

BOOK REVIEWS

A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal. By E. COURTNEY, ed. London: The Athlone Press, 1980. Pp. xiii + 650. £35.00. Cloth. Distributed in the United States by Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey, at \$79.75.

Juvenal: The Satires. By JOHN FERGUSON, ed. London: Macmillan Education, 1979. Pp. xxxix + 326. £8.95. Paper. Distributed in the United States by St. Martin's Press, New York, at \$12.95.

In his "Juvenal Report for the Years 1941-61" (*Lustrum* 8 [1963] 161-215), Michael Coffey remarked that "at the present time the greatest need in Juvenal scholarship is a full commentary" (p. 186). Seven years later the Cambridge University Press reprinted, in its Pitt Press series, the annotated edition of J. D. Duff, newly equipped by Coffey with a 35-page introduction and bibliography, but with text and notes unchanged (the volume remains available from Cambridge, at £9.50). Welcome as Coffey's scholarly and very sensible supplement was, the project was a makeshift: Duff's commentary remained, to be sure, the best available in English (even the curmudgeonly Housman, in the 1905 preface to his own text [2nd ed., Cambridge 1931], had praised its "candour and clear perception"), but it had long since betrayed the signs of its age. Originally published in 1898 and last corrected (only minimally) in 1925, the 1970 reissue was without benefit of a half century of Juvenal scholarship, including Housman's later work, the textual investigations of Knoche (ed., Munich 1950) and Clausen (ed., Oxford 1959, rev. 1966), and the interpretative studies of Anderson and others who had worked since the late 1950s to correct and augment our understanding of Juvenal's artistic intent. Moreover, like other turn-of-the-century texts (including the useful edition by the American, H. L. Wilson, New York 1903), Duff's was scarred by severe bowdlerization: Satires Two and Nine were excised entirely (an especially regrettable omission in the case of the latter poem, which, as Juvenal's only fully elaborated dialogue, represents a crucial stage in his increasingly overt use of "Horatian" irony in the later books), along with considerable excerpts from Six (including the Oxford fragment), and numerous other verses here and there throughout the Satires wherever it was feared that Victorian sensitivities might be offended.

The other two English commentaries available, in reprint, in the 1970s were similarly expurgated and obsolescent: E. G. Hardy's "red Macmillan," first issued in 1883 and revised in 1891, had few of the virtues of Duff: J. E. B. Mayor (4th ed., London 1889: rpt. Hildesheim 1966) offered an encyclopedic array of not-always-quite-so-parallel passages but virtually nothing in the way of interpretative comment on the poet's artistry or satiric intent: both editors omitted Six, as well as Two and Nine, *in toto*. In fact, until very recently, the only English-language commentaries on all sixteen poems were those of the Reverend A. J. MacLeane (2nd ed., London 1867) and J. D. Lewis (2nd ed., New York 1882), both of them useful in many respects (including their insights into Victorian attitudes toward, and understanding of, the three "profane" satires), but outdated, and generally inaccessible: even for readers not restricted to English, the most thorough annotated edition was that of L. Friedländer, amply equipped with introduction (English trans. by J. R. C. Martyn, Amsterdam 1969), notes, and several helpful indices, but also dating to the nineteenth century (Leipzig 1895: rpt. Amsterdam 1962).

Thus it is nothing less than a major event in Juvenal scholarship that there have now appeared, within the space of about a year, two complete commentaries on the Satires, both produced by Englishmen who have ably responded, each with his own purposes, to the need expressed by their countryman Coffey nearly two decades ago. John Ferguson, one of Great Britain's most prolific classicists, has applied his breadth of scholarly interests together with his paedagogical insights (F is former Dean of the Open University and author of a variety of instructional materials) to the production of a new schooltext in the Macmillan "Classical Series": while meant by the publishers specifically as a replacement for Hardy, it ought also to replace Duff in college courses where text and full commentary are desired (here I might point out that separate editions of Books One, Two, and Three are currently in preparation, by Professor Amy Richlin and me, for the new series of Bryn Mawr Latin Texts: these should prove useful in classes where only selections will be read, where a briefer commentary will suffice, and where their lower cost may make them a more affordable choice for students).

