

Wirklichkeit war Dikaiarcheia eine ephemere Gründung, deren Name nur in der literarischen Tradition Bestand hatte; epigraphisch ist er nirgends belegt. Wenn griechische Autoren von der Stadt Dikaiarch(e)ia sagen, "sie heie jetzt Puteoli", so entspricht das nicht den Tatsachen, denn im Leben hat die Grndung Dikaiarcheia keinen Bestand gehabt. Das Lemma ist auch wegen der sinnlosen Erklrungen des Namens Puteoli interessant ( gute Konjektur von Meineke). – ε 79 Ἐμπόριον: eine Stadt dieses Namens ist in Campanien sonst nicht berliefert, was die Notiz suspekt macht. In Bruttii lag eine Stadt dieses Namens (= Medma, die auch im Lexikon vorkommt: μ 114); hatte St. vielleicht sie im Sinn? (Orte, die μπόριον genannt wurden, gab es natrlich auch in Campanien). – ε 184 Ἐχέτρα: Stadt der Volsker, nur aus literarischer Tradition bekannt; die lateinische Form war *Ecetra* (die griechische Schreibweise mit -χ- knnte aus dem Etruskischen herrhren). – κ 61 Κοτύσιον: hier wird Strabon ungenau wiedergegeben, der sagt, zwei Stdte, Canusium und Argyrippa, seien *ehemals* die grten der italiotischen Stdte gewesen. – κ 187 Κοσύτη: Billerbeck gibt Bescheid ber die gestrte berlieferung. Zur Verworrenheit trgt auch bei, dass eine umbrische Stadt dieses Namens unerklrlich bleibt. – κ 255 Κύθηρα: woher mag die Nachricht stammen, Kythera sei bei Kreta gelegen? Billerbeck erwhnt in dem Similia-Apparat zwei Stellen aus Eustathios' Ilias-Kommentar. Es gibt auch andere ltere Erwhnungen, in denen Kythera und Kreta in einen Zusammenhang gebracht werden und die als Quelle fr Stephanos in Betracht gezogen werden knnen (Skylax, der Geograph Dionysios, der Grammatiker Herodianos, der Geograph Agathemeros); Hesychios sagt sogar Κύθηρα· νῆσος Κρήτης. – μ 44 Μαμάρκινα: Knnte dies mit 45 Μαμέρτιον zusammenhngen? *Mamerc-* und *Mamert-* gehren etymologisch zusammen. – Ein paar generelle Beobachtungen. Die Editorin fgt in der deutschen bersetzung oft durch spitze Klammern meines Erachtens unntige Erklrungen hinzu, z. B. unter L 19 Lakedaimon "dessen <zugehriges> Femininum"; auch scheint mir der Gebrauch von deutschen Entsprechungen in der Wiedergabe von Ethnika teilweise strend, z. B. das <Ethnikon> Lakone, anstelle von Λάκων; und "Lakainerin" anstelle von Λάκαινα; dann aber steht bald danach "das Femininum Λακωνική" auf Griechisch.

Billerbecks Ausgabe ist eine Glanzleistung; die Autorin verdient alles mgliche Lob. Zugleich mchte ich dem Wunsch Ausdruck geben, sie knne den *labor Herculeus* bald zu einem glcklichen Abschluss bringen.

Heikki Solin

NICHOLAS HORSFALL: *Virgil, "Aeneid" 6. A Commentary*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2013. ISBN 978-3-11-022990-5. 708 pp. EUR 169.95.

After writing commentaries on books 7 (2000), 11 (2003), 3 (2006) and 2 (2008) of *The Aeneid*, Nicholas Horsfall has turned his attention to the sixth, along with Bk. 2 perhaps the most demanding and from the aesthetic, religious and ideological point of view the most impressive book of Virgil's epic. Although the Aeneid has been discussed and admired by innumerable scholars, poets and essayists, we can say that it is the sixth book which has aroused more admiring comments than any other book of *The Aeneid*. The most famous discussion outside the classical philology of Bk. 6 is by T. S. Eliot in his essay "What is a Classic?" According to Eliot, the encounter of Dido and Aeneas in Hades is "one of the most civilized passages in

poetry"; it is also complex in meaning, economical in expression and an example of "civilized conscience". To give another admiring statement about Bk. 6, the Swedish critic Olof Lagercrantz in his book of memoirs, *Min första krets* (1982, *My First Circle*), mentions that poetry in the European cultural sphere has never achieved a higher level than in the sixth book of *The Aeneid*.

