presents material both on Statius and Silius, and on the Medieval and Renaissance periods.

Most of these essays are characterized by elements Narducci would seem to approve of: they are logically sound, accurate, methodologically clear, and well versed in the enormous bibliography on Lucan, as is shown in abundant notes. But for the most part they are also rather unexciting, and in some cases forbidding. One may question, for instance, the relevance for this book of an enormous article about Lucan in Medieval epic (sixty-four pages, including 214 notes and seven pages of separate bibliography), or the practical use of what appears to be a long prepublication (twenty-six pages) of a part of a commentary on Book 9, no matter how welcome such a commentary will prove to be.

This brings me to some concluding remarks. *Interpretare Lucano* obviously wants to oppose postmodern interpretations of Lucan and show how he should be interpreted, namely, according to the established norms of classical ('continental'?) philology. But is this really a convincing and fruitful opposition? Somehow one cannot help feeling uneasy about the whole project. Certainly, some excesses of postmodernism in recent Lucanean studies qualify for correction (I could not agree more). But for one thing, these studies have unquestionably rekindled interest in Lucan and brought new life to Lucanean scholarship. Whether the more traditional approaches exemplified in this collection of essays will produce similar inspiring effects remains to be seen.

A new civil war of 'postmodernists' against 'traditionalists' serves no purpose. It would be a pity if parties took positions opposite one another without seriously entering into dialogue. Gradually advancing knowledge through syntheses of apparent contrasts—is this not what scientific interpretation of texts is all about? Such forms of synthesis are, in fact, quite possible. To give just one example: the seemingly antique scholarly genre of a scientific commentary, not very popular among postmodernists, in fact offers a suitable model for approaches that combine sound philological tradition and present-day interests. (So let us not make civil war, but commentaries!)

Interpretare Lucano is, like all collections of essays, of uneven quality, but it will be useful to all Lucanean scholars. Particularly, the comprehensive essays by Esposito and Narducci may be called indispensable, the former for its broad survey of recent scholarship, the latter for its polemical discussion of what interpreting Lucan should be. We may be sure that the discussion will not end here.

University of Nijmegen VINCENT HUNINK

STATIUS' SOURCES AND STRUCTURES

F. DELARUE: *Stace, poète épique: Originalité et cohérence.* (Bibliothèque d'Études Classiques, 20.) Pp. viii + 453. Leuven and Paris: Éditions Peeters, 2000. Paper. Belg. frs. 2000. ISBN: 2-87723-494-0 (France), 90-429-0861-0 (Leuven).

During the past decade French scholars such as Franchet d'Espèrey, Georgacopoulou, Lesueur, Ripoll, and Taisne have established a sound reputation for their scholarship on Statius. *Stace, poète épique* confirms the standing of Fernand Delarue as one of these important authorities. Originally submitted in the traditional French form of a massively long doctoral thesis in 1990, this monograph has a long genesis

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.70 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in various articles written in the 1970s and 1980s. It consists of an introduction (pp. v–viii) and two parts, each of which contains six chapters and a conclusion.

The first part (pp. 3–187) examines the originality of Statius and how he locates himself in relation to his predecessors, adapts and alludes to their works, and uses their material in the composition of his epics. In the first chapter, D. discusses the references in the *Silvae* to Statius and his development as a poet (pp. 3–39). The second, third, and fourth chapters discuss the influence of Homer (pp. 41–59), Virgil (pp. 41–89), and Lucan (pp. 91–116), respectively. Although Statius borrows heavily from Homer, particularly in the battle scenes of the *Thebaid*, he does not reproduce the spirit of the *Iliad.* Similarly, while Statius owes much to the *Aeneid* in the basic conception of the *Thebaid*, there is also much that distinguishes his epic from its predecessor. The pervasive influence of Lucan is apparent from the beginning of the *Thebaid* when Tisiphone inspires the rivalry of Eteocles and Polynices for the Theban throne. D. observes that it is possible for Statius, while re-establishing the gods removed by Lucan from Roman epic, to engage with him and Virgil to describe a conflict that evokes both the memory of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey and the conflict between Aeneas and Turnus. Callimachus (pp. 117–40) and Seneca (pp. 141–76) are the subjects of the fifth and sixth chapters, respectively. Callimachus' influence is evident especially in the Nemea episode. The tragic themes and philosophical ideas of Seneca are the major sources of inspiration behind the *Thebaid*'s conception and are the basis of its unity; the mythological epic of the *Thebaid*, which narrates the unfolding of the curse of Oedipus, constitutes the counterpart of the Senecan mythological tragedy.

