

poetical and rhetorical figures of speech (*ad* 8) and meter (*ad* 6–7). B. makes excellent use of the existing commentary tradition on the *Punica*, as well as those on other epics.

Remarks on specific lemmata in the commentary: 44: cf. *concutere + urbs* in Lucr. 5.1237, etc., as well as *concutere + Italia* in Sil. 8.353; Livy 31.7.10. 66–177: for the story of Satricus and Solymus, cf. Pacuvius and Perolla in Sil. 11.267–368, as well as Asilus and Beryas in 14.148–77. 67–8: cf. Plaut., *Rud.* 918–19 *meam seruitutem/tolerarem*. 132: for ‘the one son left to me’, cf. the fate of the gens *Fabia* at the battle of the Cremera River (see *ICS* 39 (2014), 139–69). 139: cf. Sil. 5.53 *propelli signa*. 212–16: for Maharbal’s comment to Hannibal after Cannae, cf. Caesar’s comment about Pompey after Dyrrachium as reported in Plut., *Caes.* 39.8; App., *B Civ.* 2.9.62; Suet., *Iul.* 36; Eutr. 6.16. 249–50: cf. Livy 22.61.14, where Varro is described in the aftermath of Cannae as *consuli ex tanta clade, cuius ipse causa maxima fuisset, redeunti*, as well as Livy 2.36.4, etc.; Sall., *Cat. initium cladis*; and *principium + pugnae* in Verg., *Aen.* 9.53 (with Servius *ad loc.* and *ad* 10.14), etc. 284: add Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 3.10.24. 305–6: the traditional site of the Gigantomachy was Phlegra on(?) Pallene, the westernmost of the three ‘fingers’ of Chalcidice in Thrace; later, this Phlegra was confused, if not conflated, with the campi Phlegraei in Campania (see Diod. Sic. 5.71.4–6). 348: cf. Livy 1.23.1 *Troianam ... prolem*. 362–3: add Curt. 7.9.10 *perfregero ... aciem*. 382: add Sil. 2.615, 17.455. 472: add Valerius Flaccus 4.249, 740. 481: add Sil. 7.394 *pugna absistite*, as well as Livy 23.15.13, etc. 633–4: add Livy 27.26.10, 40.7.5. 634–5: add Sil. 7.72, 17.630, as well as Prop. 2.1.33, etc. 653: for the weakness of the interrogative *uiuamme*, cf. Hannibal’s *uiuam* in Sil. 17.612, 615. 653–4: cf. Sil. 5.152, 11.223, 17.646, as well as 2.204, 6.368, 12.401.

In addition to an admirably complete ‘Bibliography’ (263–78), the back matter also includes three indices: ‘Index Locorum’ (279–300), ‘General Index’ (301–4) and ‘Latin Words’ (305). I noticed the usual smattering of minor errors, including discrepancies between citations and references (e.g. Rutledge 2009 *versus* Rutledge 2002 and *CIL* 6 1984.9 *versus* *CIL* XV 7302 on p. 3; Wilson 2013 cited on p. 4 but missing from the bibliography), but nothing major. That said, B. might have dwelt more on the theme of Varro *redemptus*, given how consistently the tradition emphasises that he was welcomed back to Rome for ‘not having lost hope’ at the darkest hour.

Montclair Kimberley Academy

JOHN JACOBS

jjacobs@mka.org

doi:10.1017/S0075435823000850

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

FRANCO BELLANDI, GIOVENALE, SATIRA 9: INTRODUZIONE, TESTO, TRADUZIONE E COMMENTO (Texte und Kommentare; Bd. 67). Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2021. Pp. 393. ISBN 9783110725988 (hbk); 9783110727623 (PDF). £113.50.

Franco Bellandi’s extensive and fundamental research on Juvenal is enriched by the book under review. It comprises an introduction, text with *apparatus*, Italian translation and commentary on *Satire* 9, comprehensive bibliography and two indices (*locorum* and *rerum et nominum*).

The introduction focuses on the distinctive features of *Satire* 9. B.’s keen understanding of Juvenal’s social commentary explores the power and economic dynamics within a poem denouncing the breakdown of the patron–client relationship, where – unlike previous satires – both parties are depicted as (almost) equally corrupt.

This is the only Juvenal satire structured entirely as a dialogue, between Naevolus and an anonymous interlocutor. Despite involving two speakers, a third character is present: Naevolus’ former patron, the physically absent yet crucial co-protagonist who dominates Naevolus’ thoughts, sparking a virtual dialogue between them. Commenting on this triangulation, B. remarks on the poem’s notable absence of a strong authorial figure to deliver the authoritative moral judgments of the indignant satirist, or the ‘Democritean’ attitude found in later satires. Instead, the role of the indignant satirist is partially transferred onto Naevolus, as he is the one judging his patron’s behaviour (16–17).

Regarding the anonymous interlocutor’s identity (17–19), B. questions the assumption that he is Juvenal, noting the lack of explicit textual support and the aforementioned absence of a clearly identifiable authorial voice. Ultimately, B. argues that the reader remains uncertain about whether the

interlocutor is a projection of the author or an autonomous character like Naevolus, with the author's irony residing beneath the first level of the text. Following this second hypothesis (which I find more persuasive), B. suggests that *Satire 9* would in a way resemble Theocritus's mimes or, more aptly, a Petronian experiment where Juvenal is, for once, not foregrounded but rather a 'hidden author', with authorial irony operating behind the characters, at their expense. B. then tackles two much-debated issues: Naevolus' social status (24–7), and his patron's identity (27–31). B. interprets the controversial expression *verna eques* as '*buffone non volgare*' ('not unpolished buffoon'), contending that Naevolus has never been an *eques* but only aspires to become one, drawing evidence from the prayer to the Lares and the analogies with Trebius in *Satire 5*. The identification of Virro as Naevolus' patron is supported through a convincing analysis of the structure of the passage where he is introduced, as well as Naevolus' fear of having revealed his employer's identity.

The introduction concludes with a short essay on homosexual behaviour in ancient morality, valuable beyond Juvenal scholarship. By reassessing key passages in *Satires 6* and 11, and comparing 2 and 9, B. illustrates Juvenal's condemnation of both partners in homosexual relationships, even extending his intolerance to the (usually socially acceptable) active partner. Juvenal is thus identified as an early witness to the second century's shift in sexual mores.

B. takes a fairly conservative approach to the text, which is based on Clausen's 1992 OCT, diverging from it in five main instances (51). The text and translation are preceded by a preface addressing the transmission of Juvenal and the *conspectus siglorum*, which includes almost all manuscripts of Juvenal mentioned throughout the book and not exclusively those utilised for the *constitutio textus* (except Pal. 1708, not found elsewhere). Therefore, it includes manuscripts and fragments which do not preserve *Satire 9* (Arov., Aurel., Bob., R and V, all mentioned in the preface, with R also *ad* 138). CH and Fris. do not appear in the *apparatus*: the former is referenced at 50 n. 11, the latter *ad* 103.

The commentary typically examines either a single line or small groups of verses at a time, then delves into individual lemmata. The eight sections into which the text can be divided, corresponding to the dialogic exchanges between Naevolus and his interlocutor, are helpfully detailed in the introduction (8–13).

In B.'s dense commentary, textual issues, metre, language, style, literary models, intratexts and intertexts are all discussed in knowledgeable detail. Often, the lemmata expand on broader topics, providing macro-contextualisation for *Satire 9* and Juvenal (e.g. Horace's ideal of moderation, *ad* 9; the interplay between *Fortuna* and deterministic *fatum*, *ad* 32–7, 148–9). The commentary thus supports targeted inquiries into specific passages, as well as broader consultations about Juvenal and beyond. B. avoids any ambiguity in his interpretation of the text, articulating clear-cut opinions with precision. He effectively outlines the textual and/or interpretative issues posed by the text, evaluating options while considering previous scholarship, and consistently provides a solid, generally compelling final argument. This is especially evident in the interpretation of hermeneutically demanding passages: e.g. Naevolus' comparison with Ravola (*ad* 3–4) and the '(mis)quote' from Hom., *Od.*, 16.294 = 19.13 (*ad* 37).

Fully attuned to the dialogue's progression and Juvenal's characteristic tonal variations, B. admirably captures Naevolus' psychological and emotional changes: from angered sadness (*ad* 1–2) and disheartened fatalism (*ad* 32–7), to indignation towards Virro (*ad* 38–44, 81–5), fear of retaliation (*ad* 93–101), melancholic self-pity within existential anxiety at the fleetingness of time (*ad* 126–7), and disillusionment with *Fortuna*'s hostile indifference (*ad* 147–9). Naevolus' indirect characterisation through his interlocutor's words, and Virro's through Naevolus', are equally well emphasised and carefully handled. Besides being essential for a comprehensive understanding of the characters, this sensitivity, rooted in B.'s mastery of Juvenal's language and poetics, aids in evaluating certain textual choices (e.g. *victus* instead of *vinctus*, *ad* 2) and grasping meaningful nuances of minute grammatical elements (Naevolus' 'lapsus' in using the first person and *pf.* subjunctive, *ad* 97; also e.g. *ad* 72).

Given the insightful depth of its literary analysis, B.'s latest book represents the pinnacle of his research on *Satire 9*, and another landmark study on Juvenal.

Scuola Normale Superiore
marta.perilli@sns.it

MARTA M. PERILLI

doi:10.1017/S0075435824000509