We might well have had more about the mechanics here; Jensson's account of voice in Petronius could have added both finesse and a background in Roman rhetorical theory (*The Recollections of Encolpius: the* Satyrica *of Petronius as Milesian Fiction* (2004)).

N. is possibly too unconvinced by attempts to see morality in the satire. The commentary recurrently picks up the point that the mocking subversion seems to exclude this, but a moral sense may be implicit in the discords between what I would see as the satire's multiple voices. N. returns to the issue in the conclusion (332–40), and hints briefly at the possibility of something more than amoral wit. N.'s Juvenal uses 'Horace' to highlight the impossibility of satire in his own day; satire must now be a laughable ghost. However, the very fact that Juvenal writes satire signals that material worthy of satire exists, and the parade of his own powerlessness actually points towards it. Going further, N. wonders whether the serious Junius makes political gaffes and whether this 'seeming unconscious mockery' allows glimpses of the spirit of Lucilius (339). N. goes further, in a section headed 'Satire 6 — a tribute to Roman women': 'the conjoined voices of Junius and Decimus portray [the women in the satire] for us as having retained a kind of liveliness, individuality, and independence which their male companions no longer enjoy under the Caesars.' It seems as though N.'s Juvenal 'attacks' women in order actually to show that it is only bad women who escape the tyranny of Caesar, and that therefore imperial rule is the ultimate target of his satire.

The strength of the commentary lies in the attention to what Juvenal means and what flavour his words have. Very many of N.'s suggestions are tempting or convincing. There are inevitably omissions, or things that one might disagree with. The woman from Sulmo (6.187) thinks she is beautiful only if she speaks Greek: surely it is significant that Sulmo was Ovid's birthplace. At line 406, 'the gossip knows all the positions the woman will assume …': she knows *how many* (*modis quot*), not what, positions. There is a sort of competitive element in her curiosity. Psecas (6.491–4) is the name of a nymph (Ov., *Met.* 3.172) attending the bathing Diana (to whom her mistress then corresponds ironically). At 6.634–7, N. does not refer to Hor., *Sat.* 2.1.1–2 in dealing with the *finem legemque priorum*. Juvenal is asking whether we think that he has gone too far, but also insinuating that 'going too far' is part of the generic tradition.

University of Liverpool FREDERICK JONES
fjones@liverpool.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000701

N. LOUIS, *COMMENTAIRE HISTORIQUE ET TRADUCTION DU DIVUS AUGUSTUS DE SUÉTONE* (Collection Latomus 324). Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2010. Pp. 761, illus. ISBN 9782870312650. €106.00.

This 2000 PhD thesis at the Université de Nice was slow into print and hardly revised; in this regard, it suffers from the same fault as the French monograph on Suetonius by J. Gascou (cf. A. Wallace-Hadrill, *CR* n.s. 36 (1986), 243). It represents the third commentary on Suetonius for the series 'Collection Latomus' at intervals of every sixteen years, following K. R. Bradley's entry on the *Nero* (1978) and D. Wardle's on the *Caligula* (1994), although Louis' book is longer than both of these works combined! It is also the first commentary on the *Divine Augustus* in almost three decades, and as such fills a major gap in Suetonian scholarship. L.'s book has already been reviewed in English by Wardle online (*BMCR* 2011.11.12), and by A. A. Barrett in *Gnomon* (84 (2012), 321–4), so it would be pointless to go over the same ground. I shall, therefore, confine myself to two important points about the work that have been left unsaid.

First, L. is more dependent on non-English scholarship than she may seem — in fact, much more so. There is a misleading disjunction between L.'s bibliography, which contains several works never cited by her (such as Wallace-Hadrill's book on Suetonius and the articles of G. B. Townend), and the commentary itself, which cites articles not found in the bibliography. Some works in English and other languages are occasionally mentioned by L., but her book is essentially grounded in French works. R. Hanslik's useful article in German on the *Augustus* (*WS* 67 (1954), 99–144), for example, nowhere appears. Although L.'s legwork appears to have been concluded by 2001, as evidenced by her bibliography, a brief addendum with material through 2009 has been supplied for publication (687–9). In this space, L. might have at least listed Wardle's papers on the *Augustus* from the mid-2000s, in order to make the work of greater use to Anglophone scholars.

