

have looked further at the Greek background of Plautine comedy, exploring how other ancient dramatists staged old age. A brief discussion of the various types of old women in ancient drama would also have been helpful (there is a section on the *uxor dotata* (81–8), but there are other types like the old nurse, *nutrix*). Summaries of what we know about the realities of being old in the ancient world and of the *Nachleben* of the *senex* in European drama would have made nice additions.

There are occasional slips, but they do not mar the overall positive impression. Just two details: *peculiaris* (45) does not mean ‘vantaggioso’; he could profitably have used some works that are absent from his bibliography, most notably S. L. Walker, *The Senex Amator in Plautus: A Study in Development*, diss. Chapel Hill 1980, and for imagery (30–9) J. T. Svendsen, *Goats and Monkeys: A Study of the Animal Imagery in Plautus*, diss. University of Minnesota 1971. In sum, B. has advanced our understanding of the *senex* in Plautus and must be congratulated on this achievement.

Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald

BORIS DUNSCH

M. CHASSIGNET, *L'ANNALISTIQUE ROMAINE. TOME III. L'ANNALISTIQUE RECENTE. L'AUTOBIOGRAPHIE POLITIQUE (FRAGMENTS)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2004. Pp. clix + 295. ISBN 2-251-01435-7. €61.00.

This volume provides a critical edition and French translation of the known fragments of late Republican historiography. The Introduction surveys each author's life, works, and reception (both ancient and modern). The text, supported by a rigorous *apparatus criticus*, appendices, and extensive supplementary notes, is divided between the later annalists and political autobiography.

Hermann Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* is acknowledged as the model for this volume (cvi). Peter's edition provides the foundation, with little alteration, for the histories of P. Rutilius Rufus, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, Proclius and L. Scribonius Libo, and for the memoirs of M. Aemilius Scaurus, P. Rutilius Rufus, Q. Lutatius Catulus, and L. Cornelius Sulla. The texts of Valerius Antias and Q. Aelius Tubero include minor additions in the selection of fragments, whereas the histories of Q. Lutatius Catulus, L. Cornelius Sisenna, and C. Licinius Macer constitute a more fundamental departure from previous editions.

Sisenna's history has been fundamentally reorganized, but the Introduction and Notes offer no systematic justification for this rearrangement of the fragments. The structure and scope of each work are discussed in the Introduction, but without reference to individual fragments. The Notes offer historical and literary commentary as well as textual and linguistic analysis. As a result there is only sporadic discussion of individual fragments precisely where it is most needed to convince the reader that the selection and arrangement of fragments presented in this volume is to be preferred to any previous editions. There is a general tendency both in the Introduction and the Notes to present conflicting arguments but to avoid making judgements on matters of scholarly dispute.

The general conservatism of this volume may be illustrated by its treatment of Sulla's memoirs. The text follows Peter's selection and arrangement of the fragments, albeit with occasional differences in how much of the source text is cited. No new fragment is added. The Introduction mentions several passages from Plutarch which scholars have at various times associated with Sulla's memoirs (civ, n. 549), but no mention is made of Appian, notably Sulla's letter to the *interrex* L. Valerius Flaccus advising the appointment of a dictator in the closing months of 82 B.C. (B.C. 1.98), discussed by Heinz Bellen, ‘Sullas Brief an den Interrex L. Valerius Flaccus: zur Genese der sullanischen Diktatur’, *Historia* 24 (1975), 555–69, at 556–9. One may add Pliny's testimony that the one thing lacking to Sulla's *felicitas*, as Sulla himself admitted, was the fact that he had failed to dedicate the Capitolium (NH 7.138). There is no explicit reference to Sulla's memoirs in these passages, but they surely deserve some mention in the Introduction or Notes.

The reliability of each fragment in this volume is clearly annotated: passages marked \*\* mention the author's name but not the work, passages marked \* fail only to cite the exact book within a work, while the absence of an asterisk indicates that the author, work, and book citation are all mentioned in the source text. The Appian passage may not satisfy these criteria, but the Pliny passage certainly qualifies for a \*\* annotation, and it is arguably more reliable than Tacitus' record of Smyrna's assistance to Sulla in the war with Mithridates (*Ann.* 4.56.2), which is nevertheless included as a fragment (fr. 19 = fr. 17A Peter), even though the Notes express doubts as to the reliability of its attribution (245). Its only virtue is the long respectability gained by its

inclusion in Peter's edition. The two passages ought to be judged according to the same criteria: either the Pliny passage should have been included or the Tacitus passage dropped.

