

explored portion of the preserved text has to offer. But when you use this book, be sure to have a good critical edition around, otherwise be careful to avoid anyone resembling Friedrich Leo, from whom you would risk hearing, ‘Oh, you read Petronius without a critical apparatus’.

University of Warsaw
jan.kwapisz@uw.edu.pl
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000779

JAN KWAPISZ

C. NEWLANDS (ED.), *STATIUS, SILVAE. BOOK II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Pp. ix + 283. ISBN 9780521661874 (bound); 9780521666237 (paper). £55.00/US \$90.00 (bound); £21.99/US\$34.99 (paper).

This book marks an excellent contribution to scholarship on the *Silvae* from a leading scholar in the field. van Dam’s 1984 fine large-scale commentary on *Silvae* 2, to which Newlands is indebted, is by no means made redundant. However, N.’s work is more accessible, as well as more up to date. Her presentation of the *Silvae* as the innovative and fun poems they are should help sell their charms to a wider audience of students and scholars than they currently attract.

The introduction is divided into ten main sections. After a brief discussion of Statius’ life, N. turns to the character of the *Silvae*, laying stress on their experimental and paradoxical nature: ‘They are playful and earnest, intimate and elevated, improvisational and learned; they challenge generic distinctions ... In the stylistic extremes of haste and elevation they are profoundly anti-Callimachean; but in their learning and their interest in “minor” themes and characters they are closely tied to Hellenistic poetic traditions’ (3). The question of the *Silvae*’s political leanings, which reappears periodically throughout, particularly in the discussion of 2.2 (e.g. 121 and 134), is here first raised: N. argues (5; cf. 8–9) that Book 2’s emphasis on friendship and withdrawal from public life reveals the impact of the political turmoil of Domitian’s last years. After an examination of the term *Silvae* and a discussion of the difficulty in knowing whether M’s *tituli* were Statius’ own, N. moves on to the book’s themes: the destructiveness of death and the power of art to tame nature and confer immortality. A brief but rich discussion of structure brings out the importance of Book 2 as a thematically rich unit and places it in context as the middle book of the first published collection. Sections then follow on patrons and patronage, Martial and Statius, style, and text and reception.

N. takes advantage of new developments in scholarship, for instance, concerning the cultural milieu of Domitianic Rome. She takes a fairly conservative textual approach, basing her text on Courtney’s OCT (1990, rev. 1992) and incorporating several emendations made by Shackleton Bailey in his 2003 Loeb edition. Her decisions seem sensible, although lack of space sometimes prevents her from doing justice to the problems. For example, in the vexed issue of what to do with M’s *Lyceo* at *Silv.* 2.2.35, N. reads *Inoo ... Lechaeo* (a reference to the port which received Ino), instead of *Inoo ... Lyaeo* favoured by van Dam and Courtney (i.e. ‘the sanctuary of Dionysus which/who is connected with Ino’). Both readings are problematic, as N. admits: there does not seem to have been a covered way from the harbour to the Acrocorinth nor is there any sign of a famous temple to Dionysus (although there is evidence of the god’s worship in Corinth). Statius may well be making a loose reference to the road leading from Lechaemum to Corinth which had both porticos and shrines. However, the evidence on the other side is stronger than N. suggests: *Inoo ... Lyaeo* would tie in with the recurring motif of foster-parentage (cf., e.g. 2.1.97–8) and allow a pun on *Baccheidos*.

N. knows her way around the secondary criticism and provides a full bibliography. Books which have been published too recently for N. to take into account include C. Laes, *Children in the Roman Empire: Outsiders Within* (2011, a translation of his 2006 Dutch work), which differs from N. in arguing for a sexual relationship between Glaucias and Melior, Morgan’s 2010 work *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*, which gives further consideration to Statius’ use of hendecasyllables in 2.7, and Volume 3 of Anderson’s *The Manuscripts of Statius* (revised edn 2009), which supplements N.’s section on the reception of the *Silvae*. Consideration of the question of the book’s generic experimentation may have benefited from reference to Morgan’s arguments about children figuring as ‘non-epic’ material in the *Metamorphoses* (*JRS* 93 (2003), 66–91) and Connors’ view (*CJ* 88 (1992–3), 1–17), in a discussion of various texts including *Silv.* 2.6.17–20, that the death of a pet could be seen as unepic.