L.'s overreliance on French scholarship unfortunately leads to some ironies of omission, such as her noticeable neglect of B. Baldwin's substantial book on Suetonius (1983), which could have

been helpful to L. on many occasions had she used it, since it shares several of her prosopographical concerns; its inclusion would have profited the kind of readers who will be attracted by her 'historical' commentary. The fact that L. sidesteps the milestone represented by the books of Wallace-Hadrill and Baldwin is difficult to ignore in any assessment of her achievement: she derives no benefit from some of the most central debates on her subject. Even more ironic is the fact that, if L. is independent in spurning scholarship in English on the *Augustus*, she is tralatitious (e.g. 74, 82, 84, 87, 91, 96 etc.) in directing the reader to the Italian notes of her much earlier predecessor M. A. Levi (1951).

This leads to the second point. A crucial predecessor between Levi and L. has been disregarded to the detriment of the present commentary. Previous reviewers have claimed E. S. Shuckburgh's edition of the *Augustus* (1896) as the prior standard commentary, viewing that of J. M. Carter for the Bristol series (1982) as a minor addition that is overly concerned with administrative detail. Yet Carter's work, which is slightly longer than Shuckburgh's, is more useful on stylistic matters than one might think. Glimpses of literary appreciation for Suetonius can be found, for example, in Carter's discussion of the biographer's prose, especially his style of *diuisio* and tendency not to repeat his subject's name (pp. 4–5, 8–9), or his careful structuring of chapters in *Augustus* 57–60 (pp. 178–81) and 68–72 (p. 190) for eulogistic effect. Carter also provides interesting comments on Suetonius' overall divisions (e.g. pp. 98–9, 181), his moralism (e.g. pp. 99, 128), and even his grammatical fondness for *quasi* (p. 95). If a more balanced treatment is needed, Carter's commentary is still the best starting-point, and will at any rate continue to be favoured in classrooms for its convenient size and price.

Though failing to use Carter, L.'s commentary is itself not devoid of literary and grammatical analysis, especially in her introduction — even if, like another recent book on Suetonius (R. Poignault (ed.), *Présence de Suétone: actes du colloque tenu à Clermont-Ferrand (25–27 novembre 2004)* (2009); cf. *CR* n.s. 61 (2011), 485–7), that introduction lacks footnotes documenting previous work on topics such as Suetonius' use of the first person. Perhaps most noteworthy is her examination of the subtle language by which Suetonius clarifies his credence in facts (50–65). This is easily the best discussion to date of the biographer's bias and techniques of emphasis and understatement.

However, the two main points above vitiate a scholarly contribution which, like Gascou's *Suétone historien* (1984), is essentially too little condensed and updated, but unlike Gascou, does not often help the reader to understand how Suetonius writes. In any one note, L.'s discussion of other parts of the *Caesars* is focused on overlaps of specific content, rather than the biographer's tendency to treat particular topics; grammatical analysis (e.g. 453) is also a rare occurrence. Scholars will certainly find many individual notes in the commentary with which to wrestle, even if these notes are not always tied to other relevant scholarship. L.' s book will no doubt be consulted by advanced readers in addition to other resources on the *Augustus*, but, despite its hefty size, it cannot be relied on as a one-stop shop. *Caueat emptor*.

New York TRISTAN POWER
tristan.power@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000713

U. BABUSIAUX, *PAPINIANS* QUAESTIONES*: ZUR RHETORISCHEN METHODE EINES SPÄTKLASSISCHEN JURISTEN* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 103). Munich: C. H. Beck, 2011. Pp. ix + 309. ISBN 9783406624483. €78.00.

The pervasive force exerted by the Roman élite's thoroughgoing devotion to rhetoric has in recent years gained well-deserved attention. For, as the reviewer of a compendium puts it, 'Roman Rhetoric formed a complex and immense world' (C. van den Berg, review of Dominik and Hall, *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (2007) in BMCR 2008.09.33). Although neither the appraised volume nor its evaluator tackled one aspect of this immense world, namely, the matter of how jurisprudence and rhetoric were intertwined, that subject has in fact benefited from notable scholarly attention, e.g. J. Stroux, *Römische Rechtswissenschaft und Rhetorik* (1949); U. Wesel, *Rhetorische Statuslehre und Gesetzauslegung der römischen Juristen* (1967); B. Vonglis, *La Lettre et l'ésprit de la loi dans la jurisprudence classique et la rhétorique* (1968); F. Horak, *Rationes Decidendi. Entscheidungsbegründungen bei den älteren römischen Juristen bis Labeo* (1969). Note also O. Tellegen-Couperus (ed.), *Quintilian and the Law. The Art of Persuasion in Law and Politics* (2003) and B. Santalucia (ed.), *La Repressione criminale nella Roma repubblicana fra*