familiar tales of library foundations and burning of banned books, and observes that in the *HN* the collection of knowledge is often an imperial prerogative or imperially sponsored. M. therefore suggests that there was a tension between Pliny the polymath encyclopaedist and Pliny the imperial courtier (or 'career civil servant'): where Pliny professes ignorance this can 'only [be accounted for by] the polite assumption on Pliny's part that his own power of vision did not extend as far as Caesar's eye'. At the same time Pliny, for M., uses the imperial imprimatur of his dedication to Titus to 'claim . . . imperial power and authority for his book'.

M.'s reading is acute, though it opens wider questions about intellectual life under the Flavians. Was his postulated imperial control of the sources and organization of knowledge ever completely successful? Book-collecting was what Pliny did on a grand scale; in M.'s second chapter we see him presenting himself as one of Cicero's idealized literary aristocrats in a world of exchange and liberality, perhaps in opposition to the unlettered collectors lampooned by Petronius and Seneca. The way lies open to ask whether Pliny's self-presentation was part of a broader social discourse on the collection, ownership, and use of knowledge, and here Pliny's own nephew and heir, who combined an independent senatorial cultural identity with imperial loyalty, might have been a useful comparandus.

This moves beyond the scope of M.'s book, though, which offers a valuable way of reading Pliny's geographical and ethnographical material, and which will be particularly useful to those interested in the history of ideas in the Roman empire and the cultural life of the Flavian epoch. It is attractive and well written, and its index (everything from Cato the Younger to Oscar Wilde, via cheese, giraffes, and unicorns) is indicative of the charming ποικιλία that can make books on Pliny such a pleasure to read.

The Queen's College, Oxford MATTHEW NICHOLLS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni299

STATIUS

D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed., trans.): *Statius:* Thebaid*, Books 1–7*. Introduction, Text, and Translation. (Loeb Classical Library 207.) Pp. viii + 459. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-01208-9.

D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed., trans.): *Statius:* Thebaid*, Books 8–12*. Achilleid. Text, Translation, and Indexes. (Loeb Classical Library 498.) Pp. vi + 441. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-01209-7.

C. S. Ross: *Publius Papinius Statius: The* Thebaid*. Seven against Thebes*. Translated with an Introduction. Pp. xl + 386. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. Cased, £39.50. ISBN: 0-8018-6908-0.

Mozley's 1928 Loeb edition of the Statian corpus took up 1203 pages in two volumes; this edition takes up 1352 pages in three volumes, with the first devoted only to the

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni300 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Silvae.[1] Buyers may not be at first convinced that the extra pages justify the extra volume, especially when they notice that Mozley's text is slightly easier to read with twenty-six lines in 4″ as opposed to S. B.'s twenty-eight. They may, however, be mollified by the inclusion of a superb essay on recent scholarship by Kathleen Coleman with full bibliography (pp. 9–37). This is a most thorough and judicious account and will be of incalculable value to future scholarship. Mozley's edition had no index; S. B. has two indexes of proper names, one for the *Thebaid*, the other for the *Achilleid*.

R.'s beautifully presented translation starts with a very full and learned introduction, but one interested primarily, though not exclusively, in the history of the *Thebaid*'s reception by and influence on European literature. It is, however, by the translation that this work will be judged. R. believes that the *Thebaid* 'has received less attention than it deserves, in large part because there has been no accessible, dynamic translation of the work into English'. According to the dust cover, by casting the work into 'a lively iambic pentameter more natural to the modern ear' R. hopes to be free 'from the archaic formality that has limited previous translations'. However, not all readers will find the relentless unvarying five-beat lines (examples below) either attractive or representative of Statius' more subtle versification; though he is aware of the problem (p. xxxvii).

