

point (*Lucan: an Introduction* (1976), 50–1) that so few names worth mentioning actually did die there. The chapter ends by applying to Pompey Ankersmit's notion that 'something's essence is to be situated in what it possesses no longer'. Thus the decrepit ruination of the Pompeian oak only points to its stature and immensity, while Pompey's humble grave achieves sublimity by reflecting the intangibility of his greatness. At 227–9 the sublimity of Pompey's limitless grave might have been contextualized by Caesar's fantasy of a watery grave (5.668–71; mentioned on 152). Some small typos obtrude (at 113 n. 23 '7.155–6' = 7.155–60; at 228 Pompey's 'turn-off head' = torn-off).

This is an important and valuable study. It should be essential reading for students of Lucan because it offers a compelling model for understanding the peculiar aesthetic experience of his epic and because it contains a number of significant readings of its most important figures and scenes.

University of Sydney

paul.roche@sydney.edu.au

doi:10.1017/S007543581500129X

PAUL ROCHE

L. WATSON and P. WATSON (EDS), *JUVENAL: SATIRE 6*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. xiii + 320. ISBN 9780521854917 (bound); 9780521671101 (paper). £55.00/US\$90.00 (bound); £19.99/US\$34.99 (paper).

This Green and Yellow, the second one devoted to a portion of Juvenal's corpus, covers the long poem that constitutes *Satires* Book 2. The authors have previously collaborated on a selection of Martial's *Epigrams* (2003), with good results from their combined expertise on imperial literature and social history. This approach suits Juvenal's screed against Roman wives. The poem gets appropriate and up-to-date treatment as a satiric performance shaped by social traditions and trends.

The Introduction, a valuable resource, organizes discussion so as to put familiar issues in new light. For example, the section on Juvenal's 'Life and Work' dovetails from (flimsy) biographical information to a discussion of the poet's education and literary culture as reflected in his style. Several other sections dealing with the poem itself ('Juvenal's Anti-Matrona', 'Misogyny in Literature', 'Persona') progressively construct a historical and cultural framework for reading the satirist's misogynistic rhetoric. The rhetoric itself is 'altogether literary and tralicious' (35), but the speaker's distress and preoccupations are shaped by the complex realities and attitudes of imperial Roman society. He is an extreme traditionalist, 'represent[ing] as normative what is in actuality quite exceptional' (40). Obsessed with those faded norms of female behaviour and with the marital ideal of *concordia*, he is bound to find endless provocations to *discordia* in this world where many women are more visible, free and influential than he would like and even his fellow men have evolved. Thus Watson and Watson extend the work of late twentieth-century persona studies, which objectified the satiric speaker but did not explore how that speaker might be engaging with specific historical conditions.

W. and W. illuminate the poem's thematic coherence and purposeful composition, without denying the stream-of-consciousness effect of the presentation. They examine several passages for representative themes and treatments that reflect Juvenal's attention to vignette structure, detail and internal allusion. A separate section ('Juvenal's Style') walks through the twenty-one lines on the Bona Dea rites, identifying elements of rhetoric and diction; this will be very useful for students. In other sections, readers are treated to an economical and up-to-date history of satire studies, an account of the questions and hypotheses relating to the 'Oxford fragment', and an outline of Juvenal's nearly 700-line text. The actual text that follows varies little from Clausen's OCT (1992); I observed several dozen differences in individual words, punctuation, line-order and spelling. All variant readings and corruptions are discussed in notes.

The commentary provides extensive interpretive context and models nuanced analysis of passages. One good example is the breakdown of lines 161–83, the complaint about the irritatingly perfect wife who resembles Cornelia and Niobe. W. and W. reveal interesting effects from the juxtaposition of Roman aristocratic traditions and mythological hubris. The later passage on the erudite wife (434–56) is shown to be inspired by reality, but creative in the details. Though Roman opinions on female education varied, many upper-class women clearly knew their literature. The satirist adds clever touches: the literary critic defends Dido (she thereby vexingly combines erudition and sympathy for female passion) and the rhetorically proficient wife is portrayed as an extension of an existing stereotype, the chatterbox. The commentary on the O-fragment is as thorough as the rest, though W. and W. are careful not to argue that the passage is authentic. Unpacking language

and imagery, they show that the passage is as much about how the ‘normal’ man imagines the life of *cinaedi* as it is about wives’ bad behaviour. Near the end are good notes on Juvenal’s digression comparing his work with tragedy (634–8). W. and W. neatly observe that the passage converts a conventional literary boast (‘I am a Roman pioneer in a Greek genre’) into a fuming denial: these tales of wifely misdeeds are *not* tragic fictions.

