

astronomical dates. – As for the CD-ROM attached to the book, cf. the review by W. Englert in *BMCR* 2005.09.11.

This carefully produced book (I observed misprints only on p. 57 and 500) is the result of very solid scholarship and will be used with profit by all students of Cicero and his time.

*Olli Salomies*

VIRGIL: *Aeneid* 11. A Commentary by NICHOLAS HORSFALL. *Mnemosyne Supplementa* 244. Brill, Leiden – Boston 2003. ISBN 90-04-12934-0. XXVII, 505 pp. EUR 125.

Nicholas Horsfall's over 560-page commentary on *Aeneid* 7 (2000) was followed by a commentary of equal length on *Aeneid* 11 in 2003. Like the previous volume, the introductory part of Horsfall's new commentary comprises a Preface, which contains some personal reminiscences, and an Introduction, where the structure, sources, language and related questions, the text and previous commentaries on *Aeneid* 11 are briefly discussed. There are also instructions for the reader and a Bibliography. This introductory matter is followed by the text of *Aeneid* 11, with an English translation. The running commentary of 400 pages is followed by two Appendices ("Camilla and the *Epic Cycle*" and "*Dormitatne Maro quoque?*") and by the indices.

The actual number of pages would easily have been much higher if all the abbreviations had been spelled out. Since the text consists to such a great extent of abbreviations, the reading of the commentary may not be an easy task even for the trained classical scholar. In elegance and reader-orientedness, Horsfall's book can hardly compete for instance with Macleod's *Iliad* 23 (1982) or Nisbet's and Hubbard's *Horace, Odes I* (1970) and *II* (1978), or Nisbet's and Rudd's *Horace, Odes III* (2004). As such, Horsfall's commentary is unlikely to find readers among "common" classicists; rather, it is a work for highly specialized Virgilian scholars. Needless to say, for them it is an indispensable book of reference and cannot but arouse admiration for its immense learning, covering various fields of classical studies from anthropology and the study of religion to linguistics and literary criticism. This also means that qualified reviewers of Horsfall's commentary cannot be very numerous. The writer of the present review, coming from outside even the circle of professional classical scholars, willingly admits that he has to confine himself to more general remarks. In its length and exhaustiveness Horsfall's commentary aptly calls for a reconsideration of the nature of the classical commentary in general. It is a pleasing coincidence that some years earlier (2002), in the very same *Mnemosyne supplementa* series, a collection of essays on classical commentaries was published, edited by Roy K. Gibson and Christina Shuttleworth Kraus. The book is referred to briefly by Horsfall in his Introduction, where he has some polemical words about those who defend or even demand more readable commentaries.

In the Introduction, Horsfall discusses the structure of *Aeneid* 11. He divides it into three main parts: funerals (1–224), debate (225–444) and battle (445–915). This roughly corresponds, say, Kenneth Quinn's division in his book *Virgil's Aeneid. A Critical Commentary* (1968): Burying the Dead (1–224), Talk of Peace (225–485) and Preparations for Battle, Interlude and The Cavalry Battle (486–915). While Quinn reads

the lines 445–485 (War breaks out again) into the second part, as a kind of end of it, Horsfall ascribes it to the third part.

The commentary divides the text of Aeneid 11 into (mostly) thematic units of various lengths (usually 20 or so lines, but sometimes as long as 70 lines). There are also about 20 lines (e.g. the first four lines) which are discussed separately, without being assigned to any greater unit. The number of units containing more than one verse is 25. For comparison, it may be mentioned that Kenneth Quinn has divided the three main parts into 16 sections (5+2+9), of which the speech section 225–444 has been divided into four subsections. Quinn's objective of an aesthetic analysis of the Aeneid is of course different from that of Horsfall, who is writing a verse-by-verse commentary.

