

erläutert. Am meisten scheint er sich für die Textlieferung zu interessieren. Beinahe eigensinnig versucht er stets, die Lesarten der Handschriften zu verteidigen und auch allgemein akzeptierte Korrekturen beiseite zu schieben. Natürlich ist diese Tendenz an sich bewundernswert, auch wenn die Klarheit des Textes zuweilen darunter leidet.

Dagegen interessiert sich der Autor augenscheinlich weniger für die historische Einleitung, wo er vielmehr über Varros Landwirtschaft und die Unterschiede zwischen Catos und Varros Ratschlägen spricht. Diese Unterschiede dürften recht leicht zu erklären sein, wenn wir berücksichtigen, dass Catos Werk schon zu seiner Erscheinungszeit einigermaßen veraltet war, während Varro sein Buch etwa 100 Jahre später, unter ganz anderen Verhältnissen, veröffentlichte.

Die Übersetzung ist meines Erachtens meist fließend und sachkundig. Leider ist sie gesondert vom Text gedruckt, so dass es nicht leicht ist, sie zu überprüfen.

Die Versuche, alte Beschwörungsformeln zu übersetzen, halte ich dagegen für willkürlich und auch für überflüssig, da es klar sein dürfte, dass man deren Inhalte zu Catos Zeiten wörtlich nicht mehr verstand.

Die wenigen Abbildungen sind nützlich und anschaulich. Auch die Bibliographie ist mehr als ausreichend. Leider fehlt dagegen ein Sachindex.

Doch kann man sich vielleicht fragen, ob Professor Flach, von einigen textkritischen Verbesserungen abgesehen, mit diesem Werk sehr viel Neues geleistet hat.

Paavo Castrén

VIRGIL: *Aeneid* 3. A Commentary by NICHOLAS HORSFALL. Mnemosyne Supplementa 273. Brill, Leiden – Boston 2006. LIV, 513 pp. ISBN 90-04-14828-0. EUR 159.

In the Preface to his commentary on *Aeneid* 7 (2000), Nicholas Horsfall (hereafter H.) tells us how in 1967 Sir Roger Mynors suggested to him that he should write a commentary on that particular book of Virgil's epic. Forty years have passed since Sir Roger's suggestion. It not only provided initiative for one but also for two other commentaries on the *Aeneid* (Book 11, 2004, Book 3, 2006), not to mention the remarkable *Companion to the Study of Virgil* (1995), which was edited, and for the most part, written by H. This scholarly activity on Virgil has grown into a passion on H.'s part, or, as he puts it in the Preface to his commentary on *Aeneid* 3: "Writing commentaries on the *Aeneid* becomes not so much a habit, as a passion."

The latest of H.'s commentaries deals with the book of the *Aeneid* which has hardly been regarded as one of the best among the twelve books of Virgil's epic. However, Book 3 offers some memorable scenes: the description of Etna (570-587), which continues the remarkable tradition of descriptions of the volcano, beginning with Pindar's First Pythian Ode, or the grotesque tale about Achaemenides in the Cyclops's cave (588-691), or, to mention a passage with quite a different tone, the moving scene where Andromache gives decorated garments and a Phrygian cloak to Ascanius (483-491). Book 3 also contains that famous phrase "auri sacra fames", characterized by H. as "Greek in content /.../ though never quite so memorably expressed, at least until St. Paul ('root of all evil')".

Moreover, it should be remembered that Book 3 shows how insecure the refugees are, but also how they gradually become aware of their mission and goal. Anchises, who dies at

the end of the book, has an important role as an interpreter of omens.

Apart from the aesthetic evaluation, Book 3 is also a challenge to the commentator in many ways. It demands a good knowledge of ancient geography and topography, rites and the forms of prophecy and ceremonies. This means that relevant comparative material can be found not only in poetry, but also in Greek and Roman works on natural history, botany, agriculture, religion, etc.

H.'s new commentary begins with an Introduction which – under 13 headings – discusses different aspects of Book 3. The Introduction is followed by instructions to the reader, a bibliography and the text with an English translation. The commentary of 435 pages is followed by an appendix on Virgil's sources for the Cumaean Sibyl, a Latin and an English index, and an index of Greek and Latin names.