In over two hundred pages of notes there are many such treasures, plus more digressive background from historiography, material culture and literature. On the other hand, perhaps because it would be less original a contribution, W. and W. do not do much in the area of Juvenalian intertextuality (for example, tracing common themes of invective or techniques for performing anger). One exception to note is the four-page Appendix on the difficult lines printed as 306–8; attempting to decipher the joke, W. and W. make interesting use of a passage from *Satire* 10.

My quibbles are very few. In such a commentary I would avoid the wording ‘J is thinking primarily of ...’ (5–7n.). The note on lines 45–6 explains the rhetorical function of *quid quod*, but only with the note on O9 is there a translation of this favourite Juvenalian expression. On the aforementioned ‘perfect wife’ passage, I missed reference to Nepos’ letters of Cornelia, which portray this *matrona* as a communicator of ideology herself and not just an object of admiration (cf. her statue, mentioned at 167–8n.). The name ‘Evans-Grubbs’ is misprinted in the bibliography and relevant note. Small flaws of this kind are dwarfed by a sea of valuable scholarship and original analysis. There are plenty of helpful glosses (Juvenal is a challenging stylist and thinker), notes that are not just learned but entertaining, a great deal of up-to-date lexicographical discussion, commentary on matters from metre to topography, and an extensive bibliography reflecting the work’s scholarly breadth and rigour. This excellent team of authors shows that fresh consideration and contextualization of Juvenalian satire can still lead to new discoveries, and raises hopes of future volumes in the same vein.

Washington University in St Louis
 ckeane@wustl.edu

CATHERINE KEANE

doi:10.1017/S0075435815001136

G. DAMSCHEN and A. HEIL (EDS), *BRILL’S COMPANION TO SENECA: PHILOSOPHER AND DRAMATIST*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014. Pp. xii + 883, 1 illus. ISBN 9789004154612 (bound); 9789004217089 (e-book). €162.00/US\$222.00.

The editors of this companion hoped to produce ‘a well-ordered, concise presentation which places [Seneca’s] philosophical works and the tragedies on an equal footing and deals with them accordingly’ (xi). Yet its fifty-five chapters are arranged in six unequal parts: ‘Life and Legacy’ comprises five chapters, ‘Philosophy’ twenty-six, ‘Tragedy’ nineteen, ‘Apocolocyntosis’ one, ‘Other Works’ two and ‘Synthesis’ two. A large whole-Seneca project was always destined to be messy, but further factors here make this an unnecessarily frustrating volume. First, the book has no introduction by the editors. Habinek’s opening chapter highlighting *ratio* and *societas* in Seneca’s thought will, as it happens, be echoed at various points in the volume, but such interconnections are unacknowledged (the authors generally appear not to have had the chance to read one another’s contributions), and so it goes. Between its limited opening orientation and closing synthesis, the book labours under a bifurcating taxonomy (philosopher and dramatist), with ‘Apocolocyntosis’ and ‘Other Works’ as disparate loose ends. The chapters are variable in nature, especially between the handbook-entries on works and the discussions of ‘topics’, and this is jarring when a one-page entry on Seneca’s fragmentary biography of his father (Winterbottom) is followed by a forty-five-page chapter on ‘Seneca’s Language and Style’ (von Albrecht). Perhaps the major misstep was to assign each work its own chapter, which — absent editorial care — yields an unnecessarily atomizing approach. One outcome is repetition: the principles for dating Seneca’s works are already nicely elucidated in an early chapter by Marshall on precisely this question and did not need to be rehearsed in each chapter. It appears that rubrics such as ‘Chronology’, ‘Sources’ or ‘Reception’ were imposed from above and thus prompted contributors to reinvent the wheel or to come up with something to say even when it was not so relevant to the work in hand. (Some contributors, understandably, threw these rubrics out and wrote more cogent accounts of their given work — thereby, however, introducing further inconsistencies in presentation.)