

points clear enough in this section, with the result that some of the valuable insights on *fas* (vs. *nefas* in Lucan) may be lost, as the reader essays to decipher the connections with Derrida.

Finally, the fifth chapter ('Now: the Angel, the Boat and the Storm in Walter Benjamin') expounds on the perversion of *fas* into *nefas* by Lucan's Caesar and the obliteration of resistance, be it the Roman people's against the oncoming tyranny of the (future) emperors after Caesar or Lucan's own resistance, for ever silenced by Nero himself and the poet's suicide. To this reading of Lucan's poem, W. juxtaposes Walter Benjamin's model of successful resistance. For Benjamin history is the site of politics and of revolutionary struggle: 'our actions create new political spaces, causal nexuses, historical trajectories' (127) and thus disrupt the extent of sovereign power.

I believe W.'s ambitious project could have taken into account the political context of the poems examined here. Ultimately, I was left with a lingering question: what does all this mean for Augustan or Neronian Rome and the socio-political context of these very different two periods? Some readers will find several readings of the ancient texts through the modernist theory lens persuasive, while others less so. W. presents here a daring, and often difficult, interpretation of well-known poems, frequently with insightful ideas, which at times, however, fall short of having been exploited for their full potential and beg for further discussion that need not be as cryptic or packed. This is nevertheless a book worth reading, especially by those interested in the very often much-criticized relationship between Classics and theory.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
 aaugoust@illinois.edu
 doi:10.1017/S0075435812000767

ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS

N. BREITENSTEIN, *PETRONIUS, SATYRICA 1-15. TEXT, ÜBERSETZUNG, KOMMENTAR* (Texte und Kommentare. Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 32). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009. Pp. xviii + 238. ISBN 978311022082-7. £119.95/US\$168.00.

Declamations on the decline of rhetoric, polymetric poetry containing a disquieting number of interpretive cruxes on the one hand, shady business in the forum and the escape from a lupanar on the other, not to mention lacunas, alleged interpolations, or the author's virtuoso play with not only Roman, but also Greek literary traditions — the first fifteen chapters of the preserved text of Petronius (certainly not 'the opening of the *Satyrica*', as the publisher's promotional text refers to it) have much to offer a tiro desiring to obtain a PhD in the Classics in the old-fashioned way of our great ancestors, i.e. by preparing a commented edition of an ancient text. The revised version of Breitenstein's thesis, completed in 2008 at the University of Bern, is yet another weapon, alongside G. Vannini's 2010 commentary on *Sat.* 100-15 and P. Habermehl's on 79-141 (the first volume was published in 2006), used by de Gruyter in a recent campaign to remind us that what survives of Petronius is not limited to the *Cena*. A comparison between B.'s work and those two commentaries is difficult to avoid, but I will put B.'s book on the bookshelf next to A. Aragosti, P. Cosci and A. Cotrozzi, *Petronio: l'episodio di Quartilla* (*Satyricon 16-26.6*) (1988), since with these two volumes we have a complete commentary on the preserved fragments of *Sat.* preceding the *Cena* — a fact overlooked by B., who does not even mention the Italian book.

As is clear from the preface, B.'s book was conceived primarily as a commentary, but its main part is preceded by a brief general introduction to the study of Petronius, also specifically, to the part of *Sat.* treated in B.'s volume, and by the Latin text, which is accompanied by a German translation, intended, as B. tells us, to facilitate study of the text while having no literary pretensions (1). A bibliography and general index are at the end of the book. The introduction is extremely concise, yet well-written and instructive. The list of alleged interpolations is particularly useful (xiv). B. athetizes only five out of the twenty-eight words or phrases that have been suspected, from which we can infer that her methodological preference is to defend the transmitted text. The reader should not be disappointed by the briefness of remarks on the style, language and literary merits of *Sat.* in the introduction, as they receive proper treatment in the excellent introductory discussions of each episode within the commentary. But B. does not do full justice to Petronius' work when she dismisses the problem of the *Prosarhythmus* to a single footnote and declares that the study of rhythmical clausulae as part of editorial practice seems to her 'sehr unbefriedigend' (xii, n. 12). Vannini recently showed in his commentary on *Sat.* 100-15 that the rhythmical

properties of Petronius' text deserve at least a mention; would a heroic clausula not be *unbefriedigend* in the artful stream of Petronius' prose (cf., e.g. Vannini on 112.1 *uellet uiuere* vs. *uiuere uellet*)?

