The introductory chapter is perhaps rather sketchy, but is enough to set the scene. It begins with the topic of Juvenalian *indignatio* without probing too deeply into the question of the extent to which this was a pose adopted in the interests of entertainment; but it makes the interesting point that the items of behaviour or situations adverted to by Juvenal tend to contain within them some juxtaposition of incongruous elements, which calls for expression in the form of a pointed antithesis. Thus merely to describe them is already to satirize them: *difficile est saturam non scribere*. The feature of 'stylistic antithesis', involving a juxtaposition of high and low elements, is then introduced as a special case of rhetorical antithesis in general. I am a little doubtful about this: often the elements which contrast in stylistic level are too closely linked to contrast rhetorically. But the main point about abrupt transitions of style obviously stands, and U. uses a convenient typographical device to illustrate it: 'high' words are underlined once, 'low' words twice. So, for instance, the first passage he cites, 3.265–7 (also incidentally discussed by me, art. cit. pp. 327–8), appears as follows:

> . . . taetrumque novicius horret
> porthmea, nec sperat caenosi gurgitis alnum
> infelix, nec habet quem porrigat ore trientem.

Verse-structure is also discussed: there can be a contrast, for example, between a high-flown feature of the verse, such as a 'golden line', and the prosaic items of vocabulary included in it (this could perhaps still do with further illustration); or alternatively the freedom permitted in satirical verse can be employed to create or reinforce a 'low' effect, e.g. with long words of four, five, or six syllables at verse-end.

The main part of the book consists of studies of individual elements of diction, broadly classified as belonging either to distinctively poetic or to unpoetic registers. The latter category includes at least three sub-classes: colloquialisms, prosaic vocabulary of other kinds, and unassimilated or partially assimilated foreign borrowings (and it is interesting, in view of the common erroneous tendency to characterize Juvenal's style in general as 'high', that the latter list is appreciably longer than the former). The register of each item is identified by noting its distribution in authors other than Juvenal, with attention to variations of period and genre; its effect in the relevant Juvenalian context is then assessed. Phrases (e.g. *-que . . . -que*) as well as individual words are quite rightly also taken into consideration. The final chapter is an *exempli gratia* treatment of a passage of Satire 10 (133–288) in which the juxtaposition of words of different registers is once again fully illustrated.

This book will be an essential adjunct to the commentaries for any reader who wishes properly to appreciate this neglected but vital aspect of the Juvenalian manner.

Royal Holloway, London J. G. F. POWELL

VARRO'S MENIPPEANS

J. P. Cèbe (ed., trans., and comm.): *Varron,* Satires Ménippées 13, Tithonus—*E saturis incertis.* Pp. xix–xxxiii + 2033–228. Rome: École française de Rome, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 2-7283-0541-2.

In this, the final volume of his edition, Cèbe deals with the satires from Tithonus to *'Υδροκύων* (frr. 544–75 B.) and the fragments which cannot be assigned to particular satires (456 and 576–91). Textually there are no new proposals; a small number of

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.44 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mis-statements of readings of the MSS and proposals of earlier scholars is of no great moment; there are also a few incorrect references, e.g. on fr. 553 Valerius Maximus' account of the divorce of Carvilius Ruga is at 2.1.4, not 2.9.2. The commentary contains some novelties of interpretation. On the difficult second line of fr. 552 C. has the interesting (if not perhaps fully convincing) idea that the fr. is addressed to a woman who has borne children and so has done her duty; new too is the interpretation of fr. 554 as referring to recourse to an arbitrator for the recovery of a dowry. His suggestion that in *Virgula diuina* (where the absence of a reference to J. M. de Waele, *The Magic Staff or Rod in Greco-Roman Antiquity* [1927] is surprising) Varro compared 'la mauvaise baguette magique de Circé, symbole des vices, . . . avec la bonne baguette magique de la vertu' really depends only on the title and the reference to virtue in fr. 571 (in the context of mockery of the Stoic wise man), and it is very difficult to relate the other frr. to this theme. The notion that the mother bird feeding its young in frr. 565–8 is a symbol of moderation is surely far-fetched, and I find it hard to believe that in fr. 572 (*praesertim cum uentrem meum coherceam nec murmurari patiar*) we are dealing with a Cynic 'qui n'obéit pas à son ventre et le force a se taire quand la faim le travaille'—a good trick if it were possible. He has an interesting interpretation of fr. 570 (a tragic citation spoken by 'une dame de la bonne société' demanding her wig from 'sa camériste'), but why does she address her maid as Agamemnon and why does she cite tragedy? Still, though I do not find C.'s suggestions always convincing, they are serious attempts to explain difficulties.

