Citroni, and (marginally) Richard Heinze, in order to launch a critique of Citroni's historicist argument, in *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica* (Rome, 1995), about the rôle of the addressee in Latin poetry. Some fair points are scored, but Plato was well aware of the power wielded by an author who grants an opponent the 'freedom' to speak within a literary dialogue. In the next chapter E. suggests that in order to construct fully the 'Possible worlds' offered up by poems to their readers, we are called upon to use our 'intertextual encyclopedia' in order to supplement the gaps in the texts. E. distinguishes sharply between fictional (absolutely non-real) worlds and the 'possible worlds', in the sense of counterfactual versions of the actual world, of Latin poetry, but this would imply that all Latin poetry was resolutely realist: the world of pastoral shepherds comes closer to a 'fictional world' than does the world of the love elegist.

In the more systematic account of intertextuality in the final Chapter 8, the reader is now firmly made the locus of intertextual meaning. Intertextuality is characterized, defined even, by the uncertainty which arises from the fact that the reader alone is the authority for the boundaries of allusion. The absence of unequivocal markers of intertextuality leads E. to reject the Contean analysis of allusion as structured like metaphor (since a metaphor always declares itself as such), but, granted a reader's initial construction of an intertextuality, what is there to stop its further analysis according to the structure of a trope?

E. had almost completed his book when Stephen Hinds's *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge, 1998) came into his hands. To establish distance, E. is forced to an almost parodic summary of Hinds's subtle incorporation of an author-function into the reader's own construction of the meaning of a poetic text. Nor does E.'s charge that classicists are still too much in thrall to the presence of the author ring true to my perception of the prevalence of reader-oriented criticism, at least among Don Fowler's 'New Latinists'.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

EPIC DREAMS

J. BOUQUET: *Le songe dans l'épopée latine d'Ennius à Claudien.* (Collection Latomus, 260.) Pp. 204. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 2-87031-201-6.

In recent years the interest in dreams of antiquity and their interpretation has increased considerably. This holds true not only for different genres of sources and texts but also for a number of specific questions, e.g. concerning patterns of interpretation or the utilization of dreams for political purposes. Such studies are welcome insofar as, on the one hand, they are directed against the long-prevailing tendency towards a strong psychologization, thus making clear that dreams, dream images, and their interpretation in antiquity have to be seen within their own autonomous framework. On the other hand, such studies are also necessary for an adequate understanding of the wide range of facets and the various levels of discourse in antiquity itself.

The study under review focuses on an exactly demarcated section, i.e. Latin epics from Ennius to Claudian. The basic question refers to the relation to Homer as the 'archegetes' of dream and epic: was the Latin literary treatment of the dream-motif (influenced by Homer) rigid and static, or was there a further creative development as compared with Greek literature? It is the declared aim of the analysis 'peut-être

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.297 Published online by Cambridge University Press

de préciser la signification de cette evolution et de ces variations dans l'utilisation d'un motif traditionnel' (p. 10). For his treatment of the sources B. takes as basic assumption the existence of three categories of dreams in epics: 'le songe externe', 'le songe allégoriste', and 'le songe réaliste'. In the first category of dreams figures approach the dreamer. There is a differentiation between the figures, but in all such cases these appearances are of supernatural origin. In the second case dream images originate from the dreamer's soul. Such images do not exist in the waking world, but have to be translated into it. In the third case we are dealing with 'une pure production psychologique du rêveur' (p. 9). For all three categories the principal sources of Greek and Latin literature are at least mentioned. Here, however, B. has to concede that the two latter categories are characterized by strong parallels, even to such an extent that it might be wondered if the distinction has any value in contributing to further clarification.

The approach chosen thus has an obvious literary-critical slant, and is concerned with the function of the dream-motif within the narrative plot of the epics in question. Accordingly, there is a treatment of fifty-seven dreams all told in eight chapters (pp. 12–180). The dreams are from Ennius' *Annales*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, Statius' *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*, Silius Italicus' *Punica*, and Claudian's epic poems. Among them are well-known and particularly impressive scenes, such as Ennius' dream of Homer, or Pompeius' dream before the battle of Pharsalos as outlined by Lucan. Besides numerous important observations on details, B. arrives at the following conclusions (pp. 181–8): most of the dreams are of an external nature and thus continue the Homeric pattern. However, there are numerous innovations, such as the combination of the appearance of gods and deceased persons in Statius, or the introduction of allegorical elements in Silius. The later poets especially made use of symbolic or psychological elements for their representation of the dreaming persons and their context. The employment of dreams to serve the work's overall purpose is based on their inherent potential for interpretation. This can be seen from the dreams in the *Aeneid*, for example. These dreams are about 'la naissance du futur peuple romain' (p. 183). At the end of the study there is a bibliography, as well as indices of names and sources (pp. 189–201). An index of dream-motifs and/or symbols might also have been helpful.