Nicholas Horsfall's new commentary is divided into two parts: along with the text and translation, the first volume, about 100 pages, includes a Preface, an Introduction, a Bibliography and *Praemonenda*, while the second volume, about 660 pages, consists of the commentary and three appendices and indices. I will first discuss the introductory chapters (Preface, etc.) and appendices which in the first volume and at the end of the second volume surround the Commentary, then I will say a few words about the translation and after that turn to the Commentary itself.

The surrounding texts are in many respects very interesting and also worth reading as separate entities. Horsfall's Preface is not only a place to thank colleagues who in various ways have helped the commentator, but also a place to tell about the background and origin of the commentary as well as about some views on the nature of scholarly commentary in classical philology. Horsfall also emphasizes that his commentary is not aimed at undergraduates but for scholarly readers. Yes, we do indeed need different kinds of commentaries: for common readers, for undergraduates and for scholars who have devoted their whole lives for the study of particular authors.

The Introduction is divided into ten sections: 1) Aeneid 6 (some general and evaluative characterizations), 2) Chronology, 3) Structure (Horsfall does not give any structural overview, saying that he is in agreement with B. Otis in this respect), 4) Book 6 in relation to Books 5 and 7, 5) General comments on language, grammar, syntax and style, 6) Sources, 7) Inconsistencies (typographically the title of this section has not been put on a separate line as the titles of other sections have), 8) Eschatology (Virgil's view on the afterlife), 9) Notes on earlier commentaries (to give one example: while appreciating Mme Guillemin's commentary, Horsfall adds an ironic comment: "of course [she is] stronger on datives than [on] Orphism"), and 10) A note on the text. The most extensive of these sections is the sixth, which deals with sources. The summary of the sources is very useful, the sources being enumerated from two angles, both by scene and by time.

The Bibliography contains only the most important works, which have been used or consulted in the Commentary. The bibliographical data of other secondary literature have been given *ad loc.* The *Praemonenda* give instructions for the readers but they also include some interesting comments on Horsfall's critics as well as information about the background and writing process of the present commentary.

The three Appendices (in Volume II) are of great value. The first of them, a short discussion of the phrase 'plena deo' is illuminating, although, as stated at the end of the Appendix, "on the question of authenticity no clear position is /.../ taken". The two other Appendices, "Fifty years at the Sibyl's heels" and "In the shadow of Eduard Norden" are fine essays in intellectual history. The former essay is a piece of scholarly autobiography. I have sometimes thought that scholars should write autobiographical essays rather than extensive (and perhaps tedious) memoirs. One example of an excellent short autobiography is the cultural historian Johan Huizinga's 'My Path to History' (Engl. tr. in *Dutch Civilization in the Seventeenth Century and other Essays*, 1968). Nicholas Horsfall's presentation is an impressive specimen of

the same kind. Horsfall gives an illuminating account about his way to and explorations in Virgilian studies and the state and changes of Virgilian scholarship since the 1960s, when several important new books about Virgil were published: B. Otis' *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (1964), Knauer's *Die Aeneis und Homer* (1964), M. Putnam's *Poetry of the Aeneid* (1965), F. Klingner's *Virgil* (1967), K. Quinn's *Virgil's Aeneid* (1968, "stimulating but very careless, unsympathetic and dismissive") and L. P. Wilkinson's *The Georgics of Virgil* (1969). The list also includes Sir Roger Mynors' Oxford text of Virgil (1969) and the English translation of V. Pöschl's *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (1962, German original in 1950). Horsfall refers briefly to Mynors' anti-Semitism as well as to his own background in the Jewish intellectual tradition of Germany and western Russia.

I especially enjoyed what Horsfall had to say about John Livingston Lowes' classic study on Coleridge, *The Road to Xanadu* (1927) and what in that connection he says about the nature of commentary: "The commentary works more with facts than with theories, or should do. Livingston Lowes's subtitle is 'A study in the ways of the imagination': just so; that is a proper and elevating goal and does not call for a vast expenditure of time in order to master a new critical theory and its brutish jargon" (Appendix 2, p. 639). As smaller additions to the essay, there are in the Commentary some personal reminiscences: commenting on lines 179–82, Horsfall confesses that the splitting of wood with wedges has been his "non-classical activity for many years" (p.187; see also e.g. p. 252: a good example of school teachers' pedantry).

