

Van Rooy, C. A.: *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Brill, Leiden, 1965) pp. 229.

The enquiries undertaken in this work encompass a wider field than most that have been devoted to Roman satire and relevant problems. Some theses that were made more or less tentatively (cf. Kroll's shortish art. *satura* of 1923 in RE. II A col. 192–200) have been either refuted or confirmed. In many cases the conclusion is not novel—something hardly to be expected on the *via trita* of the sole Roman literary genre (*Graecis intacti carminis* as Hor. describes it); yet, as those conclusions are based on evidence weighed and considered afresh and with the utmost nicety they inspire confidence.

There are eight chapters of unequal length treating of the following matters: Chapter I considers the 'derivation, meaning, and extension of connotation in pre-literary usage' of the term *satura*. The author sets out from the *locus classicus* in the fourth century grammarian Diomedes; this is printed immediately before the first page of Chapter I, with the lines as numbered in Keil's *Gr. Lat.* and an English translation on the opposite page. Van Rooy (pp. 2–4) accepts Leo's view that Varro is the ultimate source of the four possible derivations of the term *satura* suggested by Diomedes, and concludes (p. 19) that (a) the original usage was probably the phrase *lanx satura* (though this occurs nowhere in any extant author; p. 5); (b) this 'well-filled dish' was in the course of time abbreviated, by the omission of *lanx*; and that the adjective *satura* was regarded as a feminine collective noun meaning 'the whole offering'; (c) the early Roman farmer used the word to mean *farcimen*, not the abstract act of filling, but the concrete stuffing used in preparing a fowl for the table (p. 13). In the case of the concrete noun *satura* under (b) and (c) 'fullness' was the primary concept, from which the transition to that of 'variety' was easy; (d) the next step was the development of an abstract noun *satura* meaning 'medley' or 'miscellany' which replaced 'fullness' as the primary concept. It is used in this sense in the phrase *per saturam*, which in the legal sphere indicates omnibus laws (from ± 150 B.C.); hence it may be inferred that the meaning 'miscellany' probably became current in the first half of the second century.

Chapter II ('Q. Ennius and the Founding of a Literary Genre'). Here (p. 32) van Rooy rejects Leo's dictum 'die Gedichten hatten kein "satirisches Element"' and concludes on the next page: 'On the meaning of "*satura(e)*" in Ennius, we may conclude by saying that it means here solely . . . "miscellaneous poems"; that this title implies nothing about the nature of his work beyond signifying its miscellaneous form and content; and that the satirical element is already manifest in it, but—judging by the extant

fragments—only as one *out of many*, so that this element has nothing to do with the meaning of “*satura(e)*”’. He ‘borrowed or adapted (certain) elements from Greek literature (mainly didactic and moralising topics)’ (p. 43), but ‘even in what (he) borrowed from Greek literature there was an element of personal achievement’, which Van Rooy sees ‘in his selection . . . of such topics from Greek moralistic literature as would have appealed to the ethical tastes of the Roman people’ (*ibid.*). The variety of his metres is deliberate and ‘accords with the informal nature and varied content of his medley’. The nature of *satura* as seen by Ennius is succinctly described (*ibid.*): ‘it has no *lex*, or φύσις, or essence of its own beyond the fact that it is a causerie, miscellaneous in form and content’. The poems probably had (as Knoche suggests) a stronger moralising trend than the extant fragments reveal.

The chapter closes with the remark that the early literary *satura* . . . ‘did not meet with abiding acceptance by Roman society or its poets: though it was not rejected completely, . . . it was developed along different lines, on the one hand by Lucilius and his successors, and on the other by the authors of the so-called Menippean Satire’.

