

du commentaire du IV^e livre). L'ouvrage commence par l'Introduction (pp. 1–26) qui contient une présentation de Plutarque et du *Comment lire les poètes* (contenu, structure, langue, style: la section sur le caractère rythmique de la langue de Plutarque est très inspirée, pp. 23–5), puis continue par le texte grec (pp. 29–69) et le commentaire (pp. 70–209) pour se terminer par la Bibliographie (pp. 210–8) et deux Index (général et des passages cités) (pp. 219–22).

Selon la Préface (p. VII), Russell avait travaillé sur une édition et un commentaire du texte pendant plusieurs années mais sans les publier et c'est Hunter qui les a étendus. Le texte grec (caractérisé comme "éclectique" par les deux auteurs) est fondé plutôt sur les éditions Teubner, Les Belles Lettres, celle d'Ernesto Valgiglio et la toute récente *editio maior* de Bernardakis que sur une nouvelle collation des manuscrits (p. 25). Néanmoins Hunter-Russell préservent toutes les différences textuelles que l'on trouve chez Plutarque dans les nombreuses citations poétiques. Le riche commentaire occupe presque les deux tiers du livre. Les auteurs proposent au début de chacun des quatorze paragraphes du texte un bref résumé de deux à huit lignes. Ensuite ils offrent leur propre analyse du texte qui met en évidence non seulement les idées de Plutarque mais aussi les influences de Platon, d'Aristote, des stoïciens et des scholies D et bT de *Illiade*. Hunter-Russell mettent aussi en lumière beaucoup de parallèles internes entre Plutarque et des auteurs contemporains qui emploient les mêmes citations poétiques. Le Commentaire est le lieu où les deux auteurs discutent des différences textuelles et des corrections proposées, soit par eux-mêmes, soit par d'autres philologues modernes. Enfin, le commentaire contient des remarques très utiles sur la syntaxe, la grammaire et la métrique. Hunter-Russell traduisent plusieurs extraits du texte grec, ainsi que toutes les citations poétiques. Il va sans dire qu'ils démontrent une connaissance impressionnante de l'ensemble de la littérature ancienne (grecque et latine) et de la bibliographie moderne sur le sujet et les utilisent de façon exemplaire.

La présentation typographique du livre est très soignée. On trouve très peu de coquilles: des accents mal placés (lire Σηδάτιε, p. 31; Νέκυιαν, p. 92; ἀπιθάνως, p. 178; Ἀγάμεμνον, la première fois dans la p. 189), des mots grecs sans tréma (pp. 75, 104, 107, 146, 192) ou coupés fautivement (p. 62: παρ-αλείψει et ἀπέχ-εται; p. 69: παιδαγ-ωγοῦ; p. 73: ἀκροάσ-εσιν). Il faut aussi corriger le nom de Carmen Barrigón en Barrigón Fuentes dans les pp. 78 et 211 et la référence à *Illiade* 11.90 et non pas 11.190 dans la p. 137.

Le livre de Hunter-Russell représente un apport remarquable aux études plutarquéennes et remplit parfaitement ses buts préliminaires: il ouvre une fenêtre sur plusieurs aspects de la pratique de la lecture dans le monde gréco-romain et contribue à une meilleure compréhension du texte même.

Orestis Karavas

Decimus Laberius: The Fragments. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 46. Edited and translated by COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2010. ISBN 978-0-521-88523-2. XXIX, 512 pp. GBP 80.

The Roman mime is one of the most poorly-documented literary genres of Graeco-Roman antiquity. What remains of it consists of fifty-five titles, roughly two hundred lines of verse (some of dubious

authenticity) and over 700 *sententiae* attributed to Publilius Syrus, which, however, shed hardly any light on the nature of this dramatic form itself. Second-hand accounts and descriptions are similarly scant and unreliable: generally, the mime was alluded to in disparaging terms by authors who condemned it largely out of snobbery (in the case of Cicero) or piety (in the case of the Christian authors). Judging by what we can glean from its scarce descriptions, we may be able to conclude the following: the Roman mime was in origin a Hellenistic genre that may have become conflated with such indigenous dramatic forms as Atellan farce. It was largely improvised, relying on "low" or "common" situations and stock characters, but often contained political satire or cultural criticism. Unlike higher forms of drama, the mime employed women actors who were blatantly sexualized. Mime actors largely eschewed the use of masks, although the evidence on this point is contradictory: Tertullian mentions *imago dei vestri*, "the mask of your (pagan) god", in his condemnation of mime (*apol.* 5,13) – a plausible explanation would be that deities were commonly portrayed with masks whereas mortal characters were not.

Contemporary educated opinion held the mime to be the lowest form of literature imaginable despite its huge popularity that persisted until the end of antiquity. This is probably due to the mime's quasi-improvisatory nature, which made mime-texts worthless for school use (Publilius's *sententiae* notwithstanding), and its unrefined content, which the literary elite found distasteful. Although Cicero in his speeches used associations with mime as a character slur to great effect, he nevertheless frequented mime performances, undoubtedly to keep his finger on the pulse of public opinion. He was also not above lauding mime authors for their wit and eloquence. Even in Cicero's opinion, a particularly accomplished representative of the genre was Decimus Laberius, his contemporary and acquaintance, who, conspicuously, was of equestrian rank. If we exclude Publilius Syrus, the overwhelming majority of surviving mime fragments are from his pen.

