

Cupid and Psyche is practical illustration of his ideas regarding the play of discourse, and the use of discourse too as a — not necessarily the — method of reaching truth. Love and the soul, matters of the highest philosophical import in Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, are treated of in a *bella fabula* narrated by a donkey focalized through a drunken old woman. While it is perfectly acceptable and even necessary to treat of *Cupid and Psyche* as a *bella fabula*, the enjoyment of the reader will surely not be lessened by reading it as a *fabula* written to a serious purpose. The editors rightly point out that you will look in vain for a 'close allegorical correspondence' between Plato's myth of the soul and Apuleius' literary creation (282). The impossibility of the donkey looking for a pen to write the story down illustrates the difficulty of using discourse such as the one used in the written story now just read as an instrument for philosophical inquiry. The fact remains that for Apuleius this instrument is all we have with which to seek the truth in a sublunar world. Apuleius sweetens probably more than the rim of his draught of philosophy with the honeyed 'wordplay' in the *Metamorphoses*. This is why the commentary is successful in its emphasis on close reading, though it still persists in placing the Platonic/philosophic approach in total opposition to the 'playful' approach. There is no reason why the two approaches must be mutually exclusive. The commentary does acknowledge where a Platonic interpretation is possible for example on Cupid as a *daimon* (286).

Psyche's trials in Book 6 are acutely observed. References offered range from archaisms in the language of Pan to intertexts from Plautus and New Comedy to features of style ekphrasis mainly, and make this section of the commentary a treasure trove. The Venus ekphrasis where she is described as an epic goddess ascending to heaven — not like the comic figure of the last chapters of Book 5 — or scratching her ear angrily as she contemplates Psyche are commented upon not only by adducing interesting parallels but also with sensitivity to the text as literature. The editors justify their promise of close reading too in respect of Psyche's *katabasis* (6.17–20) and the chapters preceding and following where the descent and all its epic and comic intertexts among many other things are admirably studied.

This commentary is a most valuable and erudite addition to Apuleian scholarship. The plain neutral style of the whole declares it to be the product of many hands while the closely-packed information displays the power of many minds. The Latin text is Helm's Teubner (1931) with a page and a half of variations noted before the start of the commentary proper. The chapter numbers are supplemented with the paragraph numbers of Robertson's Budé (1956) in brackets: 5, 22 (120, 2–7). Though it looks cumbersome this makes for the required exactness. The Bibliography is split usefully into several sections, Sections III 'Commentaries on the *Metamorphoses*, mentioned in our commentary' and V 'Apuleian Studies from GCA 2000 onward' being especially welcome. An Index Verborum, an Index Rerum along, with an extensive, and, as far as checked, accurate Index Locorum complete this indispensable commentary.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth

MAEVE O'BRIEN

G. JENSSON, *THE RECOLLECTIONS OF ENCOLPIUS: THE SATYRICA OF PETRONIUS AS MILESIAN FICTION* (Ancient Narrative Supplementum 2). Groningen: Barkhuis, 2004. Pp. xii + 327. ISBN 90-807390-8-1. €65.00.

One approaches any book that mentions 'road novel', 'Cynic popular philosophy', and 'Milesian fiction' on the dust-jacket with some trepidation. The purpose of the book is to base an interpretation of the *Satyrica* on the oft-mocked authority of Encolpius who is identified by Jensson as the speaker of his own 'recollections'. The process is fraught with difficulties not least the fragmentary nature of the text. J. sees himself as being engaged in assembling the fragments like a jigsaw puzzle, and it emerges that it is more than fragments he is assembling, for his thesis is that the *Satyrica* is 'essentially a hybrid, a Latin adaptation of a Greek work written in a multiplicity of discourse types' (292). This book, handsomely produced by Barkhuis publishing, appears as *Ancient Narrative Supplementum 2*. There is a short Preface and the book is divided into three parts: Part I 'Narrative' (3–84), Part II 'Story' (85–188), and Part III 'Genre' (189–301). Each of the three is further subdivided under separate chapter headings.

