

Chapter III is a good analysis of Plautus' introduction of Roman legal terminology into the context of amatory relationships in his plays. Only as regards Roman Elegy (118), should it be remembered that we know very little of Hellenistic Love Elegy. In this connection I would like to mention one important problem (touched upon in my *Terms of Abuse in Roman Comedy*, Helsinki, 1965, 71—77), namely, whether the legal background in Plautus can be explained by Attic or by purely Roman law.

The Bibliography and both Indices deserve special mention. The interesting Appendix might have profited from being published separately.

*Saara Lilja*

*Pierre Grimal: Seneca. Macht und Ohnmacht des Geistes.* Ins Deutsche übertragen von *Karlhans Abel*. Impulse der Forschung Bd. 24. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1978. XII, 430 S. DM 63.—. — *Pierre Grimal: Sénèque ou la conscience de l'Empire.* Collection d'études anciennes, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1979 [1978]. 503 p. Fr. 105.—.

The manuscript of Professor Grimal (now Membre de l'Institut) was finished in 1972 and the translation by K. Abel in 1976. Both the French original and the German version were published in 1978. For some reason Abel has replaced Grimal's telling sub-title with a somewhat trivial slogan.

A parallel reading of the translation and the original shows that nothing has been omitted in the former, despite the difference in the number of pages. The work contains over 1300 footnotes, which, however, for the most part consist of short references or of quotations from Seneca and other ancient or secondary sources. The notes, at the bottom of each page in Gr(imal's original book), have been placed by Ab(el in his translation) at the end (pp. 331—389). It should be observed that there are three separately numbered sets of notes, belonging to the introduction, a biographical part (I) and a philosophical part (II) respectively.

The book is straightforwardly but authoritatively written, and from a master like Grimal one expects nothing less. Everything he says rests on a profound familiarity with Seneca's extant writings and their historical and spiritual (also Greek) background and with a range of secondary literature clearly much larger than Gr's nine pages of bibliography show (by Ab compressed in seven, with some omissions but also some additions, e.g., surprisingly, of a dozen of Grimal's own articles).

The biographical part is not overloaded with historical detail; instead it always keeps Seneca's thinking in the foreground. From Grimal's account there emerges a consistent intellectual and moral development which will surprise readers believing in a 'rhetorical' and superficial Seneca. Grimal's main thesis is that Seneca's oeuvre is essentially parenetical in spirit, that it is directed towards helping other men, while at the same time making clear the writer's thoughts to himself. Some of the

work carries overt political implications: thus *De clementia* at the beginning of Nero's reign establishes Seneca as the 'conscience of the empire'.

Among Grimal's results to be noted are the eminently readable 'Ehrenrettungen' of the consolation to Polybius (Gr 99—107 = Ab 66—71, cf. 166 resp. 115) and of the Apocolocyntosis (Gr 111—119, Ab 73—82). *De beneficiis*, often dismissed as 'casuistry', is refreshingly seen from a higher humane point of view (Gr 180—183, Ab 126—128). The eternal question in Roman literature, that of tradition vs. originality, receives in Gr 352f. = Ab 250 a masterly treatment as regards the *De tranquillitate animi* (the structure of which is lucidly exposed in Gr 413—416 = Ab 294—296), a treatment miles apart from any mechanical *Quellenforschung*. Similarly Gr 392 = Ab 278, Gr 394 = Ab 280, and Gr 434f. = Ab 310, and about Seneca's own doctrine of the soul Gr 400f. = Ab 284. The discussion of the so-called chronology of Seneca's works is most illuminating: Gr 262—323 = Ab 185—229 (a whole little treatise) with many new arguments; specially for the Letters to Lucilius Gr 219—233 = Ab 155—164 plus a large appendix at the end of the book. There are very perceptive observations on the creation of a Latin philosophical language (Gr 34—41, Ab 21—26). Unexpected, but richly rewarding also for a student of the Presocratics, is a discussion of Democritus' *Peri euthymies* and its influence on Panaitios and Seneca (Gr 345—353, Ab 244—250). The chapter on literary form (II:7) is an analysis, not of style, but of thought patterns ('philosophical structure' Gr 416, Ab 297). In a short last chapter the tragedies are related to the rest of Seneca's work and seen as pregnant of philosophical thought.

