

BOOK REVIEW

Lucilius and Satire in Second-Century BC Rome. Edited by BRIAN W. BREED, ELIZABETH KEITEL AND REX WALLACE. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xiii + 319. Hardback, \$99.99. ISBN: 978-1-107-18955-3.

This valuable collection of essays sets Lucilius in his contemporary context, examining the satires in relationship to linguistic, cultural and literary trends in the 2nd century BCE.¹ The editors thus move away from the skewed assessment of Lucilius by his successor Horace and make clear that they hope to ride the wave of Ennius' recent revival. The chapters do not engage as broadly with the period as the title would suggest – there is little mention of tragedy or philosophy, for example – but the combination of linguistic and literary papers provides a vivid picture of the satirist's varied styles and interests, something that develops from the rapidly changing society in which he lived.

The papers are generally of high quality, not surprisingly given that several of the authors are leading figures in the study of satire and Republican literature. An Introduction by the editors lays out the challenges of studying Lucilius' corpus, most of them familiar but well-stated here, from editorial problems like the lack of context for the fragments to questions about whether Lucilius reflects an elite perspective or was self-consciously innovating. The authors are explicit that no single "Lucilius" is to be found.

Part I then turns to context: in the first chapter, Sander Goldberg offers a characteristically sophisticated discussion about the origins of satire and what Horace's choice of Lucilius as *inventor* of the genre indicates about both Horace and Lucilius' views of Ennius. Next, Brian Breed argues for the textuality of Lucilius' satires, highlighting references to books and readership that might tell us about audience and social life in the second century. This chapter provides an important balance to the emphasis on speech and performativity elsewhere in the volume, though some of the claims, like those about authorial arrangement of the satires, are too speculative.

¹ The volume began as a conference at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in 2013.

Part II, at 133 pages the longest section of the book, has four chapters examining linguistic patterns. It opens with Paolo Poccetti's broad survey of Lucilius' usage, which covers literary criticism and technical writing, the use of Greek and colloquialisms, and more. Three more focused studies follow: Anna Chahoud gives a detailed treatment of compounds, connectives and word placement, Giuseppe Pezzini looks at connections between Lucilius' early satires and Roman comedy in terms of meter and vocabulary, and Angelo Mercado turns to the hexameters in a highly technical study of word and metrical accent. Chahoud's study is especially noteworthy, both for its rich comparisons with Republican epic, comedy and oratory and for its careful treatment of how Lucilius succeeds in capturing the effect of spoken language in poetic verse.

Finally, Part III turns to literary analysis. The first and fourth chapters in this section take up the question of the satirist's invective and his defence: Catherine Keane examines the many references to *sermo*, especially the *apologia*, which she compares profitably with Terence's prologues, while Luca Grillo examines similarities between satire and oratory before distinguishing satire for the way that its attacks on others also end up defining a group of friends, and probably readers as well. In the second and third chapters, we find an emphasis on social critique: Cynthia Damon brings together a fascinating array of examples illustrating Lucilius' interest in value, assessment and labels, while Ian Goh's rather complicated piece addresses luxury and sumptuary laws, suggesting that Lucilius enjoyed fine eating and was not a critic of rich banquets. The connections with Terence, law and virtue friendship, while still tentative, point to some productive avenues for future study.

The primary strength of the volume is also its greatness weakness. The emphasis on linguistics is clearly important, but the placement of such long papers in the middle of the volume interrupts the two sections focused on literary interpretations and isolates them from connections that might otherwise have been made across the volume. In addition, many of the essays in Parts I and III are written at a high altitude, with few quotations or close analysis of passages from other second-century authors. We might have expected to see more of Plautus in particular, given the relevance of his plays to themes like luxury and friendship. Despite these quibbles, the combination of both literary and linguistic papers sets a new model for studying Lucilius, and the volume will be valuable for anyone interested in satire or Republican literature.

RUTH R. CASTON

University of Michigan, rcaston@umich.edu