The following studies on 'Neronian and Flavian Intratextual Politics' are a varied mix. David Konstan's introduction to intratextual theory (341–52) would have fared better at the start of the volume, alongside Sharrock's contribution. Evangelos Karakasis' identification of Lucan's Caesar with Achilles, Turnus, Catiline and Oedipus among others tends towards the unfocused (353–76). Theodore Antoniadis uniquely reads Silius Italicus' *Punica* through the lens of Stoic precepts on anger (377–96). The most memorable chapter within this section remains, however, that by Christer Henriksén, who approaches Mart. 10.1–20 through 'concatenation': reading consecutive epigrams in terms of their connections to each other (397–406). He thus demonstrates how overarching phenomena, including water imagery and the theme of friendship, culminate in the epigram addressed to Pliny the Younger (10.20).

The subsequent discussions about 'Roman Prose and Encyclopedic Literature' span a wide chronological range, from Gesine Manuwald and Therese Fuhrer on Cicero (409–22; 423–30) to Ulrike Egelhaaf-Gaiser on Aulus Gellius (431–48). The former two articles play off each other: Manuwald traces out the rippling shadow which Cicero's orations cast over the rest of his work, while Fuhrer investigates his strategic depiction of Fulvia in Sallust's exposé of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Egelhaaf-Gaiser turns away from Cicero and towards the *Ergänzungsspiel* ('supplementing game') which Gellius' Saturnalian riddles pose. Her contribution thus complements that of Kofler, who plays the same game with Hor., *Carm.* 2.8 (205–6, see above).

Richard Hunter's concluding chapter (451–70) makes for a stimulating end to the volume. By outlining several Greek precedents for Latin intratextuality, he provides a springboard for further research and, one hopes, for a companion volume on Intratextuality and Greek Literature. The user-friendly General Index (477–82) and Index Locorum (483–96) conclude the volume.

Despite occasional blips in chapter order, the book is exceptionally engaging. By granting intratextual approaches their rightful place in the sun, it encourages readers to approach Latin literature through intratextuality while, as promised in the Introduction, 'shed[ding] light on the evolution of this reading process […] across a wide range of authors, genres and historical periods' (12). Harrison, Frangoulidis and Papanghelis are therefore to be commended for this useful volume.

*King's College London* MARTIN T. DINTER
martin.dinter@kcl.ac.uk

*Harvard University* ASTRID KHOO
astrid_khoo@g.harvard.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435819000686

B. W. BREED, E. KEITEL and R. WALLACE (EDS), *LUCILIUS AND SATIRE IN SECOND-CENTURY BC ROME*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xiii + 319, illus. ISBN 9781107189553. £75.00.

The emphasis in this new collection of essays is on contextualisation. The 1,300 or so lines that remain from Lucilius' thirty-volume enterprise, a multifarious collection of poems that he may or may not have named *Saturae*, have, with few exceptions, come down to us as free-floating snippets, devoid of their original context. Ancient writers who cited the poems did so not in order to explain or preserve them, but to get things done with them. Jarring pieces loose from their original contexts, they invested these *disiecti membra poetae* with new contexts by having them perform new cultural tasks. This volume seeks to restore some of what has been lost, by building a sense of the social environment from which the poems emerged.

The volume's introductory essay by the editors (Breed, Keitel, Wallace) offers an incisive review of the main scholarly approaches to Lucilius that have emerged since the appearance of Friedrich Marx's two volume *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* in 1904–5. The essay's first section describes how hard it is to place Lucilius on any standard map of the history of Latin literature, and makes a case not for jettisoning categories that are only somewhat reliable and revealing, but for acknowledging their limits, and for letting Lucilius both adhere to and defy those limits. The essay's second section treats the culture wars of the late second century B.C.E. that are the political

backdrop of Lucilius' satires (regrettably, no individual chapter in the volume is devoted to this topic), and the third section discusses how complete editions of the fragments were gathered up from a wide range of ancient sources. Sections four and five point ahead to the topics to be explored in subsequent chapters of the book.