Scholars who have discussed Book 3 more from a general aesthetic point of view have usually divided it into 14 sections. In H.'s commentary, the text has also been divided into fourteen units, which consist of 3-216 lines. The units are as follows (their "titles" are here indicated in brackets): verses 1-12 (Proemium); 13-68 (Polydorus); 69-120 (Delos, including Anchises' speech on lines 103-117); 121-191 (Crete, including lines 147-191: Appearance of the Penates, which includes the speech of the Penates on lines 154-171); 192-208 (The storm); 209-269 (The Harpies, including lines 247-257: A prophecy); 270-293 (Strophades to Buthrotum); 294-505 (Buthrotum); 506-569 (No specific title is given; instead H. gives a short summary of this transitional passage); 570-587 (no title is given to this famous passage on Etna); 588-691 (Achaemenides and the Cyclopes); 692-707 (no title); 708-15 (The death of Anchises); 716-718 (no title, the closure).

In the long Buthrotum section, which, e.g., Kenneth Quinn has divided into three sub-sections (294-355: Andromache-Helenus; 356-471: Prophecy of Helenus; 472-505: Departure), H. finds several sections which he discusses as longer units: 321-343: Andromache ("This wonderful speech", as H. rightly calls it); 374-462: Prophecy of Helenus (including lines 389-393: Portent of the sow; and 420-428: Charybdis and Scylla) and 463-505: The Trojans' departure, in which lines 493-505 are discussed as Aeneas's farewell to Helenus and Andromache.

In my review of H.'s commentary on Aeneid 11 (*Arctos* 39 [2005] 230–233), I made some general comments on the nature and problems of classical commentaries. There is no need to repeat them here. However, I would like to make some further observations. We may ask, e.g., whether a commentary should be limited only to that information which is relevant for or needed for our understanding of particular passages in the text, or should a commentary provide the reader with a plethora of parallels? I give here two examples. Commenting on lines 389-393 ("Portent of the sow"), H. gives biological information from ancient sources (Pliny, Varro, and others). After saying that a sow has sixteen teats, we also learn that a sow can farrow unassisted up to twenty piglets, but that "in the hands of cross-breeding specialists, has reached a record of 27" (information taken from *The Daily Telegraph*). Had I not read H.'s commentary, I would have remained unaware of these facts all my life (and still enjoyed Virgil's description). The information about the sow is very interesting as such but hardly necessary to our understanding of Virgil's passage (cf. my example of ornithological material in H.'s commentary on Book 11, *Arctos* 39 (2005) 232–233).

In my previous review, I had some reservations about H.'s way of accumulating

material from older commentaries. Now, being more acquainted with H.'s Virgilian world, I am ready to admit that such material not only may have its own charm but that it also gives important and concrete insights into the history of Virgilian scholarship. I would especially like to mention H.'s references to C. G. Heyne, a leading German 18th century scholar from Göttingen, who, in the light of H.'s examples, seems to have been a shrewd reader of Virgil. An interesting acquaintance is James Henry (1798-1876), who - as I learn from *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* - as a man of independent means, travelled widely in Europe studying Virgilian manuscripts. His book *Aeneidea*, which was published in four volumes in 1873-1892, has provided some interesting material for H. (see especially p. 290).

Leaving these general considerations on the nature of classical commentaries aside, H.'s new commentary offers such rich material that I have to confine myself to only mentioning some of the most important passages discussed in the commentary, and to some occasional remarks.

The commentary on Book 3, like H.'s previous commentaries, contains many acute observations and specimens of good judgement, sometimes also showing a sense of humour. E.g., commenting on lines 4-9, where Aeneas says that he and his men began building a fleet, H. mentions in brackets: "how tedious - and retardatory - the shipbuilding detail might have been, only readers of *Swiss Family Robinson* will quite comprehend". H. also has a keen eye for some impressive depictions in Book 3, like the blind Polyphemus walking with a trimmed pine. For parallels on blind mythical figures, I would like to add the chapter "Blind People" in Maarit Kaimio's study *Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy. A Study of Stage Conventions* (1988).

From the viewpoint of an aesthetic evaluation of Virgilian passages, H.'s discussion of The Harpies episode is very interesting, both in the Introduction (" /.../ while there is admirable *Steigerung* between Aen.'s three attacks on Polydorus' bush, the Harpies' three attacks on the Trojans do not form a successful climax", p. xli) and in the commentary (on lines 209-269), where the structure of the episode is characterized as a *Dreiheit*. Apart from this 'formal' structure of the episode, H. convincingly shows its motivation in the general scheme of Book 3.

