particularly successful example of his method; less convincing is his revisitation of Marti's theory (*AJPh* 66 [1945], 367–73) that Pompey is a stoic *proficiens*.

S. at times oversimplifies or seriously misrepresents the contribution of previous scholarship on the poem. Masters, for example, has achieved much more than simply 'indenturing him (sc. Lucan) to Caesar' (p. 141 n. 58). When the claim is made that 'close reading figures not much more prominently in the recent line of Lucan criticism than it did among its predecessors' (p. 1), one is reminded of Martha Davis's objection to Masters's own, equally spurious, claim ten years ago (*BMCR* 2004.03.25): it is outrageous in light of recent work such as Bartsch's book and M. Leigh's *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement* (Oxford, 1997). These statements might be expected as relics from the Ph.D. thesis from which the book originates, but in fact S. offers a more objective assessment of his position *vis-à-vis* the pre-1996 critical tradition on the poem in his dissertation (pp. v–vi). Overall, the revision process from thesis to book has been thoughtfully and admirably executed.

Disappointing in general is S.'s refusal to integrate the narrative voice of passages such as 7.641–6: there is clearly more to Lucan than just nihilism—'than the bleakly irrefutable x = not –x of Lucan's universe' (p. 134)—both at the heart of the narrative in Book 7 and elsewhere. One of the hallmarks of recent critical work on this poem (and other imperial literature) has been its attempt to accommodate multiple voices. In S.'s ultimately reductive reading, the promotion of one insistent narrative viewpoint discounts nuances some have considered vital to its overall meaning.

The real value of S.'s contribution to the study of Lucan lies in its detailed and sustained examination of the dynamics informing one important aspect of a larger, already known, phenomenon at work within the epic. Indeed, for advanced students, S. will be among the most accessible (although, perhaps, least provocative) of the book-length studies now available on the poem.

University of Otago P. A. ROCHE

PETRONIAN IMAGES

V. RIMELL: *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*. Pp. x + 239. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Cased, £45/US$60. ISBN: 0-521-81586-X.

R.'s book is about imagery binding the mass of the Satyricon together. Key elements are dark and claustrophobic holes (Quartilla's lair, Trimalchio's dining room, the Trojan horse, Bargates' lodging house, Lichas' ship . . .) which are thematic transformations of each other, animals, and eruptions and engulfings of metamorphic bodies overstuffed with food and/or literature. There is a constant erosion of the boundaries between inside and outside, eater and eaten. Latent cannibalism (and civil war) is always lurking in wait (one character after another embodies the Cyclops), and becomes metaphorically and potentially literal in Croton. The Satyricon itself, as its characters are too, is stuffed through gobbling up other texts.

There are good things in R.'s account. While she is strongly opposed to purely comic/entertainment readings, she is right to question what 'pure' comedy might be and raise the question of what kind of comedy this could be. R. is also strong on the way literature works in people: the story of the Widow of Ephesus, for example, enacts how any kind of storytelling is drenched in all sorts of already existing story patterns.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Again, the Circe episodes show intertextuality as social interaction and texts as brews of memories, feelings etc in reader's heads. There is also the way we, as readers, are forced to see the muddle through the medium of Encolpius, a medium too hopelessly contaminated with the rôle-playing author as well as his own literary diet to be trusted. R.'s treatment of the old issue of the integrity of the first person voice is a rather subtle one.

On the other hand, there are drawbacks to the emphasis on imagery. Inevitably some links will seem less convincing than others (a number seem very weak to me). Considerable attention ought to have been given to how much, and what sort of, textual exit velocity is needed for a metaphorical sense to burst out of the surface meaning's gravitational field, especially since the accumulative connections R. makes between cavities, corporeal elements, pourings both real and metaphorical, eating and all that pertains to it, and the provision or catching of food (and so on) are of central significance in her thesis, and it matters to what extent unifying factors pull against the constant variegation of the generic patchwork of the Satyricon. Given this, R.'s own metaphorizing style seems to me not to strengthen the case, but to be in danger of presupposing too much. Too much, for example, of the burden of reinforcing the suggestion that the ship is like the Cyclops' cave, and that this links in turn with Bargates' lodging-house, also an embodiment of the Cyclops' cave (and so on), is carried by repeated reference to Lichas' ship as 'the ship-cave'. Another example is the reference to the inkmarks on Encolpius' body as 'Eumolpus' writing experiments' (p. 142) in the context of arguing that poetry in the Satyricon (even though Encolpius is not the poet) can be dangerously self-revealing. Likewise, the reference to Eumolpus as Philomela's 'rival poet' (p. 175) is tendentious. This way of referring to elements of the text tends to conflate levels of argument, and the reader has to be careful to notice what, as R. might put it, he/she is swallowing.