E. Courtney, who formerly held the Latin Chair at King's College, University of London, and serves currently on the Classics faculty at Stanford University, is, by contrast with F., a Juvenal specialist, with a more comprehensive grasp of the scholarship and a particular expertise in the area of textual transmission. While he claims rather too sweepingly in his Preface (pp. vii-x) to "have tried to serve the needs of all those who read or refer to Juvenal for any purpose whatsoever," he quickly concedes that his "is not a book for beginners; undergraduates should not try to master it at all, though I hope that they will be able to consult it with profit, as I hope that all classes of users will be able to pick out severally what corresponds to their individual needs" (p. ix: together with N. Rudd, C. published in 1977 a school edition of Satires Three, Six, and Ten, which is currently available from the Bristol Press at £3.50).

Indeed, the Courtney volume, at a cost of about \$80.00, will be quite beyond the reach of undergraduates and most graduate students, all the more so as a copy of the Latin text will have to be separately obtained. It is most unfortunate that the Athlone Press insisted on the pennywise economy of omitting the text (note C.'s discomfiture, p. vii), which at thirty-five verses per page (allowing, with reduced print, for a generous apparatus criticus as well) would have added little more than one hundred pages, or about fifteen percent, to the present size and expense of the volume: only specialists and libraries are likely to purchase the book in any case, so that the added cost of ten to fifteen dollars will not have damaged its marketability. To the contrary: C.'s principal contributions to Juvenal studies from the mid-1960s onward have been his careful reexamination of the manuscript tradition (see esp. *BICS* 13, 14, and 22) and consequent suggestions for textual emendation, the deletion of spurious lines (C. counts about fifty in all), and adjustments of punctuation and paragraphing: while not all of his proposed revisions have met with approval (*nil mirum*), scholars would nonetheless benefit from ready access to a "Courtney text" and the present volume is its natural home. As it is, we are faced with the necessity of sometimes imaginative cross-referencing from C.'s commentary to Clausen's OCT (which provides the basis for C.'s discussions, as it does for the text, clearly printed though without apparatus, in F.). The publishers ought carefully to reconsider this issue in planning for the book's second printing.

In almost every other respect, however, both C.'s work and F.'s are admirably equipped: the Introduction to each volume contains sections (the titles given here are C.'s) on "Juvenal's Life" (C., pp. 11-18: cf. F. xv-xix), "Juvenal and his Satires" (C., 11-18; F., xix-xxii), "Juvenal's View of Society and Morals" (C., 18-36; F., xxii-xxv, including an unsatisfying condensation of T. Reekmans, "Juvenal's Views of Social Change," *AS* 2 [1971] 117-61), "Juvenal's Style" (C., 36-48; F., more narrowly,

"Grammar and Syntax," xxvii–viii), "Juvenal's Metre" (C., 49–55; F., xxviii–xxx), and "Text and Manuscripts" (C., 55–58; F., xxv–vii, with a list of about sixty readings differing from Clausen's). In general, as the pagination would suggest, C.'s handling of these matters is more comprehensive, both because his acquaintance with Juvenal is more intimate and because the purposes of the two commentaries are so divergent: nevertheless, it should be stressed that F.'s essays are for the most part wholly adequate to the needs of students and reflect his familiarity with, and sensible evaluation of, much of the scholarship on the Satires that has appeared in recent years. Both men clearly present, for example, the evidence for Juvenal's life, including texts or translations of the Aquinum inscription and the fourth century *vita*, together with a reasoned assessment (more detailed and closely argued, in the case of C.) of the value of the evidence.

In addition, F.'s Introduction contains (pp. xi–xv) concise discussions of the etymology of the term *satira* (based rather superficially on Diomedes), Quintilian's dictum on the Romans' invention of the genre, the satirical elements in such Greek antecedents as iambic poetry and Old Comedy, and, most helpfully, a survey of the individual contributions to the genre made by Ennius, Lucilius, Horace, and Persius, as well as by the menippean satirists, Varro, Seneca, and Petronius. C. instead assumes his audience's familiarity with this material, though he does consider briefly the influence on Juvenal of Lucilius (of those characteristics shared by the two satirists "the most important is the tone of aggression against named individuals": p. 11) and Horace (whose "tone and technique" Juvenal more nearly approximates in the later books: p. 12); the influence of Persius, whose poems were models for Satires One and Ten in particular, is somewhat underrated ("Juvenal occasionally imitates Persius in detail, but never mentions him and has little in common with him": p. 12).

