the magmatic cauldron out of which revenge tragedies in particular emerged. The influence of the native literary tradition and the emphasis upon exemplarity in the drama arguably weighed more with English playwrights than the text of a Latin tragedian. G. stresses too that, in the tradition of English revenge drama, the motive for revenge is the defence of violated honour, not a concept of any importance to Seneca. One question did arise in my mind whilst reading this good essay: how would one apply an anthropological interpretation to the popularity of revenge tragedy in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods? Was revenge a big deal in the England of that day? I asked a respected colleague at Oxford, and she said, by no means, the whole business was pure fantasy. If that is fair, how can we test the anthropological approach to such dramas in a Roman context?

I enjoyed reading this book, but for one feature, the overlong footnotes (exceptionally, the second sentence of the first chapter has four of the wretched things). These destroy one's concentration on the core argument. If what is in the footnote is really important, it should be in the body of the text. If it is not important, it should be omitted. End of tirade.

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

PETRONIUS

E. COURTNEY: *A Companion to Petronius*. Pp. xii + 238. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-19-924552-5 (0-19-924594-0 pbk).

In view of the absence of a comprehensive modern commentary in English on the whole of the surviving *Satyrica*, the publication of a volume entitled *A Companion to Petronius* is extremely exciting news for amateur and professional devotees of Petronius. Such excitement is justifiably intensified by the fact that the author of this elegantly produced volume is a prolific scholar of Latin literature and a brilliant textual critic, whose erudition has presented Petronian scholarship with a seminal article on parody and allusion in prosimetric Roman satire, and an invaluable concise commentary on the poems of Petronius. Is this, then, the book we have been waiting for?

In the first two chapters Professor Courtney meticulously discusses the problems surrounding the identification of the author Petronius with the Tacitean (T.) Petronius (not to be confused—according to C.—with the consul T. [or, better, P.] Petronius Niger), and situates the *Satyrica* in the context of Graeco-Latin prosimetric texts and against the background of the Greek novels, whose ultimate ancestor is—in C.'s view—Xenophon's *Cyropedia*. Before embarking on the main part of his book, C. reviews the function of verse in Encolpius' narrative (there is not a lot of sympathy in his discussion here and elsewhere with Connors' recent analysis of the employment of verse in Petronius), and considers the implications of Petronius' choice of a first-person narrator: although Conte and Winkler occasionally appear in footnotes in both the preliminaries and the main body of this work, C. essentially follows Beck's views on Encolpius the overemotional actor, whose adventures are recounted by his sophisticated, older self in an ironical fashion that resembles Petronius' attitude toward his (anti)hero. Especially useful I found C.'s two brief sections on the social identity, mysterious past, and initial characterization of the main figures, although I had reservations about the unqualified manner in which he uses the anachronistic

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

terms 'heterosexual', 'homosexual', and 'bisexual' throughout his analysis of the text and in his conclusions. The book's main contribution to Petronian scholarship lies in Chapters 3–7, which are effectively divided into smaller sections dealing, in chronological sequence and from a mainly philological perspective, with all the instalments of Encolpius' amusingly melodramatic life. C.'s arrangement of the material means that a reader can easily look up his analysis of a particular scene, or his citation of parallels for a specific motif (given C.'s impressively keen eye for Petronian literary parody and allusion, this structure is a welcome compensation for the disappointing absence of an *index locorum*). This format of 'running commentary' may sometimes give the impression that C. is simply summarizing the plot without making a specific and original remark, but it is only rarely that I felt this to be true; in most cases, plot-summaries contain points, even minor ones, that are elaborated immediately after the account of the plot, or in footnotes or at a later stage (and in that case, signposting is clear).

There is a lot to be gained from C.'s careful and close reading of the extant novel, and future commentators on Petronius ought certainly to take into account C.'s views. Especially useful are his listings of thematic and textual (Homeric, in particular) parallels to Petronius, his remarks on the motifs that permeate the 'Cena Trimalchionis', his excellent analysis of the tales of the Pergamene boy and the Widow of Ephesus, and his skilful unveiling of the connecting links that Petronius discreetly places in various parts of his text to foreshadow the outcome of the plot and to connect present with past events of the story. Some of C.'s opinions (for example, his understanding of the poem in 132.15, his conclusion on the aimlessness of the heroes' actions, and his ideas on the genuine feelings of concern Petronius cultivated for some contemporary issues) are less convincing. Above all—and with all due respect to C.—I have mixed feelings about the usefulness of this book to someone interested in scholarly views that differ from (or are complementary to) C.'s ideas, or in the interpretation of the *Satyrica* from various current theoretical perspectives (like the approaches usefully outlined by Fusillo in *The Novel in the Ancient World* [Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 1996], pp. 277–305. I see that my scepticism about C.'s contribution in these areas is shared by Holzberg in *JRS* 92 [2002], 249–50).

