

terms like "Leiden *hermeneumata*" and "three-book *hermeneumata*" instead. In this way, all the glossaries included in *Gloss. biling. 2* would fall into the category *hermeneumata*. The glossaries published in *Gloss. biling. 1* and *2* are datable from the first century BC to the sixth or seventh centuries AD; the majority are datable to the third and fourth centuries AD. The affinities between some of the papyrus glossaries arranged according to subject matter and those surviving in *hermeneumata* manuscripts had already become clear when *Gloss. biling. 1* was published. The new collection includes a fragment of an everyday conversation (no. 8 = *P. Prag. II 118*), the first clear case of such a text which is certainly related to a version surviving in a *hermeneumata* manuscript, the so-called *Colloquium Harleianum* (*CGL III* pp. 108-16 = pp. 638-44).

In the first volume of *Gloss. biling.*, Kramer excluded model alphabets, literary texts with translations, and word-lists of authors. In the present volume, model alphabets have been included (nos. 1-2, two Latin model alphabets for Greek speakers). The other texts are as follows: 3: a list of Greek verbs beginning with the letters  $\alpha$ - $\gamma$ , conjugated, with Latin translation on the right; 4: a Latin-Greek glossary of words connected to inns; 5: a Greek-Latin glossary *de moribus humanis* (written on papyrus as stated in Kramer's own *editio princeps*, not on parchment as indicated here); 6: a Greek-Latin glossary *de mercibus* and *de militibus*; 7: an alphabetical list of Greek words beginning with the letters  $\pi$ ,  $\rho$ , and  $\sigma$ , with Latin translations; 8: a fragment of an everyday conversation (cf. *Colloquium Harleianum*, see above); 9: a similar fragment containing a discussion in a bath about animals and officials; 10: a fragment of the Aesopic fable no. 264. (There is a painful printing error in the Greek version of the fable, p. 101: the quotation mark " is used instead of  $\hat{\omega}$ . The error is due to the conversion of 'smart quotes' into 'straight quotes' with no regard for the font used.) The Latin text has often been transliterated with the Greek alphabet, but sometimes both languages have been written using the appropriate alphabet. Only one example (the latest) in all of Kramer's material has Greek transcribed in Latin letters. This practice differs from that of the MSS, where Latin is never written with Greek letters, and is obviously due to the fact that the papyri are Eastern, the manuscripts from the West.

All the texts have been published previously; even if the edition does not contain photographs, drawings of each text have been included. Kramer's commentary on these marginal but interesting texts is excellent. This useful edition concludes with an index of Greek and Latin words.

*Kalle Korhonen – Marja Vierros*

PATRICIA A. ROSENMEYER: *Ancient Epistolary Fictions. The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001. ISBN 0-521-80004-8. 370 pp. GBP 45 (USD 64.95).

This intriguing book belongs to a genre nowadays popular in classical studies, namely to that of focusing on one rather specific, often everyday life-related aspect, of the Graeco-Roman world. Here, as often in these types of studies, the most rewarding way to approach the "common" world is (paradoxically) through literature. In fact, literature is the only relevant vehicle of research in this study since we are not dealing with letters as

"real" letters but letters as literary devices. This book is an extensive review of the different ways letters have been used in Greek literature and at the same time it explores the definition of "fictitious" and gives new interesting meanings to it.

The study is divided into four parts according to literary genres, beginning with Homer (surprisingly!) and ending with the second sophistic. The terminology in different categories ("epistolary novel", for example, is subdivided into chapters such as "embedded letters", "pseudonymous letter collections" and "epistolary novel") is somewhat confusing, but the structure is explained in the prologue. The prologue also includes a most interesting and thorough discussion about general definitions of a letter, as well as an overview of how letters have been categorized in previous studies. The author points out what kinds of difficulties there are in defining a letter: how to determine in few sentences what a tiny piece of papyrus (perhaps containing banal notes) found in the rubbish-piles of Oxyrhynchus, and a "letter" by Cicero have in common. As her starting point, R. takes the view of J. Sykutris (*RE* suppl. V, 1931): Sykutris suggested five different types of letters, including both "real" and fictive letters. Rosenmeyer also observes the importance of Roman epistolary literature, but wisely justifies her focus on Greek fictive epistolography with the lack of an adequate study on this subject.