The analysis of the passage on Etna is illuminating in showing the parallels in other works of Greek and Roman authors; it also shows the differing opinions of scholars about the nature and value of Virgil's description of the volcano.

As for verses 679-681, where the Cyclopes are compared to trees, H. has, unlike R. D. Williams, some reservations: "The sole point of comparison here /.../ is height". However, if we visualize the scene (the huge Cyclopes on the shore), the simile may be quite acceptable.

H. draws attention to some shorter passages which prove to be fine specimens of Virgil's art. I would especially like to mention the short speech of the deceased - but buried without due rites - Polydorus (lines 41-46), which, oddly enough, has not attracted much attention from earlier scholars, although in the beginning of Book 3 it is very impressive. Another such passage can be found in The Harpies -episode (lines 247-257), "a prophecy of subtle tone and complex origins, little studied", as H. puts it.

The commentary also includes some references to modern authors and scholars of modern literature. Although these references are scattered and occasional, a reader of the commentary, like myself, may find them charming. E.g., writing about line 694, where the river Alphaeus is mentioned, H. reminds us that John Livingston Lowes has discussed the

subterranean passages from Virgil's Alpheus to Coleridge's Alph in his book *Road to Xanadu*. Inspired by H., I read Lowes' passage, and indeed, it is a brilliant piece of *Stoffgeschichte*, showing a wide range of reading.

Commenting on the phrase "consertum tegimen spinis" on line 594, H. refers to Robinson Crusoe who had needle and thread, and to Ben Gunn (in *Treasure Island*), who improvised inventively (Ben Gunn is also referred to in connection with the phrase "cum fletu precibusque", line 599).

All in all, there should be no doubt that Virgilian scholars and all the other readers who have time and courage to immerse themselves totally into the Virgilian world with H.'s commentary as their guide, will find this admirable book a worthy successor to H.'s previous studies of Virgil. Needless to say, it is indispensable for the study of any singular passage as well as of any detail in Aeneid 3. We express the hope that the trilogy of his commentaries on Aeneid 3, 7, and 11 will soon grow into a tetralogy.

H. K. Riikonen

P. OVIDIUS NASO: *Carmina amatoria. Amores, Medicamenta faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*. Edidit ANTONIO RAMÍREZ DE VERGER. Editio altera. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus K.G. Saur, Monachii et Lipsiae 2006. ISBN 3-598-71844-6. XXXVI, 376 S. EUR 78.

Zwei Teubnersche Ovidausgaben der Nachkriegszeit zeichnen sich durch ein ähnliches widersprüchliches Schicksal aus: einerseits sind sie mit Erfolg verkauft worden, andererseits hat die philologische Kritik ihre Schwächen erbarmungslos bloßgestellt. Die Metamorphosen, die seit 1977 fünf Auflagen erlebt haben, wurden von J.B. Hall, *ProcAfrClassAss* 15 (1980) 62-70 vernichtend niedergeschmettert. Und die hier zu besprechende Ausgabe hat schon drei Jahre nach dem Erscheinen der ersten Auflage (2003) eine zweite erlebt, ist aber von E.J. Kenney, dem Editor derselben Werke in den *OCT*, in *BMCR* 2004.01.13 strenger Kritik unterzogen worden. Ramírez nimmt in der Vorrede der Neuauflage keinerlei Stellung zu Kenneys Kritik, hat aber einen Teil von dessen Korrekturen stillschweigend übernommen, wie auch die meisten von Richmond, *Gnomon* 2004, 711-713 angeführten. Aufgrund kursorischer Lesung und von Stichproben scheint mir aber, dass dadurch noch nicht alle Schwächen der ersten Auflage beseitigt worden wären. – Eine Detailbemerkung: *am.* 1, 1, 10 schreibt R. (in beiden Auflagen) im Text 'Virginis' und im Apparat 'Virginis *Gold*'. Das hat nun weder Sinn noch Verstand. Wahrscheinlich meint R., dass er Goolds Schreibung des Wortes mit einem großen Anfangsbuchstaben aufnimmt. Was aber die Sache selbst betrifft, würde man ohne weiteres die Schreibung 'virginis' vorziehen, weil das Epithet *pharetrata* die Göttin identifiziert (so auch Kenney). – In demselben Gedicht 12 durfte R. nicht 'Aöniam' schreiben, denn der Gebrauch des Tremas ist irreführend, weil der Buchstabe ö in vielen europäischen Sprachen zum Alphabet gehört.

Heikki Solin