

rather than genitive; parallels would be useful. In **262** *bello fugatum*, the interpretation ‘defeated in war’ needs more supporting evidence.

In some cases explanation would be useful. P. seems not to favour horrendous pictures such as **30–1**, where ‘severed hands and arrows standing full in eyes’ lack any comment. The implied choice in **37** ‘what blood to avoid ... and what to trample’ shows a cruel attitude to the slain enemy and contradicts the discussion of human values in 34–5. An important characteristic of S.’s style are his unique *iuncturae*; these would be recognised by contemporaries, but the modern reader needs help. For instance, *porrigat umbras campus* (**251**): only here and Calp. *Ecl.* 5.59 *porrigit aesculus umbras*. In **314–15** *suffusaque sanguine ... purpura*, the (repeated) statement on the Greek construction is not helpful. But more importantly, nothing is said of the mannered conceit of red (blood) and purple (cloak), triggered by *Aen.* 10.819, for which see *Theb.* 7.683.

As in any edition, there are several places where one might disagree with P.’s readings. **28** *de uirtute queruntur*: ‘bewail the valour of the dead’, not ‘because it has been excessive’ thus problematising the concept of *uirtus*, but rather paradoxical, since they died because of this same valour. In **316–17** the enjambment in *puluere paenel calcatum* is explained as emphasising that the corpse has been treated miserably. I rather think the emphasis is on *calcatum*, the astonishing fact that horses had almost trampled his body in the dust. This also explains **319** *sternitur in uultus*, which is not a hyperbole of throwing one’s whole body on to a face, nor a synecdoche for their love or the ‘projection’ of Argia’s whole being at her dead husband, but rather the only part of his body still visible. **667–8**: *centena Cretae moenia* is not I think a reference to the labyrinth, but to the city-walls of the hundred cities, or perhaps the hundred peoples: cf. Luc. 3.184 *centenis populis*. The labyrinth is referred to at 668 (*monstrosi ambagibus antri*).

There are some unfortunate errors. At **1–2** P. discusses the comparative *tenuia* instead of *tenuiora* at *Theb.* 5.597, 6.196; something is wrong here. In line **6** not *sit*, but *est* should be understood. In **44–5** Juvenal is assumed to precede Statius.

The most striking misprints are ‘Thabaid’ featuring as the second word of the Preface (p. 9) and ‘Hofmann’ (pp. 270–7) for M. Hoffmann. The latter is the more painful since P. owes a lot to this excellent commentary on 12.312–463 (Göttingen, 1999), indeed a lot more than is acknowledged.

Unfortunately the book lacks an index of quoted passages.

Universiteit van Amsterdam

J.J.L. SMOLENAARS
j.j.l.smolenaars@uva.nl

INTO THE WOODS

GIBSON (B.) (ed., trans.) *Statius, Silvae 5*. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. Pp. lii + 492, ill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Cased, £80. ISBN: 978-0-19-927715-5.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X07002302

Readers – and commentators – who venture into the tangled paths of the *Silvae* need an exceptional range of tools if they are successfully to find their way around. In addition to a keen sensitivity to dense intertextual allusion, an ability to grapple with

the Latin language at breaking point, and expertise in an at best uncertain manuscript tradition, they require familiarity with Domitianic culture from *princeps* to freedman, in Rome and beyond, and an eclectic set of further expertises, from Neapolitan school curricula to encaustic painting, all the while coping with the alien and often rebarbative conventions of mannerist panegyric. These tools are still more necessary in the blasted grove that is *Silvae* 5, probably assembled posthumously, with one poem incomplete. Fortunately, Bruce Gibson proves that he both possesses all the required skills and is able to furnish readers with everything they need to tackle these challenging but rewarding Latin poems. The consolations, first of Domitian's *ab epistulis* Abascantus for the loss of his wife Priscilla, then of the poet himself for the death of his father and of his foster-son, the *envoi* to young Crispinus at the start of his career, and the famous short prayer to Sleep, are all made accessible. This is an exemplary edition, which will be of immense value not only to readers of the *Silvae* but to all those whose interests fall under the broad canopy of the collection's branches.