Looking at the brief introduction, one has to say that there is no basic discussion of previous studies (such as A. Grillone's *Il sogno nell'epica latino* [Palermo, 1967], which is indeed quoted at times but not sufficiently appreciated). Instead, the author refers to more general works of literary criticism. The study does not represent current scholarly research, either with regard to dreams in epics in general or with regard to individual authors and passages. Not only is there no reference to N. R. Berlin's *Dreams in Roman Epic* (diss., University of Michigan, 1994); also missing are a number of significant recent studies, such as P. Aicher, 'Ennius' Dream of Homer', *AJPh* 110 (1989), 227–32; U. Gärtner, 'Träume bei Valerius Flaccus', *Philologus* 140 (1996), 292–305. It has to be conceded that B. might not have been aware of C. Walde's book, *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), which appeared in the same year.

Moreover, one cannot help but feel that in a number of places the discourses of dreams are far more complex than B. makes them seem, especially with regard to references to motifs concerning Greek models or other genres of Latin poetry. The study might also have profited from a more detailed discussion of historical cross-references, particularly in view of the fact that the Latin epic has closer affinities to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.297 Published online by Cambridge University Press

history than its Greek counterpart. The readers of epic are largely ignored: to make any statements about their dream horizon may only be possible in the most general way, and such an undertaking would have gone far beyond the scope of the present study, since this would result in dealing with different dream discourses. And yet one has to say that the effect of a given work may be better understood by taking into account the horizon of its audience's experiences. Thus, it does make a difference whether or not the external dreams prevalent in epic are also otherwise strongly represented in experience. After all, B. repeatedly refers to modern interpretations of dreams without taking them into account sufficiently.

University of Erfurt GREGOR WEBER

PHAEDRUS' FABLES

J. HENDERSON: *Telling Tales on Caesar: Roman Stories from Phaedrus.* Pp. x + 286, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-924095-7.

Although in this follow-up to his 1977 doctoral thesis H. has clearly moved with the times—not so much by embracing recent ancient-fable scholarship (which he in fact tends to neglect), but by allowing modern critical approaches to influence his work—his concept still exudes that Seventies feeling. This was a decade of probing into imperial literature for signs of the author's true thoughts on the *principatus*, with concomitant discoveries of explicit and implicit criticism directed at an established system. Correspondingly, H. examines all of the fables in Phaedrus which say something about monarchs and *imperatores.* He looks not only at tales told about Caesars in the stricter sense—this applies only to 3.10 on Augustus, 2.5 on Tiberius, and to the remark in 3 *prol.* 33–44 about Sejanus, Tiberius' 'paranoid terrorist Chief of Police' (p. 14)—but also at 5.7 on the piper Princeps (together with 5.5), *App.* 10 on Pompey and the 'poofter', 5.1 on Demetrius and Menander, 1.14 on 'The *King* and *Dr Cobbler*', and at comparable beastly royals (Ape, Lion, Kite, Watersnake, 'and other *Wolves*': in Chapter 7 on 4.13, 4.14, 1.31, 1.2, 1.1, *et al.*). Apart from the animal fables, all of these are discussed by H. in great depth, each with an introductory analysis and running commentary. Consistently uppermost in H.'s mind are possible links between the fables and the political realities of the early Empire.

Streetwise as he clearly is, H. recognizes the problems inherent in biographical interpretations of poetic texts. He knows, for example, that he must 'repress any insidious thought that the transmission superscript that Phaedrus was *Augusti libertus . . . might* be an intelligent inference from 2.5' (p. 195 n. 6). And he stresses the need for caution when reading political statements into the texts: 'Such is the logic of fable, that it can pin but not be pinned down' (p. 166). Yet he is at pains to determine where the historical Phaedrus stood with regard to the Caesars. He therefore rates what the fabulist discloses about his *vita* as the unconcocted autobiographical truth, and what authors like Suetonius offer in the way of imperial anecdotes as historical documents. And if he cannot come up with the goods this way, he draws on the modern world's experience of autocrats. He can thus interpret the piper Princeps of 5.7, who mistakenly assumes an ovation for the *princeps* to be for him, as prototype of dictators who, in the public image they project, resemble an involuntarily funny actor: H. illustrates his point with a reference to the 'later Roman*ian* Caesar, Ceaucescu' (p. 107). But there is absolutely nothing in this text to indicate that the narrator (whom

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.297 Published online by Cambridge University Press