Chapter 1.1 'Text, Context and Identity' surveys editions of the *Satyrica* and also the literary interpretations that have arisen from these editions over time. This excavation of earlier and mostly German nineteenth-century scholarship is one of the major contributions of this book. The fragmentary nature of the *Satyrica* has resulted in arbitrariness by editors in ascribing *lacunae* in the text. Müller has recognized this and J. maintains there are less gaps in his 1995

edition. Examples of inspired guesswork in textual emendation are adduced convincingly (11) where working with the text as we have it, and not ascribing oddities to scribal interpolations or to a feeling that elegant Petronius could not have written this, is advocated. None of us likes to be told that we have not been paying attention or that we have been engaged in ‘peculiar allegorical hermeneutics’. J. looks at literary interpretations, whereby individual sections, passages, phrases or even words are privileged in order to contextualize the work and label it with a specific generic label. Interestingly, J. takes Encolpius at face value and bases his interpretation of the text on Encolpius’ authority. This reading makes the *Satyrica* ‘performance literature’ but not as we know it.

In the second half of Part I, J. insists on the ‘orality’ of Encolpius’ narrative, a *narratio in personis* or a recollected tale told by one speaker who impersonates all the characters, by closely reading the ‘clamorous’ text. The strange language of the *Satyrica*, especially the language of the freedmen, so different from the *scholastici*, can be accounted for by again looking at ancient rhetorical theory. The ‘thin style’ and its *Latinitas* described in the *Ad Herennium* is the language of the novel, but the ‘bad version’ *vitiosa oratio* of this style is found in the language of the freedmen. Referring to theories of language and declamation nearer in time to Petronius has a lot to recommend it. The idealized medium of the text is then *sermo adtenuatus* and this medium is set against the poetic utterances dotted through the *Satyrica*. Speaking poetry is the wrong way to go about mastering the spoken language, the urbane colloquialism, of the text. The spoken language, the prerequisite for making sense, is the prose. The art of performing and recollecting badly would have been appreciated by the Roman audience of the *Satyrica*: polite, educated and interested in literature their ears might indeed have been charmed by a version of the wanderings of Odysseus narrated by a clownish Encolpius, an unreliable but entertaining vagabond.

Part II is a reconstruction — necessarily speculative — and a summary of the reconstructed story by J. This section strives to change the current view of the *Satyrica* as episodic and tries to give increased ‘readability’ by constructing a more coherent fictional narrative. Here several pieces of the jigsaw puzzle are discussed and reasonable hypotheses for missing bits are adduced. Retrospective passages provide clues to the nature of a complete narrative. For example, Encolpius’ soliloquy (*Sat.* 9) is studied and the possibility that Encolpius was made to fight with a woman, ‘an Amazon of the arena’, and the possibility that he only escaped that encounter because the amphitheatre collapsed are speculated upon. The speculative reconstruction of the whole text suggests eighteen books and is attractive. Here J. is doing much what everyone else does anyway ‘in response to the fragmentary state of the tradition’ (175).

Part III looks at the narrative of the *Satyrica* and the formal plurality attributed to it especially since Bakhtin. In contrast to any writerly ideas, the first person narrator and his self-deprecation are seen to be part of the ancient comic stance. J. bases the narrative here again on the idea of *narratio in personis*. A performance adapting or impersonating many voices is undertaken by Encolpius and this establishes a genre of the ‘ancient personal novel’ (209). So as not to be a social or moral threat to his audience and in order for the narrative authority to work the personal novel has to be narrated by a humble clownish persona. Clownish Encolpius weaves poetry into prose and moves back again in the manner of Cynic philosophers touching on issues like the spread of culture to the plebs or the vice of avarice. Poetry is used to leaven the message about a corrupt society. *Bellum Civile* recited by Eumolpus (*Sat.* 119) is put into the mouth of this crazy poet by Encolpius to promote a message in favour of *libertas* comically and safely for himself. As a comic and satyr-like figure, bald and wearing make-up, Encolpius performs the ‘telling’ of the *Satyrica* in the tradition of Margites. The implied ideal audience is a creation of this performance enacted by an inferior narrator through his extensive impersonations of the discourses of Agamemnon, Echion, and Eumolpus for example.

Finally, the hidden genre of the *Satyrica* is prosimetric Milesian tale. This chapter is most valuable for its dusting down of the work of early modern Petronians, German scholars like Mommsen, Klebs, and Bürger. The motivation of those who, like Mommsen imbued with the emergent nationalism of his time, wanted to make the *Satyrica* a national Roman marvel of literary invention and who denied it a Greek predecessor is well analysed. From Bürger J. cites Cicero, *De Inventione* (1.19.27), who describes a type of non-judicial narrative with many voices, turns of events, emotional ups and downs, and a happy ending. Bürger uses Cicero to posit the existence of an earlier long prose narrative type before Petronius with which J. agrees and names *Milesiae/Milesiaka*. In addition the prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* and the Pseudo-Lucianic *Amores/Erotas* are adduced to describe and name the *Milesiae* genre. A long adventure

story, a sort of road or voyage tale about criminal delinquency and shamelessness recollected by one narrator is the central *fabula*. The narrator who impersonates all the characters weaves the tales told to him by others into this *fabula* in a virtuoso performance involving extensive impersonation.