There are two other issues which seem to me to require more explicit handling: the state of the text, and the conditions of composition and performance. First, the fragmentariness of the text is mentioned, but more could have been said (both for and against R.'s approach)—especially that, since the episodic and literary structuring of the Cena resembles that of the rest of the Satyricon, the impression of disjunct chunks of literature-based action given by the remaining fragments is not entirely due to their fragmentary state. Secondly, since we see almost no references backwards and (more importantly) no significant references forward at any point in the narrative, we may legitimately question how much planning was involved. Perhaps Petronius produced instalments. Perhaps it is part of the design that one need not have heard previous instalments; perhaps one did not need to hear subsequent ones. Such a possibility might allow rather different approaches to the connections between different parts and the relationships between the parts and the whole. I note, incidentally, that much is made of the idea that Eumolpus on board Lichas' ship is producing or acting out preparatory versions of the Civil War poem he recites on the way to Croton, and in particular the idea that that is the poem Eumolpus is described as composing while the ship is sinking. Upon this depends the idea that the Civil War poem is written inside a thematic embodiment of the Trojan horse (thus Troy contains the Civil War). I find this unconvincing: Petronius does not tell us what Eumolpus was composing in the storm and I have always assumed, though I cannot prove it, that it is an epic-style sea-storm description, suitably written in a sea storm.

R. criticizes Slater's reading (Niall W. Slater, *Reading Petronius* [Baltimore and London, 1990]), and other comic readings, a number of times. The difference is important, but ultimately I am not sure how different a game with no meaning (Slater)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press

actually turns out to be from a paradox with only reversible meaning (R. pp. 201–2). My own formulation would be that the Satyricon is an 'ontological game' where there is no reality, only representations of reality, but where some representations are nevertheless better than others, and there is a scale from the freedmen's clichés, through Trimalchio's jumble of half-baked learning and the heroes' literary posturings, to Petronius' ironic evasiveness (see F. Jones, 'Realism in Petronius' in H. Hofmann [ed.], *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 4 [1991], 105–20).

University of Liverpool F. JONES

SILVAE

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY (ed., trans.): *Statius:* Silvae. (Loeb Classical Library 206.) Pp. viii + 438, map. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99604-6.

It is a sign of renewed interest in Statius' *Silvae* that this new Loeb of the poems devotes an entire volume to them, unlike Mozley's 1928 Loeb, which includes the first four books of the *Thebaid.* Moreover, Shackleton Bailey's new volume is enriched by a full, detailed appendix, defending his textual emendations, and by a judicious discussion by Kathleen Coleman of literary criticism of the *Silvae* up to 2002, along with a detailed bibliography. These are valuable additions to the standard Loeb format, and make this Loeb a necessary addition to the library of scholars and students alike. Nonetheless, the dictum *caveat lector* comes to mind for three main reasons: the high number of emendations, the sometimes dismissive attitude towards Statius' poetic art, and infelicities in the translation.

First of all, Loeb editions are generally intended for readers who have neither the time nor the linguistic competence to devote to an Oxford Classical Text or Teubner. They are the staple of graduate students mastering a reading list for Ph.D. examinations, and of scholars in other fields seeking easy, informative access to classical texts. The majority of this volume's readers are unlikely therefore to be overly concerned about the more than 250 emendations that S.B. has introduced to the text of the *Silvae.* The Appendix provides a forum for S.B.'s sustained engagement with E. Courtney's 1990 Oxford text (as he acknowledges, many of the emendations were published earlier in *HSCPh* 91 [1987], 273–82). Given the notoriously poor state of the text's transmission—the *Silvae* descend from the sole copy (M) of the manuscript discovered by Poggio Bracciolini in 1417—the judgement of both these critics will remain in many instances open to continuing debate.

S.B. says he has been freer with emendations for the sake of the readability of his translation (p. 9). Yet, since he has a low opinion of Statius as a poet, his tendency to choose the less difficult reading sometimes leads him astray. For instance, at *Silv.* 1.2.228 he chooses Eden's conjecture *pampinea* for M's more recondite *minoa,* on the grounds that since, 'by one account', Bacchus placed his crown in the sky as the constellation Corona when Ariadne died, he is unlikely to be wearing that crown to a wedding (p. 57). S.B. does not give the source, yet in the fullest version of this myth, in Ovid's *Fasti* 3.459–516, Bacchus gives Ariadne a crown (one made originally by Vulcan for Venus) to celebrate their love; the crown then is hers, not his. Thus the adjective *minoa* in *Silv.* 1.2.228 can be understood not as a literal description of that crown, but

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press