Grimal's view of Seneca's conception of the Romanization of Britain (Gr 159, Ab 110) does not seem to me to be quite borne out by positive evidence. When in (II) note 164 (Gr 296, Ab 371) Grimal states that *defutura* in *De otio* 8,1 is an uncertain reading, he might have got a suggestion from the present reviewer, *Arctos* 2 (1958) 214—216 (*si idonea defutura*). More serious is the contradiction, as it seems to me to be, between Gr 347 (Ab 246) and Gr 219 (Ab 154f.) as to the motives for the Wise Man's actions. There is of course a chapter on the Sage in Seneca (Abel often strangely renders the technical 'sagesse' with the vague 'Reifsein'), but it is curiously disappointing, treating mainly of the figure of Cato Uticensis (to be sure, an ideal of Seneca's). Having said this I wish to emphasize, however, that Grimal's book abounds in references to the Sage: I have counted several dozens of them, only a minor part of which are mentioned in the Index s.v. Sage, Sagesse (Gr 488) and Weiser, Weisheit (Ab 429).

The various Indices are copious and in the translation based on those in the French original. An independent contribution of Abel's is the long (399—412) article 'Seneca', analysed biographically and systematically — a mine of information for future study of this author.

Abel's translation is mostly faithful and clear, in spite of a few short but unnecessary additions and of an occasional quaint word like 'Janhagel' 144 (for 'Pöbel') or 'Anodyn' 240 (difficult for the Greekless). Abel (whose Greek quota-

tions are, by the way, not always faultlessly presented) now and then introduces Greek terms (like 'adiaphora') where Grimal consistently has French paraphrases ('indifférents'), and generally does so with happy effect; a glaring exception is the totally unwarranted introduction of αὐτότης 300, cf. Gr 421. He sometimes corrects a misquotation of Grimal's (introd. n.28, (I) n.114, (II) notes 145 and 329), and occasionally presents another reading of an ancient text than Grimal (introd. n.25, (I) n.540, II n.533). But in (II) n.317 *animus* (so both Gr 342 and Ab 377f.) is a mere mistake for *animum*. In his references Abel adheres to TLL and LSJ (and APh) with unnecessary strictness; a more immediate clarity would have been welcome to the general reader, who certainly can read the book with profit.

Misprints seldom occur in either book, but Gr 157 read 'ses' instead of 'ces', and Ab 385 n.512 the page referred to should be 220f. instead of 227.

Rolf Westman

*Emin Tengström: A Study of Juvenal's Tenth Satire.* Some structural and interpretative problems. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* XLII. Göteborg 1980. 59 p. Sw. Cr. 50.—

The Swedish scholar Dr. Emin Tengström has carried out research into a wide range of topics. His previous publications include *Die Protokollierung der Collatio Carthaginiensis* (1962), *Donatisten und Katholiken* (1964) and *On the Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin* (with Margareta Benner, 1977). Nor should we forget his useful guide to the study of the history of Latin in Sweden, *Latinet i Sverige* (1973), which is written for a wider public both from a philologist's and from a cultural historian's point of view. In his latest study, Tengström has turned to a major Roman writer, the satirist Juvenal.

Tengström's new book is not a comprehensive literary or social analysis or a commentary on Juvenal's tenth satire, but rather a series of articles on various aspects of the poem. In the first article, Tengström investigates certain structural questions; the second is devoted to textual criticism (lines 148—150, 188—189 and 293—295) and in the third chapter some remarks are made both on the poem's relation to history and the Roman moral climate and on the satirist's role in society. One cannot read this book without being a little puzzled by the looseness of its composition: why write a special summary for the first chapter only and why give a position of central importance to minor questions of textual criticism, whose proper place is of course in an appendix, especially in view of the fact that Tengström does not provide any new solutions to old problems, but merely some further arguments in support of ideas already proposed by Friedländer, Labriolle-Villeneuve and Fox? One may also ask why, in the title of Chapter I, Tengström speaks of the composition *or* structure of the poem, when the term 'structure' would have been quite adequate.