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/52.2.299 Published online by Cambridge University Press

H. always seems to equate with the historical author) wishes to make not just Princeps, but also some *princeps* a figure of fun.

The only passage in all of Phaedrus which could be read as criticism of the regime is the one that mentions Sejanus in 3 *prol.* The fabulist talks here about the genre, calling it literature by which *servitus obnoxia* (i. e. the slave Aesop) *calumniam fictis elusit iocis*, and mentions being hounded himself by Sejanus on account of his *lusus.* But what is to say that this really happened to the historical Phaedrus? It might just be his Aesopic *persona*'s experiences, and Sejanus (who may well have been long gone when this was written) just a character in this poetic world, like, say, Croesus or Lycoros in the *Vita Aesopi*, whose might the Greek fabulist is made to feel. Future studies on Phaedrus would do well not to dig for more historical references, as H. does, but should instead apply the method just tested by Sven Lorenz on the (kindred) genre 'epigram': he shows that Martial's emperors can be read as *epigrammatische Kaiser*, and thus as *personae* integrated by the poet into his literary game; the characters drawn accordingly differ in part from the historical *principes* as experienced by Martial (*Erotik und Panegyrik* [Tübingen, 2002]). H. does at times seem to suspect that Phaedrus' Caesars could actually be *fabelhafte Kaiser*, but the wood here is scarcely visible for all the referential trees spotted at times in a frenzy of positivistic searching.

Does this mean that the outpourings of H.'s learnedness—which clearly places him in a line with notable classicists of bygone ages—are of doubtful value? Far from it. He presents a wealth of constructive material. For the first time ever, poems by Phaedrus have been examined with a meticulous care that covers all aspects of textual criticism, style, and their historical, cultural, and literary intertextuality. H. offers innumerable brilliant observations, for instance in his (particularly accomplished) chapter on 3 *prol.*, where he identifies Plato, *Phaedr.* 227b as a vital pretext for vv. 1–26 and thus raises one fascinating question: could the name 'Phaedrus', which appears amongst the extant texts only in 3 *prol.*, be a pseudonym? H. has now provided us with excellent commentaries on at least some of the poems (1.14, 2.5, 3 *prol.*, 3.10, 5.1, 5.5, 5.7, and *App.* 10) and will perhaps inspire someone to take the rest in hand. There will be readers who may find it irritating that H. writes, well, the way he writes. His unique intensity and colour, and the occasional indulging in his brand of *arte allusiva* sometimes cry out for commentary themselves. But given the lack of truly useful studies on the ancient fable, this book will earn H. more than enough points to make him Brown Owl of the Phaedrus pack.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

LEARNING FROM THE PAST

J. D. CHAPLIN: *Livy's Exemplary History.* Pp. xii + 245. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815274-4.

The major concern of C.'s book is the way in which Livy's *exempla* are received, interpreted, acted on, or ignored by the various audiences portrayed within the text. She interprets *exempla* with useful breadth, going beyond a focus on moralizing stories about individual characters to explore the more general theme of learning lessons from history. Livy's use of *exempla* thus becomes a particular development in the classical tradition of the usefulness of history (pp. 16–31). C. is particularly interested in the value of mapping the internal audiences' reception of *exempla* subsequent to the dramatic time in which they take place in the narrative. A close

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.299 Published online by Cambridge University Press