

actually turns out to be from a paradox with only reversible meaning (R. pp. 201–2). My own formulation would be that the Satyricon is an ‘ontological game’ where there is no reality, only representations of reality, but where some representations are nevertheless better than others, and there is a scale from the freedmen’s clichés, through Trimalchio’s jumble of half-baked learning and the heroes’ literary posturings, to Petronius’ ironic evasiveness (see F. Jones, ‘Realism in Petronius’ in H. Hofmann [ed.], *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel 4* [1991], 105–20).

University of Liverpool

F. JONES

SILVAE

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY (ed., trans.): *Statius: Silvae*. (Loeb Classical Library 206.) Pp. viii + 438, map. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99604-6.

It is a sign of renewed interest in Statius’ *Silvae* that this new Loeb of the poems devotes an entire volume to them, unlike Mozley’s 1928 Loeb, which includes the first four books of the *Thebaid*. Moreover, Shackleton Bailey’s new volume is enriched by a full, detailed appendix, defending his textual emendations, and by a judicious discussion by Kathleen Coleman of literary criticism of the *Silvae* up to 2002, along with a detailed bibliography. These are valuable additions to the standard Loeb format, and make this Loeb a necessary addition to the library of scholars and students alike. Nonetheless, the dictum *caveat lector* comes to mind for three main reasons: the high number of emendations, the sometimes dismissive attitude towards Statius’ poetic art, and infelicities in the translation.

First of all, Loeb editions are generally intended for readers who have neither the time nor the linguistic competence to devote to an Oxford Classical Text or Teubner. They are the staple of graduate students mastering a reading list for Ph.D. examinations, and of scholars in other fields seeking easy, informative access to classical texts. The majority of this volume’s readers are unlikely therefore to be overly concerned about the more than 250 emendations that S.B. has introduced to the text of the *Silvae*. The Appendix provides a forum for S.B.’s sustained engagement with E. Courtney’s 1990 Oxford text (as he acknowledges, many of the emendations were published earlier in *HSCP* 91 [1987], 273–82). Given the notoriously poor state of the text’s transmission—the *Silvae* descend from the sole copy (M) of the manuscript discovered by Poggio Bracciolini in 1417—the judgement of both these critics will remain in many instances open to continuing debate.

S.B. says he has been freer with emendations for the sake of the readability of his translation (p. 9). Yet, since he has a low opinion of Statius as a poet, his tendency to choose the less difficult reading sometimes leads him astray. For instance, at *Silv.* 1.2.228 he chooses Eden’s conjecture *pampinea* for M’s more recondite *minoa*, on the grounds that since, ‘by one account’, Bacchus placed his crown in the sky as the constellation Corona when Ariadne died, he is unlikely to be wearing that crown to a wedding (p. 57). S.B. does not give the source, yet in the fullest version of this myth, in Ovid’s *Fasti* 3.459–516, Bacchus gives Ariadne a crown (one made originally by Vulcan for Venus) to celebrate their love; the crown then is hers, not his. Thus the adjective *minoa* in *Silv.* 1.2.228 can be understood not as a literal description of that crown, but

as a sophisticated, if wittily ironic, allusion to the myth of Bacchus and Ariadne (also referred to four lines previously, in 224), in an epithalamium where the bride moreover, like Ariadne, has been married before. This is the sort of allusion that is designed for the appreciation of the poem's recipient, Arruntius Stella, dedicatee of the first book of *Silvae* and himself a renowned love poet. Yet S.B. sometimes errs on the other side. For example, at *Silv.* 2.5.1 he chooses the reading *constrata ira* over M's *monstrata ira*, even although this metaphorical use of *constrata* is unattested elsewhere. Here he has lost an etymological pun on *monstrum*, wittily appropriate to a poem about a lion.

S.B.'s low opinion of Statius is often most apparent in the explanatory footnotes and the appendix. Remarks such as 'a foolish conceit' (p. 51), 'I doubt if Statius gave the question a thought' (p. 131), 'the Nymph's flight is erratic, as though Statius was setting down the localities as they occurred to him' (p. 137), 'Statius has not thought or not troubled to inform later readers' (p. 147), and 'the conclusion that the muddle was in the author's mind seems unavoidable' (p. 390) tend to perpetuate an outmoded view of Statius as a poet of limited talent, a view that is at variance with the newer criticism of the *Silvae* that Coleman discusses in her portion of the introduction.

Finally, a translator should preferably have an affinity for the writer he translates. However, S.B.'s dismissive attitude towards the poet is evident in his translation as well as his textual criticism, which sometimes favours emendation on the grounds of authorial ineptitude. In the introduction, S.B. writes that he has modest aims in his translation, readability and avoidance of blunders (p. 10). Yet he also attempts to give a sense of what he sees as the artifice of Statius' style, and this sometimes makes for unintelligibility. His translation does not reflect the cultural sophistication that recent critics have claimed for Statius, who was born into an élite literary culture of Greek poetry (for instance, A. Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* [Liverpool, 1983] and C. McNelis, 'Greek Grammarians and Roman Society during the Early Empire: Statius' Father and some Contemporaries', *CA* 21 [2002], 67–94). In many instances, moreover, the *Silvae* are full of wit, humour, and sophisticated Greek and Latin etymological play, facets of the poems to which S.B. does not do justice.