Chapter III treats of ‘Latin *satura*: from miscellaneous poems to satire’. Van Rooy here discusses the development in the connotation of the word ‘*satura* as a title or as a term of reference . . . from Lucilius to Juvenal’ (p. 50) of which ‘the main stages . . . will be from “a collection of miscellaneous poems” to “a collection of satirical poems”, and thence to *satire* as denoting first the genre and ultimately the single satire’. The author proposes to note earlier contributions by scholars in this field (particularly that of Ullman in 1913) and to approach these in a critical spirit. He indicates why Horace avoided *satura(e)* either as a title or as a term of reference in his first book of *Sermones* but did come to employ the term both of the genre and of individual satires in Bk. II (p. 60–71). The following line of argument is advanced: following Rudd’s analysis of Sat. I. 4 Van Rooy is of opinion (pp. 62–4) that Horace is avoiding *saturae* as a title of his work ‘as a matter of expediency’; it is ‘a pose as a timid spirit’ (Rudd); in indicating his relation to Lucilius he is ‘evasive’: he is claiming (p. 62) the same right to censorious outspokenness (*libertas*) as Luc., if in a less acrimonious spirit. He reserves for himself the right to personal (*nominatim*) censure, if the occasion should arise (p. 63). But he ‘did not attack men of real consequence’ (*ibid.*). Why then, we may ask, should he have found it necessary to adopt an apologetic tone in this connection? And inasmuch as Horace himself draws attention to his close relationship to Lucilius—as Van Rooy puts it (p. 65) ‘there was no essential difference between their theories of the general style appropriate to the writing of satire’—why should he have had recourse to such an elaborate piece of (quite perspicuous) dissimulation? Surely the mere avoidance of the *title* ‘*Saturae*’ would deceive nobody?

Apart from the motive of expediency there is (p. 64) the question whether Horace in Bk. I rejected *satura(e)* as a title and literary term also 'as a matter of principle'. Some scholars have found 'the answer to this question . . . in his criticism of the artistic form, or lack of form, in Lucilius' work'. Van Rooy appears to accept this explanation: 'Why', he asks, 'did (Horace) select the term *Sermones* as a title for his book? (*ibid.*) Clearly he derived the term from Lucilius . . . Certainly, Horace selected *Sermones* as title . . . because despite Lucilius' lower artistic standards in regard to form, there was no essential difference between their theories . . .' (as quoted above). Again it is by no means clear why Horace should swallow *Sermones* and strain at *saturae*, when these two terms have equally strong Lucilian associations. An answer to this quandary is not rendered any easier by the admission at the foot of p. 66: 'Though Horace had published his first book under the title *Sermones*, we may assume that everyone, both detractor and well-wisher, referred to his poems as "saturae" or "satires".' The 'pose' had apparently been seen through upon the publication of Bk. I. What result then had been achieved by the avoidance of *satura(e)* in that book?

We should further bear in mind that the reasoning sets out from a premise that is not absolutely firm, leaning as it does on something akin to an *argumentum e silentio*. The author says at the top of p. 60: 'While Lucilius published his work under the title *Saturae*, as we have good reason to believe, but styled it "*Sermones*" in the extant fragments . . .'. Is it safe to infer that he consistently avoided a term which does not happen to occur in the extant fragments? There is a similar lack of certainty concerning the connotation (should we say the affective aura?) of the term *sermo* in Lucilius' time; cf. the statement at the foot of p. 64: 'it *probably* did not carry the same sort of stigma as the word "*satura*" . . .' (Italics in this paragraph by me).—In conclusion I do not think a case has been made out for a conscious avoidance of Lucilian terminology by Horace.

At the end of Chapter III (pp. 78–80) a clear and crisp summary is given of 'the literary history of the word "*satura*" as employed by writers of the genre from Ennius to Juvenal', to which is added 'a short review of the usage of the word by authors other than satirists from Persius to Juvenal', including Statius, Quintilian and Suetonius. Lucilius was the writer responsible for the shift in meaning by which a satirical element became part of the connotation of the word *satura(e)*.

Chapter IV 'The Satirical Elements in Greek Literature'. The author recalls that Joh. Geffcken's challenge to scholars in 1911 that a history of Greek satire should be written has gone unheeded to this day though the essay in which he threw it out had assumed the form of a thorough-going Vorarbeit of 40 pages. He suggests reasons for this and discusses methods which have been or might be employed in this task. He proposes (pp. 92–3) to set out 'from a suitable definition of Latin satire, as a genre, and

to use such a definition as the basis for an enquiry into the satiric elements of Greek literature'. This, he holds, is logical, for although the satiric element manifested itself in Greece before the existence of the Roman 'satura', it is 'an abstraction in the first place of the characteristics of Latin satire' (p. 92). The definition proposed is that offered in the Oxford New English Dictionary, but somewhat emended to read: 'Latin satire is a poem in which prevalent follies or vices, or individuals or groups as guilty of such, are assailed with ridicule or censure, or by the mixing of jest with earnestness', to which is added (partly for the comfort of Persius): 'with or without an element of moral exhortation, towards the improvement of society'. But the proviso follows 'that the essential function or immediate purpose of Latin satire is a negative, critical one'. I do not think there can be any quarrel with this standpoint; it is perfectly legitimate to inquire whether a given attitude of mind, *in casu*, the satiric spirit, manifested itself in the thought of one people, the Greeks, before it received its name and form in the language of another, the Romans. This satiric element is traced in the works of Archilochus, Solon, Aristophanes and down to Lucian and Bion.