F. also provides a "Glossary of Technical Terms" (chiefly devices of style and rhetoric: pp. xxxi–ii) that will be an aid to undergraduates; and both texts are equipped with maps (F.: Rome, Italy, and the Empire; C.: Rome, the forum area, and Egypt—maps of Italy and the Empire, similar to those in F., would have been helpful additions) and with select bibliographies (C., 61–71; F., xxxiii–ix). Both here and in the brief but important bibliographies he has appended to his commentary on each of the sixteen satires, F. is far more helpful in his coverage of the scholarship on Juvenal: fully half of C.'s bibliography is devoted to the rubric "Ancient History, Life and Thought," while for recent work on Juvenal the reader must depend for the greater part on references scattered through the commentary itself and, indirectly, on the bibliographical surveys by Coffey and Anderson which C. cites (and to which can now be added Anderson's latest, in *CW* 75 [1982] 273–99, as well as R. C. Melloni, "Otto anni di studi Giovenaliani (1969–1976)," *BStudLat* 7 [1977] 61–87).

In this connection, one may also note C.'s professed practice, in the commentary proper, of adopting the specific interpretations of other scholars without always crediting them (cf., e.g., C. on *Hispo* [2.50] with G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* [Oxford 1954] 292): "the only practical course seemed to be to limit acknowledgements to particularly striking ideas or to large-scale borrowings and discussions. Those who find their interpretations or illustrative matter adopted in silence will, I hope, be satisfied by the emphatic declaration that by far the greater proportion of my commentary is not original, and by an invitation to scholars in general to treat my commentary as I have treated the contributions of others" (p. x). The invitation is not one that many scholars are likely to accept. The acknowledgment of sources in a work of this sort, by definition a congeries of the most helpful illustrative material from a variety of sources, is most assuredly a difficulty for the commentator: nonetheless, adaptations from recent scholarship at least (the last thirty years, say)

could easily be credited within the commentary by parenthetical reference (giving only the last name, date, and pagination) to that list of journal articles on Juvenal which most certainly ought to have been incorporated into the bibliography.

Also included in C.'s text are a brief "Note on Coinage and Time, etc." (p. 59), a page of "Addenda," largely noticing a few articles that appeared in 1978-79 (p. 623; inconsistently, other addenda appear at the close of the notes for some of the individual satires, e.g., pp. 194, 380), a curiously solitary appendix in which C. presents evidence leading him to the conclusion that "Lucian probably knew and imitated the writings of Juvenal" (pp. 624-29: the essay would have been more at home in a journal, with references as appropriate in the commentary proper), and three Indices, of "Names" (p. 630: actually a listing of addenda and corrigenda to Clausen's *index nominum*), of "Subject-Matter" (pp. 630-43), and of "Style, Grammar, Latinity, Metre" (pp. 643-50). These last two indices are a most welcome guide to C.'s comments on, e.g., Juvenal's references to art or astrology or athletics, or his use of chiasmus, diminutives, neologisms, etc.: by contrast (with Duff and even Hardy, as well as C.) F.'s edition has no index at all, a major *desideratum* for the next printing.

Turning finally to the commentaries themselves, one must allow from the start that no single collection of annotations to the text of so complex an author can satisfy entirely: by definition such a commentary must be selective and hence will reflect, to a greater or lesser extent, the special interests, expertise, and interpretative biases of the commentator. Accordingly, scholars will still want to consult, *inter alios*, Mayor, and Friedländer, and Duff (though their most illuminating materials, especially Duff's, have generally been incorporated in the present editions). Nonetheless, both C. and F. have a very clear conception of purpose and of the needs of their audiences. C. (p. vii) explicitly defines the "three prime duties" of the commentator as 1) to "explain the poet's words where they need explanation," 2) to "illustrate them, where required, with parallel passages which will confirm the explanations offered, show the influence exerted on the poet by his predecessors, demonstrate his favourite turns of thought and expression, and indicate how far he is employing thoughts generally current in the ancient world and how far striking out in an original direction," and 3) to "give the reader the opportunity to pursue farther the points raised by providing references to modern works of scholarship." For the most part both C. and F. have adhered to these precepts in the selection and balance of their comments, with F. citing fewer parallel passages and secondary studies but providing interpretative comments that are nearly as full as C.'s (F.'s commentary is not as much shorter than C.'s as the pagination—216 pp. vs. 545 pp.—might suggest, since the Macmillan text is set in finer print) and that reflect generally his familiarity with modern critical scholarship (of which, in F.'s judgment, "the best . . . has been done in America by Anderson and others"). Both provide for each satire, in an ancillary essay, a discussion of structure, theme, tone, and general problems of interpretation; while C.'s essays are usually longer (one to ten pages) and more thorough, F.'s are sensible and balanced and quite sufficient to the needs of the intended audience. In these essays and in the commentary proper, F. shows a sensitivity to satiric tone, Juvenal's use of irony, and his manipulation of persona (e.g., his analysis of the double-edged Satire Seven, pp. 230-32, is in several important respects more satisfying than that of C., who fails also to appreciate Umbricius in Three, with his "Modest Proposal," as an adaptation of the Horatian "Mad Satirist" persona, wrongly insisting [p. 153] that "Juvenal must be assumed to be entirely in sympathy with Umbricius"); C.'s comments, on the other hand, are particularly helpful with regard to structure, rhetoric, and the state of the text.

