with very little Italian will have much fun mining E.'s exhaustive entries for treasures such as the one and a half pages on *BC* 4's final *sententia* (4.824), which forms part of the epiphonema on Curio ('emere omnes, hic vendidit urbem').

E. himself is a seasoned Lucan connoisseur who has published on this author for the last three decades and the wealth of material sampled here bears witness that this commentary is a labour of love and the fruit of many years of research. The author must be congratulated for this fine and welcome addition to scholarship on Lucan.

King's College London/FAPESP-University of Sao Paulo MARTIN T. DINTER
martin.dinter@kcl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000859

R. PARKES, *STATIUS,* THEBAID *4 / EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. xxxviii + 357. ISBN 9780199695256. £80.00.

Ruth Parkes' commentary on Statius *Thebaid* 4 has been long awaited, and deservedly rewards anticipation. There are still very few recent commentaries on the *Thebaid* in English: most notably Smolenaars on Book 7 (1994) and Pollmann on Book 12 (2004). Books 1 (Hill and Gibson), 2 (Gervais), 5 (Soerink) and 8 (Augoustakis) are currently in preparation. Book 4 has proved an irresistible temptation to commentators with its richly Homeric and Callimachean catalogue and its ghoulish necromancy, both full of literary self-consciousness. P. must engage with the recent treatments of the catalogue (both on lines 4.1–344) by Micozzi (2007) and Steiniger (2005), which she does conscientiously and judiciously. Further, she has plenty to add.

The commentary consists of general introduction, text, with facing translation, notes and bibliography. The text is P.'s own, originally based on Hill, but now drawing significantly on the groundwork of Hall. She tackles very effectively the extensive emendations of Shackleton Bailey's 2003 Loeb and the three-volume intervention of Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (2007), which offers an enormous amount of material not yet fully assimilated into the scholarly mainstream. P.'s textual discussions are concise and for the most part convincing, and her text seems to me to represent an improvement. The frequency and clarity of textual discussion in the commentary is welcome, especially in making clear to students of Statius where problems have been thought to lie. P. is particularly sensitive to Statius' impressionistic and compressed language and its effects on textual critics. She rejects unnecessary emendations with good reasoned arguments.

The translation is also clear, a useful guide to how P. takes the Latin. But it is not one that would stand on its own, and reads rather awkwardly, with more than its fair share of archaisms. The introduction is densely packed; P. offers introductory material on life and works and the plot of the *Thebaid*, but much of the rest is thematic and literary: delay, excess, self-consciousness, the structure of Book 4 and its place in the epic, especially in relation to Books 7 and 12, intertextuality, reception and text. The section on reception is particularly strong, especially in Claudian, but also Ariosto, Spenser and Milton. There is also much material in the commentary on later parallels and receptions of particular elements of Statius. Themes which emerge from the commentary as important to P.'s reading of the *Thebaid* include the imitation of Hercules, epic conventions under strain, the ways in which the two sides of the war (foreign enemies, yet fraternal leaders) are assimilated, the importance of viewing, interactions with Valerius Flaccus and Silius, different types of similes and threads of Statian imagery (for instance, bulls and snakes), intratextuality, the way that Statius plays with time, and ideas of substitution. The book is a snapshot of current directions in Statian criticism.

The commentary is rich, concise and detailed. I rarely felt that P. had avoided the real difficulty or missed out a key mode of reading. Her literary comments are careful and often suggestive. She makes clear her firm grasp of the ever-expanding secondary literature, though not always endorsing readings which she presents (the word 'perceives' acts as a useful distancing device). Occasionally I felt that judiciousness led to a lack of commitment, but in general it is clear which readings and ideas P. prefers. The catalogue offers opportunities to produce readings relevant to the whole poem and P. grasps these opportunities effectively, summing up approaches to each of the seven main Argive heroes.

It would not be an easy read for the average undergraduate, peppered as it is with untranslated Latin, Greek and German among other languages. This commentary is rather aimed at scholars

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