Chapter V '*Satura quidem tota nostra est*: the meaning of Quintilian's dictum' reproduces with some changes and additions a short article that appeared in *Mnemosyne* (1955), and concludes that Quintilian meant 'the (genre) satire is a wholly Roman achievement' though he (p. 121) 'certainly . . . was well aware of what we call the *satiric* elements in Greek literature'.

Chapter VI treats of 'Satura and Satyroi: the development of Greek Satyr-drama and the Rapprochement of Literary Terms' as the title proclaims. Van Rooy proposes (p. 124) 'to enquire how and when the false etymology arose' (which derived satire from the Greek satyr-drama). 'It remains, then, to consider the development of Greek Satyr-drama and thus to determine at what stage in the respective lines of development the connotation of *satura* became so similar to that of *satyroi* that the derivation of the one term from the other seemed to some literary theorist or theorists a plausible inference'. After an examination of the extant fragments of satyr-dramas, the conclusion is drawn (pp. 137-9) that the rapprochement is to be dated shortly after the death of Lucilius (102 B.C.), i.e. in the early last century B.C., 'and found its way, with other derivations, into the work of the scholar whom we regard as the ultimate source of Diomedes, viz. M. T. Varro' (p. 139).

Chapter VII treats of a medley of questions, all emanating from the *locus classicus* of Diomedes: (1) the attitude of the Latin satirists from Lucilius to Juvenal to the derivation of *satura* from Greek *satyroi*. (2) 'the relation established by them between *satura* and the Old Comedy', and (3) 'the history of the Latin loan word *satyricus* with reference to Latin satire proper and other satirical writing' (especially in the post-Juvenalian

period). No. (3), the history of *satyricus*, is traced down to Cassiodorus, and even to Isidorus, in whom antiquity finds its *explicat*. This harvest gleaned from many rarely-read authors of the Dämmerung des Altertums is offered as a readily digestible *lanx* at the close of the chapter (pp. 168–172).

The short final Chapter VIII sketches 'The Climax of Confusion in Literary Theory' down to Isidorus.

The author has produced a very thorough study, containing numerous fascinating bypaths branching off from an otherwise often travelled high-road, and the result of a careful and critical examination of views propounded by other scholars. The following example may serve: the final page and a half of Chapter I (pp. 18–20) summarises the conclusions arrived at after some very close reasoning necessitated by the tenuous nature of the extant evidence; this, perhaps inevitably, makes for some heavy reading; but no stone has been left unturned to trace what has been written on the subject; the 19 pages of the text of this Chapter are supported by 96 notes covering 9 pages; this creates a sense of reassurance that all the available evidence has been adduced; the more so as the acknowledgements in the Preface offer proof of the numerous sources of information that have been laid under contribution; these include as yet unpublished references and testimonia gleaned from the vaults of the Thes. L. L. at Munich. We have here, in short, ex Africa aliquid novi de antiquitate.

Very few typographical errors have been noted:

- p. 18 (line 12 from foot of page) *kulinarischen* for *-em*.
- p. 32 (line 10 from foot of page) *Gedichten* for *-te*.
- p. 33, line 5, *beyong* for *beyond*.
- p. 35 (middle) *das* Ennius for *dass* Ennius.
- p. 61 (line 7 from foot of page) *wolten* (italics) for *wollten*.
- p. 196 (last line, first word) has first two letters *fo-* omitted.

In the Select Bibliography (p. 206), as on p. 175, n. 39, the article on 'The Date of the "Satiricon"' in *C.Q.* 56 (1962) by K. F. C. Rose is ascribed to H. J. Rose. [The above errors have been corrected in the second impression of the book, Leiden 1966.—Ed.]

P. 20, nn. 1 and 2 unnecessarily repeat most of the Diomedes text printed before the first page of Chapter I. But these hardly deserve to be termed blemishes in a work of very sound scholarship. Horace has a claim to the last word in this regard:

velut si
egregio inspertos reprehendas corpore naevos.

University of Pretoria

H. L. GONIN

*

*

*

ACTA CLASSICA



Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

For further information go to:
http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta_classica.htm