In his essay 'Lucilius and the *poetae seniores*' (ch. 2), Sander Goldberg examines the way Lucilius engages with the tragedies and the *Annales* of Ennius, in an age when Ennius had become well established as a literary icon, and when the lines between satire and the higher generic forms that established Ennius' reputation were not altogether obvious. Keenly sensitive to the importance of Ennius to Lucilius, Goldberg explores the strange disappearance of Ennius' satires in the critical reception of satire in the first century B.C.E. and beyond. Brian Breed's chapter on 'Lucilius' books' looks at the book culture of late second-century Rome that emerges from the fragments of Lucilius, showing how the satires exploit the workings of that culture to constitute themselves as a special kind of criticism and social promotion that operates 'at that important place where discourse and social practice and text all meet' (78). Paolo Poccetti's long chapter on 'Language variation and the aims of Lucilius' satires' fleshes out the linguistic basis for the highly contradictory receptions of Lucilius, lauded by some as a master of 'thin and plain expression' (*gracilitas*), while for others he is careless and muddy, dashing off poems that are a chaotic blend of different languages, and that intermix wildly divergent levels of style. This chapter, taken together with the three that follow (Anna Chahoud on 'Speech patterns and generic stylization in Lucilius', Giuseppe Pezzini on 'Lucilius and the language of the *Palliata*' and Angelo Mercado on 'Accent in Lucilius' hexameters'), constitutes the best study now available (by far) of the stylistic range and habits of Lucilius' satires, and the multifarious cultural workings of that style. Horace would have his readers believe that Lucilius' grab-bag approach to writing was the result of carelessness rather than a strategic choice. But these chapters conspire to tell a far more compelling story about the 'style as contents' of Lucilian satire (i.e. a knowing Lucilius who sets out to seem careless, in order to exemplify freedom through the style he chose to develop) by both demonstrating, and more importantly by respecting, the many culturally infused communicative powers that saturate his motley and unrestrained style.

Catherine Keane's chapter on 'Conversations about *sermo*' looks at the large amount of conversation (*sermo*) that takes place in Books 26–30 of the satires, the earliest books in the collection, and she smartly connects the noteworthy prominence of lively verbal exchanges within these poems to the formulation of *sermo* as a generic concept, where they function as contents establishing the genre's form, and vice versa. In 'Assessments of value and the value of assessments in Lucilius' (ch. 9), Cynthia Damon looks at fragments dealing with assessments of value, quantitative evaluations, shifting prices and bizarre equivalences. In a deft critical move, she posits a connection between the unusually large number of these fragments and the critical work that the satires perform, focusing on their use of bold metaphors as specimens of assessment (i.e. figures assigning values to persons and their activities). In his chapter on 'Pikes, peacocks, and parasites', Ian Goh shows that, despite his reputation as an uncompromising moral censor, Lucilius was no enemy of high living. His satires take readers inside the *triclinia* of the rich and ridiculous, opening a window onto the gross excesses of the period, but they do so for comic purposes, not to excoriate. In many instances, Goh points out, the Lucilian scolder (whether the satirist or one of his characters) displays an awareness of the self-serving politics that went into the making of sumptuary laws; laws that few took seriously, but that garnered serious political power for those who made them. In the final chapter of the volume, Luca Grillo shows how Lucilius evokes specific moral *loci* of oratory in order to create comparisons between the praise and blame of his satires and the moral performances of Roman statesmen. At the chapter's end, Grillo suggests that the Albinus named in the *virtus* fragment (1196–1208W) may not be the consul of either 110 or 109 B.C.E., but an old enemy of Scipio who was consul in 151 B.C.E. (Aulus Postumius Albinus, *RE* 33). This is a fine attempt to connect the satires to the history of the period in a new way, but it raises a serious question about timing: one has to wonder what the point would be. Why throw back so far for a target of immorality? What would targeting the misdeeds of Albinus, so many years after the fact, say about the purposes, principles and social conduct of Lucilian satire?

