and post-graduates. The book has been well-produced and contains few errors. This is an excellent commentary and will certainly form the starting point for future engagement with this important book of the *Thebaid*; it should also be a first port of call for studies of epic catalogues and scenes of necromancy.

University of Nottingham HELEN LOVATT
Helen.Lovatt@nottingham.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000860

S. BRAUND and J. OSGOOD (EDS), *A COMPANION TO PERSIUS AND JUVENAL*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. Pp. xiv + 612, 6 pls, illus. ISBN 9781405199650. £120.00.

Quis leget haec? whines the anonymous interlocutor at the start of Persius' first satire. Every self-conscious author, editor and reviewer must echo the question. Companions sometimes suffer from the pressure to please all and sundry, answering that question with 'everyone and no one'. But the editors of this helpful new volume have hit the balance well: contributions range from introductory fleshing designed for the student tackling these difficult poets on the fly, right across to flashy new material bound to jump-start even the tiredest Juvenalian crank. Over half a millennium of pages confronts the start–finish reader, so I must be on my best behaviour and condense.

The book is companionable in three sections: 'Part I – Persius and Juvenal: Texts and Contexts'; 'Part II – Restrospectives: Persius and Juvenal as Successors'; 'Part III – Prospectives: The Successors of Persius and Juvenal'. Osgood prefaces the whole with a good introduction unfurling the rationale of the volume: the push for a distinct category of 'Imperial Satire'. This concept takes several leaves out of Philip Hardie's 'Epic Successors' book in branding Persius and Juvenal poets obsessed with, defined by, their belatedness; such a critical move may be calculated to bring these self-styled outsiders more into the mainstream of contemporary Latin studies, but it is spot on nonetheless. Tethering Persius to Juvenal has a rich history, as several contributors acknowledge. And in this history Juvenal has almost always asserted masculine swagger over sickly, feminine precocity; the odd couple has usually been 'Juvenal and Persius', rarely 'Persius and Juvenal'. As such, the volume's title plays its cards in its determinedly chronological ordering: we are implicitly promised fair attention to each.

How far this works in practice is another matter; the old hierarchy clings in many places, and Persius certainly gets shorter shrift than Juvenal simply because the volume's 'reception' section is so swollen. There Juvenal naturally occupies the lion's share, for it is difficult to rustle up 'influence' when Persius was long a mere trickle. The aim to restore parity is noble, if a little let down by the skewed treatment of the texts themselves: standard, well-known passages tend to be recycled in discussion across chapters. Despite Osgood's good intentions in recruiting the overlooked Juvenal 12 as a programmatic hinge in the introduction, for example, the later satires feature all too seldom. Gold promises big corpus-spanning things in her chapter on the 'idea of the book', but ends up sticking quite tamely to the well-trodden. Roche even mistakes *Sat.* 13's Calvinus for 12's Corvinus (201), and that slip, together with the fact that the editors missed it, confirms the suspicion that no one really reads *these* things.

Bracketing Persius and Juvenal off as primarily 'successors' has its benefits; but it takes its toll too. Some chapters are happily confined to focusing on one or the other, breathing easy without the burden of comparative companionship. But the volume feels uneven precisely because most chapters are compelled to consider both authors together — and companionship suits some topics much better than others. Bartsch, for instance, rolls out a neat chapter on Persius' Roman Stoicism, but is then obliged by comparative stricture and structure to whimper a tacked-on discussion of Stoicism in Juvenal, relying lamely on a hoary article from the '60s comparing *Sat.* 10 with Seneca. Why should the successor be lumped in with an inappropriate philosophical framework, just because his predecessor adopted it so emphatically? So too with sections on Persius' and Juvenal's 'Callimacheanism' (Cucchiarelli, McNelis). It depends on which or whose tendentious version of Callimachus you are working with, yes; but it turns out much harder to make a case for Callimachus as prime model for Juvenal than it is for Persius. Perhaps this is one more instance of the neurotic Latinist's compulsion to recuperate these poets by showing that they are just as 'Callimachean' (i.e. good) as the best Augustans, and that critical tools applied to more

gilded Latin poets serve just as well on rough-and-tumble satirists. But if the coupling of Persius and Juvenal sometimes proves unhappy, that is best seen as the collateral damage of a *iunctura acris* forcing us to see them in a productive new light.

It is an accurate (some, not I, would say sad) reflection of the current state of Classics that most of the volume's energy is generated in the reception wing. Hooley gives a masterful whistlestop of the authors' travels from antiquity to the twentieth century; Sogno nails late antique reception, introducing juicy new material for run-of-the-mill classicists; Gillespie's Renaissance expertise glitters; Braund and Osgood handle Dryden's *Discourse* (again in 'succession' terms) nicely; Parker and Braund make the minutes of the history of Persian/Juvenalian scholarship interesting; Richlin covers the often condescendingly dismissed school texts brilliantly. Perhaps the stand-out coupling is the awkward final duet: Nisbet fires off a bracing analysis of the institutional and ideological infrastructure around the art of paternalistic translation in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century England, of which we moderns like to suppose ourselves (impossibly) wholly innocent. He shows us the systematic élite containment of these authors along nationalist, classist and sexist lines. But then Winkler fills out an amorphous and superficial romp through 'Juvenal and Persius in the Media Age' with precisely another version of the same problematic bid for cultural ownership that Nisbet had so convincingly called out: 'And Juvenal's satiric perspective has become completely ours.' 'Ours'? *tota nostra*? You mean the rich white anglosphere male's? 'Our' satirists could scarcely have despatched it better themselves.

Trinity College, Oxford TOM GEUE
tom.geue@trinity.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000872

W. KEULEN and U. EGELHAAF-GAISER (EDS), *ASPECTS OF APULEIUS' GOLDEN ASS. VOL. 3, THE ISIS BOOK*. Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pp. xvi + 255. ISBN 9789004221239 (bound); 978900422551 (ebook). €105.00/US$144.00.

The team in charge of compiling the outstanding Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses or The Golden Ass* has now also created an accompanying volume to its imminently forthcoming commentary on *Met.* 11, the 'Isis Book'. This is the third in a series, with B. L. Hijmans Jr. and R. Th. Van der Paardt (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen, 1978) (*AAGA*) covering general themes of the novel, and M. Zimmerman *et al.* (eds), *AAGA* 2 (Groningen, 1998) concentrating on *Cupid and Psyche* as a companion volume to the Groningen Commentary on that section of the *Metamorphoses*.

This new volume collects articles on various aspects of the last book of the novel, which reflect its enigmatic nature by allowing often contradictory but always well argued essays to stand next to each other. The eleven articles by established scholars cover the book from many angles and tackle the problem of 'seriousness' of the Isis book under new, and often contradictory, perspectives. It begins with more traditional approaches such as textual criticism, as M. Zimmerman explains some of her textual choices for her new *Oxford Classical Texts* edition. L. Nicolini, building on her Italian book on linguistic puns in *Metamorphoses*, points out that even the 'serious' *Met.* 11 contains a sizeable amount of wordplay.

The volume then moves on to contradictory character analyses. U. Egelhaaf-Gaisser's semiotic perspective focuses on Lucius' characterization through his baldness in *Met.* 11. S. Harrison's approach is more satirical, as he sees Lucius' character in *Met.* 11 as a continuation of his portrait in the previous ten, despite the religious conversion. The impact of philosophy on *Met.* 11 has been given a substantial space in this book: L. Graverini looks at the use of *prudentia* and *providentia* in the novel and argues that Lucius has won some understanding in the last book as opposed to the previous ten, with the help of benevolent Isis. F. Drews, on the other hand, contradicts Graverini by studying the pervasive influence of Plato on the novel by reading it alongside Apuleius' philosophical Middle Platonist books. L. van der Stockt reads Apuleius' and Plutarch's portraits of Isis together and focuses on the differences in the authors' philosophies and characterization of Isis. E. Finkelpearl studies the same two authors' differences in genre, portrayal of Egypt and of personalized versus institutionalized religion. For her, Lucius' religious belief at the end is credible. S. Tilg approaches the matter of *Isis*' 'seriousness' through the novel's intertextuality and does not see the many intertextual references in the whole of the novel as a