisher's blurb means, D. has gone somewhat beyond exposition for a general academic reading public, making this book a vehicle for enlarging on his past work on the subject and also for some mild polemics, e.g. with David Blank on the interpretation of ὑπομνηματικόν on papyrus fragments of Philodemus' *Rhetoric*. In the book's seven chapters D. gives us a lucidly presented collection of evidence on a variety of topics, exploiting a mixture of very well-known and arcane texts: we see how ancient authors of various genres consulted existing writings, took notes on *pugillares*, wrote drafts in their own hand (seldom) or dictated to scribes (often), revised what they had written (*PCairoMaspero* I 67097 *verso* [pp. 53–4] gives an especially vivid example), and presented their work, first to a small circle of students or friends, perhaps by reading it aloud, and later for general circulation; and D. discusses how, ultimately, authors had to expect the loss of their rights once the material was widely disseminated. Some of the practical requirements and difficulties of the ancients have analogues with our contemporary experience. They often had an opportunity to improve their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.409 Published online by Cambridge University Press

work by interaction with an audience, and just possibly (D. rightly calls this a 'prickly' question) some texts bear authentic 'authors' variants'. Many readers will be reminded of the multiple versions of texts created by word processors, sent to colleagues through e-mail and thereby made more vulnerable to plagiarism, and sometimes lost in a computer breakdown, a modern calamity more frequent than the fires and earthquakes of antiquity. Some readers will be happy to find ancient precedent in D.'s book for modern work on the problematics of 'author-subject' and 'reader-subject'.

One general complaint: the author does not mention some texts that, though they do not always raise explicit questions of the mechanics of writing and publication, are nevertheless relevant to the general issues D. treats, texts that in fact confirm the pervasiveness and importance of those issues in ancient experience. There is nothing on the meaning of *σφραγίς* in Theognis, on Alcidamas' preference for spoken speeches, or on Plato's depiction in the *Phaedrus* of writings as defenseless orphans. D. has Galen's account of books fraudulently attributed to him that were on sale at a book dealer's, but not the similar story relevant to the fourth century B.C. told about speeches attributed to Isocrates (D.H. *Isoc*. 18). And there is virtually nothing on the question of Homeric editions. Still, this is a useful book, supplementing (to name just two works from which I have learned much about the perils besetting our texts) Ann Hanson's article, 'Galen: Author and Critic' in Glenn Most (ed.), *Editing Texts/Texte edieren* (Göttingen, 1998) and, of course, L. D. Reynolds, N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (3rd edn, Oxford, 1991).

Yale University VICTOR BERS

S. Gödde, T. Heinze (edd.): *Skenika. Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Horst-Dieter Blume.* Pp. xiii + 462, ills, 8 pls. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000. Paper, DM 78. ISBN: 3-534-15038-4.

Organizers of Festschrifts should not be afraid of a narrower focus, on the lines of the recent offering on Sophokles to Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Still, there is much of interest in this one, which reflects the honorand's range of interests, and is well produced and (most importantly) well indexed.

On Athenian tragedy we have Peter Brown on knocking at the door, Martin Hose on the probable, Susan Gödde on the poetics of ritual in *Persai*, Stephan Heilen on the ending of *Trachiniai*, and Theodor Heinze on intertextuality between *Alkestis* and *Eumenides,* with a satyric finale by Wolfgang Luppe on *Ichneutai* 369f.

On Athenian Comedy Federica Casolari writes on Plato's *Phaon*, André Hurst on *Aspis* 455–64, Geoffrey Arnott on stage business in the *Samia*, and Jean-Marie Jacques on problems in the *Sikyonians.*

On Roman drama Claudia Schindler writes on the sea-storm in Seneca's *Agamemnon* (421–78), Gregor Maurach proposes *amati* for *amare* in Naevius fr. 36 Ribbeck (*Corollaria*), Jürgen Blänsdorf discusses the dramatic qualities of *Bacchides*, and Lore Benz *Stichus* 218–33.

On drama and visual art, Klaus Stähler gives us Prokne in drama and sculpture of the classical period, Werner Fuchs and Thorsten Opper discuss the recently published epitaph of the sculptor Kallimachos (with a supplement proposed from E. *IT* 128–9), Dieter Metzler the iconography of spectator and audience in Greek art, and Reinhard Stupperich mythological stage friezes of the imperial period in the Greek east.

On the reception of the drama, we have, in chronological order from antiquity until recently, Markus Mülke on the repetition of Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletos*, Richard Green and Eric Handley on a Hellenistic vase-inscription ('a father begets children and a woman takes lovers') from southern Italy, Wolfgang Hübner on Menander and Augustus in Manilius, Richard Hunter on the politics of Plutarch's *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander*, Marie-Luise Lakman on dramatizations of Plato's dialogues, Burkhard Reis on the theatrical metaphor at Plotinus *Enneads* II 2 (47), Rainer Henke on the interpretaion by Ambrose of Milan of E. *Andr*. 987f., Klaus Ostheeren on dramatic narrative and narrative in drama from antiquity to the Middle Ages, Hans-Peter Schönbeck on the humanist Jakob Locher on the influence of Plautus, Kjeld Matthieson on the influence of the *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, especially on Goethe, Alfons Weische on Goethe *Faust* II 7018, Jürgen Werner on translations of Aristophanes, Eva Stehlíková on

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.409 Published online by Cambridge University Press