

formal textuality as by lack of regard for it. The greatest single obstacle to stemmatic analysis of manuscript transmissions is the presence in a manuscript of readings drawn from more than one source (the phenomenon stigmatised by the term ‘contamination’); I suspect that the scribes who engaged in it did so more often in the hope of recovering a better text (i.e. one closer to the original) than from a wish to reshape a text to suit their own taste.

In his closing pages Z. throws out the intriguing suggestion that classical textual criticism’s preoccupation with recovering the lost original and its morally tinged vocabulary of ‘error’ and ‘corruption’ have their origin in the Protestant need for a secure text of sacred scripture. Protestantism may well have influenced the outlook of early stemmatic critics, but it was not responsible for the charged rhetoric to which Z. rightly calls attention. Long before Luther was born, Italian humanists had deployed a rich vocabulary of moral opprobrium in describing textual error, including terms such as *uitium*, *corruptio* and *deprauatio* (cf. S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* [Rome, 1973], pp. 219–26), and in doing so they were reflecting ancient practice.

The axiom that every classical text dictates the editorial method appropriate to its particular transmission is even more applicable to scholiastic texts than to canonical works of literature. The approach taken by Clausen and Z. to editing the *CC* cannot, therefore, be straightforwardly applied to the editing of other sets of scholia. But Z.’s distinction between a text (a coherent body of writing composed by a single author) and a process (an ongoing operation in which each set of scholia creates its own identity) could have implications for other texts of this kind. Z. himself has argued that the Virgil commentary of Servius is a text, while the notes that go under the name of Servius Auctus are part of a process of early medieval Virgilian commentary. To the extent that he is right – and in this area truth is more likely to be found in degrees than in either/or dichotomies – the effort to reconstruct a compiler’s text of Servius Auctus is likely to remain frustrated. More broadly, Z.’s clear-headed analysis of the issues involved in defining and editing the *CC* can indeed serve as a model of how to think about the problems raised by editing scholiastic texts.

Harvard University

RICHARD TARRANT
tarrant@fas.harvard.edu

THE *SILVAE*

RÜHL (M.) *Literatur gewordener Augenblick. Die Silven des Statius im Kontext literarischer und sozialer Bedingungen von Dichtung.* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 81.) Pp. x + 421. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006. Cased, €118, US\$159.30. ISBN: 978-3-11-019112-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X08000784

Statius’ five books of occasional verse, the *Silvae*, are emphatically not in the shade these days. Recent years have seen the appearance of important monographs (Nauta 2002, Newlands 2003, Zeiner 2005), a special issue of *Arethusa* (2007), a new Loeb edition (2003), and numerous articles and pieces in edited collections. To this list we now add R.’s well-focussed monograph (a revision of a 2004 dissertation). In general terms, R. reads the *Silvae* closely for evidence of the nature of the occasion

at issue and for the ways in which the occasion is in dynamic relation with the constructed figures of the poet and addressees. I will note here that R. discusses all the *Silvae* in detail with the exception of 5.4, the *Somnus* poem, which has no discernible occasion.

After introductory remarks, R. begins with a chapter on literary patronage. Defining the relationship between poet and patron as a form of *amicitia* in which reciprocal duties were fulfilled, R. sees the poet providing cultural capital (R. borrows concepts from Bourdieu here), which in turn enhances the social capital of the patron. R. illustrates these comments nicely with discussion of Tacitus' *Dialogus* and various letters of Pliny. Thereafter the book is divided into two large sections, and discussion of the *Silvae* begins in earnest. In the first section (Chapters 3 and 4), called 'Gelegenheit' ('Occasion'), R. discusses the nature of occasional poetry in the ancient world, makes remarks on the various occasions of the *Silvae*, and then embarks on a detailed discussion of the various *epicedia* we find in the *Silvae*. In this section R. makes a useful distinction between the obvious occasion of the poem and a hidden one. *Silvae* 5.1, for example, has as its obvious occasion commiseration with Abascantus on the death of his wife Priscilla. The hidden occasion is revealed by looking at the preface to this poem: it is not only an *epicedion*, it also sounds out Abascantus as a potential patron. Statius remarks: *sed quamvis propiorem usum amicitiae tuae iam pridem cuperem, mallet tamen nondum inuenisse materiam*. Indeed, R. does an excellent job throughout the book of reading the prefaces carefully with the poems and making many useful remarks on the basis of these comparisons.

