

Christianization for the figure in Joseph Addison's *Cato*. Studies on minor figures (Fucecchi), ghosts (Bernstein), and key socio-linguistic systems (Coffee on *fides, pietas, gratia*, Ganiban on *scelus, nefas* and silence) contribute further to shift attention away from Pompey/Caesar, showing how closely implicated characterization and theme is at all levels in the text. And Alison Keith's *Engendering Rome* (2000), which considerably advanced the study of gender in Lucan, is here complemented by the contributions of Augoustakis, Bernstein and especially Caston, who sets Cornelia and Cleopatra against elegiac norms in Propertius *Elegies* 4.

There is undoubtedly a problem with labelling this collection a 'companion', and little sense of coherence for the reader aiming to wade through this 600-page volume in one go; staggeringly poor standards of copy-editing throughout do not help. But for the (more typical?) reader who takes the text on in bits, there is much solid material and a few outstanding pieces.

University of St Andrews

eb221@st-andrews.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435813000646

EMMA BUCKLEY

P. ASSO, *A COMMENTARY ON LUCAN, DE BELLO CIVILI IV: INTRODUCTION, EDITION AND TRANSLATION* (Texte und Kommentare: eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 33). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2010. Pp. 333. ISBN 9783110203851. €118.95.

Until recently *Bellum Civile* IV was the only book of the epic without a commentary dedicated to all or part of its contents. But with the publication of P. Esposito's commentary in 2009 (*Bellum Civile (Pharsalia) Libro IV*) and Asso's in 2010 it can now take its place at the table. A.'s commentary, as it is written in English, is likely to attract a wider readership, but its readers must be prepared for a bumpy ride; it has its strengths, to be sure, but the copyediting of the volume (or of much of it) is sub-par, and the central section of the commentary (on the Vulteius episode, ll. 402–581) is regrettably thin.

In the introduction A. covers much of the ground one expects and requires. Particularly helpful are A.'s review of the evidence for Lucan's life (2–9) and his discussion of 'Language and Style' (18–32), which includes sections on diction, syntax and word order, rhetorical devices, and metre. Less satisfying is A.'s discussion of the *Bellum Civile* as an 'antiphastic' epic (10–14), which focuses mostly on Lucan's putative Republicanism and the BC's relation to Virgil; here I would have liked some discussion of the work's place in the broader sweep of historical epic at Rome and an acknowledgement of the influence of post-Virgilian epic, in particular, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The introduction also includes a section on 'Book IV and its place in the poem' (14–17) and a 'Note on the Latin text' (33–5).

A.'s text is largely based on Housman's; the apparatus criticus is drawn from R. Badali's edition (*Lucani Opera* (1992)). The Latin text is in itself clean, and I found only two formatting errors in the apparatus criticus. There are, however, several discrepancies between the text and the commentary (e.g., in l. 719 we read Housman's *incauto metuentis ab hoste*, but in the corresponding note (p. 266) A. rejects Housman and defends Shackleton Bailey's *metuens incauto ex hoste*). There are also a few discrepancies between the text and the translation. For example, A. gives *saevius libertas uritur armis* (578: *uritur* Ω) but follows Axelson's emendation *subditur* in the translation ('freedom submits to reckless war' (p. 79)), and although *indulsit* (l. 664) is defended in the corresponding note (p. 250) against *inclusit*, a conjecture accepted in Shackleton Bailey's text, A. translates the conjecture ('he enclosed' (p. 85)). As for the translation, there are moments with which one might quibble, but, on the whole, I found it serviceable.

The commentary is divided into three parts: (1) 'The Battle of Ilerda' (ll. 1–401), (2) 'Mutual Suicide: Volteius and the Opitergians' (ll. 402–581), (3) 'Curio in Africa' (ll. 581–824). The third part, which stems from A.'s 2002 PhD thesis, is the strongest; it is thorough in its coverage of the text, is well researched, and contains many perceptive and learned insights. A. especially excels when discussing ethnographical details, mythological references, diction, and rhetorical devices, to which he consistently pays close attention throughout the commentary. A. is less attentive, however, both here and elsewhere, to verbal parallels with and allusions to literary predecessors; for these one may wish to consult Esposito's commentary, instead. Another virtue of the third part is that it contains relatively few errors. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the rest, where typographical errors, problems of English idiom, run-on sentences, spelling inconsistencies, and

other kinds of mistakes abound. As I do not have the space to list here the many errors I found, I refer the reader to Braund's review (*Gnomon* 83 (2011), 549–52), which documents well the volume's unsatisfactory copyediting. Even so, I would encourage the reader not to give up on the first part of the commentary ('The Battle of Ilerda'), which, though poorly copyedited, approaches in substance the standard of the third.

