

Ovid *Metamorphoses* i. 192-98

"sunt mihi semidei, sunt, rustica numina, nymphae  
fauniae satyrique et monticolae silvani;  
quos quoniam caeli nondum dignamur honore,  
quas dedimus, certe terras habitare sinamus.  
an satis, O superi, tutos fore creditis illos,  
cum mihi, qui fulmen, qui vos habeoque reogue,  
struxerit insidias notus feritate Lycaon?"

On these lines Haupt (Ehwald-Haupt, Berlin, 1903) contents himself with the comment "die Motivierung ist wohl Erfindung des Ovids." His conjecture admits, I think, of easy confirmation. The transition passage in which the lines occur is admittedly a travesty of the Roman senate. Lines 190-91 have been noted as a commonplace of Roman political oratory; cf. Burmann, *ad loc.*, and Muretus in his comment on Cicero, *Cat. ii.* 5. 36-37. It seems fair to see in lines 192 ff. an ingenious adaptation of the traditional appeal to a Roman audience to rally to the defense of the socii who, though not endowed with citizenship, are entitled to protection. The best comment on the motivation of this passage would accordingly be another quotation from Cicero; cf. *Manil. vi.* 1-5, "Quare si propter socios nulla iniuria laessiti maiores nostri cum Antiocho, cum Philippo, cum Aetolis, cum Poenis bella gesserunt, quanto vos studio convenit iniuriis provocatos sociorum solutem una cum imperii vestri dignitate defendere, praesertim cum de maximis vestris vectigalibus agatur?"

KETHI PRESTON

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Greek Theater and Its Drama.* By ROY C. FLICKINGER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1918. Pp. xxviii+358. 80 illustrations.

This is a book for which we have long been waiting; one, that is, that can be unhesitatingly recommended to the general reader as a reasonably satisfactory account of the Greek theater and the technique and conventions of the Greek drama. Like all of the author's numerous articles previously published, it is written in a pleasing and forceful style, and gives evidence of sound scholarship and of a firm grasp upon the problems with which it deals. Its statements are clear, its arguments cogent, and its conclusions sane. Moreover, it abounds in literary citations and is enriched with many illustrations which for the most part are well selected and beautifully reproduced. Thus it constitutes one of the most important contributions of recent years to the interpretation of ancient classical dramatic art. Among the works published in English upon this subject it easily takes rank as the best.

As stated in the Preface the book attempts (1) "to elaborate the theory that the peculiarities and conventions of the Greek drama are largely explainable by its environment; (2) to emphasize the technical aspects of ancient drama; (3) to elucidate and freshen ancient practice by modern and mediæval parallels." The author has "endeavored to treat the ancient plays as if they were not dead and inert, but as if their authors were men as real as Ibsen and Galsworthy, who had real problems and met them in a real way." In accordance with this program the emphasis throughout is placed upon the conventions and technique of the drama rather than upon the archaeological reconstruction of the theater itself. Thus eight of the nine chapters which constitute the main portion of the work treat of the influences (1) of religious origin, (2) of choral origin, (3) of actors, (4) of festival arrangements, (5 and 6) of physical conditions, (7) of national customs and ideas, and (8) of theatrical machinery and dramatic conventions. The ninth chapter is devoted to a consideration of theatrical records. Preceding these chapters is a long Introduction (pp. 1-117), in which, rather more technically, the author discusses the origin of each of the types of Greek drama and finally the development and characteristics of the Greek theater.

The difficulties which surround the topics treated in this Introduction are clearly recognized by the author, and he, I am sure, would be the first to acknowledge that his conclusions cannot be expected to meet with universal acceptance. As a rule these are not stated dogmatically, but are advanced merely as reasonable hypotheses. Taking his stand squarely on the statements of Herodotus, Aristotle, and other classical and postclassical writers,