My main criticism concerns the number of matters which are discussed rather perfunctorily or not dealt with at all. More could be said on the titles *Τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ φακῇ μύρον* (no reference to, for example, Arist. *De sensu* 443b, Cic. *Att*. 1.19.2 and Ath. 4.160b–c, nor to Pearson's article in *TAPA* 94 [1963], 176–84) and *Τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ παιδίον* (its use by, *inter alia*, Philostratus *Vit. Soph.* 2.9 and Tertull. Nat. 2.13 is not mentioned). The title *Τριοδίτης τριπύλιος* too would benefit from further discussion—there are parallels for the use of a *τρίοδος* to symbolize a choice of ways of life in Thgn. 911ff. and Pl. *Lg*. 799c–d, and there is nothing in the frr. to support the suggestion that the satire contained a 'mythique voyage' like that described by Heraclides Ponticus and referred to in fr. 560. The story of Empedotimus and the three ways may simply have been compared to the three ways in which virtue can be acquired. On the title *Triphallus* I miss a reference to Juv. 6.O 26, and on *Vinalia* he should at least mention that Varro *Ling*. 6.16 (cf. also Macr. *Sat*. 1.4.6) denied Venus any connection with the feast of April 23. The significance of *prandium caninum* in fr. 575 needs further discussion (Diog. fr. 41 Mullach and *Trag. Adesp*. 118.4 can be cited). On fr. 559 he misses a good parallel in *Rhet. Her.* 4.59. In the *sat. inc*. I would have expected a note on the scansion *pertimuĕrunt* (576; *inuenĕrunt* in fr. 111 also went without comment), a note on *hospes hirundo* (579), on *Veneris ostium*, the serving of *bulbi* at the marriage feast (attested elsewhere?), the use of pine cones and pepper as aphrodisiacs (all in 581), some parallels for *capite permulso* (584), and a note on the verb *inpancrare* (587). In fr. 578 *arundinem* surely means a 'pen' (C. translates it as 'baton'); the other passage cited by Julian is Pers. 3.11, and *bisulcam* refers to the fact that its *acumen in dyade diuiditur* (Isid. *Etym*. 6.14.3).

With this volume C. brings to a successful conclusion a task which has taken him the best part of thirty years—the first volume was published in 1972. He is to be congratulated on his pertinacity and stamina, and indeed on his willingness to devote himself to a work of an unfashionable author surviving only in fragments. The edition has much improved in quality as it has proceeded, and anyone who has occasion to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.44 Published online by Cambridge University Press

refer to the Menippeans will fail to consult it at his peril. C. has deserved well of Varro and indeed of classical scholarship. He closes the work with a warm tribute to the support of his wife ('Elle sait par expérience que partager la vie d'un universitaire chercheur n'est pas une sinécure') and his four children—they will perhaps be even more relieved than C. himself that *Fortuna currum a carcere intimo missum / labi inoffensum per aequor candidum ad calcem siuit.*

University College, Dublin RAYMOND ASTBURY

AGAINST THE SCEPTICS

A. HALTENHOFF: *Kritik der akademischen Skepsis. Ein Kommentar zu Cicero,* Lucullus *1–62*. (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 113.) Pp. 226. Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, 1998. Paper, DM 29. ISBN: 3-631-33440-0.

This revised doctoral thesis offers a commentary on §§ 1–62 of the *Lucullus*, that is to say on Cicero's introduction and on Lucullus' speech against Academic scepticism. The commentary is preceded by a German translation and a short introduction.

No Latin text is printed. H. follows Plasberg's 1922 Teubner, signalling his few departures by an asterisk in the translation. Asterisks should be added at § 12 [32.15 Plasberg] ('*illa*' for '*illi*'); at § 24 [39.26–7], where Plasberg's punctuation is significantly altered; and at § 28 [41.8–10]—see p. 164. At § 43 [48.15–16], where Plasberg obelizes, it is not clear what text H. translates. Some of his judgements are inferior to Reid's; one or two are correct (e.g. '*καταληπτόν*' for '*ἀκατάληπτον*' at § 18 [36.9]); and the dark sentence at § 16 [34.20–2] is illuminated by the observation that '*nihilne . . . investigata sunt*' does not refer to the post-Academic period (p. 107). (Lucullus means: 'Perhaps the ancients did not discover anything, but at least they tried—and later Academic quibbling cannot efface their merit'. H.'s interpretation is plausible; but it requires some change to the text, e.g. '*postea quod*' for '*postea quam*'.)

The translation, so far as I am able to judge, is accurate. In a few places there is room for doubt: at § 10 [31.8], 'unentschieden' is odd for '*integram*' (but see p. 80); at § 13 [33.13], 'Unterstützung . . . gewährt haben' is feeble for '*auctores fuisse*' (but see p. 89); at [33.14] the subject of '*suspicantur*' is '*seditiosi cives*' (*pace* p. 89 n. 8); and at [33.16] '*mentiri*' has its usual sense, in *Luc.*, of 'speak falsely' (but see p. 90). Half a dozen similar niggles might be added.

The commentary shows a decent knowledge of the secondary literature. (By the standards of doctoral theses, H. refers to it sparingly; and he has an excellent note to explain why: p. 15 n. 1.) The notes are intended to be philosophical rather than philological or historical. But there are numerous philological remarks, most of them sane and helpful. And I commend the brisk observation on p. 84: 'source-critical speculations do not in fact advance our understanding of the work'. (But H. does not always heed his own advice. The speculations about the 'original prologue', p. 68, are fanciful; the claim that '*sequitur*' at § 30 [42.5] refers to the order of discussion in 'the treatise of Antiochus' is eccentric.)

There are also numerous historical notes, some of them otiose and a few of them dubious. I still see no reason to believe that Antiochus' chief function 'on the staff of Lucullus' was diplomatic rather than recreational (p. 64). Was there in Cicero's time

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.44 Published online by Cambridge University Press