The Tacitus passage cited above should be marked \*\* (not \*), since it only mentions Sulla's name, not his memoirs. The same correction should be made to fr. 20 (= fr. 18 Peter). The translation reads 'comme il le raconte lui-même dans ses *Mémoires*', but this phrase corresponds to just one word in the Greek: φησὶ (183). One fragment marked \* cites Book 10 of Sulla's memoirs, so no star symbol should be given (fr. 17 = 16 Peter). Notwithstanding these inaccuracies, the single and double star annotation adopted in this volume introduces an extra layer of rigour and clarity to the single star system of Peter's edition. A triple star annotation might have allowed the inclusion of fragments such as the letter written by Sulla to his future *magister equitum*.

I would prefer to see a more inclusive approach to the attribution of fragments. Texts which mention a book citation within a given author's work will always hold pride of place, but less secure fragments (even the more recent attributions which cannot boast Peter's patronage) should also be included in future collections so that the reader can at least judge the potential scope of a lost work.

University College Dublin

A. G. THEIN

G. L. CAMPBELL, *LUCRETIUS ON CREATION AND EVOLUTION: A COMMENTARY ON DE RERUM NATURA BOOK FIVE, LINES 772–1104*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. xii + 385. ISBN 0-19-926396-5. £60.00.

For the last forty years or so Lucretius has been well served by editors, and there are now serviceable editions of most of the books of the *DRN*, while there has been a spate of enlightening works on the philosophical, and particularly the Epicurean, background. Book 5, with all its scientific and anthropological complexities, has always been a difficult text to get to grips with (*experto credite*), and Gordon Campbell's volume is a welcome attempt to focus attention on an important section of this book, and to dissect it with the aid of the many relevant insights of modern scholarship. (An indication of the modernity of this work is the number of online references in the footnotes and commentary.) The lines concerned (772–1104) deal with the origin of life on earth and the growth of civilization, up to primitive man's use of fire and the development of cooking. We are offered an introduction, the text, a translation, a detailed commentary, and two extensive appendices. The introduction includes an alert discussion of Lucretius' relationship with earlier theories of creation and zoogonies, particularly of course what we know or can surmise of Empedocles' and Epicurus' beliefs, in formulating his own anti-teleological world view. C. argues well for a compromise approach to Lucretius' ideas on evolution: Lucretius is anti-evolutionist in stressing the fixity of species, and evolutionist in showing that the human race has become differentiated from animals by an evolutionary process (8). Similarly C. argues against the fashionable critical dichotomy 'primitivist' and 'progressivist' as applied to Lucretius, on the grounds that the terms are unhelpful and that Lucretius 'attaches no absolute values to prehistory' (11). Another good feature of the introduction is a summary discussion of the Epicurean theory of the origin of language — a more detailed account is to be found in the commentary. Here we do have quite a lot to go on, both in the surviving works of Epicurus himself and in other Epicurean sources. C. rightly stresses the importance of this element in the tradition Lucretius inherited, as there is clear evidence that Epicurus himself associated the development of language with early man's concept of the gods and of justice and piety (283–4). This is altogether a thorough and helpful analysis of the question of early speech.

The text is supplied with a fairly full apparatus, and a spot-check of the following translation shows it to be accurate and readable (my quibbles are trivial). The following commentary forms the main section of the book. Visually this is clearly laid out and attractive to read (features not to be found in many commentaries), and the notes are learned and well argued, with due allowance made for opposing views in difficult areas. Another welcome feature is that all Greek citations are translated, as this will widen the readership which can profit from this book. The subject-sections of the commentary have each a general introductory note, and the balance of the discussions is understandably tilted towards issues of philosophy, ancient science, and anthropology, rather than grammatical and lexical details — though C. is not deaf to the aural effects of Lucretius' verse, e.g. his frequent and deliberate use of onomatopoeia. C. also has his views on textual problems, with some discussions of cruces, even if only to endorse readings