broad issues and the philosophical background of Ovid's cosmogony at 1.5–88. He then turns to analysis in detail of five shorter sections (5–20, 21–31, 32–51, 52–75, 76–88), in which he addresses himself to local details of text and interpretation. This pattern serves him very well once we are embarked upon the sea of myths that make up the poem. For these the introductory section deals with sources, and Ovid's own combinations or inventions, and the sub-sections serve to appraise the treatment. (Some smaller sections are, however, dealt with under both aspects together.) G. is alert to the poet's style, and has many helpful analyses (e.g. on p. 1348, the virtuosity of the description of Midas' golden touch). I offer only one observation, regarding 11.610 *torus . . . ebeno* (pp. 1385–6): this use of the ablative of material (or description) is less forced than G. supposes, for it was a mannerism of Virgil's (see e.g. Williams on *Aen.* 3.663 *abiete puppis*), picked up by other authors (see Hofmann-Szantyr 107).

Paduano's translation reads well, but is sometimes a bit loose: at 11.434 *incommendataque tellus omnis* is rendered by 'non c'è piú terra che non sia loro [referring to the stormwinds]' (though to be fair I have no clue how to convey the flavour of the *hapax incommendata*). Sometimes P. is not translating the text printed: for example, at 11.233 *operta* seems to be translated rather than *opertum*, and at 266 he takes Peleus as vocative. I do have one *zetema*: like most translators, P. renders 3.405 *sic amet ipse licet* as a wish, which is undeniably the sense of the rest of the sentence (*sic non potiatur amato*), but it really cannot be the sense of the first part with *licet*. What, then, does that first part mean? The logic of the Latin eludes me.

No one will be sorry to own this fine book.

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

STATIUS AT SORRENTO

A. KRÜGER: *Die lyrische Kunst des Publius Papinius Statius in Silvae II 2. Villa Surrentina Pollii Felicis*. Pp. 263. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1998. ISBN: 3-631-33077-4.

Krüger's title echoes H. Cancik's important *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius* (Hildesheim, 1965); indeed, the author notes his debt to Cancik and his work in his preface. However, K.'s book on *Silvae* 2.2, which deals with the villa of Pollius Felix on the Bay of Naples above the Marina di Puolo, is marred by a prevailing tendency towards idiosyncrasies, even though there are within it various valuable discussions of particular passages and issues.

The book's layout is curious. A substantial introduction to Statius and the poem is followed by a long section, 'Die gedankliche Einheit' (pp. 63–147), offering what is effectively a line-by-line reading of the poem. 'Die formale Einheit' (pp. 147–74) contains a series of increasingly elaborate structural analyses, followed by some unconvincing discussions of sound effects; scarcely encouraging is an example such as the pairing of ll. 11 and 13, where (p. 165) K. sees an assonance effect between *flectere* and *sed iuuere*, with no regard for the difference between long penultimate vowel in *iuuere* and the short penultimate in *flectere*. There are then sections on textual points (most to do with interepretation rather than textual criticism *tout court*), dating and topography, the symbolic landscape of the Bay of Naples, and the cultural background of *Silv.* 2.2. No formal conclusion is offered, though the book does end strongly with

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.105 Published online by Cambridge University Press

its discussion of tensions between *Polliuskult* and *Kaiserkult*, a discussion now well complemented by C. Newlands's recent exploration of similarities between Pollius' subjugation of nature and imperial power in her *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 174–91.

In terms of bibliography, K. refers to van Dam's commentary on *Silvae* 2 (Leiden, 1984), but there is no mention of the commentaries of Laguna on *Silvae* 3 (Madrid and Seville, 1992) or Coleman on *Silvae* 4 (Oxford, 1988). These omissions are all the more regrettable in the light of K.'s inclusion of excursuses dealing with poems from these books in the course of his treatment of *Silv*. 2.2. To give but one example of opportunities K. has missed: in his discussion (p. 214) of *Silv*. 4.5.10–12, consultation of Coleman would have strengthened K.'s interesting suggestion that the birds in this passage could be nightingales (more useful than his odd hypothesis that the nightingales reflect Statius himself singing about Alba Longa!), since Coleman cites Longus 3.12.1–2, a passage where nightingales have to remember how to sing after a long silence. Throughout the book, the transcription of English quotations is erratic (e.g. 'creatur', 'ist', 'ony', 'vers', and, most strikingly, 'wine steam' (*bis*), all on p. 183).

K.'s penchant for bibliographical references to such figures as Wagner and Th. Mann in itself is innocuous, but betokens what is, in general, an overly aesthetic approach to the text (for an impressive exception, see pp. 49–52, where K. discusses how romanticization of the Bay of Naples has coloured criticism of the poem). There is therefore a good deal of biographical criticism, and, inevitably, generalizing assertions. Thus we learn of Statius' intellectual crisis of identity (pp. 17–20), while, on p. 228, the suggestion that the poem was thought up in the setting of a *conuiuium* is unobjectionable, but the rider 'scilicet im Vollrausch' is surely unnecessary. K. also favours abstract observations such as 'Die Mythologie in der statianischen Lyrik ist modern, "real", also areligiös, im Gegensatz zu der archaischen Götterwelt des Horaz, die in die romantische Konzeption seiner Naturlyrik, welche die moderne Zivilisation ausschließt, eingebunden ist' (p. 28), symptomatic of a more general oversimplification of lines of demarcation between Augustan *Klassizismus* and Statius. Sometimes this leads to bizarre results, as on p. 222: 'Können sich Bewohner in Räumen, die mit phantastischen Bildern geschmückt sind, zu Hause fühlen, wenn sie nicht selbst (zumindest ein bißchen) "verruckt" waren?'

But there are good things as well: thus on p. 109 K. suggests that the name Megalia (2.2.80) may reflect the simile at *Iliad* 15.615–21, while on pp. 195–6 he usefully draws attention to Statius' deliberate omission of a major topographical feature of the Bay of Naples, Mt Vesuvius. Pp. 189–90 contain an interesting argument for dating the poem to the late autumn of 90 A.D., on the basis of Statius' mention of shadows being cast on the water in *Silv.* 2.2.48–9 and K.'s own autopsy of shadows cast in the Marina di Puolo at different times of the year. There is also much useful sustained analysis throughout of Statius' exploitation of similarities between Pollius, Apollo, and Hercules (and also Orpheus), and between Polla and Venus, though K.'s insistence that the 'dominis ambobus' of l. 107 are not Pollius and Polla, but simply 'Pollius als Hercules und Neptun' (p. 134; see also the irritatingly separated discussion of the same point on p. 184 as well!) is not convincing; K. should have noted van Dam's parallels for *domini* signifying husband and wife.

This book does contribute to Statian scholarship, but its readers must be tolerant and cautious.

University of Liverpool BRUCE GIBSON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.105 Published online by Cambridge University Press