

(then) four days' not 'for three or four days', but see *OLD* 'et' 3 on such expressions; 263 on 'temet' in Seneca, S. could usefully have considered other cases and pronouns with '-met' suffix; 267 'diuitis pauper est' is double-cretic, not ditrochaeus).

The commentary is preceded by text and facing translation. For the text, recent editors have generally adopted their own paragraphing, but S. makes each of the traditional numbered sections an individual paragraph; this enables easy alignment of the text and translation, but arguably gives undue prominence to section divisions that are not Seneca's and can obscure the structure of his argument. The text is based on Reynolds' *OCT*, but diverges in a number of places, principally where Reynolds resorts to cruces or obeli, but S. prints a conjecture giving continuous sense. Some of the conjectures are her own: 15.4 'quaslibet ex his elige, usurpa faciles' seems somewhat self-contradictory, 'choose any of them you like, use easy ones' (Watt's conjectures at *RhM* 144 (2001), 231, are overlooked); 15.8 'id est latus' may lie behind the manuscripts, but it seems a very pedestrian explanation for Seneca, perhaps better regarded as a gloss; 15.8 'mediocritatem habeat nec hoc' is possible; 19.6 'oportet' arguably introduces an unwanted idea of obligation.

S. explains that the apparatus criticus 'largely restricts itself to listing conjectures and alternative readings that are discussed in the commentary' (xxxviii). It does not help the clarity of the apparatus that separate entries related to the same line of Latin are separated only by a letter space, or that manuscript 'v' in the introduction becomes 'u' in the apparatus. Then there are a few mistakes, e.g. (references here by S.'s page and line numbers): 6.74 Buecheler proposed 'aurae ferendos', not 'aurae referendos'; 18.41 (and commentary at 133–4) on 'quoque te' is confused, because 'vulg.' in Reynolds' apparatus is misunderstood to refer to manuscripts (rather than printed editions); 34.29 '*** ω' would seemingly mean that the manuscripts indicate a lacuna, which they do not; 36.43 'in ipso culmine' is Capps's conjecture, not Gummere's; 46.54 lists conjectures, but not the manuscript reading.

S.'s intention is 'to produce a translation that gives an accurate picture of the original Latin (for a different approach that resulted in an immensely readable translation, see Graver/Long 2015)' (xxxviii). However, Graver/Long (G./L.) regularly give a clearer picture of the original Latin than S., e.g. early in the first letter: 13.1 'satis aduersus fortunam placebas tibi' is rendered by S. 'you stood your ground against fortune'; better G./L. 'you felt that you were doing quite well against fortune'; 13.3 'sed subsiluisti et acrior constitisti' becomes 'but you have gained your strength and fought back harder', G./L. 'you have jumped up and stood still more boldly on your feet'; 13.7 'iniuria' is surely 'injury' (G./L.) rather than 'injustice'; 13.8 'exiit castris' is not just 'put to flight' but 'forced (them) to abandon camp'.

The book concludes with bibliography, general index and very full index locorum, increasing the usefulness of what is overall a valuable contribution both to Senecan studies, and to the study of the Latin letter-book.

University of St Andrews
hmh@st-andrews.ac.uk

HARRY HINE

doi:10.1017/S0075435822000880

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

ERIK GUNDERSON, *THE ART OF COMPLICITY IN MARTIAL AND STATIUS: THE EPIGRAMS, SILVAE, AND DOMITIANIC ROME*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. viii + 409. ISBN 9780192898111. £90.00.

Erik Gunderson's confident new book seeks a perceptive reader attuned to the complex relationship between aesthetics and politics. In Martial's *Epigrams* and Statius' *Silvae*, politics and art can never be 'tidily separated' (3); rather, power-and-poetry coalesce into a fundamental dyad. G. analyses the protean relationship between this pair, in conversation with other concepts including freedom and constraint, form and content, poet-and-prince, as part of a larger argument against becoming a complicit reader. His metapoetic, theoretically informed readings follow specific routes through the texts, offering a chronological overview of Martial and thematic approach to Statius. G. demonstrates how both poets practise an 'art of complicity', speaking to, and about, power and the powerful. Martial and Statius emulate the absolute power of Caesar and their praise poetry allows them to

achieve their own poetic ambitions; their ideal reader submits to the power of both poet and Caesar. While the power of Martial's poetry is unrecoverable after the death of Domitian, Statius becomes a 'consummate artist of complicity' (25). This witty, expansively argued book is sure to become essential reading for those interested in Domitianic poetry and how to write successfully under a tyrannical regime.