The second part (pp. 191–432) examines the thematic and structural unity of the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid.* The seventh chapter compares and contrasts the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid* (pp. 191–231), especially their pathetic and ethical elements. The eighth chapter discusses topics such as the prologue and epilogue, and the question of whether the *Thebaid* is an epic without a hero (pp. 233–54). Chapters IX, X, and XI examine the rôle of the supernatural (pp. 255–87) and the unifying themes of *furor* (pp. 289–327) and *humanitas* (pp. 329–79) in the *Thebaid.* Most scholars of the *Thebaid* have emphasized the injustice and malevolence of the Olympian deities, especially Jupiter. Although D. acknowledges that the autocratic Jupiter at times appears as a terrifying deity, he agrees essentially with those critics who shape their view of the *Thebaid* according to the concept of retribution and guilt; his view that Jupiter's punishment of man is just and that the major theme of epic concerns human responsibility is consistent with the traditional interpretation. D. also interprets the suggested identifications of Theseus with Domitian and with Jupiter favourably, despite Theseus' destructive rôle and unfavourable associations. The final chapter examines the composition of the *Thebaid*, including its structure (pp. 381–414).

D. acknowledges that it is possible for a myth to take on a new sense and for a poet to speak of universal and contemporary problems through a Greek fable. But according to him, the *Thebaid* is only poetry, not reality, and is certainly not a political epic. While D. agrees that Statius' description of a humane and compassionate Clementia constitutes a political programme relevant to the needs of the Roman citizenry, he refutes the notion that the engagement of Statius is political as well as poetic. He dismisses without serious consideration the possibility that Statius used the myth of Oedipus to comment critically upon the principate, an idea that in my view lies at the core of the *Thebaid*'s conception; nor does he mention the possible political implications of the *Achilleid.*

Stace, poète épique is a major work of Statian scholarship. The chapters on Callimachus' influence upon Statius and the intertextual relationship between the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.70 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thebaid and the *Achilleid* are invaluable discussions that will pave the way for further treatment of these topics. (Sections from D.'s thesis on the influence of Horace and Ovid upon Statius, which unfortunately were omitted from this published version, seem to me to be potentially important contributions to Statian studies.) Although reduced in size and scope from its original form, *Stace, poète épique* contains the most wide-ranging discussion of Statius' epic technique yet published.

University of Otago WILLIAM J. DOMINIK

STATIUS' THEOLOGY

C. CRIADO: *La teología de la* Tebaida *Estaciana: El anti-virgilianismo de un clasicista.* (Spudasmata, 75.) Pp. 268. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2000. Paper, DM 68. ISBN: 3-487-11058-X.

Literary criticism of the *Thebaid* of Statius has been the domain largely of American, British, German, French, and Italian scholars. *La teologia de la Tebaida Estaciana* has been written against the largely philological tendencies of the Spanish classical academy. In this monograph Cecilia Criado mainly examines non-Virgilian elements of Statius' theological conception in the *Thebaid.*

The Introduction (pp. 3–17) includes a useful review of the scholarly reception and treatment of the *Thebaid.* In Chapter I (pp. 19–139) C. argues that Statius' adaptation of the divine machinery of the *Aeneid* is confined to particular episodes and details, and that the poet derives his material from the whole of Greek epic and tragedy as well as Ovid, Lucan, and Seneca. The *Thebaid* is characterized on the human level by the ineffectuality of the Olympian deities, who are superseded by the active agency of the infernal ones. Chapter II (pp. 141–230) not only explores the rôles of Jupiter and the Furies, but also attempts to situate the cosmic and moral worlds of the *Thebaid* in the literary and philosophical traditions; these worlds consist of the tragedy of Homeric and Euripidean fate, the theodicy and fatalism of Lucan, the providentness of Seneca, and the theology of Ovid. C. demonstrates that the vengeful actions of Jupiter are inconsistent with his Stoic pretensions, which means that, instead of being a Stoic representative of providence, as some scholars have maintained, he displays tendencies reminiscent of an autocrat.

C. maintains that Statius considerably increases the rôle of the Olympian deities in comparison with Greek tragedy by using Homer and especially Virgil as his models to rewrite the Theban myth and to give it a Virgilian appearance. But at the same time she believes that critical interpretation of the *Thebaid* has suffered from the tendency of scholars to read the *Thebaid* from the aesthetic, theological, and philosophical perspective of the *Aeneid*. Rather than the epic models of Homer and Virgil, the tragic model of Seneca explains the nature of the divine world in the *Thebaid.* The dominance of the infernal divinities in the epic is in accordance with the universe portrayed by Seneca and Lucan; evil is perpetrated not only by underworld divinities and human characters, but also by Olympian gods, notably Jupiter. The emphasis on *furor* and subsequently on *pathos* defines the nature of divine intervention in human affairs in the *Thebaid*; the pathetic quality of the epic is both tragic and Stoic in appearance since *pathos* is a quality that appears widely in literary and philosophical texts.

This study features an insightful analysis of Statius' representation of Jupiter and its implications for a contemporary political interpretation. C. asserts that critics have presupposed the Stoic identification of Jupiter with the Stoic concepts of *fatum* and

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.70 Published online by Cambridge University Press