

volumes, altogether more than 100 pages. The absence of an index is now amended by the fresh *Index* volume, published in 2002.

*Erkki Sironen*

PLAUTUS: *Amphitruo*. Edited by DAVID M. CHRISTENSON. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000. ISBN 0-521-45401-8 (hb); 0-521-45997-4 (pb). 339 pp. GBP 50 (hb), GBP 18.99 (pb).

It is pretty generally agreed that the *Amphitruo* is one of the funniest of Plautus' plays. Accordingly, one is pleased to observe the *Amphitruo* being added to the volumes of the useful Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Series. This book, a revised version of the author's dissertation (p. ix), has been fairly well received, and I have found it both useful and instructive, especially as far as the commentary goes. However, it must be admitted that there are parts which seem less impressive. This also seems to be the bottom line of other reviews of this book; and speaking of reviews, this book may well be remembered for having provoked one of the weirdest reviews in the history of scholarly reviewing, that of C. Questa (the well-known authority on Plautine metre) in *RFIC* 129 (2001) 91-99. This review must be read to be believed; note, e.g., the reference (perhaps not really needed) to Jesse James, an American outlaw of the 19th century, on p. 94, the description of a well-known modern scholar as *merobibus multibibus multiloquus* on the same page and that of two well-known female scholars as "garrule" (and of their work as "titoli amatoriali") on p. 93. One also wonders about the way the author of the book reviewed here is spoken of on p. 96, only the first name being used. – In any case, the *genre* of a scholarly commentary is an extremely difficult one, and as there is normally enormous variation in the range of potential users, of whom it is practically impossible to please everyone, one should not wonder too much if reviewers find a passage or two with which they are unhappy.

The book begins pretty much as one would expect it to begin. There are chapters on Plautus himself, on Roman comedy in general, on the *Amphitruo* ("The play's the thing", p. 13-45, with sections on "Theme, structure, and movement", "Performance", and on "Reception and reaction"), on its background and sources (no firm views being taken, understandably), on metre, on the "Rezeption" of the play, and on the transmission of the text. I rather liked the chapter on the play itself, with an emphasis on the importance of interpreting the *Amphitruo* as a play (and not as a literary product in general), and thought that the other chapters, too, were more or less useful and informative, especially if used by the uninitiated as introductions to their respective topics. However, in the (first) chapter on Plautus himself, I wondered about some things, for instance about what is said in n. 5, but especially about the passage on Plautus' name (p. 1). It may well be that, in Plautine studies, the nomenclature 'T. Maccius Plautus' is regarded as "implausible", but this is misguided. In Rome in Plautus' period, one gets one's gentile name either by being born to a father with the same name or by being manumitted by someone, again a person with the same name. Thus Plautus can have become 'Maccius' either as the son or as the freedman of another Maccius, and it is in no

way useful or even possible to introduce the existence of a *maccus* in the *fabula Atellana* at this point; what we are dealing with is a simple coincidence. As for the fact that Plautus calls himself 'Maccus' whereas later writers refer to him as 'Maccius', this was explained a long time ago by W. Schulze (*Zur Geschichte röm. Eigennamen* [1904] 298), who observed that *Maccus* is the dialectal form of an Etruscan original *mace*, and that *Maccius* is the same name equipped with a more 'Roman' ending (in the same way people called 'Bellicus' or 'Passienus' started to call themselves 'Bellicius' or 'Passienius'). As for the *praenomen*, it is really nice that it happens to be *Titus* because if Plautus did come from Sarsina in Umbria (doubted without a clear reason by Christensen, p. 1), his origin would fit marvellously with the fact that *Titus*, normally a rarish name, was the second most popular *praenomen* in Umbria (see my *Die röm. Vornamen* [1987] 158). *Plautus* was, of course, a nickname of sorts, as one would not expect someone in Plautus' position to have had a real *cognomen* in this period.

In the chapter on metre (and in the notes on metre in the commentary), a notation of the type ABCD, based on a *metron*, is used, with B and D denoting the *longae* and small letters standing for short syllables (e.g., ABcD = – – u –, aaBCdd = uu – – uu). In this chapter, the author does not seem to be at his best in explaining things, for what he says in some places must seem too complicated for the average student (e.g., the passage on resolution on p. 62 and sections ix-xi). Moreover, a detail or two in this chapter seemed a bit questionable to me; certainly I find it hard to believe that a word of the type *stultitia* was accented on the first syllable (p. 58).