Ch. 2 charts a chronological journey through Martial's *Epigrams*, and G. argues for 'both ... and' rather than 'either ... or'. Martial is both poet and poetic persona, Martial and 'Martial', at the centre of his poetry; his poetry is fact and fiction; Caesar is his ideal reader, but also a showman like the artist himself. G. warns against becoming the complicit reader of *Epigram* 1.1 (*lector studioso*, *Ep.* 1.1.4), for this is a non-critical reader who allows for the creation of non-political poetry, and we must be smarter than that. In launching a poetic project that already has a complicit reader and a famous author, Martial initiates a playful poetry whose Callimachean scope provides a contrast to Caesar's greatness. Throughout his *Epigrams*, the portrait of power is never simple or singular, but rather constantly shifting. Ganymede serves as allegory and not allegory, a 'Domitianic tic' linked to the narrator's sense of self and his project (47). Martial is the unharmed rabbit in the lion's maw (Book 1), but also the lion, spectator and editor; the lion both belongs to Caesar and is Caesar himself (50). G.'s chronological arrangement allows us to see Caesar the Master Censor become the Great General of Book 5, the Obscene Father of Book 6, a frightening figure in Book 8, the addressee of Martial's humble suppliant books, a conqueror similar to a god, a master whom the immortals might envy. Particulars of the historical context and the realities of court life emerge piecemeal, although Domitian's decree ending castration has especial relevance for G.'s analysis of Domitian's pet, the eunuch slave boy Earinus. In Book 9, the issues associated with the emperor become associated with the poet, culminating with Earinus and a 'discourse of castration' (118). Earinus offers a lock of hair as a substitute *depositio barbae* celebrating a transition into manhood, but he will never become 'a real man': as subjected subjects of Domitian, Martial implies, we have all been castrated (133). In Book 10 and beyond, Daddy Domitian is dead, and Martial's self-presentation shifts dramatically as the conversation between Martial, the reader and Caesar becomes a conversation between Martial, the reader and Rome. The poet becomes alienated under Trajan, and the power of his Domitianic poetry is lost: G. concludes, 'The art of complicity has turned into the mere kitsch it always was' (188).

In ch. 3, G. considers the extent to which Statius' *Silvae* is similarly Domitianic poetry. Despite his self-presentation as an epic poet at play, Statius presents a relationship with Caesar that is 'highly convergent with that we can see in the *Epigrams* of Martial' (190). Similar scenes and motifs populate his poetry, and the lion of *Silvae* 2.5 and Earinus of *Silvae* 3.4 offer comparative narratives and meditations on sex, power and freedom. Through Earinus, we get the most vivid look at the 'historico-politico-aesthetic nightmare' that is the 'unparalleled glory of the Domitianic age' (23). Statius does not have the Catullan charm of Martial, instead offering lofty, layered poetry characterised by a particularly 'Domitianic modernism' composed for the Domitianic 'smart set' (207). Statius' Domitianic world has a particular grammar: words of marvelling inhabit his present, and his poetry declares a state of happiness. Nouns are qualified: *libertas* is not Republican *libertas*, and faith can be a marker of fiction. The *Silvae* evoke an 'ecstatic present' while illustrating the impossible condition of the poetry as 'fresh, new, glorious, astounding, dominated, derivative, sordid, ...' (267, 270). In elucidating the grammar of Statius' art of complicity, G. teaches us to become resistant rather than complicit readers, even though the poems themselves proclaim these are 'errant' readings (194). In six closing case studies, G. demonstrates Statius' mastery of the submission game, from poems in which Statius does Martial (2.4 and 2.5) to an extended reflection on the Earinus poems, which place high poetry on display.

In his conclusion, G. offers a reappraisal of the ethics of reading and reprises the dangers of complicit criticism, asking, 'what sorts of complicities await critics themselves?' (358). It is a question worth considering under any autocratic regime.

Brandeis University
cgillespie@brandeis.edu

CAITLIN GILLESPIE

doi:10.1017/S007543582200079X

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.