The notes of both authors, besides assisting the reader with difficulties of syntax and with allusions to *realia*, draw attention to the special effects of sound, structure, and

imagery at which the highly rhetorical Juvenal was so adept. On *nobilitate comesa* (1.34), e.g., where Duff has no note, both C. and F. remark on the intended bestial imagery and C. adds that in *palpat* (1.35) "the metaphor is again that of soothing a carnivorous animal." On *summissa* (1.36), where Duff is again silent, C., comparing Cic. 2. *Verr.* 1.105 and 3.69, sees merely an allusion to "a confidential mission" ("there is no need to see an obscene meaning in the word"), while F. rightly draws our attention to the word's more complex associations in this context: the actress Thymele "is sent as a substitute; she is demeaned; she is sent to be a sexual object." Both C. and F. note the alliterative effect (onomatopoetic, more accurately) of *cachimno concutitur* in 3.100, where Duff and Hardy are again unhelpful.

The two commentators are attentive to Juvenal's use of personal names, a major traditional element in the Satires (though some names are omitted altogether: C. is silent, e.g., on Paulus, Gallus, and Basilus, at 7.143-45, on which cf. F., and on Aufidius, 9.25, probably the same as Martial's Aufidius Chius, *Epig.* 5.71). F. has a greater respect than most scholars for the boldness of Juvenal's writing, despite the satirist's proclamation at the close of One (150-71) that he shall dare to criticize only the dead by name: "it was in fact an exceedingly courageous assertion to make, that it was dangerous to attack the living" (pp. 125-26, and cf. xix-xx, 247, 325-26). C. is attuned to Juvenal's fondness for etymologizing puns, an aspect of his handling of personal names not generally recognized: see, e.g., his notes on *velox Lentulus* (8.187), *Caedicius* (13.197) as a hint at *caedit* (13.194), and *hispidam membram* *Hispo* (2.11, 50: after Hight)—F. misses all these, and both C. and F. fail to notice, e.g., *Varillus/loripedem* (2.22-23) and the name-play in *Lamiarum caede madenti* (4.154), which alludes not only to the Aelii Lamiae of Domitian's day (as both commentators note, with C. adding that "one at least was alive when this was written, L. Aelius Lamia Aelianus, cos. 116; he can hardly have read this passage with pleasure"), but also to the bloodsucking lamiae of ancient folklore (thus Juvenal leaves us at the close of Four with the spectre of a monstrous Domitian, dripping with vampires' gore, fresh from feeding upon the state's nobility, an image foreshadowed by the *nobilitas comesa* of 1.34: see R. J. Rowland, Jr., "Juvenal's *Lamiae*: Note on *Sat.* 4.154," *CB* 40 [1964] 75, and cf. my "Amicitia and the Unity of Juvenal's First Book," *ICS* 4 [1979] 169-70).

Scholars will welcome the commentaries on Two and Nine (the first in English since MacLeane and Lewis, as noted above) though both poems receive less than their due, Nine especially: F. provides only 5½ pages for the satire (150 verses) as opposed to 14½ for Four, which is of nearly the same length (154 verses), while C. has 22 pages for Nine, 35 for Four: neither offers as full an appreciation of the piece as we should like, particularly with regard to its sources (Horace and Martial principally, but also mime, and Platonic dialogue, and Petronius: see my chapter "Juvenal Nine: Themes and Variation," forthcoming in E. S. Ramage, ed., *The Artistry of Juvenal's Satires*, Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1984). In large part, however, this deficit is a product of the longstanding condemnation of the poems: certainly the appearance of both C.'s and F.'s commentaries will be at once an aid and a stimulus to their future study as to the further study of the Satires generally.

