

Pamprepii Panopolitani carmina (P.Gr.Vindob. 29788 A—C). Edidit *Henricus Livrea*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1979, XI, 82 p. M 27.—

This book is the fourth specimen of Enrico Livrea's reconstruction of later Greek epic (4th—6th c. A.D.); earlier he published Colluthus (1968), Dionysius' Bassarica and Gigantias (1973) and the so-called Blemyomachia (1978). This reconstruction work is to be welcomed in that it makes more accessible the disiecta membra of the learned epic poetry which flourished in the last centuries of Antiquity. In the edition of Pamprepius we have, indeed, access to all that can be said to be known about this poet's person and work: a preface with the relevant modern discussion, testimonies of Pamprepius' life, a critical edition of the text, and a commentary. All is based on a profound knowledge of Greek epic tradition and especially of the style and language of Nonnus of Panopolis, the main representative of the later epic.

The hexameter poems, an epyllion of high quality about works and hours (fr. 3; 198 verses), an incomplete poem in praise of the Athenian Theagenes (fr. 4), and two minor fragments (fr. 1 and 2), have survived for us in a Vienna papyrus. Livrea bases his edition not only on previous editions but also on a new reading of the papyrus. The edition is carried out with extreme care and thoroughness, so that a reviewer can hardly find anything to add. In 1 verso 12, Livrea, however, reproduces the old reading $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha[.] \cdot \theta\epsilon\omicron\nu[$, which does not fit the dactylic metre; most probably the last legible letters should be $\theta\epsilon\sigma\mu$ ($\theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}$, $\theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$?).

The identification of the fragmentary poems of the papyrus is crucial for the existence of this Teubner edition, and of course, for the existence of the poet Pamprepius. The poems are attributed to Pamprepius by the first editor Gerstinger (1928). Livrea accepts the attribution and adds further arguments for it (ZPE 25, 1977, 121—134). However, the attribution is not certain. Many question marks can be raised against it. Therefore, it is strange that the poems are published in Pamprepius' name without reservation, although Livrea himself accepts the view presented by McCail (JHS 98, 1978, 38—63) that at least fr. 1 cannot be attributed to Pamprepius.

Toivo Viljamaa

Scenae Suppositiciae oder Der falsche Plautus. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von *Ludwig Braun*. Hypomnemata, Heft 64. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen, 1980. 208 S. DM 44.—

Ich erinnere mich noch, als ich Schimpfwörter in Plautus-Stücken erforschte, wie sehr die Lücken in dem Text mich sowohl irritierten als auch interessierten. Welch eine gute Idee, Plautus-Supplemente zu sammeln und zu bearbeiten, und welche Menge von Kenntnissen verschiedenster Art innerhalb eines und desselben

Buches! Das Vorwort und die Einleitung des Verfassers liest man wie einen Detektivroman. In einer kurzen Besprechung — die in Frage stehenden Komödien sind *Amphitruo*, *Aulularia*, *Bacchides*, *Mercator* und *Pseudolus* — kann ich nur die Hauptpunkte dieser gründlichen Arbeit berühren.

In dem ersten Kapitel, das "Die Supplemente und ihre Komödien" heisst, behandelt Braun folgende Fragen: Wie passt die Ergänzung in die Lücke? Was weiss man heute über den ursprünglichen Inhalt der Lücke? Welches sind die dramatischen und sprachlichen Qualitäten der Ergänzungen? Sehr fein ist das folgende Kapitel über ein so schwieriges Thema wie Metrik; dann kommen Verfasserfragen und die Überlieferungsgeschichte der obengenannten Komödien. Dem gediegenen einleitenden Teil folgen Text, Übersetzung, kritischer Apparat und Kommentar. Einen Durchschnittsleser interessiert wohl am meisten der ungemein ergiebige Kommentar. Ich zitiere Brauns eigene Worte (S. 15): "In der Hauptsache sammelt der Kommentar aber die sprachlichen Parallelen, vor allem aus der antiken Komödie, dazu auch das weitere Material für die Frage, welche anderen antiken Schriftsteller den verschiedenen Ergänzern vertraut waren und von ihnen verwertet wurden, und wie 'korrekt', am antiken Latein gemessen, die Ausdrucksweise in den Supplementen ist."

Saara Lilja

Netta Zagagi: Tradition and Originality in Plautus. Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy. Hypomnemata, Heft 62. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen, 1980. 159 p. DM 34.—.

In Chapter I, which covers one half of the book, Zagagi demonstrates that mythological hyperboles καθ' ὑπεροχὴν were a common feature in Greek proverbs and literature, and even finds new evidence in Middle and New Comedy. When dealing with Tragedy, she should perhaps have emphasized comic parody of the tragic style (there is only one cautious remark, on p. 42) — I am thinking of such passages as the final part of Arist. *Frogs* and Plaut. *Men.* 835ff. among many others.

Zagagi's analyses of two amatory cantica of Plautus, *Cist.* 203—228 and *Trin.* 223—275, in Chapter II are very fine, but, to quote her own words, "similar research obviously needs to be done on other Plautine cantica" (132). A couple of comments on pp. 89 and 105: considering the ancient strictness with which the different literary γένη were kept apart, I would call the idea of adding elements from one γένος to another an original one (if Plautus was as well acquainted with Greek literature other than Comedy); and the conception of love can have been illustrated along similar lines by different peoples, in other words, not everything need consist of literary loans. Lastly, "repetitiousness is one of the most distinctive features of Plautus' style" (98), but this is equally true of Middle and New Comedy.