The Introduction provides a useful way into *Silvae* 5, addressing the poems' self-representation, the status of Book 5 and the consolatory genre. A reader new to the *Silvae* might wish for more orientation in the ways of patronage and panegyric, which are such a prominent, distinctive and potentially unsettling aspect of Statius' poetics. Much material may be found on this area, notably in the work of Hardie, Nauta and now Zeiner, but more attention to it here, in both introduction and commentary, would be welcome. Indeed, one of the few weaknesses of the otherwise excellent commentary is its reluctance to address the sheer oddness of the *Silvae*: why, for instance, Statius elaborately praises the late Priscilla on the grounds that she would never have committed adultery, even if tempted as Aerope was by Thyestes, or Helen by Paris (1.57–9). Perhaps it is for the reader to come to terms with such oddities once *Realien*, literary background and linguistic points have been explicated by the commentator, but these uncomfortable features are no less significant, and arguably as deserving of comment. Quibbles aside, G. shows a mastery of matters textual, linguistic, literary, prosopographical, historical and technical: his commentary is not only an excellent aid to the text, but an invaluable source of scholarly information. One might single out the subtle treatment of how Statius uses Telamon, impressive but always the ultimate side-kick, as an appropriate parallel for Crispinus' father Bolanus in his service under Corbulo (2.48–50), and how the young Crispinus himself matures from being compared to Neoptolemus to having Achilles as his avatar (2.157).

G.'s text is very good indeed, especially in light of the self-conscious peculiarity of Statius' Latin and the (not unrelated) unreliability of the principal manuscript, especially in this final, damaged, perhaps truncated book. His discussions of the many textual problems are judicious, detailed and almost always convincing, as exemplified by his defence of Q's reading *metari* at 2.43 and especially his handling of the horrendous crux at 3.41–4 and the lacunose 5.24–7. He makes some very convincing conjectures, printing several in the text. But although he exhaustively evaluates others' conjectures, his own are often proposed with too little advocacy or support. I discuss some examples below, but others include 1.66 (*fors*), 83 (*paratis*) and 219–20 (*pectusque* – not printed). An extreme case, presumably an oversight, is 5.3.240, where G. prints his conjecture *thalamis* in preference to the paradosis (and vulgate) *thamos*, without even mentioning it in the commentary. As with most of G.'s conjectures, this is utterly convincing, but it still needs to be justified. In contrast, his splendid conjecture of *aluelo* (scanned as a disyllable, as in the identical context of *A.*

6.412) for *alga* at 5.3.283, so persuasively advocated in the commentary, does not even find a place in the *apparatus*, let alone the text, where it arguably belongs. Better defended are *negatam* (2.54), *ultra* (5.1), *iuraque* (11), and *genitor* (80).

The facing translation is entirely suited to its purpose of elucidating the original; it even achieves a level of elegance which one might mischievously consider unfaithful to the syntax-stretching elaborate disarray of Statius' style. Some improvements might be suggested. 5.3.181–2: 'certain augurs', for *certis* | *auguribus*, is ambiguous, suggesting 'particular' rather than 'reliable'. 5.3.246: *quid referam* means not 'What am I to say of ...', but 'Why should I recount ...', the classic introduction to a *praeteritio* (e.g. *Ov. Pont.* 1.3.81, *inter multa alia*) and far less demeaning of Statius *père's* *mores*. 5.5.37: Achilles (*Aeacides*) is Aeacus' grandson, not his son. 5.5.43: *uulneribus ... meis* needs the emphasis of 'my own wounds' to convey the stress of the possessive adjective at the end of the sentence and the antithesis with *matrumque patrumque* | *uulnera* (38–9).

5.1.1: G. nicely parallels the effigy of Priscilla, which Statius wishes he could offer Abascantus, with Pygmalion's, but an even closer analogy is Laodamia's wax effigy of the dead Protesilaus (*Hyg. Fab.* 104). 10: the designation of a physical monument as *mortalis honos*, in contrast to what Statius can achieve with his *perenni ... lyra*, evokes (and adapts) not only *Hor. Carm.* 3.30 (as G. notes *ad* 15), but also *Ov. Am.* 1.15.7–8 *mortale est, quod quaeris, opus. mihi fama perennis | quaeritur*. 29: the image of personified grief reigning in Abascantus' thunderstruck breast must suggest, with close verbal echoes and a poignant replacement of love with grief, *in uacuo pectore regnat Amor* (*Ov. Am.* 1.1.26); cf. *Theb.* 5.202–3, where ruling love has been replaced in the breast of every Lemnian woman, not by grief, but by *sua ... Erinys*. 75: a closer parallel for *audita es*, both verbally and as an instance of prayers being answered in the course of a poem, is *audimur* (3.2.50). 103: for notable instances of Iris as a messenger of Hera/Juno rather than the Homeric Zeus, add *E. Her.* 822–74 and *Ov. Met.* 11.583–632 (the antecedent of *Theb.* 10.80–136, which G. cites). 127: G. neatly gives *V. Fl.* 8.50–1 as a parallel for repeated *tecum* expressing devotion, but both might look back to *Hor. Carm.* 3.9.24. 221: on the happiness of the dead in contrast to the living, cf. also *Lucr.* 3.894–911.