An edition by S. B. will provoke an expectation of challenging emendations. First, however, readers will need to come to terms with a very idiosyncratic way of reporting emendation. *Theb.* 2.3 offers a typical example. The apparatus reads 'turbidus P_S *(Baehrens)*: turpi- *cod. saec xi*'. S. B.'s text reads *torpidus*. As a brief account of the tradition and of how it is presented in this edition reveals (p. 5), S. B. means by this that all manuscripts read *turbidus*, except for one that reads *turpidus*, but that he wishes to accept Baehrens's *torpidus*. The physical separation of the emendator from his emendation is quite unsettling. As for the emendation, though it is clear that the familiar sense of *turbidus*, 'turbulent', is inappropriate here, nevertheless *OLD* s.v. 2b alludes to this passage together with several others where, of air and liquids, *turbidus* means 'murky', a meaning S. B. himself accepts for the word at 4.763, and which is perfectly acceptable here. When S. B. wishes to report an emendation that he does not admit into his text his practice then is conventional: he reports the proposal in the apparatus followed by the emendator's name not in parentheses. It does, however, seem counter-intuitive to parenthesize the favoured emendator's name, but not the rejected one's. Lastly, on emendation, consider 2.69–70. S. B.'s apparatus reads 'nec . . . nec Pω (*SB*^{1}: sed . . . sed *Dubner*)'; the text reads *nec . . . sed*. From this we are supposed to work out that the paradosis is *nec . . . nec*, that Dubner suggested *sed . . . sed*, and that S. B. is emending to *nec . . . sed*. (*SB*^{1} in the apparatus refers not to two manuscripts but to an article by the editor.)

But most readers of these books will not share S. B.'s enthusiasm for emendations and will ignore them, especially those reported but rejected; it is, incidentally, not always easy to see why some rejected emendations are reported while others are not. Overwhelmingly, Loeb readers will require assurance that the text is sound and competently translated. In its day, Mozley's was the best text of Statius available. It was founded on Klotz's 1908 Teubner but improved in slight but numerous respects. Since then, much further work has been devoted to the text and S. B. has been

[1]Reviewed by Carole Newlands, *CR* 54 (2004), 405–7.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni300 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assiduous in taking advantage of it. The text is basically reliable, but readers will want to look out for speculative emendation.

Mozley's translation was reasonably accurate but stilted and old fashioned even in 1928. The opening lines, for instance, begin:

> My spirit is touched by Pierian fire to recount the strife of brethren, and the battle of the alternate reign fought out with impious hatred, and all the guilty tale of Thebes. Whence, O goddesses, do ye bid me begin?

S. B.'s version goes thus:

> Pierian fire falls upon my soul: to unfold fraternal warfare, and alternate reigns fought for in unnatural hate, and guilty Thebes. Where do you command me to begin, goddesses?

R. offers:

> My mind takes Pierian fire. Fraternal strife
> unfolds: unholy hatred, alternating reigns,
> the criminality of Thebes. How far,
> O goddesses, should I go.

All three translators start with the Pierian fire (though none explains what it is in spite of their quite frequent explanatory notes), whereas Statius himself starts with *fraternas acies*, which gives a quite different emphasis. His *menti calor incidit* is a very much more natural image than S. B.'s 'Pierian fire falls upon my soul'. Mozley's 'My spirit is touched by Pierian fire' gains nothing by substituting the passive for the active, though 'touch' is better for the more nearly dead metaphor of *incidit* than S. B.'s much more live one of 'falls upon'; and Mozley's 'spirit' seems slightly better for *menti* than does S. B.'s 'soul'. Better still is R.'s 'mind'; like Mozley, he offers in 'takes fire' a fairly dead metaphor and, also like Mozley, he makes *menti* rather than *calor* the subject of the sentence. On the other hand, S. B.'s 'fraternal warfare' for *fraternas acies* clearly discloses the fact that this is to be an epic of war and not some lesser conflict as suggested by Mozley's 'strife of brethren' (leaving aside the unwelcome archaism) or R.'s 'fraternal strife'. Perhaps in an attempt to restore the notion of warfare, Mozley adds to *alternaque regna* by rendering it as 'the battle of the alternate reign'; S. B. and R. do not follow this gratuitous addition and they also preserve the plural of *alternaque regna*; none explains the phrase. *profanis . . . odiis* suggests something sacrilegious well caught by Mozley's 'impious hatred' or R.'s 'unholy hatred', whereas S. B.'s 'unnatural hate' has quite different connotations. On the other hand, S. B.'s 'unfold' for *euoluere* does not obscure the special associations of that word as Mozley's 'recount' does. R.'s unconnected 'Fraternal strife unfolds' divorces the 'unfolding' both from the poet as subject and from *acies*, *regna* and *Thebas* as objects. Finally, S. B.'s 'Where do you command me to begin, goddesses?' is an obvious improvement over Mozley's 'Whence, O goddesses, do ye bid me begin?'. R.'s 'How far, O goddesses, should I go?' obscures the fact that the issue is 'from how far back?'.