It is certainly useful for the reader to have the Latin text to accompany the commentary — unlike in Habermehl's book — but B.'s decision not to provide the reader with a critical apparatus is unfortunate, even though her meticulous discussions of the textual problems within the commentary always deserve the highest praise.

The list of the eighteen passages where B.'s text differs from Müller's Teubner edition precedes the text and translation (1). She has no new conjecture to offer. B.'s strategic decision to stay close to what the mss. have seems to me prudent, although at several points her Solomonic, all-embracing comments on competing textual variants made me think that a more unorthodox choice and departure from the mss. reading could be given a chance in the printed text. In the case of 2.1 'qui inter haec nutriuntur non magis sapere possunt quam bene olere qui in culina habitant', Salmasius' ingenious *coriaria* 'tannery' in place of *culina* (the reading of L and ϕ), deduced from B *coria* (P *curia*, R *choris*), and recognized by B. as noteworthy (39), would be a fine improvement, since *culina* is more banal and may be easily explained as a scribal emendation (relatively early — *culina* was apparently read by John of Salisbury) of the already corrupt *curia*, whereas it is harder to explain how *culina* could have become *curia* or *coria*. Similarly, B. is ready to admit that *de more* in 14.7 'cociones, qui ad clamorem confluerant, nostram scilicet de more ridebant inuidiam' is suspect, but she nevertheless prints it, though at the same time she suggests in her comment that 'qui ad clamorem <de more> confluerant, nostram scilicet [de more] ridebant inuidiam', as proposed by G. Ammannati (and independently by M. Zawadzka, *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009), 111–12), might be a desirable improvement (200). But it is in fact a merit of B.'s comprehensive commentary that it encourages such speculations, and I am sure that many readers will find her cautiousness laudable.

Perhaps the most controversial consequence of the somewhat dogmatic reverence with which B. approaches the text of the mss. is her decision to leave the poem from ch. 14 ('Quid faciunt leges, ubi sola pecunia regnat'), where L has it, i.e. after 13.4 '... ad interdictum ueniret' (Encolpius addressing Ascyrtus), instead of moving it, as with most editors, to follow Ascyrtus' response introduced by 'contra Ascyrtos leges timebat' (14.1/2). I agree with B. that the poem on money and justice is, contrary to how editors have preferred to see it, the narrator's comment on the episode rather than Ascyrtus' (181) — is this not much like Alan Price's song in Lindsay Anderson's *O Lucky Man!* ('We all want justice but you got to have the money to buy it')? — but still I am not convinced that this insertion should split up the dialogue between Encolpius and Ascyrtus, even if its first part is reported in indirect speech. B. has no comment on the 'contra' introducing Ascyrtus' response, and if she had had one, she would have noticed that elsewhere in *Sat.* the word is used to introduce a direct reaction to what precedes it (e.g. 14.6, 74.13) — so how can 'contra' come immediately after the poem to which what Ascyrtus says is not contrary?

However, it must be emphasized that the above remarks, dictated by my idiosyncratic belief that there is no commentary (and no translation) without an edition, do not do justice to B.'s work. Her commentary is a fine achievement: I never ceased to be impressed by the succinctness, erudition and instructiveness of her remarks on the polymorphic text of *Sat.*, regardless whether she comments on the poetry, rhetorical prose, court jargon or Petronian irony, on textual problems or on Petronius' sources and parallel texts, both Greek and Roman. I was helped to understand several passages which I had previously found difficult, and in several other cases I learned that I am not alone in my feelings of being lost. The more casual reader should keep in mind not to overlook the introductory mini-essays, with which the commentary on each episode begins by highlighting the main problems to be encountered. Additionally, they include suggestions for further reading.

The proofreading was good; the more serious errors which I noticed include $\pi\acute{o}\omega\tau\omicron\nu$ on p. 58, which should be $\pi\acute{o}\nu\tau\omicron\nu$, 'apud Graecos' unitalicized on p. 85, and spaces missing after the apostrophes in the Greek quotations on p. 150 (there is no such error elsewhere in the volume). The general index with which the book ends will surely be useful, but in this relatively small book — it comments on eleven pages of the Teubner text — for typically no small de Gruyterian price I would expect to find more than one index, which does not even include proper names.

To sum up, numerous enthusiasts of an inexhaustible source of fun and pleasure which we owe to Petronius will be grateful to B. for what her much-needed commentary on the relatively poorly

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 Lechaeum 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.