amatoriae more explicit, “Das Problem der Gross- und Kleinschreibung existiert für den antiken Autor nicht”. This argument unsettles her own plausible suggestion to read Inuidiae in 397; 496 iussa: Henderson rightly brings out the medical use of iubere (‘to prescribe’); 659 turpe uir et mulier, iuncti modo, protinus hostes: L.’s explanation “sehr knappe Ausdruckweise” is vague and unsatisfactory; it is an example of the construction in which a participle, subst. or adject. “in agreement with a noun or pronoun does the work of a noun-clause” (E. C. Woodcock, New Latin Syntax 75/6, cf. Szantyr 393, E. Laughton, The Participle in Cicero 89 ff.); 679 quia sis uenturus: the subj. is not potential, but a specimen of “virtual oratio obliqua” (Woodcock o.c. 196); 703 consilium est, quodcumque cano: I disagree both with Henderson (“what’er I utter is in the nature of advice”) and L. (“Ovid gibt nur Ratschläge”). The word consilium contrasts with the violent actions in vv. 699-702 (furari, raptas, resecabimus alas) and stresses the need for prudent judgement; consilium often is the counterpart of physical action: neque consilio neque manu priorem alium pati (Sall. Iug. 96.3); 734 nulla does not mean “unbedeutend”, but “non-existent” (Henderson), “qui n’existait plus” (Bornecque), cf. Szantyr 205.

Generally speaking, L.’s notes are often instructive, e.g. 419 on the use of forsitan and fortasse, 484 on Ovid’s predilection for polyptoton and geminatio, 487 on the quaeris-formula, 576 on the ‘Vorsichtsformel’, 685 on Ovid’s inconsistencies, 764 on a funny quotation from Propertius. As stated, the unattractive presentation and the lack of selection of the material form an unfortunate disadvantage of a useful contribution to Ovidian philology.

This substantial and beautifully produced volume gives the reader a complete Statius, which in itself is a great convenience as compared with the separation of the Silvae from the Thebaid in Klotz-Marastoni or Garrod-Phillimore. The text is accompanied by an Italian translation and brief explanatory notes; a lengthy introduction gives an account of Statius and his poetry and of the text.

tual transmission; separate bibliographies for the *Thebaid*, *Achilleid* and *Silvae* are added.

In judging the work one must first try to establish in what sense it is a critical edition. If an editor produces a text with a translation, he is usually aiming at readers whose Latinity is not strong enough to grapple with the original unassisted. Such readers may be supposed to approach the poems as literature, not as a stamping-ground of professional critics. The present editors would therefore have acted with perfect propriety if they had accepted the text of the most respectable modern edition, reserving the right to vary from it (with due notice to the reader) if they found the sense unacceptable. The alternative would be to set up the text for oneself, justifying it in the usual way, and continuously advising the reader, by means of a critical apparatus, what the source of each reading was. The editors have done neither of these things. They have traced at length the textual transmission; they have discussed the reading of individual passages (about 200 in the *Thebaid*, 160 in the *Silvae* and 45 in the *Achilleid*), but they give no critical apparatus. Thus the reader who is supposed to be interested in insular stages in transmission and in the identification of the York manuscript as an apograph of the *liber Iuliani v.c.* and the exemplar of the Puteaneus is at the same time presumed to be supinely indifferent to the manuscript basis of nine-tenths of the readings in the text. Thus in book 1 of the *Thebaid* the reader has no means of knowing that *et fusa* (200) is a conjecture of Markland's for *effusa* of the mss., or that *interioris* (SU) is Schrader's correction of the transmitted *ulterioris*, or that the mss. have *dimitte* (659) where editors rightly print *demitte*. Nor can he learn that the two branches of the stemma are split between *Pierio* and *laurigero* at 32, between *parentem* and *carentem* at 74, between *abrupi* and *abripui* at 83, *avius* and *aut notus* at 160, *inrat* and *instat* at 427. In other words, a reading given in the text may represent (a) the common reading of both halves of the stemma; (b) the reading of one half of the stemma; (c) an editorial conjecture, without any notice being given to the reader. The edition therefore cannot be regarded as a critical edition.

One element lacking in the "Nota Critica" is any word concerning the general soundness of the texts. Are they well preserved, or are they corrupt in many places? The absence of any such consideration suggests that the editors proceed on the principle that whatever is, is right: "It says *Bophocles* here, master." Now since in fact the text of the *Thebaid* is tolerably well preserved, while that of