Compare too the renderings of 5.588–94, when Hypsipyle first discovers the death of the infant Opheltes. Mozley:

> And now the unhappy Lemnian, wandering o'er the fields when the place was rid of the serpent, grows pale to behold on a low mound afar the herbage stained with streams of blood.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni300 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Thither frantic in her grief she hastens, and recognizing the horror falls as though lightning-struck on the offending earth, nor in the first shock of ruin can find speech or tears to shed . . .

S. B.:

> And now the hapless Lemnian wanders through the fields, now that the place is rid of the serpent, and at the top of a small distant knoll she pales to see grass stained with bloody dews. Hither she tears, wild with her heavy grief, and recognizes the tragedy. Dashed to the guilty earth like a thunderbolt, she found no words or tears in the first onset of disaster.

R.:

> Already the unhappy Lemnian
> had wandered over many fields in which
> the serpent once had dwelled; then she beheld
> not far away, a grass knoll stained with blood.
> Carried away by grief, her face grown pale,
> she hurried there, and when she recognized
> the tragedy, she tumbled, thunderstruck,
> on the offending earth, incapable
> of weeping or of speaking . . .

The 'unhappy' of Mozley and R. seems much better than S. B.'s 'hapless' for *infelix*, a word rich with associations. Mozley's 'o'er' for *super* would be better than S. B.'s 'through' but for the archaism; better still is R.'s 'over'. But S. B.'s 'now that' catches the sense implicit in the ablative absolute *pererratis . . . campis* better than Mozley's 'when'. R. loses cause and effect altogether. Mozley's 'low mound' is surely better than S. B.'s 'small knoll' for *modico . . . aggere*, especially since *agger* could not be classified as an especially poetic word. R. omits *modico, super*, and *roribus*; he translates *longe* 'not far away' and connects *aggere* (like S. B. 'knoll') with *herbas*. Mozley's 'herbage stained with streams of blood' for *sanguineis infectas roribus herbas* substitutes rivers for dew as S. B.'s 'grass stained with bloody dews' does not. And 'grass' is surely to be preferred to 'herbage' for *herbas*. Mozley's 'hastens' for *cursum rapit* seems too grandiloquent, S. B.'s 'tears' too colloquial. Why not 'hurried' with R.? Mozley's 'recognizing the horror' for *agnoscitque nefas* may not fully catch *nefas* but it is surely better than 'recognized the tragedy' the solution both of S. B. and of R. Mozley's 'as though lightning struck' is surely wrong for *fulminis in morem*; S. B. gets it right with 'like a thunderbolt'. The sense must be that Hypsipyle falls to the guilty (*nocenti*) earth like an avenging thunderbolt. R.'s 'tumbled, thunderstruck' is quite wrong. I still prefer Gossage's *funeris . . . fulmine* 'like a dead body . . . at the first shock'. S. B.'s translation is fresher than Mozley's and less burdened with archaism; R.'s version is frequently further from the Latin than either of the other two; but each one can outdo the others from time to time.

Newcastle upon Tyne D. E. HILL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni300

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni300 Published online by Cambridge University Press