

subjectivity, adheres to the scholarly traditions which set the frame for his historical enterprise.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

TAMAR LANDAU

GALEN

R. J. HANKINSON (ed.): *Galen: On Antecedent Causes*. (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 35.) Pp. xv + 349. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-521-62250-6.

Galen's short treatise *On Antecedent Causes* deals with the so-called *αἰτίαι προκαταρκτικάί*, causal triggers of disease that are external and chronologically prior to the disease itself. The main factors he is concerned with are heat and cold. The nature, relevance, and, indeed, existence of these causes had become a contentious issue in Greek medicine. Hence it comes as no surprise that Galen's treatise is highly polemical, anecdotal, and unsystematic: Galen constantly takes issue with rival views (especially those of the Methodists and of Erasistratus and his followers), and he leaves no rhetorical technique unexploited to discredit his opponents and to defend his belief in the existence and therapeutic relevance of antecedent causes.

The Greek text of the treatise is lost, and it survives only in the fourteenth-century Latin translation of Niccolò da Reggio. The Latin text was first critically edited for the *CMG* by K. Bardong in 1937; Bardong also printed a tentative *Rückübersetzung* in Greek, but did not provide a commentary. R. J. Hankinson's recent edition of the work is therefore warmly to be welcomed. It contains a critical edition of the Latin text (for which H. could rely on one further witness of which Bardong was unaware); an English translation; a commentary (which also discusses reconstructions of the Greek original); and a lavish introduction which deals with Galen's life and intellectual background, the history of Greek thought on causation, the purpose of the treatise, and the transmission of the text. There is a glossary of Latin–Greek equivalences (though regrettably without references to page and line where the words occur), a bibliography, a general index, and an *index locorum*.

There is a certain disproportion between the introduction (which draws heavily on H.'s work on Greek causal theory) and Galen's text itself, which occupies only a marginal place in the history of Greek thought on causes (H. himself concedes that he has used Galen's text as a 'peg on which to hang discussion of material drawn from a wide variety of sources throughout later antiquity', p. 2). Thus not everything in the introduction—and occasionally also in the commentary—is equally relevant to the understanding of the text (e.g. the paragraph on the difference between preceding and antecedent causes, pp. 43–5, or the note on pp. 161–2). This is not in itself a problem, although it would have been useful if H. had provided a more detailed analysis of the structure of the treatise. Galen's argument wanders widely, and it is not always easy to see where we are coming from and where we are going; a synopsis with references to chapters and sections would also have been helpful in bringing out connections—or the lack of them—in Galen's argument (e.g. what is the relation between the general issue of antecedent causes and the specific discussion of heat and cold? And why is there hardly any consideration of other typical antecedent causes such as drunkenness, indigestion, fatigue, and eating of meat?).

The translation (where I checked it) is accurate, and the interpretation offered in the commentary—with helpful analysis, sometimes exposure, of Galen's reasoning

procedures—is on the whole convincing. Some quibbles. On p. 73, section 7, it would have been clearer if instead of the second ‘they’ we would have had ‘these’ or ‘the latter’. In section 9, I really see no need to delete *non* (l. 13), and I find it very hard to believe that from section 11 Galen is rehearsing his opponents’ view, leaving his own view until VIII 98 (for what about IV 34 ff. and IV 46?); and *hoc* in II 11 (l. 17) refers to the opponents’ line of reasoning set out in sections 9–10. Whether this is ‘desperately question-begging’ (H., p. 162) of Galen is a matter of opinion, but it makes much more sense in my view. On p. 145, there is no translation of *iubet et* (p. 144 l. 7), and *rationem* (ibid., l. 10) surely means ‘method of treatment’ rather than ‘argument’. On pp. 144–8, the line numbers in the critical apparatus do not correspond with the Latin text. On p. 156, some discussion of *occasio* (the standard rendering of *αἴτια* in medieval Latin translations of Galen’s *De sectis*) would have been desirable. There is an odd slip of the pen on p. 268 (‘Diocles of Carystus in Sicily’, a relic of Wellmann’s *sikelische Schule?*). It is irritating that in the bibliography no page references are given for articles and chapters in books. In the *index locorum* Soranus’ *Gynaecia* is confusingly referred to with two different systems (and the reference to Xenophon’s *Mem.* is to Book 3, not 33).

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

PHILIP VAN DER EIJK

PLAUTUS

L. BENZ (ed.): *Maccus barbarus: Sechs Kapitel zur Originalität der Captivi des Plautus*. (ScriptOralia, 74.) Pp. 204. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1998. Cased, DM 78. ISBN: 3-8233-4564-8.

T. BAIER (ed.): *Studien zu Plautus’ Amphitruo*. (ScriptOralia, 116.) Pp. 243. Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1999. Cased, DM 96. ISBN: 3-8233-5426-4.

ScriptOralia is a resounding success. Started as recently as 1985 at the University of Freiburg as an interdisciplinary series devoted to the publication of research on the border between oral tradition and written literature, it already contains over 100 volumes. The main editors do not appear to be classical scholars, but it can be no accident that the Professors of Greek and Latin at Freiburg, Wolfgang Kullmann and Eckard Lefèvre, specialize respectively in Homer and Plautus, the two ancient authors whose works most obviously combine an oral background with a visibly written script. Together with volumes in comparative fields, including English literature, the series contains over twenty in its classical section, many on Plautus, a few on Homer, some of them of major importance.

The two books considered here are collaborative publications each devoted to a particular play of Plautus. Lefèvre plays the leading rôle in both. He has clear and incisive views about the genesis of these highly untypical plays. The *Captivi* he believes to reflect the situation in Rome at the return of Titus Flamininus from his successful war against Philip V of Macedon; Plutarch tells us (*Flam.* 13.6–8) that there were Roman citizens living in slavery in Greece from the Hannibalic wars, and that local Greek communities bought their freedom and presented them as a gift to the victorious general. If this is the background to *Captivi*, it dates the play to 194 B.C. L. describes the situation as that of a *praetexta* (a serious play in Roman dress) masquerading as a *palliata* (a comedy in Greek dress), the comic element largely provided by the parasite Ergasilus. He sketches the history of modern attitudes to this