"Fifty years at the Sibylla's heels" is also a piece of the history of classical philology from the viewpoint of the sources of Virgil. I was especially interested in Horsfall's comments on his own *Companion to Virgil*, his own attitude to biographical tradition and the interpretation of (or, "the great battle" over) the end of the last book of *The Aeneid*.

In his book *The Powers of Philology. Dynamics of Textual Scholarship* (2003) Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht writes: ".../ commentaries are always potentially multiauthored, for their intrinsic complexity and open-endedness do not require the structuring power of a single strong (author- or editor-) subject. We know that, at any given moment, it would be easy to find out the names of the scholars who wrote the Goethe commentaries for the *Bibliothek deutscher Klassiker*, but we associate the different features of this commentary /.../ with this specific publication venture rather than with any individual commentator" (p. 48). Gumbrecht is writing from the view-point of medieval and modern philology. I wonder, however, if the case is different with the commentaries of Greek and Roman literature. In the light of his essays included in the commentary of Bk. 6, his dialogue with and criticism of previous commentators and his personal reminiscences, Horsfall indeed appears as a strong author in his own right.

The latter essay, "In the shadow of Eduard Norden", deals with Norden's *Aeneis Buch VI*, but it also gives valuable information about Norden himself as well as of other writings. The lists of the virtues and defects of Norden's great book are very illuminating. As to the defects, "Even when EN is wrong (and sometimes, to speak plainly, he is), it is an education to work out exactly why" (p. 654).

The translation (in Volume I) is exceptional in that it has question marks in ambiguous or unclear places. As far as I can remember, I have never seen such additions, not even in Horsfall's previous volumes. This practice is, however, in accordance with his way of not making things easier than they should be. One of his principles as a commentator on Virgil is "il poeta doctus presuppone il lector doctus", as he puts it in his book *Virgilio: l'epopea in alambicco*. In Bk. 6 there is one expression whose translations have always bothered me. Horsfall has

translated Virgil's 'Lugentes campi' as 'the Fields of Mourning' (in other languages there are similar translations), instead of the more literal 'the Mourning Fields', which to my mind would be more effective.

As to the Commentary, I shall confine myself to general observations and some examples of the richness of Horsfall's material.

Along with line by line comments, there are several important passages (events, themes, characters, etc.) which Horsfall deals with exhaustively under specific titles (my numbering): 1) Sibyl's cave; 2) The doors of Apollo's temple; 3) Palatine Apollo and the Sibylline books; 4) Katabaseis (Descents to the Underworld); 5) The Golden Bough; 6) Misenus and his burial; 7) Felling the forest; 8) Simile of the mistletoe; 9) Towards the entrance to the Underworld; 10) Palinurus (including a discussion of the theme of the shipwrecked sailor); 11) Towards Tartarus; 12) Dido and the victims of love; 13) From Dido to Deiphobus: the warrior heroes; 14) Tartarus; 15) The Parade of Heroes (*Heldenschau*), including *epicedion Marcelli* and 16) (The Gates of Dreams. As to number 15, it seems to me that there is some (typographical) inconsistency. The "Parade of Heroes", consisting of lines 756–846, as indicated in the title (p. 510), is divided (p. 510f.) into nine sections (which, according to Horsfall, reveals "calculated inconcinnity"). The nine sections, mentioned under the title "756–846 The 'Parade of Heroes'" extend, however, to lines 847–886; moreover, lines 886–901, for their part, are discussed as the Conclusion to the "Parade of Heroes".

As mentioned above, the encounter of Dido and Aeneas was for T. S. Eliot an example of "civilized conscience" (T. S. Eliot, *Selected Prose*, ed. by Frank Kermode 1975, p. 123f; in addition to Horsfall p. 339, n. 1, see also Kermode's *The Classic* 1975, 15ff. and T. Ziolkowski's *Virgil and the Moderns*, 1993, 132ff.). Eliot's analysis is based on psychology and morality, as revealed by his choice of words meaning conscience, consciousness and forgiving. True to his capacity as a commentator, Horsfall does not go so far, but he still catches the essential nature of the scene, adding also some other aspects: "Notably, it is here Aen. who takes the verbal initiative, who speaks first, who weeps and displays evident tenderness /.../, who indeed pleads with Dido; the relative uncommunicative Aen. of 4 is transformed" and "Dido, her breach of fidelity to Sychaeus' memory forgiven, returns /.../ to his arms, while Aen., though transformed in his behaviour, once again fails to convey his thoughts and feelings to his beloved. There is no happy emotional closure: no bawling, no abuse, either, but we see that chill silence is if anything worse" (p. 338).