Typesetting errors are inevitable in works of this sort: I have noted a few (and doubtless missed others) that may readily be corrected in the reprintings that both these volumes will certainly merit: in C., read "6.407sqq." for "6.417sqq." (p. 1), "this" for "thi" (p. 225), "circumlocution" for "circumlocation" (p. 281), "74" for "47" (p. 359), and insert a comma after "(78)" (p. 436); in F., move reference to *WS* 9 (1975) from the Satire Four bibliography (p. 173) to the Satire Five bibliography (p. 185), read "Pithou" for "Pithon" (p. xxv), "41-66" for "41-6" (p. xxxvii, Nettleship entry), "proportionate" for "proproportionate" (p. 115, on verse 41), and "queens" for "queans"

(p. 135). There are problems in the printing of F.'s text, as well, that will create difficulties for students (e.g., on p. 9 a period, not a comma, should follow both *dormiret*, 1.17, and *scribere*, 1.30).

The two volumes will, I expect, be standards for years to come: libraries, scholars, and graduate students will need to have them both: for our undergraduates (and the few—too few—high-schoolers who read Juvenal) we shall certainly want Ferguson.

RICHARD A. LAFLEUR

The University of Georgia

A Historical Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion Politeia. By P. J. RHODES. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Pp. xiii, 795. \$98.00

Rhodes' commentary is based on Kenyon's 1920 Oxford text, with 114 variants (listed, pp. 737f.). The eleven constitutional changes (*metabolai*) of part one (chs. 1–41) are dealt with in 432 pages, with lettered subdivisions; the analysis of the constitution in Aristotle's own day (chs. 42–69) in 302: an almost exactly proportional treatment. R.'s 63-page introduction gives a precise account of the rediscovery of the text: discusses the sources (*Atthides*, especially Androtion; Herodotus, the tradition of Stesimbrotus' *On Themistocles*, *Thucydides* [son of Melesias], and *Pericles*; Antiphon's [lost] defence, and *A. P.*'s own general knowledge); part two is based on the law code current in the author's day. R. devoted 13½ pages to a careful discussion of *A. P.*'s style, which, he argues, involves ring-composition. He dates the work in the 320s (later than the *Politics*), and does not believe Aristotle was the author, though this does not diminish the work's interest and importance (63). R. regards *A. P.*'s historical part as mediocre, but the description of contemporary practice is first in the field (60). It occurs to me that a comparison on the one hand between the fragments of *A. P.* known before the discovery of the full papyrus (pp. 56f.) and the full text; and on the other hand between the fragments of Cicero's *Hortensius* and the various attempts at reconstruction (Grilli, Ruch, Sraume-Zimmermann) might yield an interesting value judgment.

A. *The lost beginning* (65–79). Here and throughout, R.'s citation of sources ancient and modern is as exhaustive as A. S. Pease's, with the difference that R. draws firm, well-argued, documented conclusions: e.g., as to the class structure of the Athens of the kings. The Demotionidae were a *genos*, the Alcmaeonids not (69f.: 243). The Eupatridae were the *nobiles* of pre-Solonian Athens, a narrower circle within the *gennetai* (72: 251).

C. *Between Cylon and Solon* (84–118=chs. 2–4). After surveying modern views of the *hektemoroi*, R. concludes that they were a hereditary class of serfs dependent on the aristocrats and working the land for them (92–97). At pp. 102–5 R. gives a salutary reminder that the prytaneum, located somewhere north of the east end of the Acropolis, was a different building from the Tholos. He regards *A. P.*'s section on Draco (Ch. 4) as an insertion, thinks Draco actually did codify the laws, and dates the code 621/0 (109f.). On the alleged severity of the early Areopagus, R. would have done well to note that the high-frequency user of the verb *kolazo* was the aristocratic, pious, vindictive late-fourth-century orator and financial genius Lycurgus, not Isocrates (108: 515f.).

D. *Solon* (118–79 = chs. 5–12). R. is precise about Solon's democratic measures, which he dates not later than the archonship of 594/3: (1) banning loans on personal security; (2) allowing (a) institution of lawsuits by any citizen, and (b) appeals; (3) altering the system of measures, weights, and coinage (119–24). He disbelieves the allegation that Solon "leaked" his intention of canceling debts to friends who profited