But I advise the reader to steer clear of Part II ('Volteius and the Opitergians'), which has been prepared in a hasty and careless manner. It is the thinnest portion of the commentary, covering about eight lines of text per page (compared with 4½ per page in Part I and 3 per page in Part III). Groups of lines are passed over in silence or acknowledged only by unnecessary paraphrase (see, e.g., ll. 425–30, 434–9, 450–4, 535–8, 540–3, 558–61, 563–7), and when there is commentary, it is often too brief to be helpful; extreme examples include A.'s note *ad* 557–8 ('See Esposito 2001, 42–3') and the enigmatic '*uergere] mergere*' *ad* 525–6. A. overlooks many details that deserve attention (e.g., *odoratae pinnae* (l. 438), *uaris* (l. 439)) and on several occasions ignores relevant secondary literature (e.g., M. Leigh's *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement* (1997) in connection with *deuota iuuentus* in l. 533 or when the phrase reappears in l. 695). The rich intertextuality of the text often fails to come sufficiently into view as well; for example, in ll. 549–56 (the *Spartoiterrigenae* simile) several allusions might have been noted, but are not (e.g., Ap. Rh. 3.1391–2 *ad* 553–4, Ov., *Her.* 12.97–100 *ad* 555–6; also, cf. Ov., *Met.* 3.120–1 *ad* 546–7). The following line numbers also do not match up with those in the text: 532–3 are given as 531–2 in the commentary, 538 as 539, and 543–4 as 544–5.

The volume concludes with a bibliography, an *index locorum*, and an *index nominum et rerum*.

University of Missouri
marksr@missouri.edu

RAYMOND MARKS

doi:10.1017/S0075435813000658

G. SCHMELING with the collaboration of A. SETAIOLI, *A COMMENTARY ON THE SATYRICA OF PETRONIUS*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. Pp. xlix + 681. ISBN 9780199567713. £115.00.

Fifty years have passed since Robin Nisbet, reviewing for this journal the first Konrad Müller edition of Petronius, drew the attention of academics to the 'scandalously neglected' text of the *Satyrica*. And yet, for all the subsequent scholarly engagement that is reflected in a massive bibliography, Petronius continued to miss a detailed commentary that could substitute the *editio variorum* of P. Burman (1743²) and synthesize the results so far achieved. Except for the *Cena Trimalchionis* and the *Bellum civile*, scholars have moved in this welcome direction only in recent years, publishing such extensive studies on single sections of the novel as the commentary by P. Habermehl (2006) on chs 79–110, by N. Breitenstein (2009) on chs 1–15, as well as my own (2010) on chs 100–115. The publication of the commentary on the whole *Satyrica*, planned more than twenty years ago by Schmeling and J. P. Sullivan and carried out by Schmeling and Setaioli (the latter has worked on the poetry), fulfils therefore one of the most urgent *desiderata* of classical philology and is especially welcome, all the more so because its authors are world-renowned scholars and experts on Petronius.

The book opens with a well-informed introduction (xiii–xlix), that provides us with the general information about the work and scholarship in ten brief chapters. The first, 'Author and Date', very prudently dates the *Satyrica* to the reign of Nero and establishes the identity of their author with the Petronius Arbiter described by Tacitus; it deals with the unknown *praenomen Petronii*, offers an excursus about the *Nachleben*, and elucidates the spelling of the title, which the authors trace back to both *Satyroi* and *satura*. The following chapter 'Testimonia and Manuscripts' lists testimonia, fragments (unfortunately without saying which fragments the authors ascribe to Petronius), as well as the most important manuscripts and early editions of the *Satyrica*, and provides a concise summary of the textual transmission. In the chapters 'Reconstruction' and 'A Hypothetical Schematic Reconstruction', the authors propose a conjectural reconstruction of the original work. They suppose that it was written in episodes 'intended as recitations for the literary coterie associated with Nero' and persuasively argue that it consisted of twenty-four books. An outline of the narrative is presented *exempli gratia* and includes two traditional though quite uncertain guesses: a beginning at Massilia, where the main character might have committed offence against Priapus, and an end at Lampsacus, where he might have expiated his offence.