Before the actual subject matter, there is an introduction to the "culture of letter writing", i.e., and the physical environment (writing materials and "postal services" as well as mental occasions which actualize letter writing. Intriguingly we get to know that, according to Hellanicus of Lesbos, Atossa, the queen of the Persians was considered as the "inventor" of letter writing.

Women, female deception in general, as well as magical powers are repeatedly connected with the history of the letter, beginning with the first mention of letter writing in Greek literature, namely the story of Bellerophon, King Proetus and his wife Anteia, told in the sixth book of the Iliad. Although the nature of the writing on the tablet Bellerophon carried is far from certain, it is said to contain σήματα λυγρά (*Il.* 6, 168), which definitely refer to some kind of writing. The story itself is a variation of the theme of Uriah and Batsheba and, above all, Phaedra and Hippolytus, where a letter also plays a central role and this passage is analyzed by Rosenmeyer in the chapter concerning drama.

After Homer, the book examines letters included in Herodotus, Euripides, and some "Hellenistic" authors. R. notes that, before the Hellenistic era, a letter embedded (an expression often used by R.) in literature emphasizes something curious, a phenomenon especially manifest in Herodotus, who also encounters the bizarre ways letters were delivered: e.g., tattooed on the messenger's scalp or placed in the stomach of a dead hare. This, on the other hand, is, of course, compatible with Herodotus' usual way of relating history. In drama, R. observes, letters do not occur before Euripides, but a messenger played the "part" of a letter. In Euripides' plays, letters are also placed "more often than not" in situations having to do with women. R. analyzes letters in Iphigenia in Aulis, Iphigenia in Tauris and, naturally, in Hippolytus. And once again it is shown how letters concern schemes, deceits and tricks (Agamemnon lies to Clytaemnestra in order to sacrifice his daughter, Phaedra writes the fatal suicide-note) and Euripides seems to have been the first to realize how ingenious dramatic device a letter can be.

Before going on to Hellenistic literature, we notice a change in literary culture:

Ptolemaic bureaucracy was more than familiar with all kinds of letters, and, e.g., travelers were expected to write to their families regularly, as papyri show. In Hellenistic literature this change does not, however, show as clearly as might be supposed. On the other hand, R. has chosen only a few examples of Hellenistic literature, and more occurrences of letter writing could, perhaps, be found (historiography?). In general, it is also difficult to draw a line between a "speaking object", common in epigrams, and a fictive letter, as, in principal, both bear the same function. The selection R. gives of Hellenistic epigrams is somewhat curious. Crinagoras or Rufinus can hardly be considered as the best representatives of the Hellenistic epigram, but they obviously show that invitation/gift letters belong to the Roman sphere rather than the Greek. There is also a long excursion on the theme "apple as letter", starting with "Plato's" epigram *AP* 5, 80 and concluding with three versions of the story of Acontius and Cydippe where an apple is used as a letter. As a means of deception, it also fulfills the conditions of an oath and a "performing speech act". This part of the study is most challenging, but in my opinion, at some level, also reaches a point of overinterpretation and truism: is it really necessary to remind the reader of the fact that "the impetus behind a letter is to create a bridge, to overcome distance and absence and to sustain human contact" (p. 116)?

The latter half of the book is dedicated to the letters found in the Greek novel and epistolary novel and letter collections. Embedded letters play a prominent role in Greek novels: we are shown that, besides the obvious use for correspondence (love letters between the main characters, letters of intrigue from the villain), letters in the novel often provide a central impetus for movement in narrative. For example, the letter from Chaereas to Callirhoe actually changes the direction of the narrative, although the letter itself reaches its recipient only rather late in the story. Heliodorus' lovers, on the other hand, are together and they have no need for love letters: it is the letters between Charicleia and her biological parents that play the central role in the unification of the characters. In this context, R. fascinatingly broadens the idea of a letter and suggests that the piece of cloth left with the baby can also be defined as a "letter", written from the mother to the child, and the birthmark could be taken as a final, genuine "letter", which proves Charicleia's true identity.