The big takeaway of this volume is not to be found in any radically new insights into the fragments themselves. Rather it is to be found in the new image of Lucilius that emerges from the essays taken as a whole: of a poet who, rather than flailing his way towards fame, is the by-product of his own, highly crafted literary invention. A writer who knows the rules of *Latinitas* but chooses to flout

them. A man of deep literary learning who knows just how silly and pretentious such learning can often be. An author who is as wide-ranging in his linguistic dexterity (Greek, Oscan, Latin, etc.) as he is in the travels he describes — everything from the mansions and back street taverns of Rome, to the tip of Italy's toe. And yet, he somehow manages to come off as 'one of us' wherever he goes. In so doing, he exemplifies Rome's newly consolidated control over the whole of Italy in the self that he writes.

*Yale University* KIRK FREUDENBURG
Kirk.Freudenburg@Yale.edu
doi:10.1017/S007543581900087X

J. ANNAS and G. BETEGH (EDS), *CICERO'S* DE FINIBUS: *PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACHES*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. vii + 266. ISBN 9781107074835. £64.99/US$99.99.

Recent years have seen a renewed scholarly interest in Cicero's philosophical works, and it is now routine to talk of the innovative and sophisticated elements of Cicero's own philosophical thought and practice. This volume heralds a substantial advance in that it moves well beyond the project of rehabilitation and undertakes a concerted and multi-pronged philosophical analysis of a specific key text, the *De finibus*. This work has often been held up as an excellent example of the relatively tame philosophising undertaken by Cicero, which relies heavily on reproducing and critically assessing the ethical arguments and standpoints to be found among the Hellenistic schools of philosophy. Classical scholars have focused predominately on the doxography and on the literary and political dimensions of the *De finibus*; the various contributors to this volume approach the text from a variety of (often technical) philosophical perspectives and with a powerful methodology, close and rigorous analytic reading of the Latin text, and the result is overwhelmingly clear: the volume as a whole transforms our understanding of the *De finibus* as a work of philosophy.

The volume comprises nine papers delivered to the 12th Symposium Hellenisticum held in Budapest in June 2010, together with a short introduction by Julia Annas. The first chapter by Charles Brittain focuses on the precise nature of Cicero's sceptical methods in the *De finibus*. Brittain argues that Cicero is not a 'mitigated' Philonian sceptic who ultimately finds Antiochus' ethics most plausible at the concluding end of the dialogue, but rather he is a more 'radical' Carneadean sceptic who is uncertain about the ultimate truth throughout the proceedings. The case relies heavily on comparing Cicero's treatment of epistemological issues in the *Academica* and seeing strong parallels with his treatment of ethical issues in the *De finibus*. It is compelling in so far as it brings out much more strongly the epistemological underpinning of the *De finibus* and the philosophical dynamics of the dialogue — it is much more than a procession from bad Epicureanism, through attractive yet problematic Stoicism, to the more compelling views of Antiochus. However, it is unclear how far 'radical' Carneadean scepticism can be seen in Cicero's other philosophical works, as Brittain is wont to imply; perhaps different sceptical stances were adopted by Cicero depending on the subject matter, for in some cases Cicero does appear happy to indicate his assent to specific positions, in accordance with the Philonian model.

Three chapters focus on Cicero's treatment of Epicureanism in Books 1 and 2. James Warren looks at Cicero's critical account of Epicurean pleasure and demonstrates that far from being unfair and maliciously hostile, Cicero's objections and criticisms are philosophically astute, posing fundamental dilemmas for the Epicurean to navigate that are yet to be satisfactorily answered by modern scholars of Epicureanism. Pierre-Marie Morel focuses on the Epicurean account of the virtues and the efforts to align Epicureanism with the model of the cardinal virtues and traditional Roman *mores*. Dorothea Frede enters the vexed debate surrounding Epicurean friendship: as Cicero objects in *De finibus*, given their egoistic hedonism, how can an Epicurean value his friend for his own sake, and what would their friendship actually involve in practice? Frede ultimately suggests that Epicurean friendship is best seen as a natural and unnecessary kinetic pleasure. This