The text, on p. 83-128, is given without even a rudimentary *apparatur criticus*, a decision which some will not think the best solution. However, there is a section (p. 77-80) in which the differences between this edition and those of Leo and Lindsay are noted (the author seems to choose sometimes a reading of Leo, sometimes that of Lindsay; new proposals by the author himself, two cases, are noted on p. 76). – Besides the lack of an *apparatus* of sorts, many may also object to the lack of a *conspectus metrorum*, something which does not seem to be explained anywhere. Now it is true that there is a table of the metres of lines 153-262 in the commentary on line 153ff. (p. 166) and similar tables in other places, but this is not quite the same as having a clear summary of the metrical structure of the whole play.

But let us now turn to the commentary which, for many users of the book, will be the most interesting part and which in any case is the longest (pp. 129-317). In general I must say that I found the commentary both helpful and instructive; no doubt it will be of great use to those dealing with the *Amphitruo*. At the same time I must, however, also say that there are details which I thought somewhat dubious. For instance, at 2 n., should one not scan *aBCD* (etc.) instead of *ABCD*, the *e* in *emundis* being short rather than long? At 404 n., I was wondering whether one should really be worried about the "anachronism" if the name of the *Portus Persicus*, used by Amphitryon on his way back to Thebes, were derived from an event of the Persian wars. I mean, would Plautus really have cared about a detail such as this? But let me illustrate the problems of a scholarly commentary by having a look at some notes on the text of a random passage, and let me choose the scene in which Sosia becomes aware of Mercury in front of Amphitryon's house (292ff.). Now, although most of what is said in the notes on this passage is information useful both to the student and to the scholar, there are also details I was

somewhat less happy with. Some instances: line 320: does *perii, si me aspexerit* really need to be commented upon (here, as in many other places, by a translation of the phrase)? Line 329: should not the use of *ut* ("seeing that") have earned a short explanation? Line 332: the choice of *certo* instead of *certe* is explained with a reference to "euphony"; but will this make a beginner any wiser? Line 339: *certum est* ("I'm resolved") might have deserved a bit more than just a reference to the *OLD*. Line 351: perhaps the mention of *rex Creo* should have been explained. Line 362: the point and the exact meaning of the note on *haecine tua domust?* are not clear to me. Line 365: the "Romanized Thebans" (said to have "generally" addressed *Sosia* as *puer* rather than by his name) struck me as a particularly unhappy formulation.

Thus what one observes, then, is that there are notes in the commentary of questionable relevance. However, this illustrates the extreme difficulty of writing a commentary which would please everyone rather than the results of the labours of Professor Christenson. In general, I must conclude by saying that this is a most satisfactory piece of work which will be used with profit both by students and scholars. – The book seem well produced; I noticed misprints only on pp. 44, 216, 306.

*Olli Salomies*

M. TERENTIUS VARRO: *Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta*. Edidit RAYMOND ASTBURY. Editio altera. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Monachii et Lipsiae in aedibus K. G. Saur 2002. ISBN 3-598-71236-7. XLIV, 155 S. EUR 50.

Astbury, ein harter Kritiker der großen Ausgabe von Cèbe, hat selbst 1985 eine kritische Ausgabe der Menippeischen Saturae Varros produziert. Jetzt hat der Verlag sie durch eine leicht neubearbeitete Auflage wieder zugänglich gemacht. Astburys Ausgabe wurde seinerzeit mit zwiespältigen Gefühlen aufgenommen; Lob und ernsthafte Kritik wechselten. In der Neuauflage hat A. der Kritik nicht sonderlich Rechnung getragen (so hat er auf die Einverleibung der meisten ausgewogenen kritischen Bemerkungen von Jocelyn in *CR* 1988, 33–36 verzichtet). Man kann sich auch mit Jocelyn fragen, ob die äußerliche Präsentation der Fragmente die bestmögliche ist – eine Mahnung an den Verlag mit Hinsicht auf die Gestaltung künftiger Teubner-Ausgaben.

*Heikki Solin*

*Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina*. Edidit GEORG LUCK. Editio altera. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Stutgardiae et Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri 1998. ISBN 3-598-71864-0. XLIV, 117 S. EUR 25.

Die 1988 erschienene erste Auflage der von Luck bearbeiteten Ausgabe des Corpus Tibullianum wurde von der Fachwelt nicht besonders günstig aufgenommen (vgl. vor allem Fedeli, *Gnomon* 1991, 309–313 und Tränkle, *MH* 1988, 258f). In der neuen