Horsfall's units are as follows (the titles are here indicated in brackets; some of the units are without any title): verses 5–13; 14–28 (Aeneas' speech); 29–99 (Honours to Pallas' corpse); 100–121 (The Latin Embassy); 122–132 (Drances and his first speech); 133–138 (The funerals); 139–181 (Evander's tragedy); 182–202 (The funerals, II: Trojans and Etruscans); 203–224 (The funerals, III: Latins); 225–242 (The return of the embassy to Diomedes); 243–295 (The speeches of Venulus and Diomedes); 297–299; 302–335 (Latinus' speech); 336–375 (Drances' portrait and speech); 376–444 (Turnus' speech); 445–446; 447–497; 498–535; 535–596; 597–647; 659–663; 664–835; 836–867 (Arruns' death; Camilla is avenged); 868–895 and 896–915. One may wonder why the units after v. 445 are untitled, except for vv. 836–867.

Each of these units is introduced in a passage of analytical description a quarter or at most half a page in length, usually also including a list of relevant literature (sometimes, as for instance in Fraenkel's *Horace*, Horsfall also mentions works which he does not regard as worth quoting). Occasionally these introductory parts are admirable miniature essays on various topics, such as for instance the presentation of analogies between the ritual and the Roman triumph in 11,29–99. Within each greater unit single words and phrases are then analysed verse-by-verse.

The structure of the commentary, however, is further complicated by the fact that within the larger units there are smaller ones, which again are introduced with more general remarks and then analysed verse-by-verse. Units and verse-by-verse comments are not separated typographically, although the larger units are given separate English titles (usually in block letters but not always, as in the case of vv. 29–79, 'Honours to Pallas' corpse'). One cannot help thinking that a more efficient use of typographical distinctions would have made the text more readable, even though commentaries demand their own way of reading.

If the division of the commentary into different sections may prove difficult for the reader, there is another difficulty, of course one which is very common in commentaries on classical literature: I am referring to Horsfall's way of offering comparative material in brackets (sources, parallels, readings of previous scholars, further references to scholarly literature, etc.). In order to capture the essential point, the reader has to skip over several words inserted in brackets. This can be illustrated by the description of Diomedes, which serves as an introduction to vv. 225–242. Diomedes' role and appearances in the Aeneid are first enumerated, after which the commentator reverts to earlier literature and material concerning the myth of Diomedes, in order then to emphasize that "it was Virgil who first recognized and exploited the dramatic

possibilities in involving him in Aeneas' story on Italian soil". This is followed by several references. It is possible that in this case the commentary tradition become a burden, making it troublesome to the reader to find the main point.

Along with other literature, Horsfall has consulted extensively (verse by verse) sixteen commentaries on Aeneid 11, from Servius to Gransden. The earlier views, whether accepted by Horsfall or not, are included in his commentary. It is of course necessary to know all these commentaries, but is it necessary to provide the reader with all this material? Or is this rather a task for historians of scholarship, especially where a whole series of earlier commentators is refuted, from ancient grammarians onward (as in the case of v. 308)? Of course it is sometimes satisfying to learn about the fine criticism offered by earlier scholarship (such as Heyne on Turnus' speech, vv. 376–444).

One problem with classical commentaries, which tend to comprise 400–1000 pages discussing works of 30 pages, is that many different things may be discussed under each verse (or word, or phrase): textual criticism, prosody, parallels, sources, topoi, structural questions, realia, etc.). In fixing the meaning of a particular word or phrase of an old text it is of course necessary to elucidate it from many different perspectives. One may ask, however, whether the commentary might be structured in some other way, discussing textual criticism, sources, topoi, and images, etc. under separate headings, as in some modern commentaries of more recent literary works; this might make the commentary more readable.

The task of a commentary is to bring forward the findings of previous commentaries, to correct their misunderstandings or incorrect information, and to enrich them with new insights and discoveries. It is, however, questionable whether nowadays, in the age of modern technology, a handsomely printed (and expensive) book is the most suitable vehicle for commentary activity.