Horsfall has painstakingly paid attention to Virgilian botany (e.g. p. 154), forestry (p. 183 ff.), ornithology (p. 191) and geography and astronomy (p. 544). For this purpose he has consulted scholarly and scientific books and institutions far outside the sphere of classical philology, such as A. Mayor's *The First Fossil Hunters* (p. 369), *Her Majesty's Nautical Almanac Office* (p. 341), or *The Royal Horticultural Society / Encyclopedia of Plants and Flowers* (p. 606). As to the expression 'geminae---columbae' (line 190, in the Commentary p. 191) Horsfall states that "it is not clear that the number is significant here" and that the identification of what kinds of doves they are is a hopeless task, "much though we might prefer tiresome ornithological precision". Perhaps we should, however, keep in mind, that in visual representations in mosaics and reliefs we find examples of doves, also as pairs, as shown by A. Tammisto in his comprehensive monograph *Birds in Mosaics. A Study on the Representation of Birds in Hellenistic and Romano-Campanian Tessellated Mosaics to the Early Augustan Age* (Acta IRF 18, Rome 1997, pp. 73ff.). I also have in mind the lovely stele from Paros, which was found in

1875. There we can see a girl with two doves (see Lars-Ivar Ringbom, *En flicka med två duvor* [A Girl with Two Doves], *Florilegium amicitiae till Emil Zilliacus*, Helsinki 1953, pp. 150ff).

Due to Horsfall's comments and analysis, the lines 179–182, 'felling the forest', has become one of my favourite passages in Bk. 6. In opposition to Quinn's view, Horsfall shows convincingly that the passage is anything but a pastiche. In the light of Horsfall's presentation, the passage would offer – in an admirably condensed form – essential material for modern ecocriticism, although he does not mention this current term. For ecocritics (and of course for environmentalists) the felling of trees in an ancient forest (*antiqua silva*) would be a most deplorable act. Horsfall rightly observes that the adjective 'antiqua' is used here with strong affective force. I wonder, however, if 'antiqua silva' would also be a *terminus technicus* (cf. Finn. 'ikimetsä') for an old forest, untouched by man.

As to Mt Atlas, I would say, in opposition to Horsfall, that for modern readers, including myself, Virgil's geographical inaccuracy easily passes unnoticed, and, if it is noticed, it can easily be seen as an example of *licentia poetica*.

Occasionally, Horsfall discusses the possibility of Biblical influences and parallels. He criticizes e.g. J. N. Bremmer who argues for the influence of *1Enoch* 28.2. on *Aen.* 6,658–659: "/.../ *1Enoch* or a similar text is not absurd or unthinkable reading for V., but a more detailed and circumspect case would need to be made to establish a serious likelihood for its actual use." (p. 453; cf. also Introduction p. XXIII). Horsfall's view would seem to me to sound reasonable.

In his Commentary on Bk. 6, Horsfall has again shown how useful some old studies by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholars, like C. G. Heyne, James Henry and Lucian Müller, could be (phrases like "Henry acutely noted" are fairly common in the Commentary).

Horsfall does not to any great extent give examples of the influence of Bk. 6 on later literature and culture – wisely so, because the material is endless. There are, however, some interesting exceptions. He refers (p. 124) to Enoch Powell's use of Virgil's oracular words about much blood (readers from outside Britain may not remember that the Conservative politician Powell, who was also a classical scholar, quoted Virgil in his controversial "Rivers of Blood" speech against immigration). Horsfall reminds us also that the expression "the Blessed Isles" is used by Tennyson (p. 441).

Although Horsfall indicates on every page his agreement or disagreement with previous scholars, those passages where he more extensively participates in debates about certain controversial issues are particularly interesting, e.g. the question of reproach in the "Parade of Heroes" (p. 513f.) or the battle over the end of Bk. 12 (in "Fifty years at Sibyl's heels", p. 636f.). This does not mean, however, that Horsfall would always have a strong opinion against other views. For example, his discussion of the debate about line 460 (*invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*) and its relation to Catullus' lines 66.39f (*invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi, / invita: adiuro teque tuumque caput*), as well as the plethora of questions raised by that particular line, are fascinating. The wording is very similar but the context is quite different. Pondering whether we should also take some other parallels into consideration, Horsfall admits that he is unable to offer any definite answer (p. 345). Or perhaps we should say that Virgil's line is an unconscious echo of Catullus' verses rather than a conscious allusion.

