

ent genres utilized the idea of literary memory, but I wonder if focusing on fewer genres might not have improved the coherence of the first part, even though every chapter in this part is an interesting read. I particularly enjoyed, for instance, the author's perceptive reading of the "New Simonides". Compared to the first part, the second part, in which Grethlein analyses parts of the works of Herodotus and Thucydides, gives him more space and time to develop his arguments. All in all, this is an important book, and it gives a clear overview of the employment of the idea of literary memory in fifth-century Greek literature. The editorial work by Cambridge University Press is irreproachable.

Iiro Laukola

GESINE MANUWALD: *Roman Republican Theatre. A History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011. ISBN 978-0-521-11016-7 (hardback). XII, 390 pp. GBP 65, USD 105.

This book is a general history of, and an introduction to, Roman theatre and drama. W. Beare's *Roman Stage* (1964), while still used and useful, is outdated concerning newer material. Manuwald's purpose is "to provide a synoptic discussion of the whole complex of dramatic works in Republican Rome". She wishes to accomplish this by combining a variety of diachronic and synchronic perspectives.

An important and valuable part of Manuwald's discussion is the placement of Republican drama in its contemporary historical, political, and social context. This is done in Part I, titled "Cultural and institutional background". The cult context of Roman drama is not as obvious as in its Greek counterpart, but this aspect should not be overlooked, and Manuwald does a good job of presenting the evidence for the various Roman festivals, their associated deities and temples, and the evolving development of the practice of offering dramatic performances on these occasions. The Romans' preference for temporary theatrical structures, together with the practical and architectural aspects of these constructions, are given due attention. The production process of the plays, the role of the impresarios responsible for this, the organization of the actors and their social status, the control the poets had (or did not have) over their texts after the first production, and financial matters (who paid whom and when) are all important topics covered in the first part. These multiple perspectives of a largely practical nature make up the most rewarding part of the book.

What perhaps cannot be avoided in a book with as broad a coverage as this one is the fact that the treatment is at places superficial, for example concerning the reception of Greek culture by the Romans, or the relationship between drama and the building of a national identity. These themes are mentioned several times throughout the book but nowhere discussed in detail.

The second part, "Dramatic poetry", is divided into three chapters: "Dramatic genres", "Dramatic poets", and "Dramatic Themes and Techniques". Manuwald presents all the essential sources and information. Concerning the fragmentary poets her discussion is thorough. It seems that the author wished to find a balance between the highly incongruous nature of the material that we have on Roman Republican drama, with most authors surviving only in fragments and only two represented by a series of entire plays. This is understandable, given the book's scope and aim: it is not a book on Plautus and Terence, and not even one on the *palliata*.

However, in the section on Plautus (4.6) the picture painted of the playwright remains somewhat colourless and meagre. A more detailed and inspired discussion would have been desirable. This also applies to the comparison between a passage of Menander's *Dis exapaton* on a papyrus and the corresponding passage in Plautus' *Bacchides* 494–562. This is nearly the only possibility we have to compare the source text and the Roman version, and one feels that a more substantial part of the discussion on this pair of passages could have been incorporated here. My impression is, then, that the dramatic and linguistic genius of Plautus is not given an appropriate expression.

The chapter on Terence (4.9) is largely dedicated to his prologues. While these offer exceptionally rewarding material for shaping our conception of the literary and dramatic atmosphere of the time, this focus leaves much of the plays themselves - and their dramatic technique, language, and style - untouched.

On the whole, there is very little information in the book on the language and style of Roman Republican drama, and the chapter on language, style, and metre (5.6) does little to make up for this lack. For example, on p. 325 Manuwald writes "Presumably, the language of Roman drama was originally not too artificial", with the implication that it later apparently evolved into something more artificial. This presumption is odd, and no reason for this later development is given, nor is there an explanation of what 'artificial' in this connection means. This apparent lack of interest in language is seemingly reflected in the fact that very little Latin is quoted, even when a detailed point is being made about a passage.

The book's structure is very clear, and will make it easy for readers to find the information they are looking for. This is good, since Manuwald's study will undoubtedly be used as a general reference tool in the future, both because of its broad coverage and its ample references to secondary literature. The book is rich in references to ancient *testimonia* as well.

One of Manuwald's central messages appears to be that, in all its genres, in addition to its entertaining qualities Republican drama conveyed meaningful messages to audiences. She repeatedly emphasizes that even light dramatic forms (*palliata*, *togata*, *Atellana*, mime) were not merely entertainment. This may be a point worth making, but one wonders about the necessity of adding conclusive statements with clusters of the same terms (p. 172 on *Atellana*): "The topics, characters and settings of *Atellana* result in **everyday, straightforward, entertaining, yet meaningful stories** in a (stylized) Roman or mythical environment." and (p. 180 on mime) "Generalizing somewhat, one may therefore conclude tentatively that mime became prominent when it did because it provided a perfect combination (from the audience's point of view) of the two tendencies observable in the development of drama in Republican Rome: **meaningful messages and entertaining elements**. Mime provided basic **entertainment** in an **everyday setting** as well as **straightforward** moral rules and comments on topical issues."

In general, my impression is that the book is at places repetitive in its content and phrasing, and it would have benefited from some editing and compressing of its message. Finally, as a minor observation, it can be noted that the continuous use of slashes to denote optional interpretations is irritating. In addition to and/or even such combinations as intrigues/complications (p. 174), plays/stories and plots/storylines (p. 190), Dionysus/Bacchus/Liber (p. 200), fan/student (p. 205) are found.