While there is no question about Horsfall's immense learning and philological acumen, one may ask whether all the aspects discussed are necessary to our understanding of Virgil's epic. I shall confine myself to a single example. Aeneid 11, 751–756 contains a fine bird simile. Horsfall discusses its relation to the bird simile in earlier verses (721–724) and some parallels, drawing attention to their differences. But it is the phrase *fulua ... aquila* (vv. 751–752), which interests us here. According to Horsfall, it is not reasonable to seek any ornithological precision in Virgil's description of birds; this, however, does not prevent Horsfall from pondering (not without scholarly humour, I suppose) zoological aspects. The passage in question is worth quoting here:

"Did one seek precision (folly – or at least, often folly in Virgilian ornithology!), then the golden eagle should not be an automatic choice /.../, for the upper parts of the (admittedly rarer) *circaëtus gallicus* or short-toed eagle (Ital. *biancone*) are suitably coloured and the habitual prey is precisely right; in my 'Manuale per il riconoscimento degli uccelli italiani' (1984, p. 107) it is indeed drawn eating a snake (which a golden eagle would not normally touch)!"

Horsfall is of course right in refuting as folly the quest for zoological precision. It is in any case a question of poetic image in a work of art (see also Horsfall's comments on the topographical problem, i.e. how to locate Virgil's places on the map, vv. 302–335). Why then to continue the discussion with matter (*circaëtus gallicus*) which after all is not relevant?

On the other hand, we may ask why Horsfall does not refer to the simile of eagle strangling a snake as a literary or pictorial topos in antiquity, except for mentioning an eagle in Hom. *Il.* 15,690. The literary topos of eagle and snake occurs for instance in Ov. *met.* 4, 362–364 (on eagle cf. also Soph. *Ant.* 110–116), while a figure can be seen in mosaics, as shown by Antero Tammisto (*Birds in Mosaics*, 1997, pp. 102–104, and notes 684–703, and Fig. ES1,1.)

Whatever objections to the form, structure and the selection and classification of material in Horsfall's commentary may be made, one cannot but admire its detailed knowledge of both primary and secondary sources and their interpretations. As such it is a superb scholarly achievement and a highly recommendable book of reference to every Virgilian.

*Hannu K. Riikonen*

OVID: *Metamorphoses Book XIII*. Edited by NEIL HOPKINSON. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000. ISBN 0-521-55421-7 (hb), 0-521-55620-1 (pb). VII, 252 pp. GBP 14.95.

This edition of, and commentary on, Book XIII of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, containing the debate on Achilles' arms between Ajax and Ulysses (the 'Judgement of Arms') and other episodes (Hecuba, Memnon, etc.), strikes me as particularly satisfactory and commendable. The book consists of a 43-page introduction, the text and the commentary, more than 150 pages long. At the end, there is a (not very long) bibliography and indices.

The introduction, characterized by clarity and erudition, rightly concentrates on illustrating Book XIII; there is thus nothing of the normal introductory material (Sulmo, Tomi(s), Ovid's other writings, etc.), information which one can easily find in other works. I would have had nothing against sections on language and metre, especially as the author has much of interest to say on these aspects in the commentary, but confess to be perfectly happy with the introduction such as it is. First, there is a section on the concept of metamorphosis; this is followed by a section on 'Structure and themes' (with thoughts, e.g., on how the episodes in Book XIII are meant to form a coherent whole). After this, we find introductions to the individual episodes, that on the 'Judgement of Arms' (p. 9–22) being the longest. To say a few words on this section, this is a truly admirable introduction to Ajax' and Ulysses' speeches which need elucidation from various points of view, especially from that of the speakers' characters and that of the rhetoric of the presentation of their arguments. To illustrate the first aspect, there is (on p. 11ff.) an extremely useful synopsis of the Homeric passages in which Ajax and Ulysses appear together, this being followed by notes on later authors. I was also impressed by the section on 'Rhetorical aspects of the speeches' (p. 16ff.), making use, above all, of Quintilian (also quoted here and there in the commentary) and clearly a must for students setting out to study the debate in the future.

The text is described (p. 44) as relying "on readings reported by earlier editors", but its genesis is not otherwise commented upon on. Where it differs from the recent OCT text by R. J. Tarrant (thus 28 *peti* T. ~ *peto* H., 38 *sed* ~ *at*, 76 *hic* ~ *hoc*, 133 *succedat* ~ *succedit*, 235 *repono* ~ *reposco*, etc.) Hopkinson's readings generally struck