

regarding the stemma at the point where one would expect it to be presented (in point of fact, there were moments when I thought that this could mean that M.' Praefatio had been written before Reynolds' work was published, and that, for some reason, he did not have the time to discuss Reynolds' views at length). I also wondered about some other things, for instance, about **A** appearing in the "Conspectus codicum" (p. XVI) as the only representative of "Familia  $\alpha$ ", when in fact, according to M.'s own stemma, also **B** and **E** (=  $\beta$ , and here enumerated as representatives of "Familia  $\beta$ ") are representatives of the same family  $\alpha$ , this family thus being divided into **A** and  $\beta$  (= **BE**). I also missed the mention of Petrus Marsus in M.'s "Conspectus editionum" (so those who find this character being referred to on p. 10 on line 224, must turn to Reynolds' edition).

As for the edition itself, M.'s leaves a good general impression, for instance, as one does not find here misprints such as appear in the *OCT* text (e.g., 2.5 *definito*; 2.9 *finis et*). I am also in favour of indicating, if possible, ms. readings within the text (e.g., *pot[u]erit* at 1.69). It must be confessed that the question regarding the establishment of the stemma does not really very much affect the text, the question being rather whether one should accept this or that emendation etc. Comparing M.'s text with that of Reynolds, one finds that there are a few differences here and there. I was not able to identify many suggestions by M. himself, but note, e.g., the seclusion of *voluptatum* in *varietatum [voluptatum]* at 2.10 (quite attractive). There are also other places where one observes changes from the *OCT* text which seem attractive or at least acceptable; e.g., *soleo <dicere> temere* (Giusta; or possibly some other verb?) at 4.2, or *ut eum tueretur* (without the addition of *<cum>*) at 4.17. On the other hand, there are also details (but only details) I am not so sure of; e.g., in 2.11 the deletion of *ille* (*inquit ille* M.) is, I think, useful, and the same can be said of the addition of *<tam>* at 4.1 (*tamen accurate* M.). At 4.19, there are good reasons for the deletion of *et* (*ut se et salvum* M.).

In conclusion, I think that M. might have explained himself a bit more clearly about the stemma in the Praefatio (the introduction by M. of some new mss. into the discussion does not seem a compensation); otherwise this edition can be described as the result of careful scholarly work. No doubt it will find many users.

Olli Salomies

N. MARINONE: *Cronologia Ciceroniana*. Seconda edizione aggiornata e corretta con nuova versione interattiva in cd-rom, a cura di E. MALASPINA. Collana di Studi Ciceroniani, VI. Pàtron Editore, Bologna 2004. ISBN 88-555-2773-8. 518 pp. EUR 40.

The appearance of this volume, the second edition of a book published in 1997 (reviewed, as one finds out on p. 513, in only three journals, none of them appearing outside Italy or Spain), will be welcomed not only by all Ciceronian students but also by all dealing, in one way or other, with the first century BC. Moreover, many of them will be able to acquire a copy, as this book has been priced in a way no doubt meant to attract the attention of potential buyers.

As one learns from the title page, this edition is "aggiornata e corretta". The corrections have been inserted into the main text (p. 11), whereas the "aggiornamenti" (of the same structure as the main text) have been added at the end of the book (pp. 489

[incorrectly indicated as "463" in the table of contents p. 518] – 515; an asterisk indicates the existence of addenda at the end). One observes with interest that the new bibliography (pp. 513–5) contains many items which had in fact appeared by the time of the publication of the first edition, e.g., the commentary by C. Klodt on the *Rab. Post.*, of 1992; a pity M. von Albrecht's *Cicero's Style. A Synopsis* of 2003, relevant for many points made here, apparently appeared too late to be included).

To be able to use this book, one needs a few minutes of training, but only that and the time is well spent. The book consists of three main parts, the "Repertorio" (pp. 13–49), the "Date" (pp. 51–288), and the "Calendario" (pp. 289–461). The "Repertorio", consisting of three parts, (A) "Vita pubblica e privata", (B) "Attività" (in the table of contents, this section is called "Attività politica, forense e letteraria"), and (C) "Epistolario". Part (A) gives a listing of the main dates of Cicero's life in chronological order, the same being offered for Terentia ("matrimonio – a. 80, divorzio – a. 46"), Tullia, Cicero's son, and other members of the family. Part (B), "Attività", is in fact an alphabetical list of Cicero's preserved and lost works, *Academici libri, pro Acilio*, etc. (all the pretty obscure *iuvenilia* also being included). This list is presented in three columns, "Politica" (first item *de lege agraria*), "Forense" (beginning with *pro Acilio*), and "Letteraria". For each work, a date is supplied (and a code indicating the numbering of the work within a particular year; e.g., B1 being the first item in the list of written works) or, in the case of works not exactly datable, a reference to the list of undatable activities on p. 272ff. In the "Epistolario", all letters are listed following their order in the collections, this section thus beginning with *Att. 1,1* and ending with *ad Brut. 2,5*. A date (and a code, cf. above) is furnished for each letter. What this means in practice is that parts (B) and (C) are in fact equivalent to an index since dates are furnished here and since the reader wishing to learn something about (e.g.) a certain speech or letter needs to know the exact year under which to find the relevant information.

In the second part of the book, "Date", everything known of Cicero is presented under individual years, references to sources and secondary literature (e.g., editions and other literature in the case of literary works) also being added for each item. The importance of this information collected here cannot be stressed enough. Within each year, the information is divided (as in the "Repertorio") into (A) "Vita pubblica e privata", (B) "Attività politica, forense e letteraria", and (C) "Epistolario". In the beginning, there is not much information on a particular year; for instance, under the year 106 BC, there is only (under [A]) Cicero's birth (with sources, etc.). With time, individual years take up more space, but it is not useful to compare early and late years with each other, as there are many more letters (all listed individually, with discussion of exact date, etc.) from the later period. Thus, the years 63, 59 and 58 take up six pages, 56 and 50 ten, the years 46 to 44 about twenty–one each; from the year 45 there are no less than 130 preserved letters of Cicero (and nine by his correspondents: p. 230). – As an appendix, there is a section on undatable activities (p. 272ff.; e.g., the *partitiones oratoriae* as B19 on p. 276, with a sample of suggested dates ranging between 54 and 44), already mentioned above.

The "Calendario" consists in the main of a comparison of pre-Julian and astronomical dates, this being done year by year from 70 to 45 BC and being meant, unless I am mistaken, to help Ciceronian students change Ciceronian dates to

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