After the novel, R. investigates further variations of the epistolary prose form. The Alexander Romance belongs to the category, where first-person letters vary with third-person narrative. Pseudonymous letter collections, however, form the most thought-provoking genre of letters, but according to R., cannot necessarily be called "novels". In these mostly Hellenistic and later imperial letters it is question about sheer forgeries, but their intentions are not necessarily altogether bad. The writer takes the personality of a historical person or a "hero" and retells history from an anachronistic but "individual" angle. These letters may also have a mission, namely to present an apology for the hero's life or to gain admiration for him. The names associated with pseudonymous collections include some favorite types: Politicians, tyrants (Themistocles, Phalaris, Artaxerxes and Periander), wise men (Anacharsis, Apollonius of Tyana, Democritus and Hippocrates) and philosophers. In the case of philosophers, the letters were mainly written by their followers and, as in the case of Socrates, there are also two rival schools, that of Antisthenes and that of Aristippus. The complicated history of Platonic letters is (wisely, I think) mentioned only in passing. R. also notes the care with which the pseudonymous

letters were written. The feeling of authenticity was important, although has not been achieved in many instances.

The last chapters deal with the second sophistic and discuss the letters of Alciphron, Aelian and Philostratus. These are separated from the previous examples by the fact that these letters do not cohere in a novelistic whole, but are brief glimpses into the lives of "ordinary" people. R. openly states that she aims to place Alciphron, for instance, in the proper context of epistolary literature, and to win more respect for his undervalued production (123 letters). She succeeds there, too. It is most interesting to see how much more it is possible to say about this author than, for example, the Cambridge History of Classical Literature does. This latter part of the book also elegantly rounds off the study. The theme "apple as letter" gets yet another variation in the letter of Philostratus, showing how much life this metaphor continued to have. R. also makes it clear that there remains a vast quantity of material (e.g., Aristaenetus and Theophylactus) that has not been included in the letters discussed in the study (for chronological reasons).

This study gives the reader a good idea of the vast field of letters in an imaginative and refreshing way. It also shows in how many different ways a letter can be defined, read and used: A letter could be taken as a sign of authority and integrity, but sometimes writers take advantage of the allusiveness of a letter. As an overall comment, however, it must be stated that it is the very aspect of the study that are both its strength and weakness: the term "fictive" remains perhaps too vague, and seems here to be used more or less as a synonym for the word "literary" which, in my opinion, is a too simplified interpretation. On the other hand, the study demonstrates excellently the flexible nature of a letter. Its important features are the peculiar relationship between the conventions of "real letters" and the imagination of the writer, as well as the possibility of different kinds of audiences (internal and external reader). All those who find interesting the questions concerning "fictitious" and intertextuality in ancient literary sources should read this study.

*Tiina Puroola*

*Letteratura e propaganda nell'occidente latino da Augusto ai regni romanobarbarici.* Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Arcavacata di Rende, 25-26 maggio 1998. A cura di FRANCA ELA CONSOLINO. Saggi di storia antica 15. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2000. ISBN 88-8265-094-4. 227 pp. EUR 114.

This volume contains the papers presented at the international conference on literature and propaganda in the Western Roman Empire held in Arcavacata di Rende in 1998. Although the title covers the time span from Augustus to the fifth and sixth centuries, most of the articles deal with Late Roman literature of the fourth century. The purpose of the conference was to discuss propaganda and its nuances, self-censorship and hidden criticism in Roman Antiquity as well as the problems that the application of the term 'propaganda' in the ancient world causes. Since Alan Cameron's monograph on Claudian in 1970 (see also below), which introduced the term in Late Antique studies, the word 'propaganda' has sometimes been used as an interpretative passe-partout in scholarly discussion. Nevertheless, everything, e.g., all panegyrics, cannot be taken as propaganda.