

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

play, with the most amazing downturn, from adulation of the critics up to the end of the nineteenth century, followed by almost universal depreciation. He himself seems to accept the criticisms rather too easily, expressing agreement with the view that there was no need for the exchange of identities between the slave Tyndarus and his master Philocrates once Hegio had shown his intention to arrange an exchange for his son. But surely the aim of the slave was to get his master to safety at whatever cost to himself; the alleged intentions of Hegio were not his concern. In the comic scenes in the play, mostly irrelevant to the main plot, L. sees the influence on Plautus of popular improvisatory theatre, given names like Atellan Farce and Mime in the ancient world, and known as *commedia dell'arte* in the modern, *Stegreifspiel* in German; perhaps the closest to the experience of some of us were the Pierrot shows at the seaside in our youth.

Lefèvre and the other contributors to these volumes see Plautus as essentially combining the plot conventions of New Comedy with scenes from improvised theatre; in the process, written texts are contaminated with oral routines; and oral routines have become fixed into a written script.

The situation in *Amphitruo* is analogous. In this case Lefèvre argued in 1992 (*Maccus vortit barbare*, Wiesbaden) that this play alludes, not to a lost Greek tragedy, but to a Roman one, an *Alcumena*, perhaps by Ennius, perhaps performed in 191, itself based on the *Alkmene* of Euripides, mentioned at *Rud.* 86. He refers to his 1992 publication here, and the storm of disagreement it raised; but his aim now is different. Even more than in his chapter on the *Captivi*, he hammers home the lesson that the comedy in *Amphitruo* comes from the *Stegreifspiel*, and that this is to be found particularly in the actions and reactions of the slave Sosia; but not only Sosia; he also accepts a recent view that even the extremely virtuous Alcumena is to some extent satirized, and her embarrassing situation would be a source of coarse laughter to the unfeeling Roman audience. To press home the echoes of the theatre of improvisation, he lists twelve features of the composition (disguise, metatheatre, the amorality of farce, fights on stage, and so on), and points out in each case that their natural home was in popular comedy, not in the New Comedy of Athens. When Mercurius, for example, explains to the audience that he and Sosia will look identical, 'but you will be able to tell which one I am because I shall be wearing feathers in my cap', this is both comic disguise and metatheatre.

Lore Benz and Thomas Gerick (as well as Thomas Baier; see later) contribute to both books. Benz writes on the parasite in the *Captivi*, and the metaphors in the text of that play, and on dramatic adaptation and parody in *Amphitruo*. In the last of these she stresses the point that Plautus, working at his desk to produce a text for performance, included comic routines from the popular theatre; Molière did the same, and so did Shakespeare. Gerick discusses the trochaic septenarii in both plays, following his own volume devoted to that metre (*ScriptOralia* 85, 1996). His problem is how to explain the clearly Greek origins of the long catalectic trochaic verse with its equally clearly Roman identity as the *versus quadratus*.

The other chapters are by Gregor Vogt-Spira (a regular contributor to *ScriptOralia*), on whether *Captivi* is a 'Fortuna-Komödie' (not really), and five more on *Amphitruo*: Ulrike Auhagen on elements of *Stegreifspiel* in the prologue; Barbara Sherberg on Jupiter's rôle; Stefan Faller on the 'Teloboeae' and King Pterelas (very interesting this one, and informative); Ekkehard Stärk on how this play fits into the pattern of others (Plautus' lost *Bis compressa*, Terence's *Hecyra*) in which the date of conception of a baby is significant to the plot; and Gesine Manuwald on whether

Amphitruo is better described as a parody or a tragicomedy (the latter); her contribution is unusual in showing some interest in Plautus' varied metres.

Both volumes end with an interesting discussion by Thomas Baier of Renaissance comedies derived from these of Plautus, Jean Rotrou's *Les Sosies* and *Les Captifs* (1636 and 1638, respectively). Rotrou, who also translated *Menaechmi* (*Les Ménechmes*, 1632) was a precursor of Molière, whose *Amphitryon* (1668) takes the corresponding place in the parallel volume of the Urbino-based *Lecturae Plautinae Sarsinates* (see *CR* 50 [2000], 598).

There is a great deal of interest here, and particularly in Lefèvre's magisterial chapters. One aspect, however, causes a little disappointment. The contributors quote Plautus from Lindsay's OCT, usually without even mentioning the fact, as if that represents the vulgate. This can only be explained as a traumatic loss of confidence by German scholarship. Lindsay is now over 100 years old; and even then, Leo had produced a better text, as is accepted by Questa in his recent edition of the *Cantica*. The great German Plautinists in the period after the first decades of the twentieth century—Fraenkel, Jachmann, Drexler, Otto Skutsch—would not have dreamt of quoting the text from Lindsay. In fact, they exercised their personal judgement on every line they quoted. Here we find scholars engaged in literary discussion quoting many lines in a form which they should not and surely would not have in any new edition of the plays.

We read, for example,

Capt.	400	meu' mihi, suo' quoique est carus
	439	fac fidele sis fidelis
	888	Siculus :: et nunc Siculus non est
Amph.	143	ego has habebō usque <hic> in petaso pennulas
	486	sed Alcumenai huius honoris gratia.

The inferiority of these editorial decisions to those in the texts of Leo, Goetz and Schoell (the small Teubner), and Ernout may not seem of major importance; but it is strange that nobody seems to mind.

University College London

M. M. WILLCOCK

LUCRETIUS

P. H. SCHRIJVERS: *Lucreèce et les sciences de la vie*. Pp. 231. Leiden, etc.: Brill 1999. Cased, \$91. 25. ISBN: 90-04-10230-2.

This collection of essays is a stimulating contribution to an already impressive series of recent scholarly studies on the intellectual context of the *De rerum natura*. (See K. A. Algra, M. H. Koenen, P. H. Schrijvers (edd.), *Lucretius and his Intellectual Background* [Amsterdam, 1997], in which papers by Algra and Lévy engage directly with S.'s arguments in Chapters VII and X; David Sedley, *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* [Cambridge, 1998], whose Chapter III argues directly against S.'s general conclusions; and Diskin Clay, *Paradosis and Survival. Three Chapters in the Epicurean Philosophy* [Ann Arbor, 1998].) The volume contains eleven papers from 1974–97, presenting a coherent and rich study of Lucretius' theories of human development (*DRN* 5.780–1160) and applied psychology

© Classical Association, 2001