The Bibliography (305–17) ranges back in time and wide in subject matter. J. demurs regarding the lack of material after 1996 since this book is a reworking of his dissertation. This does not mar the text substantially though as J. says both he and others — S. J. Harrison is named — were working unknown to each other on Milesian fiction. The Bibliography might have been improved by having editions of Petronius' *Satyrica* cited separately.

This book provides an interesting history of Classical scholarship on Petronius, challenges our assumptions, and puts forward interesting ideas on the genre of the *Satyrica* and Latin fiction.

National University of Ireland at Maynooth

MAEVE O'BRIEN

D. DOX, *THE IDEA OF THE THEATER IN LATIN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: AUGUSTINE TO THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004. Pp. viii + 196. ISBN 0-472-11423-9. US\$65.00.

M. ERASMO, *ROMAN TRAGEDY: THEATRE TO THEATRICALITY*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 2004. Pp. xii + 211. ISBN 0-292-70242-6. US\$45.00.

The afterlife of the dramatic legacy of fifth-century Athens has always been an area of particular interest to Classicists, even before the recent boom in reception studies. There is the tendency, however, to let the story begin around 1600, when the practice of re-performing classical scripts on the modern stage first set in. The disregard for the intervening period (almost two millennia of fascinating cultural history) is in part due to a familiar set of preconceptions about the 'rocky horror picture shows' of the Romans, the 'secondary' cultures of late antiquity, or the 'dark' ages of dominant Christianity. They are by now largely discredited, and things are changing fast. Pat Easterling, in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, has identified the reverberation of Greek tragedy in later antiquity as 'one of the most interesting challenges for contemporary critics'. Scholarship on Roman tragedy (including the fragments of republican playwrights) is surging and has already yielded a satisfyingly sophisticated Seneca (Boyle, Tarrant, Schiesaro). And the Oxford Archive for Performances of Greek and Roman Drama has started to broaden its remit to encompass study of performance cultures throughout antiquity, including sub-literary genres such as mime and pantomime. The two books under review here are thus catching (and contributing to) a wave of scholarship on the ancient theatre and its reception that is sweeping away the limiting assumptions of earlier work.

Dox's object of analysis is how the pagan theatre figured in the medieval Christian imagination. She distinguishes her approach from the study of ritual and/as performance in this period (as laid out, for instance, in O. B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (1965)) as well as the habit of turning the medieval evidence into one marginal chapter in the grand history of Western theatre. Instead, she examines discursive reactions of a string of Christian writers to an increasingly remote institution of the pagan past, from Augustine and Isidore (ch. 1) to the reception and interpretation of Aristotle's *Poetics* in the early fourteenth century (ch. 4). The two chapters in between cover the early Middle Ages, with a focus on Rabanus Maurus (c. 780–856), Remigius of Auxerre (c. 841–908), and Amalarius of Metz (775/80–850); and a series of writers from the twelfth century, notably Honorius of Autun, Hugh of St Victor, and John of Salisbury. A lucid introduction and a three-page afterword (ch. 5), which briefly outlines differences in medieval and Renaissance thought on pagan drama and Aristotle's *Poetics*, round out the argument.

Under the heading 'The Idea of the Theatre' D. includes such diverse items as physical location (often perceived as a site for the enactment of illicit pleasures, dramatic and otherwise), a corpus of scripts populated by pagan deities, or theories of representation and the attending issues of (theological) truth and (histrionic) falsehood, reality and make-belief. It is easily apparent why the ancient theatre was frequently considered a deeply problematic institution by Christian writers and could become a virtual metonymy for the larger culture of Greco-Roman antiquity that Christianity tried to supersede, not without protracted ideological tussles and a complex dialectic of condemnation and appropriation. D. well brings out the different rhetorical postures that her chosen authors assumed *vis-à-vis* the theatrical heritage of pagan antiquity, from moral