Amongst the numerous fine individual entries, there are some notes which are less convincing. So, for instance, N. argues that in metrical patterning and the idea of strolling by a river the description of Blaesus at 2.1.194 evokes Vergil's (very different) picture of Gallus at *Ecl.* 6.64 and then goes on to suggest a point of comparison in political disgrace. N. also rejects the idea that 2.7.124–5 refers to a tradition that Laodamia worshipped a Bacchic statue of Protesilaus in a Maenadic frenzy on the grounds that the evidence is slight. See, however, Bettini's *A Portrait of the Lover* (trans. Gibbs, 1999), Reeson (2001) on *Ov., Her.* 13.33–4 and *Apul., Met.* 8.7 with Hijmans, *Mnemosyne* 39 (1986), 351, 358. Additionally, the book is hampered by constraints of space. Frequently I was left wishing for longer entries, more cross-references to other poems in the collection, and a fuller picture (particularly in the case of the intertexts). Occasionally, N. could have done more with her material: for example, she does not bring out the significance of the verbal echoes of the *Thebaid's* Opheltis episode, where the slave Hypsipyle laments a high-born child, in Statius' consolation for Melior who is mourning the death of the low-born Glaucias.

The book is well-produced, with only a few mistakes (e.g. p. 31 the reading of Courtney is *qualis* not *quales*; the lemma at 2.3.24–25 prints *rapinae* instead of *rapinis*).

Exeter College, Oxford

ruth.parkes@gmail.com

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000780

RUTH E. PARKES

A. AUGOUSTAKIS (ED.), *BRILL'S COMPANION TO SILIUS ITALICUS*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009. Pp. xxi + 512. ISBN 9789004165700. €155.00/US\$225.00.

Considered with disdain and hostility by modern scholarship in the first half of the twentieth century, Silius Italicus is now back in fashion, with *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus* one of the most remarkable indications of this renewed interest. Silius' great narrative skill, his learned and ingenious intertextual research, and his historical, social and axiological thought are all prominent in this excellent set of essays, though the aesthetic and poetic dimensions of the *Punica* could perhaps have been further explored. The book is organized into four parts, rather *passee-partout* and not properly Silian, but which introduce stimulating debates for the reader as the authors, on similar points, offer diverging opinions (the figure of Scipio for instance, and the relationships with Domitian). They are: Part A, 'Introduction'; Part B, 'Context and Intertext'; Part C, 'Themes and Images'; Part D, 'Reception and Criticism'. The book also contains a comprehensive bibliography and useful Indices.

The first part introduces the author, his reputation, and the text of the *Punica* (chronology, intertextuality, structure), and offers a clear and interesting exploration of the different theories and analysis of the recent bibliography on the poem. The second part considers the relationships between Silius and his many sources and intertexts. Pomeroy reminds his reader of the difficulties in identifying the non-Livian authors which Silius used in his treatment of historical episodes. He then focuses on Silius' use of 'Thucydidean narratives' in Livy which reflects literary debates and different ways of understanding historical causality, revealing ethical rather than political aims. Gibson extends the discussion on the sources of Silius, and, using Quintilian's definition of *historia* as *carmen solutum*, he explores how Silius exploits both poetic and historical predecessors at the same time. He focuses on the digression on Sicily in Book 14, with an erudite and detailed examination of Silian allusions to, and merging of, previous poets and historians in his description. The next diptych in this part deals with the relationships between Silius and Virgil. Ganiban explores the rôle of Dido in the characterization of Hannibal and his tragic heroism. Mythological past and epic traditions guide Hannibal's decisions in the *Punica*, much more than historical motivations: Dido's curse and Juno's hatred motivate his action throughout the epic, but also implicate and enclose him in a destructive dynamic of defeat. Hannibal, as a blind hero, always looks back to the past and ignores, unlike Virgil's Aeneas, the weight of fate on the future. Kennedy Classen tries to rehabilitate Silius' originality when rewriting his models and shows how he combines Homeric and Virgilian models in Hannibal's and Scipio's characterization. The echoes in Books 12 and 13 of Homeric *nekyia* and Virgilian *catabasis* are examined in detail. Hannibal is compared to Aeneas, Achilles and Ulysses but fails to reincarnate them, being rather a new Turnus, unlike Scipio, who is a true new Aeneas, Ulysses and Achilles. Marks contributes to the exploration of