omnes pariter and *furiaeque minaeque patris*, after that vv. 3–4a *habent* and *nec caerulei timor aequoris ultra/nec miserae terra ulla procul* is not helpful for following the complicated Valerian sentence.

The abbreviation system used in the notes is unusual: P. abbreviates 'Hof-Szant.' instead of the more commonly used 'H.-Sz.' and the names of Latin and Greek authors are not abbreviated according to the *OLD*.

The bibliography at the end of the volume is accurate and up to date, and the indexes are useful and easy to consult.

This new commentary on Valerius' *Argonautica* Book 8 is an interesting aid to the analysis of the last book of this poem: it offers good starting points for future exegesis.

Milan DANIELA GALLI
daniela_galli@hotmail.com

STATIUS, *ACHILLEID*

UCCELLINI (R.) (ed.) *L'arrivo di Achille a Sciro. Saggio di commento a Stazio* Achilleide *1, 1–396*. (Tesi 9.) Pp. xxxiv + 288. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012. Paper, €30. ISBN: 978-88-7642-193-8.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X1400033X

Statius' unfinished *Achilleid* is a poem whose place in the scholarly canon of Roman literature has changed much in the last two decades, as the number of papers and publications wholly or in part dedicated to it testify. Commentary, however, is a genre with special focus on contrasting and synthesising critical views and is thus characterised by somewhat longer reaction times. First Fr. Ripoll and J. Soubiran produced a commentary in French (2008), providing more detail than Dilke's standard work (1954), and now two Italian commentaries have been published in 2012: a shorter bilingual edition by G. Nuzzo and the one under review here. U.'s commentary, originating in her Ph.D. thesis, is by far the most detailed of those mentioned, although it guides readers only through the first third of the *Achilleid:* with the commentary part itself being more extensive than Ripoll–Soubiran (some 220 pages against 160), it covers only the first major section of the poem, Achilles' arrival at Scyros (1.1–396). At first it might seem strange to write a commentary on only a section of a poem which is itself scarcely longer than one book; but, given that it is aimed (or so it seems to be) at the specialist rather than intended for classroom use, this is not a substantial problem.

In the introduction U. provides an overview of 'themes and models' (including a summary of the late-antique and medieval reception), the characterisation of Achilles and others, and 'linguistic and stylistic aspects'. The introduction is followed by the text of 1.1–396. U. adopts Rosati's text (2002^2) and, since Rosati's is not a critical edition, she supplements the text with a newly-compiled apparatus based on other critical editions from Dilke (1954) to Hall (2007). Apart from a few minor differences in punctuation (at 1.5, 16, 24, 27, 393, not noted in either the apparatus or the commentary, except the first one), the only substantial divergence from Rosati's edition I found is at 1.84, where U. accepts the MSS reading *Sigeo in puluere* instead of the transposition *in Sigeo puluere* suggested by Lachmann; unfortunately, this divergence from the base edition is not made clear in the apparatus, only in the commentary.

In the commentary itself, U. provides an introductory *lemma* for each passage or scene, followed by those discussing smaller chunks of the text. Three to five lines are usually

discussed in one *lemma*, without line numbers for the individual words or phrases, which in the case of rather lengthy *lemmata* makes the commentary inconvenient to use (see, e.g., pp. 113–6, ad 1.110–5). U.'s comments prove that she knows the scholarship on the *Achilleid* very well; I missed, though, T. Gärtner, *GB* 23 (2000), 143–6, which should be cited in connection with the allusion to Valerius' *Argonautica* at 1.62–3; Parkes 2009b, cited elsewhere, could also have been mentioned at this passage; mention of McNelis 2009, in the bibliography, is missing at 1.198–216; Fantham 1979, mentioned elsewhere, should have been cited also for 1.251–74, on Thetis' speech and Andromache's in Sen. *Tro*. In addition to summarising earlier opinions, U. makes many good points of her own. In general, a strong side of her commentary is a more detailed outlining of intertextual contexts (whether phraseology or more specific literary allusions; see, e.g., pp. 149–51, ad 1.178–81, the simile of Castor and Achilles). I very much liked, for example, her discussion of 1.301–3 (pp. 214–6), Achilles glimpsing the beautiful Deidamia and her sisters, where U. convincingly argues that in addition to traditional descriptions of the symptoms of falling in love, Virgilian allusions give some military colouring to the passage. On the other hand, discussions sometimes seem to be protracted without need. Passages from other ancient texts are recurringly quoted at unnecessary length, in original or in translation, for example Hor. *Epod*. 13 at 1.186–8 (p. 156) or Apuleius at 1.256 (p. 190); the discussion of ancient etymologies for Achilles' name, triggered by *adsuetaque pectora* at 1.197 (pp. 162–4), would be much more relevant at 2.98–102 (outside, of course, the scope of U.'s commentary). Some of these passages, even if present in the thesis version, could have been omitted from the published version to make it more streamlined and focused.

It seems worthwhile to give focus to one further comment, since it concerns an interpretation which is probably the most widely known among non-specialists: S. Hinds's suggestion (*Allusion and Intertext* [1998], pp. 126–8) that Achilles' song at 1.188–94, ending with Theseus' fight with the Minotaur and the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, has Catullus 64 as its primary intertext. Although U. in general acknowledges that the Catullan poem is among the important models for the *Achilleid* (p. xii), at this point she is very sceptical (p. 157), objecting that the first two subjects of the song (Hercules' labours and the fight between Pollux and Amycus) are absent from the epyllion. She accepts, on the other hand, P. Heslin's view (complementing, we should add, Hinds's rather than countering it) that Achilles' focus on some minor details (like the type of boxing gloves) suggests a Hellenistic style of composition (*The Transvestite Achilles* [2005], pp. 88–91). Elsewhere, again in connection with Achilles' parents, U. states that Catullus follows the 'traditional chronology' by putting the Argo's voyage first and the wedding second, while Apollonius, Valerius and many artistic representations differ from it – in fact, the reverse can be argued for and seems to be suggested by the evidence which U. herself cites. However, at least by Statius' time, we should perhaps rather speak of two alternative but equally 'traditional' versions.

Typos and mistakes in quotations and citations are, unfortunately, numerous. I only point out some examples here. In a quotation of Cat. 4 (p. 147, ad 1.167–70), *dolet* should be *solet*; in quoting Ov. *Am*. 1.7.21, *vultus* should be printed instead of *vulnus* (p. 242, ad 1.379–81); '*Il.* 26 [*sic*], 326–33' is cited instead of Book 19 (p. 170, ad 1.207). Even the text of the *Achilleid* itself is misquoted in some cases: e.g. *cecinere* (p. xxxii) should be *cecidere*; *sic ficta dedit* (p. 122, ad 1.126–43) is correctly s*ic ficta parens* (line 140 instead of 141); *mulce* (p. 153, ad 1.182) should be *mulcens*; *deficit* (p. 237, ad 1.366–9) *defigit*. Another kind of mistake is made on p. 189, ad 1.253–4: Lucretius' *caeli donavit plāga vaporis* (*DRN* 5.1095) is not a lexical parallel for the Statian *aetheriis plăgis* (however, U.'s mistake here draws attention to a potential wordplay: Thetis is fantasising about

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X1400033X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Achilles as a son of Jupiter, so the near-homonymy of 'heavenly region' and 'thunderbolt' in Latin might be quite relevant here).

U.'s commentary, despite the above criticism, is a useful and important addition to the literature on the *Achilleid* which should be consulted by any specialist. It is to be hoped that a similarly detailed and up-to-date commentary on the remaining two-thirds of the poem will soon be published.

Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest DÁNIEL KOZÁK
kozak.daniel@btk.elte.hu

PAPERS ON APULEIUS

KEULEN (W.), EGELHAAF-GAISER (U.) (edd.) *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass. Volume III: the Isis Book. A Collection of Original Papers*. Pp. xvi + 255, ills. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. Cased, €105, US$144. ISBN: 978-90-04-22123-9.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000407

For all the work that is done on Apuleius, Apuleius is always a work in progress. This compact, 250-page volume presents eleven papers given at a symposium on Book 11 in 2009. Since then, M. Zimmerman's Oxford edition of the text has appeared (2012); the Groningen Commentary on Book 11 is scheduled to appear later in 2013. If nothing else, these essays whet the appetite for that new commentary, which will take its place alongside that of Griffiths's *The Isis Book* (1975; I doubt that it could actually *supplant* Griffiths). The present essays suggest that the battle over the interpretation of Book 11 should be fought word by word, but not just over *pastophorus*, *Madaurensem* and *raso capillo*. We see here in general a movement away from looking for *clues* to looking at *structures*, and in this, though not all the authors would agree, we are witnessing yet another stage in the decline of the influence of Winkler's *Auctor & Actor* (1985). That devaluation was effectively initiated by Kahane and Laird's *A Companion to the Prologue to Apuleius'* Metamorphoses (2002). There, over two dozen Apuleian scholars, trained to nuance in language and culture, basically threw up their hands over understanding what Apuleius was doing in the Prologue. The reason, I believe, is simple: for all his brilliance, Apuleius is not an author in command of every detail of his text. He is opportunistic, flamboyant, ever straining for effect, not so much a master of ambiguity as indifferent to inconsistency. The essays here agree, from varying angles and to varying degrees, that Apuleius' religious language of transcendence is part of his rhetoric of delight, and that what we know of his philosophy (both from his own writings and from comparison to Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris*) shows that his fiction is not doctrine. So how much of what was unclear at the beginning is made clear at the end? A gullible fool was turned into an ass and then turned back again. The story could not have been about how the narrator should not have believed what happened to him, but can it be about how he tried (or tried and failed) to be worthy of the miracle that he received? If it is a tale told by a fool, can a Platonist's fiction indulge in Socratic irony?

These essays are by seasoned scholars, most of them well known in Apuleian circles, many of them authors of their own unitary books on the *Metamorphoses*: L. Graverini, writing here on *prouidentia* and *prudentia*, has just seen *Le Metamorphosi di Apuleio* (2007) translated into English (2012); S. Harrison, covering familiar ground on the clues in Book 11 that encourage an ironic reading of the narrator, in opposition to the