suggests that the *VP* is a 'Gospel', a pagan refutation of the Gospel of John. D.'s contribution is rather speculative and not written on the same level of argumentation as that reached in Essay 3. In Essay 5, George compares the theories of virtues in the *VP* and in Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*. These two texts have been compared before, but G. does not take a position on whether Athanasius actually used the *VP*. What emerges, here also, is the difference separating the virtues in the *VP* and in Athanasius, made particularly clear in G.'s analysis of the catalogue of virtues attributed to Anthony by Athanasius (cf. pp. 318–19).

This is certainly a very useful contribution to a better understanding of Iamblichus' *VP* in its immediate context, in its structure and in the broader cultural life of late antiquity. Some of the essays represent rigorous scholarly work, whereas others would be more accessible for a wider public. The contributors do not always share the same views. But this also adds to the interest of the book.

University of Fribourg DOMINIC J. O'MEARA

PRAETEXTARUM RELIQUIAE

G. MANUWALD: *Fabulae praetextae. Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. (Zetemata 108.) Pp. 399. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2001. Paper, DM 148. ISBN: 3-406-48160-4.

Scholarly accounts on serious Roman drama dealing with topics from Roman history both of the mythical past and of times closer to, or contemporary with, the playwright's era usually occupy a short space in books on Roman theatre and its relation to Roman society (an excellent contribution to this topic is now H. I. Flower, '"Fabulae Praetextae" in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?', *CQ* 45 [1995], 170–90). This is so not only because there are very few extant fragments from this literary genre (nine or ten titles, and about thirty-three fragments ranging from one word to twelve lines long), but also because so many aspects of the 'fabulae praetextae' are shrouded in mystery that very few questions about them may be answered with any certainty. Manuwald's impressively learned volume, her Habilitationschrift, may now be regarded as the most comprehensive account of all that survives from 'plays in Roman robe' and all that has been written on these plays from the 1820s to 2000.

M. divides her work into four lengthy chapters, accompanied by a brief concluding section. In Chapter A.I she deals with the origins and the meaning of the term 'praetexta'. In A.II she cites and evaluates the views of grammarians, commentators, and writers of literary theory on the 'fabulae praetextae' (Varro, cited in Diomedes, *Ars Gramm.* 3; Evanthius, *De fab.* 4.1; Festus, *De verb. signif.* 249, 14–15 L and 480, 12–18 L; Donatus, *De com.* 6.1; J. Lydus, *De magistr. pop. Rom.* 1.40; Donatus on Terence's *Ad.* 7; Horace, *Ars Poet.* 285–8 [with the corresponding ancient scholia]). In B.I she analyses the ancient 'testimonia' on individual plays of this genre: Asinius Pollio in Cicero, *Ad fam.* 10.32 (about a 'fabula praetexta' mentioned in association with L. Cornelius Balbus the Younger); Cicero, *Pro Sest.* 123 and the relevant Schol. Bob. (about Accius' *Brutus*); Varro, *De ling. Lat.* 6.18–19 (about an anonymous author's play on the rites performed on the 'Nonae Caprotinae'); Horace, *Epist.* 2.1.93 and the corresponding ancient scholia (possibly about a play on the conquest of Corinth); *Vita*

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.86 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Persi (about a 'fabula praetexta' composed by Persius); and Tacitus, *Dial.* 2–3 (about Curiatius Maternus' *Cato* and *Domitius*). In B.II she discusses specific aspects of this theatrical genre: for instance, the dates of the extant plays, the possible pre-literary stage of the 'fabulae praetextae', the relationship between playwright and magistrates, the reasons for the apparent rarity of 'fabulae praetextae', the occasions of performance of these plays, and the stage-portrayal of personages contemporary with the playwright. In Chapter C—the longest in the volume—M. prints the Latin text (following mostly Ribbeck's third edition) and a full 'apparatus criticus', and offers a running stylistic and theatrical commentary on each of the extant fragments of Naevius (*Clastidium*, *Romulus*/*Lupus*), Ennius (*Ambracia*, *Sabinae*), Pacuvius (*Paulus*), Accius (*Aeneadae vel*/*aut Decius*, *Brutus*), Cassius (*Brutus*), and Pomponius Secundus (*Aeneas*). An appendix to this chapter contains a brief interpretation of Ezechiel's *Exagoge* as a 'fabula praetexta'. Finally, in the two lengthy sub-sections of Chapter D M. revisits the issue raised by P. L. Schmidt (*ANRW* II.32.2 [1985], 1421–53) of whether or not [Seneca]'s *Octavia* should be regarded as a 'tragedy' rather than a 'fabula praetexta', since it does not seem to exhibit the congratulatory and triumphant character of the known Republican plays of this type.