In the next part of the book (Chapters 5 and 6), the focus shifts to the addressee somewhat artificially, as it is not always easy to separate addressee from occasion. In the fifth chapter ('Strategien der Freundschaftsdichtung'), R. lays out a number of different occasions and the way they function in the context of *amicitia*. These include the arrival of fatherhood, *symposia*, *ekphraseis*, *propemptika*, and the practice of poetry itself. Again, R. does a good job of revealing the existence of a hidden occasion in addition to the stated one. For example, the *ekphrasis* of lavish possessions or circumstances functions as a thank-you note for an invitation, but it also attests to the taste and distinction of the addressee and thereby increases his social capital. R. registers with precision differences between the characterisations of various addressees. Chapter 6 features lengthy discussion of three personages often addressed in the poems: Atedius Melior, Pollius Felix and Domitian. R. expertly reveals the differences in Statius' respective characterisations of his patrons. The 51 pages on the various ways Statius directly and indirectly addresses the emperor are most interesting. In poems concerned with Domitian, R. perceives two different first persons employed by Statius. Sometimes the poetic 'I' is nameless, wowed by imperial magnificence, while at other times it is the heir to Homer and Virgil, singing imperial praises from a position that has its own claim on honour and value. After interpretation of instances in which Statius addresses himself, the text proper of the book finishes with two summative chapters.

There are a bibliography and three indexes. The indexes (*rerum*, *nominum* and *locorum*) are spread over only five pages and are insufficient for a book of this length. Indeed, at only two pages and with half of the *loci* in the *Silvae*, the *index locorum* is jaw-droppingly short. In a book concerned with this most intertextual of poets and the literary scene attending the publication of his poetry, this is a source of concern. I also note that R. occasionally comes down pretty hard on politicised readings of the poetry (see, e.g., p. 333 with comments critical of Newlands, 2003). This is a mistake.

The *Silvae* are hardly univocal, and tendentious views that there is no critique of the absolute monarchy underestimate, at the very least, the polyvalence of this and any poetry at the point of its reception. Besides, do we really want to wall off Statius' thoroughgoing critique of absolute power in the *Thebaid* from the poetry that we read in the *Silvae*? I am not saying that long discussion of the *Thebaid* was necessary; but R.'s assertion (if generally through omission) that the language in the *Silvae* is uninvolved with the epic raises questions that are, at best, distractions. These reservations aside, this book is a worthy one for its thorough and sensitive coverage of the poems of the *Silvae* as occasional poetry performing various functions to the benefit of poet and patron alike.

Victoria University of Wellington

MARK MASTERSON
mark.masterson@vuw.ac.nz

THE *THEBAID* AND THE *AENEID*

GANIBAN (R. T.) *Statius and Virgil. The Thebaid and the Reinterpretation of the Aeneid*. Pp. x + 258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Cased, £50, US\$90. ISBN: 978-0-521-84039-2. doi:10.1017/S0009840X08000796

Intertextuality is currently a boom area in Statian studies, with especial interest being paid to the *Thebaid's* engagement with hitherto bypassed works such as Callimachus' *Aetia*. (See C. McNelis, *Statius' Thebaid and the Poetics of Civil War* [Cambridge, 2007].) G.'s decision to write a book on the *Thebaid's* use of the *Aeneid*, a long-established intertext, seems at first sight curiously conservative. However, it is vindicated by the results: new parallels are adduced, the significance of familiar ones re-examined, and provocative conclusions reached regarding Statian morality and politics.

Central to G.'s argument is the idea that the *Thebaid* is engaging with the *Aeneid*, or, more precisely, readings of the *Aeneid*. At times, the *Thebaid* evokes the optimistic Augustan reading of the *Aeneid*, where *pietas* is valued and cosmic order upheld, to set in relief its own nefarious, skewed world. At other times, it exploits ambivalent readings of the *Aeneid*, drawing attention to problem areas. By focussing upon the cracks in an Augustan reading, it reveals the problems of the Augustan voice, especially its moral presentation of kingship.

G. takes us through the *Thebaid* in roughly chronological order. The introductory section considers the Coroebus episode as a demonstration of how *pietas* fails and *clementia* succeeds. A disturbing view of kingship in the *Aeneid* and *Thebaid* emerges where *clementia* is a sign of tyranny. Chapter 2 argues that whereas Statius' predecessors were concerned with morality and the workings of *furor*, the *Thebaid's* interest lies in the creation and description of the *nefas* in which that *furor* results. Attention is well paid to the poetics of *nefas*, the urge to have and see the criminal action unfold, and the conflicting responses of excitement and revulsion thereby aroused. Chapter 3 explores ways in which horror is created. Not only do readers foresee the coming disasters through the prophecies but, through intertextuality, the inevitability of these events is brought home. The characters, by contrast, ignore the divine warnings and are unaware of their intertextual associations. Chapter 4 shows how Hypsipyle starts off as an Aeneas figure but ends up akin to Aeneas'