

J. R. Jenkinson (ed., tr.). *Persius. The Satires*. Text with Translation and Notes. (Classical Studies.) Warminster, Wilts.: Aris & Phillips, Ltd., 1980. Pp. vii, 131. \$29.00 (cloth); \$14.50 (paper).

Distributed in North America by International Scholarly Book Services, Inc., P.O. Box 555, Forest Grove, OR 97116.

R. A. Harvey, *A Commentary on Persius*. (Mnemosyne Supplement, 64.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981. Pp. ix, 213. No price listed (paper).

A full English commentary and a generously annotated English translation of Persius are welcome additions to recent work on Roman satire. For translations, English-speaking students have had Ramsay's revised Loeb (1940) and Rudd's Penguin (1967), both conveying the sense and much of the spirit of the original, but neither equipped with adequate explanatory notes. For commentary, Conington-Nettleship (1893) has been the outdated standard. Jenkinson and Harvey, then, address important needs, but with varied success.

Jenkinson professes to direct his work toward the reader with no ready command of Latin (pp. vi-vii). He has adopted a format ideally suited to this purpose. Clausen's Latin text with an abbreviated *app. crit.* is printed on the left-hand pages opposite Jenkinson's corresponding translation, which is itself numbered for convenient reference. The notes, which are marked in the translation only, deal with specific details and lines. Larger critical topics concerning satires 1, 3, 4 and 6 are treated in separate appendices. Thereafter Jenkinson includes a text and translation of the Probus *Vita*. The fine eight-page introduction neatly places Persius and his satires in their proper literary, historical, and even philosophical contexts.

Such general features would make this a perfect self-contained text for graduate courses in English or comparative literature, initial undergraduate courses in Latin authors, or general humanities courses in ancient literature. Unfortunately the actual translation (in which Jenkinson has striven for "the unapologetic and adventurous brevity of Persius' expression"—a phrase which should be a warning in itself) and the notes are satisfactory at best.

The translation, which is affectedly idiosyncratic in its choice of idiom and often unnecessarily inventive, loses much of Persius' point and imparts to his satires an unnaturally substantival quality. A few examples must suffice:

—Sat.1.11 cum sapimus patruos: "once we're. . . savouring sagely of the Heavy Father." This lacks the boldly compressed word-play of Persius. It translates an easily understood Latin word into an obscure idiom, "Heavy Father", that will send a diligent reader to his *OED*. Moreover, the idiom, once fathomed, is found far too strong for *patruos*.

—Prol.6 sacra vatum: "Rituals of Minstrelsy." For similarly unhappy renderings see 4.51, 3.53, 1.5, *et passim*.

—The translations of 4.5 and 6.22-24 typify the odd substantival effect.

Still, in light of Jenkinson's intention to reproduce Persius' peculiarities, the shortcomings of the translation could be accepted if sufficient help were offered to the 'intended reader' by the notes. These, however, are entirely misgauged. Typical notes list many references to very technical sources (PW, Daremberg-Saglio, German editions or essays, *Black's Medical Dictionary*, handbooks on palaeography, etc.) without explaining the point at hand (see notes 2.4, 3.17, 5.16, 6.11). When explanations are offered, they are sometimes affected by the crabbed style of the translation, e.g., note on Prol. 7: " 'of Minstrelsey', lit.

(e.g.) 'of the Prophets': 'Prophets/Rites (of the Muses)', i.e. 'poets', 'poetry', are conventional expressions and sometimes clichés." One should add [?!?!?!?!].

For the reviewer it was gratifying to turn to Harvey's commentary. In fact Jenkinson's work would profit considerably by simply substituting Harvey's notes. Harvey's one noticeable shortcoming is the failure to choose a base-text for the commentary. On the positive side one can cite: (1) the brief structural outlines for each satire; (2) the concern with style and literary devices (lacking in Jenkinson); (3) the treatment of meter at 1.93-102, 1.115, 2.10, 2.55, 6.18 (lacking in Jenkinson and Conington-Nettleship); (4) the thorough documentation of Persius' relationship to Horace throughout the six satires.

Harvey's concern with small stylistic details as well as with larger questions of meaning and thought-sequence (see note 1.26 for a well-argued reassignment of the half-lines that produces a much more sensible, poignant, and, I may note, symmetrical interchange) makes his a commentary that will add to any reader's understanding and appreciation of Persius. For a writer of whom Scaliger remarked, "cum legi vellet quae scripsisset, intellegi noluit quae legerentur," this is no small achievement.

*Fordham University*

THOMAS G. PALAIMA

William B. Dinsmoor, Jr. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis*. Vol. I. *The Predecessors*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1980. Pp. xviii, 69; (plus) plans and ill. on 24 pls., 1 folding plan. No price listed.

If the Athenian acropolis is one of the most intensely studied archaeological sites in the world, its problems are some of the most intractable. The work under review is an exemplary study of the predecessors of one of the most famous buildings on this sacred hill—the Propylaia of Mnesikles.

The author's work is the continuation of a study begun in 1910 by his father, the well-known expert in Greek architecture, William B. Dinsmoor, and which was itself a continuation of scholarly interest in the building that dates back as far as its original clearing in 1840. Utilizing this long history of scholarship, his own observations and deductions, and evidence from new discoveries (one as recent as 1975), the author presents a lucid discussion of the evidence and comes to some clearly expressed conclusions. A second volume on the Propylaia is promised.

The author deals with the prehistoric (Mycenaean) entrance to the Acropolis in a succinct chapter of only five pages. By rejecting some scrappy remains used by earlier scholars in reconstructing the Mycenaean entry system here, and utilizing logic and parallels from other Mycenaean citadels, Dinsmoor reconstructs a gate with a rectangular entrance area like those known at other Mycenaean fortresses. For the succeeding propylon, similar reasoning leads him to postulate several major periods of construction in the area of the old Mycenaean entrance.

The first period sees the area immediately to the south of the Mycenaean entrance converted into a more or less L-shaped viewing area by the construction of a stepped forecourt. This undertaking is dated to ca. 489-488 B.C. by the author. There follows the initiation of construction of the marble propylon in the years prior to 480 B.C. After a primary stage in which the stylobate and the steps of the krepidoma are built, the erection of the upper portions of the building was undertaken. Dinsmoor restores the propylon with four Doric columns *in antis* on each façade so spaced as to provide a wider central opening between each pair. Two rows of three slender Doric columns are restored in the west hall, bordering