The fact that a knight would stoop so low as to compose mime texts has caused some bewilderment among earlier researchers and led, in some cases, to a conjectural distinction between "non-literary" and "literary" mime. As Costas Panayotakis propounds in this admirable edition of the surviving fragments of Decimus Laberius, the distinction is probably artificial, and he even goes so far as to suggest that a direct continuum existed between the early Roman comedy of Plautus and Terence and later mime plays. Nevertheless, even Laberius felt deeply humiliated when Caesar made him perform in his own play, something that is testified by his complaint that is preserved in the longest extant fragment of his plays.

Panayotakis's introduction to his edition is probably one of the best summaries of the history and nature of this poorly researched and often misrepresented genre. Panayotakis covers the definition of the Roman mime and its historical origins and development before moving on to the topic of Decimus Laberius himself, using not only linguistic and literary evidence but also archaeological material to corroborate his often bold but always well-argued hypotheses. In editing this excruciatingly fragmentary material, Panayotakis has spent an impressive amount of effort in studying the textual history of the various sources (most notably Nonius, Gellius and Macrobius, probably by way of Suetonius) who have cited Laberius, however briefly. Panayotakis also offers an extensive presentation of the earlier editions of Decimus Laberius and studies of the Roman mime from Petrus Crinitus's 1505 edition to Bonaria's 1965 *Mimi Romani*. His discussions of Laberius's style and metre are uniformly insightful. Laberius's fondness for Greek loans and neologisms has been well established, but Panayotakis argues very convincingly that this is nothing unique and that he

was merely following a tradition that had its roots in Plautine comedy. Earlier studies have taken Laberius's quirky use of Greek as a sign that his plays were aimed at an educated audience. Very sensibly, Panayotakis views this, too, with scepticism. In the light of what we now know about the bilingualism of late republican Rome, his audience probably knew enough Greek to laugh at his puns or, at the very least, recognize that Greek was being parodied.

Panayotakis's analysis of Laberius's prosody uses the alphabetic notation used by A. S. Gratwick in his studies of Plautus and Terence (e.g. ABCD A/BCD ABcD for the iambic senarius), and, comparing his metrical analyses to Gratwick's, Panayotakis demonstrates that Laberius's senarii are structurally closer to those of such imperial authors as Phaedrus than those of early comedy. On two occasions, Laberius seems to have broken Meyer's law (a metrical rule that effectively bans stressed long syllables from occupying the "false" *syllabae ancipites* of archaic iambo-trochaic verse). Panayotakis does not attribute this to ignorance but, rather, to the author's deliberate attempt to break free from the constraints of earlier tradition. I would venture a third possible explanation, namely that Laberius simply counted on the fact that his audience was becoming increasingly deaf to such refinements: even the legionaries who according to Suetonius (*Iul.* 51) chanted *Urbáni se-ruate uxores, moechum caluum adducimus* violated the very same rule. Of course, given the scant evidence of post-Terentian senarii and septenarii and the Roman grammarians' general ignorance on the subject, it is hard to draw definite conclusions on the matter. Despite Panayotakis's silence on the issue, I find it plausible that the lingering survival of archaic iambo-trochaic metres into late antiquity and beyond may at least partly be attributable to the long-lasting popularity of mime, a subject that certainly calls for further research.

Panayotakis's edition of the fragments of Laberius's mimes is, if possible, even more impressive than his introduction. His conjectures on the original context and even the plot lines of Laberius's plays are often bold but invariably backed up by solid research. Laberius's sexual material, which, mime being mime, is understandably prominent, is never glossed over or misunderstood as it often was in more prudish times, and Panayotakis makes his firm intuitive grasp of the often stereotyped characters and situations that lie at the heart of Roman comedy go a long way.

Taken purely as an edition of Decimus Laberius, this remarkable piece of scholarship will certainly not be surpassed for quite some time. At the same time, its publication makes indispensable reading for anyone who wishes information on what is probably the most elusive – and arguably most scandalous – form of Roman literature.

Seppo Heikkinen

WOLFGANG HÜBNER: *Manilius, "Astronomica" Buch V. Band 1: Einführung, Text und Übersetzung, Band 2: Kommentar*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 2010. ISBN 978-3-11-020670-8. X, 303 S., 8 Taf. (Band 1), VIII, 450 S. (Band 2). EUR 178. USD 267.

Die Geschichte des Maniliustextes wird durch die drei Giganten Scaliger, Bentley und Housman bestimmt, doch ist auch nach ihnen am schwierigen Text des Verfassers des Lehrgedichts hervorragende Arbeit geleistet worden. Und Wolfgang Hübner zählt zu den ersten und wichtigsten in der Reihe. Er war wie ausgewiesen zur Editionsarbeit des Manilius, vor allem durch seine zahlrei-