The structure of the argumentation is commendably precise: at the beginning of each chapter M. states very clearly her aims and objectives. Her next step is to realize these aims and objectives with admirable caution, depressingly detailed erudition, and painstaking provision of bibliographical information in footnotes, which could take up as long as three-quarters of a page (p. 106 has three lines of main text and forty-seven lines of foonotes; could M. have been more selective in her citations?). At the end of each chapter she repeats, in a Summary, what she has said so far.

On the whole, I found M. to be a cautious, conscientious, and factual scholar: she normally confines herself to facts, she has read almost everything that has been written on her subject, and she is reluctant to indulge in speculative theories which are supported by no evidence. (In fact, in his review of this book Peter Wiseman feels that M. is counter-productively sensible in her methodological approach: see http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2002/2002-06-13.html.) I was, therefore, all the more surprised to see (i) that M. insists rather categorically and unhelpfully throughout her book that there was a clear-cut distinction between the Republican and the Imperial 'fabulae praetextae', the latter being 'nicht affirmativ, sondern kritisch gegenüber den bestehenden politischen Verhältnissen' (p. 127); (ii) that she does *not* treat the views of late grammarians and commentators with the scepticism they deserve; (iii) that she overburdens the apparatus criticus of the extant fragments with readings of various manuscripts and emendations of a dozen editors without, however, giving us a complete picture of the position (and value) of these manuscripts in the history of the transmission of the text (an issue especially important in the case of Nonius Marcellus and of Lindsay's unhelpful *sigla codicum* adopted by M.), and without offering a general overview and evaluation of the early editions of these fragments; and (iv) that she confusingly tries to have her cake and eat it by arguing that the *Octavia* should not be considered a 'tragedy' but a 'fabula praetexta' of the 'kritisch' type (is this distinction really helpful to us and applicable to the Romans' perception of serious plays?), having a double chorus of Roman citizens with two 'voices', as it were: the first chorus supports Octavia in her sufferings and wishes to destroy Nero's palace (this M. calls a 'Praetextachor') and the second flatters Poppaea without making, according to M., any politically active statements (this she terms a 'Tragödienchor'). The above criticisms are meant to be suggestions which may be taken into account in a future, revised edition of this spendidly thorough project. For, although M. may have not said

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.86 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the last word on the 'fabulae praetextae', she has done scholars and students of Roman drama a truly great service.

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

LUCILIUS

G. MANUWALD (ed.): *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit*. (Zetemata 110.) Pp. 206. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 3-406-48470-0.

The fifteen chapters (ranging from six to eighteen pages long) that comprise this slender volume were papers originally read at a symposium on 'Lucilius—Identität und Alterität', which was held at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg i. Br. in mid-February 2001; the interesting topic of this symposium is to be understood in the wider context of Eckard Lefèvre's stimulating research project, based in Freiburg, 'Identitäten und Alteritäten. Die Funktion von Alterität für die Konstitution und Konstruktion von Identität'—a project, which has already given us the valuable *Identität und Alterität in der frührömischen Tragödie*, ed. G. Manuwald (Würzburg, 2000).

The papers are arranged in alphabetical order of the authors' surnames, and discuss—at different levels of detail and depth—various aspects of Lucilius' work and ideology as projected from his fragments and the views of other ancient authors (mainly Horace) about him. The topics dealt with in this volume, which seems to have been prepared only three months after the actual conference and appeared in the same year as it, are: general overviews of Lucilius' position in the changing morality, the violent political events, and the Hellenophile culture of his turbulent times (Werner Krenkel, Eckart Olshausen, Carl Joachim Classen); Lucilius' debt to (and reworking of) Aristophanes (Bernhard Zimmermann), Callimachus (Andreas Bagordo), and New Comedy (Ulrike Auhagen); Lucilius' portrayal of the city of Rome (Eckart Schäfer) and women (Karin Haß); Lucilius' views on friendship (Ursula Gärtner), literary criticism (Severin Koster), politics (Eckard Lefèvre), and Roman tragedy (Gesine Manuwald, the editor of the volume); Lucilius' use of Greek words (Thomas Baier); and his satire on 'The Journey to Sicily' (Stefan Faller). The frustratingly fragmentary status of the satirist's extant corpus makes it easy to understand why only Faller's paper focuses on a specific Lucilian poem.

The scope of this review does not allow for a detailed discussion of the strengths (and, in some cases, the weaknesses) of these papers. All the contributors have an inspiring and thought-provoking point to make, even when the concept of 'Alterität' does not feature prominently in their argumentation (this is the case in most contributions), and even when they merely regurgitate well-known material; but readers can decide for themselves whether or not this volume as a whole has anything ground-breaking or provocatively original to say about Lucilius, especially in the absence of any new fragments of his satires. I will, therefore, confine myself here to a couple of editorial suggestions.

No attempt has been made to group these scholarly contributions under thematic categories which would give the contents of the volume more coherence and sharper focus, and would create a fruitful dialogue between juxtaposed discussions of the same (or of similar) themes (or passages) in Lucilius. The lack of sub-sections is an

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.86 Published online by Cambridge University Press