Horsfall's Commentary occasionally drops an ironic aside, such as that on line 262: "It matters little that no such cave exists upon the map, for at this point V.'s map is drawn by Lucr. /.../ not the Istituto Geografico Militare" (p. 229). He has also peppered his Commentary with some occasional pieces of information which do not add to our knowledge or understanding of

Virgil's text but which may still be of interest to devoted Virgilians. We learn e.g. that Rudolf Nureyev had a property in Southern Italy (p. 274).

In *The Powers of Philology* H. U. Gumbrecht writes: "Commentary [in contrast to the normally finite character of interpretation] appears to be a discourse that, almost by definition, never reaches its end" (p. 42). Although Virgil's commentaries have a long history, even they do not have and will not have an end. But Nicholas Horsfall's commentaries will have a permanent place in Virgilian scholarship. And when Gumbrecht says about commentaries that they are "treasure houses of knowledge", this is particularly true of Horsfall's commentaries.

H. K. Riikonen

DONATELLA PULIGA – SVETLANA HAUTALA: *La Guerra grammaticale di Andrea Guarna (1511). Un'antica novità per la didattica del latino*. Edizioni ETS, Pisa 2011. ISBN 978-88-4673061-9. 190 pp., 16 tavv. EUR 20.

Le autrici hanno fornito il volume di un sottotitolo opportuno. Il *Bellum grammaticale* di Andrea Guarna, patrizio cremonese del primo Cinquecento, può davvero essere considerato una novità sia nel contesto storico in cui apparve che ai nostri giorni. Anche oggi presenta un approccio essenzialmente innovativo alla lingua latina e all'apprendimento della stessa.

In breve, il *Bellum grammaticale* è un manuale di grammatica normativa travestito da descrizione di battaglia. Tutte le componenti della lingua, tutte le parti del discorso, le classi verbali, i generi, come anche le eccezioni, così importanti nella tradizione scolastica, sono presentate come esito delle varie battaglie nella guerra tra i re Verbo e Nome che si contendono il primo posto nella composizione del discorso. Non è, però, solamente la metafora bellica a creare la dinamica del componimento: l'intera trama si basa sull'analogia umoristica tra il mondo reale e quello fittizio. Ecco alcuni esempi della protratta metafora bellica: dotata di fertili campi dottrinali, coltivati da uomini illustri, la Grammatica è un paese prospero, circondato dall'ostile regno dell'Ignoranza e dai feroci Barbarismi. I regni più evoluti della Dialettica, della Filosofia e della Teologia si possono raggiungere solo attraversando gli stretti di Grammatica, il che si fa sotto la guida dei grammatici. Infine, l'attività produttiva principale di Grammatica è l'organizzazione del discorso, e da essa si realizzano anche tutti i proventi di entrambi i re.

Scoppia una devastante battaglia tra le personificazioni grammaticali nelle vicinanze del fiume *Sive*, nella località detta *Copula*. Lo scontro è terribile, anche se il Participio, bugiardo opportunista, che nutre interessi con tutti e due gli opposti schieramenti, rimane neutrale e non assiste alla battaglia, bensì decide di aspettare che i due re siano talmente affaticati da permettergli di impadronirsi dell'intero paese. Molte sono le vicende della battaglia. Messi in rotta, i verbi *Eo*, *Queo* e *Veneo* perdono i loro futuri in *-am* e così, *ne futurorum omnino abicerent spem*, si devono accontentare di altri futuri in *-bo* che comprano al mercato di Recanati, mentre Orazio (o Properzio) generosamente li cede gratis a *Lenio* (cfr. *lenibo*). Allo stesso modo, i verbi attivi *Audeo*, *Fido*, *Gaudeo*, *Soleo* e *Fio*, che avevano perso i loro perfetti, ottengono dal re Verbo i perfetti di alcuni passivi caduti in guerra. Alcuni nomi riescono a ricevere, come bottino, un altro nominativo: ad esempio, *Arbor* ottiene *Arbos* e *Pulver* *Pulvis*. Non indossano, però, i due vestiti tutti i giorni, ma riservano le forme più eleganti in *-s* per le festività. Terro-