

Furthermore, codicological considerations account for the publication of *Pro Caelio* and *In Vatinius* 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 Vatinius* 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-

liodorus wrote most probably close to 230 rather than in the fourth century and was a Phoenician from Emesa and a pagan (E.L. Bowie, *OCD*³, s.v. no. 4). The fact that Heliodorus quotes from Philo almost verbatim (cf. Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* 9.9.3 and Philo, *de vita Moysis* 2.195 [ii p. 164 M]), though known for long,¹ has been recently discussed in the context of the methodology of Philonian studies,² where it has been conclusively shown that we have a quotation and certainly not reliance on a common source. If Heliodorus was a pagan, he was the only pagan known to have quoted Philo — and in this case he may also have deserved a place in Menahem Stern's *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem, 1974, 1980, 1984), most aptly among the *Addenda* in vol. iii. Almost inevitably the issue of Heliodorus' religious affiliation has been brought up again, with a renewed attempt to give credit to Socrates' report.³ Few will be convinced as to the credibility of Socrates, but meanwhile a different aspect of the matter has been brought into the controversy. John Birchall has shown⁴ that Heliodorus' language contains many parallels and similarities to Christian authors of the fourth century: whether this is due to Christianity, the date, or both will have to provide food for further thought. The issue of Heliodorus' date and religion is still *sub judice*.

Joseph Geiger

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Bernd Schröder, *Die 'Väterlichen Gesetze': Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 53), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebek), 1996, xi + 313 pp.

This volume, a somewhat revised version of a 1994 dissertation at the Freie Universität of Berlin, is divided into two roughly equal sections. The first is dedicated to Josephus and, especially, to the role of the 'ancestral laws' (πάτριοι νόμοι or πάτρια νόμιμα) in each of his works. The second is devoted to the usage of the same and similar terms, such as πάτριος πολιτεία, in other ancient Greek literature, including Jewish Hellenistic literature and early Christian literature, as well as to Roman usage of *mores maiorum*. This, of course, in order to discover the context within which Josephus' usage is to be understood and its consequent implications.

To some extent, it may be said that Schröder's findings are not surprising. Thus, concerning the first half of the volume, the main conclusion is the increased emphasis on Jewish law in Josephus' works of the nineties (*Antiquities*, *Against Apion*, *Life*) in contrast to his *War*, written in the seventies. Twenty years ago, in his *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (1979), S.J.D. Cohen singled out this same point as one of the main lines of

¹ E.g. G. Lumbroso, 'Lettere, xxiii', *Arch. Papforsch.* 4 (1908), 66; J. Geffcken, *Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg 1929), 277; quoted from him by A.D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford 1933), 79; B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley etc. 1989), 543 n. 204; the *Belles Lettres* edition of Heliodorus (1943), *ad loc.*

² D.T. Runia, 'How to Search Philo', *Studia Philonica Annual* 2 (1990), 106-39 at 134-9; id., *Philo in Early Christian Literature. A Survey* (Comp. Rerum Iud. ad NT iii.1, Assen 1993), 12.

³ A. Hilhorst, 'Was Philo Read by Pagans? The Statement on Heliodorus in Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 5.22', *Studia Philonica Annual* 4 (1992), 75-7.

⁴ In an unpublished Oxford dissertation. I am very grateful for permission to refer to it.