noticed no case where the MSS show sign of misunderstanding of Greek letters, and I am inclined to think that they should appear in their Latin guise (see my remarks in *Problems in Quintilian*, Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement 25 [1970], 36). d) As for Teubner conventions, we are now fortunately long past the days when, as in the old Apuleius, every page was disfigured by changing type faces and a multiplicity of brackets. But a ghost from that unhappy past recurs even here at vii.27.3 '<e>mergit[ur]'.

I noticed very few misprints. One faulty word division could mislead: vi.28.2 uo/luit. It is unfortunate that the Sigla on pp. xxxii-xxxiii do not include the vital θ and its constituent manuscripts.

Michael Winterbottom Corpus Christi College, Oxford

T. Maslowski (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 23: Orationes in P. Vatinium testem, Pro M. Caelio*, Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1995, cxxii + 156 pp.

The new Teubner text of *Pro Caelio* and *In Vatinium* represents a clear advance on previously available editions as far as information on the manuscript tradition is concerned. M. has thoroughly studied the Carolingian tradition of *Cael.* and *Vat.* and its relatives and descendants, and the supplementary testimonies for *Cael.* The three ancient witnesses to parts of this speech (a papyrus and two palimpsests, of which one is now destroyed, the other illegible) contribute much less to the constitution of the text than one might have hoped. More important are the readings of the lost Cluniacensis, excerpted or incorporated as variants in later French and Italian manuscripts, and recorded in editions since their discovery by Clark (1905). M.'s major contribution is in elucidating the labyrinthine complexities of this later tradition, building on the work of Silvia Rizzo and Michael Reeve.

The results of these labours are presented in a Latin preface of 106 pages, referred to on p. cv as 'praefatiuncula' (!); the preface also deals with the question of Cicero's own publication of the speeches (pp. v-xii) and with the history of the editing of the text (pp. xcvii-ciii). It takes considerable application on the part of the reader to come to grips with this volume of material, expressed in a Latin style which (I have to say) is not the most concise I have ever encountered; but one certainly cannot complain that anything of significance is missing.

The text of these two speeches has been in reasonably good repair since the beginning of this century at least, and there is relatively little that any new edition could add as regards purely textual matters. M.'s changes to the text are generally minor, and hardly require extended discussion in a short review. Sometimes the Cluniacensis is favoured against the Carolingian tradition; a striking example of this occurs in the first section of *Cael.*, where M. prints *adulescentem nobilem illustri ingenio* with the Cluniacensis. But Caelius was not technically 'noble'; and the passage of Quintilian quoted in the apparatus, ostensibly in support of this reading, refers to Atratinus, not Caelius. Perhaps Cicero wrote *adulescentem nobili ingenio*, which was then glossed by *illustri*. Readings of the Cluniacensis also find favour in *Cael.* 19, *iaciebant* instead of *aiebant* (how can one choose?), 34 *proavum non atavum* (without *abavum*); but sometimes the Carolingian tradition is preferred, as in *Cael.* 1 *consuetudinis[que]*, 3 *et sine mea oratione et tacitus*, 6

dimanavit versus *de-*, 30 *fratre* versus *fratrem*. In *Cael.* 5 *Praetuttiani* has escaped from its unwanted obelus. In 18 *migrationemque <eam>* is a conjecture of M.'s own. In 37 *cur alienam ullam* etc., the MSS readings, with Ribbeck's arrangement of lines, have been restored. In 60 *conantem* has been restored, doubtless rightly, against *tonantem* (Clark claims the latter as his own conjecture, but it is actually found in a 15th-century manuscript in the Bodleian Library). In 78 *Sex. Cloelius* has duly displaced the phantom *Sex. Clodius* (the Cluniacensis had *cloelius*). In the *In Vatinium*, M. offers *heri* in section 3 for the transmitted *hesterno*; in 7 he inserts *<contemptis auspiciis>*, following the general lines of previous emendations; in 36 he prints what seems to me a very good conjecture, *ab eo* for *aut*.

There are one or two isolated orthographical oddities (*Cael.* 6 *revortar* from PG, 26 *apsunt* from P alone): it is difficult to see why these were put in the text, when the spelling is elsewhere standardised. M. has made laudable efforts to reconsider the punctuation of the text, but in a few passages his choice of punctuation seems confusing. I am not convinced by the dashes in *Cael.* 8 or by the note that *ut* there is final; it seems to me difficult not to take the two *ut*-clauses as parallel in sense, one, as it were, expanding on the other. In section 12 it is not made clear whether or not *at studuit Catilinae* is an imaginary objection (it seems to make better sense as one). And lest anyone should think that I am spending too much time on minutiae, the reader should be told that the punctuation of section 30 of *Pro Caelio* makes a real difference to our understanding of Cicero's rhetorical strategy. Clark punctuates the sentence like this: *Sunt autem duo crimina, auri et veneni; in quibus una atque eadem persona versatur.* This seems to mean 'There are two charges, concerning gold and poison; in which one and the same person is involved'. This should imply that these two were the only, or at least the most important accusations against Caelius. But it is obvious from section 23 of the speech that they were not. The borrowing of gold from Clodia was merely a pendant to the main charge of murdering Dio the Alexandrian ambassador (the gold was for bribing the slaves of Dio's host to do the deed). The charge of attempted poisoning was, in turn, a pendant to this; it may be added, as scholars have long since pointed out, that if it had been a principal charge it would have been heard in a different court, the *quaestio de sicariis et veneficis*, not the *quaestio de vi*. Consequently, on the above interpretation of the sentence, Cicero is being highly disingenuous in exaggerating the importance of these two counts. On the other hand, the meaning is changed considerably if one substitutes a comma for the semicolon: the sentence now means 'There are two charges, that concerning gold and that concerning poison, in which one and the same person is involved': the emphasis is then on the involvement of Clodia in both these accusations. It is no longer intimated that these were the important charges, which they were not; but it is intimated that Clodia is a malicious witness, and the *divisio* of the two charges prepares the way for Cicero's demolition of her credit. M., maybe aware of these issues, punctuates with a dash, thus leaving it unclear which interpretation he favours.

The apparatus is full and sometimes complex; it could have been abbreviated by omitting some of the less significant variants and finding a separate home for long notes such as that which takes up most of p. 71. Without first-hand scrutiny of the MSS I cannot judge its accuracy, but it has the air of a careful piece of work. Indeed, my overall impression is that this is a codicologist's edition, the object of which is not only to present the text and the salient evidence for it, but to display a conspectus of the manuscript tradition as well.

Furthermore, codicological considerations account for the publication of *Pro Caelio* and *In Vatinium* in the same volume: the Carolingian tradition of the two speeches is the same, and it is clearly economical, both when collating MSS and when presenting the tradition to the reader, to deal with both works at the same time. On the other hand, the *In Vatinium* belongs historically with the trial of Sestius and one does wonder why it was not included with the *Pro Sestio* when M. edited that speech a few years ago. There is a tradition (cf. the OCT) of arranging Cicero's speeches according to the groups of manuscripts in which they occur; useful as this may be for students of the history of the transmission, it seems to accord too great a weight to the arbitrary or accidental selections and juxtapositions of medieval editors. Most people who read Cicero's speeches do so from the perspective of a Roman historian, a literary Latinist or a student of rhetoric, and for these purposes a chronological arrangement would make more sense. Even so, the juxtaposition of *Cael.* and *Vat.* may possibly prompt interesting reflections on the comparison between Cicero's treatments of the two witnesses, Vatinius and Clodia.

A final detail: the continuous line numbering of the text from start to finish, as in a verse text, is a real convenience for those using the apparatus and could well be emulated.

This edition will certainly take its place on the shelves of any serious student of these two speeches, but particularly on those of anyone concerned with the manuscripts.

J.G.F. Powell Newcastle upon Tyne

Suzanne MacAlister, *Dreams and Suicides. The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996, ix + 235 pp.

Much of the volume of the present unprecedented flood of publications concerned with the Greek novel is channeled into two beds: detailed analysis of particular components of the novel on the one hand, and expansion into related genres and beyond the canonical five on the other. This book, as can be seen in the title and subtitle, partakes of both directions. Dreams and suicides are dealt with employing the theories of Bakhtin (and some help from Artemidorus) and Durkheim, and these same components are then analysed also in the novels of the twelfth-century Byzantine revival, emphasising the subtle innovations in works which are often considered slavish imitations.

No doubt both of these directions contain much that is new to the run-of-the-mill classical scholar. It certainly is a welcome sign of the complete breaking down of the barriers of the old curriculum that works like Macrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias*, Prodromus' *Rhodante and Dosicles* and Eugenianus' *Drosilla and Charicles* are considered together with the Greek novels of the Roman Empire. Whether the (somewhat belated) application of the above mentioned luminaries of literary studies and sociology to the Greek novel amounts to a real breakthrough in our understanding of ancient texts must be left to individual attitudes, and is beyond the scope of the present review. Instead, I shall try to discuss one point of particular interest.

It is maintained that the Byzantine novels are mainly influenced by the two latest and most popular of the canonical five, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*; these two writers were considered Christians in the later tradition. The related issues of Heliodorus' Christianity and fourth-century date have been the subject of renewed scholarly controversy. According to up-to-date informed opinion, He-