Is this criticism fair? Did C. set out to perform the formidable task of writing the definitive commentary on Petronius? In the Introduction we are told that the purpose of the volume, which 'seeks to provide raw material to facilitate understanding why [C.] think[s] Petronius wrote as he did', is 'fundamentally historical, not aesthetic' (p. 2), that its title 'is intended to imply a recommendation that after reading a stretch of Petronius novice users of this book should then consider that stretch in the light of [C.'s] comments' (p. 3), and that this book is primarily addressed to 'graduate students and young professors (in the American sense)' (p. 4). The reason for his rather over-selective bibliography is, somewhat dogmatically, stated on p. 3: 'I have tried not to burden the book with superfluous bibliography; most work with which I disagree, as well as some which seems to me to have its value but not to add anything essential to my text, or not to be to my purpose, is passed over in silence'. I wonder, however, if C.'s intended readership would not benefit from at least knowing about (without necesarily endorsing) the conclusions reached by other scholars regarding an issue discussed by C.; the motif of laughter is a good case-study in this respect. For, although C. rightly views laughter and humour as components of the hilarious comedy that is being played in the eyes of Petronius' original audience, and frequently refers to the works of Stöcker and others on humour published in the 1960s and 1970s, there is no mention

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Plaza's recent sophisticated analysis of this concept in the whole novel (see *CR* 52 [2002], 77–9).

I noted very few errors: '*Oxford Essays*' (p. xi); 'limited to myself to my interpretation' (p. 2); 'to do not find' (p. 2); 'ch. 21' (instead of 'ch. 51', p. 8); 'makes' (instead of 'make', p. 17); 'second century ad' (p. 19); 'It now' (instead of 'It is now', p. 21); 'lanistica' (p. 91 n. 33); '*προλαλία*', (p. 139); *Tragodien* (p. 219).

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

INSTITUTIO ORATORIA

D. A. RUSSELL (ed.): *Quintilian:* The Orator's Education*, Books 1–2*. (Loeb Classical Library 124.) Pp. viii + 430. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 0-674-99591-0.

D. A. RUSSELL (ed.): *Quintilian:* The Orator's Education*, Books 3–5.* (Loeb Classical Library 125.) Pp. xii + 535. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 0-674-99592-9.

D. A. RUSSELL (ed.): *Quintilian:* The Orator's Education*, Books 6–8*. (Loeb Classical Library 126.) Pp. xii + 483. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 0-674-99593-7.

D. A. RUSSELL (ed.): *Quintilian:* The Orator's Education*, Books 9–10*. (Loeb Classical Library 127.) Pp. xii + 404. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 0-674-99594-5.

D. A. RUSSELL (ed.): *Quintilian:* The Orator's Education*, Books 11–12*. (Loeb Classical Library 494.) Pp. xii + 432. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 0-674-99595-3.

Donald Russell's new Loeb edition of Quintilian provides everything which a reader might want from a dual language edition and much that one could barely expect to find: a new Latin text which surpasses any previously available, a lucid and accurate translation which is a pleasure to read, magnificent notes, the best brief account of Quintilian's life, a masterly introduction to the work as a whole, accurate and helpful surveys of the content and sources of each of the twelve books, and almost ninety pages of indexes.

R.'s edition replaces the four-volume Quintilian (Loeb Classical Library Latin volumes 124–7) which H. E. Butler published between 1920 and 1922. Butler worked at a time when rhetoric was a little-studied subject and Quintilian was regarded as a distinctly minor (if loquacious) Latin prose-writer. Butler often felt the need to apologize for the technicality of Quintilian's subject-matter and to add explanatory phrases to his translation of the Latin text. His text and translation, which has substantially outsold Latin-only editions, was of the greatest importance in making Quintilian available to a wider audience, and it has provided numerous students of later rhetoric with a quick way to find passages which were quarried as sources by subsequent writers. Without Butler's translation, which R. generously calls 'eloquent', Quintilian would not so rapidly have come to be seen as a major influence on Western rhetorical and educational thinking between the Middle Ages and the nineteenth

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.372 Published online by Cambridge University Press