5.2.21–6: G. cites *Enn. Ann.* 79–83 Sk. among several parallels for the crowd's excitement before a chariot race, but both the political import of the simile and the allusive signal in *Romulei ... circus* suggest that Statius is directly alluding to this famous passage. 169: G. tantalisingly parallels Domitian's looking down on Rome with the gazes of Virgil's Juno, Lucan's Caesar and Silius' Hannibal, but neither expands on nor accounts for this potentially troubling comparison.

5.3 intro: the careful weighing of the evidence for the date of Statius *père's* death and of the poem's composition seems to take the poet's assertions too literally; the inability to compose is a highly effective motif for conveying grief (as G. shows) and the figure of three months, especially the epanalepsis of *ter* at 29, feels conventional and ritualised. 10–11: G. is surely right to print Markland's *ille* for M's *certe*, but it is hard to see how an ancient reader could have distinguished the sentence as a question, without the punctuation mark G. supplies; a statement here could even be argued to make slightly better sense, if Statius is *asserting* his former status as an epic poet, which makes his current writer's block so shocking, rather than questioning it. 19–24: in addition to Lucan's Pompey and Ovid's Pythagoras, Statius *père's* philosophical exploration of the heavens must also evoke that of Lucretius' Epicurus (1.72–7). 52: for outdoing the Nemean and Olympian games, albeit in happier circumstances, and also looking back to the cited *G.* 3.19–20, cf. 3.1.139–53 (Nemean and Isthmian).

89–90: for mourning personifications, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.24.6–8. 97–8: the mention of Thalia followed by the distinctive conceit of the pentameter as a hexameter lacking a foot might suggest a more directed allusion to the two imitations of the *Aetia* prologue in Virg. *E.* 6 and Ov. *Am.* 1.1. 105: G. conjectures *solutum*, but this requires the difficult double sense that Parthenope's hair is *both* disordered by the eruption of Vesuvius *and* untied (presumably by herself) in lament, neither of which sits easily with the offering of a lock on the tomb – a cut lock of hair is neither tied nor untied – so that the alleged redundancy of M's *sepultum* seems a small price to pay for better sense. 107–8: that which *Sparta ... animosa creavit* might not be Alcman, whom G. rejects, nor as he prefers, 'all [its] famous offspring', but Tyrtaeus, who Horace claims *mares animos in Martia bella | uersibus exacuit* (*AP* 402–3). 121–3: as well as Hesiod and Callimachus, the detail of initiating the poet by touching his mouth with water evokes Prop. 3.3.51–2. 284: *Graiumque examina uatum*, playing on the literal meaning 'swarms', wittily combines the topos of poets as bees (e.g. Pl. *Ion* 534a–b) with Virgil's comparison of the souls in Elysium to bees (*A.* 6.706–9).

G.'s commentary is a splendid achievement, more than worthy to stand alongside those of Van Dam, Laguna and Coleman.

Balliol College, Oxford

BOB COWAN
bob.cowan@balliol.ox.ac.uk

THE GERMANIA

KREBS (C.B.) *Negotiatio Germaniae. Tacitus' Germania und Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Giannantonio Campano, Conrad Celtis und Heinrich Bebel.* (Hypomnemata 158.) Pp. 284. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2005. Cased, €76. ISBN: 978-3-525-25257-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X07002314

This book presents an elaborate 'imagological' study of Tacitus' *Germania* and its modern fortunes, and in particular of its reception by certain Renaissance humanists. It begins with a survey of the large secondary literature and of methodology, which focusses on theory, mythological dimensions and 'negotiation' (*negotiatio Germaniae* – *pace* Stephen Greenblatt) with later German literary tradition. Krebs goes on to consider the idealising and comparative interpretations according to the laudatory Tacitean and disparaging Roman approaches, and he follows in particular the themes of simplicity, liberty and virtue as they are aimed at the 'intended reader'. The Roman interpretation, aimed at the ancient imperial readership, regards Tacitus' work as 'rhetorical ethnography', and it employs what François Hartog in his study of Herodotus calls a 'rhetoric of otherness', which depicts the Germans as barbarians, though with political, sociological and institutional aspects. Like Caesar, Tacitus defined 'all Germany' through an 'imaginary ethnography' as well as an 'imaginary geography', derived from Caesar. But of course the virtues of the Germans had a negative as well as a positive side: an equally 'ahistorical' 'ambivalence' of liberty and license, for example, and ignorance and simplicity. The influence of the *Germania* can be traced down to the present, in its positive as well as its Nazi forms.