There are some felicitous exceptions, such as the choice of 'coiffed' for *crinitur* (*Silv.* 4.5.10) of a tree wearing its new leaves; the vigorous description of Diana shooting an arrow not with 'the usual whiz' in *Silv.* 2.3.28; or the fine punning on the lion in *Silv.* 2.5.18–19, 'nor did all your menace at once turn tail' for 'nec protinus omnes/terga dedere minae'. On the other hand, his humorous, grandiloquent apostrophe of a lion as 'educated ravisher of tall beasts' for 'altarum vastator docte ferarum' (*Silv.* 2.5.7) conjures up giraffes and misses the connotations of nobility that attach to *altus* when used of animals. The opening to the first poem, on Domitian's colossal equestrian statue, is rendered unintelligible by the opening sentence, 'what is this mass that stands embracing the Latian Forum, doubled by the colossus on its back?' (*Silv.* 1.1, p. 31), a translation that suggests a crouching Quasimodo, not a pedestal doubled in size by a colossal statue placed on top. Likewise, the translation of 'massis amerina non perustis' (*Silv.* 1.6.18) as 'Ameria's solidities unscorched' is needlessly abstruse, even if a footnote does explain 'apples and pears, picked in good time'. A straightforward concept can be rendered unnecessarily obscure, as when S.B. translates a reference to wax statues, 'locuturas mentito corpore ceras' (*Silv.* 4.6.21) as 'false bodies in wax, ready to speak'. Much clearer is K. Coleman's translation in her (1988) Oxford edition of Book 4, 'wax images that with counterfeited form seemed likely to speak'. S.B. argues that Statius is an artificial writer, but this is no reason to make the translation unintelligible. The translation unfortunately is not free from the archaisms that have

plagued earlier Loeb editions. ‘Tis’ makes its appearance twice in the translation of *Silv.* 3.4 (pp. 219, 223), and the phrase ‘to mollify sex’ (for *frangere sexum*, *Silv.* 3.4.74, with reference to castration) strains euphemism to the point of unintelligibility.

The notes that preface each book are generally useful. Not all poems merit a prefatory note. We are told that *Silv.* 4.9 is in hendecasyllables, but no mention is made of the fact that *Silv.* 1.6 and 2.7 are likewise in that metre.

There seems to be only one error. On p. 239, in the prefatory notes to Book 4, S.B. mistakenly says that it is *Silv.* 4.6 that is in Sapphic metre, instead of *Silv.* 4.7.

To this I would like to add two other places of questionable interpretation. On p. 388, the note in the appendix on *inemptas*, *Silv.* 1.6.94, specifying that ‘the fare provided for the Emperor’s guests was not bought in any market; it was produced on his own land’, overlooks the characteristic of the emperor’s Saturnalian show. As the opening lines emphasize (see *gratuitum*, 16), all the food is free for the spectators, and it represents the enormous diversity made possible by far flung imperial commerce. On pp. 393–4, *Venarum* to mean a topographical area for the transmitted *Denarumque* (*Silv.* 3.5.104) is surely wrong. On no external basis, S.B. conjectures a region around the Bay of Naples called *Venae*. He argues that *venarum lacus* is ‘gibberish’. But it is not gibberish if taken with its adjoining adjective, *medicos*; the phrase ‘*venarumque lacus medicos*’ can be taken as a reference to pools that heal ailments of the veins. S.B. makes no reference to Laguna’s attractive suggestion *Inarimesque*, genitive singular for the isle of Ischia, mentioned also in *Silv.* 2.2.76; indeed, he nowhere refers to this fine commentary on Book 3 (G. Laguna, *Estacio: Silvas III* [Madrid, 1992]). Although Laguna appears in Coleman’s bibliography, there are three notable omissions: R. Thomas, ‘Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry’, *CQ* 33 (1983), 92–113; C. Newlands, ‘*Silvae* 3.1 and Statius’ Poetic Temple’, *CQ* 41 (1991), 438–52; O. Pederzani, *Il talamo, l’albero, e lo specchio* (Bari, 1995).

University of Wisconsin, Madison

CAROLE E. NEWLANDS

A MARTIAL SELECTION

L. WATSON, P. WATSON (edd.): *Martial: Select Epigrams*. (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.) Pp. xii + 374. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Paper, £17.95/US\$26 (Cased, £47.50/US\$70). ISBN: 0-521-55539-6 (0-521-55488-8 hbk).

Since the appearance of Mario Citroni’s landmark edition of Book 1 in 1975, the individual books of Martial’s epigrams have steadily been receiving scholarly commentary, with a noticeable spurt in the last three years (my own commentary on Book 2, Galán Vioque’s on Book 7, Schöffel’s on Book 8, Leary’s on Book 13); now only the *Liber de spectaculis* and Books 3, 4, 10, and 12 remain without published full-length commentary. Older anthologies, such as that of Bridge and Lake (Oxford, 1908), were school editions, offering commentary on a corresponding level and studiously excluding epigrams deemed obscene. More recently, Uwe Walter’s selection of ninety-eight epigrams (Paderborn, 1996) is on a higher level and hardly censors, but it explicitly associates itself with the tradition more of the *Lehrerkommentar* than of the *wissenschaftlicher Kommentar*. Patricia and Lindsay Watson have now provided a modern commentary in the best tradition of the

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved